Categorical Exclusion Determination

Bonneville Power Administration
Department of Energy



Proposed Action: Wautoma-Knight #1 Spacer Replacement, 15/3 to 20/2

PP&A No.: 3662

<u>Project Manager</u>: Brent Thompson

Location: Yakima County, Washington

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

activities

<u>Description of the Proposed Action</u>: BPA proposes to replace legacy spacers on the Wautoma-Knight #1 transmission line.

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

Transmission Line/ROW	Structure #	Township	Range	Section	County, State
Wautoma-Knight #1	15/3	10N	22E	3	Yakima, WA
	15/4 to 16/4	10N	22E	4	
	16/5 to 17/1	10N	22E	9	
	17/2 to 17/5	10N	22E	8	
	18/1 to 18/3	10N	22E	17	
	18/4 to 19/2	10N	22E	18	
	19/3 to 19/4	10N	22E	19	
	19/5 to 20/2	10N	21E	24	

Replacement would be in-kind and ground-disturbing activities are not expected. A man lift would be used to place the carts on the line. Support vehicles would utilize existing roads only.

Spacers being replaced are all in easements on privately-owned property. These structures are located within or adjacent to residential properties, orchards, pastures, or similar type land uses.

The proposed action would allow safe and timely access to the transmission line which would help reduce outage times and maintain reliable power in the region. All work would be in accordance with the National Electrical Safety Code and BPA standards.

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>Shawn Barndt</u> Shawn L. Barndt Environmental Scientist

Concur:

/s/ <u>Sarah T. Biegel</u> Sarah T. Biegel NEPA Compliance Officer

Attachment:

Environmental Checklist

Date: April 19, 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: Wautoma-Knight #1 Spacer Replacement, 15/3 to 20/2

Project Site Description

Proposed routine maintenance activities are to be conducted on the Wautoma-Knight #1 Transmission Line. The project area is located on private property, within or adjacent to residential properties, orchards, pastures, or similar type land uses. The area has been previously disturbed by agricultural practices and road 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	~	
	Explanation: No ground-disturbing activition be used.	es are planned for this p	roject. Existing access roads would
2.	Geology and Soils		
	Explanation: No ground-disturbing activiti	es are planned for this p	oroject.
3.	Plants (including federal/state special-status species)		
	Explanation: No special-status species are road development.	present. Area is previou	sly disturbed by agriculture and
4.	Wildlife (including federal/state special- status species and habitats)		
	Explanation: No special-status species or dagriculture and road development.	lesignated habitat prese	nt. Area is previously disturbed by
5.	Water Bodies, Floodplains, and Fish (including federal/state special-status species and ESUs)		
	Explanation: No water bodies are present i	n project area.	

6.	Wetlands	▽					
	Explanation: None present.						
7.	Groundwater and Aquifers	▽					
	Explanation: No ground-disturbing activities are propose Spill prevention measures would be present on site.	ed, and no wells or use of groundw	ater are proposed.				
8.	Land Use and Specially Designated Areas	▽					
	Explanation: No change in land use.						
9.	Visual Quality	▽					
	Explanation: New spacers would not be noticeably different than existing structures.						
10.	Air Quality	▽					
	Explanation: Small amount of temporary dust and vehicle emissions due to construction.						
11.	Noise	▼					
	Explanation: Temporary construction noise. Operationa	I noise would not change.					
12.	Human Health and Safety	▽					
Explanation: No known soil contamination or hazardous conditions.							
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

Description:

Coordination with property owners has occurred. No concerns.

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

Signed: /s/ Shawn Barndt Date: April 19, 2017

Shawn L. Barndt/EPR-Tri Cities RMHQ