

**UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
KINGMAN FIELD OFFICE**

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

**Golden Vertex Corp
Right-of-Way Applications**

Environmental Assessment: DOI-BLM-AZ-C010-2017-0046-EA

*AZA 037252: Access Road
AZA 037253: 24.9 kV Powerline
AZA 037478: Fiber Optic Line
AZA 037253 AA: Temporary-Use Permit*

INTRODUCTION

The Bureau of Land Management (BLM) Kingman Field Office has prepared the *Golden Vertex Corp Right-of-Way Applications* Environmental Assessment (EA) to analyze the environmental impacts and document the findings of granting three right-of-ways (ROWs) and one Temporary-Use Permit (TUP) to Golden Vertex Corp., under the authority of Title V of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act. The project area is located in northwestern Arizona east of Bullhead City, Arizona. Public lands associated with this project are managed by the BLM Colorado River District's Kingman Field Office and Lake Havasu Field Office. Consideration of the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) criteria for significance (40 CFR 1508.27) with regard to context and intensity of impacts, is described below:

CONTEXT

The BLM proposes to grant the following authorizations to Golden Vertex Corp:

- (1) a ROW for the upgrade and maintenance of an access road [AZA 037252];
- (2) a ROW for the construction, operation, maintenance, and termination of a 24.9 kV overhead power line [AZA 037253];
- (3) a ROW for the construction, operation, maintenance, and termination of a communication fiber optic cable [AZA 037478]; and
- (4) a TUP for the use of three work areas [AZA 037253 AA].

The total acreage of land included as part of this project would be approximately 35 acres.

INTENSITY

The following discussion is organized around the ten Significance Criteria described at 40 CFR 1508.27. The following have been considered in evaluating intensity for this proposal:

1. Impacts that may be both beneficial and adverse:

Chapter 3 of the EA identifies both beneficial and adverse impacts of the Proposed Action. Most impacts associated with the action are temporary in nature and would only occur during project construction. An improvement to air quality would occur as a result of installing the powerline as it will reduce impacts to air quality by eliminating the use of the eight tanker trucks weekly along the road and elimination of the use of seven 610-horsepower diesel generators as identified in the EA. Measures to reduce adverse impacts to cultural resources, wildlife/special-status species, and VRM were incorporated in the design of the Proposed Action. None of the adverse environmental effects discussed in detail in the EA and associated appendices are considered significant, nor do the effects approach the threshold of significance.

2. Degree of effect on public health and safety:

The Proposed Action will not result in substantial adverse impacts to 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 Bullhead Bajada Cultural and Natural Area of Critical Environmental Concern (ACEC) is located within a portion of the project area, and within the scope of analysis for this EA. The objectives of the Bajada ACEC focus on protecting historic and pre-historic cultural resources, the Sonoran Desert Tortoise, and its critical habitat. The project will not affect these values, or the resources identified for protection by the ACEC. Potential impacts to air quality, cultural resources, wildlife/special-status species, and VRM were taken into consideration during the initial project proposal. Project design features were incorporated to reduce and/or eliminate these potential impacts. Through project design and avoidance, none of the identified resources analyzed in detail will be significantly impacted by the Proposed Action because the overall cumulative impact among the identified issues have been determined minimal (see analysis in Chapters 3 and 4 of the EA).

4. Degree to which the possible effects on the quality of the human environment are likely to be highly controversial:

Controversy in this context means disagreement about the nature of the effects (scientific controversy), not expressions of opposition to the Proposed Action. No unique or appreciable scientific controversy has been identified regarding the effects of the Proposed Action.

5. Degree to which the possible effects on the quality of the human environment are highly uncertain or involve unique or unknown risk:

This project is not unique or unusual and the BLM has experience implementing similar actions bureau-wide. The analysis in Chapter 3 of this EA demonstrates the effects are not uncertain, and do not involve unique or unknown risk.

6. 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 neither establishes a precedent for future BLM actions with significant effects, nor represents a decision in principle about a future consideration. The Proposed Action will not establish a precedent for future actions with significant effects or represent a decision in principle about a future consideration. Any future projects proposed within the project area or in the vicinity will be analyzed under separate site-specific environmental analysis at the time they are proposed.

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

No individually or cumulatively significant impacts were identified for the proposed action. No long-term commitment of resources causing significant impacts were identified in the EA. Any adverse impacts identified for the Proposed Action, in conjunction with any adverse impacts of other past, present, or reasonably foreseeable future actions would result in negligible impacts to the affected resources as described in Chapter 4 of the EA.

8. Degree to which the action may adversely affect district, sites, highways, structures, or objects listed on the National Register of Historic Places or may cause loss or destruction of significant scientific, cultural, or historical resources:

Based on the analysis in Chapter 3 of this EA, this proposal will not adversely affect districts, sites, highways, structures, or other objects listed or eligible for listing, nor will the Proposed Action cause loss or destruction of significant scientific, cultural, or historical resources. Sites identified would be avoided during construction, and no adverse cultural resource impacts are expected due to the design features and monitoring incorporated into the Proposed Action. All activities associated with this project which could adversely impact an archaeological or historic resource will be subject to full compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

9. Degree to which the action may adversely affect an endangered or threatened species or its critical habitat:

There are no Threatened or Endangered Species or Critical Habitat known to occur within the project area. Project design features included in the Proposed Action, including a pre-construction wildlife survey and monitoring, will reduce impacts to tortoise and their habitat.

10. Whether the action threatens a violation of federal, state, or local environmental protection law:

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.

DETERMINATION: Finding of No Significant Impact

Based upon the analysis of potential environmental impacts contained in EA No. DOI-BLM-AZ-C010-2016-0026-EA, incorporated mitigation measures and design features, public involvement, consideration of the context and intensity of the Proposed Action (ten criteria described in 40 CFR 1508.27), and all other information available to me, it is my determination that:

1. Implementation of the Proposed Action will not have significant environmental impacts beyond those already addressed in the Kingman Resource Management Plan/Final Impact Statement (RMP/FEIS) (USDI 1995);
2. The Proposed Action is in conformance with the Kingman RMP/Record Of Decision;
3. There will be no adverse societal or regional impacts and no adverse impacts to affected interests; and
4. The environmental effects caused by the Proposed Action and compared against the tests of significance found at 40 CFR 1508.27 do not constitute a major Federal Action having a significant effect on the human environment. Therefore, an EIS is not necessary and will not be prepared.

/s/ Amanda M. Dodson
Amanda M. Dodson
Field Manager
Kingman Field Office

5/30/2018
Date