## **EXHIBIT A**

## FLTFA LAND DISPOSAL NOMINATION PACKAGE REQUIREMENTS

Packages may be submitted in hard copy and/or electronic copy.

If submitted electronically, data must be on 3.5" disks or CDs. Maps, photographs, and other documents which were not originally created or obtained electronically should be scanned. Text must be provided in MSWord '97 or higher. Maps and photographs must be provided in .jpg format.

## Nomination packages for a 5870 land disposal project MUST include the following information and documents:

rationale for the configuration of the parcels, including the effect on expected FMV. If not all of the property is covered under the FLTFA, specify the portion of the FMV to which FLTFA is, or is not, applicable. □ Costs and proposed schedule for completing sale processing actions. Identify total costs, specifying the costs for which 5870 funds are being requested, as well as other funding sources (MLR by subactivity(ies), contributed funds (7122), etc.) proposed or committed by the field office for processing. If not all of the property is covered under the FLTFA, specify the portion of the costs which is applicable to the FLTFA. Also, identify whether the task would be completed in-house or by contract. At a minimum, the following tasks must be addressed: appraisal, cadastral survey, environmental site assessments, mineral report, cultural resource clearance, T&E clearance (plant and animal), NEPA compliance, notice to grazing permittee(s)/waivers, NORA publication and other public information/marketing, and auction costs. Identify tasks that have been completed or are not necessary, as applicable. If the project includes multiple sale parcels, identify if the costs are equally attributable to each parcel □ Known or anticipated processing actions, including costs, above "standard" clearances (e.g., validity examinations because of mining claims, cultural resource treatment plans and treatments, Section 7 consultation, etc.). If the project includes multiple sale parcels, identify whether all parcels are affected. □ Known or anticipated conflicts or issues. □ Reason for nomination of parcel; identify entity(ies) interested in having parcel offered for sale and rationale (e.g., community expansion, trespass resolution, etc.); identify known imminent willing buyer(s) and/or other rationale explaining the expected likelihood of sale at the estimated FMV. If the project includes multiple sale parcels, identify the likelihood of sale for each parcel. □ Proposed method of sale (competitive, modified competitive, or direct); for methods other than competitive, provide justification in accordance with W.O. I.M. 2002-143. □ Known or anticipated support or opposition by State/Local Government, interest groups, general public, adjacent or nearby landowners, permittees, etc. Identify the likelihood of protests/IBLA appeals/litigation. □ Identify any adverse consequences of delay of schedule (e.g., proposed use of past appraisal that would expire as of a certain date and delay would require new or updated appraisal). □ Identify if the project is a planned accomplishment/performance measure in the annual work plan. □ Identify how the project would meet Nevada Legacy Plan goals and objectives. □ Identify if realty actions would be done by field office personnel or if it is proposed to utilize the Statewide FLTFA realty positions for all or a portion of the case processing. If Statewide positions are proposed, identify the anticipated number of workmonths needed to complete the project.

FMV for each sale parcel. If a parcel is to be divided into multiple sale parcels, identify the

## POTENTIAL EVALUATION CRITERIA FOR SALE NOMINATION PACKAGES

☐ High FMV parcels and high likelihood that estimated FMV is reasonable.
☐ High likelihood of sale occurring, at least at expected FMV.
Expected high ratio of revenue to FLTFA processing costs (e.g., processing costs would be less than 20% of FMV and/or there are other committed funding sources that would eliminate/reduce FLTFA funding need); could also include projects in which various processing tasks were completed through other means (i.e., lands considered in an exchange but dropped because of equalization).
☐ High profile sale (Congressional/State/Local Government/County Citizen Advisory Board support).
□ Low chance of protests/appeals/litigation.
□ Low chance of resource issues that would stop or add lengthy delays to sale processing or would cause significant processing costs.
□ Comparison of Legacy Plan goals with costs (e.g., SMT willing to do "deficit" sale because of P.R. or other factors).
☐ Comparison of disposal actions and Federal land acquisitions, by county.
☐ Identified in annual work plan as a planned accomplishment/performance measure.