United States
Department of
Agriculture

Forest Service
Intermountain Region
May 7, 2020

Decision Notice and Finding of No Significant Impact

Leviathan-Loope Rangeland Project

Leviathan and Campbell Loope Sheep and Goat and Mud Lake, Double Springs, and Barber Cattle and Horse Allotments

CARSON RANGER DISTRICT
HUMBOLDT-TOIYABE NATIONAL FOREST

Alpine and Mono Counties, California
and
Douglas County, Nevada

For Information Contact: Courtney Ghiglieri
Project Manager
Carson Ranger District
1536 South Carson Street
Carson City, Nevada 89701
(775) 884-8151

USDA NONDISCRIMINATION STATEMENT

The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) prohibits discrimination in all its programs and activities on the basis of race, color, national origin, gender, religion, age, disability, political beliefs, sexual orientation, and marital or family status. (Not all prohibited bases apply to all programs.) Persons with disabilities who require alternative means for communication of program information (Braille, large print, audiotape, etc.) should contact USDA's TARGET Center at (202) 720-2600 (voice and TDD).

To file a complaint of discrimination, write USDA, Director, Office of Civil Rights, Room 326-W, Whitten Building, 14th and Independence Avenue, SW, Washington DC 20250-9410 or call (202) 720-5964 (voice or TDD). USDA is an equal opportunity provider and employer.

Introduction

The Campbell-Loope, Mud Lake, Double Springs, and Barber Allotments are located on the Carson Ranger District of the Humboldt-Toiyabe National Forest. The Leviathan Allotment is located on both the Carson and Bridgeport Ranger Districts of the Humboldt-Toiyabe National Forest. The Leviathan Allotment occurs in three counties: Alpine and Mono, CA and Douglas County NV; and the Campbell-Loope Allotment occurs entirely in Alpine County, CA. Mud Lake and Double Springs Allotments occur almost entirely in Douglas County, NV with a small portion (28 acres) of the Double Springs Allotment occurring in Alpine County, CA. A small portion of the Campbell-Loope Allotment occurs in the Mokelumne Wilderness.

Recent ecological monitoring shows that portions of the Leviathan and Campbell-Loope Allotments are functioning outside the natural range of variability as compared to historic known values. There is a need to manage the allotments in a manner that meets or moves toward the desired future resource conditions as defined in the Forest Plan and the site-specific desired conditions. Actions such as modified management strategies, changed seasons of use, and modified or new water developments need to be considered to meet desired future conditions. There is also a need to evaluate the closure of three small, vacant allotments. The Mud Lake, Double Springs and Barber Allotments are not able to function as part of a sustainable grazing system due to their relatively low foraging capability, isolated location and lack of connectivity to other grazable lands.

Action is being taken at this time because current and prospective permittees have expressed a desire to graze or continue grazing on allotments in the project area, and the Rescissions Act of 1995 directs the Forest Service to establish and adhere to a schedule to complete environmental analyses and decisions on all allotments. National Forest System lands provide an important source of livestock forage.

In response to the Rescissions Act and the needs for action, the Carson Ranger District prepared the Leviathan-Loope Rangeland Project Environmental Assessment (EA). The EA was prepared in compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and other relevant federal and state laws and regulations. The EA discloses the direct, indirect, and cumulative environmental effects that would result from the proposed action and the no action alternative.

Decision

Based on my review of the alternatives, it is my decision to select Alternative 1 (Proposed Action) as described in detail in the Leviathan-Loope Rangeland Project Environmental Assessment. Elements of the Proposed Action Alternative are as follows:

- Continue to authorize sheep grazing for the Leviathan and Campbell-Loope Allotments.
- Modify existing grazing management strategies to help move rangelands to a more ecologically functioning condition. Modifications include extending the permitted season of use for both allotments to provide more flexibility with meeting range management goals.
- Include a management strategy that employs proper use criteria (utilization standards, disturbance thresholds, etc.) that promotes an upward trend toward satisfactory ecological function.
- Establish proper use criteria and within season triggers to determine when livestock should be moved or removed. The proper use criteria are based on the current ecological condition for each habitat group within each allotment.
- Develop and/or maintain existing springs and water developments to increase the distribution of livestock throughout the allotment and help improve rangeland condition.

