

REVIEW OF THE SELECTED CLEANUP ACTIONS FOR REMEDIAL ACTION UNIT 3, SITE-WIDE MUNITIONS OF EXPLOSIVE CONCERN CLEANUP ACTION PLAN AT CAMP BONNEVILLE AS REQUIRED BY THE PROSPECTIVE PURCHASER CONSENT DECREE (PPCD) IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE SEPA ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

Executive Summary

The Proposed Action, for the purposes of this SEPA checklist, is the implementation of the Cleanup Action Plan (CAP) for all areas in RAU 3 at Camp Bonneville (the Property) in order to reduce the threat to human health and safety associated with Military Munitions and other contaminants located within the Property. The cleanup is overseen by the Washington Department of Ecology

The Property referenced in this SEPA Environmental Checklist is a 3,020-acres parcel owned by the Bonneville Conservation Restoration and Renewal Team, LLC (BCRRT) and 820 acres leased from the Washington Department of Natural Resources.

The RAU3 Cleanup Action Plan presents selected cleanup actions for all areas in RAU 3, the Site-Wide Munitions of Explosive Concern (MEC) Cleanup, for the former Camp Bonneville Military Reservation (CBMR) in Clark County, Washington.

Table of Contents

A. Background

1. Name of proposed project:
2. Name of applicant:
3. Address and phone number of applicant and contact person:
4. Date checklist prepared:
5. Agency requesting checklist:
6. Proposed timing or schedule
7. Additions and Expansions
8. Environmental Information
9. Other proposals affecting current proposal
10. Permits
11. Proposal Description
12. Location of the proposal

B. Environmental elements

1. Earth
2. Air
3. Water
4. Plants
5. Animals
6. Energy and natural resources
7. Environmental health
8. Land and shoreline use
9. Housing
10. Aesthetics
11. Light and glare
12. Recreation
13. Historic and cultural preservation
14. Transportation
15. Public services
16. Utilities

C. Signature

A. Background

1. Name of proposed project

The implementation of the Cleanup Action Plan (CAP) for RAU 3 within Camp Bonneville, Washington.

2. Name of applicant

Clark County Department of Public Works

3. Address and phone number of applicant and contact person

Mr. Jerry Barnett, PE, Project Manager
Clark County Public Works
1300 Franklin Street
Vancouver, WA 98660
(360) 397-6118 x4969

4. Date checklist prepared

June 2009

5. Agency requesting checklist

Clark County

1. Proposed timing or schedule

The action will be implemented as soon as possible after all required permits have been issued.

7. Additions and Expansions

Do you have any plans for future additions, expansion, or further activity related to or connected with this proposal?

The intended reuse of the Property is as a regional park and wildlife refuge.

8. Environmental Information

List any environmental information you know about that has been prepared, or will be prepared, directly related to this proposal.

A number of reports and studies have been prepared for the cleanup and ultimate reuse of Camp Bonneville. During the completion of this SEPA environmental checklist for the implementation of cleanup actions, the Environmental Assessment (EA) for Disposal and Reuse of Camp Bonneville (United States Army Corps of Engineers [USACE] 2001) was reviewed for existing site information, and the Prospective Purchaser Consent Decree (PPCD) was reviewed for specific information regarding the cleanup actions. Both documents incorporate by reference a number of other documents previously prepared for the project (see references under the EA and PPCD). Due to the number of reports and studies, they have not been listed. In summary, reports and studies prepared that directly relate to the proposed actions include NEPA/ESA compliance documentation, survey reports, investigation reports, remedial investigation/ feasibility studies (RI/FS) reports, sampling and analysis reports, and clean-up action plans.

The Camp Bonneville Cultural and Historical Resources Protection Plan (CHRPP; Baker 2006) was updated in May 2009 to include this undertaking.. Copies of these reports are available in public repositories. The public library at the Vancouver Mall is the location of one of the Repositories.

9. *Other proposals affecting current proposal*

Do you know whether applications are pending for governmental approvals of other proposals directly affecting the property covered by your proposal?

Pending approvals specific to the activities included under the Proposed Action include Department of the Army approval of the Explosives Safety Submittal (ESS) – Amendment 3.

10. *Permits*

List any government approvals or permits that will be needed for your proposal

The proposed action is being conducted under a MTCA Consent Decree therefore procedural requirements do not need to be done. However, substantive requirements for required permits will be adhered to.

11. *Proposal Description*

Give brief, complete description of your proposal, including the proposed uses and the size of the project and site. There are several questions later in this checklist that ask you to describe certain aspects of your proposal. You do not need to repeat those answers on this page. (Lead agencies may modify this form to include additional specific information on project description.)

