

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

OFFICE: Humboldt River Field Office/Winnemucca District

TRACKING NUMBER: DOI-BLM-NV-W010-2012-0047-DNA

CASEFILE/PROJECT NUMBER: SRP # NVW01000-12-09

PROPOSED ACTION TITLE/TYPE: TankSlappers FY13 MC Race

LOCATION/LEGAL DESCRIPTION:

T28N R28E	T27N R24E	T27N R25E	T26N R24E	T26N R25E
Sec. 35, 36	Sec. 01, 02, 12 13, 24-36	Sec. 4-10, 14 15, 17-20 23-26, 29 30, 34, 35	Sec. 01, 02, 9-16 23, 24	Sec. 03, 04, 07, 09 10, 16, 18, 19 21, 28, 30-33

APPLICANT:

Robert McAdam
 TankSlapper Motorcycle Club
 211 Endeavor Ln
 Fernley, NV 89408

A. Description of the Proposed Action with attached map(s) and any applicable mitigation measures. The TankSlappers Motor Cycle Club has applied for Special Recreation Permit (SRP # NVW01000-12-09) to conduct a motorcycle race in the Nightingale Mountains, Sahwave Mountains and Sage Hen Valley area on October 13-14, 2012.

No new ground disturbance would result from this proposed race. The proposed course utilizes the same course(s) used by the TankSlappers under previous SRPs.

It is estimated that there would be approximately 200 to 250 participants. Spectators would be at the start/finish area and would be comprised of vendors, family and friends. The proposed race route is on Bureau of Land Management (BLM) lands administered by the Humboldt River Field Office/Winnemucca District.

There would be several check points spread throughout the course to ensure that shortcuts are not taken and to prevent any new ground disturbance. Any racer that does not make all these points would be disqualified. Temporary directional signs would be placed throughout the course, as well as signs that would warn the driver of potential hazardous

areas. This proposal is for two to three races on Saturday (depending on the number of participants) and these races would use the smaller of the two loops represented on the attached map. Sunday's race will be more competitive and incorporate the larger loop. Should the proposed action be implemented, the BLM would have an outdoor Recreation Planner and/or Law Enforcement officer making site visits on each of the race days. In addition, emergency personnel would be on site and portable toilets sufficient to handle the expected crowd would be positioned at the start/finish area.

B. Land Use Plan (LUP) Conformance

LUP Name: Sonoma-Gerlach MFP III Date Approved: July 1982

H-2930-1 Recreation Permit Administration Date Approved: 2006

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

Motorcycle racing is not specifically addressed in the LUP

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.

Objective R1: Provide as many recreational opportunities as possible without undo environmental degradation in the Sonoma-Gerlach area.

Although the sport of motorcycle racing was not specifically discussed in the Sonoma-Gerlach MFP, this action would be within the intent of the objectives of the land use plan. The location of the proposed course was established as being open to off-road vehicles.

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

List by name, number and date (DR/FONSI or ROD) all applicable NEPA documents that cover the proposed action.

1999 Shawave Range Motorcycle Race

SRP # NV-020-99-17

EA # NV-020-99-14

DR / FONSI signed April 1, 1999

Winnemucca Lake 2000 Motorcycle Race

SRP # NV-020-00-04

EA # NV-020-00-15

DR / FONSI June 2, 2000

Nightingale Mountains Fall 2000 Motorcycle Race

SRP NV-023-01-08

EA # NV-020-01-03

DR / FONSI signed November 9, 2001

3rd Annual Stan Searles Memorial Purgatory Peak 100

SRP # NV-023-01-15

EA # NV-023-01-13

DR / FONSI signed March 9, 2001

2002 Lost Llama 100 Hare & Hound Motorcycle Race

SRP # NV-023-02-05

EA # NV-020-02-14

DR / FONSI signed February 15, 2002

2003 Blue Wing 100 Motorcycle Race

SRP # NV-020-03-04

EA # NV-020-03-13

DR / FONSI signed March 14, 2002

2003 Shawave 100 Hare & Hound Motorcycle Race

SRP # NV-020-03-09

EA # NV-020-03-08

DR / FONSI signed February 13, 2003

2003 Jessup Motorcycle Race

SRP # NV-020-04-04

EA # NV-020-04-11

DR / FONSI signed February 11, 2004

2004 Blue Wing 100 Motorcycle Race

SRP # NV-020-04-01

EA # NV-020-04-12

DR / FONSI signed February 27, 2004

List by name and date other documentation relevant to the proposed action (e.g., biological assessment, biological opinion, watershed assessment, allotment evaluation, and monitoring report).

