Categorical Exclusion Determination

Bonneville Power Administration
Department of Energy



Proposed Action: Driscoll Substation Control House Seismic Upgrade

Project Manager: Staci Pfau, NWM-1

Location: Clatsop County, Oregon

Categorical Exclusion Applied (from Subpart D, 10 C.F.R. Part 1021): B1.3 Routine Maintenance

<u>Description of the Proposed Action</u>: BPA proposes a seismic upgrade to the Driscoll Substation control house in Clatsop County, OR. The project would consist of three components: replacing the roof; replacing exterior light fixtures; and replacing a window.

Strengthening of the control house for the seismic upgrade would be done at the roof level. Portions of the roofing and sheathing would be removed to allow access to strengthen connections between the walls and the roof diaphragm. Due to the age and condition of the asphalt shingle roof, it would be replaced with a metal roof colored a sierra tan to best match the control house exterior and original roof color.

Exterior light fixtures and one window also would be replaced. The replacement light fixtures would be sited in the same locations. The replaced window would match the existing profile and fit the existing opening.

All work would be within the Driscoll Substation yard.

<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.

Date: March 16, 2018

/s/ Tish Eaton

Tish Eaton Environmental Protection Specialist

Concur:

<u>/s/ Stacy L. Mason</u> Stacy L. Mason NEPA Compliance Officer

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: Driscoll Substation Control House Seismic Upgrade

Project Site Description

All work would take place within BPA's Driscoll Substation yard. The site is fully developed with impervious and rocked surfaces, and consists of the substation equipment, control house, storage yard, and parking areas. The site is surrounded by private forested land and BPA transmission line rights-of-way.

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			
	Explanation: No adverse effect to historic properties determination made by BPA Contract Historian, Tama Tochihara, on February 8, 2018. Oregon SHPO concurrence received on March 13, 2018.			
2.	Geology and Soils			
	Explanation: No ground disturbance would occur.			
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)	V		
	Explanation: None present.			
6.	Wetlands			
	Explanation: None present.			
7.	Groundwater and Aquifers	V		
	Explanation: No new wells or use of groundwater proposed.			
8.	Land Use and Specially Designated Areas	~		
	Explanation: No specially designated areas or land use changes.			

9. Visual Quality	V				
<u>Explanation</u> : Modifications would not be noticeably different from existing conditions. The new roof color would match the existing roof color.					
10. Air Quality	<u>~</u>				
Explanation: No dust or other air quality distur	Explanation: No dust or other air quality disturbance would be generated.				
11. Noise					
Explanation: Temporary construction noise du	ring daylight hours. Ορε	erational noise would not change.			
12. Human Health and Safety					
Explanation: No known contamination or haza	rdous conditions at proj	ect location.			
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 nature products that preexist in the environment such that there would be uncontrolled or unpermitted					
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> : No notification. All work on BPA fee-owned property with no visual or other effects to adjacent landowners.					
Based on the foregoing, this proposed project does not have the potential to cause significant impacts					

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

Signed: <u>/s/ Tish Eaton</u> Date: <u>March 16, 2018</u>

Tish Eaton, ECT-4

Environmental Protection Specialist)