

Creston-Bell Transmission Line Rebuild Project

Department of Energy Bonneville Power Administration

Revision Sheet DOE/EA-4406

Summary

Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) released the Creston–Bell Transmission Line Rebuild Project Preliminary Environmental Assessment (EA) in April 2012 for public comment. BPA sent the Preliminary EA to agencies and interested parties. Notification that the EA was available and how to request a copy was sent to all others on the mailing list of potentially affected parties. BPA received six comments and responded to these comments in this revision sheet.

This revision sheet documents the changes to be incorporated into the EA. The Preliminary EA, with the addition of these changes, constitutes the Final EA, which will not be reprinted.

Revisions to the EA

A number of minor changes were made to the Preliminary EA and are presented below by the chapter and section in which they appeared in the Preliminary EA. The majority of the changes are related to the addition of information to the Cumulative Effects analysis about a nearby pipeline project. The changes also include the addition of text to a wildlife mitigation measure. Where text has been modified, deleted text is indicated in “~~strikethrough~~” format and new text is underlined.

Chapter 3 – Affected Environment, Environmental Consequences, and Mitigation Measures

3.2 Land Use and Recreation

3.2.5 *Cumulative Effects—Proposed Action* (page 3-11)

The first paragraph in this section has been revised as follows:

As discussed in Appendix B, reasonably foreseeable future projects in the vicinity of the Proposed Action include two BPA projects that would take place within the existing corridor that includes the Creston-Bell transmission line. These projects, as currently proposed, would occur within the same general timeframe as the Proposed Action; however, each project is independent of the Rebuild Project and does not require that actions be taken previously or simultaneously for completion. Both of these projects would result in ground disturbance within the extended ROW and involve limited access road improvements. The other reasonably foreseeable future project identified in Appendix B, Williams Northwest Pipeline’s (Williams’) Spokane Pipeline Replacement Project, runs roughly parallel and south of the Creston-Bell transmission line for about two miles.

Residential Land Use

The paragraph in this section has been revised as follows:

Work activities associated with the two reasonably foreseeable future BPA projects would be visible to residences within the vicinity of the existing ROW corridor and construction vehicles and equipment would pass close to some residences as they travel to the corridor. These activities may increase localized noise and fugitive dust levels for brief periods. These impacts would be limited in duration, ranging from hours to several days, and a relatively small number of residences would be affected at any one time. As with the Proposed Action, impacts are likely to be greater in areas where residential development is more concentrated. Although the two future ~~The three~~ BPA projects and the Proposed Action would ~~while~~ occurring within the same general timeframe, they would proceed at different speeds, and, as a result, impacts in specific locations would likely occur at different times. Similar impacts would likely be associated with the Williams pipeline replacement project, although construction would likely be longer in duration at any one location. Construction-related impacts associated with the Williams pipeline replacement project are not expected to coincide in time with the Proposed Action. The mitigation measures identified in Section 3.2.3 would reduce the incremental contribution of the Proposed Action to potential cumulative impacts on residential land uses and impacts are expected to be *low*.

Recreation

The paragraph in this section has been revised as follows:

The two reasonably foreseeable future BPA projects would also have similar, short-term construction-related impacts on recreation, with project-related activities taking place in Riverside State Park, the Meadowglen conservation land area, the area adjacent to Whitworth University, and in areas west of the Spokane River that receive informal recreation use. The Williams pipeline replacement project crosses immediately north of Whitworth University, but is not located near the other recreation areas noted above. The mitigation measures identified in Section 3.2.3 would reduce the incremental contribution of the Proposed Action to potential cumulative impacts on recreation and impacts are expected to be *low*.

Transportation

The paragraph in this section has been revised as follows:

Implementation of the two reasonably foreseeable future BPA projects would involve work crews traveling to and from the sites, and material and equipment deliveries. This would result in short-term increases in local traffic and periodic short-term road closures. As noted above, the two other reasonably foreseeable future BPA projects would proceed at different speeds and, as a result, localized impacts to traffic would likely occur in specific locations at different times. The Williams pipeline replacement project would likely result in similar construction-related transportation impacts, but construction of this project is not expected to coincide in time with the Proposed Action.

