

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT:

LRAM Grade Control Project at Training Areas 6, 11, 12 and the MPRC SDZ

YAKIMA TRAINING CENTER, YAKIMA, WA

The U.S. Army is proposing to execute an erosion control project in Training Areas 6, 11 and 12 (TA6, TA11, TA12) and the Multi-Purpose Range Complex surface danger zone (MPRC SDZ). This project will improve roads and trails, close unnecessary roads, improve or replace stream crossing features, remove cattle guards, and install gates leading into the MPRC SDZ. This project will help attain the following goals of the Army's Land Rehabilitation and Maintenance (LRAM) program: maintain and improve training area access and realistic training conditions; reduce fire danger by improving access roads and firebreaks and; minimize erosion, stabilize degraded stream channel crossing, and restore riparian habitats. In addition, water resources would be developed for use during construction and for fire suppression activities.

An Environmental Assessment (EA) has been prepared which identifies three action alternatives and the no-action alternative.

No-Action Alternative

The No-Action Alternative would result in no improvement to roads and trails. No road closures would be done and grade control structures would not be constructed. Stream crossing features would not be improved or replaced. No water resources would be developed and cattle guards would remain in place. No gates would be installed on roads along the MPRC SDZ.

Alternative 1 (LRAM Erosion Control Project with Development of a Well and Springs)

Under this alternative, selected combat roads and trails in TA6, TA11, TA12 and the MPRC SDZ would be improved or re-routed and grade control structures would be constructed. Degraded stream crossings would be repaired or replaced and unnecessary roads would be closed. Cattle guards would be removed from various locations on YTC and gates would be erected along the MPRC SDZ. Water for construction and fire suppression activities would be developed from up to four springs in the area and the drilling of a well. Springs would be developed by installing collection boxes and piping to carry water to storage tanks. Overflow from the tanks would return to the source drainage. The well would pump water to a storage tank. Dip points for aerial firefighting may also be located at some or all locations.

Alternative 2 (LRAM Erosion Control Project with Spring Water Development Only)

In this alternative, the erosion control project would be accomplished as described in Alternative 1. Up to four springs in the project area would be developed for construction and fire suppression activities as described in Alternative 1. No well would be drilled.

Reference: 497061-09-01

Application: U. S. Department of the Army -
Yakima Training Center

Proposed: Install six stream crossing features and
six bank barbs at the Yakima Training Center

Near: Yakima, WA

Sheet: 12 of 24

Date: February 9, 2009

Alternative 3 (LRAM Erosion Control Project with Well Water Development Only)

Under this alternative, the erosion control project would be done as described in Alternative 1. One well would be drilled and plumbed to pump to a storage tank and possibly to a dip point for aerial firefighting resources. No springs would be developed.

Anticipated Environmental and Socioeconomic Effects

Effects to air quality during project construction would range from minor to moderate for all three alternatives. Best management practices would be used to minimize dust during rock crushing and construction activities. Calculations for the use of two rock crushers operating for this action and the upgrade to the MPRC, show that no exceedance of the 100 tons/year for any one criteria pollutant will take place for Title V consideration. Air quality effects from this action would be short-term and limited to the duration of construction.

Effects from noise would be negligible for all alternatives. Noise from the three action alternatives would be expected to be within noise levels experienced previously.

Effects to the geology, topography, and soils would be minor for all three action alternatives. Although there would be short-term erosional effects during the proposed construction, long-term effects would be positive. The repair to roads, trails and crossings would mitigate the long-term effects caused by vehicular traffic. Effects for the no-action alternative would be moderate as vehicular traffic would continue to degrade the roads, trails, and crossings.

Surface water effects for all three action alternatives would be minor. There would be short-term impacts during construction, but the repair and upgrade to crossing features and grade control structures would improve surface water quality by mitigating siltation from erosion. Moderate impact would result from the no-action alternative as there would be continued erosion and sedimentation, and degradation to riparian vegetation.

Impacts to groundwater would be negligible for all alternatives due to the lack of potential modes of contamination.

There would be minor and positive effects to land use for all three action alternatives. Access to training areas would be improved and would enhance military training. The no-action alternative would have moderate impacts resulting from continued erosion and degradation of resources.

