

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

**CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION
ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW AND APPROVAL**

Project Creator: Linda Appel, RMS

Field Office: Stillwater

Lead Office: Stillwater

Case File/Project Number(s): Range Job File 4218 Mountain Well Pipeline

Range Job File 6099 La Plata Pipeline

Range Job File 0248 Mountain Well Reservoir Diversion

Applicable Categorical Exclusion

516 DM 11.5 (E) 13: Amendments to existing rights-of-way such as the upgrading of existing facilities which entail no additional disturbances outside the rights-of-way boundary.

NEPA Number: DOI-BLM-NV-C010-2012-0037CX

Project Name(s): Mountain Well Pipeline Maintenance

La Plata Pipeline Maintenance

Mountain Well Reservoir Diversion Maintenance

Project Description:

Mountain Well Pipeline Maintenance:

The proposed action will consist of maintenance to the Mountain Well Pipeline. Approximately 1 mile of no larger than 1 ¼" pipe will be dug and buried with a small track backhoe from the valve point at the last set of troughs, down through the wash to a level area adjacent to the wash where up to four troughs will be set. These range improvements will be installed in the same locations as the damaged pipeline and old troughs. The existing pipeline was installed in 1969 and is no longer serviceable.

The reestablishment of the pipeline and troughs will help with distribution of livestock in Pasture #1 which is grazed 10/16 – 4/15 annually.

La Plata Pipeline Maintenance

The proposed action will consist of maintenance to the La Plata Pipeline. Approximately 2 miles of no larger than 1¼” pipe will be dug and buried with a small track backhoe from the windmill, down along the edge of the road then through a wash to a level area adjacent to the wash where up to four troughs will be set. These range improvements will be installed in the same locations as the damaged pipeline and old troughs. The existing pipeline was installed in 1979 and is no longer serviceable.

The reestablishment of the pipeline and troughs will help with distribution of livestock in Pasture #1 which is grazed 10/16 – 4/15 annually.

Mountain Well Reservoir Diversion Maintenance

The proposed action will consist of maintenance to the Mountain Well Reservoir Diversion Pipeline. Approximately 1 mile of no larger than 1¼” pipe will be dug and buried with a small track backhoe from the valve point at the last set of troughs, down along the road then through the wash to a level area adjacent to the wash where up to four troughs will be set. These range improvements will be installed in the same locations as the damaged pipeline and old troughs. The existing pipeline was installed in 1959 and is no longer serviceable.

The reestablishment of the pipeline and troughs will help with distribution of livestock in Pasture #1 which is grazed 10/16 – 4/15 annually.

Applicant Name: Bureau of Land Management, Stillwater Field Office, 5665 Morgan Mill Road, Carson City, NV 89701

Project Location(s): Mountain Well Pipeline Maintenance – T18N R32E Sec 13, 24

La Plata Pipeline Maintenance – T18N R33E Sec 16, 17

~~Shirrtail Pipeline Maintenance – T19N R32E Sec 1, 12~~ *la*

Mtn Well Reservoir Diversion Maintenance – T18N R32E Sec 22, 26

Amount for the Project Area(s): Mountain Well Pipeline Maintenance – approx. 1 mile

La Plata Pipeline Maintenance – approx. 2 miles

~~Shirrtail Pipeline Maintenance – approx. 3 miles~~ *la*

Mtn Well Reservoir Diversion Maintenance – approx. 1 mile

Land Use Plan Conformance: The proposed action described above is consistent with the Carson City Field Office Consolidated Resource Management Plan (2001) page LSG-5 number 5 Range Improvements. Range Improvements will be developed to meet identified management objectives. Fencing and water developments improve livestock distribution, especially when developed in conjunction with a grazing management plan.

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)		J JMC JL JW
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)		JW
4. Would the Proposed Action have highly uncertain and potentially significant environmental effects or involve unique or unknown environmental risks? (PEC)		JW
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)		JW
6. Would the Proposed Action have a direct relationship to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant environmental effects? (PEC)		JW
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)		JW
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)		JW
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)		JW JW
10. Would the Proposed Action have a disproportionately high and adverse effect on low income or minority populations (EA 12898)? ((PEC)		JW
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)		JW
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: *SM Kramer 3/12/12*
Public Health and Safety/Grazing/Noxious Weeds, Jill Devaurs: *JD 3-12-12*
Recreation/Wilderness/VRM/LWC, Dan Westermeyer: *DW 3-25-12*
Wildlife/T&E (BLM Sensitive Species), John Wilson: *JW 3-12-12*
Archeology, Susan McCabe: *Susan McCabe 3/20/12 C2*
Water Quality, Gabe Venegas: *la 3/20/12*
Soils, Jill Devaurs/Linda Appel/Chelsy Simerson: *la 3/20/12*

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

3/20/2012
(date)

