

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

**CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION
ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW AND APPROVAL**

Project Creator: Dave Schroeder

Field Office: Stillwater Field Office

Lead Office: Stillwater Field Office

Case File/Project Number: NVN-90781

Applicable Categorical Exclusion (cite section): F(9) "Digging of exploratory trenches for mineral materials, except in riparian areas"

NEPA Number: DOI-BLM-NV-2012-C010-0042-CX

Project Name: New Pass Mineral Material Exploration

Project Description: The proponent, Sierra Nevada Construction (SNC), would conduct a limited exploration program on the west side of the New Pass Range. This program would consist of collecting samples for lab analysis from up to six (6) 'test pits'. Each location would be approximately 3'X 3' in area and excavated to a depth of approximately five (5) feet to collect each sample. Sites 1-5 would be accessed via approximately 1,950 feet of overland travel, Site 6 is adjacent to an existing road. A small backhoe/excavator would be used to collect the samples and the entire duration for this activity would be eight (8) hours.

Applicant Name: Sierra Nevada Construction

Project Location: MDM T.21 N., R. 40 E., section 17 W½SW, & section 18 E½SE

BLM Acres for the Project Area: 0.27

Land Use Plan Conformance (cite reference/page number): This action is in conformance with the Carson City Field Office Consolidated Resource Management Plan (2001) page MIN-1, RMP Level Decisions, Desired Outcomes 1. "Encourage development of energy and mineral resources in a timely manner to meet national, regional and local needs consistent with the objectives for other public land uses.

Name of Plan: NV – Carson City RMP.

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?		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?		gd pw Dw
3. Would the Proposed Action have highly controversial environmental effects or involve unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources [NEPA 102(2)(E)]?		pw
4. Would the Proposed Action have highly uncertain and potentially significant environmental effects or involve unique or unknown environmental risks?		pw
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?		pw
6. Would the Proposed Action have a direct relationship to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant environmental effects?		pw
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?		pw
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?		pw
9. Would the Proposed Action violate federal law, or a State, local or tribal law or requirement imposed for the protection of the environment?		pw
10. Would the Proposed Action have a disproportionately high and adverse effect on low income or minority populations (EA 12898)?		pw
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)?		pw
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)?		gd

SPECIALISTS' REVIEW:

During ID Team review of the above Proposed Action and extraordinary circumstances, the following specialists reviewed this CX: *KM 03/26/2012* *JD 3-26-12* *JA 3-26-12* *LA 3/27/12* *JW 3-26-12* *JW 4-2-12*

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 4/2/2012
(date)

Field Manager
Field Office