Socioeconomic impact from all alternatives would be negligible. The size of the project is relatively small and would not be expected to put any stress on the housing, schools, or services in the surrounding area.

Moderate, positive effects on human health would be expected from all three action alternatives. Development of water resources and improved access in the area would enhance firefighting capabilities in the area. Improvements to roads and removal of cattle guards would enhance safety. The no-action alternative would have moderate impacts to human health as there would be no development of water resources in the area and degraded access to areas would impair firefighting capabilities.

Reference: 497061-09-01

Application: U. S. Department of the Army -
Yakima Training Center

Proposed: Install six stream crossing features and
six bank barbs at the Yakima Training Center

Near: Yakima, WA

Sheet: 13 of 24

Date: February 9, 2009

All alternatives would have a negligible effect on solid waste. For the action alternatives, any solid waste generated during rock crushing and construction would be the responsibility of the contractor to recycle or dispose of properly.

The effects from hazardous waste would be negligible. Amounts generated from this project would not appreciably raise the current levels at YTC. Hazardous, toxic, and other regulated wastes would be managed through the YTC One Stop Yard.

Impact to Cultural Resources would be minor for all three action alternatives. No known cultural sites are within the project footprint and the action alternatives would improve Native American access. The impact from the no-action alternative would be moderate because degraded roads and trails would limit Native American access into traditional areas.

Because improvements to roads and trails are on existing roads, impact to upland vegetation would be negligible for all action alternatives. Minor impacts would occur under the no-action alternative because degraded roads would allow less access for fire suppression and noxious weed control activities.

The installation of catchment systems, piping, and the footprint of tanks and/or well drilling would have a small scale impact on riparian vegetation. Because of the small amount of such habitat on YTC and the disproportionate use by wildlife species, the effect from all three action alternatives on riparian vegetation would be minor. Impacts from the no-action alternative would be negligible as there would be no development in riparian areas.

Impact to fish and wildlife from the three action alternatives would be minor. Although some habitat loss in upland vegetation communities and development of riparian areas would occur and temporary displacement and/or abandonment of areas during construction are expected, these would be short-term and localized. Impacts resulting from the no-action alternative would be negligible as there would be no construction or development of springs.

No direct or indirect impacts are anticipated from all three action alternatives for threatened or endangered species. Bald eagles do not frequent the project area as there is no suitable habitat for nesting or wintering. No suitable habitat exists for listed salmonid species in the project area. No adverse impacts are anticipated for sage-grouse due to the short duration of the project, seasonal nature of sage-grouse use, and marginal habitat in the project area. For the no-action alternative, continued degradation of roads and trails would reduce access for fire suppression and noxious weed control activities. Overall, impacts from the no-action alternative would be minor.

Facts and Conclusions Leading to the FNSI

Environmental impacts for the three action alternative range from negligible to moderate (positive). The entire project except for approximately 1600 feet of re-routed roads is being done on existing roads, trails and crossings. Because of this, no new impacts would be anticipated.

Reference: 497061-09-01
Application: U. S. Department of the Army - Yakima Training Center
Proposed: Install six stream crossing features and six bank barbs at the Yakima Training Center
Near: Yakima, WA
Sheet: 14 of 24
Date: February 9, 2009

By improving or re-routing combat roads and trails and closing unnecessary roads, access to training areas would be improved and realistic training conditions maintained. Improved access would also reduce fire danger and improve firebreaks. Construction of grade control structures and improving or replacing crossing features would minimize erosion, stabilize degraded stream channel crossings, and restore riparian habitats. The development of water resources in the area for construction and fire suppression would have a positive effect by contributing to the mitigation of wildland fire damage.

The no-action alternative has slightly greater impacts than the three action alternatives to geology and soils, surface water, land use, human health, and infrastructure. The impacts of the three action alternatives are similar and no new significant impacts were identified in this analysis. It has been concluded that the selection of Alternative 3, well water development only, best meets the Army's purpose and need for this action. The option to drill a well at the Cross Road spring site was selected to provide the most reliable source of water for future wildland fire suppression needs at this particular site. This action would reduce any potential impacts to surface water and riparian resources as a result of diverting water at this site. Based on the EA, it is determined that a Finding of No Significant Impact is warranted for the preferred action.



