



— BUREAU OF —  
RECLAMATION

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT  
*and*  
DECISION RECORD  
*for*  
ANNABELLA IRRIGATION COMPANY PHASE II CANAL PIPING PROJECT  
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT  
PRO-EA-FY25-071

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR  
BUREAU OF RECLAMATION – UPPER COLORADO REGION  
PROVO AREA OFFICE; PROVO, UTAH

## **1.0 Background and Introduction**

---

The U.S. Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation) is considering funding the Annabella Irrigation Company (AIC) proposal to enclose and pipe 10,900 feet (2.06 miles) of the Annabella Canal. The Proposed Action seeks to address seepage losses of an estimated 1,533 acre-feet, by piping the unlined portions of the Annabella Irrigation Canal where water loss primarily occurs.

Reclamation has prepared an Environmental Assessment (EA) to analyze the environmental impacts from implementing one of the two alternatives:

- Under the No Action Alternative, Reclamation would not authorize the funding to implement the Proposed Action of piping the 10,900-ft of the Annabella Irrigation Canal.
- Under the Proposed Action Alternative, Reclamation would provide WaterSmart WEEG funding to AIC for designing and constructing improvements to the Annabella Irrigation Canal, as summarized below.

### Proposed Action Alternative Summary:

- Enclosing 10,900 feet of unlined canal to reduce conveyance losses. The total area of disturbance would not exceed 7.50 acres excluding staging/storage areas. Staging/storage areas constitute 7.00 acres.
- The pipeline would be designed as a non-pressurized system, which would give AIC the ability to pipe only portions of their canal where the conveyance losses are high. Preliminary design shows that the pipelines would vary from 36- to 48-inches in diameter. The pipeline will replace the existing ditch. Near the diversion, an 800-foot section of 48-inch diameter pipe would be installed connecting the diversion structure to the start of the lined ditch. At the end of the lined portion of the ditch, a 42-inch diameter pipeline would be installed until the demand allows the pipeline to be reduced to 36-inches in diameter.
- Most culverts currently crossing the canal would be removed during construction. The pipeline would end at the inlet to remaining culverts and be installed at the outlet. The pipe installed would be a watertight High-Density Polyethylene dual-wall, smooth interior pipe.
- Install concrete cleanout manholes every 400 feet and concrete boxes at each turnout location with control gates and measurement devices.

## **2.0 Environmental Commitments**

---

Environmental commitments, also known as mitigating measures, are typically outlined in Section 3 of the final EA. The environmental commitments must be implemented as outlined in the final EA and include:

### Archaeological Resources

Pursuant to 36 CFR 800.14(b)(1)(i) the “Programmatic Agreement Between the Bureau of Reclamation and the Utah State Historic Preservation Officer Regarding National Historic Preservation Act Mitigation for Adverse Effects to Irrigation Infrastructure” will be used to mitigate the adverse effects to the Annabella Canal. The objective of the Utah Historic Irrigation

Project is to mitigate the loss of historic properties associated with irrigation infrastructure by researching and documenting the history of water management and the use of irrigation, its infrastructure, and agricultural practices in Utah. It also aims to create widely available products to educate the public about this history.

Under the provisions of the Programmatic Agreement, Reclamation will contribute 1 percent of the WaterSMART grant awarded, (up to \$10,000), to Utah State University's Utah Historic Irrigation Project for additional investigation into historic irrigation systems. The Utah State Historic Preservation Officer concurred with Reclamation's proposed mitigation on November 21, 2025 (see Appendix C of the EA).

#### Invasive plants and noxious weeds, soils, vegetation

Standard Best Management Practices (BMPs) established by federal, state, and county agencies would be implemented to mitigate and minimize adverse impacts during and after construction. These measures include flagging construction limits as described in the proposed action, restricting ground disturbance to the extent practicable, salvaging and stockpiling topsoil from disturbed areas for later respreading during site reclamation, and decontaminating equipment before and after use at the site.

Following construction, AIC would reseed disturbed areas with a non-invasive seed mix and will monitor reclaimed areas for invasive species and implement weed control measures, including mechanical removal or herbicide application, as necessary.

#### Hazardous and solid waste

The following mitigation measures will be employed to ensure proper management and disposal of waste:

- Equipment refueling will occur on-site; however, no fuel will be stored on-site. The National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit requires AIC to prepare a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) which includes spill prevention measures.
- Construction debris and waste materials would be collected and transported to an approved off-site disposal facility.

### **3.0 Finding of No Significant Impact Determination**

---

Based upon the review of the analysis in PRO-EA-FY25-071, and in accordance with 42 U.S. Code § 4336 (e) (7), under NEPA, Reclamation has determined that an environmental impact statement is not needed for this Proposed Action. The selected Proposed Action Alternative will not have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment as defined in NEPA. This determination has been made by considering factors outlined in 516 DM 1 – U.S. Department of the Interior Handbook of NEPA implementing procedures, namely:

#### Both short-and long-term effects

The referenced EA includes analysis of short and long-term effects of the identified issues and discussion of reasonably foreseeable environmental trends and planned actions in relation to

those issues. None of the impacts from the Proposed Action are expected to rise to the level of significance.

*Both beneficial and adverse effects*

Potentially beneficial and adverse impacts related to the Proposed Action are disclosed and analyzed in Section 3 of the EA in the Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences sections, by each resource topic. None of these effects are determined to be significant. The EA analysis identified that the Proposed Action would have adverse effects on Archaeological Resources. These adverse effects will be mitigated using the Mitigation PA.

*Effects on public health and safety*

Effects on public health and safety are discussed in the EA and have not been found to be significant based on the nature of the Proposed Action Alternative analysis. It is expected that public health and safety will likely improve as AIC provides a more reliable conveyance system for their service area.

*Economic effects*

The project is intended to update water delivery infrastructure to convey irrigation water more reliably and efficiently to the serviced communities. The act of implementing the project would not result in adverse economic impacts, but likely make the community served more drought resilient, as described in the EA. The proposed project is not expected to cause any impact (positive or negative) on employment or make any appreciable changes to area populations.

*Effects on the quality of life of the American people.*

The quality of life of the American people in the Project Area would continue as is currently. The piping of the canal aims to improve conservation of water in the Annabella Canal by reducing loss due to seepage, improve operations and management, and improve water use efficiency in the Annabella Canal.

#### **4.0 Decision Record**

---

The NEPA process is intended to help public officials make decisions that are based on an understanding of environmental consequences, and take actions that protect, restore, and enhance the environment. Reclamation has considered all relevant information raised in the NEPA process and that the NEPA process is now closed. Therefore, based on the information contained in the EA Number PRO-EA-FY25-071, and all other information available to me at this time, it is my decision to approve the implementation of the Proposed Action Alternative and mitigation measures as described in the subject EA and consistent with the above Finding of No Significant Impact determination.



Digitally signed by RICK  
BAXTER  
Date: 2026.03.05  
08:06:54 -07'00'

---

Rick Baxter  
Area Manager