U.S. Department of the Interior
Bureau of Reclamation
Provo Area Office
Provo, Utah

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

Environmental Assessment Daniel Irrigation Canal Modification

Decision: It is my decision to authorize the Proposed Action identified in EA No. PRO-EA-15-008.

Finding of No Significant Impact: Based on the analysis of potential environmental impacts contained in the attached environmental assessment, I have determined that impacts are not expected to be significant and an environmental impact statement is not required.

Rationale for Decision: The decision to allow the Proposed Action does not result in any undue or unnecessary environmental degradation.

Recommended by:

Rick Baxter
Chief, Environmental Group

5-2-16
Date

Concur:

"Acting"

Manager, Water, Environmental, and Lands
Resources Division

5-2-16
Date

Approved by:

Wayne G. Pullan
Area Manager, Provo Area Office

02 MAY 2016
Date

Introduction

In compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969, as amended, the Bureau of Reclamation, Provo Area Office, Upper Colorado Region has conducted an Environmental Assessment (EA) for a Proposed Action to allow Daniel Irrigation Company to enclose 1.3 miles of their service canal.

The EA was prepared by Reclamation to address the need to pressurize the service canal, conserve water by reducing water loss in the canal system, and enable irrigation longer into the growing season.

Alternatives

The EA analyzed the No-Action Alternative and the Proposed Action Alternative to enclose the canal under conditions of the minimization measures and environmental commitments. Reclamation's decision is to implement the Proposed Action Alternative.

Related NEPA Documents

There are no other NEPA documents that are currently being prepared that are related to but not part of the scope of this project.

Decision and Finding of No Significant Impact

Based upon a review of the EA and supporting documents, I have determined that implementing the proposal will not significantly affect the quality of the human environment, individually or cumulatively with other actions in the area. No environmental effects meet the definition of significance in context or intensity as defined at 40 CFR 1508.27. Therefore, an Environmental Impact Statement is not required as a result of this action. This finding is based on consideration of the context and intensity as summarized here from the EA.

Context

The affected locality is the Daniel Irrigation Company area of service in Wasatch County, Utah.

Intensity

The following discussion is organized around the 10 significance criteria described in 40 CFR 1508.27. These criteria were incorporated into the resource analysis and issues considered in the EA.

1. Impacts may be both beneficial and adverse. The Proposed Action would not adversely impact resources of the human environment, in the short or long-term. None of the environmental effects discussed in the EA are considered significant, nor do the effects rise to the level of needing to complete an Environmental Impact Statement.

2. The degree to which the selected alternative will affect public health or safety or a minority or low-income population. The proposal will have no significant impacts on public health or safety. No minority or low-income community would be disproportionately affected by the Proposed Action.

3. Unique characteristics of the geographic area. There are no parks, prime farmlands, wetlands, wild and scenic rivers, or ecologically critical areas that would be affected by the proposal. Minimization measures and environmental commitments are in place to eliminate negative impacts.

4. The degree to which the effects on the quality of the human environment are likely to be highly controversial. The effects of the proposal on the quality of the human environment are not highly controversial.

5. The degree to which the possible effects on the human environment are highly uncertain or involve unique or unknown risks. There are no predicted effects on the human environment that are considered highly uncertain or that involve unique or unknown risks.

6. The degree to which the action may establish a precedent for future actions with significant effects or represents a decision in principle about a future consideration. This action would not establish a precedent for future actions with significant effects, because there are no significant effects as a result of this action. This action does not represent a decision in principle about a future consideration.

7. Whether the action is related to other actions which are individually insignificant but cumulatively significant. Cumulative effects are not predicted, as described in the EA.

8. The degree to which the action may adversely affect sites, districts, buildings, structures, and objects listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places. A determination of adverse effect will be mitigated through the execution of the memorandum of agreement.

9. The degree to which the action may adversely affect an endangered or threatened species or its habitat that has been determined to be critical under the Endangered Species Act of 1973. There are no endangered or threatened species or critical habitat affected by this action. Therefore, a no effect determination was made.

10. Whether the action threatens a violation of Federal, state, local, or tribal law, regulation or policy imposed for the protection of the environment. The project does not violate any Federal, state, local, or tribal law, regulation, or policy imposed for the protection of the environment. In addition, this project is consistent with applicable land management plans, policies, and programs.