

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

FIELD OFFICE: Stillwater Field Office, Carson City District

NEPA NUMBER: DOI-BLM-NV-C010-2011-0522-DNA

CASEFILE PROJECT NUMBER: LLNVC01000-11009

PROPOSED ACTION TITLE/TYPE: Special Recreation Permit (Stillwater Field Office - Lead)

LOCATION/LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Point-to point 548 mile race from Beatty to Dayton;
approximately 149 miles through Mineral and Churchill Counties in the Stillwater Field Office.

T5N, R36E, Sec. 24, 24, 26
T5N, R37E, Sec. 4, 5, 6
T6N, R35E, Sec. 1, 2
T6N, R36E, Sec. 6, 7, 8, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 24, 25
T6N, R37E, Sec. 30, 31, 33, 34
T7N, R35E, Sec. 25, 26, 27, 33, 34, 35
T7N, R36E, Sec. 1, 2, 11, 14, 15, 16, 19, 20, 21, 30
T8N, R35E, Sec. 3, 11, 13
T8N, R36E, Sec. 18, 19, 20, 21, 26, 27, 28, 35, 36
T9N, R35E, Sec. 4, 8, 9, 17, 20, 28, 29, 34
T10N, R35E, Sec. 11, 12, 13, 14, 22, 23, 27, 33, 34
T10N, R36E, Sec. 7, 8, 18
T11N, R36E, Sec. 4, 9, 16, 20, 21, 29, 32
T12N, R34E, Sec. 2, 3, 4, 5, 12
T12N, R35E, Sec. 7, 8, 13, 14, 15, 16
T12N, R36E, Sec. 19, 20, 21, 27, 28, 33
T13N, R32E, Sec. 4, 9, 10, 14, 15, 23, 24, 26, 25, 36
T13N, R33E, Sec. 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 36
T13N, R34E, Sec. 31, 32
T14N, R32E, Sec. 6, 7, 18, 20, 29, 32, 33
T15N, R30E, Sec. 1
T15N, R31E, Sec. 7, 15, 16, 17, 22, 23, 24, 25
T15N, 31.5E, Sec. 25, 26
T15N, R32E, Sec. 31
T16N, R27E, Sec. 24
T16N, R28E, Sec. 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 17, 18
T16N, R29E, Sec. 7, 8, 16, 17, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25
T16N, R30E, Sec. 19, 20, 21, 22, 26, 27, 35

APPLICANT: Best In The Desert, Casey Folks

A. Description of the Proposed Action and any applicable mitigation measures

Best In The Desert (BITD) has applied for a Special Recreation Permit to the Stillwater Field Office, Carson City District, to conduct a competitive off highway vehicle (OHV) race August 19-20, 2011. This event has occurred throughout Nevada for the past 17 years. Lead SRP administration and responsibility has rotated annually from each BLM District Office; however, each District and/or Field Office retains the responsibility for providing appropriate NEPA documentation, resource monitoring and personnel for the event.

As previously analyzed in EA-NV-030-08-026 (2008), the point-to-point (south to north) multi-district race would enter the Stillwater Field Office in Mineral County approximately 13 miles southeast of Mina, NV. The race would be conducted on approximately 149 miles of improved "dirt" roads within the SFO and include five race pit located adjacent to the course at main intersections.

All segments of the 149 mile 2011 route in the SFO have been approved for use under EA-NV-030-08-026 with the following exceptions: five segments differ slightly from the course reviewed for the 2008 EA but are located on graded dirt roads or dry washes that meet the intent of the original environmental analysis

- 1) T7N, R36E, Sec 1 for 1 mile
- 2) T8N, R36E, Sec 26 and 32 for two miles
- 3) T10N, R35E, Sec 11, 13 and 14 for two miles
- 4) T10N, R36E, Sec 7, 8, and 18 for three miles
- 5) T9N, R35E, Sec 17 and 20 for two mile

GENERAL INFORMATION AND MITIGATION: In addition to crossing public land, the event also uses roads that traverse private lands, county maintained roads, and cross over/under state highways. The permit applicant is responsible for notifying private land owners and for securing additional permissions and permits from the U.S. Forest Service, state, counties, cities and towns if affected by the race event. The event is widely supported by the Nevada Department of Tourism and by the rural counties in need of economic stimulus provided by the event.

