

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 0032 Buffalo Canyon Creek Well

Range Job File 0364 Tri County Well

Range Job File 0388 Grayback Well #1

Range Job File 4040 Middlegate Well

Range Job File 4123 Upper Buffalo Well

Range Job File 4164 Middle Buffalo Well

Range Job File 4254 Holly Well

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-C010-2012-0041-CX

Project Name(s): Buffalo Canyon Creek Well Solar Panel Installation

Tri County Well Solar Panel Installation

Grayback Well #1 Solar Panel Installation

Middlegate Well Solar Panel Installation

Upper Buffalo Well Solar Panel Installation

Middle Buffalo Well Solar Panel Installation

Holly Well 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): Buffalo Canyon Creek Well – T16N R37E Sec 20 Churchill Co., NV

Tri County Well – T14N R37E Sec 5 Churchill Co., NV

Grayback Well #1 – T16N R36E Sec 18 Churchill Co., NV

Middlegate Well – T16N R35E Sec 3 Churchill Co., NV

Upper Buffalo Well – T15N R37E Sec 15 Churchill Co., NV

Middle Buffalo Well – T16N R37E Sec 32 Churchill Co., NV

Holly Well – T13N R36E Sec 36 Nye Co., NV

Amount for the Project Area(s): Buffalo Canyon Creek Well – approx. .1 acre

Tri County Well – approx. .1 acre

Grayback Well #1 – approx. .1 acre

Middlegate Well – approx. .1 acre

Upper Buffalo Well – approx. .1 acre

Middle Buffalo Well – approx. .1 acre

Holly Well – 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)

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

3/20/2012
(date)