

RECLAMATION

Managing Water in the West

Finding Of No Significant Impact

Advanced Metering Infrastructure (AMI) System – South Tahoe Public Utilities District

FONSI 17-01-MP

Prepared by:



Nathaniel J. Martin
Natural Resource Specialist
Mid-Pacific Regional Office

Date: 4/17/2017

Concurred by:



Deborah Page
Water and Lands Specialist
Lahontan Basin Area Office

Date: 4/17/2017

Approved by:



Richard Woodley
Regional Resources Manager
Mid-Pacific Region

Date: 4/17/17



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 granting a CALFED Water Use Efficiency Grant to the South Tahoe Public Utilities District (STPUD) for its Advanced Metering Infrastructure (AMI) System (Proposed Action).

The Proposed Action involves installation of AMI for Phase 3 and part of Phase 4 in the STPUD service area. Phase 3 involves the installation of 1,432 water meters and Phase 4 involves the installation of 1,327 water meters. Metering in the STPUD service area will allow STPUD to meter volumetric consumption, and better determine district water allocation.

2 Alternatives Including the Proposed Action

2.1 No Action

Under the No Action Alternative, Reclamation would not award the STPUD with CALFED grant money equal to \$297,606. Although it is possible the STPUD may find alternate sources of funding for the project, the consequences of Reclamation not providing funding for the Proposed Action would result in no construction of the project which may result in STPUD not being able to meet state mandated water reductions.

2.2 Proposed Action

STPUD is a special district that supplies approximately 14,000 drinking water connections with fresh potable water and 17,000 sewer service connections to the City of South Lake Tahoe and portions of El Dorado County. All drinking water supply sources are from 12 wells and produce and average annual water supply of 9,528 acre-feet per year (AFY).

The Proposed Action involves installation of AMI for Phase 3 and part of Phase 4 in the STPUD service area. Phase 3 (Figure 1) involves the installation of 1,432 water meters and Phase 4 (Figure 2) involves the installation of 1,327 water meters. Metering in the STPUD service area will allow STPUD to meter volumetric consumption, and better determine district water allocation.

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 27, 2017. Through correspondence dated February 27, 2017, the SHPO responded with no objection to Reclamation's finding.
8. The proposed action would not adversely affect listed or proposed threatened or endangered

species (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(9)).

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). A records search was conducted on 12/21/2016 and found that the closest ITA to the Proposed Action was 12.47 miles southeast of the Proposed Action.

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).