



— BUREAU OF —
RECLAMATION



FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT
for the
REVOCATION OF THE SEEDSKADEE PROJECT WITHDRAWALS
based on a
JOINT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

Bureau of Reclamation # PRO-EA-FY26-0004
Bureau of Land Management # DOI-BLM-WY-D000-2026-001-EA

September 2026

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR

BUREAU OF RECLAMATION – UPPER COLORADO REGION
PROVO AREA OFFICE; PROVO, UTAH

BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT – HIGH DESERT DISTRICT
ROCK SPRINGS, WYOMING

1.0 Background and Introduction

The Seedskaadee Revocation Project Environmental Assessment (EA) was prepared to disclose and analyze the environmental consequences of the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation), Provo Area Office's proposed revocation of the withdrawal of certain lands from the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) administration in southwest Wyoming for the Seedskaadee Project. Appendix A of the EA lists the legal description for these lands.

The EA analyzed potential impacts that could result from the implementation of the proposed action (revocation) as well as the potential impacts of a no action alternative. Reclamation's intent to revoke its withdrawal is being made in conformance with the regulations and policies contained in 43 CFR 2370 and 603 DM 1.

Revocation is needed because Reclamation has determined that certain lands withdrawn from the BLM in Lincoln and Sweetwater Counties, Wyoming, are no longer needed for Seedskaadee Project purposes. The Reclamation Act of June 17, 1902 (Reclamation Act) (32 Stat. 388; 43 U.S.C. 416) requires Reclamation to restore public entry to all withdrawn lands no longer needed or required for project purposes. The resulting change due to this revocation would be to management agency jurisdiction. The BLM, with funding from Reclamation, has been managing these lands under various agreements for over forty years.

Reclamation wrote an EA in 2013 that proposed the revocation of previously withdrawn lands that encompassed approximately 147,555.71 acres and issued a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) on May 6, 2013. This effort was not completed and upon further review of the lands associated with the Seedskaadee Project, Reclamation recently added approximately 15,674.29 acres to the proposed revocation for a total of 163,230.00 acres.

This Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) is intended to close the environmental review process, as required by the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). The EA specifically analyzed and discussed the consequences of either revoking the withdrawal (Proposed Action) or not revoking the withdrawal (referred to as No Action Alternative).

2.0 Environmental Commitments

Environmental commitments, also known as mitigating measures, are typically outlined in the final EA. In this instance, no specific environmental commitments are incorporated herein, based on the limited number of effects. This is based largely on the administrative nature of the action. As disclosed in the EA, any impacts from subsequent proposed actions in the project area would be addressed on their own merits through separate NEPA analysis.

3.0 Finding of No Significant Impact Determination

Based upon the review of the analysis in referenced EA, and in accordance with 42 U.S. Code § 4336 (e) (7), under NEPA, Reclamation and BLM have determined that an environmental impact statement is not needed for this proposed action. The selected Proposed Action Alternative will not have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment as defined in NEPA. This determination has been made by considering factors outlined in 516 DM 1 – U.S. Department of the Interior Handbook of NEPA implementing procedures, namely:

Both short-and long-term effects

The referenced EA includes analysis of short and long-term effects of the identified issues and discussion of reasonably foreseeable environmental trends and planned actions in relation to those issues. None of the impacts from the proposed action are expected to rise to the level of significance.

Both beneficial and adverse effects

Potentially beneficial and adverse impacts related to the proposed action were not found through the analysis. Chapter 3 of the EA, in the Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences sections, provides the rationale by which few impacts were found, resulting in no mitigation measures being recommended. None of the minor effects have been determined to be significant.

Beneficial impacts to communities, area stakeholders, and the public at large, are expected to develop over the coming years as various land use actions are proposed. Adverse effects, although considered to be minimal, may take place over time, yet the potential for adverse impacts to the resources examined in the EA have not been determined to be significant.

