



US Army Corps  
of Engineers®  
San Francisco District

Regulatory Division  
450 Golden Gate Avenue, 4<sup>th</sup> Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94102-3046

SAN FRANCISCO DISTRICT

# PUBLIC NOTICE

PROJECT: Eureka-Arcata Route 101 Corridor Improvement Project

PUBLIC NOTICE NUMBER: SPN-2005-296590N

PUBLIC NOTICE DATE: April 3, 2019

COMMENTS DUE DATE: May 3, 2019

PERMIT MANAGER: Daniel Breen

TELEPHONE: 415-503-6803

E-MAIL: Daniel.B.Breen@usace.army.mil

1. **INTRODUCTION:** The California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), District 1 (POC: Denise Walker-Brown, 707-441-4684, denise.walker-brown@dot.ca.gov), 1656 Union Street, Eureka, California, 95501, has applied to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), San Francisco District, for a Department of the Army Permit for the proposed Eureka-Arcata Route 101 Corridor Improvement Project. This proposed project consists of five phased construction projects: Tide Gate Replacements, Jacoby Creek Bridge Replacement, Extension of Acceleration/Deceleration Lanes and Lighting Improvements, Guardrail and Cable Rail Safety Barrier, and Indianola Interchange and Airport Road Improvements, as well as their associated mitigation project, the Humboldt Bay Area Mitigation (HBAM). This Department of the Army permit application is being processed pursuant to the provisions of Section 404 of the Clean Water Act of 1972, as amended (33 U.S.C. § 1344 *et seq.*), and Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899, as amended (33 U.S.C. § 403 *et seq.*).

## 2. PROPOSED PROJECT:

**Project Site Location:** The project area spans a 6.4-mile stretch of U.S. Highway 101 from Post Mile (PM) 79.9, at the southern end of the Eureka Slough Bridge, to PM 86.3, at 11<sup>th</sup> Street. The site is situated east of Humboldt Bay and between the cities of Eureka and Arcata in Humboldt County, California (center coordinates: 40.8203°N, 124.0931°W). It falls within the Arcata South USGS Quadrangle Map (within portions of Township 5N, Range 1W, Section 23; Township 5N, Range 1E, Sections 4, 9, 16, 17, 18, and 19; and Township 6N, Range 1W, Sections 13, 23, and 24). Major waters within the project area include Humboldt Bay and its tributaries of Jacoby Creek, Gannon Slough, and Eureka Slough.

**Project Site Description:** U.S. Highway 101 is the most important interregional highway serving the northern California coastal area. Connecting the Santa Rosa/San Francisco metropolitan areas to the south and the State of Oregon to the north, U.S. 101 is used for intercity/interstate commerce and provides access to North Coast recreational areas, including state and national parks, rivers, and beaches. Although the U.S. 101 segment between Eureka and Arcata extends through a predominantly rural setting, it is the most heavily traveled roadway in Humboldt County. The combined population of Eureka and Arcata, Humboldt County's two largest cities, is approximately 45,000. However, the population that uses the corridor most frequently, encompassing the unincorporated areas near Eureka, Arcata, and McKinleyville in addition to the cities of Eureka and Arcata, is approximately 90,000. Most of Humboldt County's growth is occurring in and around these cities and communities along the U.S. 101 corridor, between Fortuna, 20 miles south of Eureka, and McKinleyville, 15 miles to the north. U.S. 101 between Eureka and Arcata is currently a four-lane expressway, with two lanes in each direction. This section of highway abuts Arcata Bay, which is a portion of Humboldt Bay, to the west and is characterized by tidal marshes, in addition to wildlife refuges, farmed wetlands, grazing pastures, and some relatively small pockets of commercial and industrial use. Major businesses within the project area include Murray Field Airport, Mid-City Motor World, and California Redwood Company.

