

**United States Department of the Interior, Bureau of Land Management  
Egan Field Office  
Finding of No Significant Impact**

Thirty Mile Spring-South Butte Allotment Boundary Fence and the South Butte Well and Pipeline

Environmental Assessment DOI-BLM-NV-L010-2011-0015-EA

**Finding of No Significant Impact**

I have reviewed Environmental Assessment (EA) DOI-BLM-NV-L010-2011-0015-EA, dated June, 2011. After consideration of the environmental impacts as described in the EA, I have determined that the construction of the Thirty Mile Spring-South Butte Allotment Boundary Fence and the South Butte Well and Pipeline, with the standard operating procedures as described in the EA, will not significantly affect the quality of the human environment and therefore 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 Code of Federal Regulations 1508.27), both with regard to the context and the intensity of impacts described in the EA.

**Context:** The project is located approximately 22 miles northwest of Ely, Nevada. The area affected by the fence is approximately 1.6 acres and the area affected by the well and pipeline is approximately 8 acres with a total of approximately 9.6 acres of BLM administered land. The site-specific action does not have any relevant short-and long-term effects on land with international, national, state-wide, or regional importance.

**Intensity:**

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

The Environmental Assessment has considered both beneficial and adverse impacts of the proposed action. None of the impacts considered in the EA approach the threshold of significance. In other words, none of the resource impacts are intensely adverse or beneficial.

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

Design features of the proposed action will not result in potentially adverse impacts to public health or 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, wilderness or ecologically critical areas.**

There are no park lands, prime farmlands, wetlands, wild and scenic rivers, wilderness or ecologically critical areas in or near the project area. There were no cultural resource identified within the affected area.

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

Comments were received from one interest group. These comments were reviewed and considered but did not identify any issues that would be considered controversial. It was determined that the effects are not highly controversial.

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

There are no effects of the proposed action identified in the EA which are considered uncertain or involve unique or unknown risks. Construction of the proposed action would follow standard operating procedures to minimize impacts to the environment. The stipulations will be adhered to through completion of the project.

**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 does not establish a precedent for future actions with significant effects nor does it represent a decision in principle about a future consideration. Other rangeland improvement projects occurring within other allotments in the Ely District, if they occur, would be subject to the same environmental assessment standards and independent decision making.

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

The environmental assessment analyzed cumulative impacts on relevant resources, including the authorized grazing actions within the project area. There are no significant direct or indirect cumulative impacts. The analysis of the proposed action does anticipate subsequent 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 historical resources.**

The proposed action will not cause loss or destruction or loss of scientific, cultural or historical resources. No National Register eligible districts, sites, highways, structures, or objects were identified in the project area. Design features identified in the proposed action in the EA for dealing with newly discovered items of cultural significance are specified as a condition of approval for the proposed action.

**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.**

Analysis in the EA determined that the special status species (Federally listed, proposed or candidate, threatened or endangered and State sensitive) that occur near the project area (Sage Grouse, Pygmy Rabbit) would not be adversely affected by the proposed action.

**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 will not violate or threaten to violate any Federal, State, or local law or requirement imposed for the protection of the environment.



---

Doris A. Metcalf  
Field Manager  
Egan Field Office



---

Date