

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

Barlow Jeep School
DOI-BLM-AZ-P010-2011-015-CX

A. Background

BLM Office: *Hassayampa Field Office (HFO)*

Lease/Serial/Case File No.: **n/a**

Proposed Action Title/Type: **Sedona Jeep School**

Location of Proposed Action: **Table Mesa Recreation Area**

Description of Proposed Action: Proponent will provide 4x4 driving instruction and training with emphasis on responsible public land use and recreation practices. Classes are kept small for maximum effectiveness. Experiential 4-wheel driving techniques, trail etiquette, and basic recovery procedures in a variety of terrain and obstacle types will be featured. Special clinics, private sessions, and custom groups will be features as modes of training. Anticipated number of participants range from 2 vehicles and 2 people to 12 vehicles and up to 24 people; with an anticipated average of 6 vehicles per trip and 2 trips per week. There will be no spectators or overnight events. Class will operate throughout the fall, winter, and spring months, October through May. Responsibility and awareness, safety procedures, preparation, driving techniques, and land use ethics and etiquette compose the major modules.

B. Land Use Plan Conformance

Land Use Plan (LUP) Name: **Bradshaw Harquahala Record of Decision and Approved Resource Management Plan**

Date Approved/Amended: **4/22/2010**

The proposed action is in conformance with the applicable LUP because it is specifically provided for in the following LUP decision(s): RR-30 Special Recreation Permits are authorized on a case by case basis for all recreation activities meeting the requirements in 43 CFR 2930 and applicable manuals, policies, and guidance.

The proposed action is in conformance with the LUP, even though it is not specifically provided for, because it is clearly consistent with the following LUP decision(s) (objectives, terms, and conditions):

Explain specific or implied decision(s): Permits are discretionary actions that management considers for approval or disapproval. According to the LUP, this action is covered by the above 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 2, Appendix 1, or 516 DM 11.5:

In addition, 516 DM 11 11.9, Actions for Categorical Exclusion H Recreation Management: Issuance of Special Recreation Permits for day use or overnight use up to 14 consecutive nights; that impacts no more than 3 staging area acres; and/or for recreational travel along roads, trails, or in areas authorized in a land use plan.

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 DM 2 or 516 DM 11.5 apply.

I considered: The approved Table Mesa Recreation Plan outlines the designated route system, which the permittee will use. No unauthorized routes will be approved for travel.

D: Signature

Authorizing Official: _____/s/_____ Date: ____03/31/2011____
Steven Cohn
Field Manager

Contact Person

For additional information concerning this CX review, contact:
Mary Skordinsky, 623-580-5586

Note: A separate decision document must be prepared for the action covered by the CX. See Attachment 2.

BLM Categorical Exclusions: Extraordinary Circumstances¹

Attachment 1

The action has been reviewed to determine if any of the extraordinary circumstances (43 CFR 46.215) apply. The project would:		
1. Have significant impacts on public health or safety		
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Rationale: The purpose of this action is to provide training, awareness, technical skills, and an increase in user ethics. With the number of OHV users, more schools are needed to help the sport succeed with minimal impact to the environment while providing for the health and safety of the users and others that could be affected by motorized sports activities.
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?		
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Rationale: No features of this magnitude exist within the proposed area.
3. Have highly controversial environmental effects or involve unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources [NEPA Section 102(2)(E)]?		
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Rationale: None exist.
4. Have highly uncertain and potentially significant environmental effects or involve unique or unknown environmental risks?		
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Rationale: None exist.
5. Establish a precedent for future action, or represent a decision in principle about future actions, with potentially significant environmental effects?		
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Rationale: This action will not set forth future actions that will result in potentially significant environmental effects.
6. Have a direct relationship to other actions with individually insignificant, but cumulatively significant, environmental effects?		
Yes	No	Rationale: None anticipated.

¹ If an action has any of these impacts, you must conduct NEPA analysis.

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
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?		
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Rationale: Use will be on the existing road system, and with the approved Table Mesa Recreation Plan, use will be on the designated road system which is a numbered system.
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?		
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Rationale: Activity will take place on the designated road system. The designation of the road system took into account these issues.
9. Violate a Federal law, or a State, local, or tribal law or requirement imposed for the protection of the environment?		
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Rationale: No laws will be violated.
10. Have a disproportionately high and adverse effect on low income or minority populations (Executive Order 12898)?		
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Rationale: Low income or minority populations will not be adversely affected by this action.
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)?		
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Rationale: There are no ceremonial sites that will be affected by this action.
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)?		
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Rationale: Weed control is a part of the stipulations.

Approval and Decision

Attachment 2

Compliance and assignment of responsibility: Special Recreation Permits, Mary Skordinsky

Monitoring and assignment of responsibility: Recreation, Mary Skordinsky

Review: *We have determined that the proposal is in accordance with the categorical exclusion criteria and that it would not involve any significant environmental effects. Therefore, it is categorically excluded from further environmental review.*

Prepared by: _____/s/_____
Mary Skordinsky, Recreation Planner
Project Lead
Date: February 4, 2011

Reviewed by: _____/s/_____
Leah Baker
Planning & Environmental Coordinator
Date: 03/15/2011

Reviewed by: _____/s/_____
Steven Cohn
Field Manager
Date: 03/31/2011

Project Description:
Paste Project Description here

Decision: Based on a review of the project described above and field office staff recommendations, I have determined that the project is in conformance with the land use plan and is categorically excluded from further environmental analysis. It is my decision to approve the action as proposed, with the following stipulations (if applicable).

Approved By: _____/s/_____
Steven Cohn, Field Manager
Date: 03/31/2011