**Project Description:** As shown in the attached drawings, Caltrans is proposing five phased construction projects along the Eureka-Arcata Route 101 corridor. The Tide Gate Replacement Project would replace eight deteriorated tide gates at five different locations, which would include the installation of at least one fish-friendly

tide gate at each location if federally-listed fish species may be present, in addition to making minor structural modifications to existing headwalls. The Jacoby Creek Bridge Replacement Project would consist of widening the existing northbound Jacoby Creek and Gannon Slough Bridges on U.S. 101 by approximately 24 inches and cantilevering new rails to the existing bridges; demolishing the southbound Jacoby Creek Bridge and replacing it with a new single-span bridge measuring 73-foot long by 43-foot wide, thus increasing its width by four feet; and constructing a temporary detour bridge, supported by piles, adjacent to the existing southbound bridge within the U.S. 101 median. The Extension of Acceleration/Deceleration Lanes and Lighting Improvements Project would construct acceleration and deceleration lanes at seven locations along U.S. 101 to improve traffic conditions and reduce delays at intersections. The Guardrail and Cable Rail Safety Barrier Project would install a cable rail safety barrier with a four-foot-wide concrete pad in the median between the Eureka Slough bridges and Airport Road, and from South G Street to the 11th Street overcrossing, to replace an existing three-beam guardrail at those locations, as well as replacing existing metal beam guardrails (MBGR) at five locations along U.S. 101. Lastly, the Indianola Interchange and Airport Road Improvements Project would elevate U.S. 101 up to 20 feet above the existing highway; construct a single-span bridge at the Indianola Cutoff measuring 70-foot long by 94-foot wide; widen the intersection of Jacobs Avenue and Airport Road, thus necessitating a drainage realignment; and close four median crossings within the project area.

**Basic Project Purpose:** The basic project purpose comprises the fundamental, essential, or irreducible purpose of the project, and is used by USACE to determine whether the project is water dependent. The basic project purpose is to improve highway traffic conditions on U.S. 101 between Eureka and Arcata.

**Overall Project Purpose:** The overall project purpose serves as the basis for the Section 404(b)(1) alternatives analysis and is determined by further defining the basic project purpose in a manner that more specifically describes the applicant's goals for the project while allowing a reasonable range of alternatives to be analyzed. The overall project purpose is to reduce operational conflicts and traffic delays at U.S. 101 intersections, restore and rehabilitate existing U.S. 101 infrastructure including bridges and tide gate structures, and improve public safety.

**Project Impacts:** Over all, the Eureka-Arcata Route 101 Corridor Improvement Project is expected to result in the permanent placement of 16,659.5 cubic yards of earthen fill and concrete within 8.47 acres of wetlands, in addition to temporary fill within 4.08 acres of wetlands. The Tide Gate Replacement Project would involve structural work within a total of 142.40 square feet below the mean high water line of tidally-influenced tributaries to Humboldt Bay. The Jacoby Creek Bridge Replacement project would require 1,550 cubic yards of earthen fill for the site's temporary bridge and 200 cubic yards of earthen fill for the new permanent bridge to be placed within a total of 0.28 acre of palustrine emergent wetlands and 0.10 of estuarine intertidal wetlands, in addition to other work related to the removal of the site's existing bridge within 0.07 acre below the mean high water line of Jacoby Creek and temporary fill impacts within 0.42 acre of palustrine emergent wetlands during construction. The Extension of Acceleration/Deceleration Lanes and Lighting Improvements Project would place 11,010 cubic yards of earthen fill within 0.84 acre of palustrine emergent wetlands and would also place temporary fill within 1.14 acre of palustrine emergent wetlands. The Guardrail and Cable Rail Safety Barrier Project would require the placement of 788.64 cubic yards of earthen fill and concrete within 1.04 acres of palustrine emergent wetlands and temporary fill within 0.98 acre of palustrine emergent wetlands. Lastly, the Indianola Interchange and Airport Road Improvements Project would place 118,700 cubic yards of earthen fill within 6.22 acres of palustrine emergent wetlands and temporary fill within 1.54 acres of palustrine emergent wetlands.

**Proposed Mitigation:** Permittee-responsible mitigation has been proposed at either or both of two off-site locations purchased by Caltrans in the general vicinity of the project area, a strategy that has been collectively termed the Humboldt Bay Area Mitigation (HBAM) Project. At the Samoa parcel, which is situated along Old Samoa Road and V Street within the Arcata city limits, Caltrans proposes to enhance a mosaic of existing upland and palustrine emergent wetlands. It is estimated that there would be 33.35 acres of wetland creation in adjacent uplands, 20.27 acres of tidal wetland enhancement, and 15.12 acres of palustrine wetland enhancement. At the Lanphere parcel, located approximately 3.5 miles northwest of the City of Arcata, Caltrans proposes to convert existing upland and seasonal freshwater wetland habitat into tidal and subtidal habitat, while creating, restoring, and enhancing wetlands.

