

**United States Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management**

**Determination of NEPA Adequacy
DOI-BLM-UT-Y010-2016-0045**

**December 2015
Special Recreation Permit for
Grass Roots Events – 360 Moab**

***Location:* Jeep Safari Routes and designated roads, mountain bike and hiking trails within the Moab BLM Field Office.**

***Applicant/Address:* Chris Martinez, 1170 South Canon Vista Dr., Moab, UT 84532**

Moab Field Office
82 East Dogwood
Moab, Utah 84532
Phone: 435-259-2100
Fax: 435-259-2158



Worksheet

Determination of NEPA Adequacy

U.S. Department of the Interior
Utah Bureau of Land Management

The signed CONCLUSION at the end of this worksheet is part of an interim step in the BLM's internal analysis process and does not constitute an appealable decision; however, it constitutes an administrative record to be provided as evidence in protest, appeals and legal procedures.

OFFICE: Moab Field Office

PROJECT NUMBER: MFO-Y010-16-016R

PROPOSED ACTION TITLE: Special Recreation Permit for Grass Roots Events- 360 Moab

LOCATION/LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Jeep Safari Routes and designated roads, mountain bike and hiking trails within the Moab BLM Field Office.

APPLICANT: Chris Martinez, 1170 South Canon Vista Dr., Moab, UT 84532

A. Description of the Proposed Action and Any Applicable Mitigation Measures

Chris Martinez, on behalf of Grass Roots Events, has requested reauthorization of his Special Recreation Permit (SRP) to conduct commercial trail running tours on designated roads, routes and trails within the Moab Field Office. Martinez currently holds an SRP with the Moab Field Office for competitive running events. Tours would be primarily day use but may be up to three days in length. Tours would be offered year round. The maximum group size would be twenty clients with a 1:5 guide to client ratio. Leave No Trace practices would be followed and all solid human waste and garbage would be packed out. Standard Utah BLM stipulations and the stipulations developed in the referenced Environmental Assessments would be attached to the SRP for Grass Roots Events –360 Moab.

B. Land Use Plan (LUP) Conformance

LUP Name* Moab Resource Management Plan

Date Approved October, 2008

*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 LUPs because it is specifically provided for in the following LUP decisions:

Page 97 of the Moab RMP reads as follows: "Special Recreation Permits are issued as a discretionary action as a means to: help meet management objectives, provide opportunities for economic activity, facilitate recreational use of public lands, control visitor use, protect recreational and natural resources, and provide for the health and safety of visitors." In addition, page 98 states, "All SRPs will contain standard stipulations appropriate for the type of activity and may include stipulations necessary to protect lands or resources, reduce user

conflicts, or minimize health and safety concerns....Issue and manage recreation permits for a wide variety of uses to enhance outdoor recreational opportunities, provide opportunities for private enterprise, manage user-group interaction, and limit the impacts to such uses upon natural and cultural resources.”

The Moab Resource Management Plan (RMP), Final Environmental Impact Statement, signed October 31, 2008, identified lands with wilderness characteristics. The proposed use would occur in Natural Areas that are being managed for preservation of wilderness characteristics. The proposed activity would not result in any changes in the impacts that were analyzed in the FEIS for the RMP as the proposed activity involves no new surface disturbance or any permanent facilities.

C. Identify the 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.

Environmental Assessment UT-060-2005-080, *Red Rock 4-Wheelers Jeep Safari and Fall Campout 5-Year Permit Renewal and Other Permitted, Non-Competitive Motorized Use of Jeep Safari Routes*, signed January 23, 2006, includes analysis of proposed routes.

Environmental Assessment UT-060-2008-092, *Special Recreation Permit for Moab's Ultimate X-Country Endurance Challenge*, signed September 23, 2008. The proposed action was posted on the ENBB on August 18, 2008 and notice of the authorization was posted on September 23, 2008. This document includes analysis of proposed routes.

Environmental Assessment UT-060-2006-100 “Man Against the Machine” Competitive Event was signed on May 24, 2006. The proposed action was posted on the ENBB on April 24, 2006 and notice of the authorization was posted on the ENBB May 24, 2006. This document includes analysis of proposed routes.

Environmental Assessment UT-060-2007-029, *Special Recreation Permit for Dreamride, Inc. Commercial Mountain Biking and Hiking Tours*, signed February 1st, 2007, analyzed commercial hiking tours on many of the proposed routes.

Environmental Assessment DOI-BLM-UT-Y010-2011-0072, *Authorization of Moab Canyon Bike Path for All Non-Motorized Commercial and Organized Group Use*, signed February 3, 2011, covers commercial and organized group use of the Moab Canyon bike path.

All these NEPA documents cover actions on the identical routes requested through this permit.

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).

