



US Army Corps  
of Engineers®  
San Francisco District

SAN FRANCISCO DISTRICT

Regulatory Division  
450 Golden Gate Ave., 4<sup>th</sup> Floor  
San Francisco, CA 94102-3406

# PUBLIC NOTICE

PROJECT: California Department of Transportation (Caltrans), District 4, Regional General Permit (RGP) for Routine Transportation Activities

PUBLIC NOTICE NUMBER: SPN-2020-00219

PUBLIC NOTICE DATE: June 8, 2020

COMMENTS DUE DATE: July 8, 2020

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 4 (POC: Christopher States, 510-286-7185, Christopher.States@dot.ca.gov), 111 Grand Avenue, Oakland, California, 94612, has applied to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), San Francisco District, for a Department of the Army Regional General Permit (RGP) for routine transportation projects required to maintain, replace, and construct road improvements, culverts, bridges, and other highway infrastructure. 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 program area would encompass 6,272 square miles and would include the entirety of the overlapping areas in which Caltrans District 4 implements projects and the USACE San Francisco District has regulatory authority. Please refer to the attached map of the program area (Figure 1). The program area includes the entireties of Marin, Napa, San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Clara, and Sonoma Counties and the western portions of Alameda, Contra Costa, and Solano Counties that drain to the San Francisco Bay watershed.

**Project Site Description:** The program area includes diverse soils, hydrology, topography, and consequently a wide range of aquatic resources. The area's climate is characterized as Mediterranean, with precipitation primarily restricted to winter months followed by warm, dry summers. This restriction of rain to winter months causes many of the area's aquatic resources to be

intermittent or ephemeral. Most of the work that would be proposed for authorization under the RGP would occur in non-wetland waters of the U.S. (e.g., rivers, creeks, and small streams) and along the margins of San Francisco Bay. Work may occasionally occur within palustrine wetlands and less commonly within tidally influenced wetlands.

**Project Description:** Caltrans is proposing routine activities organized into six general categories to be authorized under the RGP: Bridge Rehabilitation and Replacement; Drainage System Rehabilitation; Safety and Traffic Improvements; Bank Stabilizations and Slide Abatement; Stormwater, Trash, and Debris Management; and Scientific Investigations.

Bridge rehabilitation and replacement activities would be intended to prolong the use and function of bridges, typically in response to a problem that would affect public safety or the integrity of the structure if not promptly addressed. Culverts may also be replaced with small bridges when feasible. Most bridge maintenance and repair activities can be conducted without discharge of fill into waters of the U.S., but temporary discharges are sometimes required for equipment access or temporary dewatering. Caltrans anticipates seeking authorization under this RGP for 5–10 bridge rehabilitation and replacement projects annually, each with a span of up to 250 feet.

Drainage system projects would include new construction, rehabilitation, and replacement of culverts, drains, and ditches to ensure conveyance of surface waters, avoid erosion of infrastructure, and protect adjacent infrastructure and property. Culverts would either be replaced utilizing open-cut trenching methods, rehabilitated by installing a liner in the existing culvert, or

less commonly replaced using jack-and-bore construction if buried in deep fill. Culverts would either be replaced in-kind or modified to improve safety standards or fish passage. Rock slope protection (RSP) would typically be installed or replaced at the downstream ends of culverts to provide erosion protection. In a typical year, Caltrans anticipates seeking authorization under this RGP for 6–12 small maintenance projects and 3–5 large-scale drainage system rehabilitation projects, ranging from rehabilitating an outfall on a single drainage system to replacing numerous culverts along several miles of roadway.

Safety and traffic improvement projects would be intended to prolong the life of the roadway and enhance public safety. Large-scale projects in this category may include shoulder widening, installing roundabouts, or reconfiguring interchanges. Smaller projects may consist of pavement rehabilitation; guard rail, railings, barrier, and fencing installation or repair; rumble strip installation; or signage improvements. Safety and traffic improvement projects to be authorized under this RGP would be expected to result in only minor impacts to waters of the U.S., typically wetland ditches or modified stream channels. In a typical year, Caltrans anticipates seeking authorization under this RGP for 6–12 small-scale and 3–5 large-scale safety and traffic improvement projects.

