Categorical Exclusion Determination

Bonneville Power Administration
Department of Energy



Proposed Action: Rainwater Wildlife Areas Operations and Maintenance

Fish and Wildlife Project No.: 2000-026-00

Project Manager: Andre L'Heureux EWU-4

Location: Columbia County, WA

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

B1.20 Protection of Cultural Resources, Fish and Wildlife Habitat; B1.30 Routine Maintenance;

B 1.11 Fencing; B 1.15 Support Buildings

<u>Description of the Proposed Action</u>:

Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) proposes to fund the Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation (CTUIR) to conduct operation and maintenance (O&M) activities on the Rainwater Wildlife Area pursuant to the Columbia Basin Fish and Wildlife Program, and the Washington Wildlife Mitigation Agreement among members of the Washington Wildlife Coalition of Resource Agencies and Tribes and the Bonneville Power Administration to help the BPA meet Columbia River Basin mitigation obligations and objectives.

Specific Actions for ongoing operations and management include:

- Fence Maintenance: Annual maintenance of 6.5 miles of wildlife area boundary fence to protect habitat and reduce damage caused by trespass livestock on Robinette Mountain. Fences typically consist of four-strand barbed wire with metal posts and wooden structural elements (h-braces and rock jacks). Work would include foot and/or vehicle travel along fence alignment to visually inspect fence for damage from trees, wildlife, and/or livestock; splicing wire, replacing wooden stays or "t" posts, repairing anchor structures, tightening wire, cutting and removing downed trees, etc., as necessary to maintain fence in functional condition.
- Forest Management: During the late fall, winter or early spring (prior to the nesting season), up to 300 acres of forest would be thinned annually to reduce stand density from approximately 300 trees/acre to 50-75 trees per acre. Tree thinning would involve trees approximately less than 12 inches in diameter to encourage mature forest overstory growth. The thinning would promote healthy stands of timbered habitat. Understory debris pile burning would occur on up to 150 acres per year.
- Weed management: A long term integrated pest management program would integrate the following control techniques: biological (introducing bio-agents that control weeds), chemical (applying herbicides), cultural (burning or grazing) and mechanical (physically removing weeds). The specific combination used would be tailored to the weed species, site, topography, and management goals. Treatments would address a multitude of invasive species including, but not limited to, yellow starthistle, spotted

knapweed, and Canada thistle and to promote habitat recovery to native bunchgrass grasslands.

During the spring and summer seasons, herbicide applications would occur to control weeds on approximately 300 acres of primarily grassland along roads and ridgetops accessible by ATV. Ground-based treatments would be conducted with with backpack sprayers and ATV-mounted spray booms/nozzles using herbicides approved in BPA's Habitat Improvement Program (HIP) biological opinion with US Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service.

Late-season targeted goat grazing would be used to control yellow starthistle on 2,500 acres of the South Fork Touchet River watershed. Grazing begins when starthistle are flowering, typically in late July or August on steep rangeland.

- Road Trail Maintenance: Annually in the summer, up to 3 miles of road maintenance would occur on the South Touchet, South Fork Road, Wildlife Area Access Roads, Robinette Mountain roads and public parking areas. This would include repairing fords, cut and fill failures, and stream crossings. Pit run rock would be spread on the existing road prisms (as needed) and parking areas to stabilize and maintain vehicle access to private inholdings along with seasonal use by the general public. In addition, a nature/bird trail would be maintained in conjunction with local private landowners to increase non-consumptive public use of the wildlife area. No disturbance would extend in width or depth beyond the original road or trail prism footprint. Base rock material is readily available from several existing, local sources.
- General Maintenance: The inspection, maintenance and replacement of faded signs
 and reader boards would occur, as necessary, across all access points to inform and
 educate the public. Ongoing maintenance would occur to uphold the structural integrity
 and aesthetic of the Rainwater office/residence/field station. This would include
 installation of pressure treated wood and decking materials, roof and windows to be
 repaired on an as needed basis.

Any ground disturbance areas would be reseeded after disturbance and no ground disturbance would occur in wetlands or waterbodies. Work would largely be conducted by workers traveling on foot or via existing access roads on the wildlife area. Work would be accomplished with hand tools and equipment with the exception of the road and trail maintenance, which may require excavators and dump trucks, depending on the level of repair.

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, 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/ Dan Gambetta		
Dan Gambetta		
Environmental Protection Speci	alist	
/s/ Chad Hamel		
Chad Hamel		
Supervisory Environmental Protection Specialist		
	·	
Concur:		
Concur.		
/s/ Vator Change	Doto: May 4 2020	
/s/ Katey Grange	Date: <u>May 4, 2020</u>	
Katey Grange		
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: Rainwater Wildlife Areas Operations and Maintenance

Project Site Description

The Rainwater Wildlife area consists of 11,000-acres comprising a substantial portion of the upper South Fork Touchet River drainage in the Walla Walla River subbasin, adjacent to the Umatilla National Forest. The Wildlife Area has steep topography including approximately 8,300 acres of upland and riparian coniferous forest, 2,500 acres of native and native-like grasslands, and 200 acres of deciduous riparian habitat. Approximately 127 miles of streams have been mapped within the boundary of the wildlife area which range in size from small ephemeral draws to larger fish bearing streams such as the South Fork Touchet River. Existing conditions within Wildlife Area streams include limited quantity and quality of pool habitat, poor riparian conditions, high summer stream temperatures, and excessive stream bank erosion. Predominant fish species include resident rainbow trout, lamprey, dace, redsided shiner, and sculpin. The Wildlife Area provides 10 miles of headwater spawning and rearing habitat for ESA-listed summer steelhead, bull trout, and resident trout.

