Worksheet
Documentation of Land Use Plan Conformance and NEPA Adequacy (DNA)

U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management (BLM)
NEPA Number: _AZ-420-2005-010_____

Note: This worksheet is to be completed consistent with the policies stated in the Instruction Memorandum titled "Documentation of Land Use Plan Conformance and National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Adequacy" transmitting this worksheet and the "Guidelines for Using the DNA Worksheet" located at the end of the worksheet. (Note: The signed CONCLUSION at the end of this worksheet is part of an interim step in the BLM's internal analysis process and does not constitute an appealable decision.)

A. BLM Office: TFO **Lease/Serial/Case File No.** AZA 33009

Proposed Action Title/Type: Huachuca Concrete Mineral Material Sale

Location of Proposed Action: T. 16 S., R. 20 E., Section 17 NWSW

Description of the Proposed Action: Sand and gravel will be mined, crushed and screened and then trucked to the main yard in Sierra Vista to be made into various products like concrete and asphalt. The mining will result in the leveling of a small ridge about 40 ft high and will disturb 10 acres. The post-mining use of the land will be to construct home sites. The surface is privately owned by the applicant and the mineral estate is federal.

Applicant (if any): Huachuca Concrete, Inc.

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

LUP Name* _____Safford District RMP_____ Date Approved __September 1992

LUP Name* _____ Date Approved
Other document**_____ Date Approved

*List applicable LUPs (e.g., Resource Management Plans or applicable amendments).
**List applicable activity, project, management, water quality restoration, or program plans.

☐ The proposed action is in conformance with the applicable LUPs 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) and, if applicable, implementation plan decisions:

Safford District will encourage and foster the development of energy and mineral resources located on public lands without unnecessary and undue degradation to other resources. Sale of mineral resources will be managed through the use of appropriate regulations and stipulations – **Partial Record of Decision for the Approval of the Safford District RMP.**

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

List by name and date all applicable NEPA documents that cover the proposed action.

EA number AZ-046-95-012 12/11/95

List by name and date other documentation relevant to the proposed action (e.g., source drinking water assessments, biological assessment, biological opinion, watershed assessment, allotment evaluation, rangeland health standard's assessment and determinations, and monitoring the report).

None

D. NEPA Adequacy Criteria

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

Documentation of answer and explanation: The action is exactly the same as previously analyzed i.e., mining of sand and gravel at the same site.

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? Yes

Documentation of answer and explanation: The environmental concerns, resources, and circumstances are the same as they were in 1996. Therefore, the proposed action and no action alternative are still appropriate.

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)? Yes. Can you reasonably conclude that all new information and all new circumstances are insignificant with regard to analysis of the proposed action? Yes

Documentation of answer and explanation: Because the proposed action is not near any BLM

land most of the information sources listed above does not exist or is irrelevant for this land. There have been no new listed species that may occur on this land added since 1996. There is no new information or new circumstances that need to be analyzed.

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

Documentation of answer and explanation: The methodology and analytical approach is the same as TFO is using today, i.e., cultural and biological surveys, scoping with NEPA team.

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

Documentation of answer and explanation: Because the proposed action is exactly the same as before, the impacts analyzed before are not expected to change.

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)?
Yes
Documentation of answer and explanation: No cumulative impacts were identified in the EA and none are currently anticipated.

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

Documentation of answer and explanation: There was no public involvement or interagency review because the proposed action will occur on private land in a sparsely settled area.

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.

1. If any historic or prehistoric cultural materials are found during mining or any earth moving activity associated with the project, all activity will stop and the BLM will be notified immediately.

2. Upon completion of the project, all highwalls will be sloped to a maximum 1:3 slope to prevent erosion.

3. Operator must take measures to control fugitive dust such as watering haul roads and using control measures on crushing and screening equipment.

4. All solid waste will be properly disposed of and the site kept clean.

5. Hazardous materials must be properly stored using spill prevention measures.

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.

Note: If one or more of the criteria are not met, a conclusion of conformance and/or NEPA adequacy cannot be made and this box cannot be checked

_____
Shela McFarlin, Field Manager

_____
Date