



— BUREAU OF —
RECLAMATION

Wanapum to Mountain View Scoping Report

Wanapum to Mountain View 230-kV
Transmission Line

U.S. Department of the Interior, Bureau of
Reclamation, Columbia-Pacific Northwest
Region

Grant County, Washington
August 17, 2026

Prepared for Bureau of Reclamation, Columbia-
Pacific Northwest Region

Prepared by HDR Engineering, Inc.



Contents

1	Introduction	1
1.1	Purpose of Scoping	1
1.2	Scoping Report Organization	1
2	Proposed Action	1
2.1	Purpose and Need	2
2.2	Project Description	3
3	Project Scoping	6
3.1	Scoping Period and Notification	6
3.2	Agency Coordination	6
3.3	Public Involvement	7
4	Scoping Comments	7
4.1	Agencies, Organizations, and Public Providing Scoping Comments	7
4.2	Comment Collection and Analysis	8
4.3	Summary of Comments Received	8
4.3.1	Project Scope and NEPA Analysis	9
4.3.2	Aquatic Resources, Wetlands, and Water Quality	9
4.3.3	Biological Resources and Habitat	9
4.3.4	Cultural Resources	9
4.3.5	Alternatives, Project Routing, and Cumulative Effects	10
4.3.6	Transportation, Access, and Local Permitting	10
4.3.7	Agency Coordination	10
5	Next Steps	11

Tables

Table 1.	Comments Received from Agencies, Organizations, and the Public	8
----------	--	---

Figures

Figure 1.	Wanapum to Mountain View Transmission Line Project proposed alignment.	5
-----------	---	---

Appendices

Appendix A:	Agencies and Tribes Contacted During NEPA Scoping
-------------	---

Acronyms

CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
DAHP	Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation
Ecology	Washington Department of Ecology
EIS	Environmental Impact Statement
EPA	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Grant PUD	Grant County Public Utility District No. 2's
kV	kilovolt
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
Project	Wanapum to Mountain View 230-kV Transmission Line Project
Reclamation	Bureau of Reclamation
ROW	right-of-way
QTEP	Quincy Transmission Expansion Plan
USACE	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
USFWS	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
WDFW	Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
WSDOT	Washington State Department of Transportation

1 Introduction

1.1 Purpose of Scoping

The process of determining the focus and content of the environmental review process is known as scoping. Scoping is an early and open step in the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process that helps the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation) determine the scope of issues to be addressed, identify significant issues related to the proposed action, and develop an extent of analysis in the NEPA document. The scoping process does not serve as a process to resolve differences of opinion regarding the proposed project or evaluate its merits. Instead, it provides an opportunity for interested parties to identify potential issues, provide relevant information, and recommend areas for further analysis for consideration during the NEPA analysis. Scoping is an effective way to consolidate these comments and information prior to Reclamation determining the scope of the NEPA process. As part of the scoping process, Reclamation requested comments or recommendations from local, state, and federal agencies with potential jurisdiction, potentially affected Tribes, and internally at Reclamation regarding any issues or concerns pertaining to the development of the proposed project.

All comments received during the scoping process are part of the public record as documented in this scoping report. Reclamation will review and consider each comment, as part of the development of the proposed analysis.

The objective of the scoping process is to: 1) inform relevant federal, state, and local agencies about the project, 2) solicit input on the development of the analysis of potential issues and avoidance and minimization measures associated with the proposed project. NEPA is a public disclosure process, scoping helps define the scope of environmental analysis and encourages informed participation in the decision-making process.

1.2 Scoping Report Organization

This scoping report includes five sections and appendices, as described below:

Section 1 provides an introduction to the report and describes the purpose of scoping and presents the organization of the report.

Section 2 provides information on the project.

Section 3 provides information on the scoping and outreach process.

Section 4 summarizes the comments received and issues raised during the scoping comment period.

Section 5 describes the next steps in the proposed project development and review process.

Appendix A consist of agencies and Tribes contacted during the NEPA public scoping ..

2 Proposed Action

This section provides information on the Purpose and Need of the proposed action and a brief description of the proposed action.

