

memorandum

DATE: November 29, 2012

REPLY TO
ATTN OF: KEPR-4

SUBJECT: Environmental Clearance Memorandum

TO: Justin Estes
Project Manager – TELM-TPP-3

Proposed Action: Spring Creek – Wine County No. 1 Transmission Tower Relocation

Categorical Exclusion Applied (from Subpart D, 10 C.F.R. Part 1021): B4.6 Additions and modifications to transmission facilities

Location: Multnomah County, OR

Proposed by: Bonneville Power Administration (BPA)

Description of the Proposed Action: BPA is proposing to relocate one transmission tower, located on private agricultural land, which has been damaged by farm equipment.

Currently, tower 29/3 on BPA's Spring Creek – Wine Country No. 1 transmission line, resides on an agricultural access road that is bordered on both sides by active agricultural fields. This access road is used by both BPA, to access the transmission line, and the landowner to access the agricultural fields. Tower 29/3 has been irrevocably damaged by farm equipment using this access road and the structural integrity of the tower has been compromised.

Thus, BPA proposes to relocate the transmission tower, back-on-line 60 feet from its current position, and to raise the height of the transmission tower by approximately 15 feet. The new location and height of the transmission tower will both protect the tower from damage caused by farm equipment using the access road, and allow the landowner to continue to farm a crop on the right-of-way.

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. This proposed action meets the requirements for the Categorical Exclusion referenced above. We therefore determine that the proposed action may be categorically excluded from further NEPA review and documentation.

/s/ Lisa MacLellan

Lisa MacLellan

Physical Scientist (Environmental)

Concur: /s/ Katherine S. Pierce

Katherine S. Pierce

NEPA Compliance Officer

DATE: November 29, 2012

Attachments:

Environmental Checklist for Categorical Exclusions

Environmental Checklist for Categorical Exclusions

Name of Proposed Project: Spring Creek – Wine County No. 1 Transmission Tower Relocation

Work Order #: 299698

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.

| <u>Environmental Resources</u> | <u>No Potential for Significance</u> | <u>No Potential, with Conditions (describe)</u> |
|--|--------------------------------------|---|
| 1. Historic Properties and Cultural Resources No historic properties affected. SHPO concurrence with cultural survey results, received 10/1/12. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. T & E Species, or their habitat(s) No ESA species or habitat are present in the project area. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. Floodplains or wetlands No floodplains or wetlands are present in the project area. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 4. Areas of special designation No areas of special designation are present in the project area. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 5. Health & safety No health and safety issues are present. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 6. Prime or unique farmlands No prime or unique farmlands are present in the project area. Those farmlands that are present will be available for use based on project design. BPA has worked with the landowner to maintain use of the land. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 7. Special sources of water No special sources of water present in the project area. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 8. Other (describe) None. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

List supporting documentation attached (if needed):

SHPO Concurrence

Signed /s/ Lisa MacLellan

Date November 28, 2012

Lisa MacLellan KEPR-4