USACE is in the process of conducting a jurisdictional verification of wetlands and other waters of the U.S. currently situated on these two parcels. At this time, Caltrans is in consultation with the relevant natural resource agencies to determine the most appropriate mitigation strategy, but their current proposal is to provide all compensatory wetland mitigation on the Samoa parcel. USACE has not endorsed the submitted compensatory mitigation proposal at this time and will conduct an independent review before reaching a final mitigation decision.

**Project Alternatives:** The applicant has submitted an alternatives analysis consisting of five action alternatives, known as Alternatives 1, 1A, 2, 3, and 3A, and one no-action alternative, known as Alternative 7.

Alternative 1 proposes to restore and rehabilitate the U.S. 101 roadway with median closures. It would consist of the following components: closure, re-grading, and revegetation of U.S. 101 median crossings at intersections with Airport Road, Mid-City Motor World, California Redwood Company, Indianola Cutoff, Bracut, and Bayside Cutoff; extension of right-side acceleration lanes and decelerations at U.S. 101 crossings with Mid-City Motor World, California Redwood Company, Indianola Cutoff, Bracut, and Bayside Cutoff; install a high tension cable barrier within the median between the Eureka Slough bridges and Airport Road; replacement of the southbound U.S. 101 Jacoby Creek bridge, with bicycle railing on the outside barrier; replace the bridge rail on the U.S. 101 northbound Jacoby Creek and Gannon Slough bridges to meet current safety standards, with bicycle railing on the outside barriers; replace nine existing tide gates adjacent to U.S. 101; add or replace roadway lighting on U.S. 101 at Cole Avenue, Indianola Cutoff, Bayside Cutoff, South G Street, and the U.S. 101/255 interchange; install a metal beam guard rail at three billboards south of Bracut; remove one tree and two groups of shrubs on U.S. 101 between the Jacoby Creek bridges; remove the median barrier guardrail in the U.S. 101 median and install a high tension cable median barrier from South G Street to the 11th Street overcrossing; and remove signage within the safety corridor.

Alternative 1A is similar to Alternative 1 except that three median turnarounds at the U.S. 101/Airport Road intersection would be constructed. The turnarounds would require removing approximately 60 additional trees. U-turns would minimize out-of-direction travel and the traffic delay that would result from the elimination of left-turn movements and closing the roadway medians.

Alternative 2 contains all the elements of Alternative 1 and would also include the construction of a compact diamond grade separation at Indianola Cutoff, instead of closing the existing median at this location. Because of the proposed grade separation, Alternative 2 would require removing 41 more trees than Alternative 1.

Alternative 3 includes all of the elements of Alternative 2, but work at Airport Road would require the construction of a signalized intersection with U.S. 101. Consequently, the Airport Road intersection would be realigned outside of the existing ROW, across the end of an abandoned runway at the Murray Field Airport, and across the existing ditch east of northbound U.S. 101 to the new, signalized intersection location. An additional continuous northbound lane would be constructed from Cole Avenue to Mid-City Motor World to minimize traffic and provide adequate merging onto U.S. 101. A retaining wall on the east side of U.S. 101 would be required between Cole Avenue and Airport Road to minimize impacts to wetlands and existing drainage patterns. U.S. 101 would continue to have two northbound through lanes north of Mid-City Motor World, while southbound U.S. 101 would be modified by the left turn lane at Airport Road being realigned. Because of the proposed grade separation, Alternative 3 would require removing 39 more trees than Alternative 1.

Alternative 3A is the applicant's preferred alternative. It is similar to Alternative 3, except that the proposed grade separation at Indianola Cutoff would have steepened fill slopes and a narrower median to reduce wetland impacts and cost. There would also be a half signal at Airport Road, but it would not involve acquiring land from the airport as in Alternative 3. Left turn movements from Airport Road to southbound U.S. 101 would be controlled by the proposed half signal. This alternative would require the removal of approximately 23 trees.

Lastly, Alternative 7, the no-action alternative, would retain the current roadway alignment and access, including median openings. This alternative would propose no modifications to the existing alignment or access for this project. Other projects to maintain or rehabilitate the road surfaces, drainage improvements, bridge retrofit, widening projects, or other safety-related projects could be initiated on a case-by-case basis.

