## **Bonneville Power Administration**

## memorandum

DATE: January 22, 2014

REPLY TO

ATTN OF: KEP-4

SUBJECT: Environmental Clearance Memorandum

то: James Graeper

Civil Engineer – TELP-TPP-3

**Proposed Action:** Ellensburg-Moxee No. 1 right-of-way (ROW) Geotechnical Exploration

between Structures 17/1-22/2

Categorical Exclusion Applied (from Subpart D, 10 C.F.R. Part 1021): B4.7 Fiber Optic

Cable

**Location:** Yakima County, WA

**Proposed by:** Bonneville Power Administration (BPA)

<u>Description of the Proposed Action</u>: BPA proposes to conduct subsurface geotechnical exploration to characterize the ROW, for the direct burial of the existing overhead fiber optic cable. This section of fiber optic cable has been susceptible to acts of vandalism and is needed to protect and maintain BPA's operational communication abilities. Geotechnical exploration would include using a backhoe to excavate 37 test pits each being approximately 10 feet long by 3 feet wide and 5 feet deep. The pits would be excavated 40 feet left of the existing structures centerline. Landownership in the area includes private, Washington State Department of Natural Resources, and Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife. The area is dominated by shrub-steppe vegetation.

**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 not (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. 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/ Kevin George

Kevin George

**Environmental Protection Specialist** 

Concur: /s/ Katherine S. Pierce DATE: January 22, 2014

Katherine S. Pierce

NEPA Compliance Officer

Attachments:

**Environmental Checklist for Categorical Exclusions** 

## **Environmental Checklist for Categorical Exclusions**

Name of Proposed Project: Ellensburg-Moxee G	eotechnical Fiber Replace	ement	
<b>Work Order #:</b> 296774			
This project does <u>not</u> have the potential to cause significant impacts on the following environmentally sensitive resources. See 10 CFR 1021, Subpart D, Appendix B for complete descriptions of the resources. This checklist is to be used as a summary – further discussion may be included in the Categorical Exclusion Memorandum.			
Environmental Resources	No Potential for Significance	No Potential, with Conditions (describe)	
<ol> <li>Historic Properties and Cultural Resources</li> <li>No historic properties affected. SHPO concurrence with</li> <li>No additional comments received from Yakama Tribes period.</li> <li>Inadvertent discovery documents to be included in const</li> </ol>	regarding cultural survey res	sults w/in consultation	
2. T & E Species, or their habitat(s)		X	
in that area are low density and fairly dispersed. Diggir "colonies". However, delaying work until May/June we escape to adjacent borrows if squirrels are active in the is not believed to be active. Cindi will review the nest spresent. Falcons would be disturbed should work take paths is the case, for work sites w/in a ½ mile radius of the July.	bould allow squirrel young to area. The prairie falcon nessite in the spring and confirm place above them and within	become mobile and allow t was identified in 2003 but a whether or not falcons are their view from the nest. If	
3. Floodplains or wetlands	X		
No floodplains or wetlands would be impacted by work	activities.		
4. Areas of special designation		X	
<ul> <li>Noxious weed spread in the Wenas Wildlife Area is to be equipment entering the project area.</li> <li>WDFW would like enter into an agreement w/BPA to tathis area (typically a ~5 yr. commitment), in exchange f time. The BPA Regional NRS shall contact the WDFW area.</li> <li>For disturbed areas WDFW will identify a locally-adapt managed lands.</li> </ul>	ake on the weed control responsive enough herbicide to cover and discuss this activity priced native seed mix to be use	onsibilities for impacts in control needs and staff or to work beginning in the	
5. Health & safety	X		
No health and safety issues are present.	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	
6. Prime or unique farmlands	X		
No prime or unique farmlands are present in the project area			
7. Special sources of water	X		
• No special sources of water present in the project area.		<u> </u>	

8. Other (describe)	X	
• WA DFW has indicated that the project area between 17/1 and 20/2 would be in the middle of the (natural grazing) mass congregation of wintering elk. Approx. 800-1000 elk winter on the far slope between Cottonwood and Buffalo whose activities could be negatively impacted by geotechnical activities, and should be delayed until after April 1 to allow for the animals to move to their normal spring feeding areas outside of the proposed work area.		
List supporting documentation attached (if needed):		
SHPO Concurrence		
Signed: /s/ Kevin George	Date: January 16, 2014	
Kevin George, KEP-4		