

RECLAMATION

Managing Water in the West

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

Yountville Recycled Water Expansion Project

FONSI 13-01-MP

Recommended:

Douglas Kleinsmith
Douglas Kleinsmith
Natural Resources Specialist
Mid-Pacific Regional Office

Date: March 14, 2013

Concurrence:

David T. White
David T. White
Manager, Title XVI Program
Mid-Pacific Regional Office

Date: April 12, 2013

Approved:

Michelle H. Denning
Michelle H. Denning
Chief, Division of Planning
Mid-Pacific Regional Office

Date: 4/18/13



U. S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Reclamation
Mid-Pacific Region
Sacramento, California

March 2013

BACKGROUND

The Bureau of Reclamation proposes to provide partial funding to the Town of Yountville (Town) for Phase I of the Yountville Recycled Water Expansion Project (Project). Under the Town's Proposed Action, recycled water distribution pipelines would be extended to address irrigation demands at several existing vineyards. The Town's Proposed Action includes installing approximately 6,100 linear feet of new 8-inch diameter pipeline, 1,190 linear feet of new 6-inch diameter pipeline, new valves and turnouts (inlets), and equipment upgrades at the Joint Wastewater Treatment Plant (JTP) and Recycled Water Pump Station (RWPS) to distribute disinfected tertiary recycled water to new customers for storage in existing vineyard irrigation ponds. The Town's Proposed Action will enable the Town to meet its National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) wastewater discharge permit requirements and will offset river water and groundwater use.

Construction of Phase 1 is expected to take eight months to complete, and is anticipated to occur from April 2014 to November 2014. The Town has not secured funding for construction of Phases 2 and 3.

The Town has identified four primary objectives for the Project:

- Comply with the Town's NPDES Permit by minimizing discharges to the Napa River;
- Expand the delivery of disinfected Title 22 tertiary treated recycled water to current and future irrigation customers to replace groundwater and Napa River water;
- Construct the infrastructure necessary to deliver recycled water to current and future recycled water customers; and
- Increase delivery rate of recycled water and utilize existing storage capacity of the recycled water system, while balancing recycled water production with customer demand.

Reclamation may provide a portion of the funds to design and construct the Town's Proposed Action through Section 1604 of Public Law 102-575, as amended (Title XVI), and subsequent project-specific construction authorization. Reclamation, which has discretionary approval over the provision of this funding, is the lead Federal agency for complying with the National Environmental Policy Act.

Reclamation and the Town prepared a draft Environmental Assessment/ Initial Study – Proposed Mitigated Negative Declaration (EA/IS-Proposed MND) in July 2012, to evaluate the effects of the Proposed Action. The EA/IS-Proposed MND was available for public review on June 15, 2012. The review period ended on July 24, 2012. The Town and Reclamation received comments from four State agencies: 1) Governor's Office of Planning and Research; 2) State Water Resources Control Board; 3) California Department of Transportation; and 4) San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board.

The State Clearinghouse letter acknowledged compliance with the State Clearinghouse review requirements from draft environmental documents pursuant to the California Environmental Quality Act and provided the clearinghouse number (2012062035).

The California State Water Resources Control Board submitted a letter outlining the document submittal requirements needed for consideration for Clean Water State Revolving Fund (CWSRF) financing and comments regarding compliance with federal laws pertaining to cultural resources, the federal Clean Air Act, protection of wetlands, farmland protection, migratory birds, and floodplain management.

Caltrans provided comments regarding cultural resource protection, encroachment permit requirements, and the need for a transportation permit and a traffic control plan.

Some of the comments were related to agency-specific requirements and requests for background reports and assessments prepared for the Project.

The San Francisco Bay Regional Water Quality Control Board provided comments regarding the protection or avoidance of wetlands and jurisdictional waters and the potential need for coverage of the project under the State National Pollution Discharge Elimination System General Permit for Stormwater Discharges.

Several cultural resources mitigation measures were revised in response to comments.

The Town of Yountville has provided, or will provide when complete, the documents requested in the comment letters.

FINDINGS

Based on the attached EA/IS-Proposed MND, Reclamation finds that funding the Proposed Action is not a major Federal action that will significantly affect the quality of the human environment. The attached EA/IS-Proposed MND describes the existing environmental resources in the Proposed Action area and evaluates the effects of the No Action and Proposed Action alternatives on the resources. The EA/IS-Proposed MND was prepared in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act, Council on Environmental Quality regulations (40 CFR 1500-1508), and Department of the Interior Regulations (43 CFR Part 46). This analysis is provided in the attached EA/IS-Proposed MND, and the analysis in the EA/IS-Proposed MND is hereby incorporated by reference.

