

**U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management**

**Determination of NEPA Adequacy and FONSI
DOI-BLM-NV-L030-2011-0001-DNA
October 7, 2010**

**Mail Fire
Emergency Stabilization
and Rehabilitation Project**

43 CFR 4180.1 Fundamentals of Rangeland Health.

Lincoln County, Nevada

Ely District Office
Ely, Nevada
Phone: (775) 289-1800
Fax: (775) 289-1910



DOI-BLM-NV-L030-2011-0001-DNA

Worksheet
Determination of NEPA Adequacy (DNA)
U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management

OFFICE: Ely District

TRACKING NUMBER: DOI-BLM-NV-L030-2011-0001-DNA

CASEFILE/PROJECT NUMBER:

PROPOSED ACTION TITLE/TYPE: Mail Fire Emergency Stabilization and Rehabilitation Project. 43 CFR 4180.1 Fundamentals of Rangeland Health.

LOCATION/LEGAL DESCRIPTION: T03S, R60E, sec 7, T03S, R59E, sec 1, 12

APPLICANT (if any):

A. Description of the Proposed Action and any applicable mitigation measures:

The proposed treatment is to aerially seed approximately 56 acres with a mixture of native and introduced grass and forb seeds. Rock outcrops and significant unburned islands will be avoided by the seeding treatment. Aerial seeding would occur ahead of or concurrent with fall or winter moisture. Due to the small size of the burn, no control plots will be located in the aerial seeding treatment area.

As soon as possible after the aerial seeding treatment, the seeded area will be ATV harrowed to incorporate the seeds into the soil. The proposed ATV harrow areas would be inventoried to Class III standards per order of the protocol agreement between the Ely BLM/FO and the Nevada SHPO (Appendix F, Section J). Any sites containing cultural resources located within the treatment area will be flagged and avoided.

The fire burned 56 acres in the Irish Mountain allotment (allotment number 11006). The Irish Mountain Allotment is open to Cattle from 3/1-2/28 and sheep from 10/1-2/28. The burned area will be closed to grazing until monitoring data indicates that vegetation recovery objectives have been met. The grazing closure will be by agreement, and is not expected to be controversial.

The burned area will be monitored for treatment effectiveness.

B. Land Use Plan (LUP) Conformance

LUP Name: Ely District Resource
Management Plan

Date Approved: August 20, 2008

The proposed project is consistent with the following Plan goals and objectives:

Weed Management:
Objectives-

DOI-BLM-NV-L030-2011-0001-DNA

- To reduce introduction of and the areal extent of noxious and invasive weed populations and the spread of these populations. (Page 109)

Soil Resources:

Objectives-

- To ensure that soils throughout the planning area exhibit infiltration and permeability appropriate to the soil type, with erosion and compaction having minimal effect on soil quality. (Page 24)

Vegetation Resources/General Vegetation Management:

Objectives-

- Manage vegetation resources to achieve or maintain resistant and resilient ecological conditions while providing for sustainable multiple uses and options for the future across the landscape. (Page 26)

Livestock Management:

Objectives- To allow livestock grazing to occur in a manner and at levels consistent with multiple use, sustained yield, and the standards for rangeland health. (Page 86)

Resource Program Best Management Practices:

Soil Resources-

- “Manage activities, uses, and authorizations on burned areas to best meet resource management objectives established for the area in specific stabilization, restoration, or activity plans. The BLM authorized officer may open areas to livestock grazing based upon those considerations.” (A.1-9)

The proposed action is specifically provided for in the following management decisions:

FM-3 (4): Emergency stabilization and rehabilitation- design and implement to achieve vegetation, habitat, soil stability, and watershed objectives in accordance with the Programmatic Emergency Stabilization and Rehabilitation Plan. (Page 107)

FM-5: In addition to fire, implement mechanical, biological, and chemical treatments along with other tools and techniques to achieve vegetation, fuels, and other resource objectives. (Page 108)

VEG-7: Determine seed mixes on a site-specific basis dependent on the probability of successful establishment. Use native and adapted species that compete with annual invasive species or meet other objectives. (Page 27)

Weeds:

WEED-2: Develop weed management plans that address weed vectors, minimize the movement of weeds within public lands, consider disturbance regimes, and address existing weed infestations. (Page 110)

WEED-3: When manual weed control is conducted, remove the cut weeds and weed parts and dispose of them in a manner designated to kill seeds and weed parts. (Page 110)

