

Categorical Exclusion Determination

Bonneville Power Administration
Department of Energy



Proposed Action: Chief Joseph-Monroe No. 1 Access Road Maintenance Project: Access Roads to Structures 86/2 and 97/3

PP&A #: 3405

Project Manager: Todd Nicholson

Location: King County, Washington

Project activities would occur in the sections listed below:

Township	Range	Section
26N	11E	18
26N	12E	25

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

Description of the Proposed Action: BPA proposes to perform maintenance on approximately 1,000 feet of the access road to Chief Joseph-Monroe No. 1, Structure 86/2. Work would include cleaning one culvert, repairing the road sub-grade, installing at least 2 drain dips or water bars, installing surface rock, and installing one heavy-duty gate. Corrective repairs to the access road leading to Chief Joseph-Monroe No. 1, Structure 97/3 are also needed. Work would include removing two undersized culverts and installing a temporary bridge to allow debris passage in a non-fish ephemeral drainage.

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/ Oden Jahn

Oden Jahn
Physical Scientist

Concur:

/s/ Sarah T. Biegel

Sarah T. Biegel
NEPA Compliance Officer

Date: June 9, 2016

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 on environmentally sensitive resources and would meet other integral elements of the applied categorical exclusion.

Proposed Action: Chief Joseph-Monroe No. 1 Access Road Maintenance Project

Project Site Description

BPA access roads are located in upland and riparian forest habitat in the United States Forest Service's (USFS) Mt. Baker-Snoqualmie National Forest.

Evaluation of Potential Impacts to Environmental Resources

Environmental Resource Impacts	No Potential for Significance	No Potential for Significance, with Conditions
1. Historic and Cultural Resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<u>Explanation:</u> Both project sites are located within previously disturbed road prisms composed of graded and compacted fill material and aggregate. For the above reason, it was determined, in coordination with the USFS, that a field survey for cultural resources would not be required.		
2. Geology and Soils	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<u>Explanation:</u> Sites would be stabilized upon completion of project activities. All imported road fill and aggregate would be sourced from USFS-approved sources.		
3. Plants (including federal/state special-status species)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<u>Explanation:</u> No federal or state special-status plant species are recorded in the project area.		
4. Wildlife (including federal/state special-status species and habitats)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<u>Explanation:</u> No federal or state special-status wildlife species or habitat would be impacted by the proposed project.		
5. Water Bodies, Floodplains, and Fish (including federal/state special-status species and ESUs)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<u>Explanation:</u> The access road to Structure 86/2 is not in proximity to fish-bearing waters. The access road to Structure 97/3 is located in proximity to the South Fork of the Skykomish River and an unnamed tributary which have documented occurrences of anadromous salmonids and bull trout. The proposed work would be limited to an ephemeral tributary, and no flowing water is expected at the time of construction. No in-water work will be performed and no construction-related sediment is expected to reach the South Fork of the Skykomish River.		

- | | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 6. Wetlands | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <u>Explanation:</u> The proposed project would not impact wetlands. | | |
| 7. Groundwater and Aquifers | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <u>Explanation:</u> The proposed work is in upland areas and is not anticipated to impact groundwater. | | |
| 8. Land Use and Specially Designated Areas | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <u>Explanation:</u> The proposed project would not change land use and no specially designated areas were identified. Gates would be installed to limit unauthorized public access. | | |
| 9. Visual Quality | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <u>Explanation:</u> The proposed project would not change the visual quality of the area. | | |
| 10. Air Quality | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <u>Explanation:</u> Any fugitive dust or vehicle emissions generated during project implementation would be temporary and negligible. | | |
| 11. Noise | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <u>Explanation:</u> Construction noise would be temporary and localized. There are no residences in the project area. | | |
| 12. Human Health and Safety | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <u>Explanation:</u> Project activities would not impact human health or safety. | | |

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: On May 24, 2016, the USFS concurred with BPA's findings and use of a Categorical Exclusion for the proposed work. BPA would implement all USFS-identified Mitigation Measures and Best Management Practices listed in the May 24th letter.

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

Signed: /s/ Oden Jahn
Oden Jahn
Physical Scientist

Date: June 9, 2016