

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

**CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION  
ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW AND APPROVAL**

---

**Project Creator:** Matt Simons, Realty Specialist

**Field Office:** Stillwater Field Office

**Lead Office:** Stillwater Field Office

**Case File/Project Number:** NVN-031194

**Applicable Categorical Exclusion:** H-1790-1, Appendix 4 E(12):

“Grants of right-of-way wholly within the boundaries of compatibly developed rights-of-way.”

**NEPA Number:** DOI-BLM-NV-C010-2014-0003-CX

**Project Name:** Red Rock mill site buried municipal water pipeline

**Project Description:** Renewal of the expired Federal Land Policy and Management Act of 1976 (FLPMA) right-of-way (ROW) originally granted on December 2, 1983. The new grant would reauthorize the previously granted existing water pipeline ROW segment (524-feet long) for another 30 year term.

In addition, the new grant would include two pipeline new pipeline segments. The first segment is an extension of the originally authorized pipeline that follows the west shoulder of Sunset Lane (3,419-feet long). The second segment is a portion of a water pipeline constructed by the Southern Pacific Railroad Company (SP) many years prior to the passage of FLPMA (6,965-feet long). The two new segments meet along Sunset Lane near the private/public land boundary on the east side of Mina. The segment constructed by SP is not currently active, but is being held in reserve for future use if needed. The grant would contain a condition that Mineral County obtain a Notice to Proceed from the BLM prior to making any upgrades to the pipeline segment, including replacing the pipe.

The new grant would authorize 10,908 feet of pipeline within a 20-foot ROW.

**Applicant Name:** Mineral County

**Project Location:**

Mount Diablo Meridian

T. 6 N., R. 35 E.,

sec. 4, Lot 4 and SW $\frac{1}{4}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$  (within);

sec. 5, SE $\frac{1}{4}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$ , E $\frac{1}{2}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$ , E $\frac{1}{2}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$  and SW $\frac{1}{4}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$  (within);

sec. 8, NW $\frac{1}{4}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$  (within).

**BLM Acres for the Project Area:** 5.008 acres, more-or-less.

**Land Use Plan Conformance:**

Administrative Actions #6, page LND-7: "Exchanges and minor non-Bureau initiated realty proposals will be considered where analysis indicates they are beneficial to the public."

**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)

**Stillwater Field Office**

<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)		gd
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)		CS UK DC
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)		SDR
4. Would the Proposed Action have highly uncertain and potentially significant environmental effects or involve unique or unknown environmental risks? (PEC)		SDR
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)		SDR
6. Would the Proposed Action have a direct relationship to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant environmental effects? (PEC)		SDR
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)		fu
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)		ck
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)		SDR
10. Would the Proposed Action have a disproportionately high and adverse effect on low income or minority populations (EA 12898)? ((PEC)		SDR
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)		fu
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)		gd

**SPECIALISTS' REVIEW:**

During ID Team review of the above Proposed Action and extraordinary circumstances, the following specialists reviewed this CX:


- Planning Environmental Coordinator: Angelica Rose *AR 11/18/13*
- Public Health and Safety/Noxious Weeds: Jill Devaurs *JD 11-18-13*
- Recreation/Wilderness/VRM/LWC: Dan Westermeyer *DW 11-18-13*
- Archeology: Jason Wright *JW 11-18-13*
- Wildlife: Chris Kula *CK 11/18/13*
- Soils/Grazing: Linda Appel / Chelsy Simerson / Jill Devaurs *CS 11/18/13*

**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:

*Teresa J. Knutson*      12/3/2013  
Teresa J. Knutson      (date)  
Field Manager  
Stillwater Field Office

# Mineral County Mina Water Pipelines NVN-031194





Map created by msimons, 11/13/2013



No warranty is made by the BLM as to the accuracy, reliability, or completeness of these data for individual or aggregate use.

8 inch by 8 inch data frame represents:  
1:24,000



Carson City District  
Mount Diablo Meridian  
Nevada

Red square represents approximate extent of main data frame.

### Linear Infrastructures

- Water pipeline, buried
- Water pipeline, abandoned

### NVN-031194 Segments

- Previously granted
- Amendment needed
- Old SPRR Spring pipeline

### Linear Rights-of-way

- NVN-0047886
- NVN-060552

### Surface Mgmt. Status\*

- / Private

\*All lands administered by BLM unless otherwise noted