Bonneville Power Administration

memorandum

DATE: June 20, 2012

REPLY TO

ATTN OF: KEPR/Olympia

SUBJECT: Environmental Clearance Memorandum

то: Ryan Brady

Line Foreman III – TFOK-Chehalis

Proposed Action: Wood pole structure replacements on the Chehalis-Centralia No. 2

115-kV transmission line

PP&A Project No.: 2372, WO# 298136

<u>Categorical Exclusion Applied (from Subpart D, 10 C.F.R. Part 1021)</u>: B1.3 Routine maintenance activities...

Location: The subject transmission line is located in Lewis County, Washington, in Bonneville Power Administration's (BPA) Olympia Maintenance District. The transmission line ROW corridors cross public and privately-owned lands that are mostly rural residential property. No U.S. Forest service or tribal lands are within the project boundaries.

Proposed by: BPA

<u>Description of the Proposed Action</u>: BPA proposes to replace deteriorating wood poles and associated structural/electrical components (e.g. crossarms, insulators, and guy anchors) at existing structures along the subject transmission line in Lewis County, WA. Wood pole replacements will utilize the existing holes to minimize ground disturbance but may require slightly larger poles and hardware to upgrade the structures to 115-kV standards. If necessary, an auger would be used to remove any loose soil from the existing hole prior to new wood pole replacement.

Four wood pole structures, 14/9, 14/8, 14/13 and 14/14, have been identified for replacement in 2012. Structures 14/13 and 14/14 support the transmission line at its crossing of Interstate 5, and are critical to maintain.

There is adequate, existing access to all of the structures along this transmission line corridor and no access road work or landing construction is anticipated at any location. The proposed action is required to maintain safe and reliable power transmission in the region.

Findings: BPA has determined that the proposed action complies with Section 1021.410 and Appendix B of Subpart D of the Department of Energy's (DOE) National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Regulations (57 FR 15144, Apr. 24, 1992, as amended at 61 FR 36221-36243, July 9, 1996; 61 FR 64608, Dec. 6, 1996, 76 FR 63764, Nov. 14, 2011). The proposed action does not present any extraordinary circumstances that may affect the significance of the environmental effects of the proposal. The proposal is not connected [40 C.F.R. 1508.25(a) (1)]

to other actions with potentially significant impacts, has not been segmented to meet the definition of a categorical exclusion, is not related to other proposed actions with cumulatively significant impacts [40 C.F.R. 1508.25(a) (2)], and is not precluded by 40 C.F.R. 1506.1 or 10 C.F.R. 1021.211. Moreover, the proposed action would <u>not</u> (i) threaten a violation of applicable statutory, regulatory, or permit requirements for environment, safety, and health, (ii) require siting and construction or major expansion of waste storage, disposal, recovery, or treatment facilities, (iii) disturb hazardous substances, pollutants, contaminants, or Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act-excluded petroleum and natural gas products that pre-exist in the environment such that there would be uncontrolled or unpermitted releases, (iv) have the potential to cause significant impacts on environmentally sensitive resources, or (v) involve genetically engineered organisms, synthetic biology, governmentally designated noxious weeds, or invasive species, unless the proposed activity would be contained or confined in a manner designed and operated to prevent unauthorized release into the environment and conducted in accordance with applicable requirements.

No threatened or endangered species, critical habitat, or other sensitive areas are known to exist within the proposed project sites. Based on this, the proposal will not affect any listed threatened or endangered species, or critical habitat under the Endangered Species Act, or Essential Fish Habitat under the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act.

This proposed action meets the requirements for the Categorical Exclusion referenced above. We therefore determine that the proposed action may be categorically excluded from further NEPA review and documentation.

/s/ Philip W. Smith, for:
Greg Tippetts
District Environmental Scientist

Concur: /s/ Stacy Mason Date: June 20, 2012

Stacy Mason

NEPA Compliance Officer

Attachment:

Environmental Checklist for Categorical Exclusions

Environmental Checklist for Categorical Exclusions

Prepared by:	Greg Tippetts	Routing:	KEPR-Olympia	Date: 6/14/201	2
environmental descriptions of	pes <u>not</u> have the potent ly sensitive resources. the resources. This cl the Categorical Exclus	See 10 CFR 1021 necklist is to be us	, Subpart D, Appen sed as a summary –	dix B for complete	ıay
Environmental Resources			No Potential for Significance No Potential, w		
1. Historic Pro	perties and Cultural Res	ources		X	
immedia must be	vent that archaeological or ate vicinity must stop, the notified. es, or their habitat(s)				
3. Floodplains or wetlands			X		
_	cial designation		X		
5. Health & sat			X		
6. Prime or unique farmlands			X		
7. Special sources of water			X		
8. Other (descr	ibe)		X		

Date: June 14, 2012

Signed: /s/ Greg Tippetts