

CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION DOCUMENTATION

A. Background

BLM Office: Prineville District Office, Deschutes Resource Area

National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) register #: DOI-BLM-ORWA-POOO-2016-0031-CX

Project/lease/serial/case file #: None

Proposed action title: Grazing Preference Transfer- Webb WL Allotment to LaVelle Underhill

Location: Approximately 5 miles NE of Maupin, Oregon. Map attached.

Description: The proposed action is to transfer the BLM grazing preference for the Webb WL (07579) allotment from Webb, Underhill, and Rhodig, to LaVelle Underhill. The existing property meets the base property requirements as described in 43 CFR 4110.2-1(a) (1) and (2). The permit has 242 active AUMs authorized for the Webb WL Allotment. 53 active AUMS of the grazing preference are being transferred to base property controlled by LaVelle Underhill. The proposed administrative action involves transferring grazing preference from one individual to another which would not have any environmental effects. The existing terms and conditions and management practices of the permit would remain unchanged. These include season of use, permitted AUMs, and kind of livestock as listed below.

<u>Allotment</u>	<u>Livestock Kind</u>	<u>Grazing Season</u>	<u>%PL</u>	<u>AUMs</u>
07579	Cattle	04/06-02/28	100	53
Webb WL				

B. Land use plan conformance

Land use plan name: **Two Rivers Resource Management Plan** Date approved: **1986**

The proposed action is in conformance with the above plan because it is specifically provided for in the following land use plan decisions:

The proposed action is consistent with the Two Rivers Resource Management Plan decisions, objectives, terms, or conditions:

Page 10, Goal and Objectives, No.1: "Maintain forage production and livestock use at 17,778 AUMS."

Page 15, Map 4, Grazing Allotments: These areas are identified as available for grazing.

Page 45, Appendix C, Initial and Predicted Long Term Livestock Forage Use: "Webb WL Allotment (07579), Acres Public Land 2,978, Current Active Use 242 AUMS".

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 11.5.D (1), effective August 14, 2007, "Approval of transfers of grazing preference." This categorical exclusion is appropriate in this situation because there are no extraordinary circumstances present that would significantly affect the environment. This action is solely administrative and there are no effects to the environment through the transfer of grazing preference. The proposed action has been reviewed, and none of the extraordinary circumstances described in 516 DM 2 apply. See attached CX Extraordinary Circumstances Documentation checklist.

D. Signature

I considered the Proposed Action, land use plan, and compliance with 516 DM 11.5.D (1). A thorough evaluation was conducted to determine if any extraordinary circumstances were present that could potentially impact the environment. Upon review no significant impacts were identified, so further NEPA analysis is not necessary.

Responsible official: _____

Jeff Kitchens, Deschutes Field Manager

2/23/16

Date

Contact person

For additional information concerning this review, contact: Danny Heim, Rangeland Management Specialist, Prineville District Office, 3050 NE 3rd Street, Prineville, OR 97754, telephone 541-416-6855, dheim@blm.gov

CX EXTRAORDINARY CIRCUMSTANCES DOCUMENTATION			
The proposed action would:		YES	NO
2.1	Have significant impacts on public health or safety.		X
Rationale: The administrative action of transferring a grazing permit or lease would not impact public health or safety.			
2.2	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; and other ecologically significant or critical areas.		X
Rationale: The proposed action would not have significant impacts on park, refuge, wilderness, national natural landmarks, principal drinking water aquifers, prime farmlands, wetlands, national monuments, and ecologically significant or critical areas. None of these resources of concern are within the geographical boundaries of the proposed action.			

2.3	Have highly controversial environmental effects or involve unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources [NEPA Section 102(2)(E)].		X
Rationale: The proposed action is administrative and would not have controversial effects or involve unresolved conflicts.			
2.4	Have highly uncertain and potentially significant environmental effects or involve unique or unknown environmental risks.		X
Rationale: The administrative action of transferring grazing preference from one person to another would not have highly uncertain and potentially significant environmental effects or involve unique or unknown environmental risks.			
2.5	Establish a precedent for future action or represent a decision in principle about future actions with potentially significant environmental effects.		X
Rationale: Hundreds of grazing permit/lease and base property transfers have occurred every year since 1935 so the proposed action would not be regarded as precedent setting as it is an administrative action that involves transferring grazing preference and continuing use under the same terms and conditions.			
2.6	Have a direct relationship to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant environmental effects.		X
Rationale: Similar past actions, to the proposed action, did not result in significant direct, indirect or cumulative environmental effects. The proposed action would not alter the magnitude of environmental effects because it is an administrative action which involves people completing transfer of grazing preference forms. The proposed action provides no new effect.			
2.7	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.		X
Rationale: This administration action, approval of application and transfer of existing grazing preference (i.e. name change on existing permit), would have no effect on properties listed, or eligible for listing, on the National Register of Historic Places.			
2.8	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.		X
Rationale: This administrative action, approval of application and transfer of existing grazing preference (i.e. name change on existing permit), would have no known effect on federally listed, candidate, or BLM special status plant/wildlife species.			
2.9	Violate a federal law, or a state, local, or tribal law or requirement imposed for the protection of the environment.		X
Rationale: This routine administrative procedure (i.e. name change on existing permit) is consistent and compatible with all known Federal, State, local and Tribal laws or requirements imposed for protection of the environment.			
2.10	Have a disproportionately high and adverse effect on low income or minority populations (Executive Order 12898).		X
Rationale: The proposed action would have no measurable effect on low-income or minority populations.			
2.11	Limit access to and ceremonial use of Indian sacred sites on Federal lands by		X

Indian religious practitioners or significantly adversely affect the physical integrity of such sacred sites (Executive Order 13007).		
Rationale: The proposed action would not limit access to or the ceremonial use of Indian sacred sites on Federal lands by Indian religious practitioners or cause significant adverse effect on the physical integrity of such sacred sites.		
2.12 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).		X
Rationale: The proposed action would not measurably change the rate of introduction, continued existence or spread of noxious weeds or invasive species. Livestock entering public lands have the potential to transport some viable undesirable seed via hide or gut; however, the possibility of introducing undesirable plants, not already in the area, is minimal.		