

**NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT (NEPA)
COMPLIANCE RECORD FOR CATEGORICAL EXCLUSIONS (CX)
U.S. Department of Interior
Bureau of Land Management**

PART I. – PROPOSED ACTION

BLM Office: TFO
2015-0007-CX

NEPA No.: DOI-BLM-AZ-G020-

Case File No.: PHX-086749-01

Proposed Action Title/Type: Salt River Project Agricultural Improvement and Power District (SRP) Temporary Use Permit to allow access to replace tower T-65

Applicant: Salt River Project Agricultural Improvement and Power District (SRP)

Location of Proposed Action: T. 3 S., R 13 E., Section 8, SE1/4, SE1/4. Teapot Mountain USGS Quad

Description of Proposed Action: Salt River Project Agricultural Improvement and Power District (SRP) is requesting approval to use an existing road for vehicular access to repair and replace structure T-65. The structure is part of the Ray to Superior 115kV transmission line and which was authorized by Bureau of Land Management Right-of-Way PHX-086749. The access road is approximately 0.32 miles long and 10 feet wide. The project is anticipated to begin at the end of March, 2015 and be completed by the middle of April, 2015.

On January 8, 2015, the Salt River Project Agricultural Improvement and Power District (SRP) filed an application for a Temporary Use Permit (TUP) to repair the access road which provides access to T65. The powerpole, T-65 needs to be replaced. This site is approximately 22 miles northwest of the town of Winkleman, AZ, along highway 177.

The purpose of the TUP is to repair, by grading and adding fill dirt to an existing road in order to safely transport equipment to replace the T65 power pole. Grading would only take place within the existing prism of the road.

Wildlife surveys for threatened and endangered species were conducted on February 17, 2015 and March 6, 2015. The attached stipulations will be followed as part of the proposed action. An active & authorized LR2000 record search was done on the area on March 24, 2015. There are authorized uses in the area, but none are in conflict. There are eight active mining claims., but are not being worked at this time. A field trip to the site was held on April 21, 2015. At that time the Tucson Field Office Archaeologist performed a Class III surevy covering the proposed action, in compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) No artifacts or sites were located. The attached standard stipulations will be followed for the proposed action. The area is located within the Battleaxe Grazing Allotment. This allotment is not expected to be an issue for the TUP or vice-versa.

The TUP will be issued for a six month term with the right of renewal. This authorization will be issued under Title V of FLPMA.

Part II. – PLAN CONFORMANCE REVIEW

This proposed action is subject to the following land use plan(s): This proposed action conforms, and is in accordance with the decisions of to the following land use plan: The Phoenix Resource Management Plan, September 29 1989 (Phoenix RMP).

Decisions and page nos.: Page 14. Even though it is not specifically provided for, the Phoenix RMP does allow “Land use authorizations (rights-of-way, leases, permits, easements) would continue to be issued on a case by case basis”.

Date plan approved/amended: September 29 1989

This proposed action has been reviewed for conformance with these plans (*43 CFR 1610.5-3, BLM Manual 1601.04.C.2*).

PART III. – NEPA COMPLIANCE DETERMINATION REVIEW

A. The proposed action is categorically excluded from further documentation under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) in accordance with 516 DM 11.9 E(17) Grant of a short rights-of-way for utility service or terminal access roads to an individual residence, outbuilding or water well.

This categorical exclusion is appropriate in this situation because there are no extraordinary circumstances potentially having effects that may significantly affect the environment. The proposed action has been reviewed, and none of the extraordinary circumstances described in 516 DM 2 apply.;

And

B. Extraordinary Circumstances Review: In accordance with **43 CFR 46.215**, any action that is normally categorically excluded must be subjected to sufficient environmental review to determine if it meets any of the 12 Extraordinary Circumstances described. If any circumstance applies to the action or project, and existing NEPA documentation does not adequately address it, then further NEPA analysis is required.

IMPORTANT: Appropriate staff should review the circumstances listed in Part IV, comment and initial for concurrence. Rationale supporting the concurrence should be included in the appropriate block.

Part IV. – EXTRAORDINARY CIRCUMSTANCES DOCUMENTATION

PREPARERS:

DATE:

/s/ Linda L. Dunlavey	3/23/2015
Linda L. Dunlavey REALTY SPECIALIST	
/s/ Leslie A. Uhr	6/1/2015
Leslie A. Uhr REALTY SPECIALIST TRAINEE	
/s/ Keith Hughes	3/23/2015
Keith Hughes NATURAL RESOURCE SPECIALIST	
/s/ Amy Sobiech	6/1/2015
Amy Sobiech ARCHAEOLOGIST	

/s/ Amy Markstein
PLANNING & ENVIRONMENTAL SPECIALIST

3/23/2015
DATE

The action has been reviewed to determine if any of the extraordinary circumstances (43 CFR 46.215(a)-(l)) apply. The project would:

(a) Have significant impacts on public health or safety.

