

General Location: The project location is Douglas City, Trinity County, California.

Legal Location: M.D.M. T. 33N., R. 9W., section, 4, lot 15 and 16;
T. 32N., R. 9W., section 5, lot 5.

Map Location: Douglas City, CA 7.5' topo quad. See attached project map

A. Description of Proposed Action, including any Stipulations

Verizon of California has applied to renew an existing telephone line under case file number CACA 15577, in Shasta County. The telephone was originally authorized in 1984; an Environmental Assessment EA-84-45 was completed in 1984. The telephone line is 1,974 feet long by 10 feet wide containing .45 acres. Verizon is requesting a 30 year term. The telephone line right-of-way would authorize the maintenance and continued use of the existing telephone line. No additional ground disturbing activities are being proposed outside of their existing right-of-way.

B. Land Use Plan Conformance

The proposed project area is located within the Trinity Management Area in the Redding Resource Management Plan (RMP) and June 1993 Record of Decision. The proposed action is in the conformance and it is specifically provided for and is clearly consistent with the RMP objectives and decisions as follows on page 18 under Land Use Authorizations stating, "*Land use authorization (rights-of-way, leases, permits will continue to be issued on a case-by-case basis and in accordance with decisions established in the RMP.*"

C. Compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act

The action is categorically excluded from further documentation under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) in accordance with 516 DM 11.9 Appendix 4 (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.*"

This categorical exclusion is appropriate for this action 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, Appendix 2 apply (see Attachment 1). Supplement authorities that are considered include cultural resources, National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), as amended (16 USC 470), (see attached NHPA compliance form).

An Archaeological Reconnaissance was conducted on August 23, 1984, by Charlene Bailey, Archaeological Technician and reviewed by Dr. Eric Ritter, BLM Archaeologist. The report indicates one historic site present in the vicinity of the ROW, CA-030-232, a rock walls and platform formation (see attached record). An historic dredge and flumes were located in the vicinity but were away from the impact zone.

On August 28, 2015, BLM staff walked the existing project site right-of-way. No archeological concerns were identified. No traditional cultural properties or sites of heritage value to Native Americans were known or identified within the project area. No sensitive species were found.

No sensitive plant species are recorded in the California Natural Diversity Database for this area.

The Theodoratus Cultural Research 1985 *Mapping Project, Ethnographic Inventory Shasta-Trinity National Forest, Mendocino National Forest (Corning and Stonyford Ranger Districts) and Redding Resource Area, Bureau of Land Management* was reviewed. No intact cultural resources were noted during the records review.

The project area is within and or adjacent to the boundaries of the Northwest Forest Plan. On December 17, 2009, the U.S. District Court for the Western District of Washington issued an order in *Conservation Northwest, et al. v. Sherman, et al.*, No. 08-1067-JCC (W.D. Wash.), granting Plaintiffs' motion for partial summary judgment and finding NEPA violations in the Final Supplemental to the 2004 Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement to Remove or Modify the Survey and Manage Mitigation Measure Standards and Guidelines (USDA and USDI, June 2007). In response, parties entered into settlement negotiations in April 2010, and the Court filed approval of the resulting Settlement Agreement on July 6, 2011. Projects that are within the range of the northern spotted owl are subject to the survey and management standards and guidelines in the 2001 ROD, as modified by the 2011 Settlement Agreement.

I considered potential adverse impacts on natural and cultural resources causes by this action and specific mitigation treatments, provided by the resources specialists, were incorporated into the grant. Project resources were identified and measures will be taken to mitigate any impacts on the proposed action. For this reason there is no foreseeable potential for significant impacts.

D. Signature


Jennifer Mata
Field Manager

11/5/14

Date

E. Contact

For more information, contact Lindsey Moyer, Realty Specialists at 530-224-2121.

Review of Extraordinary Circumstances

The Department of the Interior Manual 516 2.3A (3) requires review of the following “extraordinary circumstances” (516 DM 2 Appendix 2) to determine if an otherwise categorically excluded action would require additional environmental analysis/documentation.

1) *Have significant impact on public health or safety.*

Yes No

Comments: The proposed action does not have a significant impact on public health and safety.

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; and other ecologically significant or critical areas.*

Yes No

Comments: On August 28, 2015, BLM staff walked the existing project site right-of-way. No archeological concerns were identified. No traditional cultural properties or sites of heritage value to Native Americans were known or identified within the project area. No sensitive species were found. No sensitive plant species are recorded in the California Natural Diversity Database for this area.

The right-of-way would authorize the continued use and maintenance of an existing telephone line across public lands. Construction and past maintenance of this improvement has not impacted any of the listed resources. Future impacts from continued use and maintenance of the telephone line are not anticipated.

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

Yes No

Comments: There will be no highly controversial environmental effects or involve unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources.