2.1 Purpose and Need

The primary purpose of the Wanapum - Mountain View 230-kV Transmission Line Project (Project) is to provide a new path for energy to flow from the Grant County Public Utility District No. 2 (Grant PUD) Wanapum Switchyard to Grant PUD's facilities in the City of Quincy. The proposed transmission line will connect a primary source of the region's power, the Wanapum Dam, to the Mountain View Substation ensuring the continued safe and reliable delivery of power to Grant PUD customers. The Project need is to increase electrical capacity and improve transmission system reliability as the demand for power in the region continues to grow. The Project will also provide operational flexibility for Grant PUD's facilities in Quincy.

This proposed Project is one of several individual transmission and power projects in the larger Quincy area identified as a part of Grant PUD's Quincy Transmission Expansion Plan (QTEP). Grant PUD's QTEP team was tasked with and identified potential (stand-alone) projects that would increase electrical capacity and reliability in the Quincy area to meet future energy needs. The proposed Wanapum-Mountain View Transmission Line Project is included in Grant PUD's QTEP; however, this Project has an independent purpose and need to enhance electrical service reliability, capacity, and redundancy in the county's power system by adding an additional connection to a local power source, Wanapum Dam.

The **need** for the proposed action is to:

- Increase electrical transmission capacity
- Provide additional system reliability and redundancy
- Address capacity and reliability deficiencies identified in the QTEP

The **purpose** of the proposed action is to:

- Provide a new, dedicated path for the safe and reliable flow of electricity
- Enhance operational flexibility within Grant PUD's power system
- Strengthen and modernize the regional transmission network

To meet the Project purpose and need, Grant PUD is requesting the use of Reclamation lands for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the proposed transmission line and associated actions, specifically access roads for installation and maintenance of the structures. Grant PUD has considered many alternative routes for the Project and the preferred route meets the Project purpose and need while avoiding and minimizing potential impacts to the extent possible.

Through the NEPA process, Reclamation will evaluate the potential environmental effects of the proposed action to determine whether it may significantly affect the quality of the human environment and whether it qualifies for a Finding of No Significant Impact. Based on this review, Reclamation will decide whether to:

- Approve the proposed project,
- Approve the project with modifications, or
- Deny the project.

2.2 Project Description

Grant PUD proposes to construct, operate, and maintain a new 230-kilovolt (kV) electrical transmission line in Grant County, Washington. The Project would route from the Grant PUD Wanapum Switchyard, east of Wanapum Dam, to the Grant PUD Mountain View Substation in the town of Quincy, Washington (Figure 1). This proposed transmission corridor is approximately 32 miles long. Grant PUD's proposed Project would increase electrical capacity and improve reliability as the demand.

Although the overall Project spans approximately 32 miles, Reclamation's decision and scoping responsibilities apply only to activities proposed on Reclamation-managed lands, which account for approximately 3.3 miles of the alignment across seven separate parcels.

The Project would involve installing new transmission structures, relocating distribution lines where needed, constructing and improving access roads, creating material storage areas, and improving existing distribution connections on Reclamation-managed lands. The proposed transmission line would consist of a combination of steel monopoles, double-pole, three-pole, and H-frame steel structures along different portions of the corridor. These transmission structures would support three overhead 230-kV conductors, a fiber optical ground wire, and an overhead shield wire. Portions of the transmission line would be double-circuit, with structures supporting the new 230-kV line and Grant PUD's existing 115-kV transmission line conductor.

Most structures would be placed in excavated holes and backfilled with native soil and gravel. Construction areas would accommodate excavation and equipment access, with work zones and right-of-way (ROW) widths determined by structure type and located within existing or new easements. Whenever practicable, existing dirt or gravel roads would be used for access. Improvements or repairs may include gravel additions and regrading, and new access roads may be required in some locations. Temporary matting or other mitigation measures may be used as needed in sensitive areas, and all areas disturbed by construction would be reseeded with native seed mixtures to restore habitat functions and values. The Project would also follow the Grant PUD Avian Protection Plan to minimize impacts on bird species.

Reclamation's proposed federal action is limited to deciding whether to authorize Grant PUD's requested use of Reclamation lands for the installation of transmission structures, construction and improvement of access roads, removal or replacement of certain distribution facilities, and associated construction, operation, and maintenance activities. Reclamation's NEPA review will evaluate the environmental effects of these proposed activities on Reclamation-managed parcels.