The Proposed Action, for purposes of this SEPA environmental checklist, is to conduct cleanup actions associated with RAU 3 at Camp Bonneville, as required by the PPCD and WDOE determinations. These actions are outlined in the RAU 3 CAP. The RAU3 CAP presents selected cleanup actions for all areas in RAU 3, the Site-Wide Munitions of Explosive Concern (MEC) Cleanup, for the CBMR in Clark County, Washington.

The Cleanup Actions to be conducted as part of the RAU 3 CAP implementation include Site-Wide Institutional Controls, vegetation clearance, MEC surface clearance, and MEC subsurface clearance to various depths (frost depth clearance to 14-in below ground surface[bgs], or subsurface 0 to 24 in. bgs). Details of CAP implementation procedures will be presented in subsequent Work Plans

RAU 3 consists of the entire site where MEC may be found. Cleanup actions at the following areas will be conducted:

- Target Areas
- Central Impact Area (CITA) and Central Impact Target Area (CITA-Targets) and Non-Target Zone (CITA-NT)
- Open Burn/Open Demolition Areas (OB/OD)
- Firing Points
- Roads and Trails (R&T)
- Central Valley Floor and Associated Wetlands (CVF)
- Regional Park Western Slopes Area
- Wildlife Management Area (WMA)

The cleanup is overseen by the Washington Department of Ecology.

12. Location of the proposal

Give sufficient information for a person to understand the precise location of your proposed project, including a street address, if any, and section, township, and range, if known. If a proposal would occur over a range of area, provide the range or boundaries of the site(s). Provide a legal description, site plan, vicinity map, and topographic map, if reasonably available. While you should submit any plans required by the agency, you are not required to duplicate maps or detailed plans submitted with any permit applications related to this checklist.

Camp Bonneville is located on the western slopes of the Cascade Mountains in the Lacamas Creek Valley in Clark County, Washington, approximately 15 miles northeast of Portland, Oregon and approximately 10 miles northeast of Vancouver, Washington. The installation occupies approximately 3,840 acres in sections 34 and 35, Township 3 North, Range 3 East, and sections 1, 2, 3 and 10, Township 2 North, Range 3 East of the Willamette Meridian. The Site postal address is 23201 NE Pluss Road, Vancouver, Washington 98682.

B. Environmental elements

1. Earth

a. General description of the site (circle one):

Flat, rolling, hilly, steep slopes, mountainous, other.

Mountainous with steep slopes and general hilly terrain. The majority of the Camp Bonneville area is located in the western slope foothills of the Cascade Mountains in southeastern Clark County, Washington. The western edge of the installation is within the Fifth Plain area, which is generally flat. The elevation at the installation ranges from approximately 300 feet above sea level (along Lacamas Creek) to about 1,640 feet in the southeastern corner of the Property.

b. What is the steepest slope on the site (approximate percent slope)?

Steep slopes are generally located in the eastern and central portions of Camp Bonneville. Based on review of topographic maps, the percent slope can be in excess of 30 percent in these areas.

c. What general types of soils are found on the site (for example, clay, sand, gravel, peat, muck)? If you know the classification of agricultural soils, specify them and note any prime farmland.

Soil types and classification vary across the site. Soils in the eastern and central portion of Camp Bonneville are mainly Olympic series soils, specifically Olympic stony clay loam on areas between a 30 and 60 percent slope and Olympic clay loam on slopes between eight and 30 percent. Within the Lacamas Creek valley, McBee and Cove series soils are located, which are primarily silt or silty clay loams found at slopes ranging from zero to five percent. Finally, along the western edge of the installation, there are Hesson series soils that are gravelly clay loams from zero to 20 percent slopes and clay loam at zero to eight percent slopes.

d. Are there surface indications or history of unstable soils in the immediate vicinity? If so,

describe.

Indications or a history of unstable soils in the immediate area have not been observed. Steep slopes are generally located in the eastern and central portions of Camp Bonneville, but there is no reference to slope stability issues in the EA (USACE 2001).

- e. Describe the purpose, type, and approximate quantities of any filling or grading proposed. Indicate source of fill.**

No filling or grading operations will be conducted.

- f. Could erosion occur as a result of clearing, construction, or use? If so, generally describe.**

Implementation of the Proposed Action may include some ground disturbance activities associated with clearing, grubbing, and subsurface MEC clearance. Grubbing is the removal of vegetation in order to expose the ground and allow for a visual corridor that is easily maintained around roads, fences, obstacles, etc. Subsurface MEC clearance is expected to be of a very limited nature with return of the removed material to the temporary excavation. These activities are expected to be a minimal increase in effort from the ongoing maintenance already occurring onsite. The likelihood of erosion occurring as a result of clearing and MEC clearance is minimal.

