

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR  
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT  
Klamath Falls Resource Area

**Draft Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI)  
Double J Fire Restoration & Rehabilitation Environmental Assessment  
#DOI-BLM-OR-L040-2014-06-EA**

## **Introduction**

The Klamath Falls Resource Area (KFRA) of the Lakeview District, Bureau of Land Management (BLM) has conducted an environmental analysis to evaluate the impacts of implementing restoration and rehabilitation activities within the Double J Fire area. The fire was ignited by lightning on August 22, 2013, and burned 140 acres of primarily juniper and sagebrush habitat. The EA analyzes two alternatives, the No Action Alternative, and the Proposed Action, which consists of herbicide application and seeding with native grass and brush species.

## **Plan Conformance and Consistency**

This proposed action is subject to the following land use plan(s): Klamath Falls Resource Area Resource Management Plan (RMP) and Environmental Impact Statement, approved in September 1994. The proposed action has been determined to be in conformance with this RMP as required by regulation (43 CFR 1610.5-3(a)).

## **Context**

The Proposed Action would implement herbicide treatment and seeding only on BLM lands within the Double J Fire. The 130-acre treatment area is within the Klamath Falls Field Office area, and does not include any wilderness or lands with other special designations. Imazapic application and seeding would take place in Fall 2014.

## **Intensity**

I have considered the potential intensity/severity of the impacts anticipated from Double J Fire restoration and rehabilitation actions relative to each of the ten areas suggested for consideration by the CEQ:

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

The implementation of these treatments would be beneficial to most resources outlined in the EA. I have determined that none of the direct, indirect or cumulative impacts associated with the proposed action are significant, individually or combined.

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

The proposed action is located within a rural setting. The KFRA interdisciplinary team of resource specialists reviewed the effects of the herbicide (imazapic) treatment and based on

their findings, I have determined that the treatments proposed would not affect public health or safety.

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

The 130-acre project area does not contain park lands, prime farmlands, wetlands, wild and scenic rivers, or ecologically critical areas. Cultural resource surveys were conducted and one archaeological site was recorded. The site is outside the area proposed for treatment and will not be impacted.

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

Scoping for the proposed action and background information was sent to known affected and interested publics. Two letters of comment were received in response. After review of the scoping comments and the EA analysis, I have determined that the effects described in the EA are not highly controversial.

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

Post-fire restoration projects are common actions authorized by the BLM, and similar actions have been implemented in similar areas. The analysis provided in the attached EA does not indicate that this action would involve any 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.***

The Proposed Action would not establish a precedent for future actions on KFRA-managed lands. This analysis would be used for the implementation of treatments within the Double J Fire only.

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

The actions considered in the selected alternative were considered by the interdisciplinary team within the context of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions. Significant cumulative effects are not anticipated.

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

The Proposed Action does not have adverse effects on any cultural sites listed on the National Register of Historic Places or sites known to be eligible.

**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 ESA of 1973.***

There are no terrestrial threatened or endangered listed, proposed, candidate species or designated critical habitat under the Endangered Species Act (as amended USDI Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) 1973) that occur within the project area or that would be affected from project activities.

**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 violate any known Federal, State, local or tribal law or requirement imposed for the protection of the environment. Local tribes were consulted and are listed in the EA. In addition, the project is consistent with applicable land management plans, policies, and programs.

## **DRAFT Finding of No Significant Impact Determination**

I have reviewed the Double J Fire Restoration & Rehabilitation EA (DOI-BLM-OR-L040-2014-06), dated March 2014. On the basis of the information contained in the EA, it is my determination that: (1) implementation of the Proposed Action will not have significant environmental impacts beyond those already addressed in the KFRA RMP; (2) the Proposed Action is in conformance with the RMP; 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 RMP and Environmental Impact Statement is not necessary and will not be prepared.

This finding is based on my consideration of the Council on Environmental Quality's (CEQ) criteria for significance (40 CFR 1508.27), both with regard to the context and to the intensity of the impacts described in the EA or as articulated in the letters of comment.

---

Donald J. Holmstrom  
Field Manager, Klamath Falls Resource Area

---

Date