The Project would require construction activities and long-term maintenance and operation on a total of seven (7) Reclamation parcels. Two of these properties are located immediately north of the Wanapum Switchyard (Parcels 150244000 and 150245000), one property is located between Rd 13.5 SW and Hwy 26 W (Parcel 150907000), and the remaining four properties are located adjacent to Beverly Burke Rd SW/Rd R SW (Parcels 210319000, 201835000, 201746020, and 201605000). Detailed descriptions of the planned actions for each Reclamation property involved in the Project are provided below.

Most project work on Reclamation land would take place just north of the Wanapum Switchyard, on Parcels 150244000 and 150245000. Proposed activities on these properties include the installation of new transmission structures and installation of new temporary and permanent construction /

operation / maintenance roads and improvements to existing roads within a 160- to 180-foot-wide ROW. Proposed access roads may require the placement of gravel and would be designed to avoid and minimize potential impacts to cultural and environmental resources. Proposed structures and roads would be located along the western and northern property boundaries. The Project on these parcels was designed to avoid and reduce impacts on habitat and cultural resources, with the larger area allowing flexibility to adjust project components as needed within the proposed boundary.

The other affected Reclamation properties (Parcels 150907000, 210319000, 201835000, 201746020, and 201605000) are bordered by public roads and disturbance would be limited to within approximately 100 ft of the road within an 80-foot-wide-ROW. Some of the parcel have existing distribution lines and ROWs on them and the work would entail installation of new transmission and distribution poles and removal of poles that are no longer needed.

Project Features

- On Federal Land
- Off Federal Land
- Mountain View Substation
- Wanapum Switchyard
- Interstate
- State Highway
- Local Road
- Federal Lands

Map Area

Wenatchee, Ephrata, Moses Lake, Othello, Ellensburg, Yakima, Toppenish, Richland, Pasco, Sunnyside.

Quincy, George, Frenchman Coulee, Wild Horse Mnt., Ancient Lakes Area, Colicum Ridge Golf Course.

Baseline Rd, Frenchman Coulee, Wild Horse Mnt., Ancient Lakes Area, Colicum Ridge Golf Course.

