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

OFFICE: ***Agua Fria National Monument (AFNM)***

NEPA/TRACKING NUMBER: DOI-BLM-AZ-P030-2014-0006-DNA

CASEFILE/PROJECT NUMBER: *LFHFCK2100000*

PROPOSED ACTION TITLE/TYPE: Agua Fria Grassland Fuels Reduction DNA

LOCATION/LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Township 11N, Range 3E, Portions of Sec. 11, 12, 13, 14, 24, 25, Gila and Salt River Meridian (See Map 1)

APPLICANT (if any): *N/A*

A. Description of the Proposed Action and any applicable mitigation measures:
The proposed action is to conduct juniper thinning and prescribed fire to an additional 946 acres (See Map 1) in the Agua Fria Grassland Fuels Reduction Project (EA No. AZ-020-2004-005). The treatments would include thinning of juniper by mechanical means, piling and burning, or lopping and scattering, the resulting slash in preparation for management-ignited broadcast burning.

B. Land Use Plan Conformance
Land Use Plan (LUP) Name: Agua Fria National Monument Record of Decision & Approved Resource Management Plan
Date Approved/Amended: **4/22/2010**

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

FM-8. Use suitable tools for reducing hazardous fuels, including prescribed burning, wildland fire use, and mechanical methods. Methods can include the following:

- Chainsaws
- Motorized equipment for crushing brush
- Tractor and hand piling,
- Thinning and pruning, and

Treatments selected on site-specific case that are ecologically suitable and cost effective.

☐ 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.

Finding of No Significant Impact and Environmental Assessment for: Agua Fria Grasslands Fuels Reduction Project- April 13, 2005 (AZ-020-2004-005).

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 exiting NEPA document(s)? If there are differences, can you explain why they are not substantial?**

   Yes. The proposed action involves use of the same techniques and no restricted lands specifically excluded in the Finding of No Significant Impact and Environmental Assessment for: Agua Fria Grasslands Fuels Reduction Project- April 13, 2005. The action is within and adjacent to the same analysis area with similar resource conditions.

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 proposed action is consistent with actions previously covered and reviewed in the Finding of No Significant Impact and Environmental Assessment for: Agua Fria Grasslands Fuels Reduction Project- April 13, 2005 and the range of alternatives is still appropriate. The current environmental concerns, interests and resource values have not changed at the site since the time the existing NEPA documents were prepared.

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 still valid since no new threatened, endangered, or BLM sensitive species have been listed within the project area. It can reasonably be concluded that new information and new circumstances would not substantially change the analysis of the new proposed action because the new proposed action is the same as the proposed action analyzed in the original EA.

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 proposal would result only in impacts that have been addressed in the Finding of No Significant Impact and Environmental Assessment for: Agua Fria Grasslands Fuels Reduction Project- April 13, 2005.

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

   Yes. The proposed action is the same as that covered in the Finding of No Significant Impact and Environmental Assessment for: Agua Fria Grasslands Fuels Reduction Project- April 13, 2005. Public involvement and interagency review on the original project involved public meetings with other agencies and general public inquiries.

E. Persons/Agencies/BLM Staff Consulted

Name	Title	Resource/Agency Represented
Josh Tibbetts	Fuels Specialist	Fire/Fuels Management
Paul Sitzmann	Wildlife Biologist	Wildlife
Bryan Lausten	Archaeologist	Cultural Resources
Mary Skordinsky	Outdoor Recreation Planner	Recreation/Visual Resources

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.

Josh Tibbetts-Fuels Specialist

Gloria Tibbetts-Planning and Environmental Coordinator

Rem Hawes-Hassayampa Field Manager

10/6/14
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.