

KINGMAN FIELD OFFICE SCOPING FORM

DOI-BLM-AZ-C010-2012-0021-CX

NEPA Document Number

_____ RMP Implementation No.

S:/BLMshare:

Document Location

Land Description:

Applicant:

Authorization:

INVOLVEMENT: Indicate in the left column which disciplines need to provide information into the EA.

Needed Input (X)	Discipline	Signature
X	Lands	
	Minerals	
X	Range	
	Wild Horse and Burro	
	General Recreation	
X	Cultural and Paleontological Resources	/s/ Tim Watkins 02/12/2013
	Wilderness	
	Soils	
	Surface and Groundwater Quality/Water Rights	
	Air Quality	
X	Wildlife	
X	Threatened and Endangered Plants and Animals	
X	Migratory Birds	
	Surface Protection	
	Hazardous Materials	
	Areas of Critical Environmental Concern	
	Visual Resources	
	Socio-Economics/Environmental Justice	
	General Botany/Noxious Weeds	
	Energy Policy	

Writer: /s/ Tim Watkins

Date: 02/12/2013

Environmental Coordinator: /s/ Ramone B. McCoy

Date: 01/12/2013

Field Manager: /s/ Ruben A. Sánchez

Date: 02/12/2013

Categorical Exclusion Documentation Format for Actions Other Than Hazardous Fuels and Fire Rehabilitation Actions

Golden Valley Cemetery Protection Fences NEPA Number DOI- BLM-AZ-C010-2012-21-CX

A. Background

BLM Office: Kingman Field Office Lease/Serial/Case File No.:

Proposed Action Title/Type: Golden Valley Cemetery Protection Fences
Location of Proposed Action:

Description of Proposed Action: The BLM would install a fence around each of two different locales of a historic Hualapai cemetery. Each enclosure would be built to protect burial areas as well as artifact scatters associated with them. Additionally, the BLM, in conjunction with the Hualapai Tribe, would design and build entrances to the cemetery locales which may include decorative facades and/or memorial monuments that convey the importance of the area to Hualapai people. The fences will serve to protect these sensitive areas from vandalism, unauthorized off highway vehicle activity and unauthorized livestock encroachment. Once these protection measures are in place, the Hualapai can then return the numerous recovered headstones that were stolen from the cemetery in 2005.

B. Land Use Plan Conformance

Land Use Plan Name: *Kingman Resource Management Plan/EIS*

Date Approved/Amended: March 1995

The proposed action is in conformance with the applicable LUP because it is specifically provided for in the following LUP decision(s):

CL01/VIA Protect the scientific information potential of sites, enhance the public use values of sites and manage sites for conservation (page 74)

CL02/VIA Signs marking points of interest would continue to be placed and replaced, especially along Historic Route 66 and Beale Wagon Road, and certain cultural resources would continue to be protected by signing, fencing, patrolling and surveillance.

CL11/VIB Develop cultural resource protection systems for selected cultural resources that have either a high level of significance or a history of vandalism.

CL 14/V Provide immediate and long-term in situ preservation and protection of selected cultural resources threatened by agents of deterioration.

C. Compliance with NEPA:

- I. The Proposed Action is categorically excluded from further documentation under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) in accordance with 516 DM 11.9, [CX. J. Other 7. Construction of small protective enclosures, including those to protect reservoirs and springs and those to protect small study areas.*

This categorical exclusion is appropriate in this situation because there are no extraordinary circumstances potentially having effects that may significantly affect the environment. The proposed action has been reviewed (See Attachment 1), and none of the extraordinary circumstances described in 516 DM2 apply.

I have considered the proposed fences and have determined that the project would provide a significant amount of protection to these sensitive areas. Furthermore, any impacts on resources would be considered negligible. Approximately 200 acres (encompassing all 3 burial locales) was subject to a Class III intensive pedestrian inventory. It has been deemed that no adverse effect to cultural or natural resources is anticipated. In addition, a geophysical survey has been conducted to ensure that fences will protect all known burials and associated artifact scatters.

D. Signature

Authorizing Official: /s/ Ruben A. Sánchez Date: 02/12/2013
(Signature)

Name: Ruben A. Sánchez
Title: Field Manager

Contact Person

For additional information concerning this CX review, contact:
Tim Watkins
Archaeologist
Kingman Field Office
928-718-3757

Note: A separate decision document must be prepared for the action covered by the CX. See Attachment 2.

Attachment 1: Extraordinary Circumstances Review

Extraordinary Circumstances	Comment (Yes or No with supporting Rationale)
1. Have significant effects on public health or safety.	NO, the project involves building protective fences for a historic Native American cemetery
2. Have significant impacts on such natural resources and unique geographic characteristics as historic or cultural resources; park, recreation or refuge lands; wilderness areas; wild or scenic rivers; national natural landmarks; sole or principal drinking water aquifers; prime farmlands; wetlands (Executive Order 11990); floodplains (Executive Order 11988) national monuments; migratory birds; and other ecologically significant or critical areas.	NO, adverse effects to natural and historic resources is not anticipated as a result of the proposed project.
3. Have highly controversial environmental effects or involve unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources [NEPA Section 102(2)(E)].	NO, no known controversy exists regarding the construction of protective fences for the cemetery locales.
4. Have highly uncertain and potentially significant environmental effects or involve unique or unknown environmental risks.	NO, no unique environmental risks are known to exist.
5. Establishes a precedent for future action or represents a decision in principle about future actions with significant environmental effects.	NO, protective enclosures are common.
6. Have a direct relationship to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant environmental effects.	NO, no cumulatively significant environmental effects are anticipated.
7. Have significant impacts on properties listed, or eligible for listing, on the National Register of Historic Places as determined by either the bureau or office.	NO, this will have no effect on the potentially National Register-eligible Golden Valley Cemetery.
8. Have significant impacts on species listed, or proposed to be listed, on the List of Endangered or Threatened Species, or have significant impacts on designated Critical Habitat for these species.	NO, no known species will be impacted by the proposed fence construction.
9. Violate a Federal law, or a State, local, or tribal law or requirement imposed for the protection of the environment.	NO, the proposed project will not violate any applicable law.
10. Have a disproportionately high and adverse effect on low income or minority populations (Executive Order 12898).	NO, project is located in an unpopulated, unincorporated area.
11. Limit access to and ceremonial use of Indian sacred sites on Federal lands by Indian religious practitioners or significantly adversely affect the physical integrity of such sacred sites (Executive Order 13007).	NO, consultation with affected tribe regarding this proposed project has shown that no known traditional cultural or sacred sites would be affected.
12. Contribute to the introduction, continued existence, or spread of noxious weeds or non-native invasive species known to occur in the area or actions that may promote the introduction, growth, or expansion of the range of such species (Federal Noxious Weed Control Act and Executive Order 13112).	NO, this proposed project is not anticipated to contribute to the introduction or spread of noxious weeds.

Exhibits:

- 1) **Cultural Resource Compliance Documentation with Standard Stipulations**