Leo G. Pullar
Lieutenant Colonel, US Army
Commanding
Yakima Training Center, Washington

29 Dec 08

Date

Reference: 497061-09-01
Application: U. S. Department of the Army -
Yakima Training Center
Proposed: Install six stream crossing features and
six bank barbs at the Yakima Training Center
Near: Yakima, WA
Sheet: 15 of 24 Date: February 9, 2009

RECORD OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATION
Reference REIA 09-009

1. **Project Title:** Range 20 Crossing Feature Upgrade
2. **Background:** The geo-cell ford at the Lmumma Creek ford at Range 20 is degraded and in need of upgrading. This action is in support of the LRAM program goals to stabilize degraded stream crossings to maintain and improve training area access and realistic training conditions.
3. **Description of Proposed Action:** The existing geo-cell ford at the Range 20 Lmumma Creek ford will be replaced by a cable concrete ford. This ford consists of a series of concrete blocks connected to form a single mattress. The ford will be 80 feet in length by 16 feet in width. The space between the blocks will be filled with wearing material after the placement and anchoring of the mattresses. Infill material will extend above the edge of the blocks. After installation, the four corners of the ford will be marked using corner posts.
4. **Results of screening criteria for Categorical Exclusion (CX), and discussion of Impact Analysis.** This proposal is eligible for CX because it satisfies all three Screening Criteria (i.e., the action is not segmented, no extraordinary circumstances exist, and one or more CXs encompass the proposal). See Attached Request for Environmental Impact Analysis.
5. **Proposed Date(s) of Action:** Between August 1 and December 31. **NOTE: It is strongly recommended that construction occur in August and September prior to the fall/winter precipitation to minimize affects to riparian/wetland habitat.**
6. **Reason for using a REC:** In accordance with 32 CFR Part 651, this action is adequately covered by CX g-2, stating: *Routine repairs of roads, trails, and firebreaks. Examples include, but are not limited to: grading and clearing the roadside of brush with or without the use of herbicides; resurfacing a road to its original conditions; pruning vegetation, removal of dead, diseased, or damaged trees, and cleaning culverts; and minor soil stabilization activities.*

PROPONENT: Dale Tadewald, YTC Range Facility Manager

- A. Environmental Baseline Survey: _____ NA
- B. Fish/Wildlife: Colin Leingang 3/3/09
Colin Leingang, Wildlife Program Manager, YTC, PW-ENRD
- C. Cultural Resources: Randy Korgel 3/3/09
Randy Korgel, Cultural Resource Manager, YTC, PW-ENRD
- D. Vegetation: Colin Leingang 3/3/09
Colin Leingang, Wildlife Program Manager, YTC, PW-ENRD
- E. NEPA Coordination: John McDonald 3/3/09
John McDonald, NEPA Specialist, YTC, PW-ENRD
- F. Range Control/DPTMS: See attached
George Holman, Range Officer, YTC, DPTMS
- G. Project Officer: See attached
Dale Tadewald, Range Facility Manager, YTC, DPTMS
- H. Environmental Compliance: Brian Deeken 3/3/09
Brian Deeken, Environmental Compliance Manager, YTC, PW-ENRD
- I. Natural Resources: Peter E. Nissen 5 Mar 09
Peter E. Nissen, Natural Resources Manager, YTC, PW-ENRD
- J. Staff Concurrence: Margaret Pounds 5 March 09
Margaret Pounds, Chief, YTC, PW-ENRD

Reference: 497061-09-01

Application: U. S. Department of the Army -
Yakima Training Center

Proposed: Install six stream crossing features and
six bank barbs at the Yakima Training Center

Near: Yakima, WA

Sheet: 16 of 24

Date: March 9, 2009

Date: 3 March 2009

RECORD OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATION
Reference REIA 09-009

