

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT**

Twin Falls District
Jarbidge Field Office
2536 Kimberly Rd.
Twin Falls, Idaho 83301

CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION REVIEW SHEET

NEPA No. DOI-BLM-ID-T010-2013-0001-CX

A. Project Description

The Bureau of Land Management, Jarbidge Field Office (BLM) has received an application from Flying Spear Outfitters for a Special Recreation Permit for guided hunting. Clients would pay for the opportunity to hunt for mule deer and the proposed authorization would be for the 2012 hunting season only (Oct. 22 thru Nov. 30, 2012). No proposals for permanent or reserved campsites are part of the submitted operations plan. Minimal use of BLM administered land is likely, since the operation is primarily conducted on private lands.

Hunting activities would be consistent with seasons and regulations set by the IDFG. Operations would be in compliance with the license required by the State of Idaho Outfitters and Guides Licensing Board and the BLM Special Recreation Permit.

B. Consideration of Extraordinary Circumstances

This Categorical Exclusion Review Sheet documents the review of the proposed action to determine if any of the extraordinary circumstances described in 516 DM 2, Appendix 2 apply. If any of the extraordinary circumstances apply to the proposed action, then an EA or EIS must be prepared. Any evidence or concerns that one or more of the exceptions may apply must be brought to the attention of the manager who is authorized to approve the proposed action.

1. The proposed action would not have any significant impacts on public health or safety.

The activities associated with this commercial permit would not have any significant impacts on public health and safety. The Special Recreation Permit (SRP) would contain terms, conditions, and stipulations that would require Flying Spear Outfitters to comply with Federal and State standards for public health and safety, environmental protection, operation, and maintenance of, or for, such use. The BLM authorized officer has the ability to suspend or terminate in whole or in part the permit if unforeseen conditions arise which result in the approved terms and conditions being inadequate to protect the public health and safety or to protect the environment.

2. The proposed action would not 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; and other ecologically significant or critical areas.

The proposed action would not have significant impact on natural resources and unique geographic characteristics such 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; national monuments; or other ecologically significant or critical areas. The proposed action should result in no ground disturbance and would have no effect on important cultural resources.

3. The proposed action would not have highly controversial environmental effects or involve unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources [NEPA Section 102(2) (E)].

The proposed action is in conformance with the Jarbidge Resource Management Plan (RMP), approved March 23, 1987. The proposed action is in conformance with the Resource Management Guidelines which state: "BLM will manage recreation on the public lands. A variety of means to maintain or improve recreation opportunities will be considered." (Jarbidge RMP, Pg. II-93).

Throughout the environmental process the proposal to authorize an SRP to Flying Spear Outfitters were not highly controversial, nor are the effects expected to generate future controversy.

4. The proposed action would not have highly uncertain and potentially significant environmental effects or involve unique or unknown environmental risks.

The environmental process for the SRP has not identified any effects that may involve highly uncertain and potentially significant environmental effects or involve unique or unknown environmental risks unique or unknown risks.

5. The proposed action would not establish a precedent for future actions or represent a decision in principle about future actions with potentially significant environmental effects.
6. The proposed action would not have a direct relationship to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant environmental effects.
7. The proposed action would not have significant impacts on properties listed, or eligible for listing, on the National Register of Historic Places as determined by the bureau.
8. The proposed action would not have significant impacts on species listed, or proposed to be listed, on the List of Endangered or Threatened Species, or have significant impacts on designated critical habitat for these species.

9. The proposed action would not violate a Federal law, or a State, local or tribal law or requirement imposed for the protection of the environment.

The BLM issues SRPs in accordance with Section 302 (b) of the Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 and the BLM regulations at 43 CFR 2930. Under these regulations the permit would specify that all applicable Federal, State and local laws be adhered to. The BLM has the ability to suspend and/or terminate the SRP if a Federal, State or local laws is violated. There are no tribal laws in effect for the project area.

10. The proposed action would not have a disproportionately high and adverse effect on low income or minority populations (Executive Order 12898).

The proposed action would not have a disproportionately high and adverse effect on low income or minority populations (Executive Order 12898). The effect would be the same as for the general population in the general area.

11. The proposed action would not 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).

12. The proposed action would not 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).

C. Consultation and Preparation

The affected environment of the project area was described by an interdisciplinary team, identified below.

Name of Participant	Position Title
Lisa Claxton	Realty Specialist/Project Lead
Jim Klott	Wildlife Biologist
Kate Forster	Fisheries Biologist
Jeff Ross	Archeologist/ NEPA Coordinator
Max Yingst	Outdoor Recreation Planner
Dan Strickler	Rangeland Management Specialist
Tom Stewart	Botanist
Julie Hilty	Fire Ecologist