The race would involve several classifications including but not limited to trophy trucks, buggies, jeeps, motorcycles, quads and side-by sides (UTV). It is anticipated that 240 vehicles, including 100 motorcycles and 140 trucks/buggies, would begin the race, however; about 1/3 or more of the vehicles would not finish for various reasons typically related to mechanical or equipment problems. Participants would be spread out over the course as a result of staggered starts. Highway/road crossings would be manned and pits would be located in previously

disturbed areas. Portable toilets would be provided in each pit area. Activities involving authorized race-related pit personnel, families, and friends would be limited to official gas stops and pit locations. All authorized gas stops and pit area would be located on previously disturbed sites along the edge of roads. Spectators would typically view the race in or near small communities along the race route.

Some chase vehicles and pit crews would travel on the highways and dirt access roads leap-frogging to new check points and pits. However, due to the point to point nature of the race, many of the pit crews will be providing service to multiple vehicles, reducing the need to keep ahead of the participants. Support teams and/or event staff would track their racer through radio communications and live computer graphic interactive tracking systems using Global Positioning Systems (GPS) and aircraft. Local ham radio operators will be establishing radio relay stations along the course for communications. The event promoter would provide for all Emergency services including rescue. This entails providing aircraft and ground support personnel. Four BLM law enforcement rangers will be monitoring the race for compliance.

The promoter would also acquire paved road crossing permits from Nevada Department of Transportation, and coordinate with County Commissioners and road maintenance crews. Road wardens, with flags, would be stationed at all cross roads to ensure safe, managed event vehicle crossings. Checkpoints established along the course serve two purposes: to ensure that shortcuts are not taken and to ensure that each entrant is tracked for safety.

Temporary directional signs would be placed throughout the course, as well as signs that would warn the driver of potentially hazardous areas. The entire course would be marked on both sides of the proposed route. The promoter works with the local mining claimants to ensure the race route is on approved routes that avoid mine related digging and equipment. Hazards that cannot be moved are brightly flagged and bannered to reduce the risk of a rider collision or fall.

The CCDO Special Recreation Policy requires that all OHV events be monitored. The objective of event monitoring is to ensure that the events are conducted in a safe and organized manner and in accordance with BLM regulations and permit stipulations. Monitoring is also conducted to confirm approved routes prior to the race and to identify and document actual resource impacts for post use analysis, recommendations and the development of future alternatives, where applicable. Typical monitoring methods include photo documentation, GPS mapping and personal observations in a post-use report format.

The following stipulations specific to the proposed 2011 event (in addition to the 2008 EA mitigative stipulations) for cultural resources, travel management and invasive non-native plant species are:

- Within four weeks of the event BITD the promoter will complete post event maintenance using graders, tractors and drags to remedy center berms, stutter bumps and ruts on all dirt roads. Repair and payment for any damage to fences, gates, livestock or other property is the responsibility of the BITD;

- The underside and tires of all race vehicle should be pressure washed upon departing the race event at the nearest available car wash facility.
- A “No pass and slow zone” will be signed and monitored along the Paiute Pipeline road beginning at the Monte Cristo and Fissure Ridge gap for the following four mile segment (T13N, R35E, Sec 32 for one mile and T12N, R34E, Sec 2, 3, 4, and 5 for three miles). No parking or spectators are allowed on the south side of the road west of the gap and a monitor will be on site to confirm that all participants follow the stipulations for the length of this segment as provided.

Time trials for the event will be conducted in the Las Vegas Field Office several days before the race under areas with completed NEPA review covered by the 2011 SNORE Mint 400 Decision Record.

B. Land Use Plan (LUP) Conformance

The proposed action described in this document is in conformance with the Carson City Field Office *Consolidated Resource Management Plan* (May 2001)

Section 8 – REC-2: Desired Outcomes, 1: “Provide a wide variety of recreation opportunities on public land under the administration of the Carson City Field Office.”

