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

CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION
ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW AND APPROVAL

Project Lead: Shaina Shippen
Field Office: Sierra Front
Lead Office: Sierra Front
Case File/Project Number: NVN 093346
Applicable Categorical Exclusion (cite section): 516 DM 11.5, Appendix 4–(E)(12): "grants of right-of-way wholly within the boundaries of other compatibly developed rights-of-way."

NEPA Number: DOI-BLM-NV-C020-2014-0038-CX

Project Name: Pinenut Road #2 Right-Of-Way Grant

Project Description: The BLM received a right-of-way application from Lawrence E. Layton proposing to operate and maintain an existing access road that connects his private residential parcel to Pinenut Road #2, Gardnerville, Nevada. The proposed right-of-way (ROW) is thirty (30) feet in width, four hundred and thirty-five (435) feet in length, and contains 0.30 acres, more or less. The proposed ROW would be located within an existing access road ROW (NVN 055752) granted by the BLM to James L. Breeden on March 22, 1993. The existing ROW is in good standing and would expire on March 21, 2023. There would be no new improvements to this existing access road. Use of this ROW would be effective upon issuance by the BLM and would be a standard 30 year FLPMA ROW.

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: Lawrence E. Layton

Project Location (include Township/Range, County): Douglas County, Mount Diablo Meridian, T. 12 N., R. 21 E., sec. 17, S1/2SW1/4NE1/4.

BLM Acres for the Project Area: 0.30 acres.

Land Use Plan Conformance (cite reference/page number): LND – 7, "Administrative Actions," #6: "exchanges and minor non-Bureau initiated realty proposals will be considered where analysis indicates they are beneficial to the public."

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?		**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:

B J Brittany ACTING FOR 8/26/2014

Leon Thomas
Field Manager
Sierra Front Field Office

(date)

Does this CX constitute the decision document for this Proposed Action? ☐Yes ☒ No