UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
Twin Falls District
Burley Field Office
15 East 200 South
Burley, ID 83318

NEPA No. DOI-BLM-ID-T020-2016-0014-CX

A. Background

BLM Office: Burley Field Office.

Lease/Serial/Case File No.: N/A

Proposed Action Title/Type: Application for Grazing Preference by Eugene Hruza

Location of Proposed Action: Hawley Allotment (01207) T. 8S., R.26 E., Various Sections. Approximately 5 miles East of Minidoka, Idaho, Blaine County (See attached map).

Description of Proposed Action: Eugene Hruza cancelled his base property lease with Carey Hruza. The AUMs attached to the base property were included in the lease agreement. Therefore, in accordance with 43 CFR 4110.2-3, the Proposed Action is to approve the transfer of grazing preference from Carey Hruza back to Eugene Hruza as applied. Grazing permit terms and conditions and grazing management would not change as a result of the transfer of grazing preference.

B. Land Use Plan Conformance

Land Use Plan Name: Monument Land Use Plan (Hawley Allotment)
Date Approved/Amended: 1985
Land Use Plan Name: Idaho and Southwestern Montana Land Use Plan Amendment (LUPA) FEIS
Date Approved/Amended: September 21, 2015

__X__ The proposed action is in conformance with the LUPs, even though it is not specifically provided for, because it is clearly consistent with the following LUP decision(s) (objectives, terms, and conditions): Although transfers are not identified specifically in the management plans, they outline rangeland management on the assumption that grazing would be occurring in the allotments identified and allocated for use and that name changes would occur on grazing permits.

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.1, Appendix 4 – 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. This is

because there are no effects to the environment through the transfer of a permit. The proposed action has been reviewed, and none of the extraordinary circumstances described in 43 CFR 46.215 apply.

Consideration of Extraordinary Circumstances:

This CER Sheet documents the review of the proposed action to determine if any of the extraordinary circumstances described in 43 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 46.215 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 significant impacts on public health or safety.

Approval of an application for transfer of existing grazing preference (i.e.name change on existing permit) with no additional use(s) authorized is an administrative function with no effects to public health or safety.

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; or ecologically significant or critical areas.

This management action, approval of a transfer of existing grazing preference (i.e. name change on existing permit), would not have any environmental impacts since this action is a routine administrative procedure that would not change the grazing management on the allotment.

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 approval of application for grazing preference is a routine administrative procedure that would not change the grazing management on the allotment.

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

Livestock grazing is an ongoing activity, the transfer of existing grazing preference (i.e.name change on existing permit) poses no unique or unknown environmental 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.

Approval of existing grazing preference transfer for continuation of existing grazing preference is a routine administrative procedure that would not change the grazing management on the

allotment. This action neither establishes a precedent for future actions nor represents 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.

This administrative action, approval of application and transfer of existing grazing preference, would be neither individually nor cumulatively significant.

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.

This administrative 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.

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.

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.

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.

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.

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

This administrative action, approval of application and transfer of existing grazing preference (i.e.name change on existing permit), would have no effect on low income or minority populations.

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).

This administrative action, approval of application and transfer of existing grazing preference (i.e.name change on existing permit), would have no effect and would not limit access for ceremonial use of Indian sacred sited by Indian religious practitioners; nor would there be adverse effects to the physical integrity of sacred sites.

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).

This administrative action, approval of application and transfer of existing grazing preference (i.e.name change on existing permit), would not contribute to the introduction, continued existence, or spread of noxious weeds or non-native species.

Participating Staff

Name of Participant	Position Title or Resource Expertise	Comments Provided (Initial One) None /	Attached	Date
Eric Killoy	Wildlife	/s/EK		3-16-2016
Jason Theodozio	Botany	/s/JT		3-16-2016
Lael Henrikson	Cultural Resources	/s/LSH		3-16-20163-16-2016
Scott Sayer	Supervisory RMS	/s/SS		

D. Signature

Authorizing Official: /s/Kenneth J. Crane_____**Date:** 3-21-2016_____
Name: Ken Crane
Title: Burley Field Manager

Contact Person
For additional information concerning this CX review, contact Scott Sayer, Rangeland Management Specialist, (208) 677-6630 , 15 East 200 South, Burley, ID 83318.



Legend

- Range Allotment
- Pasture
- BLM Offices
- County Boundary
- ID State Boundary
- Bureau of Land Management
- Private; other

Miles

0.2 0.1 0 0.2 0.4

1:24,000

N

These data are provided by Bureau of Land Management (BLM) "as is" and might contain errors or omissions. The User assumes the entire risk associated with its use of these data and bears all responsibility in determining whether these data are fit for the User's intended use.

Date: 2016-03-16

Document Path: R:\loc\GIS\PROJECTS\Range\Rawhide\HawleyAllotment_20160316.mxd