

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

---

**Determination of NEPA Adequacy  
DOI-BLM-UT-Y010-2016-0140**

---

**March 2015  
Special Recreation Permit for Glorieta 2.0**

***Location:***

Climbing at Wall Street, the Ice Cream Parlor, Fisher Towers and the Castleton Tower Group

***Applicant/Address:*** Scott Chapman, 11 State Road 50, Glorieta, NM 87535

---

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





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: Yes; the existing NEPA documents address the impacts of permitted canyoneering tours 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: Yes; Environmental Assessment DOI-BLM-UTY010-2010-0082 EA 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: Yes; 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. The locations are the same as in the Jackson Hole EA.

**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: Yes; the direct and indirect impacts are substantially 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: The public was notified of the preparation of EA DOI-BLM-UTY010-2010-0082, Special Recreation Permit for Jackson Hole, on January 6, 2010. These notification periods were sufficient 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 Resources; Soils,
Katie Stevens	Outdoor Recreation Planner	Areas of Critical Environmental Concern; Wild & Scenic Rivers, Recreation, Visual Resources
Mark Grover	Ecologist	Wetlands/Riparian, Floodplains,
Dave Williams	Rangeland Management Specialist	T&E Plants, Invasive Weeds, RHS, Livestock Grazing, Vegetation, Woodland/forestry
Josh Relph	Fuels Specialist	Fuels/Fire Management
M. Jared Lundell	Archaeologist	Cultural Resources; Native American Religious Concerns
David Pals	Geologist	Geology, Paleontology, Wastes
Pam Riddle	Wildlife Biologist	Threatened, Endangered, or Candidate Animal Species, Wildlife, Migratory Birds, Wildlife
Bill Stevens	Outdoor Recreation Planner	Wilderness, Natural Areas, Socioeconomics, Environmental Justice, Lands with Wilderness Characteristics

**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

3/23/16  
Date

KC Stevens  
Signature of NEPA Coordinator

3/23/16  
Date

Jamie  
Signature of the Responsible Official

3/24/16  
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 Glorieta 2.0  
**NEPA Log Number:** DOI-BLM-UT-Y010-2016-140 DNA  
**File/Serial Number:** MFO-Y010-16-081R  
**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.

Determi- nation	Resource	Rationale for Determination*	Signature	Date
<b>RESOURCES AND ISSUES CONSIDERED (INCLUDES SUPPLEMENTAL AUTHORITIES APPENDIX 1 H-1790-1)</b>				
NC	Air Quality Greenhouse Gas Emissions		Ann Marie Aubry	
NC	Floodplains		Ann Marie Aubry <i>MAA</i>	3/23/16
NC	Soils		Ann Marie Aubry	
NC	Water Resources/Quality (drinking/surface/ground)		Ann Marie Aubry <i>MAA</i>	3/23/16
NC	Wetlands/Riparian Zones		Mark Grover <i>MG</i>	3/23/16
NC	Areas of Critical Environmental Concern		Katie Stevens <i>KS</i>	3/23/16
NC	Recreation		Katie Stevens <i>KS</i>	3/22/16
NC	Wild and Scenic Rivers		Katie Stevens <i>KS</i>	3/22/16
NC	Visual Resources		Katie Stevens <i>KS</i>	3/22/16
NC	Wild Lands (BLM Natural Areas)		Bill Stevens <i>BS</i>	3-23-16
NC	Socio-Economics		Bill Stevens <i>BS</i>	3-23-16
NC	Wilderness/WSA		Bill Stevens <i>BS</i>	3-23-16
NC	Lands with Wilderness Characteristics		Bill Stevens <i>BS</i>	3-23-16
NC	Cultural Resources	include Arch SRP Elyette	Jared Lundell <i>JL</i>	3-23-16
NC	Native American Religious Concerns		Jared Lundell <i>JL</i>	3-23-16
NC	Environmental Justice		Bill Stevens <i>BS</i>	3-23-16

Determination	Resource	Rationale for Determination*	Signature	Date
NC	Wastes (hazardous or solid)		David Pals <i>DP</i>	3/23/16
NC	Threatened, Endangered or Candidate Animal Species		Pam Riddle <i>PR</i>	3/23/16
NC	Migratory Birds		Pam Riddle <i>PR</i>	3/23/16
NC	Utah BLM Sensitive Species		Pam Riddle <i>PR</i>	3/23/16
NC	Fish and Wildlife Excluding USFW Designated Species		Pam Riddle <i>PR</i>	3/23/16
NC	Invasive Species/Noxious Weeds		Dave Williams <i>DW</i>	3/23/16
NC	Threatened, Endangered or Candidate Plant Species		Dave Williams <i>DW</i>	3/23/16
NC	Livestock Grazing		Dave Williams/ Jordan Davis/ Kim Allison <i>DW</i>	3/23/16
NC	Rangeland Health Standards		Dave Williams/ Jordan Davis/ Kim Allison <i>DW</i>	3/23/16
NC	Vegetation Excluding USFW Designated Species		David Williams <i>DW</i>	3/23/16
NC	Woodland / Forestry			
NC	Fuels/Fire Management		Josh Relph <i>JR</i>	3/23/16
NC	Geology / Mineral Resources/Energy Production		David Pals <i>DP</i>	3/23/16
NC	Lands/Access		Jan Denney	
NC	Paleontology		ReBecca Hunt-Foster <i>RHF</i>	3/23/16

**FINAL REVIEW:**

Reviewer Title	Signature	Date	Comments
Environmental Coordinator	Katie Stevens <i>KS</i>	3/24/16	
Authorized Officer	J.L. Jones <i>JL</i>	3/24/16	

**FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT  
AND  
DECISION RECORD  
Glorieta 2.0  
DOI-BLM-UT-Y010-2016-0140 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 a Special Recreation Permit for Glorieta 2.0 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 the Special Recreation Permit for Glorieta 2.0 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 25, 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. If 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 Jennifer Jones

Date 3/24/16