

U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management
Carson City District Office

**CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION
ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW AND APPROVAL**

Project Creator: John M Wilson

Field Office: Stillwater FO

Lead Office: Stillwater FO

Case File/Project Number:

Applicable Categorical Exclusion (cite section): 516 DM 2, Appendix 1: (1.6) Nondestructive data collection, inventory (including field, aerial, and satellite surveying and mapping), study, research, and monitoring activities.

NEPA Number: DOI-BLM-NV-2011-C010-0510-CX

Project Name: Pinyon Juniper Rainfall, Stem Flow, and Interception Rate Experiment

Project Description: As part of research to determine the effects of pinyon-juniper presence or removal treatments on various components of the hydrologic budget, particularly tree water use, soil moisture, evaporation from plant canopies, rainfall interception, water redistributed as stemflow, surface runoff and groundwater recharge, rainfall simulation of four storm sizes will be applied on up to 30 pinyon and/or juniper trees to determine canopy interception and stemflow production by tree species. Four stakes per tree will be used to stabilize the rainfall apparatus. Water will be pumped from a tank from either the back of a pickup or on the ground using a generator.

Applicant Name: University of Nevada Reno

Project Location: 18N 39E Sec 3; 19N 39E Sec 31, 32, & 34

BLM Acres for the Project Area: Less than 1 acre total.

Land Use Plan Conformance (cite reference/page number): RIP-2I: Identify, encourage, and support research and studies needed to ensure that riparian-wetland area management objectives can be properly defined and met. Incorporate research findings into the planning and management of riparian wetland ecosystems.

Name of Plan: NV – Carson City RMP.

Screening of Extraordinary Circumstances: The following extraordinary circumstances apply to individual actions within categorical exclusions (43 CFR 46.215). The BLM has considered the following criteria:

Screening of Extraordinary Circumstances: The following extraordinary circumstances apply to individual actions within categorical exclusions (43 CFR 46.215). The BLM has considered the following criteria: (Specialist review: initial in appropriate box)

<i>If any question is answered 'yes' an EA or EIS must be prepared.</i>	YES	NO
1. Would the Proposed Action have significant impacts on public health or safety? (Range-Jill Devaurs)		JR
2. Would the Proposed Action 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 (EO 11990); floodplains (EO 11988); national monuments; migratory birds (EO 13186); and other ecologically significant or critical areas? (Archeology, Recreation, Wilderness, Wildlife, Range by allotment, Water Quality)		JR JR JR JR
3. Would the Proposed Action have highly controversial environmental effects or involve unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources [NEPA 102(2)(E)]? (PEC)		JR
4. Would the Proposed Action have highly uncertain and potentially significant environmental effects or involve unique or unknown environmental risks? (PEC)		JR
5. Would the Proposed Action establish a precedent for future action or represent a decision in principle about future actions with potentially significant environmental effects? (PEC)		JR
6. Would the Proposed Action have a direct relationship to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant environmental effects? (PEC)		JR
7. Would the Proposed Action have significant impacts on properties listed, or eligible for listing, on the NRHP as determined by the bureau or office? (Archeology)		JR
8. Would the Proposed Action 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? (Wildlife)		JR
9. Would the Proposed Action violate federal law, or a State, local or tribal law or requirement imposed for the protection of the environment? (PEC and Archeology)		JR JR
10. Would the Proposed Action have a disproportionately high and adverse effect on low income or minority populations (EA 12898)? ((PEC)		JR
11. Would the Proposed Action 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 (EO 13007)? (Archeology)		JR
12. Would the Proposed Action contribute to the introduction, continued existence, or spread of noxious weeds or non-native 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 EO 13112)? (Range-Jill Devaurs)		JR

SPECIALISTS' REVIEW:

During ID Team review of the above Proposed Action and extraordinary circumstances, the following specialists reviewed this CX:

- Planning Environmental Coordinator, Steve Kramer: *SK*
- Public Health and Safety/Grazing/Noxious Weeds, Jill Devaurs: *JD*
- Recreation/Wilderness/VRM/LWC, Dan Westermeyer: *DW*
- Wildlife/T&E (BLM Sensitive Species), John Wilson: *JW*
- Archeology, Susan McCabe: *SM*
- Water Quality, Gabe Venegas: *GV*
- Soils, Jill Devaurs/Linda Appel/Chelsy Simerson: *JD*

CONCLUSION: Based upon the review of this Proposed Action, I have determined that the above-described project is a categorical exclusion, in conformance with the LUP, and does not require an EA or EIS. A categorical exclusion is not subject to protest or appeal.

Approved by:

Teresa J. Kristman

Field Manager
Field Office

4/23/2011
(date)