DOE F 1325.8 e Electronic Form Approved by CGIR - 01/20/95(VB)
(8-89)

United States Government **Department of Energy**

Bonneville Power Administration

memorandum

DATE: April 17, 2006

REPLY TO ATTN OF: KEC-4

SUBJECT: Supplement Analysis for the Watershed Management Program EIS (DOE/EIS-0265/SA-258)

TO: Jan Brady - KEWR-4
Fish and Wildlife Project Manager

Proposed Action: Custer Soil and Water Conservation District (SWCD) Habitat Projects for FY 06, S-40 Diversion Modification and Rocky Mountain Ranch Riparian Protection Fence

Project No: 1994-017-00

Watershed Management Techniques or Actions Addressed Under This Supplement Analysis (See App. A of the Watershed Management Program EIS): 1.15 Fish Passage Improvements; 2.1 Maintain Healthy Riparian Plant Communities; 4.2 Water Measuring Devices; 4.12 Filter Strips; 4.23 Intake and Return Diversion Screens; 4.25 Consolidate/Replace Irrigation Diversion Dams; 6.1 Deferred Grazing; 6.10 Access: Fencing

Location: S-40 Site and Rocky Mountain Ranch Site in the Upper Salmon River Basin within the Custer SWCD, Custer County, ID.

Proposed by: Bonneville Power Administration (BPA), Bureau of Reclamation (BOR), USDA Forest Service Sawtooth National Recreation Area (SNRA), and Custer SWCD.

Description of the Proposed Action: The Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) is proposing to fund two watershed improvement projects through the ongoing Custer SWCD Holistic Watershed Improvement contract. The projects are proposed to improve watershed conditions, resulting in improved anadromous and native fish habitat.

The S-40 Diversion Modification project was planned and coordinated primarily by the Bureau of Reclamation in close partnership with the Custer SWCD and SNRA. The main purpose of the project is to improve fish migration and passage in the upper Salmon River.

The Rocky Mountain Ranch Riparian Protection Fence project was primarily planned and coordinated by the Custer SWCD in partnership with the ranch's landowner and the SNRA (land managers of adjacent property). The fence is intended to protect currently productive, high quality fish habitat by excluding livestock. The fence would be managed to allow wintering and migrating elk to access and use the riparian area.

Analysis: Both of these projects meet the standards and guidelines for the Watershed Management Program Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and Record of Decision (ROD).

Species listed under the federal Endangered Species Act (ESA) that may occur in the general vicinity of the projects were analyzed as appropriate in Biological Assessments (for USFWS ESA informal consultation and concurrence) and against the Habitat Improvement Project programmatic Biological Assessment area (for NMFS ESA compliance and consultation on Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) under the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act). Formal consultations were not necessary for any ESA-listed species in the projects' vicinities.

Cultural resource reviews and ID SHPO concurrences were completed for the projects. No sites or resources were found. If cultural deposits are found during project implementation, then ground-disturbing work will stop until all finds are inspected and evaluated by a qualified party.

Standard water quality protection procedures and Best Management Practices will be followed during the implementation of the projects. No construction is authorized to begin until the proponent has obtained all applicable local, state, and federal permits and approvals.

Public involvement occurred as part of the projects through recurrent, open public meetings (SWCD monthly meetings, and Soil Conservation Commission Advisory Board quarterly meetings); informational brochures, materials, and displays in public forums (e.g. fairs and conferences); and field tours, agency coordination meetings (including Model Watershed Technical Team meetings), personal conversations, and mail and email correspondence.

Findings: The projects are generally consistent with Section 7.6 A.2, 7.6 B.3, & 7.8 E.1, of the Northwest Power Planning Council's Fish and Wildlife Program. This Supplement Analysis finds: 1) that the proposed action is substantially consistent with the Watershed Management Program EIS (DOE/EIS-0265) and ROD, and 2) that there are no new circumstances or information relevant to environmental concerns and bearing on the proposed actions or their impacts. Therefore, no further NEPA documentation is required.

/s/ Mickey Carter
Mickey Carter
Supervisory Environmental Protection Specialist

CONCUR:

/s/ Katherine S. Pierce DATE: *April 17, 2006*
Katherine S. Pierce
NEPA Compliance Officer

cc:
Mr. Al Simpson, BOR, 102 South Warpath, Salmon, ID 83467
Ms. Karma Bragg, Custer SWCD, P.O. Box 305, Challis, ID 83226
Ms. Ruth Wooding, SNRA, HC 64 Box 9900, Stanley, ID 83278