

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

**CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION
ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW AND APPROVAL**

Project Creator: Erik Pignata

Field Office: Stillwater

Lead Office: Stillwater

Case File/Project Number: NVN 089539 (supersedes NVN 029954)

Applicable Categorical Exclusion

516 DM 11.5; Appendix 4 – 151, E. Realty, #9. “Renewals and assignments of leases, permits, or rights-of-way where no additional rights are conveyed beyond those granted by the original authorizations.”

NEPA Number: DOI-BLM-NV-2011-C010-0009-CX

Project Name: Candelaria Buried Communications Line

Project Description:

On September 20, 2010, Nevada Bell Telephone Company, d/b/a AT&T Nevada, filed an application to renew their existing, buried communication line servicing the Candelaria mine area. Current policy is to re-serialize renewal applications received after expiration; this authorization expired August 6, 2010. Thus, NVN 089539, a new authorization for the same facilities, supersedes the old serial number NVN 029954 upon execution.

A field visit conducted on May 4, 2011, revealed the authorization to be in compliance with the current terms and conditions of the grant. This would be a standard FLPMA grant renewal action, under a new serial number. All current regulatory stipulations would be used in the grant instrument.

The right-of-way itself is 6.2 (32,685.27 feet) miles long by 10 feet wide, for a total case acreage of 7.50 acres.

Applicant Name: Nevada Bell Telephone Company, d/b/a AT&T Nevada

Project Location: Candelaria mine

See case file for legal description. Exhibit map attached.

BLM Acres for the Project Area: 7.50 acres

Land Use Plan Conformance:

ADMINISTRATIVE ACTIONS

LND-7, #6: "Exchanges and minor non-Bureau initiated realty proposals will be considered where analysis indicates they are beneficial to the public."

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)		gd
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)		pu DCC
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)		lmz
4. Would the Proposed Action have highly uncertain and potentially significant environmental effects or involve unique or unknown environmental risks? (PEC)		lmx
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)		lmx
6. Would the Proposed Action have a direct relationship to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant environmental effects? (PEC)		lmz
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)		jkw
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)		pu
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)		lmx
10. Would the Proposed Action have a disproportionately high and adverse effect on low income or minority populations (EA 12898)? ((PEC)		lmx
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)		jkw
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)		gd

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: *smc 7/11/2011*
Public Health and Safety/Grazing/Noxious Weeds, Jill Devaurs: *JD*
Recreation/Wilderness/VRM/LWC, Dan Westermeyer: *DW 7/11/11*
Wildlife/T&E (BLM Sensitive Species), John Wilson: *JW 7-11-11*
Archeology, Susan McCabe: *SMC 8-22-11*
Water Quality, Gabe Venegas: *GV 7-11-11*
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. Knutson
Teresa J. Knutson
Field Manager
Stillwater Field Office

08/24/2011
(date)