

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-AZ-G020-2014-0008-DNA

A. BLM Office: Tucson Field Office **Lease/Serial/Case File No.** N/A

Project Title/Type: COTTONWOOD CANYON ROAD OHV IMPACTS RESTORATION

Location of Proposed Action: *Public lands along Cottonwood Canyon Road, between public land entrance and Sandman Rd., generally situated in T3S R11E Sec 6 SW ¼ S ½ Gila and Salt River PM, Pinal County, Arizona.*

Description of the Proposed Action:

Apply restoration treatments to block new OHV tracks along Cottonwood Canyon Road as shown on Map 1, and Site Location Map 1. The treatments to consist of:

- a) Scattering lopped vegetation slash to provide persistent ground litter at the openings that are attracting OHV use; the slash will be placed so it is contact with the ground in a random pattern, with the top of the slash up to 18" above the ground. The slash will be collected in the general vicinity along existing roads, by pruning overhanging branches and/or encroaching vegetation.
- b) Scattering cholla and prickly pear cuttings to promote propagation of these plants along the road side for their barrier effect.
- c) The work will be accomplished by BLM personnel, and volunteers.
- d) No excavation will be required.

Applicant (if any): OHV Management Program

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

LUP Name* Phoenix RMP Date Approved Sep 1989
LUP Name* _____ Date Approved _____
Other document** Middle Gila Canyons Transportation and Travel Management Plan
Date Approved: Nov 10, 2010

*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:

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):
The proposed action involves resource protection from unauthorized off road vehicle use, which is provided for under public land regulations, and are incorporated by reference in the current RMP.

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.

Middle Gila Canyons Transportation and Travel Management Plan (MGC TTMP); Environmental Assessment (EA) # AZ-420-2007-014, Decision Record (DR) Nov 10, 2010.

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).

Monitoring report and field notes, Amy Sobiech and Francisco Mendoza, Jan 29, 2014.

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, restoration of OHV impacts was analyzed in the MGC TTMP EA. The Decision Record includes an item on Route Closures and Restoration (Page 4), which provides for restoration work from unauthorized off road vehicle tracks, such as the proposed action.

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. Various treatments were considered, to be selected at the time a site specific restoration project is planned.

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, the existing analysis is valid. New monitoring information revealed emerging OHV impacts affecting resource values on public land. The proposed action is a response to protect resources in accordance with monitoring and management plans.

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, direct, direct and indirect impacts would be similar to those analyzed in the MGC TTMP/EA.

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:

The MGC TTMP/EA involved intensive public involvement leading up to the decisions now being implemented.

Planned notifications:

- LEN Ranch grazing permittee
- Mining Claim holder(s)

E. Persons/Agencies/BLM Staff Consulted

<u>Name</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Resource/Agency Represented</u>
Amy Sobiech	TFO Archaeologist	Cultural Resources
Francisco Mendoza	Outdoor Recreation Planner	OHV Management
Susan Bernal	Realty Specialist	Lands
Dan Moore	Minerals Specialist	Mining Claims

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.

DETERMINATION

- Based on this review it is my determination that the proposed action is in conformance with the Phoenix Resource Management Plan (approved September 1989), as amended. The proposed action implements a decision previously made in the *Middle Gila Canyons Transportation and Travel management Plan, EA# AZ-420-2007-01, Decision Record approved November 10, 2010.*

The previous decision was analyzed for compliance with NEPA, and was subject to administrative procedures for protest and appeals to the Interior Board of Land Appeals, Office of the Secretary, in accordance with the regulations contained in 43 CFR, Part 4 and the BLM Form 1842-1. No appeals were taken, and no petitions for a stay were filed, and therefore the decision is in force and effect.

The currently proposed action finalizes site specific details necessary for on-the ground work to implement the previous decision. The proposed action does not constitute a new or different decision, and may be carried out immediately subject to availability of labor and funds.

Note: If one or more of the DNA criteria are not met, a determination of conformance and/or NEPA adequacy cannot be made and the proposed action described above must undergo further NEPA review.

/s/ Francisco J. Mendoza
Francisco J. Mendoza, Project Lead

/s/ Amy H. Markstein
Signature of NEPA Coordinator

/s/ Viola Hillman
Signature of Responsible Official

02/27/2014
Date

Note: The signed DETERMINATION on this Worksheet concludes the review of the currently proposed action for compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act.