USDA Farm Service Agency
U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

New York State FSA Office
441 South Salina Street, Room 536
Syracuse, NY 13202-2455
PHONE: 315-477-6303

United States Department of Agriculture
Farm Service Agency
FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT (FONSI)
for
Bunk Silo Installation for [redacted]. in Genesee County New York

The United States Department of Agriculture, Farm Service Agency (FSA) has prepared a Final Environmental Assessment (EA) that describes the potential environmental consequences resulting from construction of a bunk silo in Genesee County, New York funded through a Farm Storage Facility Loan (FSFL). FSFL's are administered by the Farm Service Agency (FSA) of the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA).

FSFL's through FSA provide access to credit and support the agricultural economy by helping family and beginning farmers and ranchers to start, improve, expand, transition, market, and strengthen their operations.

Proposed Action

The Proposed Action is to install a 600'x300' and 400'x200' bunk silo to enable [redacted] to centralize their feed storage into one location and provide feed storage for all animals. The operation is classified as a large CAFO (confined animal feeding operation). The action is anticipated to begin in September 2025.

All proposed activities would occur on land previously disturbed by agriculture, where native vegetative communities have been removed. Temporary minor impacts to wildlife, water, and air quality may occur during the construction phase of the proposed project. It is expected that the above resources will not be permanently cumulatively impacted by the proposed action.

Alternatives

The No Action alternative means FSA assistance will not be provided, and the proposed project will not be built. Existing conditions on the site will continue and there will be no impact as the proposed action will not go forward.

Mitigation Measures

None implemented.

Environmental Impacts of the Proposed Action and Why Not Significant

Only 4 resources were elevated to the detailed Analysis level, meaning that they had the potential to have a significant impact. Wildlife and Habitat, Cultural Resources, Water Quality, and Air Quality were all elevated for review.

Wildlife and Habitat - Researched the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) - Information, Planning, and Conservation System (IPaC) about the project's potential to affect federally listed species and has completed a biological field review relative to the potential species presence as required by the Endangered Species Act of 1973. Consultation with Fish and Wildlife Service was initiated with a Determination of **"No effect".** The Fish and wildlife Service concurred with this determination.

Cultural Resources- The Agency contacted all affected tribes and received no comments regarding notification in the case of inadvertent discovery. The Agency also contacted the State Historic Preservation Office and received a finding of **"no historic properties, including archaeological and/or historic resources, will be affected by this undertaking".**

Water Quality- The Agency researched information found in the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (DEC) Regulations for CAFO operations and found all regulatory standards are and will be adhered to per the operator's CAFO plan. The existing CAFO plan and Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan addresses any impact on water uses or habitats as required by the Clean Water Act therefore, there are no anticipated impacts to water quality for the proposed project.

Air Quality- The Agency researched the site and its present use. The area where the proposed action will take place is mainly rural with an existing dairy operation. New construction will not significantly impact air quality in the surrounding area. The project will comply with the applicable Federal, state, and local regulations and standards for air quality and not exceed the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQs) for common or hazardous pollutants as also established by the Clean Air Act.

Public Feedback and FSA Responses

FSA contacted the following agencies and individuals for the draft EA.

Name and title	**Persons and Agencies Contacted with Affiliations**
Joe Stahlman, THPO	Seneca Nation of Indians THPO
William Tarrant, THPO	Seneca-Cayuga Nation THPO
Roger Hill, Chief	Tonawanda Band of Seneca

Supporting Documents

• The State Historic Preservation Office was contacted and issued a response that "based upon this review, it is the opinion of the New York SHPO that no historic properties, including archaeological and/or historic resources, will be affected by this undertaking."

Determination According to the National Environmental Policy Act and FSA's environmental regulations at 7 CFR Part 1B implementing the regulations of the Council on Environmental Quality, 40 CFR Parts 1500-1508, I find that the Proposed Action is not a major Federal action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment. Therefore, no environmental impact statement will be prepared.

State Environmental Coordinator:

_____ 9/8/25
Signature **Date**

Jamie Epstein, *State Environmental Coordinator*
Name

Designated Project Approval Official for the Proposed Action:

_____ 9/8/25
Signature **Date**

Jamie Epstein, *State Environmental Coordinator*
Name