USACE has not endorsed the submitted alternatives analysis at this time. USACE will conduct an independent review of the project alternatives prior to reaching a final permit decision.

### 3. STATE AND LOCAL APPROVALS:

**Water Quality Certification:** State water quality certification or a waiver thereof is a prerequisite for the issuance of a Department of the Army Permit to conduct any activity which may result in a fill or pollutant discharge into waters of the United States, pursuant to Section 401 of the Clean Water Act of 1972, as amended (33 U.S.C. § 1341 *et seq.*). The applicant has recently submitted an application to the California Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) to obtain water quality certification for the project. No Department of the Army Permit will be issued until the applicant obtains the required certification or a waiver of certification. A waiver can be explicit, or it may be presumed if the RWQCB fails or refuses to act on a complete application for water quality certification within 60 days of receipt, unless the District Engineer determines a shorter or longer period is a reasonable time for the RWQCB to act.

Water quality issues should be directed to the Executive Officer, California Regional Water Quality Control Board, North Coast Region, 5550 Skylane Boulevard, Suite A, Santa Rosa, California 95403, by the close of the comment period.

**Coastal Zone Management:** Section 307(c) of the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972, as amended (16 U.S.C. § 1456(c) *et seq.*), requires a Federal applicant seeking a federal license or permit to conduct any activity occurring in or affecting the coastal zone to obtain a Consistency Determination that indicates the activity conforms with the state's coastal zone management program. Generally, no federal license or permit will be granted until the appropriate State agency has issued a Consistency Determination or has waived its right to do so. Since the project occurs in the coastal zone or may affect coastal zone resources, the applicant has applied for a Consistency Determination from the California Coastal Commission to comply with this requirement.

Coastal zone management issues should be directed to the District Manager, California Coastal Commission, North Coast District Office, 710 E Street, Suite 200, Eureka, California 95501, by the close of the comment period.

**Other Local Approvals:** The applicant has applied for the following additional governmental authorizations for the project: a Bridge Permit to be issued by the U.S. Coast Guard and a Lake or Streambed Alteration

Agreement to be issued by the California Department of Fish and Wildlife.

### 4. COMPLIANCE WITH VARIOUS FEDERAL LAWS:

**National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA):** Upon review of the Department of the Army permit application and other supporting documentation, USACE has made a *preliminary* determination that the project neither qualifies for a Categorical Exclusion nor requires the preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement for the purposes of NEPA. At the conclusion of the public comment period, USACE will assess the environmental impacts of the project in accordance with the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 U.S.C. §§ 4321-4347), the Council on Environmental Quality's regulations at 40 C.F.R. § 1500-1508, and USACE regulations at 33 C.F.R. § 325. The final NEPA analysis will normally address the direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts that result from regulated activities within the jurisdiction of USACE and other non-regulated activities USACE determines to be within its purview of Federal control and responsibility to justify an expanded scope of analysis for NEPA purposes. The final NEPA analysis will be incorporated in the decision documentation that provides the rationale for issuing or denying a Department of the Army Permit for the project. The final NEPA analysis and supporting documentation will be on file with the San Francisco District, Regulatory Division.

**Endangered Species Act (ESA):** Section 7(a)(2) of the ESA of 1973, as amended (16 U.S.C. § 1531 *et seq.*), requires Federal agencies to consult with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and/or the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) to ensure that actions authorized, funded, or undertaken by the agency are not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of any Federally-listed species or result in the adverse modification of designated critical habitat. As the federal lead agency for this project via a memorandum of agreement with the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), Caltrans will be responsible for determining the presence or absence of federally-listed species and designated critical habitat and the need to conduct consultation.

