

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

Rose Mountain Allotment No. 02003

Livestock Grazing Permit Renewal

DOI-BLM-WY-R010-2012-0013-EA

1 Introduction

The Bureau of Land Management (BLM) has conducted an environmental analysis (DOI-BLM-WY-R010-2012-0013-EA) for a proposed action to address livestock grazing permit renewal in the Rose Mountain Allotment No. 02003, located in Washakie County. The project would renew the applicant's livestock grazing permit for a term of ten years, or for the term of a valid base property lease, if applicable.

2 Finding of No Significant Impact

Based upon a review of the Environmental Assessment and the supporting documents, I have determined that the project is not a major federal action and will not significantly affect the quality of the human environment, individually or cumulatively with other actions in the general area.

This finding is based on the context and intensity of the project as described. In addition, 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 Washakie Resource Management Plan, Final Environmental Impact Statement, and Record of Decision, signed September 1988, for these reasons an environmental impact statement is not needed.

2.1 Context

The Action would occur within the Rose Mountain Allotment No. 02003 and would have local impacts on the resources similar to and within the scope of those described and considered within the Washakie Resource Management Plan and EIS/Record of Decision. The project is a site-specific action directly involving approximately 116 acres of BLM administered land that by itself does not have international, national, regional, or state-wide importance.

2.2 Intensity

The following discussion is organized around the Ten Significance Criteria described in 40 CFR 1508.27. The following have been considered in evaluating intensity for this proposal:

2.2.1 Impacts that may be both beneficial and adverse.

The Action/Alternatives would affect resources as described in the EA. Mitigating measures to reduce impacts to the various resources were incorporated in the design of the action alternative. None of the environmental effects discussed in detail in the EA are considered significant, nor do the effects exceed those described in the Washakie Resource Management Plan/EIS/Record of Decision.

2.2.2 The degree to which the selected alternative will affect public health or safety.

No aspect of the Action/Alternatives would have an effect on public health and safety.

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

The historic and cultural resources of the area have been reviewed and potential impacts mitigated in the design of the alternatives. Wilderness characteristics, although present in the area, would not be affected by the action for the reasons listed in Chapter 4 of the EA. The remaining components of the Human Environment and Resource Issues are not affected because they are not present in the project area.

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

Controversy in this context is considered to be in terms of disagreement about the nature of the effects not political controversy or expressions of opposition to the action or preference among the alternatives analyzed within the EA. No unique or appreciable scientific controversy has been identified regarding the nature of the impacts.

2.2.5 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 similar actions in similar areas. 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.

2.2.6 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 project neither establishes a precedent nor represents a decision in principle about future actions. 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. An analysis of the direct, indirect, and cumulative effects of the alternatives is described in Section 5 of the EA.

2.2.7 Whether the action is related to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant impacts – which include connected actions regardless of land ownership.

The environmental analysis did not reveal any cumulative effects beyond those already analyzed in the Washakie RMP/FEIS. 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 4 of the EA.

2.2.8 The degree to which the action may adversely affect districts, sites, highways, structures, or other 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.

There are no features within the project area listed or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places.

2.2.9 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, or the degree to which the action may adversely affect: 1) a proposed to be listed endangered or threatened species or its habitat, or 2) a species on BLM's sensitive species list.

Mitigating measures to reduce impacts to wildlife have been incorporated into the design of the action alternative through proper stocking rates, timing of use and utilization stipulations.

2.2.10 Whether the action threatens a violation of federal, state, or local environmental protection law.

The action does not threaten to violate any law. The action is in conformance with the Washakie RMP, which provides the direction and guidance for public land management for the area where the Rose Mountain Allotment is located.

Karla Bird

Karla Bird
Field Manager
Worland Field Office

3-15-2012

Date