

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

OFFICE: Lower Sonoran Field Office (LSFO)

NEPA/TRACKING NUMBER: DOI-BLM-AZ-P020-2011-023-DNA

CASEFILE/PROJECT NUMBER: AZA-35727

PROPOSED ACTION TITLE/TYPE: Farrell Pit FUP

LOCATION/LEGAL DESCRIPTION: T. 5 S., R. 2 E., Section 4, portions Lots 3 & 4, G&SRM, Arizona. Site is accessed off State Route 347, approximately 2 miles south of Maricopa, Arizona, to Farrell Road, then west for approximately 6.5 miles to the pit. See attached map. Total area remains within the 25 acre parcel analyzed in EA AZ-020-2002-0011. Contract term will be for a period of ten years.

APPLICANT (if any): *Pinal County Public Works Department*

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

Issue a free use permit (FUP) for the production of 500,000 cubic yards of fill/borrow materials from the existing Farrell Pit, location as outlined above. Pit location is on federal surface, with federal minerals. Materials extracted will be used for maintenance of county roads within Pinal County. The new permit will replace expiring permit AZA-31889, and will allow continued operations at the site.

B. Land Use Plan Conformance

Land Use Plan (LUP) Final Amendment and Environmental Assessment to the Lower Gila North Management Framework Plan and the Lower Gila South Resource Management Plan

Date Approved/Amended: January, 2000

Land Use Plan (LUP) Proposed Phoenix Resource Management Plan and EIS

Date Approved/Amended: September 1989

Other document: Metropolitan Phoenix Mineral Management Program Guidelines

Date Approved: January 1995

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

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 decision(s) (objectives, terms, and conditions):

Phoenix RMP and Final EIS dated December 1988 and approved September 1989, states on page 14: "Saleable Minerals ...Free use permits would continue to be issued to the state and local communities as the need arises."

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

Environmental Assessment AZ-020-2002-0011, Pinal County Department of Public Works Free Use Permit, approved January 2002.

D. NEPA Adequacy Criteria

- 1. Is the 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 exiting NEPA document(s)? If there are differences, can you explain why they are not substantial?**

Proposed action is within existing area previously analyzed in EA AZ-020-2002-011, which covered a 25 acre parcel. Existing footprint of area is 13 acres, well within the regulatory framework previously analyzed. Material proposed to be extracted is same as was previously analyzed.

- 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?**

Proposed action is consistent with actions previously covered and reviewed in Environmental Assessment AZ-020-2002-011

- 3. Is the existing analysis valid in light of new information or circumstances (such as, rangeland health standard assessment, recent endangered species listings, and 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?**

The proposed action is consistent with actions previously covered and reviewed in EA AZ-020-2002-011. Subjects addressed at that time meet what is currently required, which includes Wildlife, Threatened and Endangered Species (T&E), including Desert Tortoise, Water Quality, Air Quality, Noise, Visual Resources, Cultural and Paleontological Resources, Hazardous Substances and Waste, Invasive,

Nonnative Weeds, Environmental Justice, and Cumulative Impacts. Other resources considered and found to be unaffected include: prime and unique farmlands, Native American issues, riparian/wetlands, wilderness, range management, wild and scenic rivers, areas of critical environmental concern (ACECs) and other similar areas with special designation, and recreation.

Subjects that were not addressed at the time the EA was developed are as follows:
 Energy Impact – The proposed action will have no impact on the development, production, supply and/or distribution of energy resources.

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?

The Proposal is the same as previously analyzed. All lands and resources affected under the new contract were included and addressed under EA AZ-020-2002-0011. The new contract would be a continuation of activities currently taking place under the existing contract.

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

The site was analyzed for the maximum disturbance as defined in EA AZ-020-2002-0011. The records of previous cultural investigation on this subject parcel document two surveys that were performed. Current disturbance remains within that area, with no additional expansion proposed. No cultural resources were identified during either of the efforts identified. No impacts to any significant cultural resources are anticipated as a result of this activity. Proposed actions are a continuation of those previously covered.

E. Persons/Agencies/BLM Staff Consulted

<u>Name</u>	<u>Title</u>	<u>Resource/Agency Represented</u>
Karen Conrath	Geologist	Project Lead, Minerals
Steve Bird	Wildlife Biologist	Lower Sonoran Field Office
Cheryl Blanchard	Archaeologist	Lower Sonoran Field Office
Jack Ragsdale	Recreation Planner	Lower Sonoran Field Office
Leah Baker	Planing & Environmental Coordinator	Phoenix District Office

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:

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 constitute BLM's compliance with the requirements of NEPA.



Karen Conrath

 9/12/11

Leah Baker



Emily Garber

9/12/11
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 Part 4 and the program-specific regulations.

Pinal County Public Works Farrell Pit