Bank stabilization and slide abatement projects would be constructed to protect infrastructure and adjacent property, while also minimizing adverse impacts to aquatic resources and listed species habitat caused by erosion. These projects would typically involve the placement of RSP and/or bioengineered stabilization treatments or the construction of retaining walls or revetments. In a typical year, Caltrans expects seeking authorization under this RGP for 5–10 small to medium-size bank stabilization projects and 1–3 large projects, with the scope ranging from small embankment repairs covering a few hundred square feet to soldier pile walls spanning one to two thousand linear feet.

Stormwater, trash, and debris management activities conducted would include various best management practices (BMPs) designed to protect and improve water quality. In a typical year, Caltrans anticipates seeking authorization under this RGP for 3–5 stormwater management and trash and debris capture projects. These activities would also often be a component of other routine activities such as drainage system rehabilitation.

Lastly, scientific investigation projects may include geotechnical surveys, soil and sediment sampling, and cultural resource, biological, and hydrologic studies. Geotechnical surveys would be the most common type because they are often needed to inform the design of other transportation projects, such as bridge rehabilitations or slope stabilizations. Caltrans anticipates seeking coverage under this RGP for 1–5 scientific investigations annually.

Project authorization requests under the RGP would be submitted to USACE to review and request any additional information within 15 days. Caltrans would then be expected to provide the additional information within 15 days. Once the project authorization request has been deemed complete, USACE would aim to provide a concurrence with the terms and conditions of the RGP within 30 calendar days. It is expected that the entire project review process would typically be completed within 60 calendar days. Each year, Caltrans would submit an annual report within 90 calendar days of the conclusion of the construction season (defined as October 31), documenting impacts to waters of the U.S. authorized under the RGP throughout the year.

**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 create a more efficient, expedited review process for the permitting of routine transportation infrastructure projects.

**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 establish a streamlined review process for the permitting of routine transportation projects required to maintain, replace, and construct road improvements, culverts, bridges, and other highway infrastructure, which would have only minimal environmental impacts, while still ensuring the continued protection of environmental resources within the nine Bay Area counties in which Caltrans District 4 works and USACE San Francisco District has regulatory authority.

**Project Impacts:** There would be limits to the allowable impacts within wetlands or other waters of the

U.S. on both a project level and program level, as recommended from an analysis performed by Caltrans of similar projects completed over the past four years. Individual projects authorized under the RGP would have permanent fill impacts within waters of the U.S. of up to 0.5 acre or 500 linear feet, a permanent loss of up to 0.25 acre or 300 linear feet of waters of the U.S., and temporary fill impacts within waters of the U.S. of up to 1.5 acres or 500 linear feet. On a program basis, permitted impacts authorized under the RGP would not exceed 5.0 acres of permanent fill within waters of the U.S. or 1.0 acre of permanent loss of waters of the U.S. over the five-year duration of the permit. There is no proposed limit on the amount of temporary fill to be permitted over the five years.

For these purposes, permanent fill would be defined as fill discharges remaining in place for the foreseeable future, a permanent loss of waters of the U.S. would mean the conversion of a jurisdictional water of the U.S. to non-jurisdictional upland, and temporary fill would be fill discharge permitted to remain in place for no more than one construction season. Impacts to culverted waters are not proposed to be counted toward program or project limits to aquatic resource impacts, meaning that when a culvert is proposed to be upgraded, only impacts to open-water portions of the aquatic resource would count toward the maximum thresholds.

