

memorandum

DATE: August 27, 2014

REPLY TO
ATTN OF: KEC-4

SUBJECT: Environmental Clearance Memorandum

TO: Sheila Adel
Technology Innovation Portfolio Manager, Technology Innovation – ST-3

Proposed Action: Aquatic Invasive Mussels Research

Categorical Exclusion Applied (from Subpart D, 10 C.F.R. Part 1021): B3.16 – Research activities in aquatic environments

Locations: San Justo Reservoir, California; Lake Roosevelt, Washington; Brownlee Reservoir, Idaho

Proposed by: Bonneville Power Administration (BPA)

Description of the Proposed Action: BPA proposes to partially fund research and modeling on the potential spread and impact of aquatic invasive mussels in the Columbia River Basin through BPA's Fiscal Year 2015 Technology Innovation Portfolio. Portland State University would conduct research and modeling efforts with co-sponsorship from the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation, San Benito County Water District, California Department of Water Resources, and Spokane Tribal Fisheries.

Research efforts would involve aquatic mussel and water sampling by using a buoy system of cages and data loggers moored to concrete block sinkers. Buoy sampling of aquatic mussels would occur on a temporary basis at San Justo Reservoir in California, a water body with established invasive mussel populations. Additional water samples would be taken along the Columbia River at Lake Roosevelt in Washington and along the Snake River at Brownlee Reservoir in Idaho where invasive aquatic mussels are not currently present. These samples would be used to model invasive mussel life stages within a water body to determine how hydroelectric facility operations may affect colonization.

Findings: BPA has determined that the proposed action complies with Section 1021.410 and Appendix B of Subpart D 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). The proposed action does not present any extraordinary circumstances that may affect the significance of the environmental effects of the proposal. The proposal is not connected [40 C.F.R. 1508.25(a)(1)] to other actions with potentially significant impacts, has not been segmented to meet the definition of a categorical exclusion, is not related to other proposed actions with cumulatively significant impacts [40 C.F.R. 1508.25(a)(2)], and is not precluded by 40 C.F.R. 1506.1 or 10 C.F.R. 1021.211. Moreover, the proposed action would not (i) threaten a violation of

applicable statutory, regulatory, or permit requirements for environment, safety, and health, (ii) require siting and construction or major expansion of waste storage, disposal, recovery, or treatment facilities, (iii) disturb hazardous substances, pollutants, contaminants, or Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act-excluded petroleum and natural gas products that pre-exist in the environment such that there would be uncontrolled or unpermitted releases, (iv) have the potential to cause significant impacts on environmentally sensitive resources, or (v) 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.

We therefore determine that the proposed action may be categorically excluded from further NEPA review and documentation.

/s/ Jeffrey J. Maslow
Jeffrey J. Maslow
Environmental Protection Specialist

Concur:

/s/ Katherine S. Pierce
Katherine S. Pierce
NEPA Compliance Officer

Date: *August 27, 2014*

Attachment:
Environmental Checklist for Categorical Exclusions

Environmental Checklist for Categorical Exclusions

Name of Proposed Project: Aquatic Invasive Mussels Research

Work Order #: 00003863

This project does not have the potential to cause significant impacts on the following environmentally sensitive resources. See 10 CFR 1021, Subpart D, Appendix B for complete descriptions of the resources. This checklist is to be used as a summary – further discussion may be included in the Categorical Exclusion Memorandum.

Environmental Resources	No Potential for Significance	No Potential, with Conditions (describe)
1. Historic Properties and Cultural Resources No potential to affect historic properties.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. T & E Species, or their habitat(s) No effect to T&E species because listed species and critical habitat would not be present at the sampling locations.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Floodplains or wetlands	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Areas of special designation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Health & safety	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Prime or unique farmlands	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. Special sources of water	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
8. Other (describe) Invasive Species Management: Best management practices (BMPs) must be implemented to prevent the inadvertent spread of invasive mussels sampled during research efforts. These BMPs include, but are not limited to, decontamination measures for equipment and euthanizing the mussels collected at San Justo Reservoir.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Supporting documentation in the official project file:
Effects Determination for Threatened and Endangered Species

Signed: /s/ Jeffrey J. Maslow

Date: August 27, 2014