United States Government

Department of Energy Bonneville Power Administration

memorandum

date: May 7, 2012

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-57129

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

Location: Two Creeks would be included in the project:

- Cee Cee Ah Creek: Township 34 North, Range 44 East, Section 28, Pend Oreille County, WA
- East Fork Smalle Creek: Township 33 North, Range 43 East, Section 6, Pend Oreille County, WA

Proposed by: Bonneville Power Administration (BPA)

Description of the Proposed Action: BPA proposes to continue to fund the Kalispel Tribe of Indians' Westslope Cutthroat Trout (WCT) reintroduction activities on Cee Cee Ah Creek. 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.

In 2011, adult WCT were reintroduced to 5.2 miles of the creek by translocating 100 adult fish. In 2012, once WCT spawning is underway in East Fork Smalle Creek, eggs would be collected from a total of 50 females and fertilized by sperm from 50 males over the course of two to three weeks. Fertilized eggs from 25 pairs would be incubated in egg tubes that would be buried 15-20 centimeters (cm) in the creek bottom with four cm washed gravel obtained off-site. 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.

Biological Resources: BPA issued a Determination of No Effect memo for threatened and endangered species on May 4, 2012. 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, 76 FR 63764, Nov. 14, 2011). 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, has not been segmented to meet the definition of a categorical exclusion, 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, (iv) have the potential to cause significant impacts on environmentally sensitive resources, or (v) involve genetically engineered organisms, synthetic biology, governmentally designated noxious weeds, or invasive species, unless the proposed activity would be contained or confined in a manner designed and operated to prevent unauthorized release into the environment and conducted in accordance with applicable requirements.

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/ Hannah Dondy-Kaplan</u> Hannah Dondy-Kaplan Environmental Protection Specialist – KEC-4

Concur:

<u>/s/ Katherine S. Pierce</u> Katherine S. Pierce NEPA Compliance Officer Date: May 15, 2012

Attachment: Environmental Checklist for Categorical Exclusions

Environmental Checklist for Categorical Exclusions

Name of Proposed Project: Reintroduction of westslope cutthroat trout in the Pend Orielle basin

Work Order #: #BPA- 196897

This project does <u>not</u> have the potential to cause significant impacts on the following environmentally sensitive resources. See 10 CFR 1021, Subpart D, Appendix B for complete descriptions of the resources. This checklist is to be used as a summary – further discussion may be included in the Categorical Exclusion Memorandum.

Environmental Resources	No Potential for Significance	No Potential, with Conditions (describe)
1. Historic Properties and Cultural Resources No ground disturbing work would occur	X	
2. T & E Species, or their habitat(s) All applicable permits would be obtained; no terrestrial specie	X es would be affected. No Ef	fect memo on file
3. Floodplains or wetlands	X	
4. Areas of special designation	X	
5. Health & safety	X	
6. Prime or unique farmlands	X	
7. Special sources of water There would be no consumptive water use	X	
8. Other (describe)		
List supporting documentation attached (if needed):		

Signed: <u>/s/ Hannah Dondy-Kaplan</u> Date: <u>May 7, 2012</u>