United States Department of the Interior

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
Glenwood Springs Field Office
50629 Highway 6 and 24
Glenwood Springs, Colorado 81601
www.co.blm.gov

CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION

NUMBER: CO140_2009_0020CE

CASEFILE/PROJECT NUMBER: 0507532

PROJECT NAME: Grazing Permit Renewal on the Jackson Allotment

LEGAL DESCRIPTION: T. 4 S., R. 92 W., Sixth Principal Meridian, Garfield County, Colorado. Jackson Allotment No 18008. Refer to the attached allotment map.

APPLICANT: Grazing Permittee

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED ACTION: The Proposed Action is to renew a term grazing permit for the above applicant. The number/kind of livestock, period of use, percent public land and Animal Unit Months (AUMS) will remain the same as the previous permit. The permit would be issued for a 10-year period unless the base property is leased for less. The proposed action is in accordance with 43 CFR 4130.2. The tables below summarize the scheduled grazing use and grazing preference for the permit.

Scheduled Grazing Use:

Allotment Name & No.	Livestock Kind & No.	Period of use	%PL	AUMs
Jackson No. 18008	20 Cattle	06/16 – 07/31	100	30

Grazing Preference (AUMS):

Allotment Name & No.	Active AUMs	Suspended AUMs	Permitted AUMs
Jackson No. 18008	31	0	31

Current Terms and Conditions that will be carried forward:

- Salt, mineral blocks and supplemental feed will be placed a minimum of ¼ mile from riparian areas and other water sources, including springs; and to avoid cultural and historical resources.
- The permittee and all persons specifically associated with grazing operations must be informed that any objects or sites of cultural, paleontological, or scientific value such as historic or prehistoric resources, graves or grave markers, human remains, ruins, cabins, rock art, fossils, or artifacts shall not be damaged, destroyed, removed, moved, or

disturbed. If in connection with allotment operations under this authorization any of the above resources are encountered, the proponent shall immediately suspend all activities in the immediate vicinity of the discovery that might further disturb such materials and notify the BLM authorized officer of the findings. The discovery must be protected until notified in writing to proceed by the authorized officer (36CFR800.110 & 112, 43CFR 0.4).[1]

- Maintenance of range improvements is required and shall be in accordance with all approved cooperative agreements and range improvement permits. Maintenance shall be required prior to turn out.

LAND USE PLAN (LUP) CONFORMANCE REVIEW: The proposed action is subject to the following plan:

Name of Plan: Glenwood Springs Resource Management Plan

Date Approved: Jan. 1984, revised 1988, amended in November 1991 - Oil and Gas Leasing and Development - Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement; amended Nov. 1996 - Colorado Standards and Guidelines; amended in August 1997 - Castle Peak Travel Management Plan; amended in March 1999 - Oil and Gas Leasing & Development Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement; amended in November 1999 - Red Hill Plan Amendment; and amended in September 2002 – Fire Management Plan for Wildland Fire Management and Prescriptive Vegetation Treatment Guidance.

__X_ The Proposed Action is in conformance with the LUP because it is specifically provided for in the following LUP decision(s):

Decision Language: The action is in conformance with Administrative Actions (pg. 5) and Livestock Grazing Management (pg. 20). Administrative actions states, "Various types of actions will require special attention beyond the scope of this plan. Administrative actions are the day-to-day transactions required to serve the public and to provide optimal use of the resources. These actions are in conformance with the plan". The livestock grazing management objective as amended states, "To provide 56,885 animal unit months of livestock forage commensurate with meeting public land health standards."

____ The Proposed Action is in conformance with the LUP, even though it is not specifically provided for, because it is clearly consistent with the following LUP decisions (objectives, terms, and conditions):

CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION REVIEW:
The proposed action qualifies as a categorical exclusion under 516 DM 11, Section: D. Range Management. Number 11:

(11) Issuance of livestock grazing permits/leases where

(a) The new grazing permit/lease is consistent with the use specified on the previous permit/lease, such that

[1] This term and condition is the most current stipulation for protection of cultural resources and revises the old version contained on the expiring grazing lease.

