



BLM - Elko, NV
Categorical Exclusion
C X

Select Field Office
 District
 Tuscarora
 Wells

Title of Proposed Action: <i>Beronio Hunting Film Permit</i>				
Lead Preparer: Marissa Murphy	NEPA ID No: BLM-NV- E0 20 (Tuscarora) - 2014- 0017 - CX			
Type of Action (Subject Code): Lands/Realty 2920	Case File No.: NVN-093296			
Applicant (if any): David Beronio	Proposal Date: 07/07/2014			
<p>Location: Hunt unit 068, north of Battle Mountain, Nevada: It comprises of those portions of Elko, Eureka and Lander Counties bounded on the east by State Route Nos. 226 and 278, and the Maggie Creek Road, on the south by the northernmost railroad track that runs from the Humboldt County line to the Palisade Road and the Palisade Road to its intersection with State Route No. 278, on the west by the Humboldt County line, and on the north by the Midas-Willow Creek Reservoir-Tuscarora Road.</p> <p>Hunt Unit 261, northwest of Pahrump, Nevada: It comprises of that portion of Nye County bounded on the north by U.S. Highway No. 95, on the east by State Route No. 160 and State Route No. 372, on the south by the California state line, and on the west by State Route No. 373. Please see attached hunt unit maps for reference.</p> <p>Legal Description: MDM Please see attached map. Township, Range, Section(s) (If more than one TRS, show on attachment)</p>				
<p>A. Proposed Action</p> <p><i>Proponent is requesting a film permit for Nevada public lands for hunt units 068, North of Battle Mountain, and 261, Northwest of Pahrump, NV. The one man film crew will be filming an archery Bighorn ewe hunt in area 068 and an archery Bighorn ram hunt in unit 261. There won't be any sets or props used. Filming will take place during the hunt while the hunter is glassing, stalking, shooting, processing the animal, and packing it back to camp. Filming will also take place at camp and may contain background information of the bighorn sheep in each area and reasoning behind the ewe hunt/ram hunt and what different agencies have done to keep the populations healthy.</i></p> <p><i>This permit is going to be processed by the Tuscarora Field Office; however the Pahrump Field Office Resource Specialists will review and determine stipulations for hunt unit 261. Please see attached application for more information.</i></p>				
<p>B. Land Use Plan Conformance</p> <p>This proposed action has been reviewed for conformance with the selected applicable resource management plan(s) (RMP) and/or amendment(s) (43 CFR 1610.5: BLM Manual Section 1617.3):</p> <table style="width: 100%; border: none;"> <tr> <td style="text-align: center; vertical-align: top;"> <u>DISTRICT</u> <input type="checkbox"/> Elko and Wells RMPs Fire Management Amendment (Approved 9/29/2004) </td> <td style="text-align: center; vertical-align: top;"> <u>TUSCARORA Field Office</u> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Elko RMP (Approved 3/11/1987) <input type="checkbox"/> Elko RMP Wild Horse Amendment (Approved 10/15/2003) </td> <td style="text-align: center; vertical-align: top;"> <u>WELLS Field Office</u> <input type="checkbox"/> Wells RMP (Approved 7/16/1985) <input type="checkbox"/> Wells RMP Wild Horse Amendment (Approved 2/2/1993) </td> </tr> </table> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other: <u>1998 Las Vegas RMP</u> <input type="checkbox"/> Wells RMP Elk Amendment (Approved 2/14/1993)</p>		<u>DISTRICT</u> <input type="checkbox"/> Elko and Wells RMPs Fire Management Amendment (Approved 9/29/2004)	<u>TUSCARORA Field Office</u> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Elko RMP (Approved 3/11/1987) <input type="checkbox"/> Elko RMP Wild Horse Amendment (Approved 10/15/2003)	<u>WELLS Field Office</u> <input type="checkbox"/> Wells RMP (Approved 7/16/1985) <input type="checkbox"/> Wells RMP Wild Horse Amendment (Approved 2/2/1993)
<u>DISTRICT</u> <input type="checkbox"/> Elko and Wells RMPs Fire Management Amendment (Approved 9/29/2004)	<u>TUSCARORA Field Office</u> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Elko RMP (Approved 3/11/1987) <input type="checkbox"/> Elko RMP Wild Horse Amendment (Approved 10/15/2003)	<u>WELLS Field Office</u> <input type="checkbox"/> Wells RMP (Approved 7/16/1985) <input type="checkbox"/> Wells RMP Wild Horse Amendment (Approved 2/2/1993)		
<p>C. Compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)</p> <p>This proposed action qualifies as a categorical exclusion (CX) under the NEPA Manual (516 DM), and has been reviewed to determine if any of the extraordinary circumstances apply. The applicable categorical exclusion is:</p>				

1. BLM Categorical Exclusion pursuant to 516 DM 11.9

2. E. Realty

3. 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.

