

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR  
BUREAU OF RECLAMATION**

**MID-PACIFIC REGION**

**SACRAMENTO, CALIFORNIA**

**FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

**Yuba City Feather River Fish Screen Project**

**FONSI-09-\_\_\_**

Recommended by:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Shelly Hatleberg  
Natural Resource Specialist  
Mid-Pacific Regional Office

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Concurred by:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Tracy Slavin  
Program Manager  
Mid-Pacific Regional Office

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Approved by:

\_\_\_\_\_  
Richard Woodley  
Regional Resources Manager  
Mid-Pacific Regional Office

Date: \_\_\_\_\_



**RECLAMATION**  
*Managing Water in the West*

**FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**  
**YUBA CITY FEATHER RIVER FISH SCREEN PROJECT**  
**FONSI 09-\_\_\_\_**

**BACKGROUND**

In accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA), the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation) and City of Yuba City (City) have prepared a joint Environmental Assessment/Initial Study (EA/IS) for the *Yuba City Feather River Fish Screen Project*, dated November 2009.

Under the Proposed Action, the City proposes to replace its existing unscreened intake structure on the Feather River with a new screened intake structure facility that meets the California Department of Fish and Game (CDFG) and National Marine Fisheries Service (NOAA Fisheries) anadromous fish screen criteria. The Proposed Action for Reclamation includes only the fish screen portion of the overall project.

Reclamation is funding a portion of this project through its Anadromous Fish Screen Program (AFSP). Reclamation's involvement is limited to contributing up to 50% of the cost of the fish screen based on the total cost of screening associated with the historical peak diversions at the existing Yuba City intake. This funding will be provided by Reclamation under Section 3406(b)(21) of the Central Valley Project Improvement Act (CVPIA), which authorizes the Department of the Interior to develop and implement measures to avoid losses of juvenile anadromous fish resulting from unscreened diversions on the Sacramento and San Joaquin Rivers and their tributaries.

**FINDINGS**

In accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, as amended, the Mid-Pacific Regional Office of Reclamation has found that the Proposed Action is not a major federal action that would significantly affect the quality of the human environment. Consequently, an environmental impact statement is not required. This finding of no significant impact is based on the following:

**1. Agriculture and Land Use:** The Proposed Action would not result in changes in agriculture or conflict with zoning for agricultural use or existing Williamson Act contracts nor would it result in the conversion of farmland. No impacts to land uses and/or land use plans would occur as the result of the implementation of the Proposed Action; therefore, the Proposed Action would not have a significant impact on agricultural resources or land use.

**2. Air Quality and Climate Change:** Short-term impacts to air quality may occur during construction. The magnitude of air quality impacts associated with gasoline powered vehicles, mobile construction equipment and fugitive dust is considered to be short term and minor. Mitigation measures would be incorporated for the construction activities. Reclamation has determined that the Proposed Action would not have a significant impact on air quality or climate change.

**3. Biological Resources:** The analysis in the EA/IS indicates that the impacts to wildlife would be less than significant with mitigation. Impacts to special-status species, including valley elderberry longhorn beetle (VELB), salmonids and North American green sturgeon, would be avoided or minimized by implementing the mitigation measures discussed in the EA/IS and the Action Specific Implementation Plan (ASIP). Reclamation is consulting with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Fisheries on effects of the Proposed Action to listed species under section 7 of the Endangered Species Act (ESA). ESA consultations will be complete prior to finalization of this EA/IS and FONSI/MND. Reclamation has determined that the Proposed Action “is not likely to adversely affect” VELB, “may affect, is not likely to adversely affect” salmonids or green sturgeon, and would not jeopardize the continued existence of any of these species. With the screened intake, there would be an overall net benefit to listed fish species as a result of the Proposed Action. Overall, the Proposed Action would have no significant impacts on biological resources.

**4. Cultural Resources:** Based on the analysis in the EA/IS, the Proposed Action does not affect historic properties. If unknown cultural resources are discovered during construction, procedures would be followed to ensure the proper handling of any potential historic properties. There would be no impacts on cultural resources.

**5. Soils and Geology:** Implementation of erosion and sediment control measures as described in the EA/IS would reduce erosion rates during and after construction. Operation of the screened intake structure is not expected to result in changes to erosion compared to existing conditions. The screened intake would be designed to minimize erosion or disturbance to soils and the area disturbed during construction would be stabilized with vegetation or engineered structures. There are no significant impacts to soils and geology associated with the Proposed Action.

**6. Water Quality:** Short-term increases in turbidity may occur because of construction; however, the increases would be temporary. Mitigation measures, as presented in the EA/IS, as well as incorporation of terms and conditions of Clean Water Act (CWA) Section 404 and CWA Section 401 compliance would be implemented to reduce the level of impact on water quality. CWA compliance would be completed prior to construction. The Proposed Action would have no significant impacts on water quality.

**7. Noise:** Short-term impacts associated with noise may occur during construction. Project construction could lead to temporary or periodic increases in ambient noise levels in the project vicinity. However, the project site is in a rural land use area and there are no sensitive receptors in the immediate area. As a result, the Proposed Action would have no significant impacts to noise during construction. Operation of the intake structure/fish screen would require four submersible pumps. Because these four pumps would be submerged and housed in the concrete intake structure, noise levels would be attenuated. Given that this system would be used only occasionally and the distance to the nearest noise sensitive uses is large (0.5 mile), there would be no significant operations-related noise impacts.

**8. Environmental Justice:** There would be no impacts to minority or low-income populations. The Proposed Action would not disproportionately affect any minority or low income populations. Therefore, no impacts regarding Environmental Justice would occur as a result of the Proposed Action.

**9. Indian Trust Assets:** The Proposed Action would not affect Indian Trust Assets. The nearest ITA is located approximately 21 miles from the project area, and there are no discernable changes that would occur outside the project area or Yuba City. Therefore, there are no impacts to Indian Trust Assets.