Categorical Exclusion Determination
Bonneville Power Administration
Department of Energy

**Proposed Action:** Maple Valley Equipment Replacement

**PP&A No.:** 4266

**Project Manager:** Lawrence Carter, TEPF-CSB-2

**Location:** King County, Washington

**Categorical Exclusion Applied (from Subpart D, 10 C.F.R. Part 1021):** B4.6 – Additions and modifications to transmission facilities

**Description of the Proposed Action:** Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) proposes to replace and relocate existing potential transformers (PTs). The largest single excavation is 25 feet by 40 feet with a maximum depth of 5 feet deep. A total of 9 footings would be added and 1 removed. The proposed work would occur on BPA-owned land within the substation fence line at Maple Valley Substation.

Equipment used to perform this work may include a combination of the following: dump trucks, bulldozers, backhoes, excavators, and work trucks. All disturbed areas would be restored at the end of the project.

**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/ Jonah Reenders
Jonah Reenders
Physical Scientist

Concur

/s/ Katey Grange
Katey Grange
NEPA Compliance Office

Date: January 9, 2020

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: Maple Valley Equipment Replacement

---

**Project Site Description**

Work would occur within the fence line of the Maple Valley substation, which is graveled. The substation is located in Renton, WA approximately a half mile south of the Cedar River Natural Zone. Surrounding land use and vegetation is residential. There are no wetlands or waterbodies located within 500 feet of the substation.

---

**Evaluation of Potential Impacts to Environmental Resources**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Resource Impacts</th>
<th>No Potential for Significance</th>
<th>No Potential for Significance, with Conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Historic and Cultural Resources</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>❑️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Explanation:</strong> The BPA Historian review of the undertaking and determined that the Maple Valley Substation, although constructed in 1961, was previously determined in 2018 to be ineligible for listing in National Register of Historic Places. Therefore, the undertaking would have no potential to affect historic properties. Additionally, as no work would occur outside of the substation, the project would have no potential to effect archaeological resources.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Geology and Soils</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>❑️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Explanation:</strong> All ground-disturbing activities proposed as part of this project would take place within the previously disturbed substation yard. The proposed work would not substantially impact geology and soils.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Plants (including Federal/state special-status species and habitats)</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>❑️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Explanation:</strong> The work area does not contain vegetation and there are no federal/ state special status species in the project area.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Wildlife (including Federal/state special-status species and habitats)</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>❑️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Explanation:</strong> The project does not include habitat for any special status species. There would be no effect to ESA-listed species in the area. Temporary wildlife disturbance from noise may occur during project work.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Water Bodies, Floodplains, and Fish (including Federal/state special-status species, ESUs, and habitats)</td>
<td>❑️</td>
<td>☑️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Explanation:</strong> No in water work is proposed for this project and there are no floodplains present within the proposed work area. Best management practices would be used during construction to prevent sediment from migrating off site during ground disturbing activities and to keep concrete washout in designated areas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. **Wetlands**

   **Explanation:** There are no wetlands located within the vicinity of the project area.

7. **Groundwater and Aquifers**

   **Explanation:** Ground excavation would not be to a depth that would intersect ground water.

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

   **Explanation:** No change in land use would occur and project activities would not impact land use. No specially designated areas were identified within the project limits.

9. **Visual Quality**

   **Explanation:** There would be no change to the visual quality of the area as a result of the proposed activities.

10. **Air Quality**

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

11. **Noise**

    **Explanation:** Some temporary construction noise would occur during daylight hours. The operational noise of the transmission line would not change.

12. **Human Health and Safety**

    **Explanation:** During project activity all standard safety protocols would be followed. A site-specific health and safety plan would be prepared and implemented to address and hazards during the proposed work. Project activities would not impact human health or 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, if necessary:** 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, if necessary:** 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, if necessary:** 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.**
**Landowner Notification, Involvement, or Coordination**

Description: All activities would take place on BPA-owned land.

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

Signed: /s/ Jonah Reenders

Jonah Reenders
Physical Scientist - EPI

Date: January 9, 2020