



US Army Corps of Engineers  
JACKSONVILLE DISTRICT

---

## FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

### SAN JUAN HARBOR NAVIGATION IMPROVEMENTS STUDY INTEGRATED FEASIBILITY REPORT AND ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT SAN JUAN, PUERTO RICO

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 (report), dated July 2018, for the San Juan Harbor Navigation Improvements Study addresses navigational efficiency improvement opportunities and feasibility in San Juan, Puerto Rico. The final recommendation is contained in the Chief's Report dated 23 August 2018.

The report, incorporated herein by reference, evaluated various alternatives that would improve navigation in the study area. The recommended plan is the National Economic Development Plan and includes:

- Widening
  - Widen Army Terminal Channel 50 feet on each side (100 feet total), from an existing width of 350 feet, to provide a total width of 450 feet.
  - Provide eastern and western flares at the intersection of the Army Terminal Channel and the Army Terminal Turning Basin.
- Deepening
  - Deepen Cut-6 of the Bar Channel to a project depth of 46 feet.
  - Deepen Anegado Channel to a project depth of 44 feet.
  - Deepen Army Terminal Channel to a project depth of 44 feet.
  - Deepen Army Terminal Turning Basin to a project depth of 44 feet.
  - Deepen the San Antonio Approach Channel, San Antonio Channel, San Antonio Channel Extension, and Cruise Ship Basin East to a project depth of 36 feet.
- Dredged Material Placement Options
  - Base Plan – Place dredged material at the existing Ocean Dredged Material Disposal Site (ODMDS).
  - Estimate includes use of a mechanical clamshell dredge in combination with a hydraulic dredge to excavate approximately 2.2 million cubic yards of material for transport to the ODMDS.
  - Beneficial use of dredged material to fill artificial depressions in Condado Lagoon to restore and enhance sea grass habitat was also evaluated.

In addition to a "no action" plan, five alternatives were evaluated. The alternatives included deepening between 41 feet to 45 feet, and a no action plan. Section 3.4 of the report provides a summary of the plan formulation evaluation.

For all alternatives, the potential effects to the following resources were evaluated:

	In-depth evaluation conducted	Brief evaluation due to minor effects	Resource unaffected by action
Aesthetics	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Air quality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Aquatic resources/nearshore habitat	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Coastal Barrier Resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Invasive species	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Fish and wildlife habitat	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Threatened/endangered species	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Historic properties	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other cultural resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Floodplains	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Hazardous, toxic & radioactive waste	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Hydrology	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Land use	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Recreation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Tribal trust resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 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 hardbottom, threatened and endangered species, and water quality. Section 6.22 of the report provides a summary of BMPs and environmental commitments. No compensatory mitigation is required.

Pursuant to section 7 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended, the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) issued a biological opinion, dated 29 May 2018, which determined the recommended plan will not jeopardize the continued existence of the following federally listed species or adversely modify designated critical habitat: leatherback, green (North Atlantic [NA] and South Atlantic [SA] distinct population segments [DPS]), hawksbill, and loggerhead (Northwest Atlantic [NWA] DPS) sea turtles; sperm, sei, blue and fin whales; elkhorn, staghorn, pillar, rough cactus, mountainous star, lobed star, and boulder star corals; scalloped hammerhead sharks (Southwest Atlantic [SWA] DPS); Nassau grouper; giant manta ray; and designated critical habitat for elkhorn and staghorn corals. All terms and conditions resulting from these consultations shall be implemented in order to minimize take of endangered species and avoid jeopardizing the species.

Pursuant to Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended, the Corps determined that the recommended plan may affect but is not likely to adversely affect the following federally listed species or their designated critical habitat: Antillean manatee. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service concurred with the Corps' determination on 21 June 2018.

Pursuant to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended, the Corps determined that historic properties would not be affected by the recommended plan. The Puerto Rico State Historic Preservation Office concurred with the determination on 18 September 2017.

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 I of the report.

A water quality certification pursuant to Section 401 of the Clean Water Act will be obtained from Puerto Rico Environmental Quality Board prior to construction. All conditions of the water quality certification will be implemented in order to minimize adverse impacts to water quality.


A determination of consistency with the Puerto Rico Coastal Management program pursuant to the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 was obtained from the Puerto Rico Planning Board. All conditions of the consistency determination shall be implemented in order to minimize adverse impacts to the coastal zone.

Public review of the draft report was completed on 22 September 2017. All comments submitted during the public comment period were responded to in the Final IFR/EA. A 30-day state and agency review of the Final IFR/EA was completed on 6 August 2018. Comments from state and federal agency review did not result in any changes to the final IFR/EA.

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. Based on these 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 significantly affect the human environment; therefore, preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement is not required.

A copy of this finding and the report will be made available to the public on the following website: <http://www.saj.usace.army.mil/About/Divisions-Offices/Planning/Environmental-Branch/Environmental-Documents/>

5 NOV 2018  
Date

  
Andrew D. Kelly, Jr.  
Colonel, Corps of Engineers  
District Commander