- g. About what percent of the site will be covered with impervious surfaces after project construction (for example, asphalt or buildings)?**

There will be no change to the percentage of the site covered by impervious surfaces as a result of the proposed action. Likewise, no grading or filling is proposed.

- h. Proposed measures to reduce or control erosion, or other impacts to the earth, if any:**

Although impacts to soils as a result of the emergency actions, step-out procedures, and subsurface MEC clearance are expected to be low or negligible, the use of some standard construction BMPs (phased construction techniques, avoidance of earth moving activities during the wet season) are proposed to minimize effects of soil disturbance. In addition, if clearing activities are occurring in close proximity to surface waters, buffers could be established along riparian corridors to help retain the function of ecosystems and reduce erosive storm water flows.

2. Air

- a. What types of emissions to the air would result from the proposal (i.e., dust, automobile, odors, and industrial wood smoke) during construction and when the project is completed? If any, generally describe and give approximate quantities if known.**

Air quality at the Camp Bonneville site complies with air quality standards. Current air emission sources at and around Camp Bonneville include vehicle traffic, ordnance emissions, and building space heaters. Impacts to air quality at the site, as a result of the proposed action, are expected to be low or negligible.

Implementation of cleanup actions may result in the temporary release of emissions of dust or debris during brush and vegetation clearing activities. When more concentrated clearing is required, step-out procedures would be initiated and that may result in further temporary release of dust or vegetation debris.

b. Are there any off-site sources of emissions or odor that may affect your proposal? If so, generally describe.

There are no known sources of off-site odors that are likely to affect the proposed actions. The surrounding land use is predominantly agricultural, residential, and forest; any air emissions would be associated with respective usage and are expected to be low or negligible.

c. Proposed measures to reduce or control emissions or other impacts to air, if any:

Not Applicable

3. Water

a. Surface:

1) Is there any surface water body on or in the immediate vicinity of the site (including year-round and seasonal streams, saltwater, lakes, ponds, wetlands)? If yes, describe type and provide names. If appropriate, state what stream or river it flows into.

Parts of Lacamas Creek and its tributaries are located within the Property boundary. Wetlands present at the site are located along Lacamas Creek and its tributaries. Per the EA (USACE 2001), there are no significant flood prone areas within the installation, although minor flooding is reported to occur. The EA does not indicate any designated floodplains within the site.

The primary source of discharge into Lacamas Creek is and will continue to be (following Proposed Actions) storm water runoff. Runoff is currently conveyed by a system of drainage ditches to Lacamas Creek. Lacamas Creek flows approximately 12.5 miles from headwaters near Camp Bonneville to Lacamas Lake and Round Lake in Camas, and eventually into the Washougal River.

2) Will the project require any work over, in, or adjacent to (within 200 feet) the described waters? If yes, please describe and attach available plans.

Yes, brush clearing and MEC surface/subsurface clearance will occur within 200 feet of the above described water bodies. The details of the actions in these areas are included in the RAU 3 CAP (Attachment 2) and subsequent RAU 3 Work Plans.

3) Estimate the amount of fill and dredge material that would be placed in or removed from surface water or wetlands and indicate the area of the site that would be affected. Indicate the source of fill material.

No fill and dredge material will be placed or removed as part of this proposed action. Best management practices (BMPs) will be followed during clearance activities to minimize any potential impacts to wetlands or water bodies.

4) Will the proposal require surface water withdrawals or diversions? Give general description, purpose, and approximate quantities if known.

No surface water withdrawals or diversions will be required

5) Does the proposal lie within a 100-year floodplain? If so, note location on the site plan.

The project action may include work in the 100 year floodplain, and any substantive requirements will be met.

6) Does the proposal involve any discharges of waste materials to surface waters? If so, describe the type of waste and anticipated volume of discharge.

Storm water runoff is currently conveyed by a series of drainage ditches to Lacamas Creek. Projected pollutants associated with storm water runoff may include bacteria, sediment, trash and debris, metals, hydrocarbons and nutrients.

b. Groundwater:

1) Will groundwater be withdrawn, or will water be discharged to groundwater? Give general description, purpose, and approximate quantities if known.

No groundwater will be withdrawn as a direct result of Proposal. Potable water is currently supplied by outside contractors and non-potable water is currently supplied to the two cantonment areas via groundwater wells located on each cantonment. The wells pump water to concrete, unlined water reservoirs where it then enters the distribution system. The existing wells at the Bonneville and Killpack cantonments would be used only as an emergency source of water.