Extensive habitat surveys were conducted in forest, riparian, and grass and shrubland cover types in 1998 and 1999 to assess habitat conditions. Forestland consists primarily of grand fir and Douglas-fir dominated timber stands with ponderosa pine occurring on south and southwest slopes. In their native states, grassland communities include Idaho fescue, bluebunch wheatgrass, and Sandberg's bluegrass. Primary shrub lands include snowberry, wild rose, mallow ninebark, and ocean spray. Riparian plant communities include black cottonwood, sitka alder, willow, dogwood, and coniferous species.

The Walla Walla Subbasin is inhabited by 10 amphibian species, 207 avian species, 69 mammalian species, and 15 reptile species. While the Rainwater Wildlife Area historically provided suitable habitat for a wide variety of these flora and fauna, the Wildlife area has been heavily impacted by previous management practices such as logging, road construction, channelization, and livestock grazing.

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: There have been five sepan NHPA in the Rainwater Wildlife Area. The related road repair in 2006 (no CR# available tree thinning and boundary fence construction in 2014 (Log No.: 090814-1: roads in 2017 (BPA CR No# WA 2017 06 Historic Preservation were consulting particles of the five consultations, BPA made a fin actions, tree thinning, plantings, fence are APEs and would be maintained to previo Rainwater office/residence/field station is therefore not considered a historic property.	ne consultations were for the able), boundary fence consuction in 2011 (Log No.: 043-BPA), and further tree this 66). CTUIR and the Washir rties, with the CTUIR condual determination of no historial road repairs would take thus conditions. No new gross a modern modular home to	e potential ground disturbance struction in 2009 (no CR# available), 1311-01-BPA), nature trail and fence nning and associated log haul out ogton Department of Archaeology & acting surveys and reports. In each oric properties affected. All ongoing place within the previously surveyed und disturbance is proposed. The
2.	Geology and Soils	~	

Explanation: Minimal soil disturbance would occur as tree removal would involve selective thinning, cut at the base rather than pushed over. Impacts are expected to be short term as slash cleanup, erosion control and other rehabilitation efforts would prevent soils from becoming mobilized. All disturbed areas from grazing or herbicide treatment would become seeded with a custom native seed mix to facilitate vegetation recovery. Ground disturbance associated with maintaining roads, trails, fences would be minimal to nonexistent while planting and reseeding efforts will stabilize soils in the long-term.

3.	Plants (including Federal/state special-	
	status species and habitats)	



<u>Explanation</u>: There would be short term adverse effects to small trees, weeds, and shrubs due to slash pile burning and tree thinning. However these activities would promote and support establishment of an old growth forest regime. All disturbed sites would be replanted with a native seed mix and slash pile burning would enrich the soil promoting further growth.

Weed management strategies would vary depending on numerous factors including weed species and associated vegetation, initial density of infestations and topography. Herbicide applications would take place primarily on upland grassland areas on slopes less than 20% and use HIP conservation measures that will minimize the potential for drift or runoff to non-target vegetation. There would be little or no treatments in riparian areas.

Grazing impacts on native plants would be negligible and largely limited to some trampling because grazing would occur by goats who would prefer to eat noxious weeds over more desirable plants and would be used typically in late July or August after native forbs have seeded by this time.

After all treatments the ground would be seeded with native grass seed to restore native Palouse grasslands. Desirable native vegetation would have adequate time to recover between grazing and herbicide application periods, to improve competition with noxious species. This would reduce the overall impact on native vegetation while suppressing noxious weeds. Over the long term, therefore, the effects to vegetation from such actions would be the restoration of native plant communities.

The only potential Federally Endangered Species Act (ESA) listed special status plant species in the Blue Mountains of SE Washington is the Ute ladies'-tresses. It is a rare perennial, terrestrial orchid that occupies riparian edges, gravel bars, old oxbows, and high flow channels, and moist wet meadows along perennial streams. None of the activities are proposed in these areas and they have never been documented or seen in the Rainwater Wildlife Area, possibly as a result of historic over grazing. Therefore, operation and maintenance of the wildlife area would have no effect on Ute ladies'-tresses.

