

RECLAMATION

Managing Water in the West

Finding of No Significant Impact

Bogus Creek Flow Meter Installation Project

Siskiyou County, California
2018-FONSI-012

Prepared by:

Kirk Young FOR
Yvonne Bernal
Natural Resource Specialist
Reclamation Technical Service Center

Date:

9/24/18

Kirk Young
Kirk Young
Natural Resource Specialist
Klamath Basin Area Office

Date:

9/24/18

Concur:

Kristen L. Hiatt
Kristen Hiatt
Environmental Compliance Branch
Klamath Basin Area Office

Date:

9/25/18

Concur:

Jennie M. Land
Jennie M. Land
Chief, Resource Management Division
Klamath Basin Area Office

Date:

9/25/18

Approved by:

Jeff Nettleton
Jeff Nettleton
Area Manager
Klamath Basin Area Office

Date:

9/25/18

Background

In accordance with Section 102(2)(c) of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA; 42 United States Code (USC) §4321 et seq.) of 1969, the Bureau of Reclamation (Reclamation) prepared an Environmental Assessment (EA), 2018-EA-012, to evaluate the potential environmental effects as a result of implementing the Bogus Creek Flow Meter Installation Project (Project). The Project would be funded in the amount of \$61,005.13 by Reclamation and administered through the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation (NFWF) to Trout Unlimited (TU) and would be performed as part of the 2016 Klamath River Coho Restoration Grant Program (Grant Program). The Grant Program was proposed by Reclamation as a conservation measure to address impacts from operation of Reclamation's Klamath Project (Klamath Project) as described in the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) and United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) *Biological Opinions on the Effects of Proposed Klamath Project Operations from May 31, 2013 through March 31, 2023, on Five Federally Listed Threatened and Endangered Species* (2013 BiOp). Through its delegated authority under the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (16 USC 661 et seq.), Reclamation is authorized to provide funding assistance for the improvement of fish and wildlife habitat affected by Reclamation's water resource development.

Bogus Creek enters the mainstem of the Klamath River approximately 2,100 feet downstream of Iron Gate Dam. Summertime flows in Bogus Creek are fed by a complex series of springs that are large enough to provide a substantial cold-water baseflow. Existing irrigation diversions have the potential to dewater approximately three miles of prime rearing fish habitat, particularly during low water years and to raise water temperatures above safe levels for rearing juvenile coho salmon. The purpose of this Project is to purchase and install flow meters on three irrigation diversion outlet pipes to help water users more accurately monitor consumption and ensure that necessary baseflows would be left in stream.

Alternatives Including the Proposed Action

No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, Reclamation would not provide Grant Program funding and NFWF would not administer \$61,005.13 to TU to implement the Project. As a result, the purchase and installation of flow meters on irrigation diversions along Bogus Creek would not occur, and irrigation withdrawals by water rights holders could not be accurately monitored. Without proper metering, water rights holders may divert more than they are permitted, leaving minimal baseflows in stream. Under these conditions, approximately 3 miles of the stream may be dewatered and/or suffer from unnaturally high stream temperatures which are detrimental to rearing coho salmon.

Proposed Action Alternative

Under the Proposed Action Alternative, Reclamation would provide Grant Program funding in the amount of \$61,005.13 to NFWF to administer to TU. Reclamation would also provide TU and its contractor(s) a notice to proceed for purchase and installation of flow meters at each of the three existing diversions on Bogus Creek. As a result, accurate water monitoring at the three diversions along Bogus Creek would be available to help ensure that adequate baseflows remain in Bogus Creek to support juvenile coho. Additionally, increases in stream temperatures, which are detrimental to coho salmon and other fish, would be minimized.

Findings

Based on the attached EA, Reclamation finds that the Proposed Action Alternative 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 describes the existing environmental resources in the Proposed Action Alternative area and evaluates the effects of both the No Action and the Proposed Action Alternatives on the resources. The EA was prepared in accordance with the NEPA, the Council on Environmental Quality Regulations for implementing the Procedural Provisions of the NEPA (40 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Parts 1500-1508), and the Department of the Interior Regulations for the Implementation of the NEPA (43 CFR Part 46). That analysis is provided in the EA, and a summation of the analysis is hereby incorporated by reference.

This Finding of No Significant Impact document is based on the following:

1. The Proposed Action would not significantly affect public health or safety (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(2)).
2. The Proposed Action would not significantly affect natural resources and unique geographical characteristics such as proximity to 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. There is no potential for the effects of the Proposed Action to be considered highly controversial (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(4)).
4. The Proposed Action would not have possible effects on the human environment that are highly uncertain or involve unique or unknown risks (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(5)).
5. The Proposed Action would 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)).

6. The Proposed Action would not have cumulatively significant impacts (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(7)).
7. The Proposed Action would not significantly affect historic properties (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(8)).
8. The Proposed Action would not significantly affect listed or proposed threatened or endangered species, or its habitat that has been determined to be critical under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (40 CFR 1508.27(b)(9)).
9. The Proposed Action would not threaten a violation of 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 would not affect any Indian Trust Assets (512 Departmental Manual (DM) 2, Policy Memorandum dated December 15, 1993).
11. Implementation of the Proposed Action would not disproportionately affect minorities or low-income populations and communities (EO 12898 and 43 CFR 46.215(j)).
12. The Proposed Action would not limit access to, and ceremonial use of, Indian sacred sites on Federal lands by Indian religious practitioners or adversely affect the physical integrity of such sacred sites (EO 13007, 43 CFR 46.215(k), and 512 DM 3).