



Forest Service
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

WO Ecosystem Management Coordination and Natural Resources Rangeland Management | January 2026

NEPA and Rangeland Management

USDA published an interim final rule on July 3, 2025, revising departmental National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) regulations at 7 CFR 1b and rescinding Forest Service NEPA regulations. This document will be updated if there are any relevant changes when the final rule is published.

This document is aligned with the revised departmental NEPA regulations and intended to help field staff better understand what authorities and tools are available to satisfy the requirements of NEPA for rangeland management projects and when actions may be taken without further analysis. Part I focuses on authorities and tools for NEPA efficiency. Part II clarifies the distinction between approving an action and authorizing a use. For example, some administrative actions, like the issuance of a new permit upon expiration of an existing permit, may not require additional analysis.

Part I – NEPA Efficiencies for Rangeland Management

NEPA requires agency decision makers to make informed decisions by considering the environmental effects of their decisions along with related social and economic effects of proposed actions. NEPA's purpose is not to generate paperwork, even excellent paperwork, but to foster excellent action. Ultimately, it is not better documents, but better decisions that count. It is also important to recognize that it is the [Agency's policy](#) to encourage responsible risk-taking, creativity, and innovation. Doing so leads to improved ways of doing business.

Most rangeland management projects and activities are subject to NEPA. However, the level of analysis should be commensurate with the decision being made and the associated complexity. There are opportunities to leverage existing flexibilities and acquire understanding from past analysis to take a more efficient approach to satisfying the requirements of NEPA.

Main Point

Focus on the circumstances, information, potential issues and relevant actions

There has been inconsistency in how NEPA is applied to rangeland management which has led to missed opportunities for increased efficiency.

In short, NEPA is intended to help responsible officials (i.e. authorized officers) make informed decisions that are based on an understanding of environmental consequences and take actions that protect, restore, and enhance the environment. The responsible official has discretion and can choose the level of environmental review based on the specific circumstances of a project, while still adhering to the overall requirements outlined in the law.

When completing the analysis needed to satisfy the requirements of NEPA, it is important to focus on the relevant actions/activities, the circumstances surrounding those actions/activities that can be meaningfully evaluated, information and issues relevant to the actions/activities, and the scope and context of the proposed action. When an analysis is approved, there is not an expiration date unless one is explicitly disclosed within the analysis and/or subsequent decision. When relying on an existing analysis, do not get distracted by the time elapsed since the last applicable analysis was completed. Instead, determine whether there are changed circumstances or new information. If the existing analysis is programmatic in nature, reliance on it is subject to Section 108 of NEPA which requires reevaluation after five years.

Additionally, when considering whether a categorical exclusion may apply to an action or activity, consider the scope and intent of the CE and not purely the lists of examples provided for a specific category.

Frequently Asked Questions

Before investing time in determining the appropriate level of NEPA to apply, first determine if the proposed action is subject to the requirements of NEPA, as outlined at 7 CFR 1b.2(e). (The “Determining When NEPA Applies” graphic found [here](#) can also help in making this determination.) If it is determined that the requirements of NEPA do apply, then consider the following FAQs to better understand and utilize available authorities and tools for efficient rangeland management decision making.

Q1: Does every livestock grazing and/or related rangeland management action (e.g., rangeland improvement) require a new analysis?

A1: No. Each situation should be considered individually. Administrative units should determine if the requirements of NEPA have already been met relative to livestock grazing and/or related rangeland management actions on the allotment(s) in question. Activities which merely implement a decision previously analyzed under NEPA generally do not require additional analysis. The official responsible must determine if the earlier environmental analysis still covers the use/activities to be authorized. Changes to the proposed action that have the potential to change the anticipated degree of effect or there are new circumstances or information with relevance to the proposal, and these have bearing on the proposed action or have potential to change the anticipated degree of effect may result in the need for updated analysis. If additional analysis is warranted, consider focusing the scope and scale of the analysis on the changed circumstances and related effects rather than updating the entire prior analysis.

Q2: What if there is no previous analysis or decision for livestock use and/or related activities that I want to authorize, and/or associated with the allotment(s) where I would like to authorize them?

