

U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management
Carson City District Office

**CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION
ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW AND APPROVAL**

Project Lead: Erik Pignata

Field Office: Sierra Front

Lead Office: Sierra Front

Case File/Project Number: NVN 090156 (reserialization of NVN 020443)

Applicable Categorical Exclusion (cite section):

516 DM 11.5; Appendix 4 – 151, 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.”

NEPA Number: DOI-BLM-NV-2012-C020-0034-CX

Project Name: Breeden Overhead Power Line Renewal

Project Description:

On March 7, 2009, a distribution line authorization held by SPPC expired. On August 17, 2011, the holder applied for renewal. Under current policy, we cannot use the same serial number to renew such a request. Thus, the old case, NVN 020443, has been reserialized as NVN 090156. Other than that, this is a renewal of the old authorization with nothing new proposed.

The line itself is 7,376 feet long by 25 feet wide, for a total acreage of 4.23 acres, carrying a voltage of 12.5 kV. It is an overhead line strung on wooden monopoles. The portion on public land is a span between two landlocked private parcels, heading generally in a west to east direction, crossing Pinenut Road due west of the intersection with Out-R-Way road, and having a short spur run north along a private access road called Wheaton Lane. All of these features are a few miles east of the Douglas County dump and the Single Tree access area.

This would be a standard FLPMA grant renewal of current, authorized facilities for 30 years. The only thing that will change is the serial number and the special stipulation found below.

Applicant Name: Sierra Pacific Power Company (SPPC) d/b/a NV Energy

Project Location (include Township/Range, County):

Mount Diablo Meridian

T. 12 N., R. 21 E.,
sec. 16, SE $\frac{1}{4}$ NE $\frac{1}{4}$, N $\frac{1}{2}$ S $\frac{1}{2}$;
sec. 17, NE $\frac{1}{4}$ SE $\frac{1}{4}$.

This line is located in Douglas County, Nevada.

BLM Acres for the Project Area: 4.23 acres

Land Use Plan Conformance (cite reference/page number):

LND-7, #6: "Exchanges and minor non-Bureau initiated realty proposals will be considered where analysis indicates they are beneficial to the public."

Name of Plan: NV – Carson City RMP.

Special Stipulation:

a. The holder shall contact the BLM and obtain approval from the authorized officer before beginning any activity that is a substantial deviation from this grant or that will cause new surface disturbance.

Quad: Gardnerville, 1997

Screening of Extraordinary Circumstances: The following extraordinary circumstances apply to individual actions within categorical exclusions (43 CFR 46.215). The BLM has considered the following criteria:

(Specialist review: initial in appropriate box)

<i>If any question is answered 'yes' an EA or EIS must be prepared.</i>	YES	NO
1. Would the Proposed Action have significant impacts on public health or safety? (project lead/P&EC)		EGP
2. Would the Proposed Action have significant impacts on such natural resources and unique geographic characteristics as historic or cultural resources; park, recreation or refuge lands; wilderness areas; wild or scenic rivers; national natural landmarks; sole or principal drinking water aquifers; prime farmlands; wetlands (EO 11990); floodplains (EO 11988); national monuments; migratory birds (EO 13186); and other ecologically significant or critical areas? (wildlife biologist, hydrologist, outdoor recreation planner, archeologist)		nc PZ RC
3. Would the Proposed Action have highly controversial environmental effects or involve unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources [NEPA 102(2)(E)]? (project lead/P&EC)		EGP
4. Would the Proposed Action have highly uncertain and potentially significant environmental effects or involve unique or unknown environmental risks? (project lead/P&EC)		EGP
5. Would the Proposed Action establish a precedent for future action or represent a decision in principle about future actions with potentially significant environmental effects? (project lead/P&EC)		EGP
6. Would the Proposed Action have a direct relationship to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant environmental effects? (project lead/P&EC)		EGP
7. Would the Proposed Action have significant impacts on properties listed, or eligible for listing, on the NRHP as determined by the bureau or office? (archeologist)		RC
8. Would the Proposed Action 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? (wildlife biologist, botanist)		BT/PZ
9. Would the Proposed Action violate federal law, or a State, local or tribal law or requirement imposed for the protection of the environment? (project lead/P&EC)		EGP
10. Would the Proposed Action have a disproportionately high and adverse effect on low income or minority populations (EA 12898)? (project lead/P&EC)		EGP
11. Would the Proposed Action 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 (EO 13007)? (archeologist)		RC
12. Would the Proposed Action 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 (Federal Noxious Weed Control Act and EO 13112)? (botanist)		BT/

SPECIALISTS' REVIEW: During ID Team consideration of the above Proposed Action and extraordinary circumstances, the following specialists reviewed this CX:

- Erik Pignata, Realty Specialist
- Arthur Callan, Outdoor Recreation Planner
- Niki Cutler, Hydrologist
- Rachel Crews, Archaeologist
- Pilar Ziegler, Wildlife Biologist/BLM Sensitive Species - Wildlife
- Dean Tonenna, Botanist - Natural Resource Specialist/BLM Sensitive Species - Plants
- Brian Buttazoni, Planning & Environmental Coordinator

Although BLM Sensitive Species is not described in one of the 12 extraordinary circumstances question, review of the applicability of this CX has taken them into consideration.

CONCLUSION: Based upon the review of this Proposed Action, I have determined that the above-described project is a categorical exclusion, in conformance with the LUP, and does not require an EA or EIS. A categorical exclusion is not subject to protest or appeal.

Approved by:

for James W Schulte
Leon Thomas
Field Manager
Sierra Front Field Office

5/2/2012
(Date)