

Categorical Exclusion Determination

Bonneville Power Administration

Department of Energy



Proposed Action: Yakama Nation's Fortune and Harris Property Fenceline

Project No.: 1997-051-00

Project Manager: Daniel Newberry, EWU-4

Location: Yakima County, Washington

Categorical Exclusion Applied (from 10 C.F.R. Part 1021): B1.11 Fencing; B1.20 Protection of cultural resources, fish and wildlife habitat

Description of the Proposed Action: Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) proposes to fund the Yakama Nation Klickitat Fisheries Project (YKFP) to install a fenceline along the property boundaries of the Fortune and Harris properties to address trespass. YKFP would also install a 12-foot-wide electric remote access gate.

YKFP would install a property boundary fenceline on the Fortune property and the Harris property. The fenceline at the Fortune property would be approximately 590 feet long. The fenceline at the Harris property would be approximately 660 feet long. Fencing would be installed at a height of 4 feet, using up to 3-inch-diameter steel support posts with up to four smooth strands of wire between posts. It is anticipated that up to 60 posts would be needed for the Fortune property, and up to 70 posts would be needed for the Harris property. Installation would be completed manually using hand tools and lightweight mechanical equipment. Post holes would be installed at a depth of up to 3 feet. YKFP would access the project sites via existing roads and on foot.

YKFP would install a 12-foot by 4-foot gate on the Fortune property. The gate would be constructed out of galvanized chain link and solar powered mechanism. The gate would be installed on existing support posts and tied into an existing fence. Installation would be completed manually using hand tools and light weight mechanical equipment.

These actions would support ongoing efforts to mitigate for the effects of the Federal Columbia River Power System on fish and wildlife in the mainstem Columbia River and its tributaries pursuant to the Pacific Northwest Electric Power Planning and Conservation Act of 1980 (Northwest Power Act) (16 U.S.C. (USC) 839 et seq.).

Findings: In accordance with Section 1021.102 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; 89 FR 34074, April 30, 2024; 90 FR 29676, July 3, 2025 [Interim Final Rule]) and *DOE National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), Implementing Procedures* (dated June 30, 2025), BPA has determined the following:

- 1) The proposed action fits within a class of actions listed in Appendix B of 10 CFR 1021;
- 2) The proposal has not been segmented to meet the definition of a categorical exclusion; and

- 3) There are no extraordinary circumstances related to the proposed action that may affect the significance of the environmental effects of the proposal (see attached Environmental Evaluation).

Based on these determinations, BPA finds that the proposed action is categorically excluded from further NEPA review.

Catherine Clark
Environmental Protection Specialist

Concur:

Katey C. Grange
NEPA Compliance Officer

Attachment(s): Environmental Evaluation

Categorical Exclusion Environmental Evaluation

This evaluation 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: Yakama Nation's Fortune and Harris Property Fenceline

Project Site Description

The proposed project would be located in Naches, Washington in Yakima County. The land is on Yakama Nation fee-owned property. The two properties are managed by the YKFP biologists; therefore, the land is primarily reserved for terrestrial and aquatic species habitat.

Evaluation of Potential Impacts to Environmental Resources

1. Historic and Cultural Resources

Potential for Significance: No

Explanation: On January 23, 2026, BPA completed a combined initiation and determination consultation (WA 2024 189) under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) on the proposed project. Consulting parties for the proposed project included the Confederated Tribes and Bands of the Yakama Nation (YN) and the Washington State Department of Archaeology and Historic Properties (DAHP). BPA determined that the proposed project would result in no historic properties affected. Washington DAHP concurred on January 26, 2026 and YN concurred on January 27, 2026.

2. Geology and Soils

Potential for Significance: No

Explanation: The proposed fence installation would require light excavation to install fence posts; these actions would be minor and localized to the property boundary.

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

Potential for Significance: No

Explanation: No Endangered Species Act (ESA)-listed, or state special-status plant species are within the project sites. Proposed activities would remove minimal plant species along the property boundary. Therefore, there would be minimal effect to plant species and no effect to ESA-listed or state special-status plant species.

4. Wildlife (including Federal/state special-status species and habitats)

Potential for Significance: No

Explanation: ESA-listed, yellow-billed cuckoo (*Coccyzus americanus*) may be present on the properties; however, they have not been documented within the project areas. There would be no negative effect on ESA-listed wildlife species, and long term effect of maintaining and enhancing these properties would have a long term positive impact on ESA-listed wildlife species.

There would be mild negative impacts to non-listed wildlife from some of the proposed project activities. Wildlife would potentially be disturbed by human presence and noise. The effect would be temporary and consistent with typical activities on adjacent lands. There would be no long term negative effect on wildlife, and long term effects of maintaining and

enhancing the properties would have long term positive impacts on local and migratory wildlife in the area.

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

Potential for Significance: No

Explanation: The Naches River contains ESA-listed bull trout (*Salvelinus confluentus*), Chinook salmon (*Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*), coho salmon (*Oncorhynchus kisutch*), and steelhead (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*) and their critical habitat. The proposed actions would not physically alter any aquatic habitat that listed species occupy and would not involve any in-water work. Therefore, there would be no adverse impacts to water bodies, floodplains, or fish.

6. Wetlands

Potential for Significance: No

Explanation: There are mapped wetlands located within the properties (USFWS National Wetlands Inventory), but there are no wetlands in the upland areas where project activities would occur, so there would be no impacts to wetlands.

7. Groundwater and Aquifers

Potential for Significance: No

Explanation: No new wells or use of ground water are proposed. All support post holes would avoid groundwater levels. The proposed activities would have no long-term impact to groundwater or aquifers.

8. Land Use and Specially-Designated Areas

Potential for Significance: No

Explanation: There would be no change to land use and no impact to specially-designated areas. YKFP manages the properties where the proposed project would take place. In the long term, the installation of the property boundary fence would prevent trespass and would support the intended use of the properties.

9. Visual Quality

Potential for Significance: No

Explanation: The proposed activities would have little effect on visual quality. Minor changes such as fence and gate installations would occur. Overall, the project would protect the properties from disturbance by removing sections of unauthorized access.

10. Air Quality

Potential for Significance: No

Explanation: There would be minor temporary effect to the air quality of the environment from exhaust due to vehicle use for project activities as a result of this project. Normal conditions would return upon project completion.

11. Noise

Potential for Significance: No

Explanation: The proposed activities would result in minor, temporary increase in ambient noise due to human presence, and use of vehicles and equipment. Normal conditions would return upon project completion.

12. Human Health and Safety

Potential for Significance: No

Explanation: The proposed work is not considered hazardous, nor does it result in any health or safety risks to the general public. There would be no soil contamination or hazardous conditions and no CERCLA sites.

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: Project activities proposed by YKFP would be implemented by employees on property managed by the tribe. YKFP staff would work with appropriate personnel to get project approval.

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

Signed:

Catherine Clark
Environmental Protection Specialist