

Determination of NEPA Adequacy (DNA)

Rock Rat Adventures OHV/ATV Touring

Virginia City

Nevada

Rock Rat proposes to offer off-highway vehicle touring in the Virginia City area. One tour will be seven miles, five miles on BLM land and the other route will consist of six miles on BLM land.

Determination of NEPA Adequacy (DNA)

Worksheet

U.S. Department of the Interior

Bureau of Land Management

OFFICE: Sierra Front Field Office, LLNVC02000

CASEFILE/PROJECT NUMBER: NVC02-15106

PROPOSED ACTION TITLE/TYPE: *Rock Rat Adventures* OHV touring

LOCATION/LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Virginia City, Storey County, Nevada

APPLICANT: Rock Rat Adventures

Description of Proposed Action and any applicable mitigation measures

Rock Rat Adventures is proposing to provide off-road vehicle excursions in the Virginia City Area. The Proposed Action would be to two routes, providing a diversity of visitor experience. The Virginia City West Route would be a seven mile round trip tour, driving through five miles of existing roads through BLM land. This staging for this route would be on private land. The Virginia City East Route would be a six mile roundtrip tour, driving through BLM existing roads. This route would include one staging area on public land which is highly disturbed. This staging area would only be used as an alternate if private staging is not available. The two courses are on existing roads. One course is part of the Virginia City Grand Prix race course, which has been evaluated under NEPA. This Special Recreation Permit would be issued for one year, but has the potential to renew over multiple years.

Land Use Plan Conformance

LUP Name*	Carson City Field Office Consolidated Resource Management Plan	Date Approved:	May 2001
-----------	--	----------------	----------

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

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

REC-2, Desired Outcome #1: "Provide a wide range of quality recreation opportunities on public lands under management of the Carson City Field Office."

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

List by name and date all applicable NEPA documents that cover the proposed action.

Virginia City Grand Prix, Final Environmental Assessment, January 2013. Approved Finding of No Significant Impact and Decision Record, January 4, 2013.

NEPA Adequacy Criteria

1. Is the new proposed action a feature of, or essentially similar to, an alternative analyzed in the existing NEPA document(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?

The new event area is a feature of the event that was analyzed in the existing NEPA analysis. The NEPA analysis considered roads and staging. The setting for the new event area is the same as what was analyzed in the existing NEPA analysis.

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

The existing NEPA analysis considered the use of existing disturbed areas (roads and staging). There are no new concerns that would need to be evaluated. The new proposed area is on existing disturbance, and is exempt from review for cultural resources because the potential for cultural sites to exist there is unlikely.

3. Is the existing analysis valid in light of any new information or circumstances (such as, rangeland health standard assessments, 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?

There is no new information for the BLM to consider. The event area is not within sage-grouse habitats. The existing and new areas are disturbed areas (existing roads, staging areas).

The BLM archeologist conducted a Class 1 survey and found a Class 111 inventory was not needed since the routes existed on established roads and already disturbed areas. No historical properties were found to be adversely affected. Cultural Resource report on file, see CRINA CCDO-CR-15-085.

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?

The new proposed event area is existing disturbance. The existing NEPA considered the event area to be existing roads. No new disturbances were evaluated. The existing analysis is consistent with the new event area.

5. Are there public involvement and interagency reviews associated with existing NEPA document(s) adequate for the current proposed action?

The BLM conducted a 30-day public scoping from June 26 to July 26, 2012. The event was widely supported and based on public comments; no revisions to the proposed event were made. On November 5 to December 5, 2012 the BLM conducted a 30-day public scoping period. No revisions to the proposed event were made. On January 4, 2013 the BLM issued the Finding of No Significant Impact and

Decision Record for the event. The BLM has determined that no new additional public outreach is necessary for this amendment.

BLM Staff Consulted

Name	Role	Discipline
Alicia Alfaro	Archeologist	Cultural Resources

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

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 constitute BLM's compliance with the requirement of NEPA.

Signature of Project Lead Melanie Hornsby
Melanie Hornsby

Signature of NEPA Coordinator Brian Buttazoni
Brian Buttazoni

Signature of the Responsible Official Leon Thomas
Leon Thomas, Manager,
Sierra Front Field Office

Date: 4/10/2015

Note:

The signed Conclusion on this Worksheet is part of an interim step in the BLM's internal decision process and does not constitute and appealable 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.