**Proposed Action:** Fish and Wildlife Inspection and Maintenance Activities – 2019 through 2023

**Project No.:** Multiple

**Project Manager:** Multiple

**Location:** Multiple locations in Oregon, Washington, Montana, Nevada, and Idaho

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

B1.3 Routine Maintenance and B1.20 Protection of Cultural Resources, Fish and Wildlife Habitat

**Description of the Proposed Action:** Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) proposes to fund on-going inspection and maintenance activities for buildings and support infrastructure that were previously installed or acquired through state, local, and tribally-sponsored fish and wildlife habitat protection, restoration, and improvement projects consistent with the Northwest Power and Conservation Council’s (Council) Fish and Wildlife Program.

Buildings and support structures could include maintenance and equipment sheds, shops, storage yards, water intake screens, and other facilities that support ongoing BPA-funded fish and wildlife projects. Specifically, BPA proposes to fund the following activities at existing facilities:

- **Inspection** – Visual assessment (e.g., photo points, aircraft surveys) and evaluation of physical parameters to ensure buildings are functioning as intended. Inspection would not result in ground disturbance beyond previously-disturbed areas.

- **Maintenance** – Debris removal, trash clearing, mowing, painting, equipment calibration, in-kind screen replacement and cleaning (including debris, gravel, and sediment removal), structural repairs and modifications, and other maintenance activities. Work would not result in ground disturbance beyond previously-disturbed areas.

These actions would occur at existing facilities. Project activities would have no potential for significant effects with conditions on environmental resources, including Endangered Species Act (ESA)-listed species or designated critical habitat. Any activities that involve hazardous materials such as asbestos or incandescent bulbs containing mercury would be disposed of at a designated hazardous waste facility. 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.

**Findings:** In accordance with Section 1021.410(b) of the Department of Energy’s (DOE) National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Regulations (57 Federal Register (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 actions:

1. fit within a class of actions listed in Appendix B of 10 CFR 1021, Subpart D (see attached Environmental Checklist);
(2) do not present any extraordinary circumstances that may affect the significance of the environmental effects of the proposal; and
(3) have 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/ Claire McClory  
Claire McClory  
Environmental Protection Specialist

Concur:

/s/ Sarah T. Biegel  
Date:  September 24, 2019  
Sarah T. Biegel  
NEPA Compliance Officer

Attachment(s): Environmental Checklist
Categorical Exclusion Environmental Checklist

This checklist documents environmental considerations for the proposed actions and explains why the actions would not have the potential to cause significant impacts on environmental resources and would meet other integral elements of the applied categorical exclusion.

Proposed Actions: Ongoing inspection and maintenance activities for buildings and support infrastructure that were previously installed or acquired through state, local, and tribally-sponsored fish and wildlife habitat protection, restoration, and improvement projects consistent with the Council’s Fish and Wildlife Program

Project Site Description

Existing building and support infrastructure throughout Oregon, Washington, Montana, Nevada, and Idaho.

Evaluation of Potential Impacts to Environmental Resources

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Resource Impacts</th>
<th>No Potential for Significance</th>
<th>No Potential for Significance, with Conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Historic and Cultural Resources</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☑</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **Explanation:** BPA Historian and/or Archaeologist reviewed proposed activities and determined that these types of activities are covered under an existing Section 106 consultation, or do not have the potential to cause significant effects to historic properties. In the event any archaeological material is encountered during project activities, work would be stopped immediately. The BPA archaeologist and historian would be notified, as well as consulting parties.

2. Geology and Soils | ☐ | ☑ |
| **Explanation:** Temporary, localized disturbance to soils may occur during project implementation activities. Soil impacts would be limited to areas that have been previously disturbed.

3. Plants (including Federal/state special-status species and habitats) | ☐ | ☑ |
| **Explanation:** Work would have no potential for significant effects with conditions on environmental resources, including Endangered Species Act (ESA)-listed plants or Federal or state special-status species and habitats. If ESA-listed species are present, the project would result in no effect determination or would be low risk according to the current biological opinion issued by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) on the effects of Bonneville’s HIP.

   ➢ Project sponsor would adhere to all applicable site-specific conservation measures identified, including, but not limited to, HIP conservation measures or other mitigation measures.

4. Wildlife (including Federal/state special-status species and habitats) | ☐ | ☑ |
| **Explanation:** Work would have no potential for significant effects with conditions on environmental resources, including ESA-listed wildlife or Federal or state special-status species and habitats. If ESA-listed species are present, the project would result in no effect determination or would be low risk according to the current biological opinion issued by the USFWS and National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) on the effects of Bonneville’s HIP.

   ➢ Project sponsor would adhere to all applicable site-specific conservation measures identified, including, but not limited to, HIP conservation measures or other mitigation measures (e.g., construction or vegetation removal restrictions under the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act or Migratory Bird Treaty Act).
5. **Water Bodies, Floodplains, and Fish** (including Federal/state special-status species, ESUs, and habitats)

**Explanation:** Effects to water bodies would be minimal; limited to temporary, low level turbidity. Actions would have no effect or be classified as low risk to species according to the current biological opinion issued by the USFWS and NMFS on the effects of Bonneville’s HIP. Project sponsors are required to obtain any applicable Clean Water Act permits and authorizations, as needed.

- Project sponsor would adhere to all applicable site-specific conservation measures identified, including, but not limited to, HIP conservation measures or other mitigation measures.

6. **Wetlands**

**Explanation:** No impacts to wetlands.

7. **Groundwater and Aquifers**

**Explanation:** No impact to groundwater or aquifers.

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

**Explanation:** No change to land use.

- If a project occurs in a specially-designated area, the project sponsor would obtain any applicable permits or authorizations prior to project initiation.

9. **Visual Quality**

**Explanation:** Minor changes to visual quality could occur in the immediate project area.

10. **Air Quality**

**Explanation:** Minor, temporary generation of emissions associated with increased vehicular traffic would occur during project activities.

11. **Noise**

**Explanation:** Minor and temporary intermittent noise would occur during implementation.

12. **Human Health and Safety**

**Explanation:** All projects are required to use best management practices to protect worker health and safety. Hazardous materials such as light bulbs, batteries, or asbestos would be disposed of at a designated hazardous waste facility.

---

**Evaluation of Other Integral Elements**

The proposed actions would also meet conditions that are integral elements of the categorical exclusion. The proposed actions 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 Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act excluded petroleum and natural gas products that preexist in the environment such that there would be uncontrolled or unpermitted releases.

**Explanation, if necessary:** Any hazardous materials generated would be disposed of at a designated hazardous waste disposal facility.

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**

**Description:** Inspection and maintenance of existing buildings and support infrastructure would not cause impacts to surrounding landowners. Project sponsors would be responsible for coordinating with underlying and surrounding landowners prior to initiating work.

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

**Signed:**  /s/ Claire McClory  
Claire McClory  
Environmental Protection Specialist  
**Date:** September 24, 2019