RD 1 NW, RD 2 NW, RD 3 NW, RD 4 NW, RD 5 NW, RD 6 NW, RD 7 NW, RD 8 NW, RD 9 NW, RD 10 NW, RD 11 NW, RD 12 NW, RD 13 NW, RD 14 NW, RD 15 NW, RD 16 NW, RD 17 NW, RD 18 NW, RD 19 NW, RD 20 NW, RD 21 NW, RD 22 NW, RD 23 NW, RD 24 NW, RD 25 NW, RD 26 NW, RD 27 NW, RD 28 NW, RD 29 NW, RD 30 NW, RD 31 NW, RD 32 NW, RD 33 NW, RD 34 NW, RD 35 NW, RD 36 NW, RD 37 NW, RD 38 NW, RD 39 NW, RD 40 NW, RD 41 NW, RD 42 NW, RD 43 NW, RD 44 NW, RD 45 NW, RD 46 NW, RD 47 NW, RD 48 NW, RD 49 NW, RD 50 NW, RD 51 NW, RD 52 NW, RD 53 NW, RD 54 NW, RD 55 NW, RD 56 NW, RD 57 NW, RD 58 NW, RD 59 NW, RD 60 NW, RD 61 NW, RD 62 NW, RD 63 NW, RD 64 NW, RD 65 NW, RD 66 NW, RD 67 NW, RD 68 NW, RD 69 NW, RD 70 NW, RD 71 NW, RD 72 NW, RD 73 NW, RD 74 NW, RD 75 NW, RD 76 NW, RD 77 NW, RD 78 NW, RD 79 NW, RD 80 NW, RD 81 NW, RD 82 NW, RD 83 NW, RD 84 NW, RD 85 NW, RD 86 NW, RD 87 NW, RD 88 NW, RD 89 NW, RD 90 NW, RD 91 NW, RD 92 NW, RD 93 NW, RD 94 NW, RD 95 NW, RD 96 NW, RD 97 NW, RD 98 NW, RD 99 NW, RD 100 NW, RD 101 NW, RD 102 NW, RD 103 NW, RD 104 NW, RD 105 NW, RD 106 NW, RD 107 NW, RD 108 NW, RD 109 NW, RD 110 NW, RD 111 NW, RD 112 NW, RD 113 NW, RD 114 NW, RD 115 NW, RD 116 NW, RD 117 NW, RD 118 NW, RD 119 NW, RD 120 NW, RD 121 NW, RD 122 NW, RD 123 NW, RD 124 NW, RD 125 NW, RD 126 NW, RD 127 NW, RD 128 NW, RD 129 NW, RD 130 NW, RD 131 NW, RD 132 NW, RD 133 NW, RD 134 NW, RD 135 NW, RD 136 NW, RD 137 NW, RD 138 NW, RD 139 NW, RD 140 NW, RD 141 NW, RD 142 NW, RD 143 NW, RD 144 NW, RD 145 NW, RD 146 NW, RD 147 NW, RD 148 NW, RD 149 NW, RD 150 NW, RD 151 NW, RD 152 NW, RD 153 NW, RD 154 NW, RD 155 NW, RD 156 NW, RD 157 NW, RD 158 NW, RD 159 NW, RD 160 NW, RD 161 NW, RD 162 NW, RD 163 NW, RD 164 NW, RD 165 NW, RD 166 NW, RD 167 NW, RD 168 NW, RD 169 NW, RD 170 NW, RD 171 NW, RD 172 NW, RD 173 NW, RD 174 NW, RD 175 NW, RD 176 NW, RD 177 NW, RD 178 NW, RD 179 NW, RD 180 NW, RD 181 NW, RD 182 NW, RD 183 NW, RD 184 NW, RD 185 NW, RD 186 NW, RD 187 NW, RD 188 NW, RD 189 NW, RD 190 NW, RD 191 NW, RD 192 NW, RD 193 NW, RD 194 NW, RD 195 NW, RD 196 NW, RD 197 NW, RD 198 NW, RD 199 NW, RD 200 NW, RD 201 NW, RD 202 NW, RD 203 NW, RD 204 NW, RD 205 NW, RD 206 NW, RD 207 NW, RD 208 NW, RD 209 NW, RD 210 NW, RD 211 NW, RD 212 NW, RD 213 NW, RD 214 NW, RD 215 NW, RD 216 NW, RD 217 NW, RD 218 NW, RD 219 NW, RD 220 NW, RD 221 NW, RD 222 NW, RD 223 NW, RD 224 NW, RD 225 NW, RD 226 NW, RD 227 NW, RD 228 NW, RD 229 NW, RD 230 NW, RD 231 NW, RD 232 NW, RD 233 NW, RD 234 NW, RD 235 NW, RD 236 NW, RD 237 NW, RD 238 NW, RD 239 NW, RD 240 NW, RD 241 NW, RD 242 NW, RD 243 NW, RD 244 NW, RD 245 NW, RD 246 NW, RD 247 NW, RD 248 NW, RD 249 NW, RD 250 NW, RD 251 NW, RD 252 NW, RD 253 NW, RD 254 NW, RD 255 NW, RD 256 NW, RD 257 NW, RD 258 NW, RD 259 NW, RD 260 NW, RD 261 NW, RD 262 NW, RD 263 NW, RD 264 NW, RD 265 NW, RD 266 NW, RD 267 NW, RD 268 NW, RD 269 NW, RD 270 NW, RD 271 NW, RD 272 NW, RD 273 NW, RD 274 NW, RD 275 NW, RD 276 NW, RD 277 NW, RD 278 NW, RD 279 NW, RD 280 NW, RD 281 NW, RD 282 