



— BUREAU OF —
RECLAMATION

Determination of National Environmental Policy Act Adequacy and Decision Record

Red Bluff Pumping Plant Addition of Pumps

CGB-ED-2026-091

**Bureau of Reclamation
California-Great Basin Region**

prepared by CASSANDRA LOZANO Digitally signed by
CASSANDRA LOZANO
Date: 2026.09.22
12:14:09 -07'00'
Cassandra Lozano
Natural Resources Specialist
Northern California Area Office
Interior Region 10
California – Great Basin, Bureau of Reclamation

approved by ELIZABETH HADLEY Digitally signed by
ELIZABETH HADLEY
Date: 2026.09.25
09:07:13 -07'00'
Elizabeth Hadley
Area Manager, Responsible Official
Northern California Area Office
Interior Region 10
California – Great Basin, Bureau of Reclamation

Mission Statements

The U.S. Department of the Interior protects and manages the Nation's natural resources and cultural heritage; provides scientific and other information about those resources; and honors its trust responsibilities or special commitments to American Indians, Alaska Natives, Native Hawaiians, and affiliated Island Communities.

The mission of the Bureau of Reclamation is to manage, develop, and protect water and related resources in an environmentally and economically sound manner in the interest of the American public.

Introduction

The Department of the Interior (DOI) Handbook of National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Implementing Procedures (516 DM 1) allows bureaus to rely on an environmental impact statement (EIS) or portion thereof, provided that the assessment or portion thereof meets the standards for an adequate assessment. This Determination of NEPA Adequacy (DNA) assesses whether the Fish Passage Improvement Project at the Red Bluff Diversion Dam Environmental Impact Statement sufficiently addresses the effects of Reclamation's proposed action.

Proposed Action

Upon request, the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation) proposes to approve the addition of two 250-cubic feet per second (cfs) pumps and 600-horsepower (hp) motors to the two vacant pump bays at the Red Bluff Pumping Plant facility (facility). The facility was designed to deliver a total capacity of 2,500 cfs from the Sacramento River to the Tehama-Colusa Canal (TCC) settling basin through a siphon system comprised of three discharge pipes. It was configured with eleven pump bays, two of which remained vacant to accommodate future expansion of water delivery up to the pumping capacity of 2,500 cfs without requiring major structural modifications. The facility currently contains nine pumps which have a combined pumping capacity of 2,000 cfs. This pumping capacity is provided by seven 250-cfs and two 125-cfs pumps equipped with adjustable-frequency drive equipment to vary the pump flows in order to meet required irrigation water demands.

The addition of the two pumps and motors would consist of using a mobile crane to place the two pumps and motors, bolting the pumps and motors into the existing concrete structure, and installing a flap-gate valve. In addition, the facility's electrical panel would be upgraded for compliance with current electrical codes. Existing roads would be used to access the project area and no improvements to these roads would be necessary as maintenance is routinely conducted.

The proposed project is located approximately two miles southeast of the City of Red Bluff and fifteen miles north of the City of Corning, California. The project footprint would be approximately 0.6 acres including potential staging areas, as shown in Figure 1. The legal lands description of the project location includes Section 33 of Township 27 N and Range 03 W in the Mount Diablo Meridian in Tehama County, California.



Figure 1 Vicinity map of project location.

Existing NEPA Documentation Review

The [Fish Passage Improvement Project at the Red Bluff Diversion Dam Environmental Impact Statement](#) (EIS) evaluates the environmental effects of constructing a pumping plant to improve fish passage through the Red Bluff Diversion Dam and continue irrigation water diversions into the Tehama-Colusa and Corning Canals and is incorporated by reference. Specifically, the construction of a pumping plant included an initial installed capacity of 2,180 cfs and a footprint that would allow expansion to 2,500 cfs, if necessary. It should be noted that the Endangered Species Act Section 7 and Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act consultations addressed construction of a new pumping plant using the 2,500-cfs footprint.

The following answers are provided to inform whether the analysis in the EA adequately covers the proposed action currently under consideration.

1. Is the new proposed action a feature of, or substantially the same as an alternative analyzed in the existing environmental document?

Yes, the new proposed action is a feature of the Preferred Alternative analyzed in the existing environmental document. The Preferred Alternative features the construction of a new pumping plant with an initial installed capacity of 2,100 cfs and a total water diversion capacity of 2,500 cfs.

