



United States Department of the Interior
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
Jarbidge Field Office
2878 Addison Ave East
Twin Falls, Idaho 83301



In Reply Refer To:
4160 (IDT010)

Finding of No Significant Impact
Tuanna Pipeline Extension and Storage Tank
NEPA# DOI-BLM-ID-T010-2015-0006-EA

Finding of No Significant Impact

I have reviewed Environmental Assessment (EA) DOI-BLM-ID-T010-2015-0006-EA, dated December, 2015. After consideration of the environmental impacts as described in the EA, I have determined that the construction of the Tuanna Pipeline Extension and Storage Tank, with the standard operating procedures as described in the EA, will not significantly affect the quality of the human environment and therefore an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is not required to be prepared. This finding and conclusion is based on my consideration of the Council on Environmental Quality's (CEQ) criteria for significance (40 Code of Federal Regulations 1508.27), both with regard to the context and the intensity of impacts described in the EA.

Context:

The project is located approximately 18 miles southeast of Glenn's Ferry, Idaho. The water storage tank and pipeline extension would create approximately 7.0 acres of temporary surface disturbance and 0.1 acre of permanent surface disturbance. There would also be permanent surface disturbance from approximately 1.8 miles of two-track road created for pipeline maintenance. Once construction of the pipeline extension and water storage tank is complete, the areas of temporary disturbance would be reseeded with a BLM-approved seed mix.

Intensity:

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

The Environmental Assessment has considered both beneficial and adverse impacts of the proposed action. None of the impacts considered in the EA approach the threshold of significance. In other words, none of the resource impacts are intensely adverse or beneficial.

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

Design features of the proposed action will not result in potentially adverse impacts to 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, wilderness or ecologically critical areas.

There are no park lands, prime farmlands, wetlands, wild and scenic rivers, wilderness or ecologically critical areas in or near the project area.

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

The activities described in the proposed action and no action alternative do not involve effects on the human environment that are likely to be highly controversial (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(4)). In the development of the EA (EA No. DOI-BLM-ID-T010-2015-0006-EA) the BLM solicited comments from the affected permittees and interested publics. Comments in response to these scoping effects did not reveal any controversy related to the size, nature, or effects necessary for the construction of the Tuanna Pipeline Extension and Storage Tank.

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

There are no effects of the proposed action identified in the EA which are considered uncertain or involve unique or unknown risks. Construction of the proposed action would follow standard operating procedures to minimize impacts to the environment. The stipulations will be adhered to through completion of the project.

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 action does not establish a precedent for future actions with significant effects nor does it represent 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 assessed resources of concern are not approaching conditions where the additional stresses associated with the proposed action and past, present, and future foreseeable actions would have consequential cumulative effects.

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. The proposed action will not cause loss or destruction of significant, cultural, or historical resources. A cultural resource survey was approved by the State Historic Preservation Office in Idaho on February 13, 2015, which revealed there would not be an adverse effect on historic properties.

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.

Analysis in the EA determined that the special status species (Federally listed, proposed or candidate, threatened or endangered and State sensitive) that occur near the project area would not be adversely affected by the proposed action.

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 will not violate or threaten to violate any Federal, State, or local law or requirement imposed for the protection of the environment.

Approved:



Elliot Traher
Field Manager
Jarbidge Field Office

4-27-16
Date