

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

OFFICE: Tucson Field Office

NEPA/TRACKING NUMBER: DOI-BLM-AZ-G020-2014-0012-DNA

CASEFILE/PROJECT NUMBER: 6090

PROPOSED ACTION TITLE/TYPE: Cinco Well pipeline installation, storage tanks, and drinkers project.

LOCATION/LLEGAL DESCRIPTION: Empire grazing allotment, Las Cienegas National Conservation Area (LCNCA)

APPLICANT (if any): Grazing lessee, Ian Tomlinson

A. Description of the Proposed Action and any applicable mitigation measures that are part of the Proposed Action.

The grazing lessee proposes to add drinkers, storage tanks, and a pipeline at an existing well site on LCNCA where the Chiricahua Leopard Frog has been re-introduced into an existing dirt tank.

At Cinco Well the Proposed Action would be to run a pipeline from the well to the existing storage tank and to place a secondary pump in the existing storage tank to pump water about 1 ½ miles east to the top of a ridge. 1 ½ miles of new pipeline would be installed and buried to pump water from the existing storage tank at Cinco Well up to the ridge. On the top of the ridge, one 5,000 gallon storage tank and four 800 gallon drinkers would be placed. The pipeline is black poly material and will be buried 18 to 24 inches to prevent freezing in the winter months.

- Equipment to be installed:
 1. Drinkers;
 2. Storage tanks;
 3. Pipeline.

Project Steps:

- A) At Cinco Well (end of pipeline), place (1) 5,000 gallon storage tank and (4) 800 gallon sized drinkers.
- B) Install approximately 1 and ½ half miles of buried pipeline.
- C) Refer to attached map:

Area 1- Two to four drinkers will be installed at location of Old Cinco Windmill area;

Area 2-Buried pipeline installation;

Area 3-Located at the end of the pipeline survey in area of flat ridge dip saddle (4) drinkers and (1) 5,000 gallon storage tanks will be installed.

The proponent and the BLM (combined use for livestock water and T&E pond) will not pump more than 8.065 Acre Feet per Year (AFY) from the Cinco Well (55-634304) per the Arizona Department of Water Resources (ADWR) tested capacity of this well at 5 gallons per minute (gpm).

B. Land Use Plan Conformance

Land Use Plan (LUP) Name: *Las Cienegas Resource Management Plan and Record of Decision*

Date Approved/Amended: 7/25/2003

The proposed action is in conformance with the applicable LUP because it is specifically provided for in the following LUP decision(s):

The proposed action is in conformance with the Las Cienegas RMP/EIS and implements decisions WF05, WF18, AA08, GM20.

Review of the RMP has determined that the project, as proposed, would not preclude attainment of any other resource goals, objectives or desired resource conditions, or otherwise interfere with carrying out other resource decisions contained in the plan. This proposed action has been reviewed to determine if it conforms to the land use plan terms and conditions as required by 43 CFR 1610.5, BLM MS 1617.3.

The proposed action is in conformance with the LUP, even though it is not specifically provided for, because it is clearly consistent with the following LUP decision(s) (objectives, terms, and conditions):

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

This paragraph is from an excerpt from the above listed EA (p.11) with details of the proposed action:

Solar Water Systems and Drinkers: Water will generally be provided from nearby wells equipped with a solar pump and panels. These systems require a panel stand with frame and wiring from the panels to the well. Poles for solar panels would be up to 15 feet tall, and have a dull finish to minimize visual impacts. Pipeline with a 1/12 inch diameter will feed water to storage tanks and drinkers (troughs). The pipe would be buried approximately one foot deep using hand tools (short run). For long lines (>50ft) heavy equipment (e.g., backhoe or bull dozer with trenching attachment) would be used to dig the trench, lay pipeline and bury it. One to four drinkers would be placed at each site. The drinkers would number from two to as many as eight. They would have a capacity of 800 gallons and would be buried six to fourteen inches deep. Water storage units would be located near drinkers. These units would have a capacity of 2,500 to 5000 gallons and are constructed of high strength plastic. Existing open water storage tanks would have wildlife ramps installed to prevent drowning. Storage tanks and troughs would have color tones selected that mimic that of adjacent environments such as trees, grass during the season of highest recreation use, in this case fall through spring (non-growing season color of yellow). Non-reflective paint or an acid treatment wash to metal that produce a rusty non-reflective appearance on metal pipe rails or other metal structures would be used to reduce visual impacts. In addition, solar systems will be placed on the south side of trees in order to further reduce their visibility.

D. NEPA Adequacy Criteria

- 1. Is the 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 Environmental Assessment (EA) # DOI-BLM-AZ-G020-2011-0028, analyzed the placement of drinking troughs, drinkers and pipelines as part of the proposed action.

- 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 alternatives considered in EA# DOI-BLM-AZ-G020-2011-0028 were appropriate for the current proposed action.

- 3. Is the existing analysis valid in light of new information or circumstances (such as, rangeland health standard assessment, recent endangered species listings, and 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 is valid for the current proposed action, and new information on resource values and current circumstances would not substantially change the analysis of the current proposed action.

- 4. Are there 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, all impacts of the current proposed action are similar to those identified in EA# DOI-BLM-AZ-G020-2011-0028. The proposed action will occur on an existing road which was previously analyzed.

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

Yes, public involvement in EA# DOI-BLM-AZ-G020-2011-0028 included sending the grazing interested publics a copy of the EA and asking for comments. A 30-day comment period was given. Also, a grazing Proposed Decision was sent to the grazing interested publics for the proposed projects included in the EA. A 30- day protest period is included with the Proposed Decision. No protests were received.

E. Persons/Agencies/BLM Staff Consulted

<u>Name</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Resource/Agency Represented</u>
Kristen Duarte	Rangeland Management Specialist	Tucson Field Office
Jeff Simms	Fisheries Biologist	Tucson Field Office
Amy Sobiech	Archaeologist	Tucson Field Office
Ben Lomeli	Hydrologist	Tucson Field Office
Catie Fenn	Outdoor Recreation Planner	Tucson Field Office
Karen Simms	Assistant Field Manager	Tucson Field Office
Amy Markstein	NEPA Coordinator	Tucson Field Office

Note: Refer to the EA/EIS 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 constitute BLM's compliance with the requirements of NEPA.

	05/30/2014
<u>/s/ Darrell Tersey</u> Project Lead, Title	Date
	05/30/2014
<u>/s/ Amy Markstein</u> Planning & Environmental Coordinator	Date
	06/05/2014
<u>/s/ Viola E. Hillman, Tucson Field Office Manager</u> Authorized Signing Official, Title	Date

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.