Categorical Exclusion Review

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
Twin Falls District
Jarbidge Field Office
2536 Kimberly Road
Twin Falls, ID 83301

Grazing Preference Transfer for the South Roseworth (#01151) Allotment

NEPA No. DOI-BLM-ID-T010-2012-0010-CX

A. Background

BLM Office: Jarbidge Field Office. Lease/Serial/Case File No.: 1100446

Proposed Action Title/Type: Grazing Preference Transfer for the South Roseworth (#01151) Allotment.

Location of Proposed Action: The South Roseworth Allotment is located in Twin Falls County, Idaho, approximately 11 miles south of Castleford, Idaho.

Description of Proposed Action: Transfer the grazing preference from Brackett Ranches LTD to Grassy Hills LLC for the following:

Allotment Name	Allotment #	Active AUMs	Suspended AUMs	Permitted AUMs
South Roseworth	01151	35	0	35

Grassy Hills LLC has applied to transfer grazing preference from Brackett Ranches LTD on the South Roseworth Allotment. Grassy Hills LLC purchased the base property attached to this permit from Brackett Ranches LTD.

Therefore, in accordance with 43 CFR 4110.2-3, the Proposed Action is to approve the transfer of grazing preference from Brackett Ranches LTD to Grassy Hills LLC as applied. No changes to current livestock grazing management and terms and conditions were requested by the applicant. All terms and conditions would be exactly as identified on the previous grazing permit #1100446. The term of the permit would be from May 21, 2012 through February 28, 2016.

The South Roseworth Allotment is subject to Chief Judge Winmill's Decision and Order of February 26, 2009. Under the Order, the Bureau of Land Management (BLM) is directed to adjust livestock grazing to maintain and enhance sage-grouse, pygmy rabbit, and slickspot peppergrass habitat. Grazing schedules are outline annually in a Grazing Agreement prior to turnout in accordance with the Order. Livestock grazing management, schedules, and rotations would continue to be in compliance with the Order.

Terms and Conditions of the transferred permit would remain exactly as identified on the existing permit. The Mandatory Terms and Conditions are as follows:

Allotment Name	Allotment #	Number and Kind of Livestock	Begin Date	End Date	% PL	Type Use	AUMs
South Roseworth	01151	35 Cattle	10/15	11/13	100	Active	35

B. Land Use Plan Conformance

Land Use Plan Name: Jarbidge Resource Management Plan.
Date Approved/Amended: March 23, 1987.

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 overall objective of the range program is to maintain or improve the soil, vegetation and watershed conditions within the resource area and to provide forage for livestock, wildlife, and wild horses. Furthermore, the proposed stocking rates are designed to provide adequate forage for watershed protection, plant requirements, wildlife, livestock and other resource uses.

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

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 (D)1. Category description: "Approval of transfers of grazing preference."

This categorical exclusion is appropriate in this situation because there are no extraordinary circumstances potentially having effects that may significantly affect the environment. The proposed action has been reviewed, and none of the extraordinary circumstances described in 43 CFR 46.215 apply. The following Departmental List of Extraordinary Circumstances apply to individual actions. Departmental instructions mandate that environmental documents must be prepared for actions which may:

1. Have significant impacts on public health or safety.

Yes ☐ No ☑

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 ☑

Comments/Explanation: The transfer of grazing preference would not have significant impacts beyond those identified in the Jarbidge Resource Management Plan.

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

Yes ☐ No ☑

Comments/Explanation: The proposed transfer of grazing privileges is a routine administrative procedure that would not change the grazing management on the allotment. Grazing management would remain in compliance with the Jarbidge Resource Management Plan and the 2009 Court Order.

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

Yes ☐ No ☑

Comments/Explanation: Livestock grazing is an ongoing activity, the continuation of which poses no unique or unknown environmental risks.

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

Yes ☐ No ☑

Comments/Explanation: Transfer of grazing preference is a routine administrative procedure that would not change the grazing management on the allotment. This action neither establishes a precedent for future actions nor represents a decision in principle about future actions with potentially significant environmental effects.

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

Yes ☐ No ☑

Comments/Explanation: Due to its administrative nature, transferring existing grazing preference would be neither individually nor cumulatively significant.

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 ☐ No ☑

Comments/Explanation: No known listed or eligible National Register properties are being significantly affected by livestock or livestock operations within the allotment.

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 ☐ No ☑

Plants - *Comments/Explanation*: No known federally listed, candidate, or BLM special status plant species would be significantly impacted by the Proposed Action.

Wildlife - *Comments/Explanation*: No known federally listed, candidate, or BLM special status wildlife species would be significantly impacted by the Proposed Action.

Aquatics - *Comments/Explanation*: No known federally listed, candidate, or BLM special status aquatic species would be significantly impacted by the Proposed Action.

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

Yes ☐ No ☑

Comments/Explanation: 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 ☐ No ☑

Comments/Explanation: 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 ☐ No ☑

Comments/Explanation: 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 effects 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 ☐ No ☑

Comments/Explanation: Transferring grazing privileges, for the continuation of current authorized grazing, would not cause additional influences to existing noxious weeds or non-native invasive species.

BLM Interdisciplinary Team Authors and Reviewers are as follows:

Name	Title	Area(s) of Participation	Initials
Dan Strickler	Rangeland Management Specialist	Project Lead, Range Management	DS
Ken Crane	Supervisory Rangeland Management Specialist	Range Management	KJC
Jeff Ross	Archaeologist	Cultural Resources	JR
Thomas Stewart	Botanist	Vegetation, Soils, Invasive Species	TS
Michael Haney	Wildlife Biologist	Wildlife	MH
Kate Forster	Fisheries Biologist	Aquatics, Wetlands, Riparian	KF
Max Yingst	Outdoor Recreation Planner	Recreation, Wilderness, Wild and Scenic Rivers, VRM	MY

D. Signature

I certify that none of the Departmental exceptions (Extraordinary Circumstances) listed in the above Part C apply to this action; therefore, this categorical exclusion is appropriate for this situation.

Authorizing Official: _____/s/ Brian W. Davis___ Date: _05/21/2013__
Name: Brian Davis
Title: Field Manager

Contact Person

For additional information concerning this Categorical Exclusion Review, contact Dan Strickler, Rangeland Management Specialist, (208)736-2356, Bureau of Land Management, 2536 Kimberly Road, Twin Falls, ID 83301.