

Categorical Exclusion Determination

Bonneville Power Administration

Department of Energy



Proposed Action: Amendment Number 5 to the Port Townsend Power Sales Agreement

Project Manager: Mark Miller, Customer Account Executive – PTL-5

Location: Portland, OR and Port Townsend, WA

Categorical Exclusion Applied (from Subpart D, 10 C.F.R. Part 1021): A2 – Clarifying or administrative contract actions

Description of the Proposed Action: Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) proposes to amend the firm power sales contract with Port Townsend Paper Corporation (Port Townsend) to modify the Minimum Demand under the contract, which represents the minimum amount of take-or-pay power that Port Townsend must purchase from BPA on an average hourly basis for each month. Because the April 2014 amendment to the contract increased the amount of power that BPA supplies to Port Townsend's existing and currently operating mill by 3.5 megawatts (MW), the proposed amendment seeks to increase the amount of minimum contract demand in proportion to this 3.5 MW increase.

The proposed amendment would modify the amount of Minimum Demand, from 6.326 MW, to the lesser of: 1) 8.138 MW; or 2) the hourly Peak Demand Entitlement established in Exhibit A of the contract. BPA expects to provide power from existing generation sources that would continue to operate within their normal operating limits. Accordingly, the amendment is administrative in nature and would not be expected to result in reasonably foreseeable environmental effects.

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, 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 A of 10 CFR 1021, Subpart D;
- (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/ Jeffrey J. Maslow

Jeffrey J. Maslow

Environmental Protection Specialist

Concur:

/s/ Stacy L. Mason

Stacy L. Mason

NEPA Compliance Officer

Date: October 23, 2014