

CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION DOCUMENTATION

DOI-BLM-ID-B030-2015-0006-CX

A. BACKGROUND

BLM Office: Owyhee Field Office

Lease/Serial/Case File No.: IDI-013445

Proposed Action Title/Type: Northwest Pipeline Company's amendment of CPS #1511

Location of Proposed Action:

Boise Meridian, Owyhee County, Idaho
T. 16 S., R. 2 W.,
sec. 29, Lot 4.

1. Description of Proposed Action:

Northwest Pipeline LLC (NWP) has found it necessary to replace existing Cathodic Protection Station (CPS) #1511 in service on its Reno pipelines in Owyhee County, Idaho. This project would also envelope the extra work space (EWS) as part of the permanent ROW width. This would allow NWP to maintain and replace anodes within their ROW without filing for an amendment every time.

A conventional CPS site consists of a power pole, a rectifier located on the same pole, electrical cable and anodes placed in a trench at a depth between 5 and 7 feet as illustrated on the attached drawing. Approximately 386 feet of positive cable, some contained in the Reno meter station leading from an existing rectifier northwesterly to 200 feet of new buried anodes in a trench parallel to existing depleted anodes.

Construction is expected to start in late summer 2015 to minimize potential effects to nesting or brooding avian species. Construction would last approximately 7 days. The electrical cable and anodes would be replaced within the fenced area of the existing Reno meter station and parallel to the existing anodes as illustrated on Appendix A. This work would be completed using rubber-tired backhoe. The new requested ROW is necessary for placement of the anodes and excavation equipment. The new anode bed would be installed directly adjacent to the existing anode bed. The area would be trenched and cables placed (approximately 24" deep) and approximately 30 anodes would be placed 6' deep on 7' centers.

The EWS would allow for equipment to move along the ROW. Water trucks would be used, as needed, for dust suppression. The area would be contoured and reclaimed as needed. A seed mix is included in Appendix B, Plan of Development.

B. LAND USE PLAN CONFORMANCE

This proposed Action is subject to the following land use plan: Owyhee RMP

Date Plan Approved: 12/30/1999

The proposed action is in conformance with the LUP, even though it is not specifically provided for, because it is clearly consistent with the following LUP decision(s) (objectives, terms, and conditions):

LAND 3, Management Actions and Allocations, item 4 provides that applications for use authorizations such as rights-of-way, permits, leases, and other realty actions be processed in a timely manner on a site-specific basis utilizing the NEPA process as well as current existing laws and regulations (p.31).

C: COMPLIANCE WITH NEPA:

The proposed action is categorically excluded from further documentation under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) in accordance with 516 DM 11.9 (12).

Category Description: Grants of right-of-way wholly within the boundaries of other compatibly developed rights-of-way. This categorical exclusion is appropriate in this situation because there are no extraordinary circumstances that would introduce potential 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.

The following list of Extraordinary Circumstances (516 DM 2, Appendix 2) was considered:

1. Have significant impacts on public health or safety.

Comments/Explanation:

The Proposed Action would not have any significant impacts to public health or safety.

Specialist Signature/Date: /s/ Katie White Bull / May 6, 2015

2. 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; or ecologically significant or critical areas, or is not in compliance with the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act.

Comments/Explanation:

No resources have been identified by the interdisciplinary team as being impacted by this action. There would be no adverse effects on natural resources.

Specialist Signature/Date: /s/ Katie White Bull / May 6, 2015

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

Comments/Explanation:

Resource specialists did not identify any highly controversial environmental effects or unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources.

Specialist Signature/Date: /s/ Katie White Bull / May 6, 2015

4. Have highly uncertain and potentially significant environmental effects or involve unique or unknown environmental risks.

Comments/Explanation:

BLM specialists reviewed the proposed project and determined there are no uncertain and potentially significant environmental effects, nor are there any unique or unknown environmental risks.

Specialist Signature/Date: /s/ Katie White Bull / May 6, 2015

5. Establish a precedent for future actions or represent a decision in principle about future actions with potentially significant environmental effects.

Comments/Explanation:

This ROW would establish no precedent for future actions, nor would it represent a decision in principal for future actions with potentially significant environmental effects.

Specialist Signature/Date: /s/ Katie White Bull / May 6, 2015

6. Have a direct relationship to other actions with individually insignificant, but cumulatively significant environmental effects.

Comments/Explanation:

The proposed authorization was reviewed by BLM specialists and it was determined that there would be no additive or cumulative impacts.

Specialist Signature/Date: /s/ Katie White Bull / May 6, 2015

7. Have significant impacts on properties listed or eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places as determined by either the bureau or office.

Comments/Explanation:

The BLM Archaeologist reviewed this project and determined there would be no adverse effects on properties listed or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places.

Specialist Signature/Date: /s/ Kelli Barnes / September 29, 2015

8. Have significant impacts on species listed or proposed to be listed on the List of Endangered or Threatened Species, or on designated Critical Habitat for these species.

Comments/Explanation:

The BLM botanist reviewed and determined that Threatened or Endangered species and their habitat would not be impacted.

Plants Specialist Signature/Date: /s/ Elizabeth Corbin / August 6, 2015

Comments/Explanation:

It was determined that Threatened or Endangered species and their habitat would not be impacted due to the small amount of disturbance and timing restrictions.

Specialist Signature/Date: /s/ Katie White Bull / May 6, 2015

Comments/Explanation:

It was determined that Threatened or Endangered species and their habitat would not be impacted due to the small amount of disturbance and lack of water in the area.

Specialist Signature/Date: /s/ Katie White Bull / May 6, 2015

9. Violate a Federal, State, local, or tribal law or requirement imposed for the protection of the environment.

Comments/Explanation:

The proposal is in conformance with appropriate Federal and State statutes, and county ordinances.

Specialist Signature/Date: /s/ Katie White Bull / May 6, 2015

