Categorical Exclusion Determination

Bonneville Power Administration Department of Energy



Proposed Action: Intalco Substation Maintenance Vehicle Storage Building Siding Repair

Project Manager: Christopher Ross, NWM-1

Location: Whatcom County, Washington

<u>Categorical Exclusion Applied (from Subpart D, 10 C.F.R. Part 1021):</u> B2.5 Facility safety and environmental improvements

<u>Description of the Proposed Action:</u> Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) proposes to remove and replace exterior siding on the maintenance vehicle storage building at Intalco Substation in Whatcom, Washington. The building's existing exterior siding has been damaged and deteriorated from water intrusion and rotting.

Specifically, a BPA crew would remove approximately four to five feet from the ground up of damaged existing exterior siding on all four 32-foot long walls, then install new exterior cement board siding and paint it to match the color of the existing siding. To make the new siding weather tight, new water-resistant barrier building paper, new flashing, and new waterproof caulking would be installed as well. In addition, damaged existing two-by-two wood trimmings would be resecured to the side of the building or removed and replaced as needed.

The project would not involve ground disturbance and would use existing access roads and work areas.

<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, 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/ Ronald "RJ" Theofield

Ronald "RJ" Theofield Contract Environmental Protection Specialist Portland State University

Reviewed by:	
/s/ Carol Leiter Carol Leiter Supervisory Environmental Protection Specialist	

Concur:

/s/ Sarah T. Biegel
Sarah T. Biegel
NEPA Compliance Officer October 13, 2020 Date

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: Intalco Substation Maintenance Vehicle Storage Building Siding Repair

Project Site Description

The project site is located at Intalco Substation in Whatcom County, Washington (Township 39 North, Range 1 East, and Section 20). The project would be within the fenced area of the substation, which is on BPA fee-owned property. The site has numerous electrical equipment and associated structures, and its surface is covered by mainly gravel and concrete for several roadways. The substation is less than a mile from the Strait of Georgia and the surrounding area consists of forested land and rural residential properties.

Evaluation of Potential Impacts to Environmental Resources

1. Historic and Cultural Resources

Potential for Significance: No

Explanation: While Intalco Substation is an eligible historic district, its maintenance vehicle storage building was constructed in 1991 and therefore, does not contribute to the historic district. On October 6, 2020, a BPA historian reviewed the project and determined the proposed work would have no potential to affect historic structures and, as no ground disturbance would occur as part of the undertaking, this project would also have no potential to affect historic resources.

2. Geology and Soils

Potential for Significance: No

<u>Explanation</u>: The proposed work would not require ground-disturbing activities.

3. Plants (including Federal/state special-status species and habitats)

Potential for Significance: No

Explanation: All work in existing substation yard; no special-status species present/disturbed. Existing roadways would be used.

4. Wildlife (including Federal/state special-status species and habitats)

Potential for Significance: No

Explanation: All work in existing substation yard; no habitat present.

5. Water Bodies, Floodplains, and Fish (including Federal/state special-status species, ESUs, and habitats)

Potential for Significance: No

<u>Explanation</u>: The proposed activities would not require in-water work or ground disturbances that would produce sediment that could enter nearby waterways.

6. Wetlands

Potential for Significance: No

<u>Explanation</u>: The proposed activities would not require ground disturbance that would produce sediment that could enter nearby wetlands.

7. Groundwater and Aquifers

Potential for Significance: No

Explanation: No ground disturbance is proposed.

8. Land Use and Specially-Designated Areas

Potential for Significance: No

<u>Explanation</u>: There would be no change in land use and the site is not located in a speciallydesignated area.

9. Visual Quality

Potential for Significance: No

<u>Explanation</u>: The new exterior siding would be a different material than the original, but it would match the color of the existing siding. Therefore, it would be visually consistent with the existing siding.

10. Air Quality

Potential for Significance: No

<u>Explanation</u>: The activities would generate a small amount of vehicle emissions and dust during construction.

11. Noise

Potential for Significance: No

Explanation: Some temporary construction noise would occur during daylight hours.

12. Human Health and Safety

Potential for Significance: No

<u>Explanation</u>: Workers would follow all standard safety protocols. Activities would not impact human health or 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:

Threaten a violation of applicable statutory, regulatory, or permit requirements for environment, safety, and health, or similar requirements of DOE or Executive Orders.

Explanation: N/A

Require siting and construction or major expansion of waste storage, disposal, recovery, or treatment facilities (including incinerators) that are not otherwise categorically excluded.

Explanation: N/A

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: N/A

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: N/A

Landowner Notification, Involvement, or Coordination

<u>Description</u>: No notification – all work on BPA fee-owned property.

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

Signed: /s/ Ronald "RJ" Theofield October 13, 2020

Ronald "RJ" Theofield, ECT-4 Date

Contract Environmental Protection Specialist

Portland State University