## **Categorical Exclusion Determination**

Bonneville Power Administration Department of Energy



**Proposed Action:** Echo Lake-Maple Valley No. 1 Footing Repair Project: Structure 10/2

Project No.: P00602

Project Manager: Gary Beck TEP-TPP-1

Location: King County, Washington

Categorical Exclusion Applied (from Subpart D, 10 C.F.R. Part 1021): B1.3 Routine maintenance

**Description of the Proposed Action:** BPA proposes to repair the four concrete footings supporting structure 10/2 on the Echo Lake-Maple Valley No. 1 500-kilovolt (kV) transmission line. Using a backhoe, BPA would excavate a 6-foot by 6-foot hole about 5 feet deep around each footing. Each hole would then be backfilled with wet concrete poured from a concrete mixing truck. Any excess soil would be disposed of offsite at an approved waste facility. The repair would likely occur in July 2016 and would take about two weeks to complete. No new access roads or road improvements are 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.

<u>/s/ Justin Moffett</u> Justin Moffett

Concur:

<u>/s/ Sarah Biegel</u> Sarah Biegel NEPA Compliance Officer Date: April 22, 2016

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:** Echo Lake-Maple Valley No. 1 Footing Repair Project: Structure 10/2

## **Project Site Description**

The proposed project site is located within the Cedar Hills Regional Landfill. The ground at the tower site consists of a layer of topsoil approximately 18 inches thick over a rubber membrane placed on top of a layer of landfill waste. Vegetation consists of a mix of native and non-native grasses and forbs.

### **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:				
	Since there would be no ground disturbance in native soil and the transmission structure is less than 50 years old, there is no potential to affect historical properties. Therefore, BPA did not initiate Section 106 consultation with Washington Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation or tribes for this action.				
2.	Geology and Soils				
	Explanation: Minimal non-native soil disturbance associated with excavating around the structure footings.				
3.	Plants (including federal/state special-status species)				
	Explanation:				
	None present.				
4.	Wildlife (including federal/state special- status species and habitats)	V			
	Explanation:				
	None present.				
5.	Water Bodies, Floodplains, and Fish (including federal/state special-status species and ESUs)	V			
	Explanation:	act cita			
	None present within a 0.3 mile radius of the proje	ett site.			

6.	Wetlands				
	Explanation:				
	None present.				
7.	Groundwater and Aquifers				
	Explanation: None present.				
8.	Land Use and Specially Designated Areas				
	Explanation:				
	No change to existing land use; not a specially designated area.				
9.	Visual Quality	<b>v</b>			
	Explanation:				
	The repaired footings would be visually consistent with the existing structure and would not be located in a visually sensitive area.				
10.	Air Quality	<b>v</b>			
	Explanation:				
	Small amount of dust and vehicle emissions during construction.				
11.	Noise				
	Explanation:				
	Temporary construction noise during daylight hours. No sensitive noise receptors near the project site.				
12.	Human Health and Safety				
	Explanation:				
	The proposed project activities would not impact human health or safety.				
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 treatme 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: BPA has coordinated with the landfill operators during all phases of project planning.

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

Signed: <u>/s/ Justin Moffett</u> Justin Moffett Date: <u>4/22/2016</u>