

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

**CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION
ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW AND APPROVAL**

Project Lead: Perry Wickham

Field Office: Sierra Front

Lead Office: Sierra Front

Case File/Project Number: NVN 046713

Applicable Categorical Exclusion (cite section): 516 DM 11.5 E (12) Grants of right-of-way wholly within the boundaries of other compatibly developed rights-of-way.

NEPA Number: DOI-BLM-NV-C020-2013-0006-CX

Project Name: NVN 046713 Amendment (power line extension)

Project Description: Sierra Pacific Power Company proposes to extend approximately 50 feet of electric service line from an existing transformer, across an existing gravel road, to an existing electric junction or pull box. Install a 200 amp meter panel near the existing transformer where the electric service line will originate. The existing junction or pull box was installed under a separate ROW grant and includes several buried conduits that serves an existing communication structure approximately 330 feet to the NNE. The existing communications structure, under separate ROW grant, proposes to be expanded and will require separate metered electric service. Construction of the proposed electric service line extension will begin following the issuance of an ROW grant and will take approximately one day to complete.

Is the project located within preliminary general habitat for sage-grouse? Yes No

Is the project located within preliminary priority habitat for sage-grouse? Yes No

Applicant Name: Sierra Pacific Power Company

Project Location (include Township/Range, County): Washoe County
Mount Diablo Meridian

T. 22 N., R. 22 E.,
sec. 24, SW1/4

BLM Acres for the Project Area: 0.03 Acres (50' x 25')

Land Use Plan Conformance: Page LND-7 (6) states "Exchanges and minor non-bureau initiated realty proposals would 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:

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

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

Realty Specialist: Perry Wickham PW or Erik Pignata ___

Outdoor Recreation Planner: Arthur Callan A

Hydrologist: Niki Cutler NC

Archaeologist: Jim Carter ___ or Rachel Crews RC

Wildlife Biologist: Pilar Ziegler PZ

Botanist: Dean Tonenna D

Planning & Environmental Coordinator: Brian Buttazoni BB

Range Management Specialist: Katrina Leavitt ___ or Ryan Leary R or Kathryn Dyer ___

Wild Horse and Burro Specialist: John Axtell J

Geologist: Dan Erbes DE or Joel Hartmann ___

Forester: Coreen Francis CF

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.

Approved by:

for Jana W Schmidt
Leon Thomas
Field Manager
Sierra Front Field Office

December 18, 2012
(date)