Categorical Exclusion Determination

Bonneville Power Administration Department of Energy



Proposed Action: Olympia District, (Cowlitz and Lewis Counties) 2016 Priority Pole Replacements

Project Manager: Jim Semrau, TEP-TPP-1

Location: Cowlitz and Lewis Counties, Washington

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

Description of the Proposed Action:

BPA is proposing to replace nine transmission line structures on the Centralia Tap to Chehalis-Covington, Chehalis-Mayfield No.1, MossyRock-Chehalis No. 1, and Lexington-Longview No.1 transmission lines in Cowlitz and Lewis Counties, Washington; which is in BPA's Olympia Maintenance District. The work would include removing deteriorating wood poles, hardware, insulators, and guy wires and replacing in-kind in the same location. Since the new poles would be installed in the same location, minimal new excavation would be required.

In addition, the project includes minor improvements to existing road surfaces and landings (blading and rocking) to safely accommodate work vehicles.

| Transmission Line | Structure(s) | Township | Range | Section |
|-------------------------------------|--------------|----------|-------|---------|
| Centralia Tap to Chehalis-Covington | 3/3 | 14N | 1W | 6 |
| Chehalis-Mayfield No. 1 | 15/6 | 13N | 1E | 34 |
| | 19/6, 19/7 | 12N | 2E | 7 |
| MossyRock-Chehalis No. 1 | 20/1 | 13N | 1W | 33 |
| | 26/8 | 13N | 2W | 28 |
| Lexington-Longview No.1 | 5/3 | 8N | 2W | 7 |
| | 6/2 | 8N | 3W | 12 |
| | 7/4 | 8N | 3W | 24 |

See table below for structure names and locations on the transmission line.

Findings: 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/ <u>Stuart Hugill for</u> Greg Tippetts EPR/Olympia Olympia District Environmental Scientist

Concur:

<u>/s/ Sarah T. Biegel</u> Sarah T. Biegel NEPA Compliance Officer Date: June 17, 2016

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: Olympia District, (Cowlitz and Lewis Counties) 2016 Priority Pole Replacements

Project Site Description

All work would be done in existing managed right-of-way that crosses rural residential, agricultural, and industrial forested use lands.

Evaluation of Potential Impacts to Environmental Resources

| | Environmental Resource | No Potential for | No Potential for Significance, with |
|----|---------------------------------|------------------|-------------------------------------|
| | Impacts | Significance | Conditions |
| 1. | Historic and Cultural Resources | | |

Explanation: A cultural resources survey and Section 106 consultation was completed for the project APEs. No resources were identified in the vicinity of the proposed work areas. Washington DAHP agreed with two no effects determinations from survey reports; on 2/3/16, Log No.: 102215-06-BPA and on 5/26/16, Log No.: 2016-03-01670. If resources are discovered during construction activities, work would cease and the appropriate archaeological resources (BPA and WA DAHP) would be contacted.

2. Geology and Soils

Explanation: Sites would be stabilized upon completion of project activities. Storm water BMPs would be used during the project to protect the surrounding area from runoff and erosion issues.

 \checkmark

| 3. | Plants (including federal/state special-status species) | | |
|----|---|--|--|
|----|---|--|--|

Explanation: Work would occur in areas maintained as an open transmission line corridor; no vegetation would be removed and no special-status species are present.

~

~

4. **Wildlife** (including federal/state specialstatus species and habitats)

Explanation: Work would occur in areas maintained as an open transmission line corridor with little wildlife habitat; no special-status species or critical habitats would be affected.

5. Water Bodies, Floodplains, and Fish (including federal/state special-status

species and ESUs)

<u>Explanation</u>: No waterbodies, floodplains, or fish habitat are located at or near the project work areas. Appropriate storm water BMPs would be used during the project to protect the surrounding area from runoff and erosion issues. Sites would be stabilized upon completion of project activities.

| 6. | Wetlands | | | | | |
|---|---|--------------|-----------------------|--|--|--|
| | Explanation: No wetlands occur at or within the area of influence of the work sites. | | | | | |
| 7. | Groundwater and Aquifers | V | | | | |
| | Explanation: Project activities do not have the potential to impact groundwater or aquifers, including public and private water wells or springs. All spills would be addressed immediately and follow BPA protocol for cleanup and regulatory notifications. | | | | | |
| 8. | Land Use and Specially Designated Areas | | | | | |
| | Explanation: The project locations are confined to the ex land use includes rural residential, agricultural, and indus designated areas. | - | - | | | |
| 9. | Visual Quality | \checkmark | | | | |
| | Explanation: Proposed action at existing facilities would are in-kind and would not be visibly different from the existing the existing and would not be visibly different from the existence of | | tructure replacements | | | |
| 10. | Air Quality | \checkmark | | | | |
| Explanation: The project has a short duration and involves normal construction equipment activities. | | | | | | |
| 11. | Noise | | | | | |
| Explanation: The project is located away from any populated areas and places of residence. Noise disturbance would be limited to general construction equipment activities, would be for a short duration, and would occur during daylight hours. | | | | | | |
| 12. | Human Health and Safety | V | | | | |
| | Explanation: Completion of this project would increase system stability and reliability to the service area. | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Evaluation of Other Integral Elements | | | | | | |
| The proposed project would also meet conditions that are integral elements of the categorical exclusion. The project would not: | | | | | | |
| • | Threaten a violation of applicable statutory, regulatory, or health, or similar requirements of DOE or Executive Orde | | ment, safety, and | | | |
| | Explanation, if necessary: | | | | | |

Require siting and construction or major expansion of waste storage, disposal, recovery, or treatment facilities (including incinerators) that are not otherwise categorically excluded.

Explanation, if necessary:

Disturb hazardous substances, pollutants, contaminants, or CERCLA excluded petroleum and natural gas products that preexist in the environment such that there would be uncontrolled or unpermitted releases.

Explanation, if necessary:

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, such as those of the Department of Agriculture, the Environmental Protection Agency, and the National Institutes of Health.

Explanation, if necessary:

Landowner Notification, Involvement, or Coordination

Description: Notifications via mailed letters have been sent to all current landowners approximately 3-8 weeks prior to project initiation. The letters provide contact information for BPA to allow feedback from landowners/managers concerning the proposed project.

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

Signed: /s/ <u>Stuart Hugill for</u> Greg Tippetts KEPR/Olympia Olympia District Environmental Scientist Date: June 17, 2016