

KINGMAN FIELD OFFICE SCOPING FORM

Proposal: Outside Alamo Herd Management Area Nuisance Wild Burro Removal

NEPA Document Number DOI-BLM-AZ-C010-2010-0047-CX

Document Location S:\BLMshare: S:\Blmshare\WHBstuff\Alamo HMA

Land Description: Public Land south of the Alamo HMA in the Harcuvar allotment.

INVOLVEMENT: Indicate in the left column which disciplines need to provide information into the CX.

Needed Input (X)	Discipline	Signature
	Lands	
	Minerals	
x	Range	/s/ Abe Clark 07/19/2010
x	Wild Horse and Burro	/s/ June Wendlandt 07/20/2010
	General Recreation	
x	Cultural and Paleontological Resources	/s/ Tim Watkins 07/20/2010
	Wilderness	
	Soils	
	Surface and Groundwater Quality/Water Rights	
	Air Quality	
x	Wildlife	/s/ Rebecca L. Peck 07/20/2010
x	Threatened and Endangered Plants and Animals	/s/ Rebecca L. Peck 07/20/2010
x	Migratory Birds	/s/ Rebecca L. Peck 07/20/2010
	Surface Protection	
	Hazardous Materials	
	Areas of Critical Environmental Concern	
	Visual Resources	
	Socio-Economics/Environmental Justice	
	General Botany/Noxious Weeds	
	Energy Policy	

Writer: /s/ June Wendlandt

Date: 07/19/2010

Environmental Coordinator: /s/ David Brock

Date: 07/19/2010

Field Manager: /s/ Jackie Neckels

Date: 07/19/2010

Categorical Exclusion Documentation Format for Actions Other Than Hazardous Fuels and Fire Rehabilitation Actions

Project Name

NEPA Number DOI-BLM-AZ-C010-2010-0047-CX

A. Background

BLM Office: Kingman Field Office Lease/Serial/Case File No.:

Proposed Action Title/Type:

Outside Alamo Herd Management Area Nuisance Wild Burro Removal

Location of Proposed Action:

The nuisance wild burros are found outside of the Alamo Herd Management Area, La Paz County, Wenden, Arizona.

Description of Proposed Action:

BLM proposes to conduct a removal of nuisance wild burros that are outside of the Alamo HMA. The removal of up to 15 burros would be conducted in the months of July through September, 2010. Wild burros would be captured by the permittee of the Harcuvar Allotment. Two permanent allotment corrals would be used to capture burros and cattle (see attached map). The two corrals are located on the state land outside of the HMA. Burros would be enticed into corrals constructed with one way gates; the animals enter, but not able to exit the corrals. Once burros are captured, they would be sorted into a holding area separate from cattle. The permittee would then contact BLM staff to transport burros to the Kingman Wild Horse and Burro Corrals.

Background:

Kingman Field Office staff has received several complaints from permittees pertaining to numerous wild burros residing outside of the HMA. There also have been complaints from the Arizona Game and Fish Department (AGFD) about burros in the main access road to Alamo Wildlife Area.

Individuals and agencies (including those who have expressed issues with the burros) will be notified by phone calls, email, or face to face contact prior to any initial bait trapping of the burros.

B. Land Use Plan Conformance

Land Use Plan Name: *Lake Havasu Resource Management Plan/EIS*

Date Approved/Amended: May 2007

The proposed action is in conformance with the applicable LUP because it is specifically provided for in the following LUP decision(s):

HB-1. Viable, color-diverse burro populations will be maintained within the HMA, while maintaining a thriving natural ecological balance with other resources and consistent with other

management agencies' objectives (including wildlife, riparian and upland vegetation, recreation, and others).

Page 121 of the LHFO RMP decision HB-6 in part states:

The BLM does not intend to maintain burros that are outside of HMA boundaries but are within the HAs, nor maintain burros that are within HA that have not been designated as an HMA.

In addition page 120 states:

Herd Management Areas (HMAs) are established on areas within HAs through the land use planning process, within which wild burros can be managed for the long term. Upon designation as an HMA, wild burros shall be managed as an integral component of the public lands on the basis of multiple uses and in a manner that maintains an ecological balance (Map 35).

Above stated guidance it is clear that burros are only to be managed within HMA boundaries.

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. Rangeland Management, (4) Removal of wild horses or burros from private lands at the request of the landowner. Nuisance wild horses and burros are further defined in IM 2010-135 by the following statement, "An animal may be considered a nuisance if it, for example, poses a safety hazard or strays onto private property and the landowner requests removal." Also in consultation with the BLM, Arizona Wild Horse and Burro State Lead, state owned land that is leased has the same consideration as private land. The permittee acts as a land agent for the state of Arizona.

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 (See Attachment 1), and none of the extraordinary circumstances described in 516 DM 2 apply.

I considered the plan conformance and NEPA compliance record and have determined that the proposed project is in conformance with the approved land use plan, and none of the exceptions described in 516 DM 2 apply, and no further environmental analysis is required.

D: Signature

Authorizing Official: /s/ Ruben A. Sánchez Date: 07/26/2010

Ruben Sanchez
Field Manager, Kingman Field Office

Contact Person

For additional information concerning this CX review, contact June Wendlandt, Wild Horse and Burro Specialist, Kingman Field Office, 2755 Mission Blvd, Kingman, AZ 86401, and 928-718-3720.

Attachment 1: Extraordinary Circumstances Review

Extraordinary Circumstances	Comment (Yes or No with supporting rationale)
1. Have significant effects on public health or safety.	No, however removing nuisance burros from this area will reduce public safety issues with regards to vehicle vs. burro collisions on the main access road to Alamo Wildlife Area.
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.	No
3. Have highly controversial environmental effects or involve unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources [NEPA Section 102(2)(E)].	No
4. Have highly uncertain and potentially significant environmental effects or involve unique or unknown environmental risks.	No
5. Establishes a precedent for future action or represents a decision in principle about future actions with significant environmental effects.	No
6. Have a direct relationship to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant environmental effects.	No
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
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
9. Violate a Federal law, or a State, local, or tribal law or requirement imposed for the protection of the environment.	No
10. Have a disproportionately high and adverse effect on low income or minority populations (Executive Order 12898).	No
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
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

