Appendix O

Clean Water Act Section 404(b)(1) Evaluation

Job No. PCA20166

APPENDIX O

FINAL
SECTION 404(B)(1) EVALUATION
FOR THE
PROPOSED CORPUS CHRISTI SHIP CHANNEL DEEPENING PROJECT

Prepared for:

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

Prepared by:

Freese and Nichols, Inc.
10431 Morado Circle, Suite 300
Austin, Texas 78759

March 2024

Table of Contents

Tables

Acronyms and Abbreviations

BU	beneficial use
CCSC	Corpus Christi Ship Channel
CSD	cutter suction dredge
cy	cubic yards
EPA	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
FEIS	Final Environmental Impact Statement
Gulf	Gulf of Mexico
LRL	laboratory reporting limit
mcy	million cubic yards
MDL	method detection limit
MLLW	mean lower low water
MSL	mean sea level
ODMDS	Ocean Dredged Material Disposal Site
PA	placement area
PCCA or Applicant	Port of Corpus Christi Authority
Port	Port of Corpus Christi
ppt	parts per thousand
USACE	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
VLCC	very large crude carriers

1.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

This appendix documents the potential short-term and long-term effects of the Port of Corpus Christi Authority (PCCA or Applicant) preferred project on the chemical, physical, and biological components of the aquatic environment in light of Subparts C through F of the Section 404(b)(1) Guidelines of the Clean Water Act.

Utilizing the detailed alternatives analysis in the Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and this factual determination analysis the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) will determine compliance or non-compliance with the Guidelines Section 230.10, Restriction on Discharge in the process of preparing the Record of Decision. This analysis is not in the EIS.

1.1 LOCATION

The Proposed Action is in the Gulf of Mexico (Gulf) and the Corpus Christi Ship Channel (CCSC). The CCSC is in Corpus Christi Bay on the south-central portion of the Texas coast, 200 miles southwest of Galveston and 150 miles north of the mouth of the Rio Grande. The coastal counties included within the study area are Aransas, Nueces, Refugio, and San Patricio. The CCSC provides deepwater access from the Gulf to the Port of Corpus Christi (Port), via Port Aransas, through Redfish Bay and Corpus Christi Bay. The waterway extends from deep water in the Gulf through the Port Aransas jettied entrance and connects to marine terminals along the Inner Harbor and La Quinta Channel. The Inner Harbor starts at Harbor Bridge and includes five turning basins. The La Quinta Channel extends from the CCSC near Ingleside, Texas, and runs parallel to the eastern shoreline of Corpus Christi Bay for 6.9 miles to the San Patricio Turning Basin. The Proposed Action will be completed within the limits of the CCSC from the Gulf to Harbor Island. The study area extends offshore from the San José, Mustang, and North Padre islands beyond the proposed CCSC extension, approximately 17 miles.

1.2 GENERAL DESCRIPTION

The CCSC is currently authorized by the USACE to project depths of –54 feet and –56 feet mean lower low water (MLLW) from Station 110+00 to Station –330+00 as part of the CCSC Improvement Project. The current authorized width of the CCSC is 600 feet inside the jetties and 700 feet in the entrance channel.

The Applicant proposes to deepen the channel from Station 110+00 to Station –72+50 to a maximum depth of –75 feet MLLW (with 2 feet of advanced maintenance and 2 feet of allowable overdredge), and from Station –72+50 to Station –330+00, the channel would be deepened to a maximum depth of –77 feet MLLW (with 2 feet of advanced maintenance and 2 feet of allowable overdredge). The Proposed Action includes a 29,000-foot extension of the CCSC from Station–330+00 to Station –620+00 to a maximum depth of –77-foot MLLW (with 2 feet of advanced maintenance and 2 feet of allowable overdredge) to reach the –80-foot MLLW bathymetric contour in the Gulf. The Proposed Action would span approximately 13.8

miles from a location near the southeast side of Harbor Island to the –80-foot MLLW bathymetric contour in the Gulf.

The Proposed Action consists of the following:

- Deepening a portion of the CCSC from the current authorization of –54 and –56 feet MLLW to final constructed deepened channel ranging from –75 to –77 feet MLLW;
- Extending the existing terminus of the authorized channel an additional 29,000 feet into the Gulf to reach the –80-foot MLLW bathymetric contour;
- Expanding the existing Inner Basin at Harbor Island as necessary to accommodate very large crude carriers (VLCC) turning.
- Straightening the northeast channel limits of the Harbor Island Transition Flare.
- Placement of new work dredged material into an existing upland dredged material placement area at Harbor Island;
- Placement of new work dredged material within the Corpus Christi New Work Ocean Dredged Material Disposal Site (ODMDS).
- Placement intended as beneficial use (BU) at:
    - Harbor Island and Port Aransas to restore eroded shorelines adjacent the CCSC;
    - Harbor Island to restore the eroded bluff and shoreline;
    - Gulf-facing shoreline of San José Island for beach restoration;
    - Gulf-facing shoreline of Mustang Island for beach restoration; and
    - Nearshore berms offshore San José and Mustang islands.

The total length of the CCSC proposed for deepening is approximately 13.8 miles. The Proposed Action would generate an estimated 46.3 million cubic yards (mcy) of new work material. The newly generated material would consist of approximately 37 percent clays (17.1 mcy) and 63 percent sand (29.2 mcy). The clay portion of the new work dredged material located in the offshore reaches (Station –620+00 to –72+50) would be placed at the Corpus Christi New Work ODMDS located approximately 2.9 miles southeast of the Aransas Pass South Jetty and adjacent to the CCSC. The clay portion of new work dredged material from Stations –72+50 to Station 110+00 may be used beneficially to create perimeter training dikes.

