

# Categorical Exclusion Determination

Bonneville Power Administration  
Department of Energy



**Proposed Action:** Sammamish-Maple Valley 23/4 culvert

**Project No.:** 4351

**Project Manager:** Lisa Casey, TEPF-TPP-1

**Location:** King County, Washington

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

**Description of the Proposed Action:** BPA proposes to remove a failed culvert and associated fill material. The work would include excavating approximately 20,000 cubic yards of existing fill and hauling offsite, removing the existing culvert, and removing eroded fill that has been deposited downstream and has blocked an additional culvert. The stream would be regraded to match existing up and downstream conditions. The stream banks would be stabilized with a combination of large woody debris, large boulders, vegetation, and matting. Approximately 6,000 feet of existing access roads may be improved to allow access to the area. Equipment would include excavators, bull dozers, dump trucks, and similar types of equipment.

**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
- 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/ Jonnel Deacon

Jonnel Deacon

Physical Scientist (Environmental)

Concur:

/s/ Sarah T. Biegel      Date: August 3, 2022

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:** Samamish-Maple Valley 23/4 Culvert

## **Project Site Description**

The project area is located in rural King County, WA and has a few homes nearby to the east. The terrain is fairly steep and is primarily forested in conifer trees.

## **Evaluation of Potential Impacts to Environmental Resources**

### **1. Historic and Cultural Resources**

Potential for Significance: No with conditions

Explanation: BPA initiated consultation with Washington Department of Natural Resources (WDNR), Washington Parks and Recreation, City of Issaquah, City of Sammamish, King County, Muckleshoot Indian Tribe, Puyallup Tribe of Indians, Snoqualmie Indian Tribe, and Washington State Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation (DAHP) on June 24, 2022. Washington DAHP provided concurrence with the Area of Potential Effect (APE) via a letter dated June 27, 2022. No additional response was received within 30 days.

### **2. Geology and Soils**

Potential for Significance: No with conditions

Explanation: A large amount of soil and sediment would be removed from the existing culvert fill prism. This is located on top of an intermittent stream channel.

Notes: Appropriate best management practices would be implemented, including erosion control measures during construction and post construction stabilization measures.

### **3. Plants (including Federal/state special-status species and habitats)**

Potential for Significance: No

Explanation: Minimal disturbance to vegetation is anticipated. There would be no effect to ESA-listed plant species. No impacts to state or federally sensitive species are anticipated. Project activities would be limited to the already impacted access road and transmission line right-of-way and would not substantially alter existing plant communities.

### **4. Wildlife (including Federal/state special-status species and habitats)**

Potential for Significance: No

Explanation: In general, the project would have a small impact to wildlife and habitat related to temporary disturbance associated with elevated equipment noise and human presence. The project would have no impacts to state or federally listed sensitive species.

## **5. Water Bodies, Floodplains, and Fish (including Federal/state special-status species, ESUs, and habitats)**

Potential for Significance: No with conditions

Explanation: The project would remove a large amount of fill and deposited sediment from a waterbody that contains resident fish. The downstream gradient combined with plugged and broken culverts would be a barrier to migration to anadromous species of fish.

Notes: Appropriate best management practices provided by NOAA's National Marine Fisheries Service and Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife would be implemented. These include dewatering (if water is present), defishing the work area (if water is present), replacing petroleum-based hydraulic fluids with biodegradable fluids in any equipment work in or over water

## **6. Wetlands**

Potential for Significance: No

Explanation: No wetlands are within the project area.

## **7. Groundwater and Aquifers**

Potential for Significance: No

Explanation: No use of groundwater proposed.

## **8. Land Use and Specially-Designated Areas**

Potential for Significance: No

Explanation: No change in land use. No specially-designated areas.

## **9. Visual Quality**

Potential for Significance: No

Explanation: All work would be performed within existing transmission line right-of-way and access road prisms.

## **10. Air Quality**

Potential for Significance: No

Explanation: The project would have a temporary impact on air quality from a small amount of vehicle emissions and dust generated during construction.

## **11. Noise**

Potential for Significance: No

Explanation: There would be temporary construction noise from vehicles.

## 12. Human Health and Safety

Potential for Significance: No

Explanation: The proposed action would not create any elevated risks to human health and safety.

### 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: N/A

**Require siting and construction or major expansion of waste storage, disposal, recovery, or treatment facilities (including incinerators) that are not otherwise categorically excluded.**

Explanation: N/A

**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: N/A

**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.**

Explanation: N/A

### Landowner Notification, Involvement, or Coordination

Description: All activities have been coordinated with landowners.

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

Signed: /s/ Jonnel Deacon  
Jonnel Deacon  
EPR-4

Date: August 3, 2022