



United States Department of the Interior  
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT  
Shoshone Field Office  
400 West F Street  
Shoshone, Idaho 83352-5284  
(208) 732-7200



In Reply Refer To:  
4100 (IDT030) P  
91013  
CERTIFIED-RETURN RECEIPT REQUESTED

October 9, 2015

James Grant  
1934 East 400 South  
Hazelton, ID 83335

**Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI)  
Livestock Grazing Permit Renewal  
Environmental Assessment No. DOI-BLM-ID-T030-2015-0007-EA**

Dear Mr. Grant:

**Introduction**

In 2005 and 2006, field assessments were conducted in the Camp III Allotment to determine whether it was meeting the Idaho Standards for Rangeland Health. On September 28, 2012, the field assessment for the allotment was mailed to you and interested publics, requesting comments or any other additional information pertaining to the allotment. A comment was received from the permit holder in regard to the Rangeland Health Assessment for Camp III Allotment.

The Shoshone Field Manager has made a formal determination that the Camp III Allotment is meeting all applicable Rangeland Health Standards and livestock grazing is in conformance with Guidelines for Livestock Grazing Management. Standard 1 (Watersheds), Standard 5 (Seedings), and Standard 8 (Threatened and Endangered Plants and Animals) in the Camp III Allotment are meeting the standard for Rangeland Health.

Standard 2 (Riparian Areas and wetlands), Standard 3 (Stream Channel/Floodplain), Standard 4 (Native Plant Communities), Standard 6 (Exotic Plant Communities) and Standard 7 (Water Quality) do not apply to the Camp III Allotment. A Determination Document is not required to

be completed if all applicable land health standards are being met.

### **Plan Conformance and Consistency**

The proposed action and alternatives have been reviewed and found to be in conformance with the 1984 Monument Resource Management Plan and Final Environmental Impact Statement.

### **Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI)**

I have reviewed the direct, indirect and cumulative effects of the proposed activities documented in the Livestock Grazing Permit Renewal for Camp III Allotment, Environmental Assessment (EA) No. BLM-ID-T030-2015-0007-EA. I have also reviewed the project record for this analysis and the effects of the Proposed Action, Alternative 1, and Alternative 2 as disclosed in Chapter 2, Proposed Action and Alternatives, and Chapter 4, Environmental Consequences of the EA.

Based upon a review of the EA and the supporting documents, I have determined that the project is not a major federal action and will not have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment, individually or cumulatively with other actions in the general area. None of the environmental effects discussed in the EA meet the definition of significance, in context or intensity, as defined in 40 CFR 1508.27 and do not exceed those effects described in the 1984 Monument Resource Management Plan and Final Environmental Impact Statement. Therefore, an environmental impact statement is not needed. This finding is based on the context and intensity of the project as described:

My finding of no significant impact in regard to context and intensity is based on the following:

#### **Context**

The project action is a site-specific action directly involving 168 acres of BLM-administered public land which is important locally but does not carry state-wide, national or international importance. The short- and long-term effects of the action would be limited to the locality of the project area and would not have any significant effect either state-wide, nationally or internationally.

#### **Intensity**

According to 40 CFR 1508.27 (b), the following criteria are required to be considered when evaluating the intensity of the project action:

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

The beneficial and adverse impacts of the Proposed Action and Alternatives are described in Chapter 4 of the EA. The Proposed Action has the greatest potential for benefiting natural resources in the allotment, maintaining the Standards for Rangeland Health, and contributing toward the local economy.

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

The proposed activities will not significantly affect public health or safety. The purpose of the Proposed Action is to allow for livestock grazing while maintaining or improving conditions to meet Standards for Rangeland Health in the Camp III Allotment. Similar actions in other grazing allotments have not significantly affected 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, or ecologically critical areas.*

There are no unique historic or cultural resources, park lands, prime farm lands, wild and scenic rivers, Wilderness Study Areas, or Areas of Critical Environmental Concern within the allotment.

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

The Proposed Action is not expected to be highly controversial because the effects are predominantly beneficial. The Camp III Allotment is also meeting all applicable Standards for Rangeland Health.

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

The potential effects, as discussed in Chapter 4, are not highly uncertain nor do they involve unique or uncertain risks to the human environment. The technical analyses conducted for determinations of the impacts to the resources are supportable with use of accepted techniques, reliable data, and professional judgment.

- 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 set a precedent or represent a decision in principle about a future management consideration. Neighboring grazing allotments have had very similar grazing permits completed and no precedent was established under those actions.

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

The EA analyzes all connected and cumulative actions within the scope of the analysis. The cumulative effects of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions are considered and disclosed in the EA, in the Cumulative Impacts Analysis (Section 4.4). The cumulative impacts for the Proposed Action are not negligible at best and not significant.