The new proposed depth for the applicable sections of the channel would be approximately –75 feet to –77 feet MLLW to account for underkeel clearances and includes 2 feet of advanced maintenance and 2 feet of allowable overdredge depth. The design depth was based on a detailed review of the dimensions of VLCCs expected to call at the Port's existing and proposed crude oil export terminals; the predominant density of crude oil to be exported and associated vessel draft; environmental effects due to winds, waves, and currents, such as sedimentation and erosion; required underkeel clearances, plus 2 feet of advanced maintenance; and 2 feet of allowable overdredge depth. The Proposed Action does not include widening the channel. Deepening activities will be completed within the footprint of the existing authorized CCSC channel. Minor incidental widening may be needed, to maintain side slope requirements.

1.3 AUTHORITY AND PURPOSE

The project purpose, as determined by the USACE after concurrence with the Cooperating Agencies, is to export safely, efficiently, and economically current and forecasted crude oil inventories via VLCC, a common vessel in the world fleet. Crude oil is delivered via pipeline from the Eagle Ford and Permian Basins to multiple locations at the Port. Crude Oil inventories exported at the Port have increased from 280,000 barrels per day in 2017 to 1,650,000 barrels in January 2020 with forecasts increasing to 4,500,000 barrels per day by 2030. Current facilities require vessel lightering to fully load a VLCC, which increases cost and affects safety.

To address the purpose and need, PCCA proposes to deepen portions of the CCSC beyond the current authorized project depth of –54 feet and –56 feet MLLW, from the Gulf (approximate Station –620+00) to Harbor Island (approximate Station 110+00), to allow berthing of VLCCs, which can then be fully laden, with drafts of up to 70 feet. This is a length of approximately 13.8 miles.

The purpose of the Proposed Action, as provided by the Applicant, is to construct a channel with the capability to accommodate transit of fully laden VLCCs from multiple locations on Harbor Island into the Gulf. Factors influencing the Applicant's need for the project include:

- The ability for more efficient movement of U.S. produced crude oil to meet current and forecasted demand in support of national energy security and national trade objectives,
- Enhancement of the PCCA's ability to accommodate future growth in energy production, and
- Construction of a channel project that the PCCA can readily implement to accommodate industry needs.

1.4 GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF DREDGED OR FILL MATERIAL

1.4.1 General Characteristics of Material

The sediment within the dredge template varies from very fine sand to high plasticity clays. The outer portions of the ship channel transition from a soft clay dominated Outer Channel (Station –330+00 to –620+00) to a sand dominated Approach Channel (Station –72+50 to –330+00). The interior portions of the ship channel, including the Corpus Christi Channel segment (Station 110+00 to 38+16.43), Harbor Island Junction segment (Station 38+16.43 to 20+82.07), Harbor Island Transition Flare segment (Station 20+82.07 to –20+00), and Jetties to Harbor Island Transition Flare (Station –20+00 to –72+50) are comprised of loose clay and silty sands with some clays. A summary is provided in Table 1.

Sediment grain size distributions among the project dredge material management unit subsamples for the inner channel ranged from 15.4 to 72.0 percent silt, 6.3 to 63.7 percent sand, and 1.5 to 53.5 percent clay (Terracon Consultants, Inc., 2023a). Sediment grain size distributions among the project dredge material management unit subsamples for the outer channel ranged from 1.4 to 47.2 percent silt, 9.2 to 90.3 percent sand, and 5.9 to 57.5 percent clay (Terracon Consultants, Inc., 2023b).

Table 1
Sediment Characterization for Corpus Christi Ship Channel by Segment

Segment	Description	Begin Station	End Station	Approximate Composition
1	Outer Channel	–620+00	–330+00	82.5% Soft Clay 17.5% Sand
2	Approach Channel	–330+00	–72+50	18% Soft Clay 4% Stiff Clay 78% Sand
3	Jetties to Harbor Island Transition Flare	–72+50	–20+00	1% Soft Clay 13% Stiff Clay 86% Sand
4	Harbor Island Transition Flare	–20+00	20+82.07	2% Soft Clay 28% Stiff Clay 70% Sand
5	Harbor Island Junction	20+82.07	38+16.43	<1% Soft Clay 27% Stiff Clay 72% Sand
6	CCSC	38+16.43	110+00	43.5% Stiff Clay 56.5% Sand

1.4.2 Quantity of Material

Approximately 46.3 mcy of material would need to be dredged. Table 2 provides a breakdown of material volumes by dredging location.

Table 2
Dredged Material Volumes per Channel Segment for the Proposed Action

Dredging Location	Dredged Material Quantity (cy) for Proposed Action
Outer Channel	9,617,390
Approach Channel	20,308,762
Jetties to Harbor Island Transition Flare	2,105,041
Harbor Island Transition Flare	2,851,897
Harbor Island Junction	2,951,614
Corpus Christi Ship Channel	8,448,886
Total	46,283,590

cy = cubic yards

1.5 DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED DISCHARGE

1.5.1 Location

Discharges are proposed at several placement areas (PAs) and other locations along the CCSC, San José Island, Mustang Island, and offshore at the New Work ODMDS. The inshore locations were chosen for PA levee improvements and fill, shoreline restoration or repair, beach restoration, and beach nourishment. Placement locations are outlined in Table 3.

Table 3
Placement Locations

Placement Site	Description
SS1	Restore eroded and washed-out shoreline at Harbor Island
SS2	Restore shoreline washouts along Port Aransas Nature Preserve
PA4	Reestablish eroded shoreline and land loss in front of PA4 (SS1 Extension), and upland placement within PA4
HI-E	Bluff and shoreline restoration with site fill
PA6	5-foot levee raise and fill (no environmental benefit)
SJI	Beach nourishment along San José Island
MI	Beach nourishment for Gulf side of Mustang Island
B1–B9	Nearshore berms offshore of San José Island and Mustang Island
New Work ODMDS	Place New Work ODMDS

1.5.2 Size

Total area of discharges may cover approximately 5,404 acres. Details regarding placement capacity for each BU site are included in Table 4.