NW, RD 283 NW, RD 284 NW, RD 285 NW, RD 286 NW, RD 287 NW, RD 288 NW, RD 289 NW, RD 290 NW, RD 291 NW, RD 292 NW, RD 293 NW, RD 294 NW, RD 295 NW, RD 296 NW, RD 297 NW, RD 298 NW, RD 299 NW, RD 300 NW, RD 301 NW, RD 302 NW, RD 303 NW, RD 304 NW, RD 305 NW, RD 306 NW, RD 307 NW, RD 308 NW, RD 309 NW, RD 310 NW, RD 311 NW, RD 312 NW, RD 313 NW, RD 314 NW, RD 315 NW, RD 316 NW, RD 317 NW, RD 318 NW, RD 319 NW, RD 320 NW, RD 321 NW, RD 322 NW, RD 323 NW, RD 324 NW, RD 325 NW, RD 326 NW, RD 327 NW, RD 328 NW, RD 329 NW, RD 330 NW, RD 331 NW, RD 332 NW, RD 333 NW, RD 334 NW, RD 335 NW, RD 336 NW, RD 337 NW, RD 338 NW, RD 339 NW, RD 340 NW, RD 341 NW, RD 342 NW, RD 343 NW, RD 344 NW, RD 345 NW, RD 346 NW, RD 347 NW, RD 348 NW, RD 349 NW, RD 350 NW, RD 351 NW, RD 352 NW, RD 353 NW, RD 354 NW, RD 355 NW, RD 356 NW, RD 357 NW, RD 358 NW, RD 359 NW, RD 360 NW, RD 361 NW, RD 362 NW, RD 363 NW, RD 364 NW, RD 365 NW, RD 366 NW, RD 367 NW, RD 368 NW, RD 369 NW, RD 370 NW, RD 371 NW, RD 372 NW, RD 373 NW, RD 374 NW, RD 375 NW, RD 376 NW, RD 377 NW, RD 378 NW, RD 379 NW, RD 380 NW, RD 381 NW, RD 382 NW, RD 383 NW, RD 384 NW, RD 385 NW, RD 386 NW, RD 387 NW, RD 388 NW, RD 389 NW, RD 390 NW, RD 391 NW, RD 392 NW, RD 393 NW, RD 394 NW, RD 395 NW, RD 396 NW, RD 397 NW, RD 398 NW, RD 399 NW, RD 400 NW, RD 401 NW, RD 402 NW, RD 403 NW, RD 404 NW, RD 405 NW, RD 406 NW, RD 407 NW, RD 408 NW, RD 409 NW, RD 410 NW, RD 411 NW, RD 412 NW, RD 413 NW, RD 414 NW, RD 415 NW, RD 416 NW, RD 417 NW, RD 418 NW, RD 419 NW, RD 420 NW, RD 421 NW, RD 422 NW, RD 423 NW, RD 424 NW, RD 425 NW, RD 426 NW, RD 427 NW, RD 428 NW, RD 429 NW, RD 430 NW, RD 431 NW, RD 432 NW, RD 433 NW, RD 434 NW, RD 435 NW, RD 436 NW, RD 437 NW, RD 438 NW, RD 439 NW, RD 440 NW, RD 441 NW, RD 442 NW, RD 443 NW, RD 444 NW, RD 445 NW, RD 446 NW, RD 447 NW, RD 448 NW, RD 449 NW, RD 450 NW, RD 451 NW, RD 452 NW, RD 453 NW, RD 454 NW, RD 455 NW, RD 456 NW, RD 457 NW, RD 458 NW, RD 459 NW, RD 460 NW, RD 461 NW, RD 462 NW, RD 463 NW, RD 464 NW, RD 465 NW, RD 466 NW, RD 467 NW, RD 468 NW, RD 469 NW, RD 470 NW, RD 471 NW, RD 472 NW, RD 473 NW, RD 474 NW, RD 475 NW, RD 476 NW, RD 477 NW, RD 478 NW, RD 479 NW, RD 480 NW, RD 481 NW, RD 482 NW, RD 483 NW, RD 484 NW, RD 485 NW, RD 486 NW, RD 487 NW, RD 488 NW, RD 489 NW, RD 490 NW, RD 491 NW, RD 492 NW, RD 493 NW, RD 494 NW, RD 495 NW, RD 496 NW, RD 497 NW, RD 498 NW, RD 499 NW, RD 500 NW, RD 501 NW, RD 502 NW, RD 503 NW, RD 504 NW, RD 505 NW, RD 506 NW, RD 507 NW, RD 508 NW, RD 509 NW, RD 510 NW, RD 511 NW, RD 512 NW, RD 513 NW, RD 514 NW, RD 515 NW, RD 516 NW, RD 517 NW, RD 518 NW, RD 519 NW, RD 520 NW, RD 521 NW, RD 522 NW, RD 523 NW, RD 524 NW, RD 525 NW, RD 526 NW, RD 527 NW, RD 528 NW, RD 529 NW, RD 530 NW, RD 531 NW, RD 532 NW, RD 533 NW, RD 534 NW, RD 535 NW, RD 536 NW, RD 537 NW, RD 538 NW, RD 539 NW, RD 540 NW, RD 541 NW, RD 542 NW, RD 543 NW, RD 544 NW, RD 545 NW, RD 546 NW, RD 547 NW, RD 548 NW, RD 549 NW, RD 550 NW, RD 551 NW, RD 552 NW, RD 553 NW, RD

