



— BUREAU OF —  
RECLAMATION

## Finding of No Significant Impact

# 2021 Tehama-Colusa Canal Authority In-Basin Water Transfers

**FONSI CGB-EA-2021-025**

Prepared by:

**DOUGLAS KLEINSMITH**

Digitally signed by DOUGLAS  
KLEINSMITH  
Date: 2021.04.15 08:47:25 -07'00'

Douglas Kleinsmith  
Interior Region 10 · California-Great Basin  
Bureau of Reclamation

Approved by:

**ADAM  
NICKELS**

Digitally signed by  
ADAM NICKELS  
Date: 2021.04.15  
09:25:14 -07'00'

Adam Nickels  
Regional Resources Manager  
Interior Region 10 · California-Great Basin  
Bureau of Reclamation

# **1 Background**

The Member Units of the Tehama Colusa Canal Authority (TCCA) may experience water shortages in 2021 and are soliciting willing sellers to transfer surface water to them. Several entities that use surface water from the Sacramento River have expressed interest in transferring water to Member Units of the TCCA. The TCCA would negotiate with these sellers, on behalf of the Member Units, to identify potential transfers of water and the specifics of each transfer arrangement.

To facilitate the transfer of water throughout the State, Reclamation is considering whether it should approve and facilitate water transfers between willing sellers and buyers when Sacramento River Settlement Contractor Base Supply or Central Valley Project (CVP) facilities are involved.

Reclamation will not take part in the transfer negotiation process, nor will Reclamation develop a “program” to connect buyers and sellers. Reclamation would focus on the approval and facilitation of individual transfers of water involving Base Supply or involving CVP facilities.

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

### **2.1 No Action**

For the No Action Alternative, the TCCA, on behalf of the Member Units, during contract year 2021, would not buy water from willing sellers who require Reclamation approval to transfer water. Agricultural water users could experience shortages in contract year 2021. If supplies are constrained, users may take alternative water supply actions in response to shortages, including increased groundwater pumping, cropland idling, reduction of landscape irrigation or permanent crop irrigation, or water rationing.

### **2.2 Proposed Action**

The Proposed Action includes potential transfers of up to 57,060 AF of Base Supply from 23 entities, listed in Table 2-1 in the environmental assessment/initial study (EA/IS) for the project to Member Units of the TCCA. The quantities in Table 2-1 summarize the maximum potential transfer quantities. Transfers or exchanges of Project Water are covered by the Reinitiation of Consultation on the Coordinated Long-Term Operation of the CVP and State Water Project Record of Decision and Biological Opinion. The Proposed Action only includes potential transfer of Base Supply of up to 57,060 AF. These water transfers also include transfers of water between “common landowners” that own land in multiple water districts that may want to move water from one district to another to preserve permanent crops.

## **3 Findings**

Based on the attached EA/IS, Reclamation finds that the Proposed Action is not a major Federal action that will significantly affect the quality of the human environment and preparation of an environmental impact statement is not required. The EA/IS 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). Analysis of the effects of the proposed action is provided in the attached EA/IS, and the analysis in the EA/IS is hereby incorporated by reference. Following are the reasons why the impacts of the proposed action are not significant with respect to the affected environment and degree of effects of the action (40 CFR 1501.3(b)):

1. Cultural Resources: Reclamation has determined that the proposed action is the type of undertaking that does not have the potential to cause effects on historic properties, should such properties be present, pursuant to 36 CFR § 800.3(a)(1). As such, Reclamation has no further obligations under 54 U.S.C. § 306108, commonly known as Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.
2. Section 7 Endangered Species Act (ESA): Reclamation has determined that the Proposed Action will have no effect on ESA-listed species or their designated critical habitat.
3. The Proposed Action will not significantly affect public health or safety (40 CFR 1501.3(b)(2)(iii)).
4. The Proposed Action will not violate Federal, state, Tribal or local law protecting the environment (40 CFR 1501.3(b)(2)(iv)).
5. The Proposed Action will not affect any Indian Trust Assets (512 DM 2, Policy Memorandum – July 2, 1993).
6. Implementing the Proposed Action will not disproportionately affect minorities or low- income populations and communities (EO 12898 – February 11, 1994).
7. 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 – May 24, 1996 and 512 DM 3 – June 5, 1998).