Table 4
Size and Capacity Among Placement Locations

Placement Site	Placement Capacity (cy)
SS1	2,793,000
SS2	374,000
PA4	4,537,400
HI-E	1,825,000
PA6	1,796,400
SJI	2,000,000
MI	2,000,000
B1–B9	8,660,000
New Work ODMDS	38,888,600

1.5.3 Type of Site and Habitat

The sites and types of habitats that could be directly impacted are outlined in Table 5.

Table 5
Habitat Types of Placement Sites

Placement Site	Habitat Cover Type(s)
SS1	Bare Land; Estuarine Aquatic Bed; Estuarine Emergent Wetland; Grassland/Herbaceous; Open Water; Palustrine Aquatic Bed; Unconsolidated Shore
SS2	Bare Land; Deciduous Forest; Estuarine Emergent Wetland; Grassland/Herbaceous; Open Water; Palustrine Emergent Wetland; Scrub/Shrub Wetland; Scrub/Shrub; Unconsolidated Shore
PA4 (includes SS1 Extension)	Bare Land; Deciduous Forest; Estuarine Emergent Wetland; Grassland/Herbaceous; Open Water; Palustrine Emergent Wetland; Scrub/Shrub; Unconsolidated Shore
HI-E	Bare Land; Deciduous Forest; Estuarine Emergent Wetland; Grassland/Herbaceous; Open Water; Palustrine Emergent Wetland; Scrub/Shrub Wetland; Unconsolidated Shore
PA6	N/A – Existing Levee
SJI	Bare Land; Grassland/Herbaceous; Open Water; Unconsolidated Shore
MI	Bare Land; Developed Low Intensity; Estuarine Emergent Wetland; Grassland/Herbaceous; Open Water; Palustrine Emergent Wetland; Scrub/Shrub; Unconsolidated Shore
B1–B9	Open Water
New Work ODMDS	Open Water

Source: NOAA (2010).

1.5.4 Time and Duration of Discharge

The conceptual construction period is expected to occur from 2023 until 2026. Maintenance will be ongoing; estimates for the CCSC deepening include a 50-year project life. Table 6 provides a breakdown of anticipated construction start and completion dates by task.

1.5.5 Description of Disposal Method

It is anticipated that most materials would be used for PA improvements and fill, or beneficially for restoration or for beach nourishment, with the remaining materials to be placed in the Maintenance ODMDS. For placement actions targeting restoration, fill discharges may consist of thin-layer placement or confined placement, depending on the target restoration elevations. Direct placement with dredged pipeline is anticipated for larger restoration actions including beach restoration. Hopper dredge would likely be used for ODMDS discharges.

Table 6
Conceptual Construction Schedule*

Task ID	Task Description	Start Date	End Date	Duration (Days)
1	CSD via Scow to ODMDS (7,213,043 cy)	7/1/2023	9/11/2024	438
2	CSD via Pipe to ODMDS (2,404,347 cy)	9/11/2024	12/28/2024	108
3	CSD via Pipe to ODMDS (4,182,610 cy)	12/28/2024	7/4/2025	188
4	CSD via Scow to B9 (1,200,000 cy)	7/4/2025	9/7/2025	65
5	CSD via Scow to B8 (1,200,00 cy)	9/7/2025	11/11/2025	65
6	CSD via Pipe to B7 (1,200,000 cy)	11/11/2025	1/4/2026	54
7	CSD via Pipe to B1 (750,000 cy)	1/4/2026	2/7/2026	34
8	CSD via Pipe to B2 (750,000 cy)	2/7/2026	3/12/2026	34
9	CSD via Pipe to B3 (750,000 cy)	3/12/2026	4/15/2026	34
10	CSD via Pipe to B4 (750,000 cy)	4/15/2026	5/20/2026	35
11	CSD via Scow to B5 (750,000 cy)	5/20/2026	6/30/2026	41
12	CSD via Scow to B6 (750,000 cy)	6/30/2026	8/9/2026	41
13	CSD via Pipe to SJI Shore (2,000,000 cy)	7/1/2023	10/4/2023	95
	CSD via Pipe to SJI Dune (2,000,000 cy)	10/4/2023	1/2/2024	90
14	CSD via Pipe to MI (2,000,000 cy)	1/2/2024	4/1/2024	90
15	CSD via Pipe to PA4 (2,026,152 cy)	4/1/2024	7/1/2024	91
16	CSD via Pipe to PA4 (993,848 cy)	7/1/2024	8/15/2024	45
17	CSD via Pipe to SS1 (1,111,193 cy)	8/15/2024	10/4/2024	50
18	CSD via Pipe to SS1 (2,851,897 cy)	10/4/2024	2/9/2025	128
19	CSD via Pipe to SS1 (836,910 cy)	2/9/2025	3/19/2025	38
20	CSD via Pipe to M10 (2,114,704 cy)	3/19/2025	6/22/2025	95
21	CSD via Pipe to M10 (4,020,764 cy)	6/22/2025	12/20/2025	181

* This table represents a preliminary construction schedule from 08/17/2020; since this time, the PAs have changed. Assumptions also include that the timeframe assumes the use of two cutter suction dredges (CSD) during the duration of the contract. Tasks 1 to 12 will be performed by one CSD while tasks 13 to 21 will be performed by another working simultaneously, and one dredge will do the majority of the offshore portion of work with open water disposal while the second dredge will perform the majority of the inshore work with beach and upland placement area disposal.

(This page intentionally left blank.)