Biological Opinion for the Red Rock 4-Wheelers Jeep Safari and Fall Campout 5-Year Permit Renewal and Other Permitted, Non-Competitive Motorized Use of Jeep Safari Routes in the Moab and Monticello Field Office Areas, issued January 19, 2006 by U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

D. 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?

- Yes
 No

Documentation of answer and explanation:

The existing NEPA documents address the impacts of permitted motorized use of Jeep Safari routes and designated roads, mountain bike and hiking trails within the Moab Field Office.

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

- Yes
 No

Documentation of answer and explanation:

Environmental Assessment UT-060-2005-080 contains analysis of the proposed action, a reduced route alternative, and a no action alternative. The environmental concerns, interests, resource values, and circumstances have not changed to a degree that warrants broader consideration. Environmental Assessment UT-060-2008-092, UT-060-2006-100, UT-060-2007-029 and DOI-BLM-UT-Y010-2011-0072.

3. Is existing analysis adequate in light of any new information or circumstances (such as, rangeland health standards assessment; recent endangered species listings, updated list 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?

- Yes
 No

Documentation of answer and explanation:

The existing analysis and conclusions are adequate as there has been no new information or circumstances presented. It can be reasonably concluded that all new information and circumstances are insignificant with regard to analysis of the 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?

- Yes
 No

Documentation of answer and explanation:

The direct and indirect impacts are substantially unchanged from those identified in the existing NEPA document. Site-specific impacts analyzed in the existing document are the same as those associated with the current proposed action.

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

- Yes
 No

Documentation of answer and explanation:

Public involvement for Environmental Assessment UT-060-2005-080 included a 30-day scoping period, during which 176 comments were received, and a 30-day public comment period on the draft EA, during which over 2,000 comments were received. Agencies consulted regarding the existing EA included National Park Service, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Utah Division of Wildlife Resources, State of Utah, School and Institutional Trust Lands Administration (SITLA), Utah State Historic Preservation Office, and all affected Native American tribes. Notification for the current proposed action was posted on the ENBB on September 18, 2007. Environmental Assessment UT-060-2008-092 was posted on the ENBB on August 18, 2008 and notice of the authorization was posted on September 23, 2008. Environmental Assessment UT-060-2006-100 was posted on the ENBB on April 24, 2006 and notice of the authorization was posted on the ENBB May 24, 2006. Environmental Assessment UT-060-2007-029 was posted on the ENBB on December 2, 2006. Environmental Assessment DOI-BLM-UT-Y010-2011-0072, *Authorization of Moab Canyon Bike Path for All Non-Motorized Commercial and Organized Group Use*, was posted on the ENBB on January 22, 2011. Notification for the current proposed action, including the 30-day period for WSA use, was posted on the ENBB on February 2, 2007. This level of public involvement and interagency review is adequate for the current proposed action.

E. Persons/Agencies/BLM Staff Consulted:

Name	Title	Resource Represented
Ann Marie Aubry	Hydrologist	Air quality; Water quality; Floodplains;
Katie Stevens	Recreation Planner	Areas of Critical Environmental Concern; Farmlands, Wild & Scenic Rivers, Visual Resources
Bill Stevens	Recreation Planner	Environmental Justice, Wastes (hazardous or solid)
Jared Lundell	Archaeologist	Cultural Resources; Native American Religious Concerns
Jordan Davis	Rangeland Management Specialist	Invasive, Non-native species
Dave Williams	Rangeland Management	Threatened, Endangered, or

	Specialist	Candidate Plant Species
Pam Riddle	Wildlife Biologist	Threatened, Endangered, or Candidate Animal Species
Bill Stevens	Recreation Planner	Wilderness, WSA, Lands with Wilderness Characteristics
ReBecca Hunt Foster	Paleontologist	Paleontology
Mark Grover	Ecologist	Wetlands/Riparian Zones
David Pals	Geologist	Wastes, Geology
Jan Denney	Realty Specialist	Lands

CONCLUSION

Plan Conformance:

- This proposal conforms to the applicable land use plan.
- This proposal does not conform to the applicable land use plan

Determination of NEPA Adequacy

- 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's compliance with the requirements of the NEPA.
- The existing NEPA documentation does not fully cover the proposed action. Additional NEPA documentation is needed if the project is to be further considered.

KC Stevens
Signature of Project Lead

12/16/15
Date

KC Stevens
Signature of NEPA Coordinator

12/16/15
Date

[Signature]
Signature of the Responsible Official

12/17/15
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.

