

Categorical Exclusion Determination

Bonneville Power Administration
Department of Energy



Proposed Action: AT&T Camelot Park LTE Upgrade

Project Manager: Jonathan Toobian—TELP-TPP-3

Location: King County, 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: Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) proposes to allow AT&T to upgrade its equipment at an existing wireless site on a BPA transmission tower on the Tacoma-Raver No. 1 transmission line in Auburn, Washington. The work would consist of removing 18 existing tower mounted amplifiers (TMA) and installing 12 new TMAs. Additionally, six remote radio heads (RRH) would be removed and replaced with six new RRHs. To ensure safety, BPA workers and their subcontractors would complete the wireless equipment replacement on the tower. The project would not involve any ground excavation.

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.

/s/ Beth Belanger

Beth Belanger
Contract Environmental Protection Specialist
Motus Staffing & Recruiting

Reviewed by:

/s/ Katey Grange

Katey Grange
Acting Supervisory Environmental Protection Specialist

Concur:

/s/ Stacy L. Mason

Stacy L. Mason
NEPA Compliance Officer

Date: January 25, 2019

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: AT&T Camelot Park LTE Upgrade

Project Site Description

Equipment replacements would occur on the Tacoma-Raver No. 1 transmission line, tower 8/4 in King County, Washington. The project area is in Section 11, Township 21 North, Range 4 East. The structure is located in an existing utility easement, adjacent to residential housing. The site has an existing access road to the tower base. The project area has 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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><u>Explanation:</u> BPA has determined that this undertaking has no potential to cause effects to historic properties because no ground disturbance would occur as a result of this undertaking, and minor additive features would not adversely impact the integrity of historic transmission line.</p>		
2. Geology and Soils	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><u>Explanation:</u> The proposed project does not involve ground disturbance. Minor soil compaction may occur due to bucket trucks driving around the site.</p>		
3. Plants (including federal/state special-status species)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><u>Explanation:</u> The project location has been previously disturbed and native plant communities are not present in the work area. The project would have no effect on any special-status or Endangered Species Act (ESA)-listed plants.</p> <p>To prevent the spread of noxious weeds, the construction vehicles would be required to be cleaned before entering a new project location.</p>		
4. Wildlife (including federal/state special-status species and habitats)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><u>Explanation:</u> No special-status species or habitats are present at the project location. The project would have no effect on special-status or ESA-listed wildlife.</p> <p>If any active nests are found on the structure prior to construction, the construction would be delayed until the nest is unoccupied.</p>		
5. Water Bodies, Floodplains, and Fish (including federal/state special-status species and ESUs)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><u>Explanation:</u> The project area does not have any water bodies, floodplains, or listed fish species; therefore, there would be no impacts to these resources.</p>		

6. **Wetlands**

Explanation: The site would be accessed from a paved driveway and residential lawn, which is located west of the tower. There are no wetlands in this area; therefore, there would be no impacts to wetlands.

7. **Groundwater and Aquifers**

Explanation: The project does not involve any ground disturbance; therefore, there would be no impact to groundwater or aquifers.

8. **Land Use and Specially Designated Areas**

Explanation: There would be no change to land use at the project location; therefore, there would be no impact to land use. Additionally, there are no specially designated areas in the project vicinity.

9. **Visual Quality**

Explanation: There would be no change to the visual quality at this location. The new equipment would be consistent with the existing use of the utility corridor.

10. **Air Quality**

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**

Explanation: Construction noise would be temporary and would occur during daylight hours. Operational noise would not change.

12. **Human Health and Safety**

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

Description: 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: /s/ Beth Belanger
Beth Belanger, ECT-4
Contract Environmental Protection Specialist
Motus Staffing & Recruiting

Date: January 25, 2019