2.0 FACTUAL DETERMINATIONS

2.1 PHYSICAL SUBSTRATE DETERMINATIONS

2.1.1 Substrate Elevation and Slope

Marsh and restoration actions target elevations ranging from below mean sea level (MSL) to about +2 feet MSL with generally flat slopes. Beach nourishment could range from –4 to +4 feet, and slopes can range from 1:50 for subaerial portions and 1:25 for intertidal portions.

At SS2, the Proposed Action involves restoration of approximately 1,085 linear feet of an eroded shoreline by an armored berm constructed with approximately 374,000 cy of dredge material hydraulically pumped to the site. Berm elevation design is +7 feet at a 4:1 slope with a crest width of approximately 10 feet. Construction of the interior levee, via hydraulic pumping and mechanical placement, at a 10:1 slope will meet the existing sand flats and wetlands at an elevation of approximately +0.5 feet mean high water. Some portions will include an armored levee built up to +7.0 feet.

At PA4 and SS1, a levee would be constructed via hydraulic pumping. Mechanically placed stiff clay will provide incremental exterior levee raising for dredged material placed between the proposed SS1 Extension levee and the existing PA4 levee to an approximate elevation of +24 feet; other parts of PA4 include a levee up to +12 feet, with incremental fills indicated up to +24 feet.

At HI-E, exterior shoreline levee design will raise the existing elevation from +8 to +15 feet at a 4:1 slope and a crest width of 15 feet. Mechanical placement of approximately 23,400 cy of riprap to +7 feet will armor the exterior shoreline levee and provide erosion control. The exterior upland levee design is to a +3 feet over grade at a 4:1 slope.

2.1.2 Sediment Type

It is assumed that stiffer clays would be used for containment levees and sands would be used for beach nourishment and other fills targeting restoration.

2.2 WATER CIRCULATION, FLUCTUATION, AND SALINITY DETERMINATIONS

2.2.1 Water

2.2.1.1 Salinity

Modeling of short-term impacts indicates that construction of the Proposed Action could slightly decrease bay salinities, less than 1 part per thousand (ppt) on average in the Corpus Christi Bay system. Some localized changes in salinity of less than ±3 ppt in the proposed dredge area and connected navigation channels may occur. Additional long-term modeling also showed that channel deepening would not cause significant salinity change on average, but it may cause short-term changes in the range of ±3 ppt in the proposed dredge area and connected navigation channels (W.F. Baird and Associates, 2022).

2.2.1.2 Water Chemistry

Dredging and placement actions would result in short-term and localized impacts and would not be expected to degrade the long-term water quality within the project area. These patterns would return to their previous condition following completion of discharges. Temporary changes to dissolved oxygen, nutrients, and turbidity may occur due to sediment disturbance and mixing during construction.

Updated sampling, chemical analysis, and bioassessment for offshore disposal of dredged material was completed for the inner channel in January 2023 in accordance with Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act Section 103. Elutriates were generated from the four project sediment composites. Project elutriates, site water samples and water samples collected from the Reference Area and New Work ODMDS were analyzed. Metals were not detected in concentrations above the criteria maximum concentrations or Texas Surface Water Quality Standards. Pesticide analytes, total polychlorinated biphenyl, and polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons were not detected above the method detection limit (MDL) in the site water and elutriate samples tested (Terracon Consultants, Inc., 2023a).

Updated sampling, chemical analysis, and bioassessment for offshore disposal of dredge material was also completed for the outer channel in January 2023 in accordance with Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act Section 103. Elutriates were generated from the five dredge material management unit sediment composites. Project elutriates, site water samples and water samples collected from the Reference Area and New Work ODMDS were analyzed. Metals were not detected in concentrations above the criteria maximum concentrations or Texas Surface Water Quality Standards, with the single exception of copper in water sample CDP_01. Pesticide analytes were reported below the MDL in the site water and elutriate samples tested. Total polychlorinated biphenyl and polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons were not detected above the MDL in the water and elutriate samples tested (Terracon Consultants, Inc., 2023b).

2.3 SUSPENDED PARTICULATE/TURBIDITY DETERMINATION

2.3.1 Dredged/Fill Material Movement

In most instances, project actions would use a containment structure to hold materials in situ; in other instances, thin layer placement would be performed where some material movement throughout the marsh is intended. Last, any beach nourishment would result in erosion into the surf zone over time. Modeling of beach nourishment (W.F. Baird and Associates, 2022) indicated up to a 5 percent loss of sediment from Mustang Island and up to a 2 percent loss from San José Island. Negligible to no movement of nearshore berms are expected according to the modeling. However, berm siting calculations using the USACE Sediment Mobility Tool employing wave hindcasts and a combination of empirical and theoretical methods predicted between 53 percent and 81 percent of material will have onshore movement. ODMDS modeling indicated a relatively stable bathymetry following discharges, but channel sedimentation in the outer channel is 2.25 times greater when comparing the Proposed Action condition versus the No-Action condition (W.F. Baird and Associates, 2022).

2.3.2 Expected Changes in Suspended Particulates and Turbidity Levels in Vicinity of Disposal Site

There will be some temporary increase in local turbidity during dredging and placement operations. Water clarity is expected to return to normal background levels shortly after operations are completed. Turbidity increases also may occur during dewatering.

2.3.3 Physical Effects on Benthos

There would be direct impacts to benthic organisms, which would be buried or removed during construction. Excavation of sediments removes and buries benthic organisms, whereas placement of dredged material and structures smothers or buries benthic communities. Dredging and placement activities may cause ecological damage to benthic organisms due to physical disturbance, mobilization of sediments, and increasing concentrations of suspended sediments (Montagna et al., 1998). Placement, however, can also release nutrients that can enhance species diversity and population densities of benthic organisms outside the immediate dredge placement area as long as the dredged material is not contaminated (Newell et al., 1998).

