Categorical Exclusion Determination

Bonneville Power Administration Department of Energy



Proposed Action: Continued funding to CRITFC for the monitoring of Snake River spring Chinook in the Grande Ronde Subbasin

Project No.: 2009-004-00

Project Manager: Tracy Hauser

Location: Grande Ronde Subbasin, Union and Wallowa Counties, Oregon

<u>Categorical Exclusion Applied (from Subpart D, 10 C.F.R. Part 1021)</u>: B3.3 - Research related to conservation of fish and wildlife

Description of the Proposed Action: BPA proposes to continue funding the Columbia River Inter-Tribal Commission (CRITFC) in the Grande Ronde Subbasin for the development of a long-term monitoring program in Catherine Creek and Upper Grande Ronde watersheds supporting listed Snake River spring Chinook. Snake River spring Chinook are key to the viability of the major population group of the Grande Ronde Subbasin. These activities fulfil commitments begun under the 2008 NMFS Federal Columbia River Power System Biological Opinion (as supplemented in 2010 and 2014) (2008 BiOp) and ongoing commitments under the 2019 NMFS Columbia River System BiOp (2019 CRS BiOp).

This program would involve assessment of standard fish habitat conditions and a variety of other monitoring aims including: assessment of abundance, distribution, and growth of juvenile salmonids and other fish species; development of water temperature models; development of low flow models; mapping of current and potential natural riparian vegetation; life cycle modeling; modeling of fish/habitat relationships and macroinvertebrate/habitat relationships using various statistical procedures; analysis of land use impacts on aquatic habitat conditions; and development of a database of restoration activities.

Fieldwork would involve the measurement of a suite of characteristics using a modified version of the Columbia Habitat Monitoring Program (CHaMP) protocol, which consists of classifying channel unit type (pool, riffle, run); measuring stream channel dimension (width, depth, length); counting pieces of large woody debris; measuring water temperature and measuring substrate size. In addition, benthic macroinvertebrate species composition and biomass, and fish abundance, size distribution, and fish growth would be measured using snorkeling and snorkelherding. Biological sampling methods would include snorkel surveys to estimate abundance of juvenile salmonids and benthic macroinvertebrate sampling using a kick net. There would be no handling or tagging of fish. The work would be focused on Chinook spawning and rearing areas (current and potential) throughout the stream system.

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.

<u>/s/ Travis D. Kessler</u> Travis D. Kessler Contract Environmental Protection Specialist Salient CRGT, Inc.

Reviewed by:

<u>/s/ Chad Hamel</u> Chad Hamel Supervisory Environmental Protection Specialist

Concur:

Date: March 6, 2020

<u>/s/ Katey Grange</u> Katey 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: Continued funding to CRITFC for the monitoring of Snake River spring Chinook in the Grande Ronde Subbasin

|--|

All activities would occur within the Catherine Creek and Upper Grande Ronde watersheds in Grande Ronde Subbasin in Union and Wallowa Counties, Oregon.

| | Environmental Resource Impacts | No Potential for Significance | No Potential for Significance, with Conditions |
|----|---|---|--|
| 1. | Historic and Cultural Resources | | |
| | Explanation: There would be no ground distur the potential to affect historic properties or cult | | he proposed activities do not have |
| 2. | Geology and Soils | $\mathbf{\overline{v}}$ | |
| | Explanation: No ground disturbing activities a potential to affect geology and soils. | are proposed. Thus, th | e proposed activities do not have the |
| 3. | Plants (including Federal/state special- status species and habitats) | | |
| | Explanation: No ground disturbing or vegetat no impact to Endangered Species Act (ESA)- | | |
| 4. | Wildlife (including Federal/state special- status species and habitats) | | |
| | Explanation: No ground disturbing or other a Thus, there would be no impact to ESA-listed | | |
| 5. | Water Bodies, Floodplains, and Fish (including Federal/state special-status species, ESUs, and habitats) | | |
| | Explanation: Fish research on hatchery-origin wide-spread activity within the Columbia Rive Biological Opinion under the 2008 NMFS Fed supplemented in 2010 and 2014) (2008 BiOp Columbia River System BiOp (2019 CRS BiO Memorandum describing the maximum numb year—the number of fish tagged in support of | er basin. Since these a leral Columbia River F) and ongoing commit p), NMFS annually iss er of individual ESA-li | activities are requirements in the Power System Biological Opinion (as ments under the 2019 NMFS sues a Determination of Take sted fish may be tagged in a given |

Bull trout are covered under Section 6 cooperative agreement with ODFW and the USFWS.

There would be no impact to adjacent waterbodies or floodplains because no ground disturbing activities are proposed.

| 6. | Wetlands | | | | |
|-----|---|-----------------------------------|-------------------|--|--|
| | Explanation: No ground disturbing activities are proposed. Thus, the action does not have the potential to impact wetlands. | | | | |
| 7. | Groundwater and Aquifers | | | | |
| | Explanation: No ground disturbing activities that may affect groundwater or aquifers are proposed. Thus, there would be no impact to groundwater and aquifers as a result of the proposed work. | | | | |
| 8. | Land Use and Specially-Designated Areas | | | | |
| | Explanation: Access to field sites is on existing road networks and all activities are compatible with local land uses. Thus, there would be no impact to land use and specially-designated areas as a result of the proposed work. | | | | |
| 9. | Visual Quality | | | | |
| | Explanation: There would be no change to the viewshed from the proposed work. Thus, there would be no impact to visual quality as a result of the proposed work. | | | | |
| 10. | Air Quality | | | | |
| | Explanation: The proposed work would have no effect on air quality. Any increase in emissions from vehicles accessing field sites would be very minor and short term. | | | | |
| 11. | Noise | | | | |
| | Explanation: The proposed work would not result in an increase in ambient noise. Thus, there would be no noise impacts as a result of the proposed work. | | | | |
| 12. | Human Health and Safety | | | | |
| | Explanation: The proposed work is not considered hazardous nor does it result in any health or safety risks to the general public. Thus, there would be no impacts to human health and safety as a result of the proposed work. | | | | |
| | Evaluation of Other In | ntegral Elements | | | |
| | e proposed project would also meet conditions that a e project would not: | re integral elements of the categ | orical exclusion. | | |
| | 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, contamin | nants, or CERCLA excluded petro | oleum 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

<u>Description</u>: No notification – All work would be completed at existing facilities or at mobile facilities accessed on existing roads on public lands.

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

Signed: <u>/s/ Travis D. Kessler</u>

Date: March 6, 2020

Travis D. Kessler, ECF Contract Environmental Protection Specialist Salient CRGT, Inc.