

United States Department of the Interior Bureau of Land Management

Final Environmental Assessment
DOI-BLM-AZ-C030-2018-0065-EA

K Lazy B Range Improvement Project: Camp Well

U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management
Colorado River District
Lake Havasu Field Office
1785 Kiowa Ave.
Lake Havasu City, AZ 86403
(928) 505-1200

February 2019



It is the mission of the Bureau of Land Management to sustain the health, diversity, and productivity of the public lands for the use and enjoyment of present and future generations.

DOI-BLM-AZ-C030-2018-0065-EA

Compliance for Section 508 of the Rehabilitation Act

The contents of this document, when accessed electronically, may not be fully Section 508 Compliant with all software applications and readers. Please contact the Lake Havasu Field Office for assistance. We will try to assist you as best we can. This may require providing the information to you in a text only format.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Identifying Information.....	1
1.2 Background.....	1
1.3 Purpose and Need for Action.....	1
1.4 Decision to be Made	2
1.5 Land Use Plan Conformance	2
1.6 Relationships to Statutes, Regulations, Other Plans and Environmental Analysis Documents	3
1.7 Scoping and Issue Identification.....	3
CHAPTER 2 PROPOSED ACTION AND ALTERNATIVES	3
2.1 Proposed Action.....	3
2.1.1 Best Management Practices.....	4
2.2 No Action Alternative.....	4
2.3 Alternatives Considered but Eliminated from Further Analysis.....	5
CHAPTER 3 AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT & ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES	5
3.1 Resources and Uses.....	5
3.2 Resources Brought Forward for Analysis.....	9
3.2.1 Livestock Grazing Management.....	9
3.2.2 Vegetation Resources (native and invasive).....	10
3.2.3 Wildlife (including Migratory Birds)	11
CHAPTER 4 CUMULATIVE EFFECTS ANALYSIS	11
4.1 Past, Present Actions, and Reasonably Foreseeable Future Actions	11
4.2 Cumulative Impacts Analysis	12
4.2.1 Cumulative Impacts of the Proposed Action.....	12
4.2.2 Cumulative Impacts of the No Action Alternative.....	12
CHAPTER 5 CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION	13
CHAPTER 6 LIST OF PREPARERS	14
APPENDIX A – SPECIES OF GREATEST CONSERVATION NEED	15
APPENDIX B – ARIZONA SENSITIVE PLANTS.....	16
APPENDIX C – MAP	17
APPENDIX D – RESPONSE TO COMMENTS.....	18

CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION

This Environmental Assessment (EA) is a site-specific analysis of potential impacts, which may result by implementing the Proposed Action or an alternative. This EA will allow the Authorizing Officer (AO) to determine whether implementing the Proposed Action or an alternative may cause significant impacts to the human environment. If the AO determines no significant impacts would occur, a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) would be prepared and a Decision Record (DR) would be issued. If significant impacts are likely to occur, or a FONSI cannot be reached, an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) would be prepared with a subsequent Record of Decision (ROD).

1.1 Identifying Information

Title, EA Number and type of Project:

K Lazy B Camp Well, 2018_0065_EA, Construction of a New Well

Location of Proposed Action:

K Lazy B Allotment, La Paz County, Arizona

T4N, R12W, Sec. 15, SWNW ¼

E269319.9, N3730797.7

Name and Location of Preparing Office:

Lake Havasu Field Office, Lake Havasu City, Arizona

Subject Function Code, Lease, Serial Number or Case File Number:

RIP # 021775

Applicant Name:

Toni Brown

1.2 Background

The Bureau of Land Management (BLM), Lake Havasu Field Office (LHFO) has received an application from the K Lazy B Allotment permittee requesting the authorization to construct a new water well with a storage tank on public lands. The reason for the request is to be able to continue providing livestock with water in the event the water currently leased is no longer available. The current water drawn to supply the trough is approximately 1 mile away on private agricultural land that once was owned by the permittee. The current owners of the land has continued to allow the permittees to use the water for their livestock use on public lands. In the event that access and use of that water is revoked, they would not be able to support livestock in that area of the allotment. The Permittee is requesting a more permanent source of water that they can draw from without having to rely on a lease with the agricultural land owners.

1.3 Purpose and Need for Action

The purpose of the action is to ensure there is a continued reliable source of water for livestock and wildlife on the K Lazy B Allotment.

The BLM's need is to respond to the application request for a water well and storage tank on public lands within the K Lazy B Allotment in accordance with the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (FLPMA) and the grazing regulations found within Title 43 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) parts 4120 and 4160.

1.4 Decision to be Made

The BLM Authorized Officer will decide whether or not to approve the construction of a new well with a storage tank to continue providing water for both livestock and wildlife, and if so under what terms and conditions.

1.5 Land Use Plan Conformance

The proposed action is in conformance with the BLM 2010 Yuma Field Office Resource Management Plan (RMP). The following resource objectives and/or management actions apply:

Livestock Grazing Management pages 2-87 through 2-93

GM-003 (3-4) – Intensity, season and frequency of use, and distribution of grazing use should provide for growth and reproduction of those plant species needed to reach desired plant community objectives.

