Categorical Exclusion Determination

Bonneville Power Administration
Department of Energy



Proposed Action: Agricultural Lease Renewal at Big Eddy Substation

LURR No.: 20170028

Project Manager: Laura Loop – TERR-3

Location: Wasco County, OR

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 renew an existing agricultural lease on BPA fee-owned land adjacent to the Big Eddy Substation in The Dalles, Oregon. The lease would allow the applicant to continue to use approximately 216 acres of BPA's land that surrounds the fenced yard of Big Eddy Substation for purposes of harvesting wheat. The applicant has been harvesting wheat on this land since 2005. No new use is proposed.

<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.

<u>/s/ Elizabeth Siping</u>
Elizabeth Siping
Contract Environmental Protection Specialist
Flux Resources, LLC

Reviewed by:	
<u>/s/ Gene Lynard</u> Gene Lynard Supervisory Environmental Protection Specialist	
Concur:	
<u>/s/ Stacy L. Mason</u> Stacy L. Mason	Date: February 14, 2017

Attachment: Environmental Checklist

NEPA Compliance Officer

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: Agricultural Lease Renewal at Big Eddy Substation - LURR 20170028

Project Site Description

The site is located at BPA's Big Eddy Substation on fee-owned ROW in Wasco County, Oregon. Big Eddy Substation is located northeast of the city center of The Dalles. The surrounding area is mostly undeveloped and agricultural land; there are some residences to northwest and southwest.

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> : The lease renewal would have no pote consultation required.	ential to affect historic _l	properties or cultural resources. No
2.	Geology and Soils		
	Explanation: The lease renewal would not change	existing farming disturb	pance to soils.
3.	Plants (including federal/state special-status species)		
	Explanation: The lease renewal would not affect for occur at the site. The applicant is responsible for o		
4.	Wildlife (including federal/state special- status species and habitats)		
	Explanation: The lease renewal would have minim species are known to occur at the site.	al disturbance to wildli	fe. No federal or state special-status
5.	Water Bodies, Floodplains, and Fish (including federal/state special-status species and ESUs)		
	Explanation: No water bodies, floodplains, or fish a	are present.	
6.	Wetlands		
	Explanation: No wetlands are present.		

7.	Groundwater and Aquifers	V			
	Explanation: No new wells or use of groundwater is proposed.				
8.	Land Use and Specially Designated Areas	V			
	Explanation: No change to land use is proposed.				
9.	Visual Quality	V			
	Explanation: No change to appearance is proposed.				
10.	Air Quality	V			
	Explanation: No change to the project site is proposed.				
11.	Noise	V			
	Explanation: No impact.				
12.	Human Health and Safety	V			
	Explanation: No impact.				
	Evaluation of Other In	tegral Flements			
The			avelusion. The		
	e proposed project would also meet conditions that are int ject would not:	egral elements of the categorical e	exclusion. The		
~	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.

Expl	anation,	if	necessary:

Landowner Notification, Involvement, or Coordination

<u>Description</u>: No notification planned; there would be no change or affect to adjacent landowners.

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

Date: *February 14, 2017*

Signed: <u>/s/ Elizabeth Siping</u>
Elizabeth Siping – ECT-4