FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

Sierra Pacific Power Company

New Pass Peak Distribution Line Project

Finding of No Significant Impacts

DOI-BLM-NV-C010-2015-0030-EA

U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Land Management
Carson City District
Stillwater Field Office
5665 Morgan Mill Road
Carson City, NV 89701
775-885-6000

June 2016

It is the mission of the Bureau of Land Management to sustain the health, diversity, and productivity of the public lands for the use and enjoyment of present and future generations.

DOI-BLM-NV-C010-2015-0030-EA

BACKGROUND

On July 29, 2014, the Bureau of Land Management (BLM), Carson City District (CCD), Stillwater Field Office (SFO) received a right-of-way (ROW) SF-299 application from Sierra Pacific Power Company (SPPCo) (doing business as NV Energy) to construct, operate, and maintain a new 24.9 kilovolt (kV) distribution line. The ROW would be 29,515 feet (5.59 mile) long, 40-feet-wide and project components would include construction of a permanent overhead single-pole and underground 24.9 kV electrical distribution line; a lower and upper adjacent 8-foot wide access road; and other project components, including temporary access roads, pull sites, and staging areas. The ROW would occupy approximately 27 acres of BLM-administered land in Churchill and Lander Counties, Nevada.

The access road would be immediately adjacent to the distribution line where topography allows. With the exception of the last portion of the lower road that is less-defined, the majority of the road would be located entirely within the requested ROW. SPPCo would obtain a private easement to site the distribution line on the 948 feet (0.18 miles) that traverses the private parcel.

Once the distribution line is operational, SPPCo operations and maintenance personnel would conduct annual inspections by helicopter, all-terrain vehicles, or line trucks. The inspections would include visual review of the line along the existing access roads. Access roads would be maintained as needed and would consist of blading the road in advance of scheduled work to remove exposed rock, repair washouts or rockslides, and remove existing deep ruts to ensure the road is passable.

In addition, SPPCo personnel would access the line under emergency conditions. They would access the line via line trucks using existing access roads, the main proposed road, or by helicopter. If the main proposed road is not accessible, or if the road is not passable, additional equipment would be used to repair the road, in order to make it passable. If emergency repair work would occur outside the approved ROW width or would deviate from the established route, SPPCo would notify the BLM as soon as practicable for approval. SPPCo would typically not be required to notify the BLM of routine and emergency maintenance of the distribution line or roads within the approved ROW unless the terms and conditions of the grant require such notice.

Land Use Plan Conformance

Implementation of the Proposed Action would be consistent with established land use plans where the Proposed Action would be located. Specifically, the implementation of the Proposed Action would be consistent with the Carson City District Consolidated Resource Management Plan and the Shoshone-Eureka Resource Management Plan, both summarized below.

Carson City District Consolidated Resource Management Plan

Public lands administered by the BLM CCD, SFO are managed in accordance with the CCD Consolidated Resource Management Plan (CRMP), which is maintained and administered in compliance with the Federal Land Policy Management Act of 1976, as amended.

The Proposed Action evaluated in this Environmental Assessment (EA) would be consistent with management objectives and decisions established in the CCD CRMP. Specifically, the Proposed Action is consistent with the Communication Site and Right-of-Way Corridor Sections management actions and

decisions (BLM 2001a). The proposed ROW request and connection to an existing communication site is also consistent with the CCD CRMP Rights-of-Way and Communication Sites map (BLM 2001b).

Communication Site Section

The New Pass Peak area is specifically referenced in the Communication Sites section of the CCD CRMP on page COM-1. The Communication Sites section summarizes land use allocations for communication sites in various planning areas and units within the District. For example, Management Action/Decision Number 3 states that the New Pass area (i.e., the proposed project area) is a preferred location to locate communication sites. The decision states that communication sites should minimize surface disturbance by grouping future communication facilities at locations where existing facilities occur, access is reasonably available, terrain is appropriate for communication facility needs, and other resource values are limited (BLM 2001a). Further, Management Action/Decision Number 7 states current standard operating procedures require that each proposal for an individual communication site would be analyzed in a project-specific environmental analysis (BLM 2001a).

