**LAND EXCHANGE DECISION SUMMARY**

**State:** Idaho Serial Number: IDI-37603 **Exchange Name:** Dewey-Levie Land Exchange

**Field Office and Counties involved:** Four Rivers Field Office; Ada and Gem Counties

**Acreage Proposed for Exchange:** Federal – 80 acres; Non-Federal – 78 acres

**Parties to the Exchange:** Don L. Dewey and Paul D. and Rae Levie and the Bureau of Land Management (BLM), Boise District

**Summary of Proposal**

* The proposed land exchange is a traditional two party, single transaction exchange which does not involve a facilitator and does not provide for assumption of costs by either party.
* Non-Federal land would be acquired from Don L. Dewey, a married man dealing with his sole and separate property, as to an undivided one-half interest, and Paul D. Levie and Rae Levie, Trustees of the Paul D. and Rae Levie Trust, dated November 20, 1973, as to an undivided one-half interest.
* Both parties would convey surface and mineral estates on the Federal and the non-Federal lands.
* No water rights exist in either property.

**Land Use Plan Consistency**

Acquisition of the non-Federal land meets the 1988 Cascade Resource Management Plan (RMP) management objectives “…to protect and enhance the watershed resource, quality of wildlife habitat, variety of recreation opportunities, and scenic values.” Following acquisition, the BLM would manage the non-Federal land as part of the adjacent Long-billed Curlew ACEC under guidelines contained in RMP.

The proposed exchange also conforms to the 1983 Kuna Management Framework Plan (MFP), which identifies the Federal land as suitable for disposal.

**Public Interest Factors**

The exchange is in the public interest since the values being conveyed out of Federal ownership are not more than the values being acquired into Federal ownership. Acquisition of the non-Federal parcel meets FLPMA Section 205 criteria, in that it is consistent with BLM’s mission and the applicable land use plan.

Disposal of the isolated Federal parcel is in the public interest because it:

1. Contains no significant resources or values;
2. Is surrounded by private land; and
3. Lacks legal access.

Acquisition of the non-Federal parcel would:

1. Protect and preserve a contiguous area of native sagebrush-grassland habitat important to nesting long-billed curlew populations;
2. Maintain opportunities for public recreation; and
3. Facilitate more efficient and effective Federal land management.

**Appraisal/Valuation Information:**

Kent C. Stevens, Review Appraiser for the DOI Office of Valuation Services, reviewed Restricted Use Appraisal Reports prepared on September 12, 2013, by Sam Langston, MAI, of Langston and Associates, Boise, Idaho. On July 13, 2015, Mr. Stevens issued a Consultation Memorandum regarding the value of the two exchange parcels. The memo states in pertinent part the following:

*“My understanding of 43 C.F.R. 2201.5 indicates it is reasonable and in the best interest of the U.S. Government to go forward with the proposed exchange based on an approximately equal value determination. Appropriate market data has been utilized in the 9/12/2013 reports. My analysis and gathering of data suggests that the same or similar values would likely be produced with new appraisal reports.”*

Mr. Stevens’ conclusions were based, in part, on the fact that the Federal and non-Federal parcels have a number of important similarities:

* The parcels are similar in size;
* Both parcels are vacant land in rural locations;
* Both parcels are used for dry grazing;
* Both parcels are land locked and have no legal access; and
* Neither parcel has active water rights.

Based on the above analysis and conclusions, the Four Rivers Field Manager determined that the land exchange should be completed based on the approximately equal value provisions in 43 CFR 2201.5, and as such, the exchange will require no acreage adjustment or cash equalization.

**Minerals Issues**

BLM’s mineral report, approved on August 25, 2015, concluded that the exchange should be consummated without mineral reservation on either parcel, since both exchange parcels have:

* Low potential for oil and gas.
* No potential for coal.
* Minimal potential for saleable resources.
* Little to no potential for locatable minerals.
* Low potential for geothermal resources.

**Land Exchange Issues**

BLM has received no comments opposing the exchange proposal. The BLM Boise District has historically received general support from State and local governments and interest groups for land exchanges that consolidate Federal holdings and facilitate more efficient management, as does this exchange. The proposal was discussed on several occasions with Shoshone-Paiute tribal representatives, who have historically opposed land disposal actions that affect their aboriginal homelands. They gave grudging consent after they learned that a cultural resource survey located no cultural sites or artifacts on the Federal land being transferred into private ownership.

**Protests or other Objections Received** N/A

**Congressional Notification**

The BLM would not conduct Congressional Appropriations Committee notification since the value of the Federal lands and minerals in this exchange is less than the $500,000 threshold.

**Solicitor’s Office Review**

In January 2012, Anne Corcoran Briggs, Attorney-Advisor in the Boise Solicitor’s Office, reviewed the land exchange proposal and Feasibility Package, and concluded that the existing documentation was legally sufficient to support the proposed exchange. On October 15, 2015, Ms. Briggs reviewed and approved the Notice of Decision package as sufficient to support the proposed title conveyances.

**Summary**

All required regulations and processing requirements have been met, and we are now prepared to consummate the land exchange as proposed. No deficiencies were noted, and no additional requirements or contingencies are needed.