BLM

United States Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management

Environmental Assessment
DOI-BLM-UT-Y010-2016-0081-EA

August 2016

Castle Valley Communication Site

Location: Castle Valley, Utah

Applicant/Address: Royce's Electronics, Inc.
611 South Main Street
Moab, Utah 84532

U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management
Moab Field Office
82 East Dogwood
Moab, Utah 84532
Phone: 435-259-2100
Fax: 435-259-2158

Castle Valley Communication Site
Environmental Assessment
DOI-BLM-UT-Y010-2016-0081-EA

Contents

1.0 PURPOSE & NEED 1
1.1 Introduction 1
1.2 Background 1
1.3 Need for the Proposed Action 2
1.4 Purpose(s) of the Proposed Action 2
1.5 Conformance with BLM Land Use Plan 2
1.6 Relationship to Statutes, Regulations, or Other Plans 3
1.7 Identification of Issues 4
1.7.1 Visual Resources 5
1.8 Issues Considered but Eliminated from Further Analysis 5
1.9 Summary 5
2.0 DESCRIPTION OF ALTERNATIVES, INCLUDING PROPOSED ACTION 6
2.1 Introduction 6
2.2 Alternative A – Proposed Action 6
2.3 Alternative B – No Action 8
2.4 Alternatives Considered but not Carried Forward for Analysis 8
3.0 AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT 8
3.1 Introduction 8
3.2 General Setting 8
3.3 Resources/Issues Brought Forward for Analysis 8
3.3.1 Visual Resources 8
4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS 9
4.1 Introduction 9
4.2 Direct and Indirect Impacts 9
4.2.1 Alternative A – Proposed Action 10
4.2.2 Alternative B – No Action 11
4.3 Cumulative Impacts Analysis 11

5.0 CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION 11
5.1 Introduction 11
5.2 Persons, Groups, and Agencies Consulted: 11
5.3 Summary of Public Participation 11
5.4 List of Preparers 12

LIST OF APPENDICES

APPENDIX A: Maps

#1 Project Location

#2 Access Road

APPENDIX B: Interdisciplinary Team Checklist

APPENDIX C: Scoping Comments

APPENDIX D: Coverage Area and Polar Graphs

APPENDIX E: Conceptual Structure Photos

APPENDIX F: Visual Contrast Rating Worksheet

APPENDIX G: Response to Comments on the EA

APPENDIX H: A Guide to the Use of the ITS Irregular Terrain Model in the Area Prediction Model

Castle Valley Communication Site
Environmental Assessment
DOI-BLM-UT-Y010-2016-0081-EA

1.0 PURPOSE & NEED

1.1 Introduction

This Environmental Assessment (EA) has been prepared to disclose and analyze the environmental consequences of a communication site facility as proposed by Royce's Electronics, Inc. The EA is a site-specific analysis of potential impacts that could result with the implementation of a proposed action or alternatives to the proposed action. The EA assists the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) in project planning and ensuring compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), and in making a determination as to whether any "significant" impacts could result from the analyzed actions. "Significance" is defined by NEPA and is found in regulation 40 CFR 1508.27. An EA provides evidence for determining whether to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) or a statement of "Finding of No Significant Impact" (FONSI). If the decision maker determines that this project has "significant" impacts following the analysis in the EA, then an EIS would be prepared for the project. If not, a Decision Record (DR) may be signed for the EA approving the selected alternative, whether the proposed action or another alternative. A Decision Record (DR), including a FONSI statement, documents the reasons why implementation of the selected alternative would not result in "significant" environmental impacts (effects) beyond those already addressed in the Moab Resource Management Plan (2008 RMP), signed October 31, 2008.

1.2 Background

Royce Henningson, on behalf of Royce's Electronics, Inc. (Royce's Electronics), filed a right-of-way (ROW) application with the Moab Field Office of the BLM. The application was assigned serial number UTU-91392. The proposed ROW would authorize a communication site and access road in Castle Valley, Utah on the BLM National System of Public Lands described below and shown in Appendix A, Map #1.

Salt Lake Meridian, Utah
T. 25 S., R. 23 E., sec. 15, S½NE¼, NE¼NW¼.

