

Categorical Exclusion Determination

Bonneville Power Administration

Department of Energy



Proposed Action: Raver Maintenance Headquarters Enhancements

Project Manager: Staci Pfau—NWM-1

Location: King County, Washington

Categorical Exclusion Applied (from Subpart D, 10 C.F.R. Part 1021): B2.1 Workplace enhancements, B2.3 Personnel safety and health equipment

Description of the Proposed Action: Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) proposes to remodel the existing bathroom within the Raver Maintenance Headquarters (MHQ) and to install door shields at two entrances to the building. The bathroom remodel would consist of moving one of the walls out 5-feet, adding a cabinet, replacing a fan, and upgrading a wall heater. The door shields are needed to prevent the wind from blowing the doors open. The shields would be anchored to the existing concrete steps and the handrail at the rear and side entrances. The wind shield materials would be made of tempered glass, with metal frames that would match the color of the exterior siding.

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 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 Recruiting & Staffing

Reviewed by:

/s/ Gene Lynard

Gene Lynard
Supervisory Environmental Protection Specialist

Concur:

/s/ Stacy L. Mason

Stacy L. Mason
NEPA Compliance Officer

Date: 10/13/2017

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: Raver Maintenance Headquarters Enhancements

Project Site Description

The project location is at BPA's Raver Substation, in King County, Washington. The building is in Sections 4 & 5 of Township 21 North, Range 7 East. The substation is located on Retreat-Kanasket Road, approximately 5 miles east of Maple Valley. The surrounding area consists of second-growth woodlands and sparsely developed rural—residential properties.

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"/>
<p><u>Explanation:</u> The Raver Substation was previously determined eligible for listing, as a district, to the National Register of Historic Places. Section 106 consultation was initiated on July 20, 2017 with the Washington State Department of Archaeology & Historic Preservation (DAHP), Muckleshoot Indian Tribe, Puyallup Tribe of Indians, Snoqualmie Tribe, and Tulalip Tribes.</p> <p>The bathroom remodel and door shield installations were determined by the BPA Historian to have no adverse effect to this historic resource. On September 1, 2017, BPA sent a determination of effect letter to the consulting parties listed above.</p> <p>DAHP concurred with the no adverse effect finding on September 6, 2017. None of the tribes responded.</p>		
2. Geology and Soils	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><u>Explanation:</u> The project would not involve any ground disturbance; therefore, there would be no impact to geology or soils.</p>		
3. Plants (including federal/state special-status species)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><u>Explanation:</u> The project would not involve any ground disturbance; therefore, there would be no impact to special-status plant species.</p>		
4. Wildlife (including federal/state special-status species and habitats)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><u>Explanation:</u> The project would not remove any habitat and is occurring within a fenced area; therefore, there would be no impact to special-status wildlife species.</p>		

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



Explanation: The project would not involve any ground disturbance; therefore, there would be no impact to water bodies, floodplains, or fish.

6. **Wetlands**



Explanation: The project would not involve any ground disturbance; therefore, there would be no impact to wetlands.

7. **Groundwater and Aquifers**



Explanation: The project would not involve any ground disturbance; therefore, there would be no impact to groundwater and aquifers.

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



Explanation: The proposed project would not change land use at this location, nor would specially designated areas be impacted.

9. **Visual Quality**



Explanation: The visual quality would largely remain unchanged. The door shields would be installed on the back and side doors; therefore, the front-facing façade would not change.

10. **Air Quality**



Explanation: Air quality would not be impacted by this project.

11. **Noise**



Explanation: There would be minimal temporary noise during construction but no long-term change to the noise levels at this location.

12. **Human Health and Safety**



Explanation: The door shields would prevent exterior doors from swinging open from the wind; therefore, improving worker 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 facility is a BPA fee-owned property and construction noise would be minimal; therefore, landowner notification would not be required for this project.

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
Beth Belanger ECT-4

Date: 10/13/2017