



# United States Department of the Interior



## BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT

Wells Field Office  
3900 East Idaho Street  
Elko, Nevada 89801

[http://www.blm.gov/nv/st/en/fo/elko\\_field\\_office.html](http://www.blm.gov/nv/st/en/fo/elko_field_office.html)

In Reply Refer To:  
4130 (NVE03000)

### **FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT CURTIS SPRING TERM PERMIT RENEWAL DOI-BLM-NV-N030-2015-0026-EA**

Based on the Environmental Assessment (EA) for the Curtis Spring Term Permit Renewal (DOI-BLM-NV-N030-2015-0026-EA) and supporting documents, I have determined that the proposed action alternative described and analyzed in the EA will not significantly affect the quality of the human environment. Therefore, preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is not required.

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

#### Context:

The proposed action put forth in this EA focuses on livestock grazing management on approximately 37,744 acres of public land approximately 35 miles east of Elko, NV and 30 miles south of Wells, NV. The 2015 Draft Standards and Guidelines for Rangeland Health (S&G) Assessment for the Curtis Spring Allotment concluded that Standard 3 (Habitat) was not being met; however, current livestock grazing was not identified as a causal factor. Standard 2 (Riparian and Wetland Sites) was not analyzed as riparian and wetland sites are not present within the Allotment. Standard 5 (Healthy Wild Horse and Burro Populations) was not analyzed as the Allotment falls outside any established Herd Management Areas (HMAs).

#### Intensity:

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

The analysis identifies any beneficial or adverse impacts on cultural resources, fire management, livestock grazing, migratory birds, non-native invasive and noxious species, special status species, soil resources, vegetation, water resources, and wildlife that may arise as a result of the proposed grazing permit renewal. Measures are incorporated to avoid, reduce, or eliminate adverse impacts from grazing, conserve habitat for sensitive species, and identify and protect cultural resources.

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

The proposed action will have no effect on public health or safety.

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

There are no unique characteristics such as park lands, Special Recreation Management Areas, prime farm lands, wetlands, Areas of Critical Environmental Concern, Wild and Scenic rivers, designated Wilderness or Wilderness Study Areas in the allotment or that would possibly be affected by the proposed action.

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

In May of 2015 the BLM mailed a scoping letter to the livestock permittee and members of the interested public explaining our intent to proceed with the Curtis Spring permit renewal. No comments were received. A draft standards and guidelines assessment was released for public comment in August 2015. No comments were received. Based on the fact that no comments were received in response to public scoping, the effects on the quality of the human environment are not considered highly controversial.

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

Possible effects are neither highly uncertain nor do they include unique or unknown risks. The analysis is based on monitoring information, and all livestock grazing authorizations are subject to applicable procedures to prevent undue environmental harm and risk.

*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 ten-year grazing permit includes terms and conditions to protect resources from significant adverse effects. This action does not make any commitments for BLM approval for any future actions beyond those outlined in the proposed action. All future proposed livestock management actions not described in the alternatives would continue to be subject to further consideration in accordance with BLM grazing and NEPA regulations and policies.

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

All resources are evaluated for cumulative impacts in the EA, and no significant impacts are identified. As a standard procedure, cumulative impacts would continue to be subject to further review as new projects are proposed, and on a site-specific basis.

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.*

The proposed action is unlikely to cause loss or destruction of significant scientific, cultural, or historic resources (See Section 3.3.1 in the EA).

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 ESA of 1973.*

No listed species are known to occur within the Curtis Spring Allotment, and no critical habitat for any species has been designated in the area. As discussed in Section 3.3.6 of the EA, the allotment does provide habitat for Greater Sage-Grouse and several other BLM Sensitive Species. The proposed action is not expected to contribute to the need to list any species of concern.

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 has been developed and reviewed in coordination with applicable agencies to ensure their consistency with plans and requirements of other Federal, State, and local agencies.

---

Marc Jackson  
Field Manager, Wells Field Office

---

Date