3.3 Geology and Soils

3.3.5 *Cumulative Effects—Proposed Action* (page 3-17)

The paragraph in this section has been revised as follows:

The principal past and ongoing activities that affect soils in the vicinity of the Proposed Action are related to farming and grazing. In addition, the other BPA projects proposed within the existing corridor (see Appendix B) have the potential to result in impacts similar to those described above for the Proposed Action. Additional disturbance would be associated with the Williams pipeline replacement project. Implementation of the mitigation measures described in Section 3.3.3 would ensure that the Proposed Action would not contribute significantly to cumulative soil impacts. As such, the contribution of the Proposed Action to cumulative impacts is considered *low*. Similar mitigation measures would be employed for the two reasonably foreseeable future BPA projects, which would further reduce total impacts.

3.4 Vegetation

3.4.5 *Cumulative Effects—Proposed Action* (page 3-28)

The third paragraph in this section has been revised as follows:

The Proposed Action is expected to have a minimal contribution to cumulative impacts on vegetation, compared to the combined impacts of past, ongoing, and future vegetation-altering activities in the study area. The amount of vegetation that would be affected by the Proposed Action is small compared to the area affected by agricultural activities, livestock grazing, wildfire, vegetation control along roads and other utility corridors, and commercial and residential development in the area. This is also the case with the two other reasonably foreseeable future BPA projects and the Williams pipeline replacement project identified in Appendix B of this EA. One exception is the potential effect of the proposed work within ~~the existing transmission line corridor~~ on weed-infested areas. Because corridors act as a path for the movement of weed species and because of the difficulty of controlling many weed species, the Proposed Action would have a *low to moderate* cumulative impact on the spread of noxious weeds.

3.5 Water Resources and Water Quality

3.5.5 *Cumulative Effects—Proposed Action* (page 3-38)

The paragraph in this section has been revised as follows:

The Proposed Action would result in some construction-related water quality impacts (e.g., increased turbidity or sedimentation) and a reduction in stream shading that could affect stream temperatures. Other projects, including the two reasonably foreseeable future BPA projects discussed in Appendix B, have the potential to result in impacts similar to those described above for the Proposed Action. Additional disturbance would be associated with the Williams pipeline replacement project. Implementation of the mitigation measures described in Section 3.5.3 would ensure that the incremental contribution of the Proposed

Action to cumulative impacts to water resources and quality would be *low*. Similar mitigation measures would be employed for the two reasonably foreseeable future BPA projects, which would further reduce total impacts.

3.6 Fish and Wildlife

3.6.2 Environmental Consequences—Proposed Action

Wildlife and Their Habitat

Operation and Maintenance (page 3-52)

The third paragraph in this section has been revised as follows:

The rebuilt transmission line would be marked with bird flight diverters in areas that may be a potential flyway for migratory bird species (water fowl), where appropriate. These potential flyway areas include the Spokane River, where the existing line that would be replaced presently has bird diverters, and a number of wetlands and wetland complexes located along the corridor where higher use by migratory birds is likely. Bird mortality as a result of collisions with conductors and structures would remain at current levels because the lines would remain in the same location with the same type of structures (a net reduction of two structures is slated as a result of the proposed project). Initially, however, the The potential for collisions may also be reduced initially due to the new conductors being slightly larger and more reflective than those currently deployed, but it is likely that any benefit will decrease over time as the reflectors weather and dull. The addition of bird flight diverters would reduce the potential for migratory bird collisions and impacts would be low. Birds generally tend to be more likely to strike ground wires, which are much smaller in diameter than conductors and normally span the top of the structure. An overhead ground wire is currently attached between the Creston Substation and Structure 1/6 and between Structure 54/7 and the Bell Substation. These wires would be reinstalled under the Proposed Action and would result in the same *low* impact as current conditions.

3.6.3 Mitigation—Proposed Action (page 3-53)

The fourth bullet of this section has been revised as follows:

- Mark the transmission line with bird flight diverters over any major water body that may be a potential flyway for migratory bird species (water fowl) where appropriate, including the Spokane River and specifically identified wetlands and wetland complexes.

3.6.5 Cumulative Effects—Proposed Action (page 3-54)

The third and fourth paragraphs in this section have been revised as follows:

As discussed in Appendix B, reasonably foreseeable future projects in the vicinity of the Proposed Action include two BPA projects that would take place within the existing extended ROW corridor that includes the Creston-Bell transmission line ROW. However, each project is independent of the Rebuild Project and does not require that actions be taken previously or simultaneously for completion. These projects are expected to have similar impacts to fish and wildlife as the Proposed Action. Impacts would primarily occur within

the existing extended ROW and similar mitigation measures to those proposed for the Proposed Action in Section 3.6.3 would be employed to further reduce potential impacts. Disturbance associated with the Williams pipeline replacement project is assumed to primarily occur within the existing maintained pipeline corridor.

