

**FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**  
**HGNC Galveston Harbor Channel Extension**  
**Galveston, Galveston County, Texas**

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Galveston 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 Supplemental Environmental Assessment (SEA) dated (*expected later in 20204*) for the Galveston Harbor Channel Extension addresses concerns about channel inefficiency and safety at the far western end of the Galveston channel.

The SEA, incorporated herein by reference, evaluated various alternatives that would increase safety and efficiency of navigation in the study area. The recommended plan is the National Economic Development (NED) Plan and includes:

- Additional channel was incorporated into the design between stations 22+571 and 23+076.
- The additional channel would involve an additional 505 feet of channel from the existing bay bottom to a depth of -46 feet, plus four feet of advanced maintenance and one foot of allowable overdepth.
- The channel bottom width would vary between 385 feet and 738.5 feet. A cutterhead, hydraulic pipeline dredge would be used to remove all material.
- The additional channel is expected to generate approximately 143,082 cy of new work material.
- New work and maintenance material would be placed into the Pelican Island PA. Construction of the additional channel is expected to add an estimated 14 days to the total construction duration.

In addition to a “no action” plan, one alternative was evaluated. The alternative included is the proposed modified plan. This consist of adding an additional 505 feet to the 2,571 authorized plan as defined in the 2017 Galveston Harbor Channel Extension Chiefs Report. During the 2017 study there were four alternatives considered in addition to the No-Action plan. The other alternatives evaluated were the Non-Structural Alternatives, Structural Alternatives, Dredge Material Placements, and the Screening of Channel and Placement alternatives.

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 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/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 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 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 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 SEA will be implemented, if appropriate, to minimize impacts. BMPs and conservation measures included in the project design are utilizing existing accesses and channels to the greatest extent practicable, employing construction BMPs, and utilizing the smallest construction footprint possible.

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

Public review of the draft SEA and FONSI was completed on 24 February 2024. All comments submitted during the public review period were responded to in the Final SEA and FONSI. A 30-day state and agency review of the Final SEA was completed on 24 February 2024. As a result of state and agency review, the final IFR/EA was updated to include a more complete environmental justice analysis using the Climate and Economic Justice Screening Tool (CEJST) as well as incorporating new information in the effects analysis for endangered species .

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 may affect but is not likely to adversely affect the following federally listed species or their designated critical habitat: West

Indian Manatee, Green Sea turtle, Kemps Ridley Sea turtle, and Logger Head Sea turtle. The National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) concurred with the Corps' determination on (*expected later in 20204*).

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 D-4 of the SEA.

A water quality certification pursuant to section 401 of the Clean Water Act was obtained from the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ). All conditions of the water quality certification shall be implemented in order to minimize adverse impacts to water quality. Project modifications do not reach the threshold for requiring new consultation, the 2017 certification remains in effect and will be followed.

A determination of consistency with the Galveston County, Texas Coastal Zone Management program pursuant to the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 was obtained from the General Land Office (GLO). All conditions of the consistency determination shall be implemented in order to minimize adverse impacts to the coastal zone. Project modifications do not reach the threshold for requiring new consistency determination, the 2017 approval remains in effect and will be followed.

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.

---

Date

---

Rhett Blackmon  
Colonel, Corps of Engineers  
District Commander