**Proposed Action:** Construction of a Post/Pole Building at the Springfield Fish Hatchery

**Project No.:** 2007-402-00

**Project Manager:** Jonathan McCloud, EWM-4

**Location:** Springfield Fish Hatchery near Springfield, Idaho in Bingham County, Idaho

**Categorical Exclusion Applied (from Subpart D, 10 C.F.R. Part 1021):** B1.15 Support buildings

**Description of the Proposed Action:** Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) proposes to provide funding to the Idaho Department of Fish and Game (IDFG) for the construction of a 24’ by 24’ by 15’4” high open-front post/pole building for storage use at the Springfield Fish Hatchery (SFH) near Springfield, Idaho.

The SFH consists of two primary hatchery structures (Figure 1), four residences, a shop/storage building and multiple smaller out-buildings on a 43 acre site of which approximately 10 are surfaced or occupied by buildings. The main hatchery building houses an egg incubation room and 22 fiberglass troughs for early rearing. An outside open-sided covered structure covers 22 concrete raceways. A former cannery is located in the southeast corner of the property.

The pole-barn storage building would be constructed within the existing facility adjacent to the shop/storage building and across from the covered raceways as displayed in Figure 1.
**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, July 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.
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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:** Construction of a Post/Pole Building at the Springfield Fish Hatchery

**Project Site Description**

Activities will occur at the Springfield Fish Hatchery near Springfield, Idaho. This site was homesteaded in the late nineteenth century with fish farming in the Crystal Springs pond beginning sometime before 1946. Fish culture facilities and structures were added in 1969-1970 and a nearby cannery was built in 1988. The current Springfield Fish Hatchery was constructed in 2012 on this former fish culture facility site. The location of the proposed pole building is within the existing facility on a gravel pad established during the 1969-1970 construction.

**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. <strong>Historic and Cultural Resources</strong></td>
<td>✔</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Explanation:** The ground-disturbing activities with this project will occur on a site that has been entirely disturbed in the past. It has been a graveled equipment storage area since around 1970. The site was surveyed for cultural resources in advance of the current hatchery facilities’ construction in 2012 with no sites identified in this location. There is no potential for disturbing previously unknown cultural resources.

| 2. **Geology and Soils** | ✔ | |  
**Explanation:** The site’s soils have been entirely disturbed in the past: it was a graveled equipment storage area since 1970. There is no potential for disturbing previously undisturbed soils. The site is topographically flat and graveled, with no potential for erosion or off-site sediment delivery.

| 3. **Plants** (including federal/state special-status species) | ✔ | |  
**Explanation:** The site is currently a graveled pad which supports no vegetation. No plants would be disturbed. The effects of the action are limited to the system’s specific graveled location with no potential (sound, water flow, toxic emissions) for off-site effects.

| 4. **Wildlife** (including federal/state special-status species and habitats) | ✔ | |  
**Explanation:** The site is currently a graveled pad in an area with a moderate to high amount of human activity (relative to wildlife disturbance thresholds). It supports no wildlife habitat. The effects of the action are limited to the system’s specific graveled location with no potential (sound, water flow, or toxic emissions) for off-site effects to wildlife.
5. **Water Bodies, Floodplains, and Fish**  
(including federal/state special-status species and ESUs)  

**Explanation:** The proposed system installation is not within or immediately adjacent to any water body, nor is it within a 100-yr floodplain. It is located nearly one mile from the nearest mapped 100-yr floodplain area.

6. **Wetlands**  

**Explanation:** There are no ground-disturbing activities within wetland areas. All actions would occur on a currently graveled pad, thus wetlands would not be affected.

7. **Groundwater and Aquifers**  

**Explanation:** The proposed construction and use of the post/pole storage building would require no additional water uses, nor does it have any potential for accidental contaminated-water discharge.

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

**Explanation:** There would be no change in land use and no work in specially-designated areas.

9. **Visual Quality**  

**Explanation:** There would be no change to the existing visual character of the site. The existing visual character is light industrial, and would remain so after construction, with no visible increase in scale or scope of structures.

10. **Air Quality**  

**Explanation:** Construction activities would likely generate a small amount of dust during construction. This impact would be short-term and limited to the immediate construction site. There are no emissions-emitting equipment operations associated with the use of this structure and thus no potential for long-term air quality impacts.

11. **Noise**  

**Explanation:** Construction activities would likely generate a small amount of noise during construction. This impact would be short-term and limited to the near vicinity of the hatchery. There are no noise-emitting equipment operations associated with the use of this structure and thus no potential for long-term noise impacts.

12. **Human Health and Safety**  

**Explanation:** There are no hatchery operational changes proposed, thus no potential for changing the risk environment for human health and safety.

### 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**

**Description:** No landowner or neighbor engagement would be necessary. All activities would occur within the fenced perimeter of the existing facility and would be consistent in character with ongoing operations at this facility.

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

Signed: /s/ Robert W. Shull  
Robert W. Shull – ECF-4  
Contract Environmental Protection Specialist  
FirstTekDOS, LLC  
Date: January 23, 2018