

**UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
GRAND JUNCTION FIELD OFFICE & DOMINGUEZ-ESCALANTE NATIONAL
CONSERVATION AREA**

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

**Kannah Creek Allotment Boundary Split and
Grazing Management Changes**

DOI-BLM-CO-N030 2015-0017-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

This environmental assessment (EA) has been prepared by the BLM to analyze livestock grazing management changes within the Kannah Creek Common (16202) grazing allotment. Currently, Highway 50 runs through the middle of the allotment with one half of the allotment portioned in the Grand Junction Field Office (GJFO) and the other half is in the Dominguez-Escalante National Conservation Area (DENCA). The allotment is grazed by two permittees: Harold Earle (0500194) and Pat Dalton (0501887). Both permittees currently graze the allotment during the late spring and early summer months. This EA will analyze dividing the allotment into two separate allotments and making management changes to season of use from the current spring/early summer to fall winter grazing only. This EA will analyze the addition of fences and cattle guards to improve livestock distribution and reduce conflict across the allotment. No changes to AUM numbers are proposed.

INTENSITY

I have considered the potential intensity/severity of the impacts anticipated from the Kannah Creek Allotment Boundary Split and Grazing Management Changes 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; however these impacts are not significant. This project would have a long term net benefit the allotments because it better suits proper grazing management of native perennial plants in lower elevation habitat. The grazing program is expected to benefit the soil and vegetation resource and the resources on which health of these resources is based.

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.*

There are no significant impacts to riparian vegetation, parklands, prime farmlands, wetlands, or wild and scenic rivers within the project area. The project has been modified to avoid impacts to cultural and historic resources. There 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 livestock 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 have a long history in the region and pose 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.*

This decision is like one of many that have previously been made and will continue to be made by BLM responsible officials regarding livestock grazing on public lands. The decision is within the scope of the Resource Management Plan and is not expected to establish a precedent for future actions, however it is the BLM intention to intensively manage lower elevation desert habitats with grazing livestock and make necessary changes to grazing use if needed.

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, 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.*

There would be no adverse impacts to the above resources. The project has been modified to avoid impacts to cultural and historic resources.

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.*

If permittees follow all terms and conditions mentioned in the proposed action there should be no impacts expected to endangered or threatened species or their designated critical habitats

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, or local laws and 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 1987 (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.



Field Manager
Grand Junction Field Office

9-29-15

Date

And



Field Manager
Dominguez-Escalante NCA

9/29/15

Date