

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

OFFICE: Colorado River Valley Field Office

TRACKING NUMBER: DOI-BLM-CO-N040-2011-0045-DNA

CASEFILE/PROJECT NUMBER: 2932

PROPOSED ACTION TITLE/TYPE: Commercial or Organized Group River Special Recreation Permit (SRP) Issuance, Renewals and Transfers

LOCATION/LEGAL DESCRIPTION: BLM public lands adjacent to the Upper Colorado River (State Bridge to Glenwood Springs), the Roaring Fork River (Wingo Junction), the Eagle River (Avon to the Colorado River confluence), Rock Creek, and Egeria Creek.

APPLICANT (if any):

Snowmass Whitewater Inc. dba Blazing Adventures	Guided whitewater rafting and inflatable kayak trips. Day use only.	Lower Colorado River (South Canyon); Roaring Fork River (Wingo Junction); Upper Colorado River (Horseshoe Bend)	Renew
Bucking Rainbow BRO High Adventures	Guided whitewater rafting. Day use only.	Eagle River (Minturn to Town of Eagle)	Renew
Centennial Canoe Outfitters, Inc.	Guided canoe trips. Overnight authorized in developed sites.	Upper Colorado River (State Bridge to Dotsero)	Renew
Colorado Fishing Guides	Guided float and wade fishing trips. Day use only.	Upper Colorado River (Pumphouse to Dotsero); Eagle River (Squaw Creek to Colorado River confluence); Roaring Fork River; Lower Colorado River (South Canyon); Rock and Egeria Creek)	Renew
Colorado Mountain College (Including	Kayak, canoe and rafting instruction.	Lower Colorado River (South Canyon); Upper	Renew

Steamboat Springs, Roaring Fork, Aspen and Leadville campuses.)	Overnight authorized in developed sites.	Colorado River (State Bridge to Bair Ranch)	
Colorado River Guides	Guided river float Trips. Overnight authorized in developed sites.	Upper Colorado River (State Bridge to Dotsero); Eagle River (Avon to the Colorado River confluence)	Renew
Cutthroat Anglers	Guided fishing float trips. Day use only.	Lower Colorado River (South Canyon); Upper Colorado River (State Bridge to Dotsero); Roaring Fork River (Wingo Junction)	Renew
Minturn Anglers LLC	Guided float and wade fishing trips. Day use only.	Lower Colorado River (South Canyon)	Renew
Vail Anglers LLC dba Gorsuch Outfitters dba Alpine River Outfitters	Guided fishing trips. Day use only.	Lower Colorado River (South Canyon); Upper Colorado River (State Bridge to Dotsero); Eagle River (Edwards to Colorado River confluence)	Renew
Roaring Fork Drifters dba Roaring Fork Outfitters	Guided float fishing and wade fishing trips. Day use only.	Lower Colorado River (South Canyon); Upper Colorado River (State Bridge to Bair Ranch); Eagle River (Edwards to Colorado River confluence); Roaring Fork River (Wingo Junction)	Renew
SSI Ventures dba Gore Creek Fly Fisherman	Guided wade and float fishing trips. Day use only.	Upper Colorado River (Pumphouse to Catamount); Eagle River (Edwards to Dotsero); Rock Creek	Renew
Turtle Tubing, Inc.	Guided tubing trips.	Upper Colorado River (Dotsero to Bair Ranch); Lower Colorado River (South Canyon)	Renew and add South Canyon.
Up Close on the River	Guided float trips, guided canoe and kayak trips, camping, float fishing. Overnight authorized in developed	Lower Colorado River (South Canyon)	Renew

	sites.		
Up Tha Creek Expeditions, Inc.	Guided whitewater rafting and kayak trips. Day use only.	Lower Colorado River (South Canyon); Roaring Fork River (Wingo Junction)	Transfer
Mountain Trout Fishing Guides	Wade fishing and float fishing trips. Day use only.	Lower Colorado River (South Canyon)	Renew
Sunrise Anglers LLC	Wade fishing and float fishing trips. Day use only.	Lower Colorado River (South Canyon)	Renew
Trout Trickers LLC	Wade fishing and float fishing trips. Day use only.	Lower Colorado River (South Canyon)	Renew
Colorado River Center, Inc.	Guided whitewater rafting, duckie and kayak trips. Overnight camping authorized at Windy Point and Catamount.	Upper Colorado River (State Bridge to Dotsero)	Transfer
Colorado River Outfitters, LLC	Guided fishing trips. Day use only.	Upper Colorado River (State Bridge to Dotsero); Eagle River (Avon to Colorado River confluence); Lower Colorado River (South Canyon)	Transfer and add South Canyon
Integrity Fishing Ventures, Inc.	Wade fishing and float fishing trips. Day use only.	Lower Colorado River (South Canyon)	New

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

The proposed action is to renew, transfer, and issue the above commercial river Special Recreation Permits (SRP's) as listed above.