ATTACHMENTS:
ID Team Checklist

INTERDISCIPLINARY TEAM CHECKLIST

Project Title: Special Recreation Permit Renewal for Grass Roots Events – 360 Moab Adventures

NEPA Log Number: DOI-BLM-UT-Y010-2016-045 DNA

File/Serial Number: MFO-Y010-16-016R

Project Leader: Jennifer Jones

DETERMINATION OF STAFF: (Choose one of the following abbreviated options for the left column)

NP = not present in the area impacted by the proposed or alternative actions

NI = present, but not affected to a degree that detailed analysis is required

PI = present with potential for relevant impact that need to be analyzed in detail in the EA

NC = (DNAs only) actions and impacts not changed from those disclosed in the existing NEPA documents cited in Section D of the DNA form. The Rationale column may include NI and NP discussions.

The following elements are not present in the Moab Field Office and have been removed from the checklist:
Farmlands (Prime or Unique), Wild Horses and Burros.

Determination	Resource	Rationale for Determination*	Signature	Date
RESOURCES AND ISSUES CONSIDERED (INCLUDES SUPPLEMENTAL AUTHORITIES APPENDIX 1 H-1790-1)				
NC	Air Quality Greenhouse Gas Emissions		A.M. Aubry AMA	12-16-15
NC	Floodplains		A.M. Aubry AMA	12-16-15
NC	Soils		A.M. Aubry AMA	12-16-15
NC	Water Resources/Quality (drinking/surface/ground)		A.M. Aubry AMA	12-16-15
NC	Wetlands/Riparian Zones		Mark Grover MG	12-15-15
NC	Areas of Critical Environmental Concern		Kate Stevens KS	12/15/15
NC	Recreation		Kate Stevens KS	12/15/15
NC	Wild and Scenic Rivers		Kate Stevens KS	12/15/15
NC	Visual Resources		Kate Stevens KS	12/15/15
NC	BLM Natural Areas		Bill Stevens BS	12-15-15
NC	Socio-Economics		Bill Stevens BS	12-15-15
NC	Lands with Wilderness Characteristics		Bill Stevens BS	12-15-15
NC	Wilderness/WSA		Bill Stevens BS	12-15-15
NC	Cultural Resources		Jared Lundell JL	12-15-15
NC	Native American Religious Concerns		Jared Lundell JL	12-15-15
NC	Environmental Justice		Bill Stevens BS	12-15-15

Determination	Resource	Rationale for Determination*	Signature	Date
NC	Wastes (hazardous or solid)		<i>DP</i> David Pals	12/19/15
NC	Threatened, Endangered or Candidate Animal Species		Pam Riddle <i>P</i>	12/15/15
NC	Migratory Birds		Pam Riddle <i>P</i>	12/15/15
NC	Utah BLM Sensitive Species		Pam Riddle <i>P</i>	12/15/15
NC	Fish and Wildlife Excluding USFW Designated Species		Pam Riddle <i>P</i>	12/15/15
NC	Invasive Species/Noxious Weeds		<i>JD</i> Jordan Davis	12/15/15
NC	Threatened, Endangered or Candidate Plant Species		<i>DP</i> Dave Williams	12/15/15
NC	Livestock Grazing		<i>JD</i> Dave Williams	12/15/15
NC	Rangeland Health Standards		<i>JD</i> Dave Williams	12/15/15
NC	Vegetation Excluding USFW Designated Species		<i>JD</i> Dave Williams	12/15/15
NC	Woodland / Forestry		<i>JD</i> Jordan Davis	12/15/15
NC	Fuels/Fire Management		Josh Relph	
NC	Geology / Mineral Resources/Energy Production		<i>DP</i> David Pals	12/15/2015
NC	Lands/Access		<i>JD</i> Jan Denney	12-15-15
NC	Paleontology		ReBecca Hunt-Foster <i>RHF</i>	12/15/15

FINAL REVIEW:

Reviewer Title	Signature	Date	Comments
Environmental Coordinator	<i>KC Stevens</i>	12/14/15	
Authorized Officer	<i>J. Hunt</i>	12/17/15	

**FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT
AND
DECISION RECORD**

Grass Roots Events – 360 Moab (Commercial Trail Running)
DOI-BLM-UT-Y010-2015-0045 DNA

FONSI: Based on the analysis of potential environmental impacts contained in the present document, I have determined that the action will not have a significant effect on the human environment and an environmental impact statement is therefore not required.

DECISION: It is my decision to reissue the commercial Special Recreation Permit for Grass Roots Events – 360 Moab to operate in the areas listed under the Proposed Action. This decision is contingent upon meeting all stipulations and monitoring requirements attached.

RATIONALE: The decision to reauthorize this Special Recreation Permit for Grass Roots Events - 360 Moab has been made in consideration of the environmental impacts of the proposed action. The action is in conformance with the Moab Resource Management Plan, which allows for recreation use permits for a wide variety of uses to enhance outdoor recreational opportunities, provide opportunities for private enterprise, manage user-group interaction, and limit the impacts to such uses upon natural and cultural resources.



Authorized Officer

12/17/15

Date