Monitoring-Noxious Weeds

“Monitoring of noxious and invasive weeds within the planning area will continue in cooperation with the State of Nevada, counties, and private interests as well as other federal agencies. Inventories to identify new introductions, distribution, and density of noxious weed populations will be carried out on an annual basis in cooperation with these entities as follows:

- Known noxious weed sites that are identified for treatment will be visited each year and evaluated for effectiveness of control.
- Known sites not identified for treatment will be visited as funding is available
- All known sites visited will be located with a global positioning system unit (or other suitable technology), measured, and a determination of the need for future treatment will be made.
- Inventories for new noxious weeds will be conducted within the planning area subject to funding. Emphasis will be placed on areas having a high potential for weed introduction and dispersal, such as road corridors and off-highway vehicle trails.
- All burned areas (natural and prescribed) will be surveyed for noxious weeds following the burn as funding becomes available. Any newly discovered sites will be located with a global positioning unit, measured, and a determination of the need for future treatment will be made. (Page 111)”

Monitoring-Livestock Grazing

“Monitoring will determine when grazing will be authorized in burned areas...” (Page 88)

In addition, management decisions for other resources and concerns that would possibly be impacted by the project were reviewed, and it was determined that the proposed action is in conformance with the Plan.

C. Identify applicable National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) documents and other related documents that cover the proposed action.

The proposed action was analyzed in the Ely Proposed Resource Management Plan/Final Environmental Impact Statement (November 2007), which states:

- "In locations where intense fires occur, short term water repellency may result. Development and implementation of emergency stabilization and rehabilitation projects would reduce these impacts. The effects of fires on soil erosion would be reduced by implementation of planned fire projects and rehabilitation efforts. Long term soil quality would improve with greater moisture infiltration as herbaceous cover is restored."(4.4-5)
- "...drought conditions or unplanned grazing damage before seedlings are well established could reduce the success and create the need for repeated treatment on the same area." (4.5-1)
- "Within the Great Basin ecological system, the greatest threats to the sagebrush communities are the spread of cheatgrass and pinyon/juniper expansion into

sagebrush (Rowland and Wisdom 2005). Where invasive species, primarily cheatgrass, dominate the understory, the invasive species would be removed to the extent practicable and replaced with perennial herbaceous species.” (4.5-4)

- Management in Sagebrush communities- “All tools, techniques, or combinations thereof may be applied to achieve desired vegetation conditions.” (4.5-6)
- “Vegetation treatments may be applied on either a localized or widespread basis to achieve the desired ranges of vegetation conditions discussed in Section 2.5. These treatments could involve any of the tools identified in Appendix G, individually or in combination. Various types of tools may be applied to modify vegetation conditions in relatively small areas and improve habitat to desired ranges of vegetation conditions. In the short term, localized vegetation treatments would generally benefit special status wildlife species by increasing quantity and quality of herbaceous forage and ground cover, and improve breeding and seasonal habitats for wildlife in the long term.” (4.7-4)
- Under the proposed RMP, restoration and habitat management within sagebrush habitats to achieve desired future conditions for greater sage-grouse would increase herbaceous forage, cover, and shrub structure for sagebrush-dependent special status species.” (4.7-10)
- Vegetation treatments would be applied in both upland and riparian areas to achieve the desired ranges of conditions outlined in Section 2.4.5, Vegetation Resources. Depending on the specific location, treatments could include herbicide application, mechanical methods such as chipping, sawing, mowing, or mulching and prescribed fire. Mechanical methods may involve the use of heavy equipment, off-highway vehicles, hand tools, broadcast seeding, and planting of live vegetation.” (4.7-10)
- “Vegetation Treatment Tools and Techniques-Pulling-Where noxious weed infestations are small and conditions are conducive, manual pulling of weeds can be an effective non-invasive method of weed management. May also be used where other methods are prohibited.” (G-2)
- “Other Tools and Techniques-Administrative or Regulatory Tools-Temporary or permanent closure-Close sensitive areas to recreational, development, treatment, and other permitted activities during sensitive period.” (G-4)
- “An interdisciplinary team will then proceed to write both an Emergency Stabilization and a Rehabilitation plan that tier to the Normal Year Fire Rehabilitation Plan. As needed and determined appropriate by the interdisciplinary team, the plans may incorporate any or all of the following prescriptions: seed mixture (unless the prescribed seed mixture does not meet unique needs of the burned area), application rates, planting/seeding methods, costs, erosion control structures, protection fencing, and grazing adjustments beyond the normally prescribed minimum two growing seasons rest period.” (G-7)
- “If planting or seeding is necessary, the use of native species is preferable.” (G-7)
- “Cultural...clearances will be completed prior to project implementation. Emergency Stabilization and/or Rehabilitation activities that involve mechanized

surface disturbance greater than 10 centimeters in depth will require a cultural survey. Any archaeological resources discovered will be marked and avoided by ground disturbing equipment or will be relocated.” (G-8)