A2: Depending on the circumstances and scope of the desired actions, there are several existing authorities and tools that may be appropriate to satisfy the requirements of NEPA. Relying on an existing environmental analysis may be a suitable tool. Under certain circumstances, the issuance of a grazing permit(s) may be met with a categorical exclusion (see [A4](#)). For rangeland improvement actions/activities, there are a number of categorical exclusions that are available that might be appropriate for the action(s) being proposed (see [A5](#)).

Q3: How can relying on an existing environmental analysis be used to authorize livestock grazing use and/or related activities?

A3: If existing environmental analysis provides the information necessary to inform the required findings or conclusions required for the level of NEPA being completed, the responsible official may rely on previous analysis completed by the Forest Service, other USDA subcomponent or by any other Federal agency (see 7 CFR 1b.9(e)). The new USDA NEPA Regulation allows responsible officials to rely on existing NEPA documents (EA/FONSI, EIS/ROD and FANEC), or a portion thereof – to include supporting analysis documentation not included in an EA, EIS, FONSI, ROD or FANEC documentation itself – provided that the assessment, statement, finding, decision, analyses, or portion thereof provides the information necessary to inform the required findings or conclusions required for the level of NEPA being completed. USDA subcomponents may rely on previous analysis completed by the subcomponent or analysis completed by any other Federal agency where the nature of the proposal, the potentially affected environment, and the anticipated effects are substantially the same for the current proposal being considered.

When planning actions for an allotment, units are encouraged to consider the proposed action they would like to take, the ecological setting, circumstances and issues on the allotment(s) they would like to take the actions on (e.g., improved grazing management, rangeland improvements, etc.) and compare those aspects to similar allotments that share similar characteristics which are supported by an existing EA or EIS or FANEC. Units can use this tool (7 CFR 1b.9.(e)(8)(i) to effectively rely on a previously completed EA or EIS or FANEC (or portion thereof) and quickly assess and apply the original analyses to the allotment(s) in question. The allotment(s) could be a vacant allotment that the unit would like to return to active status or could be an active allotment where the unit would like to update the management approach (e.g., go from stringent management to adaptive management to improve outcomes).

To utilize this tool, the scope of the new proposal must be similar to the proposed action or an alternative which was analyzed in the previously completed NEPA document. The adequacy of the original range of alternatives, as well as potential new information relevant to environmental concerns, is examined in the process. Ultimately, the responsible official is assessing whether environmental effects that would result from implementation of the new proposed action are similar to those analyzed in the previous NEPA document.

Q4: Are there any Categorical Exclusions (CEs) that can be used for issuing grazing permits?

A4: Yes, a statutory CE is codified at [43 U.S.C. 1752\(h\)\(1\)](#) that, under certain circumstances, can be used for the issuance of grazing permits. The CE may be used when the issued permit continues the “current grazing management” of the allotment and the criteria at [43 U.S.C. 1752\(h\)\(1\)](#) are met. Please note that “current grazing management” is an important phrase in this context. Although a statutory definition was not provided for the term directly within Pub. L. 113-291, one is available in the legislative history which is provided within the [Grazing Permit Issuance White Paper](#). The CE can be used to issue new grazing permits even when minor modifications to the terms and conditions are made if those modifications do not result in a departure from the current grazing management of the allotment and the conditions set forth in [43 U.S.C. §1752\(h\)\(1\)](#). Additional information and guidance on how

“current grazing management” is defined as well as aspects related to minor modifications is available within the [Grazing Permit Issuance White Paper](#).

Q5: Are there any CEs that can be used for rangeland improvement actions/activities?

A5: Yes, there are several CE’s available that could be used to approve rangeland improvement actions and activities. A [CE Tool](#) is available which is intended to help identify applicable CEs and basic statutory requirements for complying with each category. The list of available CEs in the [CE Tool](#) are a combination of USDA CEs, Forest Service CEs, statutory CEs and CEs that the Forest Service has adopted from other agencies. [Refer to Appendix A for a list of CEs applicable to rangeland management actions and activities](#). Always refer to the original text of the CE before applying one or more to your project. When reviewing CE text, units are encouraged to consider the scope and intent of the CE and not focus purely on any lists of examples provided for a specific category. Generally, the lists of examples are not exhaustive and are for illustrative purposes only.

