

**UNITED STATES  
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR  
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT  
GRAND JUNCTION FIELD OFFICE**

**FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

**Gateway Canyons Resort  
Sundial Storm Water Diversion  
DOI-BLM-CO-N030 2014-0037-EA**

Based on the analysis of potential environmental impacts contained in the attached environmental assessment (EA), and considering the significance criteria in 40 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) §1508.27, I have determined that the Proposed Action will not have a significant effect on the human environment. An environmental impact statement is therefore not required.

**BACKGROUND**

The Bureau of Land Management (BLM) prepared an EA which analyzed the effects of issuing a right-of-way (ROW) grant for the proposed Gateway Canyons Resort, Sundial Subdivision Storm Water Diversion Project. The project would consist of two water diversion berms, an engineered drainage channel, and a relocated access road. The ROW would encompass 1.84 acres adjacent to the Gateway Canyons Resort in Gateway, Colorado. The EA considered the No Action alternative of denying the ROW grant application (no construction on public land) and the Proposed Action alternative of approving the proposed ROW. Public scoping was conducted by posting this project on the Grand Junction Field Office (GJFO) NEPA website. No comments were received from the public for this project.

**Intensity**

I have considered the potential intensity/severity of the impacts anticipated from the Gateway Canyons Resort Sundial Storm Water Diversion System relative to each of the ten areas suggested for consideration by the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ). The following findings have been made with regard to each of the ten CEQ considerations:

***1. Impacts that may be both beneficial and adverse.***

This project may have minor short term impacts to soils, vegetation, surface water quality, recreation, visual resources, and wildlife; however these impacts are not significant. This project will have a long term net benefit in controlling storm runoff damage on the Gateway Canyons Resort.

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

No impacts to public health and safety are expected. The project would help direct flood waters away from a future housing development.

***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.***

Inventories have been conducted for historic and cultural resources in the project area and none were identified. There are no park lands, prime farmlands, wetlands, wild and scenic rivers, wilderness areas, or other ecologically critical areas in the project area. The project area lies within the Dolores River Special Recreation Management Area (SRMA), but the project would have no direct effect on the SRMA.

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

Management of storm water runoff is a common practice with proven engineering practices to arrive at the desired hydrologic objectives. Therefore the environmental effects are not likely to be controversial.

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

Storm water runoff projects are widely used to protect natural resources and private investments. They pose no unique or unknown risks.

***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.***

This decision is like one of many that have previously been made and will continue to be made by BLM responsible officials regarding storm water management on public lands. The decision is within the scope of the Resource Management Plan and is not expected to establish a precedent for future actions. The decision does not represent a decision in principle about a future consideration.

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

There are no significant cumulative effects on the environment, either when combined with the effects created by past and concurrent projects, or when combined with the effects from natural changes taking place in the environment or from reasonably foreseeable future projects. The ongoing development on adjacent private property is not dependent upon this project and would proceed without the requested authorization. The potential for this small project to create significant cumulative effects is summarized below by resource:

- Soils: The short-term effects on soil resources would not add measurably to cumulative soil losses in the project area.
- Water: This project would not result in a detectable change in cumulative impacts to this watershed.
- Invasive Species: The project may result in a very minor, short-term, increase in invasive weed expansion, and would not add detectably to cumulative impacts from invasive species in the Gateway area.
- Threatened and Endangered Species (T&E) and Wildlife: Impacts from the proposed action would not result in impacts to T&E, BLM Sensitive Species, or wildlife that would be detectably different than the no-action alternative.
- Cultural, Paleontological Resources, and Native American Religious Concerns: The project would have no effect on these resources.

- Visual, Recreation, and Wilderness Resources: The proposed action would have only short-term impacts to visual resources and recreation activities. The proposed action is not located in an area found to have wilderness characteristics and would not add to cumulative impacts to wilderness resource values.
- Transportation/Access, Land Tenure and Rights-of-Way: The project would not result in impacts that would alter the cumulative impacts of the no-action alternative.

**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.**

There would be no adverse impacts to the above resources. The project has been inventoried for historic and cultural resources. No impacts to districts, sites, highways, structures, objects listed in the National Register of Historic Places, or significant scientific resources have been identified.

**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.**

No impacts are expected to endangered or threatened species or their designated critical habitats.

**10. Whether the action threatens a violation of Federal, State, or local law or requirements imposed for the protection of the environment.**

This decision complies with other Federal, State, or local laws and requirements imposed for the protection of the environment.

**FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

On the basis of the information contained in the EA, and all other information available to me, it is my determination that: 1) the implementation of the Proposed Action or alternatives will not have significant environmental impacts beyond those already addressed in the "Record of Decision and Resource Management Plan," (August, 2015); 2) the Proposed Action is in conformance with the Resource Management Plan; and 3) the Proposed Action does not constitute a major federal action having a significant effect on the human environment. Therefore, an environmental impact statement or a supplement to the existing environmental impact statement is not necessary and will not be prepared.

This finding is based on my consideration of the CEQ's criteria for significance (40 CFR §1508.27), both with regard to the context and to the intensity of the impacts described in the EA.



Field Manager  
Grand Junction Field Office

2-24-2016

Date