DRAFT
FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

BOSTON COASTAL STORM RISK MANAGEMENT STUDY
BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), New England District, has conducted an environmental analysis in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) (42 U.S.C. § 4321 *et seq*.), as amended. The Final Integrated Feasibility Report and Programmatic Environmental Assessment (IFR/PEA) dated **DATE OF IFR/PEA**, for the Boston Coastal Storm Risk Management (CSRM) Feasibility Study addresses flood risk reduction alignments in the City of Boston. The implementation of the **ACTION PLAN** will ensure Boston communities and critical infrastructure are protected from coastal flooding.

The Final IFR/PEA, incorporated herein by reference, evaluated three alternatives:

- **Action Plan 1:** the No Action Alternative in which no CSRM measures would be implemented.

- **Action Plan 2:** in which a full suite of CSRM measures would be implemented across all five coastal neighborhoods impacted by coastal flooding. The final array of alternatives for each neighborhood is as follows:

    - <u>East Boston</u>

        - A vertical structure around the Orient Heights MBTA Railyard;
        - A closure structure at Suffolk Downs MBTA Station;
        - An upland vertical structure behind Constitution Beach with a closure structure across the Blue Line and East Boston Greenway Connector;
        - An upland vertical barrier along the railroad right of way at the coastal edge of Chelsea Creek;
        - A shallow foundation levee landward of Wood Island Marsh;
        - A closure structure across the Blue Line and East Boston Greenway Connector in the vicinity of Wordsworth Street;
        - A tiered elevated Harborwalk between Porzio Parks and Tomahawk with a tie in at Tomahawk Drive through a grade change in the roadway to reduce inundation risk behind the park and the roadway;
        - An adaptable upland vertical wall along Lewis Street/Carlton Wharf to complement existing features; and
        - An adaptable upland vertical wall running from LoPresti Park along New Street tying where it ties-in to high ground then adaptable vertical wall running from Maverick Street along Border Street tying in to meet waterfront north of Atlantic Works, continuing to the Eagle Hill Neighborhood along the waterfront.

- Charlestown
    - A mixture of shallow foundation berms and upland vertical elements in Ryan Playground, north of the Schrafft's City Center, and tying into the existing Harborwalk alignment. The easternmost element ties into the street grid at Medford Street to the south and east of the Schrafft's City Center;
    - Non-structural floodproofing at the Boston Autoport;
    - An upland vertical solution between the ball field northwest of the condominium complex tying into an outboard perimeter solution along the south shoreline of the Little Mystic Channel to Barry Playground where it transitions to upland vertical wall that ties into high ground at Chelsea Street; and
    - A floodwall with closure structure at Chelsea and Vine Streets; **OR**
    - An extension of the outboard perimeter measure (35% upland, 65% waterside) along Little Mystic Channel east and south to encompass Massachusetts General Hospital/Spaulding Hospital and the Charlestown Navy Yard.

- Downtown
    - A shallow foundation berm at Charlestown's Paul Revere Park which crosses the park and ties into the New Charles River Dam on its north side;
    - On the south side of the dam, this alternative also includes an outboard wall around Lovejoy Place which becomes a floodwall tied in at North Washington Street Bridge;
    - An upland vertical element along Commercial Street transitioning to a speed table at the intersection of Commercial Street and Hull Street; and
    - An in-water perimeter wall beginning at Commercial Street and Battery Wharf and continuing along the water/land interface to the Fort Point Channel; **OR**
    - A hybrid alternative has a waterside perimeter ending at Sargent's Wharf at the north, continuing upland west to across Commercial Street, tying into high ground at Fleet Street.

- South Boston
    - A one-foot addition to existing walls and a closure structure from police onramp to keep water out of I-90; and
    - A storm surge barrier at the Fort Point Channel and a perimeter solution from Fan Pier around the Institute for Contemporary Art, cutting back behind Commonwealth Pier and the Boston Fish Pier to D Street. A floodwall will extend up D Street along the existing park to the intersection of D Street and Congress

Street. A road grade change speed table-like feature will be constructed at the intersection of D Street and Congress Street to elevation 14' NAVD88 to close the flood pathways in both directions. The alignment resumes as an upland vertical perimeter wall at Summer Street to the water's edge along Pappas Way. Depending on the operating regime of the storm surge barrier and height of walls, this alternative may provide coastal storm damage reduction to the Red Line of the MBTA at South Station and Broadway Station, as well as the Silver Line of the MBTA at Tufts Medical Center, Chinatown Station, South Station, Courthouse Way Station, and World Trade Center Station. The operating protocol of the surge barrier may also make it so that interior improvements along the Fort Point Channel may ultimately be incorporated to manage risk during more frequent events; **OR**

- A storm surge barrier at the Fort Point Channel and a perimeter solution from Fan Pier around the Institute for Contemporary Art, cutting back behind Commonwealth Pier and the Boston Fish Pier to D Street. At D Street, a waterside/outboard wall continues around the perimeter of the Ray Flynn Marine Park, around the terminal to Drydock #3, transitioning to in-water in front of Drydock #3 before transitioning back to upland vertical along Black Falcon Avenue to Pappas Way.

- Dorchester
  - An upland vertical wall behind Day Boulevard transitioning to a shallow foundation levee feature through the contours of Moakley Park tying into the existing stadium (Moakley Park and Northern Connector);
  - A road grade change on Conley Street at Tenean Beach tying into a shallow foundation levee feature tying into north side of the Conley Street underpass. On the West side of the MBTA salvage yard underpass of I-93, an upland vertical wall will fill the low ground between highpoints;
  - Upland vertical walls at the south side of the Beades Bridge on Morrissey Boulevard abeam the I-93 underpass;
  - A grade change or berm at the Victory Road offramp along I-93;
  - A shallow foundation levee and in-water wall along the Neponset River from the MBTA Red Line's bridge to Pope John Paul II Park.

