Categorical Exclusion Determination

Bonneville Power Administration
Department of Energy



Proposed Action: Walnut City Tap Line Sale to McMinnville Power and Light

Project Manager: Gordon Markley

Location: Yamhill County, OR

Categorical Exclusion Applied (from Subpart D, 10 C.F.R. Part 1021): B1.24 Property Transfers

<u>Description of the Proposed Action</u>: BPA proposes to sell the Walnut City Tap Line assets and transfer ownership to McMinnville Water and Light. The BPA Walnut City 115 kV tap line spans from McMinnville's Water and Light (MW&L) Walnut City Substation to BPA's Keeler-McMinnville No. 1 transmission line. The 5.63-mile tap line is located in Yamhill County. The line's setting is mostly agricultural and rural crossing through farmland, but also residential where it crosses through McMinnville to terminate at the Walnut City Substation at 1915 SW 2nd Street.

The Walnut City tap line was designed and constructed by BPA and energized in 1965. The 5.63-milelong line is composed of 91 wood pole structures. The line remains essentially as designed and built by BPA. The underlying land is in private ownership and is currently leased by BPA, and will not be included in the sale. BPA will transfer its lease agreements to MW&L. Only the structures, conductors, and associated equipment are included in the sale.

<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.

Date: August 21, 2018

/s/ Douglas F. Corkran

Douglas F. Corkran Environmental Protection Specialist

Concur:

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

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: Walnut City Tap Line Sale to McMinnville Power and Light

Project Site Description

The project is located in the northwestern Willamette Valley in Yamhill County, OR near the City of McMinnville. The area is mostly rural agricultural land, with some areas of residences and several forested river bottom crossings.

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: The Walnut City Tap Line has been de Historic Places under Criterion A for its association Pacific Northwest Transmission System. No ground facility will continue to be operated as it has in the adverse effect on historic properties. The Oregon States	with the development d-disturbing work is asso past. BPA has determi	of the Bonneville Power Administration ociated with the asset sale and the ined the undertaking will have no
2.	Geology and Soils		
	Explanation: No ground-disturbing work is associately the change in asset ownership.	ated with the asset sale	e; soils and geology would not be affected
3.	Plants (including federal/state special-status species)	V	
	Explanation: No ground-disturbing work is associ routine vegetation management would be carried		
4.	Wildlife (including federal/state special- status species and habitats)	V	
	Explanation: No noise or habitat-disturbing work wildlife or their habitats due the change in asset of		asset sale; there would be no impacts to
5.	Water Bodies, Floodplains, and Fish (including federal/state special-status species and ESUs)	V	
	Explanation: No ground-disturbing work is associated bodies, floodplains, and fish due to the change in		; there would be no impacts to water
6.	Wetlands		
	Explanation: No ground-disturbing work is associated to the change in asset ownership.	ated with the asset sale	e; there would be no impacts to wetlands

7.	Groundwater and Aquifers					
	Explanation: No ground-disturbing work is associa groundwater and aquifers due to the change in ass	•	there would be no impacts to			
8.	Land Use and Specially Designated Areas	V				
	<u>Explanation</u> : Use and operation of the assets will remain essentially the same, just under different ownership; there would be no impacts to existing land uses or specially designated areas.					
9.	Visual Quality	V				
	Explanation: Existing conditions would remain unchanged. There would be no impacts to visual quality as a result of the change in asset ownership.					
10.	Air Quality					
<u>Explanation</u> : No dust or pollution will be released as part of the asset sale; there would be no impact quality due to the change in asset ownership.						
11.	Noise	V				
	Explanation: No noise would be produced as part of the asset sale and equipment. There would be no change to existing noise conditions and thus no noise-related impacts due to the change in asset ownership.					
12.	Human Health and Safety					
	Explanation: No new health or safety risks would be existing conditions and thus, no impacts to health a	· ·				
Evaluation of Other Integral Elements						
	Evaluation of Otl	ner Integral Elements	<u>i</u>			
	Evaluation of Otless proposed project would also meet conditions that ject would not:	_				
pro	proposed project would also meet conditions that	are integral elements o tory, or permit requirer	f the categorical exclusion. The			
pro	proposed project would also meet conditions that ject would not: Threaten a violation of applicable statutory, regula	are integral elements o tory, or permit requirer	f the categorical exclusion. The			
pro	proposed project would also meet conditions that ject would not: Threaten a violation of applicable statutory, regula health, or similar requirements of DOE or Executive	are integral elements on tory, or permit requirer e Orders.	f the categorical exclusion. The ments for environment, safety, and osal, recovery, or treatment			
pro	proposed project would also meet conditions that ject would not: Threaten a violation of applicable statutory, regula health, or similar requirements of DOE or Executive Explanation, if necessary: Require siting and construction or major expansion	are integral elements on tory, or permit requirer e Orders.	f the categorical exclusion. The ments for environment, safety, and osal, recovery, or treatment			
pro	proposed project would also meet conditions that ject would not: Threaten a violation of applicable statutory, regula health, or similar requirements of DOE or Executive Explanation, if necessary: Require siting and construction or major expansion facilities (including incinerators) that are not other	are integral elements of tory, or permit requirer e Orders. In of waste storage, displaying the categorically exclusionants, or CERCLA exclusionants, or CERCLA exclusionants.	f the categorical exclusion. The ments for environment, safety, and cosal, recovery, or treatment ded.			
pro	proposed project would also meet conditions that ject would not: Threaten a violation of applicable statutory, regula health, or similar requirements of DOE or Executive Explanation, if necessary: Require siting and construction or major expansion facilities (including incinerators) that are not other Explanation, if necessary: Disturb hazardous substances, pollutants, contamination.	are integral elements of tory, or permit requirer e Orders. In of waste storage, displaying the categorically exclusionants, or CERCLA exclusionants, or CERCLA exclusionants.	f the categorical exclusion. The ments for environment, safety, and cosal, recovery, or treatment ded.			
pro	proposed project would also meet conditions that ject would not: Threaten a violation of applicable statutory, regula health, or similar requirements of DOE or Executive Explanation, if necessary: Require siting and construction or major expansion facilities (including incinerators) that are not other Explanation, if necessary: Disturb hazardous substances, pollutants, contamination products that preexist in the environment such that	tory, or permit requirer e Orders. n of waste storage, disp wise categorically exclust there would be uncordict biology, government ad be contained or conficentironment and conditions.	f the categorical exclusion. The ments for environment, safety, and losal, recovery, or treatment ded. ded petroleum and natural gas ntrolled or unpermitted releases. ally designated noxious weeds, or ned in a manner designed and lucted in accordance with applicable			

Landowner Notification, Involvement, or Coordination

<u>Description</u>: BPA Realty and/or McMinnville Power and Light will notify affected landowners about the change in ownership.

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

Signed: <u>/s/ Douglas F. Corkran</u> Date: <u>August 21, 2018</u>

Douglas F. Corkran - ECT-4