Categorical Exclusion Determination

Bonneville Power Administration
Department of Energy



Proposed Action: FY24 Benton-White Bluffs Expedited Priority Pole Restricted Method

Replacements

Project No.: 4976

Project Manager: Michael Beyer, TEPL-TPP-1

Location: Benton County, Washington

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

Maintenance

<u>Description of the Proposed Action:</u> Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) is proposing to replace deteriorating wood pole structures and associated hardware and guy wires at specific locations in BPA's Pasco District. The five structures proposed for replacement include Benton-White Bluffs No 1 structures 1/8, 2/3, 2/4, 2/5, and 3/6. For all structures, the work would include removing the existing wood pole structures (and guy wires if present) and replacing them in kind in the same location. Trucks and equipment would be staged in work areas about 50 feet by 50 feet at each of the structure replacement locations. Existing access roads would be used to access the work areas and no additional ground disturbance beyond the existing pole holes is proposed. No helicopter use would be required.

The proposed action would 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
- 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/ Katey Grange

Katey Grange Date: <u>January 3, 2024</u> NEPA Compliance Officers

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: FY24 Benton-White Bluffs Expedited Priority Pole Restrict Method Replacements

Project Site Description

Structures being replaced are in open range land on the Hanford Site. No waterbodies or wetlands are near project work areas. The work areas are located in the Columbia Plateau Scablands and the primary vegetation type is bunchgrass.

Evaluation of Potential Impacts to Environmental Resources

1. Historic and Cultural Resources

Potential for Significance: No

<u>Explanation:</u> BPA has determined, per 36 CFR 800.3(a)(1), that this undertaking is a type of activity that does not have the potential to cause effects on historic properties, assuming such historic properties were present. Hanford tribes were notified of the work and given an advanced opportunity to observe the work if they chose to do so.

2. Geology and Soils

Potential for Significance: No

<u>Explanation</u>: Localized soil disturbance within the previously-excavated hole would occur during wood pole replacement. Standard construction erosion control measures would be utilized as necessary.

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

Potential for Significance: No

Explanation: Minimal or no disturbance to vegetation is anticipated. Areas around the structure sites are devoid of vegetation already to prevent fire damage. If vegetation would be impacted, it would be crushed in place. 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. The work

areas are outside of the roost area restrictions for bald eagles and there are no other resource issues currently in the area. All work would be performed in January 2024.

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

Potential for Significance: No

<u>Explanation</u>: The project area is not located within a floodplain and would not impact water bodies that support resident, anadromous, or ESA-listed fish. Erosion control best management practices combined with the distance to the nearest waterbody would ensure that sedimentation would not enter into any water body.

6. Wetlands

Potential for Significance: No with conditions

<u>Explanation</u>: No wetlands are documented within the project area. No impacts to wetlands are anticipated.

7. Groundwater and Aquifers

Potential for Significance: No

<u>Explanation</u>: No use of groundwater proposed. Maximum depth of disturbance would be about 12 feet below ground surface.

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.

Replacement of the wood pole and associated components would be in kind and replaced in the same location; therefore, there would not be a change to the visual quality of the area.

10. Air Quality

Potential for Significance: No

<u>Explanation</u>: 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

<u>Explanation</u>: There would be temporary construction noise. Operational noise of the transmission line would not change.

12. Human Health and Safety

Potential for Significance: No

<u>Explanation</u>: 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.

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

<u>Description</u>: BPA has coordinated with the underlying land manager, US Department of Energy-Richland (DOE-RL) for this work as well as for similar work that has already been approved in the vicinity.

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

Signed: /s/ <u>Jonnel Deacon</u> Physical Scientist (Environment) Date: January 3, 2024

EPR-Olympia