

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-G010-2015-0032

A. BLM Office: Safford Field Office/Tucson Field Office

Lease/Serial/Case File No. AZA-036831

Project Title/Type: Arizona Classic Hunts Special Recreation Permit (SRP)

Location of Proposed Action: Safford Field Office and Tucson Field Office (Gila, Black Hills, Swisselms, Peloncillos, Doz Cabezas, and Galiuro mountains) Refer to figure 1.

Description of the Proposed Action: Classic Arizona Hunts proposes to provide guided hunts for big/small game (deer and elk) and bird watching within the Safford/Tucson Field Offices' boundaries from October 23, 2015 to October 22, 2020. Hunts would take place in Game Management Units (GMU) 28, 29, 30A, 30B (Black Hills, Peloncillos, Galiuros, Swisshelm, and Mule mountains). Group size would average 5-10 people per trip with 10-15 trips per year. Average length of each trip would be up to 5-7 days. Overnight camping would not take place on BLM public lands and would be limited to state and private lands. Horse and pack animals may be used depending on the situation. The outfitter would provide meals, snacks, and bottled water. All trash would be hauled out and properly disposed of. First aid kits will be carried on each trip. Standard stipulations for all commercial recreation use will apply including noxious weed stipulations and Leave No Trace principles. This will be a 5-year permit.

Applicant (if any): David Chavez

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

LUP Name* Safford District Resource Management Plan (RMP)

Date Approved Record Of Decision (ROD) Part I Sept, 1992 and ROD Part II July 1994

LUP Name* _____ Date Approved _____

Other document** _____ Date Approved _____

*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) Safford District RMP management objective RR07:

The Safford District will endeavor to provide a variety of recreational opportunities that meets public demand and are compatible with the Bureau's stewardship responsibilities.

This complies with 43 CFR 8372 which requires BLM authorization of commercial recreation use.

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.

- Special Recreation Permits for Commercial Recreation Activities on Public Lands in Arizona EA Number AZ-931-93-001, August 1993.

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).

- NA

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 provided for in the Safford District RMP. Additionally, the 1993 SRP EA for commercial recreation activities on public lands in Arizona analyzed day use and multiple day trips for commercial recreation operators who propose activities that comply with the standard stipulations that are "designed to protect the land or resources involved, reduce user conflict, or minimize health and safety hazards" as shown in Attachment A of the EA. Much of the EA analyzes overnight camping, multiple day activities, vehicle use, use of pack stock, use of campfires, and use of latrines.

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 recreational activities proposed by Classic Arizona Hunts are included in the types of activities analyzed in the 1993 SRP EA. The types of activities proposed are covered by the analysis of the existing EA.

The proposed action also proposes use within designated Wilderness areas. For Wilderness areas that do not have a current Wilderness Management plan (Peloncillo Mountains), stipulations from the 1993 EA will be included as terms of the SRP (group size no larger than 6 people).

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 EA analyzes two alternatives, the Proposed Action Alternative (issues a commercial permit with stipulations) and the No Action Alternative (no permitting). That range of alternatives adequately covers Arizona Classic Hunts' proposed guided hunts/activities. There has been no significant change in the circumstances or significant new information germane to the Proposed Action.

Additional wildlife species and critical habitat have been listed under the Endangered Species Act since preparation of the existing EA. The Safford Field Office reviewed the current list of federally threatened, endangered, and candidate species in relation to the actions specified in the permit request in conjunction with the standard Special Recreation Permit stipulations.

Regarding predator hunt activities associated with the proposed action, three predator species are protected by state and federal law: Mexican wolves, jaguars and ocelots. An ocelot has been documented in the Huachuca Mountains several times recently and a jaguar in an adjacent mountain range. However, hunters, especially predator tag holders, must abide by state hunting regulations and must be familiar with identifying features of Mexican wolves, jaguars and ocelots (see pp. 68, 69 and 105 in "2015-16 Arizona Hunting Regulations"). Therefore, there would be no effect from the proposed action on listed species.

Further, the proposed action would not present issues regarding invasive species, water quality, and Environmental Justice.

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

The direct and indirect impacts of the proposed guiding business are not significantly different than those identified in the 1993 SRP EA. The impacts of these activities would be less than many of the overnight activities analyzed in the existing EA because the proposed action is for day use only. The proposed hunting guiding business would not change the analysis of cumulative impacts in the existing EA because it is included in the types of commercial activities analyzed in that EA. Further, the existing environment has not changed substantially since 1993; therefore, further analysis of impacts from commercial recreation uses is not necessary.

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

Public involvement in the 1993 SRP EA was substantial. About 700 draft EAs were mailed for review and comment during preparation of the analysis. Many individuals, organizations, and agencies were asked to review the draft EA.

E. Persons/Agencies/BLM Staff Consulted

<u>Name</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Resource/Agency Represented</u>
Todd Murdock		Recreation
Dan McGrew		Cultural Resources
Jeff Conn		Wildlife, T&E Species, Environmental Justice Nonnative/Invasive Plants
Amelia Underwood		Hazardous Materials, Air Quality, Water Quality
Roberta Lopez		Lands/Realty
Jason Martin		Range
Amy Corathers		Planning and Environmental Specialist

Note: Refer to the 1993 SRP EA 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 existing NEPA documentation fully covers the proposed action and constitute 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

Todd Murchison

Signature of Project Lead

Amy Corathers 10/23/15

Signature of NEPA Coordinator

Scott Cooke

Signature of Responsible Official

11/12/15

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.

DECISION:

I have reviewed this plan conformance and NEPA compliance record and have determined that the proposed action is either (a) in conformance with or (b) clearly consistent with terms, conditions, and decisions of the approved land use plan and that no further environmental analysis is required. It is my Decision to implement the project, as described, with the mitigation measures identified below.

Mitigation measures or other remarks:

1. The Swisselm Mountains is surrounded by private land. Ensure that respect and permission are given and received from applicable lands owners per general stipulation #2 from the 1993 SRP EA.
2. If hay is used for pack stock, all hay must be certified weed-free hay per Safford Field Office Commercial Special Recreation Permit Stipulations Pack and Saddle Stock stipulation #1.
3. For activities within the Peloncillo Mountains Wilderness, group size is not to exceed 6 people (per 1993 SRP EA).
4. Stipulations from the 1993 SRP EA Attachment A-Arizona BLM Stipulations For Commercial Special Recreation Permits (attached) will be incorporated into the SRP stipulations.



Field Manager

11/12/15

Date