

RECLAMATION

Managing Water in the West

Categorical Exclusion Checklist

Thomas and Karen Alexander to William G. Yockey and Rachel J. Colonna Assignment

NCAO-CEC-14- 9

Prepared by: *Jake Berens* Date: *3/21/14*
Jake Berens
Water Conservation Specialist
Northern California Area Office (Willows)

Concurrence by: *See Attachment #2* Date: *3/24/14*
Patricia Rivera
Native American Affairs Program Manager
Mid-Pacific Regional Office

Concurrence by: *See Attachment #3* Date: *3/24/14*
William Soule
Archaeologist
Mid-Pacific Regional Office

Concurrence by: *Paul Zedonis* Date: *3/24/14*
Paul Zedonis
Natural Resource Specialist
Northern California Area Office

Approved by: *Brian Person* Date: *3/24/14*
Brian Person
Area Manager
Northern California Area Office



Proposed Action

Assignment from Thomas and Karen Alexander (Sacramento River Settlement Contract Nos. 14-06-200-7754A-R-1) to William G. Yockey and Rachel J. Colonna.

Exclusion Categories

Bureau of Reclamation Categorical Exclusion - 516 DM 6 D. 14: Approval, renewal, transfer, and execution of an original, amendatory, or supplemental water service or repayment contract where the only result will be to implement an administrative or financial practice or change.

Extraordinary Circumstances

Below is an evaluation of the extraordinary circumstances as required in 43 CFR 46.215.

1. This action would have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment (40 CFR 1502.3). No Uncertain Yes
2. This action would have highly controversial environmental effects or involve unresolved conflicts concerning alternative uses of available resources (NEPA Section 102(2)(E) and 43 CFR 46.215(c)). No Uncertain Yes
3. This action would have significant impacts on public health or safety (43 CFR 46.215(a)). No Uncertain Yes
4. This action would have significant impacts on such natural resources and unique geographical characteristics as historic or cultural resources; parks, recreation, and refuge lands; wilderness areas; wild or scenic rivers; national natural landmarks; sole or principal drinking water aquifers; prime farmlands; wetlands (EO 11990); flood plains (EO 11988); national monuments; migratory birds; and other ecologically significant or critical areas (43 CFR 46.215 (b)). No Uncertain Yes
5. This action would have highly uncertain and potentially significant environmental effects or involve unique or unknown environmental risks (43 CFR 46.215(d)). No Uncertain Yes
6. This action would establish a precedent for future action or represent a decision in principle about future actions with potentially significant environmental effects (43 CFR 46.215 (e)). No Uncertain Yes

7. This action would have a direct relationship to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant environmental effects (43 CFR 46.215 (f)). No Uncertain Yes
8. This action would have significant impacts on properties listed, or eligible for listing, on the National Register of Historic Places as determined by Reclamation (LND 02-01; and 43 CFR 46.215 (g)). No Uncertain Yes
9. This action would have significant impacts on species listed, or proposed to be listed, on the List of Endangered or Threatened Species, or have significant impacts on designated critical habitat for these species (43 CFR 46.215 (h)). No Uncertain Yes
10. This action would violate a Federal, Tribal, State, or local law or requirement imposed for protection of the environment (43 CFR 46.215 (i)). No Uncertain Yes
11. This action would affect ITAs (512 DM 2, Policy Memorandum dated December 15, 1993). No Uncertain Yes
12. This action would have a disproportionately high and adverse effect on low income or minority populations (EO 12898; and 43 CFR 46.215 (j)). No Uncertain Yes
13. This action would limit access to, and ceremonial use of, Indian sacred sites on Federal lands by Indian religious practitioners or significantly adversely affect the physical integrity of such sacred sites (EO 13007; 43 CFR 46.215 (k); and 512 DM 3). No Uncertain Yes
14. This action would contribute to the introduction, continued existence, or spread of noxious weeds or non-native invasive species known to occur in the area or actions that may promote the introduction, growth, or expansion of the range of such species (Federal Noxious Weed Control Act; EO 13112; and 43 CFR 46.215 (l)). No Uncertain Yes

Regional Archeologist concurred with Item 8 (email attached).

ITA Designee concurred with Item 11 (email attached).

NEPA Action Recommended

CEC – This action is covered by the exclusion category and no extraordinary circumstances exist. The action is excluded from further documentation in an EA or EIS.

Further environmental review is required, and the following document should be prepared.

