

**Finding of No Significant
Impact: Home Camp
Acquired Lands Projects
and Authorizations: DOI-
BLM-CA-N070-2012-0201-EA**

This page intentionally
left blank

Table of Contents

1. Finding of No Significant Impact	1
1.1. BACKGROUND	1
1.2. FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT	1
1.3. Context	1
1.4. Intensity	2
1.5. Signatures:	3

This page intentionally
left blank

Chapter 1. Finding of No Significant Impact

Home Camp Acquired Lands Projects and Authorizations

This page intentionally
left blank

DOI-BLM-CA-N070-2012-0201-EA

1.1. BACKGROUND

The Surprise Field Office acquired the Home Camp lands through purchase in 2009 with appropriations through the Southern Nevada Public Land Management Act (SNPLMA). The lands were acquired specifically to conserve and improve fish and wildlife habitat and to facilitate public access while maintaining multiple uses of public lands. Upon acquisition the lands became subject to the Surprise Field Office Resource Management Plan (SFO RMP) approved 2008. Since the lands were acquired for specific purposes, the Surprise Field Office is proposing projects and authorization that will start conservation efforts on these newly acquired lands. These projects will help the Surprise Field Office better conserve these lands for the purposes in which they were acquired.

1.2. FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

On the basis of the information contained in the EA, and all other information available to me, it is my determination that: (1) the implementation of the Proposed Action will not have significant environmental impacts beyond those already addressed in Surprise RMP; (2) the Proposed Action is in conformance with the Resource Management Plan; 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 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.

1.3. Context

The following projects and authorizations would occur on the Home Camp acquired lands approximately 15 miles east of Cedarville, CA.

Boulder Reservoir Recreational Enhancement Project: Recreation and fisheries improvement project.

Pinto Springs Riparian Protection and Habitat Enhancement Project: Riparian, spring and upland habitat improvement project.

Divine Spring Aspen Stand Habitat Enhancement Project: Juniper and aspen treatment project

Divine Spring Campground: Recreation site project

Temporary Authorizations for Livestock Grazing within fenced pastures: Temporary non-renewable authorization.

Corral Allotment Aspen Stand and Sage-Steppe Habitat Enhancement Project: Juniper and aspen treatment project.

1.4. Intensity

I have considered the potential intensity/severity of the impacts anticipated from the Home Camp Acquired Lands Projects and Authorizations decision 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 projects and authorizations would be beneficial to most resources outlined in the EA. Some potential impacts include vegetation removal, soil disturbance and temporary use authorizations. However, none of these impacts would be significant at the local scale or cumulatively because of the small scale of the project and mitigation measures that would reduce erosion and visual impacts to slight levels.

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

No aspects of the project have been identified as having the potential to significantly and adversely impact public health or safety. In fact, some projects such as the Boulder recreation project and the Divine Springs Campground are designed to enhance public health by providing safe established camping areas with sanitation facilities and informational signage.

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

Some of the project areas are adjacent to the Wall Canyon Wilderness Study Area; however, the projects will not significantly affect the wilderness characteristics or its eligibility for it to be a designated wilderness in the future. Some of the projects are in proximity to know eligible cultural resource sites; however, the projects will not significantly affect cultural resources. The Pinto Springs and Boulder Reservoir projects will have fences that will reduce potential impacts to the cultural resources that are currently present. A cultural resource specialist will be on site during all major ground disturbing activity at proposed site locations.

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

No anticipated effects have been identified that are highly controversial. Reservoir, fuels, and spring projects are common projects in the Surprise Field Office. Recreational activities are already occurring at the proposed recreation sites and improving these areas will not be highly controversial. The temporary non-renewable authorization for grazing on the fields are not highly controversial since the proposed utilization and time of use is considerably lower compared to its historical use.

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

Reservoir, springs, grazing, fuels and recreation projects are common in the Surprise Field Office. The analysis does not show that these actions 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 Surprise Field Office managed lands. Any future proposals on BLM-managed lands would require project-specific NEPA analysis.

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

No significant site specific or cumulative impacts have been identified. The project is consistent with the actions and impacts anticipated in the Surprise RMP, 2008.

8. The degree to which the action may adversely affect districts, sites, highways, structures, or objects listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places or may cause loss or destruction of significant scientific, cultural, or historic 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 Endangered Species Act of 1973.

No Threatened or Endangered Species are known to occur with the Action Area and projects are not expected to adversely impact any critical habitat for any Threatened or Endangered Species.

10. Whether the action threatens a violation of Federal, State, or local law or requirements imposed for the protection of the environment.

There is no indication that this decision will result in actions that will threaten such a violation.

1.5. Signatures:

Approved by:

Timothy J. Burke
Field Manager

6/18/2012]