

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR  
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT  
Four Rivers Field Office

**CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION REVIEW**

**CX No.** DOI-BLM-ID-B010-2012-0046-CX

**A. BACKGROUND**

**BLM Office:** Four Rivers Field Office

**Lease/Serial/Case File No.:** IDI-20030

**Proposed Action Title/Type:** Commercial Occupancy Lease

**Location of Proposed Action:** Elmore County, Idaho

Boise Meridian

T. 2 S., R. 5 E.,

sec. 32, lot 4, S½S½.

(See attached Exhibit A)

**Description of Proposed Action:**

The Proposed Action is to grant a 10-year commercial occupancy lease to Carl F. Reynolds & Sons to continue to utilize 9-acres of public land for a storage facility of beets and other similar crops. The site is located at about 10-miles northwest from Mountain Home, Idaho and three miles east of Simco Road. The site has been utilized as a seasonal transfer site for sugar beets since 1982.

10-year renewal of an existing approximately 1,320 ft. long x 330 ft. wide (for a total of approximately 9 acres) lease that would allow for the operation and maintenance of the following project components:

- 9-acre site for temporary stockpiling and transfer of beets and other agricultural produce; and,
- Existing power line and utility pole, truck scale, small building and transfer rig for stockpiling beets.

The Bureau of Land Management (BLM) is authorized under Title III of the Federal Land Management and Policy Act (FLPMA) of October 21, 1976: 43 CFR § 2920 to issue a FLPMA lease.

This lease would be subject to the terms and conditions found at 43 CFR § 2920, as well as any terms, conditions and/or stipulations that would be incorporated into the lease.

**B. LAND USE PLAN CONFORMANCE**

**Land Use Plan Name:** Kuna MFP

**Date Approved or Amended:** March 30, 1983

**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):**

Lands Objective #1: *“Provide public lands having suitable soils to meet the demand for agricultural development.”*

The renewal of this commercial occupancy lease would be consistent with the land use plan decision to continue to serve the public through providing a commercial lease for the purpose of supporting the agricultural industry in SW Idaho. If approved, the continued existence of this 9-acre lease site would not likely cause any substantial or long-term, adverse effects to other resource management objectives.

**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 11.9E (9)**.

**Category Description:**

*“(9) Renewals and assignments of leases, permits, or rights-of-way where no additional rights are conveyed beyond those granted by the original authorizations. “*

**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:* No public health or safety issues have been raised over the 30-year existence of this seasonal stockpiling site. The proposed renewal of this existing lease would result in virtually the same environmental conditions as exists today. The renewal would not likely result in any adverse impacts to public health or safety.

Specialist Signature/Date:                     /s/ Jeremy Bluma                    8/27/2012

**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:* The renewal of this lease would not have any effect on natural resources or unique geographic characteristics such as those listed above. The lease would be within LEPA habitat but not within any occupied habitat. No effect would be anticipated to LEPA or its habitat because any activity(s) would be limited to within the previously disturbed ROW area.

Specialist Signature/Date:                     /s/ Dean C. Shaw                    8/29/2012

Specialist Signature/Date:                     /s/ Mark Steiger                    8/29/2012

**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 BLM has monitored the leased lands that have been utilized for the seasonal storage of beets over the past 30 years. Controversial environmental effects from these actions have not been identified and would not be anticipated as a result of a lease renewal. Controversy over the effect of seasonal beet storage and transfer is highly unlikely.

Specialist Signature/Date:                     /s/ Jeremy Bluma                    8/27/2012

**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 administered the seasonal storage and transfer of sugar beets at this site for the past 30 years. During that time, BLM personnel have monitored this use and taken corrective action when necessary to bring use into compliance with the terms of the lease. During the course of the previous lease terms, no uncertain or potentially significant environmental effects that would lead to environmental risks have occurred. The potential impacts associated with the continued use by the applicant would be known and generally unsubstantial.

Specialist Signature/Date:                     /s/ Jeremy Bluma                    8/28/2012                    

**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:* Leasing public lands for uses that are in conformance with the land use plan would be in-line with current precedents and decisions. Future proposed actions would be analyzed on their own merit according to law, federal regulations, policy and current land use plan.

