



United States Department of the Interior



BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
Anchorage Field Office
4700 BLM Road
Anchorage, Alaska 99507-2591
<http://www.blm.gov/ak>

City of McGrath, Water Treatment Site Environmental Assessment, DOI-BLM-AK-A010-2011-0038-EA

Case Files AA-87984, AA-92957, AA-093333

DECISION RECORD

Background

On June 3, 2008, the City of McGrath, Alaska (McGrath) filed an application with the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) Anchorage Field Office under the Recreation and Public Purposes Act (R&PP) of June 14, 1926, as amended for authorization to use three lots within the Federal Reserve lands located within U.S. Survey 3140B, Tract B, Block 5, Lots 6-8, Section 17, T. 33 N., R. 33 W., Seward Meridian, Alaska (serial number AA-87984). These lots are located across the road from McGrath's multi-use facility.

The three lots would be used for a new well and plant and several settling ponds to allow particulates to settle from water taken from the Kuskokwim River prior to being used for McGrath. Utilizing the three lots would allow McGrath to use existing equipment and water storage tanks located on McGrath's land adjacent to the three lots in the design of the new Plant.

McGrath submitted the R&PP application requesting a long-term lease to construct a new water source (well) and water treatment plant (plant) on these lots. However, due to the time necessary to complete the R&PP process, McGrath also filed an application for a short-term land use permit (serial number AA-92957) to allow for the construction of the facilities under a short-term permit. Ultimately, however, a third application for a right-of-way was filed by McGrath for a long-term water facility under the authority of Title V of Federal Land Policy and Management Act of October 21, 1976, as amended (90 Stat. 2776; 43 U.S.C. 1761) to allow for a long-term lease of the facilities while awaiting the completion of the processing of the R&PP application (serial number AA-093333).

Decision

I have decided to select *Alternative 1 – Proposed Action* for implementation. It is my decision to authorize a long-term (20-year) right-of-way for a development of municipal water treatment facility on these three lots.

My decision to authorize this right-of-way is summarized as follows (refer to EA, pp. 3-4 for more detail):

1. This right-of-way authorization, serial number AA-093333, is issued for twenty years, with the option for renewal.
2. All Project Design Features and best management practices identified in the EA will be utilized by the City of McGrath in the development of the water treatment facility (EA, pp. 3-4).

This decision is based on site-specific analysis in the *City of McGrath Water Treatment Site, Environmental Assessment* (DOI-BLM-AKA-010-2011-0038-EA) and the management decisions contained in the 1981 Southwest Management Framework Plan. The Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) indicates that the selected alternative has been analyzed in an EA and has been found to have no significant environmental effects. Therefore, an Environmental Impact Statement is not required and will not be prepared.

Rationale for the Decision

Alternative 2, the No Action Alternative, was not selected because it would not meet the BLM's purpose for action nor would it meet the BLM's Recreation and Public Purposes Act or right-of-way authorization objectives identified at 43 CFR § 2740.0-2 and 43 CFR § 2801.2.

Alternative 1 was selected because it fulfills the BLM's Recreation and Public Purposes Act objective to meet the needs of local governmental agencies for public lands required for recreational and, in this case, public purposes (43 CFR § 2740.0-2). Furthermore, the EA has demonstrated that the right-of-way authorization can be granted and the water treatment facility developed in a manner that protects the natural resources, prevents unnecessary and undue degradation of the public lands, and effectively consolidate (adjacent to) the new facility with McGrath's existing equipment and water storage tanks (EA, p. 1) (43 CFR § 2801.2).

Laws, Authorities, and Land Use Plan Conformance

The EA and supporting documentation have been prepared consistent with the requirements of various statutes and regulations, including but not limited to:

- Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act of 1980 (ANILCA)
- Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (FLPMA)
- National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA)
- National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (NHPA)

BLM-managed lands in the project area are subject to the Southwest Management Framework Plan (MFP), November 1981, which allows for making public lands available for the development of Multiple Use activities. The selected alternative is therefore consistent with the direction in the applicable land use plan.

Public Involvement, Consultation, and Coordination

An Anchorage Field Office interdisciplinary team of resource specialists prepared the EA. McGrath representatives were consulted throughout the process.

The EA was made available for public review for approximately one week prior to signing the Finding of No Significant Impacts and this Decision Record. No public comments were received.

