

Categorical Exclusion Review
UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
Twin Falls District
Jarbidge Field Office
2536 Kimberly Road
Twin Falls, ID 83301

Temporary Water Haul Sites in the Guerry Patrick Allotment (#01094)

NEPA No. DOI-BLM-ID-T010-2013-0017-CX

A. BACKGROUND

BLM Office: Jarbidge Field Office.

Lease/Serial/Case File No.: 1101888

Proposed Action Title/Type: Authorization of temporary water haul sites in the Guerry Patrick Allotment (#01094).

Location of Proposed Action: The 4,173 acre Guerry Patrick Allotment is located in Twin Falls and Owyhee Counties, approximately 4.5 miles east of Three Creek, Idaho. The allotment is not divided into pastures and livestock use areas are managed through the location of salt/supplements and water. The elevation within the allotment ranges from 5,900 to 7,300 feet. The main Wilson Creek – Lime Creek Road runs from north to south through the eastern portion of the allotment.

Description of Proposed Action: The Proposed Action includes placement of temporary troughs at two locations shown on the attached map (Sites #1 and #2). The proposed locations are previously disturbed areas that are used for the placement of salt/supplements, and have also been used as temporary water sites in the past. The sites are accessible by water trucks capable of travel on two-track roads. Site #1 would be authorized to receive water beginning August 1, 2013 while Site #2 would be authorized to receive water beginning September 1, 2013. Each site would be used for no longer than one month. Temporary troughs would be removed from each site within five days following the authorized time period. BLM approved bird ladders are required to be installed in all temporary troughs.

The proposed temporary trough locations are within an area mapped as Sage-grouse Preliminary Priority Habitat (PPH) through a collaborative effort between the BLM and state wildlife agencies. BLM Idaho has further classified the area as PPH – Perennial Grassland. Roughly 425,000 acres within the Jarbidge Field Office (JFO) burned in the 2007 Murphy Complex Fire, including approximately 96 percent of the Guerry Patrick Allotment. The fire removed sagebrush habitat from the project area.

B. LAND USE PLAN CONFORMANCE

Land Use Plan Name: Jarbidge Resource Management Plan (RMP).

Date Approved/Amended: March 23, 1987.

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): The overall objective of the range program is to maintain or improve the soil, vegetation and watershed conditions within the resource area and to provide forage for livestock, wildlife, and wild horses (page II-3). Furthermore, the proposed stocking rates are designed to provide adequate forage for watershed protection, plant requirements, wildlife, livestock and other resource uses (page II-3).

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 11.9 (D)2.

Category description: “Placement and use of temporary (not to exceed one month) portable corrals and water troughs, providing no new road construction is needed”

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 locations are previously disturbed areas that are used for the placement of salt/supplements, and have also been used as temporary water sites in the past. The Proposed Action has been reviewed, and none of the extraordinary circumstances described in 516 DM 6 apply.

The following list of Extraordinary Circumstances (516 DM, Appendix 2) have been considered:

1. Have significant impacts on public health or safety.

Yes No

Comments/Explanation: Hauling water to these locations would not have any significant impacts on public health or safety. Livestock grazing is a recognized and authorized use, as identified in the Jarbidge RMP (1987).

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.

Yes No

Comments/Explanation: The proposed locations are previously disturbed areas that are used for the placement of salt/supplements, and have also been used as temporary water sites in the past.

There would be no changes in management; therefore, there would be no significant impacts beyond those identified in the Jarbidge RMP.

3. Have highly controversial environmental effects or involve unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources [NEPA Section 102(2)(E)].

Yes No

Comments/Explanation: This action would not have highly controversial environmental effects or involve unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources [NEPA Section 102(2) (E)]. Time and impacts upon resources in the Guerry Patrick Allotment are limited by the current grazing authorization. Livestock use in areas adjacent to these watering sites would be dispersed over relatively large areas of herbaceous vegetation that have been regularly grazed in the past.

4. Have highly uncertain and potentially significant environmental effects or involve unique or unknown environmental risks.

