

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

**CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION  
ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW AND APPROVAL**

---

**Project Creator:** Dan Westermeyer

**Field Office:** Stillwater

**Lead Office:** Stillwater Field Office

**Case File/Project Number:** N/A

**Applicable Categorical Exclusion:** The Proposed Action is categorically excluded from further documentation under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) in accordance with 516 DM 11.9 App 4. D. 10, Vegetation management activities such as seeding, planting, invasive plant removal, installation of erosion control devices and mechanical treatments, such as crushing, piling, thinning, pruning, cutting, chipping, mulching, mowing, and prescribed fire when the activity is necessary for the management of vegetation on public lands.

**NEPA Number:** DOI-BLM-NV-C010-2013-0027-CX

**Project Name:** Habitat restoration at Sand Mountain Recreation Area

**Project Description:** This action will provide for ongoing vegetation restoration and trail rehabilitation activities along the designated OHV route system and Kearney buckwheat habitat within the Sand Mountain Recreation Area. Maintenance will be performed by BLM staff, contractors or volunteer crews. Work will include vertical mulching, trail restoration, fencing and signing. Work may include minor grooming of OHV trails using hand or motorized equipment. All work will be performed on previously disturbed areas within the trail system or OHV riding area. Access to work area will be through hiking or use of 4WD vehicles, All Terrain Vehicles or sand rails. Restoration work will only occur in areas with existing cultural resource clearance.

**Applicant Name:** BLM Stillwater Field Office

**Project Location:** Sand Mountain Recreation Area

**BLM Acres for the Project Area:** 4,000 acres

Sand Mountain Recreation Area, 25 miles east of Fallon, Nevada.

T17N R 32E Sec 17, 20, 21, 22, 29,28,32,33

T 16N R 32E Sec 4, 5

**Land Use Plan Conformance:**

This action is in conformance with the Carson City Field Office Consolidated Resource Management Plan (2001) page REC-2 –Desired Outcomes –1) “Provide a wide range of quality recreation opportunities on public lands under management by the Carson City Field Office.”; REC-7 SOP 1) “A broad range of outdoor recreation opportunities will continue to be provided on all segments of the public land, subject to the demand for such opportunities and the need to protect other resources...

**Name of Plan:** Carson City Field Office Consolidated Resource Management Plan (2001)

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

**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: *DK 3/28/13*  
Public Health and Safety/Grazing/Noxious Weeds, Jill Devaurs: *JD 3-28-13*  
Recreation/Wilderness/VRM/LWC, Dan Westermeyer: *DW 3/29/13*  
Wildlife/T&E (BLM Sensitive Species), : *JH 3/28/13*  
Archeology, Susan McCabe: *Susan McCabe Spa Appendix C 2 .*  
Soils, Jill Devaurs/Linda Appel/Chelsy Simerson: *JD 3-28-13*

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

*3-29-13*  
(date)