

KINGMAN FIELD OFFICE SCOPING FORM

Proposal:

DOI-BLM-AZ-C010-2014-0005-CX _____
 NEPA Document Number

S:/BLMshare:AML/NEPA/C010-2014-0005-CX(FY2014 AML Backfills)
 Document Location

Land Description: Cerbat Mountain Range, Mohave County, Arizona

Applicant: BLM

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

Needed Input (X)	Discipline	Signature
	Lands	
x	Minerals	/s/ Paul Misiaszek 3/12/14
	Range	
	Wild Horse and Burro	
	General Recreation	
x	Cultural and Paleontological Resources	/s/ Timothy Watkins 11/18/13
	Wilderness	
	Soils	
	Surface and Groundwater Quality/Water Rights	
	Air Quality	
x	Wildlife	/s/ Rebecca L. Peck 3/11/14
x	Threatened and Endangered Plants and Animals	/s/ Rebecca L. Peck 3/11/14
x	Migratory Birds	/s/ Rebecca L. Peck 3/11/14
	Surface Protection	
	Hazardous Materials	
	Areas of Critical Environmental Concern	
	Visual Resources	
	Socio-Economics/Environmental Justice	
	General Botany/Noxious Weeds	
	Energy Policy	

Writer: /s/ Maria Troche

Date: 11/18/2013

Environmental Coordinator: /s/ John Reid

Date: 3/27/2014

Field Manager: : /s/ Ruben Sanchez

Date: 3/27/2014

**NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT (NEPA)
COMPLIANCE RECORD FOR CATEGORICAL EXCLUSIONS (CX)
U.S. Department of Interior
Bureau of Land Management**

PART I. – PROPOSED ACTION

BLM Office: Kingman Field Office

NEPA No.: C010-2014-0005-CX

Case File No.: N/A

Proposed Action Title/Type: FY2014 KFO AML Closures - Backfills

Applicant: BLM

Location of Proposed Action: Cerbat Mountians, Mohave County, Arizona

Description of Proposed Action: The BLM would be closing up abandoned mine workings on public lands in the Cerbat Mountins, Mohave County, Arizona. Closing these dangerous abandoned mine workings will prevent accidental falls and the contamination of soil and groundwater by dumping of hazardous materials. AZGFD biologists have surveyed each working for wildlife habitat and provided a recommendation for closure based on the results. If owls, or any other wildlife, are discovered, they will be expelled before closure. All mining claimants with claims in the area have been notified of this work. No objections to the closures were received by the BLM Kingman Field Office. All mine features are adjacent to existing roads; therefore no new roads to access the features will be necessary.

Part II. – PLAN CONFORMANCE REVIEW

This proposed action is subject to the following land use plan(s): Kingman Resource Management Plan/EIS

Decisions and page nos.: “Hazardous Materials Management

The objective is to reduce hazards to the public and natural resources on public lands from toxic materials.”

Date plan approved/amended: March 1995

This proposed action has been reviewed for conformance with these plans (*43 CFR 1610.5-3, BLM Manual 1601.04.C.2*).

The action has been reviewed to determine if any of the extraordinary circumstances (43 CFR 46.215(a)-(l)) apply. The project would:

(a) Have significant impacts on public health or safety.

Yes	No	<p>Rationale: Closing abandoned mine workings will have a positive effect on public health & safety. Accidental injury or death due to falls into the openings will be eliminated. Contamination of soil and groundwater by the dumping of hazardous materials into abandoned mine shafts will be prevented.</p>
	X	

Preparer's Initials MT

(b) 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.

Yes	No	<p>Rationale: The proposed action will not have significant impacts on any of the listed. Cultural clearances have been completed for the sites and no historic features would be impacted by the closing. The area is previously disturbed. Any new disturbance will be limited to the minimum necessary to backfill the holes and material for backfill will come from waste rock dumps only. Barn owls or any other wildlife would be removed from any feature prior to backfilling.</p>
	X	

Preparer's Initials MT & RLP

(c) Have highly controversial environmental effects or involve unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources [NEPA section 102 (2) (E)].

Yes	No	<p>Rationale: Mining claimants have been notified of the proposed closures, and no objections were made. The area is often used by the railroad and various utility companies. The proposed action will not have significant effects on their activities.</p>
	X	

Preparer's Initials MT

(d) Have highly uncertain and potentially significant environmental effects or involve unique or unknown environmental risks.		
Yes	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Rationale: The proposed action will not have highly uncertain and potentially significant environmental effects or involve unique or unknown environmental risks. Preparer's Initials <u>MT</u>
(e) Establish a precedent for future action or represent a decision in principal about future actions with potentially significant environmental effects.		
Yes	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Rationale: The approval of this proposed action will not set the precedent for other actions. All other closures will be evaluated individually. Preparer's Initials <u>MT</u>
(f) Have a direct relationship to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant environmental effects.		
Yes	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Rationale: This action doesn't have cumulatively significant actions in consideration of other actions in the vicinity. Preparer's Initials <u>MT</u>
(g) Have significant impacts on properties listed, or eligible for listing, on the National Register of Historic Places as determined by the bureau.		
Yes	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Rationale: There is none of the listed in the area. Preparer's Initials <u>MT</u>

(h) 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.

Yes	No X	<p>Rationale: T&E species and Critical habitat would be unaffected. There is no critical habitat present or Threatened or Endangered Species within the project or action area. The project area is within the 10 J Experimental Range of the California condor. Condors would be unaffected as there is no condor roosting habitat within the project area and condors have not been documented within the project area.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Preparer's Initials <u>MT & RLP</u></p>
------------	---------------------------	--

(i) Violate a Federal law, or a State, local or tribal law or requirement imposed for the protection of the environment.

Yes	No X	<p>Rationale: No laws or requirements would be violated.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Preparer's Initials <u>MT</u></p>
------------	---------------------------	---

(j) Have a disproportionately high and adverse effect on low income or minority populations (Executive Order 12898).

Yes	No X	<p>Rationale: The action would have no impact on low income or minority populations.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Preparer's Initials <u>MT</u></p>
------------	---------------------------	---

(k) 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).

Yes	No X	<p>Rationale: There are no known sacred sites in the project areas.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Preparer's Initials <u>MT</u></p>
------------	---------------------------	--

(l) 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).

Yes

No

Rationale: BLM staff will be using designated routes, and cross-country travel will not be necessary; therefore, this action will not contribute to the spread of noxious weeds or non-native species.

Preparer's Initials MT

PART V. –COMPLIANCE REVIEW CONCLUSION

I have reviewed this plan conformance and NEPA compliance record, and have determined that the proposed project is in conformance with the approved land use plan and that no further environmental analysis is required.

MITIGATION MEASURES/OTHER REMARKS:

/s/ Ruben Sanchez /3/27/2014
Kingman Field Office Manager

APPROVING OFFICIAL: _____ DATE: _____

TITLE: _____

Note: The signed conclusion on this compliance record is part of an interim step in the BLM's internal decision process and does not constitute an appealable decision. A separate decision to implement the action should be prepared in accordance with program specific guidance.

