Categorical Exclusion Determination
Bonneville Power Administration
Department of Energy

Proposed Action: Balancing Authority Area Services Agreement with Georgia-Pacific Consumer Products (Camas) LLC

Project No.: B0030

Project Manager: Deborah Staats, TEP-TPP-1

Location: Multnomah County, Oregon; Clark County, Washington; Spokane County, Washington

Categorical Exclusion Applied (from Subpart D, 10 C.F.R. Part 1021): B4.1 Contracts, policies, and marketing and allocation plans for electric power

Description of the Proposed Action: BPA proposes to enter into a Balancing Authority Area Services Agreement (BAASA) with Georgia-Pacific Consumer Products (Camas) LLC (Georgia-Pacific). The BAASA establishes operating and reliability requirements that would allow Georgia-Pacific to move the load and generation from its Camas Mill Facility, located in Clark County, Washington, from PacifiCorp’s Balancing Authority Area (BAA) to BPA’s BAA. The Camas Mill Facility consists of back-pressure steam turbines cable of up to 43 MW total generation, and would ultimately integrate with BPA’s BAA through an existing 69-kV distribution line owned by Clatskanie Public Utility District that interconnects at PacifiCorp’s Troutdale Substation in Multnomah County, Oregon, which is connected to BPA’s Troutdale Substation in Multnomah County, Oregon.

BPA would install and own new generation meters and communications hardware inside the Camas Mill Facility in the same location as PacifiCorp’s existing meters. Georgia-Pacific would bring a leased telephone line into the facility to connect to BPA’s new meter. BPA would telemeter to existing SCADA RTU (supervisory control and data acquisition remote terminal unit) at Sifton Substation, located in Clark County, Washington, and perform necessary updates at Dittmer and Munroe Control Centers, located respectively in Clark and Spokane counties, Washington. PacifiCorp would provide interchange metering via existing underground cable from PacifiCorp’s Troutdale Substation to BPA’s Troutdale Substation. All work would take place inside existing facilities and no ground-disturbing activities or building modifications would occur.

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/ Hannah Sharp
Hannah Sharp
Contract Environmental Protection Specialist
CorSource Technology Group

Reviewed by:

/s/ Gene Lynard
Gene Lynard
Supervisory Environmental Protection Specialist

Concur:

/s/ Katherine S. Pierce Date: September 16, 2015
Katherine S. Pierce
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: Balancing Authority Area Services Agreement with Georgia-Pacific Consumer Products (Camas) LLC

Project Site Description

All work would take place within existing BPA, Georgia-Pacific, and PacifiCorp facilities. No habitat or vegetation is present in the project areas.

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>Explanation: Because the project would not entail any ground disturbing activities or building modifications, BPA has determined that these project activities have no potential to affect historic properties provided that the project activities are carried out as described.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Geology and Soils</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanation: No soil disturbance proposed.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Plants (including federal/state special-status species)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanation: All work in existing facilities. No plants present.</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>Explanation: All work in existing facilities. No habitat present.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Water Bodies, Floodplains, and Fish (including federal/state special-status species and ESUs)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanation: No in-water work proposed. Project would not be in a floodplain.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Wetlands</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanation: None present.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. **Groundwater and Aquifers**

   **Explanation:** No soil disturbance proposed.

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

   **Explanation:** All work in existing facilities.

9. **Visual Quality**

   **Explanation:** All work in existing facilities. New equipment would not be noticeably different from existing conditions.

10. **Air Quality**

    **Explanation:** Small amount of dust possible during construction.

11. **Noise**

    **Explanation:** Temporary noise during construction.

12. **Human Health and Safety**

    **Explanation:** No known soil contamination or hazardous conditions.

### 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.
Landowner Notification, Involvement, or Coordination

Description: Coordination with PacifiCorp and Georgia-Pacific.

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

Signed: /s/ Hannah Sharp                    Date: September 16, 2015
Hannah Sharp                                
Contract Environmental Protection Specialist
CorSource Technology Group