Categorical Exclusion Determination

Bonneville Power Administration Department of Energy



Proposed Action: Habitat Project Action Effectiveness Monitoring

Project No.: 2016-001-00

Project Manager: David Kaplowe

Location: Multiple counties, Washington, Oregon, Idaho

<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 exercises and simulations.

<u>Description of the Proposed Action</u>: Bonneville Power Administration (Bonneville) proposes to fund Cramer Fish Sciences to implement and adaptively manage the Action Effectiveness Monitoring (AEM) Program. The AEM program would monitor and evaluate habitat improvement actions implemented throughout the Columbia River Basin, with program partners including Tribes, Federal agencies, states, county and local governments, non-profit organizations, and universities.

Habitat improvement actions evaluated under the AEM Program include fish passage (complete and partial barrier removal and replacement), instream enrichment (large wood structure installation), floodplain enhancement (levee modification, floodplain reconnection, and channel reconstruction), and riparian restoration (planting and invasive plant species removal). A multiple before-after control-impact (MBACI) design would be used to evaluate sample sites before and after implementation. Personnel would assist program partners in data collection and survey.

The proposed AEM actions include:

- 1. Document Bonneville-approved AEM Program modifications in monitoringmethods.org;
- 2. Maintain AEM Program, ensure that the data are collected consistently according to the associated protocol and modify the study design or methods to maintain statistical validity and replicability;
- 3. Conduct surveys, including conducting snorkel surveys; site assessments (macroinvertebrate surveys, vegetation transects, stream transects, topographic surveys, etc.); ongoing data collection (water temperature, stream flows, turbidity, etc) at sample sites.

This would specifically satisfy some of Bonneville's Columbia River tributary mitigation commitments begun under the 2008 NMFS' Federal Columbia River Power System Biological Opinion (as supplemented in 2010 and 2014) (2008 BiOp) and ongoing commitments under the 2019 NMFS' Columbia River System BiOp (2019 CRS BiOp). The 2008 BiOp called for identifying tributary projects and the 2019 CRS BiOp largely continues the tributary habitat restoration program.

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.

<u>/s/ Israel Duran</u> Israel Duran Contract Environmental Protection Specialist Salient/CRGT

Reviewed by:

<u>/s/ Chad Hamel</u> Chad Hamel Supervisory Environmental Protection Specialist

Concur:

/s/ Katey Grange

NEPA Compliance Officer

Katey Grange

Date: June 2, 2020

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: Habitat Project Action Effectiveness Monitoring

Project Site Description

All activities would occur within waterbodies in the Columbia River basin in multiple counties in Oregon, Idaho and Washington.

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 are no ground disturbing cultural resources | actions planned and th | is project would not impact historic or |
| 2. | Geology and Soils | | |
| | Explanation: There are no ground disturbing impacted by the proposed activities. | actions planned and g | eology and soils would not be |
| 3. | Plants (including Federal/state special- status species and habitats) | | |
| | Explanation: There are no ground disturbing any plant species, and none exist within the | | |
| 4. | Wildlife (including Federal/state special- status species and habitats) | | |
| | Explanation: There are no ground disturbing impact to wildlife within the project area from There would be no effect on Endangered Spectra Spe | elevated human prese | ence during sampling activities. |
| 5. | Water Bodies, Floodplains, and Fish (including Federal/state special-status species, ESUs, and habitats) | V | |
| | Explanation: Survey activities such as snork at sample sites may temporarily disturb fish, Program programmatic biological opinion for species. Sites would be located near bodies waterbodies or floodplains. | but would be covered of effects to Endangered | under the Habitat Improvement I Species Act (ESA)-listed fish |
| 6. | Wetlands | | |
| | Explanation: There are no ground disturbing | actions planned and a | ctivities would not impact wetlands. |
| 7. | Groundwater and Aquifers | | |
| | Explanation: There are no ground disturbing groundwater or aquifers. | g actions planned and a | activities would not impact or change |
| | | | |

| 8. | Land Use and Specially-Designated Areas | | | | |
|---------------------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|---------------------|--|--|
| | Explanation: The activities would not impact or cha | nge land use. | | | |
| 9. | Visual Quality | | | | |
| | Explanation: The activities would not impact visual | quality. | | | |
| 10. | Air Quality | \checkmark | | | |
| | Explanation: The work would not impact air quality. | | | | |
| 11. | Noise | | | | |
| | Explanation: Noise levels may be increased, but the of the study period. | is would only occur during the no | ormal working hours | | |
| 12. | Human Health and Safety | \checkmark | | | |
| | Explanation: 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:

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>: All work is at existing field sites accessed on existing roads on public lands. This work would be implemented with the knowledge and coordination with partners, and landowners as needed.

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

Signed: <u>/s/ Israel Duran</u>

Date: June 2, 2020

Israel Duran ECF-4 Contract Environmental Protection Specialist Salient/CRGT