2) Describe waste material that will be discharged into the ground from septic tanks or other sources, if any.

No waste materials will be discharged into the ground from septic tanks or other sources as part of the proposed actions. Currently, sanitary sewer effluent is treated in two separate systems located at each cantonment installed in January 2007. The Killpack cantonment sanitary sewer system incorporates a portion of the former gravity flow drainage sewer lines, a septic tank, force main and gravity drain field. The septic tank located south of building T-4389 intercepts the former gravity flow sewer. The remainder of the former gravity flow sewer was abandoned. The septic tank includes a pump chamber and lift station to transfer the wastewater to the conventional gravity drain field located between buildings T-4316 and T-4327 for treatment. The Bonneville cantonment sanitary sewer system is a completely new system comprised of a gravity sewer, septic tank, force main and pressure distribution drain field. The current system does not utilize any of the former sewer system components. Wastewater from building T-1980 gravity flows to a septic tank located on the east side of the building. The septic tank includes a pump chamber and lift station to transfer the wastewater to pressure distribution drain field located between buildings T-1942 and T-1932 for treatment. Both systems have been maintained and operating within design parameters. Implementation of the Proposed Action is not expected to affect or modify either of the wastewater collection systems.

c. Water runoff (including storm water):

1) Describe the source of runoff (including storm water) and method of collection and disposal, if any (include quantities, if known). Where will this water flow? Will this water flow into other waters? If so, describe.

The primary source of discharge into Lacamas Creek is and will continue to be (following Proposed Actions) storm water runoff. Runoff is currently conveyed by a system of drainage ditches to Lacamas Creek. Projected pollutants associated with storm water runoff may include bacteria, sediment, trash and debris, metals, hydrocarbons and nutrients.

2) Could waste materials enter ground or surface waters? If so, generally describe.

Impacts to surface and groundwater would be low as a result of the Proposed Action. Clearing of brush and MEC surface/subsurface clearance may result in minor impacts to surface waters if activities are conducted in close proximity to a surface water body. There are no anticipated impacts to groundwater sources.

d. Proposed measures to reduce or control surface, ground, and runoff water impacts, if any:

Best management practices (BMPs) will be followed during clearance activities to minimize any potential impacts to wetlands or water bodies. As impacts are expected to be minimal, no mitigation measures are proposed for the cleanup actions. Vegetative buffers would be maintained to the extent practicable along riparian corridors to retain the functions of the aquatic ecosystem.

4. Plants

a. Check or circle types of vegetation found on the site.

- deciduous tree: alder, maple, aspen, other**
- evergreen tree: fir, cedar, pine, other**
- shrubs**
- grass**
- pasture**
- crop or grain**
- wet soil plants: cattail, buttercup, bulrush, skunk cabbage, other**
- water plants: water lily, eelgrass, milfoil, other**
- other types of vegetation**

Camp Bonneville is comprised of forested, undeveloped land, specifically coniferous forest and mixed coniferous and deciduous forest. Shrub communities are found primarily along drainages and wetland depressions and consist of red alder, hardhack, willows, red osier dogwood, and softstem bulrush, in addition to non-native species such as Himalayan blackberry and scotch broom. There are meadows scattered throughout the upland and wetland portions of the site, and wetlands and riparian areas as well.

b. What kind and amount of vegetation will be removed or altered?

The clearing of vegetation may impact the plant species in the area of the Proposed Action on a localized basis, as vegetation and habitat would be either removed or altered. However, it should be noted that clearing and removal activities have historically occurred on the Property; therefore, additional impacts would be low or negligible. Vegetation is expected to grow back in one year.

c. List threatened or endangered species known to be on or near the site.

Endangered plant species are listed in Appendix D of the EA (USACE 2001). Two threatened/sensitive plant species have been observed on the site. The small-flowered trillium (sensitive) and hairy-stemmed checker-mallow (threatened) were observed near Lacamas creek, however this area is not anticipated to be impacted by the proposed activities. Field Personnel are routinely briefed on the nature, appearance and presence of the plant species and instructed that if they encounter the plant in a previously undiscovered location to stop work activities and notify BCRRT. These areas are then closed off to foot traffic and no mechanical brush clearance is allowed. More diverse plant communities generally surround the Lacamas Creek drainage.

d. Proposed landscaping, use of native plants, or other measures to preserve or enhance vegetation on the site, if any:

No major impacts have been identified resulting from the Proposed Action, and thus no mitigation measures are required.

