memorandum

DATE: September 4, 2012

REPLY TO
ATTN OF: KEC-4

SUBJECT: Supplement Analysis for the Chief Joseph Hatchery Program (DOE/EIS-0384/SA-01)

TO: Linda Hermeston
Project Manager – KEWU-4

Proposed Action: Chief Joseph Hatchery Program Excess Excavated Material Removal

Fish and Wildlife Project No.: 2003-023-00

Location: Chief Joseph Dam near Bridgeport, Okanogan County, WA

Proposed by: Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) and the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation (CTCR) (NEPA cooperating agency)

Background: In 2009, BPA completed the Chief Joseph Hatchery Program Final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) (DOE/EIS-0384). In 2010, BPA issued a Record of Decision (ROD) documenting its decision to fund the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation to construct, operate and maintain the Chief Joseph Hatchery Program (CJHP). Construction of the hatchery began in fall 2010 and is currently underway. It was expected that native earthen material excavated from the construction of the hatchery could be used on site. However, it has become apparent that this material has become excess to construction needs and a hindrance to further CJHP construction. BPA is now proposing to have about 10,000 cubic yards of material moved off-site. The material would be loaded and trucked about 4 miles starting from the hatchery site on Half Sun Way to WA-17 and then via unimproved access roads where it would be dumped at one of several old gravel pits used as a source of construction material for the Chief Joseph Dam in 1949-1950. This particular gravel pit is on CTCR land near their trout hatchery in upland habitat. See attached aerial photograph. The CTCR would issue a permit to accept the material. The work would occur in late summer and autumn of 2012. Traffic safety signing, dust abatement, soil stabilization, restrictions on work hours, and weed management would also occur as needed per the CJHP EIS.

Analysis: With the removal of the excavated material, the Chief Joseph Hatchery Program is essentially the same as described in the 2009 Final EIS and 2010 ROD. The loading, hauling and dumping of the fill material would represent an increase in truck traffic, noise and dust for about 4 weeks to and at the gravel pit/dump site. However, this increase would appear insignificant given the amount of traffic, noise and dust that was described in the EIS and has been occurring and will continue to occur with the CJHP construction. Also, there are no residences or businesses in the vicinity other than scattered orchards and the resident fish hatchery itself that may be adversely affected. Effects at the CJHP hatchery site would be unchanged.
The travel route and gravel pit/dump site were evaluated for potential effects to cultural materials and Endangered Species Act-protected species and habitat. No effects are anticipated. See attached cultural resources clearance memo from the CTCR History/Archaeology Department.

**Findings:** This Supplement Analysis finds that the proposed action does not represent substantial changes to the Chief Joseph Hatchery Program relative to environmental concerns, and that there are no new circumstances or new information relevant to environmental concerns regarding the proposed action or its impacts. Therefore, no additional NEPA documentation is necessary.

/s/ Mickey Carter  
Mickey Carter  
Environmental Project Manager – KEC-4

Concur:

/s/ Stacy Mason  
Stacy Mason  
NEPA Compliance Officer – KEC-4

2 Attachments: 
Aerial Photo of gravel pit  
Archaeological clearance memo
To: Chasity Watt, IRMP Coordinator  
From: Jon Meyer, Tribal Archaeologist  
Cc: Kary Nichols, Fish and Wildlife Department  
File (JM); Chron.  
Date: August 30, 2012  
Re: Material Transfer from Chief Joseph Hatchery to Resident Fish Hatchery – 12pp268 (H/A #12.0489:U12-400)

Several cultural sites lie within one mile of the project area. However, the proposed project is unlikely to affect these sites and no sites have been previously recorded within project area. Consequently, we have no objections to this project being categorically excluded from NEPA review. As the project moves forward, we ask that the proponent keep in mind the following requirements for cultural resources protection that still carry forward, even if a project has been categorically exempted.

Inadvertent Discoveries (43 CFR 10.4) - In the event that human remains, burials, funerary items, sacred objects, or objects of cultural patrimony are found during project implementation, the proponent or his authorized agent shall cease work immediately within 200 ft. of the find. They shall then take steps to protect the find from further damage or disruption. Then they shall contact the THPO at (509) 634-2654 [desk] or the Tribal Archaeologist at (509) 634-2691 [desk] or (509) 631-2130 [cell] to report the find. The THPO or the Tribal Archaeologist shall contact the appropriate law enforcement authority if human remains are found. No further work shall be allowed on the project until the THPO has approved a plan for managing or preserving the remains or items.

Post-Review Discoveries (36 CFR 800.13) - In the event that prehistoric artifacts (i.e., arrowheads, spear points, mortars, pestles, other ground stone tools, knives, scrapers, or flakes from the manufacture of tools, fire pits, peeled trees, etc.) or historic-period artifacts or features (i.e., fragments of old plates or ceramic vessels, weathered glass, dumps of old cans, cabins, root cellars, etc.) are found during project implementation, the proponent or his authorized agent shall cease work immediately within 200 ft. of the find. Then they shall contact the THPO at (509) 634-2654 [desk] or the Tribal Archaeologist at (509) 634-2691 [desk] or (509) 631-2130 [cell] to report the find. No further work shall be allowed on the project until the THPO has approved a plan for managing or preserving the artifacts or features.

Changes in the Project Description (36 CFR 800.4) - Activities that have the potential to disturb cultural resources outside the areas specified in the accompanying document(s) are not approved and should not proceed until the agency consults with the THPO regarding the new Area of Potential Effects and review of potential adverse effects in the new area has been completed.