DECISION NOTICE AND FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT
Hotelling Gulch Fish Passage and Stream Restoration Project
U.S. Forest Service
Salmon/Scott River Ranger District
Klamath National Forest
Siskiyou County, California

The Hotelling Gulch Fish Passage and Stream Restoration Project was developed in response to the need for increased access to low gradient stream habitat for coho salmon and other anadromous fish in Hotelling Gulch, as well as improve natural stream function and the transport of watershed products to the South Fork Salmon River. The low gradient of this reach of the South Fork Salmon River makes it preferred habitat for Endangered Species Act-listed coho salmon, and Hotelling Gulch would likely be utilized for both spawning and rearing if it were accessible to the species. Currently, Hotelling has limited spatial and temporal connectivity for aquatic organisms. The current channel is also disconnected from the floodplain and groundwater and therefore is not attaining the optimal in-stream flow during critical summer months.

The project area includes about 500 feet of stream channel on Hotelling Gulch on the South Fork Salmon River within a five acre project area on the Salmon/Scott River Ranger District of the Klamath National Forest. It is within the South Fork Salmon River watershed, approximately 2.7 aerial miles southeast of the town of Forks of Salmon, California in Siskiyou County. See Appendix A for a map of the area to be treated and Appendix B for a list of project design features to be incorporated into the project design.

DECISION
Based upon my review of the Hotelling Gulch Fish Passage and Stream Restoration Project Environmental Assessment (EA), I have decided to implement Alternative 2, which will:

- Re-connect surface flows of Hotelling Gulch into one channel (the historical western alignment) within the natural valley low, and upgrade the undersized crossing at the Cecilville Road to a bridge, box culvert, or other design appropriate to the site. This new structure will fully span the reconstructed channel and allow for uninterrupted passage of watershed products (large wood and course sediment), as well as fish and other aquatic organisms.

- Re-construct approximately 550 feet of streambed in the historical western alignment which will result in a channel and floodplain area which will resemble a natural stream appropriate to the drainage area. An excavator will be used to construct the restored channel following designs that specify the appropriate grade and channel form. There is no expectation of channel maintenance following construction activities, the constructed channel will be designed to evolve in a dynamic manner in response to discharge, substrate movement, wood input, and natural events. This action includes abandoning or blocking off about
600 feet of channel in the existing (eastern) alignment. Abandonment of the eastern Hotelling Gulch channel will require installation of a lateral berm at the point of diversion to the western channel, and partial in-filling of the abandoned channel. The eastern channel alignment will be filled using excess material produced from channel and floodplain reconstruction activities.

- This action will include placement of woody debris (less than 18 inches in diameter) into the channel. This woody debris will be obtained from utilizing trees that are removed as part of project construction. They will be incorporated into pools to provide cover for rearing salmonids. The project will also restore channel complexity, which will create areas with gravel sized material suitable for spawning by adult salmonids.

DECISION RATIONALE

My rationale for choosing the selected alternative, as it responds to the purpose and need of the project (Page 2 of the EA), is described below.

Two alternatives were considered in detail in the Environmental Assessment for the Hotelling Gulch Fish Passage and Stream Restoration Project. In addition to the selected alternative (alternative 2), I considered alternative 1 (no action). In addition to these two alternatives that were discussed in detail, the interdisciplinary team also considered two alternatives that were dropped from detailed analysis. Please see page 4 of the EA to see a full description of the alternatives and a comparison of alternatives as related to the ability to meet the purpose and need.

Alternative 1 was not selected because it did not meet the stated purpose and need for the project. Under the no action alternative, there would be no improvement to fish passage or aquatic habitat within the project area. If no action is taken, Hotelling Gulch would continue to be disconnected from groundwater, and therefore not attaining the optimal in-stream flow for spatial and temporal connectivity for aquatic organisms.

The selected alternative complies with all applicable laws and regulations and is consistent with the Klamath National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan (Forest Plan, 1995 as amended). It is consistent with the Aquatic Conservation Strategy of the Forest Plan by proposing actions that are proactive in maintaining and restoring watershed processes as well as the species that depend upon high quality aquatic habitat. The selected alternative will meet the purpose and need of the project by improving fish passage and restoring aquatic habitat. The selected alternative will reconnect surface flows of Hotelling Gulch into one channel within a more natural valley at a lower elevation this will result in a channel and floodplain area which will resemble a natural stream appropriate to the drainage area. I believe that the EA appropriately details and adopts all practical means to avoid or minimize environmental harm.

