National Park Service

MEMO TO FILE

To: Files

From: Superintendent,

Lauren J. Whole Through: Park Environmental Compliance Specialist

Subject: Adequacy of National Environmental Policy Act Documentation

A. Project Information

Park Name:

Mojave NPres

Project Number:

09-moja-030/PEPC 25853

Project Type: **Project Location:** Commercial Use Authorization (OTHER)

County, State: San Bernardino, California

District, Section: Kelbaker road, from I-15 to I-40

Project Originator/Coordinator:

Danette Woo

Project Title:

CUA-AdventureCORPS, Inc., Chris Kostman

Contract #/Contractor Name:

Administrative Record Location:

Headquarters-Barstow

Administrative Record Contact:

Danette Woo

B. Project Description [To begin the statutory compliance file, attach to this form, maps, site visit notes, agency consultation, data, reports, categorical exclusion form (if relevant), or other relevant materials.1

Chris Kostman, AdventureCORPS, Inc., has applied to a commercial use authorization for his annual cycling event, Furnace Creek 508. Mr. Kostman has received incidental business permits and commercial use authorizations for several years, for the same event.

Each October since 1989, Adventure CORPS hosts an ultra-marathon cycling event known as Furnace Creek 508. Up to 350 participants (150 bicycle riders plus support crews) cycle from Valencia to Mojave, then California City, Randsburg, Johannesburg, Highway 178 to Shoshone, Highway 127 to Baker, Kelbaker Road through Kelso to Amboy, then finish at Twentynine Palms, Total distance is 508 miles, Riders must stay at least 12 meters apart during daylight hours (7:00am to 6:00pm), and at least 100 meters apart at nighttime (6:00pm to 7:00am). All riders are followed by support vehicles at night. Support vehicles are clearly marked with reflective signage, "CAUTION BICYCLE AHEAD."

The event is an individual time trial. Riders come through Mojave National Preserve on Day 2 of this three-day event, spread out over 16 hours. Each entrant is supported by at least two people in a motor vehicle. In previous years, Adventure CORPS has set up a support station at the the intersection of Kelbaker Road and Kelso-Cima Road.

Total number of riders, crew and staff total approximately 350. Of this, there are about 100 solo riders, 150 on relay teams (either two-person or four-person teams). There will be 150 support

vehicles and 100 support crew members (non-riders). At any one time, 150 bikes/cars will be on the road.

No

Preliminary drawings attached? Yes

Background info attached? Yes No

Memo To File Date: 11 May, 2009

Anticipated compliance completion date: <u>11 May, 2009</u>

Projected advertisement/Day labor start: <u>n/a</u>

Construction Start: 4 October 2009

C. Description of Previous Compliance Documentation - Briefly describe the previous NEPA compliance document, how scoping was accomplished, whether the document was on public review, and the results of the public review. Be sure to include dates of previous CE, EA and FONSI, or NOI, DEIS, FEIS, and ROD.

A categorical exclusion was signed in 2004 (reference no. 04-ce-901). The Furnace Creek 508 event consists of the same schedule of activities each year. There has been no change to the schedule of events, number of participants, or locations since 2004. This memorandum to the files serves to update Mojave National Preserve's decision to categorically exclude this request from further compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act.

D. Step 4 NEPA: Memo To file

Added to File Date: 05/07/2009	Explanation: This memorandum updates the NEPA decision for this annual event. It serves as park's NEPA decision to continue to allow AdventureCORPS' annual event, Furnace Creek 508, without further environmental review, as long as the event remains the same from year to year.
---------------------------------------	--

E. Impact Analysis - Briefly summarize the environmental impact conclusions from the previous document. Identify any mitigating measures from the previous project.