Impacts on fish and wildlife habitat from the Proposed Action are expected to be *low* compared to the combined cumulative impacts of past, ongoing, and future habitat alteration in the study area. The acreage of habitat affected within the ROW is small compared to the area affected by agricultural activities, livestock grazing, wildfire, and vegetation control along roads and other transmission lines. This is also the case with the two other reasonably foreseeable BPA projects identified in Appendix B of this EA. Habitat impacts associated with the Williams project are also expected to be relatively low because only limited habitat is available in the maintained corridor and restoration is expected to be completed by December 2012 (Williams 2012). As such, the incremental contribution of the Proposed Action to cumulative impacts on fish and wildlife and their habitat is considered *low*.

3.7 Wetlands

3.7.5 Cumulative Effects—Proposed Action (page 3-68)

The paragraph in this section has been revised as follows:

Potential cumulative impacts to wetlands in the study area could result if other projects and actions were to affect wetland functions: water quality, hydrology, and wildlife habitat. Reasonably foreseeable future projects in the vicinity of the study area include the two BPA projects identified in Appendix B of this EA, as well as the Williams pipeline replacement project. These two BPA projects would take place within the existing extended ROW corridor that includes the Creston-Bell transmission line ROW; the Williams project is located south of the existing transmission line ROW. Implementation of the mitigation measures described in Section 3.7.3 would ensure that the incremental contribution of the Proposed Action to cumulative impacts on wetlands would be *low*. In addition, wetlands are regulated by federal, state, and local agencies and impacts from other projects would likely require compensatory mitigation to ameliorate potential impacts to wetland functions.

3.8 Floodplains

3.8.5 Cumulative Effects—Proposed Action (page 3-76)

The two paragraphs in this section have been revised as follows:

Potential cumulative impacts on floodplains in the study area could result from increased compaction, erosion, or temporary removal of vegetation. The Proposed Action would have *low* to *moderate* direct impacts on floodplains. Moderate impacts would be associated with the installation of Structure 46/8 and 10 feet of access road construction within the 100-year floodplain of Deep Creek. Reasonably foreseeable future projects in the vicinity of the Proposed Action include two BPA projects that would take place within the existing extended ROW corridor that includes the Creston-Bell transmission line ROW (see Appendix B). Each project is independent of the Rebuild Project and does not require that actions be taken previously or simultaneously for completion. These projects are expected to

have similar impacts to floodplains as the Proposed Action. The Williams pipeline replacement project crosses the 100-year floodplain of an unnamed drainage of the Little Spokane River. Implementation of the mitigation measures described in Section 3.8.3 would ensure that the Proposed Action would not contribute significantly to cumulative impacts to floodplains were other projects to occur. As such, the contribution of the Proposed Action to cumulative impacts is considered *low to moderate*.

3.9 Visual Quality

3.9.5 Cumulative Effects—Proposed Action (page 3-85)

The paragraph in this section has been revised as follows:

There are two reasonably foreseeable future BPA projects in the vicinity that are independent of the Rebuild Project and do not require that actions be taken previously or simultaneously for completion. The Proposed Action would have low to moderate impacts to visual resources and while the reasonably foreseeable future BPA projects within the corridor would create short-term construction impacts, they would not alter the existing lattice-steel transmission line structures and would be subject to similar mitigation measures to those identified above in Section 3.9.3. ~~Therefore, the overall cumulative impacts to visual resources are expected to be *low to moderate*.~~ The Williams replacement pipeline project is not expected to have long-term impacts on existing visual conditions and construction-related visual impacts would be short-term (May to August 2012) with restoration of the pipeline corridor expected by December 2012. The contribution of the Proposed Action to cumulative impacts to visual resources is considered *low to moderate*.

3.10 Air Quality

3.10.5 Cumulative Effects—Proposed Action (page 3-87)

The paragraph in this section has been revised as follows:

Vehicular traffic, agricultural activities, residential wood burning, and other commercial and industrial facilities in the study area have all contributed to ambient air pollutant emissions. These sources of pollutants will continue to occur. In addition, BPA plans to implement two other reasonably foreseeable future projects in the extended ROW corridor and Williams plans to replace parts of an existing pipeline in the project vicinity (Appendix B). These reasonably foreseeable future projects would also contribute to air pollutants through emission from construction equipment. Ongoing and reasonably foreseeable future activities in the study area are not, however, expected to violate NAAQS. While the Proposed Action would contribute a small amount to pollutant levels, it is unlikely that cumulative concentrations would violate the NAAQS; therefore, cumulative impacts would be *low*.