- Apply design features to minimize the impacts or potential impacts of grazing and associated activities.
- Conduct short-term and long-term monitoring to determine if adjustments to proper-use criteria, and or to the timing, duration and intensity of grazing are necessary based on ecological assessments and management objectives.
- Develop updated Allotment Management Plans (AMPs) for Leviathan and Campbell-Loope Allotments.
- Modify the Campbell-Loope Allotment boundary to exclude areas that are largely inaccessible to livestock and contain non-contiguous patches of forage (2,753 acres).
- Close the Mud Lake, Double Springs, and Barber Allotments to livestock grazing (4,359 acres).

Rationale for Decision

I selected Alternative 1 (Proposed Action) because it provides the best balance in meeting the purpose and need, addressing impacts to resources, and complying with all applicable laws and regulations. In reaching my decision, I have sought to carefully and objectively assess the public comments, and the analysis of effects to resources disclosed in the Leviathan-Loope Rangeland Project EA. My decision is based on the following considerations.

Since the comment period, incremental changes and clarifications to the Proposed Action were made in effort to improve the proposal and provide clarity to interested parties. Minor changes and clarifications included modifying the terminology used to describe occupancy from permitted numbers to head months, and clarifying the importance of focusing on timing, intensity, and duration of livestock grazing to meet range management objectives. The season of use dates have also been adjusted to allow management flexibility to address such issues as cheatgrass infestations as well as improve the growth potential of plants by rotating seasons in which they are grazed. Documentation of these incremental changes to the proposed action is included in the EA in accordance with 40 CFR 1502.21.

The Interdisciplinary Team that prepared the EA conducted an extensive review of the Forest Plan and its amendments and found that Alternative 1 (Proposed Action) is consistent with the 1986 Toiyabe National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan (Forest Plan), the 2001 and 2004 Record of Decision for the Sierra Nevada Forest Plan Amendment (SNFPA) and the 2016 Greater Sage Grouse, Distinct Population Segment (DPS) Bi-State Sage Grouse Forest Plan Amendment.

My decision seeks to balance interests of the public at large and the permittees while providing processes to maintain or improve ecological conditions. These interests include managing rangeland vegetation to provide long-term sustainable conditions, while providing livestock grazing opportunities on National Forest System lands in accordance with the Multiple-Use Sustained–Yield Act, the National Forest Management Act, and the previously referenced Forest Plans. While meeting these interests, my decision provides methods and design features for managing rangelands to achieve diverse and healthy ecosystems. Design features described in the Environmental Assessment will be followed to meet threatened and sensitive plant and animal habitat needs (including those for the bi-state sage grouse), improve or maintain water quality effects to streams, riparian areas, and wetlands, and to minimize impacts to cultural resources or recreation values.

Comments were reviewed by the interdisciplinary team to determine if issues or concerns were raised that demonstrated a clear cause-effect relationship and if recommendations/remedies were suggested that would address the issue/concern. EA Appendix A: Comment Consideration addresses comments received during the scoping and comment periods. The Responsible Official determined that scoping input

received on the Proposed Action did not identify issues but did express the following key concerns with the proposed action. These were addressed in the cited locations.

- Allotment boundary adjustments within the wilderness are detrimental to future grazing in the area (Appendix A: Comment #38; pp. 10-11; EA p. 30)
- The Proposed Monitoring procedure is not consistent with the more recent approaches used by other agencies such as NRCS (Appendix A: Comments #17,18; Range Specialist Report pp. 24-34; and the Vegetation Specialist Report pp. 1-7).
- Allotment closures are detrimental to the future of grazing in the area (Appendix A: Comment #35)
- Sage grouse may be negatively affected from changes to season of use and improvements to water developments (EA pp 53-56; Appendix A: Comment# 39-42; Wildlife Biological Evaluation)
- How climate change was considered in the project planning (EA pp 13 and various specialist reports)

Alternatives Considered

In addition to the Proposed Action (Alternative 1), the no action alternative for this project is no grazing, as specified in the Grazing Permit Administration Handbook (FSH 2209.13 section 92.31).

Alternative 2 (No Action/No Grazing) would not authorize grazing on any of the allotments within the Leviathan-Loope Rangeland Project area (figure 1). Compared to Alternative 1 (Proposed Action), Alternative 2 (No Action/No Grazing) would result in two sheep allotments in the project area to become vacant, and three cattle allotments to remain vacant. Existing improvements that are no longer functional or needed including water developments, interior fences, and cattleguards may be removed over time as allowed by funding and management priorities. Furthermore, no new spring developments would be constructed on the Leviathan and Campbell-Loope Allotments.

