

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

**Greater Phoenix Orienteering Club
DOI-BLM-AZ-PO2O-2011-005-CX**

A. Background

BLM Office: *Lower Sonoran Field Office (LSFO)*

Lease/Serial/Case File No.: **AZA-34909**

Proposed Action Title/Type: **Special Recreation Permit**

Location of Proposed Action: **T1S, R4W Sections 29-33**

Description of Proposed Action: The Greater Phoenix Orienteering Club will be conducting a commercial orienteering event west of State Highway 85, southwest of the AG&FD Robbins Butte State Game Management Unit. The event is scheduled January 09, 2010 with 50 GPOC members expected to participate. The event is scheduled from 9:00 a.m. to 3:00 p.m. and involves riddle solving and 1 to 2 miles of cross-country foot travel through the area. The event has six stages that must be completed to get the coordinates for the event cache. The orienteering stage on private land with portable toilets, tables and water provided at the staging area. The course will be located and marked southwest of Robbins Butte, west of the Robbins Butte State Game Management Unit. The event offers both beginners and advanced map reading skills. Cell phones will be available in case of emergencies. The grazing permittee and the Game Management Unit Manager have been contacted and apprised of the proposal. Standard stipulations will be adhered to.

B. Land Use Plan Conformance

Land Use Plan (LUP) Name: **Lower Gila Resource Management Plan and Environmental Impact Statement; Amendment to the Lower Gila South Resource Management Plan and Decision Record**

Date Approved/Amended: **7/15/2005**

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

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): It is implied in the Amendment to the Lower Gila South RMP/EIS and Decision Record, "Although recreation in the Lower Gila South RMP/EIS area was not identified as a major issue... Visual resource management, management of off-road vehicle (ORV) use, and other recreation resource management will continue as recreation programs." (p.12).

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: **516 DM Appendix 5 H [5] – Issuance of special recreation permits to individuals or organized groups for search and rescue training, orienteering or similar activities and for dog trials, endurance horse races or similar minor events.**

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: **There will be no potential for significant impacts, because participants will be dispersed and walking, and not disturbing wildlife, vegetation or the cattle operation. Also, the orienteering event will be put on for one day.**

D: Signature

Authorizing Official: _____/s/_____

Date: __12/07/2010__

Emily H. Garber
Lower Sonoran Field Manager

Contact Person

For additional information concerning this CX review, contact:

Jack Ragsdale at 623-580-5643, 21605 N. 7th Ave, Phoenix, AZ 85027.

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 event is designed or planned to keep impacts to a minimum and not impact public health or safety.
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: None of the above will be affected.
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
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
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: No further analysis is required.
6. Have a direct relationship to other actions with individually insignificant, but cumulatively significant, environmental effects?		
Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Rationale: See CFR 1508.7 for a discussion of cumulative actions and impacts.
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?		

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

Yes <input type="checkbox"/>	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Rationale: No impacts are expected.
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: The AF&GD has been contacted and no impacts are expected.
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
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: No low income or minority populations will be affected.
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: No consultations will be necessary.
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: No noxious weeds or non-native invasive species will be introduced.

Approval and Decision

Attachment 2

Compliance and assignment of responsibility: Insert Program or Employee
Monitoring and assignment of responsibility: Insert Program or Employee

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/_____ **Date:** 11/22/2010

Jack Ragsdale
Project Lead

Reviewed by: _____/s/_____ **Date:** 12/02/2010

Leah Baker
Planning & Environmental Coordinator

Reviewed by: _____/s/_____ **Date:** 12/07/2010

Emily H. Garber
Manager

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: _____ **Date:** _____

Emily H. Garber