Categorical Exclusion Determination

Western Area Power Administration
Department of Energy



Proposed Action: Malin Round Mountain Tower 71-8 Spacer Replacement Landing Zone

Project No.:

Project Manager: Ryan Yeager

Location: Shasta County, CA

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

Description of the Proposed Action:

Western Area Power Administration, Sierra Nevada Region (WAPA) is responsible for the operation and maintenance of several federally owned and operated transmission lines throughout California, including the Captain Jack-Olinda (CPJ-ODA) line, located in northeast California. Part of this responsibility includes ensuring WAPA maintains reliable operation of the transmission system.

WAPA proposes replacement of spacers at Tower 71-8 on Malin Round Mountain No. 1 transmission line. To accomplish this task, WAPA intends to use helicopter landing zone approximately 500 feet west of the WAPA right-of-way (ROW) for landing and as a staging area. The land is in a clearing within the Shasta-Trinity National forest, on private land adjacent to Summit Lake Road.

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), WAPA 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, WAPA finds that the proposed action is categorically excluded from further NEPA review.

Latisha M. Signed: Saare

Digitally signed by Latisha M. Saare Date: 2022.11.07

Date: 11/7/22

Attachment: 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.

exclusion.					
Proposed Action: Malin Round Mour Zone	ntain Tower 71-8 Space	r Replacement Landing ≖			
Project Site Description					
The proposed project area is in rural Shasta Cou The dominant habitat surrounding the project are zone is a clearing along an access road. This lo	ea consists of mixed conifer, se	condary-growth, forest. The landing			
Evaluation of Potential Impacts to Environmental Resources					
Environmental Resource Impacts	No Potential for Significance	No Potential for Significance with Conditions			
Historic and Cultural Resources Explanation:	V				
The landing zone is previously disturbed. WAP, buffer on June 4, 2019. No cultural resources warcheological, paleontological, or historic evider	vere observed. Natural Resourc				

2.	Geology and Soils <u>Explanation:</u>	✓	
	Ground disturbance is not anticipated in this project; therefore	re, no impacts would occur.	
3.	Plants (including Federal/state special-status species and habitats)		
	Explanation:	✓	
	No special-status plants are known or expected at the project general area. The landing zone site is sparsely vegetated. Crequired to be clean before entering the project location to p	Construction vehicles and equipme	
	Wildlife (including Federal/state special-status species and habitats)		
	Explanation:	\overline{A}	
	Although the project lies within the range of federally-protect project area lacks the complexity of suitable habitat for the s area on October 27, 2022 and found no resources of concer outside the bird nesting season.	pecies. WAPA conducted a survey	of the project
5.	Water Bodies, Floodplains, and Fish (including Federal/state special-status		
	species, ESUs, and habitats) Explanation:	√	
	A single ephemeral drainage was noted during the surveys, zone. It was flagged for avoidance.	but it is approximately 300' from the	e proposed landing

6.	Wetlands <u>Explanation:</u>	\checkmark	
	The project area does not have wetlands; therefore, no impa	acts would occur.	
	Groundwater and Aquifers Explanation:	\checkmark	
	Spill prevention measures, including secondary containment. The project would not provide a pathway for groundwater comaterial/waste spill, Environment and the COR will be conta Federal, State, and local regulating authority notified dependence.	ntamination. In the event of a haza cted, WAPA Dispatch notified, and	rdous the appropriate
8.	Land Use and Specially-Designated Areas Explanation:	✓	
	The land use would not change at the project sites. Nor is the areas, such as National Scenic Rivers.	e project within, or near, any speci	ally designated
9.	Visual Quality Explanation:	✓	
	The visual quality would be consistent with the existing use of be no significant change to the visual quality.	of the transmission right-of-way cor	ridor. There would
1	0. Air Quality <u>Explanation:</u>		✓
	Air quality emissions would be from short-term helicopter use exhaust from worker's vehicles along access roads. Air quality within the emissions criteria for Shasta County AQMD. The oduring the project: AQ-SOP-1: The Contractor will adhere to all applicable requiquality matters, and any necessary permits for O&M will be AQ-SOP-2: Machinery and vehicles will be kept in good oper with equipment meeting applicable emission standards; appropriate for vehicles and equipment, per EPA and/or WAFAQ-SOP-3: Idle equipment will be shut down when not in act will be controlled. AQ-SOP-4: Dust —control measures will be implemented in round transporting loose material will be covered or maintain visible dust emissions. AQ-SOP-5: There will be no open burning of construction transporting activities will cease during periods of high management districts. AQ-SOP-6: Grading activities will be avoided on days when the AQ-SOP-8: Include dust-control measures such as water or AQ-SOP-9: Re-seeding of ground surfaces that have been soil. AQ-SOP-10: Regular watering of exposed soils and unpaver AQ-SOP-11: Use reasonably practicable methods and devicatmospheric emissions or discharges of air contaminants.	ty modeling emissions based on 1 contractor is expected to adopt WA rements of those agencies having obtained. The rements of those agencies having obtained. The rements of those agencies having obtained. The remission and older equipments of the remissions requirements. The remission requirements of the remission requirements. The remission requirements of the use; visible emissions from state of the least two feet of freeboard and should be a determined by local air he local Air Quality Index is expect the chemical suppressants. Significantly disturbed to prevent with access roads during maintenance.	day of work were PA's procedures jurisdiction over air at will be replaced int will be tionary generators as needed. will not create any requality ed to exceed 150. Indidispersion of eactivities.

	11. Noise					
	Explanation: ✓					
	There are no residences within the project location. Helicopter noise would be temporary and would occur during daylight hours.					
	12. Human Health and Safety					
	Explanation:					
	During project activities, all standard safety protocols would be followed. Project activities would not impact human health or safety. Contractor shall be required to follow the OSHA standards set forth in 29 CFR 1910.269. Contractor shall also adhere to the requirements under Title 8 Cal OSHA Electrical Safety Order specifically Subchapter 5 and Subchapter 7. Contractor shall maintain a safe working distance from conductors as described in the above OSHA standards. If a safe working distance cannot be maintained, a clearance shall be requested 3 days in advance.					
	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 similar requirements of DOE or Executive Orders.	health, or				
	Explanation, if necessary:					
✓	Require siting and construction or major expansion of waste storage, disposal, recovery, or treatment facilit (including incinerators) that are not otherwise categorically excluded.	ies				
	Explanation, if necessary:					
✓	Disturb hazardous substances, pollutants, contaminants, or CERCLA excluded petroleum and natural gas pethat preexist in the environment such that there would be uncontrolled or unpermitted releases.	products				
	Explanation, if necessary:					
✓	Involve genetically engineered organisms, synthetic biology, governmentally designated noxious weeds, or species, unless the proposed activity would be contained or confined in a manner designed and operated to unauthorized release into the environment and conducted in accordance with applicable requirements, such of the Department of Agriculture, the Environmental Protection Agency, and the National Institutes of Health	prevent n as those				
	Explanation, if necessary:					
Landowner Notification, Involvement, or Coordination						
	Description: WAPA will work closely with the landowners to provide adequate notification of construction timing.					
=	Based on the foregoing, this proposed project does not have the potential to cause significant					

impacts to any environmentally sensitive resource.

Signed: Latisha M.

Digitally signed by Latisha M. Saare Date: 2022.11.07 15:03:37 -08'00' Saare

Date: 11/7/22