EA

EIS

Environmental commitments, explanations, and/or remarks:

By letter dated March 9, 2014, Thomas and Karen Alexander requested to have the property delineated on Exhibit B of Sacramento River Settlement Contract Nos. 14-06-200-7754A-R-1, assigned to William G. Yockey and Rachel J. Colonna.

On December 19, 2013 by Grant Deed recorded in the Official Records of Tehama County, California, as Document No. 2013015985, Thomas and Karen Alexander voluntarily conveyed all interest to William G. Yockey and Rachel J. Colonna, husband and wife, of the land within said Contractor's Service Area.

The property delineated on Exhibit B of Sacramento River Settlement Contract No. 14-06-200-7754A-R-1 is located in a portion of Township 23N, Range 2W, Section 35 (Attachment 1). The Tehama County APNs are 091-250-31, and 091-250-32. The Lat/long is approximately 122°3'19.508"W, 39°48'0.905"N.

Article 23(a) of the Settlement Contract provides that the rights and obligations under the contract can be assigned in whole or in part with the approval of the United States. The new landowners have requested that the Settlement Contract be assigned to them in order to show the current ownership of the property delineated on Exhibit B of Sacramento River Settlement Contract No. 14-06-200-7754A-R-1. This is merely an administrative action. Currently the property is in small scale agricultural production and it is anticipated that it will remain that way for the foreseeable future. There will be no change in the land use; and no construction is anticipated to take place related to this action.

Attachment 2.



Zedonis, Paul <pzedonis@usbr.gov>

CR & ITA Review: Thomas and Karen Alexander to William G. Yockey and Rachel J. Colonna Assignment 03/21/14

RIVERA, PATRICIA <privera@usbr.gov>

Fri, Mar 21, 2014 at 6:58 PM

To: "Zedonis, Paul" <pzedonis@usbr.gov>

Cc: BOR MPR Cultural Resources Section <ibr2mprdculturalresources@usbr.gov>, Kristi Seabrook <kseabrook@usbr.gov>, Mary Williams <marywilliams@usbr.gov>, "Berens, Jacob J" <JBerens@usbr.gov>

Paul,

I reviewed the proposed action for an assignment from Thomas and Karen Alexander (Sacramento River Settlement Contract Nos. 14-06-200-7754A-R-1) to William G. Yockey and Rachel J. Colonna.

The proposed action does not have a potential to impact Indian Trust Assets.

Patricia Rivera
Native American Affairs Program Manager
US Bureau of Reclamation
Mid-Pacific Region
2800 Sacramento, California 95825
(916) 978-5194

Attachment 3.

CULTURAL RESOURCE COMPLIANCE
Reclamation Division of Environmental Affairs
MP-153

MP-153 Tracking Number: 14-NCAO-142

Project Name: Thomas and Karen Alexander to William G. Yockey and Rachel J. Colonna Assignment

NEPA Document: NCAO-CEC-14-9

NEPA Contact: Paul Zedonis, Natural Resources Specialist

MP 153 Cultural Resources Reviewer: William Soule, Archaeologist

Date: 03/24/2014

Reclamation's proposed action is to approve the assignment of property located in a portion of Township 23N, Range 2W, Section 35 (Tehama County APNs are 091-250-31, and 091-250-32) from Thomas and Karen Alexander to William G. Yockey and Rachel J. Colonna. This action is pursuant to Sacramento River Settlement Contract No. 14-06-200-7754A-R-1. This is the type of undertaking that does not have the potential to cause effects to historic properties, should such historic properties be present, pursuant to the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) Section 106 regulations codified at 36 CFR Part 800.3(a)(1).

This is strictly an administrative action. Currently the property is in small scale agricultural production and it is anticipated that it will remain that way for the foreseeable future. There will be no change in the land use; and no construction is anticipated to take place related to this action.

After reviewing the materials submitted by NCAO, I concur with item 8 in NCAO-CEC-14-9 which states that this proposed action would not have significant impacts on properties listed, or eligible for listing, on the National Register of Historic Places as determined by Reclamation. With this determination, Reclamation has no further NHPA Section 106 obligations. This memorandum is intended to convey the completion of the NHPA Section 106 process for this undertaking. Please retain a copy in the administrative record for this action. Should changes be made to this project, additional NHPA Section 106 review, possibly including consultation with the State Historic Preservation Officer, may be necessary. Thank you for providing the opportunity to comment.

CC: Cultural Resources Branch (MP-153), Anastasia Leigh – Regional Environmental Officer (MP-150)