- “All revegetated areas as well as areas that have been burned but not revegetated may be closed to grazing until resource objectives are achieved or another course of action is determined if objectives are not met. The grazing closure must be initiated the growing season following the season in which the wildfire burned. Monitoring data will determine when a closed area is reopened for grazing. Grazing closures following a wildfire may be necessary in order to allow for vegetation recovery of both seeded and non-seeded species as well as to protect soil, water, and other range resources. Recovery objectives should be established for each Emergency Stabilization and Rehabilitation Plan. Annual assessments of the burn area should be established when the grazing closure is initiated and an interdisciplinary team should evaluate the burn area at the end of each growing season to determine if recovery objectives have been met. If objectives have not been met, it may be necessary to extend the grazing closure and continue annual evaluations to determine when recovery objectives have been met, at which point normal grazing may resume. The following methods of grazing closures should be evaluated on a case-by-case basis to determine which method, or combination of methods, is/are suitable for an Emergency Stabilization or Rehabilitation Plan.
 - C. Grazing deferment without repair or construction of fence(s). In certain cases fencing may not be necessary in order to achieve grazing closure. A grazing deferment may be achieved in some locations by changing water supply for wildlife or changing grazing rotations for livestock. This method should be evaluated on a case-by-case to determine whether or not it will achieve an effective grazing closure and allow for vegetation recovery.” (G-9)
- “Seeding may be necessary in order to stabilize the soils or reestablish a desirable perennial plant community within a reasonable time frame. Seeding may also be used to prevent spread of non-native invasive weeds within the fire area by providing competing vegetation.” (G-10)
- “Seed mixes should be created on a site-specific basis taking into account the pre-fire vegetation community, probability of success, wildlife needs, the presence or absence of invasive species, and site characteristics on a watershed scale. A mixture of native and introduced species may be used for site stabilization or rehabilitation.” (G-11)
- “Aerial seeding involves the spread of seed from a helicopter or fixed-wing aircraft. This method of seeding is most effective for large areas where a rangeland drill cannot be used.” (G-11)
- “Seed mixes may be spread by hand or from an all-terrain vehicle, tractor, or truck-mounted spreader.” (G-12)
- “A harrow device can be used to cover seed at some sites, allowing for better seed germination and establishment.” (G-12)
- “Seeding may be used to prevent the establishment of invasive species.” (G-15)

The proposed action was analyzed in the Environmental Assessment for the 2006 Emergency Stabilization and Rehabilitation Projects for Forty-Six (46) Wildfires in Lincoln, Nye and White Pine Counties (October, 2006).

- “Native vegetation communities damaged by the fire would benefit from the proposed action by the interruption of the cheatgrass/red brome invasion cycle through seeding competitive, perennial grass and forb species. Seeded grass or forb species could be native or introduced depending on suitability for the particular area. (Page 24)
- “Under the proposed action, vegetative communities would be more quickly established through the different seeding methods, protection from grazing by livestock and wild horses and monitoring for weeds. This would lessen the risk of accelerated soil loss by wind and water erosion, lessening the risk for loss of site potential due to soil degradation.” (Page 25)
- “It is likely that annual grass establishment would be decreased. Because annual grasses carry fires, reduced annual grass density would be expected to decrease fire frequency.” (Page 25)
- “Under the proposed action, noxious weed and invasive plant populations would be identified, and treatments would be proposed through plan amendments or subsequent rehabilitation plans sooner than if the proposed action were not selected. Seeding treatment in conjunction with monitoring would be an effective way to combat noxious weeds. Once established, seeded perennial plants would provide competition for invading species and help to prevent the area from being dominated by annual grasses and a more frequent fire regime.” (Page 29)
- “The proposed actions of controlling weeds and invasive annual grasses and reestablishment of desirable, site-appropriate perennial plants would aid in the restoration of fire regimes to a more historic range of variability.” (Page 34)
- “The reseeding/rehabilitation efforts of 2005, 2006 and future fires would aid in cumulatively improving the health of the rangeland ecosystems managed by the Ely Field Office.” (Page 34)
- “The proposed actions of controlling weeds and invasive annual grasses and reestablishment of desirable, site-appropriate perennial plants would aid in the restoration of fire regimes to a more historic range of variability.” (Page 34)

