

Categorical Exclusion Determination

Bonneville Power Administration
Department of Energy



Proposed Action: Burnt Bridge Erosion Control Pollinator Planting

Project Manager: Chris Morse, TFBV-DOB-1

Location: Clark County, Washington

Categorical Exclusion Applied (from Subpart D, 10 C.F.R. Part 1021): B1.20 Protection of cultural resources, fish and wildlife habitat

Description of the Proposed Action: Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) proposes to sow 0.10 acre of native seeds along the North Bonneville-Ross-1 and 2 transmission line rights-of-way in Vancouver, Washington. The area has had unauthorized vehicular access that has created deep tire ruts in the right-of-way on an unofficial road. BPA would sow the seeds directly to the bare ground and then cover with a weed-free straw.

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.

Beth Belanger
Environmental Protection Specialist

Concur:

Katey C. Grange
NEPA Compliance Officer

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.

Proposed Action: Burnt Bridge Erosion Control Pollinator Planting

Project Site Description

The project area is in Vancouver, Washington in Section 30, Township 2 North, Range 2 East. The project location is within the BPA right-of-way, just west of NE Andresen Road. An unnamed intermittent stream crosses through the project area and drains to Burnt Bridge Creek, located approximately 0.20 miles to the northwest of the project area. The nearest mapped wetland is located 0.07 miles to the northwest.

Evaluation of Potential Impacts to Environmental Resources

1. Historic and Cultural Resources

Potential for Significance: No

Explanation: The project was reviewed by a BPA archaeologist, and it was determined that the project has no potential to cause effect to historic or cultural resources.

2. Geology and Soils

Potential for Significance: No

Explanation: No ground disturbance is proposed for this work. The proposed project would have a long-term beneficial impact by decreasing soil erosion due to exposed soils.

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

Potential for Significance: No

Explanation: There would be no impacts to Federal or state special-status species or habitats. Use of a locally native seed mix for revegetation would have a beneficial impact for the project area, which is currently bare ground.

Notes:

- Weed-free straw would be used to mulch the area, which would decrease the potential for non-native plant establishment.

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

Potential for Significance: No

Explanation: There would be no impacts to Federal or state special-status species or habitats. A minor increase in human presence would occur during seeding activities. In the long term, a return to more native vegetation would benefit any wildlife in the area.

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

Potential for Significance: No

Explanation: The project would not occur within a floodplain or fish habitat. An intermittent stream is in the project area; however, there would be no impact to the stream because no soil excavation activities would occur. The native seed mix that would be used contains plant species that tolerate seasonal inundation.

6. Wetlands

Potential for Significance: No

Explanation: The project would not impact wetlands.

7. Groundwater and Aquifers

Potential for Significance: No

Explanation: The project does not include any ground disturbing activities; therefore, there would be no impacts to groundwater or aquifers.

8. Land Use and Specially-Designated Areas

Potential for Significance: No

Explanation: The project would not change land use at the location; nor are there any specially-designated areas that would be impacted by the project.

9. Visual Quality

Potential for Significance: No

Explanation: The project would have a small improvement on the visual quality of the area by returning the area to a vegetated state.

10. Air Quality

Potential for Significance: No

Explanation: There would be no impacts to air quality at the project site.

11. Noise

Potential for Significance: No

Explanation: There would be no noise impacts

12. Human Health and Safety

Potential for Significance: No

Explanation: There would be no human health or safety impacts.

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: The project would occur on BPA fee-owned property and would not require any landowner coordination.

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

Signed:

Beth Belanger
Environmental Protection Specialist