

# **United States Department of the Interior**

## **BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT**

**Ely Field Office**

**702 North Industrial Way, HC 33 Box 33500**

**Ely, NV 89301-9408**

**<http://www.nv.blm.gov>**

### **DECISION RECORD (DR)**

**AND**

### **FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT (FONSI)**

**Ward Recreation Area Disc Golf Course**

**Ely Field Office**

### **ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT**

**NV 040-07-50**

## **Introduction**

The Ward Recreation Area Disc Golf Course Environmental Assessment (EA) NV-040-07-50 was completed to analyze the affects of developing a nine-hole disc golf course at Ward Recreation Area in White Pine County, Nevada approximately 6 miles West of Ely, Nevada.

## **Summary of Proposed Action**

The proposed action is to develop, manage, and maintain a nine-hole disc golf course at Ward Recreation Area. The Bureau of Land Management, Ely Field Office proposes to develop, manage, and maintain a nine-hole disc golf course at Ward Recreation Area in White Pine County, Nevada approximately 6 miles West of Ely, Nevada. The development of the disc golf course would entail installing 9 “baskets” which requires concreting 2” metal tubing approximately 2’ into the ground. 9 tee pads would also be installed; this would require clearing and leveling a pad 6’x4’ in diameter. The baskets and tee pads would be located in previously disturbed areas within the recreation area. Roads, trails, and other linear disturbances would be utilized to the greatest extent possible as fairways minimizing trampling of vegetation. Signs would also be installed at each of the tee boxes and baskets indicating the layout of the hole and the course.

Alternative 2.2 analyzed a No Action Alternative. Under this Alternative the disc golf course would not be installed.

## **Context:**

The action is proposed in response to fulfilling “Semi-Primitive Non-motorized” recreation opportunities as identified in the Recreation Opportunity Spectrum in White Pine County, Nevada. This would provide “Some opportunity for isolation from the sights and sounds of man, but not as important as for primitive opportunities. Opportunity to have a high degree of interaction with the natural environment, to have moderate challenge and risk, and to use outdoor skills.”

**Intensity:**

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

The EA considered both beneficial and adverse impacts of the Proposed Action and the No Action Alternative.

Resources are either not present, would not be affected, or are anticipated to be negligible due to the minimal levels of disturbance associated with the project, project design, mitigation outlined in the proposed action and monitoring.

None of the environmental impacts disclosed above and discussed in Chapter 3 of the EA are considered significant.

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

Implementation components of the Proposed Action would not result in potentially substantial or adverse impacts to public health and safety.

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

There are no unique, park lands, prime or unique farmlands, wild and scenic rivers, or ecologically critical areas in the vicinity. As outlined in the EA, the Project would avoid cultural resources and therefore these resources would not be impacted. In addition, the EA did not identify any significant impacts to unique species or their habitats that occur in the analysis area, or historical or cultural resources.

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

The Proposed Action is not expected to be highly controversial. A 30-day public comment period with notices made in the local paper resulted in two comments, both in support of the project as it was proposed.

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

There are no known effects of the Proposed Action identified in the EA that are considered uncertain or involve unique or unknown risks. This is demonstrated through the effects analysis in the EA.

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.*

The proposed action of establishing the Ward Recreation Area Disc Golf Course would not establish a precedent for future actions with significant effects or represent a decision about future consideration. Any future proposed activities in the area would be analyzed under their own merits and impacts would be analyzed in a site-specific environmental analysis document.

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

The reasonably foreseeable future actions have been considered in the cumulative impacts analysis within the EA in Chapter 4 and are not considered cumulatively significant. In addition, for any actions that might be proposed in the future, further environmental analysis, including assessment of cumulative impacts, would be required prior to surface disturbing activities.

8) *The degree to which the action may adversely affect districts, sites, highways, structures, or objects listed in or eligible for listing in the NRHP or may cause loss or destruction of significant scientific, cultural, or historical resources.*

The activities would be located within areas of existing disturbance or in areas where Class III cultural resource surveys have been completed. All National Register eligible cultural sites would be avoided. The action complies with the National Historic Preservation Act. Implementation of the proposed action will have no significant adverse effect on districts, sites, highways, structures, or objects listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places. (EA Chapter 3). The action will also not cause loss or destruction of significant cultural, or historical resources (EA Chapter 3).

There would not be loss or destruction of significant scientific, cultural, or historic resources. The cultural resource surveys performed to date have resulted in negative findings for eligible sites.