The proposed action is in conformance with the Department of the Interior BLM Emergency Stabilization and Burned Area Rehabilitation Handbook H-1742-1 (February 2, 2007).

The proposed action is in conformance with the State Protocol Agreement between the Bureau of Land Management, Nevada and the Nevada State Historic Preservation Office (January 2005) which states, "Any fire rehabilitation activities...that do not involve mechanized surface disturbance, will not be inventoried...activities involving more than 10cm depth of mechanized surface disturbance will be handled to Class III standards." (Page 42)

D. NEPA Adequacy Criteria

1. Is the new proposed action a feature of, or essentially similar to, an alternative analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)? Is the project within the same analysis area, or if the

project location is different, are the geographic and resource conditions sufficiently similar to those analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s)? If there are differences, can you explain why they are not substantial?

Yes No Documentation of answer and explanation:

The proposed emergency stabilization and rehabilitation project for the Mail fire is located in a pinyon pine/juniper and sagebrush dominated community. The burn area is not located at a site specifically identified in the Ely District Record of Decision and Approved Resource Management Plan (RMP) (August 2008); however, the RMP and Ely Proposed Resource Management Plan/Final Environmental Impact Statement PRMP/FEIS) (November 2007) analyzed the effects of intense fire on resources within the Ely District and stated that "all major vegetation types would improve through vegetation manipulation and resource management systems".

The Environmental Assessment for the 2006 Emergency Stabilization and Rehabilitation Projects for Forty-Six (46) Wildfires in Lincoln, Nye and White Pine Counties (October, 2006) analyzed the effects of various treatments on fires in similar vegetation types, elevations, soil types and wildlife habitats to those on the Mail Fire. While treatments varied by specific fires covered under the EA, treatments similar to the potential treatments on the Mail Fire were assessed including, aerial seeding, ATV harrowing, livestock closures, and monitoring. For example, the Hambly Fire, the Mustang Fire, the Range Fire, and the Rocky Fire were covered under the EA and these fires were ATV harrowed, seeded, closed to livestock grazing, and monitored for treatment effectiveness. The Hambly Fire is located within 10 miles of the Mail Fire. The Springer Fire, which was also covered under the EA, is also located within 10 miles of the Mail Fire.

The environmental consequences of the Mail Fire are expected to be the same as those discussed within the Ely District Record of Decision and Approved Resource Management Plan (RMP) (August 2008), the Ely Proposed Resource Management Plan/Final Environmental Impact Statement PRMP/FEIS) (November 2007), and the Environmental Assessment for the 2006 Emergency Stabilization and Rehabilitation Projects for Forty-Six (46) Wildfires in Lincoln, Nye and White Pine Counties (October, 2006).

2. Is the range of alternatives analyzed in the existing NEPA document(s) appropriate with respect to the new proposed action, given current environmental concerns, interests, and resource values?

Yes No Documentation of answer and explanation:

The alternatives in the existing NEPA documents addressed the following current issues and concerns: depleted seed bank of native perennial species, noxious weed invasion, invasive annual grass dominance and corresponding changes to fire regimes, cultural resource concerns, prevention of over-utilization of the burned area by livestock and other grazing animals, and soil erosion. The alternatives discussed in the existing NEPA documents adequately addressed the

environmental concerns, interests, and resource values present at the Mail Fire burned area. Additional alternatives are not considered necessary.

3. Is the existing analysis valid in light of any new information or circumstances (such as, rangeland health standard assessment, recent endangered species listings, updated lists of BLM-sensitive species)? Can you reasonably conclude that new information and new circumstances would not substantially change the analysis of the new proposed action?

Yes No Documentation of answer and explanation:

To the best of the interdisciplinary team's knowledge, the existing analysis is valid in light of any new information or circumstances. All new information and new circumstances would not substantially change the analysis.

