

Worksheet
Determination of NEPA Adequacy (DNA)
U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management

Project Lead: Perry Wickham
Field Office: Sierra Front Field Office
Lead Office: Sierra Front Field Office
Case File/Project Number: NVN 092125
NEPA NUMBER: DOI-BLM-NV-C020-2013-0027-DNA
Project Name: Sugarloaf Public Safety Communication Site
Applicant Name: City of Carson City
Project Location: Sugarloaf Mountain, Carson City

T. 16 N., R. 20 E., sec. 32, NW¼NW¼; Carson City County

A. Description of the Proposed Action and any applicable mitigation measures:

The City of Carson City proposes to construct a new PMRS radio site directly west of the American Tower Communication Lease (NVN 058991) located on Sugarloaf Mountain. The new communication site foot print would be approximately 70' wide by 100' long and contain an 80' tall tower, 10'x 20'x 10' communication building, emergency generator, propane tank and all enclosed within an 8' cyclone fence. Installation of underground electric service and fiber optic conduit to the AT&T Fiber vault and NV Energy electric vault at the northeast corner of said American Tower site. Installation will occur as soon as an authorization is made (summer 2013).

Is the project located within preliminary general habitat for sage-grouse? Yes No

Is the project located within preliminary priority habitat for sage-grouse? Yes No

B. Land Use Plan (LUP) Conformance

List any applicable LUPs and their dates.

The proposed action is in conformance with the applicable LUP because it is specifically provided for in the following LUP decisions:

Consolidated Resource Management Plan (May 2001): LND-7, #6: "Exchanges and minor non-Bureau initiated realty proposals will be considered where analysis indicates they are beneficial to the public."

C. Identify applicable National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) documents and other related documents that cover the proposed action.

Environmental Analysis Record NV-030-95017 for NVN 058991; accepted by the District Manager (acting) on 3/28/1995.

D. NEPA Adequacy Criteria

1. Is the new proposed action a feature of, or essentially similar to, an alternative analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)? Is the project within the same analysis area, or if the project location is different, are the geographic and resource conditions sufficiently similar to those analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)? If there are differences, can you explain why they are not substantial?

Yes, the proposed action is within and a feature of the originally proposed action. The proposed project is directly adjacent to the existing communication site and in a highly disturbed area.

2. Is the range of alternatives analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s) appropriate with respect to the new proposed action, given current environmental concerns, interests, and resource values?

Yes. The resource values were analyzed under the existing NEPA document and the proposed action will be sited in a highly disturbed area that was used as a staging area during the construction of the existing communication facility (NVN 058991).

3. Is the existing analysis valid in light of any new information or circumstances (such as, range- land health standard assessment, recent endangered species listings, updated lists of BLM-sensitive species)? Can you reasonably conclude that new information and new circumstances would not substantially change the analysis of the new proposed action?

The existing analysis remains valid, and it can reasonably be concluded that new circumstances do not influence the negligible impact to siting a new communication site on completely disturbed public land surrounding the existing communication site.

4. Are the direct, indirect, and cumulative effects that would result from implementation of the new proposed action similar (both quantitatively and qualitatively) to those analyzed in the existing NEPA document?

Yes.

5. Are the public involvement and interagency review associated with existing NEPA document(s) adequate for the current proposed action?

Yes, this action is being proposed by and being constructed by local and State government entities.

E. Persons/Agencies/BLM Staff Consulted

<u>Name</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Resource/Agency Represented</u>
Rachel Crews	Archaeologist	BLM
Brian Buttazoni	NEPA Compliance	BLM

Shawn Wiese

Electrical/Signals Tech

Carson City Public Works

Note: Refer to the EA for a complete list of the team members participating in the preparation of the original environmental analysis or planning documents.

Conclusion: Based on the review documented above, I conclude that this proposal conforms to the applicable land use plan and that the NEPA documentation fully covers the proposed action and constitutes BLM's compliance with the requirements of the NEPA.



Signature of Project Lead



Signature of NEPA Coordinator



Leon Thomas
Field Manager
Sierra Front Field Office

Date 8-4-13

Note: The signed Conclusion on this Worksheet is part of an interim step in the BLM's internal decision process and does not constitute an appealable decision. However, the lease, permit, or other authorization based on this DNA is subject to protest or appeal under 43 CFR Part 4 and the program-specific regulations.