Categorical Exclusion Determination

Bonneville Power Administration Department of Energy



Proposed Action: FY19 Pasco District Washington Priority Pole Replacements

PP&A No.: 4198

Project Manager: Meadow Nelson

Location: Benton and Franklin Counties, Washington

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

maintenance

<u>Description of the Proposed Action</u>: BPA proposes to replace deteriorating wood pole structures and associated structural/electrical components (e.g. cross arms, insulators, guy anchors, etc.) on the Benton-White Bluffs #1, Eltopia Tap to Smith Canyon-Redd and Franklin-Hedges #1 transmission lines in the Pasco district.

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

Transmission Line/ROW	Structure #	Township	Range	Section	County, State
Benton-White Bluffs #1	5/9	11N	28E	35	Benton, WA
	6/3	10N	28E	2	,
Eltopia Tap to Smith Canyon-Redd	6/6	11N	30E	23	Franklin, WA
Franklin-Hedges #1	2/1	9N	30E	35	Franklin, WA
	2/4	8N	30E	3	Franklin, WA

Replacement would be in-kind and would utilize the existing holes to minimize ground disturbance. If necessary, an auger would be used to remove any loose soil from the existing hole prior to new wood pole placement.

Access road maintenance would be limited to minor blading, grading, and rocking of access road segments that have become impassable. All road maintenance would take place in the existing road prism.

Two structures are located on DOE-Hanford property. The remaining structures being replaced are in easements on privately-owned property. These structures are located within or adjacent to residential properties, pastures, dry land wheat farming, scabland, 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.

<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, 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 14, 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/ Shawn Barndt Shawn L. Barndt Tri Cities RMHQ

Concur:

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

Attachment(s): Environmental Checklist

cc: (w/ enclosures)

T. Cossairt - TFPF-Tri Cities RMHQ

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: FY19 Pasco District Washington Priority Pole Replacements

Environmental Resource

Project Site Description

Two structures are located on DOE-Hanford property. The remaining structures being replaced are in easements on privately-owned property. These structures are located within or adjacent to residential properties, pastures, dry land wheat farming, scabland, or similar type land uses.

Evaluation of Potential Impacts to Environmental Resources

No Potential for

No Potential for Significance,

	Impacts	Significance	with Conditions				
1.	Historic and Cultural Resources						
	Explanation: WA DAHP concurrence on no adverse effect determination was received May 16, 2019. The Nez Perce, CTUIR, Wanapum, and Yakama Tribes were consulted, but did not respond during the 30-day period. Tribal staff from the Hanford Tribal Technical Working Group assisted with the survey and was in agreement with the no adverse effect determination for the replacement of the priority poles on DOE-Hanford property. The Department of Energy-Richland was consulted, but did not respond during the 30-day period.						
	 In the event that archaeological or histo activities, work in the immediate vicinity and the environmental project lead must Crews and equipment are to use existing Limit access road maintenance to the environmental project lead must 	y must stop, the a st be notified. ng access roads t	rea would be secured, and SHPO to and from each work site.				
2.	Geology and Soils	~					
	Explanation: Minimal soil disturbance (two 1 would be used.	100x100 foot area	s); erosion control measures				
3.	Plants (including Federal/state special-status species and habitats)						
	Explanation: No special-status species presagricultural operations.	sent. Area of dist	urbance is frequently disturbed by				
4.	Wildlife (including Federal/state special-status species and habitats)						
	Explanation: No special-status species or disturbed by agriculture and road development	•	present. Area is previously				
5.	Water Bodies, Floodplains, and Fish (including Federal/state special-status species, ESUs, and habitats)	V					
	Explanation: No water bodies present in pro	oject area.					

6.	Wetlands		~					
	Explanation: Wetland near Franklin-Hedges structure, but would be avoided by staying on current access roads and working in the dry season. Wetland delineation completed Novembe 2018.							
7.	Groundwater and Aquifers	V						
	Explanation: No wells or use of groundwater proposed. Spill prevention measures would be present on site. Maximum depth of ground disturbance would be 10 feet.							
8.	Land Use and Specially Designated Areas	~						
	<u>Explanation</u> : Temporary agricultural impacts during construction; landowners would be compensated for crop damage, as needed.							
9.	Visual Quality	~						
	Explanation: New wood-poles would not be r	noticeably differer	nt than existing poles.					
10.	Air Quality	V						
Explanation: Temporary and small amount of dust and vehicle emissions due to construction.								
11.	Noise	~						
	Explanation: Temporary construction noise. Operational noise would not change.							
12.	Human Health and Safety	V						
	Explanation: No known soil contamination or hazardous conditions. The proposed action would help reduce outage times and maintain reliable power in the region.							
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:							
V	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:							
V	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.

Landowner Notification, Involvement, or Coordination

Description: Coordination with DOE-Hanford and private property owners has occurred. No concerns.

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

Signed: /s/ Shawn Barndt Date: June 14, 2019

Shawn L. Barndt, Tri Cities RMHQ