1. **Project Title:** Range 20 Crossing Feature Upgrade
2. **Background:** The geo-cell ford at the Lmumma Creek ford at Range 20 is degraded and in need of upgrading. This action is in support of the LRAM program goals to stabilize degraded stream crossings to maintain and improve training area access and realistic training conditions.
3. **Description of Proposed Action:** The existing geo-cell ford at the Range 20 Lmumma Creek ford will be replaced by a cable concrete ford. This ford consists of a series of concrete blocks connected to form a single mattress. The ford will be 80 feet in length by 16 feet in width. The space between the blocks will be filled with wearing material after the placement and anchoring of the mattresses. Infill material will extend above the edge of the blocks. After installation, the four corners of the ford will be marked using corner posts.
4. **Results of screening criteria for Categorical Exclusion (CX), and discussion of Impact Analysis.** This proposal is eligible for CX because it satisfies all three Screening Criteria (i.e., the action is not segmented, no extraordinary circumstances exist, and one or more CXs encompass the proposal). See Attached Request for Environmental Impact Analysis.
5. **Proposed Date(s) of Action:** Between August 1 and December 31. **NOTE: It is strongly recommended that construction occur in August and September prior to the fall/winter precipitation to minimize affects to riparian/wetland habitat.**
6. **Reason for using a REC:** In accordance with 32 CFR Part 651, this action is adequately covered by CX g-2, stating: *Routine repairs of roads, trails, and firebreaks. Examples include, but are not limited to: grading and clearing the roadside of brush with or without the use of herbicides; resurfacing a road to its original conditions; pruning vegetation, removal of dead, diseased, or damaged trees, and cleaning culverts; and minor soil stabilization activities.*

PROPONENT: Dale Tadewald, YTC Range Facility Manager

- A. Environmental Baseline Survey: _____ NA _____
- B. Fish/Wildlife: _____
Colin Leingang, Wildlife Program Manager, YTC, PW-ENRD
- C. Cultural Resources: _____
Randy Korgel, Cultural Resource Manager, YTC, PW-ENRD
- D. Vegetation: _____
Colin Leingang, Wildlife Program Manager, YTC, PW-ENRD
- E. NEPA Coordination: _____
John McDonald, NEPA Specialist, YTC, PW-ENRD
- F. Range Control/DPTMS: _____ *5 MAR 09*
[Signature]
George Holman, Range Officer, YTC, DPTMS
- G. Project Officer: _____ *5 MAR 09*
[Signature]
Dale Tadewald, Range Facility Manager, YTC, DPTMS
- H. Environmental Compliance: _____
Brian Deeken, Environmental Compliance Manager, YTC, PW-ENRD
- I. Natural Resources: _____
Peter E. Nissen, Natural Resources Manager, YTC, PW-ENRD
- J. Staff Concurrence: _____
Margaret Pounds, Chief, YTC, PW-ENRD

Reference: 497061-09-01
 Application: U. S. Department of the Army -
 Yakima Training Center
 Proposed: Install six stream crossing features and
 six bank barbs at the Yakima Training Center
 Near: Yakima, WA
 Sheet: 17 of 24 Date: March 9, 2009

Yakima Training Center

Request for Environmental Impact Analysis-Form A

Date: 10 February 2009

INSTRUCTIONS: To request an environmental impact analysis for a project, complete the Sections below and return to: john.mcdonald22@us.army.mil. If you have any questions about this form, contact the YTC NEPA Specialist at (509) 577-3789

1. Proponent Information

Proponents located outside of YTC please fill in the following information. Local proponents need only fill in the information in Section 1.1.

Name: _____ Phone: (____) - _____ Fax: (____) - _____
Title: _____ DSN: _____ Fax DSN: _____
Email: _____

1.1. Local Proponent Information

If the Proponent is not located at YTC, a Local Proponent will be designated who is familiar with the proposed action and will be available to answer questions and attend scoping meetings if necessary.

Name: Dale Tadewald Title: Range Facility Manager
Phone: 577-3642

1.2. Proponent Review

Has the proposed action been reviewed in the context of land-use requirements contained within the Training Unit SOP?
 No Yes

2. Proposed Action

Describe the proposed action. Include any maps, plans, or diagrams that describe the action and/or area. If the action involves the demolition of a structure, include photographs of the structure.

Title: Range 20 Crossing Feature Upgrade

Purpose of and Need for the Action: There is a need at YTC to periodically install and/or repair stream crossing features. An existing geo-cell ford has been identified in TA 15, Range 20 that is in need of maintenance. The purpose of the action is to upgrade a stream crossing feature in support of LRAM program goals to stabilize degraded stream crossings to maintain and improve training area access and realistic training conditions.

