UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR - BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
FOUR RIVERS FIELD OFFICE

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

McFadden Lane Free Use Permit Renewal
DOI-BLM-ID-B010-2011-0065-EA

I have reviewed the Council on Environmental Quality Regulations (CEQ) for significance (40 CFR 1508.27) and have determined the actions analyzed in EA# DOI-BLM-ID-B010-2011-0065-EA would not constitute a major federal action that would significantly affect the quality of the human environment; therefore, an Environmental Impact Statement is not required. This finding was made by considering both the context and intensity of the potential effects, as described in the above EA, using the following factors defining significance:

1) *Impacts that may be both beneficial and adverse.*

The environmental assessment considered both beneficial and adverse impacts of the proposed action. Authorizing a renewal for Washington County Road and Bridge at this site would provide the county with a continued free source of mineral materials to construct and maintain county roads in this region. (pgs. 18 & 22)

The benefit of the free source to the general public from this authorization would go largely unnoticed. There would be no effect to any special status plant or animal species from the proposed action because none are present.

The re-authorization of this material site would result in the permanent loss of 100,000 yards of basalt over a 10-year term. The township within which this site exists has approximately 9,000 acres of federally owned minerals available. The impact from this authorization would amount to approximately 0.6% decrease of mineral resources in this township. (pg. 15-16)

2) *The degree to which the proposed action affects public health or safety.*

The analysis did not find that the Proposed Action would have any appreciable effect on public health or safety. (pg. 9)

3) *Unique characteristics of the geographic area such as proximity to historic or cultural resources, park lands, prime farmlands, wetlands, wild and scenic rivers, or ecologically critical areas.*

A short-term effect to the view-shed from the proposed action would be minimal due to the rolling nature of the countryside in this region. No major effects on any unique characteristic were identified in the EA. (pg. 21-22)

4) *The degree to which the effects on the quality of the human environment are likely to be highly controversial.*

The continued disposal of mineral materials from this site would have negligible impact on the human environment and therefore, is not expected to be controversial. (pgs. 11 - 22)

5) *The degree to which the possible effects on the human environment are highly uncertain or involve unique or unknown risks.*

The analysis did not identify any effects on the human environment which are highly uncertain or involve unknown risks as a result of this action. (pgs. 11-22)

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.*

The action analyzed in the EA is a normal practice that has been successfully implemented elsewhere. This EA does not set a precedent for future actions that have significant effects. The action is consistent with decisions and direction established in the 1989 Cascade Resource Management Plan. (pgs. 2 & 3)

7) *Whether the action is related to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant impacts.*

This EA considered potential cumulative impacts of the Proposed Action and Action Alternatives and concluded that implementation would not cause significant cumulative effects on biological, cultural, or social resources, even when considered in relation to other actions. (pgs. 19-22)

8) *The degree to which the action may adversely affect districts, sites, highways, structures, or objects listed in or eligible for listing in the NRHP or may cause loss or destruction of significant scientific or cultural resources.*

Based on the analysis documented in the EA, the proposed action would not cause loss or destruction of significant scientific or cultural resources. (pgs. 15-16 & 20)

9) *The degree to which the action may adversely affect an endangered or threatened species or its habitat that has determined to be critical under the Endangered Species Act of 1973.*

No threatened or endangered species are known to inhabit the project area. (pgs. 12-13)

10) *Whether the action threatens a violation of Federal, State, and local laws or requirements imposed for protection of the environment.*

The proposed action was developed in accordance with all applicable Federal, State, and Local laws for the protection of the environment. The EA disclosed the effects of the

proposed action on all critical and non-critical elements and it was determined that the proposed action would not adversely affect any of these elements.

__/s/ *Terry A. Humphrey*_____ __9/27/2012_____
Terry A. Humphrey Date
Four Rivers Field Manager