Bonneville Power Administration

Walla Walla–Tucannon River Transmission Line Rebuild Project

Finding of No Significant Impact

May 2011

Walla Walla–Tucannon Transmission Line Rebuild Project

DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY
Bonneville Power Administration

Finding of No Significant Impact and Floodplain Statement of Findings DOE EA-1731

Summary: Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) announces its environmental findings on the Walla Walla–Tucannon River Transmission Line Rebuild Project (Rebuild Project or Proposed Action). The Rebuild Project involves rebuilding the existing Walla Walla–Tucannon River 115-kilovolt (kV) transmission line, which was built in 1940. The 47-mile-long transmission line is located in Walla Walla and Columbia counties in Washington, extending from the city of Walla Walla to near the town of Dayton.

BPA has prepared an environmental assessment (EA) evaluating the Proposed Action and a No Action Alternative. Based on the analysis in the EA, BPA has determined that the Proposed Action is not a major federal action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment, within the meaning of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969. Therefore, preparation of an environmental impact statement (EIS) is not required and BPA is issuing this Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) for the Proposed Action. The Proposed Action is not the type of action that normally requires preparation of an EIS, and the nature of the Proposed Action is not without precedent.

Attached is a Mitigation Action Plan (MAP) that lists the mitigation measures that BPA is committed to implementing.

A Floodplain Statement of Findings is also included in this FONSI. The level of impacts on floodplains is low, and will be avoided where possible.

Public Availability: This FONSI will be mailed directly to interested parties who requested a copy. A notification of availability will be mailed to other potentially affected parties. For copies of this FONSI and EA, please call BPA's toll-free document request line: 1-888-276-7790. The documents are also available at the following website: http://www.efw.bpa.gov/environmental_services/Document_Library/Walla_Walla-Tucannon_River_Rebuild/.

Additional Information: For additional information about the project, please contact the Project Manager, Erich Orth, toll free at 1-800-282-3713, direct phone number 360-619-6559, or email etorth@bpa.gov. For additional information about the environmental analysis, please contact the Environmental Document Manager, Stephanie Breeden, toll-free at 1-800-282-3713, direct phone number 503-230-5192, or email at sfbreeden@bpa.gov.

Proposed Action: BPA currently owns, operates, and maintains the existing Walla Walla–Tucannon River 115-kV transmission line, a 47-mile-long transmission line located in Walla Walla and Columbia counties, Washington. No major rebuild work has been done on the transmission line since it was originally built. In general, wood poles supporting transmission lines are expected to have a service life of 55 to 60 years, at which point they are usually replaced because of age, rot, and other deterioration. Most of the structures on the transmission line now exceed their service life and are physically worn and structurally unsound in places.

The Proposed Action would involve:

- widening of the transmission line right-of-way (ROW) by 20 feet in both directions from the centerline;
- removal of existing wood-pole structures and conductors;
- installation of new wood-pole structures and associated components;
- installation of conductors, ground wire, and counterpoise;
- installation of two steel-lattice structures;
- improvement and reconstruction of some existing access roads;
- construction of new access roads;
- abandonment of some existing access roads;
- establishment of temporary staging areas for storage of materials;
- accommodation of facilities to allow for the potential future connection of a tap line that would connect the transmission line to Columbia Rural Electric Association (CREA) Dayton Substation;
- removal of some vegetation, including some danger trees; and
- revegetation of areas disturbed by construction activities.

The transmission line would continue to operate as a 115-kV line. The proposed schedule is to begin rebuilding the transmission line in June 2011. Ongoing stabilization of the work area, monitoring, clean up, and other project-related actions could continue through December, if needed. Details of the Proposed Action are presented in Chapter 2 of the EA.

No Action Alternative: The No Action Alternative assumes that BPA would not rebuild the transmission line and would continue to operate and maintain the existing transmission line. Construction activities associated with the Rebuild Project would not occur, and the reliability and safety concerns that prompted the proposal for action would persist.

Because of the condition of equipment, it is likely that more frequent maintenance and more frequent access would be required to maintain the transmission line as materials deteriorate and fail. Given the poor condition of some of the roads, it is possible that the road work proposed under the Proposed Action would be funded and carried out as an operations and maintenance project in the future, independent of rebuilding the transmission line. Also, if a decision is made

to build the Dayton Tap Line, BPA would need to install the appropriate equipment within its existing ROW.

