

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR  
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT  
EAGLE LAKE FIELD OFFICE

**FINDING OF NO SIGNIFIGANT IMPACT**

**Little Cleghorn Stewardship Project  
Forest Health Improvement and Hazardous Fuels Reduction  
DOI-BLM-CA-N050-2016-05-EA**

**BACKGROUND**

The Eagle Lake Field office had identified the need for mechanical treatments and prescribed fire fuels reduction treatments to reduce high densities of Jeffrey pine (*Pinus jeffreyi*) and high fuel loadings within a 558 acre project area. The vegetative composition and structure within the Little Cleghorn analysis area has undergone dramatic changes within the last one hundred fifty years. These changes include increased tree density, canopy cover, and surface and ladder fuel loadings, as well as, decreased canopy base height (CBH).

This project would reduce high densities of Jeffrey pine and reduce surface, ladder, and canopy fuel loadings within a 558 acre project area. The primary objective of the project is to reduce the existing hazardous fuel conditions and restore the natural function and biotic integrity of the Jeffrey pine ecosystem within the 558-acre project area. Reduction in Jeffrey pine stocking levels and reduction in surface and ladder fuel loadings in the Little Cleghorn Stewardship project area would break up and reduce the existing continuous fuel loadings, create a more open stand structure and allow the area to trend to a vegetative composition more characteristic of historic conditions.

**FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT DETERMINATION**

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 Eagle Lake RMP; (2) the Proposed Action is in conformance with the Eagle Lake 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 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.

**Context**

This project would reduce high densities of Jeffrey pine and reduce surface, ladder, and canopy fuel loadings within a 558 acre project area.

**Intensity**

The following discussion is organized around the 10 Significance Criteria described at 40 CFR 1508.27. The following have been considered in evaluating intensity for this proposal:

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

The implementation of the Proposed Action would be beneficial to most resources outlined in the EA. Some potential impacts include minor vegetation removal, soil disturbance, air quality associated with burning and heavy equipment use. However, none of these impacts would be significant at the local scale or cumulatively because of the small scale of the project and project design features that would minimize the impacts to slight levels.

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

No aspects of the Proposed Action have been identified as having the potential to significantly and adversely impact public health or safety.

**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.**

The Proposed Action will not significantly affect resources, wilderness characteristics or any critical areas.

**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 scientifically controversial. Recreational activities are already occurring in these areas and will not be highly controversial.

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

Thinning projects are common in the ELFO. The analysis does not show that these actions would involve any unique or unknown risks. Consultations were conducted with local tribal interests. No anticipated effects have been identified that are highly controversial.

**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 ELFO managed lands. This analysis will be used for implementing the proposed action only.

**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 Eagle Lake 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 the Proposed Action will result in actions that will threaten such a violation.

/s/ Emily Ryan

4/15/2016

---

Emily Ryan, Acting Field Manager  
Eagle Lake Field Office

---

Date