

United States Government

Department of Energy

Bonneville Power Administration

# memorandum

DATE: August 1, 2003

REPLY TO  
ATTN OF: KEC-4

SUBJECT: Supplement Analysis for the Watershed Management Program EIS (DOE/EIS-0265/SA-111)

TO: Ron Morinaka  
Fish and Wildlife Project Manager, KEWU-4

**Proposed Action:** Young Creek Stream Restoration

**Project No:** 2002-008-00

**Watershed Management Techniques or Actions Addressed Under This Supplement Analysis**

**(See App. A of the Watershed Management Program EIS):** 1.3 Restoration of Channelized River and Stream Reaches; 1.6 Install Large Woody Debris Structures; 1.7 Install Other Habitat Complexity Structures; 1.8 Bank Protection Through Vegetation Management; 1.9 Structural Bank Protection Using Bio-engineering Methods; 1.16 Spawning Habitat Enhancements; 1.17 Rearing Habitat Enhancements; 2.1 Maintain Healthy Riparian Plant Communities; 6.10 Access: Fencing.

**Location:** Lincoln County, Montana, T37N, R28W, Se ¼ of NE ¼ of Sec. 16

**Proposed by:** Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) and Montana Department of Natural Resources and Conservation, Division of Fish, Wildlife and Parks (MFWP)

**Description of the Proposed Action:** The BPA is proposing to fund a stream channel restoration project with MFWP. The proposal would return about 1200 feet of Young Creek to its original, natural channel from a straightened and leveed channel constructed in the 1950's for flood control. Rehabilitation of the man-made stream course and stabilization of the natural channel would be implemented as well as several structural and non-structural riparian and fisheries habitat improvements and protections (see list above).

**Analysis:** The NEPA Compliance Checklist for this project, completed by Jim Dunnigan of MFWP (July 9, 2003), meets the standards and guidelines for the Watershed Management Program EIS and Record of Decision. See attached. In addition, Montana Department of Natural Resources and Conservation completed an EA under the Montana Environmental Policy Act (MEPA) and issued a Decision Notice announcing the action may proceed without an EIS (February 2003).

Species protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) that may occur in the general vicinity of the project area are grizzly bear, bald eagle, bull trout, white sturgeon, gray wolf, Canada lynx, and Spalding's champion. Pursuant to Section 7 of the ESA, BPA and MFWP conducted a Biological Assessment (attached) and determined that the proposed actions may affect but are not likely to adversely effect grizzly bear, bald eagle and bull trout, and would not affect other ESA-listed species. The USFWS concurred with this determination via letter of June 19, 2003, (attached).

Pursuant to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, a cultural and historic resource review, and field survey of the project site were conducted. See the attached report. One site, ruins of an historic cabin, was recorded in the vicinity, though a lack of artifacts prevented site dating or use from being established. So, the site was presumed not eligible for nomination to the National Register of Historic Places. Another find of a few scattered metal cans in a nearby timber sale area was not formally recorded. Since both sites are outside the project's area of potential effect, BPA determined that neither site would be impacted by project activities. Since no other materials were detected in the project area, BPA determined that the proposed activities would have no effect on cultural and/or historic resources. This determination was submitted to the Montana State Historic Preservation Office, the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribe's Tribal Historic Preservation Office, and the Cultural Resources Program of the Kootenai Tribe of Idaho for consideration and concurrence. In the unlikely event that archaeological material is encountered during project activities, work would be halted in the vicinity of any finds until a qualified archaeologist inspects and assesses the situation. SHPO and THPO offices would be further consulted, as appropriate.

Standard water quality protection procedures and Best Management Practices would be followed during project implementation. Construction would be authorized only after all applicable local, state, and federal permits, licenses and approvals have been obtained.

Public involvement occurred with the MEPA process for the project and is well documented in the EA and Decision Notice. No public comments were received during scoping or the 30-day post-decisional comment period. Several internal and interdisciplinary team issues were resolved in final design of the project as presented in the EA and Decision Notice.

**Findings:** The project is generally consistent with the Northwest Power Planning Council's Fish and Wildlife Program, as well as BPA's Watershed Management Program EIS (DOE/EIS-0265) and ROD. This Supplement Analysis finds that: 1) implementing the proposed actions will not result in any substantial changes to the Watershed management Program relevant to environmental concerns; and the proposed actions are substantially consistent with the Watershed Management Program EIS (DOE/EIS-0265) and ROD; and, 2) there are no significant new circumstances or information relevant to environmental concerns pertaining to the proposed actions or their impacts. Therefore, no further NEPA documentation is necessary.

/s/ Mickey A. Carter  
Mickey A. Carter  
Environmental Protection Specialist

CONCUR:

/s/ Thomas C. McKinney  
Thomas C. McKinney  
NEPA Compliance Officer

DATE: 8/1/03

Attachments:  
NEPA Compliance Checklist  
Cultural Resource Inventory, May 2003  
BA and USFWS letter of concurrence, June 2003

cc: (w/o attachments)  
Mr. Jim Dunnigan, MFWP, Libby Area Office, 475 Fish Hatchery Road, Libby, MT 59923