## **Categorical Exclusion Determination**

Bonneville Power Administration
Department of Energy



**Proposed Action:** Hat Rock Substation Upgrades

**Project Manager:** Deborah Staats, TEP-TPP-1

Location: Umatilla County, Oregon

<u>Categorical Exclusion Applied (from Subpart D, 10 C.F.R. Part 1021)</u>: B4.1 Electric Power substations and interconnection facilities

<u>Description of the Proposed Action</u>: Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) proposes to upgrade equipment and install a Power Control Assembly (PCA) at its Hat Rock Substation, located in Umatilla County, Oregon. The existing equipment is outdated and has become inadequate for providing reliable power to BPA's service area.

The new PCA would be a prefabricated, modular building that is 736 square feet and would function as the new control house. It would house new equipment including: relays, instruments, meters, batteries, and chargers. Station service would be upgraded to accommodate the new PCA. New station service cables would be installed from the new PCA building to a panelboard and would require a 50-foot-long trench at a depth of three feet.

Equipment upgrades would include disconnect switches, potential transformers, current transformers, a surge arrester, batteries, and chargers. Yard conduit and grounding would be updated, as necessary, with minimal ground disturbance to connect new equipment to existing conduit runs. All indoor and outdoor cables and wiring would be replaced.

All existing footings and foundations would be reused, to the extent possible. If footings or foundations must be replaced or added, a maximum of 305 cubic yards of soil and concrete would be cut and then backfilled in place. Staging materials will be placed on existing graveled areas within the existing substation yard. Any contaminated materials would be disposed of in an approved waste management facility. All work for this project would occur within the existing substation fence.

<u>Findings</u>: 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.

| further NEPA review.   |                             |
|--|-----------------------------|
| /s/ Elizabeth Siping Elizabeth Siping Contract Environmental Protection Specialist Flux Resources, LLC |                             |
| Reviewed by:   |                             |
| <u>/s/ Gene Lynard</u> Gene Lynard Supervisory Environmental Protection Specialist                     | <del>.</del>                |
| Concur:  |                             |
| /s/ Stacy L. Mason   | Date: <i>April 22, 2016</i> |

Based on these determinations, BPA finds that the proposed action is categorically excluded from

Attachment: Environmental Checklist

Stacy L. Mason

**NEPA Compliance Officer** 

# **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:** Hat Rock Substation Upgrades

#### **Project Site Description**

The project site is located at BPA's Hat Rock Substation in Umatilla County, Oregon. The project area consists of the graveled yard, substation equipment, transmission lines, and a control house. The substation is located in a rural area. The terrain slopes generally toward the Columbia River, which is approximately 1,000 feet to the north/northwest. The surrounding area is partially undeveloped and partially in agricultural use.

#### **Evaluation of Potential Impacts to Environmental Resources**

|    | Environmental Resource<br>Impacts   | No Potential for<br>Significance | No Potential for Significance, with<br>Conditions |
|----|---|----------------------------------|---|
| 1. | Historic and Cultural Resources   | <b>~</b>                         |   |
|    | Explanation: Oregon State Historic Preservation Offit 4/22/2016. The Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla  |                                  |   |
| 2. | Geology and Soils   |                                  |   |
|    | Explanation: All soil disturbance would be confined Mitigation: Erosion and sediment controls would be site transport of sediment. Soil and concrete would permanent stockpiles would be permitted. | e implemented as nec             | essary to control run-off and prevent off-        |
| 3. | <b>Plants</b> (including federal/state special-status species)  |                                  |   |
|    | Explanation: All work in previously disturbed subst   | ation yard; no plants p          | present.  |
| 4. | Wildlife (including federal/state special-<br>status species and habitats)  | V                                |   |
|    | Explanation: All work in previously disturbed subst   | ation yard; no wildlife          | habitat present.                                  |
| 5. | Water Bodies, Floodplains, and Fish (including federal/state special-status species and ESUs)   |                                  |   |
|    | Explanation: No floodplains or water bodies at the north/northwest but would not be affected by wor   |                                  |   |
| 6. | Wetlands  | <b>~</b>                         |   |
|    | Explanation: None present.  |                                  |   |

