

# Categorical Exclusion Determination

Bonneville Power Administration  
Department of Energy



**Proposed Action:** Naselle-Tarlett Distressed Structure 13/6 – 14/1 Project

**PP&A No.:** 4748

**Project Manager:** Tina Edwards - TEPL-TPP-1

**Location:** Pacific County, Washington

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

**Description of the Proposed Action:** Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) proposes various work activities between structures 13/5 and 14/1 on the Naselle- Tarlett No. 2 transmission line. Structure 13/6 is immediately adjacent to a small drainage that is actively eroding the slope near the base of the structure, causing the structure to lean in the direction of failure. In order to remedy the potential failure, work has been proposed on various structures between 13/5 and 14/1. Guy wires would be added to existing anchors at structure 13/5. Structures 13/6 and 13/8 would be removed, with the wood poles cut off 6 inches below the ground surface. Structure 13/7 would be moved 30 feet back on line (BOL) and rebuilt using 95-foot-tall (instead of the existing 70-foot-tall) poles. A 50 by 50 foot landing built would be built BOL of structure 13/7. Structure 13/9 would be rebuilt in place with new 95-foot-tall poles instead of the existing 70-foot-tall poles. There would be no changes to structures 13/10 and 14/1, although the access roads and landings may be used for pulling/tensioning if needed. No access road improvements would be needed for this project.

**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, 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/ Jonah Reenders*  
Jonah Reenders

Concur:

*/s/ Katey Grange*  
Katey C. Grange                      Date: October 15, 2021  
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:** Naselle-Tarlett Distressed Structure 13/6 – 14/1 Project

## **Project Site Description**

The project site is located on private lands in Pacific County, Washington (Section 19, Township 10 North, Range 10 West). The site is approximately 4 miles southeast from the town of Long Beach, Washington and approximately 0.25 miles southeast of US Highway 101. The site includes transmission line towers and BPA right-of-way access roads located in an area cleared of most vegetation. Vegetation consists of predominantly Douglas fir trees and low-growing shrubs and forbs.

A review of the National Wetland Inventory, soil information, topography, and aerial photos revealed possible wetlands or waterbodies near the site, but no wetlands or waterbodies are located within the project work areas. Some wetland areas are located near structure 13/5 outside of the right-of-way. Other waterbodies are near 13/8 and 11/2 of the Naselle-Tarlett transmission line would be avoided during implementation of the project.

## **Evaluation of Potential Impacts to Environmental Resources**

### **1. Historic and Cultural Resources**

Potential for Significance: No

Explanation: BPA conducted background research, followed by an intensive field survey of the Area of Potential Effect (APE) that included a pedestrian survey and the excavation of two shovel test probes. Background research indicated that 2 previous archaeological surveys have been conducted within one mile of the APE, but that no previously recorded archaeological resources were located in the APE. As a result of the archaeological field survey, no historic properties were located in the APE. The Naselle-Tarlett No.2 transmission line was energized in 1975, and is not considered eligible to the NRHP. Therefore, as per §36 CFR 800.5(d)(1), BPA has determined that the implementation of the proposed undertaking would result in no historic properties affected.

### **2. Geology and Soils**

Potential for Significance: No

Explanation: There would be some soil disturbance from the work associated with guy wires added to existing anchors at structure 13/5 and the movement of Structure 13/7 30 feet. back on line (BOL). Disturbance would also be associated with the 50 by 50 foot landing built near structure 13/7. However, all ground disturbance would be minimal and have minimal impact to geology and soils.

Note: Erosion and sediment control best management practices (BMPs) would be implemented, as necessary, prior to any vegetation and ground disturbing activities.

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

Potential for Significance: No

Explanation: The project would be occurring in the BPA right-of-way that is currently managed for low growing vegetation and some vegetation may be cut or removed for installation of the project. There are no Endangered Species Act (ESA) listed or special-status species present.

### **4. Wildlife (including Federal/state special-status species and habitats)**

Potential for Significance: No

Explanation: No ESA-listed or other special-status species or habitat present at the project site. The work would be in established BPA right-of-way. No trees would be removed as part of the project. Work would occur during daytime hours with no effect to ESA-listed and special-status species and limited to no effect to non-listed species from noise and equipment presence.

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

Potential for Significance: No

Explanation: An aquatic resource is located to the north of structure 13/8. However, the proposed work would avoid all impacts to the resource. Work includes cutting the pole 6 inches below grade with no trucks or other equipment in the area. To avoid aquatic resources, a boom would be used over the structure to take the hardware off and then tension the line from structures ahead of line and behind of line.

### **6. Wetlands**

Potential for Significance: No

Explanation: Wetland areas are located near structure 10/5, but the work would not occur within the identified wetlands. No wetlands are found anywhere else in the project area. BMPs would be implemented to minimize erosion in project area.

### **7. Groundwater and Aquifers**

Potential for Significance: No

Explanation: The proposed work associated with the project would not impact groundwater or aquifers

### **8. Land Use and Specially-Designated Areas**

Potential for Significance: No

Explanation: There would be no impact to the BPA right-of-way or transmission line, and no change in adjacent land uses, associated with the proposed work.

## 9. Visual Quality

Potential for Significance: No

Explanation: The project would be consistent with existing transmission structures in the right-of-way and would result in limited visual changes to the area or surrounding environment.

## 10. Air Quality

Potential for Significance: No

Explanation: A small amount of dust and vehicle emissions would be generated; however, there would be no substantial changes to air quality during or after construction.

## 11. Noise

Potential for Significance: No

Explanation: Noise generated would be temporary and would occur during daylight hours.

## 12. Human Health and Safety

Potential for Significance: No

Explanation: During project activities, all standard safety protocols would be followed. Project activities would not impact human health or safety.

### 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**

Description: BPA reality is in coordination with the landowners for this project.

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

Signed: /s/ Jonah Reenders  
Jonah Reenders EPI-4  
Physical Scientist

Date: October 15, 2021