

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

Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI)
Norcross Pasture Boundary Fence Environmental Assessment
#DOI-BLM-OR-L040-2013-02-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 constructing approximately 0.8 mile of fence to keep the livestock herds in distinct areas of the Norcross pasture. The EA analyzes two alternatives, the Proposed Action, and the No Action alternative.

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 construction of approximately 0.8 mile of fence within the Norcross pasture on BLM lands, adjacent to private lands. The project area is within the Klamath Falls Resource Area (KFRA), and does not include any wilderness or lands with other special designations.

Intensity

I have considered the potential intensity/severity of the impacts anticipated from constructing the Norcross pasture fence relative to each of the ten areas suggested for consideration by the CEQ:

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

The construction of the proposed fence line would be beneficial to most resources, as 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 proposed fence construction. Based on their findings, I have determined that this project 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 project area does not contain park lands, prime farmlands, wetlands, wild and scenic rivers, or ecologically critical areas. Cultural resource surveys were conducted and no sites were found in the project area.

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

Scoping was conducted with the Horsefly Allotment permittees and consultation is ongoing with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. I have determined that the effects described in the EA are not highly controversial, and would be beneficial.

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

Fence construction 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 construction of Norcross pasture fence described in the EA.

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

The Proposed Action was 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.*

The proposed fence installation will have a beneficial effect on the ESA-listed endangered Shortnose Sucker (*Chasmistes brevirostris*) and associated Designated Critical Habitat adjacent to the Norcross Pasture. There are no aquatic or 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 adversely 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. In addition, the project is consistent with applicable land management plans, policies, and programs.

Finding of No Significant Impact Determination

I have reviewed the Norcross Pasture Boundary Fence EA (DOI-BLM-OR-L040-2013-02-EA), dated April 2014. I have reviewed the Biological Opinion for Grazing Management on the BLM Lakeview District, Klamath Falls resource Area, issued September 25, 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.

/s/ Richard White

Richard White
Field Manager, Klamath Falls Resource Area

10/6/2014

Date