The following federally-listed species and designated critical habitat are present at the project location or in its vicinity and may be affected by project implementation. Caltrans has made a *preliminary* determination that the proposed project may adversely affect the tidewater goby

(*Eucyclogobius newberryi*) and its critical habitat, given the possibility of direct injury or mortality (due to trampling, excessive sedimentation, or accidental chemical spills), modification of suitable and critical habitat, and other disturbances. Approximately 83.6 acres of designated critical habitat for the tidewater goby occurs within the project area. Caltrans has also made a *preliminary* determination that the proposed project may affect, but is not likely to adversely affect, the Southern Oregon/Northern California Coast (SONCC) evolutionarily significant unit (ESU) of coho salmon (*Oncorhynchus kisutch*), California Coastal Chinook salmon (*O. tshawytscha*) ESU, Northern California Distinct Population Segment (DPS) steelhead (*O. mykiss*), or Southern DPS of North American green sturgeon (*Acipenser medirostris*). These latter species may be affected by changes to aquatic habitat, including wetland fill, wetland restoration, tide gate replacement, weir construction, vegetation disturbance, artificial lighting, and increased shade; noise and visual disturbances, such as exposure to pile installation noise and vibration, construction noise, and visual disturbance; and water quality effects, including turbidity, sedimentation, and pollutants associated with stormwater runoff and accidental spills.

Caltrans has initiated formal consultations with USFWS and NMFS for these species and critical habitat, pursuant to Section 7(a) of the Act. USACE will render a final determination on the need for consultation at the close of the comment period, taking into account any comments provided by USFWS and NMFS. To complete the administrative record and the decision on whether to issue a Department of the Army Permit for the project, USACE will obtain all necessary supporting documentation from the applicant concerning the consultation process. Any required consultation must be concluded prior to the issuance of a Department of the Army Permit for the project.

**Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (MSFCMA):** Section 305(b)(2) of the MSFCMA of 1966, as amended (16 U.S.C. § 1801 *et seq.*), requires Federal agencies to consult with the NMFS on all proposed actions authorized, funded, or undertaken by the agency that may adversely affect essential fish habitat (EFH). EFH is defined as those waters and substrate necessary to fish for spawning, breeding, feeding, or growth to maturity. EFH is designated only for those species managed under a Federal Fisheries Management Plan (FMP), such as the *Pacific Groundfish FMP*, the *Coastal Pelagics FMP*, or the *Pacific Coast*

*Salmon FMP*. As the federal lead agency for this project via a memorandum of agreement with the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), Caltrans will be responsible for determining the presence or absence of EFH and the need to conduct consultation, pursuant to Section 305(5)(b)(2) of the Act.

Caltrans has made a *preliminary* determination that EFH for Pacific coast salmon, Pacific groundfish, and coastal pelagic species is present at the project location or in its vicinity and that the critical elements of EFH may be adversely affected by project implementation. The project may affect EFH by resulting in increased underwater noise and motion disturbance, decreased water quality (increased turbidity, suspended sediment, chemical pollution, and salinity), and reduced aquatic and riparian vegetation, including eelgrass.

Caltrans has initiated formal EFH consultation with NMFS. USACE will render a final determination on the need for consultation at the close of the comment period, taking into account any comments provided by NMFS. To complete the administrative record and the decision on whether to issue a Department of the Army Permit for the project, USACE will obtain all necessary supporting documentation from the applicant concerning the consultation process. Any required consultation must be concluded prior to the issuance of a Department of the Army Permit for the project.

**Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act (MPRSA):** Section 302 of the MPRSA of 1972, as amended (16 U.S.C. § 1432 *et seq.*), authorizes the Secretary of Commerce, in part, to designate areas of ocean waters, such as the Cordell Bank, Gulf of the Farallones, and Monterey Bay, as National Marine Sanctuaries for the purpose of preserving or restoring such areas for their conservation, recreational, ecological, or aesthetic values. After such designation, activities in sanctuary waters authorized under other authorities are valid only if the Secretary of Commerce certifies that the activities are consistent with Title III of the Act. No Department of the Army Permit will be issued until the applicant obtains any required certification or permit. The project does not occur in sanctuary waters, and a *preliminary* review by USACE indicates the project is not likely to affect sanctuary resources. This presumption of effect, however, remains subject to a final determination by the Secretary of Commerce or his designee.

**National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA):** Section 106 of the NHPA of 1966, as amended (16 U.S.C.

§ 470 *et seq.*), requires Federal agencies to consult with the appropriate State Historic Preservation Officer to take into account the effects of their undertakings on historic properties listed in or eligible for listing in the *National Register of Historic Places*. Section 106 of the Act further requires Federal agencies to consult with the appropriate Tribal Historic Preservation Officer or any Indian tribe to take into account the effects of their undertakings on historic properties, including traditional cultural properties, trust resources, and sacred sites, to which Indian tribes attach historic, religious, and cultural significance.

