

**U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management**

FONSI

Hay Creek (phase 1) Grazing Permit

July 2016



PREPARING OFFICE

U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management
Worland Field Office

Finding of No Significant Impact

INTRODUCTION:

The Bureau of Land Management (BLM) has conducted an environmental analysis (**DOI-BLM-WY-R010-2016-0009-EA**) for a proposed action to address livestock grazing in these 3 allotments located in in Hot Springs County. The proposed action would authorize livestock use through a grazing permit for 5 years as follows:

Alternative	Allotment	Number of Animals	Kind	Season of Use	%Public Land	Active AUMs	Suspended AUMs	Total Preference AUMs	
Proposed Action*	Coal Draw	625	Sheep	3/1-3/31	67	85	0	459	
				10/16-2/28	67	374	0		
	East Cottonwood	122	Cattle	3/1-3/31	46	57	0	308	
				10/16-2/28	46	251	0		
	Wagonhound								
	West Pasture	167	Cattle	3/1-3/31	78	133	0	715	
				10/16-2/28	78	582	0		
	Middle Pasture	131	Cattle	3/1-3/31	47	63	0	338	
				10/16-2/28	47	275	0		
	East Pasture	248	Cattle	3/1-3/31	37	94	0	504	
				10/16-2/28	37	410	0		

- Livestock number may vary in each pasture or allotment so long as grazing is within authorized period and active AUMs are not exceeded
- Utilization should not exceed 50% based on an average of several sites throughout the pasture/allotment or through use pattern mapping using BLM approved methods. If use exceeds 50% in 2 consecutive years the BLM will coordinate with the permittee to reduce grazing in the third year to be under the 50% use level.
- Specific to Coal Draw: Locations of supplements/salt blocks must be requested and approved in writing by the BLM prior to placement.
- Sheep or Cattle use may be made in the Coal Draw allotment but use may be made only by one kind during the annual use period of 10/16-3/31. The following Mandatory Terms and Conditions will apply to cattle use in Coal Draw as analyzed in DOI-BLM-WY-R010-2016-0009-EA:

Number/Kind	Dates	%Public Land	Active AUMs
69 Cattle	3/1 – 3/31	40	28
69 Cattle	10/16 – 2/28	40	123

The purpose of this action is to issue a new grazing permit for these Allotments within the Worland Field Office with appropriate terms and conditions to promote rangeland health. The need for this action is BLM's responsibility to issue grazing permits in accordance with the provisions of the Taylor Grazing Act, Federal Land Policy and Management Act, Public Rangelands Improvement Act, Administrative Procedures Act, Worland Resource Management Plan, and the grazing regulations 43 CFR 4100.

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

Based upon a review of the EA and the supporting documents, I have determined that the project is not a major federal action and would not significantly affect the quality of the human environment,

individually or cumulatively with other actions in the general area. No environmental effects 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 Worland RMP/FEIS. Therefore, an environmental impact statement is not needed.

This finding is based on the context and intensity of the project as described:

Context:

The Action would occur within Hot Springs County in multiple townships/ranges and sections. It would have local impacts on the resources similar to and within the scope of those described and considered within the Livestock Grazing Permit for the Murdoch Grazing Allotment EA. The project is a site-specific action directly involving approximately 6551 acres of BLM administered land within Coal Draw, 18,734 acres of BLM administered land within Wagonhound, and 3,415 acres of BLM administered land within East Cottonwood that by itself does not have international, national, regional, or state-wide importance.

Intensity:

The following discussion is organized around the Ten Significance Criteria described in 40 CFR 1508.27 and incorporated into resources and issues considered (includes supplemental authorities Appendix 1 H-1790-1) and supplemental Instruction Memorandum, Acts, regulations and Executive Orders.

The following have been considered in evaluating intensity for this proposal:

1. Impacts that may be both beneficial and adverse. The proposed action would impact resources as described in the EA. Mitigating measures to reduce impacts to the various resources were incorporated in the design of the alternatives and are applied to the Grazing Permit as terms and conditions. None of the environmental effects discussed in detail in the EA and associated appendices are considered significant, nor do the effects exceed those described in the EA.

2. The degree to which the proposed action affects public health or safety. No aspect of the Action/Alternatives would have an effect on public health and 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. The following components of the Human Environment and Resource Issues are not affected because they are not present in the project area or the project would not affect them: Air Quality/Climate Change, Areas of Critical Environmental Concern, BLM Natural Areas, Greenhouse Gas Emissions, Environmental Justice, Farmlands (Prime or Unique), Floodplains, Fuels/Fire Management, Geology, Fluid Mineral Resources (Surface), Energy Production (Subsurface), Hydrologic Conditions, Lands/Access, Native American Religious Concerns, Paleontology, Public Health and Safety, Recreation, Socio-economics, Threatened, Endangered, Candidate or BLM Sensitive Plant Species, Wastes (Hazardous or solid), Wetlands/Riparian Zones, Wild and Scenic Rivers, Wilderness/Wilderness Study Area, Woodland/Forestry, Wild Horses and Burros, Areas with Wilderness Characteristics, and Travel and Transportation. Components of the Human Environment and Resource Issues were analyzed in detail in Chapter 3 of the EA. None of these would be significantly impacted because of the design features.

4. The degree to which the effects on the quality of the human environment are likely to be controversial. There is no scientific controversy over the nature of the impacts.

5. The degree to which the possible effects on the human environment are highly uncertain or involve unique or unknown risks. The project is not unique or unusual. The BLM has experience implementing the same action in allotments of the field office. The environmental effects to the human environment are fully analyzed in the EA. There are no predicted effects on the human environment that are considered to be highly uncertain or involve 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 actions considered in the selected alternative were considered by the interdisciplinary team within the context of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions. Significant cumulative effects are not predicted. A complete analysis of the direct, indirect, and cumulative effects of the selected alternative and all other alternatives is described in Chapter 3 of the EA.

7. Whether the action is related to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant impacts – which include connected actions regardless of land ownership. The interdisciplinary team evaluated the possible actions in context of past, present and reasonably foreseeable actions. Significant cumulative effects are not predicted. A complete disclosure of the effects of the project is contained in Chapter 3 of the EA.

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 historical resources. The project would not adversely affect districts, sites, highways, structures, or other objects listed on or eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places, nor would it cause loss or destruction of significant scientific, cultural, or historical resources. The effects to known listed or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places is discussed and analyzed in Chapter 3 of the EA.

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 known threatened, endangered, or sensitive species of plants within the project area. Effects to known threatened, endangered, or sensitive animals were analyzed in Chapter 3 of the EA. The proposed actions design features reduce impacts to wildlife through timing and providing for appropriate stocking rates based on current vegetative states.

10. Whether the action threatens a violation of Federal, State, or local law or requirements imposed for the protection of the environment. The project does not violate any known federal, state, local or tribal law or requirement imposed for the protection of the environment.

Signed:

	8/2/2016
Worland Field Office Manager	Date