GM-007: Make 428,300 acres available for livestock grazing in the YFO planning area.

GM-011 – Authorize and maintain range improvement projects in accordance with grazing regulations and policies.

GM-013: Continue to use the allotment management categorization process to define the level of management needed to properly administer livestock grazing according to management needs, resource conflicts, potential for improvement, and BLM funding/staffing constraints. The allotment categories are:

- Custodial (C), custodial management to protect resource conditions and values,
- Maintain (M), management to maintain current satisfactory resource conditions and active management to ensure that the conditions of resource values do not decline, and
- Improve (I), active management to improve unsatisfactory resource conditions.

GM-018: Locate new livestock waters at least two miles from Category I and II Sonoran desert tortoise habitat.

GM-019: Exclude range improvement projects within Category I and II Sonoran desert tortoise habitat, including water developments, which will create conflicts with Sonoran desert tortoise populations.

TM-021: During the construction of rangeland developments, vehicles will use designated routes wherever possible for access to sites. Where no routes exist, vehicles will be authorized on a case-by-case basis to travel cross-country to avoid the need for road building. Where new roads must be built, roadbeds will be no wider than needed for reliable access. As a general practice, new roads will not be bladed for use in fence construction. Vehicles will travel cross-country or fences will be built without motorized access.

Appendix B. Best Management Practices 1.8 Typical Range of Habitat Improvements; D. Wells: Well sites will be selected based on geologic reports that predict the depth to reliable aquifers. All applicable State laws and regulations that apply to groundwater will be observed.

1.6 Relationships to Statutes, Regulations, Other Plans and Environmental Analysis Documents

The Proposed Action and Alternatives are consistent with Federal laws and regulations, plans, programs and policies of affiliated tribes, other Federal agencies, State and local governments including, but not limited to, the following:

- Federal Land Policy Management Act of 1976;
- The Taylor Grazing Act of 1934
- Title 43 of the CFR Subpart 4100;
- The Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended;
- Migratory Bird Act – Executive Order (EO). 13806;
- Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act, 1990;
- American Indian Religious Freedom Act of 1979;
- National Historic Preservation Act;
- Archaeological Resources Protection Act of 1979, as amended;
- The National Environmental Policy Act of 1969.

1.7 Scoping and Issue Identification

Internal project scoping began with the LHFO Interdisciplinary (ID) team meeting held on September 17, 2018. Initial resource concerns and issues were discussed and identified during this meeting. Public outreach; state, tribal, and federal began on October 2, 2018 and consisted of letters containing information about the proposed project and its location. Issues identified and resource concerns were identified and will be discussed in detail in this EA.

CHAPTER 2 PROPOSED ACTION AND ALTERNATIVES

2.1 Proposed Action

Toni Brown, K Lazy B Allotment Permittee, has submitted an application for a range improvement project, to request the development of a new well with a storage tank located south of US 60, south of Salome, about 9 miles down Salome road. The well would be located about 150-feet south of a water trough that is currently maintained and used for the purpose of authorized grazing management. The well would be a new point of diversion source of water to no longer rely on the current point of diversion of water. The proposed well location has been chosen for its currently existing trough site and disturbed status, since it is an area located near a power line road, adjacent to agricultural lands, and is an area currently disturbed by livestock. The project construction (obtaining material and drilling) would take place as soon as approved, if that is the case, and a cooperative agreement would be signed by all participating parties. A project of this scale should consist of a 1 to 2 man crew, about 2 vehicles with trailer to haul equipment, and should take about 14 days to complete.

The well would be drilled to a depth of about 500 feet and constructed with a submersible pump with the ability to pump 15 gallons/minute, which would be powered by either connecting to the current Arizona Public Service (APS) power line, or a generator. The preferred method for pumping water is connecting to the current APS powerline, but if this option is not feasible or permission is not obtained from APS, a generator would be used. The storage tank for holding the pumped water would be capable of holding 6000 gallons. The area of the project would have

a 20' X 40' fence to protect the pump and possibly the tank as well. Approximately 200 feet of buried pipeline would run from the storage tank to the water troughs currently located within the adjacent corral (appendix C). The drilling of the well would be within a radius of 15-feet from the proposed coordinates as described above (appendix C). The approximate cost of drilling would be \$20,000.00 while equipment, such as: pump, wire, generator, pipeline, fencing, and storage tank, would be about \$15,000.00.