5. Animals

a. Circle any birds and animals which have been observed on or near the site or are known to be on or near the site:

Birds: hawk, heron, eagle, songbirds, other:

Mammals: deer, bear, elk, beaver, other:

Fish: bass, salmon, trout, herring, shellfish, other:

Wildlife inhabiting the Camp Bonneville site includes various species of invertebrates, fish, amphibians, reptiles, birds, and mammals. Specific species currently inhabiting the Camp Bonneville site are listed on page 4-29 to 4-30 of the EA (USACE 2001).

b. List any threatened or endangered species known to be on or near the site.

In 2001, the US Fish and Wildlife Service stated that no listed species and one proposed species (coastal cutthroat trout) were within the project area. Documentation is included as Attachment A of the EA (USACE 2001), and a biologic evaluation addressing coastal cutthroat trout, for disposal of Camp Bonneville has also been prepared. The letter from USFW suggests that impacts to proposed species should also be addressed. In 1998, a letter from National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) was received that stated that Columbia River steelhead (threatened), Lower Columbia River Chinook salmon (proposed threatened), and Columbia River chum (proposed threatened) may be present within the study area.

c. Is the site part of a migration route? If so, explain.

Lacamas Dam, approximately 10 miles downstream of Camp Bonneville blocks upstream fish passage, thus Columbia River steelhead, Lower Columbia River Chinook salmon, and Columbia

River chum are not found above the dam. However, coastal cutthroat trout, which can become resident above a dam, have been found in electroshocking surveys of Lacamas Creek, above Lacamas Dam. There is no other reference to migration routes in the EA (USACE 2001).

The project area is within the Pacific flyway, a migration route for birds. Because of the size of the site, and the extent of existing wildlife use, local migration of wildlife likely occurs in the project area, however, impacts or restrictions to this migration are not anticipated as part of this action.

d. Proposed measures to preserve or enhance wildlife, if any:

No major impacts have been identified resulting from the Proposed Action, and thus no mitigation measures are required

6. *Energy and natural resources*

a. What kinds of energy (electric, natural gas, oil, wood stove, solar) will be used to meet the completed project's energy needs? Describe whether it will be used for heating, manufacturing, etc.

The completed project does not have any energy needs. It is only a cleanup action. Electrical power is supplied to the installation area by overhead service lines and an underground cable from Clark County Public Utility District No. 1. Heat is provided to buildings in the cantonment area by either individual oil furnaces (not currently in use) or electrical heaters in each building. Existing sources of power and heat would be maintained during implementation of cleanup actions.

b. Would your project affect the potential use of solar energy by adjacent properties? If so, generally describe.

The proposed action does not have the potential to impact solar energy use on adjacent properties. No impacts are expected because no modifications are proposed for the existing energy sources during the Proposed Action.

c. What kinds of energy conservation features are included in the plans of this proposal? List other proposed measures to reduce or control energy impacts, if any:

BMPs will be employed to minimize use of energy and no impacts are expected for the existing energy sources during the Proposed Action.

7. *Environmental health*

a. Are there any environmental health hazards, including exposure to toxic chemicals, risk of fire and explosion, spill, or hazardous waste, that could occur as a result of this proposal? If so, describe.

Although several environmental health hazards exist within Camp Bonneville, the environmental health hazard associated with the Proposed Action is the presence of surface and subsurface military munitions. As a result of the Proposed Action, surface and subsurface clearing of MEC would occur in order to lessen or remove environmental health hazards.

An archive search report in 1997 indicates that throughout approximately 3,200 acres of the Camp Bonneville site, there is a potential for unexploded ordnance (UXO), ranging from small arms ammunition to mortars, rockets, and grenades, due to the onsite activities from 1910 to the 1970's. Ordnance and explosives sampling conducted in 1998 led to the identification, detonation, and removal of UXO items and scrap metal, although the current clean up team with Ecology is currently preparing a report to determine actions regarding further investigations and remediation.

In addition to the hazards listed above, there is reported presence of asbestos in some of the buildings in Camp Bonneville, potential presence of polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs), and the use of lead-based paint on buildings. With regards to the lead based paint, a soil-metals survey was conducted in 1996 at specified locations (adjacent to buildings), and the lead concentrations exceeded the cleanup threshold for residential soils of 250 mg/kg.

Petroleum hydrocarbons related to vehicle and equipment usage during the Proposed Action will be addressed by BMPs and adherence to the project/Property work plans. Potential residual soil and groundwater contamination are addressed separately under other RAU Work Plans/actions.

1) Describe special emergency services that might be required.

The Vancouver Fire Department provides all emergency response including advanced and basic life support, and fire response at Camp Bonneville and Camp Killpack cantonments. The Washington Department of Natural Resources (WADNR) provides fire response for non-structures at Camp Bonneville overall.