Appeal Opportunities

This decision may be appealed to the Interior Board of Land Appeals, Office of the Secretary, in accordance with the regulations contained in 43 CFR § 4. To appeal you must file a notice of appeal at the BLM Anchorage Field Office, 4700 BLM Road, Anchorage, Alaska 99507, within 30 days from receipt of this decision. The appeal must be in writing and delivered in person, via the United States Postal Service mail system, or other common carrier, to the Anchorage Field Office as noted above. *The BLM does not accept appeals by facsimile or email.* The appellant has the burden of showing that the decision appealed from is in error.

If you wish to file a petition pursuant to regulation 43 CFR § 4.21 (58 FR 4939, January 19, 1993) for a stay of the effectiveness of this decision during the time that your appeal is being reviewed by the Board, the petition for a stay must accompany your notice of appeal. Except as otherwise provided by law or other pertinent regulation, a petition for a stay of decision pending appeal shall show sufficient justification based on the following standards: (a) The relative harm to the parties if the stay is granted or denied, (b) The likelihood of the appellant's success on the merits, (c) The likelihood of immediate and irreparable harm if the stay is not granted, and (d) Whether the public interest favors granting the stay.

Copies of the notice of appeal and petition for a stay must also be submitted to each party named in this decision and to the Interior Board of Land Appeals and to the Office of the Solicitor (see 43 CFR § 4.413); Office of the Regional Solicitor, Alaska Region, U.S. Department of the Interior, 4230 University Drive, Suite 300, Anchorage, Alaska 99508; at the same time the original documents are filed with this office. If you request a stay, you have the burden of proof to demonstrate that a stay should be granted.

/s/ Heidi Wanner for

07/13/2012

James M. Fincher
Anchorage Field Manager

Date

Attachments

Finding of No Significant Impact, July 2012

References

BLM. 1981. Management Framework Plan: Southwest Planning Area. Approved, November 25, 1981.



United States Department of the Interior



BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
Anchorage Field Office
4700 BLM Road
Anchorage, Alaska 99507-2591
<http://www.blm.gov/ak>

City of McGrath, Water Treatment Site Environmental Assessment, DOI-BLM-AK-A010-2011-0038-EA

Case Files AA-87984, AA-92957, AA-093333

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

Background

In July 2012, the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) prepared an Environmental Assessment (DOI-BLM-AK-A010-2011-0038-EA) analyzing the effects of issuing a long-term right-of-way authorization to the City of McGrath, Alaska (McGrath) for the development of a municipal water treatment facility (serial number AA-093333).

Finding of No Significant Impact

This action and its effects have been evaluated consistent with the Council on Environmental Quality regulations for determining *significance*. Per 40 CFR § 1508.27, a determination of *significance* requires consideration of both context and intensity. The former refers to the relative context in which the action would occur such as society as a whole, affected region, affected interests, etc. The latter refers to the severity of the impact.

Context

The proposed project would occur on three lots within the Federal Reserve lands located within U.S. Survey 3140B, Tract B, Block 5, Lots 6-8, Section 17, T. 33 N., R. 33 W., Seward Meridian, Alaska. The three lots are each approximately 80 feet wide by 186 feet long, containing approximately 14,900 square feet each or an aggregated total of approximately 44,700 square feet or 1.02 acres (EA, p. 1). The project site is bordered by roads on three sides, the city has extensive facilities across the street from the site, and the site is within the middle of the town (EA, p. 8). The project's footprint is small (approximately one acre) and compatible with adjacent surrounding land uses. (EA, p. 1) The proposed project is not significant in the context of the local area.

Intensity

1. Impacts that may be both beneficial and adverse.

The EA considered and disclosed both potential beneficial and adverse effects of the alternatives. For example, the EA discloses that the project would necessitate the clearing of approximately one acre of natural habitat (EA, p. 7), but the EA also acknowledges that the proposed location would best take advantage of existing facilities (EA, pp. 1 and 7-8).

2. The degree to which the proposed action affects public health and safety.

There is no potential for this project to directly affect the health and safety of the public at large. However, the availability of public lands for a new municipal water treatment facility would indirectly benefit public health over the life of the facility (EA, p. 1).

3. Unique characteristics of the geographic area such as proximity of historic or cultural resources, park lands, prime farmlands, wetlands, wild and scenic rivers, or ecologically critical areas.

