

# Categorical Exclusion Determination

Bonneville Power Administration  
Department of Energy



**Proposed Action:** LURR 20140554 Reston Substation Fiber Optic Connection

**Project Manager:** Cynthia Rounds – TEP-TPP-1

**Location:** Douglas County, Oregon

**Categorical Exclusion Applied (from Subpart D, 10 C.F.R. Part 1021):** B4.9 Multiple use of powerline rights-of-way

**Description of the Proposed Action:** Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) is proposing to approve land use review request 20140554, which would allow LS Networks (LSN) to install a utility vault and underground four-inch PVC conduit with fiber optic line in BPA fee-owned right-of-way. LSN would like to create a new fiber optic connection between the LSN backbone fiber and their local loop provider in order to provide fast and reliable data transport. The new vault would be located near the substation entrance on Coos Wagon Bay Road. The conduit for the fiber optics would be placed by directional bore approximately two feet from the edge of the access road and would be approximately 800-feet long and 4-feet deep, terminating at the existing regeneration hut.

**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/ Elizabeth Siping

Elizabeth Siping  
Contract Environmental Protection Specialist  
Adecco Engineering & Technical

Reviewed by:

/s/ Gene Lynard

Gene Lynard  
Supervisory Environmental Protection Specialist

Concur:

/s/ Katherine S. Pierce

Katherine S. Pierce or Stacy L. Mason  
NEPA Compliance Officer

Date: December 18, 2014

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:** Reston Substation Fiberoptic Connection

---

### Project Site Description

Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) is proposing to approve land use review request 20140554, which would allow LS Networks (LSN) to install a utility vault and underground four-inch PVC conduit with fiber optic line in BPA fee-owned right-of-way. LSN would like to create a new fiber optic connection between the LSN backbone fiber and their local loop provider in order to provide fast and reliable data transport. The new vault would be located near the substation entrance on Coos Wagon Bay Road. The conduit for the fiber optics would be placed by directional bore approximately two feet from the edge of the access road and would be approximately 800-feet long and 4-feet deep, terminating at the existing regeneration hut.

### Evaluation of Potential Impacts to Environmental Resources

| Environmental Resource Impacts  | No Potential for Significance       | No Potential for Significance, with Conditions |
|---|-------------------------------------|--|
| 1. <b>Historic and Cultural Resources</b>   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>                       |
| <p><u>Explanation:</u> The initiation of consultation was sent to SHPO, and Confederated Tribes of Coos, Lower Umpqua &amp; Siuslaw Indians. SHPO concurred with the Determination of No Historic Properties Affected on November 20, 2014. No response was received from the Tribes; therefore, concurrence was assumed.</p> <p><u>Mitigation:</u> In the unlikely event that an archaeological object or site is encountered during project implementation, all ground disturbance at the location should cease immediately and the BPA environmental compliance lead and BPA archaeologist should be notified.</p> |                                     |  |
| 2. <b>Geology and Soils</b>   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>                       |
| <p><u>Explanation:</u> The proponent would install the conduit by directional bore. Minimal soil disturbance would occur.</p>   |                                     |  |
| 3. <b>Plants</b> (including federal/state special-status species)   | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>                       |
| <p><u>Explanation:</u> Project area consists of gravel and dirt fill and activities would disturb minimal vegetation.</p>   |                                     |  |
| 4. <b>Wildlife</b> (including federal/state special-status species and habitats)  | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/>                       |
| <p><u>Explanation:</u> Project area is not suitable for wildlife habitat.</p>   |                                     |  |

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



Explanation: The conduit would cross a culvert for an unnamed intermittent stream, which is a tributary to Rock Creek. Due to conduit placement by directional bore, there would be no impacts to the stream.

Mitigation: LSN would use Best Management Practices (BMPs) including check dams and sediment fence to protect the stream.

6. **Wetlands**



Explanation: No wetlands are present in the project area.

Mitigation: LSN would use BMPs, including check dams and sediment fence to protect a small wetland that is located near the outfall of the stream, outside of the project area.

7. **Groundwater and Aquifers**



Explanation: No new wells or use of ground water proposed.

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



Explanation: Temporary disturbance of an already disturbed area during construction.

9. **Visual Quality**



Explanation: The conduit would be underground and therefore would not be visible after installation.

10. **Air Quality**



Explanation: Small amount of dust and vehicle emissions during construction.

11. **Noise**



Explanation: Temporary, intermittent noise during construction.

12. **Human Health and Safety**



Explanation: No impact to human health and safety from the proposed project.

### **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: Not applicable.

---

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

Signed: /s/ Elizabeth Sipina

Date: December 18, 2014