Categorical Exclusion Determination

Bonneville Power Administration
Department of Energy



Proposed Action: Kennedy Tap Switch Addition

Project Manager: Todd Wehner – TEP-TPP-3

Location: Benton County, Washington

Categorical Exclusion Applied (from Subpart D, 10 C.F.R. Part 1021): B4.11 Electric power

substations and interconnection facilities

<u>Description of the Proposed Action</u>: Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) is proposing to install one disconnect switch at the existing tap for Kennedy Substation, which is owned and operated by Benton Rural Electric Association (Benton REA). The new disconnect switch is needed to provide reliability and to provide for line maintenance without de-energizing the customer load. The disconnect switch would be owned by BPA and located on BPA right-of-way (ROW), outside of the Kennedy Substation fence, near structure 2/6 on the Red Mountain – Richland No. 1 line. BPA would provide and install a new stand-mounted loop break disconnect switch with ground pad as well as required wood pole H-frame dead-end structure.

<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.

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
Flux Resources, LLC

| Reviewed by: | |
|--------------|--|
| | |
| | |

/s/ Gene Lynard

Gene Lynard Supervisory Environmental Protection Specialist

Concur:

<u>/s/ Sarah T. Biegel</u>
Sarah T. Biegel
NEPA Compliance Officer

Attachment: Environmental Checklist

Date: August 19, 2016

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: Kennedy Tap Switch Addition

Project Site Description

The proposed action would occur at Benton REA's Kennedy Substation in Benton County, Washington. Kennedy Substation is located in a rural area, with scattered residences, agricultural areas, and a paved race track nearby. The proposed action would occur on BPA ROW on the Red Mountain – Richland No. 1 line. The project area is in an agricultural field next to BPA's structure 2/6.

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> : The Washington Department of Archaeology & Historic Preservation (DAHP) concurred with BPA's determination of no adverse effect on July, 25 2016. Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Reservation and Bands of Yakama Nation and Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation were consulted; no response was received. | | | | |
| | Mitigation: | | | | |
| | In the event any archaeological or historic materials are encountered during project activities, the following actions should be taken: | | | | |
| | Stop work in the vicinity and immediately notify the BPA environmental lead. Notify BPA project staff, interested tribes, WA DAHP, and the appropriate county, state, and federal agencies. Implement reasonable measures to protect the discovery site, including any appropriate stabilization or covering. Take reasonable steps to ensure the confidentiality of the discovery site, including restricting access. | | | | |
| 2. | Geology and Soils | | | | |
| | Explanation: The project would impact approagricultural field. | oximately 0.3 acres of | previously disturbed soil in an | | |
| 3. | Plants (including federal/state special-status species) | V | | | |
| | Explanation: There are no special-status spe | cies present in the pro | ject area. | | |
| | | | | | |

| 4. | Wildlife (including federal/state special- status species and habitats) | V | | | |
|----|--|-------------------------------------|---------------------|--|--|
| | <u>Explanation</u> : The project area is not suitable for wi would occur. | Idlife habitat; therefore, no disto | urbance to wildlife | | |
| 5. | Water Bodies, Floodplains, and Fish (including federal/state special-status species and ESUs) | | | | |
| | Explanation: No water bodies, floodplains, or fish a | are present. | | | |
| 6. | Wetlands | V | | | |
| | Explanation: No wetlands are present. | | | | |
| 7. | Groundwater and Aquifers | ~ | | | |
| | Explanation: No new wells or use of groundwater is proposed. | | | | |
| 8. | Land Use and Specially Designated Areas | ~ | | | |
| | <u>Explanation</u> : The project would be consistent with areas. | existing land use. There are no s | pecially designated | | |
| 9. | Visual Quality | ~ | | | |
| | Explanation: The project would result in one new woonsistent with the existing use of the ROW. | vood pole H-frame dead-end str | ucture, which is | | |
| 10 | Air Quality | V | | | |
| | Explanation: A small amount of dust and vehicle en | nissions would occur during con | struction. | | |
| 11 | Noise | ~ | | | |
| | Explanation: A temporary increase in noise would o | occur during daylight hours durir | ng construction. | | |
| 12 | Human Health and 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 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 landowner has been notified of the project.

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

Date: August 19, 2016

Signed: <u>/s/ Elizabeth Siping</u>
Elizabeth Siping – ECT-4