Description of the Action: Upgrade the currently degraded geo-cell ford at the Lmumma Creek crossing at Range 20 by replacing it with a cable concrete ford. This type of ford is a series of concrete blocks connected to form a single mattress. The blocks are shaped and placed in a manner to allow differential movement of adjacent blocks to conform to the surface on which they are set. The mattress is backed by a geotextile that extends outside the edge of the blocks to allow overlap. The Range 20 ford will be 80 feet in length by 16 feet in width. Space between the blocks will be filled with wearing material after the placement and anchoring of all mattresses. Infill material will extend above the edge of the blocks. After installation, the four corners of the ford will be marked using corner posts. Access to site will be along existing roads.

Approximate size/footprint of the Action: 1280 square feet

Timing/Sequencing: August 1-December 31, 2009

Specific Location (e.g., watershed, training area, range): TA15, Range 20 (UTM coordinates 706056, 5184928)

Similar or Connected Actions (i.e., bivouacking, use of lights, need for fill material): LRAM erosion control project at TA6, TA11, TA12 and the D-MPRC SDZ. (October 2008 EA Reference: 497061-09-01)

Application: U. S. Department of the Army -

Yakima Training Center

ENRD use only request Number	09-009
---------------------------------	--------

-] Proposed: Install six stream crossing features and six bank barbs at the Yakima Training Center

Near: Yakima, WA

Sheet: 18 of 24

Date: March 9, 2009

3. Preliminary Environmental Survey

Use the following section to identify issues that will be considered further in the resulting compliance documentation. If applicable, discuss both temporary activities associated with implementation of the action (i.e., construction of a facility) as well as any longer-term or ongoing activities (i.e., maintenance and operation of the facility). Any uncertainty will result in a "Yes" response. "Yes" responses need to be explained further.

3.1. Land Use

Will there be any changes to current land use as a result of the action?

No Yes Action is upgrade of existing ford

Who owns the property on which the action will take place? U.S. Army-YTC

Does the action involve a real estate transaction?

No Yes

Will the action involve the use of pyrotechnics or increase the potential for fire?

No Yes

3.2. Air Quality

Will the action result in a change in release or production of airborne pollutants, including vehicle emissions, smoke, and/or dust?

No Yes Heavy equipment and hauling of fill material.

3.3. Hazardous Materials/Waste

Does the action involve production, storage, treatment, or disposal of hazardous wastes or materials, including regulated pesticide, herbicide, fungicide, fuel, etc.?

No Yes

Does the action involve the remodeling or demolition of a structure or structures?

No Yes Replacement of existing ford.

Will the action result in the generation of solid waste and, if so, how would the waste be disposed of?

No Yes Existing geo-cell ford may be removed. Contractor will dispose of it at offsite installation.

3.4. Biological Resources

Will the action introduce fish, wildlife, or vegetative species into an area?

No Yes

Will the action result in adverse effects to existing fish or wildlife populations or habitat?

No Yes

3.5. Cultural Resources

Does the action involve any ground disturbing activities outside of the cantonment area?

No Yes Action will be done in area of previous ground disturbance.

3.6. Geology/Soils and Hydrologic Resources

Will the action result in long-term disturbance, displacement, or compaction of soils?

No Yes

Will the action result in new impervious surfaces (i.e., parking areas, improved roads, permanent structures)?

No Yes Cable concrete ford will be constructed in channel.

Reference: 497061-09-01

Application: U. S. Department of the Army -

Yakima Training Center

Proposed: Install six stream crossing features and

six bank barbs at the Yakima Training Center

Near: Yakima, WA

ENRD use only
Request Number

09-009

3.7. Water

Will the action change the course, direction, quality, or quantity of any water body, including groundwater and/or wetlands?

No Yes Construction will take place during the stream's seasonal dry period.

Does the action involve dredging or placement of fill in any body of water or drainage?

No Yes Fill will be put between blocks of the new ford.

Will any aspect of the action take place within a river, pond, or other wetland or floodplain?

No Yes Action takes place in season stream.

Will the action result in any liquid discharges?

No Yes

3.8. Socioeconomics

Will the action alter the location, distribution, density, or growth rate of the human population of an area?

No Yes

3.9. Infrastructure

Will the action result in an increase in permanent personnel on-post?