2.1.1 Best Management Practices

The following best management practices (BMPs) are included in the proposed action in an effort to minimize the impacts of the proposed action to social and natural environmental resources. The following are practices to be implemented:

- At no time would vehicle or equipment fluids (including motor oil and lubricants) be dumped on public lands. All accidental spills would be reported to the authorized officer and be cleaned up immediately, using best available practices and requirements of the law, and disposed of in an authorized disposal site. All spills of federally or state listed hazardous materials which exceed the reportable quantities would be promptly reported to the appropriate agency and the authorized officer.
- Vehicles and equipment would be power washed off-site before construction activities begin to minimize the risk of spreading noxious weeds. This would include cleaning all equipment before entering the project area.
- Any cultural (historic/prehistoric site or object) or paleontological resource (fossil remains of plants or animals) discovered within the project areas would immediately be reported to the LHFO Manager or his designee. All operations in the immediate area of the discovery shall be suspended until written authorization to proceed is issued. An evaluation of the discovery shall be made by a qualified archaeologist or paleontologist to determine appropriate actions to prevent the loss of significant cultural or scientifically important paleontological values.
- If in connection with this work any human remains, funerary objects, sacred objects, or objects of cultural patrimony as defined in the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (Public Law 101-601; 104 Stat. 3048; 25 U.S.C. 3001) are discovered, operations in the immediate area of the discovery would stop, the remains and objects would be protected, and the LHFO Manager (or his designee) would be immediately notified. The immediate area of the discovery would be protected until notified by the LHFO Manager (or his designee) that operations may resume.

2.2 No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, the Proposed Action would not be authorized. A more reliable water source to the trough would not be available. The current well would continue to be utilized until permission or access is revoked by the private landowners.

2.3 Alternatives Considered but Eliminated from Further Analysis

A water haul alternative was shortly considered but eliminated for further consideration, since hauling water would be more cumbersome and in addition would lead to greater long-term disturbance impacts due to increased vehicle traffic and was determined impractical for further consideration.

CHAPTER 3 AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT & ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

This chapter describes the potential direct, indirect, and residual effects to resources that may result from the Proposed Action or Alternatives, as well as identifies the potential monitoring needs associated with the specific resources.

3.1 Resources and Uses

The BLM is required to consider many authorities when evaluating a federal action. The table below summarizes the environmental resources that have been reviewed by the BLM ID Team to determine whether or not they would be affected by the proposed project and rationale for whether the topic will be carried forward for detailed analysis. Those resources or uses determined not present or present but not affected by the Proposed Action need not be carried forward or discussed further. Resources or uses determined to be present and may be affected may be carried forward in the document if there are issues which necessitate a detailed analysis.

Table 1: Resources and Uses

Resource/Use	Present Yes/No	May Be Affected Yes/No	Rationale	Analyzed in Section
Air Quality	YES	NO	<p>The drilling of the well would moderately contribute to the Particulate matter (PM) or particle pollution found in the localized surrounding air, however, it would not be expected to contribute to any exceedance of the National Ambient Air Quality Standards for the area.</p> <p>If a generator were used to power the well, there would be exhaust emissions contributing to the air pollution during powering times. The storage tank would hold enough water to feed the trough and the generator would temporarily be used to fill the storage tank. It is not expected that the generator would exponentially increase the PM in the localized surrounding air in the short or long-.</p>	
Areas of Critical Environmental Concern	NO	NO	No Areas of Critical Environmental Concern are present in the project area nor the vicinity.	

Resource/Use	Present Yes/No	May Be Affected Yes/No	Rationale	Analyzed in Section
Cultural Resources	NO	NO	No cultural resources were found during the survey of the site.	
Environmental Justice	NO	NO	No minority or low-income populations are located within or in the vicinity of the proposed action, nor would they be disproportionately affected by the proposed action	
Farmlands – Prime/Unique	YES	NO	The proposed action is not located in prime farmland soils (map unit symbol 312 in NRCS Soil Report attachment), however, the proposed action is surrounded by Prime Farmland if it is irrigated and either protected from flooding or not frequently flooded during growing season. The surrounding area is agriculturally used, therefore likely a Prime Farmland; however, the proposed action would have minimal to no effect on the quality of the surrounding farmland.	
Fire Management	NO	NO	Fire Management would not be affected by the proposed action as vegetation does not support continuous fuel loads in the area.	
Fish Habitat	NO	NO	Fish Habitat is not present, therefore not analyzed.	
Floodplains	YES	NO	The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) map for La Paz lists the well area as undetermined. Though it appears to be near an ephemeral drainage it is quite a way from people. There would not be an effect to floodplains due to the well project.	
Forestry Resources and Woodland Products	NO	NO	There are no forestry resources and woodland products, therefore not analyzed.	
Human Health and Safety	NO	NO	Construction of the well would not cause any human health and safety issues. Any personal protection equipment (PPE) necessary would be used during construction of the project. Human health and safety outside the project location would not be affected.	
Land Use Authorizations/Access	YES	NO	No roads would be closed or inaccessible due to the proposed action, and no new access roads or cross country travel is needed for the project.	
Lands with Wilderness Characteristics	NO	NO	No Lands with Wilderness Characteristics are present.	
Livestock Grazing Management	YES	YES	Livestock Grazing is further analyzed below.	3.3.1

