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

OFFICE:	Rawlins Field Office
CASE FILE NUMBER:	DNA14-72
PROPOSED ACTION TITLE/TYPE:	Prospect Creek Road Improvement
LOCATION/LEGAL DESCRIPTION:	T. 13 N., R. 81, Section 1 W., 6th P.M., Carbon County, Wyoming (see attached Map 1)
APPLICANT:	N/A

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

Proposed Action: Provide current and future maintenance of the existing, two-track known as Prospect Creek Rd. Pursue rerouting of the current road to an adjacent, existing two-track and improve by hardening the surface on steep grades (see Map 1). Close redundant two-tracks on the same steep grade and provide reclamation. Pursue space for passing vehicles on the existing two-track. Clear bordering vegetation to enlarge the existing unimproved parking area at boat launch. Provide ongoing monitoring to determine adaptive management.

The Decision Record for the 2013 North Platte Recreation Area Management Plan and Environmental Assessment approved a Preferred Alternative which included a switchback connector.

Regardless of the difference in length and surface acres, the Proposed Reroute of Prospect Creek Road (see Map 1) was fully analyzed for environmental impacts.

B. Land Use Plan (LUP) Conformance

LUP Name: Rawlins Resource Management Plan (RMP)

Date Approved: December 24, 2008

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): 2008 Rawlins RMP, pages 2-27:

1) Management Objective 1: "*Maintain or enhance recreation opportunities to accommodate existing niche activities, including hunting, fishing, camping, wildlife viewing, OHV touring, and other uses appropriate to the prescribed setting.*"

2) Management Objective 4: "*Maintain, restore, and enhance areas within the North Platte River area to meet Wyoming Standards for Healthy Rangelands.*"

3) Management Action 2: *"Access opportunities to the North Platte River will be identified and pursued."*

The Prospect Creek Watershed is currently failing Standard 2, Riparian/Wetland Health Standard, because of the erosive, redundant two-tracks, which would be reclaimed under the Proposed Action.

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.

- North Platte River Recreation Area Management Plan and Environmental Assessment (DOI-BLM-WY-030-2013-0094-EA), Decision Record, and Finding of No Significant Impact; September 2013.

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?**

   Yes. The proposed project is within the same analysis area as the analyzed Proposed Action in the North Platte River Recreation Area Management Plan Environmental Assessment (EA). The Proposed Project is within 215 feet of the previously analyzed switchback. Only the upper northwest portion of Proposed Reroute (555 feet) was not analyzed in the existing EA. Therefore, there are no substantial differences.

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

   Yes. The range of alternatives within the existing EA considers a range of environmental concerns, interests, and resource values in the same analysis area of the Proposed Action. The type of environmental impacts caused by the Proposed Reroute has been considered within the range of alternatives in the EA.

3. **Is the existing analysis valid in light of any new information or circumstances (such as, rangeland health standard assessment, recent endangered specifies listings, updated lists of BLM-sensitive specifies)? Can you reasonably conclude that new information and new circumstances would not substantially change the analysis of the new proposed action?**

   Yes. Current environmental concerns, interests, and resource values have not changed since the Decision Record was signed for the EA.

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?**

   Yes. The direct, indirect, and cumulative effects of the proposed action are of a similar magnitude, both quantitatively and qualitatively, under the Proposed Action. While similar in context and intensity, negative effects of the Proposed Reroute are less than the effects of the previously analyzed switchback.

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

   Yes. The public involvement and interagency review associated with the existing NEPA document is adequate for the current Proposed Action. The original North Platte River Recreation Area Management Plan EA included both internal and external scoping, several public meetings, and a public comment period prior to the Decision Record and Finding of No Significant Impact being signed.

E. Persons/Agencies/BLM Staff Consulted:

Name:	Title	Resource/Agency Represented
Christopher D. Jones	Outdoor Recreation Planner	BLM
Sheila D. Lehman	Planning and Environmental Coordinator	BLM

Note: Refer to the EA/EIS for a complete list of the team members participating in the preparation of the original environmental analyses.

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 the NEPA.

Christopher D. Jones — 4-18-14

Signature of Project Lead — Date

Sheila D. Lehman — 18 April 2014

Signature of NEPA Coordinator — Date

E. Carpenter — 4/18/14

Signature of Responsible Official — 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 § 4 *et seq.* and the program specific regulations.

Exhibit A: Map of Proposed Action for Prospect Creek Road Improvement

Exhibit A: Map of Proposed Action for Prospect Creek Road Improvement

Map1: Proposed Reroute of Prospect Creek Rd.

Existing Prospect Rd to Maintain

Redundant Two-Tracks to Reclaim

Proposed Reroute

N

0 105 210 420 630 840 Feet

No warranty is made by the Bureau of Land Management for data purposes not intended by the BLM.