

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
Bureau of Land Management
Colorado River District
Yuma Field Office

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

The Proposed La Posa Travel Management Plan
Environmental Assessment
DOI-BLM-AZ-C020-2013-0003-EA

I have reviewed the Proposed La Posa Travel Management Plan Environmental Assessment (EA) (DOI-BLM-AZ-C020-2013-0003-EA) and the La Posa Travel Management Plan (TMP) for any potentially unresolved significant environmental impacts, and reviewed and thoroughly considered all public comments regarding the EA. I have reviewed the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations at 40 CFR 1508.27, which define *significance* as used in NEPA, and have found that the actions analyzed in the La Posa TMP and EA would not constitute a major Federal action that would significantly affect the quality of the human environment. Therefore, an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) will not be prepared.

I base my finding on the following:

Implementing regulations for NEPA (40 CFR 1508.27) provide criteria for determining the significance of effects. Significance, as used in NEPA, requires consideration of both context and intensity. The disclosure of effects in the environmental assessment found the action is limited in context. Effects are local in nature and are not likely to significantly affect regional or national resources.

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

The analysis documented in DOI-BLM-AZ-C020-2013-0003-EA did not identify any individually significant short- or long-term impacts.

(2) *The degree to which the preferred alternative affects public health or safety.*

The environmental analysis documented no major effects on public health and 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.*

The environmental analysis documented no major effects on unique geographic features of the area, cultural or historic resources, park lands, prime farmlands, wetlands, wild and scenic rivers, or ecologically critical areas.

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

Based on public comment, internal discussion and the analysis of the actions, the effects on the human environment are not likely to be highly controversial by professionals, specialists, and

scientists. While some of the public comments received indicate the selected alternative may be controversial, I do not believe that there is significant controversy over the effects of this action.

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

The environmental analysis did not identify any effects on the human environment which are highly uncertain or involve 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.

The preferred alternative neither establishes a precedent for future BLM actions with significant effects nor represents a decision in principle about a future consideration.

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

The environmental analysis documents the connected and cumulative impacts within the scope of the analysis area. The cumulative effects of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable actions are considered and disclosed in the impacts section of the analysis. The cumulative effects are not significant.

(8) The degree to which the action may adversely affect districts, sites, highways, structures, or objects listed, 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 effect of the action on historic and cultural properties will be negligible throughout the Planning Area.

(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. No Threatened or Endangered species exist in The Planning Area. There is no designated Critical Habitat in the Planning Area.

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

The environmental analysis documents that the preferred alternative is consistent with Federal, State, and local laws or requirements imposed for the protection of the environment.

I have also considered, as required in Executive Order 13212, whether any adverse impacts to the production of energy will result from this Decision, and have determined no adverse impacts will occur.

/s/John MacDonald

3/8/2016

John MacDonald, Yuma Field Manager

Date