Categorical Exclusion Determination

Bonneville Power Administration Department of Energy



Proposed Action: Deschutes River Sockeye Development Project

Project No.: 2008-307-00

Project Manager: Corrie Veenstra

Location: Jefferson County, Oregon

<u>Categorical Exclusion Applied (from Subpart D, 10 C.F.R. Part 1021)</u>: 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 the development of a model to predict outmigrating kokanee (*Oncorhyncus nerka*) smolt, including providing assistance to ongoing research and monitoring. Within the Deschutes River subbasin, the Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation of Oregon (CTWSRO), Portland General Electric (PGE), and Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (ODFW) conduct *O. nerka* investigations cooperatively.

The proposed actions include:

- 1. The operation and maintenance of the Suttle Lake/Lake Creek rotary screw trap for kokanee count data.
- 2. A subsample of fish handled at the trap are tagged for mark-recapture studies.
- 3. Up to three thousand kokanee would be trapped via seine, tagged, sampled, and released at Lake Billy Chinook.
- 4. Spawning surveys along Metolius River and tributaries.
- 5. Tissue sampling at Pelton-Re-regulating Dam from returning kokanee trapped by PGE for transport.

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), Bonneville 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, Bonneville finds that the proposed action is categorically excluded from further NEPA review.

/s/ Israel Duran

Israel Duran
Contract Environmental Protection Specialist
Salient/CRGT

Reviewed by:

/s/ Chad Hamel					
Chad Hamel					
Supervisory Environmental Protection Specialist					
Concur:					
/s/ Sarah T. Biegel	Date: <i>May 21, 2020</i>				
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: Deschutes River Sockeye Development

Project Site Description

Activities would occur at Suttle Lake/Lake Creek trap, Pelton adult trap, Lake Billy Chinook, or the Metolious River watershed in Jefferson County, Oregon.

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: A BPA Archaeologist reviewed an existing Section 106 consultation or do reproperties and are not expected to cause grencountered during project activities, work well-storian would be notified, as well as consumptions and to existing structures for over 10 y affect historic or cultural properties.	ot have the potential to o ound disturbance. In the would be stopped immed ulting parties. Including t	cause significant effects to historic e event any archaeological material is diately and a BPA Archaeologist and he operation of traps that have been
2.	Geology and Soils		
	Explanation: Geology and soils would not be	oe impacted by the prop	osed activities.
3.	Plants (including Federal/state special-status species and habitats)		
	Explanation: There are no anticipated imprinclude any vegetation management, grour vegetation. Therefore, there is no potential	nd disturbance, or action	ns that would significantly impact
4.	Wildlife (including Federal/state special- status species and habitats)		
	Explanation: There are be no actions that trapping action would have minor, tempora visual disturbance. There would be no new actions would not impact wildlife within the habitat.	ry effects on wildlife due construction or any gro	to minimally increased noise and undbreaking activities. Therefore, the

5.	(including Federal/state special-status species, ESUs, and habitats)	V				
	Explanation: Bull trout are not known to inhat trap located in Lake Creek. If bull trout are en would consult with the US Fish and Wildlife S and Metolious River basin have the potential cooperation with the Oregon Department of F Section 6 cooperative agreement with ODFW	countered, all work w Service (USFWS) biol to impact bull trout, b Fish and Wildlife (ODF	ould stop and the project sponsor ogist. Activities in Lake Billy Chinook ut the proposed activities occur in			
	No other ESA-listed fishes are present in pro- encountered during trapping as by-catch, but The actions would not impact waterbodies or effect.	traps would be chec	ked daily to reduce trapping stress.			
6.	Wetlands	I✓	П			
	Explanation: The project would not take plac would not impact wetlands.	_	tlands and therefore, the activities			
7.	Groundwater and Aquifers	~				
	Explanation: The activities would not impact	or change groundwa	ter or aquifers.			
8.	Land Use and Specially-Designated Areas	~				
	Explanation: The activities would not impact	or change land use.				
9.	Visual Quality					
	Explanation: The activities would not impact	visual quality.				
10.	Air Quality					
	Explanation: The work would not impact air of	quality.				
11.	Noise					
	Explanation: Noise levels may be increased, of the study period.	, but this would only o	ccur during the normal working hours			
12.	Human Health and Safety					
	Explanation: Safety regulations would be followed	lowed 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:						
	Threaten a violation of applicable statutory, resafety, and health, or similar requirements of I					
	Explanation, if necessary:					
	Require siting and construction or major expar facilities (including incinerators) that are not ot					
	Explanation, if necessary:					

~	natural gas products that preexist in the environment such that there would be uncontrolled or unpermitted releases.			
	Explanation, if necessary:			
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, 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> : This work would be implemented with the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife on Oregon State land.				
	sed on the foregoing, this proposed project does not have the potential to cause significant pacts to any environmentally sensitive resource.			

Signed: /s/ Israel Duran_ Israel Duran ECF-4 Date: May 21, 2020

Contract Environmental Protection Specialist Salient/CRGT