

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

**LAKE HAVASU FIELD OFFICE
Southwest Transmission Cooperative, Inc.
Pesticide Use Permit
Bullhead City, Arizona
DOI-BLM-AZ-C030-2014-0028-EA**

Determination

On the basis of the information contained in the Southwest Transmission Cooperative, Inc. (SWTC) Environmental Assessment (DOI-BLM-AZ-C030-2014-0028-EA), I have determined that the Proposed Action does not constitute a federal action having a significant effect on the human environment. Therefore an environmental impact statement (EIS) is not required.

This finding is based on my consideration of the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) criteria for significance (40 CFR 1508.27), both with regard to the *context* and *intensity* of the impacts described in the EA.

Context

On May 15, 1981, Arizona Electric Power Cooperative, Inc. (AEPSCO) was issued a right-of-way and authorization to construct an electric transmission line and electric substation. Southwest Transmission Cooperative Services, Inc. (SWTC) was formed in 2001, as a result of the restructuring of AEPSCO, in which the transmission portion of AEPSCO was separated to become a transmission cooperative, SWTC. The BLM right-of-way grant AZA 14908 and associated rights and responsibilities were subsequently assigned to SWTC. Right-of-way AZA 14908 was noted as excepted and reserved when the land was given in-lieu to the State of Arizona under clearlist 580. Right-of-way AZA 14908 is located on the north side of North Oatman Road in Bullhead City (see Appendix B – Map).

Intensity

1) Impacts that may be both beneficial and adverse.

None of the environmental consequences discussed in detail in the EA are considered significant nor do the consequences exceed any known threshold of significance, either beneficial or adverse. The Proposed Action consists of issuing a Pesticide Use Permit (PUP) on a right-of-way. No new disturbance is authorized.

2) The degree to which the Proposed Action affects public health or safety.

The Proposed Action will not result in any impacts to public health and safety. Pesticide use during regular maintenance will be conducted in conformance with all Federal and State requirements to protect health and safety.

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

The project area is located on public lands administered by the Lake Havasu Field Office. There are no farmlands, wetlands, wild and scenic rivers, or ecologically critical areas in the project area.

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

The Proposed Action would provide for continued weed abatement in the right-of-way. Effects on the quality of human environment are not expected to be controversial.

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

There are no highly uncertain or unique or unknown risks in implementation of the Proposed Action.

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 Proposed Action would not establish a precedent for future actions with significant effects. Any other actions would be subject to separate analysis under NEPA.

7) Whether the action is related to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant impacts.

Past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions have been considered in the cumulative impacts analysis within Section 3 of the EA. The cumulative impacts analysis examined all of the other appropriate actions and determined that the Proposed Action will not incrementally contribute to significant impacts on any resources that are present and may be affected by the Proposed Action.

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

No historic resources have been identified within the project area. Design features within the EA prohibit surface disturbing actions outside of the right-of-way, therefore limiting impacts to potential historic or cultural resources located outside of the project area.

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.

No federally listed species under the ESA, or critical habitat for such species, are present on, or in the vicinity of, the road right-of-way and therefore would not be impacted by the Proposed Action.

10) Whether the action threatens a violation of federal, state, or local law or requirements imposed for the protection of the environment.

The Proposed Action is in conformance with the Lake Havasu Field Office Resource Management Plan (2007). The action does not violate any known federal, state, local or tribal law or requirement imposed for the protection of the environment.

FONSI

I have reviewed this environmental assessment including the discussion of environmental impacts. I have determined that the Proposed Action with the mitigation measures described below will not have any significant impacts on the human environment and that an Environmental Impact Statement is not required. I have determined that the proposed project is in conformance with the approved land use plan.

/s/Kimber Liebhauser Authenticated by S. Ahrens
Kimber Liebhauser
Field Manager,
Lake Havasu Field Office

9/11/14
Date