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 (ESA), as amended, of 1973.*

The action complies with the ESA, in that potential effects of this decision on listed species have been analyzed and documented. The action will not adversely affect any endangered or threatened species or its habitat that has been determined to be critical under the ESA of 1973, as amended.

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 would not violate or threaten to violate any federal, state, or local law or requirement imposed for the protection of the environment.

## **Decision Record**

I have reviewed Environmental Assessment (EA) NV-040-07-50, dated October 2007. After consideration of the environmental effects of the Bureau of Land Management's (BLM's) preferred alternative (Proposed Action) described in the EA and supporting documentation, I have determined that the Proposed Action with the project design specifications identified in the EA is not a major federal action and will not significantly affect the quality of the human environment, individually or cumulatively with other actions in the general area. No environmental effects meet the definition of significance in context or intensity as described in 40 CFR 1508.27. Therefore, preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement is not required.

I have determined the Proposed Action is in conformance with the approved Egan Resource Management Plan and is consistent with the plans and policies of neighboring local, county, state, tribal and federal agencies and governments. This finding and conclusion is based on my consideration of the Council on Environmental Quality's (CEQ's) criteria for significance (40 CFR 1508.27), both with regard to the context and the intensity of impacts described in the EA.

**Finding of No Significant Impact  
for Ward Recreation Area Disc Golf Course in White Pine County, Nevada**

Finding of No Significant Impact:

I have reviewed Environmental Assessment (EA) NV-040-07-50, dated October 2007. After consideration of the environmental impacts as described in the EA, and incorporated herein I have determined that the proposed actions as described in the EA will not significantly affect the quality of the human environment and that an Environmental Impact statement (EIS) is not required to be prepared. This finding and conclusion 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 the intensity of impacts described in the EA. I have determined the proposed action is in conformance with the Egan Resource Management Plan. This decision may be appealed to the Interior Board of Land Appeals, Office of the Secretary, in accordance with 43 CFR part 4 (see attachment).

Rationale:

The determining factors weighed by the Bureau of Land Management in reaching this Finding of No Significant Impact are provided below

- There are no unique characteristics within the project area to be affected (e.g., park lands, wetlands, prime farm lands.)
- No threatened or endangered species nor their habitat within the project area would be negatively impacted by any of the trails.
- The project and its potential effects on the quality of the human environment are neither controversial nor do they involve unique or unknown results.

The proposal is in conformance with all Federal, State, and local requirements, planning and laws, imposed for the protection of the environment. Appropriate mitigation has been incorporated into the proposed action. There would be no effect to the human health or environment of minority and low income populations.

---

Jeffrey A. Weeks  
Assistant Field Manager, Nonrenewable Resources  
Ely Field Office

---

Date

**Attachment**  
**Ward Recreation Area Disc Golf Course**  
**Decision Record**

**Appeal Procedures**

If you wish to appeal this decision, it may be appealed to the Interior Board of Land Appeals, Office of the Secretary, in accordance with 43 CFR part 4. If you appeal, your appeal must **also** be filed with the Bureau of Land Management at the following address:

Jeffrey A. Weeks, Assistant Field Manager  
BLM, Ely Field Office  
HC 33 Box 33500  
702 N. Industrial Way  
Ely, NV 89301

Your appeal must be filed within thirty (30) days from receipt of this decision. The appellant has the burden of showing that the decision appealed from is in error.

If you wish to file a petition pursuant to regulation 43 CFR 4.21 (58 FR 4942, January 19, 1993) for a stay (suspension) of the decision during the time that your appeal is being reviewed by the Board, the petition for stay must accompany your notice of appeal. Copies of the notice of appeal and petition for a stay must also be submitted to:

Board of Land Appeals  
Dockets Attorney  
801 N. Quincy Street, Suite 300  
Arlington, VA 22203

A copy must also be sent to the appropriate office of the Solicitor at the same time the original documents are filed with the above office.

US Department of the Interior  
Office of the Regional Solicitor  
Pacific Southwest Region  
2800 Cottage Way, Room E-1712  
Sacramento, California 95825

If you request a stay, you have the burden of proof to demonstrate that a stay should be granted. A petition for a stay is required to show sufficient justification based on the following standards:

1. The relative harm to the parties if the stay is granted or denied.
2. The likelihood of the appellants success on the merits.
3. The likelihood of immediate and irreparable harm if the stay is not granted.
4. Whether the public interest favors granting the stay.

The Office of Hearings and Appeals regulations do not provide for electronic filing of appeals, therefore they will not be accepted.