There are no parks, prime farmlands, wild and scenic rivers, or ecologically critical areas in proximity to the project site. The BLM Anchorage Field Office Archaeologist conducted a pedestrian survey of the project site on June 23, 2011; no cultural resources were identified during the survey (EA, p. 5). No previously recorded cultural sites are known in the project area (EA, p. 5). No prehistoric resources are documented within one mile of the proposed project (EA, p. 5).

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

The anticipated effects are similar to other right-of-way authorizations and/or Recreation and Public Purposes Act leases. No unique or appreciable scientific controversy has been identified regarding the effects of the project.

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

Similar to Item 4 above, the anticipated effects are similar to other right-of-way authorizations and/or Recreation and Public Purposes Act leases on BLM-managed lands. The analysis has not shown that there would be any unique or unknown risks to the human environment.

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.

Per the Southwest Management Framework Plan (1981), the project area is open to multiple uses, including the requested use. This authorization is consistent with the Record of Decision for the applicable land use plan. This project neither establishes a precedent nor represents a decision in principle about future actions.

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

The EA discloses that this project would add to the cumulative impacts in the area by removing approximately one acre of vegetation and constructing new facilities on the site (EA, p. 8). McGrath is located in remote Alaska. Beyond the town center, the landscape is largely undeveloped. The clearing of one acre of vegetation is inconsequential in context of the surrounding landscape.

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

Refer to item #3; there are no known cultural resources in the project area.

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 Endangered Species Act of 1973.*

There are no Federally threatened or endangered species within the project area (EA, p. 3).

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 threaten to violate any law. The project is in compliance with the 43 CFR § 2740 and 43 CFR § 2800 regulations and is consistent with Southwest Management Framework Plan (1981), which provides direction for the protection of the environment on public lands (EA, p. 2).

Conclusion

Therefore, on the basis of the information contained in the EA, and all other information available to me, it is my determination that:

1. None of the environmental effects identified meet the definition of significance as defined by context and intensity considerations at 40 CFR § 1508.27;
2. The project is in conformance with the Southwest Management Framework Plan (1981); and
3. The project does not constitute a major federal action having a significant effect on the human environment.

Therefore, neither Environmental Impact Statement nor a supplement to the existing EA is necessary and neither will be prepared.

/s/ Heidi Wanner for

07/13/2012

James M. Fincher
Anchorage Field Manager

Date

Attachments

BLM. 2012. City of McGrath, Water Treatment Site, Environmental Assessment, DOI-BLM-AK-A010-2011-0038-EA.

**U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT**

Anchorage Field Office
4700 BLM Road
Anchorage, Alaska 99507
(907) 267-1246

**City of McGrath, Water Treatment Site, Environmental Assessment
DOI-BLM-AK-A010-2011-0038-EA**

Case Files: AA-87984, AA-92957, AA-093333

1.0 PROJECT INTRODUCTION

A. Background

On June 3, 2008, the City of McGrath (McGrath) filed an application with the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) Anchorage Field Office (AFO) under the Recreation and Public Purposes (R&PP) Act of June 14, 1926, as amended (43 U.S.C. 869 *et. seq.*) for authorization to use three lots within the Federal Reserve lands located within U.S. Survey 3140B, Tract B, Block 5, Lots 6-8, Section 17, T. 33 N., R. 33 W., Seward Meridian, Alaska (serial number AA-87984). These lots are located across the road from McGrath's multi-use facility. The three lots are each approximately 80 feet wide by 186 feet long, containing approximately 14,900 square feet each or an aggregated total of approximately 44,700 square feet or 1.02 acres.

McGrath submitted the R&PP application requesting a long-term lease to construct a new water source (well) and water treatment plant (plant) on Federal Reserve lots adjacent to McGrath's multi-use facility that houses the public water treatment plant, bulk water storage tanks, bulk fuel tank farm, washateria, public showers and bathroom, Alaska State Troopers suite, Southcentral Foundation McGrath Health Center, State of Alaska District Court, Community Assembly Room, City of McGrath offices, Southcentral Foundation Behavioral Health and Administrative Offices, fire truck(s) bay, ambulance bay and city garages and shops.

The three lots would be used for a new well and plant and several settling ponds to allow particulates to settle from water taken from the Kuskokwim River prior to being used for McGrath. Utilizing the three lots would allow McGrath to use existing equipment and water storage tanks located on McGrath's land adjacent to the three lots in the design of the new Plant.

