

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-I010-2014-0020-DNA

**BLM Office:** Upper Snake Field Office

**Lease/Serial/Case File No.:** ID-I010-RE-14-03

**Proposed Action Title:** HAPI Trails Competitive Horse Obstacle Event

**Type of Proposed Action:** Special Recreation Permit (Competitive Event)

**Location of Proposed Action:** Portion of Victor Grazing Allotment, three miles NE of Victor, Idaho.

**Description of the Proposed Action:**

Issue a 2-year Special Recreation Permit for an annual one-day competitive horseback obstacle course. The participants would use existing game and livestock trails within a portion of the Victor Grazing Allotment (1560 acres). The event will be staged on adjacent private lands at Linn Brothers Outfitting, Inc. The obstacle course would be assembled on BLM-managed lands using natural features and objects. No ground disturbance would occur as a result of obstacle assembly. Groups would average 4-6 people, with a total of 40-50 participants. Participants would be timed as they travel through the obstacle course. Judges would be staged at each obstacle, as well as safety personnel on-hand to address medical emergencies. Registration is required to participate in the event and awards will be given upon conclusion of the event.

Competitive use means any organized, sanctioned, or structured use, event, or activity on public land in which two or more contestants compete and either of the following elements apply: 1) participants register, enter, or complete an application for the event 2) a predetermined course or area is designated.

**Applicant (if any):** HAPI Trails

**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 4 Scatted Tracts (page 11-12), “Continue to manage the area for dispersed recreation activities.”

**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:**

*Special Recreation Permits Environmental Assessment (2004) EA Number ID-074-2004-0042*

**Other documentation relevant to the proposed action:**

A post use evaluation for the previous two 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?**

Yes, the proposed action to place Hapi Trails, Horse Adoption Program under a Special Recreation Permit (SRP) complies with the alternative selected and analyzed in *Special Recreation Permits Environmental Assessment (2004) EA number ID-074-2004-0042*.

**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, section 2, page 2 of the *Special Recreation Permits Environmental Assessment (2004)* describes the alternatives considered when issuing SRP on BLM-administered lands within the USFO. 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 (pages 5-11) including direct, indirect and cumulative impacts (pages 11-13).

**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?**

Yes, 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 *Special Recreation Permits Environmental Assessment (2004) EA number ID-074-2004-0042*.

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

Yes, the Environmental Assessment provides sufficient detailed assessments of all alternatives including the Proposed Action Alternative to sustain the action of issuing a permit for competitive use (i.e., Horseback obstacle course/race) by Hapi Trails, Horse Adoption Program.

**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?**

Yes, the direct and indirect impacts of the competitive activity (i.e., Horseback obstacle course/race) that would occur in the Victor area are unchanged from those identified in the existing *Special Recreation Permits Environmental Assessment (2004)*. The current NEPA document specifically analyses impacts related to competitive events for this area.

**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)?**

Yes, the 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 *Special Recreation Permits Environmental Assessment (2004)* accurately describes impacts associated with competitive events and may be found within pages 11 through 13 of the NEPA document.

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

Yes, section 5, page 13 of the *Recreation Permits Environmental Assessment (2004)* 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 3/26/2014

NEPA Reviewer: Marissa Guenther /s/ Marissa Guenther 3/26/2014

Upper Snake Field Manager: Jeremy Casterson /s/ Jeremy Casterson 3/26/2014