
FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

Rock Creek Wind, LLC

Rock Creek Transmission Gen-Tie Line

ROW No. WYW-186605

DOI-BLM-WY-D030-2023-0011-EA

Based on the analysis of potential environmental impacts contained in the attached Environmental Assessment (EA) (DOI-BLM-WY-D030-2023-0011-EA), I have determined that the Proposed Action, which incorporates the BLM required Standard Operating Procedures, Best Management Practices, and project design features, will not result in new impacts other than those analyzed and disclosed in this EA and Rawlins Resource Management Plan (RMP), as amended. This is based upon the context and intensity of the Proposed Action, as defined in section 7.3 of the BLM National Environmental Policy Act Handbook (Manual H-1790-1, page 70). The project involves the construction, operation, and decommissioning of a transmission gen-tie line on approximately 4.7 acres of BLM-administered lands in the Rawlins Field Office, Wyoming.

Standard Stipulations/Mitigation Measures/Conditions of Approval (COA)

Upon approval, the applicant has agreed to implement the applicant-committed environmental protection measures identified in Section 2.5 of the Environmental Assessment (Applicant Committed Environmental Protection Measures) to ensure that no significant effects would occur.

Context

The proposed action would begin at a new substation to be located within the Rock Creek Wind Facility site on private land in Albany County, Wyoming, and terminate at the existing Aeolus substation in Carbon County, Wyoming.

Intensity

I have considered the potential intensity/severity of the impacts anticipated from the proposal. As a result, I have determined that a FONSI is consistent with regards to each of the following ten factors. The basis of these conclusions is summarized below:

1. Impacts that may be both beneficial and adverse.

As described in the EA, potential adverse impacts from implementation of the proposed action would be minimal impacts associated with the proposal, but impacts would be offset by identified mitigation measures, stipulations, or Conditions of Approval (COA). However, none of these impacts would be significant at the local scale because of the relative scale of the project, design features annotated in the reclamation plans and applied mitigation measures, stipulations or COAs.

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

The proposal is not anticipated to result in public health and safety issues. Safety plans implemented by the applicant would enhance safety procedures on the location. Applied COAs and adherence to applicable federal, state, and local laws and policies would also provide for public health and safety.

3. *Unique characteristics of the geographic area such as proximity of historic or cultural resources, park lands, prime farmlands, wetlands, wild and scenic rivers, or ecologically critical areas.*

Neither the Rawlins RMP, as amended, nor interdisciplinary team review found unique characteristics in the geographic area which would be adversely affected.

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

Interdisciplinary team review found no indication to which the effects on the quality of the human environment would likely be highly controversial.

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

Possible effects on the human environment are not highly uncertain and do not involve unique or unknown risks. The analysis for the proposed action does not show that this action would involve any unique or unknown risks. The potential effects of constructing the transmission line are well known. There would not be high uncertainty of the effects, nor unique or unknown risks.

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.*

The proposed action would result in no significant effects. The degree to which the Proposed Action would establish a precedent for future actions with significant effects or would represent a decision in principle about a future consideration would be minimal.

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

The Proposed Action is related to other actions but collectively the level of impact would not approach a significant impact for any resource.

8. *The degree to which the action may adversely affect districts, sites, highways, structures, or objects listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places or may cause loss or destruction of significant scientific, cultural, or historic resources.*

There would be no significant adverse effects to resources with scientific, cultural, or historic value.

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 Endangered Species Act of 1973.*

There would be no significant effects to habitat for threatened or endangered species as no habitat was identified. Timing restrictions precluding surface disturbing and disruptive activities during important wildlife seasons would adequately avoid and minimize any potential adverse effects to wildlife species and their habitat(s). Interim and final reclamation will both minimize and rectify

surface disturbance associated with this project ultimately designed to restore the landscape ecosystem function.

10. Whether the action threatens a violation of Federal, State, or local law or requirements imposed for the protection of the environment.

The project does not violate any known federal, state, or local laws or requirements imposed for the protection of the environment. In addition, the project is consistent with applicable land management plans, policies, and programs.

Based on the considerations above, I hereby affirm that the Proposed Action would not result in significant effects and therefore preparation of an environmental impact statement is not required.

Authorized Officer: _____

Timothy Novotny
Field Manager