Public, Tribal, and Agency Involvement and Scoping

Notice of this project was published in the Schedule of Proposed Actions (SOPA) on August 19, 2014. A Notice of Proposed Action (NOPA) was distributed on February 20, 2015 to approximately 42 agencies, individuals, and organizations. The NOPA summarized the Proposed Action, provided notification that an EA was being prepared and would be available for review, and requested comments on the proposed action. A legal notice advising of the availability of the NOPA was published in Reno, Nevada, in the Reno Gazette Journal, the newspaper of record on February 26, 2015.

The 30-day comment period on the proposed action ended on March 27, 2015. The Forest received comments from three organizations and individuals during the comment period and comments from one organization outside of the comment period. Scoping material has been posted at https://www.fs.usda.gov/project/?project=45038. A summary of the scoping comments and responses is located in Appendix A.

Efforts were made to involve local tribal governments and to solicit their input regarding the proposed action. Formal consultation was initiated with the Washoe Tribe of California and Nevada at a semi-annual meeting in 2013. As a result of the meeting, concern for an important cultural site was expressed and a site visit requested. Former District Archaeologist, Joe Garrotto, and the Tribal Historic Preservation Officer (THPO) for the Washoe Tribe visited the location in summer 2013. As part of this undertaking, the site was fully recorded with the help of the Washoe THPO and other volunteers. In

addition to being formally recorded, sheep will not be allowed to graze within the site boundaries. The project was also discussed in subsequent formal consultation meetings in March 2015 and March 2016. The Tribe expressed no other concerns regarding this project.

The Forest Service consulted individuals, Federal, State, tribal, and local agencies during the development of this EA. The list of entities contacted are listed in the Agencies and Persons Consulted section at the end of the EA.

Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI)

The responsible official is responsible for evaluating the effects of the project relative to the definition of significance established by the Council for Environmental Quality (CEQ) Regulations (40 CFR 1508.13). Based on review and consideration of the Environmental Assessment (EA) and documentation included in the project record, they have determined that the Proposed Action for the Leviathan-Loope Rangeland Project would not have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment. As a result, no environmental impact statement will be prepared. Rationale for this finding is as follows, organized by sub-section of the CEQ definition of significance.

Context

Disclosure of direct, indirect, and cumulative effects in the EA demonstrate analysis of the proposed action primarily in the context of the analysis area (i.e., effects within the Leviathan-Loope Rangeland Project analysis area) and the locality (e.g., effects beyond the boundaries of the project area, including downstream and to adjacent landowners). Effects to the geographic region were also considered. Both short-term and long-term effects of the Proposed Action were found to be of limited extent and are not expected to affect national resources or the human environment (EA pages 34-64).

Intensity

Intensity is a measure of the severity, extent, or quantity of effects, and is based on information from the effect's analysis of the EA, specialist reports, and the references in the project record. The effects of this project have been appropriately and thoroughly considered with an analysis that is responsive to concerns and issues raised by the public. The agency has taken a hard look at the environmental effects using relevant scientific information and knowledge of site-specific conditions gained from field visits. The finding of no significant effect is based on the context of the project and intensity of effects using the 10 factors identified in 40 CFR 1508.27(b). Effects that may be both beneficial and adverse. A significant effect may exist even if the Federal agency believes that on balance the effect will be beneficial.

The interdisciplinary team analyzed the direct, indirect, and cumulative effects of the Proposed Action on resources in and around the Leviathan-Loope Project analysis area. The analyses documented in the Environmental Effects Chapter 3 of the EA (pages 34–64) state that some direct, indirect, and cumulative effects are expected in the short-term in the context of the analysis area. Design features have been agreed upon by the ID Team to ensure that even short-term effects to these resources will not be significant. The project record also includes detailed analyses of the effects of the Proposed Action to range, vegetation, soil, hydrology, recreation and designated areas, wildlife, fisheries and aquatics, botanical resources, and cultural resources. These analyses contribute to the decision maker's understanding of the effects of the alternatives and confirm that there will be no significant effects to those resources.

1. Effects that may be both beneficial and adverse. A significant effect may exist even if the Federal agency believes that on balance the effect will be beneficial.

The interdisciplinary team analyzed the direct, indirect, and cumulative effects of the proposed action on biological, physical, and cultural resources in and around the Leviathan-Loope Project analysis area. The

analyses documented in the Environmental Effects chapter of the EA (pages 34–64) state that some direct, indirect, and cumulative effects are expected in the short-term in the context of the analysis area. Design features have been agreed upon by the ID Team to ensure that even short-term effects to these resources will not be significant. The project record also includes detailed analyses of the effects of the alternatives to range, vegetation, soil, hydrology, recreation and designated areas, wildlife, fisheries and aquatics, botanical resources, and cultural resources. These analyses contribute to the decision maker's understanding of the effects of the alternatives and confirm that there will be no significant effects to those resources (EA pages 34–64).

