

**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: Tucson Field Office

NEPA No.: G020-2015-0003-CX

Case File No.: N/A

Proposed Action Title/Type: Altar Valley High Priority Abandoned Mine Remediation

Applicant: Bureau of Land Management - Tucson Field Office

Location of Proposed Action: Gila & Salt River Meridan, T.17 S., R. 10 E., secs. 23, 26, 27, 34, and 35; and T. 18 S., R. 10 E., secs. 1, 2, and 12; Pima County, Arizona.

Description of Proposed Action: The Bureau of Land Management - Tucson Field Office, with assistance from Arizona Game and Fish Department, would be fencing approximately 50 abandoned mine workings on public lands in the Altar Valley, Pima County, Arizona. The fences would be five-strand barbed wire and posted with "Danger - Hazardous Mine" warning signs. The project work would be completed in FY2015 by Arizona Game & Fish Department staff. All mine features are adjacent to existing roads, and no new roads to access the features would be necessary for the completion of this project. All mine workings identified for fencing have been surveyed by the AZGFD for potential wildlife habitat (see attached list of the features). Fencing off dangerous abandoned mine workings would eliminate hazards to the public, reduce liability of the Bureau of Land Management, and protect wildlife habitat.

Part II. – PLAN CONFORMANCE REVIEW

This proposed action is subject to the following land use plan(s): Phoenix 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: 1998

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	Rationale: Fencing off abandoned mine workings would have a positive effect on public health & safety. Accidental injury or death due to entry into the openings would be prevented by securing these mines.
	X	
Preparer's Initials <u> ks </u>		

(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	Rationale: The proposed action would not have significant impacts on any of the listed. No historic or prehistoric features would be impacted by the fencing project. The area is previously disturbed. The effect on wildlife, particularly bats and barn owls, would be positive., because fences would prevent human disturbance at the mine openings.
	X	
Preparer's Initials <u> ks </u>		

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

Yes	No	Rationale: There are several individuals with active mining claims in the area. The proposed action would not have significant effects on their activities or ability to perform mining activity on their claims.
	X	
Preparer's Initials <u> ks </u>		

(d) Have highly uncertain and potentially significant environmental effects or involve unique or unknown environmental risks.

Yes	No	Rationale: The proposed action would not have highly uncertain and potentially significant environmental effects or involve unique or unknown environmental risks.
	X	
Preparer's Initials <u> ks </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 would not set the precedent for other actions. All other methods of closure will be evaluated individually. Preparer's Initials <u>ks</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>ks</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: No historic or prehistoric features would be impacted by fencing and signing abandoned mine features. Preparer's Initials <u>ks</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 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Rationale: None of these listed are in the project area, therefore T&E species and Critical Habitat would be unaffected by the project. Preparer's Initials <u>ks</u>
(i) Violate a Federal law, or a State, local or tribal law or requirement imposed for the protection of the environment.		
Yes	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Rationale: No laws or requirements would be violated. Preparer's Initials <u>ks</u>
(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> ks </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 area.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Preparer's Initials <u> ks </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 X	<p>Rationale: AZGFD 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.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Preparer's Initials <u> ks </u></p>
<p>PART V. –COMPLIANCE REVIEW CONCLUSION</p> <p>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.</p> <p>MITIGATION MEASURES/OTHER REMARKS: /s/ Karen Simms, Acting Field Office Manager 02/04/2015</p> <p>APPROVING OFFICIAL: _____ DATE: _____</p> <p>TITLE: _____</p>		

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.