

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

Hamilton City Flood Damage Reduction and Ecosystem Restoration Project
Glenn County, California
PG&E Utilities Relocation and Bridge Abutment Protection

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Sacramento District (Corps) has conducted an environmental analysis in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, as amended. The Environmental Assessment (EA) dated [DATE], for the Hamilton City Flood Damage Reduction and Ecosystem Restoration Project addresses proposed design modifications to the project that was authorized for construction in Title I, Section 1001(8) of the Water Resources Development Act of 2007 (WRDA 2007) (Pub. L. No. 110-114, Title I, §1001(8), 121 Stat. 1041, 1050).

An Integrated Feasibility Report/Environmental Impact Statement/Impact Report (IFR/EIS/EIR) was finalized in July 2004, with a Record of Decision (ROD) signed by the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works in December 2006. The 2004 IFR/EIS/EIR and resultant ROD is incorporated herein by reference.

Construction of the authorized project's setback levee and floodplain restoration have already been completed for Phase 1. The setback levee has also been partially completed for Phase 2A. Design refinements for Phase 2B of the project have resulted in modifications that required additional analysis of environmental effects. These changes consist of removal of approximately 4,300 feet of an existing natural gas pipeline and installation of 4,600 feet of new pipeline, relocation and removal of approximately 5,600 feet and 9,000 feet of power line, respectively, and placement of additional erosion protection features at the Gianella Bridge east bank abutment.

For the proposed Phase 2B design refinements, in addition to a "no action" plan, potential effects were evaluated, as appropriate. A summary assessment of the potential effects of the preferred alternative are listed in Table 1.

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 EA will be implemented, if appropriate, to minimize impacts. No compensatory mitigation is required as part of the preferred alternative.

Public review of the draft EA and FONSI was completed on [DATE]. All comments submitted during the public review period were responded to in the Final EA and FONSI.

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Aquatic resources/wetlands	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Invasive species	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Fish and wildlife habitat	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Threatened/Endangered species/critical habitat	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Historic properties	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Other cultural resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Floodplains	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Hazardous, toxic & radioactive waste	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Hydrology	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Land use	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Navigation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Noise levels	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Traffic and circulation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Socio-economics	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Environmental justice	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Soils	<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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Climate change	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Utilities	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Pursuant to section 7 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended, USACE determined that the preferred alternative may affect but is not likely to adversely affect the following federally listed species or their designated critical habitat:

- Sacramento River winter-run Chinook salmon (*Oncorhynchus tshawytscha*) Endangered
- Central Valley spring-run Chinook salmon (*O. tshawytscha*) Threatened
- Central Valley steelhead (*O. mykiss*) Threatened
- Southern Distinct Population Segment (DPS) of North American green sturgeon (*Acipenser medirostris*) Threatened

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, and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation entered into a Programmatic Agreement (PA), dated 15 September 2010. All terms and conditions resulting from the agreement shall be implemented in order to minimize 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). The Clean Water Act Section 404(b)(1) Guidelines evaluation found in the 2004 EIS/EIR was updated as necessary to capture the placement of erosion protection along the Gianella Bridge abutment. A water quality certification pursuant to section 401 of the Clean Water Act will be obtained from the Central Valley Regional Water Quality Control Board prior to construction. All conditions of the water quality certification will be implemented in order to minimize adverse impacts to water quality.

Technical, environmental, and cost effectiveness criteria used in the formulation of alternative plans were those specified in the Water Resources Council's 1983 Economic and Environmental Principles and Guidelines for Water and Related Land Resources Implementation Studies. All applicable laws, executive orders, regulations, and local government plans were considered in evaluation of alternatives. Based on the EA, 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 preferred alternative would not cause significant adverse effects on the quality of the human environment; therefore, preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement is not required.

Date

James J. Handura
Colonel, U.S. Army
Commander and District Engineer