Environmental Consequences: To evaluate potential impacts from construction and from operation and maintenance activities, four impact levels were used—high, moderate, low, and no impact. In addition, some impacts have been identified as beneficial. This impact analysis is detailed in Chapter 3 of the EA and is summarized below. High impacts are considered to be significant impacts, whereas moderate and low impacts are not. Direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts were evaluated.

The impact evaluation in Chapter 3 of the EA includes required mitigation. As mentioned above, a detailed MAP was developed to list the mitigation measures, components, persons responsible, and implementation schedule for each measure. The MAP includes measures to reduce impacts even when those impacts are not considered significant.

The following discussion provides a summary of the Proposed Action's potential impacts and the reasons these impacts would not be significant.

Land Use and Recreation: Impacts on land use and recreation would be low, except for low to moderate impacts on residential land uses, as noted below.

- Although BPA, as a Federal agency, is not required to comply with local land use regulations and policies, repairs to and replacement of existing structures under the Proposed Action would not conflict with these regulations or policies, and BPA would endeavor to be consistent with these regulations and policies wherever possible. Impacts related to local plans and policies thus are expected to be low.

- Construction of the project would permanently remove approximately 0.4 acre of land from agricultural production and would result in the temporary disturbance of an additional 32 acres of cultivated land. Given the small area of impact compared with the overall agricultural capacity of the Walla Walla Valley, impacts on agricultural production associated with construction would be low.

- Access to residential properties could be temporarily delayed, and dust and noise could be increased by equipment used for construction and maintenance. Because construction would be within the existing ROW and along existing access roads, the level of impact would depend on the proximity of homes to construction work sites. The level of impact for the residences along Wolf Fork Road near the intersection with Touchet River Road could rise to a moderate level given the relatively high density of homes.

- Because of the temporary nature of construction activities and the small number of recreational facilities in the study area, overall impacts on recreation as a result of the Proposed Action are anticipated to be low.

- Traffic delays from increased construction traffic and temporary lane closures are not expected to substantially degrade traffic operation because of their short duration.

Geology and Soils: Impacts on geology and soils would be low to moderate.

- Use of heavy equipment during construction and maintenance would result in soil compaction and soil disturbance that would increase the potential for erosion. Because disturbance would be localized and minimal, it would not significantly increase or permanently alter stormwater runoff with the implementation of best management practices.
- Road construction or reconstruction would require removal of existing vegetation, grading, compaction, placement of crushed rock as a road base, and construction or replacement of culverts, as necessary. These activities would result in soil compaction and temporary increases in construction-related erosion and stormwater runoff. Similarly, abandoned roadbeds would likely degrade over time and might contribute to soil erosion. However, implementation of the mitigation measures would reduce the potential for construction-related erosion and resulting impacts on soils.
- In general, operation and maintenance activities would have a low direct impact on soils, because they would be confined to small, localized areas dispersed along the length of the transmission line corridor.
- The Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) has designated over 90% of the study area as highly erodible lands that, if in crop production subject to federal farm benefits, must be managed under an NRCS-approved soil conservation system. With implementation of mitigation measures, the impacts of the Proposed Action would be low to moderate.

Vegetation: Impacts on vegetation would be low to moderate.

- Structure work would remove or temporarily disturb vegetation, with the amount of disturbance depending on the type of structure, the quality of existing vegetation and soils, and site topography. Impacts would be minimized by the restriction of construction work areas to limit disturbance to vegetation.
- Access road improvements would require removal of existing vegetation, grading, compaction, placement of crushed rock as a road base, and construction/replacement of culverts, as necessary. These activities would result in soil compaction and impacts on existing vegetation. Impacts on these areas would be low, due to the small size of the disturbance area.
- Staging areas would be located outside sensitive areas (streams, wetlands), in level, open, and already developed or disturbed sites.
- Construction-related ground disturbance would open up new areas for weed infestation. Impacts from weed spread would be low with implementation of mitigation measures.
- Operations and maintenance activities in the ROW would result in localized vegetation disturbance. Vegetation maintenance would be conducted under BPA's *Transmission System Vegetation Management Program*, which uses a variety of methods. Impacts on

vegetation resulting from operation and maintenance of the Proposed Action are expected to be low.

