CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION DOCUMENTATION

CX No. DOI-BLM-ID-B010-2012-0003-CX

A. BACKGOUND

BLM Office: Four Rivers Field Office
Lease/Serial/Case File No.: IDI-37173
Proposed Action Title/Type: Half Yard Productions, LLC
Location of Proposed Action: Boise Meridian, Washington County
(See attached map Exhibit A, dated October 6, 2011)

Description of Proposed Action: Half Yard Productions submitted an application on September 29, 2011, for a Land Use Permit (LUP) to film a hunting video in various areas of Washington County, Idaho containing public land. This video is being filmed for a hunting show called Gun It shown on Versus, during which they will be hunting for chukar and deer.

There will be five people in the "hunting" party, including a cameraman, the host of the hunting show and a guide. There are no specific locations, as this is a hunting activity and exact locations cannot be predicted. However, the general area for the each hunting activity is outlined on the map attached as Exhibit A, dated October 6, 2011. According to the applicant, all Idaho hunting licenses/permits are in order.

There will be three motor vehicles including a Chevy Tahoe and a Winnebago used to access the public lands via existing roads. There will be no off-road use. All hunting activities will be performed on foot.

This permit will be issued for a period of October 7, 2011, through October 12, 2011, at midnight. It will be subject to the terms and conditions found at 43 CRF 2900, as well as the stipulations attached as Exhibit B, dated October 6, 2011.

This Film Permit would be authorized under Title III of the Federal Land Management and Policy Act (October 21, 1976; 43 CFR 2800) which allows BLM to authorize permits for this type of land use.

B. LAND USE PLAN CONFORMANCE

Land Use Plan Name: Cascade RMP Dated: July 1988

The proposed action is in conformance with the applicable LUP because it is specifically provided for in the following LUP decision(s):

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): The Cascade Resource Management Plan of 1988, on page 38 under Resource Management Guidelines, Public Land Management, the plan states "Any valid use, occupancy, and development of the public lands, including, but not limited to those requiring rights-of-way, leases, and licenses will be considered, subject to applicable environmental review

procedures, unless specifically excluded in the plan. The area applied for does not fall within a special management area that excluded such use.

C: COMPLIANCE WITH NEPA:

The proposed action is categorically excluded from further documentation under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) in accordance with 516 DM E. (19).

Category Description:

Issuance of short-term (3 years or less) rights-of-way or land use authorizations for such uses as storage sites, apiary sites, and construction sites where the proposal includes rehabilitation to restore the land to its natural or original condition.

Departmental List of Extraordinary Circumstances Review: Before any non-Energy Act CX is used, you must conduct sufficient review to determine if any of the following extraordinary circumstances apply (516 DM 2, Appendix 2). If any of the extraordinary circumstances are applicable to the action being considered, either an EA or an EIS must be prepared for the action. Part 516 of the Departmental Manual (516 DM 2, Appendix 2) states that extraordinary circumstances exist for individual actions within CXs which may: (Mark applicable answer for each item. If "yes", prepare an EA/EIS and append this form to it.)

The following list of Extraordinary Circumstances (516 DM 2, Appendix 2) were considered:

1. **Have significant impacts on public health or safety.**
   NO, does not apply
   Comments/Explanation: Any impacts would be indistinguishable from impacts associated with general recreational use, therefore this use does not pose any risk to public health or safety.

   Specialist Signature/Date: Kelley Moore 10/7/11

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.**
   NO, does not apply
   Comments/Explanation: Any impacts would be indistinguishable from impacts associated with general recreational use. No ground disturbance is anticipated with this action. No travel, other than by foot will occur anywhere except existing roads. Therefore there will be no significant impacts associated with the items listed.

   Specialist Signature/Date: Kelley Moore 10/7/11

3. **Have highly controversial environmental effects or involve unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources [NEPA Section 102(2)(E)].**
   NO, does not apply

Comments/Explanation: The authorizing of a person taking video of hunting activities is a minor action. There will be no highly controversial environmental effects or involve unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources. BLM authorizes many of these types of uses every year.

Specialist Signature/Date: Kelley Moore 10/7/11

4. **Have highly uncertain and potentially significant environmental effects or involve unique or unknown environmental risks.**
NO, does not apply
Comments/Explanation: BLM has issued many of these types of permits and no highly uncertain and potentially significant environmental effects have been experienced or have involved unique or unknown environmental risks. The BLM has extensive experience in issuing land use permits. The potential impacts associated with the activities themselves are well known and generally negligible.

Specialist Signature/Date: Kelley Moore 10/7/11

5. **Establish a precedent for future actions or represent a decision in principle about future actions with potentially significant environmental effects.**
NO, does not apply
Comments/Explanation: This proposal would not set a precedent or represent a decision in principle about future actions with potentially significant environmental effects. Any future proposal will be analyzed based on its own environmental impacts and according to laws, federal regulations, and BLM policy.

Specialist Signature/Date: Kelley Moore 10/7/11

6. **Have a direct relationship to other actions with individually insignificant, but cumulatively significant environmental effects.**
NO, does not apply
Comments/Explanation: This land use permit proposal would not cause any ground disturbance and would result in no impacts. By Definitions there would be no cumulative effects.

Specialist Signature/Date: Kelley Moore 10/7/11

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.**
NO, does not apply
Comments/Explanation: Any impacts would be indistinguishable from impacts associated with general recreational use. Any site that is eligible or listed would have use restrictions.

Specialist Signature/Date: Dean Shaw 10/5/11

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.**
NO, does not apply
Comments/Explanation: By restricting motorized access to existing roads there are no 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. Impacts associated by foot travel will be slight.

Specialist Signature/Date: Amy Stillman 10/6/11

Comments/Explanation: Any impacts would be indistinguishable from impacts associated with general recreational use, therefore will be no 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.

Specialist Signature/Date: Christa Braun 10/6/11

Comments/Explanation

Specialist Signature/Date:

9. **Violate a Federal, State, local, or tribal law or requirement imposed for the protection of the environment.**
NO, does not apply
Comments/Explanation: Any impacts would be indistinguishable from impacts associated with general recreational use, therefore this does not violate a Federal, State, local, or tribal law or requirement imposed for the protection of the environment. The proposed action would be in compliance with all laws and requirements that pertain to environmental protection in the area.

Specialist Signature/Date: Dean Shaw 10/5/11

10. **Have a disproportionately high and adverse effect on low income or minority populations (Executive Order 12898).**
NO, does not apply
Comments/Explanation: Any impacts would be indistinguishable from impacts associated with general recreational use, therefore this will not have a disproportionately high and adverse effect on low income or minority populations. Low income or minority visitors to the area would not be affected any differently by the proposed activities than any other visitor.

Specialist Signature/Date: Kelley Moore 10/7/11

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).**
NO, does not apply

Comments/Explanation: Since there are no known sacred sites in the proposed area this will not limit access to and ceremonial use by Indian religious practitioners or significantly adversely affect the physical integrity of such sacred sites.

Specialist Signature/Date: *Dean Shaw 10/5/11*

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).

NO, does not apply

Comments/Explanation: Any impacts would be indistinguishable from impacts associated with general recreational use, therefore this will not significantly 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.

Specialist Signature/Date: *Lonnie Huter 10/7/2011*

D: SIGNATURE

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.

Authorizing Official: *Terry A. Humphrey* Date: *10/7/2011*

(Signature)

Terry A. Humphrey
Four Rivers Field Manager

Prepared By/Contact Person:

Kelley Moore
Supervisory Realty Specialist
Boise District BLM
3948 Development Avenue
Boise, Idaho 83705
208-384-3339
kmoore@blm.gov