

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

**CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION
ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW AND APPROVAL**

Project Lead: Ryan Leary

Field Office: Sierra Front

Lead Office: Sierra Front

Case File/Project Number:

Applicable Categorical Exclusion (cite section):

Department of the Interior, Departmental Manual, Effective Date: August 14, 2007

Series: Environmental Quality

Part 516: National Environmental Policy Act of 1969

Chapter 11: Managing the NEPA Process--Bureau of Land Management

Originating Office: Office of Environmental Policy and Compliance

11.9 Actions Eligible for a Categorical Exclusion (CX) in E. Realty (18) "Temporary placement of a pipeline above ground."

NEPA Number: DOI-BLM-NV-C020-2012-0045-CX

Project Name: Spanish Springs/Mustang Interim Water Source

Project Description: Provide an interim water source for livestock on the Spanish Springs/Mustang Allotment. In summer/fall of 2012 lay 1 ¼ inch pipe aboveground for approximately 1.5 miles (half on private land and half on BLM land) along the existing power company right of way to run water from the well on private property to a trough out to the BLM land. The private land owner on the property adjacent to the west side of the Spanish Springs/Mustang Allotment will be fencing his property. He is willing to provide water for permitted livestock and wildlife but it will need to be piped from his property through the fence. The project is not located within preliminary general or priority habitat for the greater sage-grouse.

Applicant Name: Ed Depaoli

Project Location (include Township/Range, County): T 20 N R22 E Sec 20, Washoe County

BLM Acres for the Project Area: 12 Acres

Land Use Plan Conformance (5. Range Improvements/LSG-5): "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: 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:

<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)		X
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)		X
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)		X
4. Would the Proposed Action have highly uncertain and potentially significant environmental effects or involve unique or unknown environmental risks? (project lead/P&EC)		X
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)		X
6. Would the Proposed Action have a direct relationship to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant environmental effects? (project lead/P&EC)		X
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)		X
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)		X
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)		X
10. Would the Proposed Action have a disproportionately high and adverse effect on low income or minority populations (EA 12898)? (project lead/P&EC)		X
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)		X
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)		X

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

Realty Specialist: JoAnn Hufnagle ___ or Erik Pignata ESP

Outdoor Recreation Planner: Arthur Callan ADC III

Hydrologist: Niki Cutler nc

Archaeologist: Jim Carter ___ or Rachel Crews RGC

Wildlife Biologist: Pilar Ziegler PZ

Botanist: Dean Tonenna DT

Planning & Environmental Coordinator: Brian Buttazoni BB

Range Management Specialist: Ryan Leary RL

Wild Horse and Burro Specialist: John Axtell JA

Geologist: Dan Erbes DE

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.

Approved by:



Leon Thomas
Field Manager
Sierra Front Field Office

7-16-12

(date)