Categorical Exclusion Determination

Bonneville Power Administration
Department of Energy



Proposed Action: King County Parcel Conservation Easement Acquisition

Project Manager: Wendy Jansen – TERR-Olympia

Location: King County, Washington

<u>Categorical Exclusion Applied (from Subpart D, 10 C.F.R. Part 1021)</u>: B1.25 Real property transfers for cultural resources protection, habitat preservation, and wildlife management

<u>Description of the Proposed Action</u>: BPA proposes to acquire a conservation easement to be granted by the Washington Department of Natural Resources (WDNR) on 40 acres in King County, Washington. BPA purchased the parcel in 2002 as mitigation for the Kangley-Echo Lake transmission line project. BPA is transferring ownership of the parcel to WDNR as mitigation for the Central Ferry-Lower Monumental transmission line project. When initially purchased by BPA, BPA agreed that if any part of the parcel was sold, the buyer would grant BPA a conservation easement. To comply with this requirement, WDNR is granting BPA a conservation easement upon completion of the property transfer. Landownership would transfer to WDNR, but the land use would remain unchanged. The 40-acre parcel would be managed by WDNR in the same manner as described in the Raging River North and West Forest Stewardship Plan and WDNR's Habitat Conservation Plan.

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, Jul. 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

Date: June 26, 2019

(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/ Tish Eaton</u>

Tish Eaton Environmental Protection Specialist

Concur:

/s/ Sarah T. Biegel
Sarah T. Biegel
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: King County Parcel Conservation Easement Acquisition

Project Site Description

The 40-acre parcel (part of a larger BPA-owned parcel) is forested with moderate to somewhat steep slopes throughout. The parcel is bordered on the east by WDNR's Raging River State Forest and to the south and west by the City of Seattle's Cedar River Watershed. The area is closed to the public and there are no structures and few roads on the parcel.

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 has determined that no his the conservation easement from WDNR. It is comply with the Raging River North and West Conservation Plan.	expected that all activit	ies conducted on the parcel would
2.	Geology and Soils		
	Explanation: See explanation for #1 above.		
3.	Plants (including Federal/state special-status species and habitats)		
	Explanation: See explanation for #1 above.		
4.	Wildlife (including Federal/state special-status species and habitats)	V	
	Explanation: See explanation for #1 above.		
5.	Water Bodies, Floodplains, and Fish (including Federal/state special-status species, ESUs, and habitats)		
	Explanation: See explanation for #1 above.		
6.	Wetlands		
	Explanation: See explanation for #1 above.		
7.	Groundwater and Aquifers	~	
	Explanation: See explanation for #1 above.		
8.	Land Use and Specially-Designated Areas		
	Explanation: See explanation for #1 above.		

9.	Visual Quality				
	Explanation: See explanation for #1 above.				
10.	Air Quality				
	Explanation: See explanation for #1 above.				
11.	Noise				
	Explanation: See explanation for #1 above.				
12.	Human Health and Safety	V			
	Explanation: See explanation for #1 above.				
Evaluation of Other Integral Elements					
	e proposed project would also meet conditions that a e project would not:	re integral elements of the categ	orical exclusion.		
~	Threaten a violation of applicable statutory, regulator safety, and health, or similar requirements of DOE of	ry, or permit requirements for en or Executive Orders.	wironment,		
	Explanation, if necessary:				
~	Require siting and construction or major expansion facilities (including incinerators) that are not otherwi	of waste storage, disposal, reco se categorically excluded.	very, or treatment		
	Explanation, if necessary:				
V	Disturb hazardous substances, pollutants, contamin natural gas products that preexist in the environmer unpermitted releases.	ants, or CERCLA excluded petro it such that there would be unco	oleum and ntrolled or		
	Explanation, if necessary:				
V	Involve genetically engineered organisms, synthetic weeds, or invasive species, unless the proposed ac designed and operated to prevent unauthorized releaccordance with applicable requirements, such as the Environmental Protection Agency, and the National	tivity would be contained or conf ase into the environment and co hose of the Department of Agric	ined in a manner onducted in		
	Explanation, if necessary:				
<u>Landowner Notification, Involvement, or Coordination</u>					
<u>Description</u> : None required.					

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

Signed: <u>/s/ Tish Eaton</u> Tish Eaton, ECT-4 Date: June 26, 2019