

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-G020-2014-0011-DNA

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

Project Title/Type: Whitlow Kiosk Site Plan

Location of Proposed Action: The proposed portal site is on public lands in the Middle Gila Canyons Travel Management Area, at an existing parking turnout along the Whitlow Ranch Road approximately 1 mile north of the Florence-Kelvin Hwy. The proposed portal site is generally situated in T5S R11E Sec. 15 NW ¼ NW ¼ G&SR PM, Pinal County, Arizona. Map 1 and Map 2 show the location of the proposed action. Site Map 1 shows the layout of the existing parking turnout, nearby existing cattle guard, and the proposed information kiosk installation site.

Description of the Proposed Action: Install a visitor information kiosk at the existing parking turnout as shown on Site Map 1. The kiosk installation requires excavation of two holes approx. 10” diameter and 30” deep, and setting the steel posts which support the information display board. The existing parking turnout will be capped with aggregate, and maintained as part of Whitlow Ranch Rd. Parking turnout maintenance work includes grading when Whitlow Ranch Road is maintained; pruning or removing encroaching vegetation as needed, replacing or repairing the signs, picking up litter, and monitoring use. Traffic control barriers are not immediately needed due to vegetation and existing fencing which provide an edge limiting the spread of vehicle use impacts. Boulder barriers may be installed in the future if the need arises. The visitor information kiosk will be installed within the existing disturbance of the parking turnout. The site will be visited periodically by BLM personnel or volunteers to inspect conditions, check for compliance, and maintain the site.

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**	_____	Date Approved	_____
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 Middle Gila Canyons TMP implemented OHV designations established in the Phoenix 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.

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 portal site along the Whitlow Ranch Road near the Florence-Kelvin Highway intersection. The proposed action implements that decision, but the location selected instead is an existing parking turnout approximately 0.7 miles farther north.*

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. *Whitlow Ranch Road Right of Way (ROW# AZA 29840, 12.5'), held by Pinal County in T5S R11E Sec 15. The ROW covers the existing travel way; the existing parking turnout extends outside the road ROW.*

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 substantially the same as previously analyzed, except it is at a more suitable existing turnout farther north along Whitlow Ranch Rd.

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. The proposed portal kiosk is at a more suitable location than the original site considered in the existing NEPA document.

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 initial portal kiosk site was located closer to Florence Kelvin Highway on the west side of the road. This location requires north bound road users to maneuver off the main road across traffic, travel on a single lane road to the existing turn out for parking and maneuvering. The proposed portal kiosk location is on an existing turnout on the east side of the road, with safer maneuvering and temporary parking space.

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. The proposed action utilizes an existing turnout for parking and information kiosk installation.

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 decision to provide portal information along public land access routes in the TMP.

E. Persons/Agencies/BLM Staff Consulted

<u>Name</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Resource/Agency Represented</u>
Francisco J. Mendoza,	Outdoor Recreation Planner	Recreation, Access, Transportation
Claire Crow	IFNM Manager	Renewable Resources
Linda Dunlavey	Realty Specialist	Lands/Realty, ROWs
Kristen Duarte	Range Specialist	Grazing, Permits
Amy Markstein	Coordinator	NEPA Reviews
Amy Sobiech,	Archaeologist	Cultural Resources
Albert Mezzano,	Park Ranger	Operations and Site Work

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

04/09/2014
Date

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