

# Categorical Exclusion

## UNR Granite Hills Paleoseismic Trenching

Sierra Front Field Office

Carson City

Nevada 89701 775-885-6000

### *Categorical Exclusion Review*

#### **Background**

On March 4, 2016, the applicant met with D. Erbes, V. Wilkins and S. Shippen to discuss the proposed action of paleoseismic trenching and the appropriate authority to permit the activity. It was decided to process the application as a 90-day mineral material exploration permit under 43 CFR 3601.30.

**BLM Office:** LLNVC02000

**Lease/Serial/Case File No.:** N-94641

**Location of Proposed Action:** sec. 26, T. 21 N., R. 18 E., MDBM, Washoe Co., NV

**Description of Proposed Action:** The applicant proposes to mobilize an excavator to advance up to two paleoseismic trenches (up to 15' deep, 6' wide and 300' long) to expose fault and soil horizons in the Granite Hills area north of Reno, Nevada. Access would be achieved using existing OHV trails or overland travel. Excavation activities would occur during summer/fall 2016 and cause short-term noise and disturbance. Only a nominal increase in traffic and noise would occur for the week or so excavation is taking place. Trenches would be then be fenced with bright orange plastic fencing for the duration which trenches remain open. Trenches would remain fenced and open for a period not to exceed 6 months (the maximum duration of the mineral materials exploration permit), after which time a nominal increase in traffic and noise would occur for an additional week or so as trenches are backfilled, fencing is removed and surface disturbance is reclaimed.

#### **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):**

Continue to provide mineral material commodities to the using public (CRMP/MIN-5).

## 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 Appendix 4, F(9) "Digging of exploratory trenches for mineral materials, except in riparian areas."

I considered:

NOTE: Answers to the Extraordinary Circumstances questions below will affect the level of NEPA required for this project.

If the answer to all Extraordinary Circumstances is NO, the use of the CX is appropriate.

If the answer to any one Extraordinary Circumstance is MAYBE or UNKNOWN, an EA is the appropriate NEPA document.

If the answer to any Extraordinary Circumstance is YES, an EIS is required.

EXTRAORDINARY CIRCUMSTANCES <i>Does the proposed action...</i>	NO/MAYBE OR UNKNOWN/YES & RATIONALE (If appropriate)	RESOURCE/PROGRAM SPECIALIST(S) ASSIGNED REVIEW	NAME OF TEAM MEMBER(S) ASSIGNED REVIEW	INITIALS AND DATE
---	---	--	--	-------------------

## Impacts to Public Health and Safety

1. Have significant impacts on public health and safety?

	<b>NO</b>	Geologist		
	<b>NO</b>	Planning and Environmental Coordinator	B. Buttazoni	BB 6/27/2016

## Impacts to 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?

	<b>NO</b>	Geologist	D. Erbes	DBE 7/25/2016
--	-----------	-----------	----------	---------------

## Level of Controversy

3. Have highly controversial environmental effects or involve unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources [NEPA Section 102(2)(E)]?

	<b>NO</b>	Geologist	D. Erbes	DBE 7/25/2016
	<b>NO</b>	Planning and Environmental Coordinator	B. Buttazoni	BB 6/27/2016

## Highly Uncertain or Unique or Unknown Environmental Risks

4. Have highly uncertain and potentially significant environmental effects or involve unique or unknown environmental risks?

	<b>NO</b>	Geologist	D. Erbes	DBE 7/25/2016
	<b>NO</b>	Planning and Environmental Coordinator	B. Buttazoni	BB 6/27/2016

## Precedent Setting

5. Establish a precedent for future action, or represent a decision in principle about future actions, with potentially significant environmental effects?

	<b>NO</b>	Geologist	D. Erbes	DBE 7/25/2016
	<b>NO</b>	Planning and Environmental Coordinator	B. Buttazoni	BB 6/27/2016

## Cumulatively Significant Effects

6. Have a direct relationship to other actions with individually insignificant, but cumulatively significant, environmental effects?

	<b>NO</b>	Planning and Environmental Coordinator	B. Buttazoni	BB 6/27/2016
--	-----------	--	--------------	--------------

## Impacts to Cultural Resources

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?

	<b>NO</b>	Archeologist	A. Jensen	AEJ 7/25/2016
--	-----------	--------------	-----------	---------------

## Impacts to 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?

	<b>NO</b>	Planning and Environmental Coordinator	B. Buttazoni	BB 6/27/2016
--	-----------	--	--------------	--------------

## Compliance with Other Laws

9. Violate a Federal law, or a State, local, or tribal law or requirement imposed for the protection of the environment?

	<b>NO</b>	Planning and Environmental Coordinator	B. Buttazoni	BB 6/27/2016
--	-----------	--	--------------	--------------

## Environmental Justice

10. Have a disproportionately high and adverse effect on low income or minority populations (Executive Order 12898)?

	<b>NO</b>	Planning and Environmental Coordinator	B. Buttazoni	BB 6/27/2016
--	-----------	--	--------------	--------------

## Access to 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)?

	<b>NO</b>	Archeologist	A. Jensen	AEJ 7/25/2016
--	-----------	--------------	-----------	---------------

## Noxious Weeds or 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)?

	<b>NO</b>	Planning and Environmental Coordinator	B. Buttazoni	BB 6/27/2016
--	-----------	--	--------------	--------------

## Approval and Contact Information

Bryant D. Smith Field Manager		Date: 7/29/16
----------------------------------	---	------------------

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