Resource/Use	Present Yes/No	May Be Affected Yes/No	Rationale	Analyzed in Section
Mineral Resources	YES	NO	There are no locatable mineral resources that would be disturbed or obstructed by the proposed action. Any other mineral resources such as sand or gravel would not be disturbed by the project. Saleable minerals are open for disposal in the project area.	
Native American Religious Concerns/ Traditional Values	NO	NO	No concerns were brought up during initial coordination with potentially interested tribes.	
Noise	YES	NO	Noise pollution from running of the generator would only occur during the time needed to fill the storage tank, which would not be an everyday occurrence. This temporary noise pollution would not affect or exceed any established standards.	
Paleontological Resources	NO	NO	The project site is located in Quaternary Alluvium. The Potential Fossil Yield Classification is unknown. Nearby bedrock is identified as Precambrian metamorphic rocks, Vishnu Schist, and volcanic rocks. Due to the type of the surrounding bedrock, potential fossil yield is low for this project. Based on the size of the proposed well hole, there is negligible adverse effects on potential fossil resources. If any fossils are uncovered during drilling, earthwork shall cease until findings are documented by a BLM geologist or archaeologist.	
Recreation	YES	NO	Dispersed camping and vehicle touring are the main recreational uses occurring in the area, however the proposed project area is small and in a dispersed recreation area and would not limit recreation opportunities.	
Socio-economics	YES	NO	The proposed action may benefit the livestock operator, however any gain would be minimal and result in the continuation of livestock grazing in the area.	
Soil Resources	YES	NO	Soil resources would not be affected any more than disturbance that is already present outside of project area. See soil survey for soil types in and near project area (NRCS Soil Survey attachment).	
Threatened, Endangered, and Special Status Species	NO	NO	The project area is not within any critical habitat designated by the	

Resource/Use	Present Yes/No	May Be Affected Yes/No	Rationale	Analyzed in Section
			United States Fish and Wildlife Service for threatened and endangered species.	
Travel and Transportation Management	YES	NO	Access roads are currently open and would remain open during construction of the well.	
Vegetation Resources (native and invasive)	YES	YES	Vegetation Resources is further analyzed in its section below.	3.3.2
Visual Resources	YES	NO	The location of the proposed well is within a class III Visual Resource Management area that allows for management activities to attract attention but should not dominate the view of the casual observer. The well and storage tank would not dominate the view of the overall landscape anymore than the structures already located in the area.	
Wastes – Hazardous or Solid	NO	NO	There are no known hazardous or solid wastes within or adjacent to the project area. Any solid waste generated by the proposed action would be disposed of in an approved facility. Best management practices would reduce any impacts from vehicle or equipment fluids as described in section 2.1.1. No hazardous wastes would be generated, stored, treated or transported as a result of the proposed action.	
Water Resources (including water rights)	YES	NO	No existing wells in Sec 15 or 16. Two surface water rights: private irrigation about ¼ mile north and BLM stock tank ¼ mile south. The well would be using a ground water resource and not be associated with the surface waters.	
Water Quality (Surface/ Ground)	YES	NO	Well water would be tested before being used. Well would be capped if water is found not meeting state standards. The project would not affect surface water since it is pulling groundwater and, drainages in the area are ephemeral. No known surface water features such as springs, seeps, creeks, or perennial waters are found in the area. The only means of affecting groundwater would be by punching a hole in an underlying bad water lens and contaminating good water. If only bad water is found, the well would be capped with neat cement and bentonite to prevent further contamination. The	

Resource/Use	Present Yes/No	May Be Affected Yes/No	Rationale	Analyzed in Section
			water is for a watering trough, the amount drawn would be less than 1 acre foot, and it is not expected to contribute to significant water table drawdown.	
Wetlands/ Riparian Zones	NO	NO	No Wetlands or Riparian Zones are present. The dry wash located west of the project does not meet the definition of a riparian zone, as it does not have specie indicators of a riparian zone. Water that would run in the wash is ephemeral.	
Wild and Scenic Rivers	NO	NO	No wild or scenic rivers are present on or near the project area.	
Wild Horses and Burros	NO	NO	The proposed action is not located within a Herd Management Area (HMA)	
Wilderness	NO	NO	The proposed action is not located in a wilderness area, nor is there a wilderness area in the near area.	
Wildlife (including Migratory Birds)	YES	YES	Wildlife and migratory birds are further analyzed in the section below.	3.3.3

3.2 Resources Brought Forward for Analysis

The ID Team evaluated potential impacts from the Proposed Action and Alternatives to determine which resources, and resource uses (as listed in the tables above) necessitate detailed analysis. Through this process, the ID team determined the following resources warrant detailed analysis in this EA.

The description of the Affected Environment for the No Action and other Alternatives would be the same as that for the Proposed Action.

3.2.1 Livestock Grazing Management

Affected Environment

The K Lazy B Allotment has 128,466 acres of public lands with 1861 available Animal Unit Months (AUMs) and currently has a permitted use of 165 cattle for 12 month grazing. Throughout the allotment, there are wells and dirt tanks that support livestock and wildlife grazing. The placement of such waters helps to improve rangeland health standards. Properly placing waters throughout the allotment allows for improved grazing distribution. The current trough located approximately 150 to 200-feet north of the proposed well is the only water source available for livestock for the north end of the allotment.

Environmental Consequences

Proposed Action

The construction of a well with storage tank would allow the current trough to have the available water needed to continue supporting livestock should private landowners revoke access to the

current water source. The supply of water would also continue to support grazing distribution. Distributing the authorized livestock for the allotment reduces grazing pressure in concentrated locations.