**Proposed Mitigation:** Caltrans would utilize standard avoidance and minimization measures (AMMs) for projects authorized under the RGP. USACE would determine on a project-specific basis whether a project would require compensatory mitigation and expects to require compensatory mitigation for all projects with permanent impacts exceeding 0.10 acre of waters of the U.S. If compensatory mitigation is required for a project, the purchase of mitigation bank credits by Caltrans would be the preferred option if the project site occurs within the service area of an existing, approved mitigation bank. Caltrans has already purchased 0.5 acre of tidal wetland credits from the San Francisco Wetland Mitigation Bank, which they have not yet applied to a project and intend to utilize as mitigation for qualified projects to be permitted under this RGP. If mitigation bank credits are not available for a project, Caltrans would implement permittee-responsible compensatory mitigation, either through on-site restoration or enhancement, if possible at the project site, or off-site mitigation opportunities within the same watershed. Parcels where permittee-responsible compensatory mitigation is implemented would be

protected in perpetuity by a USACE-approved site protection instrument. Caltrans is establishing an Advanced Mitigation Program with the intention of streamlining mitigation efforts by implementing off-site mitigation at key sites for multiple projects within the same watershed.

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 a no-action alternative and four action alternatives: a Maintenance Only alternative, Increased Covered Activities alternative, Fill Limit alternative, and Reporting Requirement alternative, apart from the applicant's preferred alternative.

The no-action alternative would not establish a new RGP for routine Caltrans transportation projects. Instead, relevant projects would continue to be permitted under USACE's existing Nationwide Permit (NWP) Program. The no-action alternative would not meet Caltrans' stated purpose of establishing a more efficient program for permitting routine projects involving maintenance, replacement, or construction of existing roads, culverts, bridges, and other highway infrastructure.

The Maintenance Only alternative would only provide an expedited review process for maintenance activities and not for any other routine transportation projects, such as the replacements of culverts with bridges. The Increased Covered Activities alternative, in contrast, would provide authorization of a greater 15 categories of transportation activities, which have been reduced in the preferred alternative to the most common routine activities to make the proposed program more consistent with USACE's minimal threshold requirement. The Fill Limit alternative would only maintain maximum fill impact thresholds for individual projects, not limits to the permanent loss of waters of the U.S. or cumulative thresholds for the expected five-year duration of the RGP. The Reporting Requirement alternative would permit only a small subset of projects with very minimal impacts that could be reported to USACE post-construction, but this protocol would not allow for a case-by-case consideration of additional review that is required by other interrelated federal laws.

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 would submit an application to the California Regional Water Quality Control Board (RWQCB) to obtain water quality certification for projects to be permitted under the RGP. No Department of the Army Permit authorization will be valid 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 either the Executive Officer, California Regional Water Quality Control Board, San Francisco Bay Region, 1515 Clay Street, Suite 1400, Oakland, California 94612, or 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 projects to be authorized under this RGP may occur in the coastal zone or may affect coastal zone resources, the applicant is hereby advised to apply for a Consistency Determination from either the San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission or the California Coastal Commission to comply with this requirement for such projects.

Coastal zone management issues should be directed to either the Executive Director, San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission, 375 Beale St., Suite 510, San Francisco, California, 94105, or the District Supervisor, California Coastal Commission, North Central Coast District Office, 45 Fremont Street, Suite 2000, San Francisco, California 94105.

**Other Local Approvals:** The applicant may also be applying for the following additional governmental authorizations for projects to be authorized under the RGP: a Bridge Permit to be issued by the U.S. Coast Guard and/or 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 either the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and/or the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) to ensure 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 would initially be responsible for determining the presence or absence of federally-listed species and designated critical habitat and the need to conduct ESA section 7 consultation.

