Categorical Exclusion Determination

Bonneville Power Administration
Department of Energy



Proposed Action: Bagley and Cimarron Wireless Communication Facilities

Project Manager: Jonathan Toobian TEP-TPP-1

Location: Clark County, Washington

Categorical Exclusion Applied (from Subpart D, 10 C.F.R. Part 1021): B1.19 Microwave, meteorological,

and radio towers

<u>Description of the Proposed Action</u>: BPA proposes to allow Verizon Wireless to collocate two new wireless communication facilities at the base of towers 29/3 and 35/3 on its North Bonneville-Ross No. 1 transmission line. Each site would include equipment and cabinetry placed beneath the tower legs. Several antennas would be attached atop each tower and cables would run from the antennas to the new base cabinetry. About 100 feet of buried power cable would run from the tower facilities to an off-site transformer outside of BPA property. At the Cimarron facility (tower 29/3), the existing dirt access road would be graveled to allow for ongoing maintenance access to the site. At the Bagley facility (tower 35/3), a new gravel road and small parking area would be installed to allow for ongoing maintenance access to the site. The new road would be constructed adjacent to Linda Lane.

<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, July 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.

Date: August 26, 2015

<u>/s/Claire McClory</u>
Claire McClory
Environmental Protection Specialist

Concur:

<u>/s/ Katherine S. Pierce</u>
Katherine S. Pierce
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: Bagley and Cimaron Wireless Communication Facilities

Project Site Description

Both sites are located in western Washington. Vegetation at each site consists of grasses and blackberry bushes. The Cimarron site has been heavily disturbed by the existing transmission towers, paved parking, and buried utilities. The Bagley site has been previously disturbed by existing transmission towers, Linda Lane, and buried utilities.

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		
	Explanation: WA SHPO concurrence on no historic properties consulted Cowlitz Tribe.	s affected on 7/27/2015. No	o response was received from the
2.	Geology and Soils		
	Explanation: Minimal soil disturbance.		
3.	Plants (including federal/state special-status species)	V	
	Explanation: No special status species present.		
4.	Wildlife (including federal/state special-status species and habitats)	V	
	Explanation: No special status species present.		
5.	Water Bodies, Floodplains, and Fish (including federal/state special-status species and ESUs)		
	Explanation: None present.		
6.	Wetlands		
	Explanation:		

None present					
7. Groundwate	r and Aquifers	V			
Explanation:					
None present	t.				
8. Land Use and	Specially Designated Areas	V			
Explanation: No change to	land use proposed. Trenched areas would I	pe returned to their present use.			
9. Visual Qualit	у	V			
Explanation:					
Aerial antenn	_				
10. Air Quality		V			
Explanation:					
	t of dust and vehicle emissions due to const	_	_		
11. Noise					
Explanation: Temporary co	erational noise would not change.				
12. Human Healt	h and Safety	V			
Explanation: No impact.					
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 vio	ment, safety, and				
Explanation, if necessary:					
facilities (incl	g and construction or major expansion of wa uding incinerators) that are not otherwise c		treatment		
Explanation,	<u>ır necessary</u> :				
	rdous substances, pollutants, contaminants, preexist in the environment such that ther		_		
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			
Description: BPA owns the property in fee.			
Based on the foregoing, this proposed project does not have the potential to cause significant impacts on any environmentally sensitive resources.			
Signed: /s/ Claire McClory Date: August 26, 2015 Claire McClory			