



**Bureau of Land Management**

Anchorage Field Office  
6881 Abbott Loop Road  
Anchorage, AK 99507  
<http://www.anchorage.ak.blm.gov>

---

**Categorical Exclusion  
Withdrawal Extension for the Fanshaw Natural Area**

**Applicant: U.S. Forest Service  
Case File Number: AA-50224  
AK-040-07-CX-013**



**Location:**  
Copper River Meridian  
Secs. 3, 4, 9, & 10, T. 54 S., R. 75 E.

**Prepared By:**  
David J. Krantz  
Realty Specialist  
January 18, 2007

Case File No.: AA-50224  
AK-040-07-CX-013

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR  
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT  
Anchorage Field Office  
**CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION (CX) FORM**

---

CX No.: AK-040-07-CX-013

Case File No.: AA-50224

**Proposed Action Title/Types:** Withdrawal Extension for the Cape Fanshaw Natural Area.

**Location of Proposed Action:** Approximately 600 acres located 35 miles northwest of Petersburg, Alaska, in the Tongass National Forest, Petersburg Ranger District, more specifically described as follows: Copper River Meridian, T. 54 S., R. 75 E., Secs. 3, 4, 9, and 10.

**Description of Proposed Action:** The U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, requested the extension of Public Land Order No. 6676 for a 20-year period.

This order withdrew the Cape Fanshaw Natural Area from settlement, location, and entry under public appropriation and mining laws, for management as a natural ecological complex for forest research and educational purposes. To maintain this research value, this parcel cannot undergo any human generated surface disturbance. This extension is necessary in order to complete on-going research projects in the withdrawal area.

The original withdrawal was issued in May 23, 1988, and is due to expire on May 23, 2008.

**Applicant:** United States Department of Agriculture, Forest Service

---

**PART I - PLAN CONFORMANCE REVIEW**

This Proposed Action is in conformance with Section 204 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976, 43 U.S.C. § 1714, as amended.

The proposed action affects public lands that are not covered by a Bureau of Land Management, management framework plan or a resource management plan. However, an environmental assessment addressing withdrawal of these lands was completed on September 11, 1986. That document assessed the impacts associated with withdrawing these lands from settlement, location, and entry and provided a basis for the initial withdrawal. 43 CFR § 1610.8(b)(1) (2006).

Remarks:

**PART II - NEPA REVIEW**

**A. Categorical Exclusion Review.**

This proposed action qualifies as a categorical exclusion under 516 DM 11.5, E.(1):

“Withdrawal extensions or modifications which only establish a new time period and entail no changes in segregative effect or use.”

**B. Departmental List of Extraordinary Circumstances Review.**

The following Departmental List of Extraordinary Circumstances apply to individual actions. Departmental instructions mandate that environmental documents **MUST BE PREPARED** for actions which may: (Mark applicable answer for each item. If "yes", prepare an EA/EIS and append this form to it.)

		YES	NO
1.	Have significant adverse impacts on public health or safety.	_____	_____ X
2.	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.	_____	_____ X
3.	Have highly controversial environmental effects or involve unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources [NEPA Section 102(2)(E)].	_____	_____ X
4.	Have highly uncertain and potentially significant environmental effects or involve unique or unknown environmental risks.	_____	_____ X
5.	Establish a precedent for future action or represent a decision in principle about future actions with potentially significant environmental effects.	_____	_____ X
6.	Have a direct relationship to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant environmental effects.	_____	_____ X
7.	Have significant impacts on properties listed, or eligible for		

- |     |   |       |              |
|-----|---|-------|--------------|
|     | listing on the National Register of Historic Places as determined by either the bureau or office.   | _____ | <u>  X  </u> |
| 8.  | Have significant impacts on species listed, or proposed to be listed, on the List of Endangered or Threatened Species, or have significant impacts on designated Critical Habitat for these species.  | _____ | <u>  X  </u> |
| 9.  | Violate Federal law, or a State, local, or tribal law or requirement imposed for the protection of the environment.   | _____ | <u>  X  </u> |
| 10. | Have a disproportionately high and adverse effect on low income or minority populations (Executive Order 12898).  | _____ | <u>  X  </u> |
| 11. | 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).   | _____ | <u>  X  </u> |
| 12. | Contribute to the introduction, continued existence, or spread of weeds or non-native invasive species known to occur in the actions that may promote the introduction, growth, or expansion of the range of such species (Federal Noxious Weed Control Act and Executive Order 13112). | _____ | <u>  X  </u> |

I certify that none of the Departmental Extraordinary Circumstances listed in the above Part B (516 DM 2, Appendix 2) apply to this action.

Preparer: David Krantz

Date: January 22, 2007

**PART III – DECISION**

---

Although there is no Bureau of Land Management planning document addressing the lands affected by the proposed action, an environmental assessment, dated September 11, 1986, did address the impacts associated with segregating the lands from settlement, location, and entry and provided a basis for the initial decision. 43 CFR § 1610.8(b)(1) (2006). This action is a renewal of that initial withdrawal. As such, the Department of the Interior has determined and found that the proposed action is within a category of actions, which do not individually or cumulatively have a significant effect on the human environment and that neither an environmental assessment nor an environmental impact statement is required, 40 CFR § 1508.4 (2006).

Authorized Official: Gary Reimer

Date: February 12, 2007