Yes No

Comments/Explanation: This action would not have highly uncertain or potentially significant environmental effects, nor would it involve unique or unknown environmental risks. Livestock grazing is an ongoing activity, the continuation of which poses no unique or unknown environmental risks. The proposed locations are previously disturbed areas that are used for the placement of salt/supplements, and have also been used as temporary water sites in the past.

5. Establish a precedent for future actions or represent a decision in principle about future actions with potentially significant environmental effects.

Yes No

Comments/Explanation: This action would not establish a precedent for future actions or represent a decision in principle about future actions with potentially significant environmental effects. The Proposed Action would allow for continued grazing use within the existing permit terms and conditions. Future actions would not be affected or set by this action, as no changes to stocking rate, season of use, length of season, or flexibility in livestock movements are being proposed or implemented through this action.

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

Yes No

Comments/Explanation: This action does not have a direct relationship to other actions with individually insignificant, but cumulatively significant environmental effects. The proposed locations are previously disturbed areas that are used for the placement of salt/supplements, and have also been used as temporary water sites in the past. The impacts of livestock grazing in conjunction or cumulatively with other on-the-ground activities are already occurring and would continue at the current rate and intensity as existing permitted actions.

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 No

Comments/Explanation: No known listed or eligible National Register properties would be significantly affected by the Proposed Action.

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.

Yes No

Plants - *Comments/Explanation:* No known federally listed, candidate, or BLM special status plant species would be significantly impacted by the Proposed Action.

Wildlife - *Comments/Explanation:* No known federally listed, candidate, or BLM special status wildlife species would be significantly impacted by the Proposed Action.

Aquatics - *Comments/Explanation:* No known federally listed, candidate, or BLM special status aquatic species would be significantly impacted by the Proposed Action.

9. Violate a Federal, State, local, or tribal law or requirement imposed for the protection of the environment.

Yes No

Comments/Explanation: This action does not violate any Federal, State, local or tribal laws or requirements 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 No

Comments/Explanation: The Proposed Action would not have a disproportionately high and adverse effect on low income or minority populations (Executive Order 12898). There are no known low income or minority populations in the area of the Proposed Action. Low income or minority visitors to the area would not be affected any differently by the proposed activity than any other visitor.

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 No

Comments/Explanation: There are no known ceremonial and/or sacred sites on public land in this allotment. However if sites were to be discovered in the future, the Proposed Action would not limit access for ceremonial use of Indian sacred sites by Indian religious practitioners; nor would there be adverse affects to the physical integrity of 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 No

Comments/Explanation: The proposed temporary trough locations are previously disturbed areas that are used for the placement of salt/supplements, and have also been used as temporary water sites in the past. The Proposed Action would allow for continued grazing use within the existing permit terms and conditions, and is not expected to cause additional influences to existing noxious weeds or non-native invasive species.

BLM Interdisciplinary Team Authors and Reviewers are as follows:

Name	Title	Area(s) of Participation	Initials
Dan Strickler	Rangeland Management Specialist	Project Lead, Range Management	DS
Jeff Ross	Archaeologist	Cultural Resources	JR
Thomas Stewart	Botanist	Vegetation, Soils, Invasive Species	TS
Michael Haney	Wildlife Biologist	Wildlife	MH
Darek Elverud	Fisheries Biologist	Aquatics, Wetlands, Riparian	DE
Max Yingst	Outdoor Recreation Planner	Recreation, Wilderness, Wild and Scenic Rivers, VRM	MY
Krystle Pehrson	NEPA Coordinator	NEPA	KP

D. SIGNATURE

I certify that none of the Departmental exceptions (Extraordinary Circumstances) listed in the above Part C apply to this action; therefore, this categorical exclusion is appropriate for this situation.

Authorizing Official: /s/ Jeffery W. Ross for Brian W. Davis

Date: 8/1/2013

Name: Brian W. Davis

Title: Field Manager

Contact Person

For additional information concerning this CX review, contact Dan Strickler, Rangeland Management Specialist, (208)736-2356, Bureau of Land Management, 2536 Kimberly Road, Twin Falls, ID 83301.