I believe the EA presents an objective and well-documented analysis of environmental effects expected to result from implementation of the selected alternative. The analysis, including interrelated and interdependent actions, shows that the scenario depicted by the
selected alternative can effectively meet the purpose and need and restore the project area, while resulting in a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI). My conclusion is based on a review of the record that shows a thorough review of relevant scientific information, a consideration of responsible opposing views, and the acknowledgment of incomplete or unavailable information, scientific uncertainty, and risk.

The Hotelling Gulch Fish Passage and Stream Restoration Project EA documents the environmental analysis and conclusions upon which this decision is based.

PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

This action was originally listed as a proposal on the Klamath National Forest Schedule of Proposed Actions and updated periodically during the analysis. On February 12, 2016, the proposal was mailed to nearby landowners or claim owners, to four tribes and to the North Coast Water Quality Control Board for a 30-day public scoping period from 12 February to 14 March 2016. The proposal was posted on the Forest website on April 1, 2016, and first listed in the Schedule of Proposed Actions on April 1, 2016. The Forest did not receive any comments from the public as a result of scoping the proposed action.

The EA lists agencies and people consulted on page 3 in the public involvement section.

FINDINGS REQUIRED BY OTHER LAWS AND REGULATIONS

This decision is consistent with the Klamath National Forest Land Management Plan. The project was designed in conformance with the Aquatic Conservation Strategy.

A Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) and EA were considered. I determined these actions will not have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment, and an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) will not be prepared.
FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

The significance of environmental impacts must be considered in terms of context and intensity. This means that the significance of an action must be analyzed in several contexts such as society as a whole (human and national), the affected region, the affected interests, and the locality. Significance varies with the setting of the proposed action. In the case of a site-specific action, significance usually depends upon the effects in the locale rather than in the world as a whole. Intensity refers to the severity or degree of impact. (40 CFR 1508.27)

CONTEXT

For the proposed action, the context of the environmental effects is based on the environmental analysis in this document. The proposed action will improve the crossing of Hotelling Gulch stream channel underneath the Ceci Vilie Road, near Forks of Salmon, California. The lowest reach, approximately 600 feet, of Hotelling Gulch, just upstream from its confluence with the South Fork Salmon River, will be reconstructed so that natural geomorphic processes and fish passage are restored.

INTENSITY

Intensity is a measure of the severity, extent, or quantity of effects, and is based on information from the effects analysis of this environmental assessment and the references in the project record. The effects of this project have been appropriately and thoroughly considered with an analysis that is responsive to any concerns and issues raised by the public. The agency has taken a hard look at the environmental effects using relevant scientific information and knowledge of site-specific conditions gained from field visits. The ten factors identified in 40 CFR 1508.27(b) for evaluating intensity are as follows.

1. **Impacts that may be both beneficial and adverse. A significant effect may exist even if the Federal agency believes that on balance the effect will be beneficial.** As summarized in the EA, the proposed action: (1) would have no effect or be unlikely to adversely affect populations of ESA listed, Sensitive, and/or management indicator species; (2) would benefit fish in the short- and long-term following completion of project implementation; (3) would not adversely affect cultural or heritage resources; (4) would have no effect on government or private use of public land beyond the immediate vicinity of the project sites; and (5) would have no effect on private lands.

2. **The degree to which the proposed action affects public health or safety.** The proposed action may benefit public safety in that the current crossing on this County road typically fails during substantial storm events. During past storm events, the crossing has failed to the point that public access over the crossing was prohibited until the County was able to complete emergency stabilization and repair work. Post-project the crossing will sustainably convey water, wood and sediment associated with 100-year flood events, while allowing for unimpeded public use of the road.

3. **Unique characteristics of the geographic area such as the proximity to historical or cultural resources, parklands, prime farmlands, wetlands, wild and scenic rivers, or ecologically critical areas.** There are signs of historical mining activity in
the project area, however the proposed action would not adversely affect these heritage resources. The project area is near or within the Wild and Scenic corridor of the South Fork Salmon River. The outstandingly remarkable value for the river is fisheries. There will be a positive benefit to fisheries resources and habitat (see fisheries resources section of the EA), therefore the outstandingly remarkable values will be benefited by this project. The visual effects of this project will be noticeable from the South Fork Salmon River during and immediately after the changes to the stream channel configuration. These will be subordinate to the overall landscape within three years of implementation and will not be noticeable after about 10 years once the vegetation has fully recovered.

