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

CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION
ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW AND APPROVAL

Project Lead: Ardith Collins
Field Office: Sierra Front
Lead Office: Sierra Front
Case File/Project Number: NVN 092380 (Old Number NVN 0 060520)
Applicable Categorical Exclusion: 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-C020-2014-0022-CX

Project Name: Smith Valley-Topaz Sub SPPC ROW Renewal

Project Description: Sierra Pacific Power Company (SPPC) has applied for the renewal of an existing Right-of-Way (ROW) grant, NVN 092380, for an existing 23kV Over Head (O/H) power line that was constructed in September, 1964. The existing authorization expired on September 19, 2013 and so the 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 NW quarter of the section and continues for 23,235.1 feet in length and 40 feet in width. The O/H distribution line is currently operational and will remain in use after the grant is re-issued. The original ROW was issued to SPPC on September 20, 1963 for a term of fifty (50) years. The conversion of the pre-FLPMA to a FLPMA authorization would be for a term of thirty (30) years.

Does the project include new surface disturbing activities? ☐Yes ☒No
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
Is the project located within proposed critical habitat for bi-state sage-grouse? ☒Yes ☐No

The project area is southeast of the Pine Nut Mountains crest. The nearest telemetry data for bi-state sage-grouse (*Centrocercus urophasianus*) is approximately four miles west of the power line. The north segment is west of the public/private land boundary and residential lot development. Based on telemetry data, this area is unoccupied and this renewal would have "no effect" to the proposed threatened bi-state sage-grouse, and renewing this powerline would not further modify the proposed critical habitat.

Applicant Name: Sierra Pacific Power Company

Project Location (include Township/Range, County): Douglas and Lyon Counties
T. 10 N., R. 23 E., secs. 4, 5, 7, and 8;
T. 10 N., R. 23 E., secs. 22, 27, 33, and 34.

BLM Acres for the Project Area: 21.34.

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.

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

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:

B L Brettys

ACTING FOR Leon Thomas
Field Manager
Sierra Front Field Office

6/17/2014
(date)