No Yes

Will the action result in a change in amount or distribution of vehicular traffic on- and/or off-post?

No Yes

Does the action involve the addition of new utility systems or substantial alterations to existing systems? Utility systems include electrical power, telephone and data connectivity, drinking and irrigation water conveyance, and wastewater collection and treatment.

No Yes

Will the action result in discharges to the wastewater treatment system or a stand alone septic system?

No Yes

Will the action result in new temporary or permanent facilities/structures? For temporary structures, state duration and responsible party for removal or demolition/disposal.

No Yes Cable concrete ford is a permanent structure.

3.10. Noise

Will the action result in increases in actual or perceived noise levels?

No Yes

Reference: 497061-09-01
Application: U. S. Department of the Army -
Yakima Training Center
Proposed: Install six stream crossing features and
six bank barbs at the Yakima Training Center
Near: Yakima, WA
Sheet: 20 of 24 Date: March 9, 2009

ENRD use only Request Number	09-009
---------------------------------	---------------

Yakima Training Center

Request for Environmental Impact Analysis-Form B Request No. 09-009

4. Resource Specialist Review

Using the information provided by the proponent and your professional judgment complete the following section. When applicable, discuss any past, present, or reasonably foreseeable future actions which may contribute to cumulative effects of the proposed action.

4.1. Land Use

Will there be any changes to current land use as a result of the action?

No Yes

4.2. Air Quality

Will the action take place within a non-attainment or maintenance area?

No Yes

Are any permits or approvals required?

No Yes

4.3. Hazardous Materials/Waste

Does the action involve production, storage, treatment, or disposal of hazardous wastes or materials, including regulated pesticide, herbicide, fungicide, etc.?

No Yes

Are any permits or approvals required?

No Yes

Will the action result in the generation of solid waste and, if so, how would the waste be disposed of?

No Yes If generated, the contractor will dispose according to regulations.

4.4. Biological Resources

Has the site been surveyed for rare and sensitive plant species? If so, please elaborate on any vegetative communities that may be affected by the action.

No Yes Site is an existing crossing on Lmumma Creek consisting of a degraded geo-cell that was surveyed in 1996 by Saltstrom and Easterly. Typical riparian vegetation (willows, cattails, sedges, rushes) inhabit the intermittent stream adjacent to the crossing. No known populations of rare/sensitive species exist on site. An existing enclosure is located adjacent to the proposed project area and should be protected/maintained.

Will the action affect any plant species covered under YTC's *Sensitive Plant Management Plan*, and/or unique vegetation communities?

No Yes As proposed, the project will have discountable impacts to riparian habitat.

Will the action affect riparian, spring, or wetland habitat?

No Yes The project is replacing a degraded geo-cell crossing on Lmumma Creek. It will impact riparian/wetland habitat with the placement of a cable concrete ford. Overall the short-term impacts of replacing the geo-cell with the more appropriate cable concrete ford will improve the crossing which is currently contributing to erosion and sedimentation downstream of the site. Strongly suggest that construction occur in August and September prior to fall/winter precipitation.

Is the site within the Sage Grouse Protection Area?

Reference: 497061-09-01

Application: U. S. Department of the Army -
Yakima Training Center

Proposed: Install six stream crossing features and
six bank barbs at the Yakima Training Center

Near: Yakima, WA

Sheet: 21 of 24

Date: March 9, 2009

No Yes Site is within the SGPA and all aspects of the project will need to occur outside protection periods. The only exemption to current protection measures allowed with this action is digging related to the construction.

Does the action have the potential to affect species of management emphasis on YTC?

No Yes There will be short-term disturbance related impacts with riparian associated species.

Does the action have the potential to affect Essential Fish Habitat (EFH)?

No Yes This crossing feature is upstream of known fish populations within Lmumma Creek west of the Badger Pocket MSR to the installation boundary. Lmumma Creeek is a tributary to the Yakima River which provides EFH for several listed salmonids. Overall, any short-term negative impacts to existing riparian habitat will be minimized by working in the dry season, allowing natural revegetation to occur, and by improving the crossing feature thus reducing potential erosion/sedimentation downstream.

Does the action require a Section 7 Consultation?

No Yes No impacts to federal listed species are anticipated as designed. Given the small scale, duration, and that this project is considered maintenance/repair of an existing crossing feature it does not require Endangered Species Act Section 7 Consultation.

