

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR  
CENTRAL UTAH PROJECT COMPLETION ACT OFFICE  
FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT  
REALIGNMENT OF A PORTION OF THE UTAH LAKE DRAINAGE BASIN  
WATER DELIVERY SYSTEM**

Recommended by: Sarah Sutherland Date: Nov. 15, 2010

Sarah Sutherland  
Environmental Programs Manager  
Central Utah Water Conservancy District

Recommended by: Lee G. Baxter Date: 11-15-2010

Lee G. Baxter  
Program Coordinator  
U.S. Department of the Interior

Approved by: Reed R. Murray Date: 11/15/10

Reed R. Murray  
Program Director  
U.S. Department of the Interior

## **U.S. Department of the Interior Finding of No Significant Impact**

### **FINDING**

The U.S. Department of the Interior (Interior) finds that none of the Action Alternatives, as described in the Environmental Assessment (EA) for the Realignment of a Portion of the Utah Lake Drainage Basin Water Delivery System, would have a significant impact on the quality of the human or natural environment and that an Environmental Impact Statement is not required. Potential impacts on the human and natural environment were evaluated relative to the existing environment. For each environmental resource or issue, anticipated direct and indirect effects were assessed, considering both short- and long-term project effects. Interior, in coordination with the Central Utah Water Conservancy District (CUWCD) and the Utah Reclamation Mitigation and Conservation Commission (Mitigation Commission), as Joint Lead Agencies, has decided to authorize implementation of Alternative 1 - the Preferred Alternative, with Option C as the proposed action. This decision was based on a thorough review of the EA and the public comments received on the EA. This decision is in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969 (Public Law 91-90), as amended, the Council on Environmental Quality Regulations for Implementing the Procedural Provisions of NEPA (40 Code of Regulations (CFR) 1500-1508), and Interior's Regulations for Implementing the Procedural Provisions of NEPA (43 CFR Part 46).

### **DECISION**

Interior has decided to authorize implementation of Alternative 1- the Preferred Alternative, with Option C, for the proposed action. CUWCD is hereby authorized to implement the following proposed action for the construction alignment of the Provo and Orem portion of the Spanish Fork – Provo Reservoir Canal (SFPRC) Pipeline:

The proposed action (Alternative 1- Preferred Alternative with Option C) would begin in Provo at the intersection of 450 North and Seven Peaks Boulevard and follow Seven Peaks Boulevard to 700 North and then proceed west on 700 North to 900 East. The alignment would then proceed north on 900 East to 2200 North and then continue west along 2200 North to the intersection of Canyon Road and 2200 North. The alignment would then proceed north along Canyon Road to approximately 2045 North, where the alignment could turn west across the northern section of a soccer field to University Avenue. The alignment would then proceed north along University Avenue to approximately 700 North in Orem (5700 North in Provo), where the pipeline would cross the Provo River and connect to the proposed flow control structure located just north of 800 North. From the flow control structure, the pipeline would continue north and terminate at the Alpine/Jordan Aqueduct. Alternative 1 also includes a pipeline from the flow control structure back to and along 800 North that would connect to the Provo Reservoir Canal (PRC) on 800 North, as well as a short pipeline from the flow control structure to the Provo River.

The overall length of this alignment is approximately 6.8 miles.

Features of the proposed action include:

- Combined flow control structure at the mouth of Provo Canyon to control water deliveries to the PRC and the Provo River
- Flow Control Structure for the Alpine/Jordan Aqueduct connection
- Pipeline in 800 North in Orem for delivering water to the PRC
- Provo River Delivery Point
- Increased Pipe Diameter to allow for flow maintenance (pigging)
- Pipeline Segment from Flow Control Structure to Alpine/Jordan Aqueduct

## **REASONS FOR THE DECISION**

The proposed Realignment would avoid active and historical landslides, reduce the risk associated with geologic faults, and shorten the overall pipeline length.

Option C is preferred because of traffic and utility conflicts associated with 2200 North and University Avenue. The alignment along 2200 North between Canyon Road and University Avenue is heavily congested with utilities and would likely require the relocation of a 4-inch gas line during construction. Avoiding the intersection of 2200 North and University Avenue would also reduce traffic impacts during construction

Interior has analyzed the environmental effects, public comments, and the alternatives in detail and has determined that the Alternative 1 – the Preferred Alternative with Option C would achieve the Purpose and Need identified in the EA without significant impacts to environmental resources, as described in Chapter 3 of the EA.

.

## **PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT**

The Interior published a Notice of Intent (NOI) in the Federal Register on February 25, 2010, regarding the proposed project. The NOI announced plans to prepare an EA to evaluate potential impacts associated with the Realignment. CUWCD placed a public notice in local newspapers, and mailed an Interested Parties' letter to all property owners along the proposed project realignments announcing an open house to identify and discuss any issues and concerns associated with the construction, operation, and maintenance of the proposed realigned pipeline.

A public open house (Scoping) was held on March 23, 2010 in the Provo City Library located on University Avenue in Provo, Utah. Informational displays and opportunity for public comments and discussion were available throughout the meeting. Displays included posters describing the project purpose and need; proposed project alternatives;

proposed project schedule; and the NEPA process. Visitors signed in as they entered the room and were encouraged to ask questions and identify any issues or concerns they had regarding the proposed project and to fill out and sign a comment form prior to leaving the meeting.

A Draft Environmental Assessment was released for public review on July 29, 2010.

The 30-day public comment period ended on August 30, 2010. Comments received during that public review resulted in a 30-day extension of the comment period as well as additional public meetings.