4.	Wildlife (including Federal/state special- status species and habitats)		
	Explanation: The proposed activities associate that can affect wildlife. These include noise, so modify habitats, they can temporarily disrupt vactions (e.g. brush pile burning or herbicide at habitats while not eliminating the habitat altogetical elements.	smoke, traffic, smells wildlife behavior and pplication) may affec	s, etc. While these actions don't displace their use of habitats. Some
	The wildlife area provides habitat for big game grouse, wild turkey and California quail. Noise thinning and road repair would incur short termile. All activities are intended to improve habbeneficial effect by eventually restoring mature.	e, smoke and haulin n behavioral avoidan bitat for these forest	g activities associated with tree nce to any wildlife within a quarter of a
	All actions would be implemented primarily aft migratory birds. Shrubby riparian areas (key spring (key migratory nesting period) as it wou associated with fencing may occur during that neglible, and likely from unintentional disturbations.	migratory bird nestin uld be too wet to ope t time however the in	ng areas) would not be impacted in the erate machinery. Handwork inpact to migratory birds would be
	In the spring, before tree thinning activities tall project sponsor would conduct thinning outsid spring nesting season, the sponsor would connesting eagles or raptors have been detected extensively logged and currently lacking old g species of concern such as raptors, hawks an	de of the nesting sea nduct nesting bird su in the wildlife area, I rrowth overstory which	son or, if conducting the activity during rveys prior to clearing. In the past no likely due to the forest itself being
	The following ESA-listed terrestrial species ar Washington, Gray Wolf (Canis lupus) and Car exist for these ESA-listed species in the Rainwith a neglible likelihood for presence in the fu Gray Wolf have been detected passing throug and will not be affected by noise, smoke and brepair. The project would be conducted in acc Program (HIP) Biological Opinion for any pote Note:	nada lynx (Lynx canawater Wildlife Area, ruture and the actions ghothe area however, hauling activities assocordance with BPA's	adensis). While suitable habitat may no records show the presence of lynx s would have no effect on this species. there are no permanent denning sites sociated with tree thinning and road s programmatic Habitat Improvement
	If spring tree thinning is needed, ident thinning areas.	tify active bird nests	and avoid nest if identified in tree
5.	Water Bodies, Floodplains, and Fish (including Federal/state special-status species, ESUs, and habitats)		
	Explanation: A majority of all activities would and surface waters. Herbicide applications we conservation measures to minimize drift and rapplications of pit-run base rock to harden the drainage, and decrease sediment delivery to the livestock from trespassing into the Wildlife Are to stream channels.	ould occur mainly in runoff exposure. Roa e road surface and de the South Fork River	the upland areas and utilize HIP ad repairs would entail spot ecrease rutting, improve road . Ongoing fence repair would prevent
6.	Wetlands	V	
	Explanation: Although Rainwater Wildlife Area would occur within the existing footprint and w with tree thinning would avoid wetlands. HIP of herbicides near any wetlands by requiring an a rocking road segments would occur outside of conditions.	rould not impact any conservation measu adequate buffer. Roa	wetlands. All activities associated res would preclude the application of ad-related actions associated with spot

7.	Groundwater and Aquifers		
	Explanation: There would be no ground disturbance	e hence no effect to groundwater	and aquifers.
_	Land Use and Specially Designated eas		
	Explanation: The Rainwater Wildlife Area supports seasons, beginning with turkey season in early May August/early September. In addition, the public eng camping. Recreationists using and traveling through short-term (2-4 weeks seasonally) delays from adjainited size, frequency and duration of these activities to negligible.	r and general archery season for gages in antler and mushroom co h the Rainwater Wildlife Area wo cent forest management activitie	deer and elk in late ollecting as well as ould experience s. Due to the
	 Notes: Proposed activities would be timed to not in bear hunting and antler collection (April-Jun seasons (elk, deer, cougar, bear, grouse) (A 	ne), fishing (July-August) and big	
9.	Visual Quality	▽	
	Explanation: Maintenance activities include upkeep (kiosks), litter pickup, and maintenance of 1.6 miles these projects would result in improved viewing thro residents. CTUIR staff promptly identify, retrieve, an order to maintain a clean and visually aesthetic environments.	public/private nature trail. Long- ughout the valley for both recrea and dispose of all debris left at the	-term benefits from tionists and
10.	Air Quality	V	
	Explanation: Vehicle traffic on primitive roads would long-term substantial changes to air quality as road sedimentation issues.		
11.	Noise		V
	Explanation: Noise from light maintenance (e.g., ro roads, log hauling on heavily-used roads, chainsaws improvements, and road repairs, would not be detected these impacts would occur during daylight hours dutype of noises would be within the typical sounds gelevel of significance due to the limited frequency of the second	s for felling trees, heavy equipmentable above ambient levels greauring the summer months on a seenerated by a ranching communi	ent for road ter than 0.25 miles. easonal basis. The
12.	Human Health and Safety		
	Explanation: No long-term public safety problems a hazards would exist such as truck traffic and equipment through an area closure and contract safety provision hazardous materials (lead and asbestos) would be notifice/residence/field station.	nent needed. These activities we ons and would not impact public	ould be mitigated safety. No

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

The wildlife area is managed under the Rainwater Wildlife Area Watershed Management Plan developed by the CTUIR, who conducted public open house public meetings on the draft plan. Annual project proposals are submitted to and reviewed by the 15-member Rainwater Advisory Committee and done in accordance with the site's management plan.

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

Signed: /s/Dan Gambetta Date: May 4, 2020

Dan Gambetta ECF-4

Environmental Protection Specialist