Categorical Exclusion Review

National Environmental Policy Act Nn.DOI-BLM-AK-963-2009-0004-CX

BLM Office: Alaska State Office AK 963 Serial/Case File No. AA-90831

Title of Proposed Action: 2160.01 Acquisitions of Conservation Easements from Uganik Natives Inc.

Location of Proposed Action: Parcels 3A located in T. 21 S., R. 20 W., and Parcel 3B, located in T. 21 S., R. 19 W., Seward Meridian, on Afognak Island, Alaska.

Description of Proposed Action: On-going administration of the Exxon Valdez Oil Spill Restoration plan and implementation of the decisions of the Exxon Valdez Oil Spill Trustee Council. The BLM is to acquire a conservation easement for the subject land with the fee title to be acquired by the State of Alaska.

Applicant (if any): State of Alaska

NEPA REVIEW.

Categorical exclusion review. This proposed action qualifies as a categorical exclusion under 516 DM 2, Appendix 3 Departmental Categorical Exclusion 1.7 (CX number). It has been reviewed under 516 DM 2, Appendix 2 (see reverse), and determined that none of the extraordinary Circumstances exceptions described apply.

acting for Date: April 3, 2009

Jolie Pollet, Supervisory Planner & Environmental Coordinator,
Division of Resources

Remarks:

US Forest Service, as a representative of the Exxon Valdez Oil Spill Trustee Council has determined that the action is consistent with the Exxon Valdez Oil Spill Restoration Plan and Environmental Impact Statement published in November 1994 and determined that it meets the criteria for the attached Categorical Exclusion.

Carolyn J. Spoon Date: 4/3/09

(I do/do not concur) Branch Chief, Lands & Realty Branch

Remarks:

Screening for Extraordinary Circumstances: Will this project...

Yes	No		
☐	X	1)	Have significant adverse effects 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?
☐	X	8)	Have significant impacts on species listed, or proposed to be listed, on the List of Threatened or Endangered Species; or have significant impacts on designated Critical Habitat for these species?
☐	X	9)	Violate a Federal, State, local, or tribal law or requirement imposed for the protection of the environment?
☐	X	10)	Have a disproportionately high and adverse effect on low income or minority populations (Executive Order 12898)?

All of the above questions must be answered negatively before the Categorical Exclusion may be approved.