4. Are the direct, indirect, and cumulative effects that would result from implementation of the new proposed action similar (both quantitatively and qualitatively) to those analyzed in the existing NEPA document?

Yes No Documentation of answer and explanation:

The interdisciplinary team (listed below in section E) that assessed the current proposed action determined that the anticipated direct and indirect effects of the proposed action are substantially the same as identified in the existing NEPA documents. The existing NEPA documents analyze site conditions, treatments, and anticipated environmental consequences that are comparable to those at the Mail Fire burned area.

5. Are the public involvement and interagency review associated with existing NEPA document(s) adequate for the current proposed action?

Yes No Documentation of answer and explanation:

The public involvement and interagency review associated with the existing NEPA document(s) was determined by an interdisciplinary team to be adequate for the current proposed action.

E. Persons/Agencies /BLM Staff Consulted

Name	Title	Resource/Agency Represented
Benjamin Noyes	Wild Horse and Burro Specialist	Wild Horses/BLM
Brenda Linnell	Realty Specialist	Lands/BLM
Cameron Boyce	Rangeland Management Specialist	Range/BLM
Dave Jacobson	Wilderness Planner	Wilderness/BLM
David R Davis	Geologist	Geology/BLM
Elvis Wall	Tribal affairs	Tribal affairs/BLM
Melanie Peterson	Environmental Protection Specialist	Hazards/BLM
Zachary Peterson	Forester, NEPA Specialist	Forests, NEPA/BLM
Mark D'Aversa	Hydrologist	Hydrology/BLM
John R Miller	Outdoor Recreation Planner	Wilderness, recreation/BLM
Mindy Seal	Natural Resource Specialist	Weeds/BLM
Alicia Styles	Wildlife Biologist	Wildlife/BLM
Nicholas Pay	Cultural Resource Specialist	Archeology/BLM

Conclusion *(If you found that one or more of these criteria is not met, you will not be able to check this box.)*

- Based on the review documented above, I conclude that this proposal conforms to the applicable land use plan and that the NEPA documentation fully covers the proposed action and constitutes BLM's compliance with the requirements of the NEPA.

Signature of Project Lead

Signature of NEPA Coordinator

Signature of the Responsible Official:

Date

Note: The signed Conclusion on this Worksheet is part of an interim step in the BLM's internal decision process and does not constitute an appealable decision. However, the lease, permit, or other authorization based on this DNA is subject to protest or appeal under 43 CFR Part 4 and the program-specific regulations.

**UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
ELY DISTRICT OFFICE**

INTRODUCTION

I have reviewed the Determination of NEPA Adequacy (DNA) DOI-BLM-NV-L030-2011-0001-DNA, for the Emergency Stabilization and Rehabilitation on the 2010 Mail Fire, dated September 2010, taking into consideration the project design specifications, including minimization or mitigation measures identified in the applicable NEPA documents listed in Section C of the DNA:

I have also considered the Council on Environmental Quality's (CEQ) criteria for significance (40 CFR 1508.27), both with regard to the context and the intensity of impacts described in the EA:

Context:

The Mail Fire burned a total of 56 acres approximately 12 miles north of Hiko, NV. All acres that burned were on BLM administered land. There are several historical burns within 10 miles of the Mail Fire, including the Seaman 1 Fire (15,663 acres, 1984), Davis Cabin Fire (1,445 acres, 1985), Mail Fire (50 acres, 1988), Mail Summit 1 Fire (993 acres, 2002), Mail Summit 2 Fire (686 acres, 2004), Mail Summit Fire (137 acres, 2005), Mail Summit 3 Fire (522 acres, 2006), Springer Fire (5,496 acres, 2006), the Hambly Fire (22,215 acres, 2006), the Jacob Fire (407 acres, 2008), and the Irish Fire (484 acres, 2008).

A field tour of the burned area occurred on 8/24/2010.

Based on the field visit, the dominant vegetation in the burn area pre-fire was young pinyon juniper. This site was most likely a sagebrush site prior to pinyon juniper invasion. Cheatgrass (*Bromus tectorum*) was present underneath unburned shrubs but generally were not found in the spaces between the shrubs.

