

PROGRAM CONSULTATION & COORDINATION/DNA CHECKLIST
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
TUCSON FIELD OFFICE
Determination of NEPA Adequacy (DNA)

Office: Tucson Field Office, Las Cienegas NCA
 Project Name: Steve Boice Trail Ride
 Location: Las Cienegas NCA
 NLCS Unit: LCNCA
 Quad Name: Empire Ranch
 Project Lead: Catie Fenn

NEPA #: DOI-BLM-AZ-G020-2013-0010-DNA
 Case/Project No.: AZA 036155

Technical Review:

Criteria Applies?	NAME	CRITERIA	SIGNATURE	DATE
Yes No			NEPA TEAM	1/14/2013
() ()		(1) The new proposed action is a feature of or essentially the same as the alternative selected in the document being reviewed.		
() ()		(2) A reasonable range of alternatives to the new proposed action was analyzed in the document being reviewed.		
() ()		(3) The information or circumstances upon which the document being reviewed are based are still valid and germane to the new proposed action.		
() ()		(4) The methodology and analytical approach used in the document being reviewed is appropriate for the new action.		
() ()		(5) The direct and indirect impacts of the new proposed action do not significantly differ from, or essentially the same as, those identified in the document being reviewed.		
() ()		(6) The new proposed action, if implemented, would not significantly change the cumulative impact analysis..		
() ()		(7) Public involvement in the document being reviewed provides suitable coverage for the new proposed action..	↓	↓

Final Review:

Manager/Supervisor: /s/ Mark Rekshynskyj Date: 2/6/2013

Environmental Coordinator: /s/Amy Markstein Date: 1/17/2013

Worksheet
Documentation of Land Use Plan Conformance and NEPA Adequacy (DNA)

U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management (BLM)

NEPA #:

A. BLM Office: Tucson Field Office **Lease/Serial/Case File No.** AZA
Project Title/Type: Steve Boice Trail Ride February 14-16, 2013
Location: Las Cienegas NCA, Airstrip Group Site
NLCS Unit: LCNCA

Description of the Proposed Action: Steve Boice applied for a Special Recreation Permit (SRP) to conduct a horseback ride in LCNCA February 14-16 2013 staged at the Airstrip Group Site in Las Cienegas NCA, there will be approximately 40 participants.

Applicant (if any): Steve Boice

B. Conformance with the Land Use Plan (LUP) and Consistency with Related Subordinate Implementation Plans

LUP Name* Las Cienegas National Conservation Area RMP/ EIS/ ROD July 2003
Other document** _____ Date Approved _____

*List applicable LUPs (e.g., Resource Management Plans or applicable amendments).
**List applicable activity, project, management, water quality restoration, or program plans.

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

Excerpt from Approved LCNCSA RMP/ROD July 2003 Page 44

1. Special Recreation Permits

- a. Many types of Special Recreation Permits may be applied for on Las Cienegas NCA for commercial, competitive and organized group events. These applications will continue to be considered on a case-by-case basis and issuance of permits is discretionary.
- b. 30 or more people are required to get a SRP. page 45 LCNCARMP
- c. Page 45, Table 6 Special Recreation Permit Guidance by Recreation Zone.
Non-motorized, organized events can occur.

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 the applicable NEPA document(s) and other related documents that cover the proposed action.

List by name and date all applicable NEPA documents that cover the proposed action.

1. 2. EA NO. AZ-931-93-001 SPECIAL RECREATION PERMITS FOR COMMERCIAL RECREATION ACTIVITIES ON PUBLIC LANDS IN ARIZONA

List by name and date other documentation relevant to the proposed action (e.g., source drinking water assessments, biological assessment, biological opinion, watershed assessment, allotment evaluation, rangeland health standard's assessment and determinations, and monitoring the report).

D. NEPA Adequacy Criteria

1. Is the current proposed action substantially the same action (or is a part of that action) as previously analyzed?

Documentation of answer and explanation:

Yes, this activity is covered in the Las Cienegas NCA RMP/ROD 2003

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

Documentation of answer and explanation:

Yes, and also conforms to the Las Cienegas National Conservation Area RMP /ROD for this type of use/activity.

3. Is the existing analysis valid in light of any new information or circumstances (such as, riparian proper functioning condition [PFC] reports; rangeland health standards assessments; inventory and monitoring data; most recent lists of endangered species listing; updated BLM-sensitive species)? Can you reasonably conclude that all new information and new circumstances would not substantially change the analysis of the new proposed action?

Documentation of answer and explanation:

Yes, there is no new information or new circumstance that would change the analysis of this 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?

Documentation of answer and explanation:

Yes, the activity is minimal and cumulative impacts unchanged.

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:

Yes, the anticipated activity of this type is covered in the Programmatic EA and Las Cienegas NCA RMP/ROD. The RMP is a public community-based planning document.

E. Persons/Agencies/BLM Staff Consulted

<u>Name</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Resource/Agency Represented</u>
Catie Fenn Las Cienegas NCA Staff TFO Nepa Review Team	Outdoor Recreation Planner	Recreation

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

- Based on the review documented above, I conclude that this proposal conforms to the applicable land use plan and that the existing NEPA documentation fully covers the proposed action and constitute BLM’s compliance with the requirements of NEPA.

Note: If one or more of the criteria are not met, a conclusion of conformance and/or NEPA adequacy cannot be made and this box cannot be checked

/s/ Catie Fenn
Signature of Project Lead

/s/ Amy Markstein
Signature of NEPA Coordinator

/s/ Brian B. Bellew
Signature of Responsible Official

2/6/2013
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.

DECISION:

I have reviewed this plan conformance and NEPA compliance record and have determined that the proposed action is either (a) in conformance with or (b) clearly consistent with terms, conditions, and decisions of the approved land use plan and that no further environmental analysis is required. It is my Decision to implement the project, as described, with the mitigation measures identified below.

Mitigation measures or other remarks:

_____/s/ Brian B. Bellew_____
Field Manager

_____/2/6/2013_____
Date