

Appendix B – Resources and Issue Identification Checklist

The following tables were developed based on the professional judgement of the BLM's interdisciplinary team and review of baseline studies.

B1 Supplemental Authorities

Appendix 1 of the Bureau of Land Management's (BLM) NEPA Handbook (H-1790-1) identifies supplemental authorities that are subject to requirements specified by statute or executive order and must be considered in all BLM environmental documents. Table B-1 lists the Supplemental Authorities and their status in the Analysis Area (Section 3.1). Supplemental authorities that *may be affected* by the Proposed Action or No Action Alternative and *warrant detailed analysis* are further described in this Environmental Assessment.

TABLE B-1 SUPPLEMENTAL AUTHORITIES			
Resource	Present (Yes/No)	May be Affected (Yes/No)	Rationale for Not Analyzing Resources in Detail
Air Quality	Yes	No	The BLM has reviewed the National Ambient Air Quality Standards for the Analysis Area. The Analysis Area is within non-attainment for fine and large particulates (PM2.5 and PM10). Pinal County would obtain any required air quality permits for construction, which would likely require dust abatement measures such as applying water to limit fugitive dust and require mufflers on all equipment. The increases in fugitive dust and emissions from construction would be short-term, localized and adverse. In the long-term, use of the Analysis Area by motorized vehicles would result in adverse, but negligible, increases in vehicle emissions. The increased emissions would not be expected to affect the attainment status of the air basin. No detailed analysis is warranted.
Areas of Critical Environmental Concern	No	No	There are no Areas of Critical Environmental Concern within the Analysis Area.
Cultural Resources	Yes	No	The BLM has completed a Class III cultural resources survey for the three Recreation and Public Purposes (R&PP) parcels and the right-of-way (ROW) area for the non-motorized trail system. Based on these surveys, while cultural sites are in the Analysis Area, there would be no impacts to the cultural sites from the Proposed Action (BLM-200-17-151). No detailed analysis is warranted.

**TABLE B-1
SUPPLEMENTAL AUTHORITIES**

Resource	Present (Yes/No)	May be Affected (Yes/No)	Rationale for Not Analyzing Resources in Detail
Environmental Justice	No	No	Executive Order 12898 (Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations), requires that federal agencies identify and address any disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of their programs, policies, and activities on minority and low-income populations. There are no disproportionately low income or minority populations in the Analysis Area.
Farm Lands (prime or unique)	No	No	There are no U.S. Department of Agriculture designated prime or unique farm lands in the Analysis Area.
Floodplains	No	No	There are no Federal Emergency Management Agency designated flood hazard areas in the Analysis Area.
Noxious and Invasive Weeds	Yes	No	Noxious and invasive weeds may be present in the Analysis Area. Pinal County would manage weed populations through an integrated approach, consistent with the Phoenix District's Integrated Weed Management Plan (BLM 2015).
Migratory Birds	Yes	No	The analysis area is described as Lower Colorado Subdivision of Sonoran Desertscrub. The site contains sparse vegetation with low diversity of species present, which is common for the area. Typical migratory birds that may occur in the area include: verdin (<i>Auriparus flaviceps</i>), greater roadrunner (<i>Geococcyx californianus</i>), cactus wren (<i>Campylorhynchus brunneicapillus</i>), mourning dove (<i>Zenaida macroura</i>), and various hummingbird species. The Project would result in permanent disturbance of approximately 52.4 acres. This represents approximately 13 percent of the 1,440-acre analysis area. During construction, there would be short-term displacement into adjacent available habitat. In the long-term, the Project would result in decreased available habitat (approximately 39 acres). Vehicle use along the new roads would result in long-term noise and localized displacement and could also result in increased mortality through collisions with individuals. The Project would not result in long-term changes to populations. Short- and long-term impacts would be adverse and minor. No detailed analysis is warranted.
Special-status Species (Animals)	Yes	Yes	Carried forward for analysis in Section 3.5.