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

Yes No

Comments: This project will not have any highly uncertain and potentially significant environmental effects or involve unique or unknown environmental risks.

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

Yes No

Comments: This project will not establish a precedent for future action or represent a decision in principle about future actions with potentially significant environmental effects.

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

Yes No

Comments: The proposed right-of-way renewal will allow for continued use and maintenance of a telephone line, the proposed action is individually insignificant and sensitive resources are not known to be affected by the aggregate of development activity in this area. Cumulative impacts from the proposed action are therefore, not anticipated.

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.*

Yes No

Comments: An Archaeological Reconnaissance was conducted on August 23, 1984, by Charlene Bailey, Archaeological Technician and reviewed by Dr. Eric Ritter, BLM Archaeologist. The report indicates one historic site present in the vicinity of the ROW, CA-030-232, a rock walls and platform formation (see attached record). An historic dredge and flumes were located in the vicinity but were away from the impact zone.

The project area has been surveyed on August 26, 2015, for cultural resources with no sites found, as mentioned in the Decision Record, and found within the archaeological report, by Eric Ritter, Archaeologist. It has been determined that there are no eligible sites that may be affected, as a result of the proposed action.

8) *Have an effect on species listed, or proposed to be listed, on the List of Endangered or Threatened Species, or have significant impacts on designated Critical Habitat.*

Yes No

Comments: The proposed action was reviewed by Gary Diridoni, BLM Biologist. The site does not contain suitable habitat for any species listed, or proposed for listing, on the list of T&E Species, including designated Critical Habitat. On August 26, 2015, BLM Forest Ecologist Laura Broadhead surveyed the proposed project site for T&E plants. No sensitive plants, including T&E species, were discovered during the survey. In addition, no sensitive plants are included in the California Natural Diversity Database for the project area.

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

Yes No

Comments: This project will not violate a Federal law, or a State, local, or tribal law or requirement imposed for the protection of the environment.

10) *Have a disproportionately high and adverse effect on low income or minority populations (Executive Order 12898).*

Yes No

Comments: This action will not have a disproportionately high and adverse effect on low income or minority populations.

11) *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).*

Yes No

Comments: There are no known Indian sacred sites in the project area and therefore, the proposed action will not limit access to ceremonial use or Indian sacred sites.

12) *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).*

Yes No

Comments: None Identified.

Redding Field Office Consistency Review of Northwest Forest Plan Implementation

Does the proposed action occur within either the California Klamath or California Cascades Physiographic Zones of the Northwest Forest Plan?

Yes No

The project occurs within the California Klamath/Cascades Mountains Physiographic Zone of the Northwest Forest Plan.

1.A. Projects that comply with the Pechman Exemption(Attachment 1).

Does the proposed action meet an existing exemption category (2006 Pechman Exemption)

Yes No

1.B. Projects that Comply With the 2001 Survey and Manage Record of Decision and Plan Amendment with Subsequent ASRs except for the Red Tree Vole (Attachment 1).

The project area has been examined for the three required survey criteria, which include 1. Does the project area occur within the range of the species?

Yes No

Comments: The following species have the potential to occur in Trinity County: Siskiyou Sideband, Blue-Gray Taildropper, and Tehema Chaparral. The access road is not suitable habitat.

2. Does the project contain suitable habitat

Yes No

Comments: The right-of-way power line is not suitable habitat and does not occur in limestone, riparian or forested landscape. The power line is on the edge of marginal habitat for S&M Species.

3. Does the project negatively affect the species or habitat?

Yes No

Comments: With no new construction proposed, the continued use of the existing power line does not negatively affect the species or their habitat.

The project does not meet the three required survey criteria; therefore, surveys are not required.

2. Aquatic Conservation Strategy (ACS) Compliance

Will the proposed action prevent or retard attainment of any of the ACS objectives, below, in the long term at both the site and watershed level.

Yes No

1. *The Proposed Action would maintain or have no effect upon the distribution, diversity, and complexity of watershed and landscape-scale features to ensure protection of the aquatic systems to which species, populations, and communities are uniquely adapted.*
2. *The Proposed Action would maintain or have no effect upon the spatial and temporal connectivity within and between watersheds.*
3. *The Proposed Action would maintain or have no effect upon the physical integrity of the aquatic system.*
4. *The Proposed Action would maintain or have no effect upon water quality necessary to support healthy riparian, aquatic, and wetland ecosystems.*
5. *The Proposed Action would maintain or have no effect upon the sediment regime under which this aquatic ecosystem evolved.*
6. *The Proposed Action would maintain or have no effect upon in-stream flows.*
7. *The Proposed Action would maintain or have no effect upon the timing, variability, and duration of floodplain inundation and water table elevation in meadows and wetlands.*
8. *The Proposed Action would maintain or have no effect upon species composition and structural diversity of plant communities in riparian areas and wetlands.*
9. *The Proposed Action would maintain or have no effect upon habitat which supports well-distributed populations of native plant, invertebrate and vertebrate riparian-dependent species.*

The proposed project will have no effect on ACS compliance and will not prevent or retard attainment of any of the ACS objectives listed above.

