

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

CONTINUING AUTHORITIES PROGRAM SECTION 14 EMERGENCY STREAMBANK PROTECTION FOR MORTAR CREEK QUITMAN, FAULKNER COUNTY, ARKANSAS

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Little Rock 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) **DATE**, for the Continuing Authorities Program Section 14 Emergency Streambank Protection for Mortar Creek addresses stream bank restoration opportunities and feasibility in Faulkner County, Arkansas.

The Final DPR/EA, incorporated herein by reference, evaluated various alternatives that would protect the streambank and Mortar Creek Road bridge from erosion and avoid closure of Mortar Creek Road in the study area. The recommended plan (Alternative 3) is the National Economic Development (NED) Plan and includes:

- Removal of former bridge abutments and footings on the north side of the existing bridge,
- Restore the bank to the natural channel width and hardened with a minimum of 30 inches thick of R400 riprap and placed no steeper than a 2H:1V slopes,
- Reinforce the existing four wingwalls of the bridge abutment with a minimum of 30 inches thick of R400 riprap and placed no steeper than a 2H:1V slopes.

In addition to a “no action” plan, 8 alternatives were evaluated. The alternatives included Alternative 2 – remove former abutment alone; Alternative 3 – protect bank and remove former bridge abutment; Alternative 4 – build out bank and remove former bridge abutment; Alternative 5 – Build out and protect bank and remove former bridge abutment; Alternative 6 – build out, protect bank, provide redirective structures, and remove former bridge abutment; Alternative 7 - remove former bridge abutment, protect bank upstream and provide redirective structures downstream; and Alternative 8 – relocate the bridge.

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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Air quality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Aquatic resources/wetlands	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Invasive species	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Fish and wildlife habitat	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Threatened/Endangered species/critical habitat	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Hazardous, toxic & radioactive waste	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Hydrology	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Land use	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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"/>
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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Soils	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Tribal trust resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Water quality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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) as detailed in the DPR/EA will be implemented, if appropriate, to minimize impacts. Final project designs and specifications will use measures to avoid and minimize impacts to natural and cultural resources including: utilizing the smallest footprint practicable, avoiding tree removal during the bat pupping season (May 15 – July 31) and migratory bird nesting season (April 1 - July 31) when possible; if the seasonal timing restrictions cannot be avoided then surveys for roosting bats and active nests would be completed prior to tree removal; construction Site Planning and Management such as Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plans, erosion, runoff and sediment controls, good housekeeping and materials management, and use of higher tiered heavy equipment, when practicable.

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

Public review of the draft DPR/EA and FONSI was completed on **DATE**. 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 will have no effect on federally listed species or their designated critical habitat.

Pursuant to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers determined that the recommended plan has no effect on 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 is found in Appendix B of the DPR/EA.

A water quality certification pursuant to section 401 of the Clean Water Act was obtained from the Arkansas Department of Environmental Quality. All conditions of the water quality certification shall be implemented in order to minimize adverse impacts to water quality.

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

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 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

Damon M. Knarr
Colonel, Corps of Engineers
District Commander