Bonneville Power Administration

memorandum

DATE: August 9, 2012

REPLY TO ATTN OF: KEC-4

SUBJECT: Environmental Clearance Memorandum

то: Tim Murray

Project Manager – TELP-TPP-3

Proposed Action: AT&T Fiber Addition North Bonneville-Ross No. 2

Categorical Exclusion Applied (from Subpart D, 10 C.F.R. Part 1021): B4.7 Fiber optic cable

Location: Vancouver, WA

Proposed by: Bonneville Power Administration (BPA)

<u>Description of the Proposed Action</u>: BPA is proposing to allow AT&T to install an additional fiber optic line and vault within BPA's North Bonneville-Ross right-of-way easement and into an existing wireless communication facility. BPA has a commercial lease agreement with AT&T for co-location on its facilities and AT&T must request permission to update those facilities when they have the potential to affect BPA's transmission resources.

AT&T would install a conduit and utility vault containing fiber optic lines between the edge of the right-of-way and transmission line tower # 31/4 on BPA's North Bonneville-Ross No. 2 transmission line. The tower is currently being used to house cellular communications equipment. All ground disturbance would occur in areas that have been previously disturbed by transmission line construction and right-of-way clearing activities. Construction vehicles would utilize existing gravel access roads. AT&T's work would not affect BPA's transmission resources.

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.

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/ Douglas F. Corkran
Environmental Protection Specialist

Concur:

/s/ Stacy Mason

Stacy Mason Date: <u>August 9, 2012</u> NEPA Compliance Officer

Attachment:

Environmental Checklist for Categorical Exclusions

Environmental Checklist for Categorical Exclusions

| | No Potential for No Potential, with | |
|--|---|--|
| Environmental Resources | Significance | Conditions (describ |
| Historic Properties and Cultural Resources BPA initiated Section 106 consultation with the Wareservation (DAHP) and the Cowlitz, Indian Tribe communication site was conducted. The project work and the July 2012, BPA submitted a cultural resource reportion historic properties would be affected as a result responded in an email on July 30, 2012 indicating to followed. The SHPO concurred with BPA's findings | on July 29, 2011. In August was delayed a year, and in rt to the SHPO and the Cow t of the proposed project. they wanted inadvertent di | 2011 a field survey of the litz Tribe determining the The Cowlitz Tribe scovery protocols |
| 2. T & E Species, or their habitat(s) No ESA species are present in or around the propo | X | |
| species. | | |
| 3. Floodplains or wetlands | X | |
| 3. Floodplains or wetlands 4. Areas of special designation | X | |
| 3. Floodplains or wetlands 4. Areas of special designation | X | |
| 3. Floodplains or wetlands4. Areas of special designation5. Health & safety | X | |
| 4. Areas of special designation | X | |