Categorical Exclusion Determination

Bonneville Power Administration
Department of Energy



Proposed Action: Raymond Substation Entrance Bridge Re-decking Project

Project Manager: Erich Orth, TELF-TPP-3

PPA Proj #: **4213**

<u>Location</u>: Pacific County, Washington

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

<u>Description of the Proposed Action</u>: Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) is proposing to resurface the bridge crossing of Butte Creek, which leads to BPA's Raymond Substation. The bridge decking is in severe deterioration and may become unsafe for travel. Tasks include: removing old treated timber decking, placing a steel bridge deck pan, and laying asphalt inside the steel pan. New DOT compliant guard rails would be installed. Tarps would be deployed under the work area to catch any debris that may fall during the demolition and road surfacing. Erosion control materials would be installed to protect the stream during the work.

Additionally, BPA would complete restorative maintenance to an access road on BPA fee property that leads to the East side of the substation from Butte Creek Road. Maintenance would include moving vegetation, addition of rock road surfacing, and installation of a new gate. Due to the bridge work, access to the substation may be limited up to three weeks. For reliability and emergency purposes, this road work must be completed prior to the bridge maintenance.

The location of the bridge maintenance project is:

Transmission Facility	Township	Range	Section	Land Use
Raymond Substation	14N	9W	12	BPA Fee owned

<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/ <u>Greg Tippetts</u>
Greg Tippetts EPR/Olympia
Olympia District Environmental Scientist

Concur:

/s/ <u>Sarah T. Biegel</u> Date: <u>June 25, 2019</u> Sarah T. Biegel 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: Raymond Substation Entrance Bridge Re-decking Project

Project Site Description

The project involves maintenance of access roads, including the bridge crossing of Butte Creek from State HWY 101 leading to Raymond Substation. The project is entirely on BPA fee owned land.

Evaluation of Potential Impacts to Environmental Resources

1.	Environmental Resource Impacts Historic and Cultural Resources	No Potential for Significance	No Potential for Significance, with Conditions			
1.	Explanation: All work would be completed on existing access roads consisting of imported rock and road surfacing, including timbers and asphalt. The project does not involve any ground-disturbing activities. BPA cultural staff (ECC) have reviewed to project for potential impacts to historical or culturally sensitive resources. In an email response for the project on May 10 th , 2019, BPA Archaeologist Tama Tochihara stated, "Raymond Substation has been evaluated as a historic substation district in a recent intensive level survey and the substation was determined not eligible, with concurrence from the State Historic Preservation Office. This bridge was not included in the evaluation, but would be a contributing structure to the district. Because the district is not eligible the bridge would also be determined not eligible. The undertaking for bridge maintenance and improvements would have no potential to effect and can proceed without further Section 106 review."					
	If from some reason resources are discovered darchaeological resources (BPA and WA DAHP) w		ork would cease and the appropriate			
2.	Geology and Soils					
	<u>Explanation</u> : The project does not involve any gostormwater BMPs would be used during the projects.					
3.	Plants (including federal/state special-status species)					
	Explanation: Work would occur within the exist special-status species are present within the pro-	~	sings. No vegetation is present. No			
4.	Wildlife (including federal/state special- status species and habitats)					
	Explanation: Work would occur within the exist mapped special-status species are known to be		d not be considered wildlife habitat. No			

5.	Water Bodies, Floodplains, and Fish (including federal/state special-status species and ESUs)					
	Explanation: During bridge decking demolition and resurfacing activities, tarps would be hung underneath the bridge to catch any debris that may fall. No debris would be allowed to fall into the water. Stormwater BMPs would be used during the project to protect butte creek from project runoff. No in-water work is authorized for the project. No FEMA-mapped floodplains are mapped within the project site. No ESA or EFH listed species are known to inhabit the creek.					
6.	Wetlands	▽				
	Explanation: Aside from Butte Creek itself, no wetlands are within the project boundary. No in-water work is authorized for the project.					
7.	Groundwater and Aquifers	~				
	<u>Explanation</u> : Project activities do not have the potential to impact groundwater or aquifers, including public and private water wells or springs. Any spills would be addressed immediately and follow BPA protocol for cleanup and regulatory notifications.					
8.	Land Use and Specially Designated Areas	~				
	Explanation: The project is located entirely on BPA fee owned land associated with Raymond Substation. Project locations do not include any specially-designated areas.					
9.	Visual Quality	<u> </u>				
	Explanation: Proposed action at existing facilities would not alter or affect visual quality.					
10.	Air Quality	V				
	Explanation: The project has a short duration and involves normal construction equipment activities. A small amount of vehicle emissions is expected due to construction.					
11.	Noise	~				
	<u>Explanation</u> : The project is located away from any populated areas and places of residence. Noise disturbance would be limited to general construction equipment activities, would be for a short duration, and would occur during daylight hours.					
12.	Human Health and Safety	V				
	Explanation: No known hazardous conditions are known.					

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

Description: NA. BPA is the property owner

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

Signed: /s/ Greq Tippetts Date: June 25, 2019

Greg Tippetts KEPR/Olympia

Olympia District Environmental Scientist