Following are the reasons why the impacts of the Town's Proposed Action are not significant:

1. The Proposed Action will not significantly affect aesthetics/visual resources.
2. The Proposed Action will not significantly affect agricultural and forest resources, land use and planning, mineral resources, or recreation.
3. The Proposed Action will not significantly affect air quality or increase green house gas emissions.

4. The Proposed Action will not significantly affect biological resources. Potential construction-related impacts to California red-legged frog, nesting birds, wetlands and waters of the United States will be avoided, minimized, or mitigated by implementing the mitigation measures discussed in the EA/IS- Proposed MND. On July 26, 2012, Reclamation requested that the Fish and Wildlife Service concur with the findings that the Proposed Action may affect but is not likely to adversely affect listed or proposed threatened or endangered species. The Fish and Wildlife Service concurred on January 28, 2013.
5. The Proposed Action will have no effect on historic properties, pursuant to 36 CFR §800.4 (d)(1). Reclamation initiated consultation with the California State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) on October 17, 2013 seeking concurrence with the determination that one multi-component archaeological and historic resource located within the Area of Potential Effects (APE) is not eligible for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). Additionally, Reclamation requested concurrence with the finding that the undertaking will result in no historic properties affected.

SHPO responded on December 11, 2012. SHPO advised Reclamation to expand the APE to include the Napa Railroad as they believed it could be affected by the project, but also stated that they would agree to no adverse effect finding with the information already provided. The SHPO concurred with Reclamation's determination that the multi-component site is not eligible for listing on the NRHP.

Reclamation responded on December 20, 2012 justifying the APE and finding of effect, and clarifying how the previously submitted documentation adequately supported this finding. Pursuant to the regulations at 36 CFR §800.5(c), if SHPO has 30 days from receipt to review an agency finding. If after 30 days the SHPO has not responded, the regulations state that "...the agency official shall then carry out the undertaking in accordance with paragraph (d)(1) of this section [§800.5(c)(1)]. Because the SHPO has failed to comment on Reclamation's finding within the period of time provided to them pursuant to the Section 106 regulations, Reclamation may conclude the Section 106 process with no additional consideration.

6. The Proposed Action will not create a significant hazard to the public or environment from hazardous materials.
7. The Proposed Action will not significantly affect hydrology or water quality. Trenchless construction techniques will avoid impacts to Chase Creek and a mitigation measure to reduce potential impacts due to frac out¹ is included in the EA/IS- Proposed MND. Potential impacts related to erosion, siltation, and turbidity during open trench construction will be minimized by implementing mitigation measures described in the EA/IS- Proposed MND; including developing a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan and restoring jurisdictional waters and wetlands temporarily impacted during construction. The Proposed Action may

¹ When the drilling slurry containing bentonite (a fine clay material used as a lubricant) surfaces in the stream bed.

reduce existing agricultural demands on groundwater, providing a beneficial effect on groundwater levels.

8. The Proposed Action will not significantly affect noise levels. Construction activities creating ground-borne vibration or noise will be limited and short in duration and operation of the Proposed Action will not substantially increase ambient noise levels. Mitigation measures discussed in the EA/IS- Proposed MND will reduce construction-related noise effects to sensitive receptors by requiring the implementation of noise-reducing construction practices and limiting construction work hours.
9. The Proposed Action will not significantly affect transportation and traffic.
10. The Proposed Action will not significantly affect public services or utilities because it will not increase the demand on public services, utilities, or service systems. The Proposed Action will not increase the amount of recycled water produced by the Town; it is designed to balance the supply and demand of recycled water, based on current average yearly production. Use of recycled water for agricultural use will offset potable demands and will improve local and regional water supply reliability.
11. The Proposed Action will not significantly affect energy resources.
12. The Proposed Action will not disproportionately impact minority or low-income populations or communities.
13. The Proposed Action will not affect Indian Trust Assets (ITA). The nearest ITA is Middletown Rancheria, approximately 27 miles northwest of the location of the Proposed Action.
14. The Proposed Action will not result in adverse cumulative effects.
15. There is no potential for the effects to be considered highly controversial.