

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-W010-2013-0014-DNA

CASEFILE/PROJECT NUMBER: SRP# NVW01000-13-02

PROPOSED ACTION TITLE/TYPE: 2013 Cheaters MC Race

LOCATION/LEGAL DESCRIPTION:

T21N R27E	T22N R26E	T22N R27E	T22N R29E	T22N R28E	T23N R27E	T24N R27E	T24N R2E
Sec. 04-06, 08	Sec. 24, 25	Sec. 01-04, 09, 10, 16-19, 23-27, 30-34	Sec. 4, 6-9, 16-18	Sec. 06, 07, 17-19	Sec. 02, 03, 11, 13, 14, 21- 28, 33- 35	Sec. 13, 23, 24, 26, 35	Sec. 3, 10, 15-18
T25N R28E	T25N R29E	T26N R29E	T26N R30E	T27N R30E	T27N R31E		
Sec. 1, 22-25, 27, 34, 36	Sec. 04-10, 16, 19, 29, 30, 33, 34	Sec. 36	Sec. 13, 22- 28, 31, 32	Sec. 4-8, 18	Sec. 29-31		

APPLICANT:

Paul Ziegler
964 Terminal Way
Reno, NV 89502

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

The Cheaters Motorcycle Club has applied for a Special Recreation Permit to conduct a motorcycle race in the Hot Springs Mountains, Trinity Range and surrounding area on March 09 & 10, 2013.

No new ground disturbance will result from this proposed race. The proposed course utilizes the same course(s) used by Motorcycle Racing Association of Northern Nevada under numerous previous SRPs.

It is estimated that there would be approximately 300 participants. Spectators would be at the start/finish area and be comprised of family members of the participants & pit crews. The proposed race route is on lands under the jurisdiction of the BLM, private (checkerboard lands) and approximately ½ mile on Bureau of Reclamation land. Portions of the course would cross power line and pipe line ROW's.

There would be several check points spread throughout the course to ensure that shortcuts are not taken and no 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 potentially hazardous areas.

Should the proposed action be implemented, the BLM would have an Outdoor Recreation Planner and Law Enforcement Officer on site during the race. 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 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.

EA # NV-020-03-06

Fallon to Lovelock Motorcycle Race (1992)

Decision: 11.17.1992

EA # NV-020-98-24

1998 MRANN Desert Peak Race

Decision: 06-04-98

EA # NV-020-99-28
1999 MRANN Searle Race
Decision: 10-01-99

EA # NV-020-00-17
Lovelock 250 Desert Four Wheel Drive Race
Decision: 06.14.2000

EA # NV-020-02-14
2002 Lost Lama 100
Decision: 02-15-02

EA # 02-02-16
2002 Tank Slappers Hare Scrambles
Decision: 05-08-02

EA # NV-020-04-20
2004 Jessup Desert Motorcycle Race
Decision: 05-05-2004

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 Cheaters 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, Bureau of Reclamation and the Pershing county road department. The BLM would also consult with the Bureau of Reclamation.

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	
Jason Spence / Assistant Field Manager - Range	Rangeland Management	\\S\ Garret Noles 12-10-2012	
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	

DOI-BLM-NV-W010-2013-0014 DNA

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.