

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

OFFICE: Winnemucca District/Humboldt River FO

TRACKING NUMBER: DOI-BLM-NV-W010-2013-0013 DNA

CASEFILE/PROJECT NUMBER: SRP# NVW01000-13-01

PROPOSED ACTION TITLE/TYPE: 2013 Trailblazers MC Race

LOCATION/LEGAL DESCRIPTION:

T26N R25E	T26N R26E	T25N R24E	T25N R25E	T25N R27E	T24N R26E	T24N R27E
Sec. 13, 23, 24 27, 26, 31	Sec. 19, 20, 28- 30, 33, 35 36	Sec. 01,02, 11 13, 14	Sec. 01-03, 05- 10, 12, 13 16, 17, 20 21, 28, 29 30-33	Sec. 18-22, 27 33, 34	Sec. 03-08, 10 11, 15-23 26, 27, 34- 36	Sec. 04, 09, 16 20, 21, 28 29, 31-33

APPLICANT:

Josh Wilson
 9732 State Route 445 # 214
 Sparks, NV 89441

A. Description of the Proposed Action with attached map(s) and any applicable mitigation measures.

This proposal is composed of two loops (East Loop & West Loop – see maps). The proposed races would take place on February 16 & 17, 2013. The East Loop would be used for the Minis (100 cc) & women’s amateur races on Saturday, February 16. The Masters race (both men & women) would run each loop once and would be held on Sunday, February 17. Should the West loop be impassable due to snow at the higher elevations, the Masters Race would run the East Loop twice. The entire race would be routed on existing single track, two track and primitive/county roads.

NO NEW GROUND DISTURBANCE WOULD RESULT FROM THIS PROPOSED RACE.

It is estimated that there would be approximately 150 - 200 participants (total for all races) and 200 – 250 spectators (family members and pit crew). These spectators would be at the start/finish area. No spectators would be allowed on the course during the race – the 1 mile ‘pee wee’ (8 years old and under) course being the exception. The proposed race route is on BLM and private lands that are entirely within the WFO resource area. The race organizers would be required to obtain permission / authorization from the private landowners before race day.

There would be several check points spread throughout the course to ensure that shortcuts are not taken, nor 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 racer of potentially hazardous areas.

Should the proposed action be implemented, the BLM would have an Outdoor Recreation Planner and Law Enforcement Officer on site at the start of each of the races on Saturday and Sunday. In addition, emergency personnel would be on site, and portable toilets sufficient to handle the expected crowd would be positioned at the start/finish line.

B. Land Use Plan (LUP) Conformance

LUP Name: Sonoma-Gerlach MFP III

Date Approved: July 1982

The proposed action 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 in is 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.

EA #: NV-020-99-28

Title: 1999 Fernley Motorcycle Race

Decision date: October 1, 1999

EA #: NV-020-02-14
Title: Lost Lama 100 Motorcycle Race
Decision date:

EA #: NV-020-03-08
Title: 2003 Trailblazers Motorcycle Race
Decision date: February 13, 2003

EA #: NV-020-04-11
Title: 2004 Trailblazers Desert Motorcycle Race
Decision date: February 04, 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 and the proposed race is in the general time frame as previously analyzed.

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 previously referenced EAs 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. The dates of the proposed race are outside of migratory bird nesting season.

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 the Trailblazers Motorcycle Club 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 private land owners, Right of Way owners and the Pershing county road department.

E. Persons/Agencies/BLM Staff Consulted

Name /Title	Resource/Agency Represented	Signature/Date	Comments (Attach if more room is needed)
Pat Haynal / Archaeologist	Cultural Resources	\\S\ Patrick Haynal 11-28-2012	
Mark Hall / Archaeologist	Native American Religious Concerns	\\S\ Mark Hall 12-12-2012	
Pat Haynal / Archaeologist	Paleontological Resources	\\S\ Patrick Haynal 11-28-2012	
Joey Carmosino / Outdoor Recreation Planner	Recreation	\\S\ V.J. Carmosino 11-28-2012	
Garret Noles / Assistant Field Manager - Range	Rangeland Management	\\S\ Garret Noles 12-10-2012	See Attached
John Callan / Environmental Protection Specialist	Hazardous Waste	\\S\ John L. Callan 11-28-2012	
Eric Baxter / Natural Resource Specialist – ESR & Weeds	Invasive Non-native Species	\\S\ Eric Baxter 12-05-2012	
Rob Burton / Natural Resource Specialist	Vegetation, Soils, & Air Quality	\\S\ Rob Burton 12-12-2012	
Mandy Deforest / Assistant Field Manager – Natural Resources	General Wildlife Habitat, T&E Species & Special Status Species	\\S\ A. DeForest 12-07-2012	
Samantha Gooch / Wild Horse & Burro Specialist	Wild Horse & Burro	\\S\ S. Gooch 12-06-12	
Rob Bunkall / GIS Specialist	GIS	\\S\ Rob Bunkall 11-28-2012	
Kristine Struck / Wilderness Specialist	Lands / Wilderness Characteristics	\\S\ Kristine Struck 11-28-2012	
Lynn Ricci / Planning & Environmental Coordinator	NEPA Coordinator	\\S\ Lynn B 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\ Lynn B. Ricci
Signature of NEPA Coordinator

\S\ Edward Seum
Signature of the Responsible Official

12-20-2012
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.