



United States
Department
of the Interior

Bureau of Land
Management



United States
Department of
Agriculture

U.S. Forest
Service

August 2003

Finding of No Significant Impact

Portneuf Westbench Fuels Management Project

EA# ID-075-2003-009

Gateway Interagency Fire Front,
Pocatello Field Office, Bureau of Land Management.
Westside Ranger District, Caribou-Targhee National Forest

The setting of this project is localized, with implications to the immediate treatment areas only. The people most affected by the treatments will be local residents and local public land users. After considering the environmental effects described in the Portneuf Westbench Fuels Management Environmental Analysis and the entirety of the Project Planning Record, we have determined that these actions will not have a significant impact on the quality of the human environment considering the context and intensity of impacts (40 CFR 1508.27). Thus, an environmental impact statement (EIS) will not be prepared.

Philip Damon, Field Manager, Pocatello Field Office, Upper Snake River District Date

Jerald Tower, District Ranger, Westside Ranger District, Caribou-Targhee NF Date

We base our findings on the following:

Factors Considered	Intensity (How Much of an Impact)	Reasons the Action is Not Significant
Firefighter and Public Health & Safety	<i>Firefighter and public safety will be improved due to the reduced risk of high intensity wildland fire (EA & Specialists Reports)</i>	<i>The proposed action and alternative would not significantly affect public health and safety but would reduce current and expected risks.</i>
Unique Characteristics <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Historic or cultural resources • Native American Religious Concerns • Parklands, Prime farmlands • Wild & Scenic Rivers • Ecologically critical areas 	<i>No Parklands, Prime farmlands, Wild & Scenic Rivers, Wilderness Areas, or Ecologically critical areas are within the treatment areas, therefore none would be impacted. Cultural resource surveys have been completed within the treatment areas. Design Criteria would avoid sites. Government to government consultation has occurred.</i>	<i>Not significant because sites would be avoided</i>
Effects likely to be highly controversial?	<i>There is no substantial scientific controversy over the effects of this proposal.</i>	<i>Since there is no scientific controversy related to the effects disclosed in the EA, there is no significant effect.</i>
Beneficial & Adverse Effects	<i>Both beneficial and adverse effects have been considered</i>	<i>This finding of no significant impact is not biased by my consideration of benefits versus adverse effects.</i>
Precedent established for future actions?	<i>These actions do not set any precedent for future actions.</i>	<i>Not Significant.</i>

Factors Considered	Intensity (How Much of an Impact)	Reasons the Action is Not Significant
Impacts highly uncertain or involve unique or unknown risks	<i>Similar projects in the Pocatello WUI have exhibited the desired change in wildfire behavior by reducing rate of spread and intensity of the fire.</i>	<i>Not significant because in our experience with this type of project, effects are not uncertain and we are not taking unique or unknown risks.</i>
Cumulatively significant?	<i>A small percentage of the total analysis area is being treated. Effects are expected to be similar to projects implemented in the past. This coupled with the design criteria and the small overall percentage of vegetation being treated result in no significant cumulative impacts.</i>	<i>Not significant. Based on the effects disclosed in the EA, specialists' reports and supporting documentation in the project planning record, there are no cumulative impacts.</i>
Loss or destruction of significant scientific, cultural or historical resources (NHPA consistency)	<i>No sites will be impacted.</i>	<i>Not significant because no sites will be impacted.</i>
Adversely affect T&E species or habitat? (ESA consistency)	<i>The Proposed Action with its design criteria does not negatively impact habitat.</i>	<i>Not significant.</i>
Consistent with Federal, State or local laws for the protection of the environment? <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • National Forest Management Act • Federal Land Policy and Management Act • Clean Water Act • Clean Air Act 	<i>Yes – The proposed action would be consistent with the Revised Forest Plan, Pocatello RMP, and with applicable state and federal laws.</i>	<i>Not significant, the action is consistent with applicable laws.</i>
Environmental Justice (E.O. 12898).	<i>Considered and not impacted.</i>	<i>The alternative would not significantly impact environmental justice.</i>