**TABLE B-1
SUPPLEMENTAL AUTHORITIES**

Resource	Present (Yes/No)	May be Affected (Yes/No)	Rationale for Not Analyzing Resources in Detail
Native American Religious Concerns	–	–	<p>The American Indian Religious Freedom Act of 1978 (42 U.S.C. 1996) requires federal agencies to consider whether their proposals impeded access to sacred sites required in their religions, including cemeteries, by Native Americans. Executive Order 13007 (Indian Sacred Sites) requires federal agencies to: (1) accommodate access to and ceremonial use of Indian sacred sites by Indian religious practitioners and (2) avoid adversely affecting the physical integrity of such sacred sites.</p> <p>On November 20, 2020 the BLM notified the following tribes of this Project and provided them with early information: Ak-Chin Indian Community, Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community, Pascua Yaqui Tribe, Gila River Indian Community, Tohono O’odham Nation, Hopi Tribe, Yavapai-Apache Nation, Pueblo of Zuni, Tonto Apache Tribe, and White Mountain Apache Tribe.</p>
Threatened or Endangered Species	No	No	There is no proposed or designated critical habitat for proposed or listed threatened or endangered species. There are no known occurrences of proposed or listed threatened or endangered species in the Analysis Area.
Wastes, Hazardous or Solid	No	No	Resource not present.
Water Quality (Surface/Ground)	No	No	There are no Clean Water Act Section 303 (b) impaired waters in the Analysis Area. Drainages in the Analysis Area are ephemeral and may contain water during summer monsoons or winter rains; otherwise these drainages do not support surface water for extended periods of time. No detailed analysis is warranted.
Wetlands/Riparian Zones	No	No	There are no Clean Water Act Section 404 jurisdictional wetlands in the Analysis Area. Ephemeral drainages in the Analysis Area do not support riparian vegetation.
Wild and Scenic Rivers	No	No	There are no Congressionally-designated Wild and Scenic Rivers in the Analysis Area.
Wilderness	No	No	There are no Congressionally-designated Wilderness areas in the Analysis Area.
SOURCE: See BLM Handbook H-1790-1, Appendix 1 – Supplemental Authorities to be Considered (January 2008)			

B2 Resources or Uses Other than Supplemental Authorities

BLM specialists have evaluated the potential impact of the Proposed Action or No Action Alternative on these resources and documented their findings (Table B-2). Resources or uses that *may be affected* by the Proposed Action or No Action Alternative and *warrant detailed analysis* are further described in this EA (BLM Handbook H-1790-1).

TABLE A-2 RESOURCES OR USES OTHER THAN SUPPLEMENTAL AUTHORITIES			
Resource or Issue	Present Yes/No	May be Affected Yes/No	Rationale for Not Analyzing Resources in Detail
BLM Sensitive Species (plants)	No	No	Resource not present.
General Wildlife	Yes	No	Typical species associated with the Sonoran desertscrub vegetation community that may occur in the Analysis Area include: the side-blotched lizard (<i>Uta</i> spp.), red-tailed hawk (<i>Buteo jamaicensis</i>), king snake (<i>Lampropeltis</i> sp.), black-tailed jackrabbit (<i>Lepus californicus</i>), and coyote (<i>Canis latrans</i>). The Project would result in permanent disturbance to approximately 52.4 acres. This represents approximately 3.6 percent of the 1,417-acre Analysis Area. During construction, there would be short-term displacement into adjacent available habitat. In the long-term, the Project would result in decreased available habitat (approximately 52.4 acres). Vehicle use along the new roads would result in long-term noise and localized displacement and could also result in increased mortality through collisions with individuals. While individuals may be displaced or impacted, the Project would not result in long-term changes to populations. Short- and long-term impacts would be adverse and minor. No detailed analysis is warranted.
Lands and Realty	Yes	No	The issuance of an R&PP lease and ROW in the Analysis Area would be a beneficial impact for the BLM's lands and realty program. There are other existing ROWs in the Analysis Area; however, the Proposed Action would have no impact on the existing land use authorizations. No detailed analysis is warranted.
Lands with Wilderness Characteristics	No	No	There are no BLM-managed lands designated to manage for wilderness character in the Analysis Area.
Livestock Grazing	Yes	No	The 164-acre McDavid Road Trailhead parcel is located within the 118,422-acre Conley Allotment. This represents 0.13 percent of the