Attachment 1: Projects that Comply With the 2001 Survey and Manage Record of Decision and Plan Amendment with Subsequent ASRs except for the Red Tree Vole or the Pechman Exemptions: Language for Inclusion in NEPA/Decision Documents

A. Projects that Comply With the 2001 Survey and Manage Record of Decision and Plan Amendment with Subsequent ASRs except for the Red Tree Vole.

The Verizon Telephone line ROW project is consistent with the 2001 Record of Decision and Standards and Guidelines for Amendments to the Survey and Manage, Protection Buffer, and other Mitigation Measures Standards and Guidelines, as incorporated into the District Resource Management Plan.

This project utilizes the December 2003 species list. This list incorporates species changes and removals made as a result of the 2001, 2002, and 2003 Annual Species Reviews with the exception of the Red Tree Vole. For the red tree vole, the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals in *KSWC et al. v. Boody et al.*, 468 F3d 549 (9th Cir. 2006) vacated the category change and removal of the red tree vole in the mesic zone, and returned the red tree vole to its status as existed in the 2001 ROD S&Gs, which makes the species Category C throughout its range. Details of the project surveys are described below:

The project area was examined and as noted in Redding Field Office Consistency Review of Northwest Forest Plan Implementation 1.B. checklist. Upon review of the above survey criteria, it has been determined that the project occurs within the range of S&M species, consistent with the last valid Record of Decision as stated above; however, the project does not contain suitable habitat and does not negatively affect species or their habitat, therefore the project does not meet required survey criteria.

US DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
BUREAU OF LAND MANAGEMENT
Redding Field Office
355 Hemsted Drive
Redding, CA

**Decision Record for a Categorically Excluded Action
DOI-BLM-CAN060-2015-60- CX**

Introduction and Background

Verizon of California has applied to renew an existing telephone line under case file number CACA 15577, in Shasta County. The telephone was originally authorized in 1984; an Environmental Assessment EA-84-45 was completed in 1984. The telephone line is 1,974 feet long by 10 feet wide containing .45 acres. Verizon is requesting a 30 year term. The telephone line right-of-way would authorize the maintenance and continued use of the existing telephone line. No additional ground disturbing activities are being proposed outside of their existing line right-of-way.

Decision and Rationale

It is my decision to approve and implement the proposed action. I have determined that the proposed action is categorically excluded from further analysis under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) in accordance with 516 DM 11.9 Appendix 4 (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.”*

Compliance with Laws, Regulations, Policies and Land Use Plans

The proposed action is in conformance with the Redding Resource Management Plan, 1993. All necessary steps were taken by a qualified staff specialist(s) to identify, record, and evaluate effects on cultural properties if present. These steps comply with all standards and guidelines of the 2014 Protocol Agreement between BLM and the California State Historic Preservation Officer. Based on these efforts, no properties deemed eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places (including Traditional Cultural Properties) are located within the area of potential effect.

An archaeological report has been prepared for the proposed action by BLM staff. It has been determined that the road is not eligible, as determined by Dr. Eric Ritter, since the site has been modernized and is not uncommon. The proposed action will also not harm the line and these resources will remain basically the same, with no adverse effects.

It is my determination that all necessary steps have been taken to comply with the provisions of the 1994 Record of Decision (ROD) for Amendments to Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management Planning Documents within the Range of the Northern Spotted Owl. Standards and Guidelines for Management of Habitat for Late-Successional and Old-Growth Forest Related Species Within the Range of the Northern Spotted Owl. For the foregoing reasons, this contract is in compliance with the 1994 ROD, as stated in the U.S. District Court in *Pacific Coast Fed. of*

Fishermen's Assn. et al. v. Natl. Marine Fisheries Service, et al., Civ. No. 04-1299RSM (W.D. Wash) (*PCFFA IV*), and constitutes my ACS compliance certification.

Administrative Remedies

Administrative remedies may be available to those who believe they will be adversely affected by this decision. Appeals may be made to the Office of Hearings and Appeals, Office of the Secretary, U.S. Department of Interior, Board of Land Appeals (Board) in strict compliance with the regulations in 43 CFR Part 4. Notices of appeal must be filed in this office within 30 days after publication of this decision. If a notice of appeal does not include a statement of reasons, such statement must be filed with this office and the Board within 30 days after the notice of appeal is filed. The notice of appeal and any statement of reasons, written arguments, or briefs must also be served upon the Regional Solicitor, Pacific Southwest Region, U.S. Department of Interior, 2800 Cottage Way, E-1712, Sacramento, CA 95825.


Field Manager

11/5/2016
Date