

# Categorical Exclusion Determination

Bonneville Power Administration  
Department of Energy



**Proposed Action:** Oregon Trail Solar Facility Battery Energy Storage System Interconnection

**Project No.:** G0709

**Project Manager:** Cherilyn Randall, TPCV-TPP-4

**Location:** Gilliam County, Oregon; Clark and Spokane counties, Washington

**Categorical Exclusion Applied (from Subpart D, 10 C.F.R. Part 1021):** B1.7 Electronic equipment

**Description of the Proposed Action:** Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) proposes to accommodate a request from Aurora Solar, LLC (Aurora) to interconnect a 41-megawatt (MW) battery energy storage system at BPA's Slatt Substation through Aurora's existing tie line near Arlington, Gilliam County, Oregon. Aurora would install the necessary generator tripping equipment to participate in BPA's remedial action schemes (RAS), and BPA would add the new inputs from that generating tripping equipment to the BPA Sequential Events Recorder and Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition (SER/SCADA) remote terminal unit (RTU) at Aurora's Montague II Station. BPA would also complete software modifications at Dittmer Control Center in Vancouver, Clark County, Washington and Munro Control Center in Spokane, Spokane County, Washington to fully integrate the new equipment with its SER/SCADA system. All of BPA's proposed actions would occur indoors at existing facilities, and BPA would not fund or undertake any ground disturbing activities.

**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.

Walker Stinnette  
Environmental Protection Specialist

Concur:

Katey C. Grange  
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:** Oregon Trail Solar Facility Battery Energy Storage System Interconnection

## **Project Site Description**

The proposed action would occur indoors at existing facilities, including Aurora's Montague II Substation located near Arlington, Gilliam County Oregon as well as BPA's Dittmer Control Center in Vancouver, Clark County, Washington and Munro Control Center in Spokane, Spokane County, Washington.

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

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

Potential for Significance: No

Explanation: No ground disturbance or structural modifications would be required to accommodate the interconnection request. Therefore, the proposed undertaking would have no potential to cause effects on historic properties.

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

Potential for Significance: No

Explanation: No ground disturbance would be required to accommodate the interconnection request. Therefore, the proposed action would not impact geology and soils.

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

Potential for Significance: No

Explanation: No ground disturbance or vegetation management would be required to accommodate the interconnection request. Therefore, the proposed action would have no effect on special-status plant species or habitats.

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

Potential for Significance: No

Explanation: No wildlife habitat modifications or activities with the potential to disturb wildlife would be required to accommodate the interconnection request. Therefore, the proposed action would have no effect on special-status 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 disturbance or in-water work would be required to accommodate the interconnection request. Therefore, the proposed action would not impact water bodies and floodplains and would have no effect on special-status fish species or habitats.

**6. Wetlands**

Potential for Significance: No

Explanation: No ground disturbance would be required to accommodate the interconnection request. Therefore, the proposed action would not impact wetlands.

**7. Groundwater and Aquifers**

Potential for Significance: No

Explanation: No ground disturbance would be required to accommodate the interconnection request. Therefore, the proposed action would not impact groundwater and aquifers.

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

Potential for Significance: No

Explanation: No change in land use would be required to accommodate the interconnection request. The proposed action would not impact any adjacent land uses or specially-designated areas.

**9. Visual Quality**

Potential for Significance: No

Explanation: The proposed action would not impact visual quality.

**10. Air Quality**

Potential for Significance: No

Explanation: The proposed action would not impact air quality.

**11. Noise**

Potential for Significance: No

Explanation: No activities with the potential to disturb any noise-sensitive receptors would be required to accommodate the interconnection request.

**12. Human Health and Safety**

Potential for Significance: No

Explanation: The proposed action would not adversely affect human health and 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:

**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: No landowner notification, involvement, or coordination is required.

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

Signed:

Walker Stinnette  
Environmental Protection Specialist