However, due to the time necessary to complete the R&PP process [which includes a Notice of Realty Action (NORA) published in the Federal Register], McGrath also filed an application for a short-term land use permit under regulations found at 43 CFR 2920 under the authority of Title III of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act (FLPMA) of October 21, 1976, as amended (90 Stat. 2776; 43 U.S.C. 1732) (serial number AA-92957) to allow for the construction of the facilities under a short-term permit. Ultimately, a third application for a right-of-way was filed by McGrath under regulations found at 43 CFR 2800 for a long-term water facility under the

authority of Title V of FLPMA of October 21, 1976, as amended (90 Stat. 2776; 43 U.S.C. 1761) to allow for a long-term lease of the facilities (to obtain funding from United States Department of Agriculture Village Safe Water Program) while awaiting the completion of the processing of the R&PP application (serial number AA-093333).

B. Land Status

This site is on BLM managed lands that have been withdrawn for Federal purposes under the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission.

C. Relationship to Statutes, Regulations, Policies, Plans or Other Environmental Analyses

An R&PP lease to use public lands for public purposes is required under regulations contained in 43 CFR 2912 which implement the R&PP Act of June 14, 1926, as amended (43 U.S.C. 869 *et. seq.*) For the disposal of the land under the R&PP Act, the regulations at 43 CFR 2740 are applicable. Further, in accordance with Section 212 of Title II of FLPMA, it must be shown to be to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Interior that the land is to be used for an established or definitively proposed project, that the land involved is not of national significance, nor more than is reasonably necessary for the proposed use.

With regards to a short-term land use permit and right-of-way, which would be issued under FLPMA, the appropriate regulations at 43 CFR 2920 and 2800 would be applicable.

D. Land Use Plan Conformance

This area is subject to the Southwest Management Framework Plan (MFP), November 1981, which allows for making public lands available for the development of Multiple Use activities.

E. Purpose and Need

The purpose of the proposed action is to provide McGrath the use of Federal public lands to construct a well and plant consistent with the intent of the R&PP Act. The need for the action is established by the BLM's responsibility under the R&PP Act and under FLPMA to respond to applications filed for uses of public lands.

F. Issues Considered but Eliminated

Lands with Wilderness Characteristics – The affected lands were reviewed for Lands with Wilderness Characteristics and found to contain none as the approximately one-acre parcel is completely surrounded by private lands and therefore does not meet the size criteria for Lands with Wilderness Characteristics.

Federally Threatened and Endangered Species - A records review shows there are no threatened and endangered species in the area of the proposed action and alternatives.

Subsistence Resources - The lands are Federal Public Lands within the meaning of Alaska National Interest Lands Conservation Act (ANILCA), Section 102(3); fall under the jurisdiction of the Federal Subsistence Board; and are subject to the Subsistence Management Regulations for the Harvest of and Wildlife, Fish and Shellfish on Federal Public Lands in Alaska. However, the proposed project site is within the city limits of McGrath and will not affect fish or wildlife subsistence resources.

2.0. ALTERNATIVES

A. Alternative #1- Proposed Action

The proposed action is to grant McGrath a long-term (20 year) right-of-way for a municipal water facility. (After the right-of-way is issued, an R&PP lease for 20 years will be pursued.) The design features submitted by the McGrath's plan of development would be utilized for the right-of-way, and, ultimately, the 20-year R&PP Lease. McGrath would make cut firewood available to the village elders.

The following Project Design Features apply to the Proposed Action Alternative. These measures have been developed to minimize or altogether avoid adverse impacts to resources in the project area.

Invasive Plants: Prevention, Monitoring, and Best Management Practices

- Weed eradication efforts should be made to remove all known invasive plants from the project construction activity area. This should involve hand-pulling all species listed in Chapter 3 of this EA. Taking this action will help prevent the spread of the plant propagules into the new construction area.
- All vehicles, transport equipment used in access, construction, maintenance and operations of project must be thoroughly cleaned prior to moving equipment and gear. High-pressure washing to remove material that can contain weed seeds or other propagates will help to insure equipment is weed free. All parts of drilling and earth moving equipment and associated gear, including but not limited to the insides of bumpers, wheel wells, undercarriages, belly plates, excavating blades, buckets, tracks, rollers, drills, buckets, shovels, any digging tools, etc., to remove potential propagules, seeds, and soil carrying vegetative material. All gear, tool bags and accessories must be free of all plant debris, mud, and materials which can be the source of non-native invasive plants and pathogens.
- After all preventive precautions have been employed prior to construction, the construction project manager should conduct early detection rapid response (EDRR) monitoring of the project area after the construction is completed. This involves a minimum of one site visit annually during the growing season (preferably July) to look for the occurrence of non-native invasive plants. Should any occurrences be detected, the

