

Categorical Exclusion Review
 U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
 BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
 Boise District Office
 Owyhee Field Office

Rabbit Creek/Peters Gulch, Jump Creek and Evans FFR Grazing Preference Transfer

| CE No.: DOI-BLM-ID-B030-2011-0015-CX | Lease/Serial/Case File No.: 1101487 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--|------------------|----------------|------------------|----------------|----------------|----------------------------|----------|------|---------------------------|-------|------------|-------|-----|----|--------|-----------|-------|------|------|----|--------|-----|------------|-------|-----|-----|------|-----|--------|-----|-----------|-------|---|-----|-------|-----|-----------|----|
| Purpose and Need for Action: To address the Grazing Preference Application filed by Hook Family LLC in accordance with the grazing regulations (43 CFR 4110.2-3) and the National Environmental Policy Act. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Description of Proposed Action: Transfer the grazing preference from Thomas Hook to Hook Family LLC for the following: | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse; text-align: center;"> <thead> <tr style="background-color: #cccccc;"> <th>Allotment</th> <th>Allotment #</th> <th>Active AUMs</th> <th>Suspended AUMs</th> <th>Permitted AUMs</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td>Rabbit Creek/ Peters Gulch</td> <td>00517</td> <td>2193</td> <td>1892</td> <td>4085</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Jump Creek</td> <td>00570</td> <td>450</td> <td>0</td> <td>450</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Evans FFR</td> <td>00619</td> <td>84</td> <td>0</td> <td>84</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | | Allotment | Allotment # | Active AUMs | Suspended AUMs | Permitted AUMs | Rabbit Creek/ Peters Gulch | 00517 | 2193 | 1892 | 4085 | Jump Creek | 00570 | 450 | 0 | 450 | Evans FFR | 00619 | 84 | 0 | 84 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Allotment | Allotment # | Active AUMs | Suspended AUMs | Permitted AUMs | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Rabbit Creek/ Peters Gulch | 00517 | 2193 | 1892 | 4085 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Jump Creek | 00570 | 450 | 0 | 450 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Evans FFR | 00619 | 84 | 0 | 84 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Hook Family LLC has applied to transfer grazing preference from Thomas Hook on allotments Rabbit Creek Peters Gulch (00517), Jump Creek (00570) and Evans FFR (00619). | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Therefore, in accordance with 43 CFR 4110.2-3, the Proposed Action is to approve the transfer of grazing preference from Thomas Hook to Hook Family LLC as applied. No changes to current livestock grazing management and terms and conditions were made by the applicant. The grazing rotation and all terms and conditions would be exactly as identified on the previous grazing permit and the 2003 Final Decision. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Livestock grazing permit #1101487 would authorize livestock grazing to the following extent. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse; text-align: center;"> <thead> <tr style="background-color: #cccccc;"> <th>Allotment</th> <th>Allotment #</th> <th>Livestock Number</th> <th>Begin Date</th> <th>End Date</th> <th>% PL</th> <th>Type Use</th> <th>AUMS</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td rowspan="2">Rabbit Creek Peters Gulch</td> <td rowspan="2">00517</td> <td>450</td> <td>5/1</td> <td>8/8</td> <td>96</td> <td>Active</td> <td>1234</td> </tr> <tr> <td>253</td> <td>11/1</td> <td>2/28</td> <td>96</td> <td>Active</td> <td>958</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Jump Creek</td> <td>00570</td> <td>148</td> <td>7/1</td> <td>9/30</td> <td>100</td> <td>Active</td> <td>448</td> </tr> <tr> <td>Evans FFR</td> <td>00619</td> <td>9</td> <td>3/1</td> <td>11/30</td> <td>100</td> <td>Custodial</td> <td>84</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> | | Allotment | Allotment # | Livestock Number | Begin Date | End Date | % PL | Type Use | AUMS | Rabbit Creek Peters Gulch | 00517 | 450 | 5/1 | 8/8 | 96 | Active | 1234 | 253 | 11/1 | 2/28 | 96 | Active | 958 | Jump Creek | 00570 | 148 | 7/1 | 9/30 | 100 | Active | 448 | Evans FFR | 00619 | 9 | 3/1 | 11/30 | 100 | Custodial | 84 |
| Allotment | Allotment # | Livestock Number | Begin Date | End Date | % PL | Type Use | AUMS | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Rabbit Creek Peters Gulch | 00517 | 450 | 5/1 | 8/8 | 96 | Active | 1234 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | 253 | 11/1 | 2/28 | 96 | Active | 958 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Jump Creek | 00570 | 148 | 7/1 | 9/30 | 100 | Active | 448 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Evans FFR | 00619 | 9 | 3/1 | 11/30 | 100 | Custodial | 84 | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Project Location: Rabbit Creek Peters Gulch (00517), Jump Creek (00570) and Evans FFR (00619) are located in Owyhee County, Idaho, approximately 15 miles south of Marsing Idaho and 7 miles North of Silver City. The elevation ranges from 1,000 feet to over 6,000 feet. | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Applicant (if any): Hook Family LLC | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Part I – Plan Conformance Review

