



## FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

### SUPPLEMENT TO THE COLUMBIA RIVER FEDERAL NAVIGATION CHANNEL OPERATIONS AND MAINTENANCE DREDGING AND DREDGED MATERIAL PLACEMENT NETWORK UPDATE RICE ISLAND SHORELINE PLACEMENT AND HOWARD ISLAND IN-WATER DREDGED MATERIAL RE-HANDLING SITE (SUMP)

#### COLUMBIA COUNTY, OREGON and COWLITZ COUNTY, WASHINGTON

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Portland District (Corps) has conducted an environmental analysis in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, as amended. In September 2015, the Corps prepared an Environmental Assessment, *Supplement to the Columbia River Federal Navigation Channel Operations and Maintenance Dredging and Dredged Material Placement Network Update, Rice Island Shoreline Placement and Howard Island In-water Dredged Material Re-handling Site (Sump)*, to specifically address dredge material placement at two sites, further refining goals under the third objective of the original 1999 Final IFR/EIS. After completion of the 2015 EA, further analysis found that the performance of the sump would be improved by moving it upstream. Because the new location is now in the waters of both Oregon and Washington, has a slightly larger footprint, and was not evaluated in previous NEPA documents, a supplemental environmental analysis was required. The final Supplemental Environmental Assessment (SEA), dated August 2019, to the aforementioned 2015 EA for Rice Island Shoreline Placement and Howard Island In-water Dredged Material Re-handling Site (Sump), addresses the proposed relocation of the Howard Island Sump to a more suitable adjacent location slightly upstream of the originally proposed site.

The Final SEA, incorporated herein by reference, evaluated two alternatives that would provide temporary in-water placement for material dredged from the Columbia River in the study area. The preferred alternative includes:

The Corps' Proposed Action would change the current sump location between RM 68 and RM 69 of the Columbia River for temporary storage of dredged material to a more stable site, which would improve efficiency of upland placement at Howard Island, reduce shoaling, and facilitate ongoing channel maintenance.

The alternatives included the "no action" alternative which would keep the original sump location of the preferred alternative in the 2015 EA. Whereas the preferred alternative would modify the sump site to an overlapping footprint slightly upstream, larger, and in a more suitable location, as described in Section 2.1 of the SEA. 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Air quality	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Aquatic resources/wetlands	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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"/>
Hydrology	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Environmental justice	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 SEA will be implemented, if appropriate, to minimize impacts. The Corps will comply with all BMPs and reasonable and prudent measures outlined in the environmental compliance documents referred to in Section 5 of the SEA. No compensatory mitigation is required as part of the recommended plan.

Public review of the draft SEA and FONSI was completed on 3 April 2019. No comments were submitted during the public review period, however, final results of resource agency coordination were included in the Final SEA and FONSI and may be found in section 6.2.

**ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT**

Pursuant to section 7 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended, the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) issued a biological opinion, dated 11 July 2012, that determined that the recommended plan will not jeopardize the continued existence of the following federally listed species or adversely modify designated critical habitat: Lower Columbia River (LCR) Chinook salmon (*Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*), Upper Willamette River (UWR) spring-run Chinook salmon, Upper Columbia River (UCR) spring-run Chinook salmon, Snake River (SR) spring/summer run Chinook salmon, SR fall-run Chinook salmon, Columbia River chum salmon (*O. keta*), LCR coho salmon (*O. kisutch*), SR sockeye salmon (*O. nerka*), LCR steelhead (*O. mykiss*), UWR steelhead, Middle Columbia River (MCR) steelhead, UCR steelhead, Snake River Basin (SRB) steelhead, southern green sturgeon, or eulachon, or result in the destruction or adverse modification of designated critical habitats of any of those species, except for LCR coho salmon, for which critical habitat was not proposed or designated. On 1 August 2019 NMFS concurred that the Proposed Action to relocate the Howard Island sump fell within the scope of effects analyzed under the 2012 BiOp (NWR-2011-02095). 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 7 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) issued a biological opinion, dated 6 June 2014, that determined that the recommended plan will not jeopardize the continued existence of the following federally listed species or adversely modify designated critical habitat: threatened streaked horned larks, threatened bull trout, threatened Columbian white tailed deer, and their designated critical habitat determinations in those opinions remain unchanged. No new species or critical habitat have been designated since the 2014 BiOp for streaked horned larks; therefore, the USFWS concurred with this determination during a phone call with Ms. Cat Brown on 4 May 2015, and the Corps determination is recorded in a memorandum for the record dated 20 May 2015. This determination was reexamined for the proposed action to revise the sump location and the Corps found that the 2015 determination remains valid, as no ESA-listed species occur within the project area, nor is there critical habitat present within the expanded footprint. 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.

#### ***NATIONAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION ACT***

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.

#### ***CLEAN WATER ACT SECTION 404(B)(1) COMPLIANCE***

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 Section 5.1.3 of the SEA.

#### ***CLEAN WATER ACT SECTION 401 COMPLIANCE***


A water quality certification pursuant to section 401 of the Clean Water Act was obtained from both Washington Department of Ecology and Oregon Department of Environmental Quality. All conditions of the water quality certifications shall be implemented in order to minimize adverse impacts to water quality.



**FINDING**

All applicable laws, executive orders, regulations were considered in evaluation of the preferred alternative and no action alternative considered in the current SEA. Based on this SEA, the reviews by other Federal, State and local agencies, Tribes, input of the public, and the review by my staff, it is my determination that the recommended plan would not cause significant adverse effects on the quality of the human environment; therefore, preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement is not required.

2019-10-10  
Date

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Aaron L. Dorf  
Colonel, Corps of Engineers  
District Commander