Fish and Wildlife:

Fish and Essential Fish Habitat

Impacts on fish and fish habitat would be low.

- Culvert replacements would be done in the dry season to avoid potential impacts on water quality during installation.
- Construction and maintenance activities could impact fish habitat, if sediments from work areas reach streams. Implementation of mitigation measures, including best management practices, would limit impacts.
- Tensioning sites are required at various points in a specific alignment with the proposed support structures and conductor alignment. There would be no impact on fish, including federally listed fish species, or fish habitat from installing tensioning sites and counterpoise.
- If trees in riparian corridors within the study area are removed, there is the potential for a reduction in stream shading and habitat functions; however, very few trees would be removed that would have any effect on shading of small streams and only one small tree that would be removed is located near a larger, fish-bearing stream.
- Approximately 40 danger trees would be located within 300 feet of fish-bearing streams. Impacts resulting from the removal of these trees would be minimized through mitigation measures to reduce disturbance, erosion, and sedimentation.
- During operation and maintenance of the transmission line, only approved herbicides would be applied near streams or wetlands, and buffer distances would be observed in accordance with BPA's *Transmission System Vegetation Management Program*.
- The Proposed Action would result in future widening of the ROW through easement acquisition. Approved BPA vegetation management practices would be implemented in the new ROW, once acquired. As on the existing ROW, impacts on fish and fish habitat, including federally listed fish species, from ROW easement acquisition would be low.

Threatened and Endangered Species

- BPA has consulted with the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Association (NOAA) National Marine Fisheries Service under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act on the potential effects of the Proposed Action on federally listed species or their habitat. NOAA has issued specific terms and conditions that BPA is committed to follow, assessed and outlined in the Environmental Assessment MAP. A Biological Opinion has not been received from NOAA on the Proposed Action; therefore BPA will not work in or near stream crossings until the Biological Opinion is received.

Wildlife and Their Habitat

Impacts on wildlife from habitat modification, degradation, or loss and disturbance of wildlife would be low to moderate.

- Habitat loss associated with removal and installation of new structures would only occur within the existing ROW and would result in a temporary loss of vegetation already subject to ongoing vegetation management activities.
- Indirect impacts from noxious weed infestation of wildlife habitat could occur as noxious weeds establish themselves in the disturbed area surrounding structures; however vegetation management and mitigation measures specific to the spread of noxious weeds within the study area would minimize that impact.
- Use of roads during construction would result in a slight increase in noise and activity levels compared to existing conditions; however, no appreciable wildlife response to construction activities would be expected. Impacts on wildlife and their habitat from road construction or reconstruction are considered low.
- Potential impacts associated with staging areas would be the same as those associated with removal of existing structures and installation of new structures, but would differ slightly in magnitude, because the affected staging areas would be somewhat larger. Nonetheless, this impact would be low because BPA would attempt to locate staging areas in industrial or paved areas.
- Potential impacts associated with tensioning sites and counterpoise would be considered low, because they would only occur in the existing ROW and the sites would be allowed to return to their previous condition.
- The updated transmission line would likely require less maintenance work, compared with the existing transmission line, due to the newer condition of the facilities and structures once installed. Maintenance activities could remove trees and temporarily displace wildlife from work areas, but impacts are expected to be low.
- Bird mortality as a result of collisions with conductors and structures would remain at current levels, because the lines would remain in the same location with the same type of structures. Additionally, new overhead ground wire would not be installed on new sections of the line. Birds tend to be more likely to strike ground wires, which are much smaller in diameter than conductors and normally span the top of the structure.
- The Proposed Action would result in future widening of the ROW through easement acquisition. Approved BPA vegetation management practices would be implemented in the widened ROW, once acquired. Impacts on wildlife from ROW easement acquisition are considered low.
- Danger trees of various sizes and species would be removed. Some of these trees are located in riparian areas. Given the relatively small number of trees to be removed, it is

unlikely that wildlife habitat would be limited by danger tree removal activities. Impacts on wildlife and their habitat from danger tree removal activities are considered low.

- Impacts on state priority species and habitats would be similar to those described above for wildlife species in general. Minimization measures incorporated into the design of the Proposed Action (i.e., limiting the disturbance area near aquatic habitats, minimizing the use of access roads in such habitats, and implementing temporary erosion and sediment control measures to protect water quality) would minimize the potential for impacts on these species.

