

## DRAFT FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

### REGIONAL EMERGENCY STREAMBANK PROTECTION PROGRAM WITH STANDARD PROJECT CONDITIONS PURSUANT TO SECTION 14 OF THE 1946 FLOOD CONTROL ACT, AS AMENDED

1. Pursuant to the Authority of Section 14 of the 1946 Flood Control Act, as amended, the Pittsburgh District, United States Army Corps of Engineers, proposes to implement a Regional Emergency Streambank Protection Program (Program) governing the placement of fill material or other plant or structural materials for bank protection and stabilization in all waters in the District. Work performed under Section 14 corrects bank and shore erosion that endangers public or non-profit facilities. Bank protection typically is provided by the placement of riprap, quarry-run stone, gabions, retaining walls, bioengineering techniques, or rigid linings such as concrete or grout bags.

2. Alternatives considered in the Programmatic Environmental Assessment (PEA) for the proposed Program are (1) Implement the Section 14 Program projects that comply with the general criteria described in Section 1G of the PEA; (2) No-Action - A, where emergency streambank stabilization will continue with individual processing of each project; and (3) No-Action - B, in which no streambank stabilization projects are executed. Under No-Action - A, individual environmental reviews and approvals would result in the continuation of projects but at a greater expenditure of both time and funds than if the PEA were implemented. No-Action - B establishes baseline conditions, i.e. continuation of erosion issues that threaten various localities. The preferred alternative is to implement the Program projects that comply with the criteria described in Section 1.G. of the PEA.

3. In accordance with 33 CFR 230, Policy and Procedures for Implementing NEPA, a PEA has been prepared and circulated to all appropriate Federal and State agencies and other interested groups for review and comment, and is hereby adopted and incorporated in this FONSI. The PEA indicated that no significant adverse environmental impacts would result from the proposed work for those projects that meet the criteria in Section 1G. The proposed work would create a beneficial socioeconomic impact by providing protection to public and non-profit facilities. There would be no changes of land use as a result of authorization granted under this program. The repair of property would allow the public to continue to use each respective facility as originally intended.

4. Streambank protection would cause minimal loss of wildlife habitat: in cases where bioengineering is used, this loss would be short-term. Providing streambank protection may require extending the bank shoreward to create minor slope conditions. However, any design should minimize removal of vegetation to that necessary to achieve this stable streambank design slope configuration. Placement of bank protection would temporarily increase turbidity levels, dislocate various organisms, and possibly disrupt the movement of some organisms. Bank stabilization would reduce long-term erosion and siltation. Materials such as riprap could also provide quality habitat for some aquatic organisms. Standards of water quality established by the states of Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Ohio, Maryland and New York are not anticipated to be exceeded during and immediately after implementation of bank protection and would be expected to improve once implementation has been completed. In addition, under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act, each project will be coordinated with the USFWS and the respective

state fish and wildlife agency. Accordingly, the proposed work will not adversely affect any federally or state-listed threatened or endangered species or critical habitat. Coordination with the State Historic Preservation Officer and any federally listed tribe with historic ties to the project area will be specifically conducted for each project.

5. I have reviewed the PEA for the Program and the Public Notice, as well as all responses and comments received during the review period and have determined that the discharge of dredged or fill material is in compliance with the guidelines, in accordance with Section 404(b)(1) and is not contrary to the public interest. Additionally, I have determined that the work will not constitute a major federal action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment within the meaning of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969. Accordingly, I have concluded that an Environmental Impact Statement covering the proposed work is not required.

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_  
John P. Lloyd  
Colonel, Corps of Engineers  
District Engineer