3.11 Socioeconomics and Public Services

3.11.5 Cumulative Effects—Proposed Action (page 3-93)

The first paragraph in this section has been revised as follows:

The Proposed Action would have a small but positive impact on the regional economy during construction through the local procurement of materials and equipment and spending by construction workers. These impacts would be *temporary* and *low* and not expected to noticeably contribute to cumulative impacts in the study area. The two other reasonably foreseeable future BPA projects proposed for the extended ROW corridor would have similar impacts to the Proposed Action (Appendix B). These independent projects would occur within the same general timeframe as the Proposed Action, with one project expected to employ 20 workers and the other expected to employ 12 workers. These workers would be distributed along the extended ROW corridor with the workforce employed as part of the Proposed Action, which is expected to consist of up to 30 workers. The Williams pipeline project is expected to employ three separate work crews, with total short-term employment of about 100 workers (Johnson 2012). The combined impacts of these projects on the regional economy would be similar to those under the Proposed Action, small but positive.

3.12 Cultural Resources

3.12.5 Cumulative Effects—Proposed Action (page 3-97)

The paragraph in this section has been revised as follows:

Cultural resources in the project vicinity have likely been cumulatively affected by past, present, and current development activities. Most impacts have likely occurred as a result of inadvertent disturbance or destruction from ground-disturbing activities such as road work, farming, site development, and forestry operations. Like the Proposed Action, other reasonably foreseeable future projects in the vicinity of the study area have the potential to disturb previously undiscovered cultural resources. Reasonably foreseeable future projects in the vicinity of the study area include two independent BPA projects ~~identified in Appendix B of this EA, as well as the Williams pipeline replacement project (Appendix B).~~ These BPA projects would take place within the existing extended ROW corridor that includes the Creston-Bell transmission line ROW. The Williams project will primarily take place within an already disturbed existing pipeline corridor, south of the transmission line ROW.

Implementation of the mitigation measures described in Section 3.12.3 would minimize potential impacts associated with the Proposed Action and reduce the potential for construction activities to contribute incrementally to the adverse cumulative impact to cultural resources in the area. Similar mitigation measures would be employed for the two reasonably foreseeable future BPA projects, which would further reduce total impacts. In the event that previously undiscovered historic properties were encountered, potential impacts would be *low* to *moderate*, depending on the level and amount of disturbance and the eligibility of the resource.

3.13 Noise, Public Health, and Safety

3.13.5 Cumulative Effects—Proposed Action (page 3-104)

The second paragraph in this section has been revised as follows:

Other reasonably foreseeable future projects in the vicinity include two independent BPA projects that would take place within the extended ROW corridor that includes the Creston-

Bell transmission line ROW. While these projects and the Proposed Action would occur within the same general timeframe, they would proceed at different speeds, and, as a result, short-term impacts in specific locations would likely occur at different times. In addition, the timing of the Williams project construction is not expected to coincide with the Proposed Action so impacts would not coincide. ~~Therefore, the~~ The potential for the Proposed Action to contribute to construction noise-related cumulative impacts is expected to be *low*.

3.14 Climate Change

3.14.5 Cumulative Effects—Proposed Action (page 3-107)

The paragraph in this section has been revised as follows:

As described above in Section 3.14.2, the impacts of the Proposed Action on GHG concentrations would be *low*. Impacts would be further reduced through implementation of the mitigation measures identified in Section 3.14.3. All levels of GHG emissions are significant in that they contribute to global GHG concentrations and climate change. However, given the low amount of contribution, the Proposed Action's incremental impact on GHG concentrations would be *low*. This would also be the case when combined with the other two independent reasonably foreseeable future BPA projects proposed for the extended ROW corridor and the Williams pipeline replacement project. These projects would have similar overall impacts to the Proposed Action and the two other BPA projects would employ similar mitigation measures, further reducing their potential impact.

Chapter 4 – Environmental Consultation, Review, and Permit Requirements

4.5 Fish and Wildlife

4.5.4 Migratory Bird Treaty Act and Federal Memorandum of Understanding (page 4-6)

The third paragraph in this section has been revised as follows:

BPA would mark the rebuilt transmission line with bird flight diverters over any major water body that may be a potential flyway for migratory bird species (water fowl) where appropriate. These areas include the Spokane River, where there are already bird flight diverters on the existing line that would be replaced as part of the Proposed Action, and a number of wetlands and wetland complexes located along the corridor where higher use by migratory birds is likely.

