Categorical Exclusion Determination

Bonneville Power Administration
Department of Energy



Proposed Action: Columbia Basin PIT Tag Support Project

Project No.: 1990-080-00

Project Manager: Tom Pansky

Location: Multiple locations in Oregon, Washington, and Idaho

<u>Categorical Exclusion Applied (from Subpart D, 10 C.F.R. Part 1021)</u>: B1.3 Routine maintenance and B3.3 Research related to conservation of fish, wildlife and cultural resources.

<u>Description of the Proposed Action</u>: Bonneville Power Administration proposes to fund ongoing operation and maintenance (O&M) and installation of PIT tag infrastructure for the administration and system operation of the Columbia River Basin PIT Tag Information System (PTAGIS). A comprehensive overview of the project is described online at http://www.ptagis.org/learn.

To operate and maintain the Columbia River Basin-wide database for PIT-tagged fish and to operate and maintain the established interrogation systems to provide that data in 'near-real' time. Specifically, the actions include:

- 1. Management of an accessible, long-term Columbia River Basin-wide database system;
- 2. Maintenance and documentation of fish tagging and interrogation software;
- 3. Operation and maintenance of equipment at remote sites;
- 4. Provision of technical support for the software and hardware;
- 5. Provision of training to users; and
- 6. Distribution of PIT tags and associated equipment.

This project provides operations and maintenance (O&M) support for PIT tag actuated diversion gates at various fish facilities and installs and maintains the programmable logic controllers (PLCs) at various locations throughout the Columbia River Basin. At US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) facilities, the Pacific States Marine Fisheries Commission and USACE operate under the following memorandum of understanding (MOU):

http://www.ptagis.org/docs/default-source/ptagis-program-documents/coe-and-bpa-mou-regarding-pit-tag-infrastructure.pdf?sfvrsn=10.

PTAGIS also provides a repository for automated detection data collected at 283 interrogation sites operated by other entities.

If a new a system is approved by BPA, PTAGIS coordinates with USACE or other agencies to install the electrical components of this system (transceivers, network, PLC, data collection computers) as noted in the MOU.

Actions proposed would be reviewed by the BPA environmental compliance lead to ensure that the activities fall within the range of those described in this Categorical Exclusion prior to initiating work.

<u>Findings</u>: 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, Jul. 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/ Israel Duran | | | | | | |
|---|-------------------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| Israel Duran | | | | | | |
| Contract Environmental Protection Specialist | | | | | | |
| Salient/CRGT | | | | | | |
| Declared by | | | | | | |
| Reviewed by: | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| /s/ Chad Hamel | | | | | | |
| Chad Hamel | | | | | | |
| Supervisory Environmental Protection Specialist | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| Concur: | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| /s/ Sarah T. Biegel | Date: <i>January</i> 22, 2020 | | | | | |
| Sarah T. Biegel | | | | | | |
| NEPA Compliance Officer | | | | | | |

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: Columbia Basin PIT Tag Support

Project Site Description

Existing support infrastructure throughout Oregon, Washington, and Idaho. The PSMFC office in Portland, Oregon houses the PTAGIS systems. The field office in Kennewick, WA is primarily responsible for operations and equipment maintenance of 30 key PIT tag interrogation sites.

Evaluation of Potential Impacts to Environmental Resources

| | Environmental Resource Impacts | No Potential for Significance | No Potential for Significance, with Conditions | | |
|----|---|----------------------------------|---|--|--|
| 1. | Historic and Cultural Resources | ▽ | | | |
| | Explanation: The proposed activities would occur within the confines of the existing structures, and would not require any ground-disturbing activities for the completion of this work. Ground disturbance or activities external to the existing structure are not planned. For the installation of new systems, the MOU states that BPA shall fund the purchase and installation of electronic components to make facilities completely operable pit tag detection systems. The USACE is responsible for designing and constructing the basic PIT tag detections facilities (fish passage avenues, electrical requirements, separation gates, secure facilities for data storage, etc.) at USACE facilities. | | | | |
| 2. | Geology and Soils | V | | | |
| | <u>Explanation</u> : Any ground-disturbing activities confines of the existing facilities. Ground distunct planned. | | | | |
| 3. | Plants (including Federal/state special-status species and habitats) | ~ | | | |
| | <u>explanation</u> : All work is within existing facilities; no habitat present. There are no anticipated impacts to ny sensitive plant species, and none exist within the immediate area of impact. | | | | |
| 4. | Wildlife (including Federal/state special- status species and habitats) | V | | | |
| | Explanation: All work is implemented within (including Endangered Species Act-listed) withere would be no effect. | | | | |
| 5. | Water Bodies, Floodplains, and Fish (including Federal/state special-status species, ESUs, and habitats) | V | | | |
| | <u>Explanation</u> : Facilities may be located near r footprint of existing structures, and would not of the work. | | | | |

| 6. | Wetlands | ▼ | | | | | |
|--|--|--|-------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| | be impacted. | | | | | | |
| 7. | Groundwater and Aquifers | ▽ | | | | | |
| | Explanation: All work would occur in the footprint of planned. | existing facilities, and no ground | d excavation is | | | | |
| 8. | Land Use and Specially-Designated Areas | | | | | | |
| | Explanation: All work would occur in the existing factoriand use. | cilities footprints, and would not i | mpact or change | | | | |
| 9. | Visual Quality | V | | | | | |
| | Explanation: All work would occur in existing facilities | es, and would not impact visual o | quality. | | | | |
| 10 | Air Quality | V | | | | | |
| | Explanation: The installation and O&M of the PTAGIS system would not impact air quality. | | | | | | |
| 11 | Noise | ▽ | | | | | |
| <u>Explanation</u> : All work would occur in existing structures, and installation, operation and mainten the system would not raise noise levels above background. | | | | | | | |
| 12 | Human Health and Safety | V | | | | | |
| | Explanation: All work would occur in the existing facilities, and safety regulations would be followed as necessary. | | | | | | |
| | Evaluation of Other Integral Elements | | | | | | |
| The proposed project would also meet conditions that are integral elements of the categorical exclusion. The project would not: | | | | | | | |
| V | 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, contamina natural gas products that preexist in the environment unpermitted releases. | | | | | | |
| | Explanation, if necessary: | | | | | | |
| | Involve genetically engineered organisms, synthetic by weeds, or invasive species, unless the proposed active designed and operated to prevent unauthorized releas accordance with applicable requirements, such as the Environmental Protection Agency, and the National Interpolation, if necessary: | vity would be contained or confir se into the environment and cor ose of the Department of Agricul | ned in a manner nducted in | | | | |
| | Explanation, il necessary. | | | | | | |

Landowner Notification, Involvement, or Coordination

<u>Description</u>: This work would be implemented on USACE property according to the provisions outlined in the MOU.

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

Signed: /s/ Israel Duran Date: January 22, 2020

Israel Duran ECF-4

Contract Environmental Protection Specialist

Salient/CRGT