A Public Meeting was held at the Provo City office building on September 16, 2010. A short presentation was made to inform attendees of the resource evaluations applicable to each alternative Informational displays and opportunity for public comments and discussion were available throughout the meeting. Displays included posters describing the proposed project purpose and need; project alternatives; proposed project schedule; and the NEPA process. Again, visitors signed in as they entered and were encouraged to ask questions and identify any issues or concerns they had regarding the proposed project and to fill out and sign a comment form prior to leaving the meeting..

At the request of members of the Tree Streets neighborhood, a neighborhood meeting was also held at Wasatch Elementary. The displays and presentation for this meeting were the same were presented at the Public Meeting at the Provo City office building.

Revisions as a result of public comments were incorporated into the Final EA and a summary of all comment and responses can be found in Appendix B of the Final EA.

## **SUMMARY OF PROJECT IMPACTS AND MITIGATION**

Section 2.10 of the EA described and incorporated Best Management Practices (BMPs) for project implementation. Adherence to standard and project-specific BMPs for the following activities are anticipated to reduce short-term impacts during the construction of the Preferred Alternative and other related construction activities:

- Landscape preservation and impact avoidance
- Erosion and sediment control
- Cultural and paleontological resource site clearances
- Site restoration and revegetation
- Air quality protection
- Prevention of water pollution
- Hazardous material storage, handling, and disposal
- Cultural clearance
- Traffic control
- Public involvement and public notification

These procedures will be incorporated into all construction specifications and contract documents, as appropriate, and all contractors would be required to follow them.

Mitigation measures were developed and described in the EA for those resources potentially more than minimally impacted. Those measures are detailed below:

### **Transportation**

The following is proposed mitigation for the expected impacts to the transportation network:

- Minimize the use of low-volume residential urban streets for construction haul routes
- Coordinate with Provo, Orem, and UDOT to develop construction phasing and traffic control plans to minimize impacts to the public
- Maintain as many open lanes of traffic as possible, with flaggers to direct traffic through construction areas
- Prepare detour plans and signing to minimize the impact to normal traffic patterns and emergency vehicles
- Prepare a public information plan to inform residents and business owners of project schedule, status, and contact information
- Coordinate with local community representatives (including schools and neighborhood organizations) to incorporate public events into the construction schedule and detour routes

The contractor would be required to implement these mitigation measures throughout the project construction

### **Utilities**

Utility impacts would be mitigated by preparing a detailed inventory of utilities and coordinating with utility providers during construction to minimize the disruption in utility service.

The public information plan implemented by the contractor will provide advance notification of utility disruption.

### **Socioeconomics**

Schedule coordination with schools and communication with residents would reduce impacts.

### **Soils**

To minimize the potential for soil erosion, particularly in areas with steep slopes within all alignments, the following BMPs will be implemented:

- Erosion-control measures—including, but not limited to, silt fencing, application of gravel or riprap, and straw bales—would be installed, where necessary, during and immediately after construction to avoid erosion and runoff.
- Topsoil and excavated soil will be stockpiled immediately adjacent to trenching activities and will be used to fill in the open trenches as soon as possible upon completion of pipe installation.
- Disturbed areas will be reseeded where vegetation previously existed.

- During pipeline design process, potential geological hazards (faults and landslides) will be avoided to the extent practicable.

### **Surface Water Resources**

To avoid sediment delivery or the introduction of foreign substances to the Provo River, BMPs described in Chapter 2 of the EA would be implemented during project construction.

### **Air Quality**

To minimize emissions of PM from construction activities, BMPs for mitigating fugitive dust and diesel exhaust would be employed during construction activities. The following BMPs would be used to mitigate construction PM emissions and comply with R307-309-8:

- Minimize the extent of surface disturbance to the fullest extent possible
- Reseed or otherwise provide temporary and permanent vegetation or groundcover to disturbed areas as soon as possible after construction is completed in an area
- Build construction entrances where appropriate using aggregate material to minimize sediment trackout on paved highways
- Use dust abatement techniques (such as watering or minimizing loader bucket drop heights) for earthmoving, excavating, trenching, grading, and other construction activities
- Minimize equipment and vehicle idling times during construction activities
- Prevent to the maximum extent possible material from being deposited onto any paved road other than a designated deposit site
- Promptly remove material that may create fugitive dust on a public or private paved road

### **Historic, Cultural, Archaeological, and Paleontological Resources**

If construction activities reveal unknown historic, cultural, archaeological, or paleontological resources, the contractor would immediately suspend construction operations in the vicinity (approximately 100-foot buffer around the discovery) and would notify the project manager of the nature and exact location of the discovery. The project manager would contact the CUWCD Environmental Programs Manager, who would assess the nature of the discovery and determine the necessary course of action. Construction would resume following notification from the project manager.

Should project implementation result in an adverse effect to historic resources, a memorandum of agreement to resolve the adverse effect would be prepared, agreed upon, and executed by the Interior, CUWCD, the Mitigation Commission, and the SHPO.

### **Hazardous Waste**

The Utah Division of Environmental Response and Remediation (DERR) would be contacted immediately upon the discovery of any contaminated soil or hazardous material. If petroleum hydrocarbons or other previously unidentified hazardous materials

or contaminated soil are encountered during construction, appropriate characterization and handling of the soil/waste would be conducted in accordance with DERR guidance.

Maintenance of construction equipment onsite would be minimized to the fullest extent possible. If onsite maintenance of construction equipment is required, absorbent pads or sheets would be placed under likely leak or spill sources. In addition, absorbent pads or sheets would be readily available during all refueling activities in the event of minor diesel spills. Spills of fuel or hydraulic fluid would be cleaned up immediately, and contaminated soil would be removed from the site and properly disposed of in accordance with state and federal regulations.

The handling, storage, and disposal of all hazardous materials, wastes, petroleum products, and solid wastes would be conducted in conformance with federal and state regulations to prevent soil, groundwater, or surface water contamination and associated adverse effects on the environment or worker health and safety.