The construction and operation of the communication site would provide high speed internet and more reliable internet service to the town of Castle Valley. In November 2014, the town of Castle Valley lost 911 emergency services for a day. The proposed communication site would provide a 911 back-up to the current service.

1.3 Need for the Proposed Action

Royce's Electronics has filed a ROW application for a communication site facility. The BLM's underlying need is to respond to the applicant's proposal for a ROW grant for facilities which are in the public interest and which require ROWs upon such lands. The need for the project is established by BLM's responsibility under Title V of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (FLPMA), as amended, to respond to a request for a right-of-way grant for facilities which are in the public interest and which require rights-of-way upon such lands.

1.4 Purpose(s) of the Proposed Action

BLM is considering approval of the ROW to Royce's Electronics for construction and operation of a communication site facility on BLM lands under the authority of the FLPMA.

Federal regulations at 43 CFR 2800 state that it is BLM's objective to grant ROWs to any qualified individual, business, or government entity and to control the use of the ROW in a manner that protects natural resources and prevents undue and unnecessary degradation of public lands. Additionally, the Moab Field Office (MFO) Resource Management Plan (RMP) recognizes the issuances of ROWs to meet public needs while minimizing adverse impacts to resource values.

1.5 Conformance with BLM Land Use Plan

The Proposed Action and alternatives analyzed in this EA have been determined to be in conformance with the terms and conditions of the Moab RMP. The Proposed Action and alternatives are in conformance with the approved RMP based on the following:

1) Lands and Realty, Goals and Objectives, page 65, which states: "Meet public needs for use authorizations such as rights-of-way (ROWs), alternative energy sources, and permits while minimizing adverse impacts to resource values."
2) Lands and Realty, Management Decision LAR-7, page 65, which states: "Right-of-way (ROW) avoidance and exclusion areas will be consistent with the stipulations identified in Appendix A for oil and gas leasing and other surface-disturbing activities. These stipulations have been developed to protect important resource values." The proposed action involves lands identified as a ROW avoidance area with a No Surface Occupancy (NSO) stipulation in order to protect the Castle Valley Municipal Watershed. However, the stipulation grants an exception "for activities where it can be demonstrated that the proposed action would not result in a negative impact to the aquifer. No exception for oil and gas leasing." (2008 Moab Resource Management Plan, page A-10). Since the proposed action would not impact groundwater, soils, or aquifer characteristics, the proposal is in conformance with the NSO provision for the Castle Valley Municipal Watershed.
3) Lands and Realty, Management Decision LAR-13, page 66, which states: "Lands and/or interest in lands (such as minerals and conservation easements) acquired through future LTA will take on the management of the surrounding area."

1.6 Relationship to Statutes, Regulations, or Other Plans

Construction, operation and maintenance of utilities by private industry are an integral part of the BLM's land management program under the authority of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1761-1777).

BLM regulations and general requirements for utility development, contained in 43 CFR, would be applied to the Proposed Action, as applicable, to provide standard procedures and environmental protection measures. A number of federal, state, and local governmental agencies may have authority over the construction and operation of the communication site and are listed in Table 1-1.