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

The proposed action is not expected to significantly affect public health or safety. The use of a herder with herding dogs on site at all times minimizes the potential for livestock to negatively interact with humans.

3. Unique characteristics of the geographic area such as the proximity to historical or cultural resources, parklands, prime farmlands, wetlands, wild and scenic rivers, or ecologically critical areas.

Campbell-Loope Allotment is located within the Mokelumne Wilderness and was an established allotment prior to wilderness designation in 1964/84. Consistent with provisions in the Wilderness Act and the Congressional Grazing Guidelines (USDA FS 2007a, FSM 2323.23), the allotment was preserved and has been in active or vacant status since. However, the portion of the allotment in wilderness has low forage capability and is largely inaccessible to livestock and therefore has not been used by the permittee for livestock grazing. As part of the Decision, the boundary of the Campbell-Loope Allotment will be adjusted to exclude this portion of the allotment to more accurately reflect the grazing use. EA pp. 30 and 64 and Appendix A: Response to Comment #38.

The EA (pages 62-64) and the Recreation and Roadless Area Specialist Report summarizes potential impacts to Mt. Bullion Roadless Area which is located in the project area. The activities and impacts are consistent with the Toiyabe National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan as it pertains to recreation, roadless areas, and range developments.

The analysis area does not include parklands, prime farmlands, wild and scenic rivers, or ecologically critical areas. A survey of cultural resources has been completed in accordance with consultation with the California and Nevada State Historic Preservation Offices and Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act to ensure that any cultural resources found within proposed treatment areas will be protected (EA pages 33, 49).

The special and unique legal and political relationships of tribal governments and the United States government are reflected in the United States Constitution, treaties, statutes, court decisions, executive orders, and memoranda. These relationships impart a duty on all federal actions to consult, coordinate, and communicate with American Indian Tribes on a government-to-government basis. Because American Indian Tribes can be affected by Forest Service policies and actions managing the lands and resources under its jurisdiction, the Forest Service has a duty to consult with American Indian Tribes on matters affecting their interests. Because of this government-to-government relationship, efforts were made to involve local tribal governments and to solicit their input regarding the proposed action. Communication and consultation with tribal governments has occurred since 2013. In conclusion, analysis found that the Project would interface with designated areas but would not pose to significant changes or effects to these areas.

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

The key concerns raised during public comment periods were related to allotment boundary adjustments within the wilderness, proposed allotment closures, climate change and potential impacts to bi-state sage grouse. While there will continue to be disagreement regarding multiple uses of National Forest System lands, these issues are addressed in the EA (pp. 12-13; Appendix A Response to Comments 17-24, 35, 38, 39-42) and in various sections of the Range, Vegetation, and Wildlife Specialist Reports and are not considered to be highly controversial.

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

The effects analyses documented in the EA and in the project record incorporated accepted techniques and methods, the best available scientific literature, reliable data, field review, and the judgment of qualified professional resource specialists. Neither these analyses nor public comments identified highly uncertain effects or unique or unknown risks associated with the alternatives (EA pages 34–64).

6. The degree to which the action may establish precedent for future actions with significant effects or represents a decision in principle about a future consideration.

Comments expressed concern that the Leviathan-Loope Rangeland Project Proposed Action could be detrimental to the future of grazing in the area due to the modification of the Campbell-Loope Allotment boundary (which now excludes a portion of the Mokelumne Wilderness); as well as the proposed closure of three grazing allotments (Mud Lake, Double Springs, and Barber). In the EA, it was determined these actions would have no measurable effect on grazing due to the current lack of forage capability, access, and general grazing feasibility of these areas. Additionally, Mud Lake, Double Springs, Barber and the wilderness portion of the Campbell-Loope Allotment have not been grazed for several decades while in Forest Service management Concerns regarding boundary adjustments and allotment closures were addressed in more detail in the EA on pages 12, 30, 32, 46, as well as in Appendix A; Comment #35 and #38, and in the Range Specialist Report.

The activities associated with the Leviathan-Loope Rangeland Project analysis area are similar to many that have previously been implemented and will continue to be implemented by Forest Service line officers on National Forest System lands. The activities are within the scope of the Forest Plan and are not expected to establish a precedent for future actions.