2. Is the proposed action within the same analysis area, or if the location of the proposed action is different, are the geographic and resource conditions sufficiently like those analyzed in the existing environmental document? If there are differences, can the bureau explain why they are not substantial?

Yes, the new proposed action is within the same analysis area which is within the existing pumping plant. The new proposed action would not result in an expansion of the pumping plant footprint.

3. Is the range of alternatives analyzed in the existing environmental document appropriate with respect to the new proposed action, given current environmental concerns and resource values?

There are no new environmental concerns, interests, or resource values that have changed since the EIS was approved. No additional concerns have been identified that would necessitate analysis of additional alternatives.

4. Is the existing analysis valid considering any new information or circumstances relevant to the proposed action? Can the bureau reasonably conclude that new information and new circumstances do not warrant substantial change to the analysis of the new proposed action?

The existing analysis in the EIS is valid and relevant to the new proposed action.

5. Are the environmental effects (e.g., ecological, aesthetic, historic, cultural, economic, social, local custom, and cultural, or health effects) that would result from implementation of the new proposed action similar (both quantitatively and qualitatively) to those analyzed in the existing environmental document?

The pumping capacity of 2,500 cfs, which includes the addition of these two pumps, was accounted for during the analysis of the Selected Alternative. The environmental effects that would result from the installation of additional pumps would be negligible and would not quantitatively or qualitatively broaden the environmental effects analyzed in the EIS since the new proposed action would not result in ground disturbance or change in water quality, hydrology, or visual resources.

6. Is the public involvement and interagency review associated with the existing EAs/EIS adequate for the new proposed action?

Public involvement occurred during the EIS and is summarized in Section 4.0 of the Final EIS and is adequate for the new proposed action. No new concerns have been raised with the new proposed action. Therefore, additional public involvement and interagency review is unnecessary.

Based on the evaluation and documentation in this DNA, Reclamation has determined that the Fish Passage Improvement Project at the Red Bluff Diversion Dam EIS is adequate to cover the proposed action and no additional analysis under NEPA is required.

Endangered Species Act (ESA) Compliance

Reclamation has determined that the new proposed action would not result in significant effects to any species listed as endangered or threatened, proposed candidate species under the ESA, or their designated critical habitat due to lack of presence and/or suitable habitat in the project area. The project area does not contain any suitable foraging or nesting habitat for avian species. Nor does it have stagnant ponds, wetlands or vernal pool features that would support reptiles, amphibians, crustaceans, or flowering plants. There is no abundance of flowering plants required for the Monarch butterfly or elderberry shrubs required for the Valley elderberry longhorn beetle. The project area is not directly adjacent to the Sacramento River as the fish screen and forebay separate the pump station from the river itself. Therefore, aquatic species would not have the potential to inhabit the project area.

As such, no additional mitigation measures would be required. All practicable means to avoid or minimize environmental harm from implementation of the Selected Alternative are adopted with this decision.

National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) Compliance

Reclamation has determined that no historic properties would be affected by implementation of the undertaking, pursuant to 36 CFR § 800.4(d). Reclamation received concurrence from the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) via letter dated August 17, 2009, stating no objections with Reclamation's area of potential effects (APE) pursuant to 36 CFR § 800.4(a)(1) and that a reasonable and good faith effort was performed to identify historic properties in the APE pursuant to 36 CFR 800.4(b)(1). Finally, SHPO agreed with Reclamation's finding that the proposed Project would result in no historic properties affected pursuant to 36 CFR § 800.4(d). A close out document conveying the completion of the NHPA Section 106 process for this undertaking was received September 14, 2026.

Indian Trust Assets

Indian Trust Assets (ITAs) are legal interests in assets that are held in trust by the United States for federally recognized Indian tribes or individuals. There are no Indian reservations, Rancherias, or allotments in the project area. The closest ITA to the proposed action is 50F 5080, a public land allotment (a parcel of land or real estate holding that may or may not be affiliated with a particular tribe or is in the process of being recorded) which is 9.87 miles from the project site. On August 25, 2026, Reclamation determined that because the new proposed action would not impact Indian hunting or fishing resources or water rights nor is the proposed activity on actual Indian lands, it is reasonable to assume the proposed action would not have any impacts on ITAs.

This document certifies that the Reclamation has considered all relevant information raised in the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) process and that the NEPA process has concluded. Public involvement occurred with the EIS and is not required with the DNA. Reclamation may proceed with

the consideration of the approval of the installation of two additional pumps and may authorize the proposed action through appropriate internal processes.