

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 081493

NEPA Number: DOI-BLM-NV-C020-2014-0027-DNA

Project Name: Homestretch Wabuska Underground Utilities

Applicant Name: Brad Jamieson

Project Location (County, Township/Range/Section[s]): MDM, T. 15 N., R. 25 E., sec. 22, W $\frac{1}{2}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$, W $\frac{1}{2}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$, W $\frac{1}{2}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$, within. Lyon County.

A. Describe the Proposed Action and any applicable mitigation measures: The Proposed Action is to assign the existing case (right-of-way [ROW] NVN 081493) from Brad Jamieson to Homestretch Ditch Company, LLC, and to amend the case to add approximately .75 miles (3,960 feet) of underground utility, excluding oil and gas pipeline. The existing case is an access road with underground utilities. It was originally built to service a proposed housing development (Diamond Hot Springs Estates) with waterski lakes. The placement of the road abuts the private/public border between the Homestretch Geothermal site (private) north of the town of Wabuska (northern Mason Valley, east of Highway 95). The new solution is to utilize this amendment to direct the water south to the farmers of Mason Valley. Other buried utilities would also be authorized, to allow for such right-of-way transportation as electrical distribution (the proposed route crosses a power line ROW) within the same proposed disturbance.

The requested ROW amendment is for the same dimension as the original – 50 feet wide. Approximately 16 feet of clearing and grubbing utilizing a grader would be necessary within this corridor for overland travel and burying the 36-inch high-density-polyethylene water pipe and other buried utilities to a depth of approximately three feet with a backhoe. This constitutes a surface disturbance of about 1.45 acres. Approximately 1,000 tons of sand would be used in the trench. The 16-foot wide disturbance for access and burying utilities would be reclaimed to its original condition through ripping and seeding during the construction phase. The use would be year-round. No staging areas on public land are necessary. The existing ROW including the proposed amendment/assignment would be re-issued for a standard term of 30 years.

B. Land Use Plan (LUP) Conformance:

The Proposed Action is in conformance within the applicable LUP because it is specifically provided for in the following LUP sections:

LND-7 states: “non-bureau initiated realty proposals would 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 Assessment (EA-NV-030-06-18) *Falcon Pointe Development Diamond Hot Springs Estates Access Road Rights-of-Way*, Wabuska, Nevada.

D. NEPA Adequacy Criteria

1. Is the new Proposed Action a feature of, or essentially similar to, an alternative analyzed in existing NEPA document(s)? If 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 included the installation of two buried water pipelines.

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 range of alternatives in the original Environmental Assessment (EA) pertain to the Proposed Action to install a buried water pipeline.

3. Is the existing analysis valid in light of new information or circumstances (such as rangeland health standard assessment, recent endangered species listing, updated lists of BLM sensitive species)? Can you reasonably conclude the new information and new circumstances would not substantially change the analysis of the new Proposed Action? Yes, the project area is not within greater sage-grouse preliminary general or priority habitats. A class III cultural resources inventory was completed for the project area.

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(s)? Yes, the effects of the Proposed Action are similar (both quantitatively and qualitatively) to the action analyzed under the original EA which included the transportation of water in a buried pipeline.

5. Are the public involvement and interagency review associated with the existing NEPA document(s) adequate for the new Proposed Action? No. In May 2014 the BLM sent a consultation letter to the Yerington Paiute Tribe, which has concerns about potential burials in the area. To address this concern, a tribal representative would be invited to monitor the project during its construction.

E. Persons/Agencies/BLM Staff Consulted

<u>Name</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Resource/Agency Represented</u>
Rachel Crews	Archeologist	BLM

Note: refer to the NEPA document(s) for a complete list of team members that participated in the preparation of the original environmental analysis or planning document(s).

Conclusion: Based on the review documented above, I have concluded that this Proposed Action conforms to the LUP and that existing NEPA document(s) fully cover the Proposed Action and constitutes BLM's compliance with the requirements of the NEPA.

Does this DNA constitute the decision document for this Proposed Action? Yes No



Signature of Project Lead



Signature of NEPA Coordinator



Leon Thomas
Field Manager
Sierra Front Field Office