This proposed Action is subject to the following land use plan: Owyhee Resource Management Plan (ORMP)
Date Plan Approved: December 30, 1999

The proposed action is in conformance with the LUP, even though it is not specifically provided for, because it is clearly consistent with the following LUP decision(s) (objectives, terms, and conditions): LVST 1 – Provide for a sustained level of use compatible with meeting other resource objectives.

Remarks: The Proposed Action has been reviewed for conformance with the plan (43 CFR 1610.5, BLM MS 1617.3)

Part II – NEPA Review

- A. Categorical Exclusion Review: This proposed action qualifies as a categorical exclusion under 516 DM 11.9(D)1. Category description: "Approval of transfers of grazing preference." See Part 1 – Plan Conformance Review – Remarks.

- B. Exceptions Review (Departmental List of Extraordinary Circumstances Review): Review the 12 exceptions which apply to individual actions within categorical exclusion. Environmental documents (EA or EIS) must be prepared for any actions involving these exceptions. The following Departmental List of Extraordinary Circumstances apply to individual actions. Departmental instructions mandate that environmental documents **MUST BE PREPARED** for actions which may: (Mark applicable answer for each item. If "yes", prepare an EA/EIS and append this form to it.)

List of Exceptions

1. Have significant impacts on public health or safety.

Yes No Specialist Signature/Date: Peter Torma 6/13/2011

Comments/Explanation: The transfer of existing grazing privileges with no additional use(s) authorized is an administrative function with no effects to public health or safety.

2. Have significant impacts on such natural resources and unique geographic characteristics as historic or cultural resources; park, recreation, or refuge lands; wilderness areas; wild or scenic rivers; national natural landmarks; sole or principal drinking water aquifers; prime farmlands; wetlands (Executive Order 11990); floodplains (Executive Order 11988); national monuments; migratory birds; or ecologically significant or critical areas, or is not in compliance with the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act.

Yes No Specialist Signature/Date: Peter Torma 6/13/2011

Comments/Explanation: The allotment contains no unique natural or cultural features that would be affected by this transfer, and no ecologically significant or critical areas occur in the general area of the allotment.

3. Have highly controversial environmental effects or involve unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources [NEPA Section 102(2)(E)].

Yes No Specialist Signature/Date: Peter Torma 6/13/2011

Comments/Explanation: The proposed transfer of grazing privileges is a routine administrative procedure that would not change the grazing management on the allotment.

4. Have highly uncertain and potentially significant environmental effects or involve unique or unknown environmental risks.

Yes No Specialist Signature/Date: Peter Torma 6/13/2011

Comments/Explanation: Livestock grazing is an ongoing activity, the continuation of which poses no unique or unknown environmental risks. Environmental effects such as climate change, and potential listing of candidate species would be addressed in future documents and would be implemented specific to the actions being proposed.

