

# Categorical Exclusion Determination

Bonneville Power Administration

Department of Energy



**Proposed Action:** Spokane Tribal Hatchery Modernization

**Project No. :** 1991-046-00

**Project Manager:** Mary Todd Haight

**Location:** Stevens County, Washington

**Categorical Exclusion Applied (from Subpart D, 10 C.F.R. Part 1021):** B1.20 Protection of cultural resources, fish and wildlife habitat

**Description of the Proposed Action:** BPA proposes to fund the installation of a new outdoor tank area, construction of four new 30-foot diameter dual drain circular tanks, a pre-engineered metal roof cover over the tanks that is enclosed with predator barriers, water supply and drain piping, water aeration equipment, a low pressure air blower and delivery system, aero boost water recirculation equipment, instrumentation, and associated electrical power, lighting, and outlets to facilitate tank operation. Associated work includes but is not limited to the excavation, backfill, trenching, asphalt patching, electrical, piping, pipe fittings, and valves for a complete and operational circular tank with water reuse project.

**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.

/s/ Ted Gresh

Ted Gresh  
Contract Environmental Protection Specialist  
SalientCRGT, Inc.

Reviewed by:

/s/ David K. Kennedy

David K. Kennedy  
Executive Manager  
Environmental Planning and Analysis

Concur:

/s/ Sarah T. Biegel

Sarah T. Biegel  
NEPA Compliance Officer

Date: January 3, 2017

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:** Spokane Tribal Hatchery Modernization

---

### Project Site Description

This project is located within the boundaries of the Spokane Indian Reservation in Stevens County, about seven miles east from Wellpinit, Washington. The project area is located next to several hatchery buildings and ponds. Vegetation within the hatchery has been mostly cleared or is covered in ornamental grasses. The surrounding vegetation is made up of native grasses, pinion pines, and various shrubs. The property also contains several springs which help supply water to the hatchery. Modern impacts include the dirt roads accessing the hatchery buildings, the addition of ponds, and water supply lines.

### Evaluation of Potential Impacts to Environmental Resources

Environmental Resource Impacts	No Potential for Significance	No Potential for Significance, with Conditions
1. <b>Historic and Cultural Resources</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><u>Explanation:</u> As a result of the archaeological field survey, artifacts were found that were associated with site 45ST401 Gilbraith Springs Campsite. Due to previous grading and disturbance on the ground surface, the proposed project would not affect the site. The shovel tests, which were placed at the location of the proposed roof poles, resulted in only two shovel tests containing artifacts. The two positive shovel tests containing artifacts were in a disturbed context up to 86 cm below surface. The two artifacts that were found in a primary context were located below 86 cm. Due to the previous disturbance, the testing in the location of the proposed roof poles, and the few artifacts that were located in primary context, it has been shown that the site will not be adversely affected as a result of the proposed construction.</p>		
2. <b>Geology and Soils</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><u>Explanation:</u> Project would occur where previous ground disturbance has occurred.</p>		
3. <b>Plants</b> (including federal/state special-status species)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><u>Explanation:</u> Project would occur where previous ground disturbance has occurred. No vegetation in the area.</p>		
4. <b>Wildlife</b> (including federal/state special-status species and habitats)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<p><u>Explanation:</u> Project would occur where previous ground disturbance has occurred. No habitat for wildlife is within the proposed Project Area.</p>		

5. **Water Bodies, Floodplains, and Fish**  
(including federal/state special-status species and ESUs)



Explanation: Project would occur in previously disturbed area and in upland areas only.

6. **Wetlands**



Explanation: Project would occur in upland areas only and outside wetland areas.

7. **Groundwater and Aquifers**



Explanation: No groundwater would be used for installation and excavations would be five feet in depth or less, which is above groundwater levels at the site.

8. **Land Use and Specially Designated Areas**



Explanation: No change to land use.

9. **Visual Quality**



Explanation: Project is a small addition to the existing hatchery so no change to visual quality.

10. **Air Quality**



Explanation: No new sources of emissions. Dust and emissions generated during construction would be minimal and temporary.

11. **Noise**



Explanation: No new sources of noise. Noise generated during construction would be localized and temporary.

12. **Human Health and Safety**



Explanation: No change to human health or safety.

### 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**

Activities would occur at the existing Spokane Tribal Hatchery on land owned by the Spokane Tribe of Indians (the project proponent).

---

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

Signed: /s/ Ted Gresh  
Ted Gresh, ECF-4

Date: January 3, 2017