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

OFFICE: Kingman Field Office (KFO)

NEPA DOCUMENT NUMBER: DOI-BLM-AZ-C010-2009-035-DNA
CASE FILE NUMBER:

PROPOSED ACTION TITLE/TYPE: Cook Canyon WH&B Stock Tank

LOCATION/LEGAL DESCRIPTION: NE ¼ of NW ¼ of Sec 6., Twn 20N., R17 W.

APPLICANT (if any): BLM

A. Description of the Proposed Action and any applicable mitigation measures: Place a 3000 gallon metal storage tank off of existing pad at the burro corrals. From the new tank run approximately 300 feet of 1 ¼ " flexible black plastic pipe to a circular trough outside of the existing corral fence. Tank would be filled using the existing well. The trough would provide water for livestock on the Cook Canyon Allotment. Storage tank would be painted to blend with the landscape. Trough would be set with the top being no more than 20 inches from the ground to ensure wildlife have access to water.

B. Land Use Plan (LUP) Conformance

LUP Name: *Kingman Resource Management Plan/EIS*
Approved 1995

The proposed action is in conformance with the applicable LUP because it is specifically provided for in the following LUP decisions:

GM-21/V Stock waters will be developed to allow safe access by wildlife at all times. Ladders or ramps will allow safe use by small animals and birds. In important wildlife areas, separate wildlife waters will be developed adjacent to livestock waters. They will be constructed at ground level, and a minimum of one acre fenced around each facility to exclude livestock (Program Document page 7).

GM-19/V Range improvements will be constructed in line with the specific management requirements identified for each allotment. The BLM may construct some range improvements on private and state-owned lands when benefits to resources are essential to the success of grazing systems, when benefits to resources on public lands will result, and when necessary easements and cooperative agreements can be obtained. Construction will start immediately and continue to completion as

Cook Canyon Burro Corrals Water Trough DOI-BLM-AZ-C010-2009-035-DNA

funds become available (Program Document page 2).

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

Kingman Regional Wild Horse and Burro Facility EA No. AZ-030-2001-0006. (Burro Corrals EA) Approved 2005.

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?

Documentation of answer and explanation: Yes, (EA at 3 and 6) the Burro Corrals EA proposed and analyzed the impacts of installing a water tank and trough. The proposed trough and tank are adjacent to those described in the existing EA. The vegetative and wildlife communities are identical to those described in the Burro Corrals 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 values?

Documentation of answer and explanation: Yes. (EA at 3 and 6) The EA analyzed a proposed and a no action alternative which is sufficient for this proposed action.

3. Is the existing analysis valid in light of any new information or circumstances (such as, rangeland health standard assessment, 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?

Documentation of answer and explanation: Yes. (EA at 8) There are no new circumstances or information provided that would change the analysis of the existing EA. No species have been federally listed in this project area since the analysis of the Burro Corrals EA was performed.

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?

Documentation of answer and explanation: Yes. (EA at 8) The Burro Corrals EA analyzed impacts from a much larger disturbance than what is proposed here.

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

Documentation of answer and explanation: Yes. (EA at 12) The Burro Corrals EA underwent internal and external scoping including public meetings and an open house. No concerns were brought forward about impacts of installing troughs or water tanks. However, this proposed action was discussed in a bi-monthly NEPA coordination meeting on May 4, 2010 that is open to the public and other agencies. No concerns regarding impacts from the proposed action were brought forward. This proposed action was also discussed with Bob Morton the permittee of the Cook Canyon Allotment on April 22, 2010.

E. Persons/Agencies/BLM Staff Consulted

<u>Name</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Resource/Agency Represented</u>
-------------	--------------	------------------------------------

A. List of Preparers

Ammon Wilhelm	Wildlife Biologist, Kingman Field Office	
David Brock	Rangeland Management Specialist, Kingman Field Office	

B. Persons or Groups Consulted

Don McClure	Assistant Field Manager, Kingman Field Office	
Jesse Schreiner	Force account, Kingman Field Office	
Ammon Wilhelm	Wildlife Biologist, Kingman Field Office	
David Brock	Rangeland Management Specialist, Kingman Field Office	
Britt Bowen	Engineer, Colorado River District	
Bob Morton	Permittee for Cook Canyon Grazing allotment	

This project has been discussed at BLM Project Coordination meeting on May 4, 2010 (minutes are on file at BLM). On May 12, 2010 a site evaluation was attended by all of the persons above for design specifications and inspection. A site was chosen and approved by the permittee for construction.

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 requirements of the NEPA.

Signature of Project Lead

David Brock

Date

Signature of NEPA Coordinator

David Brock

Date

Signature of Supervisor
Don McClure

Date

Signature of the Responsible Official
Ruben Sanchez
Field Manager
Kingman Field Office

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 and appeal under 43 CFR Part 4 and the program-specific regulations.

DECISION RECORD

NEPA Document Number: DOI-BLM-AZ-C010-2010-035-DNA

Description of the Proposed Action:

LUP Name: *Kingman Resource Management Plan/EIS* Approved: March 1995

Based on the analysis of potential environmental impacts contained in the attached Determination of NEPA Adequacy and as analyzed in the previous environmental assessment (EA-AZ- C010-2010-035-DNA) (or documents), I have determined that the action will not have a significant effect on the human environment. An environmental impact statement is therefore not required.

It is my decision to approve the action as proposed, with the following stipulations (if applicable).

Signature of the Responsible Official

Ruben Sanchez
Field Manager
Kingman Field Office

Date

Exhibits:

- 1) Stipulations: