

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 516 DM 11.9: J.8 Installation of minor devices to protect human life (eg., grates across mines).

NEPA Number: DOI-BLM-NV-C010-2012-0002-CX

Project Name: King Mine Closure

Project Description: The Nevada Division of Minerals and the Nevada State Office BLM are proposing to mitigate human health and safety risks associated with the abandoned King Mine in Mineral County. Bat surveys have been completed by the Nevada Department of Wildlife and the following adits and shafts have been identified as providing habitat for bats: MI-1266 (adit), MI-1267 (adit), MI-1268 (adit), MI-1269 (adit), and MI 1302 & MI-1303 (inclined shaft 50 degrees & adit). These will be gated to allow for their continued utilization by bats. The gating design will be determined in the field and will be installed upon concurrence from the SWFO wildlife biologist. No cultural resources have been identified but if found during installation, the project would be discontinued and appropriate measure would be taken to ensure protection of cultural resources.

Applicant Name: Nevada Division of Minerals

Project Location: T34N R13E Sec 04 Slate Mountain Quadrangle

BLM Acres for the Project Area: <1

Land Use Plan Conformance: MIN-4. 1: Identify hazards to the public around inactive and active mine claims through signing, fencing, or other appropriate means. Priorities for hazard reduction will be established and carried out by the mineral by the minerals program, in cooperation with the State Mine Inspector and claimants.

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)

<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)		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)		JD
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)		JD
4. Would the Proposed Action have highly uncertain and potentially significant environmental effects or involve unique or unknown environmental risks? (PEC)		JD
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)		JD
6. Would the Proposed Action have a direct relationship to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant environmental effects? (PEC)		JD
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)		JD
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)		JD
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)		JD
10. Would the Proposed Action have a disproportionately high and adverse effect on low income or minority populations (EA 12898)? ((PEC)		JD
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)		JD
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: *SKZ* 10/11/2011
- Public Health and Safety/Grazing/Noxious Weeds, Jill Devaurs: *JD* 10-11-11
- Recreation/Wilderness/VRM/LWC, Dan Westermeyer: *DW* 10/11/11
- Wildlife/T&E (BLM Sensitive Species), John Wilson: *JW* 10-11-11
- Archeology, Susan McCabe: *SMC* 10/11/11
- Water Quality, Gabe Venegas: *N/A*
- Soils, Jill Devaurs/Linda Appel/Chelsy Simerson: ~~*LA*~~ *C7* 10/11/11

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:

Coneen Knutson

Acting for Teresa J. Knutson
Field Manager
Stillwater Field Office

10/17/11

(date)