

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

**Draft Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI)
Stove Springs CCC Road Environmental Assessment
#DOI-BLM-OR-L040-2013-24-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 relocating a BLM easement road out of a wet meadow riparian area and constructing a new road segment in an adjacent upland area. The EA analyzes two alternatives, the No Action Alternative and the Proposed Action.

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)).

The Wyden Amendment (Public Law 109-54, Section 434) authorizes the BLM to enter into cooperative agreements to benefit resources within watersheds on BLM lands.

Context

This segment of the Stove Springs CCC Road is located on private inholdings adjacent to BLM lands in the Gerber Reservoir watershed. This project would not result in any change to BLM or public egress or ingress. The project would assist both landowner and BLM (easement owner) in achieving the joint objective of reduced sediment and nutrient loading in Barnes Creek and Gerber Reservoir, known to support shortnose suckers, an endangered fish species listed under the Endangered Species Act. The project is within the Klamath Falls Resource Area, 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 Stove Springs CCC Road 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. I have determined that the actions 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 project area does not contain park lands, prime farmlands, wild and scenic rivers, or ecologically critical areas. The project is proposed to benefit a wetland area by relocating the existing road out of a wet meadow. Cultural resource surveys were conducted and no archaeological sites will 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. No comments were received in response. After review of the 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.*

Road relocation, rehabilitation, and 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 implementation of the Stove Springs CCC Road Relocation project 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 threatened or endangered listed, proposed, candidate species or designated critical habitat under the Endangered Species Act (as amended USDI Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) 1973) that occur within the project area or that would be affected from project activities. The USFWS conducted Section 7 Intra-Service Consultation for potential downstream effects to the shortnose sucker and designated critical habitat, and concluded that the project is expected to be beneficial.

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 Stove Springs CCC Road Environmental Assessment (#DOI-BLM-OR-L040-2013-24-EA), 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