



BLM - Elko, NV
Categorical Exclusion
C X

Select Field Office
 District
 Tuscarora
 Wells

Title of Proposed Action: AT&T Emigrant Pass Comm Site Amendment				
Lead Preparer: Marissa Murphy	NEPA ID No: BLM-NV- E0 20 (Tuscarora) - 2015- 0016 - CX			
Type of Action (Subject Code): 1430	Case File No.: NVN-065744			
Applicant (if any): AT&T Mobility II	Proposal Date: 1/14/2015			
Location: Emigrant Pass, Eureka County, Nevada Legal Description: MDM T. 32N., R. 50E., sec 16. Township, Range, Section(s) (If more than one TRS, show on attachment)				
<p>A. Proposed Action</p> <p>AT&T Mobility is requesting to amend their Emigrant Pass Communication Site. They are proposing to expand their current monopole platform from 18' X 18' to 23' X 20'6". The additional platform will be approximately 20 cubic yards of concrete with reinforcing rebar. They will also be adding shaft reinforcements to the existing monopole. They will be staying completely within their existing comm site (100'X100') and road right-of-way for construction and staging. They need to expand the platform to sustain a new tenant on their tower, Commnet Wireless, who recently received a right-of-way for their equipment shelters within the existing communication site.</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) <input type="checkbox"/> Wells RMP Elk Amendment (Approved 2/14/1993) </td> </tr> </table>		<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) <input type="checkbox"/> Wells RMP Elk Amendment (Approved 2/14/1993)
<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) <input type="checkbox"/> Wells RMP Elk Amendment (Approved 2/14/1993)		
<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> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. BLM Categorical Exclusion pursuant to 516 DM 11.9 2. E. Realty 3. 13. Amendments to existing rights-of-way, such as the upgrading of existing facilities, which entail no additional disturbances outside the right-of-way boundary. 				

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/ Richard E. Adams

Title **Tuscarora Field Manager**

Date **1/15/2015**

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

Screening for Extraordinary Circumstances

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	Deborah McFarlane		
AFM – Renewables	Melanie Mirati		
Air/Hydrology/Soils			
Archaeology			
Biologist Fisheries and/or Wildlife			
Cultural/Native American Concerns			
Grazing/Range Mgmt			
Env. Justice/Health			
Recreation Planner			
Weed Specialist			