Categorical Exclusion Determination
Bonneville Power Administration
Department of Energy

Proposed Action: Gate Installation and Fence Replacement on the North Bonneville-Midway No. 1 Transmission Line

LURR Number: 20170278

Project Manager: Harley Canaday, TERR-3

Location: Klickitat County, Washington

Categorical Exclusion Applied (from Subpart D, 10 C.F.R. Part 1021): B4.9 Multiple use of powerline rights-of-way

Description of the Proposed Action: The Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) proposes to allow a landowner to install a gate at the entrance of the landowner’s driveway and replace field-fencing, both of which are located within the BPA rights-of-way. The project area is located between structures 30/2 and 30/3 of the North Bonneville-Midway No. 1 transmission line. The approximate 130-linear feet of field-fencing parallels Spencer Hill Road, in White Salmon, Washington. The driveway gate would be installed immediately north of the fencing, and would continue the same north-south line that the fence followed.

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, July 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/ Becky Hill
Becky Hill
Contract Environmental Protection Specialist
Flux Resources, LLC
Reviewed by:

/s/ Gene Lynard
Gene Lynard
Supervisory Environmental Protection Specialist

Concur:

/s/ Stacy Mason       Date: July 9, 2018
Stacy Mason
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 to environmentally sensitive resources and would meet other integral elements of the applied categorical exclusion.

**Proposed Action:** Gate Installation and Fence Replacement on the North Bonneville-Midway No. 1 Transmission Line (LURR20170278)

---

### Project Site Description

The project area is located on BPA fee-owned property between structures 30/2 and 30/3 on the North Bonneville-Midway No. 1 transmission line, in White Salmon, Washington. In Township 3 North, Range 11 East, Section 5, the project area is surrounded by rural residences, agricultural crops, pastures and forested lands.

---

### Evaluation of Potential Impacts to Environmental Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Resource Impacts</th>
<th>No Potential for Significance</th>
<th>No Potential for Significance, with Conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Historic and Cultural Resources</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Explanation:** The BPA archaeologist conducted a site visit and determined that the project has no potential to impact historic properties, and no further review under the National Historic Preservation Act is needed. Should any cultural resources be discovered during project activities, then all project work must stop, and the EC lead should be notified immediately.

| 2. Geology and Soils | ☐ | ☑ |

**Explanation:** Erosion and sediment control best management practices (BMPs) would be implemented prior to any vegetation and ground disturbing activities.

| 3. Plants (including federal/state special-status species) | ☑ | ☐ |

**Explanation:** There are no documented occurrences of any plant species listed under the ESA in the project area; therefore, the proposed project would not have an effect on ESA-listed plant species. The vegetation that could be disturbed as a result of project activities include: native and non-native grasses and forbs, and an agricultural crop that appears to be wheat, grass seed or hay.

| 4. Wildlife (including federal/state special-status species and habitats) | ☑ | ☐ |

**Explanation:** There are no documented occurrences of any wildlife species listed under the ESA in the project area; therefore, the proposed project would not have an effect on ESA-listed wildlife species.

| 5. Water bodies, Floodplains, and Fish (including federal/state special-status species and ESUs) | ☑ | ☐ |

**Explanation:** There are no water bodies, floodplains or fish habitat present in the project area; therefore, no water bodies, floodplains or fish habitat would be impacted by the project. The nearest water body is Jewett
Creek located approximately 0.3 miles southwest of the project area.

6. **Wetlands**

   - **Explanation:** There are no wetlands present in the project area; therefore, no wetlands would be impacted by the project. The nearest wetland is located approximately 1 mile west of the project area.

7. **Groundwater and Aquifers**

   - **Explanation:** No new wells or use of groundwater are proposed with this project.

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

   - **Explanation:** There are no specially-designated land use areas in the project area.

9. **Visual Quality**

   - **Explanation:** The new fencing would replace existing fencing, and the addition of a new driveway gate would not significantly change the visual quality of the site and would be visually consistent with other properties in the area.

10. **Air Quality**

    - **Explanation:** Temporary dust and vehicle emissions could increase in the local area during construction activities.

11. **Noise**

    - **Explanation:** Temporary noise could increase in the local area during construction activities.

12. **Human Health and Safety**

    - **Explanation:** No impacts to health and human safety as a result of this project.

---

**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, if necessary:**

- **Require siting and construction or major expansion of waste storage, disposal, recovery, or treatment facilities (including incinerators) that are not otherwise categorically excluded.**

  - **Explanation, if necessary:**

- **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, if necessary:**

- **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, if necessary:**

---

**Landowner Notification, Involvement, or Coordination**

**Description:** The project area is located on BPA fee owned property and BPA is coordinating with the landowner requesting the gate installation and fence replacement; adjacent landowners would not be affected by the action.

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

Signed: /s/ Becky Hill  
Becky Hill, ECT-4  
Contract Environmental Protection Specialist  
Flux Resources, LLC

Date: **July 9, 2018**