Categorical Exclusion Determination

Bonneville Power Administration
Department of Energy



Proposed Action: Snohomish Maintenance Headquarters Lighting Upgrades

Project Manager: Staci Pfau—NWM-1

Location: Snohomish County, Washington

Categorical Exclusion Applied (from Subpart D, 10 C.F.R. Part 1021): B5.1 Actions to Conserve Energy

<u>Description of the Proposed Action</u>: Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) proposes to replace interior and exterior lights with new LED fixtures at its Snohomish Maintenance Headquarters (Snohomish MHQ). The existing lighting fixtures consist of T8 and T12 linear and compact fluorescents, incandescent, and high-intensity discharge (HID) lights. The project would improve energy efficiency at the facility by upgrading to high-efficiency LED's. The lighting upgrades would occur at eleven buildings within the Snohomish MHQ facility.

<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/ Beth Belanger

Beth Belanger
Contract Environmental Protection Specialist
Motus Recruiting & Staffing

D	evi	اما		_	٦I	h١	,.
ĸ	evi	ıe	w	е	u I	IJ١	1.

/s/ Gene Lynard

Gene Lynard

Supervisory Environmental Protection Specialist

Date: May 31, 2017

Concur:

/s/ Stacy L. Mason

Stacy L. Mason

NEPA Compliance Officer

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: Snohomish Maintenance Headquarters Lighting Upgrades

Project Site Description

The project location is at the Snohomish Substation and Maintenance Headquarters in the City of Snohomish, Snohomish County, Washington. The facility is located in the Southeast one-fourth of Section 12, Township 28 North, Range 5 East. The substation and associated buildings were constructed in 1950. Additional buildings were constructed between 1971 and 2010. The surrounding area consists of residential housing and commercial properties.

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 project was reviewed by not have the potential to cause effects to historic project.		• •
2.	Geology and Soils		
	Explanation: The project would not include any gr	round disturbing activiti	es.
3.	Plants (including federal/state special-status species)		
	Explanation: The project would not include any go	round disturbing activit	ies.
4.	Wildlife (including federal/state special- status species and habitats)		
	Explanation: The project would not include any go	round disturbing activit	ies.
5.	Water Bodies, Floodplains, and Fish (including federal/state special-status species and ESUs)		
	Explanation: The project would not include any gr	round disturbing activit	ies.
6.	Wetlands		
	Explanation: The project would not include any gr	ound disturbing activiti	es.

7.	Groundwater and Aquifers		
	Explanation: The project would not include any ground	disturbing activities.	
8.	Land Use and Specially Designated Areas		
	Explanation: The proposed lighting fixture upgrades wo	uld not change the current land use	e at this location.
9.	Visual Quality		
	Explanation: There would be no significant visual change	es to the project area or surroundir	ng environment.
10.	Air Quality		
	Explanation: The project would not include any ground	disturbing activities.	
11.	Noise		
	Explanation: There would be no construction associated	d with this project. Operational noi	se would not change.
12.	Human Health and Safety		
	<u>Explanation</u> : The project has the potential to disturb sm and/or asbestos. All applicable Occupational Safety and followed to protect worker's health from exposure to learn mercury would be disposed of at a designated hazardou health or safety.	Health Administration (OSHA) stan ad and asbestos. Incandescent bull	dards would be bs that contain
	nearth of Safety.		
	Evaluation of Other In	ntegral Elements	
			exclusion. The
	Evaluation of Other In proposed project would also meet conditions that are in	tegral elements of the categorical e	
pro	Evaluation of Other In proposed project would also meet conditions that are in ject would not: Threaten a violation of applicable statutory, regulatory, or	tegral elements of the categorical e	
pro	Evaluation of Other In 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 error permit requirements for environers.	ment, safety, and
pro	Evaluation of Other In 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	tegral elements of the categorical error permit requirements for environers.	ment, safety, and
pro	Evaluation of Other In 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 error permit requirements for environers. Paste storage, disposal, recovery, or categorically excluded.	ment, safety, and treatment



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 project is occurring at a BPA facility; the nearest property is approximately 300 feet east. The project is unlikely to affect surrounding landowners.

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

Signed: /s/ Beth Belanger

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

Date: May 31, 2017