

Finding of No Significant Impact

Five-Year Fuels Management for Auburn Project Lands: Goat Grazing on 176 acres Auburn Shaded Fuel Break

California Great Basin - Interior Region 10 FONSI CGB-EA-2022-001

	Elizabeth Dyer
Prepared by:	Elizabeth Dyer
	Natural Resource Specialist
	Central California Area Office
Reviewed by:	
	Dan Cordova
	Chief, NEPA & Compliance Branch
	Central California Area Office
Reviewed by:	
,	Bradley Hubbard
	Chief, Resource Management Division
	Central California Area Office
Approved by:	
PP0, 04 0).	Drew Lessard
	Area Manager
	Central California Area Office

Background

In accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, as amended, the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation) prepared an Environmental Assessment (EA) for the Five-Year Fuels Management for Auburn Project Lands: Goat Grazing on 176 acres Auburn Shaded Fuel Break (SFB). Reclamation has decided that executing the SFB will not have a significant impact on the quality of the human environment, and consequently, an environmental impact statement will not be required.

Alternatives Including the Proposed Action

No Action: Under the No Action Alternative, Reclamation would not contract for goat grazing activities on 176 acres on Auburn Project Lands.

Proposed Action: Reclamation would contract for goat grazing as another type of treatment to address construction and maintenance of the SFB on Auburn Project Lands in Placer County, CA. This contract would include 176-acres of the SFB for goat grazing, from approximately 150- to 300-feet from the Federal Boundary Line into Auburn Project Lands at the wildland-urban interface. Thinning of the vegetation will provide for changing the forest structure to reduce the amount of grasses and other fuel load vegetation types and to increase the area where fire responders can access the community to protect structures from a wildland fire. Work would commence in the winter of 2021/2022 and be completed in approximately three months. The SFB would be maintained on an annual basis for five years, as funding and resources are available.

Findings

Based on the attached EA (CGB-EA-2022-001), Reclamation finds that the Proposed Action is not a major Federal action that will significantly affect the quality of the human environment, and preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement is not required. The EA describes the existing environmental resources at the location of the Proposed Action and evaluates the effects of the No Action and Proposed Action alternatives. The attached EA was prepared in accordance with National Environmental Policy Act, Council on Environmental Quality regulations (40 CFR1500-1508), and Department of the Interior Regulations (43 CFR Part 46) and is hereby incorporated by reference.

Reclamation considered Indian sacred sites, Indian Trust Assets, environmental justice, cultural resources and biological resources. Following are the reasons why the impacts of the Proposed Action are not significant, with respect to the affected environment and degree of effects of the action (40 CFR 1501.3(b)):

- 1. The Proposed Action will not significantly affect public health or safety (40 CFR 1501.3(b)(2)(iii)).
- 2. The Proposed Action will not violate federal, state, tribal, or local law protecting the environment (40 CFR 1501.3(b)(2)(iv)).
- 3. Pursuant to 54 United States Code Section (§) 306108, commonly known as Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, and its implementing regulations at 36 CFR §800.5(c),

Reclamation determined the proposed action would not have significant impacts on properties listed, or eligible for listing, on the National Register of Historic Places.

- 4. The Proposed Action will not affect any Indian Trust Assets (512 DM 2, Policy Memorandum July 2, 1993).
- 5. Implementing the Proposed Action will not disproportionately affect minorities or low income populations and communities (EO 12898 February 11, 1994).
- 6. The Proposed Action will not limit access to, and ceremonial use of, Indian sacred sites on Federal lands by Indian religious practitioners or significantly adversely affect the physical integrity of such sacred sites (EO 13007 May 24, 1996 and 512 DM 3 June 5, 1998).