Section 8 – REC-2: Land Use Allocations, 1: “All public lands under CCFO jurisdiction are designated open to Off-Highway Vehicle (OHV) use unless they are specifically restricted or closed.”

Section 8 – REC-6: Administrative Actions, 4: “On public land designated open for off highway vehicles, there will generally be no restrictions on use. Organized competitive OHV events have been allowed in Mason Valley, Wilson Canyon, Hungry Valley OHV Area, Moon Rocks, Lemmon Valley MX Area, Dead Camel Mountains, Salt Wells Area, Wassuk Range and in the Frontier 500 and Carson Rally OHV corridors. Organized events will be handled on a case-by-case basis through the Special Recreation Permit review and Environmental review process. Organized activity is generally restricted to existing roads and trail

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

Name of Document:	Best in the Desert, Vegas to Reno OHV Race
Document No.:	NV-030-08-026 (EA)
Date of Approval:	7/30/2008

Name of Document: Best in the Desert, Vegas to Reno OHV Race
Document No.: EA-NV-030-04-013
Date of Approval:

Name of Document: VORRA Fallon 250
Document No.: NV-C010-2009-0015-EA
Date of Approval: 6/15/2009

Name of Document: VORRA Fallon 250 OHV Race
Document No.: NV-030-93057 (EA)
Date of Approval: 7/22/93

Name of Document: 2011 SNORE Mint 400 Decision Record
Document No.: DOI-BLM-NV-S010-2011-0050-EA
Date of Approval:

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 2011 event is addressed in the action analyzed in the 2008 EA. The proposed 2011 event consists of the same type of vehicles, number of entrants (240), spectators, and pit stops from the previous two events. The event is proposed to be held the same time of year as the 2008 EA. The only notable difference from the 2008 event is the five segments of re-route on public lands south of the Gabbs area that will remain on dirt roads.

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?

Yes. The environmental concerns, interests, and resource values have not changed from the analysis performed in the referenced 2008 EA. The range of alternatives in the 2008 EA is still appropriate.

3. Is the existing analysis valid in light of any new information or circumstances (such as, range- land health standard assessment, recent endangered species listings, and 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?

On March 5, 2010, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service announced that listing the greater sage-grouse (range wide) and Bi-State population (previously referred to as the Mono Basin area population) under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) is warranted, but precluded by higher

priority listing actions. As a result, both populations are now candidate species for ESA protection. According to BLM Manual 6840 – Special Status Species Management, all Federal candidate species are to be conserved as Bureau sensitive species. The anticipated impacts to the resources have not significantly changed. The proposed action will not have any adverse effect on the range-land health, human health or environment of minority and low income populations. The proposed action describes measures that will be taken which will limit and prevent cumulative impacts.

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 current proposed action are the same as those analyzed in the 2008 EA both quantitatively and qualitatively and are sufficient.

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

Yes. The 2008 EA provided adequate internal and external review opportunities.

E. Persons/Agencies/BLM Staff Consulted

Name	Title	Resource/Agency Represented
Dan Westermeyer, Outdoor Recreation Planner, Project Lead		<i>[Signature]</i> 8/10/11
Steve Kramer, Planning and Environmental Coordinator		<i>[Signature]</i> 08/10/2011
John Wilson, Wildlife Biologist		<i>[Signature]</i> 8/11-11
Susan McCabe, Archaeologist		<i>[Signature]</i> 8/15/11
Jill Devaurs, Range Specialist		<i>[Signature]</i> 8-11-11
Linda Appel, Range Specialist		<i>[Signature]</i> 8/10/11
Chelsey Simerson, Range Specialist		<i>[Signature]</i> 8/17/11
Ken Depaoli, Geologist		<i>[Signature]</i> 8/11/11

Conclusion (If you found that one of more of these criteria is not met, you will not be able to check this box.)

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 constitute BLM's compliance with the requirements of the NEPA.



Signature of Project Lead



Signature of NEPA Coordinator



Signature of Responsible Official

Date 08/15/2011

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.