7. Whether the action is related to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant effects. Significance exists if it is reasonable to anticipate a cumulatively significant effect on the environment. Significance cannot be avoided by terming an action temporary or by breaking it down into small component parts.

The analysis completed for the EA demonstrates that there are no significant cumulative effects on the environment when project impacts are combined with the effects of past and reasonably foreseeable future projects and the effects from natural changes taking place in the environment (EA pages 34-64 and individual resource specialist reports).

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 Cultural Resource Report for the Leviathan-Loope Range Rescission Project (R2014041702413) addresses the potential effects to cultural resources from the authorization of livestock grazing. Cultural resources in the project area are being managed in accordance with Section 106 of the National Historic

Preservation Act of 1966 (NHPA). The Forest Service consulted with the California State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) on the identification efforts, eligibility determinations and effects determinations. It received concurrence in a letter dated April 17, 2019. Design features identified in the Environmental Assessment shall be followed to ensure no adverse effects to cultural resources (EA Page 33).

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.

A Biological Assessment (BA) was prepared to analyze the effects to Lahontan cutthroat trout (LCT) which is the only federally listed species that occurs in the project area. LCT occur within the project area within the East Carson River which is in the Western Lahontan Basin Geographic Management Unit (GMU) for LCT. However, this portion of the East Carson River contains LCT that are stocked for recreational fisheries and does not contain any recovery populations. The EA (pp. 52-53) summarizes the BA prepared for LCT. In a letter received on July 16, 2019, the USFWS concurred with the Forest Service determination that the proposed project may affect but will not adversely affect LCT (USDI 2019 and Biological Assessment-Project File).

A Biological Evaluation (BE) was prepared to analyze the potential impacts of the Proposed Action to Region 4 Forest Sensitive Wildlife Species and is summarized in the EA (Table 18, pp. 49-56). According to the BE, activities associated with the Proposed Action may impact individual bi-state sage grouse as well as mountain quail but will not result in a loss of viability or lead to a trend toward federal listing. The greater sage grouse bi-state Distinct Population Segment (DPS) population is proposed for listing as threatened by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) in October 2013. A rule to delineate proposed critical habitat was also issued at this time. The greater sage grouse bi-state DPS is also designated as a Region 4 Forest Service sensitive species. Potential impacts to bi-state sage grouse and mountain quail were considered to be minor and offset by the expected improved conditions to sage grouse and mountain quail habitat from implementation of the Proposed Action. In addition, the project will not adversely affect proposed critical habitat for Bi-state sage grouse.

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 is consistent with Federal, State, and local laws and requirements required for the protection of the environment. These include the following:

- **Migratory Bird Treaty Act:** The Wildlife Specialist Report analyzed potential impacts from the Alternatives to migratory birds, consistent with the act, the subsequent Executive Order 13186, and the memorandum of understanding between the USDI Fish and Wildlife Service and USDA Forest Service, which provides for the protection of migratory birds (Wildlife Specialist Report; summarized in EA pp 57-59). It found that the Proposed Action may result in short-term impacts but will not lead to any long-term effects to migratory bird populations, alter their distribution, or affect their conservation status.

- **National Clean Water Act, as amended; Water Rights:** The Watershed Resources report (summarized in the EA (pp. 59-62) evaluated consistency with the Clean Water Act (as primarily administered through Regional Water Quality Control Boards) and through the California water rights database. Based on the information in the EA and the project record concerning hydrology, the Alternatives are consistent with the Clean Water Act (as amended).

- **National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) and 36 CFR Part 800-The Section 106 Process:** General consistency with the NHPA was documented in FONSI element 8 above. Consistent with 36 CFR Part 800, communications were established with Tribal Representatives to assure government-to-government communication prior to initiating scoping of the project. The Bridgeport Indian Colony was not originally involved in these communications but will be included in any future discussions about activities in the Monitor Pass area, including the Leviathan-Loope Rangeland Project. Because of this government-to-government relationship, efforts were made to involve local tribal governments and to solicit their input regarding the proposed action. Formal consultation was initiated with the Washoe Tribe of Nevada and California at a semi-annual meeting in 2013. As a result of the meeting, concern for an important cultural site was expressed and a site visit requested. Former District Archaeologist, Joe Garrotto, and the Tribal Historic Preservation Officer (THPO) for the Washoe Tribe visited the location in summer 2013. As part of this undertaking, the site was fully recorded with the help of the Washoe THPO and other volunteers. In addition to being formally recorded, sheep will not be allowed to graze within the site boundaries. The project was also discussed in subsequent formal consultation meetings in March 2015 and March 2016. The Tribe expressed no other concerns in regard to this project.

