Proposed Action: Clark County Verizon Upgrades

Project Manager: Chuck Wedick – TELP-TTP-3

Location: Clark County, Washington

Categorical Exclusion Applied (from Subpart D, 10 C.F.R. Part 1021): B4.9 Multiple use of powerline rights-of-way; B1.19 Microwave, meteorological and radio towers

Description of the Proposed Action: Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) proposes to allow Verizon to make upgrades to antennas and associated equipment at multiple wireless sites. Work would occur on structures and in equipment yards under or adjacent to the structures which house existing wireless communication equipment. Project actions would include removing, replacing, or installing new antennas, remote radio units, coaxial cable, and other associated equipment. Replacement equipment and antennas would be of similar dimensions with some antennas being the same size, while others would be shorter but wider and heavier. There would be no ground disturbance associated with this project. Equipment used would likely include pickup trucks, a bucket truck, and hand tools.

Franklin Park: Project actions would occur on structure 2/3 of the Ross-Alcoa No. 3 line.

Bagley: Project actions would occur on structure 35/3 of the North Bonneville-Ross No. 1 line.

Cimarron: Project actions would occur on structure 29/3 of the North Bonneville-Ross No. 1 line.

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/ Kali Levy
Kali Levy
Contract Environmental Protection Specialist
Portland State University
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:** Clark County Verizon Upgrades

**Project Site Description**

The project sites are located in Clark County, Washington on fee-owned rights-of-way (ROW) in urban areas. All structures are accessible by access roads or driveways. The primary vegetation around the structures and access roads is maintained grass.

**Franklin Park:** Project actions would occur on structure 2/3 of the Ross-Alcoa No. 3 line (Township 2 North, Range 1 East, and Section 10).

**Bagley:** Project actions would occur on structure 35/3 of the North Bonneville-Ross No. 1 line (Township 2 North, Range 1 East, and Donation Land Claim 43).

**Cimarron:** Project actions would occur on structure 29/3 of the North Bonneville-Ross No. 1 line (Township 2 North, Range 2 East, and Section 25).

**Evaluation of Potential Impacts to Environmental Resources**

1. **Historic and Cultural Resources**

   Potential for Significance: No

   **Explanation:** BPA historian review of the proposed project actions found no potential to cause effects to historic resources.

2. **Geology and Soils**

   Potential for Significance: No

   **Explanation:** There would be no ground disturbance with this project.

3. **Plants (including Federal/state special-status species and habitats)**

   Potential for Significance: No

   **Explanation:** No special-status plants are known to be in the project areas. Additionally, the structures are accessible by access roads and driveways, the use of which would minimize impacts to vegetation. Some vegetation may be crushed.
4. **Wildlife (including Federal/state special-status species and habitats)**

   Potential for Significance: No

   Explanation: No special-status wildlife are known to be near the project sites. Project locations are not located within or adjacent to any critical habitat areas. Any local wildlife in the area may be temporarily be disturbed by project noise.

   Notes:
   - If any active nests are found on the structures prior to construction, the construction would be delayed until the nests are unoccupied.

5. **Water Bodies, Floodplains, and Fish (including Federal/state special-status species, ESUs, and habitats)**

   Potential for Significance: No

   Explanation: The project sites are not located in or near water bodies.

6. **Wetlands**

   Potential for Significance: No

   Explanation: The project sites are not located in wetlands.

7. **Groundwater and Aquifers**

   Potential for Significance: No

   Explanation: There would be no ground disturbance with this project. There would be no effect to groundwater or aquifers.

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

   Potential for Significance: No

   Explanation: There would be no change of land use. The project sites house existing communications equipment.

9. **Visual Quality**

   Potential for Significance: No

   Explanation: There would be minimal changes to the appearance of the project sites.
10. Air Quality

Potential for Significance: No

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

Potential for Significance: No

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

12. Human Health and Safety

Potential for Significance: No

Explanation: All applicable safety standards would be followed during project work. The project would not create conditions that would increase risk 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: N/A

Require siting and construction or major expansion of waste storage, disposal, recovery, or treatment facilities (including incinerators) that are not otherwise categorically excluded.

Explanation: N/A

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: N/A

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: N/A
**Landowner Notification, Involvement, or Coordination**

**Description:** BPA owns the land where work would occur. Verizon would be responsible for coordinating landowner notifications to gain access.

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

Signed: /s/ Kali Levy ____________________________ 12/1/2021  
Kali Levy, ECT – 4  
Contract Environmental Protection Specialist  
Portland State University