Not Applicable

D. NEPA Adequacy Criteria

1. Is the new proposed action a feature of, or essentially similar to, an alternative analyzed in the existing NEPA documents(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: The information upon which the existing NEPA documents are based remains valid and germane to the proposed action. The current proposed course is the same as that analyzed for previous races. The number of participants expected is the same or less than previous races. Participants for these types of events have fallen dramatically over the course of the last several years. The dates of the proposed race are outside of migratory bird nesting season.

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

Documentation of answer and explanation: The current proposed route is a combination of previously evaluated and subsequently approved routes.

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: There has been no new information or circumstances identified since the completion of EA # NV-020-04-12 with the exception of the concern regarding the Greater Sage Grouse. None of the proposed route is within Preliminary Priority Habitat or Preliminary General Priority Habitat.

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: The direct and indirect impacts of the current proposed action are unchanged from those analyzed in the existing NEPA documents. There would be temporary impacts to the previously used course, but as part of the stipulations for permitting the race members of the TankSlappers would return to the course within a month to rehabilitate the course via dragging and raking berms and ruts. Depending on soil type and weather, all road and trail impacts are virtually unnoticeable after a one to three season rest.

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: In addition to the public scoping involved in the development of the EAs listed above, the race proponents would be responsible for contacting all Right of Way owners regarding this proposal.

E. Persons/Agencies/BLM Staff Consulted

See Attached Section E for Review Signatures and Conclusion

Bureau of Land Management
Winnemucca District Office

Determination of NEPA Adequacy
(Continued from DNA form)

DOI-BLM-NV-W010-2012-0047-DNA

E. Persons/Agencies/BLM Staff Consulted

Name /Title	Resource/Agency Represented	Signature/Date	Comments (Attach if more room is needed)
Cultural Resources	Mark E. Hall	\s\ Mark E Hall 7/30/2012	
Native American Religious Concerns	Mark E. Hall	\s\ Mark E Hall 7/30/2012	See Stipulation on next page
Recreation	Joey Carmosino	\s\ VJ Carmosino 7/18/2012	None
Rangeland Management	Damon Corley	\s\ Damon Corley 8/2/2012	
Hazardous/Solid Waste	John Callan	\s\ John Callan 7/30/2012	None
Fire Management	Derek Messmer	\s\ Dereck Messmer 8/13/2012	
Vegetation/Soils	Rob Burton	\s\ Rob Burton 7/30/2012	None
Wetlands/Riparian Zones	John McCann	\s\ John McCann 7/30/2012	None
General Wildlife Habitat, Special Status Species, T&E Species	Joanne Lowden	\s\ Joanne Lowden 8/1/2012	None
Wild Horse & Burro	Melanie Mirati	\s\ Melanie Mirati 8/7/2012	None
GIS	Dan Cozar	\s\ Dan Kozar 7/30/2012	None
LWC	Kristine Struck	\s\ Kristine Struck 8/7/2012	None
NEPA Coordinator	Lynn Ricci		

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 (If you found that one or 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 constitutes BLM' compliance with the requirements of the NEPA.

\s\ V.J. Carmosino
Signature of Project Lead

\s\ Zwaantje Rorex
Signature of NEPA Coordinator

\s\ Ken Loda
Signature of the Responsible Official

19/Sept/12
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.

NAC Stipulation:

Due to concerns from the Pyramid Lake Paiute Tribe, the race should be kept away from the eastern shore of the former Winnemucca Lake. The routes through T26n R24E Sec.9 & T26 N R24E Sec. 16 should not be used. Instead they should use the route through T26N R24E Sec. 10.