United States Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management

Determination of NEPA Adequacy
DOI-BLM-UT-Y010-2016-0107 DNA

March 2016

Special Recreation Permit for Fox Factory, Inc., ST USA Holding Inc.

Location: **Jeep Safari Routes within the Moab Field Office**

Applicant/Address: **Shellie Wheaton, 491 W. Garfield Ave., Coldwater, MI 49036**

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

BLM

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-Y010-16-047R

PROPOSED ACTION TITLE: Special Recreation Permit for Fox Factory, Inc. ST USA Holdings Inc.

LOCATION/LEGAL DESCRIPTION: Jeep Safari Routes within the Moab Field Office.

APPLICANT: Shellie Wheaton, 491 W. Garfield Ave., Coldwater, MI 49036

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

Shellie Wheaton, on behalf of Fox Factory Inc. ST USA Holdings Inc, has requested authorization through a Special Recreation Permit (SRP) to conduct trail rides on Jeep Safari routes in the Moab Field Office. Fox Factory Inc. ST USA Holdings Inc has not previously held an SRP with the Moab Field Office. The proposed use would typically be day use only and during the annual Easter Jeep Safari event. 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 Assessment would be attached to the SRP for Fox Factory Inc. ST USA Holdings Inc.

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, 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 does not include any areas determined to have wilderness characteristics. 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-UT-Y010-2011-0189, *Red Rock 4-Wheelers Jeep Safari and Fall Campout10-Year Permit Renewal and Other Permitted, Non-Competitive Motorized Use of Jeep Safari Routes*, signed December 28, 2012, includes analysis of what is outlined in the proposed action.

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 10-Year Permit Renewal and Other Permitted, Non-Competitive Motorized Use of Jeep Safari Routes in the Moab Field Office Area, issued September 5, 2012 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 document addresses the impacts of permitted motorized use of Jeep Safari routes in the Moab Field Office. These are the routes requested by the current applicant.

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-UT-Y010-2011-0189 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.

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 unchanged from those identified in the existing NEPA document. 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

Documentation of answer and explanation: Public involvement for Environmental Assessment DOI-BLM-UT-Y010-2011-0189 included a 30-day scoping period and a 30-day public comment period on the draft EA, during which over 500 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 onJune 1, 2011. 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, Soils
Katie Stevens	Recreation Planner	Areas of Critical Environmental Concern; Recreation, Visual Resources, Wild & Scenic Rivers
Jared Lundell	Archaeologist	Cultural Resources; Native American Religious Concerns
David Williams	Range Management Specialist	Threatened, Endangered, or Candidate Plant Species; Livestock Grazing, RHS, Vegetation
Jordan Davis	Range Management Specialist	Invasive, Non-native species, Woodland
David Pals	Geologist	Geology, Paleontology, Wastes (hazardous or solid)
Pam Riddle	Wildlife Biologist	Threatened, Endangered, or Candidate Animal Species, Migratory Birds, Utah Sensitive Species, Fish and Wildlife
Bill Stevens	Recreation Planner	Wilderness, Socioeconomics, Lands with Wilderness Characteristics, Natural Areas, Environmental Justice
Jan Denney	Realty Specialist	Lands/Access
Mark Grover	Ecologist	Wetlands/Riparian Zones
ReBecca Hunt-Foster	Paleontologist	Paleontology

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	3/1/16
Signature of Project Lead	Date
KC Stevens	3/1/16
Signature of NEPA Coordinator	Date
Jennifer Jones	3/2/16
Signature of the Responsible Official	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 for ~~Sport Truck USA, Inc. (St. USA Holding Corp)~~ (Fox Factory Inc., ST USA Holdings Inc.)
NEPA Log Number: DOI-BLM-UT-Y010-2016-167DNA
File/Serial Number: MFO-Y010-16-047R
Project Leader: Katie Stevens

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	3/2/16
NC	Floodplains		Ann Marie Aubry Mark Grover	3/2/16
NC	Soils		Ann Marie Aubry	3/2/16
NC	Water Resources/Quality (drinking/surface/ground)		Ann Marie Aubry	3/2/16
NC	Wetlands/Riparian Zones		Mark Grover	3/2/16
NC	Areas of Critical Environmental Concern		Katie Stevens KS	2/25/16
NC	Recreation		Katie Stevens KS	2/25/16
NC	Wild and Scenic Rivers		Katie Stevens KS	2/25/16
NC	Visual Resources		Katie Stevens KS	2/25/16
NC	Wild Lands (BLM Natural Areas)		Bill Stevens BS	3-2-16
NC	Socio-Economics		Bill Stevens BS	3-2-16
NC	Wilderness/WSA		Bill Stevens BS	3-2-16
NC	Lands with Wilderness Characteristics		Bill Stevens BS	3-2-16
NC	Cultural Resources		Jared Lundell	3-2-16
NC	Native American Religious Concerns		Jared Lundell	3-2-16
NC	Environmental Justice		Bill Stevens BS	3-2-16

Determi-nation	Resource	Rationale for Determination*	Signature	Date
NC	Wastes (hazardous or solid)		David Pals	3/2/16
NC	Threatened, Endangered or Candidate Animal Species		Pam Riddle	3/2/16
NC	Migratory Birds		Pam Riddle	3/2/16
NC	Utah BLM Sensitive Species		Pam Riddle	3/2/16
NC	Fish and Wildlife Excluding USFW Designated Species		Pam Riddle	3/2/16
NC	Invasive Species/Noxious Weeds		Dave Williams	3/2/16
NC	Threatened, Endangered or Candidate Plant Species		Dave Williams	3/2/16
NC	Livestock Grazing		Dave Williams/ Jordan Davis/ Kim Allison	3/2/16
NC	Rangeland Health Standards		Dave Williams/ Jordan Davis/ Kim Allison	3/2/16
NC	Vegetation Excluding USFW Designated Species		Kim Allison	3/2/16
NC	Woodland / Forestry		Kim Allison	3/2/16
NC	Fuels/Fire Management		Josh Relph	3/2/16
NC	Geology / Mineral Resources/Energy Production		David Pals	3/2/16
NC	Lands/Access		Jan Denney	
NC	Paleontology		ReBecca Hunt-Foster	3/2/16

FINAL REVIEW:

Reviewer Title	Signature	Date	Comments
Environmental Coordinator	Katie Stevens	3/2/16	
Authorized Officer	J.L. Jones	3/2/16	

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT
AND
DECISION RECORD
Fox Factory Inc. ST USA Holdings Inc

DOI-BLM-UT-Y010-2016-0107 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 issue this Special Recreation Permit to Fox Factory Inc. ST USA Holdings Inc for organized group 4WD trail rides 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 the Special Recreation Permit for Fox Factory Inc. ST USA Holdings Inc 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.

APPEALS:

The decision may be appealed to the Interior Board of Land Appeals, Office of the Secretary, in accordance with the regulations contained in 43 CFR Part 4. Public notification of this decision will be considered to have occurred on March 2, 2016. Within 30 days of this decision, a notice of appeal must be filed in the office of the Authorized Officer at the Moab Field Office, 82 East Dogwood, Moab, Utah 84532. It a statement of reasons for the appeal is not included with the notice, it must be filed with the Interior Board of Land Appeals, Office of Hearings and Appeals, U.S. Department of the Interior, 801 North Quincy St., Suite 300, Arlington, VA 22203 within 30 days after the notice of appeal is filed with the Authorized Officer

Authorized Officer

3/2/2016
Date