5. Establish a precedent for future actions or represent a decision in principle about future actions with potentially

| | | | | |
|---|--------------------------|----|-------------------------------------|---|
| significant environmental effects. | | | | |
| Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> | No | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Specialist Signature/Date: Peter Torma 6/13/2011 |
| <i>Comments/Explanation:</i> Transferring the grazing preference would not result in future action with potentially significant environmental effects. The proposed action would allow for the continued use of the above allotments as identified in the existing permit terms and conditions. | | | | |
| 6. Have a direct relationship to other actions with individually insignificant, but cumulatively significant environmental effects. | | | | |
| Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> | No | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Specialist Signature/Date: Peter Torma 6/13/2011 |
| <i>Comments/Explanation:</i> There are no environmental effects from transferring existing grazing preference, so there would be no cumulatively impacts. | | | | |
| 7. Have significant impacts on properties listed or eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places as determined by either the bureau or office. | | | | |
| Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> | No | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Specialist Signature/Date: Brian McCabe 6/13/2011 |
| <i>Comments/Explanation:</i> The affected grazing allotment contains no known properties listed, or eligible for listing, on the National Register of Historic Places. | | | | |
| 8. Have significant impacts on species listed or proposed to be listed on the List of Endangered or Threatened Species, or on designated Critical Habitat for these species. | | | | |
| Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> | No | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Specialist Signature/Date for Plants: Beth Corbin 6/14/2011 |
| | | | | Specialist Signature/Date for Wildlife:  5/25/2011 |
| | | | | Specialist Signature/Date for Aquatics: Rich Jackson 6/13/2011 |
| Plants <i>Comments/Explanation:</i> No federally listed, candidate, or BLM special status plant species would be significantly impacted by the Proposed Action. | | | | |
| Wildlife <i>Comments/Explanation:</i> No known federally listed wildlife species are known to be present. Greater sage-grouse (a candidate species) occurs in the allotment. In addition, the allotment is within California bighorn sheep (a BLM sensitive species) distribution range. The proposed transfer would not be expected to result in adverse impact because the proposed transfer of grazing preferences would result in no changes to current livestock grazing management within the above allotments. | | | | |
| Aquatics <i>Comments/Explanation:</i> No federally listed, candidate, or BLM special status aquatic species are impacted by the Proposed Action. | | | | |
| 9. Violate a Federal, State, local, or tribal law or requirement imposed for the protection of the environment. | | | | |
| Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> | No | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Specialist Signature/Date: Peter Torma 6/13/2011 |
| <i>Comments/Explanation:</i> This routine administrative procedure is consistent and compatible with all known Federal, State, local and Tribal laws or requirements imposed for protection of the environment. | | | | |
| 10. Have a disproportionately high and adverse effect on low income or minority populations (Executive Order 12898). | | | | |
| Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> | No | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Specialist Signature/Date: Peter Torma 6/13/2011 |
| <i>Comments/Explanation:</i> There are no known low income or minority populations in the area of the Proposed Action. However, if low income or minority populations do exist, the transfer of existing grazing privileges would not be expected to have a disproportionately high or adverse effect on these populations. | | | | |
| 11. Limit access to and ceremonial use of Indian sacred sites on Federal lands by Indian religious practitioners or significantly adversely affect the physical integrity of such sacred sites (Executive Order 13007). | | | | |
| Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> | No | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Specialist Signature/Date: Brian McCabe 6/14/2011 |
| <i>Comments/Explanation:</i> There are no known ceremonial and/or sacred sites on public land in this allotment. However if sites were to be discovered in the future, the continuation of an ongoing activity would not limit access for ceremonial use of Indian sacred sites by Indian religious practitioners; nor would there be adverse affects to the physical integrity of sacred sites. | | | | |
| 12. Contribute to the introduction, continued existence, or spread of noxious weeds or non-native invasive species | | | | |

| | | | |
|--|--------------------------|-----------------|--|
| known to occur in the area or actions that may promote the introduction, growth, or expansion of the range of such species (Federal Noxious Weed Control Act and Executive Order 13112). | | | |
| Yes | <input type="checkbox"/> | No | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Specialist Signature/Date: Peter Torma 6/13/2011 |
| <i>Comments/Explanation:</i> Transferring grazing privileges, for the continuation of current authorized grazing, would not cause additional influences to existing noxious weeds or non-native invasive species. | | | |
| I certify that none of the Departmental exceptions (Extraordinary Circumstances) listed in the above Part II (516 DM 2, Appendix 2) apply to this action; therefore, this categorical exclusion is appropriate for this situation. | | | |
| Remarks: None | | | |
| Authorizing Official: /s/ Buddy W. Green | | Date: 6/13/2011 | |
| Name: Buddy W. Green | | | |
| Title: Owyhee Field Manager | | | |