

## Appendix A Finding of No Significance (FONSI)

South Pacific Division, Continuing Authorities Program San Francisco District



Continuing Authorities Program (CAP), Section 103

## FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

## Lower Colma Creek Continuing Authorities Program Section 103 Project South San Francisco, San Mateo County, California

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, San Francisco District (Corps) has conducted an environmental analysis in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, as amended. The final Detailed Project Report and Environmental Assessment (DPR/EA) dated 15 December 2023, for the Lower Colma Creek Continuing Authorities Program Section 103 Project addresses coastal storm risk management opportunities and feasibility in the study area in South San Francisco, CA.

The Final DPR/EA, incorporated herein by reference, evaluated various alternatives that would manage the risk of coastal flooding, minimize the risk to human life and safety, and reduce the environmental degradation and impacts to the community associated with releases of untreated effluent in the study area. The recommended plan is the National Economic Development (NED) Plan and includes:

 A 2,000-foot-long I-wall (sheetpile) floodwall, approximately 3 to 6.5 feet above grade and involving driving of sheetpiles to a maximum depth of 13 feet at the Water Quality Control Plant (WQCP) at the north side of the WQCP adjacent to the right-bank of Creek, as well as a second 700-foot-long approximately two-foot-high floodwall south of plant adjacent to San Francisco Bay. The sheetpile flood walls will be topped with a concrete cap. The footprint of disturbance will be limited to four feet on either side of the wall centerline. There will also be some plantings on the waterside of the wall. At Pump Station 4, a perimeter sheetpile floodwall, approximately 2-4 feet above grade, would be constructed.

In addition to a "no action" plan, three alternatives were evaluated. The alternatives included a north wall-only option, a north and south wall option (Recommended Plan), and a non-structural alternative to raise utilities most sensitive to flooding. These alternatives are described in more detail in Section 3.5.3 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	$\boxtimes$			
Air quality	$\boxtimes$			
Aquatic resources/wetlands	$\boxtimes$			
Invasive species			$\boxtimes$	
Fish and wildlife habitat	$\boxtimes$			
Threatened/Endangered species/critical habitat	$\boxtimes$			
Historic properties	$\boxtimes$			
Other cultural resources	$\boxtimes$			
Floodplains	$\boxtimes$			
Hazardous, toxic & radioactive waste	$\boxtimes$			

## Table 1: Summary of Potential Effects of the Recommended Plan

	Insignificant effects	Insignificant effects as a result of mitigation*	Resource unaffected by action
Hydrology	$\boxtimes$		
Land use	$\boxtimes$		
Navigation			$\boxtimes$
Noise levels	$\boxtimes$		
Public infrastructure	$\boxtimes$		
Socio-economics	$\boxtimes$		
Environmental justice	$\boxtimes$		
Soils	$\boxtimes$		
Tribal trust resources	$\boxtimes$		
Water quality	$\boxtimes$		
Climate change	$\boxtimes$		

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. The USACE will implement BMPs to ensure that surface water runoff and associated sedimentation and contamination do not enter waterways. Further, the USACE will implement a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) that will include sediment control measures. For biological resources, prior to construction, the project area will be surveyed by a qualified biologist for nesting birds. If active nests are found, the biologist will set up a 50 ft buffer until the nests are no longer active. If the nesting bird is a raptor, the biologist will set up a 250 ft buffer until the nest is no longer active. For Special-Status Species, equipment is not allowed below the level of extreme high tide to minimize impacts to sensitive habitats. Also for Special-Status Species, for any work below the level of extreme high tide, the work area shall be isolated at low tide to allow any fish present in the area to escape to areas with deeper water. For recreation, the USACE will limit trail closures during project construction to the maximum extent practicable; coordinate with the local sponsor to provide public notices regarding trail closures; provide suitable detour if feasible; and maintain access to the pedestrian bridge during construction. For Cultural Resources, the USACE will perform archaeological subsurface testing and ensure archaeological and tribal monitors are present during any ground disturbing work.

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

Public review of the draft DPR/EA and FONSI was completed on 13 July 2022. 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. Army Corps of Engineers determined that the recommended plan may affect but is not likely to adversely affect the following federally listed species or their designated critical habitat: Central California Coast Steelhead and Southern Distinct Population Segment Green Sturgeon critical habitat. The National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) concurred with the Corps' determination on 24 February 2023.

Pursuant to section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers determined that historic properties may be adversely affected by the recommended plan. The Corps and the California State Historic Preservation Officer

entered into a Programmatic Agreement (PA) on 6 September 2023 to ensure further identification and an effects determination for historic properties occur before construction to determine the extent of historic properties within the recommend plan and if their characteristics will be altered directly or indirectly. All terms and conditions resulting from the agreement shall be implemented in order to avoid, minimize, or mitigate adverse impacts to 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). There is no discharge of dredged or fill material to jurisdictional waters of U.S., therefore a full 404(b)(1) evaluation is not required.

A 401 Water Quality Certification is not required. Significant impacts to water quality are not anticipated given that the project is not occurring directly in the water, and there is no discharge of dredged or fill material to jurisdictional waters of the U.S.

A determination of consistency with the State of California Coastal Zone Management program pursuant to the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 was obtained on 3 May 2023 from the Bay Conservation and Development Commission. 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. An evaluation of the project's effects on Essential Fish Habitat as defined by the Magnussen Stevens Fisheries Conservation and Management Act was included with the Biological Assessment in Appendix B of the DPR/EA. NMFS has provided their concurrence on 24 February 2023.

Technical, environmental, economic, and cost effectiveness criteria used in the formulation of alternative plans were those specified in the Water Resources Council's 1983 <u>Economic and Environmental Principles and Guidelines for Water and Related Land Resources</u> <u>Implementation Studies.</u> 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, 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.

Date

Shantel K. Glass Major, U.S. Army Acting District Commander