Right-of-Way Corridor Section

The Right-of-Way Corridor objectives and selected provisions are referenced in the Right-of-Way Corridors section of the CCD CRMP on page ROW-1. This section summarizes the preferred outcome of providing an east-west and north-south network of ROW corridors within the District. For example, Management Action/Decision Number 1 designates 686 miles of ROW, which includes existing transmission lines, and identifies 218 miles of planning corridors.

Management Action/Decision 4 and Action/Decision 5 indicate that there is currently a planning corridor running from Austin to Dixie Valley and from Dixie Valley to southern California. While the Proposed Action is not located within a special designation area, the Dixie Valley is located to the east of the project area; the distribution line established via the Proposed Action would connect to an existing distribution line (i.e., the Austin 201 Distribution Line) that connects to transmission line facilities within this corridor at the Austin substation.

Visual Resources Management Section

The Proposed Action is in conformance with Visual Resources Management (VRM) section of the CCD CRMP. Specifically, on pages VRM-1 through VRM-4: Interim visual management objectives are established where a project is proposed and there are no land use planning level designated VRM objectives in existence. The interim objectives are developed using the guidelines in Handbook Section 8410 and must conform to the land use allocations set forth in the current land use plan, which covers the project area. The designation of interim VRM objectives will not require a plan amendment unless the project itself requires one.

Shoshone-Eureka Resource Management Plan

A small section of public lands along the east side of the crest of New Pass Peak are within the BLM Battle Mountain District. These lands are administered by the Mount Lewis Field Office and are managed in accordance with the 1986 Shoshone-Eureka Resource Management Plan (RMP), which is maintained and administered in compliance with the Federal Land Policy Management Act of 1976, as amended.

The Proposed Action evaluated in this EA would be consistent with management objectives and decisions established in the Shoshone-Eureka RMP and Record of Decision (ROD). Specifically, the Proposed Action is consistent with the Utility Corridors (Section 3) Management Decisions (MD) (BLM 1986a). The proposed ROW request and connection to an existing communication site, including use of the existing road along the top of New Pass Peak that occurs within the Battle Mountain District, Mount Lewis Field Office is also consistent with the Shoshone-Eureka RMP Utility Corridors map (BLM 1986a).

Utility Corridors Management Decision

Utility corridor management decisions are summarized in Part II of the Shoshone-Eureka RMP ROD. The Proposed Action is consistent with both objectives listed under the Resource Decisions.

> Objective 1, as listed on page 17 of the Shoshone-Eureka RMP ROD states: "to ensure a system for transmission of utilities through the resource area by establishing an east-west and north-south network of utility corridors."
>
> Objective 2, as listed on page 18 of the Shoshone-Eureka RMP ROD states: "to minimize adverse impacts to the environment by concentrating compatible rights-of-way in designated corridors that avoid sensitive resource values."

Utility corridor management decisions are referenced in Section 3, on page 3 of the ROD. This section designates 112 miles of utility corridors, which includes existing transmission lines and identifies an additional 167 miles of planning corridors, as shown on the Shoshone RMP Utility Corridors map (Map 3).

As shown on Map 3, Land Tenure Adjustments and Utility Corridors, the planning area east of the top of New Pass Peak within the Shoshone-Eureka RMP contains an existing utility corridor, connecting to a hub of various planned utility corridors near Austin, Nevada.

Section 1, Part B, of the Utility Corridors Management Actions, page 18 specifically references New Pass Peak. This section references designating a corridor including the existing 230 kV powerline ROW from the summit of Simpson Creek on the east border of the resource area to New Pass Summit on the west border (excluding the portion which crosses the Toiyabe National Forest).

Approved Greater Sage Grouse Plan Amendments

The Proposed Action would be consistent with Greater Sage-Grouse (GRSG) conservation measures outlined in the Record of Decision and Approved Resource Management Plan Amendments for the Great Basin Region, Including the Greater Sage-Grouse Sub-Regions of Idaho and Southwestern Montana, Nevada and Northeastern California, Oregon, and Utah (Approved Greater Sage Grouse Plan Amendment) (September 2015). The Approved Greater Sage Grouse Plan Amendment is the baseline plan for the management of GRSG in northeastern California and Nevada. It identifies appropriate measures in existing land use plans intended to conserve, enhance, and restore GRSG habitat by avoiding, minimizing, or compensating for unavoidable impacts, such as habitat fragmentation from infrastructure development (BLM 2015b). Required Design Features (RDFs) are discussed in the EA in Section 3.7 Special Status Animal Species; applicable RDFs are listed under the Avoidance and

Mitigation Measures in the same location. The Approved Greater Sage Grouse Plan Amendment also presents goals, objectives, and MDs for protecting and preserving GRSG and its habitat on BLM lands (BLM 2015b).