2) Proposed measures to reduce or control environmental health hazards, if any:

Specific to the Proposed Action, implementation of cleanup actions would result in beneficial direct and indirect impacts on environmental health hazards from military munitions. These cleanup actions will reduce the threat to human health and safety as a result of the investigation and cleanup, including the MEC clearance and vegetation removal within the investigation areas associated with implementation of the RAU 3 CAP.

b. Noise

1) What types of noise exist in the area which may affect your project (traffic, equipment, operation, other)?

Current sources of noise at Camp Bonneville are associated with vehicle traffic and heavy equipment operated during construction and brush removal activity. Existing cleanup activities, such as planned unexploded ordnance detonation, also temporarily, produce high noise levels.

2) What types and levels of noise would be created by or associated with the project on a short-term or a long-term basis (for example: traffic, construction, operation, other)? Indicate what hours noise would come from the site.

Implementation of the Proposed Action could result in low impacts related to noise levels. Vegetation removal will be performed using hand held tools and heavy equipment and could result in increased noise levels. Any MEC discovered during surface/subsurface clearance will be evaluated to determine whether or not they are safe to move. If so, they will be transported to a

secure storage facility. If not, the item will be exploded in place. The impact of this action will temporarily increase noise levels in the vicinity of the operation. These impacts will be temporary and will be minimized through the use of sandbag mitigation. The sandbag mitigation requirements are outlined in the ESS..

3) Proposed measures to reduce or control noise impacts, if any:

Although not required, there are proposed mitigation measures for noise described in the EA (USACE 2001). As related to Proposed Action, mitigation measures could include limitations on the hours of operation to reduce off-site noise effects.

8. *Land and shoreline use*

a. What is the current use of the site and adjacent properties?

Camp Bonneville itself is comprised of two small cantonment areas (Bonneville Cantonment and Killpack Cantonment) that together cover about 30 acres. The cantonment areas represent the most impervious and densely developed portions of the site. The remainder of the installation area includes 18 training areas, 28 firing ranges, and a 1,500-foot long helicopter landing area, all areas of which generally look similar to a park. There are also some forest management areas onsite. Adjacent, surrounding land use is predominantly agricultural, rural residential, and forest.

b. Has the site been used for agriculture? If so, describe.

The facility was a military training facility and was not used for agriculture.

c. Describe any structures on the site.

The Camp Bonneville facility was used as a military training facility; thus there were no permanent residences. Most structures onsite are located at the cantonment areas and include 22 barracks, 2 dining halls, 1 classroom building, 4 latrines, 1 command post, 3 ammunition bunkers, 1 parade field, 1 training building, 7 storage facilities, 1 well house/water treatment facility, 1 well pump house, 1 grounds maintenance shop, 1 sanitary sewer lift station, 1 reservoir, and 1 vehicle maintenance shop (see Tables 4-2 and 4-3 of the EA). There are also two buried, parallel natural gas pipelines running across the southeastern portion of the installation.

d. Will any structures be demolished?

No structures are planned to be demolished as part of Proposed Action.

e. What is the current zoning classification of the site?

The zoning designation of the Property site is Forest Tier I-80.

f. What is the current comprehensive plan designation of the site?

The comprehensive plan designation of the Property site is Forest Tier I (large land parcels that can produce forest and mineral products).

- g. If applicable, what is the current shoreline master program designation of the site?**

Rural Environmental.

- h. Has any part of the site been classified as an "environmentally sensitive" area? If so, specify.**

There are no federally designated critical habitats on Camp Bonneville, although there is habitat for threatened and endangered species. There are wetlands (as identified by the Army Corp of Engineers and the National Wetland Inventory) and a surface water body (Lacamas Creek) present onsite. The EA (USACE 2001) does not identify any specific environmentally sensitive areas.

- i. Approximately how many people would reside or work in the completed project?**

Currently there are approximately 25 employees at Camp Bonneville (22 field personnel engaged in the cleanup, site maintenance and security. Additionally there are three employees temporarily residing on-site.

Following reuse of the site (medium-low intensity), there are expected to be 15-30 employees at any one time and approximately 540 visitors daily, on average.

- j. Approximately how many people would the completed project displace?**

Camp Bonneville was an inactive military base and would not displace any permanent residents.

