

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-037166

Applicable Categorical Exclusion: H-1790-1, Appendix 4 E(9)

“Renewals and assignments of leases, permits, or rights-of-way where no additional rights are conveyed beyond those granted by the original authorizations.”

NEPA Number: DOI-BLM-NV-C010-2014-0004-CX

Project Name: Mina to Luning 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 November 4, 1982. The new grant would reauthorize the existing water pipeline ROW for another 30 year term.

The new grant would authorize 7.93 miles of pipeline within a 20-foot ROW.

Applicant Name: Mineral County

Project Location:

Mount Diablo Meridian

T. 7 N., R. 34 E.,

sec. 2, Lot 4, SW $\frac{1}{4}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$, N $\frac{1}{2}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$, and SE $\frac{1}{4}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$ (within);

sec. 3, Lot 1 (within);

sec. 11, W $\frac{1}{2}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$, SE $\frac{1}{4}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$, NE $\frac{1}{4}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$, and E $\frac{1}{2}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$ (within);

sec. 13, W $\frac{1}{2}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$, N $\frac{1}{2}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$, and SE $\frac{1}{4}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$ (within);

sec. 14, NE $\frac{1}{4}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$ (within);

sec. 24, SW $\frac{1}{4}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$, E $\frac{1}{2}$ NW $\frac{1}{4}$, W $\frac{1}{2}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$, and SE $\frac{1}{4}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$ (within);

sec. 25, E $\frac{1}{2}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$ and NE $\frac{1}{4}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$ (within).

T. 8 N., R. 34 E.,
sec. 34, SE $\frac{1}{4}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$ (within).

T. 6 N., R. 35 E.,
sec. 5, W $\frac{1}{2}$ SW $\frac{1}{4}$ (within);
sec. 6, Lot 2, S $\frac{1}{2}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$, and E $\frac{1}{2}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$ (within).

T. 7 N., R. 35 E.,
sec. 30, Lots 3 and 4 (within);
sec. 31, Lot 1, E $\frac{1}{2}$ W $\frac{1}{2}$, and SW $\frac{1}{4}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$ (within).

BLM Acres for the Project Area: 19.220 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)		os ck Dec
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)		ju
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)		ju ADR
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)		ju
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
Teresa J. Knutson
Field Manager
Stillwater Field Office



12/3/2013
(date)

Mineral County Mina to Luning 4" water pipeline NVN-037166 - Page 1 of 3



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




Red square represents approximate extent of main data frame.



- Water pipeline, buried
- NVN-037166
- Surface Mgmt. Status***
- Private

*All lands administered by the BLM unless otherwise designated

Mineral County Mina to Luning 4" water pipeline NVN-037166 - Page 2 of 3




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



- Water pipeline, buried
- NVN-037166
- Surface Mgmt. Status***
- Private



*All lands administered by the BLM unless otherwise designated.

Mineral County Mina to Luning 4" water pipeline NVN-037166 - Page 3 of 3



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.

- Water pipeline, buried
- NVN-037166

Surface Mgmt. Status*

- Private

*All lands administered by the BLM unless otherwise designated.