United States Government

memorandum

DATE: August 21, 2012

REPLY TO ATTN OF: KEC-4

SUBJECT: Environmental Clearance Memorandum

Michael R. Gilchrist, Project Manager, TEP-TPP-1
 Gregory L. Vassalo, Coordinating Engineer, TPCV-Alvey

Proposed Action: Midstate Electric Cooperative, Inc, Integration Request, Line and Load Interconnection Request L0296 (*update to previous Categorical Exclusion issued on September 30, 2009*)

<u>Categorical Exclusion Applied (from Subpart D, 10 C.F.R. Part 1021)</u>: B4.11 – Electric power substations and interconnection facilities

Location: Deschutes County, Oregon

Proposed by: Bonneville Power Administration (BPA)

Description of the Proposed Action: BPA proposes to interconnect Midstate Electric Cooperative, Inc. (MEC) into the Federal Columbia River Transmission System at BPA's La Pine Substation in Deschutes County, OR. The original interconnection proposal involved developing a tap on BPA's Pilot Butte-La Pine 230-kilovolt (kV) transmission line through the installation of three disconnect switches and installing revenue metering equipment at MEC's proposed Lava Cast Substation. However, due to changes in the project scope, BPA now proposes to develop a new electrical bay (breaker and relay/disconnect switches) at La Pine Substation that would serve as a terminal for a new MEC 115-kV line. The new bay would be within the existing fenced electrical yard and would involve the relocation of existing transmission line terminations to existing bays within the substation. BPA would also install revenue metering equipment within the substation. MEC would design, construct, and own a new 17-mile long 115-kV line. The interconnection would help MEC serve load growth, provide operational flexibility, and improve overall system reliability within the La Pine, Oregon, area.

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 <u>not</u> (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.

<u>/s/ Andrew M. Montaño</u> Andrew M. Montaño, PMP Environmental Project Manager

Concur:

<u>/s/ Stacy Mason</u> Stacy Mason NEPA Compliance Officer Date: August 23, 2012

Attachment: Environmental Checklist for Categorical Exclusions

Environmental Checklist for Categorical Exclusions

Name of Proposed Project:	Midstate Electric Cooperative, Inc, Integration Request, Line and	
	Load Interconnection Request L0296 (update to previous	
	Categorical Exclusion issued on September 30, 2009)	

Work Order #: 00004866, Task 4

This project does <u>not</u> have the potential to cause significant impacts on the following environmentally sensitive resources. See 10 CFR 1021, Subpart D, Appendix B for complete descriptions of the resources. This checklist is to be used as a summary – further discussion may be included in the Categorical Exclusion Memorandum.

Environmental Resources	No Potential for Significance	No Potential, with Conditions (describe)
1. Historic Properties and Cultural Resources OR SHPO Final Determination Concurrence received on Se	X ptember 24, 2009	
 T & E Species, or their habitat(s) All proposed work occurring within existing fenceline of the 	X e La Pine Substation	
3. Floodplains or wetlands n/a	X	
4. Areas of special designation n/a	X	
5. Health & safety n/a	X	
6. Prime or unique farmlands n/a	X	
 Special sources of water n/a 	X	
8. Other (describe)		

Supporting documentation in the official project file: Section 106 consultation for the National Historic Preservation Act

Signed: <u>/s/ Andrew M. Montaño</u> Date: <u>August 21, 2012</u>