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 039762/NVN 092001
NEPA NUMBER: DOI-BLM-NV-C020-2013-0028-DNA
Project Name: Carson Highlands Wastewater Treatment Plant
Applicant Name: Lyon County
Project Location: Moundhouse, Nevada

Township 16 North, Range 21 East, Section 31; Lyon County

A. Description of the Proposed Action and any applicable mitigation measures: The proposed action is an administrative action that will relinquish an existing Right-of-Way Grant, (NVN 039762), and re-issue it as a Recreation and Public Purpose Act (R&PP) lease. No physical change and or construction are proposed as a result of this action.

Is the project located within preliminary general habitat for sage-grouse? ☐Yes X No
Is the project located within preliminary priority habitat for sage-grouse? ☐Yes X 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-030-4-94 for NVN 039762; accepted by the District Manager on 9/19/1984 and Environmental Analysis Record #NV-030-97041 for amendment to NVN 039762; accepted by the District Manager on 9/4/1997.

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 a feature of the originally analyzed proposed action. The new proposed action is merely an administrative process that will convert an existing Right-of-Way Grant (NVN 039762) to an R&PP Lease (NVN 092001) under the Recreation and Public Purposes Act (68 Statute 173; 43 United States Code 869 et. seq.).

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. No new development or change of use will occur as a result of this action.

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?

Yes, the existing analysis remains valid and the proposed action will not change the analysis.

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. The direct, indirect and cumulative effects of the original project will remain unchanged.

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

Yes. The proposed action is only an administrative process to convert an existing Right-of-Way Grant to an R&PP Lease.

E. Persons/Agencies/BLM Staff Consulted

Name	Title	Resource/Agency Represented
Rachel Crews	Archaeologist	BLM
Brian Buttazoni	NEPA Compliance	BLM
Mike Workman	Director	Lyon County 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 8-14-13

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.