Categorical Exclusion

Plumas Webber's Ivesia Exclosure

Sierra Front Field Office

Carson City

Nevada

89701

775-885-6000

Categorical Exclusion Review

Background

There is a population of the threatened plant, Webber's ivesia in the southwest corner of the east pasture of the Plumas Station Grazing Allotment (Allotment). A fence would protect this area from damage from cattle, off-highway vehicles (OHVs) and wildlife.

BLM Office:

LLNVC02000

Lease/Serial/Case File No.:

N/A

Location of Proposed Action:

T22N, R17E, Sec. 25

Description of Proposed Action:

Project Description: Install an approximately 3,400 foot protective fence for the threatened plant, Webber's ivesia (*Ivesia Webberi*). The fence would tie into the existing Allotment boundary fence at both ends.

Specifications and Requirements

- Fence Specifications. The fence would be a 4-wire "Cattle with Antelope Fence" whose design would draw on both the wildlife and engineering specifications as authorized by BLM Fencing Handbook H-1741-1 p IV-1 which references "Fences" USDI/USDA and BLM's Engineering Standard Drawings (See attached drawing Barbed Wire Fence Nevada (4-wire x 16 ½ feet) NV02834-(53)).

- The fence would comply with the Barbed Wire Fence Nevada (4-wire x 16 ½ feet) NV02834-(53) specifications with the following wire spacing exceptions:
    - Bottom wire (smooth) would be 18 inches from the ground (antelope and fawns);
    - At least 12 inches between the top two wires (deer);
    - Total height would be no more than 42 inches, preferably 40 inches (deer);
    - Other wire spacings are to be determined, with rationale provided, and would be based on the Engineering Guide Specifications and Engineering Standard Drawings

Land Use Plan Conformance

Land Use Plan Name: Nevada, Carson City Consolidated Resource Management Plan

Date Approved/Amended: May 2001

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

Implementation Level Decisions, SSS-3. "Use fencing, emergency OHV closure, no disposal of public lands, minerals' coordination, or any other legal means necessary to protect identified T/E plant populations."

Compliance with NEPA:

The Proposed Action is categorically excluded from further documentation under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) in accordance with 516 DM 2, Appendix 1, or 516 DM 11.9,

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.

The applicable section is: 516 DM 11.9 (J) Other – "Construction of small protective enclosures, including those to protect reservoirs and springs and those to protect small study areas."

I considered the following:

Impacts on Public Health and Safety

1. Does the proposed action have significant impacts on public health and safety?		
YES	**NO**	**REVIEWER/TITLE**
	X	Ryan Leary, Range Management Specialist
	X	Brian Buttazoni, Planning & Environmental Coordinator

Impacts on Natural Resources or Unique Geographic Characteristics

2. Have significant impacts on such natural resources and unique geographic characteristics as historic or cultural resources; park, recreation or refuge lands; wilderness or wilderness study areas; wild or scenic rivers; national natural landmarks; sole or principal drinking water aquifers; prime farmlands; wetlands (Executive Order 11990); floodplains (Executive Order 11988); national monuments; migratory birds (Executive Order 13186); and other ecologically significant or critical areas?		
YES	**NO**	**REVIEWER/TITLE**
	X	Arthur Callan, Outdoor Recreation Planner
	X	Rachel Crews, Archeologist
	X	Niki Cutler, Hydrologist
	X	Brian Buttazoni, Planning & Environmental Coordinator for Wildlife Biologist

Level of Controversy

3. Have highly controversial environmental effects or involve unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources [NEPA Section 102(2)(E)]?		
YES	**NO**	**REVIEWER/TITLE**
	X	Ryan Leary, Range Management Specialist
	X	Brian Buttazoni, Planning & Environmental Coordinator

Highly Uncertain or Unique or Unknown Environmental Risks

4. Have highly uncertain and potentially significant environmental effects or involve unique or unknown environmental risks?		
YES	**NO**	**REVIEWER/TITLE**
	X	Ryan Leary, Range Management Specialist
	X	Brian Buttazoni, Planning & Environmental Coordinator

Precedent Setting

5. Establish a precedent for future action, or represent a decision in principle about future actions, with potentially significant environmental effects?		
YES	**NO**	**REVIEWER/TITLE**
	X	Ryan Leary, Range Management Specialist
	X	Brian Buttazoni, Planning & Environmental Coordinator

Cumulatively Significant Effects

6. Have a direct relationship to other actions with individually insignificant, but cumulatively significant, environmental effects?		
YES	**NO**	**REVIEWER/TITLE**
	X	Ryan Leary, Range Management Specialist
	X	Brian Buttazoni, Planning & Environmental Coordinator

Impacts on Cultural Properties

7. Have significant impacts on properties listed or eligible for listing, on the National Register of Historic Places as determined by either the Bureau or office?		
YES	**NO**	**REVIEWER/TITLE**
	X	Rachel Crews, Archeologist

Impacts on Federally Listed Species or Critical Habitat

8. 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?		
YES	**NO**	**REVIEWER/TITLE**
	X	Dean Tonenna, Botanist

Compliance with Laws

9. Violate a Federal law, or a State, local, or tribal law or requirement imposed for the protection of the environment?		
YES	**NO**	**REVIEWER/TITLE**
	X	Brian Buttazoni, Planning & Environmental Coordinator

Environmental Justice

10. Have a disproportionately high and adverse effect on low income or minority populations (Executive Order 12898)?		
YES	**NO**	**REVIEWER/TITLE**
	X	Brian Buttazoni, Planning & Environmental Coordinator

Sacred Sites

11. 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)?		
YES	**NO**	**REVIEWER/TITLE**
	X	Rachel Crews, Archeologist

Noxious and Non-Native Invasive Species

12. Contribute to the introduction, continued existence, or spread of noxious weeds or non-native invasive 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 Executive Order 13112)?		
YES	**NO**	**REVIEWER/TITLE**
	X	Dean Tonenna, Botanist

Approval Information

Bryant D. Smith Acting Field Manager	Date 2/3/2016

This categorical exclusion worksheet does not constitute the decision to approve this project. See accompanying decision record for appeal information.