Is this action considered a military readiness activity as defined by the Final Rule regarding Take of Migratory Birds by DoD?

No Yes This is not a military readiness activity and would require evaluation of impacts to migratory birds. No population level impacts to migratory birds are anticipated as this will have minimal/discountable impacts to riparian habitat and construction is proposed outside the nesting season for migratory birds.

4.5. Cultural Resources

Has the site been surveyed for cultural resources?

No Yes

Will the action affect any resources of significance to either the Wanapum or Yakama?

No Yes

Will this action require a dig permit?

No Yes

4.6. Geology/Soils

Will the action result in changes to runoff, erosion, and/or increased sediment loading of water bodies?

No Yes The action may initially cause increased minor sediment loading during first flush of a runoff event due to construction activities. Runoff or erosion should not change with the action.

Are there highly erodible soils within the proposed project area?

No Yes

4.7. Water

Will the project be located below Ordinary High Watermark?

No Yes

Are any permits or approvals required?

No Yes Project will require a Joint Aquatic Resource Permit Application (JARPA)

4.8. Socioeconomics

Will the action disproportionately affect children, minority, or low-income populations?

No Yes Project is in an isolated area away from general pop

Will the action alter the location, distribution, density, or growth rate of the

Reference: 497061-09-01

Application: U. S. Department of the Army - Yakima Training Center

Proposed: Install six stream crossing features and six bank barbs at the Yakima Training Center

Near: Yakima, WA

Sheet: 22 of 24

Date: M... 2000

No Yes Overall, project is short-term and not large enough to affect population of the ROI

4.9. Infrastructure

Will the action result in a substantial change in amount or distribution of vehicular traffic on- and/or off-post?

No Yes _____

Does the action involve the addition of new utility systems or substantial alterations to existing systems?

No Yes _____

Will the action result in discharges to the wastewater treatment system or a standalone septic system?

No Yes _____

4.10. Noise

Will the action result in increases in actual or perceived noise levels?

No Yes There will be no change to the use in the area and therefore no increase in the actual or perceived noise levels.

Reference: 497061-09-01
Application: U. S. Department of the Army -
Yakima Training Center
Proposed: Install six stream crossing features and
six bank barbs at the Yakima Training Center
Near: Yakima, WA
Sheet: 23 of 24 Date: March 9, 2009

5. Determination of Impacts

Based on the information provided in Sections 2 through 4 of this form, work through the following questions to determine the level of analysis warranted by the proposed action.

5.1. Will the action have a significant impact on the human environment?

- No. Go to 5.2.
 Yes or uncertain. Go to 5.5.

5.2. Is the action covered under a Categorical Exclusion (CX)?

- No. Go to 5.5
 Yes. Go to 5.3.

5.3. Do any exceptional circumstances exist? See 32 CFR 651.29 paragraphs (b) (1) through (14).

- No. Go to 5.4.
 Yes. Go to 5.7.

5.4. Is the action segmented?

- No. If required, prepare a Record of Environmental Consideration (REC).
 Yes. Go to 5.7.

5.5. Has the action been adequately analyzed and, if applicable, mitigated for in a previous Environmental Assessment (EA) or Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)?

- No. Go to 5.6.
 Yes. Go to 5.3.

5.6. Does the action have any significant impacts in which mitigation measures cannot be applied to minimize impacts to an acceptable (non-significant) level?

- No. Go to 5.7.
 Yes. Prepare an EIS.

5.7. Is the action controversial in nature?

- No. Prepare an EA.
 Yes. Prepare an EIS.

Reviewed by (box checked by NEPA Specialist)

- Richard Barry, Natural Resource Management Specialist
 Joan Bartz, Environmental Compliance Specialist
 Phil Fischer, Engineer
 Sally Jones, SRP Coordinator
 Randy Korgel, Cultural Resource Manager
 Colin Leingang, Wildlife Program Manager
 Pete Nissen, Natural Resource Manager

Reference: 497061-09-01

Application: U. S. Department of the Army -
Yakima Training Center

Proposed: Install six stream crossing features and
six bank barbs at the Yakima Training Center

Near: Yakima, WA

Sheet: 24 of 24

Date: March 9, 2009