



# United States Department of the Interior

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT  
MEDFORD DISTRICT OFFICE  
3040 BIDDLE ROAD  
MEDFORD, OREGON 97504

## AQUATIC AND RIPARIAN HABITAT ENHANCEMENT (DOI-BLM-OR-M000-2009-0004-EA)

### FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT (FONSI)

May 2009

#### INTRODUCTION

On April 15, 2009 the Medford District released the Programmatic Aquatic and Riparian Habitat Enhancement Environmental Assessment (EA). The EA identifies a suite of activities to maintain and restore watershed conditions, establishes the scope and sideboards of the activities, and provides an analysis of the environmental consequences. The Programmatic EA does not include site specific projects. Rather the activities identified in this EA will be implemented in site specific projects identified in the future.

#### FINDING

On the basis of the information contained in the environmental assessment and after consideration of the comments received from the public, I find that Alternative 2 in the EA, the proposed action, will not result in significant impacts to the quality of the human environment. Thus, the Aquatic and Riparian Habitat Enhancement EA does not constitute a major federal action having a significant effect on the human environment and therefore an environmental impact statement (EIS) is not necessary and will not be prepared.

#### RATIONALE

This conclusion is based on my consideration of the Council on Environmental Quality's (CEQ) ten criteria for significance (40 CFR §1508.27), examining both the context and intensity of the actions and impacts. With regard to each:

*1) Impacts can be both beneficial and adverse and a significant effect may exist regardless of the perceived balance of effects.* The assessment has considered both beneficial and adverse impacts. The EA analysis found none of the individual or cumulative effects as being significant. The EA identified potential negligible, short term increases in turbidity and sediment during construction but long term reduction in sediment and long term benefits to aquatic resources.

*2) The degree of the impact on public health or safety.* No aspects of the project have been identified as having the potential to significantly and adversely impact public health or safety. Rather, proposed actions including road improvements will increase user safety.

3) *Unique characteristics of the geographic area.* No impacts to unique characteristics have been identified. As specific actions are identified, the site specific effects likewise will be identified and compared to the effects disclosed in the EA. If, at the site level, effects to unique resources are anticipated or uncertain, the project will be dropped or modified.

4) *The degree to which the effects on the quality of the human environment are likely to be highly controversial effects.* Public comments received were in support of this project; no controversial actions were identified.

5) *The degree to which the possible effects on the human environment are likely to be highly uncertain or involve unique or unknown risks.* The analysis does not show that this action would involve any unique or unknown risks. As specific actions are identified, the site specific effects, likewise, will be identified and compared to the effects disclosed in the EA. If, at the site level, effects are uncertain or unique the project will be dropped or modified.

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 decision will not set any precedents for future actions with significant effects. Actions in this decision were chosen because of the predictable effects to species and habitat regardless of location. Actions are consistent with actions identified by National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) and the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) in the Biological Opinion for Programmatic Consultation on Fish Habitat Restoration Activities in Oregon and Washington, CY2007-CY2012.

7) *Whether the action is related to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant impacts.* No significant cumulative impacts have been identified. All actions are intended to improve aquatic habitat and species distribution. However, if short term adverse effects add to existing or concurrent effects, generating significant cumulative effects, the project will be modified or dropped from consideration.

8) *The degree to which the action may adversely affect National Historic Register listed or eligible to be listed sites or may cause loss or destruction of significant scientific, cultural or historical resources.* Prior to any project implementation under this programmatic, a cultural resource survey would be completed and site-specific protection measures would be implemented to preserve the integrity of all recorded cultural sites.

9) *The degree to which the action may adversely affect ESA listed species or critical habitat.* All proposed projects would be consistent with actions identified by National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) (Fisheries BO 2008/03506) and the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)(Wildlife BO #13420-2007-F-0055 and Plant LOC 13420-2008-1-0136) for Programmatic Consultation on Fish Habitat Restoration Activities in Oregon and Washington.

10) *Whether the action threatens a violation of environmental protection law or requirements.* There is no indication that this decision will result in actions that will threaten such a violation.

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Timothy B. Reuwsaat  
District Manager  
Medford District, Bureau of Land Management

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Date