

CHAPTER 7: INTRODUCTION TO PROPOSED PHASE III EARLY RESTORATION PROJECTS.....	2
7.1 Overview of Proposed Phase III Early Restoration Projects .....	2
7.2 Offsets Estimation Methodologies .....	6
7.2.1 HEA and REA .....	6
7.2.2 Monetized Offsets .....	10
7.3 Performance Monitoring .....	11
7.4 Consistency with Project Evaluation Criteria.....	11
7.5 Environmental Compliance.....	12
7.5.1 Endangered Species Act (16 U.S.C. §§ 1531 et seq.) .....	12
7.5.2 Migratory Bird Treaty Act (16 U.S.C. §§ 703-712) .....	13
7.5.3 Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. §§ 1801 et seq.) .....	13
7.5.4 Marine Mammal Protection Act (16 U.S.C. §§ 1361-1421h) .....	13
7.5.5 Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act (16 U.S.C. § 668-668c) .....	14
7.5.6 Coastal Zone Management Act (16 U.S.C. §§ 1451-1456).....	14
7.5.7 Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. §7401 et seq.) .....	15
7.5.8 Federal Water Pollution Control Act (Clean Water Act, 33 U.S.C. §§ 1251 et seq.) and/or Rivers and Harbors Act (33 U.S.C. §§ 401 et seq.) .....	15
7.5.9 National Historic Preservation Act (16 U.S.C. §§ 470 et seq.) .....	16
7.5.10 Executive Order 13112: Invasive Species .....	16
7.6 Overview of Proposed Phase III Early Restoration Projects .....	16
7.6.1 Texas .....	16
7.6.2 Louisiana .....	17
7.6.3 Mississippi.....	18
7.6.4 Alabama .....	19
7.6.5 Florida .....	20
7.7 Organization and Content of Proposed Phase III Project Chapters .....	27
7.8 Intent to Adopt Existing NEPA Analyses .....	28
7.8.1 Louisiana .....	28
7.8.2 Mississippi.....	28
7.9 References .....	30

## **CHAPTER 7: INTRODUCTION TO PROPOSED PHASE III EARLY RESTORATION PROJECTS**

This chapter provides introductory, overview information about the Phase III Early Restoration projects that are proposed for implementation by the Trustees. The Trustees anticipate that additional projects will be proposed and approved as the Early Restoration process continues. As noted throughout this document, Early Restoration actions are not intended to provide the full extent of restoration needed to make the environment and the public whole for the injuries to natural resources caused by the Spill. Furthermore, after injury assessment activities are complete, there will be additional opportunities for consideration of restoration projects as the NRDA claim development and restoration planning processes move forward. Throughout the restoration process public input and comment will be considered.

To facilitate the public's review and evaluation of the proposed Phase III projects, the remainder of this chapter provides:

- A summary of proposed Phase III projects;
- A general description of the methodologies used to estimate Offsets for the projects;
- A general description of the Trustees' approach to environmental compliance; and
- A brief overview of each proposed project.

Detailed information about each project, as well as project-specific information on affected environments and evaluations of environmental consequences, is provided in Chapters 8-12. Each chapter covers the projects proposed for implementation within each individual Gulf Coast state, including those on federally managed lands within those states.

### **7.1 Overview of Proposed Phase III Early Restoration Projects**

Table 7-1 lists the 44 proposed Phase III projects, identifies the state in which each is located or proximate, and relates each project back to the project type(s) and programmatic alternatives described in Chapter 5.

The Trustees are proposing a set of Phase III Early Restoration projects totaling approximately \$627 million in estimated projects' costs (including contingencies). These projects are being evaluated in this document to permit the Trustees to expeditiously implement any selected projects, and to avoid the delay in implementing any selected projects that would be incurred by evaluating these projects under individual NRDA restoration plans and their supporting individual NEPA analyses. Ecological projects comprise \$396.9 million (63%) of this total, and recreational projects comprise the remaining \$230 million (37%). Within the ecological project category, barrier island restoration accounts for \$318.4 million of estimated project costs, followed by restoration of living shorelines (\$66.6 million), oysters (\$8.6 million), Seagrasses (\$2.7 million) and dune projects (\$0.6 million). Overview information concerning all of the proposed projects is presented in Chapter 7. More detailed project information and environmental analyses for proposed Phase III Early Restoration projects are included in Chapters 8-12 of this document.