Chapter 7 – References

7.1 Printed References (page 7-8)

The following reference has been added:

Williams. 2012. Spokane Replacement Project. Fact Sheet. Available online at: http://www.energy.williams.com/Spokane_Replacement_Project_2012.

7.2 Personal Communications (page 7-8)

Johnson, Sherm. Williams Northwest Pipeline. May 3, 2012—Personal communication with John Crookston, Tetra Tech, regarding estimated workers from the Spokane Replacement Project.

Appendix B – Other Projects in the Rebuild Project Vicinity

Other Projects in the Project Vicinity (page B-2)

The following section has been revised as follows:

Review of the resources identified above did not identify any other reasonably foreseeable future projects that would coincide in time or space with the Proposed Action. One other reasonably foreseeable future project was identified during the public comment period for the Preliminary EA.

WILLIAMS NORTHWEST PIPELINE SPOKANE PIPELINE REPLACEMENT PROJECT

Williams Northwest Pipeline (Williams) is planning to remove and replace approximately 5.1 miles of 16-inch diameter natural-gas pipeline located in the Spokane area. This work is part of Williams Northwest Pipeline’s Integrity Management Program for maintaining its pipeline system. This project would occur along two stretches of the pipeline between pipeline mile posts 158.3 and 164.3.

Maps provided by Williams indicate that the approximate 2 mile stretch that extends between pipeline mile posts 160.7 and 162.7 runs generally parallel to the existing Creston-Bell transmission line (between structures 52/7 and 54/6), ranging in distance from less than 100 feet to about 500 feet south of the transmission line (Johnson 2012). The pipeline does not share an extended ROW with the transmission line and is separated by wooded vegetation for much of this length. The other stretch of pipeline that would be replaced as part of Williams’ Spokane Pipeline Replacement Project is located further south of the Creston-Bell transmission line.

Environmental review of the Williams project was conducted by the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission in 2011. Construction is expected to extend from May to August 2012, with final restoration of disturbed areas completed by December 2012. Pipeline construction activities are unlikely to coincide in time with the Rebuild project, which is scheduled to begin at the Creston Substation and move east, with construction likely to occur in the Spokane area after construction work on the Williams project is completed.

References (page B-2)

The following reference has been added to this section:

Johnson, Rex. Contract Right of Way Agent. Northwest Pipeline GP. May 1, 2012—Email communication with Stephanie Breeden, BPA, regarding the Spokane Pipeline Replacement Project.

Public Comment

This section presents comments received on the Preliminary EA and responses to those comments. Comments are numbered consecutively as they are received. Breaks in the number sequence result when comments are deleted because they were submitted in error or have inappropriate content. BPA deleted Comment Number CLBR 002 because it was spam. BPA received a total of six valid comment letters.

Table 1. Public Comments on the Preliminary Environmental Assessment

Comment Number	Comment Author
CLBR 001	Baker/Home
CLBR 003	Bon
CLBR 004	Pierce
CLBR 005	Welk
CLBR 006	Ebel
CLBR 007	Jacobsen

Comment CBLR 0001

CBLR 0001 Baker/Home
We support these efforts, but have a concern about a line of trees just north of our north property line (see our address). We hope this line of trees will not be removed as it is a very necessary visual and physical barrier between us and the unstable male who lives north of our property. Please preserve this line of trees! If this line of trees must be removed, we would appreciate advanced notice so that we can consider options such as installing a fence or planting trees or bushes. Thank you for your consideration of this important request.

Response:

The line of trees identified in this comment would not be removed as part of the Proposed Action.

Comment CBLR 0003

B O N N E V I L L E P O W E R A D M I N I S T R A T I O N

Proposed Creston – Bell Transmission Line Rebuild Project
Comment Form

CBLR0003

Does the preliminary EA analyze the resources important to you?

Are there other ways to lessen potential resource impacts?

JUST DO IT CORRECTLY! THANKS

Other comments?

IN PREVIOUS plans it has been stated that one unused line of poles would be removed. This has not been done. Can the old pole line be taken out at the same time you work on the Rebuild of this line.

OR can you pressure AVISTA to do it if it is their line. Apparently someone stole the copper from this line because the was still there.

Please mail your comments by **April 25, 2012** to:
BPA Public Affairs - DKE-7
PO Box 14428
Portland, OR 97293-4428.

