Categorical Exclusion Determination

Bonneville Power Administration
Department of Energy



Proposed Action: Celilo Fred Johnson Building Sealant Replacement

Project Manager: David McAfee—NWM-PSB-2

Location: Wasco 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>: The project would replace the joint sealant (caulking) located on the exterior walls of the Fred Johnson Building at the Celilo Converter Station facility in The Dalles, Oregon. The sealant between the precast stone panels, masonry columns, windows, and metal louvers would be removed and replaced. The existing sealant has been tested and determined to contain elevated levels of polychlorinated biphenyl (PCBs), which would require abatement, and disposal at an approved landfill.

<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 Staffing & Recruiting

Reviewed by:

/s/ Katey Grange

Katey Grange

Acting Supervisory Environmental Protection Specialist

Concur:

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

Attachment: Environmental Checklist

Date: *January 25, 2019*

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: Celilo Fred Johnson Building Sealant Replacement

Project Site Description

The project location is the Fred Johnson building, located at Bonneville Power Administration's (BPA) Celilo Converter Station in The Dalles, Oregon. The building is located in Section 6, Township 1 North, Range 14 East. The surrounding area is a mix of undeveloped shrub-steppe habitat and agricultural land.

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: The Celilo Convertor Station and Fred Johnson Building were constructed in 1967 and are eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. On May 25, 2017, no adverse effect determination letters were sent to the Oregon State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation, Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation and Confederated Tribes and Bands of the Yakama Nation. No responses were received from any of the consulting parties.					
		historian determined that the project would have no adverse effect on the building, as long as the ment sealant matches the original sealant color and the surrounding façade.				
2.	Geology and Soils	~				
	Explanation: The project does not involve any gro properly abated to prevent PCB contamination of	_	s. Removal of the sealant would be			
3.	Plants (including federal/state special-status species)					
	Explanation: The project area does not contain ar	ny special-status plants;	therefore, there would be no effect.			
4.	Wildlife (including federal/state special- status species and habitats)					
	Explanation: The project area does not contain su swallows, which are protected by the Migratory B		-			
	✓ Work would not occur during the critical ness no nesting activity would be necessary.	sting period for swallow	rs (April 15-August 15) or verification of			
5.	Water Bodies, Floodplains, and Fish (including federal/state special-status species and ESUs)	V				
	Explanation: There are no water bodies, floodplaieffect.	ins, or fish in the projec	t area; therefore, there would be no			

6.	Wetlands	V				
	Explanation: There are no wetlands in the project area; therefore, there would be no impacts to wetlands.					
7.	Groundwater and Aquifers	V				
	Explanation: The project does not involve ground disturbance; therefore, there would be no impact to groundwater or aquifers.					
8.	Land Use and Specially Designated Areas	V				
	Explanation: The site is zoned as an Urban Area within the Columbia River Gorge National Scenic Area (CRGNSA) that is exempt from CRGNSA regulations. The underlying land use would not change as a result of this project.					
9.	Visual Quality	V				
	Explanation: The visual quality would not change as a re	sult of this project.				
10.	Air Quality	V				
	<u>Explanation</u> : A small amount of dust and vehicle emissions would occur; however, there would be no significant changes to air quality during or after construction.					
11.	Noise	V				
	<u>Explanation</u> : Construction noise would be temporary an would not change.	d would occur during daylight hour	s. Operation noise			
12.	Human Health and Safety		~			
	<u>Explanation</u> : The construction contractor would be required to manage the waste according to acceptable regulatory practices and mandate that workers comply with OSHA health and safety standards. There would be no impact to human health and safety.					
Evaluation of Other Integral Elements						
The proposed project would also meet conditions that are integral elements of the categorical exclusion. The project would not:						
~	ment, safety, and					
	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, products that preexist in the environment such that there	•	•			
	<u>Explanation, if necessary</u> : Building materials containing PCB compounds would be disposed of at a BPA approved landfill. The construction contractor would be required to manage the waste according to acceptable regulatory practices and mandate that workers comply with OSHA health and safety standards.					
~	Involve genetically engineered organisms, synthetic biolo invasive species, unless the proposed activity would be c					

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

Explanation, if necessary:

Landowner Notification, Involvement, or Coordination

<u>Description</u>: The project would occur on BPA fee-owned property. There are no nearby landowners that would be affected by the project; therefore, landowner notification would not be required.

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: <u>January 25, 2019</u>

Beth Belanger, ECT-4

Contract Environmental Protection Specialist

Motus Staffing & Recruiting