Q6: There are examples for most CEs; but what if the examples do not specifically cover the rangeland improvement actions/activities I would like to implement?

A6: The examples that are given are illustrative, but do not define the full extent of application of the CEs. Each USDA and adopted CE states: “Examples include but are not limited to” prior to the list of examples. Be sure you understand the language used in the CEs and think broadly about the application of the CEs to the specific situation in question. Be sure to consult with your Environmental Coordinator and rangeland management program lead if there are questions.

Q7: What are some new ways the Agency is approaching NEPA compliance more efficiently that I may not know about?

A7: Here are some suggestions:

- Determine whether NEPA applies.
- Determine whether an environmental analysis has already been completed and a decision made for a particular use and/or action and the decision is still appropriate. Relying on a previously completed environmental analysis can include documents prepared by other federal agencies.
- Separate the decision to **approve** a use or a project from the **authorization** needed to implement the use or project over time (See [Part II – NEPA and Livestock Grazing Use](#)).
- Before including a timing limit in your NEPA decision to approve a proposed use, consider whether the limit is necessary for the proposed uses (see [A10](#)).
- Use CEs whenever appropriate to limit the need to prepare EAs and EISs. Consider using all appropriate statutory, departmental, agency and adopted categorical exclusions, including some specific to issuance of grazing permits and rangeland improvements and those specific to other related purposes – such as wildlife habitat improvement (See [A4](#), [A5](#) and [A6](#)). [See Appendix A for a list of applicable CEs](#).
- Determine if there are nearby allotments which are supported by an existing analysis and share similar characteristics with the allotment in question. Determine if reliance on existing analysis is appropriate to effectively apply the analysis from a previously completed EA or EIS or FANEC (See [A3](#)).

- If an EA or EIS is needed, follow the templates and statutory and regulatory requirements for EA/EIS to prepare a focused document vs. a more encyclopedic analysis. Pay particular attention to page and time limit requirements.
- Consider using a single NEPA document to analyze and approve similar actions or uses (especially where a CE is not available). For example, it may be efficient to prepare a Forest-wide analysis of vacant allotment use and associated activities in a single EA and then authorize individual grazing permits based on the overarching NEPA document as needed.

Part II – NEPA and Livestock Grazing Use

Background

Approving livestock grazing on National Forest System (NFS) lands usually includes compliance with NEPA. Once a responsible official makes a decision about approving a use, authorized officers will typically issue a grazing permit (term grazing permit, temporary grazing permit or livestock use permit) which authorizes livestock occupancy and use of NFS lands and outlines the terms and conditions of the use. Direction regarding the issuance of grazing permits can be found at [36 CFR §222.3](#) and [FSH 2209.13](#) (Chapter 10).

Livestock grazing permits can take on many labels such as permit, term grazing permit, temporary and livestock use permits or agreements. For the purposes of this document, “grazing permit” is used to generally refer to this class of instruments.

Main Point

Separate “approving a use” from “authorizing a use”

There has been inconsistency in how NEPA is applied to livestock grazing which has led to inefficiency. In short, an informed decision made following an analysis “approves” an action/activity to take place on the landscape. A grazing permit “authorizes” a specific entity’s livestock to occupy and use a specific area(s) on the landscape along with associated rangeland management activities (e.g., rangeland improvements). Grazing permits are administrative actions and do not necessarily require a NEPA analysis. The distinction between approving an action and authorizing a use is important to track because it underpins part of, and guides the decision process around, permitted livestock grazing. A decision supported by NEPA may approve a new use or expansion of an existing use, but the applicant or grazing permit holder cannot proceed until a grazing permit is issued or modified. The grazing permit (and a paid for grazing bill), not the approval of use, is what authorizes an entity to occupy and use NFS lands for livestock grazing purposes.

There are many components of administering permitted livestock grazing that do not require additional NEPA compliance. When considering a particular activity remember to separate out the administrative action of “authorizing a use” from the NEPA decision to “approve a use.”

Frequently Asked Questions

These FAQs are intended to help field staff and authorized officers better understand and use the authorities and tools provided in our current regulations and directives for approving livestock grazing use and associated rangeland management activities.