| 7.  | Groundwater and Aquifers   | <b>~</b>  |                    |  |  |
|---|--|---|--------------------|--|--|
|   | Explanation: No new wells or use of groundwater propo  | sed.  |                    |  |  |
|   | <u>Mitigation</u> : Spill prevention kits would be present on site. Fueling shall not take place where any spilled material may enter any natural or manmade drainage conveyance including ditches, catch basins and pipes.  |   |                    |  |  |
| 8.  | Land Use and Specially Designated Areas  |   |                    |  |  |
|   | Explanation: All work in existing substation yard.   |   |                    |  |  |
| 9.  | Visual Quality   |   |                    |  |  |
|   | Explanation: Proposed addition of PCA would be consistent with existing conditions.  |   |                    |  |  |
| 10.   | Air Quality  | <b>~</b>  |                    |  |  |
|   | Explanation: Small amount of dust and vehicle emissions anticipated during construction.   |   |                    |  |  |
| 11.   | Noise  |   |                    |  |  |
|   | Explanation: Temporary construction noise during daylight hours. Operational noise would not change.   |   |                    |  |  |
| 12.   | Human Health and Safety  |   |                    |  |  |
|   | Explanation: No known soil contamination or hazardous conditions.  |   |                    |  |  |
|   | <u>Mitigation</u> : Contractor would adhere to Best Management Practices in the Pollution Abatement Clearance. Spill prevention kits would be present on site.   |   |                    |  |  |
| Evaluation of Other Integral Elements   |  |   |                    |  |  |
| The proposed project would also meet conditions that are integral elements of the categorical exclusion. The project would not: |  |   |                    |  |  |
|   |  | tegral elements of the categorical  | exclusion. The     |  |  |
|   |  | or permit requirements for environ  |                    |  |  |
|   | ject would not:  Threaten a violation of applicable statutory, regulatory,   | or permit requirements for environ  |                    |  |  |
| pro   | ject would not:  Threaten a violation of applicable statutory, regulatory, health, or similar requirements of DOE or Executive Ord  Explanation, if necessary:   | or permit requirements for environ<br>ers.  | nment, safety, and |  |  |
|   | ject would not:  Threaten a violation of applicable statutory, regulatory, health, or similar requirements of DOE or Executive Ord   | or permit requirements for environers.  raste storage, disposal, recovery, or                         | nment, safety, and |  |  |
| pro   | ject would not:  Threaten a violation of applicable statutory, regulatory, health, or similar requirements of DOE or Executive Ord  Explanation, if necessary:  Require siting and construction or major expansion of w  | or permit requirements for environers.  raste storage, disposal, recovery, or                         | nment, safety, and |  |  |
| pro   | ject would not:  Threaten a violation of applicable statutory, regulatory, health, or similar requirements of DOE or Executive Ord  Explanation, if necessary:  Require siting and construction or major expansion of w facilities (including incinerators) that are not otherwise or  | or permit requirements for environers.  vaste storage, disposal, recovery, or categorically excluded. | r treatment        |  |  |
| pro   | ject would not:  Threaten a violation of applicable statutory, regulatory, health, or similar requirements of DOE or Executive Ord  Explanation, if necessary:  Require siting and construction or major expansion of w facilities (including incinerators) that are not otherwise of Explanation, if necessary:  Disturb hazardous substances, pollutants, contaminants | or permit requirements for environers.  vaste storage, disposal, recovery, or categorically excluded. | r treatment        |  |  |

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**

<u>Description</u>: Hat Rock Substation is owned by BPA and, other than a slight change in visual appearance with the PCA, there will be no effect to adjacent agricultural landowners.

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

Signed: <u>/s/ Elizabeth Siping</u> Date: <u>April 22, 2016</u>

Elizabeth Siping Environmental Protection Specialist