

U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management
Coeur d'Alene Field Office
3815 Schreiber Way, Coeur d'Alene, ID 83815

Determination of NEPA Adequacy (DNA) Worksheet

PFHD – 2014 Hayden Gravel Pit Permit
DOI-BLM-ID-C010-2014-0004-DNA

A. Description of the Proposed Action

In 2003, the BLM issued a Free Use Permit (FUP; IDI-34132) to the Post Falls Highway District (PFHD) authorizing them to extract and use sand and gravel from a 14.5 acre (approximate) parcel of federal mineral estate north of Post Falls, Idaho. The subject parcel is immediately adjacent to the PFHD's existing gravel pit on private property. The sand and gravel resources in the existing private pit have been exhausted and the PFHD has initiated operations on the parcel with federal mineral estate under the 2003 permit which expires on July 22, 2014.

On March 5, 2014, the BLM received a request from the PFHD for another 10 year FUP authorizing them to continue extracting and using mineral materials from the subject parcel. The PFHD's 2014 request indicates no changes to the original mine and reclamation plan. The PFHD continues to forecast removal of less than 100,000 cubic yards of material each year. The pit boundaries would be located no closer than 50 feet from any property line and the pit would be between 10 to 30 feet deep, depending on depth of usable material. The expansion process would occur over a long timeframe, estimated up to 40 years, which would require a new permit every 10 or 11 years during the life of the pit.

B. Location

Kootenai County, T. 51 N., R. 4 W., S18 (NW¹/₄NE¹/₄), Boise Meridian

C. Land Use Plan Conformance

In accordance with the Federal Land Policy and Management Act (FLPMA), this proposed action has been reviewed for conformance with the Coeur d'Alene Resource Management Plan (RMP; Record of Decision signed June, 2007). It is consistent with the following decisions from the RMP:

Minerals (MN):

Goal MN-2;

“Make...mineral materials...available for exploration, acquisition, and production...consistent with other resource goals.”

Objective MN-2.1;

“Identify area(s) open to...mineral material disposal...”

D. National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Documents

The following NEPA document(s) covers the proposed action:

Environmental Assessment - Post Falls Highway District Free Use Permit, ID086-03-18, 04/30/2003: FONSI/DR signed: 06/17/2003

E. NEPA Adequacy Criteria

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

Documentation of answer and explanation: Yes. The proposed action is exactly the same as that analyzed in the identified EA. It is a continuation of the previous proposal.

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?*

Documentation of answer and explanation: Yes. Environmental concerns, interests, and resource values remain unchanged since the previous analysis.

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

Documentation of answer and explanation: Yes. There is no new information and/or new circumstances that would change the previous analysis in any manner.

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?*

Documentation of answer and explanation: Yes. Direct, indirect, and cumulative effects would be the same both quantitatively and qualitatively.

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

Documentation of answer and explanation: Yes. Public comment was solicited with no comments being submitted; and, the interagency review resulted in no change to previous analysis.

F. Persons/Agencies Consulted

Adjacent landowners

G. 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 constitutes BLM's compliance with the requirements of the NEPA.

/s/ Kurt Pavlat
Kurt Pavlat
Field Manager

7/23/2014
Date