Q8: Does the issuance of a new grazing permit, following the waiver or expiration of an existing permit on the same allotment(s) with no change in scope, need a new analysis?

A8: Generally, no. Authorizing a use is an administrative action, but certain circumstances associated with the livestock grazing use may warrant additional and/or new analysis.

Some grazing permits may or may not be associated with grazing allotments where the requirements of NEPA have been met (i.e., the grazing permit may or may not be supported by an analysis and decision that approves the use). Some use decisions pre-date NEPA, in which case the requirements of NEPA must be satisfied. There are other instances where there is an existing analysis but changed circumstances that can be meaningfully evaluated and/or new information that is relevant to the livestock grazing use are present. In these cases, the responsible official must determine if the earlier environmental analysis still covers the use to be authorized (See [FSH 2209.13, Chapter 90, Section 96](#) for additional information).

If it is determined that the earlier environmental analysis still covers the use to be authorized, further analysis is not needed to proceed with issuance of a grazing permit. If there is no existing analysis or the earlier analysis is not adequate, see [A3](#) and [A4](#) for a description of existing authorities and tools that may be appropriate to satisfy the requirements of NEPA.

Q9: What if it is determined that a new and/or additional analysis is warranted but I do not have the capacity or resources to complete it at this time?

A9: Pursuant to [43 U.S.C. §1752\(c\)\(2\)](#), the terms and conditions in a grazing permit that has expired, or was waived, shall be continued under a new permit until the date on which any environmental analysis and documentation for the permit is completed as required under NEPA and other applicable laws. See the [Grazing Permit Issuance White Paper](#) for additional guidance and requirements regarding the use of this authority.

Q10: Is there any way to avoid having to do a new analysis every 10 years when permits expire that authorize grazing use on the same allotment?

A10: Yes. Quite simply, consider whether you really need to set a time limit on the decision informed by an analysis. Don't make the decision document temporally limited (tied to a specific time frame) unless there is a specific known reason to do so (i.e., "I think it might change in the future" is not a reason).

For example, if the impacts of livestock grazing use and associated activities (e.g., pasture rotations, rangeland improvements) are expected to be similar every year, then approve the use and associated activities through a decision document that does not have an end date. Let the grazing permit, not the decision document based on NEPA analysis, set the time limit in the terms and conditions. That way, subsequent grazing permits can tie back to the same decision document. If there are changed circumstances or new information causing you to reconsider a decision, refer to [FSH 2209.13, Chapter](#)

90, Section 96. Additionally, decisions should not be for a specific grazing permit entity. The analysis is for the use, the authorization is administrative and is for any entity conducting the use (i.e., grazing their livestock). As we know, entities change, sell out to another, etc. We want the analysis to support the authorization, not the specific entity.