Caltrans has made a *preliminary* determination that some but not all of the projects to be permitted under the RGP may affect federally-listed species and/or their designated critical habitat. Federally-listed species managed by the USFWS within the program area that may be affected by projects authorized under the RGP may commonly include, but are not limited to, the California red-legged frog (*Rana draytonii*), California tiger salamander (*Ambystoma californiense*), Ridgway's rail (*Rallus obsoletus*), salt marsh harvest mouse (*Reithrodontomys raviventris*), Alameda whipsnake (*Masticophis lateralis*), San Francisco garter snake (*Thamnophis sirtalis tetrataenia*), and San Joaquin kit fox (*Vulpes macrotis mutica*). Federally-listed species managed by NMFS within the program area that may be affected by projects authorized under the RGP may commonly include, but are not limited to, the Central California Coast (CCC) steelhead (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*) distinct population segment (DPS); Central California Coast (CCC) evolutionarily significant unit (ESU) of coho salmon (*Oncorhynchus kisutch*); California Coastal (CC) ESU, Sacramento River Winter-run (SRWR) ESU, and Central Valley Spring-run (CVSR) ESU of Chinook salmon (*Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*), and North American green sturgeon (*Acipenser medirostris*) southern DPS.

Caltrans would initiate project-specific ESA section 7 consultation with the USFWS and/or NMFS for projects that may affect federally-listed species and/or their designated critical habitat. If programmatic ESA consultation is applicable to a project, the programmatic consultation would be listed in the submittal to USACE and compliance with terms and conditions would be documented. An existing programmatic agreement between NMFS, Caltrans, and USACE entitled "Caltrans' Routine Maintenance and Repair Activities in Districts 1, 2, and 4, and Individual Corps Permits for These Activities," issued by NMFS on October 13, 2013, may be applicable for some of the projects to be permitted under the RGP. Caltrans is currently engaged in technical assistance with the USFWS to develop potential programmatic agreements for the federally-listed species

most commonly encountered within the geographic range of the RGP.

USACE will render a final determination on the need for ESA section 7 consultation. To complete the administrative record and the decision on whether to issue a Department of the Army Permit for a project, USACE will obtain all necessary supporting documentation from Caltrans concerning the ESA consultation process. Any required ESA consultation for a project must be concluded prior to the issuance of a Department of the Army Permit verification 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 would initially 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/or coastal pelagic species may be present at the location or general vicinity of some of the projects to be permitted under the RGP and that the critical elements of EFH may be adversely affected by project implementation. Projects 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 would initiate project-specific consultation with NMFS for projects that may affect EFH. If programmatic EFH consultation is applicable to a project, the programmatic consultation would be listed and compliance with terms and conditions would be documented. An existing programmatic agreement

between NMFS, Caltrans, and USACE entitled “Caltrans’ Routine Maintenance and Repair Activities in Districts 1, 2, and 4, and Individual Corps Permits for These Activities,” issued by NMFS on October 13, 2013, includes EFH conservation recommendations and may be applicable for some of the projects to be permitted under the RGP.

USACE will render a final determination on the need for EFH consultation. To complete the administrative record and the decision on whether to issue a Department of the Army Permit for a project, USACE will obtain all necessary supporting documentation from Caltrans concerning the EFH consultation process and compliance with EFH conservation recommendations. Any required EFH consultation for a project must be concluded prior to the issuance of a Department of the Army Permit verification 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. Projects to be permitted under the RGP are not expected to 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 would initially be responsible for determining the presence or absence of historic properties or archaeological resources and the need to conduct Section 106 consultation.

Caltrans has made a *preliminary* determination that historic or archaeological resources may be present in the permit area of some of the projects to be authorized under the RGP. Caltrans would initiate project-specific Section 106 consultation with the State Historic Preservation Officer for projects with a potential to affect historic properties. If programmatic Section 106 consultation is applicable to a project, the programmatic consultation would be listed and compliance with terms and conditions would be documented. An existing programmatic agreement for FHWA-assisted projects in California entitled “Programmatic Agreement Among the Federal Highway Administration, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, the California State Historic Preservation Officer, and the California Department of Transportation Regarding Compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act as it Pertains to the Administration of the Federal-Aid Highway Program in California (106 PA),” issued on January 1, 2004, and amended in 2014, may be applicable for some of the projects to be permitted under the RGP.

USACE will render a final determination on the need for Section 106 consultation, 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. 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 Section 106 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 the applicant 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, Suite 1111, San Francisco, California 94102-3404; 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: <https://www.spn.usace.army.mil/Missions/Regulatory>.