construction project manager should implement EDRR. EDRR efforts are designed to detect new invasive plants early enough in the growth stage to allow efficient assessments to be made and respond to invasions in an effective, environmentally sound manner that will prevent the spread and permanent establishment of invasive species. EDRR is achieved by visual observation of the ground in the area of concern looking for suspected plant species and taking prompt action to remove the infestation, typically by hand pulling or digging and properly disposing of the debris. Care needs to be taken to judiciously contain seed bearing parts of the plants. Repeated visits to infested sites within a single growing season may be necessary, before plants produce seeds. The objective is to remove the seed bank and any propagative parts of the plants, thus minimizing the potential for increased spread.

- Site reclamation should be implemented as soon as possible after construction using the original duff layer. This original duff layer is to be removed and set aside upon initial site disturbance, and replaced on disturbed areas in lieu of revegetation with non-local materials.
- All revegetation and stabilization efforts must use native and/or Alaska certified weed free products. Sources for weed free products can be found by calling the Plant Materials Center: 907-745-4469.
- Revegetation Guidance can be found at: http://www.dnr.state.ak/ag/pmcweb/PMC_reveg

Cultural Resources

- Any cultural and/or paleontological resource (historic or prehistoric site or object) discovered by the permit holder, or any person working on his behalf, on public or Federal land shall be immediately reported to the authorized officer.
- The permit holder shall suspend all operations in the immediate area of such discovery until written authorization to proceed is issued by the authorized officer.
- An evaluation of the discovery shall be made by the authorized officer to determine appropriate actions to prevent the loss of significant cultural or scientific values. The holder shall be responsible for the cost of evaluation and any decision as to proper mitigation measures shall be made by the authorized officer after consulting with the holder.
- If, in connection with operations under this authorization, any human remains, funerary objects, sacred objects or objects of cultural patrimony as defined in the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (P.L. 101-601; 104 Stat. 3048; 25 U.S.C. 3001) are discovered, the holder shall stop operations in the immediate area of the discovery, protect the remains and objects, and immediately notify the authorized officer. The holder shall continue to protect the immediate area of the discovery until notified by the authorized officer that operations may resume.

B. Alternative #2 - No Action Alternative

The No Action Alternative would be to deny the requests for the short-term land use permit, long-term right-of-way, and, ultimately, the 20-year R&PP lease. Denying these authorizations would leave the lots in the current unimproved condition.

3.0 AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

A. Cultural Resources

No previously recorded cultural sites are known in the project area. Several previously recorded historic sites are located within one mile of the project area. The closest resources include MCG-00050, the NWS Facilities Housing Site B-12; MCG-00044, the Old School; and MCG-00152, the Jewelry Shop building and outhouse. None of these resources would be impacted by the proposed project. The viewshed of the town has previously been altered to include large water towers and other modern structures. No prehistoric resources are documented within one mile of the proposed project.

The BLM AFO Archaeologist conducted a pedestrian survey of the proposed project area on June 23, 2011. The parcels are undeveloped and forested; however, there is some recent disturbance around the edges of the parcels, including dozer berms, a pad for a small storage shed, and minor disturbance from residents (primarily children playing) in the area. No cultural resources were identified during the survey. Vegetation and ground formation were examined in order to determine whether there was any potential for the remains of historic or prehistoric structures, but none was found.

B. Vegetation Resources

Non-native invasive plant species have been found in McGrath (Table 1).

Table 1. Known occurrences of non-native invasive plant species in McGrath.

Scientific Name	Common Name
<i>Bromus inermis</i> Leys.	smooth brome
<i>Caragana arborescens</i> Lam.	Siberian peashrub
<i>Chenopodium album</i> L.	lambsquarters
<i>Crepis tectorum</i> L.	narrowleaf hawksbeard
<i>Elymus repens</i> (L.) Gould	quackgrass
<i>Euphrasia nemorosa</i> (Pers.) Wallr.	common eyebright
<i>Hordeum jubatum</i> L.	foxtail barley
<i>Hordeum vulgare</i> L.	common barley
<i>Linaria vulgaris</i> P. Mill.	yellow toadflax
<i>Matricaria discoidea</i> DC	pineappleweed
<i>Plantago major</i> L.	common plantain
<i>Polygonum aviculare</i> L.	prostrate knotweed
<i>Stellaria media</i> (L.) Vill.	common chickweed
<i>Taraxacum officinale</i> F.H. Wigg.	common dandelion
<i>Trifolium repens</i> L.	white clover
<i>Viola tricolor</i> L.	johnny jumpup

Source: Alaska Natural Heritage Program Exotic Plant Clearinghouse (AKEPIC) <http://aknhp.uaa.alaska.edu/maps/akepic/>

Figure 1 displays locations where the invasive plants listed in Table 1 have been found in McGrath. The majority of these species are located in the immediate vicinity of the proposed project site.



