Categorical Exclusion Determination

Bonneville Power Administration Department of Energy



Proposed Action: Equipment Ownership Transfer at Stateline Substation

Project Manager: Jay Largo—TPCV-TPP-4

Location: Umatilla County, Oregon

Categorical Exclusion Applied (from Subpart D, 10 C.F.R. Part 1021): B1.24 Property

transfers

<u>Description of the Proposed Action</u>: Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) proposes to transfer ownership of transformers and associated equipment at Columbia Rural Electric Association's (CREA) Stateline Substation. CREA would take ownership of BPA's equipment at CREA's substation.

<u>Findings</u>: 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/ Beth Belanger

Beth Belanger Contract Environmental Protection Specialist Flux Resources, LLC

Reviewed by:

/s/ David K. Kennedy

David K. Kennedy

Executive Manager, Environmental Planning and Analysis

Concur:

/s/ Katey Grange Date: September 9, 2019

Katey Grange

NEPA Compliance Officer

Attachment: 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: Equipment Ownership Transfer at Stateline Substation

Project Site Description

The project location is at the Stateline Substation in Umatilla County, Oregon, located approximately three miles south of the Oregon-Washington border and eight miles west of the town of Milton-Freewater. The site is in Section 28, Township 6 North, Range 34 East. The surrounding area is a mixed use of agricultural production and windpower facilities.

An unnamed stream and riparian area are located 150-feet west of the substation. There are no wetlands within close proximity of the substation.

Evaluation of Potential Impacts to Environmental Resources

	Environmental Resource Impacts	No Potential for Significance	No Potential for Significance, with Conditions
1.	Historic and Cultural Resources	V	
	Explanation: The BPA Historian review has sl would not adversely impact the integrity of the occur as a result of this undertaking. The Stat which falls within the period of significance, ar house exists at the substation, the site does not 106 review is required.	Stateline Substation, a teline Substation was o nd was later sold to CR	and no ground disturbance would designed and built by BPA in 1973, EA. However, since only a metering
2.	Geology and Soils		
	Explanation: The proposed action would not therefore, there would be no impact to geolog		r ground disturbing activities;
3.	Plants (including Federal/state special-status species and habitats)	~	
	Explanation: The proposed action would not therefore, there would be no impact to plants		r ground disturbing activities;
4.	Wildlife (including Federal/state special- status species and habitats)	~	
	Explanation: The proposed action would not therefore, there would be no impact to wildlif		r ground disturbing activities;
5.	Water Bodies, Floodplains, and Fish (including Federal/state special-status species, ESUs, and habitats)	V	
	Explanation: The proposed action would not therefore, there would be on impact to water		

6.	Wetlands	▽			
	Explanation: The proposed action would not involve therefore, there would be on impact to wetlands	construction or ground disturbing	ng activities;		
7.	Groundwater and Aquifers	V			
	Explanation: The proposed action would not involve therefore, there would be no impact to groundwater		ng activities;		
8.	Land Use and Specially-Designated Areas				
	Explanation: There would be no change to land use areas in the vicinity.	at the site and there are no spe	ecially-designated		
9.	Visual Quality	▽			
Explanation: There would be no change to the visual quality at the site.					
10.	Air Quality	V			
	Explanation: There would be no impacts to air quali	ty.			
11.	Noise	V			
	Explanation: There would be no noise impacts.				
12.	Human Health and Safety	▼			
	Explanation: There would be no impacts to human I	nealth 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:					
V	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. Explanation, if necessary:					

Landowner Notification, Involvement, or Coordination

<u>Description</u>: No landowner notification or coordination would be necessary, since this is an equipment property transfer between BPA and CREA, the owners of the substation.

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

Signed: <u>/s/ Beth Belanger</u> Date: <u>September 9, 2019</u>

Beth Belanger, ECT-4

Contract Environmental Protection Specialist

Flux Resources, LLC