**TABLE A-2
RESOURCES OR USES OTHER THAN SUPPLEMENTAL AUTHORITIES**

Resource or Issue	Present Yes/No	May be Affected Yes/No	Rationale for Not Analyzing Resources in Detail
			<p>Allotment, or 0.17 percent of the BLM-managed lands in the Allotment. There is no current permit for the Allotment. The McDavid Road Trailhead parcel has been historically disturbed and lacks palatable species. The BLM anticipates renewing the Allotment permit in Fiscal Year 2022. Any decrease in forage/area availability for grazing would be addressed during this permit process. There are no range improvements for the Allotment in the McDavid Road Trailhead parcel. The R&PP parcel and non-motorized trail system ROW would have a long-term, adverse, and negligible impact on the Allotment. No detailed analysis is warranted.</p> <p>The 187-acre Farrell Road Trailhead and Campground parcel and 60.5-acre Table Top Road OHV Area parcel are both located in the 22,344-acre Palo Verde Mountains Allotment. This represents 1.1 percent of the Allotment, or 5.6 percent of the BLM-managed lands in the Allotment. There is no current permit for the Allotment, which is classified as ephemeral. There are no range improvements for the Allotment in either the Farrell Road Trailhead and Campground or the Table Top OHV Area parcels. Any decrease in forage/area availability for grazing would be addressed during the permit process. The R&PP parcels and non-motorized trail system ROW would have a long-term, adverse, and negligible impact on the Allotment. No detailed analysis is warranted.</p>
Minerals	Yes	No	<p>As per the Mineral Potential Report, the proposed lease area has “high potential for the occurrence of salable minerals, but due to the abundance of similar material in the vicinity, the salable mineral deposits on the proposed lease are unlikely to be critical for community development.”. There are no unpatented mining claims in any of the three R&PP parcels. No detailed analysis is warranted.</p>
Paleontological	No	No	<p>The BLM has reviewed the Potential Fossil Yield Classification (PFYC) System for the Analysis Area. There is no or low potential for fossils based on these classifications within the</p>

TABLE A-2 RESOURCES OR USES OTHER THAN SUPPLEMENTAL AUTHORITIES			
Resource or Issue	Present Yes/No	May be Affected Yes/No	Rationale for Not Analyzing Resources in Detail
			Expansion Area. No detailed analysis is warranted.
Recreation	Yes	Yes	Carried forward for analysis in Sections 3.3.1 and 3.3.2.
Socioeconomics	Yes	No	The Proposed Action would provide for new formal recreation developments in the Analysis Area. Public use of these developments could result in increased economic activity in the vicinity through purchase of supplies, outdoor gear, and gasoline for motor vehicles. Over the long-term, use of the recreation developments has low potential to increase seasonal employment in the vicinity. No detailed analysis is warranted.
Soils	Yes	No	During construction of the recreation developments and non-motorized trail system, there would be surface disturbing activities on approximately 52.4 acres. This represents 3.6 percent of the 1,417-acre Analysis Area. Pinal County would follow best management practices to minimize potential wind and water caused-soil erosion. No detailed analysis is warranted.
Travel Management	No	No	The Analysis Area is not within an approved Travel Management Area.
Vegetation	Yes	No	The Analysis Area consists of open desertscrub with xeroriparian vegetation along the ephemeral drainages. Dominant species occurring within the vicinity of the Analysis Area are typical of the Sonoran desertscrub community, and primarily consist of creosotebush (<i>Larrea tridentata</i>), blue paloverde (<i>Parkinsonia florida</i>), velvet mesquite (<i>Prosopis velutina</i>), and saguaro (<i>Carnegiea gigantean</i>). The xeroriparian vegetation contains densest concentrations of the upland species dominated by paloverde and mesquite. Approximately 52.4 acres would be permanently impacted. This represents approximately 3.6 percent of the 1,417-acre Analysis Area. Long-term impacts to vegetation would be adverse and minor. No detailed analysis is warranted.
Visual Resource Management	Yes	No	The Analysis Area is within Visual Resource Management (VRM) Class IV which allows for moderate change to the visual character. Project design would incorporate appropriate colors for a park setting in order to minimize visual contrast within the Analysis Area. The element of the Project that cannot be

**TABLE A-2
RESOURCES OR USES OTHER THAN SUPPLEMENTAL AUTHORITIES**

Resource or Issue	Present Yes/No	May be Affected Yes/No	Rationale for Not Analyzing Resources in Detail
			<p>minimized is the introduction of motor vehicles, including buses, which may be white, blue or red shades that contrast with the natural landscape. The introduction of a road system, parking lots, and other facilities would result in moderate visual changes. The introduction of a non-motorized trail system connecting the three recreation developments would result in weak to moderate changes. The Project would be in conformance with VRM Class IV. No detailed analysis is warranted.</p>
Wild Horses and Burros	No	No	<p>There is no BLM designed herd management area for wild burros or horses in the Analysis Area.</p>