- k. Proposed measures to avoid or reduce displacement impacts, if any:**

Not Applicable

- l. Proposed measures to ensure the proposal is compatible with existing and projected land uses and plans, if any:**

The implementation of cleanup actions per the Proposed Action are consistent with past and current maintenance activities, thus they would not result in any additional impacts to land use as a result of the clearing activities

9. *Housing*

- a. Approximately how many units would be provided, if any? Indicate whether high, middle, or low-income housing.**

Camp Bonneville is a military training center and provided temporary housing (via barracks). The barracks are wood structures with either wood or concrete floors and were constructed in the 1920's and 1930's. The barracks have been inactive since 1996, and since 1996, no military personnel have been housed onsite. No new housing units are proposed.

- b. Approximately how many units, if any, would be eliminated? Indicate whether high,**

middle, or low-income housing.

None

c. Proposed measures to reduce or control housing impacts, if any:

Any cut vegetation will be allowed to grow back. Vegetation regrow is expected within one year.

10. Aesthetics

a. What is the tallest height of any proposed structure(s), not including antennas; what is the principal exterior building material(s) proposed?

Not Applicable

b. What views in the immediate vicinity would be altered or obstructed?

None since the area is heavily forested.

c. Proposed measures to reduce or control aesthetic impacts, if any:

Not Applicable

11. Light and glare

a. What type of light or glare will the proposal produce? What time of day would it mainly occur?

The proposal would not produce light or glare.

b. Could light or glare from the finished project be a safety hazard or interfere with views?

Not Applicable

c. What existing off-site sources of light or glare may affect your proposal?

No off-site sources of light are expected to impact proposal.

d. Proposed measures to reduce or control light and glare impacts, if any:

Limits on the time of day for which construction could occur is a proposed mitigation measure that will be implemented for this Proposed Action, to minimize any temporary impacts associated with light and glare.

12. Recreation

a. What designated and informal recreational opportunities are in the immediate vicinity?

There are numerous recreational opportunities within Clark County, in areas surrounding Camp Bonneville. Past use of Camp Bonneville was not recreational in nature, as it was a military training ground and firing range that has since been inactivated.

b. Would the proposed project displace any existing recreational uses? If so, describe.

Implementation of the Proposed Action would have a negligible impact to recreation, as the site is not currently used for recreational purposes. However, by conducting the cleanup actions, the recreational potential of the site is increased.

c. Proposed measures to reduce or control impacts on recreation, including recreation opportunities to be provided by the project or applicant, if any:

None

13. *Historic and cultural preservation*

a. Are there any places or objects listed on, or proposed for, national, state, or local preservation registers known to be on or next to the site? If so, generally describe.

Camp Bonneville buildings and structures have been evaluated twice for National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) eligibility, in 1986 and 1997. During both inspections, Camp Bonneville buildings were determined to be ineligible for the NHRP. The EA (USACE 2001) contains an overview of the Camp Bonneville area including prehistory, ethnohistory, and history in Appendix H. Four archeological investigations have been conducted at the Camp Bonneville site from 1979 to 1998, although none of the investigations have been a systematic, system-wide survey because of the potential safety issues associated with the unexploded ordnance. Per the archeological investigations, there were some areas of cultural relevance discovered (see EA Section 4.11.1; USACE 2001).

b. Generally describe any landmarks or evidence of historic, archaeological, scientific, or cultural importance known to be on or next to the site.

There have been no Native American resources reported at Camp Bonneville. However, the Cowlitz Tribe has located, documented and forwarded to the Army both oral history and other facts that characterize the types of cultural resources likely to occur on the Camp Bonneville Site. Because of this, Ecology intends to involve the Tribe in development of cultural protection measures to be taken during this action.

During the first investigation, two prehistoric isolated finds and three historic land use areas were discovered. The finds, however, only contained individual artifacts and thus were not eligible for the NHRP. The three historic land uses contained limited assemblages and lack of association with significant persons or history, such that if evaluated, would unlikely meet the criteria of NHRP. During the second investigation, remains of 10 aligned fruit trees were discovered, which are shown on a 1916 map of the area.

The third investigation uncovered one small prehistoric campsite, but the site was too disturbed by construction and training activities to be eligible for NHRP. Finally, the fourth investigation identified the historic remains of an orchard, fruit trees, homestead foundation, and various other prehistoric artifacts, but based on preliminary examination, these artifacts do not appear to meet

the criteria for NHRP either.

c. Proposed measures to reduce or control impacts, if any:

As a result of Proposed Action, there are no direct or indirect impacts expected because there are no eligible NRHP archeological sites or buildings found onsite. There is no known Native American traditional cultural properties so there would not be any impacts expected for those type resources either. In addition, as required by the PPCD (Attachment 1, page 18, paragraph 113) a Cultural Resource Protection Plan has been developed (see Attachment 2, Appendix D of the CAP). Furthermore, The Finding of Suitability for early Transfer and the Programmatic Agreement between the Army, State, County and Tribe also describes and controls cultural resource protection. Finally, all individuals conducting vegetation or MEC clearance are required to attend a Cultural and Archaeological Training.

