

Date: November 26, 1986

A. APPLICATION

5. County: Twin Falls State: Idaho

The power from the project amendment would be useful in meeting a small part of the need for power projected by the Western Systems Coordinating Council (WSCC) for the Northwest region. From the time the project goes on-line it will be available to displace fossil-fueled power generation in the WSCC region and thereby, to conserve nonrenewable fossil fuels, and to reduce the emission of noxious byproducts caused by the combustion of fossil fuels.

C. PROPOSED PROJECT AND ALTERNATIVES

1. Description of the proposed action: The applicant proposes to modify the partially constructed project by adding a fourth generation unit rated at a capacity of 778 kilowatts (kW). This would increase the total capacity of the project from 2,146 kW to 2,924 kW. In order to accommodate the new installed generating unit, the proposed powerhouse would be extended by 18 feet. An additional 100 square yards of material would be excavated to construct the proposed powerhouse.

2. Applicant's proposed mitigative measures.

a. Construction: The applicant has filed a plan to mitigate impacts to riparian and wetland habitats adversely affected by construction of the licensed project. The plan includes provisions for successfully revegetating the riparian areas disturbed during past construction and for replacing wetlands damaged or destroyed.

b. Operation: None.

3. Federal lands affected.

☒ No. ☐ Yes; agency: _____; acreage = _____;

____ The federal land management agency has provided conditions by letter dated: ____/____/____ (Attachment ____).

____ Conditions have not been provided.

Remarks: _____

4. Alternatives to the proposed action.

a. ☒ No other reasonable action alternatives have been found.

____ Action alternative: _____

b. Alternative of no action.

No action would prohibit the applicant from modifying the licensed project. No action would involve no alterations to the existing environment and would preclude the applicant from producing additional electrical power at the site.

D. AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT

1. Descriptions of the resources in the project impact area.

a. Geology and soils. Soils in the project area are composed of sand, gravel, and boulder alluvium on the canyon bottoms below the adjacent basalt cliffs.
The soils on the upper plateau are relatively shallow, silty, and sandy-loamy.
The bedrock consists of basalt ranging from massive to dense and interbedded with lake and stream sediments.

b. Streamflow.

low flow: 18 cfs; flow parameter: Average low flow, winter
high flow: 332 cfs; flow parameter: Average high flow, summer
average flow: 50 cfs; flow parameter: Average annual flow
Remarks. Streamflow is regulated by irrigation needs but the applicant is required by the existing license to provide a minimum flow of 25 cubic feet per second (cfs) from the project.

c. Water quality. Water quality in the creek is fair. Most of the water comes from collected wastewater from surface irrigation. Water quality is affected by silt, fertilizers, and nutrients.

d. Fisheries.

Anadromous: X None. Species include:

Resident: None. X Species include: rainbow trout.

Remarks.

e. Vegetation.

<u>Cover type</u>	<u>Dominant species</u>
<u>sagebrush shrub</u>	<u>big sagebrush, cheat, aster, and various other</u>
<u>riparian</u>	<u>grasses and forbs</u>
<u>wetland</u>	<u>willow, wild rose, chokecherry, currant, wild rye,</u>
	<u>mint, and bigsting nettle</u>
	<u>cattail, hardstem, bullrush, and sedge</u>

Remarks. Small isolated patches of wetland vegetation occur throughout the length of Cedar Draw Creek.

f. Wildlife.

Species inhabiting the project area include: mule deer, chukar partridge, ring-necked pheasant, coyote, mink, raccoon, marsh hawk, and a variety of small mammals and songbirds.

Remarks. The riparian vegetation and wetlands along Cedar Draw Creek are important wildlife habitats.

MAR 28 1995

g. Cultural.

There are properties listed on or eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places in the area of the project's potential environmental impact.

Description.

X National Register (listed and eligible) properties have not been recorded.

Remarks. The Idaho State Historic Preservation officer (SHPO) states that the proposed amendment of license would have no effect on cultural resources (letter from Thomas J. Green, SHPO, Idaho State Historical Society, Boise, Idaho, September 4, 1985). A condition of the existing license would ensure the protection of cultural resources in the event of future construction or land-disturbing activities at the project site.

h. Visual quality. The project is located in a sparsely vegetated, rocky, box canyon. Two Falls, a waterfall located approximately 400 feet upstream of the diversion structure, would provide a visual attraction for any visitors to the project area. The waterfall, however, is not readily accessible to the public because of private ownership of the surrounding land.

i. Recreation. Recreational use of the project area is limited because much of the surrounding land is privately owned. Some fishing, hunting, and hiking does occur along Cedar Draw Creek.

j. Land use. Land in the project area is primarily used for irrigation, agriculture, and commercial rearing of trout. Commercial trout ponds are located downstream of the project site and utilize water from Cedar Draw Creek for their operations.

k. Socioeconomics. The socioeconomic well-being of the area is influenced primarily by agriculture and trout farming.

l. Ambient noise. Ambient noise levels in the project area are moderate because of the project's location near a waterfall.

m. Ambient air quality. Ambient air quality in the project area is good because of the project's location away from industrial areas and heavily used roads.

n. Other resources. No other resources would be affected by the project.

MAR 28 1986

F. COMMENTS

1. The following entities provided comments on the application in response to the public notice dated 3 / 11 / 86.

<u>Commenting entity</u>	<u>Date of letter</u>
<u>Idaho Department of Fish and Game</u>	<u>4 / 18 / 86</u>
<u>Idaho Department of Health and Welfare</u>	<u>4 / 21 / 86</u>
<u>Department of the Interior</u>	<u>5 / 19 / 86</u>
<u> </u>	<u> </u>
<u> </u>	<u> </u>
<u> </u>	<u> </u>
<u> </u>	<u> </u>
<u> </u>	<u> </u>
<u> </u>	<u> </u>
<u> </u>	<u> </u>
<u> </u>	<u> </u>

* Indicates a petition to intervene.

2. The applicant responded to the comments by letter dated no response.

G. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Mitigative measures recommended by the staff are in addition to those proposed by the applicant, Section C(2), and those conditions identified in Section C(3), as appropriate. There are 3 issues addressed below.

1. Issue: Controlling erosion, sedimentation, turbidity, and instability of slopes.

(a) Comments: The Idaho Department of Fish and Game (IDFG) states that the slope stabilization and revegetation plan lacks detail.

(b) Applicant's response: None.

(c) Conclusions and recommendations: Land-clearing and ground-disturbing activities would increase the potential for erosion, sedimentation, turbidity, and instability of slopes. The slope stabilization and revegetation plan should be revised to provide detailed and site-specific treatment measures to mitigate construction and operation impacts. Therefore, after consultation with the IDFG and the Department of Army, Walla Walla District, Corps of Engineers (Corps), a revised plan should be filed with the Commission before starting any land-clearing or ground-disturbing activities. The revised plan should include detailed and site-specific descriptions of proposed measures to control erosion, sedimentation, turbidity, and slope instability.