Water Resources and Water Quality: Impacts on waterways and water quality would be low to moderate.

- The Proposed Action would result in 0.1 to 0.2 acre of ground disturbance from the removal of each existing structure and the installation of a new structure. Although these areas would be revegetated, the structure sites would have a small area of exposed bare soil for a few weeks that could, if unchecked, erode and be a source of sediment to nearby streams. Generally, this would fall within the range of current conditions, and the implementation of the mitigation measures would reduce these potential construction-related water quality impacts.

- Access road construction would require clearing and grading that would temporarily expose soil to potential erosion and transport of sediment to surface waters. Implementation of mitigation measures would reduce the potential for erosion and adverse water quality impacts associated with access road construction.

- BPA would require the construction contractor to locate all staging areas outside stream channels in level, open, and already developed or disturbed sites, where feasible.

- Tensioning sites are required at various points in a specific alignment with the proposed support structures and conductor alignment. Because the tensioning equipment would likely be vehicle- or trailer-mounted, these sites would need to be vehicle-accessible. Tensioning sites would pose no special concerns for surface waters.

- Operation and maintenance activities would not change from existing conditions. Generally, these activities would have no impact on surface waters. Temporary increases in turbidity associated with danger tree removal during maintenance activities would not exceed the terms and conditions of permits that would be obtained for the Proposed Action or any regulatory thresholds. Because the disturbance would be isolated to specific locations, would be temporary, and would not exceed water quality parameters, the direct impacts on water quality would be low.

- Approved BPA vegetation management practices would be implemented in the widened ROW, once acquired. Generally, these activities would have low impacts on surface waters.

- Surface water quality could be directly affected by increased turbidity from erosion and sedimentation associated with danger tree removal. However, based on the relatively low number of danger trees that would be removed near surface waters in isolated locations, this impact is considered to be low.

- The Proposed Action would have no impact on groundwater during the construction phase. During operation and maintenance, the only potential effect on groundwater would be associated with the application of chemical herbicides for vegetation management. However, herbicides use would be limited to approved herbicides applied by a licensed applicator in quantities that would degrade in the surface soil or plant surfaces in accordance with BPA's *Transmission System Vegetation Management Program.*

Wetlands: Impacts on wetlands would be low.

- Less than 0.1 acre of temporary impact on a wetland area would result through disturbance to vegetation and potential compaction of the wetland soil. In this case, the old structure would be pulled out and a new wood pole would be placed in the same hole, resulting in minimal, temporary impacts on wetland vegetation and soils if plants are trampled, broken, or crushed by equipment. Any excavated materials would be disposed of in an upland location outside of the wetland and its buffer area.

- Reconstruction of existing roads would occur near two wetlands. Implementation of mitigation measures would reduce any impacts associated with access roads in or near wetland areas.

- The use of tensioning sites would result in low impacts, if they were located within 100 feet of wetlands. These impacts would be associated with a low potential for increased construction-related runoff and erosion.

- Maintenance of structures or roads in or directly adjacent to wetlands would rarely be needed, but could result in minor disturbance of wetland or adjacent upland vegetation.

- Approximately 40 trees and no brush would be removed within a wetland as part of danger tree removal activities required for the Proposed Action. All felled trees would be removed from the wetland. This would result in a minor disturbance of wetlands. The removal of danger trees would have a low impact on wetlands.

Floodplains: Impacts on floodplains would be low.

- Impacts within floodplains from removal, relocation, and replacement of nine existing structures, including soil compaction and vegetation removal, would be temporary and localized. Work within floodplains would only minimally alter floodplain functions.

- In addition to the structures identified above, five existing structures are located within 200 feet of mapped floodplains and would be replaced in-kind. This impact is considered low, because it would be temporary in nature, limited in scale, and would occur outside of the mapped floodplains and because the disturbed area would revegetate in one growing season.

