BLM

U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management

Categorical Exclusion

Elko County Cattle Drive Access Road Renewal

PREPARING OFFICE

U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management
Tuscarora Field Office
3900 E. Idaho St.
Elko, NV USA
753.753.0200

Categorical Exclusion
Elko County Cattle Drive Access Road Renewal

Prepared by
U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management
Elko District, Tuscarora Field Office

This page intentionally
left blank

Table of Contents

1. Categorical Exclusion Worksheet 1

2. Screening for Extraordinary Circumstances 3

This page intentionally
left blank

List of Tables

Table 2.1. Screening for Extraordinary Circumstances 5
Table 2.2. Reviewer Comments and Concurrence 5

This page intentionally
left blank

Chapter 1. Categorical Exclusion Worksheet

Elko County Cattle Drive Access Road Renewal

This page intentionally
left blank

A. Background

NEPA ID No: DOI-BLM-NV-E020-2015-0031-CX

BLM Office: Tuscarora Field Office

LLNV02000

Prepared by: Elisabeth Puentes

Lease/Serial/Case File No.: NVN038994

Type of Action (Subject Code): 2800

Location of Proposed Action: Elko County, Nevada, Mount Diablo Meridian, T. 34 N., R. 55 E., Sec. 8, N2S2SWNW,SWSWSWNW,N2N2NWSW,SWNWNWSW,NWSWNWSW.

Applicant: Elko County

Description of Proposed Action: Elko County is proposing to renew Right-of-Way Grant NVN038994 (Cattle Drive), for perpetuity. The original ROW Grant was issued on July 5, 1984 for a 30 year term and expired on July 4, 2014. The Right-of-Way consists of two segments. Road 1 is 80 feet wide and 2346.82 feet long and road 2 is 66 feet wide and 1251.06 feet long, together containing 6.21 acres. There will be no new disturbance and the proponent is in compliance with the terms and conditions of the original Grant. The BLM action is to renew this ROW Grant. Please see attached information and maps.

B. Land Use Plan Conformance

Land Use Plan Name: Elko Resource Area Resource Management Plan

Date Approved/Amended: March 11, 1987

The proposed action is in conformance with the applicable LUP because it is specifically provided for in the following LUP decision(s):

The proposed action is in conformance with the LUP, even though it is not specifically provided for, because it is clearly consistent with the following LUP decision(s) (objectives, terms, and conditions) : The Elko Resource Management Plan, as approved March 11, 1987, is silent on the Proposed Action. However, it is consistent with the objectives for the management of lands, right-of-way corridors, access, recreation, livestock management, wildlife, and minerals as prescribed and identified in the Record of Decision of the Resource Management Plan (BLM 1987, p.1-4).

C. Compliance with NEPA:

The Proposed Action is categorically excluded from further documentation under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) in accordance with Departmental Categorical Exclusion pursuant to BLM Categorical Exclusion pursuant to 516 DM 11.9.

E. Realty 9. Renewals and assignments of leases, permits, or rights-of-way where no additional rights are conveyed beyond those granted by the original authorizations.

This categorical exclusion is appropriate in this situation because there are no extraordinary circumstances potentially having effects that may significantly affect the environment. The proposed action has been reviewed, and none of the extraordinary circumstances described in 516 DM 2 apply.

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 the criteria for the selected CX. There is no potential for significant impacts. Therefore, the action is excluded from further environmental analysis and documentation.

/s/ Richard E. Adams 5/22/2015

Richard E. Adams Date
Tuscarora Field Manager

Contact Information

For additional information concerning this CX review, contact:
Elisabeth Puentes
Realty Specialist
Tuscarora Field Office
3900 E. Idaho St.
Elko, NV 89801
(775) 753–0294
epuentes@blm.gov

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

Chapter 2. Screening for Extraordinary Circumstances

Elko County Cattle Drive Access Road Renewal

This page intentionally
left blank

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

Table 2.1. Screening for Extraordinary Circumstances

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

Table 2.2. Reviewer Comments and Concurrence

Resource	Specialist Name	Comments	Initials	Date
AFM- Non-Renewables	Deb McFarlane	No Issues	DNM	5/20/2015
AFM- Renewables	S. Servoss		SRS	5/21/2015
Air/Hydrology/Soils				
Archaeology				
Cultural Resources				
Fisheries				
Health and Safety				
Native American Concerns				
NEPA	Terri Dobis	No Concerns	TKD	5/22/2015

Range Management/ Grazing				
Recreation				
Weeds				
Wildlife	Ken Wilkinson	Confirm control of any noxious weeds on ROW in Coordination with BLM Weed Specialist. This effort would mitigate the effects of potential weed invasion on wildlife habitat.	K. Wilkinson	5/20/2015