

**United States Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management**

**FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT
(FONSI)**

**DOI-BLM-MT-C020-2016-0010-EA
12/03/2015**

**THOMPSON CREEK ALLOTMENT
Grazing Transfer**

Location: Powder River County, MT

T. 8 S., R. 47 E., Sections: 25, 26, 35
T. 8 S., R. 48 E., Sections: 28, 29, 30, 31, 32

U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management
Miles City Field Office
111 Garryowen Road
Miles City, MT 59301
Phone: 406-233-2800
FAX: 406-233-2921



**UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
MILES CITY FIELD OFFICE
FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

DOI-BLM-MT-C020-2016-0010-EA

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

On the basis of the information contained in the EA (DOI-BLM-MT-C020-2016-0010-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 Bureau of Land Management (BLM) 2015, Miles City Field Office (MCFO), Proposed Resource Management Plan and Final Environmental Impact Statement (PRMP/FEIS).
- (2) The Proposed Action is in conformance with the Record of Decision for the BLM 2015, MCFO Approved Resource Management Plan (ARMP); 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 Council on Environmental Quality's (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. This finding is based on my consideration of the Council on Environmental Quality's (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 or as articulated in the letters of comment.

Context

The proposed action for the Thompson Creek Allotment (#10197) is to issue the grazing permit with an expiration date of 02/28/2025 as follows:

GR#2503424

Allotment Name and Number	Pasture	Livestock		Grazing Period		% PL	Type Use	AUMs
		Number	Kind	Begin	End			
Thompson Creek #10197	River	2	Cattle	03/01	02/28	100	Custodial	29
	L. Thompson Cr.	1	Cattle	03/01	02/28	100	Custodial	18
	Thompson Creek	60	Cattle	05/15	12/20	63	Active	273

Total Active AUMs: 320

Terms and Conditions:

Grazing is authorized during the listed season for the recognized capacity of the public land. Livestock will not be on the public land continuously for the entire season. Livestock numbers are not restricted.

Intensity

I have considered the potential intensity/severity of the impacts anticipated from the proposed action and all alternatives relative to each of the ten areas suggested for consideration by the CEQ.

1. Impacts that may be both beneficial and adverse. The analysis documented in EA- DOI-BLM-MT-C020-2016-0010-EA did not identify any individual significant adverse short-term or long-term impacts. In the long-term, under the proposed grazing management practices, the overall rangeland health within the Thompson Creek Allotment will be maintained.

2. The degree to which the proposed action affects public health and safety. No significant effects to public health and safety were identified in the EA.

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 known historic or cultural resource sites that would be affected by the proposed action. A review of BLM and SHPO Cultural Resource Records databases indicates that one cultural resource site and no paleontological localities have been recorded on public lands within this allotment. The National Register eligibility of cultural site in the allotment would not be impacted. The proposed action meets the inventory exemption criteria found in BLM's Montana/Dakotas Cultural Resources Handbook H-8110-1, Appendix One, Range 1 and Instruction Memorandum No. 2009-011: Guidelines for Assessment and Mitigation of Potential Impacts to Paleontological Resources. Issuance of a grazing permit is an action that generally does not involve any direct surface disturbance and as a non-surface disturbing type of activity, has little or no potential or ability to significantly affect cultural properties or paleontological resources. As a result, no cultural resource inventory or paleontological inventory is necessary prior to approving and authorizing this undertaking to proceed. Consequently, no cultural resource values considered eligible for the National Register of Historic Places would likely be impacted or affected by this undertaking (see report number listed in the environmental assessment). There are no parks, prime farmlands, or wild and scenic rivers in the planning area.

4. The degree to which the effects on the quality of the human environment are likely to be highly controversial. The effects of the actions planned under the Proposed Action are similar to many other grazing permit actions implemented within the scope of the BLM 2015 MCFO ARMP. No unique or appreciable scientific controversy has been identified regarding the effects of the Proposed Action.

5. The degree to which the possible effects on the human environment are highly uncertain or involve unique or unknown risks. The analysis has not shown that there would be any unique or unknown risks to the human environment not previously considered and analyzed in EISs to which this EA is tiered.

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 neither establishes a precedent nor represents a decision in principle about future actions. The proposed action is consistent with actions appropriate for the area as designated by the BLM 2015 MCFO ARMP.

7. Whether the action is related to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant impacts. The environmental analysis did not reveal any cumulative effects beyond those already analyzed in the EISs which accompanied the BLM 2015 MCFO ARMP.

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. The proposed action will not adversely affect any district, site, highway, structure, or object listed or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places or cause loss or destruction of significant scientific, cultural, or 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. There are no threatened or endangered species or habitat in the area of the proposed action. There are no threatened or endangered plant species or habitat in the area.

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 does not threaten to violate any Federal, State, or local law.

/s/ Shane Findlay, Acting

12/3/2015

Date

Eric D. Lepisto
Acting Field Manager
Miles City Field Office