Appendix A – CEs Applicable to Rangeland Management (RM) Actions and Activities

Application to RM	Categorical Exclusion	Examples Included or Additional Forest Service Handbook Direction	Legal Citation
Rangeland Improvements	Implementation or modification of minor management practices to improve allotment condition or animal distribution.	Examples include but are not limited to: (i) Rebuilding a fence to improve animal distribution; (ii) (ii) Adding a stock watering facility to an existing water line; and (iii) (iii) Spot seeding native species of grass or applying lime to maintain forage condition.	7 CFR 1b.4d- USDA-33d- USFS
Post fire repair of rangeland infrastructure	Post-fire rehabilitation activities, not to exceed 4,200 acres (such as tree planting, fence replacement, habitat restoration, heritage site restoration, repair of roads and trails, and repair of damage to minor facilities such as campgrounds), to repair or improve lands unlikely to recover to a management approved condition from wildland fire damage, or to repair or replace minor facilities damaged by fire. Such activities: (i) Shall be conducted consistent with Agency and Departmental procedures and applicable land and resource management plans; (ii) Shall not include the use of herbicides or pesticides or the construction of new permanent roads or other new permanent infrastructure; and (iii) Shall be completed within 3 years following a wildland fire.	None included with category.	7 CFR 1b.4d- USDA-34d- USFS
Reduction of woody encroachment, targeted grazing to reduce natural fuel build up and improve plant vigor or reduce invasives, overseeding to improve native plant diversity	Forest and grassland management activities with a primary purpose of meeting restoration objectives or increasing resilience. Activities to improve ecosystem health, resilience, and other watershed and habitat conditions may not exceed 2,800 acres. . . The following requirements or limitations apply to this category: (A) Projects shall be developed or refined through a collaborative process that includes multiple interested persons representing diverse interests; (B) Vegetation thinning or timber harvesting activities shall be designed to achieve ecological restoration objectives, but shall not include salvage harvesting as defined in Agency policy; and (C) Construction and reconstruction of permanent roads is limited to 0.5 miles. Construction of temporary roads is limited to 2.5 miles, and all temporary roads shall be decommissioned no later than 3 years after the date the project is completed. Projects may include repair and maintenance of NFS roads and trails to prevent or address resource impacts; repair and maintenance of NFS roads and trails is not subject to the above mileage limits.	Activities to meet restoration and resilience objectives may include, but are not limited to: (A) Stream restoration, aquatic organism passage rehabilitation, or erosion control; (B) Invasive species control and reestablishment of native species; (C) Prescribed burning; (D) Reforestation; (E) Road and/or trail decommissioning (system and non-system); (F) Pruning; (G) Vegetation thinning; and (H) Timber harvesting.	7 CFR 1b.4d- USDA-47d- USFS
Issuance of Term Grazing Permits	(1) In general. – The issuance of a grazing permit or lease by the Secretary concerned may be categorically excluded from the requirement to prepare an environmental assessment or an environmental impact statement under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) if –(a) the issued permit or lease continues the current grazing management of the allotment; and (b) the Secretary concerned—(i) has assessed and evaluated the grazing allotment associated with the lease or permit; and (ii) based on the assessment and evaluation under clause (i), has determined that the allotment—(II) with respect to National Forest System land...(aa) is meeting objectives in the applicable land and resource management plan; or (bb) is not meeting the objectives in the applicable land and resource management plan due to factors other than existing livestock grazing.	None included with category.	402(h)(1) of FLPMA (43 U.S.C. 1752)
Trailing/crossing	(2) The trailing and crossing of livestock across public land and the implementation of trailing and crossing practices by the Secretary concerned may be categorically excluded from the requirement to prepare an environmental assessment or an environmental impact statement under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.).	None included with category.	402(h)(2) of FLPMA (43 U.S.C. 1752)

