



REPLY TO
ATTENTION OF

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
SEATTLE DISTRICT, CORPS OF ENGINEERS
P.O. BOX 3755
SEATTLE, WASHINGTON 98124-3755

CENWS-PM-ER

**EDIZ HOOK BEACH NOURISHMENT
CLALLAM COUNTY, WASHINGTON**

**DRAFT
FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT (FONSI)**

1. Background. Ediz Hook provides storm protection to Port Angeles Harbor and its boat basin, provides a land-link to the mainland for the U.S. Coast Guard (USCG) station located on the spit's eastern end, and provides day use recreation for local residents and tourists. Erosion from wave action and the lack of new sediment feeding the spit has caused incremental bank failure along several hundred feet of shoreline at the site. The primary focus of the project is to perform routine maintenance work on the Ediz Hook Beach Erosion Control Project. Access for the project would be via the Ediz Hook Road. The work would take place on two sections of beach along the northwest, Strait of Juan de Fuca, side of the Ediz Hook spit.

The purpose of the Ediz Hook Beach Erosion Control Project is to protect the sand spit from erosion, thereby maintaining protection of Port Angeles Harbor and the small boat basin from direct wave action, and preserving access to a U.S. Coast Guard station located at the tip of the spit. Erosion has resulted from a reduction in sand, gravel, and cobble materials carried to the spit via longshore currents as compared to historic conditions. This reduction has been attributed to shoreline armoring along the toe of feeder bluffs west of Ediz Hook, and two dams on the Elwha River.

2. Proposed Action. The action area for the proposed project is comprised of the upland portions of Ediz Hook, on the northwestern side of the spit, and adjacent Strait of Juan de Fuca waters out to the -20 foot Mean Lower Low Water (MLLW) depth contour, which is where the active sediment transport zone ends.

Beach nourishment material would be placed along the face of the revetment at two stockpile locations. The nourishment material, consisting of about 50,000 tons (approximately 34,500 cubic yards) of 3- to 12- inch rounded gravel and cobble from an existing upland gravel pit, would be brought to the stockpile areas by 20-cubic yard end-dump trucks.

The trucks would dump their loads creating the top of a berm at the +12 ft MLLW contour and extending seawards approximately 25 ft. Gravity would do the work to bring the nourishment material down to the 0 ft MLLW contour, approximately 40 feet seaward from the revetment face. No grooming of the slope by mechanical means would be necessary. Approximately 10 tons (7 cubic yards) of material would be placed per linear foot of beach. The affected area of nourishment would be approximately 5200 feet (ft) in length. The waterward face of the stockpile would not be graded; instead, it would be allowed to reach a natural angle of repose, likely on the order of 1.5:1 or 2:1. However, a small bulldozer may be used to spread material laterally along the top of stockpiles to allow for dump truck access. The maximum width of the dump truck access would be 25 feet in the cross-shore direction.

Each of the two stockpiles would have a single access point, created by removal of revetment stones. These stones would be side cast landward of the revetment and would be rekeyed before equipment demobilization. The addition of revetment stones (riprap) is not planned during this maintenance cycle. A small equipment staging area would be located on an existing concrete/gravel pad adjacent to the Nippon mill.

Beach logs and pieces of driftwood, larger than 1-ft diameter and greater than 6 ft in length, found in the beach nourishment reaches would be removed from the beach prior to construction of the fill, placed landward of the work area, but seaward of the road. Upon completion of fill placement, the beach logs and driftwood would be replaced on the beach above elevation +12 ft MLLW. All other debris, including small beach logs, small pieces of driftwood, trash, and other items, would be removed and disposed offsite.

In all, approximately 6.5 acres of cobble habitat between elevations 0 ft and +12 ft MLLW, and a length of 5200 linear feet, would be directly affected by the beach nourishment and creation of the stockpiles. Once on the beach, the nourishment material is expected to disperse over the entire spit rapidly.

The construction period is expected to take place late summer to fall and would be in compliances with construction conservation windows.

1. Rock Sources. Rock sources would be existing commercial or governmental quarries.
2. Access. Access to the beach would be restricted to one site for each of the placement areas. Revetment stones removed for access would be replaced before equipment is demobilized.
3. Duration. Work is expected to take 8 weeks, which includes mobilization and demobilization as well as allowances for weather delays. At a rate of 10,000 tons of rock per week, it is expected to take a total of 5 weeks to place the 50,000 tons of rock
4. Habitat Loss Prevention and/or Mitigation. No upland or sub-tidal habitat would be lost. Approximately 6.5 acres of intertidal beach, 5200 linear ft, would be filled as a result of the project. To lessen potential project effects to sub-tidal habitat, all work would take place from land and above the MLLW line. Further,

- lessen potential impacts to threatened, endangered, and sensitive species work would take place in during the work window of July 15 to November
5. **Material Quantities.** Approximately 50,000 tons of 3 to 12 inch washed cobble would be place on 5200 linear feet of beach.

3. Conservation Measures. Construction would occur when Chinook, Hood Canal chum, and bull trout are least likely to be present in the action area. The proposed construction schedule (between mid-July to September) is outside of the USFWS in-water closure period for bull trout in Puget Sound marine waters (February 16 - July 15), and the NMFS closure period for Chinook in Puget Sound marine waters (March 1 – July 1). The work would also occur outside bald eagle wintering season (November 1 – March 1).

