Date: 4/2/2009
Field Office: Stillwater

Applicant: Vulcan Power Co.

Legal Description: Site 1: S/12 Sec. 33, T. 17 N., R. 30 E.; Site 2: SW1/4, Sec. 10; and Site 3: SW1/4 Sec. 11, T. 16 N., R. 30 E.

Define Proposed Action (who, what, where, when, how; include SOPS’s and any specifications and/or requirements). Notice of Intent for three (3) Geothermal Temperature Gradient Wells to maximum of 1,000’. No pad construction in proposed. Tanks will be used to contain the fluids and muds, so no sumps are proposed. The locations will be off existing access for Sites 2 and 3. Site #1 may require cross country access of 1,000’.

This action is in conformance with the Carson City Field Office Consolidated Resource Management Plan (2001); Reference and page number citation: MIN-1 #1 Desired Outcomes.

Categorical Exclusion Reference 516 DM 11.9 (cite eligible action): B (6) Approval of Notices of Intent to conduct geophysical exploration of oil, gas, or geothermal, pursuant to 43 CFR 3150 to 3250, when no temporary or new road construction is proposed.

Supplemental Guidance issued December 19, 2008 includes the drilling of temperature gradient wells where no well pad is proposed.

SCREENING FOR EXTRAORDINARY CIRCUMSTANCES: The following extraordinary circumstances apply to individual actions within categorical exclusions (516 DM 2, Appendix 2). The preparer and/or indicated specialist must verify that the Proposed Action does not:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>INITIALS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preparer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 2.1 Have significant adverse effects on public health or safety
- 2.2 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.
- 2.3 Have highly controversial environmental effects or involve unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources.
- 2.4 Have highly uncertain and potentially significant environmental effects or involve unique or unknown environmental risks.
- 2.5 Establish a precedent for future actions or represent a decision in principle about future actions with potentially significant environmental effects.
- 2.6 Have a direct relationship to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant environmental effects?
- 2.7 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.
- 2.8 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.
- 2.9 Violate a Federal law, or a State, local or tribal law or requirement imposed for the protection of the environment?
- 2.10 Have a disproportionately high and adverse effect on low income or minority populations (EO 12898).
- 2.11 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 (EO13007).
- 2.12 Contribute to the introduction, continued existence, or spread of noxious weeds or non-native 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 EO 13112).

Other reviewers (As determined by the Field Manager):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESOURCE</th>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>COMMENTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Biological</td>
<td>Rita Suminski</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural</td>
<td>Susan McCabe</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>Gabe Venegas</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military Liaison</td>
<td>Charles Kihm</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RMP conformance and CX review confirmation:

David Parker  
Preparer

EC Initials

Carla James  4-9-09  
Supervisory Natural Resource Specialist

DECISION: Based upon the review of this proposal, I have determined that the above-described project is a categorical exclusion, in conformance with the RMP, and does not require a NEPA analysis. It is my decision to implement the action, as described.

Approved By: Carla James, Acting Stillwater FM  
Authorized Officer

4-13-09  
Date