

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

**SECTION 204 REGIONAL SEDIMENT MANAGEMENT
GALVESTON ISLAND COASTAL EROSION
GULF OF MEXICO
GALVESTON, TEXAS**

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Galveston District (Corps) has conducted an environmental analysis in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, as amended. The Detailed Project Report and Environmental Assessment (DPR/EA) **DATE OF DPR/EA**, for the Galveston Island Coastal Erosion study addresses the effects of the beneficial use of dredged material for coastal storm risk management opportunities and feasibility in Galveston, Texas. The recommended plan was identified as the National Economic Development (NED) plan consists of the following:

- Renourish approximately 1.7 miles of Galveston Island beach from Sunbather Lane to Ghost Crab Lane using approximately 530,000 cubic yards (cy) of beach sand dredged from the Galveston Harbor and Channel (GHC)

In addition to a “no action” plan, five alternatives were evaluated including the recommended plan. The alternatives included beach nourishment on the west end of Galveston Island with two alternatives meeting the objective of delaying coastal erosion damage. Detailed information about the alternatives can be found in Chapter 4 of the DPR/EA.

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

Table 1: Summary of Potential Effects of the Recommended Plan

	Insignificant effects	Insignificant effects as a result of mitigation*	Resource unaffected by action
Aesthetics	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Air quality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Aquatic resources/wetlands	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Invasive species	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Fish and wildlife habitat	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Threatened/Endangered species/critical habitat	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Historic properties	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Other cultural resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Floodplains	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Hazardous, toxic & radioactive waste	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Hydrology	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Land use	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Insignificant effects	Insignificant effects as a result of mitigation*	Resource unaffected by action
Navigation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Noise levels	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Public infrastructure	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Socio-economics	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Environmental justice	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Soils	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Tribal trust resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Water quality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Climate change	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

All practicable and appropriate means to avoid or minimize adverse environmental effects were analyzed and incorporated into the recommended plan. Best management practices (BMPs) as detailed in the DPR/EA will be implemented, if appropriate, to minimize impacts. BMPs and conservation measures included in the project design include: seasonal timing restrictions, biological monitors with stop-work authority, utilizing existing access roads and channels to the greatest extent practicable, siting pumps and pipes in areas that would have the least disturbance on sensitive habitats, utilizing the smallest construction footprint possible, restoring staging areas and access roads to pre-construction conditions when work complete, use of silt fencing, refueling and maintaining vehicles in designated areas, limiting idling, minimizing project equipment and vehicles transiting between the staging area and restoration site to the greatest extent practicable, minimizing use of construction lighting at night, and directing construction lighting toward the construction activity area and shielding from view outside of the project area to the maximum extent practicable.

No compensatory mitigation is required as part of the recommended plan.

Public review of the draft DPR/EA and FONSI was completed on **DATE DRAFT EA AND FONSI REVIEW PERIOD ENDED**. All comments submitted during the public review period were responded to in the Final DPR/EA and FONSI.

Pursuant to section 7 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) issued a biological opinion, dated 17 June 2019, that determined that the recommended plan will not jeopardize the continued existence of the following federally listed species or adversely modify designated critical habitat: Kemp's ridley sea turtle (*Lepidochelys kempii*), hawksbill sea turtle (*Eretmochelys imbricata*), and leatherback sea turtle (*Dermochelys coriacea*), the West Indian manatee (*Trichechus manatus*), loggerhead sea turtle (*Caretta caretta*), green sea turtle (*Chelonia mydas*), red knot (*Calidris canutus rufa*), and piping plover (*Charadrius melodus*). All terms and conditions, conservation measures, and reasonable and prudent alternatives and measures resulting from these consultations shall be implemented in order to minimize take of endangered species and avoid jeopardizing the species.

Pursuant to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers determined that the recommended plan has no effect on historic properties.

Pursuant to the Clean Water Act of 1972, as amended, the discharge of dredged or fill material associated with the recommended plan has been found to be compliant with section 404(b)(1) Guidelines (40 CFR 230). The Clean Water Act Section 404(b)(1) Guidelines evaluation is found in Appendix C-3 of the DPR/EA.

A water quality certification pursuant to section 401 of the Clean Water Act was obtained from the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality on **DATE**. All conditions of the water quality certification shall be implemented in order to minimize adverse impacts to water quality.

A determination of consistency with the Texas Coastal Zone Management program pursuant to the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 was obtained from the Texas General Land Office on **DATE**. All conditions of the consistency determination shall be implemented in order to minimize adverse impacts to the coastal zone.

All applicable environmental laws have been considered and coordination with appropriate agencies and officials has been completed. No concerns were raised, and no agencies objected to the project.

Technical, environmental, and cost effectiveness 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 the alternatives. Based on this report, the reviews by other Federal, State and local agencies, Tribes, input of the public, and the reviews by my staff, it is my determination that the recommended plan is not a major federal action that would result in significant adverse impacts of the quality of the human or natural environment; therefore, preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement is not required.

Date

COMMANDER
Colonel, Corps of Engineers
District Commander