14. Transportation

a. Identify public streets and highways serving the site, and describe proposed access to the existing street system. Show on site plans, if any.

The primary roads servicing the Camp Bonneville location are Fourth Plain Road, 182nd Avenue, 83rd Street, 222nd Avenue, 88th Street, and Pluss Road (main access road). Based on traffic studies, the roads to the west of Camp Bonneville (182nd Avenue, Ward Road, 88th Street) are operating at a level of service (LOS) C while the minor roads to the east of the three roads previously referenced are operating at a LOS B. Average daily traffic counts show a general reduction in vehicles as a result of the closure of Camp Bonneville in 1996.

Internal roads in Camp Bonneville include approximately 1.5 miles of 20-foot wide paved roads and 14 miles of 12-foot wide primary and secondary use compacted gravel roads. There are also approximately 40 miles of narrow dirt roads on the installation, some. The EA (USACE 2001) does not reference public transportation available onsite or in close proximity to the installation.

b. Is site currently served by public transit? If not, what is the approximate distance to the nearest transit stop?

No public transportation is available onsite or in close proximity to the installation.

c. How many parking spaces would the completed project have? How many would the project eliminate?

The Proposed Action would neither eliminate nor generate any parking spaces.

d. Will the proposal require any new roads or streets, or improvements to existing roads or streets, not including driveways? If so, generally describe (indicate whether public or private).

No additional roads or driveways are proposed.

e. Will the project use (or occur in the immediate vicinity of) water, rail, or air transportation? If so, generally describe.

No water rail or air transportation is available onsite or in close proximity to the installation.

- f. How many vehicular trips per day would be generated by the completed project? If known, indicate when peak volumes would occur.**

Two to four trips per day are anticipated. The peak volumes would occur between 7 am and 6 pm.

- g. Proposed measures to reduce or control transportation impacts, if any:**

There are no direct or indirect impacts expected as a result of the implementation of Proposed Action, as cleanup actions are similar to the ongoing maintenance activities already conducted at the site. Clearing of MEC and initiation of step-out procedures would only impact traffic within the Camp Bonneville property. There are no measures proposed to reduce or control transportation impacts.

15. Public services

- a. Would the project result in an increased need for public services (for example: fire protection, police protection, health care, schools, other)? If so, generally describe.**

The Vancouver Fire Department provides all emergency response including advanced and basic life support, hazardous material cleanup, and fire response at Camp Bonneville. For law enforcement, the Clark County Sheriffs Office would be the first to respond, followed by the Vancouver Police Department and/or FBI if a major disturbance occurs. The Washington Department of Natural Resources (WADNR) responds in the case of a forest fire at Camp Bonneville. American Medical Response provides transportation in case of medical emergencies and the closest hospital is the Southwest Washington Medical Center, located in Vancouver.

The project would not result in an increased need for public services.

- b. Proposed measures to reduce or control direct impacts on public services, if any.**

None

16. Utilities

- a. Circle utilities currently available at the site: electricity, natural gas, water, refuse service, telephone, sanitary sewer, septic system, other.**

Currently, Camp Bonneville has potable water delivered, a non-potable water supply, fire protection, sanitary wastewater collection, storm water collection, power, heat, solid waste collection, and telecommunications. Description of the existing public service conditions is included in Section 4.7 of the EA (USACE 2001).

- b. Describe the utilities that are proposed for the project, the utility providing the service and the general construction activities on the site or in the immediate vicinity which might be needed.**

As a result of the Proposed Action, there would be no direct impacts to utilities. Cleanup actions, including the removal of vegetation and MEC surface clearance would only result in an indirect impact to utilities if the clearing activity inadvertently caused disruption to the utility (e.g., power lines, telecommunication lines, etc).

Based on the description of existing site conditions documented in the EA (USACE 2001) and description of cleanup actions (the Proposed Action) in the PPCD, it was determined that implementation of the Proposed Action would have little to no significant impact on the quality of natural or human environment. The interim actions, specifically vegetation removal and MEC surface/subsurface clearance and the potential for initiation of the step-out actions are considered to be minor activities in magnitude, and the associated impacts would be low and considered non-significant. This document has been reviewed and submitted to Ecology.

C. Signature

The above answers are true and complete to the best of my knowledge. I understand that the lead agency is relying on them to make its decision.

Signature:  _____
Heath H. Henderson, PE, Engineering Program Manager, Clark County Public Works

Date Submitted: 6/3/2009