

# RECLAMATION

*Managing Water in the West*

## Finding Of No Significant Impact

# Garden Highway Mutual Water Company 2015 System Modernization and Real-Time Monitoring and Control

FONSI 16-12-MP

Recommended by:

*Douglas W. Kleinsmith*  
Douglas Kleinsmith  
Natural Resource Specialist  
Mid-Pacific Regional Office

Date: 6/23/16

Concurred by:

*David T. White*  
David T. White  
Water Conservation Specialist  
Mid-Pacific Regional Office

Date: 6/23/16

Concurred by:

*Rod Wittler*  
Rod Wittler  
Acting Chief, Program Management Branch  
Mid-Pacific Regional Office

Date: 24 Jun 16

Approved by:

*Richard Woodley*  
Richard Woodley  
Regional Resources Manager  
Mid-Pacific Region

Date: 6-23-16



# **1 Background**

In accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA), as amended, the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation) prepared an Environmental Assessment (EA) to analyze impacts of providing a CALFED Water Use Efficiency Grant to the Garden Highway Mutual Water Company (GHMWC) for its system modernization and real-time monitoring and control project. GHMWC is located in Sutter County on the west side of the Feather River, approximately 14 miles south of Yuba City, California. The EA was available for public review on June 9, 2016. The review period ended on June 23, 2016. No comments were received on the EA.

## **2 Alternatives Including the Proposed Action**

### **2.1 No Action**

Under No Action, Reclamation would not provide grant funds to GHMWC for modernizing the SAG weir and providing real time measurement, monitoring and controls for their water supply system. GHMWC would construct the project over several years as funds became available. If GHMWC could not get alternative funding, GHMWC would construct only part of the project over several years.

### **2.2 Proposed Action**

Reclamation will provide \$170,319 of CALFED Water Use Efficiency Grant funding to GHMWC to modernize the SAG Weir, integrate a Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition (SCADA) system, and use real-time flow measurement, monitoring, and control of system flows. The proposed project would conserve water by reducing operational spillage and tailwater through a combination of infrastructure improvements and implementation of real-time flow monitoring and diversion control. Remote sites to be integrated into the proposed SCADA system include the three diversion pumps at the Feather River, two primary spill sites, the Orchard Ditch Heading (a key operational site where diverted flows are divided between the Rice Canal and Orchard Ditch), and seven groundwater wells currently owned by GHMWC and operated in certain years

### 3 Findings

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

Following are the reasons why the impacts of the proposed action are not significant:

1. The proposed action will not significantly affect public health or safety (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(3)).
2. The proposed action will not significantly impact natural resources and unique geographical characteristics such 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 (Executive Order (EO) 11990); flood plains (EO 11988); national monuments; migratory birds; and other ecologically significant or critical areas (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(3) and 43 CFR 46.215(b)).
3. The proposed action will not have possible effects on the human environment that are highly uncertain or involve unique or unknown risks (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(5)).
4. The proposed action will neither establish a precedent for future actions with significant effects nor represent a decision in principle about a future consideration (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(6)).
5. There is no potential for the effects to be considered highly controversial (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(4)).
6. The proposed action will not have significant cumulative impacts (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(7)).
7. The proposed action will not adversely affect any districts, sites, highways, structures, or objects listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(8). Pursuant to 54 USC § 306108, commonly known as Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, and its implementing regulations at 36 CFR Part 800, Reclamation notified the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) of a finding of no historic properties affected for the undertaking through correspondence on February 26, 2016. Through correspondence dated March 24, 2016, the SHPO responded with no objection to Reclamation's finding.
8. The proposed action may affect but is not likely to adversely affect listed or proposed

threatened or endangered species (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(9)). The Fish and Wildlife Service concurred with Reclamation's finding on May 23, 2016.

9. The proposed action will not violate federal, state, tribal or local law or requirements imposed for the protection of the environment (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(10)).

10. The proposed action will not affect any Indian Trust Assets (512 DM 2, Policy Memorandum dated December 15, 1993).

11. Implementing the proposed action will not disproportionately affect minorities or low-income populations and communities (EO 12898).

12. The proposed action will not 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 and 512 DM 3).