FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

SELMA, ALABAMA FLOOD RISK MANAGEMENT STUDY
INTEGRATED FEASIBILITY REPORT AND ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT
SELMA, DALLAS COUNTY, ALABAMA

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Mobile 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 (IFR/EA) dated **May 2021**, for the Selma, Alabama, Flood Risk Management Study addresses damages caused by flooding, opportunities, and feasibility in the City of Selma, Alabama. The final recommendation is contained in the report of the Chief of Engineers, dated **October 7, 2021**.

The final IFR/EA, incorporated herein by reference, evaluated various alternatives that would reduce flood, life safety, and residual risk as well as improve bank stabilization in the study area. The recommended plan is the least cost plan and includes:

- A soldier-pile retaining wall for bank stabilization along the Alabama River in downtown Selma and, a flood response plan for the City of Selma to address life safety risk. The principle features of the plan include:
    - An approximately 1,000 linear-foot soldier-pile wall along the Alabama River in the vicinity of downtown Selma with a top elevation of 110.0 feet (ft)-NAVD88. Components of the wall include:
        - Approximately 94 soldier piles placed vertically into pre-drilled holes and grouted in place and approximately 22,500 total square feet of reinforced precast concrete lagging panels placed in-between each pile;
        - Tie-back anchors installed at multiple levels between soldier piles and the riverbank to provide lateral support;
        - A drainage system consisting of porous gravel backfill material the wall to adequately drain during river drawdown events. Filter/geotechnical fabric to wrap the gravel backfill material to prevent seepage waters from eroding upper horizon soils;
        - A perforated header pipe extending parallel to the slope of the riverbank with laterals which outfall to the face of the lagging wall to address both seepage waters and flood waters behind the lagging wall;
        - Grouted riprap placed behind the wall at the bottom of wall to retain backfill material from escaping beneath any potential voids at the interface of the bottom of the soldier-pile wall and the riverbank; and
        - A secondary, set back, cast-in-place retaining wall structure constructed in areas along the proposed project site where determined necessary to retain soils above the top of wall elevation of 110-ft-NAVD88;

- A flood response plan to provide the City of Selma with a comprehensive document to direct actions to reduce life safety risk in the event of an incoming flood. The principle features of this document include:
  - The identification of flood prone areas though floodplain mapping of several forecasted stages based on river stage forecasts;
  - The identification of flood fighting actions to reduce impacts;
  - The appropriate level of response based on river stage forecast;
  - Evacuation routes for inhabited, flood prone areas; and
  - Identification of critical infrastructure at risk.

In addition to a "no action" plan, 10 initial alternatives were evaluated. The final array of alternatives included: Alternative 1.A Buyouts; Alternative 3 Optimized Levee Alignment; Alternative 4 Bank Stabilization; Alternative 5 Bank Stabilization and Buyouts; and Alternative 6 Optimized Levee Alignment, Bank Stabilization, and Buyouts. Though the Nonstructural Alternative (Alternative 1.A) was the least damaging to the natural environment, it was determined that the study area would be better served by a flood response plan to reduce life safety risk.

For all alternatives, the potential effects were evaluated, as appropriate. A summary assessment of the potential effects of the recommended plan are listed in Table 1:

Table 1: Summary of Potential Effects of the Recommended Plan

	Less than significant effects	Less than significant effects as a result of mitigation*	Resource unaffected by action
Hydrology	☒	☐	☐
Water Quality	☒	☐	☐
Geology and Soils	☒	☐	☐
Prime and Unique Farmlands	☒	☐	☐
Climate	☒	☐	☐
Air Quality and Greenhouse Gasses	☒	☐	☐
Hazardous, Toxic, and Radioactive Waste	☒	☐	☐
Vegetation	☒	☐	☐
Aquatic Species	☒	☐	☐
Terrestrial Species	☒	☐	☐
Threatened and Endangered Species	☒	☐	☐
Migratory Birds	☒	☐	☐
Bald and Golden Eagles	☒	☐	☐
Wetlands	☒	☐	☐
Architectural Resources	☐	☒	☐
Cultural and Archaeological Resources	☐	☒	☐
Land Use	☒	☐	☐
Noise	☒	☐	☐
Aesthetics	☒	☐	☐
Recreation	☒	☐	☐