- **Executive Order 119990 of May 1977 (Wetlands):** This executive order requires the Forest Service to take action to minimize destruction, loss, or degradation of wetlands and to preserve and enhance the natural and beneficial values of wetlands. In compliance with this order, Forest Service direction requires that an analysis be completed to determine whether adverse impacts would result. The EA and the project record confirm that this decision complies with EO 11990 by maintaining and restoring riparian conditions.

- **Executive Order 11988 of May 1977 (Floodplains):** This executive order requires the Forest Service to provide leadership and to take action to (1) minimize adverse impacts associated with occupancy and modification of floodplains and reduce risks of flood loss; (2) minimize impacts of floods on human safety, health, and welfare; and (3) restore and preserve the natural and beneficial values served by flood plains. The EA and the project record confirm that this decision complies with EO 11998 by maintaining floodplain integrity.

- **Other National Forest Management Act (NFMA) Requirements** – The Action Alternative is consistent with the following provisions of the NNFMA:

    - a. Soil, slope, or other watershed conditions will not be irreversibly damaged (16 USC 1604(g)(3)(E)(i)).

    - b. Protection is provided for streams, streambanks, shorelines, lakes, wetlands, and other bodies of water from detrimental changes in water temperatures, blockages of water courses, and deposits of sediment, where harvests are likely to seriously and adversely affect water conditions or fish habitat (16 USC 1604(g)(3)(E)(iii)).

- **Management Indicator Species:** USDA Forest Service Management Indicator Species (MIS). MIS are identified in the Toiyabe National Forest Land and Resource Management Plan (USDA 1986) as representing a group of species having similar habitat requirements. A review was conducted to determine: 1) if the project is within the range of any MIS, 2) if habitat is present within the proposed project area, and 3) if there are potential direct, indirect or cumulative effects

on habitat components. The EA pp. 57-59 summarizes the findings of the MIS analysis from the Wildlife Specialist Report.

- **Humboldt-Toiyabe FSM Supplement to Chapter 2080 – Noxious Weeds Management:** Leviathan-Loope Rangeland Project Vegetation Specialist Report and Noxious Weed Risk Assessment, which is summarized in the EA pp. 36-45 and Table 14, evaluated the potential for the Proposed Action to introduce and/or expand noxious weeds and other invasive species into the Leviathan-Loope Rangeland Project area. The Weed Risk Assessment was conducted consistent with Forest Service Manual 2081.02 and the Sierra Nevada Forest Plan Amendment (SNFPA), and developed design features associated with the alternatives would reduce the risk of weed establishment and/or spread. Design Features were established to comply with Noxious Weed Order 36 CFR 261.58(t)/regional order 04-00-097.

Administrative Review and Objection Rights

Eligibility to File an Objection

This project was subject to a pre-decisional administrative review process, also known as an objection process (36 CFR 218, Subparts A and B). Only individuals or entities (as defined by 36 CFR 218.2) who previously submitted timely and specific written comments (as defined by 36 CFR 218.2) regarding this proposed project during a designated opportunity for public comment established by the responsible official were eligible to file an objection to the draft decision. Issues raised in objections must be based on previously submitted comments unless based on new information that arose after the designated opportunities to comment. The 45-day Objection Period for the Leviathan-Loope Rangeland Project began on March 12, 2020. A Draft Decision Notice and Final Environmental Assessment was provided to all eligible parties for review. The objection period concluded on April 27th, 2020. We received two general comment letters during this period however, no objections were filed.

Implementation Date

As per 36 CFR 218.12, this decision was not signed until after the 5th business day following the close of the objection period. I intend to implement this decision as soon as possible. During the spring of 2020, Allotment Management Plans will be finalized and ten-year term grazing permits will be created to include the direction provided in this decision. The Annual Operating Instructions for the 2020 grazing season will implement the direction provided in this decision.

Contact

For more information about the Leviathan-Loope Rangeland Project, contact Courtney Ghiglieri, Project Manager, Carson Ranger District, 1536 South Carson Street, Carson City, Nevada, 89701. Phone: (775) 884-8151.

Matthew Zumstein
Carson District Ranger
Humboldt-Toiyabe National Forest

05/08/20
Date