UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT - APPLEGATE FIELD OFFICE

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

Boulder Reservoir Gravel Free Use Permit

EA # DOI-BLM-CA-N070-2015-010-EA

INTRODUCTION

The Bureau of Land Management (BLM), Applegate Field Office, has conducted an environmental assessment (EA # DOI-BLM-CA-N070-2015-010-EA) for the issuance of free use permits to the Washoe County Road Department and BLM for operation of a gravel pit in northern Washoe County, Nevada.

PROPOSED ACTION

The proposed action would result in the issuance of Free-Use Permits to WCRD and BLM for the development and use of a new 10 acre gravel pit on BLM lands near Boulder reservoir road. The proposed gravel pit would be located in northern Washoe County, Nevada, specifically within the northeastern corner of Township 41 N., Range 20 E., section 34. The Free-Use Permits would allow the County and BLM to mine and extract up to 5,000 yards of material annually from the pit for a 10-year term.

Future mining operation in the pits would occur for the next 10 years. Total permitted extraction would be 50,000 yards per pit during that period. All hauling would occur on BLM and county maintained roads. The mining plan would be to excavate material from the walls of the pit, generally working toward the pit's proposed boundaries. The material would then be placed in stockpiles within the pit and when necessary to meet road bed or other specification, passing it through a portable crusher and screen to produce road base gravel or chips, Replenishment of the stockpiles would occur throughout the year as needed, generally between the months of April and November. Excavation at this pit would remain at least 75 feet from intermittent drainages. Prior to disturbance of any new surface, topsoil would be removed and stored on-site. As excavation continues, the sides of the pits would be sloped at not greater than 3:1 horizontal to vertical.

There would be no explosives used at this pit. The pit would be authorized for 10 acres however it is likely only 4-5 acres would be disturbed in the first 5 years. The pit would be expanded to the 10 acres over the life of the pit.

The Standard Operating Procedures and Stipulations contained in Appendix 1 of the EA will be included as stipulations to the Free Use Permits.

PLAN CONFORMANCE AND CONSISTENCY

This proposed action is subject to the following use plan(s): Surprise Resource Management Plan (RMP) and Records of Decision (ROD), approved on April 2008. The proposed action has been determined to be in conformance with these plans as required by regulation (43 CFR 1610.5-3(a)). "Provide mineral materials for local, state, and federal agencies and meet public demand." See page 2-13

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT DETERMINATION

It is my determination that the proposed action will not result in significant impacts to the quality of the human environment. Thus, the project does not constitute a major federal action having a significant effect on the human environment. Therefore, an environmental impact statement (EIS) is not necessary and will not be

prepared. This conclusion is based on my consideration of the Council on Environmental Quality's criteria for significance (40 CFR §1508.27) regarding the context and intensity of the impacts described in the Barrows Allotment Livestock Grazing Permit Renewal Environmental Assessment (EA). The criteria include:

1. Impacts may be both beneficial and adverse. A significant effect may exist even if the Federal agency believes that on balance the effect will be beneficial.

I have determined that none of the direct, indirect or cumulative impacts are significant individually or combined.

2. The degree to which the selected alternative will affect public health or safety.

The proposed action is located within a rural setting. There are no actions that are proposed that would affect public health or safety. Increasing the ability of the WCRD and BLM to maintain roads in northern Washoe County is likely to increase public safety by improving the condition of the roads.

3. Unique characteristics of the geographic area such as proximity to historic or cultural resources, park lands, prime farm lands, wetlands, wilderness, wild and scenic rivers, or ecologically critical areas.

A discussion of cultural resources is located in chapter 3 of the EA. Adequate measures have been taken to identify any potential resources and implement protective measures prior to treatments.

4. The degree to which the effects on the quality of the human environment are likely to be highly controversial.

An interdisciplinary team reviewed the proposed action and the impacts that would result on the identified issues/resources. No anticipated effects have been identified that are controversial.

5. The degree to which the possible effects on the human environment are highly uncertain or involve unique or unknown risks.

The actions that would be implemented do not involve unique or unknown risks. The BLM has experience implementing similar actions in similar areas. Based on the attached EA, there are no predicted effects on the human environment that are considered to be highly uncertain or involve unique or unknown risks.

6. The degree to which the action may establish a precedent for future actions with significant effects or represents a decision in principle about a future consideration.

The alternatives described in the EA are not precedent setting and are limited in scope.

7. Whether the action is related to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant impacts – which include connected actions regardless of land ownership.

The actions considered in the selected alternative were considered by the interdisciplinary team within the context of past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions. Significant cumulative effects are not predicted on the identified issues. An analysis of the cumulative effects of the selected alternative and all other alternatives is described in chapter 4 of the EA.

***8.* The degree to which the action may adversely affect districts, sites, highways, structures, or other objects listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places or may cause loss or destruction of significant scientific, cultural, or historical resources.**

The gravel pit would encompass 10 BLM managed acres of which have been surveyed for cultural resources. In general, the pits are considered to have low sensitivity due to the relative lack of water and

previous disturbance. No National Register eligible sites or other significant scientific, cultural or historical resources would found.

9. The degree to which the action may adversely affect an endangered or threatened species or its habitat that has been determined to be critical under the Endangered Species Act of 1973, or the degree to which the action may adversely affect: 1) a proposed to be listed endangered or threatened species or its habitat, or 2) a species on BLM's sensitive species list.

There are no threatened or endangered species occurring within the Project Areas that would be affected by the selected alternative. The Greater sage-grouse, a candidate species, does occur near the project area. The EA determined that impacts to sage-grouse and its habitat would be limited in scope.

10. Whether the action threatens a violation of a federal, state, local, or tribal law, regulation or policy imposed for the protection of the environment, where nonfederal requirements are consistent with federal requirements.

The project does not violate any known federal, state, local or tribal law or requirement imposed for the protection of the environment. Local tribes were contacted and are listed in the EA. In addition, the project is consistent with applicable land management plans, policies, and programs.

/s/ Dennis A. Sylvia 4/18/2015

Dennis A. Sylvia PhD., Applegate Field Manager Date