

# CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION DOCUMENTATION

CX No. DOI-BLM-ID-B010-2012-0006-CX

## A. BACKGROUND

**BLM Office:** Four Rivers Field Office

**Lease/Serial/Case File No.:** IDI-037206

**Proposed Action Title/Type:** Boise District Office Complex ROW

**Location of Proposed Action:** T. 3 N., R. 2 E., Section 27, SE $\frac{1}{4}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$  SW $\frac{1}{4}$ , Lot 2 (eastern portion) and Lot 3, BM

(See attached map Exhibit A)

**Description of Proposed Action:** The proposed action would be to grant a right-of-way (ROW) for the existing 2.5 acre Boise District Office complex located at 3948 Development Avenue Boise, Idaho. In 1966 the parcel was part of the Intermountain Forest and Range Experiment Station administered by the Forest Service (USFS). In 1969, the parcel was withdrawn from public occupant and mineral entry for 20 years and in 1980 an office building was constructed on the site. In 1991, the parcel was withdrawn for another 20 years and was transferred to the Bureau of Land Management (BLM).

The grant would be issued for a period of 20 years and subject to the terms and conditions found at 43 CFR 2800.

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

## B. LAND USE PLAN CONFORMANCE

**Land Use Plan Name:** Cascade RMP, July 1988

**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 RMP designates 480,000 acres of the resource area as "available for various types of rights-of-ways" and identifies avoidance areas including one cultural site, fifteen developed recreation areas/facilities, and thirteen candidate, sensitive or uncommon plant species areas (page 13 Cascade RMP). This proposal is not within an area identified as an avoidance area on page 13; therefore, this proposal would be in compliance with the Cascade RMP.

## 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 11.9.E. (16)**

Category Description: "Acquisition of easements for an existing road or issuance of leases, permits or right-of-way for the use of existing facilities, improvements or sites for the same or similar purposes." 516 DM 11.9.E. (16). The proposed action is the issuance of a ROW for the use of an existing facility for the same purpose.

**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:* There would be no impacts on public health or safety as this is an existing administrative complex and the use and operation will continue in the same manner.

Specialist Signature/Date: *Dusty D. Parson 11/21/11*

---

- 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:* This is an existing administrative complex, including buildings and paved parking areas over almost the entire complex. No historic properties were located in the project area during a reconnaissance survey conducted by a BLM Archaeologist and, therefore, there would be no significant impacts on the above mentioned resources.

Specialist Signature/Date: *Dean Shaw 11/21/11*

---

- 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:* There is no controversy over the effect of this proposal. The effects of issuing this right-of-way are known and understood and agreed upon in the scientific community. The Boise District Office complex for which the ROW is proposed has been in existence since the early 1980s and the proposal does not alter the existing use.

Specialist Signature/Date: *Dusty D. Parson 11/21/11*

---

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

NO, does not apply

*Comments/Explanation:* The BLM has extensive experience in issuing ROW authorizations on public lands and, in this instance, there will be no uncertain or significant environmental effects.

Specialist Signature/Date: *Dusty D. Parson 11/21/11*

---

- 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 would be analyzed based on its own environmental impacts and according to laws, federal regulations, and BLM policy.

Specialist Signature/Date: *Dusty D. Parson 11/21/11*

---

**6. Have a direct relationship to other actions with individually insignificant, but cumulatively significant environmental effects.**

NO, does not apply

*Comments/Explanation:* This ROW would not have any direct relationship to other actions; therefore, there would be no cumulative environmental effects.

Specialist Signature/Date: *Dusty D. Parson 11/21/11*

---

**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:* A reconnaissance survey was conducted by a BLM Archaeologist. No cultural resources were found during the survey, therefore there would be no significant impacts on listed or eligible properties.

Specialist Signature/Date: *Dean Shaw 11/14/2011*

---

**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:* A survey was conducted by a FRFO Biologist who determined that there are no special status animals or their critical habitat within the proposed area; therefore, there would be no significant impacts or effects on wildlife.

Specialist Signature/Date: *Jill Holderman 11/21/11*

---

*Comments/Explanation:* The FRFO Botanist determined that no habitat for threatened or endangered species of vegetation exists in the proposed project area and approval of the ROW, therefore, would not impact any special status or threatened and endangered species.

Specialist Signature/Date: *Mark Steiger 11/07/11*

---

*Comments/Explanation:* There are no aquatics in the proposed project areas and, therefore, no concerns to aquatics.

Specialist Signature/Date: *Mark Steiger 11/07/11*

---

**9. Violate a Federal, State, local, or tribal law or requirement imposed for the protection of the environment.**

NO, does not apply

*Comments/Explanation:* The proposed action would be in compliance with all laws and requirements that pertain to environmental protection in the area.

Specialist Signature/Date: *Dusty D. Parson 11/21/11*

---

**10. Have a disproportionately high and adverse effect on low income or minority populations (Executive Order 12898).**

NO, does not apply

*Comments/Explanation:* There would be no low income or minority populations living in the project area. 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: Dusty D. Parson 11/21/11

**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:* Access for such use would not be limited, because there are no known sites in the proposed project area.

Specialist Signature/Date: Dean Shaw 11/21/11

**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:* The proposed ROW is a developed administrative complex and the use of the complex would continue in the same manner. Any noxious weeds would be treated, monitored, and retreated as necessary, consistent with established BLM procedures, to prevent infestations from establishing and spreading in the project area.

Specialist Signature/Date: Lonnie Huter 11/21/11

**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:** /s/ Terry A. Humphrey Date: 12/21/2011  
Terry A. Humphrey  
Four Rivers Field Manager

**Prepared By/Contact Person:**

Dusty D. Parson  
Presidential Management Fellow  
Boise District BLM  
3948 Development Avenue  
Boise, Idaho 83705  
208-384-3373  
[ddparson@blm.gov](mailto:ddparson@blm.gov)