As the federal lead agency for this undertaking via a memorandum of agreement with the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), Caltrans will be responsible for determining the presence or absence of historic properties or archaeological resources and the need to conduct consultation. Caltrans has made a *preliminary* determination that historic or archaeological resources are present in the permit area and that such resources may be adversely affected by the project. These resources include Batini Dump, a refuse dump dating back to the 1930s, and a portion of Murray Field Airport, due to the architecture of the original 1930s hangar that is central to the airport and its history.

To complete the administrative record and the decision on whether to issue a Department of the Army Permit for the project, USACE will obtain all necessary supporting documentation from Caltrans concerning the consultation process. USACE will render a final determination on the need for consultation at the close of the comment period, taking into account any comments provided by the State Historic Preservation Officer, the Tribal Historic Preservation Officer, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, and Native American Nations or other tribal governments. Any required consultation must be concluded prior to the issuance of a Department of the Army Permit for the project.

If unrecorded archaeological resources are discovered during project implementation, those operations affecting such resources will be temporarily suspended until USACE concludes Section 106 consultation with the State Historic Preservation Officer or the Tribal Historic Preservation Officer to take into account any project related impacts to those resources.

**5. COMPLIANCE WITH THE SECTION 404(b)(1) GUIDELINES:** Projects resulting in discharges of dredged or fill material into waters of the United States

must comply with the Guidelines promulgated by the Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency under Section 404(b) of the Clean Water Act (33 U.S.C. § 1344(b)). An evaluation pursuant to the Guidelines indicates the project is not dependent on location in or proximity to waters of the United States to achieve the basic project purpose. This conclusion raises the (rebuttable) presumption of the availability of a less environmentally damaging practicable alternative to the project that does not require the discharge of dredged or fill material into special aquatic sites. The applicant has submitted an analysis of project alternatives that is being reviewed by USACE.

**6. PUBLIC INTEREST EVALUTION:** The decision on whether to issue a Department of the Army Permit will be based on an evaluation of the probable impacts, including cumulative impacts, of the project and its intended use on the public interest. Evaluation of the probable impacts requires a careful weighing of the public interest factors relevant in each particular case. The benefits that may accrue from the project must be balanced against any reasonably foreseeable detriments of project implementation. The decision on permit issuance will, therefore, reflect the national concern for both protection and utilization of important resources. Public interest factors which may be relevant to the decision process include conservation, economics, aesthetics, general environmental concerns, wetlands, cultural values, fish and wildlife values, flood hazards, floodplain values, land use, navigation, shore erosion and accretion, recreation, water supply and conservation, water quality, energy needs, safety, food and fiber production, mineral needs, considerations of property ownership, and, in general, the needs and welfare of the people.

**7. CONSIDERATION OF COMMENTS:** USACE is soliciting comments from the public; Federal, State, and local agencies and officials; Native American Nations or other tribal governments; and other interested parties in order to consider and evaluate the impacts of the project. All comments received by USACE will be considered in the decision on whether to issue, modify, condition, or deny a Department of the Army Permit for the project. To make this decision, comments are used to assess impacts on endangered species, historic properties, water quality, and other environmental or public interest factors addressed in a final environmental assessment or environmental impact statement. Comments are also used to determine the need for a public hearing and to determine the overall public interest in the project.

8. **SUBMITTING COMMENTS:** During the specified comment period, interested parties may submit written comments to Daniel Breen, San Francisco District, Regulatory Division, 450 Golden Gate Avenue, 4<sup>th</sup> Floor, San Francisco, California 94102-3406; comment letters should cite the project name, applicant name, and public notice number to facilitate review by the Regulatory Permit Manager. Comments may include a request for a public hearing on the project prior to a determination on the Department of the Army permit application; such requests shall state, with particularity, the reasons for holding a public hearing. All substantive comments will be forwarded to the applicant for resolution or rebuttal. Additional project information or details on any subsequent project modifications of a minor nature may be obtained from the applicant and/or agent or by contacting the Regulatory Permit Manager by telephone or e-mail (cited in the public notice letterhead). An electronic version of this public notice may be viewed under the *Public Notices* tab on the USACE website: <http://www.spn.usace.army.mil/Missions/Regulatory>.