4. **The degree to which the effects on the quality of the human environment are likely to be highly controversial.** Improving aquatic organism passage at road crossings and restoring natural function within stream channels are actions that have low risk of being controversial. The project will have no impact on domestic water use or availability. No comments were received during the 30-day scoping period.

5. **The degree to which the possible effects on the human environment are highly uncertain or involve unique or unknown risks.** The outcome of projects such as the proposed action are fairly certain and do not involve unique or unknown risks. This judgment is based on experience from implementation of aquatic organism passage projects within Klamath River tributaries including the Salmon River and multiple detailed geological and hydrological assessments of the site.

6. **The degree to which the action may establish precedent for future actions with significant effects or represents a decision in principle about a future consideration.** The proposed action will not establish precedent and does not represent a decision in principle.

7. **Whether the action is related to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant impacts.** Significance exists if it is reasonable to anticipate a cumulatively significant impact on the environment. Significance cannot be avoided by terming an action temporary or by breaking it down into small component parts. The EA found that watershed disturbance caused by implementing the proposed action would be very minor because so few acres in each watershed would be disturbed. The disturbance caused by implementation of the proposed action would increase cumulative effects a very slight amount. The increase in cumulative watershed effects was too small to model with any statistical significance.

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 historical resources.** The proposed action will not affect the eligibility for listing in the National Register of Historical Places and will not significantly increase the risk of loss of 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 EA found that the proposed action would have no effect or be unlikely to adversely affect ESA listed species.
10. **Whether the action threatens a violation of Federal, State, or local law or requirements imposed for the protection of the environment.** The proposed action is in compliance with all laws, regulations, Forest Service policies, and the Klamath National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan.

After considering the effects of the actions analyzed, in terms of context and intensity, I have determined that these actions will not have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment. Therefore, an environmental impact statement will not be prepared.

**CONTACT**

For additional information concerning this decision, contact: Bobbie Miller by phone at 530.841.4418, or by email at bdimontemontemiller@fs.fed.us.

**Ted O. McArthur**

**District Ranger, Salmon/Scott River Ranger District**

7/12/2017

---

In accordance with Federal civil rights law and U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) civil rights regulations and policies, the USDA, its Agencies, offices, and employees, and institutions participating in or administering USDA programs are prohibited from discriminating based on race, color, national origin, religion, sex, gender identity (including gender expression), sexual orientation, disability, age, marital status, family/parental status, income derived from a public assistance program, political beliefs, or reprisal or retaliation for prior civil rights activity, in any program or activity conducted or funded by USDA (not all bases apply to all programs). Remedies and complaint filing deadlines vary by program or incident.

Persons with disabilities who require alternative means of communication for program information (e.g., Braille, large print, audiotape, American Sign Language, etc.) should contact the responsible Agency or USDA’s TARGET Center at (202) 720-2600 (voice and TTY) or contact USDA through the Federal Relay Service at (800) 877-8339. Additionally, program information may be made available in languages other than English.

To file a program discrimination complaint, complete the USDA Program Discrimination Complaint Form, AD-3027, found online at http://www.ascr.usda.gov/complaint_filing_cust.html and at any USDA office or write a letter addressed to USDA and provide in the letter all of the information requested in the form. To request a copy of the complaint form, call (866) 632-9992. Submit your completed form or letter to USDA by: (1) mail: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights, 1400 Independence Avenue, SW, Washington, D.C. 20250-9410; (2) fax: (202) 690-7442; or (3) email: program.intake@usda.gov.

USDA is an equal opportunity provider, employer, and lender.

El USDA es un proveedor, empleador y prestamista que ofrece igualdad de oportunidad.
Figure 1: Vicinity map showing the project area relative to the Forest boundary.
Figure 2: Project area map.
APPENDIX B – PROJECT DESIGN FEATURES

Project design features specific to this project, developed prior to and after scoping, will be used as a part of the proposed action to minimize or eliminate negative effects to resources in the project area. Specific best management practices (BMPs) that will be followed are listed in appendix B of this document. Design features listed in Table 1 are listed under the resource for which they are intended to mitigate effects.

