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.

/s/ 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/ Katey C. Grange Date: August 13, 2019
Katey C. Grange
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 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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Resource</th>
<th>No Potential for Significance</th>
<th>No Potential for Significance, with Conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Historic and Cultural Resources</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Explanation</strong>: BPA historian review found that because there would be no ground disturbance and the additions would be minor additive features to the structure, the project would not adversely impact the integrity of historic transmission line. BPA has determined that this undertaking has <strong>No Potential to Effect</strong> historic properties. No further review under the National Historic Preservation Act is required.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Geology and Soils</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Explanation</strong>: Geology and soils within and around the project site were likely previously disturbed during the installation of the transmission tower and the telecommunications facility. Although the proposed project would use established access roads and work areas and would not involve ground excavation, minor soil compaction may occur due to the use of vehicles and heavy equipment around the structure.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Plants (including Federal/state special-status species and habitats)</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Explanation</strong>: No tree or vegetation removal is proposed. Project-related activities (e.g. vehicle and equipment use) may result in disturbance of vegetative cover in small areas. There are no documented occurrences of any state special-status or Endangered Species Act (ESA)-listed plant species near the project area. Therefore, the proposed project would have no effect on protected plant species.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Wildlife (including Federal/state special-status species and habitats)</td>
<td>☑️</td>
<td>☐️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Explanation</strong>: Minor and temporary disruption of normal wildlife behavior could occur from elevated noise and human presence during completion of the project. There are no documented occurrences of any state special-status or ESA-listed wildlife or wildlife habitat near the project area. Therefore, the proposed project would have no effect on protected wildlife species. If any active nests are found on the transmission structure prior to construction, then construction would be delayed until the nests become unoccupied.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**
   
   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-designated areas are in the project vicinity.

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

12. **Human Health and Safety**
    
    Explanation: No impacts to human health and safety 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.

**Landowner Notification, Involvement, or Coordination**

*Description:* 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