memorandum

DATE: January 11, 2012

REPLY TO: KEC-4

ATTN OF:

SUBJECT: Environmental Clearance Memorandum

TO: Gary Wilson
Project Manager – TERR-BELL-1

Proposed Action: Land Use Application - Zirkle Fruit Water Pipeline Easement at Columbia Substation

Categorical Exclusion Applied (from Subpart D, 10 C.F.R. Part 1021): B4.9 Multiple use of powerline rights-of-way

Location: Township 21 North, Range 22 East, Section 21 in Douglas County, Oregon

Proposed by: Bonneville Power Administration (BPA), Zirkle Fruit Company

Description of the Proposed Action: The proposed project is to allow Zirkle Fruit Company an easement to construct and operate a 665-foot-long section of water pipeline across the southwest corner of BPA’s fee-owned property near the existing Columbia Substation. Construction activities would include excavation of an approximately three foot-wide by six foot-deep trench for pipeline placement. After placement of the pipe, the trench would be backfilled and restored to existing conditions. No construction staging areas or additional access roads would be needed on BPA property. All work would occur in a previously disturbed area.

Findings: BPA has determined that the proposed action complies with Section 1021.410 and Appendix B of Subpart D 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). The proposed action does not present any extraordinary circumstances that may affect the significance of the environmental effects of the proposal. The proposal is not connected [40 C.F.R. 1508.25(a)(1)] to other actions with potentially significant impacts, has not been segmented to meet the definition of a categorical exclusion, is not related to other proposed actions with cumulatively significant impacts [40 C.F.R. 1508.25(a)(2)], and is not precluded by 40 C.F.R. 1506.1 or 10 C.F.R. 1021.211. Moreover, the proposed action would not (i) threaten a violation of applicable statutory, regulatory, or permit requirements for environment, safety, and health, (ii) require siting and construction or major expansion of waste storage, disposal, recovery, or treatment facilities, (iii) disturb hazardous substances, pollutants, contaminants, or Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act-excluded petroleum and natural gas products that pre-exist in the environment such that there would be uncontrolled or unpermitted releases, (iv) have the potential to cause significant impacts on environmentally sensitive resources, or (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.

Based on a site survey and a detailed cultural resource report produced by a BPA in-house archaeologist covering the proposed area of potential effect, it was determined that no adverse effects to cultural resources would occur by this project. The cultural resource report and a summary letter were sent on September 1, 2011 to the Washington Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation (DAHP), and the Confederated Tribes of the Yakama Nation. The DAHP concurred with the undertaking January 10, 2012. The Yakama requested that a cultural resource monitor be present during construction.

The project area is absent of unique wildlife habitat, water features, or other environmentally sensitive resources. Because of the previous disturbance and lack of habitat, no ESA species listed or proposed for listing are likely to be present. There would also be no effect to floodplains or wetlands. It was therefore determined that no adverse environmental effects would occur from construction of the project.

Based on the provisions identified on the attachment below this proposed action meets the requirements for the categorical exclusions referenced above. We therefore determine that the proposed action may be categorically excluded from further NEPA review and documentation.

/s/ Claire McClory
Claire McClory
Environmental Project Manager

Concur:

/s/ Richard Yarde
DATE: January 11, 2012
Richard Yarde
Acting NEPA Compliance Officer

Attachment:
Provisions
BPA Inadvertant Discovery of Cultural Resources Procedure
CX Checklist
Environmental Checklist for Categorical Exclusions

Name of Proposed Project: LUA - Zirkle Fruit Water Pipeline Easement at Columbia Substation

Work Order #: 00184006, Task 01

This project does not have the potential to cause significant impacts on the following environmentally sensitive resources. See 10 CFR 1021, Subpart D, Appendix B for complete descriptions of the resources. This checklist is to be used as a summary – further discussion may be included in the Categorical Exclusion Memorandum.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Resources</th>
<th>No Potential for Significance</th>
<th>No Potential, with Conditions (describe)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Historic Properties and Cultural Resources</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. T &amp; E Species, or their habitat(s)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Floodplains or wetlands</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Areas of special designation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Health &amp; safety</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Prime or unique farmlands</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Special sources of water</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Other (describe)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

List supporting documentation attached (if needed):
Categorical Exclusion

Signed: /s/ Claire McClory Date: January 11, 2012
Claire McClory, KEC-4