

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR  
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT  
Klamath Falls Resource Area

**Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI)**  
**Harpold & Stukel Mineral Pits Renewal Environmental Assessment**  
**#DOI-BLM-OR-L040-2014-12-EA**

## **Introduction**

The Klamath Falls Resource Area (KFRA) of the Lakeview District, Bureau of Land Management (BLM) has conducted an environmental analysis to evaluate the impacts of renewal of the Harpold and Stukel Mineral Pit free use permits (FUPs) as requested by Klamath County Public Works Department (KCPWD). The EA analyzes two alternatives: the no action alternative, and the proposed action.

## **Plan Conformance and Consistency**

This proposed action is subject to the following land use plan(s): Klamath Falls Resource Area Resource Management Plan (RMP) and Environmental Impact Statement, approved in September 1994. The proposed action has been determined to be in conformance with this RMP as required by regulation (43 CFR 1610.5-3(a)).

## **Context & Intensity**

The proposed action would renew the free use permits for the existing Harpold and Stukel mineral material sites on BLM lands. Both FUP areas are within the Klamath Falls Field Office area, and do not include any wilderness or lands with other special designations. I have considered the potential intensity/severity of the impacts anticipated from renewal of the FUPs relative to each of the ten areas suggested for consideration by the CEQ:

### ***1. Impacts that may be both beneficial and adverse.***

Based on the analysis contained in the EA, the proposed action would not have significant beneficial or adverse impacts on the human environment. This is a renewal of FUPs for existing quarries and there are no areas of critical environmental concern, research natural areas, wilderness study areas, designated wilderness areas, areas with wilderness characteristics, wild and scenic rivers, prime and unique farmlands, floodplains, special status plants, forest or woodlands, wetlands or riparian areas, fisheries or aquatic habitats, wild horses, or livestock grazing use in the project area. I have determined that none of the direct, indirect, or cumulative impacts associated with the proposed action are significant, individually or combined.

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

The proposed action is located within a rural setting. Renewal of these two FUPs for existing quarries would have no significant impacts on public health or safety. Further, there are no

known hazardous waste sites in the project areas. Wastes would be managed through the development and implementation of the Spill Contingency Plan located in the Plan of Operations. Air quality impacts would be minimal. There are no perennial streams or surface drinking water sources located in the immediate project areas and no impacts expected to water resources. Further, renewal of the FUPs would not have disproportionate impacts to low income or minority populations.

***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 existing quarries in the project area do not contain park lands, prime farmlands, wetlands, wild and scenic rivers, or ecologically critical areas. Cultural resource surveys were conducted and one archaeological site will be monitored. Impacts on cultural resources were not found to be significant.

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

Both the Harpold and Stukel quarries were originally authorized as FUPs by the BLM in the early 1980s, and have been in use for more than 30 years. A total of 70 scoping letters describing the proposed action and background information was sent to adjacent landowners, agencies, groups, and other affected and interested publics. No comments were received. The EA was sent to affected and interested publics and again, no comments on the EA were received.

The EA was amended to include upgrade/installation of a pipe gate adjacent to (inside) the existing powder river gate. The pipe gate will be locked only during the Deer Winter Range Closure from November 1 through April 15. The existing gate, which was previously locked year-round, will remain closed (but not locked) during the cattle grazing season. The KFRA interdisciplinary team of resource specialists determined that there would be no additional effects due to the pipe gate installation. I have determined that the effects described in the EA are not highly controversial.

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

Renewal of FUPs for existing mineral material sites is a common action authorized by the BLM, and similar actions have been implemented in similar areas, such as the Lakeview Resource Area on the east side of the Lakeview District. The nature of these impacts is not highly uncertain, nor does it involve unique or unknown risks. The analysis provided in the attached EA does not indicate that this action would involve any 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 proposed action would not establish a precedent for future actions on KFRA-managed lands. This analysis would be used for the renewal of the FUPs for the Harpold and Stukel mineral material sites only.

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

The actions considered in the selected alternative were considered by the interdisciplinary team within the context of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions. Significant cumulative effects are not anticipated.

**8. The degree to which the action may adversely affect districts, sites, highways, structures, or objects listed in or eligible for listing in the NRHP or may cause loss or destruction of significant scientific, cultural, or historical resources.**

The proposed action would not have adverse effects on any cultural sites listed on the National Register of Historic Places or sites known to be eligible.

**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 ESA of 1973.**

There are no threatened or endangered listed, proposed, candidate species or designated critical habitat under the Endangered Species Act (as amended USDI Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) 1973) that occur within the project areas or that would be affected from project activities.

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

The project does not violate any known Federal, State, local or tribal law or requirement imposed for the protection of the environment. Local tribes were consulted and are listed in the EA. In addition, the project is consistent with applicable land management plans, policies, and programs.

## **Finding of No Significant Impact Determination**

I have reviewed the EA (DOI-BLM-OR-L040-2014-02-EA), dated June 2014. On the basis of the information contained in the EA, it is my determination that: (1) implementation of the proposed action will not have significant environmental impacts beyond those already addressed in the KFRA RMP; (2) the proposed action is in conformance with the RMP; and (3) the proposed action does not constitute a major Federal action having a significant effect on the human environment. Therefore, an environmental impact statement or a supplement to the existing RMP and Environmental Impact Statement is not necessary and will not be prepared.

This finding is based on my consideration of the Council on Environmental Quality's (CEQ) criteria for significance (40 CFR 1508.27), both with regard to the context and to the intensity of the impacts described in the EA or as articulated in the letters of comment.

\_\_\_\_/s/ Terry Austin, acting for \_\_\_\_\_  
Donald J. Holmstrom  
Field Manager, Klamath Falls Resource Area

\_\_\_\_7/9/2014\_\_\_\_\_  
Date