

U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management
Carson City District Office
CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION
ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW AND APPROVAL

Project Lead: Jo Hufnagle
Field Office: Sierra Front
Lead Office: Sierra Front
Case File/Project Number: NVN 091015

Applicable Categorical Exclusion (cite section): **516 DM 11.9 E. Realty (16)**. Acquisition of easements for an existing road or issuance of leases, permits, or rights-of-way for the use of existing facilities, improvements, or sites for the same or similar purposes.

NEPA Number: DOI-BLM-NV-2012-C020-0006-CX

Project Name: Southwest Gas Arrowhead ROW

Project Description: Southwest Gas Corporation has applied for a right-of-way (ROW) for gas pipeline purposes under the authority of the Mineral Leasing Act of 1920. An existing 4-inch pipeline was installed in 1965 and a 6-inch pipeline was installed in 2006 along Arrowhead Drive and Goni Road in Carson City, Nevada to serve natural gas demand to the area. Southwest Gas is proposing to install cathodic protection facilities in association with the existing gas lines as part of their pipeline maintenance program. They recently discovered that the existing facilities had never been authorized through a ROW from BLM and are requesting a ROW to cover the existing facilities and proposed cathodic protection facilities which consist of buried anodes and a 6-foot tall wood pole and electric meter attached to an electric line already present in the area (BLM ROW NVN 085256). Less than 0.05 acres of new surface disturbance is proposed. Installation of the cathodic facilities is proposed for fall of 2012 and is expected to last approximately 10 days.

Applicant Name: Southwest Gas Corporation

Project Location (include Township/Range, County): T. 15 N., R. 20 E.,
sec. 4, ~~W~~ 1/2 of lot 2 of NW 1/4,
sec. 5, ~~E~~ 1/2 of lot 2 of NE 1/4.

gth c/26

Dimensions: 2,715 feet by 20 feet - ROW
0.044 acres temporary construction

BLM Acres for the Project Area: 1.29 acres

Land Use Plan Conformance (cite reference/page number): Lands and Realty Administrative Actions 3. All applicants for right-of-way grants, whether or not they are within corridors, are subject to standard approval procedures as outlined in the right-of-way regulations (43CFR 2802) ROW-4

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? (project lead/P&EC)		Jbt
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? (wildlife biologist, hydrologist, outdoor recreation planner, archeologist)	YES	PZ RC AC nc
3. Would the Proposed Action have highly controversial environmental effects or involve unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources [NEPA 102(2)(E)]? (project lead/P&EC)		Jbt
4. Would the Proposed Action have highly uncertain and potentially significant environmental effects or involve unique or unknown environmental risks? (project lead/P&EC)		Jbt
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? (project lead/P&EC)		Jbt
6. Would the Proposed Action have a direct relationship to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant environmental effects? (project lead/P&EC)		Jbt
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? (archeologist)	YES	RC
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 biologist, botanist)		DT PZ
9. Would the Proposed Action violate federal law, or a State, local or tribal law or requirement imposed for the protection of the environment? (project lead/P&EC)		Jbt
10. Would the Proposed Action have a disproportionately high and adverse effect on low income or minority populations (EA 12898)? (project lead/P&EC)		Jbt
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)? (archeologist)	YES	RC
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)? (botanist)		DT

SPECIALISTS' REVIEW: During ID Team consideration of the above Proposed Action and extraordinary circumstances, the following specialists reviewed this CX:

Jo Ann Hufnagle, Realty Specialist

Arthur Callan, Outdoor Recreation Planner

Niki Cutler, Hydrologist

Rachel Crews Archaeologist

Pilar Ziegler, Wildlife Biologist/BLM Sensitive Species - Wildlife

Dean Tonenna, Botanist - Natural Resource Specialist/BLM Sensitive Species - Plants

Brian Buttazoni, Planning & Environmental Coordinator

Although BLM Sensitive Species is not described in one of the 12 extraordinary circumstances question, review of the applicability of this CX has taken them into consideration.

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.

DECISION: It is my decision to implement the action, as described and approve the ROW for a 30-year term, with right to renew, subject to standard terms, conditions and stipulations.

Approved by:



Alan Bittner
Acting Field Manager
Sierra Front Field Office

4/16/12
(date)