

Worksheet
Documentation of Land Use Plan Conformance and NEPA Adequacy (DNA)
DNA #CA-060-0010-0028

U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management
Palm Springs-South Coast Field Office

A. BLM Office: Palm Springs-South Coast Field Office

Lease/Serial/Case File No.: CACA-43949

Proposed Action Title/Type: La Posta Mountain Warfare Training Facility

Location of Proposed Action: The Department of Navy (hereafter referred to as the Navy) conducts special warfare training on 1,079 acres of land located approximately 4 miles northeast of Campo, San Diego County, California. The BLM recently analyzed a Navy proposal, under Environmental Assessment and Decision Record #CA-060-0010-0002, to expand training operations from 1,079 to 5,554 acres in the Campo, California vicinity. As part of this overall warfare training facility proposal is a jurisdictional withdrawal of BLM lands by the Navy, identified as Parcel “C”, under regulations at Title 43, CFR, Part 2300.

Description of the Proposed Action: The Navy recently requested a change in the administrative handling of Parcel “C” to allow for the BLM issuance of an interim right-of-way grant until such time the lands are placed under the withdrawal.

Background:

Environmental Assessment and Decision Record #CA-060-0010-0002 evaluates the potential environmental consequences of several land use changes between the BLM and the Navy; and the construction and operation of new military training facilities at and surrounding the La Posta Mountain Warfare Training Facility. Specifically, the following Navy project was analyzed and approved under this Environmental Assessment and Decision Record (refer to Fig. 1-2 & Table 1-1 in EA #CA-060-0010-0002):

1. Withdraw Parcels C, E, and G from the BLM for exclusive use by Navy.
2. Issue a right-of-way grant for nonexclusive use by the Navy of Parcels A, B, D, F, and H.
3. Change the existing land use designation for the 1,079 acres of existing facilities from that of an obsolete Microwave Space Relay Station to use as a Mountain Warfare Training Facility.
4. Change the land use of the existing 1,079 acre withdrawal area from both exclusive and nonexclusive use to entirely exclusive use by Navy.
5. Construct and operate a new multi-structure training complex on Parcel C.
6. Enhance the current training activities conducted on Parcels C, E, and G.

New facility construction and training enhancements would be completed as both identified and analyzed in the Environmental Assessment and Decision Record.

B. Conformance with the Land Use Plan (LUP) and Consistency with Related Subordinate Implementation Plans

The proposed interim right-of-way grant for parcel C is in conformance with the *South Coast Resource Management Plan/Record of Decision (1994)* as it is not restricted or prohibited under land use allocations and directives in the plan.

C. Identify the applicable NEPA document(s) and other related documents that cover the proposed action.

Environmental Assessment and Decision Record #CA-060-0010-0002
Allotment Management Plan: Clover Flats Grazing Allotment

D. NEPA Adequacy Criteria

1. Is the current proposed action substantially the same action (or part of that action) as previously analyzed?

The current proposed action is:

- the issuance of a right-of-way grant by the BLM that would authorize the Navy to conduct specified warfare training on “Parcel C” exactly as analyzed under the Proposed Action Alternative in Environmental Assessment and Decision Record #CA-060-0010-0002, including construction of facilities and the exclusion of the public from the subject lands. Essentially, a right-of-way grant would be substituted for the land withdrawal as a means of conveying these lands to the Navy for purposes of constructing and operating the described facility. A right-of-way grant conveys the rights to construct, operate, and maintain facilities for authorized purposes under the terms and conditions of the grant (see regulations at Title 43 CFR Part 2800). The right-of-way grant is subject to both valid existing rights and conditions designed to mitigate environmental impacts. The BLM insures compliance with all terms and conditions throughout the life of the grant.

The previously analyzed action in the Environmental Assessment and Decision Record CA-060-0010-0002 is:

- the transfer of administrative jurisdiction of “Parcel C” from the BLM to the Navy, using a land withdrawal, to conduct specified warfare training including construction of facilities and the exclusion of the public from the subject lands. A land withdrawal transfers jurisdiction over an area of Federal land from one department, bureau or agency to another department, bureau or agency (see regulations at Title 43 CFR Part 2300). The land withdrawal is subject to both valid existing rights and conditions designed to mitigate environmental impacts. Jurisdiction over withdrawn lands is held by the agency holding the withdrawal.

The current proposed action represents an administrative change in the Navy's right to conduct specified warfare training on Parcel "C" from a land withdrawal to a right-of-way grant. The environmental impacts, as analyzed in the Environmental Assessment and Decision Record #CA-060-0010-0002, would be the same in either option.

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

The current proposal represents an administrative change in the Navy's right to utilize Parcel "C". No changes in current environmental concerns, interests, resource values and circumstances exist that would necessitate further review.

3. Is the existing analysis adequate and are the conclusions adequate in light of any new information or circumstances (including, for example, riparian proper functioning condition [PFC] reports; rangeland health standards assessments; Unified Watershed Assessment categorizations; inventory and monitoring data; most recent Fish and Wildlife Service lists of threatened, endangered, proposed, and candidate species; most recent BLM lists of sensitive species)? Can you reasonably conclude that all new information and all new circumstances are insignificant with regard to analysis of the proposed action?

The current proposal represents an administrative change in the Navy's right to utilize Parcel "C". No new information or circumstances exist that would necessitate further review.

4. Do the methodology and analytical approach used in the existing NEPA document(s) continue to be appropriate for the current proposed action?

The current proposal represents an administrative change in the Navy's right to utilize Parcel "C". No changes in methodology or analytical approach are regarded necessary.

5. Are the direct and indirect impacts of the current proposed action substantially unchanged from those identified in the existing NEPA document(s)? Does the existing NEPA document sufficiently analyze site-specific impacts related to the current proposed action?

The current proposal represents an administrative change in the Navy's right to utilize Parcel "C". The direct and indirect impacts of the proposals are the same.

6. Can you conclude without additional analysis or information that the cumulative impacts that would result from implementation of the current proposed action are substantially unchanged from those analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)?

The current proposal represents an administrative change in the Navy's right to utilize Parcel "C". The cumulative impacts of the proposals are the same.

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

The current proposal represents an administrative change in the Navy's right to utilize Parcel "C". No additional public involvement or agency review is regarded necessary as the environmental impacts are the same.

E. Mitigation Measures: List any applicable mitigation measures that were identified, analyzed, and approved in relevant LUPs and existing NEPA document(s). List the specific mitigation measures or identify an attachment that includes those specific mitigation measures. Document that these applicable mitigation measures must be incorporated and implemented.

All mitigation measures and requirements identified in the Environmental Assessment and Decision Record #CA-060-0010-0002 would apply for the current proposal.

CONCLUSION

Based on the review documented above, I conclude that this proposal conforms to the applicable land use plan and that the existing NEPA documentation fully covers the proposed action and constitute BLM's compliance with the requirements of NEPA.



Field Manager
Palm Springs-South Coast Field Office
USDI Bureau of Land Management
1201 Bird Center Drive
Palm Springs, CA 92262

February 12, 2010