Categorical Exclusion Determination

Bonneville Power Administration
Department of Energy



Proposed Action: Ross-Lexington No. 1 Transmission Structure Inspections

PP&A No.: 3,520

Project Manager: Kevin Machtelinckx - TELM-TPP-3

Location: Clark County, WA, & Cowlitz County, WA

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

<u>Description of the Proposed Action</u>: BPA is proposing to conduct an inspection of transmission tower steel lattice legs and concrete footings at 187 towers of the Ross-Lexington No. 1 230 kV transmission line. The action is to address potential corrosion of the steel lattice and degradation of concrete footings, which may be impacting the structural integrity of the towers and putting the transmission lines at risk. The project would involve soil sampling for redox potential and pH testing, visual inspection of the steel lattice legs, and hand excavation 12 – 24 inches deep in the immediate vicinity of the concrete and plate footings to inspect the concrete and steel lattice below ground surface. The inspection at each steel lattice tower would be documented for later repairs, as necessary. The excavated area would then be backfilled and restored with an appropriate seed mix.

<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/ <u>Aaron Siemers</u>

Aaron Siemers
Physical Scientist (Environmental)

Concur:

/s/ <u>Stacy L. Mason</u> Stacy L. Mason NEPA Compliance Officer

Attachment(s):

Environmental Checklist

Date: April 24, 2017

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: Ross-Lexington No. 1 Transmission Structure Inspections

Project Site Description

The proposed project sites are located along BPA's Ross-Lexington No. 1 230 kV transmission line which runs from Ross Substation in Clark County, WA, to Lexington Substation in Cowlitz County, WA. The ground disturbing work would be completed in the compacted backfill footprint that was emplaced during the original construction of the towers. Tower locations range from urban and suburban areas, to rolling foothills and farmlands. The transmission line starts at Ross Substation in Vancouver, WA, in the Portland/Vancouver basin before crossing the foothills of the western Cascades lowlands and valleys, and then dropping back into the Columbia River valley near Lexington Substation. The locations of the towers, and the towers proposed for inspection under this project, are listed below:

Township		Range		Section	Towers
2	N	1	Е	14	1/1
2	N	1	Е	11	1/2, 1/3, 1/4, 1/5, 1/6, 1/7, 2/1, 2/2
2	N	1	E	59	2/3, 2/4
2	N	1	Е	1	2/5, 3/1
2	N	1	E	58	3/2, 3/3, 3/4
3	N	1	E	36	3/5, 3/6, 4/1, 4/2, 4/3
3	N	1	E	25	4/4, 4/5, 5/1, 5/2, 5/3
3	N	1	E	24	5/4, 6/1, 6/2, 6/3
3	N	1	Е	13	6/4, 6/5, 7/1, 7/2, 7/3
3	N	1	E	12	7/4, 8/1, 8/2, 8/3, 8/4
3	N	1	E	1	8/5, 8/6, 9/1, 9/2,
4	N	1	Е	36	9/3, 9/4, 10/1, 10/2,10/3
4	N	1	E	25	10/4, 10/5, 11/1, 11/2, 11/3
4	N	1	Е	24	11/4, 11/5, 12/1, 12/2, 12/3, 12/4
4	N	1	E	13	12/5, 12/6, 13/1, 13/2
4	N	1	Е	12	13/3, 13/4, 13/5, 14/1, 14/2
4	N	1	E	1	14/3, 15/1, 15/2, 15/3, 15/4
5	N	1	E	36	15/5, 15/6, 16/1, 16/2, 16/3
5	N	1	Е	25	16/4, 17/1, 17/2, 17/3
5	N	1	E	24	17/4, 17/5, 18/1, 18/2, 18/3
5	N	1	E	13	18/4, 19/1, 19/2
5	N	1	E	12	19/3, 19/4
5	N	1	Е	11	19/5, 20/1
5	N	1	E	2	20/2, 20/5, 21/1, 21/2, 21/3
6	N	1	E	35	21/4, 21/5, 22/1
6	N	1	Е	34	22/2, 22/3
6	N	1	Е	27	23/1, 23/2, 23/3
6	N	1	E	22	23/4, 23/5, 24/1, 24/2
6	N	1	Е	21	24/3
6	N	1	Е	16	24/4, 25/1, 25/2, 25/3, 25/4, 25/5
6	N	1	Е	9	26/1, 26/2, 26/3, 26/4, 26/5, 26/6