In both tables, the proposed projects are organized by state, from west to east within the Gulf. Note that the ultimate decision to select (or not) each individual project for implementation is subject to a consensus decision by all Trustees. Except as otherwise noted in Chapters 8-12, State Trustees will be the lead for project implementation and management of projects located in their states. For example, two of the proposed projects would be implemented on federally managed lands within the boundaries of Florida, and for organizational purposes are included with the Florida projects.

**Table 7-1. Proposed Phase III Early Restoration Projects: Relationship to Programmatic Alternatives.**

	PROPOSED PROJECT	LOCATION	ALTERNATIVE 4											
			ALTERNATIVE 2									ALTERNATIVE 3		
			CREATE AND IMPROVE WETLANDS	PROTECT SHORELINES AND REDUCE EROSION	RESTORE BARRIER ISLANDS AND BEACHES	RESTORE AND PROTECT SUBMERGED AQUATIC VEGETATION	CONSERVE HABITAT	RESTORE OYSTERS	RESTORE AND PROTECT FINFISH	RESTORE AND PROTECT BIRDS	RESTORE AND PROTECT SEA TURTLES	ENHANCE PUBLIC ACCESS TO NATURAL RESOURCES FOR RECREATIONAL USE	ENHANCE RECREATIONAL EXPERIENCES	PROMOTE ENVIRONMENTAL AND CULTURAL STEWARDSHIP, EDUCATION, AND OUTREACH
1	Freeport Artificial Reef Project	TX											X	
2	Matagorda Artificial Reef Project	TX											X	
3	Mid/upper Texas Coast Artificial Reef Ship Reef Project <sup>1</sup>	TX											X	
4	Sea Rim State Park Improvements	TX										X	X	
5	Galveston Island State Park Beach Redevelopment	TX										X	X	
6	Louisiana Outer Coast Restoration	LA <sup>2</sup>			X									
7	Louisiana Marine Fisheries Enhancement, Research, and Science Center	LA											X	X
8	Mississippi Hancock County Marsh Living Shoreline Project	MS	X	X										
9	Restoration Initiatives at the INFINITY Science Center	MS										X	X	X
10	Popp's Ferry Causeway Park	MS										X	X	X
11	Pascagoula Beach Front Promenade	MS										X	X	
12	Alabama Swift Tract Living Shoreline	AL		X										
13	Gulf State Park Enhancement Project	AL										X	X	X
14	Alabama Oyster Cultch Restoration	AL						X						
15	Beach Enhancement	FL <sup>3</sup>											X	

	PROPOSED PROJECT	LOCATION	ALTERNATIVE 4												
			ALTERNATIVE 2									ALTERNATIVE 3			
			CREATE AND IMPROVE WETLANDS	PROTECT SHORELINES AND REDUCE EROSION	RESTORE BARRIER ISLANDS AND BEACHES	RESTORE AND PROTECT SUBMERGED AQUATIC VEGETATION	CONSERVE HABITAT	RESTORE OYSTERS	RESTORE AND PROTECT FINFISH	RESTORE AND PROTECT BIRDS	RESTORE AND PROTECT SEA TURTLES	ENHANCE PUBLIC ACCESS TO NATURAL RESOURCES FOR RECREATIONAL USE	ENHANCE RECREATIONAL EXPERIENCES	PROMOTE ENVIRONMENTAL AND CULTURAL STEWARDSHIP, EDUCATION, AND OUTREACH	
	Project at Gulf Islands National Seashore														
16	Gulf Islands National Seashore Ferry Project	FL <sup>3</sup>											X		
17	Florida Cat Point Living Shoreline Project	FL	X	X											
18	Florida Pensacola Bay Living Shoreline Project	FL	X	X											
19	Florida Seagrass Recovery Project	FL				X									
20	Perdido Key State Park Beach Boardwalk Improvements	FL											X	X	
21	Big Lagoon State Park Boat Ramp Improvement	FL											X	X	
22	Bob Sikes Pier Parking and Trail Restoration	FL											X	X	
23	Florida Artificial Reefs	FL											X	X	
24	Florida Fish Hatchery	FL											X	X	
25	Scallop Enhancement for Increased Recreational Fishing Opportunity in the Florida Panhandle	FL											X	X	
26	Shell Point Beach Nourishment	FL												X	
27	Perdido Key Dune Restoration Project	FL			X										
28	Florida Oyster Cultch Placement Project	FL							X						
29	Strategically Provided Boat Access Along Florida's Gulf Coast	FL											X	X	
30	Walton County Boardwalks and Dune Crossovers	FL											X	X	
31	Gulf County Recreation Projects	FL											X	X	
32	Bald Point State Park Recreation Areas	FL											X	X	
33	Enhancements of Franklin County Parks and Boat Ramps	FL											X	X	X
34	Apalachicola River Wildlife and Environmental Area Fishing and Wildlife Viewing Access Improvements	FL											X	X	

