

## FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

Integrated Disposition Study and Environmental Assessment

Apoon Mouth of the Yukon River Project, Alaska

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Alaska District (Corps) has conducted an environmental analysis in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, as amended. The Final Disposition Study and Environmental Assessment (DS/EA) dated XX, for the disposition of a previously authorized project (The Apoon Mouth of the Yukon River Project) at Apoon Pass) addresses the Secretary of the Army's authority to review projects completed by the Corps in Alaska. The final recommendation is contained in the report of the Chief of Engineers, dated XX.

The Final DS/EA, incorporated herein by reference, evaluated two alternatives, the No-Action alternative and the Preferred Alternative, the recommended deauthorization of the authorized project. The Preferred Alternative is the deauthorization of the authorized project at Apoon Pass and includes:

• The rationale for the recommendation to deauthorize the Apoon Mouth of the Yukon River project.

In addition to a no-action alternative, only the deauthorization alternative was evaluated.1

For both alternatives, the potential effects were evaluated, as appropriate. A summary assessment of the potential effects of the Preferred Alternative are listed in Table 1:

1

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> 40 CFR 1505.2(b) requires a summary of the alternatives considered.



Table 1: Summary of Potential Effects of the Recommended Plan

Table 1. Summary of Potential Effects	Insignificant effects	Insignificant effects as a result of mitigation*	Resource unaffected by action
Aesthetics			$\boxtimes$
Air quality			$\boxtimes$
Aquatic resources/wetlands			
Invasive species			$\boxtimes$
Fish and wildlife habitat			$\boxtimes$
Threatened/Endangered species/critical habitat			$\boxtimes$
Historic properties			$\boxtimes$
Other cultural resources			$\boxtimes$
Floodplains			$\boxtimes$
Hazardous, toxic & radioactive waste			$\boxtimes$
Hydrology			$\boxtimes$
Land use			$\boxtimes$
Navigation			$\boxtimes$
Noise levels			$\boxtimes$
Public infrastructure			$\boxtimes$
Socio-economics			$\boxtimes$
Environmental justice			$\boxtimes$
Soils			$\boxtimes$
Tribal trust resources			$\boxtimes$
Water quality			$\boxtimes$
Climate change			$\boxtimes$

There are no adverse environmental effects or unavoidable adverse impacts associated with either the No-Action or the Preferred Alternative. Similarly, there are no recommended best management practices, avoidance and minimization measures, or compensatory mitigation requirements that would be enacted by the implementation of the Preferred Alternative.

Public review of the Draft DS/EA was completed on XX. All comments submitted during the public review period were responded to in the Final DS/EA and FONSI. A 30-day state and agency review of the Final DS/EA was completed on XX.

Pursuant to section 7 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended, the Corps determined that the Preferred Alternative would 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.



In a 02 March 2021 Memorandum for CECW-POD, the Office of Water Project Review stated it "would not require the Alaska District to acquire a Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act Report or other environmental compliance documents" [not otherwise required by law] associated with the proposal to study the deauthorization of the Apoon Mouth of the Yukon River project.

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.<sup>2</sup> 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.<sup>3</sup>

Date	Damon Delarosa
	Colonel, Corps of Engineers
	District Commander

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

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> 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.