

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

**CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION  
ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW AND APPROVAL**

---

**Project Lead:** Cory Gardner

**Field Office:** Sierra Front

**Lead Office:** Sierra Front

**Case File/Project Number:** NVN 024960 01

**Applicable Categorical Exclusion** (cite section): 516 DM 11.9 E (19), "Issuance of short-term (3 years or less) rights-of-way or land use authorizations for such uses as storage sites, apiary sites, and construction sites where the proposal includes rehabilitation to restore the land to its natural or original condition."

**NEPA Number:** DOI-BLM-NV-C020-2014-0026-CX

**Project Name:** Reno City Gate #5 Temporary Use Area

**Project Description:** Paiute Pipeline Company proposes to construct two Temporary Work Areas as they rebuild the Reno City Gate #5 Valve which lies within an existing right-of-way (ROW). The location of the temporary work areas would be placed on each side of the existing ROW. The temporary work areas will be used to store materials such as piping and assembly components. The work scheduled for these two areas would take approximately two weeks to complete. Work would begin upon approval of the temporary use permit.

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 the bi-state sage-grouse?  Yes  No

**Applicant Name:** Paiute Pipeline Company

**Project Location (include Township/Range, County):** Lot 36, T20N, R20E, Mount Diablo Baseline and Meridian, Washoe County.

**BLM Acres for the Project Area:** 0.35 acres

North temporary work space #1: 25ft. wide. by 200 ft. long = 0.12 acres

South temporary work space #2: 50ft. wide. by 200 ft. long = 0.23 acres

**Land Use Plan Conformance** (cite reference/page number): LND-7, #6: "non-bureau initiated realty proposals would be considered where analysis indicates they are beneficial to the public.

**Name of Plan:** NV – Carson City RMP.

Sierra Front Field Office June 2014

**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>	<b>YES</b>	<b>NO</b>
1. Would the Proposed Action have significant impacts on public health or safety?		<b>X</b>
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?		<b>X</b>
3. Would the Proposed Action have highly controversial environmental effects or involve unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources [NEPA 102(2)(E)]?		<b>X</b>
4. Would the Proposed Action have highly uncertain and potentially significant environmental effects or involve unique or unknown environmental risks?		<b>X</b>
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?		<b>X</b>
6. Would the Proposed Action have a direct relationship to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant environmental effects?		<b>X</b>
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?		<b>X</b>
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?		<b>X</b>
9. Would the Proposed Action violate federal law, or a State, local or tribal law or requirement imposed for the protection of the environment?		<b>X</b>
10. Would the Proposed Action have a disproportionately high and adverse effect on low income or minority populations (EA 12898)?		<b>X</b>
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)?		<b>X</b>
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)?		<b>X</b>

**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.

Does this categorical exclusion constitute the decision document for this Proposed Action?

Yes  No

Approved by:



Leon Thomas  
Field Manager  
Sierra Front Field Office



(date)