

---

**Determination of NEPA Adequacy (DNA)**

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

---

**OFFICE:** Kingman Field Office (KFO), AZ-310

**NEPA DOCUMENT NUMBER:** DOI-BLM-AZ-C010-2012-0039-DNA

**CASE FILE NUMBER:** None

**PROPOSED ACTION TITLE/TYPE:** Twenty-Six Wash Trailhead Kiosk and Visitor Register Installation

**LOCATION/LEGAL DESCRIPTION:** T25N R17W s6 NWSW

**APPLICANT (if any):**

**A. Description of the Proposed Action and any applicable mitigation measures:**

Install a visitor register and informational kiosk at established trailhead at Twenty-Six Wash Trail. Dig two holes approximately 6 foot apart and 2½ foot deep for placing the post for the kiosk. Dig one hole approximately 2 foot deep for placing the post for the visitor register. Volunteers will be used for installing the visitor register and assisting in the installation of the kiosk in recognition of National Trails Day. The area surrounding the trailhead would also be cleared of brush to improve parking. This event would be co-sponsored by the BLM, the Back-Country Horsemen, and the local hikers on Saturday, June 2, 2012, between the hours of 8 am and 12 noon. The newly re-aligned and maintained Twenty-Six Wash trail would be available to equestrians and hikers to enjoy for the remainder of the day. Hikers and horseback riders would use a combination of the existing trail and cross-country travel. During periods of cross-country travel, hikers and equestrians would be instructed to fan out, rather than trailing each other, to prevent concentration of impacts.

**B. Land Use Plan (LUP) Conformance**

LUP Name: *Kingman Resource Management Plan/EIS*

Date Approved: March 1995

The proposed action is in conformance with the applicable LUP because it is specifically provided for in the following LUP decisions:

- “...trailhead sites and interpretive sites would be developed.” Page 75, Kingman RMP, 1995
- Decision RR16: Provide outdoor recreation opportunities for the public while continuing the BLM policy of providing dispersed and backcountry recreation.

**C. Identify applicable National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) documents and other related documents that cover the proposed action.**

*EA# AZ-CO10-2012-0015, 2012 Wilderness Trail Re-Alignment & Maintenance*

#### **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?**

The new proposed action is similar to that analyzed in the reference EA. The proposed action would be conducted in the same geographic area, and resource conditions are unchanged from those scrutinized in the 2012 EA.

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

The range of alternatives analyzed in the reference EA is considered appropriate with respect to the new proposed action. There are no new current environmental concerns, interests or resource values that would warrant development of additional alternatives.

**3. Is the existing analysis valid in light of any new information or circumstances (such as, rangeland health standard assessment, recent endangered species listings, and updated lists 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?**

The analysis undertaken in the reference EA is considered valid for the new 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?**

The direct and indirect effects created by the current proposed action would be the same as those identified in the reference EA. The reference EA did not identify any cumulative impacts for that proposed action; the same would be true for the current proposal.

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

The level of public involvement and interagency review associated with the reference EA is considered adequate for the current proposed action..

**E. Persons/Agencies/BLM Staff Consulted**

The team members participating in the preparation of the original environmental analysis or planning documents are listed below.

- Rebecca Peck, Lead Wildlife Biologist, Kingman Field Office
- Ammon Wilhelm, Wildlife Biologist, Kingman Field Office
- Len Marceau, Outdoor Recreation Planner/Visual Resource Management, Kingman Field Office
- Chad Benson, Wild Horse and Burro Specialist, Kingman Field Office
- Tim Watkins, Archaeologist, Kingman Field Office
- Amanda Deeds, Outdoor Recreation Planner, Kingman Field Office
- Ramone McCoy, Wilderness Specialist, Kingman Field Office

This proposal was presented at the KFO interdisciplinary project coordination meeting on May 21, 2012. The following is a list of participating BLM staff.

**Conclusion**

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 constitute BLM’s compliance with the requirements of the NEPA.

    /s / Ramone B. McCoy  
Project Lead/ NEPA Coordinator  
Ramone McCoy

    5/21/2012  
Date

    /s / Ruben A. Sanchez  
Signature of the Responsible Official  
Ruben Sanchez  
Field Manager  
Kingman Field Office

    5/29/2012  
Date