Categorical Exclusion Determination

Bonneville Power Administration
Department of Energy



Proposed Action: Washington County Sidewalk Easements

Project No.: 20160323 & 20160343

Project Manager: Victor Alvarado—TERR-Chemawa

Location: Washington County, Oregon

Categorical Exclusion Applied (from Subpart D, 10 C.F.R. Part 1021): B4.9 Multiple use of powerline

rights-of-way

<u>Description of the Proposed Action</u>: Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) is proposing to grant easements to Washington County, to install curbs and sidewalks near the Oregon City Stub transmission line. The first easement would be on the north side of SW Bull Mountain Road, near structure 17/4 of the transmission line. The second easement would be on the north side of SW Beef Bend Road, near structure 18/4. Each easement would be 5-ft wide by 100-ft long.

<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/ Beth Belanger

Beth Belanger
Contract Environmental Protection Specialist
Motus Recruiting & Staffing

Reviewed by:
/s/ Gene Lynard Gene Lynard Supervisory Environmental Protection Specialist

Date: *February 7, 2017*

Concur:

/s/ Stacy L. Mason
Stacy L. Mason
NEPA Compliance Officer

Attachment: 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: Washington County Sidewalk Easements

Project Site Description

The project locations are in Washington County, Oregon, along Bonneville Power Administration's (BPA) Oregon City Stub C transmission line, near towers 17/4 and 18/4. This project would occur along portions of the line that are located in Sections 8 and 16, Township 2 South, Range 1 West. The sites are within right-of-way easements, just north of SW Bull Mountain Road and SW Beef Bend Road.

The vegetation along the proposed sidewalk easement, north of SW Bull Mountain Road, consists of plantain (*Plantago lanceolata*), Queen Anne's lace (*Daucus carota*), red clover (*Trifolium pretense*), hawks beard (*Crepis* sp.), poison oak (*Toxicodendron diversilobum*), tansy (*Tanacetum vulgare*) and unidentified grasses.

The vegetation along the proposed sidewalk easement, north of SW Beef Bend Road, consists of native rose (*Rosa nootka*), curly dock (*Rumex crispus*), Queen Anne's lace (*Daucus carota*), plantain (*Plantago lanceolata*), Hawksbeard (*Crepis* sp.), blackberries (*Rubus* spp.), velvet grass (*Holcus lanatus*) and reed canary grass (*Phalaris arundinacea*).

A review of the National Wetland Inventory, topography and aerial photos did not indicate that there are any wetlands or water bodies at the sites; however, the USDA Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS) soil survey rates the soils at both locations as being hydric. During a site visit, BPA staff determined that neither location exhibits wetland characteristics.

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					
	Explanation: A Section 106 review concluded that there would be no adverse effects to historical or cultural resources. On December 23, 2016, the cultural resource survey was sent to the Oregon State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde and Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians. SHPO's Archaeologist, Dr. Dennis Griffin, concurred with BPA's no effect determination on January 6, 2017. To date, neither tribe has responded.					
	5	ertent archaeological discovery, all construction work would cease, until the BPA appropriate parties are notified, and suitable action is taken.				
2.	Geology and Soils	~				
	Explanation: The project areas are mostly level, but would require minor excavation and grading of soils. The grading would be to a maximum depth of 24 inches.					
	Best management practices (BMPs) would be util	ized to prevent erosion	of soils.			

	Plants (including federal/state special-status species)	V			
	<u>Explanation</u> : There are no special status plant species of native and non-native forbs. The right-of-way corridor tree growth.				
4.	Wildlife (including federal/state special- status species and habitats)	V			
	Explanation: There are no special status wildlife species to special-status species.	s or habitat present. The project w	ould have no impacts		
5.	Water Bodies, Floodplains, and Fish (including federal/state special-status species and ESUs)				
	Explanation: The project area does not have any waterbodies, floodplains or listed fish species. The nearest stream to the SW Bull Mountain Road easement is approximately 1,600 feet to the east; and the nearest stream to the SW Beef Bend Road area is approximately 1,000 feet to the east. BMPs would be utilized to avoid erosion during construction.				
6.	Wetlands				
	<u>Explanation</u> : The project area does not contain wetlands. The soils in both project areas are classified as hydric; however, a site visit was completed in September of 2016 and the project area did not exhibit wetland vegetation or hydrology characteristics. The locations are immediately adjacent to existing roadways. There would be no impacts to wetlands.				
7.	Groundwater and Aquifers	V			
	Explanation: The project would not impact groundwater or aquifers, as maximum depth of disturbance would be 3 feet.				
8.	Land Use and Specially Designated Areas	~			
	Explanation: There would be no major changes to the land use in the project areas.				
9.					
Э.	Visual Quality	V			
9.	Visual Quality Explanation: The project would not alter the visual quality				
	Explanation: The project would not alter the visual qua	ality of the area. I ons would occur during constructions	on; however there		
10.	Explanation: The project would not alter the visual quality Explanation: A small amount of dust and vehicle emiss	ality of the area. I ons would occur during constructions	on; however there		
10.	Explanation: The project would not alter the visual quality Air Quality Explanation: A small amount of dust and vehicle emiss would be no significant changes to air quality during or	ility of the area. v ions would occur during construction after construction. v 5 feet from the project location. Co			
10.	Explanation: The project would not alter the visual quality Air Quality Explanation: A small amount of dust and vehicle emiss would be no significant changes to air quality during or Noise Explanation: The nearest residence is approximately 3	ility of the area. v ions would occur during construction after construction. v 5 feet from the project location. Co			
10.	Explanation: The project would not alter the visual quality Explanation: A small amount of dust and vehicle emiss would be no significant changes to air quality during or Noise Explanation: The nearest residence is approximately 3 be temporary and would occur during daylight hours.	ions would occur during construction after construction. For feet from the project location. Construction noise would not change.	onstruction noise would		

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 permit requirements for environment, safety, and health, or similar requirements of DOE or Executive Orders.

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

<u>Description</u>: The project would occur on BPA owned property and would not require landowner notification or coordination.

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

Signed: <u>/s/ Beth Belanger</u>

Beth Belanger—ECT-4

Contract Environmental Protection Specialist

Motus Recruiting & Staffing