You may also fax your comments to 503-230-3285, call: 800-622-4519,
or submit comments online at www.bpa.gov/comment

Response:

The unused line of poles identified in the above comment belongs to Avista. BPA has passed your comment onto Avista.

Comment CBLR 0004

B O N N E V I L L E P O W E R A D M I N I S T R A T I O N

CBLR0004

**Proposed Creston – Bell Transmission Line Rebuild Project
Comment Form**

Does the preliminary EA analyze the resources important to you?

Are there other ways to lessen potential resource impacts?

Other comments?

*I Don't know if you are aware that Northwest pipeline is going to be replacing their natural gas pipeline thru our neighborhood this Spring construction to begin May 7, 2012. You may want to speak with their contact Agent for more information. Their phone numbers are
Rex Johnson 509-315-9946
Sheam Johnson 509-290-5832*

mail your comments by **April 25, 2012** to:
BPA Public Affairs - DKE-7
PO Box 14428
Portland, OR 97293-4428.
You may also fax your comments to 503-230-3285, call: 800-622-4519,
or submit comments online at www.bpa.gov/comment

Response:

Thank you for this information. BPA has contacted Williams Northwest Pipeline for additional information and will coordinate activities, as necessary. This project has been added to the Cumulative Effects analysis for each resource and to Appendix B in the EA.

Comment CBLR 0005

B O N N E V I L L E P O W E R A D M I N I S T R A T I O N

Proposed Creston – Bell Transmission Line Rebuild Project
Comment Form

CBLR0005

Does the preliminary EA analyze the resources important to you?
No

Are there other ways to lessen potential resource impacts?
No

Other comments?
We are OK with the project.

Please mail your comments by **April 25, 2012** to:
BPA Public Affairs - DKE-7
PO Box 14428
Portland, OR 97293-4428.
You may also fax your comments to 503-230-3285, call: 800-622-4519,
or submit comments online at www.bpa.gov/comment

Response:

Thank you for your comment.

Comment CBLR 0006

CBLR 0006
Ebel

I have an air strip on the farm here at Creston, WA. My wife's father put it in about the time the first power lines were built. We would have to go back to old aerial photos to see which was built first. The first lines were considerably lower than they are now, so the two existed simultaneously for awhile.

I regraded and widened the air strip, probably about 8 years ago. The air strip is south of the corridor. The approach would be over the corridor where it crosses Welch Creek.

The last line built is considerably higher than the one it replaced and also much higher than the others. The line to be replaced soon is on the south side of the corridor, so am assuming it will be even more of an obstacle than what existed now. So I feel I have a legitimate complaint. The usefulness of my air strip will be negatively impacted.

I should have spoken sooner, obviously, but I don't think I'm on your mailing list. My wife is, so I'm aware of the project, but we usually don't open each other's mail, & I wasn't smart enough to ask her to see the correspondence.

Of course, it's possible both names have been on the labels, but we haven't kept the mailings. It's a mute point by now anyway.

It would be logical that the appropriate person from your agency came out so I can show them the problem. Will await your comments on that.

We will be gone tomorrow (Wednesday 4-25-12) and most of Thursday.

We have been having trouble with our e-mail server, so it's not 100%, but seems to be working now, so that would be my preferred means of communicating. The phone is fine too, don't have an answering recorder, so can't leave messages.

Regards, Ordean

Response:

BPA reviewed the Proposed Action with respect to the location of the above referenced airstrip and determined that the rebuilt line would be raised approximately 6 feet across the approach that the planes make. Mr. Ordean Ebel indicated in a telephone conversation with BPA on April 30, 2012 that a 6 foot increase would not affect use of the airstrip. BPA will coordinate with Mr. Ebel and review the plans for that area in person in the field.

Comment CBLR 0007

CBLR 0007
Jacobsen

Dear Mr. Orth, Which mile numbers (from your map on page 3-3 of the pamphlet you sent to us) would be in Section 23 and 22 in Township 26 N and Range 36 E? Also, if a wood pole has been replaced in the last five years, is it going to be replaced again? Thank you, Mr. Kenneth E. Jacobsen

Response:

The Township and Range sections identified in the comment are crossed by line miles 12 and 13. The wood poles currently supporting the existing Creston-Bell transmission line will all be replaced. Although a pole may have been replaced in the last 5 years as part of ongoing maintenance activities, it will still need to be replaced as part of this action. In most cases the existing poles would not be tall enough to support the new conductor BPA is proposing to install and still maintain a safe clearance between the wires and the ground.