

Categorical Exclusion Review

National Environmental Policy Act No. DOI-BLM-AK-9630-2009-0001-CX

BLM Office: Alaska State Office AK 963 Serial/Case File No. AA-86684

Title of Proposed Action: 2160.01 Acquisitions of Conservation Easements

Location of Proposed Action: Soldotna, Alaska/ Lot 1 of R&L Subdivision according to Plat 2008-75, filed in the Kenai Recording District, Third Judicial District, State of Alaska./06001134.

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.

/s/ Jolie Pollet Date: January 8, 2009

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

Remarks:

/s/ Mark Fulmer Date: January 8, 2009

(I do concur) Mark Fulmer, Acting Branch Chief, Lands & Realty Branch

Remarks:

Screening for Extraordinary Circumstances: Will this project...

<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	
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.