Categorical Exclusion Determination

Bonneville Power Administration
Department of Energy



Proposed Action: Fairmount Substation 230-kV Reactor

Addition **Project No.**: P01356

Project Manager: Rasha Kroonan, TEP-TPP-1

Location: Jefferson County, Washington

<u>Categorical Exclusion Applied (from Subpart D, 10 C.F.R. Part 1021)</u>: B4.11 Electric Power Substations and Interconnection Facilities

<u>Description of the Proposed Action</u>: The Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) proposes to install a new three phase 230-kilovolt (kV) reactor, breaker, motor operated disconnect switch and necessary appurtenances within the existing BPA Fairmount Substation yard, located approximately 25 miles east of Port Angeles, Washington.

<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/ Becky Hill

Becky Hill Contract Environmental Protection Specialist Flux Resources, LLC

Reviewed by:

/s/ Dave Kennedy, for

Gene Lynard

Supervisory Environmental Protection Specialist

Concur:

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

Attachment(s): Environmental Checklist

Date: *October 26, 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 to environmentally sensitive resources and would meet other integral elements of the applied categorical exclusion.

Proposed Action: Fairmount Substation 230-kV Reactor Addition

Project Site Description

The proposed project would take place on BPA-fee owned property associated with the Fairmount Substation, located approximately 25 miles east of Port Angeles, in Jefferson County, Washington. This region of the Olympic Peninsula has small rural towns, surrounded by heavily forested parcels of land, and occasional agriculture fields. The substation is located approximately 1 mile south of Discovery Bay. Snow Creek, a freshwater designated critical habitat, is located approximately 170 feet west of the substation's western fence; an unnamed tributary is located approximately 130 feet south of the substation's southern fence. Five rural residences are located in the immediate vicinity of the BPA substation property. HWY 101 and a transmission line corridor are located to the east of the substation, a Washington Department of Natural Resources parcel is located to the north, and an open grassland pasture with a wetland and FEMA Q3 floodplain is located to the west.

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> : On October 13, 2016, the BPA archae no potential to effect historic properties. | eologist determined th | at the proposed undertaking presented |
| 2. | Geology and Soils | | |
| | <u>Explanation</u> : The project area is located in a previous substation yard. | ously-disturbed, gravel | led, industrial setting within the fenced |
| 3. | Plants (including federal/state special-status species) | | |
| | <u>Explanation</u> : There are no special-status species p graveled, vegetation-free, fenced substation yard. | resent within the proj | ect area, which consists of the existing, |
| 4. | Wildlife (including federal/state special- status species and habitats) | | |
| | <u>Explanation</u> : There are no special-status species o which consists of the existing, graveled, vegetation | • | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · |
| 5. | Water bodies, Floodplains, and Fish (including federal/state special-status species and ESUs) | | |
| | Explanation: A designated critical habitat stream (substation. A FEMA Q3 floodplain (and wetland dis Snow Creek. | | |

| | No work is proposed to occur outside of the Fairmount Substation fenced yard where the previously mentioned water bodies, floodplains and fish bearing streams are located. Erosion and sediment control plans and other best management practices (BMPs) would be implemented to ensure no impacts to nearby aquatic resources. | | | | |
|---|--|------------------------------------|---------------------|--|--|
| 6. | Wetlands | | V | | |
| | <u>Explanation</u> : The nearest wetland is approximately 670 is proposed to occur outside of the Fairmount Sub disturbed. Any potential runoff of comprised quality vecontrol to water bodies, floodplains, and fish. | station fenced yard; therefore, no | o wetlands would be | | |
| 7. | Groundwater and Aquifers | | V | | |
| | <u>Explanation</u> : All new equipment installations with potentially hazardous liquids would be outfitted with containment vessels, and construction would be accomplished with spill prevention BMPs. | | | | |
| | Do not allow petroleum products or other deleterious materials to enter groundwater by using adequate Spill Prevention Control and Countermeasures (SPCC). | | | | |
| 8. | Land Use and Specially Designated Areas | | | | |
| | Explanation: All work would occur on BPA fee-owned property. The project area has been previously disturbed for substation construction. No changes in land use are expected. | | | | |
| 9. | Visual Quality | | | | |
| | <u>Explanation</u> : The additional reactor equipment would be This new equipment would be visually consistent with the substation. | | | | |
| 10. | Air Quality | | | | |
| | Explanation: There would be temporary dust and vehicle emissions during construction activities. | | | | |
| 11. | Noise | V | | | |
| | <u>Explanation</u> : There would be temporary, intermittent noise from construction activities during daylight hours. The new reactor's operational noise would be in compliance with BPA's audible noise policy, which states audible noise levels for substations will meet a maximum level of 50 dBA ath the substation property line. Transformer and reactor noise will be evaluated at 100 percent of rated voltage with all cooling in service. | | | | |
| 12. | Human Health and Safety | | | | |
| | Explanation: There would be no impact to human healt | h and safety from the proposed pro | ject. | | |
| 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, health, or similar requirements of DOE or Executive Ord | | ment, safety, and | | |
| | 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: All work would be completed on BPA fee-owned property; the visual and noise impacts to adjacent landowners would not be significant.

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

Signed: /s/ Becky Hill Date: October 26, 2016

Becky Hill, ECT-4

Contract Environmental Protection Specialist

Flux Resources, LLC