### **Bonneville Power Administration**

# memorandum

DATE: May 19, 2011

REPLY TO

ATTN OF: KEC-4

SUBJECT: Environmental Clearance Memorandum

то: Lee Watts

Project Manager - KEWM-4

**Proposed Action:** Reintroduction of westslope cutthroat trout in the Pend Orielle basin.

Fish and Wildlife Project No.: 2007-149-00, Contract #BPA-52530

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

**B1.20** Small-scale activities undertaken to protect, restore, or improve fish and wildlife habitat, fish passage facilities (such as fish ladders or minor diversion channels), or fisheries.

**<u>Location</u>**: Four Creeks will be included in the project:

- Cee Cee Ah Creek: Township 34 North, Range 44 East, Section 28, Pend Oreille County, WA
- Middle Creek: Township 35 North, Range 44 East, Section 15, Pend Oreille County, WA
- Upper West Branch: Township 35 North, Range 45 East, Section 25, Pend Oreille County, WA
- Paqua Creek: Township 35 North, Range 44 East, Section 25, Pend Oreille County, WA

**Proposed by:** Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) and the Kalispel Tribe of Indians. (Kalispel Tribe).

<u>Description of the Proposed Action</u>: BPA proposes to fund the Kalispel Tribe's Westslope Cutthroat Trout (WCT) reintroduction activities on Cee Cee Ah, Colza, and Paqua Creeks. WCT have recently been extirpated in upper Cee Cee Ah Creek due to displacement by brook trout. In 2008, 2009, and 2010, Cee Cee Ah Creek was treated with rotenone and non-native brook trout were successfully eradicated. Re-invasion of the treatment area is impossible due to the Cee Cee Ah Falls.

Assessments completed through BPA project 1995-001-00 have identified WCT and brook trout distribution throughout the Upper West Branch Priest River (UWB) watershed. WCT are at relatively low densities and confined to headwater reaches. Two tributary streams - Colza and Paqua creeks--were found to be void of fish. In 2010, the Kalispel Tribe determined that 100 WCT could be mined from the UWB population without impacting genetic health. In 2011, 50 male and 50 female WCT would be collected in UWB and translocated into fishless reaches in Paqua Creek.

#### Cee Cee Ah Creek Reintroduction

One-hundred mature, pre-spawn WCT--50 males and 50 females--would be collected from Middle Creek, a neighboring tributary, and translocated directly into reclaimed reaches of Cee Cee Ah Creek. That effort would immediately be followed by the collection of eggs and sperm from Middle Creek WCT. Fertilized eggs from 25 pairs would be incubated in egg tubes that would be buried 15-20 centimeters (cm) in the creek bottom with about four cm washed gravel obtained off-site from a landscape material supplier. Egg tubes would be evenly dispersed around the four release locations. Eggs from the remaining 25 pairs would be evenly divided and incubated in four remote-site incubators (RSIs). Each RSI would be placed near one of the four release sites.

#### Upper West Branch Reintroduction

The Kalispel Tribe would collect 50 mature male and 50 mature female WCT from the Upper West Branch of the Priest River (UWB) and would relocate them into an unoccupied stream segment in Paqua Creek, which is located upstream of a fish passage barrier. The fish would be collected from UWB using electrofishing gear after the fish have spawned. No more than 10 fish would be collected per 100 meters of stream channel in order to limit the number of related individuals. The fish would be transported in large aerated buckets.

<u>Biological Resources:</u> BPA issued a Determination of No Effect memo for threatened and endangered species on April 14, 2011. The memo details the project actions and how their impact may or may not effect threatened and endangered species (as listed under the Endangered Species Act) or their habitat. The analysis found that, due to the low-impact of the action, combined with the lack of presence of threatened and endangered species in the project areas, there would be no effect from this project.

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.

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.

/s/ Hannah Dondy-Kaplan

Hannah Dondy-Kaplan Environmental Protection Specialist – KEC-4

Concur:

/s/ Katherine S. Pierce Date: May 19, 2011

Katherine S. Pierce

NEPA Compliance Officer – KEC-4

Attachment:

Environmental Checklist for Categorical Exclusions

## **Environmental Checklist for Categorical Exclusions**

Name of Proposed Project:	Reintroduction of wests basin	lope cutthroat tro	at in the Pend Orielle
Work Order #: #BPA- 19	6897		
This project has been found to $\underline{not}$ adversely affect the following environmentally sensitive resources, laws, and regulations:			
Environmental Resources		No Adverse Effect	No Adverse Effect With Conditions
Cultural Resources No ground disturbing work would	d occur	X	
2. T & E Species, or their hab All applicable permits would be or		X ould be affected. No	Effect memo on file
3. Floodplains or wetlands		X	
4. Areas of special designation	n	X	
5. Health & safety		X	
6. Prime agricultural lands		X	
7. Special sources of water There would be no consumptive v	water use	X	
8. Consistency with state and All applicable permits will be obt	<del>-</del>	X	
9. Pollution control at Federal	facilities	X	
10. Other		X	
List supporting documentation	attached (if needed):		

Signed: <u>/s/ Hannah Dondy-Kaplan</u> Date: <u>May 19, 2011</u>