

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

**CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION
ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW AND APPROVAL**

Project Lead: Hufnagle

Field Office: Sierra Front

Lead Office: Sierra Front

Case File/Project Number: NVN 088744 Amendment/2800

Applicable Categorical Exclusion (cite section): 516 DM 11.9 E (12) Grants of right-of-way wholly within the boundaries of other compatibly developed rights-of-way.

NEPA Number: DOI-BLM-NV-C020-2012-0044-CX

Project Name: Pursel Lane ROW Amendment

Project Description: Lyon County has applied for an amendment of existing ROW NVN 088744, issued in November of 2010 for road and buried utility purposes. The existing ROW is approximately 13,890 feet long and 60 feet wide. The County has requested that overhead utility lines be allowed within the 60 foot wide ROW. They have provided plans for installation of a 25 kV power distribution line on 30 foot tall poles. Installation is scheduled for July 2012. No new disturbance is proposed outside the existing ROW. Power facilities would be constructed to NV Energy standards and would incorporate a short segment of existing facilities. Costs to bury a distribution line resulted in the proposed overhead facilities. Any equipment storage necessary for construction would be on private lands. The application for amendment includes details on location of the proposed power facilities within the ROW and also addresses termination of the line, including cutting poles off at ground level, recontouring and revegetation of any disturbed area with a BLM-approved seed mixture. Amendment of the ROW would also allow for installation of other overhead utility lines within the 60 foot wide boundary. Overhead utility lines would be used to serve mining and other private ventures on private lands in the area.

Applicant Name: Lyon County

Project Location (include Township/Range, County): Lyon County, Nevada

T 13 N, R 26 E,

sec 32, SW¹/₄SE¹/₄, SE¹/₄SE¹/₄; sec 33, SW¹/₄SW¹/₄, SE¹/₄SW¹/₄, SW¹/₄SE¹/₄, SE¹/₄SE¹/₄;

sec 34, SW¹/₄SW¹/₄, SE¹/₄SW¹/₄, SW¹/₄SE¹/₄SE¹/₄SE¹/₄; sec 35, SW¹/₄SW¹/₄ (excluding Mineral Survey No. 4893).

BLM Acres for the Project Area: No additional acreage – current ROW is 19.1 acres

Land Use Plan Conformance (cite reference/page number): Administrative Actions Administrative Actions ROW-4, #3, All applicants for right-of-way grants, whether or not they are within corridors, are subject to standard approval procedures as outlined in the right-of-way regulations (43 CFR 2800). These procedures include: 1) Preparation of an environmental document in accordance with NEPA... 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.

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)		JAT
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)		ADC hc RGC AB
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)		JAT
4. Would the Proposed Action have highly uncertain and potentially significant environmental effects or involve unique or unknown environmental risks? (project lead/P&EC)		JAT
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)		JAT
6. Would the Proposed Action have a direct relationship to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant environmental effects? (project lead/P&EC)		JAT
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)		RGC
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 AB
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)		JAT
10. Would the Proposed Action have a disproportionately high and adverse effect on low income or minority populations (EA 12898)? (project lead/P&EC)		JAT
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)		RGC
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:

Jo Ann Hufnagle, Lead Realty Specialist
Arthur Callan, Outdoor Recreation Planner

Niki Cutler, Hydrologist

Rachel Crews [INSERT NAME], Archaeologist

Pilar Ziegler, Wildlife Biologist/BLM Sensitive Species - Wildlife

Dean Tonenna, Botanist - Natural Resource Specialist/BLM Sensitive Species - Plants

Brian Buttazoni, Planning & Environmental Coordinator

DECISION: 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. It is my decision to approve the ROW amendment as proposed subject to current grant terms and conditions.

Approved by:

for 

Leon Thomas
Field Manager
Sierra Front Field Office

6/21/12

(date)