

## NEPA Document Number: DOI-BLM-AZ-A010-2009-0022-CX

### A. Background

BLM Office: Arizona Strip Field Office

Allotment No. #00097

Proposed Action Title/Type: Tuckup Allotment Permit Transfer

Location of Proposed Action: The Tuckup Allotment is located North of Tuweep Valley and is found within the following described area:

Gila & Salt River Meridian, Mohave County, Arizona

T. 35 N., R. 7 W.,  
sections 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17,  
18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 27, 28, 29 & 30.  
T. 36 N., R. 7 W.,  
sections. 25, 26, 27, 34, 35 and 36.  
T. 35 N., R. 6 W.,  
sections. 6, 7, 18, and 19.

BLM Acres: 15,884  
State Acres: 639  
Total Acreage: 16,523

Description of Proposed Action: This transfer of grazing preference from Tuckup LLC, c/o Dirk Ballard to David R. Finicum applies only to the Tuckup Allotment (#00097), with an attached preference of 1075 AUMs = 161 cattle 10/15 to 5/15. There are no changes to the grazing preference or terms and conditions of the permit. The permit resulting from this transfer will be effective for the same period of time as the current permit.

### B. Land Use Plan Conformance

Land Use Plan Name: Arizona Strip Field Office Resource Management Plan(RMP).

Date Approved/Amended: January 29, 2008

The proposed action is in conformance with the RMP decision number LA-GM-01, which states, "All allotments will continue to be classified as available for grazing by livestock under the principle of multiple use and sustained yield, except where specifically noted...." The Tuckup Allotment is classified as available for grazing by livestock under this decision.

**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, Appendix 5.4: D. (1) 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. The proposed action has been reviewed, and none of the extraordinary circumstances described in 516 DM2 apply.

**D: Signature**

Authorizing Official: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
(Signature)

Name: Lorraine M. Christian  
Title: Arizona Strip Field Office Manager

**Contact Person**

For additional information concerning this CX review, contact Kevin Schoppmann, Rangeland Management Specialist, BLM, Arizona Strip Field Office, 345 East Riverside Drive, St. George, Utah 84790, phone (435)688-3220.

# Attachment 1

<b>EXTRAORDINARY CIRCUMSTANCES REVIEW AND CHECKLIST</b>		
<p>IMPORTANT: Appropriate staff should review the circumstances listed below, and comment for concurrence. Rationale supporting the concurrence should be included where appropriate.</p>		
<b>EXTRAORDINARY CIRCUMSTANCES</b>	<b>YES/NO &amp; RATIONALE</b> <b>(If - Appropriate)</b>	<b>STAFF</b>
Does the proposed action...		
1. Have significant impacts on public health and safety?	No	KSchoppmann
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?	No	JHerron DHawks KJensen
3. Have highly controversial environmental effects or involve unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources [NEPA Section 102(2)(E)]?	No	KSchoppmann
4. Have highly uncertain and potentially significant environmental effects or involve unique or unknown environmental risks?	No	KSchoppmann
5. Establish a precedent for future action, or represent a decision in principle about future actions, with potentially significant environmental effects?	No	KSchoppmann

6. Have a direct relationship to other actions with individually insignificant, but cumulatively significant, environmental effects?	No	KSchoppmann
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?	No	JHerron
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?	No	KJensen LHughes
9. Violate a Federal law, or a State, local, or tribal law or requirement imposed for the protection of the environment?	No	KSchoppmann
10. Have a disproportionately high and adverse effect on low income or minority populations (Executive Order 12898)?	No	KSchoppmann
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)?	No	GBenson
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)?	No	LD Walker

# Attachment 2

