# **Categorical Exclusion Determination**

Bonneville Power Administration Department of Energy



Proposed Action: AT&T Redland South LTE Antenna Upgrade

Project Manager: Jonathan Toobian – TELP-TPP-3

Location: Clackamas County, Oregon

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

**Description of the Proposed Action:** Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) proposes to allow AT&T to upgrade an existing telecommunications facility located on a BPA-owned transmission structure (78/4) on the Big Eddy-Chemawa No. 1 transmission line in Oregon City, Oregon. Six existing panel antennas and three existing tower-mounted amplifiers would be removed. Six new panel antennas, six new tower-mounted amplifiers, and six new coaxial cables would then be installed on the structure. To ensure safety, BPA workers and their subcontractors would complete the equipment removal and installation on the transmission structure.

In addition to upgrading tower-mounted equipment, removal and/or replacement of ground-level telecommunications equipment would occur in AT&T's fenced equipment area underneath the transmission structure on privately-owned property within BPA's easement.

The project would not involve any ground excavation or grading and would use established access roads and work areas.

**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.

<u>/s/ W. Walker Stinnette</u> W. Walker Stinnette Contract Environmental Protection Specialist Portland State University – Hatfield Resident Fellow Reviewed by:

<u>/s/ Douglas F. Corkran</u> Douglas F. Corkran Supervisory Environmental Protection Specialist

Concur:

<u>/s/ Katey C. Grange</u> Katey C. Grange NEPA Compliance Officer Date: August 13, 2019

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: AT&T Redland South LTE Antenna Upgrade

## **Project Site Description**

Access to the site is via an approximately 200-foot-long, existing unpaved road from S. North End Road. AT&T maintains a fenced, ground-level equipment area underneath the transmission structure on privately-owned property. Ground cover within the equipment area consists of a concrete pad, gravel, and some exposed soils with little to no vegetation. The project site is surrounded by a maintained transmission line right-of-way (ROW). The ROW is used as livestock pasture and contains a mix of low-growing native and non-native herbaceous and shrub species. There are no surface water bodies or wetlands within 500 feet of the site.

#### **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 historian review found that additions would be minor additive features to integrity of historic transmission line. BPA has Effect historic properties. No further review u	the structure, the projects the structure, the projects as determined that this u	t would not adversely impact the ndertaking has <b>No Potential to</b>
2.	Geology and Soils		
	Explanation: Geology and soils within and a the installation of the transmission tower and project would use established access roads minor soil compaction may occur due to the	d the telecommunication and work areas and wor	s facility. Although the proposed uld not involve ground excavation,
3.	<b>Plants</b> (including Federal/state special- status species and habitats)		
	Explanation: No tree or vegetation removal equipment use) may result in disturbance of occurrences of any state special-status or E project area. Therefore, the proposed project	f vegetative cover in sma Indangered Species Act	all areas. There are no documented (ESA)-listed plant species near the
4.	<b>Wildlife</b> (including Federal/state special- status species and habitats)		
	Explanation: Minor and temporary disruption noise and human presence during completion any state special-status or ESA-listed wildliff proposed project would have no effect on pro- lift any active posts are found on the transmit	on of the project. There a ie or wildlife habitat near rotected wildlife species.	are no documented occurrences of the project area. Therefore, the

If any active nests are found on the transmission structure prior to construction, then construction would be delayed until the nests become unoccupied.

5.	Water Bodies, Floodplains, and Fish (including Federal/state special-status species, ESUs, and habitats)				
	Explanation: The project site is not in or near any mapped water bodies or floodplains, and there are no documented occurrences of any state special-status or ESA-listed fish or fish habitat near the project area. Therefore, the proposed project would have no impact on these resources.				
6.	Wetlands	$\checkmark$			
	Explanation: The project site is not in or near any mapped wetlands. The project would use established access roads and work areas, and would not include ground excavation. Therefore, the proposed project would have no impact on wetlands.				
7.	Groundwater and Aquifers				
	Explanation: The project would not involve any ground excavation. Therefore, the proposed project would have no impact on groundwater and aquifers.				
8.	Land Use and Specially-Designated Areas				
	Explanation: There would be no change to land use at the project site. No specially-designat are in the project vicinity.				
9.	Visual Quality	$\checkmark$			
	Explanation: There would be no change to visual quality at the project site. The tower-mounted equipment is consistent with the existing use of the site as a telecommunications facility.				
10.	Air Quality				
	Explanation: Temporary and minor dust and vehicle emissions would increase in the local area from use of vehicles and equipment during removal and installation activities. However, there would be no long-term changes in air quality following completion of the project.				
11.	Noise	$\checkmark$			
	Explanation: Construction noise would be temporar Operational noise would not change.	y and would occur during daylig	ht hours.		
12.	Human Health and Safety				
	Explanation: No impacts to human health and safet	y would be expected as a result	of project activities.		
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.

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 transmission structure is owned by BPA. AT&T 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: /s/ W. Walker Stinnette

Date: August 13, 2019

W. Walker Stinnette – EC-4 Contract Environmental Protection Specialist Portland State University – Hatfield Resident Fellow