

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
TUCSON FIELD OFFICE
TUCSON, ARIZONA**

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

SR 86 Expansion

NEPA Number DOI-BLM-AZ-G020-2013-0034-EA

Based on the analysis of potential environmental impacts contained in the attached Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) environmental assessment (EA) numbered STP-086-A (APA) 086 PM 156 H6806 01C dated April 16, 2010 and amended August 14, 2014, and considering the significance criteria in 40 CFR 1508.27, described below, I have determined that the proposed action with the design specifications will not have a significant effect on the human environment. An environmental impact statement is therefore not required.

Context:

The project is a site-specific action directly involving 35.55 acres of public lands within the Tucson Field Office.

BLM has been approached by Arizona Department of Transportation, Southwest Gas, Tucson Electric Power, Pima County, Century Link, and the City of Tucson Water Department in order to expand State Route 86 from a two lane highway to four lanes. BLM has been requested to amend or issue new rights-of-way for the entities across public lands.

Intensity:

The following discussion is organized around the 10 Significance Criteria described at 40 CFR 1508.27. The following have been considered in evaluating intensity for this proposal:

- 1. *Impacts that may be both beneficial and adverse.*** The EA considered both potential beneficial and adverse effects. None of the effects are beyond the range of effects analyzed in FHWA EA.
- 2. *The degree to which the proposed action affects public health and safety.*** No aspect of the Proposed Action would have an adverse effect on public health and safety.
- 3. *Unique characteristics of the geographic area such as proximity of historic or cultural resources, park lands, prime farmlands, wetlands, wild and scenic rivers, or ecologically critical areas.*** Any historic or cultural resource sites that would be affected by the Proposed Action have been properly mitigated in the FHWA EA. There are no parks, prime

farmlands, or wild and scenic rivers in the project area. No Area of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC) is within the project area.

4. ***The degree to which the effects on the quality of the human environment are likely to be highly controversial.*** Possible effects on the quality of the human environment are not likely to be controversial.
5. ***The degree to which the possible effects on the human environment are highly uncertain or involve unique or unknown risks.*** The analysis has not shown that there would be any unique or unknown risks to the human environment not previously considered and analyzed in FHWA EA to which this decision is tiered.
6. ***The degree to which the action may establish a precedent for future actions with significant effects or represents a decision in principle about a future consideration.*** This project neither establishes a precedent nor represents a decision in principle about future actions. The Proposed Action is consistent with actions identified in BLM's guidance as to issuances of ROW grants on public land.
7. ***Whether the action is related to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant impacts.*** This action is not related to other actions that would cumulatively cause significant negative actions.
8. ***The degree to which the action may adversely affect districts, sites, highways, structures, or objects listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places or may cause loss or destruction of significant scientific, cultural, or historic resources.*** This action will not adversely affect any district, sites, highways, structures, or objects listed on the National Register of Historic Places. If any sites are found and would be affected by the Proposed Action they have been properly mitigated in the FHWA EA.
9. ***The degree to which the action may adversely affect an endangered or threatened species or its habitat that has been determined to be critical under the Endangered Species Act of 1973.*** Any species found that could be affected by the Proposed Action have been properly mitigated in the FHWA EA.
10. ***Whether the action threatens a violation of Federal, State, or local law or requirements imposed for the protection of the environment.*** The Proposed Action does not threaten to violate any law.

Finding of No Significant Impact:

I have reviewed the FHWA environmental assessment, relating to the issuance of grants, letters of consent and amendments of 14 grants to the entities listed above located on the following public lands:

T. 15 S., R. 11 E., Gila & Salt River Meridian, Arizona

Section 12, Lot 1, N $\frac{1}{2}$ S $\frac{1}{2}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$.

T. 15 S., R. 12 E., Gila & Salt River Meridian, Arizona

Sections 3, Lots 1, 2, and 30, S $\frac{1}{2}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$;

4, Lots 1 and 2, SE $\frac{1}{4}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$;

7, Lots 3, 4, 21, 22, and 23, E $\frac{1}{2}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$.

This includes the explanation and resolution of any potentially significant environmental impacts. I have determined that the proposed action will not have any significant impacts on the human environment and that an EIS is not required. I have determined that the proposed action is in conformance with the Phoenix Resource Management Plan approved in Record of Decision dated December, 1998

Attachments: FHWA EA numbered STP-086-A (APA) 086 PM 156 H6806 01C dated April 16, 2010 and amended August 14, 2014

/s/ Bruce Sillitoe

03/18/2015

Bruce Sillitoe, Acting Field Manager, Tucson Field Office

Date