

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

**CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION
ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW AND DECISION**

Project Lead: Katrina Leavitt

Field Office: Sierra Front

Lead Office: Sierra Front

Case File/Project Number: N/A

Applicable Categorical Exclusion (cite section): 516 DM 11.9 D (3) "Placement and use of temporary (not to exceed one month) portable corrals and water troughs, providing no new road construction is needed."

NEPA Number: DOI-BLM-NV-C020-2013-0007-CX

Project Name: Temporary Water Hauls for Livestock

Project Description:

The United States Department of Agriculture (USDA) declared a drought disaster for the state of Nevada. The declaration of drought disaster was affirmed by Nevada's Governor Brian Sandoval. In response to drought conditions water will be hauled to temporary water troughs to redistribute livestock use during drought conditions. Water haul areas will be used during the 2012-2013 grazing season, however, no one site will be used for more than 30 days. Water hauling will occur in nine allotments. The number of water haul areas in any one allotment varies between one and five. The total number of water haul areas is 23. See table below.

Temporary Water Haul Areas 2012-2013

Allotment Name	Water Haul Number	Greater Sage- Grouse		Bi-State Sage- Grouse
		PPH	PGH	Priority Habitat
Adriance Valley	1	NA	NA	No
	2	NA	NA	No
	3	NA	NA	No
Antelope Mountain	1	No	Yes	NA
	2	No	Yes	NA
	3	No	Yes	NA
	4	No	Yes	NA
	5	No	No	NA
Artesia	1	NA	NA	No
Hallelujah Junction	1	No	No	NA
	2	No	No	NA
	3	No	No	NA

Hudson Hills	1	NA	NA	No
Lincoln Flat	1	NA	NA	No
	2	NA	NA	No
Paiute	1	No	No	NA
	2	No	No	NA
	3	No	No	NA
Spanish Springs / Mustang	1	No	No	NA
	2	No	No	NA
Truckee / Virginia	1	NA	NA	NA
	2	NA	NA	NA
	3	NA	NA	NA

Applicant Name: BLM

Project Location (include Township/Range, County):

Adriance Valley: T15N, R25E Section 12; T15N, R24E Section 22; T14N, R24E Section 2 – Lyon County

Antelope Mountain: T23N, R19E Sections 12,13 & 14; T22N, R18E Section 36 – Washoe County

Artesia: T13N, R24E Section 22 – Lyon County

Hallelujah Junction: T22N, R17E Sections 1, 3 & 12 – Washoe County

Hudson Hills: T13N, R24E Section 28 – Lyon County

Lincoln Flat: T14N, R24E Section 7, 27 (Unsurveyed Protracted) – Lyon County

Paiute: T22N, R20E, Sections 6, 17 & 20 – Washoe County

Spanish Springs /Mustang: T 19N, R21E Section 10 – Washoe County

Truckee Virginia: T19N, R26E, Sections 16 & 30; T18N R25E, Section 14 – Lyon & Churchill Counties

BLM Acres for the Project Area: 23.0

Land Use Plan Conformance (cite reference/page number):

LSG-1 & LSG-5

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: Perry Wickham ___ or Erik Pignata ESP

Outdoor Recreation Planner: Arthur Callan AC

Hydrologist: Niki Cutler nc

Archaeologist: Jim Carter ___ or Rachel Crews for B2B

Wildlife Biologist: Pilar Ziegler PZ

Botanist: Dean Tonenna B2B

Planning & Environmental Coordinator: Brian Buttazoni B2B

Range Management Specialist: Katrina Leavitt KL or Ryan Leary ___ or Kathryn Dyer ___

Wild Horse and Burro Specialist: John Axtell JA

Geologist: Dan Erbes ___ or Joel Hartmann JH

Forester: Coreen Francis CF

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. It is my Decision to implement the described temporary water hauls for livestock.

Approved by:

for James W Schindler
Leon Thomas
Field Manager
Sierra Front Field Office

12-21-2012
(date)

APPEAL PROCEDURES

This decision may be appealed to the Interior Board of Land Appeals, Office of the Secretary, in accordance with 43 CFR Part 4. If you appeal, your appeal **must also** be filed with the Bureau of Land Management at the following address:

Leon Thomas, Sierra Front Field Manager
BLM, Carson City District Office
5665 Morgan Mill Road
Carson City, NV 89701

Your appeal must be filed within thirty (30) days from receipt or issuance of this decision. The appellant has the burden of showing that the decision appealed from is in error.

If you wish to file a petition pursuant to regulation 43 CFR 4.21 (58 FR 4942, January 19, 1993) for a stay (suspension) of the decision during the time that your appeal is being reviewed by the Board, the petition for stay must accompany your notice of appeal. Copies of the notice of appeal and petition for a stay must also be submitted to:

Board of Land Appeals
Dockets Attorney
801 N. Quincy Street, Suite 300
Arlington, VA 22203

A copy must also be sent to the appropriate office of the Solicitor at the same time the original documents are filed with the above office.

U.S. Department of the Interior
Office of the Regional Solicitor
Pacific Southwest Region
2800 Cottage Way, Room E-1712
Sacramento, CA 95825

If you request a stay, you have the burden of proof to demonstrate that a stay should be granted. A petition for a stay is required to show sufficient justification based on the following standards:

1. The relative harm to the parties if the stay is granted or denied.
2. The likelihood of the appellants success on the merits.
3. The likelihood of immediate and irreparable harm if the stay is not granted.
4. Whether the public interest favors granting the stay.

The Office of Hearings and Appeals regulations do not provide for electronic filing of appeals, electronically filed appeals will therefore not be accepted.