3 Project Scoping

This section describes the methods used to notify different agencies about the scoping process conducted for initial planning for the Project. It outlines how Reclamation shared information with the agencies for review and identifies the avenues made available for providing comments on the Project.

3.1 Scoping Period and Notification

Reclamation distributed a Scoping Information Package to federal, state, and local agencies, as well as Tribal governments, to provide an overview of the Project, including purpose and need, project description, and anticipated environmental considerations. A list of agencies and Tribal governments contacted during the scoping process is provided in Appendix A. The scoping period began on May 22, 2026, and ended on June 12, 2026.

Notifications were provided via:

- Email distribution to agency and Tribal contacts
- Direct coordination with key regulatory agencies
- Targeted outreach to stakeholders with jurisdiction or interest in project resources

Agencies, Tribes, and other stakeholders were invited to submit comments during the scoping period through email correspondence, formal written letters, and direct coordination meetings and calls. All comments received during the scoping period were considered equally and were incorporated into the decision file.

3.2 Agency Coordination

Reclamation conducted direct coordination with several agencies to discuss the proposed project and identify potential environmental concerns. This included a coordination call with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), as well as written correspondence from state and local agencies, including the Washington Department of Ecology (Ecology), Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW), Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT), and Grant County Public Works.

In addition, Reclamation coordinated with Tribes that may have an interest in the Project area, including the Wanapum Tribe of Priest Rapids, Confederated Tribes and Bands of the Yakama Nation, and the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation. Scoping letters, National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) Section 106 consultation letters, and government-to-government consultation invitation letters were provided to the Tribes to inform them of the proposed Project, solicit information regarding cultural resources and other Tribal concerns, and request input on issues that should be considered during the NEPA process. Reclamation also offered opportunities for government-to-government consultation meetings and continued coordination throughout the environmental review process. Tribal comments and information received during scoping and consultation will be considered in the development of the environmental analysis and in Reclamation's decision-making process.

3.3 Public Involvement

The approach to public scoping by the Department of Interior (DOI) has recently undergone considerable transformation. DOI's latest revision to NEPA regulations, along with the release of the DOI Handbook of NEPA Implementing Procedures (516 DM 1) in February 2026, has updated the requirements and guidance for public involvement. Specifically, Appendix 1, Section 1 of the 2026 DOI Handbook discusses both mandatory and discretionary scoping and public involvement and clarifies that NEPA does not require scoping, except when intending to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). Instead, the Responsible Official now has the discretion to decide if, when, and how to involve the public during the NEPA process. Additionally, Reclamation NEPA practitioners are strongly encouraged to maximize use of public involvement flexibilities permitted under these updated procedures. This includes streamlining processes and limiting discretionary comment periods unless there is substantial public interest or strong applicant support. These changes aim to make the scoping process more efficient while still considering the perspectives of interested parties when warranted. Because the appropriate level of NEPA review had not yet been determined, scoping was focused on Tribal governments and regulatory agencies with jurisdiction, special expertise, or an interest in the proposed action. Therefore, public scoping and formal public meetings were not conducted for this project during the scoping period.

Although scoping was not formally opened to the general public, Reclamation received, accepted, and considered unsolicited comments from a few interested members of the public and stakeholders to maintain an inclusive process. These comments were included in the decision file and considered during the identification of issues and concerns associated with the proposed action. In recognition of the apparent public interest in the project, Reclamation intends to make the draft environmental review document available for public review and comment, providing an additional opportunity for interested parties to participate in the environmental review process.