No Action

With no well and storage tank placed to replace the water currently leased by the adjacent farm land, and with the possibility of not being able to continue leasing water, the water sought by livestock would be absent. This would affect grazing operations; any livestock removed from the area to be distributed elsewhere could potentially increase grazing pressure in other areas, and lead to degradation due to heavier livestock concentrated use in areas where livestock are redistributed.

3.2.2 Vegetation Resources (native and invasive)

Affected Environment

During a site visit on 08/16/2018, it was determined that within the proposed project site there was minimal vegetation as a result of previous disturbance. Arizona State/BLM sensitive native plant species such as those listed in the species table in the appendices B were not present in the proposed well, storage tank, pipe, and enclosure installation site. During a second site visit on 10/04/2018, recent rains had sprouted invasive weeds within and around the area of the proposed project. Two invasive species were identified; Goathead/Puncture vine (*Tribulus terrestris*), and a species of Pigweed (*Amaranthus sp.*) likely Redroot pigweed (*Amaranthus retroflexus*). Seeds will stay dormant until adequate conditions are present. Both species found are common to disturbed areas such as cultivated fields, roadsides, orchards, vineyards, waste places, and other disturbed places. Both species do well in dry, open, sunny areas. Species of mesquite (*Prosopis sp.*) were also found in the surrounding area.

Environmental Consequences

Proposed Action

The native species listed in the Arizona State/BLM sensitive table do not occur within the proposed well installation site due to a lack of suitable habitat; therefore, there would be no impact on those species from the well, storage tank, pipe, and enclosing fence installation.

Mesquite species are found outside of the project area but current condition of mesquites is not expected to be altered by the proposed project.

Invasive species are present; there is the potential of further introduction of invasive vegetation during the hauling of equipment to the site.

No Action

If the case of No Action option, the well would not be installed. There would be no immediate impact to native vegetation nor the potential increase of invasive species as no construction or surface disturbing activities would occur.

Recommended Mitigation and Monitoring

Refer to section 2.1.1 Best Management Practices

3.2.3 Wildlife (including Migratory Birds)

Affected Environment

Arizona State Species of Greatest Conservation Need (SGCN) and BLM sensitive species such as those listed in the SGCN species table may occur in the greater area (appendix A). Wildlife in general would utilize the water source for consumption. Migratory birds are not present at the installation site year round but may utilize the water source during their migration for consumption.

Environmental Consequences

Proposed Action

Installation of the well would provide a reliable year-round water source thereby benefiting the wildlife currently utilizing the existing water trough. The Proposed location of the well is not located within Category I and II of Sonoran desert tortoise habitat therefore should not create conflicts with desert tortoise habitat.

During a site visit on 08/16/2018, it was determined that the proposed well installation site is previously disturbed and located adjacent to a watering trough within an existing grazing allotment, therefore the well, storage tank, pipe, and enclosure installation is not likely to impact Arizona State SGCN or BLM sensitive species. The species listed in the SGCN table (appendix A) do not occur within the proposed well installation site due to a lack of suitable habitat; therefore, there would be minimal impact on those species from the well, storage tank, pipe, and enclosure installation. Impacts of noise and presence of equipment could keep wildlife away that do utilize the trough. However, these impacts would be temporary in nature and would be expected during construction of the well (which is anticipated to be about two weeks from when construction begins) or when the generator (if connection to the APS power line is not an option) runs to fill the trough.

No Action

If the case of No Action option, the well would not be installed. There would be no immediate impact to wildlife unless the current well becomes non-functioning.

Recommended Mitigation and Monitoring

None.

CHAPTER 4 CUMULATIVE EFFECTS ANALYSIS

This section introduces other actions that overlap geographically and temporally with the proposed project and will be considered in cumulative impacts.

Past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions are analyzed to the extent that they are relevant and useful in analyzing whether the reasonably foreseeable effects of the Proposed Action and/or Alternatives may have an additive and significant relationship to those effects.

4.1 Past, Present Actions, and Reasonably Foreseeable Future Actions

Past actions considered are those whose impacts to one or more of the affected resources have persisted to present day. Present actions are those occurring at the time of this evaluation and

during implementation of the Proposed Action. RFFAs constitute those actions that are known or could reasonably be anticipated to occur within the analysis area for each resource, within a time frame appropriate to the expected impacts from the Proposed Action. The past, present, and RFFAs applicable to the assessment area are identified in the following Table.

Table 2: Past, Present and RFFAs Applicable to the CESA

Project -- Name or Description	Status (X)		
	Past	Present	Future
Livestock grazing	X	X	X
Range Improvements	X	X	X
Dispersed Recreation including OHV travel	X	X	X
Right of Way (ROW) and access	X	X	X

4.2 Cumulative Impacts Analysis

Only those resources directly or indirectly affected by the Proposed Action or Alternatives are considered for cumulative effects.

4.2.1 Cumulative Impacts of the Proposed Action

If the proposed action is taken, both livestock and wildlife would continue to utilize the water available in the trough. Similar grazing distribution would continue in the allotment and the livestock operation by the permittee would continue in the area. By implementing the project it would provide a more permanent source of water, which is important for distribution and the overall health of the range. Continuing and adding available water throughout the allotment benefits wildlife and allows for improved utilization by livestock. It is to the benefit of the range that if grazing is to occur, that utilization by an allotted number of livestock be dispersed and not concentrated in one or just a few areas.

