Categorical Exclusion Determination

Bonneville Power Administration
Department of Energy



Proposed Action: AT&T Lake Meridian LTE Antenna 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

<u>Description of the Proposed Action</u>: Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) proposes to allow AT&T to upgrade an existing telecommunications facility located on a BPA-owned transmission tower (structure 3/6 on the Covington-Duwamish No. 1 transmission line) in Kent, Washington. The work would consist of removing three existing panel antennas and replacing them in-kind with new panel antennas. In addition, nine existing tower-mounted amplifiers (TMAs) would be removed and six new TMAs would be installed. To ensure safety, BPA workers and their subcontractors would complete the tower installation work. In addition to upgrading tower-mounted equipment, removal and/or installation of ground-level telecommunications equipment would occur in AT&T's equipment shelter adjacent to the transmission tower on privately-owned property. The project would not involve any ground excavation, and the site would be accessed via existing routes.

<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.

W. Walker Stinnette

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

Reviewed by:

/s/ Douglas F. Corkran
Douglas F. Corkran
Supervisory Environmental Protection Specialist

Concur:

/s/ Sarah T. Biegel Sarah T. Biegel NEPA Compliance Officer

Attachment(s): Environmental Checklist

Date: May 1, 2019

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 Lake Meridian LTE Antenna Upgrade

Project Site Description

The project site consists of an existing AT&T telecommunications facility in Kent, King County, Washington. The AT&T facility is collocated with an 85⁺-foot BPA transmission tower (structure 3/6 on the Covington-Duwamish No. 1 transmission line) in Section 22, Township 22 North, Range 5 East. An AT&T equipment shelter is located less than 50 feet north-northwest of the transmission tower. The project site is immediately surrounded by a maintained transmission line right-of-way (ROW) containing a mix of low-growing native and non-native herbaceous and shrub species. Within the ROW, 144th Avenue SE is located east of the transmission tower and residential lawns and gardens surround the tower to the north, west, and south. Land use outside of the ROW is primarily commercial and residential development.

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: The project would use establish ground excavation. All work would occur on not adversely impact the integrity of historic activities and determined that this undertaking review under the National Historic Preservation.	the structure itself, and stresources. The BPA histograms has No Potential to I	such minor additive features would torian reviewed the proposed		
2.	Geology and Soils				
	Explanation: Geology and soils within and a the installation of the transmission tower and project does not involve excavation or grading driving around the project site.	d the telecommunication	ns facility. Although the proposed		
3.	Plants (including Federal/state special-status species and habitats)				
	Explanation: Project-related activities (e.g. vehicle and equipment use) may result in removal of vegetative cover in small areas. There are no documented occurrences of any state special-status plant species or plant species protected under the Federal Endangered Species Act (ESA). Therefore, the proposed project would have no effect on protected plant species. To prevent the spread of noxious weeds, the construction vehicles would be required to be cleaned before entering a new project site.				
4.	Wildlife (including Federal/state special- status species and habitats)				
	Explanation: There are no documented occurred wildlife species protected under the Federa on protected wildlife species.				
	If any active nests are found on the tower puthe nests are unoccupied.	rior to construction, the	construction would be delayed until		

Э.	(including Federal/state special-status species, ESUs, and habitats)				
	Explanation: The project site is not in or near any magnetic special-status fish species. Therefore, the proposed				
6.	Wetlands	~			
	Explanation: The project site is not in or near any maccess roads and work areas, and would not include would have no impact on wetlands.				
7.	Groundwater and Aquifers	~			
	<u>Explanation</u> : The project would not involve any grouwould have no impact on groundwater and aquifers.		roposed project		
8.	Land Use and Specially-Designated Areas				
	Explanation: There would be no change to land use areas are in the project vicinity.	e at the project location. No spec	cially-designated		
9.	Visual Quality	▽			
	Explanation: There would be no change to visual quand equipment are consistent with the existing use				
10.	Air Quality	▽			
	<u>Explanation</u> : Minor dust and vehicle emissions would occur during construction. However, there would be no significant changes to air quality during or after construction.				
11.	Noise	~			
	<u>Explanation</u> : Construction noise would be temporar Operational noise would not change.	ry and would occur during daylig	ht hours.		
12.	Human Health and Safety	~			
	Explanation: No impacts to human health or safety	are expected as a result of proje	ect 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:					
V	Threaten a violation of applicable statutory, regulator safety, and health, or similar requirements of DOE of	ory, or permit requirements for en or Executive Orders.	vironment,		
	Explanation, if necessary:				
~	Require siting and construction or major expansion facilities (including incinerators) that are not otherwi	of waste storage, disposal, reco se categorically excluded.	very, or treatment		
	Explanation, if necessary:				
~	Disturb hazardous substances, pollutants, contamin natural gas products that preexist in the environmer 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:

<u>Landowner Notification, Involvement, or Coordination</u>

<u>Description</u>: The transmission tower 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.

Date: May 1, 2019 Signed: /s/ W. Walker Stinnette

W. Walker Stinnette – EC-4

Contract Environmental Protection Specialist

Portland State University – Hatfield Resident Fellow