6	N	1	Е	5	27/1, 27/2, 27/3, 27/4, 28/1, 28/2
7	N	1	Е	31	28/3, 28/4, 29/1, 29/2, 29/3
7	N	1	Е	30	29/4, 30/1
7	N	1	W	25	30/2, 30/3, 30/4, 30/5
7	N	1	W	23	31/1, 31/2, 31/3, 31/4, 32/1, 32/2
7	N	1	W	15	32/3, 32/4, 33/1, 33/2, 33/3, 33/4, 34/1
7	N	1	W	10	34/2
7	N	1	W	9	34/3, 34/4, 35/1, 35/2
7	N	1	W	4	35/3
7	N	1	W	5	35/4, 36/1, 36/2, 36/3, 36/4, 36/5, 36/6
8	N	1	W	31	37/1, 37/2, 37/3, 38/1, 38/2
8	N	2	W	25	38/3, 38/4, 38/5, 39/1, 39/2, 39/3, 39/4
8	N	2	W	23	40/1, 40/2, 40/3, 40/4, 40/5, 40/6
8	N	2	W	14	41/1, 41/2
8	N	2	W	15	41/3

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: BPA archaeology staff reviewed the prinvolve 12"-24" inches of soil excavation immediate that all excavation would take place in previously potential to impact historic properties.	tely surrounding the co	ncrete and plate footings, and the fact
2.	Geology and Soils		
	Explanation: The project would have minimal soil upon project completion.	disturbance. All disturb	ed soil will be backfilled and compacted
3.	Plants (including federal/state special-status species)		
	Explanation: No special-status species are known plant data shows no presence of endangered speright-of-way (ROW). Soil disturbance would be is The sites would be reseeded upon backfill with a effect special status plants.	ecies. Work would be co solated around steel late	nducted in an existing transmission line cice legs, and conducted with hand tools.
4.	Wildlife (including federal/state special- status species and habitats)		
	Explanation: Near tower 37/1, state records show scope of the project, which involves hand excava disturb the nest if it happened to be active. No or sites, and no designated habitat is present in the species and other wildlife.	tion without heavy mad ther special status speci	hinery, project activities would not es are known to be present in the work

5.	Water Bodies, Floodplains, and Fish (including federal/state special-status species and ESUs)						
	Explanation: Standard erosion control BMPs would be implemented and no riparian habitat would be affected. No endangered fish-bearing streams would be impacted by the project.						
6.	Wetlands	V					
	<u>Explanation</u> : Six structure sites are located in areas listed in the National Wetland Inventory. However, these sites can easily be approached on foot, standing or flowing water is not present, and water quality would not be impacted by excavation. No additional fill material would be emplaced at the work sites, so permitting or notification to regulatory agencies is not required. Standard erosion control BMPs would be implemented						
7.	Groundwater and Aquifers	▽					
	Explanation: No new wells or use of ground water is proposed.						
8.	Land Use and Specially Designated Areas	▽					
	<u>Explanation</u> : Existing land use would not be affected. All designated areas are present.	the work is within the BPA right-of	f-way, and no specially				
9.	Visual Quality	▽					
	<u>Explanation</u> : All excavations are located around steel to from the scope of work.	wer legs. There would be no impac	ts to visual quality				
10.	Air Quality	▽					
	Explanation: The project would involve hand-digging, intowers. There would be no significant impacts to air qua	•	ce transmission				
11.	Noise	▽					
	Explanation: The project would involve hand-digging, intowers. There would be no significant impacts to ambier		ce transmission				
12.	Human Health and Safety	▽					
	<u>Explanation</u> : Workers on the project would follow a safety.	ety plan. The project would not imp	act human health or				
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: NA						
V	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: NA

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: NA

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: NA

Landowner Notification, Involvement, or Coordination

<u>Description</u>: The proposed project is located on private and public land. BPA will continue ongoing coordination with the landowners.

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

Signed: /s/ <u>Aaron Siemers</u> Date: <u>April 24, 2017</u>

Aaron Siemers

Environmental Protection Specialist