

Determination of NEPA Adequacy (DNA)
U.S. Department of Interior
Bureau of Land Management

OFFICE: *Sonoran Desert National Monument*

NEPA/TRACKING NUMBER: DOI-BLM-AZ-P040-2010-005-EA (BLM/AZ/PL-95-012+4332)

CASEFILE/PROJECT NUMBER: AZA 25490

PROPOSED ACTION TITLE/TYPE: Table Top Wilderness Restoration and Reclamation Project

LOCATION/LEGAL DESCRIPTION: T. 8 S., R. 2 E., Sec. 13; T. 8 S., R. 3 E., Secs 7, 8, 17, 18., Table Top Wilderness area and Smith Road alignment, SDNM.

APPLICANT (if any): N/A

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

Reclamation and restoration work to remove and permanently eliminate smuggler created roads and trails east of Smith Road and within the SE corner of the Table Top Wilderness Area. Using hand tools and manual labor, restore, reclaim and remove up to 1.5 miles of illegally created smuggler routes. Apply vertical mulching techniques to successfully mitigate soil, plant and resource damage caused by smugglers making new and illegal travel routes with vehicles or by foot. Retrieve and remove all bicycles, trash, car parts, clothing and other items. Restore vegetation through planting and transplanting. Removal of undocumented immigrant trash along eight miles of Smith Road and within the eastern quarter of the Table Top Wilderness.

B. Land Use Plan Conformance

Land Use Plan (LUP) Name: The proposed action is subject to the Approved Amendment to the Lower Gila North Management Framework Plan and Lower Gila South Resource Management Plan and the Amendment Approved July 15, 2005. This proposed action has been reviewed to determine if it conforms to the RMP terms and conditions as required by 43 CFR 1610.5, BLM MS 1617.3. The proposed action is in conformance with the applicable LUPs because it is specifically provided for in the following LUP decisions: RR-14. Road or area closures will be enacted where off-highway or special recreation vehicle use is determined to be inconsistent with established Recreation Opportunity Spectrum classifications (map 5) and/or such use is causing harm to natural or cultural resources. (Approved Amendment to the Lower Gila North Management Framework Plan and Lower Gila South Resource Management Plan). In the field office, it is standard practice to follow route and/or area closures with immediate reclamation and restoration efforts to ensure closure compliance and ensure corrective action timely and targeted.

Date Approved/Amended: **7/15/2005**

The proposed action is in conformance with the applicable LUP because it is specifically provided for in the following LUP decision(s):

The proposed action is in conformance with the applicable LUPs because it is specifically provided for in the following LUP decisions: RR-14. Road or area closures will be enacted where off-highway or special recreation vehicle use is determined to be inconsistent with established Recreation Opportunity Spectrum classifications (map 5) and/or such use is causing harm to natural or cultural resources.

The proposed action is in conformance with the LUP, even though it is not specifically provided for, because it is clearly consistent with the following LUP decision(s) (objectives, terms, and conditions):

Insert applicable Land Use Plan Decision(s)

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

Approved Amendment to the Lower Gila North Management Framework Plan and Lower Gila South Resource Management Plan and the Amendment Approved July 15, 2005. Maricopa Complex Wilderness Management Plan, June 15, 1995.

List by name and date other documentation relevant to the proposed action (e.g. biological assessment, biological optioning, watershed assessment, allotment evaluation, and monitoring report.

D. NEPA Adequacy Criteria

- 1. Is the proposed action a feature of, or essentially similar to, an alternative analyzed in the existing ENPA 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 exiting NEPA document(s)? If there are differences, can you explain why they are not substantial?**

Yes. The Maricopa Complex Wilderness Management Plan (WMP/EA), under Management Object 1, authorizes the rehabilitation of unplanned or unauthorized impacts within one year of occurrence and requires coordination of the multi-agency emergency and law enforcement responses to such impacts or conditions. The proposed restoration project and the actions addressed in the WMP/EA are for the same geographic area. Action Decision 1.8: BLM must maintain the following resource standards for the surface restoration project area: No detectable evidence of new surface disturbances, including trails or campsites. Action Decision 1.11: BLM must respond to and correct unwanted surface disturbances from unauthorized

vehicular transport and emergency activities by rehabilitating such disturbances. Disturbances can arise from legal and illegal motorized and foot traffic, or from associated law enforcement actions. Rationale: The quick rehabilitation of surface disturbances will promote natural reclamation and reduce or eliminate the continued use of the illegal and unauthorized trails, routes and sites. Differences? The plan anticipated resource impacts might evolve from recreational intrusions or search and rescue actions, and did not directly cite human and drug smuggling as potential environmental factors. Resource impacts, however, are identical.

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?

Yes. Four alternatives were addressed. The Proposed Action, No Action, Visitor Use and Wildlife Enhancement Alternative, and the Naturalness Enhancement Alternative. The proposed Table Top Wilderness resource restoration and reclamation project is consistent with each of these alternatives and their respective outcomes. All current environmental concerns, interests and resource values remain appropriate to the range of presented alternatives, and are valid.

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

Yes. The WMP analysis is valid. All base resource conditions remain as described in the WMP/EA. There is no new information or circumstances that would substantially change the analysis of the proposed Table Top Wilderness resource restoration and reclamation project.

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 reclamation of illegal roads, human disturbances, trash, and other surface disturbances within the Table Top Wilderness match those described in the current WMP/EA document. The lands will be restored to a natural condition, the overall perception of naturalness would be cumulatively enhanced over both the short and long-term, and long-term preservation and conservation of wilderness values, roadlessness and solitude opportunities would be maintained and enhanced.

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

Yes. The original WMP/EA addressed maintaining this area's wilderness character and resource values in an unimpaired condition, or, if damaged immediately taking corrective actions. As the proposed action accomplishes this intent, the need for additional public, interest group, or agency involvement in this reclamation/restoration action is adequate.

E. Persons/Agencies/BLM Staff Consulted

<u>Name</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Resource/Agency Represented</u>
Dave Scarbrough,	Outdoor Recreation Planner,	SDNM, Steve Bird, Wildlife Biologist,
SDNM, Byron Lambeth,	Lead Range Conservationist,	Lower Sonoran Field Office,
Cheryl Blanchard,	Archaeologist,	Lower Sonoran Field Office

Note: Refer to the EA/EIS for a complete list of the team members participating in the preparation of the original environmental analysis or planning documents

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 constitutes BLM's compliance with the requirements of NEPA.

Richard B. Hanson

Leah Baker

Richard B. Hanson

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.