Any other resources or activities would not change once the project is in place. Any outside activity utilizing the adjacent road would not be impeded during construction or after the well is in place. During construction, there is a potential for invasive species to spread into areas of soil disturbance or on the equipment brought in for the project. However, with the incorporation of the best management practices for vehicle washing prior to entering the project area should help mitigate the spread. Livestock that are grazing in the area compact the soil and would still impact soil resources in and near the project area. Additionally, soil resources would still be impacted with or without the project by off-roading and by other soil disturbing activities in the area.

4.2.2 Cumulative Impacts of the No Action Alternative

If the no action alternative is taken, both livestock and wildlife may no longer have available water specifically provided for them in this portion of the allotment. Wildlife would have to seek water resources elsewhere and livestock would no longer be able to graze in that area of the allotment. Livestock would need to be moved to other areas of the allotment where water is available. If that occurs, vegetative and soil resources would be impacted due to the higher density of livestock where water is available elsewhere in the allotment. Soil degradation could increase due to compaction and erosion. Vegetation would be heavier grazed and less available as soil degradation increased.

If the permittee decided not to relocate the livestock and remove them due to the lack of water, it could affect the current authorized use. The current range improvement project, the corral and trough, would no longer serve its intended purpose.

Any invasive species currently in the proposed action area might not change. However, other disturbed areas caused by grazing, off-road travel, and agriculture could promote the spread of invasive species. By removing grazing from this area, invasive species in the area would be expected to decrease, however it would not remove the potential for increased invasive species as other activities such as agriculture and off-road recreation are still present to potentially increase invasion.

CHAPTER 5 CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION

Agency, Tribe or Organization Name	Contact First Name	Contact Last Name
AZ Department of Transportation	N/A	N/A
Ak Chin Indian Community of Maricopa Indian Reservation	Robert	Miguel
Arizona Game and Fish Department-Kingman	Larry	Phoenix
Arizona Game and Fish Department-Yuma	N/A	N/A
Arizona Resource Advisory Council	Adam	Eggers
AZ Cattle Growers Association	N/A	N/A
AZ Department of Agriculture	Mark	Killian
AZ State Land Department	Steve	Williams
Bureau of Reclamation-Lower Colorado Region	N/A	N/A
Bureau of Indian Affairs	N/A	N/A
Cocopah Tribe	Charles	Wood
Colorado River Indian Tribes	Sherry	Cordova
Chemehuevi Tribe	Dennis	Patch
Fort McDowell Yavapai Nation	Bernadine	Burnette
Fort Mojave Tribal Council	Timothy	Williams
Gila River Indian Community	Stephen R.	Lewis
Havasupai Tribe	Muriel	Ugualla-Coochytewa
Hopi Tribe	Herman G.	Honanie
Hualapai Tribe	Damon	Clarke
Kaibab Band of Paiute Indians	Roland	Maldonado
La Paz County Commissioners	N/A	N/A
La Paz County Public Works	Thomas	Simmons
Las Vegas Paiute Tribe	Benny	Tso
Moapa Band Paiute Indians	Darren	Deboda
Mohave County Livestock Association	Emmitt	Sturgill
Navajo Nation	Russell	Begaye
Pascua Yaqui Tribe	Robert	Valencia
Paiute Indian Tribe of Utah	Corrina	Bow
Quechan Tribe	Kenny	Escalanti, Sr.

Agency, Tribe or Organization Name	Contact First Name	Contact Last Name
Salt River Pima-Maricopa Indian Community	Delbert	Ray
Tohono O'odham Nation	Edward D.	Manuel
Twenty-Nine Palms Band of Mission Indians	Darrell	Mike
USFWS Southwest Region	Amy	Leuders
USFWS Bill Williams National Wildlife Refuge	N/A	N/A
Western Watersheds Project	Cyndi	Tuell
Yavapai Cattle Growers	N/A	N/A
Yavapai-Apache Nation	Thomas	Beauty
Yavapai-Prescott Indian Tribe	Ernest	Jones, Si.
Zuni Tribe	Val	Panteah

CHAPTER 6 LIST OF PREPARERS

NAME	TITLE
Vincent Beresford	Geologist
Sheri Ahrens	Realty Specialist
Caroline Kilbane	Outdoor Recreation Planner
Harry Ford Mauney	Wildlife Biologist
Jessica Han	Archaeologist
Angelica Rose	Planning & Environmental Coordinator
Eric Duarte	Range Specialist
Adam B. Cochran	Assistant Field Manager
Jason R. West	Field Manager

