



FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

PINELLAS COUNTY, FLORIDA COASTAL STORM RISK MANAGEMENT PROJECT TREASURE ISLAND AND LONG KEY SEGMENTS INTEGRATED FEASIBILITY REPORT AND ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT PINELLAS COUNTY, FLORIDA

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Jacksonville 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 dated **XXX**, for the Treasure Island and Long Key Segments of the Pinellas County, Florida Coastal Storm Risk Management Project addresses erosion problems and potential storm damage to infrastructure opportunities and feasibility in the Pinellas County, Florida – Treasure Island and Long Key Segments. The final recommendation is contained in the report of the Chief of Engineers, dated **DATE OF CHIEF'S REPORT**.

The Final Integrated Feasibility Report and EA, incorporated herein by reference, evaluated various alternatives that would reduce storm damages susceptibility of structures along two barrier islands fronting the Gulf of Mexico in the study area.

The study area includes the following two barrier islands:

- Treasure Island: R-126 to R-143 (3.4 miles)
- Long Key: R-144 to R-166 (4.0 miles)

The seven reaches in the study area include, from north to south:

- Sunshine Beach (Treasure Island): R126 – R129 (0.6 mile)
- Boca Ciega (Treasure Island): R129 to R137 (1.7 miles)
- Sunset Beach (Treasure Island): R137 – R143 (1.2 miles)
- Upham Beach (Long Key): R144 – R147 (0.5 mile)
- St. Pete Beach North (Long Key): R147 – R155 (1.6 miles)
- St. Pete Beach South (Long Key): R155 – R160 (0.9 mile)
- Pass-a-Grille Beach (Long Key): R160 – R166 (1.0 mile)

The recommended plan is the National Economic Development (NED) Plan and includes:

- Periodic beach nourishment, including dune and berm features, at the north and/or south ends of Treasure Island (Florida Department of Environmental Protection reference monuments R126 to R-129 and R-136 to R-143) and Long Key (R-144 to R-147 and R-160 to R-166).

The maximum dimensions include:

- A berm extension of up to 100 feet seaward from the dune toe; and



- A dune with a height of up to +10 feet NAVD88 and a width that could extend the entire equilibrated beach profile up to 20 feet seaward.
- This plan proposes to use sand from the Johns Pass, Blind Pass, and Pass-a-Grille inlet complexes, as well as from Egmont Shoal. These sources contain material compatible with the native sand within the study area and have sufficient quantity for the 50 year planning horizon. Renourishment events will occur approximately every five to seven years.

In addition to a “no action” plan, seven alternatives were evaluated.¹ The alternatives included:

- Alternative 1: Buyout of Structures and Land Acquisition (area-wide)
- Alternative 2: Jetty Improvements (Sunshine Beach, Sunset Beach, Upham Beach, Pass-a-Grille Beach)
- Alternative 3: Beach Nourishment (Sunshine Beach, Sunset Beach, Upham Beach, Pass-a-Grille Beach)
- Alternative 4: Dune Creation/Enhancement (area-wide)
- Alternative 5: Beach Nourishment with Dunes (Sunshine Beach, Sunset Beach, Upham Beach, Pass-a-Grille Beach)
- Alternative 6: Beach Nourishment with Dunes and Groins (Sunset Beach, Pass-a-Grille Beach)
- Alternative 7: Dunes with Seawalls/Floodwalls (Boca Ciega, St. Pete Beach North)

Section 3.7 of the report provides a summary of the plan formulation evaluation.

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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"/>
Hazardous, toxic & radioactive waste	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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"/>
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"/>

¹ 40 CFR 1505.2(b) requires a summary of the alternatives considered.



	Insignificant effects	Insignificant effects as a result of mitigation*	Resource unaffected by action
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Vegetation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Coastal Barrier Resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

All practical means to avoid or minimize adverse environmental effects were analyzed and incorporated into the recommended plan. Best management practices (BMPs) as detailed in the report will be implemented to minimize impacts. BMPs shall include protection measures for nearshore hardbottoms, threatened and endangered species and water quality. Section 6 of the Feasibility Report and Environmental Assessment provides a summary of BMPs or environmental commitments. No compensatory mitigation is required as part of the recommended plan.

Public review of the draft Integrated Feasibility Report and EA and FONSI was completed on **DATE DRAFT EA AND FONSI REVIEW PERIOD ENDED**. All comments submitted during the public review period were responded to in the Final Integrated Feasibility Report and EA and FONSI.

ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT

Pursuant to section 7 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) issued a biological opinion, dated 7 January 2007, and the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) Gulf Regional Biological Opinion dated November 19, 2003; Revision No 1, June 24, 2005; Revision No. 2, January 9, 2007, that determined that the recommended plan, in accordance with previously written Biological Opinions, will not jeopardize the continued existence of the following federally listed species or adversely modify designated critical habitat: nesting sea turtles, sea turtles in the water, gulf sturgeon and smalltooth sawfish.

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 **sea turtles in the water and gulf sturgeon**, and may affect but is not likely to adversely affect the: **manatees, piping plover, rufa red knot, and smalltooth sawfish**. All terms and conditions, resulting from section 7 consultation shall be implemented in order to minimize effects to these species. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) concurred with the Corps' determination on **DATE OF CONCURRENCE LETTER**

NATIONAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION ACT

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 potential to cause adverse effects on historic properties.



CLEAN WATER ACT SECTION 404(B)(1) COMPLIANCE

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 Integrated Feasibility Report and Environmental Assessment.

CLEAN WATER ACT SECTION 401 COMPLIANCE:

A water quality certification pursuant to section 401 of the Clean Water Act will be obtained from the Florida Department of Environmental Protection prior to construction. In a letter dated **DATE OF LETTER**, the State of Florida, stated that the recommended plan appears to meet the requirements of the water quality certification, pending confirmation based on information to be developed during the pre-construction engineering and design phase. All conditions of the water quality certification will be implemented in order to minimize adverse impacts to water quality.

COASTAL ZONE MANAGEMENT ACT

A determination of consistency with the State of Florida Coastal Zone Management program pursuant to the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 will be obtained from the State of Florida prior to construction. In a letter dated **DATE OF LETTER**, the State of Florida stated that the recommended plan appears to be consistent with state Coastal Zone Management plans, pending confirmation based on information to be developed during the pre-construction engineering and design phase. All conditions of the consistency determination shall be implemented in order to minimize adverse impacts to the coastal zone. The Coastal Zone Management Act evaluation is found in Appendix F of the report.

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

FINDING

Technical, environmental, economic, 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.² 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

² 40 CFR 1505.2(B) requires identification of relevant factors including any essential to national policy which were balanced in the agency decision.



effects on the quality of the human environment; therefore, preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement is not required.³

Date

Andrew D. Kelly, Jr.
Colonel, U.S. Army
District Commander

³ 40 CFR 1508.13 stated the FONSI shall include an EA or a summary of it and shall note any other environmental documents related to it. If an assessment is included, the FONSI need not repeat any of the discussion in the assessment but may incorporate by reference.