

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR  
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT**

Jarbidge Field Office  
2536 Kimberly Road  
Twin Falls, ID 83301

**Finding of No Significant Impact**

**Northwest Pipeline Cathodic Protection Site**

**NEPA # DOI-BLM-ID-T010-2012-EA**

**IDI-36807**

**INTRODUCTION:**

The Bureau of Land Management, Jarbidge Field Office (BLM) has conducted an environmental assessment (EA, No. DOI-BLM-ID-T010-2012-EA) to analyze the environmental effects and document the findings of an application submitted to the BLM by Northwest Pipeline to operate and maintain a cathodic protection site along an existing gas pipeline pursuant to the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920, as amended, and the BLM regulations at 43 CFR 2800.

The environmental assessment (EA, No. DOI-BLM-ID-T010-2012-EA) also analyzed the environmental effects and documented the findings of an application submitted to the BLM Jarbidge Field Office by Idaho Power Company (IPC) to install and operate a power distribution line to supply power for the operation of the cathodic protection site pursuant to the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976, as amended, and the BLM regulations at 43 CFR 2800.

The existing natural gas pipeline traverses several western states and runs from Ignacio, Colorado through Idaho to Sumas, Washington where it serves both residential and commercial customers. The cathodic protection site would help protect the steel pipe from corrosion and would ensure compliance with federal pipeline safety regulations with U.S. Department of Transportation. The cathodic protection site would be about 500 feet in length and about 20 feet wide totaling about 0.23 acres.

To supply power to the cathodic protection site an overhead distribution power line would be installed along the Magic Waters road. The new segment of power line would extend approximately 2,178 feet on public land with a 20 foot right-of-way totaling about 0.99 acres. The power line would be a single phase 7.5 kilovolt line, placed on seven wood structures and spaced about 300 feet apart.

The cathodic protection site is located on parcels of land located in the Boise Meridian, Township 8 South, Range 14 East, Section 30, SWSW and Township 8 South, Range 13 East, Section 25, S2SE that generally runs parallel to the Magic Waters Road. The distribution line extension lies to the west and the cathodic protection site lies to the east of Northwest's Ignacio-Sumas 1400 Pipeline corridor.

The underlying need for the proposed action is for BLM to grant a right-of-way for the operation and maintenance of a cathodic protection site and to grant a right-of-way for the installation of a distribution power line to supply power to the cathodic protection site.

An EA (DOI-BLM-ID-T010-2012-EA) was prepared describing a proposed action and alternatives. This EA is available at the following website: <http://www.blm.gov/id/st/en/info/nepa.html> or at the Jarbidge Field Office, and is incorporated by reference for this Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI).

### **PLAN CONFORMANCE AND CONSISTENCY:**

The BLM's planning regulations state that the term "conformity" or "conformance" means that "... a resource management action shall be specifically provided for in the plan, or if not specifically mentioned, shall be clearly consistent with the terms, conditions, and decisions of the approved plan or amendment" (43 CFR 1601.0-5(b)). The installation of the cathodic protection site and distribution power line is not specifically provided for in the Jarbidge Resource Management Plan (RMP). Because the RMP does not specifically mention the proposed activity, the plan direction was reviewed to determine if the action was consistent with the terms, conditions, and decisions in the plan.

The proposed action is in conformance with the Jarbidge RMP, approved March 23, 1987. The proposed action is in conformance with the Resource Management Guidelines which states: "Rights-of-ways, under Title V of FLPMA, will be considered in the Jarbidge Resource Area except where specifically identified in the RMP for avoidance." (Jarbidge RMP, Pg. II-76, 77). The project area is not within an avoidance area.

### **FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT DETERMINATION:**

I have reviewed the direct, indirect and cumulative effects of the proposed activities documented in the Northwest Cathodic Protection Site 1915 EA (DOI-BLM-ID-T010-2012-EA). I have also reviewed the project record for this analysis and the impacts of the proposed action and alternatives as disclosed in the Alternatives and Environmental Impacts sections of the EA. Based upon a review of the EA and the supporting documents, I have determined that the project is not a major federal action and will not significantly affect the quality of the human environment, individually or cumulatively with other actions in the general area. Because there would not be any significant impact, an environmental impact statement is not required.

I have determined the proposed action is in conformance with the approved Jarbidge RMP (1987), and is consistent with the plans and policies of neighboring local, county, state, tribal and federal agencies and governments. This finding and conclusion is based on my consideration of the Council on Environmental Quality's (CEQ) criteria for significance (40 CFR 1508.27), both with regard to context and the intensity of impacts described in the EA.

**A) Context: This requirement means that the significance of an action must be analyzed in several contexts such as society as a whole (human, national), the affected region, the affected interests, and the locality. Significance varies with the setting of the proposed**

**action. For instance, in the case of a site-specific action, significance would usually depend upon the effects in the locale rather than in the world as a whole. Both short- and long-term effects are relevant (40 CFR 1508.27).**

The disclosure of effects in the EA found the actions limited in context. The planning area is limited in size and the activities limited in potential. Effects are local in nature and would not significantly affect regional or national resources.

**B) Intensity. This requirement refers to the severity of impact. Responsible officials must bear in mind that more than one agency may make decisions about partial aspects of a major action. The following are considered in evaluating intensity (40 CFR 1508.27).**

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

Impacts associated with the proposed action are discussed in the Environmental Impacts section of the EA.

The proposed action is anticipated to have beneficial impacts to the local economy since the construction of the cathodic protection site would protect the natural gas steel pipeline from corrosive activity on a portion of the pipeline that is not currently receiving adequate cathodic protection. Adverse effects will be short-term and mostly limited to the inconveniences directly associated with construction activities. Visual impacts from the removal of vegetation and the implementation of the cathodic protection site would be mitigated through use of reseeded the disturbed area. Natural resources would experience negligible to minor impacts. Removal of vegetation and soils during construction and alteration of the topography would occur on a small scale. Permanent improvements would be constructed that would create long-term disturbance to soils and vegetation. Wildlife would experience minor adverse impacts from localized short-term displacement during construction activities in addition to some loss of non-critical habitat.

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

The proposed activities will not significantly affect public health or safety. The purpose of the proposed action is to allow installation and operation of a cathodic protection site to protect a natural gas pipeline from corrosive activity and to provide power to the cathodic protection site. Similar actions have not significantly affected public health or safety.

*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.*

There are no unique historic or cultural resources, park lands, prime farm lands, wild and scenic rivers, wetlands, Wilderness Study Areas, or Areas of Critical Environmental Concern within the project area.

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

Throughout the environmental process the proposal to install, operate, and maintain a cathodic protection site and a power line on public lands was not highly controversial, nor are the effects expected to generate future controversy. The initial scoping period for the project did not generate controversy.

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

The effects of constructing, operating, and maintaining a cathodic protection site and a power line are fairly straightforward and do not pose uncertainties. The environmental process has not identified any effects that may involve highly unique or unknown risks.

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.*

Neither the proposed action, nor any of the alternatives are expected to set a precedent for future actions with significant effects, nor does it represent a decision in principle about a future consideration because all future actions involving the project area will be considered on a case-by-case basis.

Because there are rights-of-way projects throughout the BLM, action for this project will not set any BLM precedent. The proposed action is consistent with actions permitted elsewhere.

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

The EA analyzes all actions within the scope of the analysis. No cumulative effects of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable actions were identified.

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 historical resources.*

The proposed action will not adversely affect districts, sites, highways, structures, or objects in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places. It also will not cause loss

