

Worksheet Documentation of Land Use Plan Conformance and NEPA
Adequacy (DNA)
U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management (BLM)

NEPA#: DOI-BLM-ID-I010-2014-0006-DNA

BLM Office: Upper Snake Field Office

Lease/Serial/Case File No.: ID-I010-RE-14-02

Proposed Action Title: Egin Lakes Campground and Day Use Facility Vending Permit

Type of Proposed Action: Special Recreation Permit (Vending Permit Renewal)

Location of Proposed Action: Egin Lakes Campground and Day Use Facility (Egin)

Description of the Proposed Action:

Altitude Enterprises is a company seeking a vendor permit through the Bureau of Land Management at the Egin Lakes Campground and Day Use Facility (Egin). The proposed project is to issue a five-year vending permit that would allow Altitude Enterprises to operate “The Pit Stop” at Egin. “The Pit Stop” would sell motorcycle, off-highway vehicle, and sand rail parts. They would also sell a variety of drink and food items, bagged ice, wood, race fuel, off road vehicle stickers, and regulation flags.

Applicant (if any): Altitude Enterprises

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

LUP Name: *Medicine Lodge Resource Management Plan* **Date Approved:** April 1985

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) and, if applicable, implementation plan decisions:

Management Area 5 Sands, Objective 8 (page 13), “Intensively manage the White Sand dunes for ORV use...”

The proposed vending permit enhances the visitor experience by providing the necessary items the visitor would need to be in compliance with regulations, as well as increase visitor safety in the chosen motorized sport.

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

This proposed action is addressed in the following existing BLM EA/EIS:

Name/Number of NEPA Document:

Egin Lakes Vending Permit (1996) EA number ID-030-96-18

Other documentation relevant to the proposed action:

A post use evaluation for the previous five years, documenting the permitted company is in compliance with BLM rules and regulations.

NEPA Adequacy Criteria

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

The proposed action to place Altitude Enterprises under a vending Special Recreation Permit complies with the alternative selected and analyzed in *Egin Lakes Vending Permit (1996) EA number ID-030-96-18*.

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?

Yes, the *Egin Lakes Vending Permit (1996)* describes the alternatives considered when issuing a vending permit on BLM-administered lands within the Upper Snake Field Office. The action alternative is described in detail and the alternative considered but not carried through for full analysis is presented. A description of the No Action Alternative (no change from current management) is also included as required by CEQ regulations (40 CFR 1502.14d).

Two alternatives were developed by the Interdisciplinary (ID) team on issues identified during internal scoping. A full analysis of the two alternatives is described in the EA including direct, indirect and cumulative impacts (page 4-6).

Is the existing analysis adequate and are the conclusions adequate in light of any new information or circumstances (including, for example, riparian proper functioning condition [PFC] reports; rangeland health standards assessments; Unified Watershed Assessment categorizations; inventory and monitoring data; most recent Fish and Wildlife Service lists of threatened, endangered, proposed, and candidate species; most recent BLM lists of sensitive species)? Can you reasonably conclude that all new information and all new circumstances are insignificant with regard to analysis of the proposed action?

There has been no significant change in circumstances or significant new information germane to the proposed action. No new information is presented under the proposed action to warrant any further analysis. The proposed action is adequately analyzed under the existing NEPA document *Egin Lakes Vending Permit (1996) EA number ID-030-96-18*.

Do the methodology and analytical approach used in the existing NEPA document(s) continue to be appropriate for the current proposed action?

The Environmental Assessment provides sufficient detailed assessments of all alternatives including the proposed action alternative to sustain the action of issuing a vending permit for Altitude Enterprises.

Are the direct and indirect impacts of the current proposed action substantially unchanged from those identified in the existing NEPA document(s)? Does the existing NEPA document sufficiently analyze site-specific impacts related to the current proposed action?

The direct and indirect impacts by issuing a vending permit are unchanged from those identified in the existing *Egin Lakes Vending Permit (1996) EA number ID-030-96-18* (pages 3-4). The current NEPA document specifically analyses impacts related to vending at Egin.

Can you conclude without additional analysis or information that the cumulative impacts that would result from implementation of the current proposed action are substantially unchanged from those analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)?

Cumulative impacts of the proposed action are essentially the same as those identified in the existing document. The direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts section of the *Egin Lakes Vending Permit (1996) EA number ID-030-96-18* accurately describes impacts associated with vending and may be found within pages 3-6 of the NEPA document.

Are the public involvement and interagency review associated with existing NEPA document(s) adequately for the current proposed action?

Yes, page 7 of the *Egin Lakes Vending Permit (1996)* lists the individual resource specialists who participated in the preparation of the EA. Also, public involvement during the broader EA process was in accordance with NEPA timelines. The final EA was available to the public for a thirty day comment period and no comments were received either positive or negative from any constituents or members of the public. The Shoshone-Bannock Tribes were consulted during the process and did not provide comments related to the EA.

Interdisciplinary Analysis: Identify those team members conducting or participating in the preparation of this worksheet.

Shannon Bassista, Outdoor Recreation Planner, Recreation

Marissa Guenther, Archaeologist, Cultural Resources and Upper Snake NEPA Specialist

Dan Kotansky, Supervisory Hydrologist, Hydrology and Hazmat

Devin Englestead, Wildlife Biologist, Wildlife

Mitigation Measures:

Issue a Special Recreation Use Permit, which requires Altitude Enterprises to abide by all Special Recreation Permit Stipulations.

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 constitutes 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

Preparer: Shannon Bassista /s/ Shannon Bassista 1/7/2014

NEPA Reviewer: Marissa Guenther /s/ Marissa Guenther 1/7/2014

Upper Snake Field Manager: Jeremy Casterson /s/ Jeremy Casterson 1/7/2014