Finding

This finding and conclusion is based on the consideration of the Council on Environmental Quality's criteria for significance (40 Code of Federal Regulations 1508.27), both with regard to the context and the intensity of impacts described in the EA.

Based upon the analysis in the EA# DOI-BLM-NV-C010-2015-0030-EA *New Pass Peak Distribution Line Project Environmental Assessment,* it is my determination that implementation of the Proposed Action will not have significant environmental impacts and that the Proposed Action is in conformance with the CRMP adopted in 2001, the Shoshone-Eureka RMP of 1986 and the Approved Greater Sage-Grouse Plan Amendment of 2015. I have determined that the Proposed Action is not a major federal action, and will not significantly affect the quality of the human environment, individually or cumulatively with other actions in the general area. Therefore, an environmental impact statement is not necessary and will not be prepared for the Proposed Action.

Context:

The general project area is located approximately 70 miles east-northeast of Fallon, Nevada, approximately six and a half miles north of US Highway 50 in the Edwards Creek Valley, and along the New Pass Range in Churchill and Lander Counties, Nevada.

The Edwards Creek Valley is surrounded by the New Pass Range to the east, and the Clan Alpine Mountains to the north and west. Alluvial fans slope gently from the bases of the moderately steep mountains of the New Pass Range toward the interior of the valley where a dry lake bed is located. Vegetation consists primarily of low-growing, sparse, and regularly spaced shrubs (e.g., sagebrush and greasewood) and bunch grasses in the valley floors. Trees (e.g., Utah juniper and singleleaf pinyon pines) are located on the upper elevations in the New Pass Range within the general project area, but are relatively sparse due to two historic forest wildfires in 1999 and 2012 (BLM 2013).

The elevation of the project area ranges from approximately 5,200 feet above mean sea level (AMSL) at the valley floor to approximately 9,200 feet AMSL at the top of New Pass Peak. The project area is located in a high mountain desert where the climate can vary significantly between the summer and winter months. Rainfall in Churchill County varies from four to seven inches annually and temperatures range from lows between 30 and 40 degrees Fahrenheit during winter months to highs between 80 and 90 degrees Fahrenheit in the summer (Western Regional Climate Center 2015).

After review of the recently published data provided in the Approved Greater Sage Grouse Plan Amendment, it was found that the project area overlaps with non-habitat areas and Other Habitat Management Areas (OHMA) (refer to Figure 10 in Appendix A of the EA). Non-habitat areas exist in the northwestern two miles of the project area and a small part of the eastern portion of the project area. OHMA overlaps with 1.5 miles of the middle portion of the project area and the easternmost 1.5 miles of the project area.

Intensity:

The following discussion is based on the relevant factors that should be considered in evaluating intensity as described in 40 Code of Federal Regulations 1508.27.

1. Impacts that may be both beneficial and adverse.

All resource values have been evaluated for direct, indirect and cumulative impacts, as shown in Chapter 3 of the EA. None of the direct, indirect or cumulative impacts associated with the Proposed Action (as analyzed in Chapter 3 of the EA) are significant, individually or combined. The EA evaluated both beneficial and adverse impacts of the Proposed Action for the New Pass Peak Distribution Line Project in Churchill and Lander Counties, Nevada.

