

# Determination of NEPA Adequacy (DNA)

## Worksheet

U.S. Department of Interior  
Bureau of Land Management

---

OFFICE: Las Vegas FO, NVS00100

TRACKING NUMBER: DOI-BLM-NV-S010-0031-DNA

CASEFILE/PROJECT NUMBER: NVN-88078

PROPOSED ACTION TITLE/TYPE: Film Permit for Filming and Still Photography of the Sun Buggy Rental Company, in Logandale, Nevada on Bureau of Land Management (BLM) lands. DNA off of Environmental Assessment NV-050-2006-079, for a Special Recreation Permit for Sun Buggy Rentals.

LOCATION/LEGAL DESCRIPTION:Public Lands in Logandale, Nevada

Mount Diablo Meridian, Nevada

T. 15 S., R. 67 E., sec. 31, E1/2;

T 16 S., R. 66 E., sec. 1, SE1/4SE1/4, sec. 12, E1/2, sec. 13, E1/2;

T.16 S., R. 67 E., sec. 6,7,18.

APPLICANT (if any):

Calico (Print Management LLC)

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

Print Management, LLC, has applied for a Film Permit to do videotaping and still photography of the Sun Buggy Rental Company, in Logandale, Nevada, on public lands. They will be filming the Sun Buggy Rental Company for one day for commercial purposes. The crew will consist of four cars and seven OHV buggies. They will not have exclusive use of the area. The proposed action will not disturb the landscape or impact the environment. A minimum impact film permit under 43 CFR Part 2920 will be in full force and effect and will remain in effect during the period of the permit. The Sun Buggy Rental Company has already obtained a Special Recreation Permit from the BLM, and the permit has gone through an environmental assessment (EA) and

NEPA evaluation, EA number NV-050–2006–079. Since the proposed action will not impact the environment, therefore, a worksheet DNA off of EA number NV-050–2006–079 is being prepared.

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

LUP Name\* Las Vegas Resource Management Plan and Final Environmental Impact Statement Date Approved: October 1998

*\*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:**

Lands Management Objective, Land Use Authorizations, LD-2: All public lands within the planning area, unless otherwise classified, segregated or withdrawn and with the exception of Areas of Critical Environmental Concern and Wilderness Study Areas, are available at the discretion of the agency for land use leases and permits under section 302 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act..

Management Direction, LD-2-a: Land use lease or permit application and airport lease applications will be addressed on a case-by-case basis, where consistent with other resource management objectives and local land uses. Special terms and conditions regarding use of the public lands involved will be developed as applicable.

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

Las Vegas RMP EIS, ROD signed October 5, 1998. 43 CFR 2920–2–2(a)(b), and BLM Manual, Sections 2920, and 2930 for permits. The proposed action will DNA off of Environmental Assessment NV-050–2006–079 and Decision Record NV-050–2006–302, for Sun Buggy Rentals, (aka Adrenaline ATV Tours), a Special Recreation Permit to conduct on-going guided scenic tours, approved 7/5/2006.

Biological Opinion # 1-5-97–251

## **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 of still photography and commercial filming is within the same analysis area, and the geographic and resource conditions are sufficiently similar to those analyzed in Environmental Assessment NV-050-2006-079 and Decision Record NV-050-2006-302, for Sun Buggy Rentals, (aka Adrenaline ATV Tours), approved 7/5/2006. The filming crew will be filming the Sun Buggy Rental company performing their recreation activities. The proposed area is the same area as was analyzed under NV-050-2006-302 and the geographic location and the resource conditions are the same. The proposed action of video filming and still photography will not change the event or procedures of the action, therefore, the alternatives analyzed in the EA will not change.

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

The proposed activity of filming and still photography will not change or add to the activity that has already been analyzed under the EA for a Special Recreation Permit for Sun Buggy Rentals. The proposed action will be of no impact to the environment, and will not cause any damage or disturbance to the public lands, their resources, or improvements, therefore, there are no new environmental concerns, or new environmental impacts which need to be analyzed. The range of alternatives analyzed in the existing EA are sufficient and remain the same since the activity is the same with the exception of the addition of filming the activity. No impacts to the environment will occur. No re-evaluation of the alternatives or environmental impacts is necessary since there will be no new impact to the environment or to the natural resources in the area.

**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?**

Since the proposed action will be of no impact to the environmental or to the natural resources, or to the T&E Species in the area, therefore, the existing analysis is still valid. No new information or circumstances will be affected by the proposed 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?**

No impacts to the environment or to the natural resources in the area will occur, therefore, there will be no cumulative effects that will result from implementation of the new proposed action.

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

Sun Buggy Rental companies’ recreational activities have already been assessed and adequately reviewed in EA NV-050–2006–079. The proposed action of filming and still photography of the activity will not change the activity, which has already been evaluated, therefore, the review of the activity will remain the same. Therefore, a new review and evaluation is not necessary..

## E. Persons/Agencies/BLM Staff Consulted

### Note

Refer to EA number NV-050–2006–079 for a complete list of the team members and public who participated in the preparation of the environmental analysis or planning documents. The EA was reviewed and analyzed by the BLM Las Vegas Field Office Resource Specialists shown below. This DNA and the proposed action was reviewed by specialists listed on the ARF Affected Environment document.

Name	Title	Resource/Agency Represented
James Lee Kirk	BLM Outdoor Recreation Planner	Las Vegas Field Office
Suzanne Rowe	BLM Cultural Resources, Archaeologist	Las Vegas Field Office
Michael Johnson	BLM Planning and Environmental Coordinator	Las Vegas Field Office
Christina Lund	BLM Botanist	Las Vegas Field Office
David Fanning	BLM Minerals	Las Vegas Field Office
Carolyn Ronning	BLM Wildlife Biologist	Pahrump Field Office
Lisa Christianson	BLM Air Quality Specialist	Las Vegas Field Office

## 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 constitute BLM’s compliance with the requirements of the NEPA.

---

Project Lead: Dorothy Jean Dickey, Realty Specialist

---

NEPA Coordinator: Jeff Steinmetz

---

Kimber Liebhauser, Assistant Field Manager,  
Division of Lands

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 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.