Yes	No	Rationale: This action would have no significant environmental effects.
	X	
		Preparer's Initials <u>lld</u>

(b) 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 (Executive Order 11990); floodplains (Executive Order 11988); national monuments; migratory birds; and other ecologically significant or critical areas.

Yes	No X	<p>Rationale: No 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 (Executive Order 11990); floodplains (Executive Order 11988) national monuments; and other ecologically significant or critical areas exist in the affected environment nor would any of these resources be impacted. If there are any occurrences of BLM sensitive or State listed species within the project area the attached stipulations will be followed, which will mitigate any significant impacts.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Preparer's Initials <u>kh</u></p>
------------	---------------------------	--

(c) Have highly controversial environmental effects or involve unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources [NEPA section 102 (2) (E)].

Yes	No X	<p>Rationale: The proposed action is not controversial nor are there any unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Preparer's Initials <u>lld</u></p>
------------	---------------------------	---

(d) Have highly uncertain and potentially significant environmental effects or involve unique or unknown environmental risks.

Yes	No X	<p>Rationale: No significant environmental effects are known.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Preparer's Initials <u>lld</u></p>
------------	---------------------------	---

(e) Establish a precedent for future action or represent a decision in principal about future actions with potentially significant environmental effects.

Yes	No X	<p>Rationale: Future actions regarding this project, if any, would require processing in accordance with laws, regulations, and policy and does not establish a precedent for future action or represent a decision in principal about future actions with potentially significant environmental effects. Any additional proposals would be analyzed and a separate decision would be arrived at based on the analysis.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Preparer's Initials <u>kh</u></p>
------------	---------------------------	--

(f) Have a direct relationship to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant environmental effects.		
Yes	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Rationale: The effects of the proposed TUP would be limited to the issued TUP. Preparer's Initials <u>lld</u>
(g) Have significant impacts on properties listed, or eligible for listing, on the National Register of Historic Places as determined by the bureau.		
Yes	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Rationale: No properties listed, or eligible for listing, on the National Register of Historic Places are within the project area nor would any properties be affected by the proposed project because no sites have been identified on the property site. Preparer's Initials <u>as</u>
(h) 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.		
Yes	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Rationale: No listed species or species proposed to be listed are found within the project footprint for the proposed action. If there are any occurrences of BLM sensitive or State listed species within the project area the attached stipulations will be followed, which will mitigate any impacts. A threatened and endangered effects determination document was prepared as documentation for the no effects determination. Preparer's Initials <u>kh</u>
(i) Violate a Federal law, or a State, local or tribal law or requirement imposed for the protection of the environment.		
Yes	No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Rationale: No laws or requirements imposed for the protection of the environment would be violated. Preparer's Initials <u>lld</u>
(j) Have a disproportionately high and adverse effect on low income or minority populations (Executive Order 12898).		

Yes	No X	<p>Rationale: The effects to the population as a whole resulting from the proposed action would be the same.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Preparer's Initials <u>lld</u></p>
<p>(k) 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 (Executive Order 13007).</p>		
Yes	No X	<p>Rationale: No limitations to access sacred or any other sites would result from the proposed action.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Preparer's Initials <u>as</u></p>
<p>(l) Contribute to the introduction, continued existence, or spread of noxious weeds or non-native invasive 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 Executive Order 13112).</p>		
Yes	No X	<p>Rationale: Any contribution to spread on noxious weeds or non-native invasive species will be mitigated by following the attached stipulations.</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Preparer's Initials <u>kh</u></p>
<p>PART V. –COMPLIANCE REVIEW CONCLUSION</p> <p>I have reviewed this plan conformance and NEPA compliance record, and have determined that the proposed project is in conformance with the approved land use plan and that no further environmental analysis is required.</p> <p>MITIGATION MEASURES/OTHER REMARKS: See Attached.</p> <p>APPROVING OFFICIAL: /s/ Melissa Warren 06/02/2015 Acting Tucson Field Manager</p> <p>APPROVING OFFICIAL: _____ DATE: _____</p> <p>TITLE: _____</p>		

Note: The signed conclusion on this compliance record is part of an interim step in the BLM's internal decision process and does not constitute an appealable decision. A separate decision to implement the action should be prepared in accordance with program specific guidance.