Categorical Exclusion Determination

Bonneville Power Administration Department of Energy



Proposed Action: Sappho Substation Expansion

Project Manager: Mike Gilchrist TEP-TPP-1

Location: Clallam County, Washington

<u>Categorical Exclusion Applied (from Subpart D, 10 C.F.R. Part 1021)</u>: B4.6: Additions and modifications to transmission facilities.

Description of the Proposed Action: Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) is proposing to expand its Sappho substation in Clallam County, WA. The proposed project will expand the facility's footprint onto previously disturbed land on BPA's fee-owned property. The project will include the installation of an upgraded control house building and upgrades to the 69-kV system including: a new capacitor group, breaker, disconnect switches, buss work and support footings, and other necessary electrical components. The proposal also includes the removal of potentially hazardous vegetation (trees) within the property boundary that could fall into the new and existing facility. This project is being proposed to increase system stability and reliability.

Findings: In accordance with Section 1021.410(b) 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), BPA has determined that the proposed action:

- (1) fits within a class of actions listed in Appendix B of 10 CFR 1021, Subpart D (see attached Environmental Checklist);
- (2) does not present any extraordinary circumstances that may affect the significance of the environmental effects of the proposal; and
- (3) has not been segmented to meet the definition of a categorical exclusion.

Based on these determinations, BPA finds that the proposed action is categorically excluded from further NEPA review.

/s/<u>Phil Smith for</u> Greg Tippetts KEPR/Olympia Olympia District Environmental Scientist

/s/<u>Phil Smith</u> Phil Smith Manager, Technical and Regional Services

Concur:

/s/<u>Stacy L. Mason</u> Stacy L. Mason NEPA Compliance Officer Date: April 7, 2015

Attachment(s): Environmental Checklist

Categorical Exclusion Environmental Checklist

This checklist documents environmental considerations for the proposed project and explains why the project would not have the potential to cause significant impacts on environmentally sensitive resources and would meet other integral elements of the applied categorical exclusion.

Proposed Action: Sappho Substation Expansion

Project Site Description

The proposed project is located on BPA fee owned property associated with the existing Sappho substation. The expansion area was previously disturbed as part of the original facility construction and is currently a parking and staging area. The surrounding property is WA DNR and privately owned industrial forest in the early developmental stage.

Evaluation of Potential Impacts to Environmental Resources

	Environmental Resource Impacts	No Potential for Significance	No Potential for Significance, with Conditions		
1.	Historic and Cultural Resources				
	<u>Explanation</u> : A cultural resources survey and Section 106 consultation was completed for the project APE. No resources were identified in the vicinity of the proposed work areas. Washington DAHP agreed with a no effects determination from the survey report on 04/02/2015, Log No.: 021715-10-BPA. The consulted tribes; Lower Elwha, Jamestown S'Klallam, Quileute, Hoh, and Makah Tribes had no comment during the process. If resources are discovered during construction activities, work will cease and the appropriate archaeological resources (BPA and WA DAHP) will be contacted.				
2.	Geology and Soils				
	Explanation: Storm water BMPs will be used durine erosion issues.	ng the project to protec	t the surrounding area from runoff and		
3.	Plants (including federal/state special-status species)				
	Explanation: No species with special-status are known to occur at the sites. Site development will be confined to previously disturbed area currently used as a parking and staging area.				
4.	Wildlife (including federal/state special- status species and habitats)				
	Explanation: A no effect determination for ESA sp	pecies and critical habita	ats was completed for the project.		
5.	Water Bodies, Floodplains, and Fish (including federal/state special-status species and ESUs)	V			
	Explanation: A no effect determination addressing ESA aquatic species and ESUs was completed for the project. The sites do not include any water bodies or nearby connections to any waterbodies, including any fish bearing				

streams. Any potentially affected drainage area will be protects with appropriate storm water BMPs.

6.	Wetlands					
	Explanation: No wetlands are involved in the project area. Storm water BMPs will be used during the project to protect the surrounding area from runoff and erosion issues into nearby drainages.					
7.	Groundwater and Aquifers					
	Explanation: The project does not involve any drilling or deep excavations. All spills will be addressed immediately and follow BPA protocol for cleanup and regulatory notifications.					
8.	Land Use and Specially Designated Areas					
	Explanation: The property is already used as an electrical transmission facility and does not include any special designated areas.					
9.	Visual Quality					
	Explanation: The project is located on BPA fee owned pr homes.	operty and is located away from ar	ny public roads or			
10.	Air Quality					
Explanation: The project has a short duration and involves normal construction equipment activities.						
11.	Noise					
<u>Explanation</u> : The project is located away from any populated areas and places of residence. Noise disturbance will be limited to general construction equipment activities and be for a short duration.						
12.	Human Health and Safety					
	Explanation: Completion of this project with increase sy	stem stability and reliability to the	service area.			
Evaluation of Other Integral Elements						
	e proposed project would also meet conditions that are int ject would not:	egral elements of the categorical e	exclusion. The			
•	Threaten a violation of applicable statutory, regulatory, or permit requirements for environment, safety, and health, or similar requirements of DOE or Executive Orders.					
	Explanation, if necessary:					

Require siting and construction or major expansion of waste storage, disposal, recovery, or treatment facilities (including incinerators) that are not otherwise categorically excluded.

Explanation, if necessary:

Disturb hazardous substances, pollutants, contaminants, or CERCLA excluded petroleum and natural gas products that preexist in the environment such that there would be uncontrolled or unpermitted releases.

Explanation, if necessary:

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, such as those of the Department of Agriculture, the Environmental Protection Agency, and the National Institutes of Health.

Explanation, if necessary:

Landowner Notification, Involvement, or Coordination

Description: The project will be confined to BPA fee owned property.

Based on the foregoing, this proposed project does not have the potential to cause significant impacts on any environmentally sensitive resources.

Signed: /s/<u>Phil Smith for</u> Greg Tippetts KEPR/Olympia Olympia District Environmental Scientist Date: April 7, 2015