Table 1-1: Regulatory Authorities and Guidance

Federal Authorities and Responsibilities	
Cultural Resources	
BLM Native American Trust Resource Policies (303 DM 2 and 512 DM 2); BLM H-8120-1 – General Procedural Guidance for Native American Consultation; BLM Manual 8120, Tribal Consultation under Cultural Resources; EO 13175 Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments (65 FR 67249, November 2000); EO 13007 Indian Sacred Sites (61 FR 26671, May 1996); American Indian Religious Freedom Act of 1978 (PL 95-341; 42 USC 1996)	Native American consultation regarding possibly affected traditional cultural properties.
Archaeological and Historic Data Preservation Act of 1974 (PL. 86-253, as amended by PL 93291; 16 USC 469); Archaeological Resources Protection Act of 1979 (PL. 96-95; 16 USC. 470aa-mm); National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, Section 106, (PL 89-665; 16 USC. 407(f) and 36 CFR Part 800)	Requirement for cultural resource inventories to determine the presence of cultural resources and protection of sites discovered during project operations.
Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act of 1990 (PL 101-601)	Procedures to be followed in the event of discovery of human remains.
Rangeland and Livestock Grazing	
BLM Rangeland Health Standards and Guidelines (43 CFR 4100, Subpart 4180)	Consistency with rangeland standards in grazing allotment.
Paleontological Resources	
Paleontological Resources Preservation Act of 2009	Requirement for paleontological resource inventories to determine the presence of fossil resources and protection of sites discovered during project operations.
Land Management and Use	
Title V of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act, as amended (FLPMA; 43 U.S.C. 1761-1771)	Authorizes issuance of federal mineral leases and encourages private exploration and development.
Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976, Section 201(a) (PL 94-579; 43 USC 1701 et seq.)	Management of federal lands under principles of multiple use and sustained yield while protecting environmental resources.
Federal Communications Commission (Title 47 of the Code of Federal Regulations)	Regulates interstate and international communications by radio, television, wire, satellite and cable in all 50 states, the District of Columbia and U.S. territories.
National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (PL 91-190; 42 USC 4321); 40 CFR Parts 1500-1508 CEQ implementation of NEPA; BLM Handbook H-1790-1; U.S. Department of the Interior Department Manual 516, Environmental Quality	Evaluation of impacts to environmental resources that may result from a proposed action prior to its implementation.
Vegetation	
Federal Noxious Weed Act of 1974 (7 U.S.C. §§ 2801-2814, January 3, 1975, as amended 1988 and 1994); Noxious Weed Control and Eradication Act of 2004 (7 U.S.C. 7781- 7786)	Monitoring and treatment of weed infestations including performance of corrective actions.

Water Quality	
EO 11988 Floodplain Management (43 CFR 6030)	To avoid long and short-term adverse impacts associated with the occupancy and modification of floodplains.
Wildlife	
Bald Eagle and Golden Eagle Protection Act of 1940 (16 USC. 668-668d, 54 Stat. 250) as amended (PL 95-616 (92 Stat. 3114)) November 8, 1978.	Coordination, consultation and impact review regarding eagles.
Endangered Species Act of 1973 (PL. 85-624; 16 USC 661, 664 1008)	Coordination, consultation and impact review regarding federally listed threatened and endangered species.
Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1918 (16 USC 703-712, as amended); EO 13186 Responsibilities of Federal Agencies to Protect Migratory Birds; BLM MOU WO-230-2010-04 To Promote the Conservation of Migratory Birds	Migratory bird impact coordination and protection of nesting migratory birds.
State of Utah Authorities and Responsibilities	
Cultural Resources	
Section 106 of National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended (16 U.S.C. 470 et seq.) and Advisory Council Regulations on the Protection of Historic and Cultural Properties, as amended (36 CFR. Part 800)	Utah State Historic Preservation Office consultation on cultural resource survey, evaluation, and mitigation.
Grand County Authorities and Responsibilities	
County Code and Zoning Resolution applicable to construction permits and conditional use permits.	Construction/use permits.

The Proposed Action is consistent with the goals and objectives in the Grand County General Plan (Grand County, 2012). The Grand County General Plan Update lists several policies related to a diversified economy, natural resource development, multiple use of the public lands, and expeditious processing of use permits for economic uses of public lands.

1.7 Identification of Issues

The BLM conducted internal scoping for this project in January and February of 2016, which consisted of an interdisciplinary team (IDT) review of the proposal and discussion of project related concerns. The IDT Checklist documents the internal issues raised and the resources that may be impacted by the Proposed Action (See Appendix B). The IDT identified visual resources as an issue to carry forward for analysis.

The BLM conducted external scoping for this project in January and February 2016. The Proposed Action was posted on the BLM ePlanning website on January 21, 2016, to notify the public of the proposal, including mention of BLM's intent to prepare an EA for this project. In addition, the BLM issued a press release on January 28, 2016 to inform the public of the proposal and to initiate a public scoping period until February 29, 2016 for identifying issues. Appendix C provides documentation of the comments received during public scoping and details for the BLM's consideration of the comments received. The public did not raise any issues to carry forward for analysi the EA. The issues identified for analysis are listed below:

1.7.1 Visual Resources

- What visual effect would the Proposed Action cause and would the project meet the BLM Visual Resource Inventory Class II designation?

