

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT
PORT ROYAL HARBOR DISPOSITION STUDY
BEAUFORT COUNTY, SOUTH CAROLINA

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Charleston District (USACE), has conducted an environmental analysis in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, as amended. The Port Royal Harbor Disposition Study – Integrated Report and Environmental Assessment (IR/EA) dated May 2024 evaluates the existing Port Royal Harbor Federal Navigation Project to determine whether federal interest exists to deauthorize the project. There is no associated real property for disposal.

The IR/EA, incorporated herein by reference, evaluates the “no action” and the “proposed action” alternatives. The “no action” alternative involves retaining the federal project with responsibility for any required future channel maintenance. The “proposed action” alternative involves disposition of the federal navigation project. The recommended plan, disposition of the federal project, would result in no responsibility for future project condition surveys or maintenance dredging of the federal channel to remove accumulated sediments. The alternatives are described in Section 6.0 of the report and compared in Section 6.3. *SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL EFFECTS*

Pursuant to Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended, USACE has made a determination of no effect on threatened and endangered species under the jurisdiction of United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS).

Pursuant to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended, USACE has determined that disposition of the federal project would have no effect on historic resources.

Pursuant to Section 305(b)(2) of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act, USACE has determined that disposition of the federal project would have no adverse effect on essential fish habitat.

Pursuant to the Coastal Zone Management Act, USACE has determined that disposition of the federal project would have no effect on land, water use, or natural resources of the coastal zone.

A Section 404(b)(1) evaluation is not required. Disposition of the federal project would not involve placement of dredged or fill material into waters of the U.S.

A Section 401 Water Quality Certification from the South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control is not required because there would be no discharge of effluent or materials as a result of disposition of the federal project.

A summary assessment of the potential effects of the Recommended Plan is provided below:

Summary of Potential Effects of the Recommended Plan

Environmental Resource	Insignificant Effect	Insignificant effects as a Result of Mitigation	Resource Unaffected by Action
Climate	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Geology/Topography	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Bathymetry	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Soils	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Water Quality	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Air Quality	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Noise	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Tides	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Terrestrial and Aquatic Habitats	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Vegetation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Birds	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Terrestrial Mammals	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Fish	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Marine Mammals	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Invertebrates	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Threatened and Endangered Species	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Wetlands	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Cultural Resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Essential Fish Habitat	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

FINDINGS

Technical, environmental, 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 will not have significant effects on the quality of the human environment; therefore, preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement is not required.

Date _____

Patrick G. Ripton
Major, U.S. Army
Acting Commander and District Engineer