

**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-G020-2014-0010-DNA

---

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

**Project Title/Type:** Arizona National Scenic Trail Red Mountain Access Point Site Plan

**Location of Proposed Action:** Public lands in the Middle Gila Canyons Travel Management Area, at the existing Red Mountain trail access point along the Rincon Road. The trail access point is generally situated in T4S R12E Sec. 5 NW ¼ NE ¼ G&SR PM, Pinal County, AZ. Map 1 shows the location of the proposed action.

**Description of the Proposed Action:** Provide maintenance for an existing designated access point for the Arizona National Scenic Trail from Rincon Road as shown on Map 1 and Map 2. The access point includes an existing primitive parking turnout, existing boulder barriers to control vehicle access onto the trail, existing signing, a planned trail information kiosk, and monitoring. Maintenance work includes grading the parking turnout when Rincon Road is maintained in the future, pruning or removing encroaching vegetation as needed, and reinforcing the boulder barriers with additional boulders if the existing barriers become ineffective. The trail information kiosk will be installed within the existing disturbance of the parking turnout, and within the trail development corridor previously surveyed for archaeological resources. Vegetation trimming will be done with hand tools using proper pruning techniques, and slash will be lopped and scattered as mulch on adjacent grounds. The existing parking turnout is occasionally used for camping, and any campfires will be cleaned and obliterated to discourage camping to avoid potential conflicts with trail access. The site will be visited periodically by BLM personnel or volunteers to inspect conditions, check for compliance with trail use restrictions, clean up any litter, maintain the trail, and monitor trail use.

**Applicant (if any):** BLM Recreation Management Program.

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

LUP Name*	<u>Phoenix RMP/EIS</u>	Date Approved	<u>Sep. 1989</u>
Other document**	<u></u>	Date Approved	<u></u>
Other document**	<u>Middle Gila Canyons TTMP EA</u>	Date Approved	<u>Nov. 10, 2011</u>

\*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):

Comments:

*The Arizona National Scenic Trail was developed in this area consistent with public land laws and regulations, which is provided for under the existing LUP.*

**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. *Middle Gila Canyons Transportation and Travel Management Plan, EA# AZ-420-2007-01; Decision Record Nov. 10, 2010. This Plan and EA identifies installation of a trail access point along the Rincon Road for back country trail access. The proposed action implements that decision.*
2. *Arizona Trail Copper Butte Project Phase II, White Canyon Passage, Pinal County, Arizona; EA# AZ-420-2006-020. This NEPA review provided for trail development from the Florence-Kelvin Highway trailhead to the National Forest land boundary, including the Red Mountain trail segment involved in this proposed action.*
3. *Arizona National Scenic Trail White Canyon Passage Trail Development, DNA# AZ-G020-2010-0030. This NEPA review document finalized the trail location for construction of the existing trail at the site of the proposed action. Trail construction was completed in 2011.*

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).

1. *Middle Gila Roads Inventory 2008: Cultural Resources Inventory of 46 Miles of Existing Roads on BLM land East of Florence, Pinal County, Arizona, July 7, 2008 (Revised). This inventory identifies the cultural resource inventory projects covering the location of the proposed action. No cultural resource values were identified at the project site.*

**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, the proposed action is the same as previously analyzed.*

**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, the range of alternatives analyzed in the existing NEPA document is appropriate for the current proposed action.*

**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 in light of new information. The 2008 cultural resources inventory identified no cultural resource values at the project site.*

**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, indirect and cumulative impacts from the currently proposed action are similar to those analyzed in the existing NEPA documents.*

**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. Extensive public and interagency review was conducted for the Middle Gila Canyons TMP and EA. The current proposed action identifies site specific measures proposed to implement decisions in the TMP.*

**E. Persons/Agencies/BLM Staff Consulted**

<b><u>Name</u></b>	<b><u>Title</u></b>	<b><u>Resource/Agency Represented</u></b>
Francisco J. Mendoza,	Outdoor Recreation Planner	Recreation, Access, Transportation
Amy Sobiech,	Archaeologist	Cultural Resources
Albert Mezzano,	Park Ranger	Operations and Site Work
Shawn Redfield	Trail Steward	Arizona Trail Association
Fred Gaudet	Trail Operations	Arizona Trail Association

Note: Refer to the EA 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 Markstein  
Signature of NEPA Coordinator

/s/ Viola E. Hillman  
Signature of Responsible Official

4/16/2014  
Date

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