United States Government **Department of Energy**

Bonneville Power Administration

DATE: January 17, 2003

REPLY TO ATTN OF: KEC-4

SUBJECT: Supplement Analysis for the Watershed Management Program EIS (DOE/EIS-0265/SA-102)

David Byrnes, KEWL-4
Fish and Wildlife Project Manager

Proposed Action: Yakima Tributary Access and Habitat Program – Ellensburg Water Company/ Cooke Creek Diversion Project

Project No: 2002-025-00

Watershed Management Techniques or Actions Addressed Under This Supplement Analysis (See App. A of the Watershed Management Program EIS)*:* 1.5 Install Grade Control Structures and Check Dams; 1.7 Install Other Habitat Complexity Structures; 1.8 Bank Protection Through Vegetation Management; 1.15 Fish Passage Enhancement – Fishways; 2.1 Maintain Healthy Riparian Plant Communities; 4.10 Water Conveyance – Pipeline; 4.20 Water Measuring Devices; 4.23 Intake and Return Diversion Screens; 4.25 Consolidate/Replace Irrigation Diversion Dams; 7.4 Divert Water Around Construction of Larger Structures

Location: Kittitas County, Washington

Proposed by: Bonneville Power Administration (BPA), South Central Washington Resource Conservation and Development, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, Kittitas County Water Purveyors, Bureau of Reclamation, and Kittitas County Conservation District.

Description of the Proposed Action: The Bonneville Power Administration (BPA) is proposing to fund a canal-stream crossing and fish screen improvement project on Cooke Creek in Kittitas County, Washington. The project proposes to place the Ellensburg Water Company's (EWC) main canal into a siphon passing underneath Cooke Creek, to build a fish screen on the EWC diversion on Cooke Creek, and to restore the Cooke Creek channel to a more natural state. The goal of this project is to improve fish habitat conditions in the Yakima River Basin and to protect ESA listed Mid-Columbia steelhead and bull trout. This project is part of the Yakima Tributary Access and Habitat Program, which works with landowners, water purveyors, and municipalities to restore fish passage to Yakima River tributaries that historically supported salmonids and to improve habitat in areas where access is restored.

Analysis: The compliance checklist for this project was completed by Dave Myra of South Central Washington Resource Conservation and Development (January 15, 2003) and meets the standards and guidelines for the Watershed Management Program Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and Record of Decision (ROD).

In complying with its responsibilities under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) of 1973, as amended, BPA submitted a Biological Assessment (BA) for the EWC/ Cooke Creek Project to NOAA Fisheries and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) in October 2002. As part of the BA, BPA determined that the proposed project would have no effect on gray wolf, grizzly bear, Canada lynx, Northern spotted owl, Ute ladies'-tresses, and Wenatchee Mountains checkermallow. BPA also determined that the proposed actions may affect, but are not likely to adversely affect, bald eagle, bull trout, and steelhead and that the proposed actions are not likely to adversely affect Essential Fish Habitat for chinook salmon or coho salmon. NOAA Fisheries concurred with BPA's determinations on December 4, 2002, and USFWS concurred with BPA's determinations on December 20, 2002.

Under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, BPA consulted with the Washington State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) to identify and mitigate for any potential adverse affects to historic or cultural resources. On October 7, 2002, BPA sent a letter to the Washington SHPO describing the site and the proposed project. BPA concluded that there would be no affect on cultural or historic resources associated with the EWC/ Cooke Creek Project given the present site conditions and proposed activities. The Washington SHPO determined that they had no record of cultural and/or historic resources in the proposed project area. However, since the project involves excavation near a stream the SHPO concluded that there is potential for buried cultural deposits at the site and recommended that all excavation activities be monitored by a qualified archaeologist (SHPO letter, October 11, 2002). Project proponents will adhere to these recommendations and all excavation activities will be monitored by a qualified archaeologist. In the event that archaeological material is encountered during construction of the site, an archaeologist will immediately be notified and work halted in the vicinity of the finds until they can be inspected and assessed.

Standard in-channel water quality protection procedures will be followed during the construction of the EWC/ Cooke Creek Project. Project proponents have obtained the appropriate authorizations for in-stream work, including a Hydraulic Project Approval from the State of Washington, a Section 404 Permit from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, and a Section 401 Water Quality Certification from Washington Department of Ecology. All identified permits conditions must be met.

There are numerous partners on this project that meet on a regular basis to work together and coordinate efforts. Partners include: Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife, Bureau of Reclamation, local conservation districts, Kittitas County Water Purveyors, local irrigation districts and water associations, and landowners. Consultation and coordination has also been conducted with The Yakama Nation, and Kittitas and Yakima counties. Additional public involvement has taken place through public meetings and workshops and mailings to local landowners. Plans are also underway to provide program information to local newspapers, television and radio stations, and other media outlets.

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 action will not result in any substantial changes to the Watershed Management Program that are

relevant to environmental concerns; and 2) there are no significant new circumstances or information relevant to environmental concerns and bearing on the Watershed Management Program or its impacts. Therefore, no further NEPA documentation is required.

/s/ Shannon C. Stewart 1-21-2003
Shannon C. Stewart
Environmental Specialist

CONCUR:

/s/ Robert W. Beraud for DATE: *1-21-2003*
Thomas C. McKinney
NEPA Compliance Officer

Attachments:
NEPA Compliance Checklist
NOAA Fisheries Letter, December 4, 2002
USFWS Letter, December 20, 2002
Washington SHPO Letter, October 11, 2002

cc: (w/ attachments)
Mr. Richard Visser, Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife
Mr. Larry Browne, Ellensburg Water Company
Mr. Dave Myra, South Central WA Resource Conservation and Development
Mr. Dana Postlewait, MWH Americas, Inc.