1.8 Issues Considered but Eliminated from Further Analysis

During scoping, concerns were expressed by the public regarding public health and safety, as well as, the biological and environmental effects of operating a wireless communication site. Concerns included the potential effects of electrical or electromagnetic fields and associated risks, hazards and impacts of radio frequency/microwave on humans, plants and animals.

Radio frequency (RF) exposure is regulated by the Federal Communication Commission (FCC) through their frequency licensing permitting process. Regulations [47 C.F.R. 1.1307(b), 1.1310, 2.1091, 2.1093] require licensees to maintain RF hazards to be within the public safety standard as defined by the FCC.

Use of communication equipment is contingent upon the possession of a valid Federal Communication Commission (FCC) or Director of Telecommunication Management/Interdepartmental Radio Advisory Committee (DTM/IRAC) authorization (if required), and the operation of the equipment is in strict compliance with applicable requirements of FCC or IRAC. The following link provides information from FCC on Radio Frequency Safety: https://www.fcc.gov/general/radio-frequency-safety-0.

BLM regulations found at 43 CFR 2805.12 (a) requires a holder of a ROW to comply with all existing and subsequently enacted, issued, or amended Federal laws and regulations and state laws and regulations applicable to the authorized use. Since RF public safety standards are regulated by the FCC and BLM has no regulatory authority, no further consideration was provided or additional analysis.

1.9 Summary

This chapter has presented the purpose and need of the proposed project, as well as the relevant issues, i.e., those elements of the human environment that could be affected by the implementation of the proposed project. In order to meet the purpose and need of the proposed project in a way that resolves the issues, the BLM has considered and/or developed a range of action alternatives. These alternatives are presented in Chapter 2. The potential environmental impacts or consequences resulting from the implementation of each alternative considered in detail are analyzed in Chapter 4 for each of the identified issues.

2.0 DESCRIPTION OF ALTERNATIVES, INCLUDING PROPOSED ACTION

2.1 Introduction

The BLM ID Team evaluated a reasonable range of alternatives that meet the underlying purpose and need for the proposed project. Two alternatives are carried forward for full analysis within this EA; Alternative A, which is the Proposed Action and consists of Royce's Electronics ROW proposal, and Alternative B, the No Action alternative, which is required by the CEQ regulations (40 CFR 1502.14). Alternative A is described in Section 2.2. Alternative B is described in Section 2.3. One additional alternative was considered but eliminated from detailed analysis because it did not meet the purpose and need for the project.

2.2 Alternative A – Proposed Action

The Proposed Action is to grant a right-of-way (ROW) to Royce's, Electronics, Inc. for a communication site in Castle Valley, Utah. On August 21, 2015, Royce Henningson, on behalf Royce's Electronics, LLC, filed ROW application UTU-91392 under the authority of Title V of the FLPMA. The ROW application, which includes a Plan of Development and supplemental information, has been used to develop the Proposed Action.

The project area is located approximately 2.5 miles east of the town of Castle Valley, Utah. The ROW for the communication site would be 40 feet by 50 feet and the corridor for the access road would be 15-feet wide and 3,410 feet long (totaling approximately 1.21 acres). The proposed access road is a designated route in the Moab Field Office Travel Management Plan (See Map #2, Appendix A). The communication site would be in place and in use year-round. The ROW would be issued for 10 years.

Facility design factors include the following:

- Rohn 25 g lattice tower (15 feet tall)
- Microwave dish (2 feet in diameter)
- Solar panel rack (8 x 8 x10 feet)
- Metal equipment cabinet (2 x 2 x 8 feet)

The proposed project would be regulated by the FCC under 47 CFR Part 15. In addition to the communication site, there would be 3 access points located on private property. All of the wireless equipment would use QAM[1] as the modulation scheme. The power and energy characteristics for the point to point link would consist of 5.725-5.85 GHz band with an EIRP[2] up to 55 dBm[3] (316 watts) within 3° of the center of an antenna, by 10° off center the power

[1] Quadrature amplitude modulation is a method of combining two amplitude-modulated (AM) signals into a single channel, thereby doubling the effective bandwidth.