Effects on public health and safety

Effects on public health and safety are discussed in the EA and have not been found to be significant based on the administrative nature of the Proposed Action Alternative analysis. It is expected that public health and safety will persist in its current state as the lands continue to be managed as they are presently. Any future effects to public health and safety would be disclosed in site-specific NEPA documents, as such projects are proposed.

Economic effects

The act of implementing the project would not result in adverse economic impacts but likely be consistent with present and future development in the project area. The proposed project is not expected to cause a large impact (positive or negative) on employment on or to area populations. Implementation of the Proposed Action Alternative in and of itself is not anticipated to cause significant impact to or substantially increase demand for local government services, infrastructure, or housing.

Effects on the quality of life of the American people.

Quality of life of the American people, in the Project Area, would continue to persist and evolve with land use and development patterns as discussed in the EA. Future proposed projects would allow for similar trends in energy development, grazing activities, and recreation to be consistent with area trends and energy demands, likely resulting in positive effects to the quality of life of the American people.

4.0 BLM Land Use Plan Conformance

Kemmerer Field Office:

The Proposed Action is in conformance with the May 10, 2010, Approved Kemmerer Resource Management Plan (RMP), as amended and the land use direction pertaining to Land Resources (LR); Goal LR: 1:1 and LR:2.1:

1.1: *Conduct review of withdrawals and determine whether the withdrawal is still necessary. Only lands that will enhance multiple-use management and protection of nationally significant resource values and do not create a liability or burdensome management cost to the BLM will be considered for revocation. New withdrawals will be considered as the need arises. New requests will be processed for protection of resources prior to lifting existing withdrawals, when those withdrawals are in the same location. Areas that contain withdrawal conflicts will be handled on a case-by-case basis.*

2.1: *Manage lands and (or) interests (access) in lands acquired in a manner consistent with adjacent or nearby public lands.*

Specifically, Table 2.2 lists the Seedskaadee related project lands as part of itemized withdrawals for the approved RMP.

Pinedale Field Office RMP, approved November 26, 2008:

The proposed action is in conformance with the Pinedale Field Office RMP, as amended and land use direction pertaining to 2.3.4 Lands and Realty Management – Objective 4 (b).

2.3.4 Lands and Realty Management - Objective 4. Approximately 13,770 acres of new withdrawals from locatable mineral entry and land disposal will be pursued to protect cultural, wildlife habitat, and recreational values (Table 2-26; Map 2- 34).

b. Existing land withdrawals currently encumbering public lands will be reviewed to determine the need for continuation, modification, revocation, or termination of the withdrawals. Unneeded withdrawals will not be continued. These include power site, oil shale, and other miscellaneous withdrawals.

Rock Springs Field Office:

The Proposed Action is in conformance with the December 20, 2024, Approved Rock Springs Resource Management Plan (RMP), as amended, and the land use direction pertaining to Lands and Realty Resources (LR) and Management Action (Action #6008), listed in Appendix O of the Approved RMP. Specifically, LR-03, Biological Resources (BR) BR-20, and Heritage Resources (HR) HR-13:

Revoke withdrawals which no longer serve the purpose for which they were established Appendix J).

Review withdrawn lands, prior to revocation or expiration, to determine if any other resource values require withdrawal protection. Manage lands within withdrawn areas that expire or are revoked in accordance with the management of the surrounding lands.

Note that this FONSI is limited to the NEPA process and not subsequent actions that may follow. Specifically, BLM is expected to issue a Suitability Determination that determines that the subject lands are suitable to be returned to BLM management. Following the approved determination, the Department of the Interior would issue, at its discretion, an approved Public Land Order as the federal decision, in the Federal Register, to enact the revocation, open the lands to public entry under the public land laws and return the land to BLM management, as applicable.



Digitally signed by
RICK BAXTER
Date: 2026.09.28
13:24:30 -06'00'

Rick Baxter
Provo Area Office Manager



Digitally signed by
MICHAEL GATES
Date: 2026.09.28
13:35:16 -06'00'

Michael Gates
High Desert District Manager (Acting)