APPENDIX A – SPECIES OF GREATEST CONSERVATION NEED

Common Species Name	Scientific Name
Sonoran Desert Toad	<i>Bufo alvarius</i>
Arizona Toad*	<i>Bufo microscaphus</i>
Bald Eagle*	<i>Haliaeetus leucocephalus</i>
Wood Duck	<i>Aix sponsa</i>
Western Burrowing Owl*	<i>Athene cunicularia hypugaea</i>
American Bittern	<i>Botaurus lentiginosus</i>
Ferruginous Hawk*	<i>Buteo regalis</i>
Gilded Flicker*	<i>Colaptes chrysoides</i>
Lincoln's Sparrow	<i>Melospiza lincolnii</i>
Gila Woodpecker	<i>Melanerpes uropygialis</i>
Savannah Sparrow	<i>Passerculus sandwichensis</i>
Abert's Towhee	<i>Melozone aberti</i>
Le Conte's Thrasher*	<i>Toxostoma lecontei</i>
Pacific Wren	<i>Troglodytes pacificus</i>
Arizona Bell's Vireo	<i>Vireo bellii arizonae</i>
Harris' Antelope Squirrel	<i>Ammospermophilus harrisi</i>
Pale Townsend's Big-eared Bat*	<i>Corynorhinus townsendii pallescens</i>
Spotted Bat*	<i>Euderma maculatum</i>
Greater Western Mastiff Bat*	<i>Eumops perotis californicus</i>
Western Red Bat	<i>Lasiurus blossevillii</i>
Western Yellow Bat	<i>Lasiurus xanthinus</i>
California Leaf-nosed Bat*	<i>Macrotus californicus</i>
Cave Myotis*	<i>Myotis velifer</i>
Yuma Myotis	<i>Myotis yumanensis</i>
Pocketed Free-tailed Bat	<i>Nyctinomops femorosaccus</i>
Arizona Pocket Mouse	<i>Perognathus amplus</i>
Little Pocket Mouse	<i>Perognathus longimembris</i>
Mexican Free-tailed Bat	<i>Tadarida brasiliensis</i>
Harquahala Southern Pocket Gopher	<i>Thomomys bottae subsimilis</i>
Kit Fox	<i>Vulpes macrotis</i>
Sonoran Desert Tortoise*	<i>Gopherus agassizii (Sonoran Population)</i>
Gila Monster	<i>Heloderma suspectum</i>
Monarch Butterfly *	<i>Danaus plexippus plexippus</i>

BLM Sensitive =*

APPENDIX B – ARIZONA SENSITIVE PLANTS

Common Species Name	Scientific Name
Blue Palo Verde	<i>Parkinsonia florida</i>
Desert Ironwood	<i>Olneya tesota</i>
Elephant Tree	<i>Bursera microphylla</i>
Foothill Palo Verde	<i>Parkinsonia microphyllum</i>
Joshua Tree*	<i>Yucca brevifolia</i>
Kofa Mountain Barberry*	<i>Berberis harrisoniana</i>
Saguaro	<i>Carnegiea gigantea</i>
Scaly Stemmed Sandplant*	<i>Pholisma arenarium</i>
Screwbean Mesquite	<i>Prosopis pubescens</i>
Smoke Tree	<i>Psoralea argophylla</i>
Velvet Mesquite	<i>Prosopis velutina</i>
Western Honey Mesquite	<i>Prosopis glandulosa</i> var. <i>torreyana</i>

BLM Sensitive =*

APPENDIX C – MAP



APPENDIX D – RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

Comments were accepted on the *K Lazy B Range Improvement Project: Camp Well* Environmental Assessment (EA), DOI-BLM-AZ-C030-2018-0065-EA, for a 30-day period from December 19, 2018 through January 19, 2019; and additionally from February 5, 2019 through February 14, 2019 although comments received in a timely manner after this date were also considered.

Letters to 38 individuals, organizations and agencies were mailed on October 2, 2018. The letter included a description of the proposed project, a map of the project location, and an invitation for comments or feedback regarding the project. Responses from four Tribal agencies were received in response to this letter, requesting review of the document when it is available.

Although not required for an EA by regulation, an agency may respond to substantive and timely comments. Substantive comments: 1) question, with reasonable basis, the accuracy of information in the EIS or EA; 2) question, with reasonable basis, the adequacy of, methodology for, or assumptions used for the environmental analysis; 3) present new information relevant to the analysis; 4) present reasonable alternatives other than those analyzed in the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) or EA; and/or 4) cause changes or revisions in one or more of the alternatives. No response is necessary for non-substantive comments (BLM, 2008). All comments were reviewed, considered, and then categorized into topics when feasible. Distinct topics and comments/comment summaries are described in table below.

Comment letters were received from one non-governmental organization, Western Watersheds Project by email, and electronically through the project webpage. Minor non-substantive changes were made to the EA as a result of the individual letters (noted in the response tables).

