

Categorical Exclusion Determination

Bonneville Power Administration

Department of Energy



Proposed Action: Sickler MHQ SPC Lab Project

Project Manager: Sean LaFreniere—NWM-1

Location: Douglas County, Washington

Categorical Exclusion Applied (from Subpart D, 10 C.F.R. Part 1021): B2.1 Workplace enhancements, B1.31 Installation or relocation of machinery and equipment

Description of the Proposed Action: Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) proposes to convert an underutilized conference room into a lab for use by the System Protection & Control (SPC) work group. The conference room is located on the ground floor, near the center of the Sickler Maintenance Headquarters (MHQ) building. The project would involve removing a divider wall, to expand the size of the room, relocating a door, and installing additional IT wall jacks.

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 Staffing & Recruiting

Reviewed by:

/s/ Gene Lynard

Gene Lynard

Supervisory Environmental Protection Specialist

Concur:

/s/ Sarah T. Biegel

Sarah T. Biegel

NEPA Compliance Officer

Date: March 16, 2018

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: Sickler MHQ SPC Lab Project

Project Site Description

The project location is at BPA's Sickler Maintenance Headquarters (MHQ) in eastern Washington. The building is located in Section 35 of Township 24 North, Range 20 East. The site is east of the Columbia River, located between Lincoln Rock State Park and Highway 97. The surrounding habitat consists of a shrub/steppe ecosystem.

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 BPA contract historian has reviewed the undertaking and determined that the activity would have no potential to cause effects to historic properties. Sickler Substation is an eligible contributing historic district; however, the MHQ was built in 1976, which does not meet the minimum requirements for eligibility. For a built resource within a substation to be eligible under the Multiple Property Documentation Form, it must, at a minimum, be owned and operated all or in part by the Bonneville Power Administration during some portion of the period of significance (pre 1975).</p>		
2. Geology and Soils	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><u>Explanation:</u> The proposed project does not involve 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 proposed project does not involve ground disturbance; therefore, there would be no impact to special-status plants.</p>		
4. Wildlife (including federal/state special-status species and habitats)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><u>Explanation:</u> The proposed project would occur within the existing building and would not involve ground disturbance; therefore, there would be no impact to special-status wildlife.</p>		

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



Explanation: The proposed project would occur within the existing building and would not involve ground disturbance; therefore, there would be no impact to water bodies, floodplains, or fish.

6. **Wetlands**



Explanation: The proposed project would occur within the existing building and would not involve ground disturbance; therefore, there would be no impact to wetlands.

7. **Groundwater and Aquifers**



Explanation: The proposed project would occur within the existing building and would not involve 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 remain unchanged.

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 there would be no long-term change to the noise levels at this location.

12. **Human Health and Safety**



Explanation: The project was initiated to provide the SPC workgroup a more centrally located work area to reduce heavy lifting of equipment. The project would improve worker safety.

The building is known to have lead and asbestos materials in the construction materials. For protection of human health, workers would be required to comply with relevant Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) standards. Asbestos and lead-containing construction materials would be disposed of at a BPA approved landfill, in accordance with Federal and local regulations.

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 is occurring within interior spaces; therefore, landowner notification would not be required.

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
Contract Environmental Protection Specialist
Motus Staffing & Recruiting

Date: March 16, 2018