

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 038419

Applicable Categorical Exclusion (cite section): 516 DM 11.5 E (9) "Renewals and assignments of leases, permits, or rights-of-way where no additional rights are conveyed beyond those granted by the original authorization."

NEPA Number: DOI-BLM-NV-C020-2014-0037-CX

Project Name: Sun Valley General Improvement District, Tank Site, Road and Pipeline Right-of-Way Renewal.

Project Description: Sun Valley General Improvement District (SVGID) has operated and maintained a tank site with an access road and pipeline in the Sun Valley, Nevada area since the original FLPMA right-of-way (ROW) was issued on August 8, 1984. SVGID is requesting a renewal of their ROW for a 30 year term. There is no new disturbance proposed at this time. The only change is a decrease in acreage from 2.74 acres to 2.0 acres due to two patents that were issued to Washoe County (27-86-0080 and 27-2009-009). This decrease in acreage pertained to both the access road and pipeline. This ROW renewal would be effective upon issuance by the Bureau of Land Management.

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

Is the project located within critical habitat for Webber's Ivesia? Yes No

Applicant Name: Sun Valley General Improvement District

Project Location (include Township/Range, County):

MDM, Nevada, T. 20 N., R. 19 E., section 12, SE¼SE¼ (Washoe County)

BLM Acres for the Project Area: 2.0

Land Use Plan Conformance (cite reference/page number): Page LND-7 states "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>	YES	NO
1. Would the Proposed Action have significant impacts on public health or safety?		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?		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)]?		X
4. Would the Proposed Action have highly uncertain and potentially significant environmental effects or involve unique or unknown environmental risks?		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?		X
6. Would the Proposed Action have a direct relationship to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant environmental effects?		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?		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?		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?		X
10. Would the Proposed Action have a disproportionately high and adverse effect on low income or minority populations (EA 12898)?		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)?		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)?		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:



ACTING
FOR

Leon Thomas
Field Manager
Sierra Front Field Office

(date)

Does this CX constitute the decision document for this Proposed Action? Yes No (see ROW grant).