Categorical Exclusion Determination

Bonneville Power Administration Department of Energy



Proposed Action: Sandpoint Maintenance Building Demolition

Project Manager: Sean LaFrienere-NWM-1

Location: Sandpoint Substation located in Bonner County, Idaho.

Categorical Exclusion Applied (from Subpart D, 10 C.F.R. Part 1021): B1.23 Demolition and disposal of buildings

Description of the Proposed Action: Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) proposes to remove a maintenance building at its Sandpoint Substation in Bonner County, Idaho. The one-story building is 125 square feet in size and was constructed circa 1950. It is located on a cement slab outside the fenced substation yard. The building is currently unused and deteriorating. The building would be demolished and all debris removed, including the underground utility pipes. Waste materials would be disposed of properly and the site would be graded and graveled. Equipment and staging would be located in the graveled parking area around the building.

<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/ Beth Belanger</u> Beth Belanger Contract Environmental Protection Specialist Motus Recruiting & Staffing Reviewed by:

<u>/s/ Gene Lynard</u> Gene Lynard Supervisory Environmental Protection Specialist

Concur:

<u>/s/ Stacy L. Mason</u> Stacy L. Mason NEPA Compliance Officer Date: July 12, 2017

Attachment: 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: Sandpoint Maintenance Building Demolition

Project Site Description

The maintenance building demolition work would be at the Sandpoint Substation which is adjacent to Highway 2, on flat terrain, and surrounded by agricultural fields and rural-residential dwellings.

A review of the National Wetland Inventory, topography and aerial photos did not reveal any wetlands or water bodies in the vicinity of the substation.

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				
		lanation: On May 24, 2016, BPA initiated Section 106 consultation with Idaho State Historic Preservation ce (SHPO), Kalispell Tribe of Indians, and Kootenai Tribe of Idaho.			
	Sandpoint maintenance building was evaluated and determined to be eligible for listing on the National ister of Historic Places (NRHP). BPA's proposal to demolish the building would result in an adverse effect.				
	determination. Neither the Kalispell Tribe of Indian				
	On March 13, 2017, the Advisory Council of Histori consultation. The ACHP did not respond with inter		as invited to participate in the MOA		
	Mitigation was determined and agreed upon by bo on June 19, 2017 and June 21, 2017, respectively.	oth parties. The final MO	A was signed by Idaho SHPO and BPA		
2.	Geology and Soils				
	Explanation: Ground disturbance would be minim with some underground pipes. The maximum dep	-			
3.	Plants (including federal/state special-status species)				
	Explanation: The work would take place in an un-	-vegetated, previously di	-		

removed or disturbed. There are no ESA-listed plant species in Bonner County, nor are there any known occurrences of special-status plant species present within the project area.

4.	Wildlife (including federal/state special- status species and habitats)				
	Explanation: An occupied Osprey nest exists on a building demolition work would not start until aft and would not be harmed by this project. The BP young have fledged prior to initiating work.	ter August 15, to ensure	that the young have fledged the nest		
5.	Water Bodies, Floodplains, and Fish (including federal/state special-status species and ESUs)	V			
	Explanation: No water bodies, floodplains or fish are present within the project area.				
6.	Wetlands				
	Explanation: No wetlands are present within the project areas.				
7.	Groundwater and Aquifers				
	Explanation: No impact to groundwater or aquifers would occur.				
8.	Land Use and Specially Designated Areas				
	Explanation: No land use changes are proposed. All work would occur at an existing facility.				
9.	Visual Quality				
	Explanation: The removal of the building would not adversely affect the visual quality of the area.				
10.	Air Quality				
	Explanation: There may be a small amount of dust and vehicle emissions during deconstruction; however, there would be no significant changes to air quality during or after construction.				
11.	Noise				
	Explanation: Noise generated during building deconstruction would be temporary and localized.				
12.	Human Health and Safety				
	Explanation: No impact to human health or safety. The building is likely to have been built with hazard materials, specifically lead paint and asbestos. For protection of human health, workers would be required to				

materials, specifically lead paint and asbestos. For protection of human health, workers would be required to comply with relevant OSHA standards. All waste materials from the building would be disposed of properly, in accordance with federal and local regulations.

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>: The project would occur on BPA fee-owned property. There would be no significant visual changes 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/ Beth Belanger</u>

Date: July 12, 2017

Beth Belanger, ECT-4 Contract Environmental Protection Specialist Motus Recruiting & Staffing