- **Action Plan 3:** An upland vertical wall would be constructed behind Day Boulevard transitioning to a shallow foundation levee feature through the contours of Moakley Park in Dorchester, tying into the existing stadium.

The proposed action plan is **TO BE DETERMINED**.

For all alternatives, the effects, meaning changes to the human environment from the **ACTION PLAN** or alternatives that are reasonably foreseeable and have a reasonably close causal relationship to the proposed action or alternatives were evaluated as appropriate. A summary assessment of the potential effects of the proposed action is listed in Table 1:

Table 1: Summary of Potential Effects of the Proposed Actions

	Less than significant effects	Less than significant effects as a result of mitigation*	Resource unaffected by action
Natural Environment			
Wetlands/Intertidal	☐	☒	☐
Submerged Aquatic Vegetation	☒	☐	☐
Upland Vegetation	☒	☐	☐
Terrestrial Wildlife	☒	☐	☐
Plankton	☒	☐	☐
Fish and Fishery Resources (including EFH)	☐	☒	☐
Benthic Resources	☐	☒	☐
Protected Species	☒	☐	☐
Coastal Barrier Resources	☐	☐	☒
Air Quality	☒	☐	☐
Noise	☒	☐	☐
Physical Environment			
Land Use	☒	☐	☐
Geology, Landforms, Soils	☐	☐	☒
Coastal Hydraulics	☐	☐	☒
Floodplains	☐	☐	☒
Water Quality	☒	☐	☐
Hazardous Materials and Wastes	☐	☐	☒
Cultural Resources: Structures	☐	☒	☐
Cultural Resources: Archaeology	☐	☒	☐
Native American Land	☐	☐	☒
Aesthetic and Recreational Resources	☒	☐	☐
Built Environment			
Roads, Bridges, Tunnels	☒	☐	☐
Ports and Waterways	☒	☐	☐
Rail Freight/CSX/Commuter/Amtrak	☒	☐	☐
Stormwater and Wastewater Infrastructure	☒	☐	☐
Energy Infrastructure	☒	☐	☐
Communications Infrastructure	☒	☐	☐
Safety Infrastructure	☒	☐	☐
Public Spaces	☒	☐	☐
Aviation	☒	☐	☐
Schools	☒	☐	☐
Economic Environment			
Socioeconomics	☒	☐	☐

All practicable and appropriate means to avoid or minimize adverse environmental effects were analyzed and incorporated into the **ACTION PLAN**.

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

Pursuant to section 7 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (ESA), as amended, the USACE determined that the proposed action is not likely to adversely affect any listed species protected by the ESA. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) concurred with the USACE's determination on **DATE OF CONCURRENCE LETTER** and **DATE OF CONCURRENCE LETTER**, respectively (See Appendix D).

Pursuant to Section 101(a) of the Marine Mammal Protection Act of 1972, the USACE determined that the proposed action will not result in the harassment or incidental take of any marine mammals, as no work will occur below the mean high-water line or impact the marine environment. As such, a Marine Mammal Protection Act Report is not needed and consultation with the NMFS is not required.

Pursuant to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended, the USACE determined that the **ACTION PLAN** will adversely effect historic properties. A Programmatic Agreement has been developed. The Programmatic Agreement was executed among the Mass SHPO, consulting parties and concurring parties on **[DATE OF EXECUTION]**. Correspondence can be found in Appendix C.

In accordance with the 1996 amendments to the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act, the USACE prepared an Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) assessment. The USACE concluded that the **ACTION PLAN** would not result in a substantial, adverse impact to EFH. USACE initiated EFH consultation with the NMFS on **DATE**. NMFS provided their concurrence on **DATE OF CONCURRENCE LETTER**. Results of consultation with the NMFS can be found in Appendix D.

Pursuant to the Clean Water Act of 1972, as amended, the discharge of dredged or fill material associated with the **ACTION PLAN** has been evaluated and 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 D of the IFR/PEA. A water quality certification pursuant to section 401 of the Clean Water Act was obtained from the Massachusetts Department of Environmental Protection on **DATE OF CONCURRENCE LETTER** (See Appendix D). All conditions of the water quality certification shall be implemented to minimize adverse impacts to water quality.

A determination of consistency with the Connecticut Coastal Zone Management program pursuant to the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 was obtained from the Massachusetts Executive Office of Energy and Environmental Affairs on **DATE OF**

CONCURRENCE LETTER (see Appendix D). All conditions of the consistency determinations shall be implemented to minimize adverse impacts to the coastal zone.

A Clean Air Act conformity analysis was performed for the **ACTION PLAN** as the project area is within an area listed as maintenance for the carbon monoxide National Ambient Air Quality Standards criteria pollutant. Results of the conformity analysis for carbon monoxide **were below *de minimis* values**. The **ACTION PLAN** meets the requirements of Section 176(c) of the Clean Air Act.

All applicable laws, executive orders, regulations, and local government plans were considered in evaluation of alternatives. Based on this Final IFR/PEA, 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 **ACTION PLAN** would not cause significant adverse effects on the quality of the human environment; therefore, preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement is not required.

_____ _____

Date

Charles W. Comfort Jr.
Colonel, Corps of Engineers
District Commander