United States Government

memorandum

date: July 13, 2010

REPLY TO ATTN OF: KEC-4

SUBJECT: Environmental Clearance Memorandum

το: Sandra Fife Project Manager – KEWU-4

Proposed Action: Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) would provide funds to the Confederated Tribes of the Colville Reservation [Colville Confederated Tribes] (CCT) for the acquisition of two parcels of land for wildlife mitigation in Okanogan County, Washington. Conservation easements would be placed on the two parcels as part of the purchase and the lands would be managed by the CCT.

Budget Information: Work Order # 198353

Fish and Wildlife Project No.: 2007-27-007, CR#41714

Categorical Exclusion Applied (from Subpart D, 10 C.F.R. Part 1021):

B1.25 Transfer, lease, disposition or acquisition of interests in uncontaminated land for habitat preservation or wildlife management, and only associated buildings that support these purposes. Uncontaminated means that there would be no potential for release of substances at a level, or in a form, that would pose a threat to public health or the environment.

Location: Both properties are located in Okanogan County, Washington. Property near Omak: Township 34 North, Range 27 East, Sections 22, 24-28 and 34-36. Property near Omak Lake: Township 32 North, Range 27 East, Section 16, Parcels 1001, 1005 and 2003.

Proposed by: BPA, CCT

Description of the Proposed Action: BPA funds the Federal Columbia River Power System (FCRPS) Wildlife Mitigation Program, which is tasked with the acquisition and restoration of key habitats within the Columbia River basin. The FCRPS mitigation program purchases private land to be owned and managed by program participants for the protection, mitigation, and enhancement of wildlife affected by the construction and operation of the federal hydroelectric facilities on the Columbia River, such as Chief Joseph Dam. These parcels would have perpetual conservation easements placed upon them to restrict activities that could affect the habitat value.

The BPA is proposing to fund the CCT to acquire two properties totaling 2,313 acres in Okanogan County, Washington. These areas include 1,993-acres near Omak, and 320-acres near Omak Lake. The properties proposed for acquisition contain a variety of wildlife habitat that will provide BPA with credits for partial mitigation of wildlife habitat losses due to the construction and operation of the FCRPS. The subject property provides habitat for Sharp-tailed, blue, and Sage grouse, as well as mule deer, white-tailed deer, bobcat, mourning dove, Lewis and downy woodpecker, mink, bats, and waterfowl.

BPA would provide funds for the CCT to purchase the property and a perpetual conservation easement would be placed on the property to protect its value for fish and wildlife. The property would be owned and managed by the CCT. Closure for the purchase of the property is expected in the fall of 2010.

Once these lands have been acquired, the CCT would develop a management plan to guide the protection and enhancement of resources on the property. The public would be given the opportunity to review and provide comments on any proposed actions and the management plan prior to implementation of these actions and plans.

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). 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, 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, or (iv) adversely affect environmentally sensitive resources.

Based on the provision that a cultural resource survey will be conducted prior to any ground disturbing actives, this proposed action meets the requirements for the Categorical Exclusion referenced above. We therefore determine that the proposed action may be categorically excluded from further NEPA review and documentation.

<u>/s/ Lisa S. Wright</u> Lisa S. Wright Environmental Protection Specialist –KEC-4

Concur:

<u>/s/ Katherine S. Pierce</u> Katherine S. Pierce NEPA Compliance Officer

DATE: July 13, 2010

Attachments: Environmental Checklist for Categorical Exclusions Map of Parcels

Environmental Checklist for Categorical Exclusions

Name of Proposed Project: Okanogan County Wildlife Habitat Land Acquisition

Project #: 2007-027-00, CR#41714

This project has been found to <u>not</u> adversely affect the following environmentally sensitive resources, laws, and regulations:

Environmental Resources	No Adverse Effect	No Adverse Effect With Conditions
1. Cultural Resources	X	
No effect as this is strictly a land acquisition.		
2. T & E Species, or their habitat(s)	X	
No effect as this is strictly a land acquisition.		
3. Floodplains or wetlands	Χ	
No effect as this is strictly a land acquisition.		
4. Areas of special designation	X	
No effect as this is strictly a land acquisition.		
5. Health & safety	Χ	
No effect as this is strictly a land acquisition.		
6. Prime agricultural lands	Χ	
No effect as this is strictly a land acquisition.		
7. Special sources of water	X	
No effect as this is strictly a land acquisition.		
8. Consistency with state and local laws and regulations	s X	
No effect as this is strictly a land acquisition.		
9. Pollution control at Federal facilities	X	
No effect as this is strictly a land acquisition.		
10. Other	X	
No effect as this is strictly a land acquisition.		

List supporting documentation attached (if needed):

Signed: /s/ Lisa S. Wright

Date: June 15, 2010

