

**Determination of NEPA Adequacy
(DNA)
Eldridge ROW for Residential Access**

DOI-BLM-NV-E020-2015-0010-DNA

**Prepared by
U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management
Tuscarora Field Office
Elko, Nevada**

April 2015

This page intentionally
left blank

Table of Contents

1. Determination of NEPA Adequacy (DNA) 1

This page intentionally
left blank

List of Tables

Table 1.1. List of Preparers 3

This page intentionally
left blank

Chapter 1. Determination of NEPA Adequacy (DNA)

Eldridge ROW for Residential Access

This page intentionally
left blank

U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management

OFFICE:LLNVE02000, Tuscarora Field Office

TRACKING NUMBER:DOI-BLM-NV-E020-2015-0010-DNA

CASEFILE/PROJECT NUMBER:NVN093300

PROPOSED ACTION TITLE/TYPE: Eldridge Right Of Way for Residential Access (2800)

LOCATION/LEGAL DESCRIPTION:Elko County, Nevada, MDM, T.34 N., R.55 E., sec. 8, NW¹/₄NW¹/₄

APPLICANT (if any):Mark and Veronica Eldridge

A. Description of Proposed Action and any applicable mitigation measures

Mark and Veronica Eldridge have submitted an application for an access road right-of-way (ROW) across public land located in Elko County, Nevada, at MDM, T.34 N., R.55 E., sec. 8, NW¹/₄NW¹/₄. The ROW is needed to gain access to their private property located in an adjacent section at MDM, T.34 N., R.55 E., sec. 7, NE¹/₄ (see attached map). They will be subdividing the property into approximately 5 parcels. The road would provide all-season access to residents. The proposed project would be 627.78 feet in length and 60 feet in width, encompassing 0.86 acres, more or less. The area would be cleared, graded and graveled and would have ditches for drainage.

B. Land Use Plan Conformance

LUP Name*	<u>Elko Resource Area Resource Management Plan</u>	Date Approved:	<u>1986</u>
Other Document	<u>Elko Resource Area Resource Management Plan</u>	Date Approved:	<u>1987</u>
	<u>Record of Decision</u>		

**List applicable LUPs (for example, resource management plans; activity, project, management, or program plans; or applicable amendments thereto*

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 decisions (objectives, terms, and conditions):

The Elko Resource Management Plan, as approved March 11, 1987, is silent on the Proposed Action. However, it is consistent with the objectives for the management of lands, right-of-way corridors, access, recreation, livestock management, wildlife, and minerals as prescribed and identified in the Record of Decision of the Resource Management Plan (BLM 1987, p.1-4).

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

List by name and date all applicable NEPA documents that cover the proposed action.

*Chapter 1 Determination of NEPA Adequacy (DNA)
A. Description of Proposed Action and any
applicable mitigation measures*

Environmental Assessment DOI-BLM-NVE020-2010-0009-EA — Adobe Heights Right-of-Way for Residential Access, June 2012

List by name and date other documentation relevant to the proposed action (e.g. biological assessment, biological opinion, watershed assessment, allotment evaluation, and monitoring report).

Class III Archeological survey completed February 2015 — Negative report

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 and substantially similar to the action selected in the existing NEPA document listed above. The proposed project area has the same resources conditions as those analyzed in the Adobe Heights EA. The proposed project and the Adobe Heights ROW are located a couple miles from each other. The general setting of the proposed project are similar to those of the Adobe Heights ROW described in Section 3.1 of the EA. Both projects are located Northwest of Elko, NV in an area where topography varies from gentle slopes to relatively level areas and primary use of private land adjacent to the project area is large lot residential subdivisions. Due to the close proximity of the new proposed project and the Adobe Heights ROW the resources affected and the effect to the resources are similar to those described in Chapter 3 of the EA.

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 value?

Yes, the range of alternatives analyzed is appropriate with respect to the new proposed action. Because there are no potential impacts related to the proposed action that would require resolution through further analysis of alternatives, the range of alternatives addressed in the Adobe Heights EA is adequate. Current environmental concerns, interests, and resource value have remained the same.

3. Is the existing analysis valid in light of any new information or circumstances (such as, rangeland health standard assessments, 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, existing analysis is valid because resource conditions for the project area are similar to those addressed in the Adobe Heights EA and have not changed substantially since publication in 2012. There has been a U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) review regarding the status of the Greater sage grouse and a BLM policy change regarding management of sage grouse. The project area is not within sage grouse habitat therefore the proposed project would not adversely affect Greater sage grouse.

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 new proposed action are similar to those analyzed in Section 3.3 of the Adobe Heights EA. There was found to be minimal to no substantive direct, indirect and cumulative effects to the affected resources. However there would be a permanent negative effect to wildlife habitat due to the removal of vegetation for construction of the road and there would be an indirect affect to wildlife species that would avoid disturbances associated with construction and post-construction activities. The proposed project area is immediately outside the city limits with substantial residential development in the surrounding private parcels of land. Based on this and the small footprint of the proposed action, approximately 0.86 acres of new disturbance, any increment in direct, indirect, or cumulative impacts to lands, and resources would be negligible.

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

Per the Adobe Heights EA Decision Record signed on August 9, 2012, a press release informing the public of the availability of the EA was distributed to local media resources and posted on the Elko District Office website on June 13, 2012. The EA was posted for a 30 days for public review in accordance BLM Elko District Office policy. In addition the BLM sent a notification letter on June 13, 2012, to 74 potentially affected parties including the owners of adjacent properties as well as owners of lots in the Adobe Hills Subdivision. Other notice recipients include holders of BLM ROW grants, mineral leases, grazing permits, and other parties who have requested the BLM to provide them with notice of pending action on public lands. In addition, the Tuscarora Field Manager consulted with the Elko Temoke Tribe regarding the Eldridge ROW via phone and they did not have any immediate concerns but requested that a copy of the signed DNA be mailed to the Tribe.

E. Persons/Agencies/BLM Staff Consulted

Table 1.1. List of Preparers

Name	Role	Discipline
Lucinda Langston	Cultural Resources/Native American Concerns	Archaeologist
Ken Wilkenson	Migratory Birds/Threatned/Endangered Species/Wildlife	Wildlife Biologist
Samantha Cisney	Non-Native Invasive and Noxious Species	Weed Management Specialist
Lea Garcia	Livestock Grazing/Rangelands	Natural Resource Specialist

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 constitutes BLM's compliance with the requirement of NEPA.

/s/ Elisabeth Puentes 4/30/2015

Signature of Project Lead

/s/ Terri Dobis 4/30/2015

Signature of NEPA Coordinator

/s/ Richard E. Adams 4/30/2015

Signature of the Responsible Official

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 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.