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

CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION
ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW AND APPROVAL

Project Creator: John Wilson

Field Office: Stillwater

Lead Office: Stillwater

Case File/Project Number:

Applicable Categorical Exclusion: The following actions is pursuant to 516 DM 2.3A(2) (1.6): Nondestructive data collection, inventory (including field, aerial, and satellite surveying and mapping), study, research, and monitoring activities.

NEPA Number: DOI-BLM-NV-C010-2012-0001-CX

Project Name: Pre-treatment hydrological monitoring for Porter and Dalton Canyons

Project Description: The following action is for pre-treatment monitoring that is outlined for the Desatoya Mountains Habitat Resiliency, Health, and Restoration Project Environmental Assessment (EA), which is expected to be completed in winter of 2012. It is essential for this hydrological baseline data collection to start in fall of 2011. This is so that habitat restoration treatments from the EA can begin in 2012 for Dalton Canyon and 2015 for Porter Canyon. Up to three, 2.5H-flumes will be installed to assess hydrological changes resulting from PJ removal in Porter Canyon; two above the meadow, and one below. Proposed locations are identified on the attached maps. Locations are approximate and may need to be moved a small distance up or down stream to ensure appropriate channel configuration to support flume installation (See Map 1). A 3ft deep concrete cutoff wall on the upstream side of flume would be installed, and may need wing walls on either side depending on the width of the channel. Wing walls will be needed where channel width is greater than the width of the flume. Total area disturbed, based on flume and approach dimensions, will be approximately 15 feet in length and 10 feet in width. Gravel will be placed under the flume to ensure a solid and level footing for installation and a rock erosion barrier will be placed in the channel immediately downstream of the flume to prevent scouring and undercutting of the flume. Approximately 3.6 cubic yards of material will placed in the channel, including cut-off wall, gravel footing, and erosion barrier. Wing walls, if needed, will be keyed into the banks approximately 3 feet, and will require an additional ½ cubic yard of material; although this material will not be placed within the channel.

Basic H-flume design is attached along with a schematic of a typical installation.

Eight groundwater monitoring wells will be installed to gather baseline ground water levels before PJ removal and meadow restoration begins in Dalton Canyon. Ground disturbance entails a 6-inch hole up to 25 feet deep. The hole is dug by an auger attached to the back of a pickup truck. Exact locations will be determined in the field at the time of installation (See Map 2 for general locations). Cultural surveys have been completed in both canyons and eligible sites will be avoided.

Applicant Name: BLM

Project Location: See Maps 1 & 2.

Township	Range	Section (s)	Principal Meridian
17	38	1, 12-13	Mount Diablo Meridian
19	39	32-33	Mount Diablo Meridian

BLM Acres for the Project Area: <1

- **Land Use Plan Conformance:** RIP-2 I. 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: Carson City Field Office Consolidated Resource Management Plan (2001)

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)

If any question is answered 'yes' an EA or EIS must be prepared.	YES	NO
1. Would the Proposed Action have significant impacts on public health or safety? (Range-Jill Devaurs)		JD
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)		[illegible] SMZ FORDW DW SMC
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)		SMZ
4. Would the Proposed Action have highly uncertain and potentially significant environmental effects or involve unique or unknown environmental risks? (PEC)		SMZ
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)		SMZ
6. Would the Proposed Action have a direct relationship to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant environmental effects? (PEC)		SMZ
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)		SMC
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)		[illegible]
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)		SMZ
10. Would the Proposed Action have a disproportionately high and adverse effect on low income or minority populations (EA 12898)? ((PEC)		SMZ
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)		SMC
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)		JD

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: 10/03/2011
Public Health and Safety/Grazing/Noxious Weeds, Jill Devaurs: 10-3-11
Recreation/Wilderness/VRM/LWC, Dan Westermeyer: for D W 10/3/11
Wildlife/T&E (BLM Sensitive Species), John Wilson: 10-3-11
Archeology, Susan McCabe: 10/5/11
Water Quality, Gabe Venegas:
Soils, Jill Devaurs/Linda Appel/Chelsy Simerson: 10-3-11

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. Knutson 10/05/2011
Teresa J. Knutson (date)
Field Manager
Stillwater Field Office