## **Categorical Exclusion Determination**

Bonneville Power Administration
Department of Energy



**Proposed Action:** Monroe Substation Line Retermination

**Project Manager:** Charla Burke – TEP-TPP-1

Location: Snohomish County and Douglas County, Washington

<u>Categorical Exclusion Applied (from Subpart D, 10 C.F.R. Part 1021)</u>: B4.6 Additions and modifications to transmission facilities

<u>Description of the Proposed Action</u>: Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) proposes to reterminate an existing transmission line and add related equipment at its Monroe Substation in Snohomish County and Chief Joe Substation in Douglas County, Washington. The work is needed to increase operational flexibility, reliability, and capacity of existing transmission lines.

Equipment to be added inside of the yard at Monroe Substation would include a substation dead-end tower, power circuit breakers, disconnect switches, breaker differential relays, instrument transformers, surge arrestors, and utility breakers. The Chief Joe-Monroe and the Custer-Monroe No. 2 transmission lines would be reterminated including their overhead ground wires. Equipment to be removed and replaced with bus pedestals includes a power circuit breaker, disconnect switches, instrument transformers, surge arrestors, and breaker relays.

Equipment to be replaced at Chief Joe Substation inside the control house includes line protection relays and transfer trip.

<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.

<u>/s/ Elizabeth Siping</u>
Elizabeth Siping
Contract Environmental Protection Specialist
Flux Resources, LLC

D		٠ ما ام	
Rev	iewe	d bv:	

\_/s/ Gene Lynard\_\_

Gene Lynard Supervisory Environmental Protection Specialist

Concur:

\_/s/ Stacy Mason\_\_

Stacy L. Mason NEPA Compliance Officer

Attachment: Environmental Checklist

Date: August 16, 2017

# **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:** Monroe Substation Line Retermination

#### **Project Site Description**

The project site is located at BPA's Monroe Substation in Snohomish County, Washington and Chief Joe Substation in Douglas County, Washington. The project area at Monroe Substation is inside the substation yard and consists of the graveled yard, substation equipment, transmission lines, and the control house. The project area at Chief Joe Substation is within the control house.

### **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 proposed action occurs within bot potential to affect historic properties or cultural res		
2.	Geology and Soils	<b>V</b>	
	Explanation: Some soil disturbance would occur wi to remove existing equipment footings and install in	· ·	
	<u>Mitigation</u> : Erosion and sediment controls would b transport of sediment. Soil and concrete would be		
3.	<b>Plants</b> (including federal/state special-status species)		
	Explanation: Work would occur in the substation y	ards where no vegetat	cion is present.
4.	Wildlife (including federal/state special- status species and habitats)		
	Explanation: Work would occur in the substation y	ards where no wildlife	is present.
5.	Water Bodies, Floodplains, and Fish (including federal/state special-status species and ESUs)	V	
	Explanation: No water bodies or floodplains at or r	near the project sites. I	No in-water work proposed.
6.	Wetlands	<b>V</b>	
	Explanation: None present.		

7.	Groundwater and Aquifers					
	<u>Explanation</u> : No new wells or use of groundwater propo five feet.	sed. Maximum depth of disturband	ce would be less than			
	Mitigation: Spill prevention kits would be present on site	2.				
8.	Land Use and Specially Designated Areas	V				
	Explanation: All work on BPA fee-owned property. Ther	e are no specially designated areas				
9.	Visual Quality	<u>v</u>				
	Explanation: Modifications would not be noticeably different from existing conditions.					
10.	Air Quality	<u>v</u>				
	Explanation: Small amount of dust and vehicle emissions	s anticipated during construction.				
11.	Noise	<b>V</b>				
	Explanation: Temporary construction noise during daylig	th hours. Operational noise would	not change.			
12.	Human Health and Safety	V				
	Explanation: No impact to human health and safety.					
Evaluation of Other Integral Elements						
	Evaluation of Other In	ntegral Elements				
	Evaluation of Other In e proposed project would also meet conditions that are in ject would not:		exclusion. The			
	proposed project would also meet conditions that are in ject would not:	tegral elements of the categorical or permit requirements for enviror				
pro	proposed project would also meet conditions that are in ject would not:  Threaten a violation of applicable statutory, regulatory,	tegral elements of the categorical or permit requirements for enviror				
pro	proposed project would also meet conditions that are in ject would not:  Threaten a violation of applicable statutory, regulatory, health, or similar requirements of DOE or Executive Order	tegral elements of the categorical or permit requirements for enviror ers.	iment, safety, and			
pro	e proposed project would also meet conditions that are in ject would not:  Threaten a violation of applicable statutory, regulatory, health, or similar requirements of DOE or Executive Order Explanation, if necessary:  Require siting and construction or major expansion of works.	tegral elements of the categorical or permit requirements for enviror ers.	iment, safety, and			
pro	e proposed project would also meet conditions that are in ject would not:  Threaten a violation of applicable statutory, regulatory, health, or similar requirements of DOE or Executive Order Explanation, if necessary:  Require siting and construction or major expansion of we facilities (including incinerators) that are not otherwise or	tegral elements of the categorical or permit requirements for environers.  vaste storage, disposal, recovery, or categorically excluded.	r treatment			
pro	Explanation, if necessary:  Disturb hazardous substances, pollutants, contaminants	tegral elements of the categorical or permit requirements for environers.  vaste storage, disposal, recovery, or categorically excluded.	r treatment			
pro	e proposed project would also meet conditions that are in ject would not:  Threaten a violation of applicable statutory, regulatory, health, or similar requirements of DOE or Executive Order Explanation, if necessary:  Require siting and construction or major expansion of we facilities (including incinerators) that are not otherwise of Explanation, if necessary:  Disturb hazardous substances, pollutants, contaminants products that preexist in the environment such that the	tegral elements of the categorical or permit requirements for environers.  Taste storage, disposal, recovery, or categorically excluded.  To or CERCLA excluded petroleum and re would be uncontrolled or unpermonentally designated no contained or confined in a manner onment and conducted in accorda	r treatment  Ind natural gas mitted releases.  Exious weeds, or designed and noce with applicable			

### **Landowner Notification, Involvement, or Coordination**

<u>Description</u>: No notification. All work on BPA fee-owned property and no visual or other effects 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/ Elizabeth Siping</u> Date: <u>August 16, 2017</u>

Elizabeth Siping – ECT-4

Contract Environmental Protection Specialist

Flux Resources, LLC