# **Categorical Exclusion Determination**

Bonneville Power Administration Department of Energy



**Proposed Action:** Montana State Lands Easement Acquisition

**Project Manager**: Jaime Murray- TERR-Kalispell

**Location**: Multiple Counties, Montana

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

transfers

Description of the Proposed Action: Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) proposes to acquire approximately 800 easements from the Montana Department of State Lands for its existing transmission lines and facilities in the State of Montana. BPA was granted easements on Montana State lands from 1952 to 1972. The State of Montana issued the grants for easements crossing State trust lands. The State is the trustee of public lands for the beneficial use of Montana Public Schools. While the State had the authority to grant the easements, the State also had a fiduciary obligation to secure fair market value on behalf of their beneficiary. The Montana Supreme Court, and other Federal courts, have held that the State has a fiduciary obligation to obtain full market value for the use of school trust lands. Given that the State did not receive compensation for the grant, the rights are void. Montana passed legislation authorizing affected parties to file an application for easements on historical rights of way. The easement acquisitions would occur where there is land owned by the State of Montana underneath the following existing lines and facilities, in the following counties:

Transmission Lines	Facilities	Counties
Anaconda Aluminum Tap	Dixon Substation	Broadwater
Anaconda-Silver Bow No. 1	Garrison Substation	Deer Lodge
Broadview-Garrison No. 1 and No. 2	Hot Springs Substation	Flathead
Columbia Falls-Trego No. 1	Kalispell Maintenance Headquarters	Gallatin
Garrison-Anaconda No. 1	Kalispell Substation	Granite
Garrison-Taft No. 1 and No. 2	Libby Substation	Jefferson
Hot Springs-Rattlesnake No. 1	Rocky Ridge Radio Station	Lake
Hungry Horse-Conkelley No. 1	Troy Substation	Lincoln
Libby-Bonners Ferry No. 1		Mineral
Libby-Conkelley No. 1		Missoula
Mack's Inn-Madison No. 1		Powell
Noxon-Hot Springs No. 1		Sanders
Noxon-Libby No. 1		Silver Bow
Rattlesnake-Garrison No. 1		
Taft-Hot Springs No. 1		

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 10, 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.

## /s/ Douglas Corkran

Douglas Corkran 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: Montana State Lands Easement Acquisitions

### **Project Site Description**

The project locations are scattered throughout western Montana in 13 counties. There is a wide variety of conditions surrounding the locations, including shrub-steppe, grassland, forested areas, and urban areas.

### **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> : There would be no construction or ground disturbance associated with acquiring the easements; therefore, there is no potential to cause effects to historic or cultural resources.				
2.	Geology and Soils				
	Explanation: There would be no ground disturble would be no effects to geology or soils.	irbance associated with	h acquiring the easements; therefore,		
3.	<b>Plants</b> (including Federal/state special-status species and habitats)				
	Explanation: There would be no ground disturbance associated with acquiring the easements; therefore, there would be no impact to Federal or State special-status plants.				
4.	Wildlife (including Federal/state special- status species and habitats)				
	Explanation: There would be no impact to wi	Idlife associated with a	acquiring the easements.		
5.	Water Bodies, Floodplains, and Fish (including Federal/state special-status species, ESUs, and habitats)	V			
	<u>Explanation</u> : There would be no ground disturbance associated with acquiring the easements; therefore, there would be no impact to water bodies, floodplains, or fish.				
6.	Wetlands				
	Explanation: There would be no ground disturble would be no impact to wetlands.	ırbance associated with	h acquiring the easements; therefore,		
7.	Groundwater and Aquifers				
	<u>Explanation</u> : There would be no ground disturbance associated with acquiring the easements; therefore, there would be no impact to groundwater and aquifers.				

8.	Land Use and Specially-Designated Areas					
	Explanation: Existing land uses within the easemer impact to land use or specially-designated areas.	nt areas would be continued. The	ere would be no			
9.	Visual Quality	V				
	Explanation: Existing infrastructure and land uses we therefore, visual quality would not change.	vould remain following acquisitio	n of the easement;			
10.	Air Quality	V				
	<u>Explanation</u> : There would be no ground disturbance or construction associated with acquiring the easements; therefore, there would be no impact to air quality.					
11.	Noise	V				
	Explanation: There would be no construction or changes in transmission system operation associate with acquiring the easements; therefore, there would be no noise impacts.					
12.	Human Health and Safety	<u> </u>				
	Explanation: There would be no construction or chawith acquiring the easements; therefore, there would					
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, regulato safety, and health, or similar requirements of DOE of		vironment,			
	Explanation, if necessary:					
~	Require siting and construction or major expansion facilities (including incinerators) that are not otherwise		ery, or treatment			
	Explanation, if necessary:					
~	Disturb hazardous substances, pollutants, contamin natural gas products that preexist in the environment unpermitted releases.					
	Explanation, if necessary:					
~	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 ease into the environment and co hose of the Department of Agricu	ined in a manner anducted in			
	Explanation, if necessary:					

### **Landowner Notification, Involvement, or Coordination**

<u>Description</u>: BPA Realty staff would work closely with the underlying landowner (State of Montana) to acquire the additional easements.

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 Corkran</u> Date: <u>June 10, 2019</u>

Douglas Corkran—ECT-4

**Environmental Protection Specialist**