[2] Effective isotropic radiated power, is the apparent power transmitted towards the receiver. It is a product of the antennas gain and the emitted power from the transmitting element.

[3] Decibel-milliwattsis a logarithmic representation of the absolute power of a signal in milliwatts, and is preferred for its ability to represent both very small and very large numbers in an easily readable form.

would fall off to roughly 37 dBm (5 watts) and by 30° off center the power would fall off to roughly 20 dBm (0.1watts). The desired effect, and the only way to legally and essentially achieve this type of power, would be to have a high power output in one direction where an antenna would focus the energy and create a narrow 3° beam of emitted power. The paths of area coverage, RF propagation views, RF propagation statistics, and polar graphs showing the emission patterns for the point to point antennas are provided in Appendix D.

The power and energy characteristics for the multipoint link to provide service to residences and businesses would use a much more diverse range of frequencies. They would contain 900 MHz, 2.4 GHz, 3.6 GHz, and 5 GHz. The antenna on the tower would have a 60° to 120° area cover on its azimuth plane and a 5-7° pattern on its elevation plane. Depending on FCC regulations, it would have an EIRP of 30 dBm (1watt) to 40 dBm (10watts) for the access points (the device on the tower). The device that would be attached to a customer's house, known as a subscriber module, would have an EIRP of up to 35 dBm (3 watts), but, if it is close enough to the access point, the subscriber module would lower its output power significantly. These devices are also highly directional with a very high front to back ratio[4] and in a typical install they would be pointed up and away from the residence or business.

Construction of the Facilities

Prior to construction, the site would be staked and flagged. To avoid raptor nesting season, construction would not be conducted between March 1 and August 31. A raptor survey would be required if construction takes place during the raptor nesting season. All construction vehicles and equipment would be power-washed in Moab prior to entering the work site to prevent the spread of noxious weeds. Construction of the communication site would require a concrete base for the tower. The base would be 2-foot x 2-foot x 2-foot (8 cubic-feet) and combined with the tower would weigh approximately 1,200 pounds. The solar panel would have eight legs; each leg would be set in concrete. The four front legs would be cemented in 1-foot x 1-foot holes and the four back legs would be cemented in 1-foot x 2-foot holes. There would be one access point antenna and two back-haul antennas attached to the lattice tower. There would be a 2-foot diameter microwave dish attached to the tower near the solar array panel. The equipment cabinet would be set on a 2-foot x 2-foot concrete block pad next to the solar array on the west end of the site. The cabinet would include batteries in plastic battery boxes to contain any possible leaks and to prevent a potential fire hazard. The cemented-in tower would be attached to the equipment cabinet and no guy wires would be needed for the tower. See conceptual structure photos, Appendix E.

Equipment for construction would be driven to the end of the access road in two pickup trucks and hand carried to the communication site location. There would be no improvements needed

[4] Front to back ratio is the ratio of signal that is transmitted to the forward direction of an antenna vs. the back. A high front to back ratio means that an antenna concentrates most of its power to the front while emitting very little behind it.

to the proposed access road. There would be no grading of the site. Hand tools would be used to level a site for the tower and equipment. The natural grade would be used to the extent possible and existing trees would be used for visual screening of the site as much as possible. Concrete would be mixed on-site in a wheel barrow for construction of the site. Any plants that could be destroyed during construction would be salvaged and used to reclaim the site. After construction, the disturbed areas would be raked out, and, if necessary, re-vegetated with native species as specified by the BLM. The area would be fenced if needed, but is not proposed at this time. There would be no night lighting associated with the communication site.

Termination and Restoration

When termination is deemed necessary, all structures would be removed from the project area and the location would be re-vegetated as specified by the BLM.

2.3 Alternative B – No Action

Under the No Action Alternative, the proposed ROW would not be granted. Therefore, the proposed communication site would not be constructed.

2.4 Alternatives Considered but not Carried Forward for Analysis

No other alternatives were identified by the ID Team or by the public during scoping. Therefore, there are no other alternatives that were considered for analysis.

