United States Government

Department of Energy Bonneville Power Administration

memorandum

DATE: May 8, 2013

REPLY TO ATTN OF: KEC-4

- SUBJECT: Environmental Clearance Memorandum
 - то: Amy Freel Project Manager – TEP-TPP-1

Proposed Action: Monroe Substation Integrated Project

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

Location: Snohomish County, Washington; Township 28 North, Range 7 East, Section 22

Proposed by: Bonneville Power Administration (BPA)

Description of the Proposed Action:

The purpose of the project is to provide upgrades required as part of BPA's ongoing sustaining programs by providing voltage support and preventing power outages. The project would consist of the following activities:

- Installation of two new 500-kilovolt (kV) shunt capacitor groups with current limiting reactors, a circuit breaker, disconnect switch, and tower structure in the southwest corner of the substation yard ;
- Addition of an additional circuit breaker, potential transformers, and tower structures in the existing 500-kV yard;
- Replacement of existing control and protection equipment and 125 VDC batteries inside the existing control house ; and
- Replacement of three 230-kV circuit switchers, two 500-kV circuit breakers, and five 230-kV disconnect switches.

Construction is scheduled to begin in July 2013 and would last about 270 days.

Project equipment would include, but would not necessarily be limited to: excavator(s), crane(s), support vehicles and dump trucks. All work would occur either within the substation control house or in the previously disturbed, graveled area within the substation yard.

Findings:

All of the work would take place either inside of the substation building or within the disturbed gravel yard inside of the existing substation fenceline. The project would not impact streams, wetlands, or other water bodies. Because of the previous disturbance on the BPA property, the minimal scale of the impact, and the lack of suitable habitat, there would be no effect to ESA-listed species or designated critical habitat.

A cultural resources survey conducted at the site on January 30, 2013 found no evidence that effects to cultural resources would occur as a result of this project. BPA consulted with the State of Washington Department of Historic Preservation (DAHP), Sauk-Suiattle Indian Tribe, Stillaguamish Tribe of Indians, and Tulalip Tribes regarding the proposed undertaking. BPA received concurrence with its determination of No Adverse Effect from the DAHP on April 22, 2013. No response was received from any of the consulted tribes.

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 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.

/s/ Carolyn Sharp Carolyn Sharp Environmental Project Manager

Concur:

<u>/s/Katherine S. Pierce</u> Katherine S. Pierce NEPA Compliance Officer Date: May 8, 2013

Attachment(s): Environmental Checklist for Categorical Exclusions

Environmental Checklist for Categorical Exclusions

Name of Proposed Project: Monroe Substation Integrated Project

Work Order #: 308591

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 DAHP concurrence on No Adverse Effect received 4/22/13	x	
2. T & E Species, or their habitat(s)	x	
3. Floodplains or wetlands	x	
4. Areas of special designation	x	
5. Health & safety	x	
6. Prime or unique farmlands	x	
7. Special sources of water	x	
8. Other (describe) All work within existing substation yard	x	

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

Date: May 8, 2013