

U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management
Coeur d'Alene District, Idaho

**Categorical Exclusion Documentation
and
Decision Record
Conklin Road Access Right-of-Way**

Office: Cottonwood Field Office

NEPA Register No. DOI-BLM-ID-C020-2012-0020-CX

Subject Code / Case File No.: 2800 / IDI-37324

Location: Idaho County, Idaho; Twin Bridges
T. 27 N., R. 1 E., sec. 15, lot 4, Boise Meridian.

Description of the Proposed Action

The BLM is evaluating an application for a road right-of-way (ROW) to access a mining claim located on private property. The road is located in Idaho County near Twin Bridges, river left of the Salmon River, approximately 5.5 air miles south of White Bird Idaho. The road has been in existence since the early 1930's and has required minor maintenance for the clearing of minor debris. It is located in an area where the Cottonwood Field Office has limited motorized use on existing roads. The applicant was using the road for commercial purposes and conducted minor maintenance without authorization. The BLM's proposed action is to authorize a 5 year road right-of-way in order to resolve the trespass. The applicant will be required to restore the disturbed areas to their original condition as a term in the grant. The road will be used year round for administrative access to the mining claim and to haul materials and supplies, including fuel, over the road. The proposed action incorporated design features, which will be added as stipulations to the ROW Grant, in order to protect the Salmon River from erosion, additional sloughing and possible fuel contamination.

Land Use Plan Conformance

This proposed action has been reviewed for conformance with the Cottonwood Resource Management Plan (RMP), approved December 21, 2009. It is consistent with the following decision from the RMP:

Objective LR-1.2 – Consider all requests for Right-of-Way, Land Use Permits and Leases.
Page 49.

Compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)

The proposed action is excluded from further documentation under NEPA in accordance with the BLM categorical exclusion (CX) established in 516 DM 11.9 E. 16. "Acquisition of easements for an existing road or issuance of leases, permits, or rights-of-way for the use of existing facilities, improvements, or sites for the same or similar purposes." Application of this CX is appropriate in this

situation because there are no extraordinary circumstances having effects that may significantly affect the environment. The proposed action has been reviewed (attachment), and none of the extraordinary circumstances described in 43 CFR 46.215 exist.

Conclusion

In reviewing the proposed action, I considered that the authorization would meet the needs of the public through right-of-way permits with no or minimal impact to natural and cultural resources. The project has been designed to incorporate control features, through terms and conditions, which are common for roads which cross public lands. The proposal has little or no impacts, and therefore does not warrant further review through an EA or EIS.

Decision

It is my decision to proceed with offering a right-of-way, IDI-37324, to Mike Conklin for a term of 5 years.

Authorizing Official: Originally Signed Date: 07/18/2012
Will Runnoe, Field Manager

Contact: For additional information, contact Jeff Cartwright, Realty Specialist, at (208) 962-3680.

Administrative Review Procedures

This decision may be appealed under the regulations found at 43 CFR Part 4. In accordance with the right-of-way regulations found at 43 CFR 2801.10(a) and (b), all BLM right-of-way decisions remain in effect pending appeal unless the Secretary of the Interior rules otherwise, or as noted in this part. A petition for a stay of a BLM decision under this part of the regulations may be filed with the Office of Hearings and Appeals, Department of Interior.

**Categorical Exclusion Documentation -- Extraordinary Circumstances Review
Conklin Road Access Right-of-Way**

NEPA Register No: DOI-BLM-ID-C020-2012-0020-CX

CX Reference No: 516 DM 11.9 E. 16

| The following must be answered <i>No</i> for this action to be categorically excluded: | NO | Initials |
|---|-----------|-----------------|
| <i>Will this project</i> have significant adverse effects on public health or safety? | X | JSC |
| <i>Will this project</i> adversely affect such unique geographic characteristics as: | | |
| historic or cultural resources; | X | DS |
| park, recreation or refuge lands, wilderness areas, wild or scenic rivers; | X | JSC |
| sole or principal drinking water aquifers; | X | CAJ |
| prime farmlands; wetlands (Executive Order 11990); floodplains (Executive Order 11988); | X | CAJ |
| or ecologically significant or critical areas, including those listed on the Department of the Interior's National Register of Natural Landmarks? | X | JSC |
| <i>Will this project</i> have highly controversial environmental effects (NEPA section 102(2)(E))? | X | LSW |
| <i>Will this project</i> have highly uncertain and potentially significant environmental effects or involve unique or unknown environmental risks? | X | JSC |
| <i>Will this project</i> establish a precedent for future action or represent a decision in principle about future actions with potentially significant environmental effects? | X | JSC |
| <i>Will this project</i> be related to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant environmental effects? | X | LSW |
| <i>Will this project</i> have adverse effects on properties listed or eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places? | X | DS |
| <i>Will this project</i> have adverse effects on species listed or proposed to be listed on the List of Threatened or Endangered Species, or have adverse effects on designated Critical Habitat for these species? | X | CAJ |
| <i>Will this project</i> threaten to violate a Federal, State, local or tribal law or requirement imposed for the protection of the environment? | X | JSC |
| <i>Will this project</i> have a disproportionately high and adverse effect on low income or minority populations? (Executive Order 12898 -- Environmental Justice) | X | JSC |
| <i>Will this project</i> 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 – Sacred Sites) | X | DS |
| <i>Will this project</i> 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, Executive Order 13112) | X | LD |

Reviewers and Comments

| Specialist | Name | Comment | Date |
|-----------------------------|-----------------|---|-------------|
| Realty | Jeff Cartwright | Existing road, minimal maintenance required | 6/18/12 |
| Archeologist | Dave Sisson | Inventory and consultation completed | 6/18/12 |
| Biologist | Craig Johnson | See 7/5/12 TES clearance and Memo | 7/5/12 |
| Natural Resource Specialist | Lynn Danly | Re-seed disturbed area for weed resistance | 6/18/12 |
| NEPA Coordinator | Lorrie West | LUP and CX confirmation | 7/17/12 |