

Documentation of Land Use Plan Conformance and NEPA Adequacy (DNA)
U.S. Department of the Interior Bureau of Land Management
Grand Junction Field Office, Colorado
Dog Island Campsite Relocation
DOI-BLM-CO-134-2014-0004-DNA

A. Purpose and Need:

The proposed action is to relocate the Dog Island Campsite, in the Ruby/Horsethief Recreation Area (RHRA), on the Colorado River. The purpose of this action is to further implement and support the broad recreation management goals for the area established through the 2004 RMP, which calls for BLM to manage the RHRA to “provide opportunities for visitors to engage in overnight flat-water boating for social group and family affiliation in a naturally appearing red-walled river canyon”. This action is needed to move the campsite to a more suitable location. The current location of the campsite is on a gravel bar that is not suitable for camping. During the spring run-off, the campsite is usually flooded for an extended period of time.

B. Proposed Action:

The proposed location of the new campsite is 530 yards downstream of the site in current use. Relocating the campsite would include clearing 0.35 of an acre of cheat grass to create a social area, clearing willows along the bank to create a landing site and path to the social area, and relocating the 4-inch x4-inch campsite marker/post to the new landing site. The work would take place in the spring, and would take one to two days. The campsite currently in use would be marked as closed and allowed to rehabilitate naturally. Vegetation clearing would be conducted utilizing hand tools and a weed eater.

6th PM, T. 10 S., R. 104 W., section 27, SE¼, SE¼

C. Land Use Plan (LUP) Conformance

LUP Name: Colorado Canyons National Conservation Area RMP/ROD

Date Approved: September 2004

Decision Number/Page: 2-10

Decision Language: Preserve and enhance traditional recreation activities – hiking, camping, mountain biking, OHV use, horseback riding, hunting, and boating.

An administrative action in the RMP/ROD stated that there would be no camping allowed on Dog Island, due to the presence of nesting raptors. A survey of the area by resource specialists, in the fall of 2014, determined that there were no nests on or near the island. The administrative action was removed through plan maintenance.

D. Identify applicable NEPA documents and other related documents that cover the proposed action.

Name of Document: Ruby-Horsethief Recreation Area Management Plan

Date Approved: November 2011

E. NEPA Adequacy Criteria

1. Is the current proposed action substantially the same action (or is a part of that action) as previously analyzed? Is the current proposed action located at a site specifically analyzed in an existing document?

The current proposed action would designate a campsite as analyzed in the Ruby-Horsethief Recreation Area Management Plan (DOI-BLM-CO-134-2011-0012-EA) The proposed action falls within the boundary of the area analyzed in that EA.

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, and resource values?

The proposed action area within Ruby-Horsethief Recreation Area Management Plan has the same environmental concerns, interests, and resource values as the area analyzed in the existing NEPA document. The proposed action falls within the range of alternatives provided in the original NEPA document.

3. Is the existing analysis valid in light of any new information or circumstances?

Yes. No circumstances or information has changed that would result in impacts that were not analyzed in the existing 2011 EA.

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

Yes. The area is within the analysis area for the referenced EA and the methodology and analytical approach used in the existing 2011 EA would be the same if a new EA was written.

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 analyze site-specific impacts related to the current proposed action?

Yes. The direct and indirect impacts of the proposed action are the same as those identified in the existing NEPA document, because the proposed action is the same as the action in the preferred alternative of the referenced EA, the resources and resource concerns are the same.

6. Are the cumulative impacts that would result from implementation of the current proposed action substantially unchanged from those analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)?

Yes, this action combined with the actions analyzed in the existing EA would provide an additional camping opportunity. Cumulative impacts in the area are limited and would remain the same as those analyzed in the referenced EA.

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

This proposed action is consistent with the actions of the existing 2011 EA in which scoping and public meetings were held.

F. Interdisciplinary Analysis: Team members conducting or participating in the NEPA analysis and preparation of this worksheet.

Name	Title
Nikki Grant-Hoffman	Ecologist
Natalie Clark	Archaeologist
Mark Taber	Natural Resources Specialist/Invasive, Non-native Species
Shane Dittlinger	Outdoor Recreation Planner
Alan Kraus	Hazmat Coordinator
Scott Gerwe	Geologist/Paleontology
Christina Stark	Planning & Environmental Coordinator

Table 1– Potentially Impacted Resources

Resources	Not Present On Location	No Impact	Potentially Impacted	Effects sufficiently analyzed/ mitigated in previous NEPA document or proposed action?	BLM Evaluator Initial & Date	Comments
PHYSICAL RESOURCES						
Air and Climate	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>	PLB 12/2/2014	
Water (surface & subsurface, floodplains)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>	PLB 12/2/2014	
Soils	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>	PLB 12/2/2014	
Geological/Mineral Resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>	DSG 12/16/14	
BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES						
Special Status Plants	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>	NGH 10.10.2014	
Special Status Wildlife	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>	NGH 10.10.2014	
Migratory Birds	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>	NGH 10.10.2014	
Other Important Wildlife Habitat	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>	NGH 10.10.2014	
Vegetation, Forestry	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>	NGH 10.10.2014	
Invasive, Non-native Species	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>	MT 8/26/14	See text
Wetlands/Riparian Zones	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>	NGH 10.10.2014	
HERITAGE RESOURCES AND HUMAN ENV.						
Cultural or Historical	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>	NFC 10/10/14	
Paleontological	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>	DSG 12/16/14	
Tribal& American Indian Religious Concerns	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>	NFC 10/10/14	
Visual Resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>	KSD 12/3/14	

Table 1– Potentially Impacted Resources

Resources	Not Present On Location	No Impact	Potentially Impacted	Effects sufficiently analyzed/ mitigated in previous NEPA document or proposed action?	BLM Evaluator Initial & Date	Comments
Social/Economic	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>	CS 2/2/15	
Transportation and Access	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>	KSD 12/3/14	
Wastes, Hazardous or Solid	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>	AK 10/2/14	
LAND RESOURCES						
Recreation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>	KSD 12/3/14	
Special Designations (ACEC, SMAs, WSR)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Y <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>	KSD 12/3/14	
Wilderness & Wilderness Characteristics	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>	KSD 12/3/14	
Range Management	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>	JRD 1/26/15	
Wild Horse and Burros	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>	JRD 1/26/15	
Land Tenure, ROW, Other Uses	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>	RBL 12/17/14	
Fire/Fuels	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Y <input type="checkbox"/> N <input type="checkbox"/>	JP 1/26/15	

NAME OF ENVIRONMENTAL COORDINATOR: Christina Stark

DATE: 2/3/15

Conclusion

 X 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.

SIGNATURE OF AUTHORIZED OFFICIAL:

 2/4/15

National Conservation Area Manager

DATE SIGNED:

The signed Conclusion on this document 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.