

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

Fire Fuels Reduction by Goat Grazing at Auburn Recreation District Lands

CGB-EA-2020-010

Prepared by:

Date: 2/7/2020

William DeGrush Natural Resource Specialist Central California Area Office

Reviewed by:

MA

Date: 2/7/2020

Bradley Hubbard Chief, Resources Management Division Central California Area Office

Approved by:

Drew Lessard Area Manager Central California Area Office

Date: 2/7/2020

U.S. Department of the Interior Bureau of Reclamation Interior Region 10: California-Great Basin

January 2020

U.S. Department of the Interior Bureau of Reclamation Interior Region 10: California-Great Basin

January 2020

Background

In accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, as amended, the Bureau of Reclamation prepared an Environmental Assessment (EA) for the Fire Fuels Reduction by Goat Grazing at Auburn Recreation District Lands Project. The EA was prepared to examine the potential direct, indirect, and cumulative effects associated with allowing Auburn Area Recreation and Park District (ARD) to graze vegetation for fuel reduction on Reclamation lands per the January 2012 Managing Partner Agreement. The Managing Partner Agreement is an agreement between Reclamation and the California Department of Parks and Recreation to cooperate on the management of the lands at Folsom Lake, Lake Natoma, Auburn Dam and Reservoir lands. The Auburn Area Recreation and Park District (ARD) is a management district under the California Department of Parks and Recreation.

Alternatives Including the Proposed Action

No Action: Under the No Action Alternative, ARD would leave fuels unmanaged and hazardous conditions would persist.

Proposed Action: Reclamation proposes to allow ARD to graze vegetation for fuel reduction on Reclamation lands under the MPA. The Proposed Action consists of initiating grazing to control the annual grasses and weeds on approximately 42 acres of managed lands along the boundary of the City of Auburn (Figure 1). The Proposed Action is expected to be implemented as needed due to fuel loading and vegetation conditions.

Proposed Action includes:

- Contracting for periodic grazing animals under the MPA to help reduce fuels within at least 100 feet of fences along the adjacent private property line and residences in the Project Area. The operational definition of "periodic" could be defined as one to three grazing sessions per season; balancing the project's goals while preventing overgrazing will be paramount.
- Removing or thinning vegetation including weedy growth and grasses within the recreation areas and facilities under the MPA.
- ARD staff and the contractor will monitor the grazing animals, install electrified fencing where needed, and notification signs for residents and guests.
- Proper grazing techniques such as temporary fencing, rotation of goats, regular monitoring, and avoidance of overstocking or overgrazing (Lovreglio 2014).

FINDINGS

Based on the attached EA, 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 CFR 1500-1508), and Department of the Interior Regulations (43 CFR Part 46) and is hereby incorporated by reference. Following are the reasons why the impacts of the Proposed Action are not significant:

- 1. The Proposed Action will not significantly affect public health or safety (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(2)).
- 2. The Proposed Action will not significantly impact natural resources and unique geographical characteristics such as historic or cultural resources; parks, recreation, and refuge lands; wilderness areas; wild or scenic rivers; national natural landmarks; sole or principal drinking water aquifers; prime farmlands; wetlands (Executive Order (EO) 11990); floodplains (EO 11988); national monuments; migratory birds; and other ecologically significant or critical areas (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(3)).
- 3. The Proposed Action will not have possible effects on the human environment that are highly uncertain or involve unique or unknown risks (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(5)).
- 4. The Proposed Action will neither establish a precedent for future actions with significant effects nor represent a decision in principle about a future consideration (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(6)).
- 5. There is no potential for the effects to be considered highly controversial (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(4)).
- 6. The Proposed Action will not have significant cumulative impacts (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(7)).
- 7. The Proposed Action will not adversely affect any districts, sites, highways, structures, or objects listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(8). Pursuant to 54 USC § 306108, commonly known as Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, and its implementing regulations at 36 CFR Part 800, Reclamation determined the undertaking has no potential to cause effects to historic properties.
- 8. The Proposed Action will not negatively affect listed or proposed threatened or endangered species (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(9)).
- 9. The Proposed Action will not violate Federal, State, local law or requirements imposed for the protection of the environment (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(10)).

- 10. The Proposed Action will not affect any Indian Trust Assets (512 DM 2, Policy Memorandum dated December 15, 1993).
- 11. Implementing the Proposed Action will not disproportionately affect minorities or lowincome populations and communities (EO 12898).
- 12. 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 and 512 DM 3).