The non-native invasive annual grass, cheatgrass (*Bromus tectorum*), is present in the vicinity of the burned area, and was present in low densities within the burned area pre-fire. It is likely that seeds of this species remain viable within the seedbank in the burned area post-fire. These invasive annual grasses often increase in abundance following fire, and cause burned areas to become more susceptible to future fires, promoting increased fire frequency and further degradation of the native plant community (D'antonio and Vitousek 1992, Brooks et al. 2004). Without treatments, non-native species infestations may spread into new areas and establish over larger acreages.

Evidence from the 2008 Irish burn suggests that invasive annuals will most likely increase within the Mail Fire perimeter. Monitoring crews reported that the aerial seeding treatment on the Irish fire is on its way to being a successful treatment. Invasive annuals are present within the burn area; however, seeded species are becoming established within the burn perimeter.

Site stabilization is needed to protect soils from wind and water erosion. The fire burned across slopes and soils that possess a high erosion hazard. Because perennial vegetation

cover is an important component to control erosion on these soils, the burned area is at risk for loss of topsoil unless a perennial plant community can be established rapidly. The primary vegetative community was piñon juniper with a limited understory. As such, re-establishment of a perennial community will be slow in response without supplemental seeding. With the present lack of plant cover due to the fire, the burned area is at a higher risk for experiencing accelerated soil erosion. Establishing a desirable perennial plant community would improve the watershed condition, and initiate a trend towards the area meeting "Public Land Health Standards for soil and water".

Intensity: Provide Rationale for each Criteria

- 1) Impacts that may be both beneficial and adverse:
The DNA references an environmental assessment and an environmental impact statement that have considered both beneficial and adverse impacts of emergency stabilization and rehabilitation projects similar to the proposed project. Overall, the project will be beneficial to the environment. The project should improve desirable vegetation, minimize invasion of invasive annuals, and help stabilize fragile soils.
- 2) The degree to which the Proposed Action affects public health or safety:
There are no concerns for human life and safety caused by the effects of the fire. There are no infrastructures down-stream from the fire. Personnel involved with planning, implementation and monitoring of the burned area will follow applicable BLM safety standards.
- 3) Unique characteristics of the geographic area such as proximity to historical or cultural resources, parks lands, prime farmlands, wetlands, wild and scenic rivers, or ecologically critical areas:
The fire is located near Irish Mountain. It is anticipated that there are cultural resources within the area. If cultural resources are found, they will be avoided.
- 4) The degree to which the effects on the quality of the human environment are likely to be highly controversial:
The effects of emergency stabilization and rehabilitation actions following wildland fires are not highly controversial in that emergency stabilization and rehabilitation actions result in revegetation of burned areas, reduced erosion, and soil stabilization. The methods used for emergency stabilization and rehabilitation actions are accepted methods employed to meet resource or management objectives and are not considered highly controversial.
- 5) The degree to which the possible effects on the human environment are highly uncertain or involve unique or unknown risks:
The proposed project and its potential effects on the human environment are not uncertain and do not involve unknown risks since essentially the same actions have been implemented in the past with success.
- 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:
Given that the proposed action is essentially the same as past actions that have already been analyzed, it is unlikely that the proposed action would establish a precedent for future actions or effect a decision in principle about a future

consideration. Other emergency stabilization or rehabilitation projects, if they occur, would be subject to the same environmental assessment standards and independent decision making.

- 7) Whether the action is related to other actions with individually insignificant, but cumulatively significant impacts:
The proposed action is essentially the same as past actions that have been analyzed for cumulatively significant impacts. These past actions found no significant cumulative impacts. Other post fire rehabilitation/stabilization projects will also likely occur in the future. These projects seen together with other land disturbing activities in the area would not result in cumulatively significant impacts at the local or watershed scale.
- 8) The degree to which the action may adversely affect districts, sites, highways, structures, or objects listed in or eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places or may cause loss or destruction of significant scientific, cultural, or historic resources:
No districts, sites, highways, structures, or objects listed in or eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) were identified in the project area. The proposed action will not cause the loss or destruction of significant scientific, cultural, or historical resources.
- 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:
The location for the proposed action is not in threatened or endangered species' habitat.
- 10) Whether the action threatens a violation of Federal, State, local or tribal law or requirements imposed for the protection of the environment:
The proposed action will not violate or threaten to violate Federal, State, or local laws or requirements imposed for the protection of the environment.

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

I have concluded that the analysis in the documents listed in Section C of the DNA is sufficient to determine that the proposed action would not have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment.



Victoria Barr
Field Manager
Caliente Field Office

10.8.10

Date