United States Government

memorandum

SUBJECT: Environmental Clearance Memorandum

то: Joe Beebe Project Manager – TESF-CSB-2

Proposed Action: Raver Substation-Control House Expansion & Seismic Retrofit

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

Location: King County, Washington; Township 21 North, Range 7 East, Section 4&5

Proposed by: Bonneville Power Administration (BPA)

Description of the Proposed Action: Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) proposes to expand the control house at BPA fee-owned Raver Substation and seismically retrofit the existing structure. The control house expansion is proposed in order to install additional equipment racks and batteries needed to accommodate load growth in the south Puget Sound area. Because the expansion would involve removing existing siding and exposing the underlying structure of the building, BPA would also use the opportunity to seismically upgrade the entire building.

The east side (rear) of the control house would be expanded 30 feet for a total of approximately 1500 square feet all within the existing developed substation yard. An existing access route, a gate, and a 30-foot section of perimeter wall that runs from the existing control house to the maintenance building would be removed to accommodate the control house expansion. The access gate would be relocated closer to the main complex entrance. For the seismic upgrade, a shear wall would installed to provide additional interior structural support for the roof and bracing for all interior equipment.

The Raver control house was built in 1967 and is eligible for the National Register of Historic Places because the overall architectual integrity remains even though minor modifications have been made over time,. The original exterior walls of the control house and accessory buildings were "BPA blue" composite asbestos panels with aluminum tube mullions (vertical elements) between the panels. In 2006, beige metal siding was installed over the paneling on the control house in an effort to encapsulate the asbestos, a hazardous material. To restore the original character of the building, BPA would reside the entire control house with modular panels that have a similar appearance to the original blue panels, though without aluminum mullions. The seismic retrofits would not be visible from the outside of the building.

Proper handling and disposal of the existing asbestos siding would be detailed in a safety plan prepared in accordance with applicable state and federal requirements and there would be no uncontrolled or unpermitted release of hazardous substances, pollutants or contaminants.

Findings:

BPA has determined that the addition to the control house as proposed would have an effect on the Raver Substation, a National Register eligible property, but that such effect is consistent with the original design intent of the facility and supports its historic character while extending its utility. The Washington State Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation concurred with this determination on August 2, 2012.

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 not (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 Actexcluded 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/ Carolyn Sharp</u> Carolyn Sharp Environmental Project Manager

Concur:

<u>/s/ Stacy Mason</u> Stacy Mason NEPA Compliance Officer Date: August 14, 2012

Attachment: Environmental Checklist for Categorical Exclusions

Environmental Checklist for Categorical Exclusions

Name of Proposed Project: Raver Substation-Control House Expansion & Seismic Retrofit

Work Order #: 304324

This project does <u>not</u> 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 Control house is a National Register-eligible structure. Wash historic character received August 2, 2012	X nington DAHP concurrence t	hat actions support its
2. T & E Species, or their habitat(s)	X	
3. Floodplains or wetlands	X	
4. Areas of special designation	X	
5. Health & safety Proper handling and disposal of asbestos siding would be de applicable state and federal requirements	X etailed in a safety plan prepar	
6. Prime or unique farmlands	X	
7. Special sources of water	X	
8. Other (describe)	X	

Signed: <u>/s/ Carolyn A. Sharp</u>

Date: August 14, 2012