

**UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
GRAND JUNCTION FIELD OFFICE**

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

Lapham-Post Allotment Grazing Permit Renewal

DOI-BLM-CO-N030 2015-0008-EA

Based on the analysis of potential environmental impacts contained in the attached environmental assessment, and considering the significance criteria in 40 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) §1508.27, I have determined that the Proposed Action will not have a significant effect on the human environment. An environmental impact statement is therefore not required.

BACKGROUND

The Bureau of Land Management prepared an Environmental Assessment (EA) which analyzed the effects of re-authorization of Grazing Permit #0507155 on the Lapham-Post Allotment. The EA analyzed impacts and recommended mitigation measures for managing grazing on public lands in a responsible manner that is compatible with Standards for Public Land Health, other resource uses and objectives, and in compliance with grazing regulations under 43 CFR §4110.1(a)(1). In order to graze livestock on public land, the livestock permittee must hold a valid grazing permit

The EA identified a proposed action that would modify the current grazing schedule of 93 cattle grazing from 05/02 – 11/15 with 605 animal unit months (AUMs) to 86 cattle grazing from 05/02 – 11/30 with 604 AUMs. This change would extend the grazing season by two weeks at the end of November, but would maintain the AUMs at approximate the same level.

RATIONALE

The analysis demonstrates that the proposed action would not have any significant impacts to natural or cultural resources. The proposed grazing plan and water hauling sites would allow for growth and reproduction of key forage species, and the rangeland monitoring program would continue to measure the impacts from grazing. The proposed action is in accordance with 43 CFR §4130.2.

INTENSITY

I have considered the potential intensity and severity of the impacts anticipated from the Lapham-Post Allotment Grazing Permit renewal project decision relative to each of the ten areas suggested for consideration by the Council on Environmental Quality's (CEQ). The following findings have been made with regard to each of the ten CEQ considerations:

1. Impacts that may be both beneficial and adverse.

This project may have minor short-term impacts to soils, vegetation, wildlife, and recreation; however these impacts are not significant. Proper grazing management is expected maintain or

improve the soil and vegetation resource, and other resources that rely on the health of soils and vegetation.

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

The proposed action is not expected to impact public health and safety.

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

The proposed action would not significantly impact the unique characteristics associated with historical or cultural resources on the allotment. There are not park lands or prime farmlands located within the allotment. There would be no significant impacts to wetlands or wild and scenic rivers within the project area under the proposed action. Riparian vegetation is expected to be maintained or improve under the propose action. There also are no municipal water supplies in the project area.

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

The impacts of grazing are generally well known and documented in the academic and practicing communities. Therefore, the environmental effects are not likely to be controversial.

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

Livestock grazing has a long history in the region and poses no unique or unknown risks.

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 is similar to many other livestock grazing activities that have previously taken place on public land managed by the BLM, and will continue to occur on public lands. The Proposed Action is within the scope of the Resource Management Plan, and is not expected to establish a precedent for future actions. The proposed grazing activities would not represent a decision in principle about a future consideration.

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

There are no significant cumulative effects on the environment from the Proposed Action, either when combined with the effects created by past and concurrent projects, or when combined with the effects from natural changes taking place in the environment, or from reasonably foreseeable future projects.

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.

Cultural inventories have been conducted to establish potential impacts from livestock grazing. No adverse impacts have been identified for the proposed action at this time.

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.

No impacts were brought forward that would indicate any adverse impacts to endangered or threatened species or their habitats. A No Effect determination was made for this project.

10. Whether the action threatens a violation of Federal, State, or local law or requirements imposed for the protection of the environment.

This decision complies with other Federal, State, local laws, and other requirements imposed for the protection of the environment.

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

On the basis of the information contained in the EA, and all other information available to me, it is my determination that: 1) the implementation of the Proposed Action or alternatives will not have significant environmental impacts beyond those already addressed in the "Record of Decision and Resource Management Plan," (August 2015); (2) the Proposed Action is in conformance with the Resource Management Plan; and (3) the Proposed Action does not constitute a major federal action having a significant effect on the human environment. Therefore, an environmental impact statement or a supplement to the existing environmental impact statement is not necessary and will not be prepared.

This finding is based on my consideration of the CEQ criteria for significance (40 CFR §1508.27), both with regard to the context and to the intensity of the impacts described in the EA.

NAME OF PREPARER: Scott Clarke

NAME OF ENVIRONMENTAL COORDINATOR: Christina Stark

DATE: 9/16/15

SIGNATURE OF AUTHORIZED OFFICIAL:



Field Manager
Grand Junction Field Office

9/16/15
Date