

# Categorical Exclusion Determination

Bonneville Power Administration  
Department of Energy



**Proposed Action:** Equipment Sale at Westside Substation

**Project Manager:** Jay Largo, TPCV-TPP-4

**Location:** Bonneville County, Idaho

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

**Description of the Proposed Action:** Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) proposes to sell its Westside Substation assets and transfer ownership to Idaho Falls Power (IFP), who already owns the substation and the underlying land. The sale would include the BPA-owned control house and associated equipment, including protective line relays, transformer protection relays, breaker failure relays, relay communication equipment, sequential event recorder (SER), batteries, battery chargers, and metering equipment. BPA would also sell its substation equipment located in Bay 2, Bay 4, and Bay 5, including disconnect switches, power circuit breakers, arrestors, fuses, bus work, transformer bank, station service transformer, and all associated footings, switch stands, support structures, and jumpers.

Currently, BPA does not have communication equipment or supervisory control and data acquisition (SCADA) equipment at Westside Substation. By transferring ownership of its substation equipment, BPA would avoid required investments in new communication and control equipment. In addition, the sale would be consistent with BPA's objective to simplify mixed asset ownership arrangements inside BPA and customer-owned facilities.

**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, 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/ W. Walker Stinnette

W. Walker Stinnette

Contract Environmental Protection Specialist

Salient CRGT

Reviewed by:

/s/ Carol P. Leiter

Carol P. Leiter

Supervisory Environmental Protection Specialist

Concur:

/s/ Katey C. Grange                      January 15, 2021

Katey C. Grange

Date

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:** Equipment Sale at Westside Substation

## **Project Site Description**

The substation equipment is located within IFP's Westside Substation, which is graveled and fenced, near Idaho Falls, Bonneville County, Idaho (Township 2 N, Range 37 E, Section 27). The proposed project would not require any on-the-ground work at the project site.

## **Evaluation of Potential Impacts to Environmental Resources**

### **1. Historic and Cultural Resources**

Potential for Significance: No

Explanation: Westside Substation is not eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places, and no ground-disturbing work is associated with the asset sale. Therefore, the proposed undertaking would have no potential to cause effects to historic properties.

### **2. Geology and Soils**

Potential for Significance: No

Explanation: No ground-disturbing work is associated with the change in asset ownership. Therefore, the proposed asset sale would have no impact on geology and soils.

### **3. Plants (including Federal/state special-status species and habitats)**

Potential for Significance: No

Explanation: No ground-disturbing work is associated with the change in asset ownership and the area is graveled with no vegetation. Therefore, the proposed asset sale would have no effect on protected plant species or habitats.

### **4. Wildlife (including Federal/state special-status species and habitats)**

Potential for Significance: No

Explanation: No ground-disturbing or noise-generating work is associated with the change in asset ownership. Therefore, the proposed asset sale would have no effect on protected wildlife species or habitats.

### **5. Water Bodies, Floodplains, and Fish (including Federal/state special-status species, ESUs, and habitats)**

Potential for Significance: No

Explanation: No ground-disturbing work is associated with the change in asset ownership. Therefore, the proposed asset sale would have no impact on water bodies and floodplains and would have no effect on protected fish species or habitats.

## **6. Wetlands**

Potential for Significance: No

Explanation: No ground-disturbing work is associated with the change in asset ownership. Therefore, the proposed asset sale would have no impact on wetlands.

## **7. Groundwater and Aquifers**

Potential for Significance: No

Explanation: No ground-disturbing work is associated with the change in asset ownership, and no new wells or other uses of groundwater or aquifers is proposed. Therefore, the proposed asset sale would have no impact on groundwater and aquifers.

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

Potential for Significance: No

Explanation: Use and operation of substation equipment would remain essentially the same following the change in asset ownership. Therefore, the proposed asset sale would not require a change in land use and would have no impact on any specially-designated areas.

## **9. Visual Quality**

Potential for Significance: No

Explanation: Use and operation of substation equipment would remain essentially the same following the change in asset ownership. Therefore, the proposed asset sale would not change visual quality.

## **10. Air Quality**

Potential for Significance: No

Explanation: Use and operation of the substation equipment would remain essentially the same following the change in asset ownership. Therefore, the proposed asset sale would not change air quality.

## **11. Noise**

Potential for Significance: No

Explanation: Use and operation of the substation equipment would remain essentially the same following the change in asset ownership. Therefore, the proposed asset sale would not change ambient noise.

## **12. Human Health and Safety**

Potential for Significance: No

Explanation: The proposed asset sale would not adversely affect the safety of BPA employees, its customers, or the public. IFP has demonstrated the ability to operate and maintain the equipment in a safe manner.

### **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: N/A

**Require siting and construction or major expansion of waste storage, disposal, recovery, or treatment facilities (including incinerators) that are not otherwise categorically excluded.**

Explanation: N/A

**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: N/A

**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: N/A

### **Landowner Notification, Involvement, or Coordination**

Description: IFP owns Westside Substation and the underlying land. No landowner notification, involvement, or coordination would be required.

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

Signed: /s/ W. Walker Stinnette January 15, 2021  
W. Walker Stinnette, EC-4 Date  
Contract Environmental Protection Specialist  
Salient CRGT