All impacts, beneficial and adverse, to general wildlife species, migratory birds, vegetation, special status species (includes Threatened and Endangered Species and BLM sensitive animal species), forest resources and visual resources were analyzed in detail in chapter 3 of the EA. These impacts include the temporary disturbances to wildlife, migratory birds and special status species from human presence, traffic and construction noise. The long-term loss of approximately 5.27 acres of suitable habitat from vegetation, tree and rock removal due to installation of the distribution structures, access roads and junction enclosures could also occur from implementation of the Proposed Action. Indirect long-term effects would occur due to the degradation of existing habitat through the removal of vegetation, trees, and rock. Habitat availability would be slightly decreased following completion of the project due to the removal of 5.27 acres of vegetation from the installation of permanent structures. The acreage planned for removal is small in context to the amount of available habitat within the vicinity of the project area and current vegetation quality is low within the project area due to the presence of many invasive non-native species, frequent livestock grazing, and recent wildfires that left burned, dead trees. Although the project would permanently and temporarily disturb and remove vegetation, the project area would be revegetated with native seed and would potentially restore areas to a better condition than prior to the construction of the project. For these reasons, effects to general wildlife, vegetation, special status species and migratory birds associated with the implementation of the new distribution line facilities would minimal.

As described in Section 3.7 of the EA, the Proposed Action would result in direct and indirect effects to GRSG habitat within the project area, as a portion of the new distribution line would result in new and additional disturbance within an OHMA. However, the Proposed Action would be consistent with MDs SSS-4 in the Approved Greater Sage Grouse Plan Amendment, as the Proposed Action would incorporate feasible RDFs, as needed into the project design. Only a small portion of the proposed upper access road and the underground distribution line would occur within OHMA. The majority of the new disturbance would be collocated along the existing switchbacks and adjacent to the existing upper access road. Consultation with the BLM State Director, BLM biological staff, and Nevada Division of Wildlife concluded that GRSG habitat quality in the project area is limited (Enviroscientists 2014). The distribution line within OHMA near the top of New Pass Peak would be placed underground, consistent with the management direction for land use authorizations outlined in MD LR -10 within Priority Habitat Management Areas to further reduce impacts to the GRSG habitat. Only a small portion of the 1.74 mile upper access road between the top of the switchbacks to the intersection with New Pass Peak road would be new.

The Proposed Action would result in long-term effects to forest resources within the project area from permanent removal of trees. Tree removal would degrade the quality of existing forest resources and

replacement of trees is not anticipated. Tree species present are slow-growing and slow to reproduce, so reforestation would take multiple decades. Many trees present were recently burned and may not have survived the fire. Although forestry impacts are expected, the overall impact is small relative to the available forest resources within the vicinity of project area. Indirectly, tree removal causes habitat that provides shelter and food resources for wildlife to become degraded in the project area. All of the tree species present provide habitat for birds, mammals, and reptiles. Although impacts could occur to habitat and wildlife, the majority of the project area was recently burned and trees in the project area no longer provide as many resources for wildlife. Burnt snags may still provide cover and food for some specialist species such as woodpeckers. Additionally, tree species present in the project area tend to reduce groundcover, and their removal may encourage the growth of opportunistic vegetation, including invasive and noxious weeds.

The Proposed Action would result in the introduction of several permanent structural elements that are visually similar to existing man-made conditions and landscape character (i.e. a modified landscape with varying levels of energy or communication infrastructure). Contrast associated with the Proposed Action would be low and would not attract the attention of the casual observer. Long-term visual effects would result from the introduction of the new lower access road, the cleared vegetation within the ROW, operation of the distribution line and associated structures along the valley floor, and on the west side of the New Pass Range. The junction enclosures along the upper access road along the New Pass ridge line could also contrast in form and color with the surrounding landscape. However, the small size of the junction enclosures would likely result in moderate to weak contrast. Further, the distance of the project from sensitive viewers would create low levels of contrast. Most viewers would consist of motorists over six and a half miles away, travelling along US Highway 50.

With the implementation of the applicant committed avoidance and mitigation measures (AMMs) and BLM proposed AMMs , impacts from implementation of the Proposed Action would be further reduced. All of the impacts and identified AMMs are described and analyzed in detail in Chapter 2 and 3 of the EA and in the Decision Record.

2. The degree to which the proposed action affects public health or safety.

Effects to public health and safety would be negligible. SPPCo would receive all appropriate permits from permitting agencies and follow all requirements of these permits. AMMs identified in Chapter 2 of the EA will be incorporated into practices for construction, operation and maintenance of the distribution line which would further reduce any impacts to public health or safety. The area is highly remote and is visited infrequently by the public other than the dispersed recreationist and other right-of-way holders in the area of New Pass Peak. There would be minimal impacts to air quality, mainly in the form of fugitive dust from traveling on dirt roads and construction activities. None of these would exceed National Air Ambient Quality Standards. Further, the applicant has committed to applying water to disturbed areas and access roads as needed to reduce dust in addition to limiting driving speeds to 35 miles per hour on unpaved roads and on the right-of-way to reduce dust and promote safety.

