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 0022 Edwards Valley Well #1

Range Job File 4007 Shoshone Well

Range Job File 4265 Edwards Well One

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-C010-2012-0040-CX

Project Name(s): Edwards Valley Well #1 Solar Panel Installation

Shoshone Well Solar Panel Installation

Edwards Well One Solar Panel Installation

Project Description:

The proposed actions will consist of the installation of solar panels to the above listed wells surrounded by four livestock panels to keep cattle from rubbing on the post. A metal post no larger than 3" diameter and 8 feet tall will be inserted into the ground 3 feet by each well. Solar panels will be attached to the top of the pole – the number to be determined by the size of the well pump. Wires will be run from the panels to the pump. If needed, four livestock panels, each no longer than 16 feet, will be placed around the post for protection. In each corner of this a metal T-post will be inserted into the ground approximately 18" in order to help stabilize the panels.

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

Project Location(s): Edwards Valley Well #1 – T21N R39E Sec 3 Churchill Co., NV

Shoshone Well – T22N R39E Sec 32 Churchill Co., NV

Edwards Well One – T20N R39E Sec 18 Churchill Co., NV

Amount for the Project Area(s): Edwards Valley Well #1 – approx. .1 acre

Shoshone Well – approx. .1 acre

Edwards Well One – approx. .1 acre

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)

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]
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)		[illegible]
4. Would the Proposed Action have highly uncertain and potentially significant environmental effects or involve unique or unknown environmental risks? (PEC)		[illegible]
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)		[illegible]
6. Would the Proposed Action have a direct relationship to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant environmental effects? (PEC)		[illegible]
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)		SMC
10. Would the Proposed Action have a disproportionately high and adverse effect on low income or minority populations (EA 12898)? ((PEC)		[illegible]
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: 3/12/2012
Public Health and Safety/Grazing/Noxious Weeds, Jill Devaurs: 3-12-12
Recreation/Wilderness/VRM/LWC, Dan Westermeyer: 3/12/12
Wildlife/T&E (BLM Sensitive Species), John Wilson: 3-12-12
Archeology, Susan McCabe: 3/20/12 Ag C. 2.
Water Quality, Gabe Venegas: 3/20/12
Soils, Jill Devaurs/Linda Appel/Chelsy Simerson: 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 3/20/2012
Teresa J. Knutson (date)
Field Manager
Stillwater Field Office