

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

**CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION  
ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW AND APPROVAL**

---

**Project Creator:** Kenneth Depaoli

**Field Office:** Stillwater Field Office

**Lead Office:** Stillwater Field Office

**Case File/Project Number:** NVN 091546

**Applicable Categorical Exclusion** (cite section): 516 DM 11.9: F(10) "Disposal of mineral materials such as sand, stone, gravel, pumice, pumicite, cinders, and clay in amounts not exceeding 50,000 cubic yards or disturbing more than five (5) acres, except in riparian areas."

**NEPA Number:** DOI-BLM-NV-2013-C010-0009-CX

**Project Name:** NAS Dead Camel Free Use Permit

**Project Description:** Naval Air Station (NAS) Fallon is requesting a Free Use Permit for 25,000 cubic yards of sand and gravel borrow material from an existing pit (see maps). This material contract, pursuant to 43 CFR §3600, will authorize NAS Fallon to excavate and remove the borrow material from the existing pit. The site is not in a riparian area. Access is southwest of NAS Fallon Main Gate to B16. Reclamation will occur at the completion of the contract.

**Applicant Name:** NAS Fallon

**Project Location:** MDM T. 17 N., R. 27 E., Section 10 S2SESE, Section 15 N2NENE

**BLM Acres for the Project Area:** 5.0 acres

**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? (Range-Chelsy Simerson)		g
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)		g
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)		g
4. Would the Proposed Action have highly uncertain and potentially significant environmental effects or involve unique or unknown environmental risks? (PEC)		g
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)		g
6. Would the Proposed Action have a direct relationship to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant environmental effects? (PEC)		g
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)		g
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)		g
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)		g
10. Would the Proposed Action have a disproportionately high and adverse effect on low income or minority populations (EA 12898)? ((PEC)		g
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)		g
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-Chelsy Simerson)		g

**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 10/9/2012*  
Public Health and Safety/Grazing/Noxious Weeds, Jill Devaurs: *JD 10-9-12*  
Recreation/Wilderness/VRM/LWC, Dan Westermeyer: *DW 10/9/12*  
Wildlife/T&E (BLM Sensitive Species), John Wilson: *John 10-16-12*  
Archeology, Jason Wright: *JW 10-11-12*  
Water Quality:  
Soils, Jill Devaurs:

**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:

*Carla Jann, Acting*  
Teresa J. Knutson  
Field Manager  
Stillwater Field Office

*10-17-12*  
(date)