Recolonization of areas impacted by dredging and dredged material placement occurs through vertical migration of buried organisms through the dredged material, immigration of organisms from the surrounding area, recruitment from the water column, and/or sediments slumping from the side of the dredged area (Bolam and Rees, 2003; Newell et al., 1998). The response and recovery of the benthic community from dredged material placement is affected by many factors, including environmental (e.g., water quality, water stratification), sediment type and frequency, and timing of disposal. Communities in these dynamic ecosystems are dominated by opportunistic species tolerant of a wide range of conditions (Bolam et al., 2010; Bolam and Rees; 2003, Newell et al., 2004; Newell et al., 1998). Although changes in community structure, species composition, and guild function may occur, these impacts would be temporary in some dredging and disposal areas (Bolam and Rees, 2003). Shallower, higher energy estuarine habitats can recover as fast as 1 to 10 months from perturbation, while deeper, more-stable habitats can take up to 8 years to recover (Bolam et al., 2010; Bolam and Rees, 2003; Newell et al., 1998; Sheridan, 1999, 2004; VanDerWal et al., 2011; Wilber et al., 2006).

2.3.3.1 Other Effects

Construction activities, particularly beach restoration and offshore sediment source dredging, may affect, but are unlikely to adversely affect, Federally-listed sea turtles. Beach restoration actions are anticipated to benefit sea turtles by increasing available nesting habitat. Beach restoration activities may also have temporary and localized disturbances to the Federally-listed Piping Plover (*Charadrius melodus*) and Rufa Red Knot (*Calidris canutus rufa*); however, long-term benefits to these species are anticipated due to beach nourishment and tidal habitat restoration.

2.3.3.2 Actions Taken to Minimize Impacts

Some of the project features were developed as a result of stakeholder coordination and placement discharges will take place on existing PAs, eroding shorelines, storm-damaged shorelines, or eroding beach. Best management practices will be in place to avoid and minimize impacts during discharge, such as use of turbidity curtains, to protect seagrass.

2.3.3.2.1 Clarity

There would be some temporary increase in local turbidity during dredging and placement operations. Water clarity is expected to return to normal background levels shortly after operations are completed.

2.3.3.2.2 Color

Water immediately surrounding the construction area would become discolored temporarily due to disturbance of the sediment during dredging and placement actions but would be expected to return to normal after operations cease.

2.3.3.2.3 Odor

Negligible amounts of hydrogen sulfide may be expected during excavation and placement activities, which would be temporary and localized.

2.3.3.2.4 Taste

It is anticipated that no drinking water sources would be impacted by the Proposed Action; no effects to taste are anticipated.

2.3.3.2.5 Dissolved Gas Levels

Negligible amounts of hydrogen sulfide may be expected. Hydrogen sulfide and other gases, like methane, are associated with high amounts of decaying organic matter, which are not expected to be present in excavated and placed materials. Offshore sediments may be very low in total organic carbon, an indicator of organic content. Dissolved gases have not been identified as a problem with maintenance material of the current channels. Temporary dissolved oxygen decreases associated with extended periods of construction and dredged material placement may also happen from aerobic decomposition from short-term increases in organic matter suspended within the water column.

2.3.3.2.6 Nutrients

Temporary changes to nutrient levels may occur due to sediment disturbance and mixing during construction. Changes in ratios of nitrogen and phosphorus may change plankton communities in the bay, particularly in areas with oysters that rely on plankton as their primary food source.

2.3.3.2.7 Eutrophication

Nutrients are not expected to reach levels high enough for periods long enough to lead to eutrophication of the surrounding waters.

2.3.3.2.8 Others as Appropriate

No other potential impacts to water quality have been identified; additional information can be found in the Final EIS (FEIS).

2.3.3.3 Current Patterns and Circulation

2.3.3.3.1 Current Patterns and Flow Velocity

Discharges associated with placement would not alter typical current patterns and flow velocities. Since some of the PAs will include levees (including some armored levees of heights up to +20 feet MLLW or more), storm surges could be altered.

Channel deepening would not result in significant impacts on currents in Corpus Christi Bay, Redfish Bay, and Nueces Bay. Modeling predicted that the Proposed Action would reduce current speeds through the deepened navigation channel. The mean current speed at Aransas Pass is reduced by about 0.213 feet per second and the maximum current speed change is a reduction up to 0.614 feet per second. The current speed increases in the CCSC from Port Aransas to Ingleside where the water depth remains unchanged. The current speed at the Inner Channel near Port Aransas increases about 0.09 to 0.19 feet per second, up to 0.36 feet per second (W.F. Baird and Associates, 2022).

Secondary long-term modeling also demonstrates no significant impact on currents in Corpus Christi Bay, Redfish Bay, and Nueces Bay. Channel deepening would reduce current speeds through the proposed dredge area and increase the current speed in the Corpus Christi Channel from Port Aransas to Port Ingleside where the water depth remains unchanged. (W.F. Baird and Associates, 2022).

2.3.3.3.2 Stratification

Relatively minor amounts of vertical salinity stratification may result from the Proposed Action.

2.3.3.3.3 Hydrologic Regime

Deepening of navigation channels can alter circulation patterns and increase the tidal range and tidal prism within bay systems (USACE, 1987). The Applicant's Preferred Alternative would result in these types of local bathymetric changes within and adjacent to the existing CCSC. These changes would be small compared to the scale of regional bathymetry.

2.3.3.4 Normal Water Level Fluctuations

Short-term hydrodynamic modeling indicates that channel deepening is unlikely to change mean water levels in the bay. However, modeling predicted that high tide would increase by less than 0.79 inches in Corpus Christi and Redfish Bay. The maximum increase of high tide occurs at Humble Basin which is about 1.57 inches. The model predicted that low tide would drop by less than 1.57 inches in Corpus Christi and Redfish Bay. The maximum drop of low tide occurs in the Inner Channel near Humble Basin which is 3.94 inches (W.F. Baird and Associates, 2022).