Table 1: Project Design Features incorporated into Alternative 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Design Feature</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AIR-1</td>
<td>Dust control measures will be implemented to minimize dust generation and effects to visibility to drivers on the county road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCH-1</td>
<td>If any late discoveries of human remains or features not previously recorded are identified during project implementation, work in the immediate area will stop and the District Archaeologist and Heritage Program Manager will be contacted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WS-1</td>
<td>For activities that occur within Riparian Reserves, the Normal Operating Season (NOS) will be June 1st to November 15th. Ground disturbing activities will also be restricted during periods of wet weather during the NOS. See BMP 1.5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WS-2</td>
<td>Mulch and/or seed areas disturbed by restorations activities where sufficient levels of soil cover are lacking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WS-3</td>
<td>Erosion control and other requirements to protect water quality are described in BMPs, Appendix B).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Feature</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| WS-4 | The designated Project drafting site is within a Pacific salmonid-bearing stream reach. Therefore, *NOAA Fisheries Water Drafting Specifications* guidelines will be used. They include, but are not limited to, the following:  
1. When in habitat potentially occupied by Chinook and Coho salmon, intakes will be screened with 3/32-inch mesh for rounded or square openings, or 1/16-inch mesh for slotted openings. When in habitat potentially occupied by steelhead trout, intakes will be screened with 1/8-inch mesh size. Wetted surface area of the screen or fish-exclusion device shall be proportional to the pump rate to ensure that water velocity at the screen surface does not exceed 0.33 feet/second.  
a. Use of a NOAA approved fish screen will ensure the above specifications are met.  
2. Fish screen will be placed parallel to flow.  
3. Pumping rate will not exceed 350 gallons-per-minute (gpm) or 10% of the flow of the anadromous stream drafted from.  
4. Pumping will be terminated when tank is full. |
| WEED-1 | Noxious weed infestations will be flagged on the ground prior to project implementation. Material from within the flagged noxious weed boundary will not be transported unless to a location that is approved by the District Botanist in order to prevent transporting seed bank to uninfested locations. Known infestations of noxious weeds will be treated by either manual or mechanical methods prior to seed set to avoid transporting seeds from the infested locations into other portions of the project area. |
| WEED-2 | Equipment will be cleaned of soil, seeds, vegetative matter, and other debris that could contain or hold seed prior to moving to the project area, and after leaving the project area. |
| WEED-3 | Wherever seed and/or straw is used to restore areas of ground disturbance, certified weed free seed and straw would be specified in the contract and used during implementation and any follow up treatments. |
| WL-1 | To avoid disturbance to NSO that may be breeding near the project area, project activities that involve louder than ambient noise levels will be prohibited from February 1 to July 9 each year. |
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DECISION

Based upon my review of the Hotelling Gulch Fish Passage and Stream Restoration Project Environmental Assessment (EA), I have decided to implement Alternative 2, which will:

- Re-connect surface flows of Hotelling Gulch into one channel (the historical western alignment) within the natural valley low, and upgrade the undersized crossing at the Cecilville Road to a bridge, box culvert, or other design appropriate to the site. This new structure will fully span the reconstructed channel and allow for uninterrupted passage of watershed products (large wood and course sediment), as well as fish and other aquatic organisms.

- Re-construct approximately 550 feet of streambed in the historical western alignment which will result in a channel and floodplain area which will resemble a natural stream appropriate to the drainage area. An excavator will be used to construct the restored channel following designs that specify the appropriate grade and channel form. There is no expectation of channel maintenance following construction activities, the constructed channel will be designed to evolve in a dynamic manner in response to discharge, substrate movement, wood input, and natural events. This action includes abandoning or blocking off about
600 feet of channel in the existing (eastern) alignment. Abandonment of the eastern Hotelling Gulch channel will require installation of a lateral berm at the point of diversion to the western channel, and partial in-filling of the abandoned channel. The eastern channel alignment will be filled using excess material produced from channel and floodplain reconstruction activities.

- This action will include placement of woody debris (less than 18 inches in diameter) into the channel. This woody debris will be obtained from utilizing trees that are removed as part of project construction. They will be incorporated into pools to provide cover for rearing salmonids. The project will also restore channel complexity, which will create areas with gravel sized material suitable for spawning by adult salmonids.

