

United States Government

Department of Energy

Bonneville Power Administration

memorandum

DATE: November 10, 2005

REPLY TO
ATTN OF: KEC-4

SUBJECT: Supplement Analysis for the Watershed Management Program EIS (DOE/EIS-0265/SA-241)

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

Proposed Action: Idaho Model Watershed Projects for FY 05

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; 4.2 Water Measuring Devices; 4.23 Intake and Return Diversion Screens; 4.25 Consolidate/Replace Irrigation Diversion Dams

Location: L-3 Site within the Lemhi Soil and Water Conservation District (SWCD), Lemhi County, ID.

Proposed by: Bonneville Power Administration (BPA), Bureau of Reclamation, Lemhi SWCD.

Description of the Proposed Action: BPA is proposing to provide funding for the L-3 Diversion/Return Flow Screening project through the Lemhi SWCD. The project is proposed to screen salmon and steelhead from entering the ditch system above the L-3 wasteway diversion, improve watershed conditions below the diversion, resulting in improved anadromous and native fish migration and habitat in a side channel habitat to the Lemhi River. The project was planned and coordinated by the Bureau of Reclamation in Salmon, Idaho.

The L3 Diversion/Return Flow Screen diversion replacement project involves the installation of concrete weir, headgate and associated facilities in an irrigation ditch. The structures would require little or no annual maintenance other than debris removal, and are designed to provide year round fish screening in all flow conditions. These structures would replace temporary barriers made up of various available materials, which have to be rebuilt seasonally and often are ineffective at blocking anadromous fish passage into the ditch system.

Analysis: The BOR was primarily responsible for completing the environmental compliance documents for the project. As designed and presented to BPA, the project meets the standards and guidelines for the Watershed Management Program Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and Record of Decision (ROD).

Species listed under the Endangered Species Act (ESA), which may occur in the general vicinity of the project, were analyzed by a local Fish and Wildlife Service Biologist through informal consultation, and a 'no effect' finding was suggested. The project was also evaluated against the Habitat Improvement Project programmatic Biological Opinion (for NMFS ESA compliance and consultation on Essential Fish Habitat under the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act). Formal consultation was not necessary for any ESA-listed species in the projects' vicinities.

A cultural resource review and ID SHPO concurrence was completed for the project. 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 project. No construction is authorized to begin until the proponent has obtained all applicable local, state, and federal permits and approvals.

Public involvement has taken place as part of the project through 3 sets of recurrent, open public meetings (USBWP Technical Team monthly meetings, SWCD monthly meetings, Soil Conservation Commission Advisory Board quarterly meetings); informational brochures, materials, and displays in public forums (e.g. fairs and conferences); field tours, agency coordination meetings, personal conversations, and mail correspondence.

Findings: The project is 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

Katherine S. Pierce

Acting NEPA Compliance Officer

DATE: November 10, 2005

cc:

Mr. Al Simpson, BOR, Salmon, ID

Ms. Elizabeth Olson, LSWCD, Salmon, ID

Mr. Russell Knight, USBWP, Salmon, ID