Categorical Exclusion Determination

Bonneville Power Administration Department of Energy



Proposed Action: Wireless Communication Upgrades at Various Sites in Oregon and Washington

Project Manager: Jonathan Toobian—TELP-TPP-3

Location: Deschutes County, Oregon. Clark, King, and Snohomish Counties, Washington

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

Description of the Proposed Action: BPA proposes to allow AT&T and Verizon to upgrade their antennas and equipment at five existing wireless sites on BPA transmission towers in central Oregon and western Washington. The work would consist of removing antennas and replacing those with new antennas. In some cases, the number of antennas on the towers would increase from the original installation and/or the antenna configuration would change. Additionally, remote radio units (RRUs) or tower mounted amplifiers (TMAs) would be added to the antenna mounts and new coaxial cable would be installed, connecting the RRUs or TMAs to existing equipment located on the ground at the tower base. To ensure safety, BPA workers and their subcontractors would complete the wireless antenna and coaxial cable installation work. The project would not involve any ground excavation.

The upgrades would occur at the following locations:

AT&T's Beaver Lake site: King County, WA. Section 2, Township 24 North, Range 6 East. Sammamish-Maple Valley No. 1 Transmission Line.

Verizon's Bagley site: Clark County, WA. DC (donation claim) 43, Township 2 North, Range 1 East. North Bonneville-Ross No. 1 Transmission Line.

Verizon's North Sultan site: Snohomish County, WA. Section 29, Township 28 North, Range 8 East. Chief Joseph-Snohomish No. 3 Transmission Line.

Verizon's South Redmond site: Deschutes County, OR. Section 19, Township 15 South, Range 13 East. Redmond-Pilot Butte No.1 Transmission Line.

Verizon's Walnut Grove site: Clark County, WA. DC (donation claim) 56, Township 2 North, Range 1 East. Sifton-Ross No.1 Transmission Line.

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, 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.

<u>/s/ Beth Belanger</u>

Beth Belanger Contract Environmental Protection Specialist Motus Staffing & Recruiting

Reviewed by:

<u>/s/ Gene Lynard</u> Gene Lynard Supervisory Environmental Protection Specialist

Concur:

<u>/s/ Sarah T. Biegel</u> Sarah T. Biegel NEPA Compliance Office Date: June 19, 2018

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: Wireless Communication Upgrades at Various Sites in Oregon and Washington

Project Site Description					
Antenna equipment replacements would occur on existing transmission structures located within existing transmission line rights-of-way. The structures are located in urban and rural residential areas. The sites have existing access roads to the tower bases. All of the sites have had prior ground disturbance.					
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: BPA Cultural staff have reviewed the proposed activities and determined that there is no pote effect historic properties because the locations are in areas that have had extensive ground disturbance as of the development of the areas with roads, housing, utility corridors, etc. Additionally, the structures are accessible by paved and graveled access roads. No further review under the National Historic Preservation required.				
2.	Geology and Soils				
	<u>Explanation</u> : The proposed projects do not involve ground disturbance. Some insignificant compaction of soils may occur due to bucket trucks driving around the site.				
3.	Plants (including federal/state special-status species)				
	Explanation: The project locations have been The project would have no impacts to any spe		ive plant communities are not present.		
	To prevent the spread of noxious weeds, the c entering a new project location.	construction vehicles would b	e required to be cleaned before		
4.	Wildlife (including federal/state special- status species and habitats)	~			
	Explanation: No special-status species or habit no impacts to special-status wildlife.	tats are present at the projec	t locations. The projects would have		
	If any active nests are found on the structures nests are unoccupied.	prior to construction, the co	nstruction would be delayed until the		
5.	Water Bodies, Floodplains, and Fish (including federal/state special-status species and ESUs)				
	Explanation: The project areas do not have ar would be no impacts to these resources.	ny water bodies, floodplains,	or listed fish species; therefore, there		

6.	Wetlands	v			
	Explanation: The projects are not in or near wetlands; th	erefore, there would be no impact	to wetlands.		
7.	Groundwater and Aquifers	v			
	Explanation: The project does not involve any ground disturbance; therefore, there would be no impact to groundwater and aquifers.				
8.	Land Use and Specially Designated Areas	\checkmark			
	Explanation: There would be no change to land use at the project locations. There are no specially designated areas at any of the locations.				
9.	Visual Quality	v			
	Explanation: The wireless antennas and equipment are of	he utility corridor.			
10.	Air Quality	v			
	Explanation: A small amount of dust and vehicle emissions would occur during construction; however, there would be no significant changes to air quality during or after construction.				
11.	Noise	v			
	Explanation: Construction noise would be temporary and would occur during daylight hours. Operational noise would not change.				
12.	Human Health and Safety	\checkmark			
Explanation: There would be no impact to 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, 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>: The project proponent is responsible for acquiring and maintaining easements for their facilities from underlying landowners.

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: June 19, 2018

Beth Belanger, ECT-4 Contract Environmental Protection Specialist Motus Staffing & Recruiting