Short-term hydrodynamic modeling predicted tidal amplitude increases of about 11 percent in Redfish Bay, 8 percent in Corpus Christi Bay, 7 percent in Nueces Bay, and 3 percent at Rockport. The tidal amplitude at the Inner Channel near Port Aransas has the largest increase, which is about 17 percent. There is no major change in tidal amplitudes in Aransas Pass and the Outer Channel. The model predicted that the average tidal range increase is about 1.57 inches at the Inner Channel near Port Aransas, ranging from 0.12 to 0.35 inches. The average tidal range increase at Corpus Christi Bay and Redfish Bay is less than 0.79 inches, ranging from –0.04 to 1.57 inches. A noticeable impact on the tidal range is limited to the Navigation Channel from Point Mustang to the inner basin (W.F. Baird and Associates, 2022).

Additional long-term hydrodynamic modeling indicates similar impacts to mean water levels as predicted by the short-term model. The model predicted that the tidal amplitude at the Inner Channel near Port Aransas had the largest increase of about 15 percent. The increase in tidal amplitudes were found to be approximately 10 percent in Redfish Bay, 9 percent in Corpus Christi Bay, 7 percent in Nueces Bay, and 3 percent in Rockport. The model predicted that the average increase in tidal range is approximately 1.38 inches at the inner channel near Port Aransas, and the average tidal range increase at Corpus Christi Bay and Redfish Bay is less than 0.79 inches. These were consistent with the short-term model (W.F. Baird and Associates, 2022).

2.3.3.5 Salinity Gradients

Short-term salinity modeling was conducted to assess the impact of channel deepening on salinity by comparing the salinity predicted for the Proposed Action to existing conditions. The results indicate that channel deepening would increase average salinity by less than 1 ppt along the navigation channel. Channel deepening may result in small instantaneous changes in salinity (about ±3 ppt) in proposed dredge area and connected navigation channels. Channel deepening may also cause some small change in salinity (about ±3 ppt) at the outlet of Nueces Bay during high flow periods from the Nueces River (W.F. Baird and Associates, 2022).

Additional long-term salinity modeling also showed that channel deepening would not cause significant salinity change on average, but it may cause short-term changes in the range of ±3 ppt in the proposed dredge area and the connected navigation channels (W.F. Baird and Associates, 2022).

Activities associated with offshore placement and the BU of dredged material are not anticipated to impact salinity levels in the project area. Localized impacts may occur in areas where new work material is used to develop or expand bird islands in Corpus Christi Bay. These impacts would be limited to short-term changes in salinity resulting from freshwater runoff during rain events.

2.3.3.6 Actions that Will Be Taken to Minimize Impacts

Some of the project features were developed because of stakeholder coordination and placement discharges will take place on existing PAs, eroding shorelines, storm-damaged shorelines, or eroding beach. Best management practices will be in place to avoid and minimize impacts during discharge such as use of turbidity curtains to protect seagrass.

2.3.4 Effects on Chemical and Physical Properties of the Water Column

2.3.4.1 Light Penetration

The temporary and localized turbidity increases during dredging and placement actions would also have temporary and localized impacts to light penetration. Conditions are anticipated to return to normal levels of light penetration following construction.

2.3.4.2 Dissolved Oxygen

Temporary dissolved oxygen decreases associated with extended periods of construction and dredged material placement may happen from aerobic decomposition from short-term increases in organic matter suspended within the water column. Additional information can be found in Section 4.1.4 of the FEIS.

2.3.4.3 Toxic Metals and Organics

Most of the 13 metals analyzed were detected at concentrations above the laboratory reporting limit (LRL) in the samples tested. The metals detected above the LRL were each below their respective threshold effects level and (or) effects range-low, following Texas Commission on Environmental Quality regulatory standards. Pesticides and polychlorinated biphenyls were not detected above the MDLs in the 2023 samples tested. The 15 polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbon analytes tested were detected below the LRLs in the samples tested (Terracon Consultants, Inc., 2023a). Additional information can be found in Section 4.1.4 of the FEIS.

The following measured sediment chemistry parameters exceeded the threshold effects level, effects range-low or LRL:

- Pesticide analytes chlordane (technical), dieldrin, y-BHC (lindane), and toxaphene were reported with MDLs in at least one sample that exceeded the respective threshold effects level and/or effects range-low.
- Total phenol was detected above the LRL in at least one sample.
- The four semivolatile organic compound analytes (bis[2-ethylhexyl] phthalate, di-n-butyl phthalate, di-n-octyl phthalate, and total phenol) were detected above the LRLs in at least one sample.
- Bis(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate and total phenol were detected above the LRL in at least one sample.
- Di-n-butyl phthalate was detected above the LRL in at least one sample.

2.3.4.4 Pathogens

Sediments are not expected to contain or influence pathogens.

2.3.4.5 Aesthetics

Placement areas that target restoration or beach nourishment may reduce aesthetic appearance during placement, but would improve aesthetics afterward. Placement areas with levee improvement and fill may detract from aesthetics.

2.3.4.6 Others as Appropriate

No other potential impacts to water quality have been identified; additional information can be found in the FEIS.

2.3.5 Effects on Biota

Long-term effects to biota are expected to be beneficial due to restoration actions; negative effects to biota are expected to be temporary and localized.

2.3.6 Actions Taken to Minimize Impacts

Some of the project features were developed because of stakeholder coordination and placement discharges will take place on existing PAs, eroding shorelines, storm-damaged shorelines, or eroding beach. Best management practices will be in place to avoid and minimize impacts during discharge such as use of turbidity curtains to protect seagrass.

