## United States Government

## memorandum

Department of Energy

**Bonneville Power Administration** 

DATE: August 8, 2012

REPLY TO ATTN OF: KEPR-4

SUBJECT: Environmental Clearance Memorandum

то: Michael Marleau Project Manager – TEP-TPP-1

Proposed Action: Sno-King Substation Expansion

<u>Categorical Exclusion Applied (from Subpart D, 10 C.F.R. Part 1021)</u>: Appendix B4.11 Electric power substations and interconnection facilities

Location: Bothell, Snohomish County, WA

Proposed by: Bonneville Power Administration (BPA)

**Description of the Proposed Action:** BPA is proposing to expand its Sno-King Substation's fenced electrical yard by approximately 0.2 acres to accommodate new equipment. The substation expansion is necessary to make room for the addition of a back-up 500/230-kV power transformer, which BPA can energize in the event of a primary transformer failure. The additional transformer will increase the safety and reliability of the system.

The expansion will occur on the substation's SE corner on BPA property and will require the perimeter fence be extended by approximately 100 square feet. The expansion will displace an existing wood pole transmission structure, which will be relocated and rebuilt using steel, outside the perimeter fence (approximately 200 feet from current position), but within the substation complex and current alignment. The road used to access the substation perimeter and nearby transmission structures will be improved by grading and rocking the already existing roadbed (approximately 700 feet). Two 40-foot-long, 24-inch-diameter culverts will be installed beneath the road and a 350-foot-long, three-foot-wide drainage ditch will be constructed to manage storm water on-site.

Sno-King Substation is located within the city limits of Bothell, WA, in an urban environment that is used for both commercial and residential developments. The new transformer will be constructed with a new oil containment system that will tie into the existing system.

**Findings:** BPA has determined that the proposed action complies with Section 1021.410 and Appendix B of Subpart D 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). The proposed action does not present any extraordinary circumstances that may affect the significance of the environmental effects of the proposal. The proposal is not connected [40 C.F.R. 1508.25(a)(1)] to other actions with potentially significant impacts, has not been segmented to meet the definition of a categorical exclusion, is not related to other proposed actions with cumulatively

significant impacts [40 C.F.R. 1508.25(a)(2)], and is not precluded by 40 C.F.R. 1506.1 or 10 C.F.R. 1021.211. Moreover, the proposed action would <u>not</u> (i) threaten a violation of applicable statutory, regulatory, or permit requirements for environment, safety, and health, (ii) require siting and construction or major expansion of waste storage, disposal, recovery, or treatment facilities, (iii) disturb hazardous substances, pollutants, contaminants, or Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act-excluded petroleum and natural gas products that pre-exist in the environment such that there would be uncontrolled or unpermitted releases, (iv) have the potential to cause significant impacts on environmentally sensitive resources, or (v) 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. This proposed action meets the requirements for the Categorical Exclusion referenced above. We therefore determine that the proposed action may be categorically excluded from further NEPA review and documentation.

<u>/s/ Lisa MacLellan</u> Lisa MacLellan Physical Scientist (Environmental)

Date: August 8, 2012

Concur: <u>/s/ Stacy Mason</u> Stacy Mason NEPA Compliance Officer

Attachment: Environmental Checklist for Categorical Exclusions

## **Environmental Checklist for Categorical Exclusions**

Name of Proposed Project: Sno-King Substation Expansion

Work Order #: 00282475

This project does not have the potential to cause significant impacts on the following environmentally sensitive resources. See 10 CFR 1021, Subpart D, Appendix B for complete descriptions of the resources. This checklist is to be used as a summary - further discussion may be included in the Categorical Exclusion Memorandum.

Environmental Resources	No Potential for Significance	No Potential, with Conditions (describe)
1. Historic Properties and Cultural Resources No historic properties affected. SHPO concurrence with cult	X ural resource survey received	1 1/31/2012.
<ul><li>2. T &amp; E Species, or their habitat(s)</li><li>No T &amp; E species or habitat present.</li></ul>	X	
3. Floodplains or wetlands Although storm water can be present on site, the area is not a isolated and not connect into waters of the U.S.	X a designated wetland. The ne	•
4. Areas of special designation None.	X	
5. Health & safety None.	Χ	
6. Prime or unique farmlands None.	X	
<ol> <li>Special sources of water</li> <li>No water bodies are located in the project vicinity. Erosion appropriate.</li> </ol>	X control measures will be used	d during construction as
8. Other (describe) None.	X	
Supporting documentation in the official project file: SHPO concurrence letter		

Signed: <u>/s/Lisa MacLellan</u> Date: August 2, 2012