Categorical Exclusion Determination

Bonneville Power Administration
Department of Energy



Proposed Action: AT&T Mount Blyn/Millers Peninsula Wireless Upgrades

Project Manager: Chuck Wedick TELP-TPP-3

Location: Jefferson County, WA

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>: AT&T proposes to upgrade their wireless communications infrastructure that is currently located on BPA's existing Mt. Blyn communications tower. AT&T would replace four existing microwave antennas and install two new microwave antennas. AT&T would also replace nine existing wireless antennas and install three new wireless antennas. Additional power and coaxial cables would be installed from the control house up the tower to the new antennas.

<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, 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.

/s/ Douglas F. Corkran	
Douglas F. Corkran	
Environmental Protection Specialis	st

Concur:

/s/ Sarah T. Biegel Date: November 21, 2019

Sarah T. Biegel

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: AT&T Mount Blyn/Millers Peninsula Wireless Upgrades

Project Site Description

The proposed project is located on Mt. Blyn which sits approximately 2100 feet above sea level. The top of the mountain is mostly bare of trees and contains a number of existing communications sites, including 11 communications towers of various heights. The mountain top is surrounded by second growth fir forest that was logged and replanted approximately 40 years ago.

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: No ground-disturbing work would historian reviewed the project and determined cultural or historic resources.				
2.	Geology and Soils				
	<u>Explanation</u> : No ground-disturbing work woul impact to geology and soils is expected.	d take place; therefore	e no soil disturbance would occur. No		
3.	Plants (including Federal/state special-status species and habitats)	V			
	Explanation: No ground-disturbing work would occur. No impact to plants is expected	ld take place; therefore	e no disturbance to plants would		
4.	Wildlife (including Federal/state special-status species and habitats)				
	<u>Explanation</u> : No ground-disturbing work would take place; therefore no disturbance to ground-dwelling wildlife would occur. Noise disturbance during construction may briefly affect nearby wildlife however; ambient noise and disturbances are high in the area due to operations and maintenance activities at the other radio sites, so many wildlife species are habituated to high levels of disturbance. There is no habitat suitable for marbled murrelets in or near the project area, so the project would have no effect on them. Overall, no impacts to wildlife are expected.				
5.	Water Bodies, Floodplains, and Fish (including Federal/state special-status species, ESUs, and habitats)	~			
	Explanation: The project is located on a mou proposed project would have no effect on wat				
6.	Wetlands				
	<u>Explanation</u> : There are no wetlands near the occur, therefore; no impacts to wetlands are explanation.		no ground-disturbing work would		

7.	Groundwater and Aquifers	 				
	Explanation: There is no groundwater at the top of Mt. Blyn and no ground-disturbing work would take place, therefore no impact to groundwater or aquifers is expected					
8.	Land Use and Specially-Designated Areas	~				
	Explanation: Mt. Blyn is heavily used for communications sites and is not a specially-designated area. The proposed project would continue this use and would not cause changes or impacts to land use or specially-designated areas.					
9.	Visual Quality	~				
	Explanation: Most of the existing AT&T antennas would be replaced with antennas of similar appearance. Some new antennas would be placed on the tower, but would not appreciably change the appearance of the tower. There are no sensitive viewer areas (e.g. residences) that would be affected by changes in visual appearance. No impacts to visual quality are expected.					
10	. Air Quality	~				
	Explanation: Some minor emissions would occur from the equipment and vehicles used to remove and install the antennas and cables during construction, but these would not appreciably affect air quality.					
11	. Noise	~				
<u>Explanation</u> : Some minor noise would be generated by the equipment and vehicles used to install the antennas and cables during construction. No additional noise would be generated operation of the equipment. No impacts from noise are expected.						
12	. Human Health and Safety	~				
	Explanation: The project would not general conditions that would increase risk to humare expected.					
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:					
V	Require siting and construction or major explanation (including incinerators) that are not					
	Explanation, if necessary:					
V	Disturb hazardous substances, pollutants, on natural gas products that preexist in the enunpermitted releases.					
	Explanation, if necessary:					
V	Involve genetically engineered organisms, s weeds, or invasive species, unless the prop designed and operated to prevent unauthor accordance with applicable requirements, s Environmental Protection Agency, and the	posed activity would be contribed release into the envirous that as those of the Departr	ained or confined in a manner nment and conducted in ment of Agriculture, the			

Landowner Notification, Involvement, or Coordination

<u>Description</u>: The site is owned by BPA, and no landowner notification is necessary.

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

Signed: <u>/s/ Douglas F. Corkran</u> Date: <u>November 21, 2019</u>

Douglas F. Corkran ECT-4

Environmental Protection Specialist