All noxious and invasive weed treatments would be coordinated with the BLM and controlled through the use of BLM-approved biological, cultural/mechanical and chemical controls (when applicable several of these methods could be combined). Any herbicide use and application would be in conformance with herbicide labels' handling and application instructions and the Final Vegetation

Treatments Using Herbicides on Bureau of Land Management Lands in 17 Western States Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement and ROD (BLM 2007).

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 BLM Interdisciplinary Team scoped the Proposed Action internally to determine if there would be any impacts to any unique characteristics of the geographic area. There are no park lands, prime farmlands, wetlands, wild and scenic rivers designated Wilderness Areas/Wilderness Study Areas (WSAs) or ecologically critical areas in the vicinity or proposed sale areas.

Based on consultation with regional Native American Tribes, interagency coordination, and according to the 2014 Final Class III Cultural Resources Inventory (215 Acres for a NV Energy Distribution Line from New Pass Peak to Edwards Creek Valley in Churchill and Lander Counties, Nevada Report No. BLM3-2694(P)), there were no National Register of Historic Places (NRHP)-eligible cultural resources present within the project area, including historic properties of sacred or religious significance. Consultation with local Native American Tribes is ongoing.

AMMs (as described in Chapter 2 of the EA) are applicable to the Proposed Action to address discoveries of any undocumented cultural resources (historic or prehistoric cultural items) or human remains during project activities. An intensive survey would be conducted prior to construction of the distribution line and as possible, eligible cultural sites would be avoided.

If previously unidentified and/or undiscovered gravesites, traditional cultural properties, artifacts, or similar occur, all work within 300 feet of the area would cease and the BLM would be notified of the discovery. Activities would be halted until a Notice to Proceed is issued by the BLM. SPPCo would implement the stipulations and environmental protection measures described in the EA. These measures and stipulations include the procedures set forth in 43 CFR Part 10, Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Regulations.

After review of the Record of Decision (ROD) for the Approved Resource Management Plan Amendments for the Great Basin Region, Including the Greater Sage-Grouse Sub-Regions of Idaho and Southwestern Montana, Nevada and Northeastern California, Oregon, and Utah approved in 2015 it was found that the project area overlaps with non-habitat areas and OHMA. Non-habitat areas exist in the northwestern two miles of the project area and a small part of the eastern portion of the project area. OHMA overlaps with 1.5 miles of the middle portion of the project area and the easternmost 1.5 miles of the project area. The AMMs described in both Chapters 2 and 3 of the EA include the RDFs from the 2015 ROD and SPPCo has committed to burying the line where it crosses OHMA to reduce impacts to the greater sage-grouse OHMA in this area.

With the implementation of the applicant committed AMMs (as described in section 2.1.6 of the EA) and BLM proposed AMMs (identified in Chapter 3 of the EA), impacts from implementation of the Proposed Action would be further reduced.

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

No unresolved issues were identified during the internal scoping or the public comment and review period. The effects analysis in Chapter 3 of the EA also demonstrates that there were no unresolved issues that would suggest this project or its impacts would be highly controversial.

The EA was made available for public review and comment from April 13, 2016 through May 13, 2016. Comment letters were received from three State agencies and one Federal agency during this comment period. Minor non-substantive changes were made to the EA as a result of these comments; most changes were for clarification purposes. Refer to Appendix F: Response to Comments in the Final EA.

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

The analysis provided in Chapters 3 and 4 of the EA do not indicate that this action would involve any unique or unknown risks. Relevant components of the human environment which would be either affected or potentially affected by the Proposed Action and other alternatives were addressed through the effects analysis in Chapter 3 of the EA and the cumulative impacts analysis in Chapter 4 of the EA. Additionally, implementation of the applicant committed AMMs (as described in section 2.1.6 of the EA) and BLM proposed AMMs (identified in Chapter 3 of the EA), would further reduce any impacts from 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.