**DECISION RATIONALE**

My rationale for choosing the selected alternative, as it responds to the purpose and need of the project (Page 2 of the EA), is described below.

Two alternatives were considered in detail in the Environmental Assessment for the Hotelling Gulch Fish Passage and Stream Restoration Project. In addition to the selected alternative (alternative 2), I considered alternative 1 (no action). In addition to these two alternatives that were discussed in detail, the interdisciplinary team also considered two alternatives that were dropped from detailed analysis. Please see page 4 of the EA to see a full description of the alternatives and a comparison of alternatives as related to the ability to meet the purpose and need.

Alternative 1 was not selected because it did not meet the stated purpose and need for the project. Under the no action alternative, there would be no improvement to fish passage or aquatic habitat within the project area. If no action is taken, Hotelling Gulch would continue to be disconnected from groundwater, and therefore not attaining the optimal in-stream flow for spatial and temporal connectivity for aquatic organisms.

The selected alternative complies with all applicable laws and regulations and is consistent with the Klamath National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan (Forest Plan, 1995 as amended). It is consistent with the Aquatic Conservation Strategy of the Forest Plan by proposing actions that are proactive in maintaining and restoring watershed processes as well as the species that depend upon high quality aquatic habitat. The selected alternative will meet the purpose and need of the project by improving fish passage and restoring aquatic habitat. The selected alternative will reconnect surface flows of Hotelling Gulch into one channel within a more natural valley at a lower elevation this will result in a channel and floodplain area which will resemble a natural stream appropriate to the drainage area. I believe that the EA appropriately details and adopts all practical means to avoid or minimize environmental harm.

I believe the EA presents an objective and well-documented analysis of environmental effects expected to result from implementation of the selected alternative. The analysis, including interrelated and interdependent actions, shows that the scenario depicted by the
selected alternative can effectively meet the purpose and need and restore the project area, while resulting in a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI). My conclusion is based on a review of the record that shows a thorough review of relevant scientific information, a consideration of responsible opposing views, and the acknowledgment of incomplete or unavailable information, scientific uncertainty, and risk.

The Hotelling Gulch Fish Passage and Stream Restoration Project EA documents the environmental analysis and conclusions upon which this decision is based.

PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

This action was originally listed as a proposal on the Klamath National Forest Schedule of Proposed Actions and updated periodically during the analysis. On February 12, 2016, the proposal was mailed to nearby landowners or claim owners, to four tribes and to the North Coast Water Quality Control Board for a 30-day public scoping period from 12 February to 14 March 2016. The proposal was posted on the Forest website on April 1, 2016, and first listed in the Schedule of Proposed Actions on April 1, 2016. The Forest did not receive any comments from the public as a result of scoping the proposed action. The EA lists agencies and people consulted on page 3 in the public involvement section.

FINDINGS REQUIRED BY OTHER LAWS AND REGULATIONS

This decision is consistent with the Klamath National Forest Land Management Plan. The project was designed in conformance with the Aquatic Conservation Strategy.

A Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) and EA were considered. I determined these actions will not have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment, and an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) will not be prepared.
FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

The significance of environmental impacts must be considered in terms of context and intensity. This means that the significance of an action must be analyzed in several contexts such as society as a whole (human and national), the affected region, the affected interests, and the locality. Significance varies with the setting of the proposed action. In the case of a site-specific action, significance usually depends upon the effects in the locale rather than in the world as a whole. Intensity refers to the severity or degree of impact. (40 CFR 1508.27)

CONTEXT

For the proposed action, the context of the environmental effects is based on the environmental analysis in this document. The proposed action will improve the crossing of Hotelling Gulch stream channel underneath the Cecilville Road, near Forks of Salmon, California. The lowest reach, approximately 600 feet, of Hotelling Gulch, just upstream from its confluence with the South Fork Salmon River, will be reconstructed so that natural geomorphic processes and fish passage are restored.

INTENSITY

Intensity is a measure of the severity, extent, or quantity of effects, and is based on information from the effects analysis of this environmental assessment and the references in the project record. The effects of this project have been appropriately and thoroughly considered with an analysis that is responsive to any concerns and issues raised by the public. The agency has taken a hard look at the environmental effects using relevant scientific information and knowledge of site-specific conditions gained from field visits. The ten factors identified in 40 CFR 1508.27(b) for evaluating intensity are as follows.

