

UNITED STATES  
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR  
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT  
GRAND JUNCTION FIELD OFFICE

**FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

**10 Year Permit Renewal for  
28 Hole Allotment**

**DOI-BLM-CO-134-2014-0002 -EA**

Based on the analysis of potential environmental impacts contained in the attached environmental assessment, and considering the significance criteria in 40 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) §1508.27, I have determined that the Proposed Action will not have a significant effect on the human environment. An environmental impact statement is therefore not required.

**BACKGROUND**

The Bureau of Land Management prepared an Environmental Assessment which analyzed the effects of re-authorization of Grazing Permit #0504598 for Warren Gore (Hawks base property lease) on the 28 Hole Allotment to determine impacts and mitigation required to continue to allow grazing on public lands in a responsible manner that is compatible with Standards for Public Land Health, other resource uses and objectives, and in compliance with grazing regulations under 43 CFR §4110.1 (a) (1). In order to graze livestock on public land, the livestock permittee must hold a valid grazing permit.

The EA analyzed a proposed action to continue the previous grazing schedule with a modified spring rotation system, along with additional provisions for adaptive management and Temporary Non-renewable use. The grazing period, livestock type and numbers, percent public land, and active AUMs would remain unchanged from the previous permit with the addition of a rotation system that provides rest from spring grazing in each use area every other year. Additional terms and conditions that would be added to the permit include Adaptive Management, Temporary Non-renewable use, Gunnison Sage Grouse and general livestock management.

**RATIONALE:**

The analysis demonstrates that the proposed action would have negligible impacts to the natural resources. The proposed grazing program is a modification of the previous permit by including a rotation system that provides rest from spring grazing every other year in each use area. This periodic rest should improve the vigor and seed production of desired perennial forage plants. The current grazing schedule was resulting in lands Meeting or Meeting with Problems in regards to Land Health Standards, and vegetative communities that are in a static or upward trend. The proposed rotation should improve land health and the findings for each standard. Including adaptive management allows for some flexibility in grazing dates, which helps to

account for variations in growth conditions of forage plants resulting from annual changes in temperature and precipitation. The proposed action is also in accordance with 43 CFR §4130.2.

## **Intensity**

I have considered the potential intensity and severity of the impacts anticipated from the continuation of grazing on the 28 Hole Allotment relative to each of the ten areas suggested for consideration by the CEQ. The following findings have been made with regard to each of the ten CEQ considerations:

***1. Impacts that may be both beneficial and adverse.***

Proposed changes in the grazing program are expected to benefit the soil and vegetation resource and the resources on which health of these resources is based. The proposed grazing program is a modification of the previous permit by including a rotation system that provides rest from spring grazing every other year in each use area. This periodic rest should improve the vigor and seed production of desired perennial forage plants.

***2. The degree to which the proposed action affects public health and safety.***

The proposed action is not expected to impact public health and safety. Proposed maintenance activities on range facilities that involve use of heavy equipment would be infrequent and in remote locations that are not often visited by the public.

***3. Unique characteristics of the geographic area such as proximity of historic or cultural resources, park lands, prime farmlands, wetlands, wild and scenic rivers, or ecologically critical areas.***

The proposed action would not significantly impact the unique characteristics of the historical or cultural resources on the allotments. Monitoring has been completed or is scheduled for completion to address any impacts to cultural resources. There are no significant impacts to parklands, prime farmlands, wetlands, or wild and scenic rivers within the project area. There are no municipal water supplies in the project area.

***4. The degree to which the effects on the quality of the human environment are likely to be highly controversial.***

The proposed action is expected to improve the quality of the human environment by improving the resources. The effects are relatively well understood by the academic and practicing communities.

***5. The degree to which the possible effects on the human environment are highly uncertain or involve unique or unknown risks.***

Livestock grazing has a long history in the region and poses no unique or unknown risks.

***6. The degree to which the action may establish a precedent for future actions with significant effects or represents a decision in principle about a future consideration.***

This decision is like one of many that have previously been made and will continue to be made by BLM responsible officials regarding livestock grazing on public lands. The decision is within the scope of the Resource Management Plan and is not expected to establish a precedent for

future actions. The decision does not represent a decision in principle about a future consideration.

**7. *Whether the action is related to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant impacts.***

There are no significant cumulative effects on the environment, either when combined with the effects created by past or concurrent projects, or when combined with the effects from natural changes taking place in the environment or from reasonably foreseeable future projects.

**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 historic resources.***

Cultural inventories have been conducted to establish potential impacts from livestock grazing. Potential impacts on cultural resources would be mitigated when identified. No adverse impacts have been identified for the proposed action at this time.

**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.***

No impacts were brought forward that would indicate any adverse impacts to endangered or threatened species or its habitats. A No Effect determination was made for impacts to sensitive species.

**10. *Whether the action threatens a violation of Federal, State, or local law or requirements imposed for the protection of the environment.***

This decision complies with other Federal, State, or local laws and requirements imposed for the protection of the environment.

**NAME OF PREPARER:** Jim Dollerschell

**NAME OF ENVIRONMENTAL COORDINATOR:** Christina Stark

**DATE:** 9/30/14

**FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

On the basis of the information contained in the EA, and all other information available to me, it is my determination that: 1) the implementation of the Proposed Action would not have significant environmental impacts beyond those already addressed in the "Record of Decision and Resource Management Plan," for the Grand Junction Resource Area (*January 1987*) and Record of Decision," for the Colorado Canyons National Conservation Area and Black Ridge Canyons Wilderness (*September 2004*); (2) the Proposed Action is in conformance with the Resource Management Plans; and (3) the Proposed Action does not constitute a major federal

action having a significant effect on the human environment. Therefore, an environmental impact statement or a supplement to the existing environmental impact statement is not necessary and will not be prepared.

This finding is based on my consideration of the Council on Environmental Quality's (CEQ) criteria for significance (40 CFR §1508.27), both with regard to the context and to the intensity of the impacts described in the EA.

SIGNATURE OF AUTHORIZED OFFICIAL

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Katie A. Sten", written over a horizontal line.

Field Manager  
Grand Junction Field Office

A handwritten date "9-30-2017" in blue ink, written over a horizontal line.

Date