3.0 AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

3.1 Introduction

This chapter presents the potentially affected existing environment (i.e., the physical, biological, social, and economic values and resources) of the impact area as identified in the Interdisciplinary Team Checklist found in Appendix B and presented in Chapter 1 of this assessment. This chapter provides the baseline for comparison of impacts/consequences described in Chapter 4.

3.2 General Setting

The project area is located in the east-central part of the Colorado Plateau Physiographic Province in the Salt Anticline Physiographic region. Average precipitation in the area ranges from 10-12 inches per year. Average daytime temperatures range from the 20s in the winter to the 90s (°F) in the summer. The elevation in the proposed area is approximately 5,000 feet above sea level. Vegetation at the site is sparse and consists of Indian ricegrass, galleta grass, Mormon tea, pinyon pine and Utah juniper.

3.3 Resources/Issues Brought Forward for Analysis

3.3.1 Visual Resources

The proposed action is in an area that is managed by the BLM as VRM Class II. The objective of Visual Resource Management(VRM) Class II is to retain the existing character of the

landscape. The level of change to the characteristic landscape should be low. That is, projects can occur but should not change the overall landscape conditions.

Castle Valley is a scenic valley that drains to the Colorado River. It contains iconic landscape features including Castle Rock, the Priest and Nuns, Round Mountain and Porcupine Rim. The southern backdrop to the valley is the La Sal Mountain Range. People are attracted to Castle Valley because of its outstanding scenery.

Approximately 50 percent of the valley is private land. A community of approximately 400 people lives in the valley. Many of these people live in Castle Valley because of the scenery found on both the private and public land. The Castle Valley General Plan's Land Use Goal is stated below:

- To remain a peaceful, quiet, rural residential/agricultural community characterized by scenic views, a sense of open space, clean water and air, and the ability to enjoy landscape and sky.
- Enable residents to work at home and grow food locally while protecting our aquifer and the character, scale, and residential/rural atmosphere of the Town.

There are few developments or infrastructure on public land within Castle Valley; these include some fencing and signage, the power lines servicing the valley and a corral fairly close to the proposed site. The power lines parallel the Castle Valley road on the west side. On private land, residential development is characterized by large (5 acre) lots with houses. The type of infrastructure associated with residential rural development is also found in the valley, including power lines and roads. There is no commercial or industrial zone within Castle Valley, and no activities of that kind are found within the valley.

The Castle Valley Road is a segment of the La Sal Mountain Loop Road which is a State of Utah Scenic Backway. Visitors to the Moab area, as well as Castle Valley residents, travel this road with great regularity.

4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS

4.1 Introduction

Chapter 4 analyzes impacts of the proposed action to resources described in the affected environment in Chapter 3. The impact analyses presented in this chapter incorporate the Applicant's environmental commitments described in Chapter 2 (Section 2.2).

4.2 Direct and Indirect Impacts

Direct impacts are caused by the action and occur at the same time and place. Indirect impacts are caused by the action and are later in time or farther removed in distance, but are still reasonably foreseeable. With regard to visual resources the effects are direct and indirect.

4.2.1 Alternative A – Proposed Action

4.2.1.1 Visual Resources

The addition of the communications facility on public land within Castle Valley would not change the characteristic landscape of the valley. The residential nature of the valley means that there is already residential infrastructure found within the valley The level of change to visual resources from the addition of the communications facility would be very low.

The project's visual impact was assessed during a field visit on June 7, 2016. The Visual Contrast Rating Worksheet is attached as Appendix F. Two BLM observers, as well as the project designer, visited the proposed site. The Key Observation Point for the project was the Castle Valley Road which is travelled by residents and visitors alike. The Castle Valley Road is a State of Utah Scenic Backway and is a key observation point for the surrounding scenery, including Castle Rock and Round Mountain. The communications facility was simulated by using a tripod and large white foam board.