4 Scoping Comments

4.1 Agencies, Organizations, and Public Providing Scoping Comments

This section summarizes the key issues raised during the scoping comment period. A total of 8 written comment submissions and one oral comment were received during the scoping period. Comments were submitted by federal, state, and county agencies, local residents, and legal representatives. Table 1 summarizes the agencies, organizations, and members of the public that provided comments on the Project.

Table 1. Comments Received from Agencies, Organizations, and the Public

Commenters	Date
Washington State Department of Transportation	May 26, 2026
Environmental Protection Agency	June 3, 2026
Washington State Department of Transportation	June 10, 2026
Environmental Protection Agency Washington Department of Ecology Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife Grant County Public Works	June 11, 2026
Jacqueline Rasmussen	June 17, 2026
Evergreen Property Law, PLLC on behalf of private landowners	July 6, 2026

4.2 Comment Collection and Analysis

Comments were collected through email correspondence, written letters, and direct coordination meetings and calls conducted during the scoping period. For the purposes of this report, a comment submission refers to a single correspondence received from an agency, organization, Tribe, or member of the public. A comment refers to an individual concern, recommendation, or issue identified within a comment submission. A commenter refers to the individual or organization submitting comments.

All comments received during the initial scoping period along with the extended comment period provided to individual landowners and an attorney based on previous coordination with Reclamation were reviewed and included in the decision file. Comments were evaluated to identify issues relevant to Reclamation's consideration of the proposed federal action and the scope of environmental analysis. Comments addressing similar topics were consolidated into common issue categories to avoid duplication and facilitate development of the environmental review.

A substantive comment was considered a comment that identified a specific environmental issue, concern, potential impact, information source, regulatory requirement, or recommendation relevant to the environmental review or decision-making process. Comments expressing support, opposition, or preferences without providing information relevant to the scope of analysis were documented and considered but were not identified as separate issue categories.

The categories presented below summarize the consolidated topics raised during scoping and will help inform the scope of environmental review, resource studies to be conducted, agency coordination, and consideration of avoidance, minimization, and potential mitigation actions.

4.3 Summary of Comments Received

Reclamation received a limited number of substantive scoping comments from federal, state, and local agencies during the initial scoping period for Project and comments from individual landowners and an attorney shortly after. Although the total volume of comments was relatively small, the feedback provided clear direction on several key issues that will guide the scope and level of analysis in the NEPA review.

Overall, the comments focused on six primary issue areas: project scope and level of NEPA review; aquatic resources and wetlands; biological resources and habitat; cultural resources; alternatives and cumulative impacts; and local permitting, coordination, and public involvement.

4.3.1 Project Scope and NEPA Analysis

Multiple agencies, particularly the EPA and Ecology, emphasized the importance of clearly defining the scope of the analysis. These agencies recommended that the NEPA review evaluate the entire transmission line project, including portions outside of federal lands, rather than limiting the analysis solely to the segments on Reclamation-managed lands. This input highlights the need to consider connected actions and reasonably foreseeable environmental effects under NEPA.

Several commenters stated that an EIS should be prepared, citing the project's potential impacts to wetlands, cultural resources, and other sensitive resources, as well as the broader environmental effects associated with construction and operation of a high-voltage transmission line. Reclamation will determine the level of NEPA analysis based on current guidance and potential impacts.

4.3.2 Aquatic Resources, Wetlands, and Water Quality

Comments from Ecology and EPA emphasized the importance of avoiding and minimizing impacts to aquatic resources, including wetlands, waters of the state, and jurisdictional waters. Agencies noted that impacts to these resources could trigger regulatory requirements, including Clean Water Act compliance and coordination with state and federal permitting agencies.

Ecology also highlighted the potential need for a Construction Stormwater General Permit for disturbance exceeding one acre and recommended continued coordination as project design advances. These comments underscore the importance of evaluating water quality, stormwater management, and wetland impacts in the NEPA review.

4.3.3 Biological Resources and Habitat

WDFW and local landowners identified biological resources and habitats as key concerns within the project area on Reclamation property. Comments identified the presence of priority habitats, including shrub-steppe, wetlands, and inland sand dunes, and noted that the area may provide habitat for several priority, sensitive, and shrub-steppe-dependent wildlife species.

