

**FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT  
FOR THE  
PROPOSED KARUK MEDICAL AND DENTAL CLINIC  
FEE-TO-TRUST PROJECT**

**AGENCY:** Bureau of Indian Affairs

**ACTIONS:** Finding of No Significant Impact

**SUMMARY:**

The Karuk Tribe (Tribe) submitted a request to the Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA) for approval to transfer 5.6 acres of fee land (project site) into federal trust on behalf of the Tribe to be used for a new medical/dental clinic (Proposed Action). The project site is located at 64100 Hillside Road in Happy Camp, California. Based upon the entire administrative record including analysis in a July 22, 2020 Environmental Assessment (EA), the BIA makes a finding of no significant impact (FONSI) for the Proposed Action. This finding constitutes a determination the Proposed Action is not a Federal action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment. Therefore, in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act, 42 U.S.C § 4321 et seq., an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is not required.

**PURPOSE AND NEED:**

The purpose of the Proposed Action is to provide improved health care services for the community, allow for the expansion of sovereign Tribal authority over the project site, and to ensure continued social and economic independence for the Tribe. Additional details regarding the purpose and need can be found in EA Section 1.3.

**ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED:**

Two alternatives are analyzed in the EA: Alternative A (Proposed Action) and Alternative B (No Action). The Proposed Action is summarized above and includes the fee-to-trust transfer of 5 parcels totaling approximately 5.6 acres. The Tribe subsequently proposes to develop one of the 5 parcels with an approximately 11,500 square-foot medical/dental clinic. The Proposed Action would best meet the purpose and need and therefore has been identified as the Preferred Alternative. Under Alternative B, no federal actions would occur and the Tribe would not construct the proposed medical/dental clinic. Additional details regarding Alternatives A and B can be found in EA Section 2.

## **ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS:**

Potential impacts to land resources, water resources; air quality; biological resources; cultural and paleontological resources; socioeconomics; resource use patterns; transportation; hazardous materials; noise; visual resources; and public services were evaluated in the EA, with the following conclusions (see EA Sections 3, 4, and 5 for detailed analysis and for specific mitigation measures):

### **Air Quality**

Impacts to air quality would occur during construction and operation of the proposed medical/dental clinic. Mitigation measures detailed in EA Section 5.1 would ensure air quality impacts are less than significant.

### **Visual Resources**

Impacts to visual resource would occur from the development of the medical/dental clinic and associated improvements. Mitigation measures detailed in EA Section 5.2 would ensure visual resources impacts are less than significant.

### **Biological Resources**

Impacts to biological resources would occur from the development of the medical/dental clinic and associated improvements. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service found that no federally Threatened or Endangered species would be impacted by the Proposed Action. Mitigation measures detailed in EA Section 5.3 would ensure impacts to biological resources are less than significant.

### **Cultural Resources**

Impacts to cultural resources could occur from the development of the medical/dental clinic and associated improvements. Mitigation measures detailed in EA Section 5.4 would ensure impacts to cultural resources are less than significant.

### **Hazards and Hazardous Materials**

Hazardous materials impacts could occur during construction and operation of the medical/dental clinic. Mitigation measures detailed in EA Section 5.5 would ensure hazards/hazardous materials impacts are less than significant.

### **Land Resources**

Land resources impacts could occur during the construction and operation of the medical/dental clinic. Mitigation measures detailed in EA Section 5.6 would ensure land resources impacts are less than significant.

### **Noise**

Noise impacts would occur during construction and operation of the medical/dental clinic. Mitigation measures detailed in EA Section 5.7 would ensure noise impacts are less than significant.

**Public Services**

Impacts to public services would occur from the operation of the medical/dental clinic. Mitigation measures in EA Section 5.8 would ensure impacts to public services are less than significant.

**Socioeconomics and Community Resources**

No significant socioeconomics or community resources impacts would occur.

**Transportation and Circulation**

Impacts to transportation and circulation would occur during construction and operation of the medical/dental clinic. Mitigation measures in EA Section 5.10 would ensure impacts to transportation and circulation are less than significant.

**Water Resources**

Impacts to water resources would occur during construction and operation of the medical/dental clinic. Mitigation measures in EA Section 5.11 would ensure impacts to water resources are less than significant.

**Human Health and Safety**

No significant human health and safety impacts would occur.

**PUBLIC AVAILABILITY:**

A Notice of Availability for the EA and this FONSI has been provided to agencies, organizations, and interested parties. These documents have been made available for a 30 day review period. BIA will take no administrative action on the Proposed Action prior to expiration of the review period and review of any comments received.

**DETERMINATION:**

It has been determined that the proposed Federal action to take 5.6 acres of fee land into federal trust for the purpose of constructing and operating a medical/dental clinic, does not constitute a major federal action that would significantly affect the quality of the human environment. Therefore, in accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act, 42 U.S.C § 4321 et seq., an Environmental Impact Statement is not required. This determination is supported by the aforementioned findings described in this FONSI and the analysis contained in the entire administrative record, including the July 22, 2020 EA, and the mitigation imposed. This fulfills the requirements of NEPA as set out in the Council on Environmental Quality Regulations for Implementing NEPA (40 C.F.R. 1500–1508), and the BIA NEPA Guidebook (59 IAM 3-H, August, 2012).

Approved:

Date:

---

Acting Regional Director  
Bureau of Indian Affairs, Pacific Region