

**SOUTH FORK WALLA WALLA
LANDOWNER ACCESS
FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT #OR-035-05-04**

The attached Environmental Assessment (EA) and its supporting materials contain a description of the proposed action, an analysis of expected impacts on land and resources, and mitigating measures to reduce those impacts.

In relation to context, I find that the project's affected regions is localized and the effects of implementation are relevant to people recreating and living in the area. There would be no societal or regional impacts and no impacts on potentially affected interests.

I have evaluated the effects of the proposed action, together with the proposed mitigating measures, against the tests of significance found at 40 CFR 1508.27. I have determined that:

1. The proposed action would cause no significant impacts, either beneficial or adverse; all impact would be minimal; most would be of short duration.
2. The proposed action would have no effect on public health or safety.
3. The proposed action would not affect unique characteristics of the geographic area.
4. The proposed action would have no highly controversial effects. The EA examines the issue of possible effects to Chinook Salmon which has the potential to generate controversy. The proposed mitigation is expected to render any controversy not significant.
5. The proposed action would have no uncertain effects and would not involve unique or unknown risks.
6. The proposed action is a routine and common project and does not establish a precedent for future actions.
7. The proposed action is not related to any other action being considered by BLM.
8. The proposed action would have no effect to any property listed on or eligible for listing on the national Register of Historic Places.
9. The proposed action would not significantly adversely affect an endangered or threatened species, or any habitat critical to an endangered or threatened species. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) in 2004 and NOAA Fisheries in 2005 concurred with the BLM in their respective Biological Opinions that allowing the land owners to drive up the SFWW River was a "Likely to Adversely Affect" determination. However, with the non-discretionary terms and conditions already in place for the No Action Alternative and any additional non-discretionary terms and conditions placed upon the BLM by USFWS and NOAA Fisheries as a result of new consultations on any chosen alternative, the BLM considers that any "adverse affect" would not be significant.
10. The proposed action does not violate any law or requirement imposed for the protection of the environment.

DETERMINATION

Therefore, I have determined that the proposed action, with the proposed mitigating measures, would not have any significant impacts on the human environment, and that an Environmental Impact Statement is not required. However, Alternative 2A would not be in accordance with the SFWW Plan Amendment (July 1992) and if chosen would require re-releasing this EA under the BLM planning regulations.

Field Manager, Baker Field Office, Vale District

Date