

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR  
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT**

Casper Field Office  
2987 Prospector Drive  
Casper, WY 82604

**FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT  
Cañon City, Delta (Sutherland), and Wheatland Off-Range Corrals  
Environmental Assessment  
NEPA NO. DOI-BLM-WO-WO2000-2020-004-EA**

I have reviewed the Cañon City, Delta, and Wheatland Off-Range Corrals Environmental Assessment (EA) DOI-BLM-WO-WO2000-2020-004-EA. After consideration of the environmental effects as described in the EA, and incorporated herein, I have determined that the proposed action to fund space, feeding, and care for up to 3,500 excess wild horses and burros (WHB) near Wheatland on private land, with the project design specifications identified in the EA, will not significantly affect the quality of the human environment and that an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is not required to be prepared.

This finding and conclusion 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 the intensity of impacts described in the EA.

**Context:** The disclosure of effects in the EA found the actions limited in context. The Wheatland Off-Range Corral (ORC) is limited in size (200 acres) and the activities limited in potential. Effects are local in nature and would not significantly affect regional or national resources. The EA was prepared with input from interested parties.

**Intensity:** When evaluating the intensity, or the severity, of the impacts to resources that would occur by implementing Proposed Action, I am required by CEQ (40 CFR 1508.27 (b)) to consider the following 10 elements:

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

**Rationale:** This facility would be constructed and operated on private land owned by ZimMetal and Welding, Inc. that is currently planted to alfalfa under a center pivot. Natural resources such as native vegetation have been removed many years ago. None of the environmental effects regarding wildlife habitat discussed in detail in the EA are considered significant, nor do the effects exceed any known threshold of significance, either beneficial or adverse. Any additional adverse effects to resources resulting from implementation of this action would be immeasurable or unobservable.

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

**Rationale:** For this measurement of intensity, I have considered the effects from such things as air quality and water quality, etc., if the Proposed Action were implemented (NEPA Handbook H-1790-1, 7.3). No activities authorized under Proposed Action would affect long-term public health or safety. The environmental analysis documented no effects to public health and safety from any of the actions analyzed in Proposed Action.

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.*

**Rationale:** There are no park lands, prime farmlands, or jurisdictional wetlands, or wild and scenic rivers within the affected project area. There will be no effect to Historic Properties or other cultural resources within the project area.

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

**Rationale:** Controversy in this context means disagreement about the nature of the effects, not expressions of opposition to a proposed action (H-1790-1). Substantial dispute within the scientific community about the effects from an ORC would indicate there is a high level of controversy. I do not see such a dispute in this case. Additionally, no such dispute was brought forward during the public comment period.

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

**Rationale:** There will always be a level of unknown risk associated with decisions affecting WHB management. Significance does not arise from uncertainty about future actions by others; it arises from a high degree of uncertainty about the effects of the agency action. There are no effects of implementing the Proposed Action identified in the EA that are considered uncertain or involve unique or unknown risks. There are numerous ORCs that have been in operation for several years and the operation of these facilities result in no unique or unknown effects or risks. If the risks are known and have been incurred for similar actions in the past, significance is not implicated, as is the case here.

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.*

**Rationale:** I have determined that implementing the Proposed Action to fund the operation and maintenance of an ORC for WHB does not set a precedent for future actions that may occur in the area. While the populations of WHB continue to increase, this Proposed Action does not affect any future actions involving ORC facilities that exist now or would be built in the future.

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

**Rationale:** The Proposed Action of funding the operation and maintenance of a WHB ORC is not part of other connected actions, nor would this action be a segmented portion of other actions to be proposed in the future and for which NEPA analysis would be conducted. This would be a specific, stand-alone action.

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.*

**Rationale:** There will be no effect to Historic Properties or other cultural resources within the project area.

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.*

**Rationale:** The Proposed Action would not affect any endangered or threatened species. As described in the EA, no known threatened or endangered species or critical habitat has been identified on the site in consideration in this EA. The 200-acre project area is potential habitat for three BLM special status species, however the area is currently cultivated, so many of the habitat values were lost when the area was converted to cultivated land.

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

**Rationale:** This action violates no federal, state, or local environmental protection laws. The action will be implemented in accordance with all federal, state, and local environmental protection laws. Solicitation #140L0119R0007 (and subsequent contract) and the Decision Record require and acknowledge all local, state, and federal laws/regulations/rules must be followed and all necessary applications/permits must be obtained by ZimMetal and Welding.

**APPROVED:**

---

Lonny R. Bagley  
Casper Field Manager

---

Date