Current uses of the land surrounding the New Pass Peak Distribution Line Project are expected to remain the same for the foreseeable future and it is unlikely that increases in these or other land uses would occur. The proposed action will not establish a precedent for future actions with significant effects or represent a decision about a future consideration. Completion of this EA does not establish a precedent for other distribution line ROW projects nor does it authorize other distribution line projects in this area that are outside the scope of the EA. Any future projects within the areas that are outside of the scope of EA# DOI-BLM-NV-C010-2015-0030-EA, or in surrounding areas will be analyzed on their own merits, independent of the actions currently proposed.

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

Direct and indirect impacts of the Proposed Action were analyzed in Chapter 3 (Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences) of the EA. None of the environmental impacts discussed in Chapter 3 of this EA are considered significant. Past, present and reasonably foreseeable future actions have been considered for cumulative impacts and the analysis within Chapter 4 of the EA concludes that the cumulative impacts would not incrementally contribute to significant impacts. In addition, for any actions that might be proposed in the future, further environmental analysis, including assessment of cumulative impacts, would be required.

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

The Proposed Action would not adversely affect districts, sites, highways, structures or objects listed in or eligible for listing in the NRHP. According to the *2014 Final Class III Cultural Resources Inventory of 215 Acres for a NV Energy Distribution Line from New Pass Peak to Edwards Creek Valley in Churchill and Lander Counties, Nevada* (Report No. BLM3-2694(P)), there was no NRHP-eligible cultural resources present within the project area (as described in Chapter 3 of the EA). The Proposed Action has no potential to adversely affect significant scientific, cultural, or historical resources.

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 ESA of 1973.

Surveys for wildlife were conducted by biologists from July 28, 2014 through July 31, 2014 in accordance with the 2014 Draft Statewide Wildlife Survey Protocols for BLM Nevada (Appendix C of the EA). Additionally several sources of information were used to develop a species list, including the following documents:

- 2011 BLM Nevada Sensitive Species List for the Carson City District;
- Habitat Assessment Form located in Appendix A of the 2014 Draft Statewide Wildlife Survey Protocols for BLM Nevada for wildlife species with potential habitat;
- USFWS Information, Planning and Conservation System to perform a search for a site-specific list of federally endangered, threatened, or candidate species that have the potential to occur in the project area;
- Nevada Department of Wildlife site-specific species information, including general wildlife and special status species information that have the potential to occur within the project area; and
- Nevada Natural Heritage Program endangered, threatened, candidate, or at-risk taxa recorded within or near the project area.

Additional sources of information including the United States Geological Survey (USGS) National Southwest Regional Gap Analysis Project vegetation community data, the Natural Resources Conservation Service soils data, the USGS National Hydrography Dataset for potential water sources, fire history, Google aerial imagery, USGS topographic maps, slope analysis for potential golden eagle habitat, site photographs, and known species accounts in the project area.

The USFWS determined that two federally threatened or candidate species could have potential habitat within the project area: the Lahontan cutthroat trout (*Oncorhynchus clarkii henshawi*), a federal threatened species, and the Columbia spotted frog (*Rana luteiventris*), a federal Candidate species (USFWS 2014). However, no perennial drainages are located within the project area; therefore, there is no suitable habitat present for the Lahontan cutthroat trout or the Columbia spotted frog and therefore the Proposed Action would not adversely affect any federally listed species or their habitat under the Endangered Species Act

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 compliance with the Carson City Consolidated Resource Management Plan Record of Decision (ROD) approved in 2001, the Shoshone-Eureka Resource Management Plan ROD approved in 1986, and the ROD and Approved Resource Management Plan Amendments for the Great Basin Region, Including the Greater Sage-Grouse Sub-Regions of Idaho and Southwestern Montana, Nevada and Northeastern California, Oregon, and Utah approved in 2015. The Proposed Action is consistent with Statutes, regulations and policies of neighboring local, County, State, Tribal governments and other Federal agencies. The Proposed Action does not violate or threaten to violate any federal, State, or local law or requirement imposed for the protection of the environment.

Teresa J. Knutson

Teresa J. Knutson
Field Manager
Stillwater Field Office

6/23/2016

Date