Application to RM	Categorical Exclusion	Examples Included or Additional Forest Service Handbook Direction	Legal Citation
Application of targeted grazing as a vegetation and habitat improvement tool	(b) CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION.—(1) IN GENERAL . . . for covered vegetation management activities carried out to protect, restore, or improve habitat for greater sage-grouse or mule deer. . . . (1) COVERED VEGETATION MANAGEMENT ACTIVITY.— (A) IN GENERAL.—The term ‘covered vegetation management activity’ means any activity described in subparagraph (B) that— (i)(I) is carried out on National Forest System land administered by the Forest Service; or (II) is carried out on public land administered by the Bureau of Land Management; (ii) with respect to public land, meets the objectives of the order of the Secretary of the Interior numbered 3336 and dated January 5, 2015; (iii) conforms to an applicable forest plan or land use plan; (iv) protects, restores, or improves greater sage grouse or mule deer habitat in a sagebrush steppe ecosystem as described in— (I) Circular 1416 of the United States Geological Survey entitled ‘Restoration Handbook for Sagebrush Steppe Ecosystems with Emphasis on Greater Sage-Grouse Habitat—Part 1. Concepts for Understanding and Applying Restoration’ (2015); or (II) the habitat guidelines for mule deer published by the Mule Deer Working Group of the Western Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies; (v) will not permanently impair— (I) the natural state of the treated area; (II) outstanding opportunities for solitude; (III) outstanding opportunities for primitive, unconfined recreation; (IV) economic opportunities consistent with multiple-use management; or (V) the identified values of a unit of the National Landscape Conservation System; (vi)(I) restores native vegetation following a natural disturbance; (II) prevents the expansion into greater sage grouse or mule deer habitat of— (aa) juniper, pinyon pine, or other associated conifers; or (bb) nonnative or invasive vegetation; (III) reduces the risk of loss of greater sage-grouse or mule deer habitat from wildfire or any other natural disturbance; or (IV) provides emergency stabilization of soil resources after a natural disturbance; and (vii) provides for the conduct of restoration treatments that— (I) maximize the retention of old-growth and large trees, as appropriate for the forest type; (II) consider the best available scientific information to maintain or restore the ecological integrity, including maintaining or restoring structure, function, composition, and connectivity; (III) are developed and implemented through a collaborative process that— (aa) includes multiple interested persons representing diverse interests; and (bb)(AA) is transparent and nonexclusive; or (BB) meets the requirements for a resource advisory committee under subsections (c) through (f) of section 205 of the Secure Rural Schools and Community Self-Determination Act of 2000 (16 U.S.C. 7125); and (IV) may include the implementation of a proposal that complies with the eligibility requirements of the Collaborative Forest Landscape Restoration Program under section 4003(b) of the Omnibus Public Land Management Act of 2009 (16 U.S.C. 7303(b)).	This categorical exclusion shall: comply with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.); apply the extraordinary circumstances procedures under section 220.6 of title 36, Code of Federal Regulations (or successor regulations), in determining whether to use the categorical exclusion; and consider the relative efficacy of landscape-scale habitat projects; the likelihood of continued declines in the populations of greater sage-grouse and mule deer in the absence of landscape-scale vegetation management; and the need for habitat restoration activities after wildfire or other natural disturbances. (HFRA, Sections 606(b)). If the categorical exclusion...is used to implement a covered vegetative management activity in an area within the range of both greater sage-grouse and mule deer, the covered vegetative management activity shall protect, restore, or improve habitat concurrently for both greater sage-grouse and mule deer. (HFRA, Sections 606(c)).	Section 606 of HFRA (16 U.S.C. 6591e)
Targeted grazing	FOREST MANAGEMENT ACTIVITIES DESIGNATED FOR CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION.— (1) IN GENERAL.—The category of forest management activities designated under subsection (b) for a categorical exclusion are forest management activities described in paragraph (2) that are carried out by the Secretary concerned on public lands (as defined in section 103 of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (43 U.S.C. 1702)) administered by the Bureau of Land Management or National Forest System land the primary purpose of which is to establish and maintain linear fuel breaks that are— (A) up to 1,000 feet in width contiguous with or incorporating existing linear features, such as roads, water infrastructure, transmission and distribution lines, and pipelines of any length on Federal land; and (B) intended to reduce the risk of uncharacteristic wildfire on Federal land or catastrophic wildfire for an adjacent at-risk community. (2) ACTIVITIES.—Subject to paragraph (3), the forest management activities that may be carried out pursuant to the categorical exclusion established under subsection (b) are— (A) mowing or masticating; (B) thinning by manual and mechanical cutting; (C) piling, yarding, and removal of slash or hazardous fuels; (D) selling of vegetation products, including timber, firewood, biomass, slash, and fenceposts; (E) targeted grazing; (F) application of— (i) pesticide; (ii) biopesticide; or (iii) herbicide; (G) seeding of native species; (H) controlled burns and broadcast burning; and (I) burning of piles, including jackpot piles.	None included with category.	Pub. L. 117-58, Sec. 40806
Temporary rangeland improvements	Rangeland Management: Placement and use of temporary (not to exceed one month) portable corrals and water troughs, providing no new road construction is needed.	None included with category.	BLM D(2) (516 DM 11.9)
Placement of Portable Virtual Fence router stations	New construction or improvement of temporary buildings or experimental equipment (e.g., trailers, prefabricated buildings, and test slabs) on previously disturbed ground, with no more than 1 acre (0.4 hectare) of ground disturbance, where the proposed facility use is generally compatible with the surrounding land use and applicable zoning standards and will not require additional support infrastructure.	None included with category.	NTIA C(6)

