

**NEPA COMPLIANCE RECORD
CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION (CX)
Safford Field Office**

NEPA #: DOI-BLM-AZ-G010-2013-0015-CX

Serial/ Case File No. Little Ortega Lake Grazing Allotment (#60280)

Proposed Action Title/Type: The proposed action is the transfer of grazing preference on the Midway Canyon Grazing allotment.

Location of Proposed Action (include name of 7.5 topographic map): The Little Ortega Lake allotment is located in the western portion of Apache County, approximately 24 miles east of Showlow, AZ. The allotment is checked boarded in ownership. The allotment is split by highway 61 which runs east and west through the allotment.

Description of Proposed Action: Transfer the existing grazing preference from the current permittee (Marvin and Alice Prescott) to Andrus Ranch Holding, LLC. All terms and conditions of the permit would remain the same. The permittee BLM has on record is AZ Land LLC for this allotment there was never a transfer file from them to the Prescotts'. Since that time the base property and the grazing privileges have be sold to the Andrus Ranch Holding.

Applicant (if any): Andrus Ranch Holding, LLC

PART I: PLAN CONFORMANCE REVIEW. This proposed action is subject to the following land use plan: Safford District Resource Management Plan (RMP) and Record of Decision approved September 1992 and July 1994.

The proposed action has been reviewed and determined to be in conformance with this plan (43 CFR 1610.5, BLM MS 1617.3).

/s/ Gwen Dominguez
Specialist Signature

5/30/2013
Date

PROGRAM CONSULTATION & COORDINATION/CX CHECKLIST
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
SAFFORD FIELD OFFICE

PART II: CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION REVIEW

NEPA #: DOI-BLM-AZ-G010-2013-0015-CX

ASSIGNMENT AND REVIEW

Subactivity: _____
Case/Project No.: 60280

Project Name: Little Ortega Lake Allotment Transfer
Location (legal description): T 11N , R. 25E part of Sec 12
NLCS Unit: _____
Quad Name: _____
Project Lead: Gwen Dominguez

Draft Review: Unit Manager/Supervisor: _____ Date: _____

Technical Review:

Applies?		NAME	EXCEPTION	SIGNATURE	DATE
Yes	No				
	(X)	RJ Estes	(1) Have Significant adverse effects on public health or safety?	/s/ RJ Estes	5/29/2013
()	(X)		(2) Have adverse effects on such unique geographic characteristics as historic or cultural resources, parks, recreation or refuge lands, wilderness areas, wild or scenic rivers, sole or principal drinking water aquifers, prime farmlands, wetlands, floodplains or ecologically significant or critical areas including those listed on the Department's National Register of Natural Landmarks.	/s/ Gwen Dominguez	5/29/2013
()	(X)		(3) Have highly controversial environmental effects	/s/ Gwen Dominguez	5/29/2013
()	(X)		(4) Have highly uncertain and potentially significant environmental effects or involve unique or unknown environmental risks.	/s/ Gwen Dominguez	5/29/2013
()	(X)		(5) Establish a precedent for future action or represent a decision in principle about future actions with potentially significant environmental effects.	/s/ Gwen Dominguez	5/29/2013
()	(X)		(6) Individually Insignificant, but cumulatively significant effects.	/s/ Gwen Dominguez	5/29/2013
()	(X)	Dan McGrew	(7) Have adverse effects on properties listed or eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places.	/s/ Dan McGrew	5/30/2013
()	(X)	Tim Goodman	(8) Have adverse effects on species listed on the List of Endangered or Threatened Species, or have adverse effects on designated Critical Habitat for these species.	/s/ Tim Goodman	5/29/2013
()	(X)	Dan McGrew	(9) Violate a Federal law, or a State, local, or tribal law or requirement imposed for the protection of the environment.	/s/ Dan McGrew	5/30/2013
()	(X)	Tim Goodman	(10) Have a disproportionately high and adverse effect on low income or minority populations.	/s/ Tim Goodman	5/29/2013
()	(X)	Dan McGrew	(11) Limit access to and ceremonial use of Indian sacred sites on Federal lands by Indian religious practitioners.	/s/ Dan McGrew	5/30/2013
()	(X)	Dave Arthun	(12) Contribute to the introduction, continuation existence, or spread of noxious weeds or non-native invasive species.	/s/ Dave Arthun	5/20/2013

Final Review:

Environmental Coordinator: /s/ Joseph David Date: 6/13/2013

This proposed action qualifies as a categorical exclusion under the National Environmental Policy Act in accordance with 516 DM 11, 11.9, D (1): Rangeland Management-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. It has been reviewed to determine if any of the exceptions described in 516 DM 2, Appendix 2, apply.

The action does not have significant adverse effects on public health and safety nor does the action adversely affect such unique geographic characteristics as historic or cultural resources, parks, recreation, or refuge lands, wilderness areas, wild or scenic rivers, sole or principal drinking water aquifers, prime farmlands, wetlands, floodplains, or ecologically significant or critical areas, including those listed on the Department's National Register of Natural Landmarks. The action does not have highly controversial environmental effects nor have highly uncertain environmental effects or involve unique or unknown environmental risk nor does it adversely affect a species listed or proposed to be listed on the list of endangered or threatened species. It does not establish a precedent for future action or represent a decision in principle about a future consideration with significant environmental effects or related to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant environmental effects. The proposed action does not adversely affect properties listed or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places or threaten to violate a Federal, State, local or tribal law or requirements imposed for the protection of the environment or which require compliance with Executive Order 11988 (Floodplain Management), Executive Order 11990 (Protection of Wetlands) or the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act.

Mitigation Measures/Stipulations:

No mitigation measures or stipulations are warranted in this transfer.

Part III: Decision. I have reviewed this plan conformance and NEPA compliance record and have determined that the proposed action does not conflict with major land-use-plans and will not have any major adverse impacts on other resources. Therefore, it does not represent an exception, and is categorically excluded from further environmental review. It is my decision to implement the project, as described, with the mitigation measures attached.

Authorized Official: /s/ Tom Schnell (Acting Field Manager)

Date: 6/13/2013

