Categorical Exclusion Determination

Bonneville Power Administration
Department of Energy

Proposed Action: Big Eddy - Spring Creek 5/1 and 13/3 Impairment Remedy

PP&A No.: 3905

Project Manager: Mark Korsness

Location: Klickitat County, WA

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

Description of the Proposed Action: BPA is proposing to remedy two impairments on the Big Eddy - Spring Creek transmission line. An impairment is an area where the distance from the conductor to the ground surface is inadequate, per National Electrical Safety Code (NESC) standards, resulting in a threat to line reliability and posing a risk to public health and safety. The proposed work is necessary to ensure the line meets current NESC and Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) standards.

The impairments on the Big Eddy - Spring Creek transmission line are located near structures 5/1 and 13/3 and cannot be permanently remedied at this time, so BPA is proposing to install fencing around the impairment to restrict human, livestock, and wildlife access and lessen potential safety concerns until a permanent fix can be implemented. Installation of the fence may require minimal ground disturbance such as digging post holes.

Table 1. Impairment Remedy Location

Structures	Township, Range, Section	County, State	Ownership	USGS Quad Name
Big Eddy-Spring Creek				
5/1	T2N R14E Section 18	Klickitat, WA	Private, USFS	Stacker Butte
13/3	T3N R15E Section 32	Klickitat, WA	Private	Wishram

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, July 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.

Laura Roberts
Biological Scientist

Concur:

Date: _____

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: Big Eddy - Spring Creek 5/1 and 13/3 Impairment Remedy

---

Project Site Description

The Big Eddy-Spring Creek impairment remedy work would be located on existing right-of-way, in eastern Washington, on private range land and USFS range land managed by the Columbia Gorge National Scenic Area.

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: Because of the minimal to no disturbance proposed, BPA has determined the project would have no potential to effect historic properties.		
2. **Geology and Soils**	☑	☐
Explanation: Little to no disturbance to the soil would result from the proposed project.		
3. **Plants** (including federal/state special-status species)	☑	☐
Explanation: No federal/special-status plant species are present within the project area.		
4. **Wildlife** (including federal/state special-status species and habitats)	☑	☐
Explanation: No federal/special-status wildlife is present within the project area.		
5. **Water Bodies, Floodplains, and Fish** (including federal/state special-status species and ESUs)	☑	☐
Explanation: There are no federal/state special-status species, water bodies, or floodplains found within the project area.		
6. **Wetlands**	☑	☐
Explanation: There are no wetlands found within the project area.		
7. **Groundwater and Aquifers**	☑	☐
Explanation: Spill prevention measures would be utilized during project activities. The project would not result in any groundwater withdrawals nor provide a pathway for groundwater contamination.		

Explanation, if necessary:

8. **Land Use and Specially Designated Areas** ☑ ☐

Explanation: No specially designated areas would be impacted by the project.

9. **Visual Quality** ☑ ☐

Explanation: There would be no change to the visual quality as a result of the proposed impairment remedy.

10. **Air Quality** ☑ ☐

Explanation: There would be no change to the air quality as a result of the proposed impairment remedy.

11. **Noise** ☑ ☐

Explanation: There would be no change to noise levels as a result of the proposed impairment remedy.

12. **Human Health and Safety** ☑ ☐

Explanation: The proposed action would provide public safety and maintain reliable power in the region until a permanent remedy for the impairment can be implemented.

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:

☑ 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:

☑ 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: BPA Realty would make the necessary landowner notifications.

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

Signed:  Date: _____

Laura Roberts
Biological Scientist