WDFW recommended conducting habitat assessments to determine the presence and extent of existing species and habitat present within the project area and emphasized avoiding and minimizing the potential disturbance to inland sand dunes where possible due to their limited ability to be mitigated. Local landowners cited previous biological assessments and agency coordination records documenting additional concerns regarding potential impacts to wetlands, Ute ladies'-tresses habitat, aquatic resources supporting trout, beaver habitat, wildlife movement corridors, habitat fragmentation, and priority habitats located near the Wanapum Substation.

WDFW and local landowners requested a detailed site-specific analysis of existing habitat and species presence and extent be conducted and a detailed analysis of avoidance, minimization, and mitigation measures to address potential impacts associated with project activities. These issues will be considered during development of the NEPA review and supporting resource studies.

4.3.4 Cultural Resources

Several commenters expressed concern regarding potential impacts to cultural resources, traditional cultural properties, and areas used by the Wanapum Tribe of Priest Rapids for traditional gathering activities. Commenters referenced prior agency correspondence indicating that portions of the

Project area may overlap with traditional plant gathering areas and locations used for collection of First Foods. Commenters requested that the NEPA review include a thorough evaluation of potential impacts to cultural resources and Tribal interests, including impacts associated with construction, operation, and maintenance activities. Reclamation has extended an invitation to the Tribes for government-to-government consultation. Reclamation will also conduct the cultural resource review in accordance with Section 106 of the NHPA, working with the Tribes and the Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation (DAHP).

4.3.5 Alternatives, Project Routing, and Cumulative Effects

Multiple landowners and their legal representative requested evaluation of additional route alternatives and modifications to the proposed route. Commenters requested analysis of alternatives that would avoid or reduce impacts to adjacent private properties, remain entirely on Reclamation-managed lands where feasible, avoid sensitive biological and cultural resources, and minimize habitat fragmentation. Additional comments suggested evaluation of co-location opportunities with existing or planned utility corridors and consideration of route alternatives previously evaluated during Grant PUD's routing process. Commenters also requested evaluation of cumulative impacts in conjunction with other regional energy infrastructure projects, including transmission and renewable energy developments in the vicinity of the Wanapum Substation.

4.3.6 Transportation, Access, and Local Permitting

Grant County Public Works identified several local permitting requirements, including the need for ROW permits, approach permits for staging areas, and grading permits for significant earthwork. These requirements highlight the importance of coordinating with local agencies regarding construction access, road use, and infrastructure impacts.

WSDOT did not provide substantive technical comments but indicated that coordination may be necessary if the project affects state highways or transportation infrastructure.

4.3.7 Agency Coordination

EPA requested to remain engaged as a participating agency, with continued coordination throughout the NEPA process and the opportunity to review the Draft environmental review document. Ecology and WDFW expressed similar interest in continued coordination as the project design evolves.

Several commenters expressed concerns regarding public notification and involvement during project development. Commenters requested inclusion on future distribution lists and requested continued opportunities for public review and comment throughout the NEPA process. Reclamation will continue public outreach efforts and provide opportunities for review and comment consistent with NEPA requirements during preparation and publication of the Draft environmental review document.

Tribal governments were notified consistent with consultation requirements; however, no substantive comments were received during the scoping period.

5 Next Steps

Scoping is an important part of the environmental review process and in the creation of the environmental review document, since it allows outreach to federal, state, and local agencies early on. The substantive comments that have been received will be used to guide the analysis within the environmental review document. Scoping comments also help guide the potential impacts on resources that are analyzed in the environmental review document. The next step in the NEPA process is the writing of the Wanapum to Mountain View Transmission Line environmental review document. It is anticipated that the draft document will be released to the public in the first quarter of 2027. Once released, there will be a 30-day comment period for the public to provide input on the analyses, impacts, and potential mitigations.

This scoping report and all other NEPA documents concerning this project will be compiled into the decision file. Reclamation does not formally respond to comments submitted during scoping. However, substantive scoping comments will be used to help define the environmental review's scope and identify concerns for further analysis.

Appendix A: Agencies and Tribes Contacted During NEPA Scoping

Entity Contacted
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE)
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)
Washington Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation (DAHP)
Washington State Department of Ecology
Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (WDFW)
Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT)
Grant County Planning & Development Services
Grant County Public Works
Confederated Tribes and Bands of the Yakama Nation
Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation
Wanapum Tribe of Priest Rapids