

Categorical Exclusion Determination

Bonneville Power Administration

Department of Energy



Proposed Action: Wren Substation Fence Replacment

Project Manager: Jody Solmonsson – TEP-CSB-2

Location: Benton County, Oregon

Categorical Exclusion Applied (from Subpart D, 10 C.F.R. Part 1021): B1.11 Fencing

Description of the Proposed Action: Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) would remove the existing chain link fence system (fencing, poles, gates, barbed wire) at this location and replace it with approximately 700 linear feet of new steel fabric mesh fence panels and associated hardware, hinges, straps, rail, tightners, and barbed wire. Additionally, there would be approximately 260 fence poles and concrete footings. One 20-foot vehicle access gate, one 10-foot gate, and one 4-foot man gate would be installed. The grounding system would be expanded (copper conductors and ground rods) along with installation of added switchyard rock, as needed. Staging areas for the proposed project would be in the existing graveled parking area on the east side of the substation and on a grassy area on the north side of the substation.

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 Mason

Stacy L. Mason
NEPA Compliance Officer

Date: March 28, 2016

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: Wren Substation Fence Replacment

Project Site Description

The project location is at the Wren Substation, in western Oregon. Wren Substation is located in Township 11 South, Range 06 West, Section 28. The site is approximately five miles northwest of the town of Philomath. The surrounding topography consists of undulating hills, situated in between the Coast Range and the Willamette Valley. Neighboring parcels are comprised of a patchwork of livestock pastures, cultivated agricultural fields, and mid-seral forests. A review of the National Wetland Inventory, soil information, topography, and aerial photos did not reveal any wetlands or waterbodies at the site. Mary’s River is approximately 200-250 feet to the northwest.

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"/>
<u>Explanation:</u> The project was reviewed and it was determined that the substation has been previously surveyed for cultural resources and will therefore not need further review. The project is occurring within the existing substation footprint. In the event that cultural materials are located during construction, all work shall halt and a BPA archaeologist shall be notified.		
2. Geology and Soils	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<u>Explanation:</u> There would be minimal soil disturbance. All work is occurring in and around a previously disturbed substation yard.		
3. Plants (including federal/state special-status species)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<u>Explanation:</u> Although the project is close to critical habitat for Kincaid’s lupine, the substation does not have any lupine populations; therefore there would be no impact to this species. There would be no effect to any listed or special-status species.		
4. Wildlife (including federal/state special-status species and habitats)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<u>Explanation:</u> Although the project is close to critical habitat for Fender’s blue butterfly and Taylor’s checkerspot butterfly, the site does not have suitable habitat to support these species; therefore there would be no impact to these species. There would be no effect to any listed or special-status species.		
5. Water Bodies, Floodplains, and Fish (including federal/state special-status species and ESUs)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<u>Explanation:</u> The project area does not have any water bodies, floodplains, or listed fish species. The nearest waterbody is Mary’s River, which is located approximately 200 to 250 feet from the substation. Best		

management practices (BMP's) will be employed by the contractor to control erosion, sedimentation, and to prevent hazardous material spills.

6. **Wetlands**

Explanation: The project area does not have any wetlands.

7. **Groundwater and Aquifers**

Explanation: The project would not impact groundwater or aquifers.

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

Explanation: There would be no permanent changes to the land use at this location.

9. **Visual Quality**

Explanation: There would be no visual changes to the project area or surrounding environment.

10. **Air Quality**

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

11. **Noise**

Explanation: Temporary construction noise during daylight hours. Operation noise would not change.

12. **Human Health and Safety**

Explanation: No impact.

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 project would be occurring on BPA fee-owned property. There would be no visual or other effects to adjacent landowners.

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
Contract Environmental Protection Specialist
Motus Recruiting & Staffing

Date: March 28, 2016