

Categorical Exclusion Documentation
 U.S. Department of the Interior
 Bureau of Land Management, Spokane District
 Border Field Office
 1103 North Fancher Road
 Spokane Valley, Washington 99212

A. Background

BLM Office: Border Field Office

Lease/Serial/Case File No.: WAOR 35492

NEPA Log Number: DOI-BLM-OR-135-2015-0009

Proposed Action Title: Bundy Water Pipeline ROW

Location of Proposed Action: See Exhibit A Map

Willamette Meridian, Stevens County, Washington

T. 32 N., R. 40 E., sec. 20, SW¹/₄SW¹/₄.

Proposed Action:

The Bureau of Land Management (BLM) is proposing to renew a right-of-way grant authorizing Glen Bundy to operate and maintain a water pipeline. Mr. Glen Bundy submitted an application requesting to renew a right-of-way authorization for a 5” PVC water pipeline across public lands in Stevens County, Washington. The pipeline was planned, engineered, and implemented in 1983 with the assistance of USDA Soil Conservation Service and provides water for irrigation and livestock watering.

The right-of-way is approximately 1,510 feet long and 15 feet wide for a total of .52 acres at a depth of approximately 2 to 3 feet. No new rights will be issued or new ground disturbance approved as a result of this administrative action. The terms of the grant will be 30 years and will expire on December 31, 2044.

B. Land Use Plan Conformance

Land Use Plan Name: Spokane Resource Management Plan (RMP)

Date Approved/Amended: Approved 1987/Amended 1992

The proposed action is in conformance with the Spokane RMP because it is specifically provided for in the following LUP decision(s): Keep public lands open for



exploration/development of mineral resources, rights-of-way, access, and other public purposes with consideration to mitigate designated resource concerns (BLM 1987, p.12).

C. Compliance with NEPA

The proposed action is categorically excluded from documentation in an environmental assessment or environmental impact statement. The proposed action is a kind of action that has been determined to fit within a category of actions which do not individually or cumulatively have significant effect on the human environment. The proposed action falls within category of actions at 516 DM 11.9.E(9) Renewals and assignment of leases , permits, or rights-of-way where no additional rights are conveyed beyond those granted by the original authorizations..

This categorical exclusion is appropriate in this situation because there are no extraordinary circumstances potentially having effects that may significantly affect the environment. The proposed action has been reviewed, and none of the extraordinary circumstances described in 43 CFR 46.215 apply, as described below:

- a. The proposed action would not have significant impacts on public health or safety. The renewal of this right-of-way will have no new or significant impacts on health or public safety. The pipeline has existed since 1983. No additional ground disturbance will be approved as a result of this action.
- b. The proposed action would not have significant impacts on such natural resources and unique geographic characteristics as historic or cultural resources; park, recreation or refuge lands; wilderness areas; wild or scenic rivers; national natural landmarks; sole or principal drinking water aquifers; prime farmlands; wetlands (Executive Order 11990); floodplains (Executive Order 11988); national monuments; migratory birds; and other ecologically significant or critical areas. There will be no new ground disturbance as a result of this renewal of an existing pipeline and there will be no significant impacts on natural resources and unique geographic characteristics.
- c. The proposed action would not have highly controversial environmental effects or involve unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources [NEPA Section 102(2)(E)]. The approval of this right-of-way renewal would not have any environmental effects that are highly controversial or involve unresolved conflicts. The effects of issuing a right-of-way to authorize operation and maintenance of an existing pipeline are well understood.
- d. The proposed action would not have highly uncertain and potentially significant environmental effects or involve unique or unknown environmental risks. The effects of issuing a right-of-way to authorize operation and maintenance of an existing pipeline are well understood.
- e. The proposed action would not establish a precedent for future actions or represent a decision in principle about future actions with potentially significant environmental effects. Issuing a right-of-way for continued operation of an existing pipeline would not set a precedent for any future action.

f. The proposed action would not have a direct relationship to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant environmental effects. The renewal of this existing water pipeline does not have a direct relationship to actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant effects. Operation and maintenance of the pipeline would result in a continuation of impacts that have been ongoing since 1983 when the pipeline was constructed. No new or additional impacts that would result in cumulatively significant impacts are predicted to occur as a result of continued operations.

g. The proposed action would not have significant impacts on properties listed, or eligible for listing, on the National Register of Historic Places as determined by the bureau. Approving of this right-of-way renewal will entail no new rights or additional ground disturbance as a result of this action.

h. The proposed action would not have significant impacts on species listed, or proposed to be listed, under the Endangered Species, or have significant impacts on designated critical habitat for these species. The proposed action would not have any new significant impacts to endangered, threatened, or proposed species or designated critical habitat. The proposed action would not change the amount or suitability of wildlife habitat in the project area as this is an existing right-of-way and no new activities are being proposed or permitted.

i. The proposed action would not violate a Federal law, or a State, local, or tribal law or requirement imposed for the protection of the environment. The right-of-way grant will include stipulations for the protection of the environment.

j. The proposed action would not have a disproportionately high and adverse effect on low income or minority populations (Executive Order 12898).

k. The proposed action would not limit access to and ceremonial use of Indian sacred sites on Federal lands by Indian religious practitioners or significantly adversely affect the physical integrity of such sacred sites (Executive Order 13007). There are no identified sacred, ceremonial, or religious Indian sites within the area of the proposed action.

l. The proposed action would not contribute to the introduction, continued existence, or spread of noxious weeds or non-native invasive species known to occur in the area or actions that may promote the introduction, growth, or expansion of the range of such species (Federal Noxious Weed Control Act and Executive Order 13112). The right-of-way grant will include standard stipulations that address the control of noxious weeds and invasive plant species.

D. Signature

/s/ Lindsey Babcock
Lindsey Babcock
Field Manager

9/15/2015
Date

E. Contact Person & Reviewers

For additional information concerning this Categorical Review, contact Heidi Lee Honner, Realty Specialist, (509) 536-1216.

Reviewers	Resource	Initials	Date
Jason Lowe	Wildlife, Special Status Wildlife	JL	9/15/15
Kim Frymire	Botany, Special Status Plants	KF	9/16/15
Anne Boyd	Historic/Cultural	AB	9/15/15
Katherine Farrell	NEPA	kf	9/15/15
Heidi Lee Honner	Lands and Realty	HLH	9/10/2015

Note: A separate decision document has been prepared for the action covered by this CX.