2.4 CONTAMINANT DETERMINATIONS

Although additional sediment sampling is pending, prior sampling for the –54-foot authorized depth did not indicate any concern for contaminants. A Sampling Analysis Plan for the Marine Protection, Research and Sanctuaries Act Section 103 evaluation of sediment was developed to determine if the new work material sediments proposed to be dredged are acceptable for disposal in the New Work ODMDS. Included in that plan is the biological testing of sediment, including sediment toxicity and bioaccumulation (Freese and Nichols, Inc., 2021).

Measurable impacts from chemical contaminants such as heavy metals, synthetic organic compounds, and nutrients are not expected. This conclusion is based on pre-dredging bulk analyses and toxicity and bioaccumulation assessments conducted from 1980 to 2002, that indicate no extensive or severe contamination occurs in the sediments within the CCSC, and that dredged material was suitable for offshore placement without special management conditions (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency [EPA] and USACE, 2008; USACE, 2003).

Testing specific to the Proposed Action was conducted by PCCA, and sediment sampling indicated no adverse environmental effects would be expected. The USACE has reviewed these reports and screened the proposed project through the EPA Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act Regulations at 40 CFR 225-228, and they have requested concurrence from the EPA. Based on the results of the sampling, testing, and evaluation of the sediment, the CCSC Improvement Project analysis concluded that no adverse environmental effects would be expected from dredging or placement of the sediment from the project areas in the New Work ODMDS (EPA concurrence February 2024; see Appendix B8 of the FEIS).

2.5 AQUATIC ECOSYSTEM AND ORGANISM DETERMINATIONS

2.5.1 Effects on Plankton

During construction of the Proposed Action, temporary disturbances and impacts to plankton assemblages would occur. Turbidity from total suspended solids tends to reduce light penetration and thus reduce photosynthetic activity by phytoplankton (Wilber and Clarke, 2001). Such reductions in primary productivity would be localized around the immediate area of the dredging and placement operations. This reduced productivity may be offset by an increase in nutrients released into the water column during dredging activities that can increase productivity in the area surrounding the dredging activities (Newell et al., 1998; Wilber and Clarke, 2001). In past studies of impacts of dredged material placement from turbidity and nutrient release, the effects are both localized and temporary (May 1973). Due to the capacity and natural variation in phytoplankton populations, the impacts to phytoplankton from project construction, dredging within the project area, and dredged material placement of material would be temporary.

2.5.2 Effects on Benthos

Impacts to benthos would be localized and temporary; however, benthic organisms are expected to quickly rebound following construction activities since the majority of the project is in shallower, high energy estuarine habitats (Bolam et al., 2010; Bolam and Rees, 2003; Newell et al., 1998; Sheridan, 1999, 2004; VanDerWal et al., 2011; Wilber et al., 2006). There would be direct impacts to benthic organisms, which would be buried or removed during construction of the Proposed Action. Excavation of sediments removes and buries benthic organisms, whereas placement of dredged material and structures smothers or buries benthic communities. Dredging and placement activities may cause ecological damage to benthic organisms due to ecosystem physical disturbance, mobilization of sediment contaminants making them more bio-available, and increasing concentrations of suspended sediments (Montagna et al., 1998).

2.5.3 Effects on Nekton

During construction of the Proposed Action, temporary disturbances and impacts to nekton assemblages would occur. Although there may be temporary and localized effects to nekton due to dredging and placement operations, long-term benefits may result from restoration actions.

2.5.4 Effects on Aquatic Food Web

The effects on benthic biota (such as infauna) and nekton (e.g., plankton) that form the base of the aquatic food web would be localized, temporary, and not result in substantial adverse impacts to populations. Long-term benefits to ecological functions, including trophic dynamics, may result from restoration actions that benefit biota.

2.5.5 Effects on Special Aquatic Sites

Direct impacts to Special Aquatic Sites are anticipated, but the overall action is intended to restore Special Aquatic Sites. The Port Aransas Nature Preserve should benefit from placement of sediment at proposed placement site SS2. Placement of dredged material for BU should restore two shoreline breaches and land at the Port Aransas Nature Preserve.

2.6 PROPOSED DISPOSAL SITE DETERMINATIONS

2.6.1 Mixing Zone Determination

It is assumed that there would be no discharge quality concerns and that no mixing zones would be required. The sampling and analysis results in the FEIS, Section 4.1.4.3 indicated no concerns for elutriate contaminants that would require considering mixing and dilution to meet State water quality standards.

2.6.2 Determination of Compliance with Applicable Water Quality Standards

Project actions would be performed in compliance with State and Federal regulations and would adhere to applicable water quality standards, as discussed in the previous section.

2.6.3 Potential Effects on Human Use Characteristics

2.6.3.1 Municipal and Private Water Supply

There are municipal and private water supplies located within the project area, but water quality of water supplies and drinking water would not be impacted.

2.6.3.2 Recreational and Commercial Fisheries

Although the Proposed Action is anticipated to have minor impacts on salinity, tidal amplitude, tidal velocities, freshwater retention time, and tidal prism (all of which may result in effects to recreational and commercial fisheries), some placement actions targeting restoration may result in the provision of additional habitats for recreational and commercial fisheries.

2.6.3.3 Water-related Recreation

Some placement actions targeting restoration may result in the provision of additional habitats for recreational and commercial fisheries. Bird watching opportunities may also be enhanced with some of the placement actions.

2.6.3.4 Aesthetics

Placement areas that target restoration or beach nourishment may improve aesthetics by restoring natural habitat features. Placement areas with levee improvement and fill are unlikely to detract from aesthetics given location.

2.6.3.5 Parks, National and Historic Monuments, National Seashores, Wilderness Areas, Research Sites, and Similar Preserves

No Federal lands would be affected by the Proposed Action. The Port Aransas Nature Preserve should benefit from placement of sediment at proposed placement site SS2. Placement of dredged material for BU should restore two shoreline breaches and land at the Port Aransas Nature Preserve. State-owned lands include beaches, and beach nourishment may benefit those areas on Mustang and San José islands.