The placement of the nourishment materials and all rock removal and re-keying work would be timed to avoid periods when tidal waters have inundated the project site. In addition, several construction best management practices (BMPs) would be implemented:

- use of motorized equipment on the beach would be minimized, with a single access point for each stockpile area and a 50 ft work corridor waterward of the armor rocks;
- some large woody debris may be removed from the nourishment stockpile areas prior to gravel/cobble placement, but any logs would be moved to adjacent beach areas instead of off-site;
- drive trains of equipment would not operate in the water;
- biodegradable hydraulic fluids would be used for machinery at the site;
- at least one fuel spill kit with absorbent pads would be onsite at all times; and
- no equipment fueling or servicing would occur within 300 feet of the water.

If, during construction activities, the contractor observes items that might have historical or archaeological value, the contractor would stop operations and notify the Corps archaeologist. The contractor shall prevent his employees from trespassing on, removing, or otherwise damaging such resources. The Corps archaeologist will make notification to the State Historic Preservation Officer and affected tribes.

If human remains are found, the Clallam County Sheriff will be called to determine if the human remains are of recent and potentially criminal origin. Concurrently, the Corps archaeologist will notify the appropriate Indian tribe(s) for consultation about the nature and disposition of the remains, should the Sheriff's Department determine that the remains are not the result of a crime. The contractor shall redirect work to other areas or tasks until the disposition of the remains is arranged to the satisfaction of the appropriate Indian group.

4. Summary of Impacts and Compliance. This office has assessed the impacts of the proposed action on important resources, including water quality, vegetation, fish and wildlife, threatened and endangered species, cultural resources and Native American concerns, land use, utilities and public services, air quality, noise, transportation,

socioeconomics, recreation, and aesthetics. No significant adverse impacts were identified for any important resources. No impacts were identified that would require compensatory mitigation.

Unavoidable adverse effects of the proposed project include: (1) noise disturbance to wildlife and recreational users in the vicinity of operating heavy machinery; (2) mortality of sessile and mobile epibenthic invertebrates within and directly adjacent to the stockpile footprints; and (3) disruption of local and tourist traffic in the project vicinity. Given the temporary, localized, and minor nature of these effects, the Corps has determined that the proposed maintenance work is not expected to result in significant adverse environmental impacts.

In accordance with Section 7(a)(2) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended, federally funded, constructed, permitted, or licensed projects must take into consideration impacts to federally listed or proposed threatened or endangered species and their critical habitats. A Biological Evaluation and Section 7 ESA consultation will be completed prior to construction. The Corp has determined that the project **may affect but is not likely to adversely affect** marbled murrelet, green sturgeon, eulachon, rockfish, bull trout, Chinook salmon, steelhead, and Steller sea lion. The project is **may affect but would not likely adversely affect** the critical habitat of green sturgeon, eulachon, bull trout and Chinook salmon. The proposed project would have **no effect** on the critical habitat of marbled murrelet, chum salmon, and Steller sea lion. The project would have **no effect** on killer whales or leatherback sea turtles or their critical habitats. In letters dated _____ the USFWS and NMFS concurred with these findings.

The National Historic Preservation Act (16 USC 470) requires that the effects of proposed actions on sites, buildings, structures, or objects included or eligible for the National Register of Historic Places must be identified and evaluated. To comply with the National Historic Preservation Act, a historic site records search was conducted at the Washington State DOAHP and a pedestrian archaeological reconnaissance survey was conducted of the proposed project area in August 2002. Both the SHPO and the Lower Elwha Tribe were consulted. The 2002 pedestrian survey included the 2011 beach nourishment area and determined that the nourishment and placement of boulder sized revetment rocks should not disturb native sediment. The pedestrian survey did not find any evidence of prehistoric or historic-period cultural material within the proposed project area. The SHPO concurred with the Corps determination that there would be no adverse affect to NRHP eligible properties for the undertaking

Verification of Coastal Zone Consistency and a Section 401 Water Quality Certification under a Nationwide Permit 3 was submitted to the Washington Department of Ecology in May 2011. The Corps will abide by the conditions of the Water Quality Certification to ensure compliance with Washington water quality standards.

5. Public Involvement. The proposed action has been coordinated with appropriate Federal, state, and local agencies. The draft EA was made available for public review on 24 June 2011 via mailings to local libraries and posting on the public Corps website.

_____ public comments were received during the 30-day public review period; and _____ requests for an extension of the review period were received.

6. Conclusion. Based on the attached environmental documentation, coordination, and analysis conducted by the Corps environmental staff, I have determined that this proposed action with the incorporation of mitigation measures will not result in significant adverse environmental impacts. The proposed action is not a major Federal action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment and, therefore, does not require preparation of an environmental impact statement.

DRAFT

Date

ANTHONY O. WRIGHT
Colonel, Corps of Engineers
Commanding

cc:
PM-ER files (Ediz Hook FONSI)

McCASLAND/PM-ER

LEWIS/PM-ER

HICKS/OD-TS-NS

MORRIS/PM

NELSON/OC

SWANSON/PM

ACHESON/DDC

WRIGHT/DC/s