Identify potential effects to the following physical, natural, or cultural resources	No Effect	Negligible Effects	Minor Effects	Exceeds Minor Effects	Data Needed to Determine/Notes
1. Geologic resources – soils, bedrock, streambeds, etc.					
2. From geohazards	X				

	T		1	1	
3. Air quality	X				
4. Soundscapes	X				-
5. Water quality or	X				
quantity					
6. Streamflow	X				
characteristics					
7. Marine or estuarine	X				
resources					
8. Floodplains or	X				
wetlands					
9. Land use, including	X				
occupancy, income,					
values, ownership, type of					
use					
10. Rare or unusual	X				
vegetation - old growth					
timber, riparian, alpine					
11. Species of special	X				
concern (plant or animal;					
state or federal listed or					
proposed for listing) or					
their habitat					
12. Unique ecosystems,	Х				
biosphere reserves, World					
Heritage Sites			:		
13. Unique or important	X				
wildlife or wildlife habitat					
14. Unique or important	Х				
fish or fish habitat					
15. Introduce or promote	X				
non-native species (plant					
or animal)					
16. Recreation resources,	X	1	,		
including supply,					
demand, visitation,					
activities, etc.					
17. Visitor experience,		х			Temporary negligible
aesthetic resources					impacts to visitors using
acsinotic resources					Kelbaker road and visiting
					sights along this road.
					Traffic will not be stopped
					but may be slowed for brief
					periods of time from the
10 A1. 1 1 1	v				permitted activity.
18. Archeological	X				
resources	37				
19. Prehistoric/historic	X				
structure	37				
20. Cultural landscapes	X				

•

		1	F	·	
21. Ethnographic	X				
resources					
22. Museum collections	X				
(objects, specimens, and					
archival and manuscript					
collections)					
23. Socioeconomics,	X				
including employment,					
occupation, income					
changes, tax base,					
infrastructure					
24. Minority and low	X				
income populations,					
ethnography, size,					
migration patterns, etc.					
25. Energy resources	X				
26. Other agency or tribal	X				
land use plans or policies					
27. Resource, including	X				
energy, conservation					
potential, sustainability					
28. Urban quality,	X				
gateway communities,			i		
etc.					
29. Long-term	X				
management of resources					
or land/resource					·
productivity					
30. Other important	X				
environment resources					
(e.g. geothermal,				•	·
paleontological					
resources)?					

We can only use a memo to file if (1) all impact topics were analyzed in site-specific detail; (2) there are no changes to the proposal; (3) there are no changes in affected environment (e.g. newly listed threatened or endangered species, or listing of a resource in the National Register of Historic Places, etc.); and (4) there are no changes regarding adverse impacts to environmental resources. Make sure the memo addresses these points. Be sure to describe the results of any consultation regarding compliance with federal, state, or applicable local laws and regulations, including ESA Section 7 for threatened/endangered species, NHPA Section 106 for cultural resources, or CWA Section 404 permits for floodplains or wetlands, if necessary.

F. Conclusion [you should be able to concur with statement]

The interdisciplinary team (IDT), consisting of the IDT members listed below, conducted internal scoping to review the proposed project. After careful review the team concurs that the previous document adequately describes and analyzes the impacts for Project Title: <u>CUA-AdventureCORPS</u>, Inc., Chris Kostman. There is no change to project scope, the description of impacts (context, intensity and duration) remain as described in the previous NEPA document, and site conditions have not changed since preparation of the environmental assessment. No

additional public involvement is required. Because neither the original categorical exclusion, nor this evaluation, has resulted in the identification of any major adverse effects to NPS resources and values, there would be no impairment to National Park System resources and values from implementation of this project. [If previous document was an EIS and major adverse effects were identified, explain why those adverse effects do not constitute impairment.]

Interdisciplinary Team Leader Name	Field of Expertise			
Danette Woo	Project Leader/NEPA Specialist			
Technical Specialists Names	Field of Expertise			
David Ashe David Ashe	Chief Ranger			
David Moore ANA	Chief of Resources, ACTING			
Steven Carlson S	Chief of Maintenance			
David Nichols	NHPA Specialist			
Linda Slater (5	Chief of Interpretation			
Lisa Wilson	Administrative Officer			

G. Signatory

Based on the environmental impact information contained in the statutory compliance file and in this environmental screening form, environmental documentation for this stage of the subject project is complete.

Recommended:

Compliance Specialist	Telephone Number	Date
NEPADanette Woo	760 252 6107	