

Categorical Exclusion Determination

Bonneville Power Administration
Department of Energy



Proposed Action: Shelton Control House Window Repairs and Landscaping Changes

Project No.: PID 5296

Project Manager: Christopher Ross

Location: Mason County, Washington

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

Description of the Proposed Action: Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) proposes to make repairs and changes at the Shelton Control House to enhance security. Glass panes in four windows and one door would be replaced. A clear anti-intrusion film would be added to windows and doors which face the street. The security card reader would be replaced. The landscaping would be changed from river rock to landscaping cloth with mulch. The landscaping changes would not require excavation or extend beyond the previously-installed river rock. No ground disturbance or vegetation removal would be required.

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, 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/ Kali Levy

Kali Levy
Contract Environmental Protection Specialist
Portland State University

Reviewed by:

/s/ Carol Leiter

Carol Leiter
Supervisory Environmental Protection Specialist

Concur:

/s/ Katey C. Grange August 18, 2021

Katey C. Grange Date
NEPA Compliance Officer

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: Shelton Control House Window Repairs and Landscaping Changes

Project Site Description

The project site is in Shelton, Mason County, Washington (Township 20 North, Range 4 West, Donation Land Claim 37). Activities would occur within previously-disturbed areas around the control house and the substation yard. Immediately surrounding the project site are businesses, a neighborhood, and a highway. Less than 0.5 mile from the project site there are areas of undeveloped partially forested land.

Evaluation of Potential Impacts to Environmental Resources

1. Historic and Cultural Resources

Potential for Significance: No

Explanation: Although constructed in 1947, the site was determined not eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). Additionally, the footprint of the substation has seen substantial disturbance (to a depth of upwards of 5 feet and extends upwards of 4 feet from the substation), and it is highly unlikely that archaeological resources would be identified during the project. BPA has determined, per 36 CFR 800.3(a)(1), that because no ground disturbance would occur as a result of this undertaking and no built historic resources are present, the proposed work would have no potential to cause effects to historic properties.

2. Geology and Soils

Potential for Significance: No

Explanation: River rocks would be removed and landscaping cloth and mulch put down, which would not require digging. No ground disturbance would occur, so there would be no impacts to soils and geology.

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

Potential for Significance: No

Explanation: Project actions would occur in areas previously landscaped with only river rock and little to no vegetation, so there would be no impacts to plants.

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

Potential for Significance: No

Explanation: Project actions would occur in previously disturbed areas around the control house and substation yard. No suitable special-status species habitat exists within or near the project area. Disturbances to wildlife from project noise are unlikely as the project site is in a developed area where noise from human activity would be common.

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

Potential for Significance: No

Explanation: Work would occur in existing, fenced, or graveled facilities; no water bodies, floodplains, or fish habitat affected.

6. Wetlands

Potential for Significance: No

Explanation: Work would occur in existing, fenced, or graveled facilities, no wetlands present.

7. Groundwater and Aquifers

Potential for Significance: No

Explanation: Work would occur in existing, fenced, or graveled facilities; no groundwater or aquifer impacts.

8. Land Use and Specially-Designated Areas

Potential for Significance: No

Explanation: No change in land use would occur.

9. Visual Quality

Potential for Significance: No

Explanation: The landscape would change from river rocks to mulch. The window and door frames would remain the same and the protective film added would be clear. The changes would not impact visual quality.

10. Air Quality

Potential for Significance: No

Explanation: Minor, temporary generation of emissions associated with increased vehicle traffic and construction equipment would occur during construction.

11. Noise

Potential for Significance: No

Explanation: Minor, intermittent noise associated with construction activities would occur during construction.

12. Human Health and Safety

Potential for Significance: No

Explanation: Personnel would use best management practices to protect worker health and 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

Description: The facility is BPA fee-owned property. No coordination needed.

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

Signed: /s/ Kali Levy

Kali Levy, ECT-4
Contract Environmental Protection Specialist
Portland State University

August 18, 2021

Date