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

LUP Name\* Date Approved \_Glenwood Springs Resource Management Plan Jan. 1984, revised 1988, amended in November 1991 - Oil and Gas Leasing and Development - Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement; amended Nov. 1996 - Colorado Standards and Guidelines; amended in August 1997 - Castle Peak Travel Management Plan; amended in March 1999 - Oil and Gas Leasing & Development Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement; amended in November 1999 - Red Hill Plan Amendment; and amended in September 2002 – Fire Management Plan for Wildland Fire Management and Prescriptive Vegetation

Treatment Guidance; amended in August 2006 - Roan Plateau Planning Area Including Naval Oil Shale Reserves Numbers 1 & 3 Resource Management Plan Amendment & Environmental Impact Statement \_\_\_\_\_

Other document Date Approved \_\_\_\_\_

Other document Date Approved \_\_\_\_\_

*\* List applicable LUPs (for example, resource management plans; activity, project, management, or program plans; or applicable amendments thereto)*

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

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 decisions (objectives, terms, and conditions):

Page 34 of the Glenwood Springs Resource Area Resource Management Plan: Recreation Resource Management Objective, To ensure the continued availability of outdoor recreational opportunities which the public seeks and which are not readily available from other sources, to reduce the impacts of recreational use on fragile and unique resource values, and to provide for visitor safety.

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

List by name and date all applicable NEPA documents that cover the proposed action.  
EA#CO-078-98-062 Issuance of Special Recreation Permits for Commercial River Operations; June 1998

List by name and date other documentation relevant to the proposed action (e.g., biological assessment, biological opinion, watershed assessment, allotment evaluation, and monitoring report). None.

### **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?**

Documentation of answer and explanation: Yes, EA#CO-078-98-062 served as an umbrella EA to analyze the issuance of new and the renewal of existing commercial river permits. This proposed action has not changed from the EA except to also approve transfers, which have the same effects as renewals.

**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?**

Documentation of answer and explanation: Yes, EA#CO-078-98-062 considered current environmental concerns, interests, and resource values. Cultural and Threatened and Endangered clearances have occurred at all developed recreation sites along the river stretches.

**3. Is the existing analysis valid in light of any 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?**

Documentation of answer and explanation: Yes, the analysis is still valid and there has been no "new" identified impacts resulting from the proposed action. In addition, the proposed action does not involve any new developments or trails not does it introduce any new uses as it has been occurring throughout these areas for years.

**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?**

Documentation of answer and explanation: Yes, the use of umbrella EAs helps to streamline the issuance of SRP's when the proposed commercial activities are similar activities, have similar impacts and do not authorize new uses, permanent structures, trails or facilities. It also helps to comply with BLM's priority and policies regarding commercial and competitive recreational land uses, to ensure that the United States receives fair value for use of Federal land. The impacts, both direct and indirect, although not described on a site specific basis, are mitigated through attached stipulations. The Special Recreation Permit allows the land management agencies to better identify the public needs, subsequent needed services and the needed management to mitigate possible environmental and social impacts. Yes, the renewal and transfers of these Special Recreation Permits will not introduce new uses on public lands, and the issuance of a new permit at South Canyon and adding South Canyon on existing permits is mitigated through adding a stipulation to help with congestion in that area. The cumulative impacts will remain substantially unchanged, as these new permits or additions are utilizing an existing developed facility that was built specifically for this activity.

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

Documentation of answer and explanation: Yes, no new information or concerns have been identified regarding commercial river operations on the rivers involved in this proposed action.

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

Name	Title	Resource/Agency Represented
Kimberly Miller	Outdoor Recreation Planner	Recreation, WSR, Wilderness
Brian Hopkins	Wildlife Biologist	Terrestrial Wildlife, Special Status, Wildlife Species
Greg Wolfgang	Outdoor Recreation Planner	Visual Resources, Travel
Mike Kinser	Rangeland Management Specialist	Riparian
Carla DeYoung	Ecologist	ACEC, Special Status Plants, Vegetation
John Brogan	Archaeologist	Cultural Resources, Native American Religious Concerns
Tom Fresques	Fisheries Biologist	Aquatic Wildlife, Special Status Aquatic Species
Isaac Pittman	Rangeland Management Specialist	Range
Pauline Adams	Hydrologist	Hydrology
Carole Huey	Realty Specialist	Lands and Realty

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** (If you found that one or more of these criteria is not met, you will not be able to check this box.)

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.

Signature of Project Lead:

Kimberly Miller

Signature of NEPA Coordinator:

John Starnell

Signature of the Responsible Official:

Michael J. [Signature]

Date:

3-4-11

**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.

## CONCLUSION

### DOI-BLM-CO-N040-2011-0045-DNA

Based on the review documented above, I conclude that this proposal conforms to the land use plan and that the NEPA documentation previously prepared fully covers the Proposed Action and constitutes BLM's compliance with the requirements of NEPA.

SIGNATURE OF RESPONSIBLE OFFICIAL:

 3-4-11

Matthew Thorburn

Supervisory Natural Resource Specialist

DATE SIGNED:

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.