

PRELIMINARY ASSESSMENT FOR MAINTENANCE
DREDGING SEARSPORT HARBOR FEDERAL
NAVIGATION PROJECT - SEARSPORT, MAINE

APPENDIX I
CLEAN WATER ACT SECTION 404(B)(1) EVALUATION

DRAFT

This page left intentionally blank

CLEAN WATER ACT SECTION 404 (b)(1) EVALUATION
U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS,
NEW ENGLAND DISTRICT
CONCORD, MA

PROJECT: Searsport Harbor Navigation Maintenance Dredging Project, Searsport, Maine

PROJECT MANAGER: Mr. Patrick McNamara Phone: (978) 318-8673

FORM COMPLETED BY: Mr. Todd Randall Phone: (978) 318-8518

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

USACE is proposing to dredge approximately 39,100 cubic yards of mixed sand and fine-grained sediments from shoaled areas totaling seven acres within the Searsport Harbor Federal Navigation Project (FNP) (16,333 cy to required depth and 22,769 cy of 2-foot allowable overdepth) (Figure 1). These areas within the FNP will be mechanically dredged to the authorized project depth of -35 feet at mean lower low water (MLLW) plus 2 feet of allowable over depth. Unsuitable material from the FNP and the surficial layers of two confined aquatic disposal (CAD) cells (A and B) will be placed within CAD Cells A and B (Figure 1) adjacent to the FNP. The approximately 63,900 cy of suitable material from the construction of the CAD cells will be placed at the Rockland Disposal Site.

**NEW ENGLAND DISTRICT
U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS
Evaluation of Clean Water Act Section 404(b)(1) Guidelines**

PROJECT: Searsport Harbor Navigation Maintenance Dredging Project, Searsport, Maine

1. Review of Compliance (Section 230.10(a)-(d)).

- a. The discharge represents the least environmentally damaging practicable alternative and if in a special aquatic site, the activity associated with the discharge must have direct access or proximity to, or be located in the aquatic ecosystem to fulfill its basic purpose. YES NO
- b. The activity does not appear to:
1) violate applicable state water quality standards or effluent standards prohibited under Section 307 of the CWA; 2) jeopardize the existence of Federally listed threatened and endangered species or their critical habitat; and 3) violate requirements of any Federally designated marine sanctuary YES NO
- c. The activity will not cause or contribute to significant degradation of waters of the U.S. including adverse effects on human health, life stages of organisms dependent on the aquatic ecosystem, ecosystem diversity, productivity and stability, and recreational, aesthetic, and economic values YES NO
- d. Appropriate and practicable steps have been taken to minimize potential adverse impacts of the discharge on the aquatic ecosystem YES NO

2. Technical Evaluation Factors (Subparts C-F).

	<u>N/A</u>	<u>Signif-icant</u>	<u>Signif-icant*</u>			
a. Potential Impacts on Physical and Chemical Characteristics of the Aquatic Ecosystem (Subpart C).						
1) Substrate.			X			
2) Suspended particulates/turbidity.			X			
3) Water.			X			
4) Current patterns and water circulation.			X			
5) Normal water fluctuations.			X			
6) Salinity gradients.	X					
b. Potential Impacts on Biological Characteristics of the Aquatic Ecosystem (Subpart D).						
1) Threatened and endangered species.			X			
2) Fish, crustaceans, mollusks and other aquatic organisms in the food web.			X			
3) Other wildlife.			X			
c. Potential Impacts on Special Aquatic Sites (Subpart E).						
1) Sanctuaries and refuges.	X					
2) Wetlands.	X					
3) Mud flats.	X					
4) Vegetated shallows.	X					
5) Coral reefs.	X					
6) Riffle and pool complexes.	X					
d. Potential Effects on Human Use Characteristics (Subpart F)						
1) Municipal and private water supplies.	X					
2) Recreational and commercial fisheries.			X			
3) Water related recreation.			X			
4) Aesthetics.			X			
5) Parks, national and historic monuments, national seashores, wilderness areas, research sites, and similar preserves.	X					

3. Evaluation and Testing (Subpart G).

a. The following information has been considered in evaluating the biological availability of possible contaminants in dredged or fill material. (Check only those appropriate.)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) Physical characteristics..... | X |
| 2) Hydrography in relation to known or anticipated sources of contaminants..... | X |
| 3) Results from previous testing of the material or similar material in the vicinity of the project . | X |
| 4) Known, significant sources of persistent pesticides from land runoff or percolation | X |
| 5) Spill records for petroleum products or designated hazardous substances (Section 311 of CWA) | X |
| 6) Public records of significant introduction of contaminants from industries, municipalities, or other sources | X |
| 7) Known existence of substantial material deposits of substances which could be released in harmful quantities to the aquatic environment by man-induced discharge activities..... | X |
| 8) Other sources (specify) | |

List appropriate references.

Environmental Assessment for the Searsport Harbor Federal Navigation Maintenance Dredging Project, Searsport, Maine, 2026.

b. An evaluation of the appropriate information in 3a above indicates that there is reason to believe the proposed dredge or fill material is not a carrier of contaminants, or that levels of contaminants are substantively similar at extraction and disposal sites and not likely to require constraints.

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
YES	NO

4. Disposal Site Delineation (Section 230.11(f)).

a. The following factors, as appropriate, have been considered in evaluating the disposal site.

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) Depth of water at disposal site | X |
| 2) Current velocity, direction, and variability at the disposal site..... | X |
| 3) Degree of turbulence..... | X |
| 4) Water column stratification | |
| 5) Discharge vessel speed and direction..... | |
| 6) Rate of discharge..... | |
| 7) Dredged material characteristics (constituents, amount, and type of material, settling velocities) | X |
| 8) Number of discharges per unit of time | |
| 9) Other factors affecting rates and patterns of mixing (specify)..... | X |

List appropriate references:

Environmental Assessment for the Searsport Harbor Federal Navigation Maintenance Dredging Project, Searsport, Maine, 2026.

b. An evaluation of the appropriate factors in 4a above indicates that the disposal site and/or size of mixing zone is acceptable

X	
YES	NO

5. Actions To Minimize Adverse Effects (Subpart H).

All appropriate and practicable steps have been taken, through application of recommendation of Section 230.70-230.77 to ensure minimal adverse effects of the proposed discharge.

X	
YES	NO

List actions taken: See Project Description Above.

6. Factual Determination (Section 230.11).

A review of appropriate information as identified in items 2 - 5 above indicates that there is minimal potential for short or long term environmental effects of the proposed discharge as related to:

- | | |
|---|--------------|
| a. Physical substrate
(review sections 2a, 3, 4, and 5 above). | YES X NO |
| b. Water circulation, fluctuation and salinity
(review sections 2a, 3, 4, and 5). | YES X NO |
| c. Suspended particulates/turbidity
(review sections 2a, 3, 4, and 5). | YES X NO |
| d. Contaminant availability
(review sections 2a, 3, and 4). | YES X NO |
| e. Aquatic ecosystem structure, function
and organisms (review sections 2b and
c, 3, and 5) | YES X NO |
| f. Proposed disposal site
(review sections 2, 4, and 5). | YES X NO |
| g. Cumulative effects on the aquatic
ecosystem. | YES X NO |
| h. Secondary effects on the aquatic
ecosystem. | YES X NO |

7. Findings of Compliance or non-compliance.

The proposed disposal site for discharge of dredged or fill material complies with the Section 404(b) (1) guidelines.	YES X NO
---	--------------

DATE

Justin R. Pabis
Colonel, Corps of Engineers
District Engineer