

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

**CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION
ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW AND APPROVAL**

Project Creator: Dave Schroeder

Field Office: Stillwater

Lead Office: Stillwater

Case File/Project Number: n/a

Applicable Categorical Exclusion (cite section): BLM NEPA Handbook H-1790-1, Appendix 4: BLM Categorical Exclusions, J (8): "Installation of minor devices to protect human life (eg., grates across mines)."

NEPA Number: DOI-BLM-NV-C010-2015-0017-CX

Project Name: Kaiser Mine AML

Project Description: The Nevada Division of Minerals (NDOM) is proposing to construct one (1) bat cupola, two (2) culvert gates, conduct six (6) backfills, and depending on future wildlife surveys either backfill or grate two (2) additional abandoned mine hazards North of Gabbs in Mineral County, Nevada in the vicinity of the "Kaiser Mine". The closure structures would be Bat Conservation International compatible gates.

Applicant Name: Nevada Division of Minerals

Project Location: MDM T. 14 N., R. 34 E. section 25 SW¼

BLM Acres for the Project Area: less than ¼ acre

Land Use Plan Conformance: (cite reference/page number): This action is in conformance with the Carson City Field Office Consolidated Resource Management Plan (2001); **MIN-4, Implementation Level Decisions #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: Carson City Field Office Consolidated Resource Management Plan (2001)

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: (Specialist review: initial in appropriate box)

<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? (Range)		ck
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? (Archeology, Recreation, Wilderness, Wildlife, Range by allotment, Water Quality)		ck pec
3. Would the Proposed Action have highly controversial environmental effects or involve unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources [NEPA 102(2)(E)]? (PEC)		ADR
4. Would the Proposed Action have highly uncertain and potentially significant environmental effects or involve unique or unknown environmental risks? (PEC)		ADR
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? (PEC)		ADR
6. Would the Proposed Action have a direct relationship to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant environmental effects? (PEC)		ADR
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? (Archeology)		jm
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)		ck
9. Would the Proposed Action violate federal law, or a State, local or tribal law or requirement imposed for the protection of the environment? (PEC and Archeology)		ADR
10. Would the Proposed Action have a disproportionately high and adverse effect on low income or minority populations (EA 12898)? ((PEC)		ADR
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)? (Archeology)		jm
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)? (Range)		ck

SPECIALISTS' REVIEW:

During ID Team review of the above Proposed Action and extraordinary circumstances, the following specialists reviewed this CX:

Planning Environmental Coordinator, Angelica Rose: *KDR 4/7/14*
Public Health and Safety/Grazing/Noxious Weeds, Jill Devaurs/Linda Appel/Chelsy Simerson: *JD 4-7-14*
Recreation/Wilderness/VRM/LWC, Dan Westermeyer: *DCW 4/7/14*
Wildlife/T&E (BLM Sensitive Species), Chris Kula: *CK 4/7/14*
Archeology, Jason Wright: *JW 4/20/15*
Water Quality: *ea 4/7/14 ck 4/7/14*
Soils, Jill Devaurs/Linda Appel/Chelsy Simerson: *ea 4/7/14*

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. A categorical exclusion is not subject to protest or appeal.

Approved by:

Teresa J. Knutson
Teresa J. Knutson
Field Manager
Stillwater Field Office

4/20/2015
(date)