Figure 1. Locations of invasive plants listed in Table 1.

C. Forest Resources

A maximum of approximately 1.02 acres of vegetation would be removed from the project area; however, the exact quantity of commercial forest resources (saw logs or firewood) within the project footprint is unknown. A forest inventory/timber cruise would reveal the quantity and value of commercial forest products available in the project area.

D. Wildlife

These parcels of land provides limited habitat for moose and migrant and resident song bird species that are found in the area. The area is surrounded by previous disturbances caused by the

construction of infrastructure and is within the limits of McGrath.

4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

A. Impacts of the Proposed Action (Alternative 1)

Both alternatives would result in the three lots (approximately one acre) being cleared of vegetation to be able to drill the well and install the plant. McGrath would make the cut firewood available to the village elders.

Cultural Resources

Based upon the negative survey of the project area by the AFO archaeologist, even though the project would permanently impact these parcels, this project has no potential to affect cultural resources. A stipulation regarding the discovery of previously unknown cultural resources will be included in the right-of-way grant.

Vegetation

Based on current known infestations of non-native invasive plants in McGrath, and the likelihood of these being present on heavy equipment working the ground in the community, there is a high probability of additional infestations and spread from this proposed action. These impacts would be mitigated by implementing the project design features described for the Proposed Action Alternative to ensure equipment is thoroughly washed prior to entering the worksites, and subsequent to the site work to prevent further spread into the community. (See Project Design Features for invasive plant management.)

Wildlife

Although the site may provide limited habitat for wildlife species found in the area, the location of the proposed site is on land within the City of McGrath. This area has been previously disturbed by the construction of roads and structures as part of the urban environment. The clearing of this 1.02 acre parcel would permanently remove forest habitat for wildlife, however, it would not affect wildlife populations at the population level.

B. Impacts of Alternative #2 - No Action Alternative:

If the No Action Alternative is selected, there would be no impacts to the site and the lots would remain in the forested condition that now exists. This would potentially cause a socio-economic impact as McGrath would not be able to build the new community facilities next to the existing facilities. This could necessitate McGrath having to construct unplanned facilities such as an additional pipeline to bring the water from wherever the proposed plant and wells construction would be moved to the existing tank facilities or constructing additional facilities, such as new water storage tanks.

Cultural Resources

There would be no impacts to cultural resources since the lands would not be cleared or disturbed.

Vegetation

There would be no impacts to vegetation since no additional disturbance of the site would be approved. There would be a low probability of new invasive species introduction. However, the known occurrences of invasive species in the area would continue to spread and out-compete local flora, changing the ecosystem character and function but at a slower rate than if the site was disturbed with no mitigation.

Wildlife

There would be no impacts under the No Action Alternative since the site would not be disturbed and the vegetation and trees would continue to be available to wildlife in the area.

C. Cumulative Impacts

The proposed well and plant would add to the cumulative impacts in the area by removing approximately one acre of vegetation and constructing new facilities on the site. Given that the area is already impacted by roads on three sides, the city has extensive facilities across the street from the site, and the proposed site is within the middle of the town, the incremental effect of this one-acre of clearing would not materially affect the natural or human environments.

5.0. CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION

Internal scoping was conducted by the Anchorage Field Office staff and included threatened and endangered species, cultural, and ANILCA 810 analysis.

6.0 LIST OF PREPARERS

Brenda Becker	Realty Specialist, Glennallen Field Office
Geoff Beyersdorf	Former Natural Resource Specialist (Subsistence), AFO
Jenny H. Blanchard	Archaeologist, AFO
Stephen L. Fusilier	Former Lands Branch Manager, AFO
Bruce Seppi	Wildlife Biologist, AFO
Laurie Thorpe	Natural Resource Specialist (Vegetation), AFO