(1) the same kind of livestock is grazed,
(2) the active use previously authorized is not exceeded, and
(3) grazing does not occur more than 14 days earlier or later than as specified on the previous permit/lease, and

(b) The grazing allotment(s) has been assessed and evaluated and the Responsible Official has documented in a determination that the allotment(s) is
(1) meeting land health standards, or
(2) not meeting land health standards due to factors that do not include existing livestock grazing.

The Departmental Manual (516 DM 2.3A(3) & App. 2) requires that before any action described in the following list of categorical exclusions is used, the exceptions must be reviewed for applicability in each case. The proposed action cannot be categorically excluded if one or more of the exceptions apply, thus requiring either an EA or an EIS. When no exceptions apply, the following types of bureau actions normally do not require the preparation of an EA or EIS.

None of the following exceptions in 516 DM 2, Appendix 2, apply:

EXCLUSION	YES	NO
1. Have significant impacts on public health or safety.		X
2. Have significant impacts on such natural resources and unique geographic characteristics as historic or cultural resources; park, recreation or refuge lands; wilderness areas; wild or scenic rivers; national natural landmarks; sole or principal drinking water aquifers; prime farmlands; wetlands (Executive Order 11990); floodplains (Executive Order 11988); national monuments; migratory birds; and other ecologically significant or critical areas.		X
3. Have highly controversial environmental effects or involve unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources [NEPA Section 102(2)(E)].		X
4. Have highly uncertain and potentially significant environmental effects or involve unique or unknown environmental risks.		X
5. Establish a precedent for future action or represent a decision in principle about future actions with potentially significant environmental effects.		X
6. Have a direct relationship to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant environmental effects.		X
7. Have significant impacts on properties listed, or eligible for listing, on the National Register of Historic Places as determined by either the bureau or office.		X
8. Have significant impacts on species listed, or proposed to be listed, on the List of Endangered or Threatened Species, or have significant impacts on designated Critical Habitat for these species.		X
9. Violate a Federal law, or a State, local, or tribal law or requirement imposed for the protection of the environment.		X
10. Have a disproportionately high and adverse effect on low income or minority populations (Executive Order 12898).		X
11. 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 (Executive Order 13007).		X
12. Contribute to the introduction, continued existence, or spread of noxious weeds or non-native invasive species known to occur in the area or actions that may promote the introduction, growth, or expansion of the range of such species (Federal Noxious Weed Control Act and Executive Order 13112).		X

INTERDISCIPLINARY REVIEW:

Name	Title	Area of Responsibility
Isaac Pittman	Range Management Specialist	Range
Mike Kinser	Range Management Specialist	Riparian/Wetlands
Cheryl Harrison	Archaeologist	Cultural and Native American Concerns
Kay Hopkins	Outdoor Recreation Planner	VRM, WSR, Wilderness
Carla DeYoung	Ecologist	ACEC, T/E/S Plants, Vegetation
Brian Hopkins	Wildlife Biologist	Wildlife, T/E/S Wildlife, Migratory Bird
Jeff O'Connell	Hydrologist	Soil, Air, Water
Dereck Wilson	Range Management Specialist	Invasive, Non-native Species

REMARKS/MITIGATION:

Land Health Standards: The allotment included in this grazing permit renewal was assessed as documented in the Elk Creek Land Health Assessment Summary Report and Determination Document, 2007. The allotment was considered to be meeting the Standards and existing livestock grazing was not identified as a land health issue.

NAME OF PREPARER: Isaac Pittman, Range Management Specialist

DATE: Dec 10, 2008

DECISION AND RATIONALE: I have reviewed this CER and have decided to implement the proposed action.

This action is listed in the Department Manual as an action that may be categorically excluded. I have evaluated the action relative to the 12 criteria listed above and have determined that it does not represent an exception and is, therefore, categorically excluded from further environmental analysis.

SIGNATURE OF AUTHORIZED OFFICIAL: Kyle B. Mendon
Supervisory Natural Resources Specialist

DATE SIGNED: 12/10/2008


Jackson Allotment
Allot. # 18008
Land Status
BLM
USFS
Private Land
State Land
Allotment Boundary
Bureau of Land Management
Glenwood Springs Field Office
USGS Quad(s): Rifle Falls
1:15,000 Scale
Nov 10, 2008
4WD
8675
8600
8700
Spring
13
West
24
Elk
Elk Reservoir
West
WEST
ELK
STOCK
DRIVE
8600
WHITE RIVER
Cherry