

Categorical Exclusion Determination

Bonneville Power Administration
Department of Energy



Proposed Action: Covington Untanking Tower Door Repair

Project Manager: Christopher Ross—NWM-1

Location: King County, Washington

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

Description of the Proposed Action: Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) proposes to repair the existing sliding garage door of the untanking tower building at the Covington Maintenance Headquarters. The untanking tower is a tall building that was originally used for making repairs to transformers, which could be rolled into the building for maintenance activities. The concrete wheel guard on the lower side of the garage door frame, has water damage, which has resulted in expansion of the concrete and angle iron; therefore, making it difficult to close the sliding garage door. The repairs would consist of removing the concrete and removing some of the outer edge angle iron. The area would then be resurfaced with concrete, replacement angle iron added, and painted to match the existing color of the garage door frame and wheel guard. There would be no ground disturbance.

Findings: 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, Jul. 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
Flux Resources, LLC

Reviewed by:

/s/ Carol Leiter

Carol Leiter
Supervisory Environmental Protection Specialist

Concur:

/s/ Katey Grange
Katey Grange
NEPA Compliance Officer

Date: March 4, 2020

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: Covington Untanking Tower Door Repair

Project Site Description

The proposed project area is at BPA's Covington Maintenance Headquarters (MHQ) in King County, Washington. It is in Section 36, Township 22 North, Range 5 East. The site is graveled and the surrounding area is developed with the Covington Substation and other BPA facility buildings. Covington MHQ is in the Lower Green River Watershed. Jenkins Creek is the nearest body of water and is located 0.10 miles southeast of the project area. There are no wetlands or waterbodies at, or within close proximity to the site.

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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<u>Explanation:</u> The Covington untanking tower building was constructed in the early 1940s and is listed on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), as a contributing and individually significant resource. The proposed project was reviewed by BPA's Historian and determined to have no potential to effect the building's listing on the NRHP. The project would be considered a maintenance activity that would overall improve the lifespan of the building.		
2. Geology and Soils	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<u>Explanation:</u> The project would not involve any ground disturbing activities; therefore, there would be no impacts to geology or soils.		
3. Plants (including Federal/state special-status species and habitats)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<u>Explanation:</u> The project would not impact any vegetation, including Federally-listed or special-status plant species.		
4. Wildlife (including Federal/state special-status species and habitats)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<u>Explanation:</u> The work is occurring at a substation facility and would not impact wildlife. The noise levels of the door repairs would be consistent with ambient noise of the operations at the substation.		
5. Water Bodies, Floodplains, and Fish (including Federal/state special-status species, ESUs, and habitats)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<u>Explanation:</u> The project area does not have any water bodies, floodplains, or listed fish species; therefore, there would be no impacts to these resources.		
6. Wetlands	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<u>Explanation:</u> The project area does not contain wetlands; therefore, there would be no impacts to wetlands.		

7. **Groundwater and Aquifers**



Explanation: The project does not involve any ground-disturbing activities: therefore, there would be no impacts to groundwater or aquifers.

8. **Land Use and Specially-Designated Areas**



Explanation: There would be no change to land use at the project location. Additionally, there are no specially designated areas near the project site.

9. **Visual Quality**



Explanation: There would be no change to the visual quality of the project area.

10. **Air Quality**



Explanation: A small amount of dust and vehicle emissions would occur during construction; however, there would be no significant changes to air quality during or after construction.

11. **Noise**



Explanation: Construction noise would be temporary and would occur during daylight hours. Operational noise would not change.

12. **Human Health and Safety**



Explanation: During project activities all standard safety protocols would be followed. Repairing the door would increase safety and security at the site.

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: The building and underlying land is owned by BPA. This small amount of work would not require notification 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: /s/ Beth Belanger Date: March 4, 2020
Beth Belanger, ECT-4
Contract Environmental Protection Specialist
Flux Resources, LLC