	Less than significant effects	Less than significant effects as a result of mitigation*	Resource unaffected by action
Industry	☒	☐	☐
Demographics	☒	☐	☐
Public Safety	☒	☐	☐
Traffic and Navigation	☒	☐	☐

All practicable and appropriate means to avoid or minimize adverse environmental effects were analyzed and incorporated into the recommended plan. Best management practices (BMPs) as detailed in the final IFR/EA will be implemented, if appropriate, to minimize impacts. The USACE determined that the proposed action "may affect and is likely to adversely affect" the tulotoma snail (*Tulotoma magnifica*); however, those impacts will be minimized through adherence to the reasonable and prudent measures (RPMs) set forth within the December 21, 2020 Biological Opinion (BO). RPMs within the final BO include RPM #1 snail relocation and RPM #2 proposed action will occur as designed and with the implementation of BMPs. BMPs (e.g., erosion control blankets, fiber rolls, geotextiles, sediment traps, seeding, silt fences, vegetated buffers) will be specified in a stormwater pollution prevention plan. A copy of this plan will be provided to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). A copy of the BO, including terms and conditions of those RPMs, can be found in Appendix B of the final IFR/EA. The USACE also determined that the proposed action would have an adverse effect to architectural and cultural/archaeological resources; therefore, a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) between the USACE, Alabama State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), and Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) was executed to mitigate for adverse effects. Copies of the MOA signature pages can be found in Appendix E of the final IFR/EA. The resulting actions necessary for minimization/mitigation are included for reference.

The MOA resulted in the following actions:

- The USACE shall ensure that a data recovery plan for Archaeological Site 1DS412 is implemented prior to and in coordination with those undertaking activities that could disturb the site.
- The USACE shall ensure that a historic property treatment plan for Archaeological Site 1DS412 is implemented prior to and in coordination with those undertaking activities that could disturb the site.
- The USACE shall ensure that design and implementation methods minimize impacts, including visual impacts to the Edmund Pettus Bridge and the Water Avenue Historic District. The USACE shall ensure that design and implementation methods of the undertaking will be done in consultation with the SHPO and the National Park Service and coordination of the design and implementation shall occur prior to undertaking construction activities.

No compensatory mitigation is required as part of the recommended plan.

Public review of the draft IFR/EA and Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) was completed on October 16, 2020. All comments submitted during the public review

period were responded to in the final IFR/EA and FONSI. A 30-day state and agency review of the draft IFR/EA was completed on October 16, 2020. Comments from state and federal agency review did not result in any changes to the final IFR/EA.

Pursuant to Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended, the USFWS issued a BO, dated December 21, 2020, that determined that the recommended plan will not jeopardize the continued existence of the following federally listed species or adversely modify designated critical habitat: tulotoma snail. All terms and conditions, conservation measures, and reasonable and prudent alternatives and measures resulting from these consultations shall be implemented in order to minimize take of endangered species and avoid jeopardizing the species.

Pursuant to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended, the USACE determined that properties listed on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) may be adversely affected by the recommended plan. The USACE, Alabama SHPO, and ACHP executed a MOA, dated May 7, 2021. All terms and conditions resulting from the agreement shall be implemented in order to minimize adverse impacts to properties listed on the NRHP. Copies of the MOA signature pages are found in Appendix E of the final IFR/EA.

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 final IFR/EA.

Pursuant to Section 401 of the Clean Water Act of 1972, as amended, a Water Quality Certification (WQC) was obtained from the Alabama Department of Environmental Management. All conditions of the WQC shall be implemented in order to minimize adverse impacts to water quality. A copy of the WQC is found in Appendix B of 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 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.

DATE: March 4, 2022

CHAPMAN.JEREMY.JIGGS.1187181077 Digitally signed by CHAPMAN.JEREMY.JIGGS.1187181077 Date: 2022.03.04 08:59:33 -06'00'

Jeremy J. Chapman
Colonel, U.S. Army
District Commander