Categorical Exclusion Determination

Bonneville Power Administration Department of Energy



Proposed Action: Ellensburg Substation Control House Demolition

Project Manager: Rasha Kroonen TEP-TPP-1

Location: Kittitas County, Washington

Categorical Exclusion Applied (from Subpart D, 10 C.F.R. Part 1021): B4.10 Removal of electric transmission facilities

Description of the Proposed Action: BPA proposes to decommission and demolish the old Control House (CH) and associated utilities at the Ellensburg Substation in Kittitas County, Washington. The CH is frequently inundated by flooding and is no longer in use. A new Power Control Assembly was recently constructed and has replaced all the old CH functionality with new equipment that operates under newer standards. Decommissioning the CH would include removal of all electrical connectivity to Ellensburg Substation, removing the grounding grid, and removing the CH building and associated old batteries, as well as the flood protection wall surrounding it. All work would occur within the existing substation fence using excavators, bulldozers, and hand removal as needed.

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/ Claire McClory</u> Claire McClory Environmental Protection Specialist Concur:

<u>/s/ Stacy L. Mason</u> Stacy L. Mason NEPA Compliance Officer Date: May 30, 2017

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: Ellensburg Substation Control House Demolition

Project Site Description

The Ellensburg Substation site is located in an industrial area on the west side of the City of Ellensburg in Washington. The site has been heavily graded and rocked for substation installation.

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					
	Places. Washington Department of Archaeology and determination that demolition would have an advert	anation: The Ellensburg Substation Control House is eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic es. Washington Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation (DAHP) concurred with BPAs rmination that demolition would have an adverse effect to historic properties on 9/20/2016. BPA entered a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) with DAHP on 5/15/2017.				
2.	Geology and Soils					
	Explanation: Some disturbance to substation fill m surrounding fill materials. Project would not impa					
3.	Plants (including federal/state special-status species)					
	Explanation: None present.					
4.	Wildlife (including federal/state special- status species and habitats)					
	Explanation: None present.					
5.	Water Bodies, Floodplains, and Fish (including federal/state special-status species and ESUs)					

Explanation: The Ellensburg Substation is within a mapped FEMA floodplain. The site historically flows approximately once every 5 years. Removal of the old CH would result in a minor reduction to floodplain impacts.

- ✓ Excess soil would be removed to offset any floodplain volume displaced during demolition
- ✓ Surface rock would be reused to regrade the site so that flows would generally follow existing yard grades.
- ✓ Excess excavation material, if generated, shall be disposed of off-site, resulting in no net increase to fill

	material on-site.				
6.	Wetlands				
	Explanation: None present.				
7.	Groundwater and Aquifers				
	Explanation: No impact.				
8.	Land Use and Specially Designated Areas	V			
	Explanation: No changes to land use.				
9.	Visual Quality				
	Explanation: No impact.				
10.	Air Quality	V			
	Explanation: Small amount of dust and vehicle emissions during building removal.				
11.	Noise	V			
	xplanation: Small amount of construction noise during daylight hours.				
12.	Human Health and Safety				
	Explanation: No impact.				
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

<u>Description</u>: Ellensburg Substation is on BPA fee-owned property and there would be no effect to adjacent landowners.

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

Signed: <u>/s/ Claire McClory</u> Claire McClory ECT-4 Date: May 30, 2017