

United States Government

Department of Energy
Bonneville Power Administration

memorandum

DATE: August 18, 2006

REPLY TO
ATTN OF: KEP-4

SUBJECT: Supplement Analysis for the Transmission System Vegetation Management Program FEIS
(DOE/EIS-0285/SA-315) KEP Project Tracking No: **V-O-06/17**

TO: Jim Jellison – TFO
Natural resource specialist

Proposed Action: Vegetation Management, Danger Tree cutting, along the Chehalis-Raymond No. 1, 115 kV Transmission Line Corridor from Mile 19/1 heading west to Raymond Substation.

Location: The project line is located in Lewis and Pacific counties Washington, from Pe El substation located in Pe El WA, extending 26 miles west to Raymond Substation located in Raymond, WA. The project is located in BPA's Olympia Region.

Proposed by: Bonneville Power Administration (BPA).

Description of the Proposal: BPA proposes to conduct vegetation control activities that includes cutting of Danger Trees adjacent to the right of way. The work may include chemical treatment of the stumps, and cut lop and scatter of debris depending on species and location of the tree. Danger Trees are located off of the Right of way and have been determined to pose a threat to the transmission line. The subject danger trees have a greater potential to fall into the line and interfere with the safety, reliability, operation, and maintenance of the transmission line. Danger tree management work will occur between miles 19 to 45 of the Chehalis-Raymond No. 1, 115 kV transmission line. Approximately 3,350 trees will be felled adjacent to the Chehalis-Raymond No. 1, 115 kV line corridor.

Analysis: A Vegetation Management Checklist was completed for this project in accordance with the requirements identified in the Bonneville Power Administrations Transmission System Vegetation Management Program FEIS (DOE/EIS-0285).

The subject corridor traverses public and private lands in Lewis and Pacific counties Washington. Landowners include private residential, private timber, and Washington State DNR lands. No tribal lands are involved.

Section 3 of the checklist identifies the natural resources present in the area of the proposed work. The following summarizes natural resources occurring in the project area along with applicable mitigation measures.

Water Resources: Water bodies (streams, rivers, lakes, wetlands) occurring in the project area are listed in section 3.1 of the Vegetation Management Checklist. Trees felled in riparian zones will be left in place to provide future large woody debris. No ground disturbing vegetation management methods will be implemented thus minimizing the risk for soil erosion and sedimentation near the streams. The following herbicide buffers will be implemented for the project. Outside a 100' buffer from any stream, ponds, or wetlands Triclopyr BEE (common formulations, Garlon 4 & Tahoe 4E) may be applied. Formulations of Triclopyr TEA (common formulations Garlon 3A & Tahoe 3A) may be applied for spot or localized applications up to the waters edge. Herbicide will be applied directly to the stumps of hardwood species only.

Two designated Water Shed areas were identified along the right of way. No herbicide application will be made within a 164-foot buffer of the watersheds as specified in the EIS. For location information see section 3.2 of the attached project checklist.

Threatened and Endangered Species/Essential Fish Habitat: Pursuant to its obligations under the Endangered Species Act, BPA has made a determination of whether its proposed project will have any effects on any listed species. Species lists were reviewed from the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) on December 22nd, 2005, identifying threatened and endangered species and Critical Habitat Units potentially occurring in the project area. In addition a review of species under the jurisdiction of NOAA Fisheries was conducted.

On June 28th 2006 BPA submitted a Biological Assessment to initiate informal consultation with the USFWS. The BA expressed BPA's opinion that the project may effect but would not adversely affect certain potential populations of endangered species including Marbled Murrelets and Northern Spotted Owls. A determination of "No Effect" was made for all other ESA listed species potentially occurring in the project area. On August 18th, 2006 BPA received a letter of concurrence regarding the BA from the USFWS. The letter is the official opinion of the USFWS completing the consultation process and fulfilling BPA's obligations under Sec. 7 of the Endangered Species Act. A determination of "No Effect" was made for Essential Fish Habitat waters that occur in the project area.

Cultural Resources: No cultural resources are known for the project area. If a site is discovered during the course of vegetation control, work will be stopped in the vicinity and the appropriate tribe, the BPA Environmental Specialist, and the BPA archeologist will be contacted.

Monitoring: The entire project will be inspected during the work period. Additionally the line will be patrolled annually after treatment to monitor the effectiveness of the treatment and any issues associated with the project.

Findings: This Supplement Analysis finds that (1) the proposed actions are substantially consistent with the Transmission System Vegetation Management Program FEIS (DOE/EIS-0285) and ROD, and; (2) there are no new circumstances or information relevant to environmental concerns and bearing on the proposed actions or their impacts. BPA completed informal consultation with the USFWS for the proposed action. The conclusion of the consultation was that the proposed actions will not adversely affect threatened or endangered species. Therefore, no further NEPA documentation is required.

/s/ Jamse R. Meyer for _____

Greg P. Tippetts
Physical Scientist (Environmental)

CONCUR /s/ James Kehoe for _____

DATE: 8-21-06

Kathy Pierce
NEPA Compliance Officer

Attachments:

Vegetation Management Checklist, Endangered Species Effects Determination.