- No impact on floodplains would result from construction of the new access roads, because none of them would be located within 200 feet of 100-year floodplains. Reconstruction or improvement of existing access roads would have low impacts on three floodplain areas along the alignment.
- Maintenance of access roads and other infrastructure in the study area, including grading or rocking road surfaces, replacing culverts, and removing vegetation, could result in minor soil compaction, erosion, and loss of vegetation within floodplains. These impacts are anticipated to be low because they would be infrequent, temporary, and limited in scope.
- Impact from tensioning sites is expected to be low, because the impact would be temporary and the footprint would be limited in scale. Implementation of mitigation measures would further ensure that tensioning would result in a low impact on floodplains.
- Approved BPA vegetation management practices would be implemented in the widened ROW, once acquired. These vegetation management activities would not be ground-disturbing; therefore, there would be low to no impacts on floodplains in the widened ROW.
- Impacts on floodplains from tree and vegetation removal would be low because of the small area that would be affected relative to the overall size of each of the floodplains and the limited number of danger trees that would be removed.

Visual Quality: Temporary and permanent visual impacts would be low.

- Views of the transmission line from U.S. 12 are confined to the area where the line crosses the highway between Structures 22/4 and 22/5. Because views of the transmission line from U.S. 12 are confined to this single location, and the transmission line is an existing visual element, replacement with similar structures would not significantly alter the visual landscape.
- The existing transmission line corridor is already a prominent element in the visual landscape for nearby residential viewers. Permanent impacts from the installation of additional structures would be confined to residents in the immediate vicinity of each of the additional structures and are anticipated to be low.
- Visual impacts of the Proposed Action on recreational viewers—recreational bicyclists and sightseers along public roadways, as well as hikers, hunters, or campers on private property—would consist of the temporary exposure to construction activities and would be considered low.

Air Quality: Impacts on air quality would be low.

- Operation of heavy equipment during construction and maintenance could result in temporary and localized increases in air pollutants.

- Air quality could also be slightly affected as a result of the operation and maintenance of facilities associated with the Proposed Action, including the widened ROW, but the number of vehicles trips is anticipated to be low and would be similar to existing conditions.

Socioeconomics and Public Services: Impacts on socioeconomics and public services would be low or no impact, and some effects would be beneficial.

- The main beneficial socioeconomic impact of the Proposed Action would be the economic activity associated with rebuilding the transmission line. The rebuild would require up to 30 construction workers each working an average of 60 hours per week for approximately 6 months.

- The main adverse economic impact of the Proposed Action would be temporary displacement of crop production—mainly dryland grain—resulting from land disturbance from construction activities. Because only a very small area (approximately 32 acres) would be affected and this impact would be temporary, the impact would be low. In addition, because the beneficial economic impacts of additional construction activity in the region would outweigh the adverse impacts of displaced crop production, the overall economic impact of the Proposed Action would be beneficial.

- Some short-term impacts on property value and salability could occur on an individual basis during construction; however, the Proposed Action would have no appreciable impacts on property values over the long term.

- The Proposed Action would not affect the amount of property taxes collected by the counties crossed by the transmission line.

- Taxes generated as a result of local purchases by contractors would not result in a considerable change in state tax revenues collected. Therefore, the impact on state sales tax revenues would be low.

- During construction, guard structures would be placed over local utility lines and roadways to ensure continued service and safe passage in the event that the conductor line or other materials were dropped during construction. Therefore, the Proposed Action would result in low or no impacts on public services.

Cultural Resources: Impacts on cultural resources eligible for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) are expected to be low or none.

- Although not currently listed, the Walla Walla–Tucannon River transmission line is considered eligible for listing on the NRHP. It is anticipated that the Proposed Action would have no adverse effect on the transmission line as a historic property.

- Construction activities have the potential to affect cultural resources, including human remains, not currently known to exist in the study area. Implementation of mitigation

measures would ensure that previously undiscovered cultural resources were managed properly and would minimize both direct and indirect impacts from the Proposed Action.

- No operation- or maintenance-related impacts on cultural resources would occur as a result of the Proposed Action, because these activities are not ground-disturbing.

Noise, Public Health, and Safety: Noise impacts from construction and maintenance work would be low to moderate. Impacts on public health and safety would be low.

- Construction activities would result in short-term and intermittent noise impacts as construction progresses along the transmission line corridor. Noise would come from construction equipment and vehicles used for road work and structure removal and replacement, but are not expected to result in a significant increase in average traffic noise levels. Noise impacts from construction traffic along local roads would be considered low.

- Periodic noise impacts would occur during maintenance activities and would typically be associated with equipment used to maintain or repair infrastructure associated with the Proposed Action.

