

Appendix C

Finding of No Significant Impact

Pool 5 Dredged Material Management Plan

Upper Mississippi River

Wabasha and Winona Counties, Minnesota

Buffalo County, Wisconsin



**US Army Corps
of Engineers**

St. Paul District

This Page is Intentionally Left Blank

DRAFT FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

MISSISSIPPI RIVER POOL 5 DREDGED MATERIAL MANAGEMENT PLAN FEASIBILITY REPORT AND INTEGRATED ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT WABASHA AND WINONA COUNTIES, MINNESOTA; BUFFALO COUNTY, WISCONSIN

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, St. Paul District (Corps) has conducted an environmental analysis in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, as amended. The final Integrated Feasibility Report and Environmental Assessment (IFR/EA) dated 10 February 2020, for the Mississippi River Pool 5 Dredged Material Management Plan Feasibility Study addresses the long-term plan for managing material dredged in Pool 5 of the Upper Mississippi River (UMR) for the purposes of continued operation and maintenance of the 9-foot Navigation Channel sites in Pool 5.

The Final IFR/EA, incorporated herein by reference, evaluated various alternatives that would be used to manage an estimated 4,700,000 cubic yards of material over a 40 year period. The recommended plan consists of:

- Periodically placing dredged material temporarily at the three designated island placement sites (Above West Newton, Above Fisher Island, and Lost Island). Once the islands are designated as “full”, they will be offloaded at the West Newton Chute transfer site where the material will then be trucked to the Rolling Prairie permanent placement site.

In addition to a “no action” plan, several alternatives were evaluated which are detailed in Chapter 5 Formulation of Alternatives and Plan Selection. In summary, the St. Paul District evaluated the management of material dredged from the nine dredge cuts at a number of existing (historic) and potential dredged material placement sites in the vicinity of Pool 5 on the UMR. Placement sites were evaluated using factors such as cost effectiveness, environmental acceptability, and operational feasibility. Current local land uses were assessed and land owners were contacted to develop a list of sites potentially suitable for permanent placement of dredged material. Once identified, sites were evaluated based on aspects of environmental acceptability, operational feasibility and estimated costs. Finally, alternative plans were developed that would meet the study objectives. Historically, a limited amount of beneficial use of dredged material in Pool 5 has been part of management plans. The study team decided to formulate alternatives that incorporated permanent upland placement as the long-term goal for most of the material, but to include sites that could provide for some beneficial use.

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	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Air quality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Aquatic resources/wetlands	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Invasive species	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Fish and wildlife habitat	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Threatened/Endangered species	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Historic properties	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Other cultural resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Floodplains	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Hazardous, toxic & radioactive waste	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Hydrology	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Land use	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Navigation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Noise levels	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Public infrastructure	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Socio-economics	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Climate change	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

All practicable and appropriate means to avoid or minimize adverse environmental effects were analyzed and incorporated into the recommended plan. Best management practices (BMPs), such as those related to erosion control at the placement site, will be implemented, if appropriate, to minimize impacts.

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

Public review of the draft IFR/EA was completed on 18 October 2019. All comments submitted during the public comment period were responded to in the Final IFR/EA. A 30-day state and agency review of the Final IFR/EA was also completed on 18 October 2019.

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 will have no effect on federally listed species or their designated critical habitat.

Pursuant with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended (54 U.S.C. § 306108, et seq.) and its implementing regulations 36 CFR Part 800 – Protection of Historic Properties, a programmatic agreement has been executed pursuant to 36 CFR § 800.14(b)(1)(ii) and compliance with Section 106 has been satisfied.

Pursuant to the Clean Water Act of 1972, as amended, the discharge of dredged or fill material associated with the recommended plan must be compliant with section 404(b)(1) Guidelines (40 CFR 230). The recommended plan is not anticipated to result in any fill activity in a Water of the U.S., including wetlands. As a result, a 404(b)(1) and 401 water quality certification is not required. Impacts to waters or wetlands will be avoided during dredged material placement at the Rolling Prairie site to the extent practicable for the duration of the plan. If avoiding wetland fill later becomes impracticable due to capacity needs, the District will first conduct an evaluation in accordance with Section 404(b)(1) of the Clean Water Act, and compensate for wetland losses as appropriate at that time. When hydraulic dredging methods are used to place material at the Homer site or Winona Harbor Site, excess carriage water would be returned to the river. This discharge is addressed in Nationwide Permit 16, which also includes Section 401 Water Quality Certification from the MPCA.

Pursuant with the Farmland Protection Policy Act of 1981, the recommended plan will not require irreversible conversion of important farmland to nonagricultural uses when the land is converted to the Rolling Prairie site.

All applicable environmental laws have been considered and coordination with appropriate agencies and officials has been completed.

Technical, environmental, and economic 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 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.

10 FEB 2020

Date

Karl D. Jansen

KARL D. JANSEN
Colonel, Corps of Engineers
District Commander

