

# Categorical Exclusion Determination

Bonneville Power Administration  
Department of Energy



**Proposed Action:** L0387 Leslie Road Tap - City of Richland Benton PUD Interconnection Project

**Project Manager:** Sarah Sprague – TEP-TPP-1

**Location:** Benton County, WA

**Categorical Exclusion Applied (from Subpart D, 10 C.F.R. Part 1021):** B4.11 Electric power substations and interconnection facilities

**Description of the Proposed Action:** This Interconnection is for shifting 29.5 Mega Volt Amp (MVA) of existing load and interconnecting 0.7 MVA of new load at the new customer substation to BPA's Badger Canyon-Reata 115kv Transmission Line. In the long term (approximately 2024), the load at the new interconnection point will increase to 36.6 MVA. The proposed new customer substation will be jointly owned, constructed, and operated by the City of Richland and Benton PUD and has a proposed energization date of December 2018. The plan of service for BPA calls for constructing a Loop-in near structure 1/10 of the Badger Canyon-Reata 115kv line for service to the new customer substation. A new point of delivery revenue meter will be required for each new line at the new customer substation and the new meters will require a cellular or Public Switch Telephone Network (PSTN) connection.

**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/ Michael Henjum

Michael Henjum

Environmental Protection Specialist

Concur:

/s/ Sarah T. Biegel

Sarah T. Biegel

NEPA Compliance Officer

Date: October 1, 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:** L0387 Leslie Road Tap - City of Richland Benton PUD Interconnection

---

## Project Site Description

The plan of service for BPA calls for constructing a Loop-in near structure 1/10 of the Badger Canyon-Reata 115kv line for service to the new customer substation. A new point of delivery revenue meter will be required for each new line at the new customer substation and the new meters will require a cellular or Public Switch Telephone Network (PSTN) connection.

The project area is adjacent to Leslie Road and is located approximately one-half mile away from Highway 82 and approximately 500 feet from the nearest residential housing development. The closest BPA Substation, Badger Canyon, is approximately 1 mile away. Several other housing developments exist within 1 mile of the project area. Increasing housing density exists northward towards the city of Franklin and increasing agricultural activity exists southward. The intermittent undeveloped areas consist of traditional Eastern Washington desert landscape, with patches of sage brush as the primary vegetation.

## Evaluation of Potential Impacts to Environmental Resources

Environmental Resource Impacts	No Potential for Significance	No Potential for Significance, with Conditions
1. <b>Historic and Cultural Resources</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><u>Explanation:</u> BPA's archaeologist determined that the tap upgrades would have no potential to affect historic properties or cultural resources. On July 17, 2018, the Washington State Department of Archaeology &amp; Historic Preservation concurred with this determination. The Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation (CTUIR) and The Yakama Nation were also consulted regarding the project. BPA did not receive responses from the tribes on project initiation or on BPA's determination of no effect.</p> <p><u>Note:</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>✓ Treat potential discoveries of archeological materials with the 'inadvertent discovery' guidelines: Stop work, contact BPA ECT lead and BPA ECC archeologist for further notifications, and ensure integrity of site and materials until further instructions.</li></ul>		
2. <b>Geology and Soils</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><u>Explanation:</u> Soils within the project area consist of hezel loamy fine sand with 2 to 15 percent slopes. This soil type falls within the somewhat excessively drained soils, which has moderately low runoff potential. Additionally, the closest surface water, the Columbia River, is approximately 3 miles away from the project site. Impacts to surface waters are thus not likely.</p>		
3. <b>Plants</b> (including federal/state special-status species)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><u>Explanation:</u> Temporal impacts to the existing vegetation are likely for vehicle and construction</p>		

equipment to access the project area. Long-term impacts to vegetation within the project area would be negligible. No special-status species are documented to exist within 5 miles of the project area.

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



Explanation: The project area is adjacent to mostly developed land and is in close proximity to the city of Franklin. No other unique environmental features (e.g., water bodies, wetlands, topographic variation) exist within or adjacent to the project area. Therefore, it is unlikely the project area is suitable for wildlife habitat. Additionally, no special-status species are known to exist within 5 miles of the project area.

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



Explanation: The closest waterbody, the Columbia River, is approximately 3 miles to the north of the project area and no direct pathway exists for water to reach this waterbody. Several housing developments exist between the project area and the Columbia River. No other water bodies, wetlands, or floodplains exist near the project area.

6. **Wetlands**



Explanation: The closest waterbody, the Columbia River, is approximately 3 miles to the north of the project area. No wetlands, floodplains, or other waterbodies are present in close proximity to the project area.

7. **Groundwater and Aquifers**



Explanation: Construction BMPs will be required to mitigate against onsite erosion and offsite sediment transport.

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



Explanation: The project would be consistent with existing land use. There are no specially designated areas.

9. **Visual Quality**



Explanation: The project area consists of several housing developments, power transmission and distribution rights-of-way, local roads, and Highway 82. The proposed work is consistent with the existing site conditions.

10. **Air Quality**



Explanation: A small amount of dust and vehicle emissions may occur during construction.

11. **Noise**



Explanation: A temporary increase in noise would occur during daylight hours during construction.

12. **Human Health and Safety**



Explanation: This project will require the review and approval of a site-specific safety plan, which would keep construction personnel and potential public bystanders safe during the short-term project implementation phase. No long-term impacts to human health and safety are anticipated.

### **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: Landowners were consulted as part of the City of Richlands SEPA process.

---

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

Signed: /s/ Michael Henjum  
Michael Henjum – ECT-4

Date: October 1, 208