- Under the Proposed Action, the operating voltage of the transmission line would not change. Thus, the corona-generated audible noise environment along the impacted line sections is not expected to significantly change as a result of the Proposed Action.

- Potential health and safety impacts would be associated with the use of construction and heavy equipment, potential exposure to hazardous materials such as fuels and lubricants during construction, construction traffic entering and traveling across the transmission line corridor, potential aircraft hazards, and worker proximity to high-voltage power lines. Standard construction safety procedures would be required and employed to minimize safety risks.

- No changes to the electromagnetic field (EMF) environment in the vicinity of the transmission line are expected. In a few isolated cases, pole heights would need to be increased slightly to raise the conductor-to-ground clearances. In these areas, ground-level EMF would decrease slightly within the existing ROW.

- The operating voltage of the transmission line would not change. Additionally, the Proposed Action would result in new, properly installed connecting hardware that would reduce any risk associated with aging hardware spark-discharge activity.

Climate Change: Impacts from greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions would be low.

- The Proposed Action would result in an estimated total of 6,828 metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent (CO_2e)[1] emissions during the first year of implementation and a total of an estimated 7,628 metric tons of CO_2e emissions for ongoing operations and maintenance activities over the 50-year lifespan of the line. Because these activities would be similar to existing conditions, project GHG emissions would not represent a substantial change. Therefore, given these low contributions, the impacts of construction, operations and maintenance, and vegetation removal on GHG concentrations would be low.

Floodplain Statement of Findings: This Floodplain Statement of Findings was prepared in accordance with 10 CFR Part 1022. BPA is proposing to rebuild the existing Walla Walla-Tucannon River transmission line in the existing ROW that crosses the 100-year floodplains of Dry Creek, Spring Valley Creek, Coppei Creek, South Fork Touchet River, Wolf Fork Touchet River, an unnamed tributary to West Patit Creek, and North Patit Creek. An assessment of impacts on floodplains is discussed in greater detail in Section 3.8 of the EA.

Currently, nine existing structures are located in four floodplains (Dry Creek, Spring Valley Creek, Coppei Creek, and Wolf Fork Touchet River). Seven of these structures would be replaced in-kind, in the same location as the existing structures. One structure would be relocated approximately 120 feet away from the existing location and in the floodplain. One existing structure located in the floodplain would be relocated outside of the floodplain. No new structures would be located in mapped floodplains. Floodplain function would be altered minimally from these activities.

Indirect impacts on floodplains could occur as a result of increased sedimentation from erosion associated with ground disturbance and vegetation removal during construction within 200 feet of floodplains. Installation of structures located within 200 feet of floodplains could cause erosion and the deposition of soils in floodplains. In addition to the structures identified above, five existing structures are located within 200 feet of mapped floodplains and would be replaced in-kind. These structures are located in the floodplains of five streams: Dry Creek, Spring Valley Creek, Coppei Creek, Wolf Fork Touchet River, and North Patit Creek. These structures would have no impact on the flood storage capacity, direction of flood flows, or wildlife habitat value of any of the floodplains in the study area.

No impact on floodplains would result from construction of the new access roads, because none of them would be located within 200 feet of 100-year floodplains. Maintenance of access roads and other infrastructure in the study area could result in minor soil compaction, erosion, and loss

[1] CO_2e is a unit of measure used by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change that takes into account the global warming potential of each of the emitted GHGs using global warming potential factors.

of vegetation within floodplains. These impacts are anticipated to be low, because they would be infrequent, temporary, and limited in scope.

Widening of the ROW would have low to no impacts on floodplain storage, water quality functions, and fish and wildlife habitat functions.

A total of 217 danger trees would be removed along the 47-mile-long transmission line. Of these, approximately 41 are located within floodplains. Impacts on floodplains from tree and vegetation removal would be low.

Determination: Based on the information in the EA, as summarized here, BPA determines that the Proposed Action is not a major federal action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment within the meaning of NEPA (42 USC 4321 et seq.). Therefore, an EIS will not be prepared and BPA is issuing this FONSI for the Proposed Action.

Issued in Portland, Oregon.

/s/ F. Lorraine Bodi — *May 17, 2011*
F. Lorraine Bodi — Date
Vice President
Environment, Fish and Wildlife