

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

**Determination of NEPA Adequacy
DOI-BLM-UT-Y010-2016-0057**

December 2015

Special Recreation Permit Amendment for Mountain Madness

Location: Climbing locations within the Moab Field Office:

Applicant/Address: Jaime Pollitte, 3018 SW Charleston St., Seattle, WA 92126

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



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, on page 98 of the Moab RMP, it 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 includes areas within lands with wilderness characteristics three of which are being managed as Natural Areas. Other lands within the proposal, although identified as possessing wilderness characteristics are not being managed as such. The proposed activity would not result in any changes in the impacts that were analyzed in the FEIS for the RMP.

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 DOI-BLM-UTY010-2010-0082 EA, *Special Recreation Permit for Jackson Hole Mountain Guides*, signed February 8, 2010, covers all the climbing activities considered in the Proposed Action.

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 climbing 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 DOI-BLM-UTY010-2010-0082 contains analysis of the proposed action and a no action alternative. The environmental concerns, interests, resource values, and circumstances have not changed to a degree that warrants broader consideration.

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 documents. Yes; 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

The public was notified of the preparation of Environmental Assessment DOI-BLM-UTY010-2010-0082 EA, *Special Recreation Permit for Jackson Hole Mountain Guides*, on January 6, 2010. This level of involvement and notification is adequate for the current proposed action.

E. Persons/Agencies/BLM Staff Consulted:

<u>Name</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Resource Represented</u>
Ann Marie Aubry	Hydrologist	Air quality; Water quality; Floodplains, Soils, Wetlands/Riparian
Katie Stevens	Recreation Planner	Areas of Critical Environmental Concern; Wild & Scenic Rivers, Recreation, Visual Resources
David Pals	Geologist	Wastes (hazardous or solid), Paleontology, Geology
Dave Williams	Rangeland Management Specialist	T&E Plants, Invasive Weeds, Livestock Grazing, RHS, Vegetation

Jan Denney	Realty Specialist	Lands/Access
Jared Lundell	Archaeologist	Cultural Resources; Native American Religious Concerns
Pam Riddle	Wildlife Biologist	Threatened, Endangered, or Candidate Animal Species, Wildlife, Migratory Birds, Utah Sensitive Species
Bill Stevens	Recreation Planner	Wilderness, Natural Areas, Socioeconomics, Lands with Wilderness Characteristics, Environmental Justice

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

12/23/15
Date

KC Stevens
Signature of NEPA Coordinator

12/23/15
Date

[Signature]
Signature of the Responsible Official

12/23/15
Date

**ATTACHMENTS:
ID Team Checklist**

INTERDISCIPLINARY TEAM CHECKLIST

Project Title: Special Recreation Permit Amendment for Mountain Madness
NEPA Log Number: DOI-BLM-UT-Y010-0057
File/Serial Number: MFO-Y010-15-060R

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		Ann Marie Aubry AMA	12-22-15
NC	Floodplains		Ann Marie Aubry AMA	12-22-15
NC	Soils		Ann Marie Aubry AMA	12-22-15
NC	Water Resources/Quality (drinking/surface/ground)		Ann Marie Aubry AMA	12-22-15
NC	Wetlands/Riparian Zones		Ann Marie Aubry Mark Grover	12-22-15
NC	Areas of Critical Environmental Concern		Katie Stevens KS	12/22/15
NC	Recreation		Katie Stevens KS	12/22/15
NC	Wild and Scenic Rivers		Katie Stevens KS	12/22/15
NC	Visual Resources		Katie Stevens KS	12/22/15
NC	Wild Lands (BLM Natural Areas)		Bill Stevens BS	12/22/15
NC	Socio-Economics		Bill Stevens BS	12/22/15
NC	Wilderness/WSA		Bill Stevens BS	12/22/15
NC	Lands with Wilderness Characteristics		Bill Stevens BS	12-22-15
NC	Cultural Resources		Jared Hunden Don Montoya JAM	12/22/15

Determination	Resource	Rationale for Determination*	Signature	Date
NC	Native American Religious Concerns		Sarah Lurdell Don Montoya VM	12/22/15
NC	Environmental Justice		Bill Stevens	12/22/15
NC	Wastes (hazardous or solid)		Rebecca Dougherty David Pals	12/22/15
NC	Threatened, Endangered or Candidate Animal Species		Pam Riddle	12/22/15
NC	Migratory Birds		Pam Riddle	12/22/15
NC	Utah BLM Sensitive Species		Pam Riddle	12/22/15
NC	Fish and Wildlife Excluding USFW Designated Species		Pam Riddle	12/22/15
NC	Invasive Species/Noxious Weeds		Dave Williams	12/22/15
NC	Threatened, Endangered or Candidate Plant Species		Dave Williams	12/22/15
NC	Livestock Grazing		Dave Williams/ Jordan Davis/ Kim Allison	12/22/15
NC	Rangeland Health Standards		Dave Williams/ Jordan Davis/ Kim Allison	12/22/15
NC	Vegetation Excluding USFW Designated Species		Kim Allison	12/22/15
NC	Woodland / Forestry		Jordan Davis	12/22/15
NC	Fuels/Fire Management		Josh Relph	
NC	Geology / Mineral Resources/Energy Production		David Pals	12/22/15
NC	Lands/Access		Jan Denney	
NC	Paleontology		Rebecca Hunt-Foster	

FINAL REVIEW:

Reviewer Title	Signature	Date	Comments
Environmental Coordinator	Katie Stevens	12/23/15	
Authorized Officer	Beth Ransel Rock Smith	12/23/15	

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

**Mountain Madness (commercial rock climbing tours)
DOI-BLM-UT-Y010-0057**

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 issue the commercial Special Recreation Permit for Mountain Madness 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 authorize this Special Recreation Permit for Mountain Madness 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

12/23/15
Date