

# CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION DOCUMENTATION

## A. Background

**BLM Office:** Prineville District Office, Deschutes Resource Area

**National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) register #:** DOI-BLM-ORWA-POOO-2016-0038-CX

**Project/lease/serial/case file #:** None

**Proposed action title:** Grazing Preference Transfer- Paulus

**Location:** Approximately 20 miles northwest of Redmond, Oregon. Map attached.

**Description:** The proposed action is to transfer the BLM grazing preference for the Paulus Allotment (05081) from Tom Paulus, to Richard Gillespie Living Trust. The existing property meets the base property requirements as described in 43 CFR 4110.2-1(a) (1) and (2). The permit has 14 active AUMs authorized for the Paulus Allotment. 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>
05081 Paulus	Cattle	04/02-05/30	100	14

## B. Land use plan conformance

Land use plan name: **Upper Deschutes Resource Management Plan** Date approved: **2005**

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

Maps, RMP Map 5 Livestock Grazing Allotments: These areas are identified as available for grazing.

Page 79, Guidelines, No. 12: "Grazing operators in good standing can continue to hold or transfer permits to other qualified applicants ..."

Page 246, Appendix G, Livestock Grazing Management Summary: "Paulus Allotment (5081) Grazing Matrix Classification-Open for livestock grazing".

## 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. 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: Kristen Heim for 3/16/16  
 Jeff Kitchens, Deschutes Field Manager 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](mailto:dheim@blm.gov)

<b>CX EXTRAORDINARY CIRCUMSTANCES DOCUMENTATION</b>		<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>
The proposed action would:			
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 a grazing lease 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 a grazing lease 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: There are no known properties within the project area 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: There are no known species on the Endangered or Threatened Species List or Critical Habitat in the project area.		
2.9	Violate a federal law, or a state, local, or tribal law or requirement imposed for the protection of the environment.	X
Rationale: The proposed action conforms to the direction given for the management of public lands in the 2005 Upper Deschutes RMP, which comply with all applicable laws, such as the Clean Water Act, Endangered Species Act.		
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 Indian religious practitioners or significantly adversely affect the physical integrity of such sacred sites (Executive Order 13007).	X
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	X

promote the introduction, growth, or expansion of the range of such species (Federal Noxious Weed Control Act and Executive Order 13112).		
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.		