DOE F 1325.8e Electronic Form Approved by Forms Mgmt. 04/19/2006
(08-89)

United States Government **Department of Energy**

Bonneville Power Administration

memorandum

DATE: October 29, 2013

REPLY TO ATTN OF: KEP-4

SUBJECT: Supplement Analysis for the Transmission System Vegetation Management Program FEIS (DOE/EIS-0285/SA-534)

TO: Jacob Marti
Natural Resource Specialist – TFBV-THE DALLES

Proposed Action: Vegetation management along the Big Eddy-Spring Creek #1 transmission line corridor

Pollution Prevention and Abatement Project No.: 2754

Location: Klickitat County, Washington: Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) The Dalles District

Proposed by: BPA

Description of the Proposal: BPA proposes to clear unwanted vegetation along and adjacent to the transmission line corridor, and access roads of the 230-kilovolt (kV) Big Eddy-Spring Creek #1 transmission line from Structure 2/3 to Structure 5/3 and the 115-kV Spearfish Tap to Chenoweth-Goldendale #1 transmission line from Spearfish Substation to Structure 4/3. The right-of-way (ROW) corridor measures from 150 to 125 feet in width and crosses approximately six miles of terrain through private industrial, agricultural and rural lands.

For this project, a 50 foot radius around 26 wood pole structures would be mowed. An anti-germination herbicide would be applied within a six foot radius around each wood pole at 25 of these 26 structures to maintain bare-ground conditions for fire safety. All methods are consistent with the methods approved in BPA's Transmission System Vegetation Management Program EIS. Debris would be disposed of using on-site chip, lop and scatter, or mulching techniques. All on-site debris would be scattered along the ROW.

Analysis: A Vegetation Control Prescription & Checklist was developed for this corridor that incorporates the requirements identified in BPA's Transmission System Vegetation Management Program FEIS (DOE/EIS-0285, May 2000) and Record of Decision (August 23, 2000). The following summarizes natural resources occurring in the project area along with applicable mitigation measures outlined in the Vegetation Control Prescription & Checklist.

Water Resources: Water bodies (streams, rivers, lakes, wetlands) in the project area do not have the potential to be impacted by the proposed activities because no work will take place within 150 feet of water bodies.

Threatened and Endangered Species: Pursuant to its obligations under the Endangered

Species Act (ESA), BPA has made a determination of whether its proposed project would have any effects on any listed species. A species list was obtained for federally listed, proposed and candidate species potentially occurring within the project boundaries from the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). Based on the ESA review conducted, BPA made a determination that the project would have "No Effect" for all ESA listed species under USFWS' jurisdiction. BPA also conducted a review of species under the jurisdiction of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, National Marine Fisheries Service (NOAA Fisheries). A determination of "No Effect" was made for all ESA listed species under NOAA Fisheries' jurisdiction, with the implementation of the conservation measures in Water Resources section above.

Essential Fish Habitat: Because water bodies in the project area do not have the potential to be impacted by the proposed activities, the project would not adversely affect EFH.

Cultural Resources: No ground disturbing work is proposed within the project area; however, if a cultural site is discovered during the course of vegetation control, work would be stopped in the vicinity and the BPA Environmental Specialist and the BPA Archeologist would be contacted.

Re-Vegetation: Native grasses and low-growing shrubs are present on the ROW and are expected to naturally seed into the areas that would have lightly disturbed soil.

Monitoring: The entire project would be inspected during the work period, fall 2013 to fall 2014. A follow-up treatment would occur 6-12 months after the initial treatment. Additional monitoring for follow-up treatment would be conducted as necessary. A diary of inspection results would be used to document formal inspections and will be filed with the contracting officer.

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. Therefore, no further NEPA documentation is required.

/s/ Oden W. Jahn
Oden W. Jahn
Environmental Scientist

CONCUR: */s/ Stacy Mason* DATE: *October 29, 2013*
Stacy Mason
NEPA Compliance Officer

References:
Vegetation Management Prescription and Checklist
Effects Determination