From the Castle Valley Road, the communications facility would be partially obscured from view by pinyon and juniper trees. The road is approximately 1,600 feet from the proposed facility, further mitigating the visual impact. The facility is relatively small: a 2-foot by 2-foot by 8-foot box with a 15-foot tall, 18 inch diameter lattice tower with a painted dish that would be 2 feet in diameter. The facility would be painted with colors that would further obscure its visibility from the road. It would not be surrounded by a chain link fence, which would enhance its obscurity. However, the solar panels on the facility cannot be painted or obscured. It is primarily the solar panels that could be visible from the Castle Valley Road. There would be two 4 by 6 feet solar panels which would cover approximately 4 by 12 feet (48 square feet).

Southbound on the Castle Valley Road (going toward the La Sal Mountains), the facility would not be viewed by the casual observer as it would require the viewer to look away from the road in front and from the view of the mountains which dominates the landscape. Southbound drivers and passengers would have to look at a 90 degree angle and away from the scenery to see the solar panels on the facility. This is unlikely to occur unless one is specifically looking for the facility.

Northbound on the Castle Valley Road (going toward the town and the Colorado River), the solar panels on the facility would be visible by a viewer trying to see the facility for a total of 10 seconds when travelling at 45 miles per hour which is the posted speed limit. The dominant view when travelling north is that of Castle Rock, which towers over the valley. Viewers whose gaze is drawn to Castle Rock could possibly see the glint of the solar panels for about 5 seconds when travelling north. It is unlikely that a 4 foot by 6 foot solar panel viewed for 5 seconds would diminish the enjoyment of that iconic feature. Furthermore, some infrastructure development, including houses, already exists on private land in the valley, so a view of a solar panel would not be unexpected in this context.

4.2.2 Alternative B – No Action

4.2.2.1 Visual Resources

Under the No Action alternative, the proposed ROW would not be issued and none of the components of the Proposed Action would be approved or constructed. The existing visual environment would remain in its current condition, with no new or additional impact to visual resources.

4.3 Cumulative Impacts Analysis

The Cumulative Impact Area is Castle Valley. The addition of a communications facility and its solar panels would not add appreciably to the level of development already found in Castle Valley on private land. The cumulative impacts to visual resources within Castle Valley would be negligible.

5.0 CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION

5.1 Introduction

The issue identification section of Chapter 1 identifies those issues analyzed in detail in Chapter 4. The ID Team Checklist provides the rationale for issues that were considered but not analyzed further. The issues were identified through the public and agency involvement process described in sections 5.2 and 5.3 below.

5.2 Persons, Groups, and Agencies Consulted:

Name	Purpose & Authorities for Consultation or Coordination	Findings & Conclusions
Utah State Historic Preservation Officer	Consultation for undertakings is required by the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) (16 USC 470). Section 106 0f the NHPA requires the BLM to account for the effects of its undertakings on historic properties. The procedures in 36 CFR Part 800 define how the BLM meets these statutory responsibilities. The National Register Criteria for Evaluation of Significance and procedures for nominating cultural resources to the National Register of Historic Places are outlined in 36 CFR 60.4.	Findings meet the requirements for inclusion in the statewide programmatic agreement for small scale undertakings. The determination of no effect to historic properties was submitted to SHPO on February 19, 2016. On May 10, 2016, SHPO acknowledged receipt of the project as part of the quarterly log, under the 2014 Programmatic Agreement for Small Undertakings.

5.3 Summary of Public Participation

During the preparation of this EA, the public was notified of the Proposed Action by posting on ePlanning on January 18, 2016. A press release, dated January 28, 2016, announced a scoping period through February 29, 2016. Appendix B provides documentation of the comments

received and the details of the BLM's consideration of the issues that were identified during scoping.

A public comment period on the EA was held from June 16 to July 1, 2016. The availability of the EA was posted on ePlanning and a press release was issued on June 16, 2016 announcing the draft EA comment period. There were 40 comments received from 18 commenters. Sixteen of the commenters were supportive of the proposed action and two commenters objected to the proposed action. The BLM response to comments is detailed in Appendix G.

5.4 List of Preparers

Name	Title	Responsible for the Following Section(s) of this Document
Jan Denney	Realty Specialist	Preparation of the EA
Rebecca Doolittle	Planner/Environmental Coordinator	Technical Coordination and Quality Control
Katie Stevens	Outdoor Recreation Planner	Visual Resources