

**United States Department of the Interior  
Bureau of Land Management  
Coeur d'Alene Field Office, Idaho**

**FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

**Project Name:** Prichard Creek Channel Restoration Environmental Assessment

**BLM Office:** Coeur d'Alene Field Office, 3815 N. Schreiber Way, Coeur d'Alene, ID 83815

**NEPA Register No.:** DOI- BLM-ID-C010-2012-008-EA

**Project Location:** Shoshone County, Idaho. Boise Meridian  
T. 49 N., R. 5 E., Section 6

**Contact:** Mike Stevenson (Hydrologist, 208-769-5024)

The BLM prepared the attached environmental assessment (EA) for compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). Based upon my review of the EA, I have determined the proposed Prichard Creek Channel Restoration is not a major federal action that may have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment. As analyzed in the EA, no environmental effects of the proposed action meet the definition of significance as defined by regulations to implement NEPA found at 40 CFR 1508.27. This finding is based on my consideration of both the context and intensity of the project as described below.

**Context**

The BLM, Coeur d'Alene Field Office, is proposing to stabilize several eroding stream bank sites and improve channel function in a reach of Prichard Creek near Murray, Idaho. The over-steepened banks and unstable floodplains are a chronic source of sediment directly entering Prichard Creek. The multi-year restoration work would be implemented under a contract, over several low-flow seasons, beginning in the late summer or early fall of 2012.

**Intensity**

This requirement refers to the severity of the proposed impacts. The following factors are considered in evaluating intensity.

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

The EA documents that the proposed action will benefit water resources, fish, vegetation, and wildlife by reducing impacts associated with stream bank erosion. There may be some short-term adverse impacts due to soil disturbance, including minor sediment delivery from the first flow after construction. However, these will be overcome by the long-term benefits of the proposed action, including a reduction in chronic sediment loading from target areas.

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

There were no major concerns associated with this environmental assessment.

**(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.***

The stream banks that will be stabilized as part of this environmental assessment are adjacent to historic boulder dredge piles located on private land. The bank stabilization will not affect these mine dredge piles.

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

As summarized in chapter 3 of the EA, there are no known impacts to the human environment. This should be a non-controversial action.

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

The proposed stream restoration has few identified potential adverse environmental effects on natural and cultural resources. These potential adverse environmental effects are minor and short term in nature and generally improve the resource by reducing erosion.

**(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 proposed stream restoration project does not establish a precedent or represent a decision in principle about a future consideration. Additional Prichard Creek stream work may occur in the future, with or without this action.

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

As summarized in Chapter 3 of the EA, the stream restoration will result in some short term impacts, but provide greater beneficial direct and indirect effects to visual, natural, resources. There is no potential for cumulatively significant adverse impacts when added to other past, present and reasonably foreseeable future actions.

**(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 stream restoration project would not impact highways, structures or objects listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places.

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

As summarized in the EA, the easement acquisition will not adversely affect any endangered or threatened species or its habitat.

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

The proposed action is consistent and compatible with all known Federal, State, and local laws, regulations, or requirements imposed for the protection of the environment.

**Conclusion**

Based upon review of the EA, I have determined that the Prichard Creek Channel Restoration Project will not have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment. Therefore, preparation of an environmental impact statement is not required.

/s/ Kurt Pavalat  
Kurt Pavlat, Field Manager

August 24, 2012  
Date