

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

---

**Determination of NEPA Adequacy (DNA)**

**Leeville-Carlin Mines Freshwater Pipeline  
DOI-BLM-NV-E020-2015-0046-DNA**

**PREPARING OFFICE**

U.S. Department of the Interior  
Bureau of Land Management  
Tuscarora FO  
3900 E Idaho Street  
Elko, NV 89801  
775-753-0200





# **Determination of NEPA Adequacy (DNA)**

**Leeville-Carlin Mines Freshwater Pipeline  
DOI-BLM-NV-E020-2015-0046-DNA**

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

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)**

*Leeville-Carlin Mines Freshwater Pipeline Worksheet*

This page intentionally  
left blank

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

---

OFFICE: Tuscarora FO, LLNVE02000

TRACKING NUMBER: DOI-BLM-NV-E020-2015-0046-DNA

CASEFILE/PROJECT NUMBER: NVN-70574

PROPOSED ACTION TITLE/TYPE:Leeville-Carlin Mines Freshwater Pipeline

LOCATION/LEGAL DESCRIPTION: MDB&M, T35N, R50E, sections 10 and 11. Between the Leeville Underground Mine and the Carlin open pit Mine in the Carlin Trend.

APPLICANT (if any): Newmont Mining Corporation

## **A. Description of Proposed Action and any applicable mitigation measures**

Newmont is proposing to construct a buried pipeline from the Leeville Water Treatment Plant to the existing buried pipeline that runs along the Mill 1 tailing facility. The pipeline would supply freshwater to the Pete Bajo Project, underground mine at Carlin Mine-Pete Project. The new pipeline would be approximately 4,000 feet long and 8 inches in diameter; buried minimum of 4 feet deep. The Project would create approximately 0.92 acres of disturbance. The disturbance would be temporary lasting until the pipeline is installed and would then be seeded in the fall. The pipeline would run parallel to Barrick's access road, but Newmont would stay out of Barrick's right-of-way for the access road. The pipeline would take approximately 6 weeks to construct. Newmont would like to begin construction ASAP. See attached copy of the map. Most of the area the pipeline would be placed into is already permitted for a waste rock dump under the Genesis Plan of Operations.

## **B. Land Use Plan Conformance**

LUP Name\* NV - Elko RMP Date Approved: 1987

*\*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 applicable LUP because it is specifically provided for in the following LUP decisions:**Elko RMP ROD, Minerals Management, prescription — 1, page 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 decisions (objectives, terms, and conditions):**NA

## **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*

- March 2002 Draft Environmental Impact Statement Leeville Project
- July 2002 Final Environmental Impact Statement Leeville Project
- November 1996 carlin Exploration Project Environmental Assessment (BLM/EK/PL-96/017)
- October 1992 High Desert Environmental Assessment (EA-NV-010–92–080)
- February 2010 Genesis Project Draft Environmental Impact Statement
- March 2011 Genesis Final Environmental Impact Statement

**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).NA**

## **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?**

The proposed action is similar to a feature analyzed in the Leeville EIS, a buried pipeline. However, the proposed action is a smaller diameter pipeline than was analyzed in the EIS. The project area for the proposed pipeline was analyzed in all of the NEPA documents listed above. In the exploration EA's the area was analyzed for exploration activities, which included roads and trenches. The proposed pipeline would be buried approximately 4 feet deep. The resource conditions are very similar to those analyzed in the existing NEPA documents. The difference is in the title designated for sage grouse habitat. Sage grouse habitat was analyzed in all of the NEPA documents listed above. The proposed action is not located near any sage grouse leks. The pipeline would be constructed adjacent to Barrick's Access road which is a main travel route.

**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 alternative analyzed in the existing NEPA documents is appropriate with respect to the new proposed action. The resource values are the same or similar to what is stated in the analysis, with the exception of the title that is now used to designate sage grouse habitat. The pipeline is located in the middle of the mining area and along a major travel route. A portion of the area for the proposed pipeline is already approved for a waste rock disposal facility. The area has been surveyed for cultural resources, the survey reports are stated in the NEPA analyses along with the findings. Native American consultation was conducted at the time of the NEPA documents were completed.

**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, the new designation of the sage grouse habitat would not substantially change the analysis because of the location. The proposed pipeline is surrounded by existing mining activity and will be located adjacent to a main travel route that receives a lot of mine traffic.

**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 from the proposed action would be the same as described in the NEPA documents listed above. The disturbance acreages analyzed in the exploration EA's is more disturbance than what currently exists on the ground. The disturbance would be temporary lasting until the installation of the pipeline has been completed and reclaimed. Seeding the disturbance would occur in the fall.

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

All of the NEPA documents listed above went through public scoping and review. Therefore, public and interagency review associated with NEPA is adequate for the proposed action.

## **E. Persons/Agencies/BLM Staff Consulted**

**Table 1.1. List of Preparers**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Title</b>	<b>Initials</b>
Nycole Burton	Wildlife Biologist	NB
Ryan Brown	Archaeologist	RB
John Daniel	Hydrologist	JD

**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/Janice Stadelman 8/17/2015

---

Signature of Project Lead

/S/Terri Dobis 8/26/2015

---

Signature of NEPA Coordinator

/S/Richard E. Adams

8/27/2015

---

Signature of Authorize Officer

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.