Specialist Signature/Date:                     /s/ Jeremy Bluma                    8/28/2012                    

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

NO, does not apply.

*Comments/Explanation:* The area that has been applied for a lease renewal is the same site that has been utilized for the past 30 years. There are currently no other planned or reasonably foreseeable future actions in this area to analyze in conjunction with this proposed lease renewal.

Specialist Signature/Date:                     /s/ Jeremy Bluma                    8/28/2012                    

**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 review of the cultural resources was provided at the time of the environmental analysis in 1982 prior to the lease originally being issued. That analysis was reviewed in 2002 by D. Shaw and he determined that no cultural resources within the 9-acre area of potential effect (APE) would be impacted because none were known to exist. No significant impacts to properties listed or eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places would be impacted if this lease were to be renewed since none are known to be present. Recommend renewing the lease as applied for.

Specialist Signature/Date:                     /s/ Dean C. Shaw                    8/29/2012                    

**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.

*Botanical Comments/Explanation:* Given the heavily disturbed nature of the site and the fact that A. DeBolt reviewed it in 2002 with a “no effect” call, I am comfortable renewing the existing lease as long as the lease footprint will be the same. After 30-plus years of continual disturbance, it is unlikely

that any slickspots exist on the site if they ever did in the first place. No affect to slickspot peppergrass habitat would occur from the proposed action of renewing the grant as long as no additional disturbance outside the previously disturbed area occurs.

Specialist Signature/Date:           /s/ Mark Steiger          8/29/2012

*Wildlife Comments/Explanation:* No adverse effects to any special status wildlife species or their habitat would occur from the applied-for renewal of the Carl F. Reynolds & Sons lease near Crater Rings. J. Holderman issued a full-clearance back in 2002 as part of the NEPA analysis done at that time. Nothing has changed that would amount to further potential impacts to wildlife. Any wildlife that may occur in the area has likely adapted to the ongoing seasonal use of storage and transfer of produce. No special or additional stipulations would be required.

**Wildlife** Specialist Signature/Date:           /s/ Joseph M. Weldon          8/28/2012

**Wildlife** Specialist Signature/Date:           /s/ Jill C. Holderman          8/28/2012

*Aquatics/Riparian Comments/Explanation:* The renewal of this lease would not impact riparian or other aquatics resources because none exist in the area.

Specialist Signature/Date:           /s/ Jeremy Bluma          8/29/2012

**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:           /s/ Jeremy Bluma          8/28/2012

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

NO, does not apply.

*Comments/Explanation:* The area of this proposed renewal is in a rural location that is sparsely populated with no particular low income or minority population areas. Furthermore, the proposed renewal of this lease for produce storage and transfer would not affect low income or minority populations living in the area any differently than any other citizen.

Specialist Signature/Date:           /s/ Jeremy Bluma          8/28/2012

**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 to and ceremonial use of Indian sacred sites on Federal lands would not be impeded by the renewal of this lease. No adverse impacts are anticipated to occur to Indian ceremonial or sacred sites by the proposed action of renewing this lease.

Specialist Signature/Date:           /s/ Dean C. Shaw          8/29/2012

**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:* No populations of noxious weeds known to exist in the proposed lease renewal area. If noxious weeds would be encountered after the implementation of this renewal, the grant holder would be required to treat, monitor, and retreat as necessary, consistent with established BLM procedures, to prevent infestations from establishing and spreading in the project area.

Specialist Signature/Date:                     /s/ Lonnie R. Huter                    8/29/2012                    

**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 would be appropriate for this situation.

Authorizing Official: */s/ Terry A. Humphrey*

Date: 9/18/2012

Terry A. Humphrey  
Four Rivers Field Manager

**Prepared By/Contact Person:**

Jeremy Bluma  
Realty Specialist  
BLM - Boise District Office  
3948 Development Avenue  
Boise, Idaho 83705  
(208) 384-3348  
jbluma@blm.gov