Categorical Exclusion Determination

Bonneville Power Administration
Department of Energy



<u>Proposed Action</u>: Approval of Land Use Review Request for Underground Line Installation in a BPA Right-of-Way in Washington County

Project No.: LURR 20150196

Project Manager: Jill Nystrom, TERR-3

Location: Washington County, Oregon

<u>Categorical Exclusion Applied (from Subpart D, 10 C.F.R. Part 1021)</u>: B4.9 Multiple use of power line

rights-of-way

Description of the Proposed Action: BPA proposes to authorize Portland General Electric (PGE) to install a new underground single-phase primary 7.2-kilovolt (kV) distribution line on BPA fee-owned right-of-way (ROW) in Washington County, Oregon. The existing distribution line has reached the end of its useful life and is difficult to access because it is located on private property adjacent to BPA's ROW. The project area is located near structure 8/3 of the Oregon City Stub 115-kV transmission line and structure 7/3 of the Keeler-Oregon City No. 2 115-kV transmission line. NW West Union Road and NW Perimeter Drive border the project area to the north and south, respectively. Workers would install 1-2" conduit from an existing PGE pole outside BPA's ROW on NW West Union Road to a new PGE vault on BPA's ROW adjacent to NW Perimeter Drive. The conduit would be installed at a depth of 4 feet via boring or trenching for approximately 320 feet along the western side of the ROW and 45 feet across the ROW adjacent to NW Perimeter Drive. Disturbance for the vault would entail use of a backhoe to excavate a 4-foot by 4-foot by 5-foot deep hole. All work on BPA property would be within the previously disturbed ROW footprint.

<u>Findings</u>: In accordance with Section 1021.410(b) 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), BPA has determined that the proposed action:

- (1) fits within a class of actions listed in Appendix B of 10 CFR 1021, Subpart D (see attached Environmental Checklist);
- (2) does not present any extraordinary circumstances that may affect the significance of the environmental effects of the proposal; and
- (3) has not been segmented to meet the definition of a categorical exclusion.

Based on these determinations, BPA finds that the proposed action is categorically excluded from further NEPA review.

/s/ Hannah Sharp

Hannah Sharp Contract Environmental Protection Specialist CorSource Technology Group

Reviewed by:

/s/ Gene Lynard

Gene Lynard Supervisory Environmental Protection Specialist

Concur:

/s/ Katherine S. Pierce Date: July 30, 2015

Katherine S. Pierce NEPA Compliance Officer

Attachment(s): Environmental Checklist

Categorical Exclusion Environmental Checklist

This checklist documents environmental considerations for the proposed project and explains why the project would not have the potential to cause significant impacts on environmentally sensitive resources and would meet other integral elements of the applied categorical exclusion.

Proposed Action: Approval of Land Use Review Request for Underground Line Installation in a BPA Right-of-Way in Washington County

Project Site Description

The project site is located on BPA fee-owned ROW in Beaverton, Washington County, Oregon. The ROW is located between structures 8/3 and 8/4 of the Oregon City Stub 115-kV line and structures 7/3 and 7/4 of the Keeler-Oregon City No. 2 115-kV line. NW West Union Road and NW Perimeter Drive border the project area to the north and south, respectively. The project site is managed for vegetation and consists almost entirely of grass. The surrounding landscape consists of residential development.

Evaluation of Potential Impacts to Environmental Resources

	Environmental Resource Impacts	No Potential for Significance	No Potential for Significance, with Conditions
1.	Historic and Cultural Resources	~	
	<u>Explanation</u> : OR SHPO concurrence on no adverse e consulted—no response.	effect determination 6/	30/15. Grande Ronde and Siletz Tribes
2.	Geology and Soils		
	Explanation: Ground disturbance would occur on a		
	Mitigation: Implement erosion and sediment conticlearing and prior to initiating ground-disturbing a	•	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
3.	Plants (including federal/state special-status species)		
	Explanation: Disturbance to approximately 0.75 ac No special-status species present.	cres of low-quality grass	ses. ROW vegetation regularly managed.
4.	Wildlife (including federal/state special- status species and habitats)		
	Explanation: Minimal disturbance to low-quality goodsignated habitat present.	rass habitat in develope	ed area. No special-status species or

5.	Water Bodies, Floodplains, and Fish (including federal/state special-status species and ESUs)				
	<u>Explanation</u> : No water bodies, floodplains, or fish prese proposed.	nt at or adjacent to the project site	. No in-water work		
6.	Wetlands	~			
	Explanation: None present.				
7.	Groundwater and Aquifers	~			
	Explanation: No new wells or use of groundwater proportion approximately 5 feet.	osed; maximum depth of disturband	e would be		
8.	Land Use and Specially Designated Areas	~			
	Explanation: All work on fee-owned right-of-way.				
9.	Visual Quality	~			
	Explanation: No permanent visual impacts. Temporary ground disturbance during construction.				
10.	Air Quality	~			
	Explanation: Small amount of dust and vehicle emissions due to construction.				
11.	Noise	~			
	Explanation: Temporary construction noise during daylight hours. Operational noise would not change.				
12.	Human Health and Safety	~			
	Explanation: No known soil contamination or hazardous conditions at project locations.				
Evaluation of Other Integral Elements					
	proposed project would also meet conditions that are integral elements of the categorical exclusion. The ject would not:				
~	Threaten a violation of applicable statutory, regulatory, or permit requirements for environment, safety, and health, or similar requirements of DOE or Executive Orders.				
	Explanation, if necessary:				

	equire siting and construction or major expansion of waste storage, disposal, recovery, or treatment cilities (including incinerators) that are not otherwise categorically excluded.	
<u>Ex</u>	xplanation, if necessary:	
	visturb hazardous substances, pollutants, contaminants, or CERCLA excluded petroleum and natural gas roducts that preexist in the environment such that there would be uncontrolled or unpermitted releases.	
<u>Ex</u>	xplanation, if necessary:	
inv op re	nvolve genetically engineered organisms, synthetic biology, governmentally designated noxious weeds, or avasive species, unless the proposed activity would be contained or confined in a manner designed and perated to prevent unauthorized release into the environment and conducted in accordance with applicable equirements, such as those of the Department of Agriculture, the Environmental Protection Agency, and the ational Institutes of Health.	
<u>E</u> :	Explanation, if necessary:	
Landowner Notification, Involvement, or Coordination		
Descr	<u>ription</u> : Not applicable.	
Rased	on the foregoing, this proposed project does not have the potential to cause significant impacts	

Based on the foregoing, this proposed project does not have the potential to cause significant impacts on any environmentally sensitive resources.

Signed: <u>/s/ Hannah Sharp</u> Date: <u>July 30, 2015</u>

Hannah Sharp

Contract Environmental Protection Specialist

CorSource Technology Group