

Categorical Exclusion Documentation

Communication Site Lease Assignment

DOI-BLM-AZ-P010-2013-0032-CX

A. Background

BLM Office: *Hassayampa Field Office (HFO)*

Lease/Serial/Case File No.: AZA-9979

Proposed Action Title/Type: **Communication Site Lease Assignment (Schroeder to Kline)**

Location of Proposed Action: **T. 3 N., R. 3 W., Sec. 28 Tract 37**

Description of Proposed Action: The applicant, Robert C. Kline, has filed a request for assignment of a Communications Use Lease, with concurrence from Mark S. Schroeder. The communication site is located on White Tank Mountain (Middle Peak). The assignment of the communication site would not authorize any new features or development to the site, other than what has been previously authorized. The lease will expire on December 15, 2017.

B. Land Use Plan Conformance

Land Use Plan (LUP) Name: The Bradshaw-Harquahala Resource Management Plan (RMP).

Date Approved/Amended: April 2010

The proposed action is in conformance with the applicable LUP because it is specifically provided for in the following LUP decision(s):

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):

LR-24: Continue to issue land use authorizations (rights-of-way, leases, permits, easements) on a case-by-case basis and in accordance with resource management prescriptions in this land use plan.

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 2, Appendix 1, or 516 DM 11.5:

E.9 which states: Renewals and assignments of leases, permits, or rights-of-ways where no additional rights are conveyed beyond those granted by the original authorization.

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 516 DM 2 or 516 DM 11.5 apply.

I considered: N/A

D: Signature

Review: *We have determined that the proposal is in accordance with the categorical exclusion criteria and that it would not involve any significant environmental effects. Therefore, it is categorically excluded from further environmental review.*

Prepared by: // Jo Ann Goodlow **Date:** 6/17/13

**Jo Ann Goodlow
Project Lead**

Reviewed by: // Leah Baker **Date:** 6/19/13

**Leah Baker
Planning & Environmental Coordinator**

Reviewed by: // D. Remington Hawes **Date:** 6/20/13

**D. Remington Hawes
Field Manager**

Contact Person

For additional information concerning this CX review, contact:

Jo Ann Goodlow, Realty Specialist, Phoenix District Office - Lower Sonoran Field Office, 21605 North 7th Avenue, Phoenix, Arizona 85027, 623-580-5500.

BLM Categorical Exclusions: Extraordinary Circumstances¹
Attachment 1

The action has been reviewed to determine if any of the extraordinary circumstances (43 CFR 46.215) apply. The project would:		
1. Have significant impacts on public health or safety?		
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Rationale: The proposed action is to assign the R/W from one individual to another. Based on that, there would be no impacts on 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 or wilderness study 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 (Executive Order 13186); and other ecologically significant or critical areas?		
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Rationale: The proposed action is to assign the R/W from one individual to another. Based on that, there would be no impacts on natural resources and unique geographic characteristics as historic or cultural resources; park, recreation or refuge lands; wilderness or wilderness study areas; wild or scenic rivers; national natural landmarks; sole or principal drinking water aquifers; prime farmlands; wetlands; floodplains; national monuments; migratory birds and other ecologically significant or critical areas.
3. Have highly controversial environmental effects or involve unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources [NEPA Section 102(2)(E)]?		
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Rationale: The assignment of this right of way from one party to another will not have any controversial environmental effects or involve unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources.
4. Have highly uncertain and potentially significant environmental effects or involve unique or unknown environmental risks?		
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Rationale: The assignment of the R/W will not have any highly uncertain and potentially significant environmental effects or involve unique or unknown environmental risks.
5. Establish a precedent for future action, or represent a decision in principle about future actions, with potentially significant environmental effects?		
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Rationale: The assignment of this R/W/ will not establish a precedent for future actions, nor represent 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	Rationale: The assignment of this R/W will not have a direct

¹ If an action has any of these impacts, you must conduct NEPA analysis.

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	relationship to other actions with individually insignificant, but cumulatively significant, environmental effects.
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 <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Rationale: The assignment of this R/W will not have any significant impacts on properties listed or eligible for listing, on the National Register of Historic Places as determined by either the Bureau.
8. 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?		
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Rationale: The assignment of this R/W does not have any significant impacts on species listed, or proposed to be listed, on the List of Endangered or Threatened Species, nor does it have significant impacts on designated Critical Habitat for these species.
9. Violate a Federal law, or a State, local, or tribal law or requirement imposed for the protection of the environment?		
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Rationale: The assignment of this R/W does not violate a Federal law, or a State, local, or tribal law, or requirement imposed for the protection of the environment.
10. Have a disproportionately high and adverse effect on low income or minority populations (Executive Order 12898)?		
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Rationale: The assignment of this R/W does not have a disproportionately high and adverse effect on low income or minority 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 <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Rationale: The assignment of the R/W will not limit access to and ceremonial use of Indian sacred sites on Federal lands by Indian religious practitioners, nor significantly adversely affect the physical integrity of such 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 <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Rationale: The assignment of the R/W will 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.

Decision
Attachment 2

Project Description:

The applicant, Robert C. Kline, has filed a request for assignment of a Communications Use Lease, with concurrence from Mark S. Schroeder. The communication site is located on White Tank Mountain (Middle Peak). The assignment of the communication site would not authorize any new features or development to the site, other than what has been previously authorized. The lease will expire on December 15, 2017.

Decision: Based on a review of the project described above and field office staff recommendations, I have determined that the project is in conformance with the land use plan and is categorically excluded from further environmental analysis. It is my decision to approve the action as proposed, with the following stipulations (if applicable).

Approved By: // D. Remington Hawes **Date:** 06/20/13
D. Remington Hawes

MITIGATION MEASURES / OTHER REMARKS