D. Conclusion and Signature

Based upon this review, I have determined that the Proposed Action, as described, is in conformance with the land use plan and meets criteria for the selected CX. There is no potential for significant impacts. Therefore, the action is excluded from farther environmental analysis and documentation.

Managers Name **Richard E. Adams** /s/ Deborah N. McFarlane, acting for

Title **Tuscarora Field Manager**

Date **7/23/2014**

*Note: A separate decision document must be prepared for the action covered by the CX.

Screening for Extraordinary Circumstances-Tuscarora Field Office

Each of the following questions must be answered negatively, by all resource specialists participating on the interdisciplinary team before this CX may be approved (516DM).

Resource Concerns		Yes	No
1. Will this project have significant adverse effects on public health or safety?			X
2. Will this project adversely affect such unique geographic characteristics as: (a) historic or cultural resources; (b) park, recreation or refuge lands, wilderness areas, wild or scenic rivers; (c) sole or principal drinking water aquifers; (d) prime farmlands, wetlands, flood plains, or (e) ecologically significant or critical areas, including those listed on the Department of the Interior's National Register of Natural Landmarks?			(a) X (b) X (c) X (d) X (e) X
3. Will this project have highly controversial environmental effects?			X
4. Will this project have highly uncertain and potentially significant environmental effects or involve unique or unknown environmental risks?			X
5. Will this project establish a precedent for future action or represent a decision in principle about future actions with potentially significant environmental effects?			X
6. Will this project be related to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant environmental effects?			X
7. Will this project have adverse effects on properties listed or eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places?			X
8. Will this project have adverse effects on species listed or proposed for listing on the Threatened or Endangered Species List, or have adverse effects on designated Critical Habitat for these species?			X
9. Will this project require compliance with Executive Order 11988 (Floodplain Management), Executive Order 11990 (Protection of Wetlands), or the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act?			X
10. Will this project threaten to violate a Federal, State, local or tribal law or requirement imposed for the protection of the environment?			X
11. Will this project 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? (Executive Order 13007— Sacred Sites)			X
12. Will this project 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?			X
Reviewers and Comments			
Resource	Specialist Name	Comment	Initials
AFM – Non-Renewables	D.N. McFarlane	No Comments	/s/ DNM 7/21/14
AFM – Renewables	M. Wood	No Comments	/s/ MRW 7/21/14
Air/Hydrology/Soils	NA		
Archaeology	NA		
Biologist Fisheries and/or Wildlife	K. Wilkinson	No concerns, Applicant needs to be aware of extreme fire hazards	/s/ KW
Cultural/Native American Concerns	NA		
Grazing/Range Mgmt	NA		
Env. Justice/Health	NA		
Recreation Planner	Z. Pratt	No Concerns	/s/ ZP 7/23/14
Weed Specialist	NA		

Screening for Extraordinary Circumstances-Pahrump Field Office

Each of the following questions must be answered negatively, by all resource specialists participating on the interdisciplinary team before this CX may be approved (516DM).

Resource Concerns		Yes	No
1. Will this project have significant adverse effects on public health or safety?			X
2. Will this project adversely affect such unique geographic characteristics as: (a) historic or cultural resources; (b) park, recreation or refuge lands, wilderness areas, wild or scenic rivers; (c) sole or principal drinking water aquifers; (d) prime farmlands, wetlands, flood plains, or (e) ecologically significant or critical areas, including those listed on the Department of the Interior's National Register of Natural Landmarks?			(a) X (b) X (c) X (d) X (e) X
3. Will this project have highly controversial environmental effects?			X
4. Will this project have highly uncertain and potentially significant environmental effects or involve unique or unknown environmental risks?			X
5. Will this project establish a precedent for future action or represent a decision in principle about future actions with potentially significant environmental effects?			X
6. Will this project be related to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant environmental effects?			X
7. Will this project have adverse effects on properties listed or eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places?			X
8. Will this project have adverse effects on species listed or proposed for listing on the Threatened or Endangered Species List, or have adverse effects on designated Critical Habitat for these species?			X
9. Will this project require compliance with Executive Order 11988 (Floodplain Management), Executive Order 11990 (Protection of Wetlands), or the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act?			X
10. Will this project threaten to violate a Federal, State, local or tribal law or requirement imposed for the protection of the environment?			X
11. Will this project 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? (Executive Order 13007— Sacred Sites)			X
12. Will this project 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?			X
Reviewers and Comments			
Resource	Specialist Name	Comment	Initials

SEE AFFECTED RESOURCES FORM FOR PAHRUMP FIELD OFFICE REVIEW