

## DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS, SACRAMENTO DISTRICT 1325 J STREET SACRAMENTO CA 95814-2922

## FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

Incline Village General Improvement District
Effluent Storage Facility
Washoe County, Nevada

The U.S Army Corps of Engineers, Sacramento District (USACE) has conducted an environmental analysis in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969, as amended. The Final Environmental Assessment (EA) dated October 2023, for the Incline Village General Improvement District (IVGID) Effluent Storage Facility Project addresses the construction of an effluent storage facility operated as a component of a Wastewater Reclamation Facility located in Washoe County, Nevada.

The Final EA, incorporated herein by reference, evaluated the Proposed Action and the No Action alternatives. Under the proposed action, USACE would help fund the construction of an effluent storage tank and access road that would allow for the storage of effluent during emergency conditions and for repair and maintenance of the facility's effluent export line. Additionally, the proposed storage tank serves to meet the conditions of IVGID's operation permit issued by the Nevada Department of Environmental Protection. The recommended action includes:

- Modification of an existing access road that would serve for project access during construction and long-term operation and maintenance of the tank.
- Construction of a 2-million-gallon pre-stressed concrete tank, piping, and Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition (SCADA) system.
- Installation of permanent best management practices to slow and retain stormwater runoff, minimize erosion, and minimize sediment discharge from the site.

In addition to the Proposed Action, a No Action alternative that establishes the baseline conditions against which the action alternative is compared was also evaluated.

For all alternatives, the potential effects were evaluated, as appropriate. A summary of assessment of the potential effects of the preferred alternative are listed in Table 1.

Table 1. Summary of Potential Effects of the Proposed Action

| Resource                            | Less than significant effects | Less than significant effects as a result of mitigation | Resource<br>unaffected<br>by the action |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------|---|---|
| Greenhouse Gases and Climate Change | ×                             |   |   |
| Recreation                          |                               |   | $\boxtimes$                             |
| Land Use                            |                               |   |   |
| Prime or Unique Farmlands           |                               |   | $\boxtimes$                             |
| Aesthetics and Visual Resources     | $\boxtimes$                   |   |   |
| Air Quality                         |                               | $\boxtimes$   |   |
| Biological Resources                |                               | $\boxtimes$   |   |
| Cultural Resources                  | $\boxtimes$                   |   |   |
| Hydrology and Water Quality         |                               | $\boxtimes$   |   |
| Noise                               | $\boxtimes$                   |   |   |
| Socioeconomics and Environmental    |                               |   | $\boxtimes$                             |
| Justice                             |                               |   |   |
| Traffic and Transportation          |                               | $\boxtimes$   |   |
| Hazardous Materials                 | $\boxtimes$                   |   |   |

All practicable and appropriate means to avoid or minimize adverse environmental effects were analyzed and incorporated into the proposed action. Best management practices (BMPs) as detailed in the Final EA will be implemented, as appropriate, to minimize impacts.

According to USACE NEPA implementing guidance, Engineer Regulation 200-2-2, section 11, since the proposed action is not a feasibility, continuing authority, or special planning report, nor is it an operation and maintenance activity involving discharge of dredged or fill material, a draft EA was not circulated for public comment. Rather, a notice of availability of the EA and FONSI will be posted on USACE and IVGID's website located at, https://www.spk.usace.army.mil/Media/USACE-Project-Public-Notices/ and

https://www.yourtahoeplace.com/ivgid/resources/construction-updates.

Pursuant to Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended, USACE determined that the recommended plan would have no effect on federally listed species or their designated critical habitat.

Pursuant to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) of 1966, as amended, USACE determined that no historic properties would be affected by the recommended plan. USACE consulted with the Nevada State Historic Preservation Office on August 15<sup>th</sup>, 2023. USACE received a response from on September 8, 2023, agreeing to USACE's identification efforts throughout the area of potential effects. USACE submitted supplementary information to the Nevada State Historic Preservation Office dated October 4, 2023, and

anticipates a response with concurrence on a finding of No Historic Properties Affected (36 C.F.R. § 800.4(d)(1)) for the undertaking in October 2023.

Pursuant to the Clean Water Act of 1972, as amended, the discharge of dredged or fill material associated with the Proposed Action has been found to be compliant with Section 404(b)(1) Guidelines (40 CFR 230). A water quality certification is not required pursuant to Section 401 of the CWA (40 CFR 121).

All applicable laws, executive orders, regulations, and local government plans were considered in evaluation of the alternatives.

Technical, environmental, and economic criteria used in the formulation of alternative plans were those specified in the Water Resources Council's 1983 Economic and Environmental Principles and Guidelines for Water and Related Land Resources Implementation Studies. All applicable laws, executive orders, regulations, and local government plans were considered in evaluation of alternatives. Based on this report, the reviews by other Federal, State and local agencies, Tribes, and review by my staff, it is my determination that the recommend plan would not cause significant adverse effects on the quality of the human environment; therefore, preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement is not required.

Kevin P. Arnett, P.E., Ph.D. Lieutenant Colonel, U.S. Army Acting District Commander