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 091520/2800 (Old Number NVN 0 055204)
Applicable Categorical Exclusion (cite section): 516 DM 11.5 E (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-C020-2013-0010-CX

Project Name: Honker Ranch Power Line, Sierra Pacific Power Company (SPPC)

Project Description: Sierra Pacific Power Company (SPPC) has applied for the renewal of an existing Right-of-Way (ROW) grant, NVN 0055204, for an existing 23KV Over Head (O/H) distribution power line that was constructed in March, 1962. The BLM does not renew pre-FLPMA right-of-way authorizations, the holder must apply for a new authorization under FLPMA. The existing authorization expired on May 17, 2010 and so BLM will need to convert the pre-FLPMA ROW Grant to a FLPMA ROW Grant authorization. The existing O/H distribution power line begins in the SE1/4 of the NW1/4, Township 12 North, Range 23 East, Section 13, Mount Diablo Meridian and terminates at the Honker Ranch located in the SW1/4 of the NE1/4 of Township 12 North, Range 23 East, Section 11, Mount Diablo Meridian. The O/H distribution power line is currently operational and will remain in use after the grant is re-issued. The original ROW was issued to SPPC on May 18, 1960, for a term of fifty (50) years and expired on May 17, 2010. The conversion of the pre-FLPMA to a FLPMA authorization would be for a term of 30 years.

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):
Mt. Diablo Meridian

T. 12 N., R. 23 E.,
sec. 11, E1/2SE1/4.
sec. 13, E1/2NW1/4.

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:

If any question is answered 'yes' an EA or EIS must be prepared.	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

BLM Acres for the Project Area: 3,727' (feet) long x 25' (feet) wide and containing 2.14 acres. The original ROW was 4,397' (feet) long x 100' (feet) wide and contained 10.09 acres.

Land Use Plan Conformance (cite reference/page number): Page LND-7 states "non-bureau initiated realty proposals would be considered where analysis indicates they are beneficial to the public".

Name of Plan: NV – Carson City RMP.

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

Outdoor Recreation Planner: Arthur Callan AC

Hydrologist: Niki Cutler NC

Archaeologist: Jim Carter ___ or Rachel Crews RC

Wildlife Biologist: Pilar Ziegler PZ

Botanist: Dean Tonenna DT

Planning & Environmental Coordinator: Brian Buttazoni BZB

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

Wild Horse and Burro Specialist: John Axtell BZB

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 Leon Thomas
Field Manager
Sierra Front Field Office

1/2/2013
(date)