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

CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION
ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW AND APPROVAL

Project Lead: Dan Erbes
Field Office: Sierra Front
Lead Office: Sierra Front
Case File/Project Number: N/A
Applicable Categorical Exclusion (cite section): 516 DM 11.9: J.(8) "Installation of minor devices to protect human life (e.g., grates across mines)."

NEPA Number: DOI-BLM-NV-C020-2014-0013-CX

Project Name: NDOM Storey, Lyon and Douglas Co AML Closures 2014

Project Description: Nevada Division of Minerals (NDOM) is proposing to mitigate human health and safety risks associated with 24 abandoned mine workings in Lyon (9) and Douglas (15) Counties. A bat survey would be completed by the Nevada Department of Wildlife (NDOW) for all underground mine workings. Depending on the outcome of the bat surveys, abandoned mine hazards will be backfilled and/or secured with bat gates or grates. Additionally NDOM is proposing to install a 6-foot high chain link fence around the Sutro Air Shaft #3 abandoned mine working in Storey County, Nevada. During these proposed actions should any cultural resources be uncovered, the project would be discontinued and appropriate measures taken to ensure that all cultural resources are protected.

Does the project include new surface disturbing activities? ☒Yes ☐No
Is the project located within preliminary general habitat for sage-grouse? ☐Yes ☒No
Is the project located within preliminary priority habitat for sage-grouse? ☐Yes ☒No
Is the project located within proposed critical habitat for bi-state sage-grouse? ☐Yes ☒No

Applicant Name: Nevada Division of Minerals
Project Location (include Township/Range, County):
Sutro Air Shaft #3 = sec. 33 NE, T. 17 N., R. 21 E., Storey County, Nevada
Fort Churchill AML = secs. 9,10,15,22 and 28, T. 17 N., R. 24 E., Lyon County, Nevada
Chukar AML = secs. 2 and 3, T. 12 N., R. 21 E., Douglas County, Nevada

BLM Acres for the Project Area: less than 5
Land Use Plan Conformance (cite reference/page number): This action is in conformance with the Carson City Field Office Consolidated Resource Management Plan (2001) pg. MIN-1; "Identify hazards to the public around inactive and active mine claims through signing, fencing or other appropriate means. Priorities for hazard reduction will be established and carried out by the minerals program, in cooperation with the State Mine Inspector and claimants."

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:

If any question is answered 'yes' an EA or EIS must be prepared.	**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**

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.

Approved by:

B L Bretty

ACTING FOR Leon Thomas
Field Manager
Sierra Front Field Office

5-8-2014
(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.