

**Worksheet**  
**Determination of NEPA Adequacy (DNA)**  
U.S. Department of the Interior  
Bureau of Land Management

---

OFFICE: Black Rock Field Office, Winnemucca District

TRACKING NUMBER: DOI-BLM-NV-W030-2014-0015-DNA

CASEFILE/PROJECT NUMBER: NVW01000-14-08

PROPOSED ACTION TITLE/TYPE: Bay Area Rocketry Vending SRP

LOCATION/LEGAL DESCRIPTION:

T. 35 N., R. 25 E., sec. 22-28; 33-36  
T. 35 N., R. 26 E., sec. 19-20; 29-32  
T. 34 N., R. 25 E., sec. 5-8; 18  
T. 34 N., R. 26 E., sec. 1-4; 10-14

APPLICANT:

**A. Description of the Proposed Action with attached map(s) and any applicable mitigation measures.**

The proposed action would be to authorize a 5 year commercial Special Recreation Permit (SRP) for Bay Area Rocketry to conduct vending services in conjunction with rocket launching SRPs. This permit would allow for critical retail and delivery services associated with rocket launching activities. All permitted activities would occur in the rocket launching area (12,499 acres) indicated on the attached map, unless otherwise approved for public safety, resource concerns, or due to specific operating requirements. Only superficial surface disturbance is anticipated as a result of driving onto the Black Rock Desert playa.

**B. Land Use Plan (LUP) Conformance**

LUP Name: Record of Decision and Resource Management Plan for Black Rock Desert-High Rock Canyon Emigrant Trails National Conservation Area and Associated Wilderness, and other Contiguous Lands in Nevada. Date Approved: July 2004

Other Documents: H-2930-1 – Recreation Permit Administration  
Date Approved: 08/07/2006

Other Documents: Black Rock Desert-High Rock Canyon Emigrant Trails National Conservation Area Act of 2000      Date Approved: December 2000

\*List applicable LUPs (for example, resource management plans; activity, project, management, or program plans; or applicable amendments thereto)

The proposed action in conformance with the applicable LUP because it is specifically provided for the following LUP decisions:

REC-28: Rocket launching activities would be required to use the rocket launching area (12,499 acres) indicated on Map 2-15, unless otherwise approved for public safety, resource concerns, or due to specific operating requirements.

**C. Identify applicable National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) documents and other related documents that cover the proposed action.**

Proposed Resource Management Plan and Final Environmental Impact Statement for the Black Rock Desert-High Rock Canyon Emigrant Trails National Conservation Area (NCA) and Associated Wilderness, and other Contiguous Lands in Nevada. ROD 7/2004  
Publication number: BLM/WN/PL-03/027+1793

Burning Man 2012-2016 Special Recreation Permit EA  
DOI-BLM-NV-W030-2012-0007- EA / June 2012  
DR dated 06/12/2012 and FONSI dated 06/12/2012.

Special Recreation Permit for CXST Spaceshot  
EA # NV-020-02-22  
Decision Date: 5/23/02

AeroPac and Balls Rocket Launches  
EA # NV-020-02-23  
Decision Date: 6/7/02

Special Recreation Permit for CXST Spaceshot  
EA # NV-020-03-19  
Decision Date: 6/9/2003

List by name and date other documentation relevant to the proposed action (e.g., biological assessment, biological opinion, watershed assessment, allotment evaluation, and monitoring report).

N/A

**D. NEPA Adequacy Criteria**

**1. Is the new proposed action a feature of, or essentially similar to, an alternative analyzed in the existing NEPA documents(s)? Is the project within the same analysis area, or if the project location is different, are the geographic and resource conditions sufficiently similar to those analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)? If there are differences, can you explain why they are not substantial?**

Documentation of answer and explanation:

Yes. The proposed action would be held in the same area analyzed in the above mentioned EAs. There are no potentially substantial differences between the current proposal and the potential impacts analyzed in the EAs.

There are no environmental issues that would cause BLM to determine that the proposal for Vendor SRP constitutes a substantial difference from potential impacts analyzed in the above EAs.

**2. Is the range of alternatives analyzed in the existing NEPA documents(s) appropriate with respect to the new proposed action, given current environmental concerns, interests, and resource values?**

Documentation of answer and explanation:

The information upon which the existing NEPA documents are based remains valid and germane to the proposed action.

**3. Is the existing analysis valid in light of any new information or circumstances (such as, rangeland health standard assessment, recent endangered species listings, updated lists of BLM-sensitive species)? Can you reasonably conclude that new information and new circumstances would not substantially change the analysis of the new proposed action?**

Documentation of answer and explanation:

Yes. At the present time, there is no new information or changed circumstances that would substantially change the analysis of the new proposed action.

**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. At the present time there is no new information or circumstances that have changed that would substantially change the direct, indirect and cumulative effect of the new proposed action.

**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. In addition to the normal scoping methods and processes used for the EIS, EAs and RMP mentioned above, this document will be posted on the Winnemucca District web site.

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

Name /Title	Resource/Agency Represented	Signature/Date	Comments (Attach if more room is needed)
Joey Carmosino ORP	Recreation	/s/ V.J. Carmosino June 18, 2014	None
Kathy Cadigan	T&E Species, Special Status Species, Wildlife Habitat	/s/ K. Cadigan June 18, 2014	None
Kathy Ataman	Cultural Resources	/s/ K. Ataman June 18, 2014	None
Mark Hall	NEPA Coordinator		

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.

**Conclusion** *(If you found that one or more of these criteria is not met, you will not be able to check this box.)*

Based on the review documented above, I conclude that this proposal conforms to the applicable land use plan and that the NEPA documentation fully covers the proposed action and constitutes BLM' compliance with the requirements of the NEPA.

\_\_\_\_\_/s/ V.J. Carmosino\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of Project Lead

\_\_\_\_\_/s/ Mark E. Hall\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of NEPA Coordinator

\_\_\_\_\_/s/ Shonna Dooman\_\_\_\_\_  
Signature of the Responsible Official

June 18, 2014  
Date

**Note:** The signed Conclusion on this Worksheet is part of an interim step in the BLM's internal decision process and does not constitute an appealable decision. However, the lease, permit, or other authorization based on this DNA is subject to protest or appeal under 43 CFR Part 4 and the program-specific regulations.