

**Supplement Analysis**  
for the  
**Transmission System Vegetation Management Program EIS**  
(DOE/EA/EIS-0285/SA-907)

**Pollution Prevention and Abatement Project Number 5039**  
**Natural Resource Specialist/Project Manager: Jacob Grinolds**

Bonneville Power Administration  
Department of Energy



**Proposed Activities**

BPA proposes to clear unwanted vegetation in and adjacent to certain portions of the Echo Lake-Maple Valley 1 and 2 No 1, Mt Si-Tanner No 1, Echo Lake-Monroe No 1, Rocky Reach-Maple Valley No 1, Olympia-Grand Coulee No 1, South Tacoma-Southwest No 1, Cowlitz Tap to Chehalis-Covington No 1, McCullough Tap to Cowlitz-Canyon No 1 and 2, Franz Holmes Tap to Cowlitz-Canyon No 1 and 2, Chehalis-Covington No 1, Covington-White River No 1, South Tacoma-White River No 1, and Sammamish-Maple Valley No 1 rights-of-ways in King, Kittitas, and Pierce Counties, Washington. This SA does not cover work along Chehalis-Covington No 1 39/3-44/4, 64/2-65/2 and Olympia-Grand Coulee No 1 54/4-67/3 as noted in the cutsheets. Vegetation management needs were assessed, and Vegetation Control Cut Sheets were created for the right-of-way corridor and associated access roads along these transmission assets. Locations throughout the project that require cultural surveys or monitoring are also noted in the cutsheets.

The corridor in the proposed project area measures approximately 115-300 feet wide and 150 miles long of terrain through residential, rural residential, United States Forest Service (USFS), and Washington Department of Natural Resources (DNR)-managed lands.

Coordination with USFS and DNR has occurred and no concerns were expressed. Letters, on-site meetings, emails, and phone calls would be used to notify landowners approximately three weeks prior to commencing vegetation management activities. Door hangers would also be used at properties where special treatments are anticipated. Any additional measures proposed by landowners or land managers through ongoing communication would be incorporated into the vegetation management plan during project implementation.

To comply with Western Electricity Coordinating Council standards, BPA proposes to manage vegetation with the goal of removing tall-growing vegetation that is currently or will soon become a hazard to the transmission line (a hazard is defined as one or more branches, tops, and/or whole trees that could fall or grow into the minimum safety zone of the transmission line(s) causing an electrical arc, relay, and/or outage). The overall goal of BPA is to establish low-growing plant communities along the right-of-way (ROW) to control the development of potentially threatening vegetation.

A combination of selective and nonselective vegetation control methods would be used to perform the work, and may include hand cutting, mowing, herbicidal treatment, or a combination of those methods. Herbicides would be selectively applied using spot treatment (stump or stubble treatment, basal treatment, and/or spot foliar) or localized treatments (broadcast application and cut stubble treatments) with chemicals approved in BPA's Transmission System Vegetation Management Program

Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) (DOE/EIS-0285, May 2000), to ensure that the roots are killed - preventing new sprouts - and selectively eliminating vegetation that interferes with the operation and maintenance of transmission infrastructure.

Approximately 3,100 acres and 150 miles would be initially treated in the fall of 2024. In addition, BPA proposes to remove approximately 650 trees and limb 200 more. Additional vegetation management may be necessary in subsequent years in discrete areas of noxious weeds, or where BPA personnel discover vegetation that poses a hazard to the transmission line. All debris would be disposed of onsite, along the ROW, using on-site lop and scatter, or mulching techniques.

## **Analysis**

A Vegetation Control Cut Sheet was developed for this corridor that incorporated the requirements identified in BPA's Transmission System Vegetation Management Program FEIS 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 Cut Sheets.

### **Water Resources**

Water bodies (streams, rivers, lakes, wetlands) occurring in the project area are noted in the Vegetation Control Cut Sheets. As conservation and avoidance measures, only spot and localized treatment with Garlon 3A (Triclopyr TEA) would be used within a 100-foot buffer up to the water's edge of any stream containing threatened or endangered species. Trees in riparian zones would be selectively cut to include only those that would grow into the minimum approach distances of the conductor at maximum sag; other trees would be left in place or topped to preserved shade. Shrubs that are less than 10-foot-high would not be cut where ground to conductor clearance allows. No ground-disturbing vegetation management methods would be implemented, thus eliminating the risk for soil erosion and sedimentation near the streams. Where private water wells/springs or agricultural irrigation sources have been identified along the ROW and noted in the Vegetation Control Cut Sheets, no herbicide application would occur within a 50-foot radius of the wellhead, spring, or irrigation source (164 feet when using herbicides with ground/surface water advisory).

### **Endangered Species Act and Magnuson-Stevens Act**

Pursuant to its obligations under the Endangered Species Act (ESA), BPA 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 conducted a review of ESA-listed species, designated critical habitat, and Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) (as defined by the Magnuson-Stevens Act), under the jurisdiction of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS); the proposed vegetation management activities are within the scope of activities and action area evaluated in the *Endangered Species Act Section 7 Programmatic Conference and Biological Opinion and Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act Essential Fish Habitat Consultation for Standard Local Operating Procedures for Endangered Species to Administer Maintenance or Rebuild Projects for Transmission Line and Road Access Actions Authorized or Carried Out by the Bonneville Power Administration in Oregon, Washington, and Idaho* (SLOPES PBO) (WCR-2014-1600, September 22, 2016). Streams in the project area with documented presence of ESA-listed fish, designated as critical habitat for one or more species,

and/or identified as Essential Fish Habitat (EFH), have been noted in the vegetation control prescription. It was determined that, by complying with the project design criteria listed within the SLOPES PBO, potential effects to ESA-listed anadromous salmonids and EFH would be consistent with those evaluated and addressed in the SLOPES PBO.

#### Cultural Resources

The proposed vegetation management actions do not result in ground disturbance to the physical environment, so the action is not one that typically has the potential to affect historic and/or cultural resources. If a site is discovered during the course of vegetation control, work would be stopped in the vicinity and the BPA Environmental Specialist and the BPA archaeologist would be contacted. Locations throughout the project that require cultural surveys or monitoring are also noted in the cutsheets.

#### Re-Vegetation

Existing naturalized grasses and woody shrubs are present on the entire ROW and are expected to naturally seed into the areas that would have lightly-disturbed soil predominantly located on the ROW roads.

#### Monitoring

The entire project would be inspected during the work period, 2024 through 2025. A follow-up treatment may occur after the initial treatment. Additional monitoring for follow-up treatment would be conducted as necessary. A vendor scorecard would be used to document formal inspections and would be filed with the contracting officer.

#### Findings

BPA finds that the types of actions and the potential impacts related to the proposed activities have been examined, reviewed, and consulted upon and are similar to those analyzed in the Transmission System Vegetation Management Program FEIS (DOE/EIS-0285) and ROD. There are no substantial changes in the EIS' Proposed Action and no substantial new circumstances or information about the significance of the adverse effects that bear on the analysis in the EIS' Proposed Action or its impacts within the meaning of 10 CFR § 1021.314 and 40 CFR § 1502.9. Therefore, no further NEPA analysis or documentation is required.

/s/ Jonnel Deacon

Jonnel Deacon  
Physical Scientist (Environmental)

Concur:

/s/ Katey Grange

Katey Grange  
NEPA Compliance Officer      Date: November 15, 2024

References:

Vegetation Control Cut Sheets