Application to RM	Categorical Exclusion	Examples Included or Additional Forest Service Handbook Direction	Legal Citation
Rangeland Improvements	The construction of new, or the addition of, small structures or improvements, including structures and improvements for the restoration of wetland, riparian, instream, or native habitats, which result in no or only minor changes in the use of the affected local area.	The following are examples of activities that may be included. (a) The installation of fences. (b) The construction of small water control structures. (c) The planting of seeds or seedlings and other minor revegetation actions. (d) The construction of small berms or dikes. (e) The development of limited access for routine maintenance and management purposes.	USFWS B(3) (516 DM 8.5)
Post fire/events repair of rangeland infrastructure	Emergency Stabilization. Planned actions in response to wildfires, floods, weather events, earthquakes, or landslips that threaten public health or safety, property, and/or natural and cultural resources, and that are necessary to repair or improve lands unlikely to recover to a management-approved condition as a result of the event. Such activities shall be limited to: repair and installation of essential erosion control structures; replacement or repair of existing culverts, roads, trails, fences, and minor facilities; construction of protection fences; planting, seeding, and mulching; and removal of hazard trees, rocks, soil, and other mobile debris from, on, or along roads, trails, campgrounds, and watercourses. These activities: (1) Shall be completed within one year following the event; (2) Shall not include the use of herbicides or pesticides; (3) Shall not include the construction of new roads or other new permanent infrastructure; (4) Shall not exceed 4,200 acres; and (5) May include temporary roads which are defined as roads authorized by contract, permit, lease, other written authorization, or emergency operation not intended to be part of the BLM transportation system and not necessary for long-term resource management. Temporary roads shall be designed to standards appropriate for the intended uses, considering safety, cost of transportation, and impacts on land and resources; and (6) Shall require the treatment of temporary roads constructed or used so as to permit the reestablishment by artificial or natural means, or vegetative cover on the roadway and areas where the vegetative cover was disturbed by the construction or use of the road, as necessary to minimize erosion from the disturbed area. Such treatment shall be designed to reestablish vegetative cover as soon as practicable, but at least within 10 years after the termination of the contract.	None included with category.	BLM I(1) (516 DM 11.9)
Rangeland Improvements	Construction or ground disturbance actions. The following list includes categorical exclusions for construction or ground disturbance proposed actions: (1) Bridges; (2) Chiseling and subsoiling in areas not previously tilled; (3) Construction of a new farm storage facility; (4) Dams; (5) Dikes and levees; (6) Diversions; (7) Drop spillways; (8) Dugouts; (9) Excavation; (10) Grade stabilization structures; (11) Grading, leveling, shaping and filling in areas or to depths not previously disturbed; (12) Installation of structures designed to regulate water flow such as pipes, flashboard risers, gates, chutes, and outlets; (13) Irrigation systems; (14) Land smoothing; (15) Line waterways or outlets; (16) Lining; (17) Livestock crossing facilities; (18) Pesticide containment facility; (19) Pipe drop; (20) Pipeline for watering facility; (21) Ponds, including sealing and lining; (22) Precision land farming with ground disturbance; (23) Riparian buffer establishment; (24) Roads, including access roads; (25) Rock barriers; (26) Rock filled infiltration trenches; (27) Sediment basin; (28) Sediment structures; (29) Site preparation for planting or seeding in areas not previously tilled; (30) Soil and water conservation structures; (31) Stream bank and shoreline protection; (32) Structures for water control; (33) Subsurface drains; (34) Surface roughening; (35) Terracing; (36) Underground outlets; (37) Watering tank or trough installation, if in areas not previously disturbed; (38) Wells; and (39) Wetland restoration.	None included with category.	7 CFR 1b.4d- USDA-01d- FSA

Application to RM	Categorical Exclusion	Examples Included or Additional Forest Service Handbook Direction	Legal Citation
Rangeland Health Enhancement (improve native plant diversity) and/or Restoration	Planting appropriate herbaceous and woody vegetation, which does not include noxious weeds or invasive plants, on disturbed sites to restore and maintain the sites ecological functions and services.	None included with category.	7 CFR 1b.4d- USDA-03d- NRCS
Post fire/events repair of rangeland infrastructure	Replacing and repairing existing culverts, grade stabilization, and water control structures and other small structures that were damaged by natural disasters where there is no new depth required and only minimal dredging, excavation, or placement of fill is required.	None included with category.	7 CFR 1b.4d- USDA-06d- NRCS
Rangeland Restoration	Restoring an ecosystem, fish and wildlife habitat, biotic community, or population of living resources to a determinable pre-impact condition.	None included with category.	7 CFR 1b.4d- USDA-13d- NRCS