

Worksheet
Documentation of Land Use Plan Conformance and NEPA Adequacy (DNA)

U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management (BLM)
NEPA #: DOI-BLM-AZ-C010-2012-0011-DNA

A. BLM Office: Kingman Field Office **Lease/Serial/Case File No.** AZA 32315

Project Title/Type: Wind Testing Renewal

Location of Proposed Action:

See Attachment A

Description of the Proposed Action:

MET Tower, Acreage Reservation, and associated access

Applicant (if any): British Petroleum Wind Energy North America (BPWE)

B. Conformance with the Land Use Plan (LUP) and Consistency with Related Subordinate Implementation Plans

LUP Name*	Kingman Resource Management Plan_____	Date Approved	March 1995
LUP Name*	_____	Date Approved	_____
Other document**	_____	Date Approved	_____

*List applicable LUPs (e.g., Resource Management Plans or applicable amendments).

**List applicable activity, project, management, water quality restoration, or program plans.

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

This proposed action is subject to the following land use plan: Kingman Resource Management Plan. Date Approved: March 1995. This proposed action has been reviewed for conformance with this plan (43 CFR 1610.5, BLM MS 1617.3) and is in conformance with Decision LR 13a, "All other minor rights-of-way would be evaluated through the environmental review process and granted or rejected on a case-by-case basis. Existing rights-of-way would be used when possible to minimize surface disturbance".

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):

C. Identify the applicable NEPA document(s) and other related documents that cover the proposed action.

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

DOI-BLM-AZ-C010-2011-0033-CX, DOI-BLM-AZ-C010-2010-0064-CX, CX No. AZ-310-2008-028, CX No. AZ-310-2006-046 have been completed previously. EIS for full development is currently underway.

List by name and date other documentation relevant to the proposed action (e.g., source drinking water assessments, biological assessment, biological opinion, watershed assessment, allotment evaluation, rangeland health standard's assessment and determinations, and monitoring the report).

Various assessments included and attached to the above referenced CX documents.

D. NEPA Adequacy Criteria

1. Is the current proposed action substantially the same action (or is a part of that action) as previously analyzed?

The proposed action is a renewal of the existing authorization, with no changes in location or construction.

2. Is the range of alternatives analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s) appropriate with respect to the current proposed action, given current environmental concerns, interests, resource values, and circumstances?

Previous Categorical Exclusions completed were appropriate for the proposed action. No new environmental concerns or interests have been identified with the existing testing infrastructure. Additional detailed analysis currently underway, EIS, for full development of the wind farm.

3. Is the existing analysis valid in light of any new information or circumstances (such as, riparian proper functioning condition [PFC] reports; rangeland health standards assessments; inventory and monitoring data; most recent lists of endangered species listing; updated BLM-sensitive species)? Can you reasonably conclude that all new information and new circumstances would not substantially change the analysis of the new proposed action?

There are no new species or resource impacts associated with this renewal. The existing cultural and wildlife clearances completed for the construction of the MET towers, placement of SODAR unit, test well, and associated access are adequate and sufficient for this proposed renewal action.

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?

There are no new direct, indirect, or cumulative effects associated with the renewal of these temporary

facilities.

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

No additional public involvement needed or required for this renewal action. EIS for full development is currently underway.

E. Persons/Agencies/BLM Staff Consulted

<u>Name</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Resource/Agency Represented</u>
Len Marceau	Outdorr Recreation Planner	BLM/KFO
Tim Watkins	Archaeologist	BLM/KFO
Ammon Wilhelm	Wildlife Biologist	BLM/KFO

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

X Based on the review documented above, I conclude that this proposal conforms to the applicable land use plan and that the existing NEPA documentation fully covers the proposed action and constitute BLM’s compliance with the requirements of NEPA.

Note: If one or more of the criteria are not met, a conclusion of conformance and/or NEPA adequacy cannot be made and this box cannot be checked

/ s / Andy Whitefield for Melissa Warren
Signature of Project Lead

/ s / Ramone B. McCoy
Signature of NEPA Coordinator

/ s / Ruben A. Sánchez
Signature of Responsible Official

12/06/2011
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.

DECISION:

I have reviewed this plan conformance and NEPA compliance record and have determined that the proposed action is either (a) in conformance with or (b) clearly consistent with terms, conditions, and decisions of the approved land use plan and that no further environmental analysis is required. It is my Decision to implement the project, as described, with the mitigation measures identified below.

Mitigation measures or other remarks:
See draft grant.

 / s / Ruben A. Sánchez
Ruben Sanchez, Kingman Field Manager

 12/06/2011
Date