

Categorical Exclusion Documentation Format for Actions Other Than Hazardous Fuels and Fire Rehabilitation Actions

APS - Leonard J Hassett Extension
DOI-BLM-AZ-P020-2010-0020-CX

A. Background

BLM Office: *Lower Sonoran Field Office (LSFO)*

Lease/Serial/Case File No.: AZA-10028

Proposed Action Title/Type: FLPMA R/W Renewal

Location of Proposed Action: T. 2S., R. 2 W., Section 30

Description of Proposed Action: The AZ Public Service Company has requested to renew its existing authorization for it Leonard J Hassett Extension. The renewal will consist of an existing 12kV overhead electrical distribution line, which includes down guys, electrical power lines, poles, and other appurtenant facilities, all of which have been previously authorized. The line, as authorized, is approximately 0.505 miles in length and 15 feet in width (approximately 0.918 acres).

B. Land Use Plan Conformance

Land Use Plan (LUP) Name: Lower Gila South Resource Management Plan/EIS

Date Approved/Amended: June 0, 1988

The proposed action is in conformance with the applicable LUP because it is specifically provided for in the following LUP decision(s):

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):

Lower Gila Resource Area processes a variety of land actions in the Lower Gila South RMP/EIS area - rights-of-way, communication sites, easements, permits, and unauthorized occupancy. All land cases would continue to be evaluated on a case-by-case basis.

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 2, Appendix 1, or 516 DM 11.5: 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 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 or 516 DM 11.5 apply.

I considered: The proposal is to renew an existing authorization where no additional improvements are anticipated. Therefore, no pertinent design features have been incorporated into the project design, and therefore there is no potential for significant impacts.

D: Signature

Authorizing Official: _____/s/_____ Date: ___09/13/2010___
Emily Garber
Field Manager

Contact Person

For additional information concerning this CX review, contact:
Jo Ann Goodlow, Realty Specialist, Phoenix District Office - Lower Sonoran Field Office,
21605 North 7th Avenue, Phoenix, Arizona 85027, 623-580-5500.

Note: A separate decision document must be prepared for the action covered by the CX. See Attachment 2.

BLM Categorical Exclusions: Extraordinary Circumstances¹
Attachment 1

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| The action has been reviewed to determine if any of the extraordinary circumstances (43 CFR 46.215) apply. The project would: | | |
| 1. Have significant impacts on public health or safety | | |
| Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Rationale: There are no significant impacts on public health that are known at this time. The proposal is to renew an existing authorization where no additional improvements are anticipated. |
| 2. Have significant impacts on such natural resources and unique geographic characteristics as historic or cultural resources; park, recreation or refuge lands; wilderness or wilderness study 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 (Executive Order 13186); and other ecologically significant or critical areas? | | |
| Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Rationale: There are no known significant impacts to such natural resources as those listed above. |
| 3. Have highly controversial environmental effects or involve unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources [NEPA Section 102(2)(E)]? | | |
| Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Rationale: The proposed action is to renew an existing authorization. Therefore there are no highly controversial environmental effects, nor will it involve any 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 <input type="checkbox"/> | No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Rationale: The proposed action is to renew an existing authorization. Therefore there are no highly uncertain and potentially significant environmental effects, nor will it 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 <input type="checkbox"/> | No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Rationale: The proposed action is to renew an existing authorization. Therefore it does not establish a precedent for future action, nor does it represent a decision in principle about future actions, with potentially significant environmental effects. |

¹ If an action has any of these impacts, you must conduct NEPA analysis.

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| 6. Have a direct relationship to other actions with individually insignificant, but cumulatively significant, environmental effects? | | |
| Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Rationale: The proposed renewal does not have a direct relationship to any other actions with individually insignificant, but cumulatively significant, environmental effects. The proposal is existing, with no anticipated improvements. |
| 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 <input type="checkbox"/> | No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Rationale: A cultural resource survey was conducted on July 18, 1977 (by Chris Kincaid). No cultural resource materials were located. |
| 8. 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 <input type="checkbox"/> | No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Rationale: The proposed action is to renew an existing authorization. There are no anticipated improvements to the existing structures. No Threatened or Endangered species will be impacted by the renewal. |
| 9. Violate a Federal law, or a State, local, or tribal law or requirement imposed for the protection of the environment? | | |
| Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Rationale: The proposed action is to renew an existing authorization. The project does not violate Federal law, or State, local or tribal law. |
| 10. Have a disproportionately high and adverse effect on low income or minority populations (Executive Order 12898)? | | |
| Yes <input type="checkbox"/> | No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Rationale: The renewal 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 <input type="checkbox"/> | No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Rationale: The proposed action is to renew an existing authorization. No Indian sacred sites will be impacted. |
| 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 <input type="checkbox"/> | No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Rationale: The proposed action is to renew an existing authorization. No additional improvements to the existing facilities are anticipated. Therefore the renewal will not contribute to the spread of noxious weeds or non-native invasive species. |

Approval and Decision

Attachment 2

Compliance and assignment of responsibility: Jo Ann Goodlow

Monitoring and assignment of responsibility: Jo Ann Goodlow

Review: *We have determined that the proposal is in accordance with the categorical exclusion criteria and that it would not involve any significant environmental effects. Therefore, it is categorically excluded from further environmental review.*

Prepared by: _____/s/_____ **Date:** 08/13/2010

Jo Ann Goodlow

Project Lead

Reviewed by: _____/s/_____ **Date:** 09/10/2010

Leah Baker

Planning & Environmental Coordinator

Reviewed by: _____/s/_____ **Date:** 09/13/2010

Emily Garber

Manager

Project Description:

The AZ Public Service Company has requested to renew its existing authorization for it Leonard J Hassett Extension. The renewal will consist of an existing 12kV overhead electrical distribution line, which includes down guys, electrical power lines, poles, and other appurtenant facilities, all of which have been previously authorized. The line, as authorized, is approximately 0.505 miles in length and 15 feet in width (approximately 0.918 acres).

Decision: Based on a review of the project described above and field office staff recommendations, I have determined that the project is in conformance with the land use plan and is categorically excluded from further environmental analysis. It is my decision to approve the action as proposed, with the following stipulations (if applicable).

Approved By: _____/s/_____ **Date:** 09/13/2010

Emily Garber