2.7 DETERMINATION OF CUMULATIVE EFFECTS ON THE AQUATIC ECOSYSTEM

The Proposed Action is expected to contribute to cumulative effects on tidal amplitude. For example, with the Proposed Action, the tidal amplitude at the Inner Channel near Port Aransas may experience up to a 15 percent increase. When considering the impacts of tidal amplitude of the No-Action condition (–54 feet MLLW authorized depth) over previous condition (–48 feet MLLW authorized depth), modeling indicates that the –54 feet depth also increased the tidal amplitude over the –48 feet depth, by up to 18 percent at the Inner Channel. These modeling results indicate that the CDP would result in a direct cumulative impact to tidal range, particularly at the Inner Channel near Port Aransas where cumulative increases of tidal amplitude approach 36 percent (W.F. Baird and Associates, 2022).

The Proposed Action would result in temporary and localized increases in turbidity which can affect the aquatic ecosystem. The impacts are expected to be minor. Where past, present, or reasonably foreseeable actions may have simultaneous construction and similar impacts, there could be a chance of cumulative effects (although they would be minor, localized, and temporary). Beneficial cumulative effects may result from placement actions that target restoration in conjunction with other ecosystem restoration actions in the region.

3.0 REFERENCES

Bolam, S.G., J. Barry, M. Schratzberger, P. Whomersley, and M. Dearnaley. 2010. Macrofaunal recolonization following the intertidal placement of fine-grained dredged material. Environmental Monitoring and Assessment 168(1–4):499–510.

Bolam, S.G., and H.L. Rees. 2003. Minimizing impacts of maintenance dredged material disposal in the coastal environment: a habitat approach. Environmental Management, Vol. 32, No. 2.

Freese and Nichols, Inc. 2021. Statement of Work and Sampling Analysis Plan: MPRSA Section 103 Evaluation of Sediment from the Port of Corpus Christi Authority Channel Deepening Project, Corpus Christi, Texas. Prepared for USACE and EPA. Version 2. July.

May, E.B. 1973. Environmental effects of hydraulic dredging in estuaries. Alabama Marine Resources Bulletin 9:1–85.

Montagna, P.A., S.A. Holt, and K.H. Dunton. 1998. Characterization of Anthropogenic and Natural Disturbance on Vegetated and Unvegetated Bay Bottom Habitats in the Corpus Christi Bay National Estuary Program Study Area. Final Project Report, Corpus Christi Bay National Estuary Program, Corpus Christi, Texas.

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA). 2010. NOAA Coastal Change Analysis Program, 2010 Landcover Dataset. https://coast.noaa.gov/digitalcoast/data/.

Newell, R.C., L.J. Seiderer, and D.R. Hitchcock. 1998. The impact of dredging works in coastal waters: a review of the sensitivity to disturbance and subsequent recovery of biological resources on the sea bed. Oceanography and Marine Biology: An Annual Review 36:127–178.

———. 2004. Impacts of overboard screening on seabed and associated benthic biological community structure in relation to marine aggregate extraction. Technical Report to the Office of the Deputy Prime Minister and Mineral Industry Research Organization. Project No. SAMP.1.022. Marine Ecological Surveys Limited, St. Ives, Cornwall. 152 pp.

Sheridan, P. 1999. Temporal and spatial effects of open water dredged material disposal on habitat utilization by fishery and forage organisms in Laguna Madre, Texas. Final Report to the Laguna Madre Interagency Coordination Team, March 1999.

Terracon Consultants, Inc. 2023a. Sampling, Chemical Analysis, and Bioassessment for Offshore Disposal of Dredge Material, Port of Corpus Christi Authority Channel Deepening Project – Inner Harbor Port Aransas, Texas. Submitted to the USACE and EPA. November 6, 2023.

———. 2023b. Sampling, Chemical Analysis, and Bioassessment for Offshore Disposal of Dredge Material, Port of Corpus Christi Authority Channel Deepening Project – Outer Channel Port Aransas, Texas. Submitted to the USACE and EPA. October 23, 2023.

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE). 1987. Environmental Engineering for Deep–Draft Navigation Projects. USACE Publication Engineer Manual (EM) No. 1110–2–1202. Department of the Army, USACE, Washington, DC.

———. 2003. Corpus Christi Ship Channel, TX Channel Improvement Project volume I: final feasibility report and final environmental impact statement. USACE Galveston District, Southwestern Division. April 2003.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE). 2008. Corpus Christi Ship Channel, Texas, Site management plan for the maintenance dredging ocean dredged material disposal site under Section 102 of the Marine Protection, Research and Sanctuaries Act. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 6 and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Galveston District.

VanDerWal, D., R.M. Forster, F. Rossi, H. Hummel, T. Ysebaert, F. Roose, and P. Herman. 2011. Ecological evaluation of an experimental beneficial use scheme for dredged sediment disposal in shallow tidal water. Marine Pollution Bulletin 62(1):99–108.

W.F. Baird and Associates, Ltd. 2022. Environmental Impact Assessment for Channel Deepening, Port of Corpus Christi – Hydrodynamic and Salinity Modeling Study. Prepared for Freese and Nichols, Inc. March 17, 2022.

Wilber, D.H., and D.G. Clarke. 2001. Biological effects of suspended sediments: a review of suspended sediment impacts on fish and shellfish with relation to dredging activities in estuaries. North American Journal of Fisheries Management 21:855–875.

Wilber, D.H., D.G. Clarke, and S.I. Rees. 2006. Responses of benthic macroinvertebrates to thin-layer disposal of dredged material in Mississippi Sound, USA. Marine Pollution Bulletin doi:10.1016/ j.marpolbul.2006.08.042.