1. Impacts that may be both beneficial and adverse. A significant effect may exist even if the Federal agency believes that on balance the effect will be beneficial. As summarized in the EA, the proposed action: (1) would have no effect or be unlikely to adversely affect populations of ESA listed, Sensitive, and/or management indicator species; (2) would benefit fish in the short- and long-term following completion of project implementation; (3) would not adversely affect cultural or heritage resources; (4) would have no effect on government or private use of public land beyond the immediate vicinity of the project sites; and (5) would have no effect on private lands.

2. The degree to which the proposed action affects public health or safety. The proposed action may benefit public safety in that the current crossing on this County road typically fails during substantial storm events. During past storm events, the crossing has failed to the point that public access over the crossing was prohibited until the County was able to complete emergency stabilization and repair work. Post-project the crossing will sustainably convey water, wood and sediment associated with 100-year flood events, while allowing for unimpeded public use of the road.

3. Unique characteristics of the geographic area such as the proximity to historical or cultural resources, parklands, prime farmlands, wetlands, wild and scenic rivers, or ecologically critical areas. There are signs of historical mining activity in
the project area, however the proposed action would not adversely affect these heritage resources. The project area is near or within the Wild and Scenic corridor of the South Fork Salmon River. The outstandingly remarkable value for the river is fisheries. There will be a positive benefit to fisheries resources and habitat (see fisheries resources section of the EA), therefore the outstandingly remarkable values will be benefited by this project. The visual effects of this project will be noticeable from the South Fork Salmon River during and immediately after the changes to the stream channel configuration. These will be subordinate to the overall landscape within three years of implementation and will not be noticeable after about 10 years once the vegetation has fully recovered.

4. The degree to which the effects on the quality of the human environment are likely to be highly controversial. Improving aquatic organism passage at road crossings and restoring natural function within stream channels are actions that have low risk of being controversial. The project will have no impact on domestic water use or availability. No comments were received during the 30-day scoping period.

5. The degree to which the possible effects on the human environment are highly uncertain or involve unique or unknown risks. The outcome of projects such as the proposed action are fairly certain and do not involve unique or unknown risks. This judgment is based on experience from implementation of aquatic organism passage projects within Klamath River tributaries including the Salmon River and multiple detailed geological and hydrological assessments of the site.

6. The degree to which the action may establish precedent for future actions with significant effects or represents a decision in principle about a future consideration. The proposed action will not establish precedent and does not represent a decision in principle.

7. Whether the action is related to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant impacts. Significance exists if it is reasonable to anticipate a cumulatively significant impact on the environment. Significance cannot be avoided by terming an action temporary or by breaking it down into small component parts. The EA found that watershed disturbance caused by implementing the proposed action would be very minor because so few acres in each watershed would be disturbed. The disturbance caused by implementation of the proposed action would increase cumulative effects a very slight amount. The increase in cumulative watershed effects was too small to model with any statistical significance.

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 historical resources. The proposed action will not affect the eligibility for listing in the National Register of Historical Places and will not significantly increase the risk of loss of 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 EA found that the proposed action would have no effect or be unlikely to adversely affect ESA listed species.
10. Whether the action threatens a violation of Federal, State, or local law or requirements imposed for the protection of the environment. The proposed action is in compliance with all laws, regulations, Forest Service policies, and the Klamath National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan.

After considering the effects of the actions analyzed, in terms of context and intensity, I have determined that these actions will not have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment. Therefore, an environmental impact statement will not be prepared.

CONTACT

For additional information concerning this decision, contact: Bobbie Miller by phone at 530.841.4418, or by email at bdimontemontemiller@fs.fed.us.

Ted O. McArthur

District Ranger, Salmon/Scott River Ranger District

In accordance with Federal civil rights law and U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) civil rights regulations and policies, the USDA, its Agencies, offices, and employees, and institutions participating in or administering USDA programs are prohibited from discriminating based on race, color, national origin, religion, sex, gender identity (including gender expression), sexual orientation, disability, age, marital status, family/parental status, income derived from a public assistance program, political beliefs, or reprisal or retaliation for prior civil rights activity, in any program or activity conducted or funded by USDA (not all bases apply to all programs). Remedies and complaint filing deadlines vary by program or incident.

