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INTRODUCTION

In accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969 (Public Law 91-90), Council on Environmental Quality regulations implementing NEPA (40 CFR 1500-1508), and Department of the Interior NEPA regulations (43 CFR 46), the Bureau of Reclamation, in cooperation with the Pima-Maricopa Irrigation Project (P-MIP) and Bureau of Indian Affairs (BIA), has issued the attached Supplemental Environmental Assessment (SEA) (Reclamation 2011) to disclose the potential environmental impacts that will result from construction of the Consolidated Canal Extension (CCE) and Goodyear Lateral.

The SEA is tiered to, and supplements the, Santan Area Final Environmental Assessment (EcoPlan 2001) and the P-MIP Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (EcoPlan 1997).

ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

The following alternatives were considered in the SEA:

No Action. Under the no action alternative, the CCE and Goodyear Lateral would not be constructed and Central Arizona Project (CAP) water from the off-reservation Consolidated Canal could not be delivered to the Santan Canal. No grants of permanent easement for the proposed canal alignments would be issued by the BIA.

Proposed Action. Under the proposed action, P-MIP will utilize funds provided by Reclamation to construct the CCE and Goodyear Lateral within the alignments described in the SEA. The purpose of the project is to provide infrastructure to convey CAP water and other water from the Consolidated Canal to reaches ST-IC and ST-ID of the Santan Canal. Prior to construction, BIA will grant permanent easements for the CCE and Goodyear Lateral.

PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

The SEA was distributed for a 10-day public comment period on April 25, 2011. During this period, the SEA and a notice soliciting public comment were posted at the BIA Pima Agency, P-MIP offices, and the U.S. Post Office in Sacaton, Arizona. In addition, the notice and SEA were posted on Reclamation’s Phoenix Area Office web site. Reclamation received no comment on the proposed action.

MAJOR CONSIDERATIONS

The following issues have been taken into consideration in Reclamation’s deliberation whether a Finding of No Significant Impact is appropriate, or an environmental impact statement should be prepared.

1. The SEA demonstrates that there will be no significant adverse or beneficial impacts on the quality of the human environment including air, soil, land, and biological resources. Impacts to physical and biological resources will be highly localized and limited to the project area. P-MIP has contracted with
Wild at Heart, a federally permitted organization, to excavate suspected burrowing owl burrows and relocate any burrowing owls and nest contents that might be present. In addition, the action will not contribute to the introduction, continued existence, or spread of noxious weeds or non-native invasive species known to occur in the area or result in actions that may promote the introduction, growth, or expansion of the range of such species.

2. Public health and safety are minimally affected by the project. There will be no significant and disproportionate direct or indirect adverse effects on populations defined in Executive Order 12898 (Environmental Justice). Appropriate hazardous material management and waste disposal associated with construction will minimize any potential risks to public health, safety, and the environment.

3. There are no wildlife refuges, parks and other recreational areas, forests, aquatic resources, jurisdictional waters, wetlands, sole source aquifers, floodplains, wilderness areas, unique ecological areas, or other unique or rare characteristics of the land or viewshed that occur in or near the project area.

4. There are no known scientific controversies over the effects of the proposed action on the human environment.

5. There are no known effects on the human environment that are highly uncertain or involve unique or unknown risks.

6. The proposed action does not set a precedent for similar projects that may be implemented by Reclamation or other agencies.

7. Site-specific cumulative effects associated with the action were considered in the SEA. There are no known incremental effects of the action that become significant when added to other past, present, or reasonably foreseeable future actions that have affected, or will affect, the project area.

8. Cultural resource surveys of the area of potential effect indicated that no significant historical or archaeological sites will be adversely affected by the proposed action. The Tribal Historic Preservation Office concurred with a no adverse effect determination on April 7, 2011.

9. The SEA demonstrates that federally listed species will not be affected by the proposed action.

10. The proposed action will not violate any Federal, State, or local environmental laws or requirements.

11. Indian trust assets will not be significantly affected.

12. The mitigation requirements identified in the SEA will be implemented by P-MIP.
FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

Based upon a review of public comments and consideration of the effects presented in the SEA, I have determined the proposed action will not significantly impact the human environment and that preparation of an environmental impact statement is not warranted.
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