Bonneville Power Administration

memorandum

DATE: January 8, 2013

REPLY TO

ATTN OF: KEPR-4

SUBJECT: Environmental Clearance Memorandum

то: Gregory L Vassallo

Electical Engineer – TPCV-ALVEY

Proposed Action: Rogue-Gold Beach No. 2 disconnect switch replacement

Pollution Prevention and Abatement Project No.: 2411

Categorical Exclusion Applied (from Subpart D, 10 C.F.R. Part 1021): B4.6 Additions and

modifications to transmission facilities

Location: Curry County, Oregon

Proposed by: Bonneville Power Administration (BPA)

<u>Description of the Proposed Action</u>: BPA and Coos-Curry Electric Cooperative, Inc. (Coos-Curry) have developed a joint plan to replace the existing B-1734 115-kilovolt, group-operated disconnect switch located at BPA's Gold Beach Substation with a new horizontally-mounted, 1600 Amp disconnect switch and load break attachment. The new disconnect switch would be mounted on a new disconnect switchstand installed at BPA's Gold Beach Substation.

The existing B-1734 disconnect switch, installed in 1971, is near the end of its life due to harsh coastal environment. The wood pole is also approaching the end of its life (40-50 years for the coast). Moving the disconnect switch from its present location on a wood pole inside BPA's Gold Beach Substation, to a new location (horizontally-mounted on a switchstand inside BPA's Gold Beach Substation) will make it easier to maintain and resolve maintenance and jurisdiction concerns. At the present location, BPA owns B-1734 and Coos Curry maintains it because they own the wood pole it is mounted on.

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.

The proposed project will not affect any listed threatened or endangered species or designated critical habitat under the Endangered Species Act, or historic properties under the National Historic Preservation Act. The project will not have any visual impacts.

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/ Philip W. Smith
Philip W. Smith
Manager, Technical & Regional Services

Concur: /s/ Katherine S. Pierce DATE: January 8, 2013

Katherine S. Pierce NEPA Compliance Officer

Environmental Checklist for Categorical Exclusions

| Name of Proposed Project: Rog | gue-Gold Beach N | o. 2 disconnect switch re | placement |
|---|------------------|----------------------------------|---|
| Work Order #: 00005022, Task | 1 | | |
| 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 | S | No Potential for Significance | No Potential, with Conditions (describe) |
| 1. Historic Properties and Cultural R | esources | X | |
| Routine work to be performed within existing substation yard no potential to impact historic or cultural resources. | | | |
| 2. T & E Species, or their habitat(s) All work within existing substation deve | loned yard | X | |
| Floodplains or wetlands | ioped yard | X | |
| 4. Areas of special designation | | X | |
| 5. Health & safety | | X | |
| 6. Prime or unique farmlands | | X | |
| 7. Special sources of water | | X | |
| 8. Other – Visual Impacts | | X | |
| List supporting documentation attached (if needed): | | | |
| Signed: <i>Philip W. Smith</i> | | Date: <i>January 7</i> , 2013 | |

Philip W. Smith, KEPR-4