Persons with disabilities who require alternative means of communication for program information (e.g., Braille, large print, audiotape, American Sign Language, etc.) should contact the responsible Agency or USDA’s TARGET Center at (202) 720-2600 (voice and TTY) or contact USDA through the Federal Relay Service at (800) 877-8339. Additionally, program information may be made available in languages other than English.

To file a program discrimination complaint, complete the USDA Program Discrimination Complaint Form, AD-3027, found online at http://www.ascr.usda.gov/complaint_filing_cust.html and at any USDA office or write a letter addressed to USDA and provide in the letter all of the information requested in the form. To request a copy of the complaint form, call (866) 632-9992. Submit your completed form or letter to USDA by: (1) mail: U.S. Department of Agriculture, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights, 1400 Independence Avenue, SW, Washington, D.C. 20250-9410; (2) fax: (202) 690-7442; or (3) email: program.intake@usda.gov.

USDA is an equal opportunity provider, employer, and lender.

El USDA es un proveedor, empleador y prestamista que ofrece igualdad de oportunidad.
Figure 1: Vicinity map showing the project area relative to the Forest boundary.
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APPENDIX B – PROJECT DESIGN FEATURES

Project design features specific to this project, developed prior to and after scoping, will be used as a part of the proposed action to minimize or eliminate negative effects to resources in the project area. Specific best management practices (BMPs) that will be followed are listed in appendix B of this document. Design features listed in Table 1 are listed under the resource for which they are intended to mitigate effects.

Table 1: Project Design Features incorporated into Alternative 2.
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<tr>
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<th>Description</th>
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<td>Dust control measures will be implemented to minimize dust generation and effects to visibility to drivers on the county road.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARCH-1</td>
<td>If any late discoveries of human remains or features not previously recorded are identified during project implementation, work in the immediate area will stop and the District Archaeologist and Heritage Program Manager will be contacted.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WS -1</td>
<td>For activities that occur within Riparian Reserves, the Normal Operating Season (NOS) will be June 1st to November 15th. Ground disturbing activities will also be restricted during periods of wet weather during the NOS. See BMP 1.5.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WS-2</td>
<td>Mulch and/or seed areas disturbed by restorations activities where sufficient levels of soil cover are lacking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WS-3</td>
<td>Erosion control and other requirements to protect water quality are described in BMPs, Appendix B).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Feature</td>
<td>Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| WS-4           | The designated Project drafting site is within a Pacific salmonid-bearing stream reach. Therefore, *NOAA Fisheries Water Drafting Specifications* guidelines will be used. They include, but are not limited to, the following:  
   1. When in habitat potentially occupied by Chinook and Coho salmon, intakes will be screened with 3/32-inch mesh for rounded or square openings, or 1/16-inch mesh for slotted openings. When in habitat potentially occupied by steelhead trout, intakes will be screened with 1/8-inch mesh size. Wetted surface area of the screen or fish-exclusion device shall be proportional to the pump rate to ensure that water velocity at the screen surface does not exceed 0.33 feet/second.  
      a. Use of a NOAA approved fish screen will ensure the above specifications are met.  
   2. Fish screen will be placed parallel to flow.  
   3. Pumping rate will not exceed 350 gallons-per-minute (gpm) or 10% of the flow of the anadromous stream drafted from.  
   4. Pumping will be terminated when tank is full.  
   For any water drafting that occurs in non-fish bearing waters, Forest Service BMP 2.5 defines restrictions.  
   All water drafting will avoid areas of thermal refugia. Drafting is not to have any effect on the amount of cold water in thermal refugia at creek mouths and seeps. |
| WEED-1         | Noxious weed infestations will be flagged on the ground prior to project implementation. Material from within the flagged noxious weed boundary will not be transported unless to a location that is approved by the District Botanist in order to prevent transporting seed bank to uninfested locations. Known infestations of noxious weeds will be treated by either manual or mechanical methods prior to seed set to avoid transporting seeds from the infested locations into other portions of the project area. |
| WEED-2         | Equipment will be cleaned of soil, seeds, vegetative matter, and other debris that could contain or hold seed prior to moving to the project area, and after leaving the project area. |
| WEED-3         | Wherever seed and/or straw is used to restore areas of ground disturbance, certified weed free seed and straw would be specified in the contract and used during implementation and any follow up treatments. |
| WL-1           | To avoid disturbance to NSO that may be breeding near the project area, project activities that involve louder than ambient noise levels will be prohibited from February 1 to July 9 each year. |