

memorandum

DATE: May 16, 2012

REPLY TO
ATTN OF: KEC-4

SUBJECT: Environmental Clearance Memorandum

TO: Kelly Miller
Project Manager – TG-DITT-2

Proposed Action: BPA Acquisition of OTEC Disconnect Switch at the BPA LaGrande Substation

Categorical Exclusion Applied (from Subpart D, 10 C.F.R. Part 1021): Appendix B 1.24
Property Transfer

Location: BPA LaGrande Substation, in the City of LaGrande, Union County, Oregon

Proposed by: Bonneville Power Administration (BPA)

Description of the Proposed Action: BPA proposes to purchase the 230-kilovolt (kV) main bus disconnect switch (MB A-270) that is currently installed and operating within the BPA LaGrande Substation. The disconnect switch is owned by the Oregon Trail Electric Cooperative (OTEC). On October 7, 2011, the manager of engineering for OTEC requested that BPA purchase the disconnect switch. The disconnect switch is the only piece of equipment within Bay 3 of the LaGrande Substation that is not owned by BPA. BPA currently maintains the disconnect switch through a reimbursable agreement with OTEC.

Purchase of the disconnect switch is consistent with BPA's desire to own all network equipment within BPA substations. BPA would maintain the switch and could therefore remove the disconnect switch maintenance from the maintenance agreement with OTEC.

Because the disconnect switch is existing and currently operational there would be no construction impacts. Purchase of the disconnect switch would not result in any change in impacts and would not pose a threat to public health or the environment.

Findings: BPA has determined that the proposed action complies with Section 1021.410 and Appendix B of Subpart D 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). The proposed action does not present any extraordinary circumstances that may affect the significance of the environmental effects of the proposal. The proposal is not connected [40 C.F.R. 1508.25(a)(1)] to other actions with potentially significant impacts, has not been segmented to meet the definition of a categorical exclusion, is not related to other proposed actions with cumulatively significant impacts [40 C.F.R. 1508.25(a)(2)], and is not precluded by 40 C.F.R. 1506.1 or 10 C.F.R. 1021.211. Moreover, the proposed action would not (i) threaten a violation of applicable statutory, regulatory, or permit requirements for environment, safety, and health,

(ii) require siting and construction or major expansion of waste storage, disposal, recovery, or treatment facilities, (iii) disturb hazardous substances, pollutants, contaminants, or Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act-excluded petroleum and natural gas products that pre-exist in the environment such that there would be uncontrolled or unpermitted releases, (iv) have the potential to cause significant impacts on environmentally sensitive resources, or (v) 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.

This proposed action meets the requirements for the Categorical Exclusion referenced above. We therefore determine that the proposed action may be categorically excluded from further NEPA review and documentation.

/s/ Kimberly R. St.Hilaire
Kimberly R. St.Hilaire
Environmental Project Manager

Concur:

/s/ Stacy Mason
Stacy Mason
NEPA Compliance Officer

Date: May 16, 2012