# **Categorical Exclusion Determination**

Bonneville Power Administration Department of Energy



**<u>Proposed Action</u>**: Monitoring and Evaluation Activities in Support of Johnson Creek Artificial Propagation Program

Project No.: 1996-043-00

Project Manager: J. McCloud, EWM-4

**Location:** Various locations in the South Fork Salmon River Sub Basin in Idaho: Idaho and Valley Counties, Idaho

**Categorical Exclusion Applied (from Subpart D, 10 C.F.R. Part 1021)**: B3.16 Research activities in aquatic environments

**Description of the Proposed Action:** Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) proposes to provide ongoing funds to the Nez Perce Tribe of Idaho (Nez Perce Tribe) to monitor natural and hatchery fish production and life history traits in support of the Johnson Creek Artificial Production Program. This monitoring and evaluation (M&E) program collects baseline life-history characteristic information, to examine survival of the natural and hatchery fish in Johnson Creek and the South Fork Salmon River Subbasin (i.e., East Fork South Fork Salmon River, South Fork Salmon River, Secesh River) and any potential effects that the Johnson Creek supplementation program may have on natural Chinook and steelhead populations.

Specific M&E activities may include the collection of juvenile and adult spring/summer Chinook and steelhead data through the use of rotary screw traps, spawning ground surveys, existing PIT tag arrays, and adult weir operations. Juveniles captured in the rotary screw traps may be PIT tagged and monitored to help inform abundance, survival, and life history characteristics. Adult spawning ground surveys and weir operations help to inform adult abundance, spawner distribution, and life history characteristics. No new weirs would be installed.

**Findings**: In accordance with Section 1021.410(b) 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), BPA has determined that the proposed action:

- (1) fits within a class of actions listed in Appendix B of 10 CFR 1021, Subpart D (see attached Environmental Checklist);
- (2) does not present any extraordinary circumstances that may affect the significance of the environmental effects of the proposal; and
- (3) has not been segmented to meet the definition of a categorical exclusion.

Based on these determinations, BPA finds that the proposed action is categorically excluded from further NEPA review.

<u>/s/ Katey Grange</u> Katey Grange Environmental Protection Specialist

Concur:

<u>/s/ Stacy L. Mason</u> Stacy L. Mason NEPA Compliance Officer Date: December 13, 2016

Attachment(s): Environmental Checklist

## **Categorical Exclusion Environmental Checklist**

This checklist documents environmental considerations for the proposed project and explains why the project would not have the potential to cause significant impacts on environmentally sensitive resources and would meet other integral elements of the applied categorical exclusion.

| Proposed Action: | Monitoring and Evaluation Activities in Support of Johnson Creek Artificial |
|------------------|---|
|                  | Propagation Program   |

### **Project Site Description**

Adult and juvenile M&E activities would be conducted throughout the South Fork Salmon River sub basin. Weirs and PIT tag arrays have been previously established. Screw trapping and spawner surveys are largely conducted within the waterbodies or from the stream banks.

#### **Evaluation of Potential Impacts to Environmental Resources**

|    | Environmental Resource<br>Impacts   | No Potential for<br>Significance | No Potential for Significance, with<br>Conditions |
|----|---|----------------------------------|---|
| 1. | Historic and Cultural Resources   | <b>v</b>                         |   |
|    | Explanation: No new receivers or weirs would be in attachment to potentially-historic structures. No p  |                                  | ere would be no ground disturbance or             |
| 2. | Geology and Soils   |                                  |   |
|    | Explanation: No ground disturbance would be requ  | uired.                           |   |
| 3. | Plants (including federal/state special-status species)   |                                  |   |
|    | Explanation: No ground disturbance that would di required.  | sturb plants, including          | any ESA-listed plants, would be                   |
| 4. | Wildlife (including federal/state special-<br>status species and habitats)  |                                  |   |
|    | Explanation: Work would be conducted at existing wildlife habitat, including ESA-listed wildlife, would   |                                  | be passive in nature. No wildlife or              |
| 5. | Water Bodies, Floodplains, and Fish<br>(including federal/state special-status<br>species and ESUs)   |                                  |   |
|    | Explanation: Capture of ESA-listed salmon is cover<br>Section 10 permit 1134 - 6R, which expire in Decer<br>Wildlife Service Section 10 permit TE001598-5, wh<br>obtained after January 2017. | mber of 2017. Bull tro           | ut capture is covered under US Fish and           |
| 6. | Wetlands  |                                  |   |
|    | Explanation: No ground disturbance that would dis   | turh wetlands would I            | he required                                       |

| 7.  | Groundwater and Aquifers   | V                                    |                   |  |  |
|-----|--|--------------------------------------|-------------------|--|--|
|     | Explanation: No ground disturbance or excavation that winto groundwater would be required.   | vould disturb groundwater or intro   | duce contaminants |  |  |
| 8.  | Land Use and Specially Designated Areas  |                                      |                   |  |  |
|     | Explanation: All fixed monitoring locations (PIT tag array use would not alter existing land uses.   | s and weirs) are previously-establis | hed and continued |  |  |
| 9.  | Visual Quality   |                                      |                   |  |  |
|     | Explanation: All fixed monitoring locations (PIT tag arrays and weirs) are previously-established and continued use would not alter existing visual quality of the area.   |                                      |                   |  |  |
| 10. | Air Quality  |                                      |                   |  |  |
|     | Explanation: No ground disturbance or use of heavy equipment that would produce increased dust or emissions would be required. Some vehicle emissions would be generated to access data collection sites. These emissions would be temporary and similar to those generated in the area by vehicles. |                                      |                   |  |  |
| 11. | Noise  |                                      |                   |  |  |
|     | Explanation: No activities would be noise generating.  |                                      |                   |  |  |
| 12. | Human Health and Safety  |                                      |                   |  |  |
|     | Explanation: Appropriate safety measures, such as the use of floatation devices, would be employed for staff working near the water.   |                                      |                   |  |  |
|     |  |                                      |                   |  |  |

### **Evaluation of Other Integral Elements**

The proposed project would also meet conditions that are integral elements of the categorical exclusion. The project would not:

Threaten a violation of applicable statutory, regulatory, or permit requirements for environment, safety, and health, or similar requirements of DOE or Executive Orders.

Explanation, if necessary:

Require siting and construction or major expansion of waste storage, disposal, recovery, or treatment facilities (including incinerators) that are not otherwise categorically excluded.

Explanation, if necessary:

Disturb hazardous substances, pollutants, contaminants, or CERCLA excluded petroleum and natural gas products that preexist in the environment such that there would be uncontrolled or unpermitted releases.

Explanation, if necessary:

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, such as those of the Department of Agriculture, the Environmental Protection Agency, and the National Institutes of Health.

Explanation, if necessary:

#### Landowner Notification, Involvement, or Coordination

<u>Description</u>: Coordination with several entities, including the FWS-Lower Snake River Compensation Plan and Idaho Fish and Game, who operate or fund various hatchery and monitoring facilities in the area, and other regional partners is ongoing and part of the regular annual planning process.

Based on the foregoing, this proposed project does not have the potential to cause significant impacts to any environmentally sensitive resource.

Signed: <u>/s/ Katey Grange</u>

Date: December 13, 2016

Katey Grange Environmental Protection Specialist