

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT
FOR THE
PROJECTS FOR IMPLEMENTATION OF THE STEENS MOUNTAIN
COOPERATIVE MANAGEMENT AND PROTECTION ACT OF 2000
EA-OR-027-01-27

The Bureau of Land Management (BLM), Burns District, Andrews Resource Area has analyzed effects of the implementation of projects proposed to achieve the “no livestock grazing area” and replacement forage objectives contained in the Steens Mountain Cooperative Management and Protection Act of 2000 (Act). A proposed action and several alternatives are analyzed. The Act was passed by Congress, signed by the President on October 30, 2000, and became Public Law 106-399. The Act requires that a wilderness “no livestock grazing area” be established and replacement forage areas be developed for affected grazing permittees. Section 113(e)(2) of the Act requires the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) to “be responsible for installing and maintaining any fencing required for resource protection within the designated no livestock grazing area.” Section 113(e)(4) of the Act requires the BLM to “construct fencing and develop water systems as necessary to allow reasonable and efficient livestock use of the forage resources...” within the replacement forage area on BLM land. The EA analyzes effects of the implementation of projects proposed to achieve these objectives.

These fencing and water system projects will secure the “no livestock grazing area” and achieve the replacement forage objectives contained in the Act. All of the proposed actions are in conformance with the Act as directed in the various sections cited previously. Those projects not directly referred to in the Act are in conformance with the Andrews Management Framework Plan, 1982, and the Andrews Rangeland Program Summary Update, 1984.

Determination

Based on the analysis of environmental impacts contained in the attached EA and all other available information, I have determined that the proposal and the alternative analyzed do not constitute a major Federal action that would adversely impact the quality of the human environment. Therefore, an EIS is unnecessary and will not be prepared. This determination is based on the following factors:

1. Beneficial, adverse direct, indirect, and cumulative environmental impacts have been disclosed in the EA. Analysis indicated no significant impacts on society as a whole, the affected region, the affected interests or the locality. The physical and biological effects are limited to the Burns District, Andrews Resource Area and adjacent land.
2. Public health and safety would not be adversely impacted. There are no known or anticipated concerns with project waste or hazardous materials.
3. There would be no adverse impact to regional or local air quality, prime or unique farmlands, known paleontological resources on public land within the area, wetlands,

floodplains, areas with unique characteristics, ecologically critical areas or designated Areas of Critical Environmental Concern.

4. There are no highly controversial effects on the environment.
5. There are no effects that are highly uncertain or involve unique or unknown risk. Sufficient information on risk is available based on information in the EA and other past actions of a similar nature.
6. This alternative does not set a precedent for other actions that may be implemented in the future to meet the goals and objectives of adopted Federal, State or local natural resource related plans, policies or programs. It does not preclude consideration or adoption of various alternatives in the Andrews Resource Area / Steens Mountain Cooperative Management and Protection Area RMP/EIS which will supercede the Andrews MFP.
7. No cumulative impacts related to other actions that would have a significant adverse impact were identified or are anticipated.
8. Based on previous and ongoing cultural resource surveys, and through mitigation by avoidance, no adverse impacts to cultural resources were identified or anticipated. There are no known American Indian religious concerns or persons or groups who might be disproportionately and adversely affected as anticipated by the Environmental Justice policy.
9. No adverse impacts to any threatened or endangered species or their habitat that was determined to be critical under the Endangered Species Act were identified. If, at a future time, there could be the potential for adverse impacts, treatments would be modified or mitigated not to have an adverse effect or new analysis would be conducted.
10. This alternative is in compliance with relevant Federal, State and local laws, regulations and requirements for the protection of the environment.

Signature on File

July 27, 2001

Miles R. Brown
Andrews Resource Area Field Manager

Date