Categorical Exclusion Determination

Bonneville Power Administration
Department of Energy

Proposed Action: Ross Warehouse Asbestos and Lead Paint Abatement

Project Manager: Jody Solmonsson

Location: Clark County, WA

Categorical Exclusion Applied (from Subpart D, 10 C.F.R. Part 1021): B1.16 Asbestos removal

Description of the Proposed Action: Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) is proposing to remove materials containing asbestos and lead paint from its Ross Warehouse at the Ross Complex. All work is proposed inside of the Ross Warehouse and no ground disturbance is proposed

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/ Elizabeth Siping
Elizabeth Siping
Contract Environmental Protection Specialist
David Evans and Associates, Inc.

Reviewed by:

/s/ Gene Lynard
Gene Lynard
Supervisory Environmental Protection Specialist

Concur:

/s/ Stacy L. Mason Date: *September 21, 2015*
Stacy L. Mason
NEPA Compliance Officer

Attachment: 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: Ross Warehouse Asbestos and Lead Paint Abatement

---

Project Site Description

All work would take place within Ross Warehouse at BPA's Ross Complex in Clark County, Washington.

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**	☑	☐
Explanation: No potential to affect historic or cultural resources.		
2. **Geology and Soils**	☑	☐
Explanation: No ground disturbance proposed.		
3. **Plants** (including federal/state special-status species)	☑	☐
Explanation: No disturbance to plants would occur.		
4. **Wildlife** (including federal/state special-status species and habitats)	☑	☐
Explanation: No disturbance to wildlife would occur.		
5. **Water Bodies, Floodplains, and Fish** (including federal/state special-status species and ESUs)	☑	☐
Explanation: No water bodies present.		
6. **Wetlands**	☑	☐
Explanation: No wetlands present.		

7.	**Groundwater and Aquifers**	☑	☐
	Explanation: No impact to groundwater or aquifers.		
8.	**Land Use and Specially Designated Areas**	☑	☐
	Explanation: All work within BPA's Ross Warehouse.		
9.	**Visual Quality**	☑	☐
	Explanation: No impact to visual quality.		
10.	**Air Quality**	☑	☐
	Explanation: No impact to air quality. All asbestos and lead paint would be removed and disposed of in accordance with applicable regulations by a licensed abatement contractor, and therefore would not impact air quality.		
11.	**Noise**	☑	☐
	Explanation: Minimal temporary noise during abatement.		
12.	**Human Health and Safety**	☑	☐
	Explanation: All asbestos and lead paint would be removed and disposed of in accordance with applicable regulations by a licensed abatement contractor. A positive impact to human health and safety would occur by removing asbestos-containing materials and lead paint, thereby reducing potential exposure.		

Evaluation of Other Integral Elements

The proposed project would also meet conditions that are integral elements of the categorical exclusion. The project would not:

☑ 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: Not applicable.

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

Signed: */s/ Elizabeth Siping*
Elizabeth Siping – KEC-4

Date: *September 21, 2015*