Table 1: Response to Comments Received on the DOI-BLM-AZ-C030-2018-0065-EA

#	Comment/Summary of Comment	BLM Response
1	The BLM must disclose whether or not the permittee has the requisite base property and water rights.	The BLM has determined that the permittee owns/controls property with preference for the allotment and holds a valid permit. If a decision is issued to approve the well, the permittee would be required to obtain the appropriate water rights with the State prior to commencing construction.
2	Please provide information regarding this concern and/or documentation regarding the permittee’s base property ownership. How long has the permittee been leasing water for this allotment? When was the property from which the water is leased sold or transferred from the permittee to the current owner? This must be disclosed and provided to the public prior to any decision regarding this project.	See response to comment #1.
3	The EA indicates that this 128,466 acre allotment with 1861 AUMs with 165 cattle grazing for twelve months currently has wells and dirt tanks throughout the allotment. EA at 9. Apparently the proposed well would provide the only water source for livestock in the north end of the allotment. <i>Ibid</i> . What is not disclosed is whether or not the permittee has legal rights to water on the south end of the allotment. This information must be disclosed and the public must have an opportunity to review and comment on this information.	The purpose of the proposed action is to respond to the application submitted by the Permittee for a new well on the north end of the allotment. No additional activities or changes to the other water sources within the allotment are proposed. As water rights are issued by the State, legal rights to water on the south end of the allotment is not within the scope of the current proposed project.
4	The EA fails to explain or provide documentation regarding the reasons the permittee believes they may lose the ability to lease water. Without this information there is no demonstrated need for this project.	The BLM is responsible for the evaluation and has a responsibility under the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 and the grazing regulations found within Title 43 Code of Federal Regulations parts 4120 and 4160 to respond to the application submitted by the Permittee.
5	It is unclear from the EA whether this project occurs in Category I and II Sonoran desert tortoise habitat.	Clarification has been added to section 3.2.3 <i>Wildlife</i> of the Final EA.

#	Comment/Summary of Comment	BLM Response
6	[I]s the lack of Sonoran desert tortoise in the project area caused by the trough that already exists there? The BLM should answer this question before approving a project that would ensure the habitat in the area would continue to be degraded.	Refer to comment response #5. Additionally, as mentioned in the EA section 2.1 <i>Proposed Action</i> , the location for the well was found to be appropriate due to the existing disturbance of the area. This location is environmentally preferable due to the existing disturbance thus reducing impacts to undisturbed habitat elsewhere in the allotment.
7	While it <i>may</i> be true that “[i]t is to the benefit of the range that if grazing is to occur, that utilization by an allotted number of livestock be dispersed and not concentrated in one or just a few areas[,] the BLM should have considered and analyzed an alternative that would remove livestock grazing from the entire allotment if the water development is not approved. This would have the greatest benefit to the landscape and wildlife. EA at 11.	Removal of livestock grazing is outside the scope of the decision to be made. Livestock use levels will be considered under the allotment evaluation and determination process.
8	Similarly, the BLM has failed to disclose any information regarding springs or creeks that might occur in or near the project area that would be negatively impacted by a new well even though the project occurs near an ephemeral drainage. EA at 6. The only information regarding impacts to aquatic resources is a “rationale” provided at page 8 of the EA and we again see a statement of conformance with the Land Use Plan and an excerpt regarding best management practices: “Appendix B. Best Management Practices 1.8 Typical Range of Habitat Improvements; D. Wells: Well sites will be selected based on geologic reports that predict the depth to reliable aquifers. All applicable State laws and regulations that apply to groundwater will be observed.” EA at 2. The rationale that the well would not affect surface water because the project is located where drainages are ephemeral fails to recognize the connection between ephemeral stream flows and ground water levels. EA at 8.	Clarification has been added to the Final EA in section 3.1 <i>Resources and Uses</i> under <i>Water Quality (Surface/Ground)</i> .
9	What is the source of funding for the \$20,000 for drilling and the \$15,000 for equipment? EA at 4. Are any federal dollars anticipated for these aspects of this project? Are any state dollars	If approved, a Cooperative Agreement would be signed between the Permittee and the Lake Havasu Field Manager outlining the

#	Comment/Summary of Comment	BLM Response
	<p>anticipated for use for this project? If the funding is from the permittee, what assurances are there that the permittee has the necessary funds?</p> <p>The BLM has mischaracterized the economic benefit of this project to the permittee. Assuring continued livestock operation through the development of a new well is not a “minimal” gain to the livestock operator. EA at 7. Alternatively, if the continued operation of livestock operations is not of significant economic benefit to the livestock operator, a benefit of at least \$35,000, please explain why \$35,000 worth of improvements are being proposed.</p>	<p>responsibilities of each party for the project. The Permittee would pay for part of the project while the rest of the funding would come from 8100 funds, which are set aside for Range Improvement Projects. These 8100 funds are obtained from grazing fees.</p>
10	<p>The EA indicates that wildlife would supposedly benefit from this project which would provide a “reliable year-round water source[.]” EA at 10. However, the risks to wildlife from the trough and from the well drilling operations are not disclosed. This information must be provided to the public and we must be given the opportunity to review and comment upon that information.</p>	<p>The trough already exists as part of another range improvement project and would remain in place whether or not the newly proposed well is approved.</p> <p>Additional information regarding disturbances to wildlife from the proposed drilling operations have been added to section 3.2.3 <i>Wildlife</i> in the EA.</p>
11	<p>The BLM has failed to analyze the noise and air pollution impacts from the generator that could be used to pump the 15 gallons per minute from the well. EA at 3.</p>	<p>Clarification has been added to the Final EA in section 3.1 <i>Resources and Uses</i> under <i>Air Quality</i> and <i>Noise</i>.</p>