	PROPOSED PROJECT	LOCATION	ALTERNATIVE 4											
			ALTERNATIVE 2							ALTERNATIVE 3				
			CREATE AND IMPROVE WETLANDS	PROTECT SHORELINES AND REDUCE EROSION	RESTORE BARRIER ISLANDS AND BEACHES	RESTORE AND PROTECT SUBMERGED AQUATIC VEGETATION	CONSERVE HABITAT	RESTORE OYSTERS	RESTORE AND PROTECT FINFISH	RESTORE AND PROTECT BIRDS	RESTORE AND PROTECT SEA TURTLES	ENHANCE PUBLIC ACCESS TO NATURAL RESOURCES FOR RECREATIONAL USE	ENHANCE RECREATIONAL EXPERIENCES	PROMOTE ENVIRONMENTAL AND CULTURAL STEWARDSHIP, EDUCATION, AND OUTREACH
35	Navarre Beach Park Gulfside Walkover Complex	FL										X	X	
36	Navarre Beach Park Coastal Access	FL										X	X	
37	Gulf Breeze Wayside Park Boat Ramp	FL										X	X	
38	Developing Enhanced Recreational Opportunities at the Escribano Point Portion of the Yellow River Wildlife Management Area	FL										X	X	X
39	Norriego Point Restoration and Recreation Project	FL										X	X	X
40	Deer Lake State Park Development	FL										X	X	
41	City of Parker – Oak Shore Drive Pier	FL										X	X	
42	Panama City Marina Fishing Pier, Boat Ramp and Staging Docks	FL										X	X	
43	Wakulla Marshes Sands Park Improvements	FL										X	X	
44	Northwest Florida Estuarine Habitat Restoration, Protection and Education – Fort Walton Beach	FL										X	X	X

<sup>1</sup> As described in more detail in Chapter 8, the Trustees include an alternative (the Corpus Artificial Reef Project) to the Mid/upper Texas Coast Artificial Reef Ship Reef Project, to be implemented in the event the Ship Reef Project becomes technically infeasible (e.g., an appropriate ship cannot be acquired with available funding). The Corpus Artificial Reef Project 'Alternative' has its own project description, description of Affected Environment and analysis of environmental consequences in Chapter 8; is categorized within the same Programmatic Alternative as the Ship Reef Project; and would provide similar Offsets.

<sup>2</sup> One component of this proposed project would be implemented on federally-managed lands and managed by DOI.

<sup>3</sup> These proposed projects would be implemented on federally-managed lands and managed by DOI.

## 7.2 Offsets Estimation Methodologies

The Trustees used three primary methods to estimate Offsets for Early Restoration projects: Habitat Equivalency Analysis (“HEA”), Resource Equivalency Analysis (“REA”), and monetized estimates of project benefits. A general overview of each of these methods is provided below. Table 7-2 provides the estimated cost (including contingencies) of each project and information about the type(s) of Offsets negotiated with BP for each project. More detailed information about estimated Offsets for each proposed project can be found in Chapters 8-12 of this document.

The methods used to estimate Offsets for Early Restoration projects were implemented pursuant to the Framework Agreement and are based on the expected benefits for each project. In the context of Early Restoration under the Framework Agreement, the Trustees used the best information and methodologies available to judge the adequacy of proposed Early Restoration actions relative to OPA regulatory evaluation standards (see 15 C.F.R. § 990.54(a)) while determining that the agreements reached with BP under the Framework Agreement were also fair, reasonable, and in the public interest. It is important to note that, under the Framework Agreement, neither the amount of the Offsets nor the methods of estimation used in analyzing any project may be used as precedent for assessing the gains provided by any other projects either during the Early Restoration process or in the assessment of total injury.

When the Trustees’ NRD claim is resolved, the NRD Offsets will be credited against BP’s NRD liability as provided in the project stipulations and the Framework Agreement.

### 7.2.1 HEA and REA

HEA and REA are methods commonly used in natural resource damage assessments. HEA is used to quantify changes in ecological services on a habitat basis (e.g., acres of marsh habitat) whereas REA is used to quantify changes in ecological services<sup>1</sup> in resource specific units (e.g., birds, oysters, etc.). When HEA or REA is used to estimate restoration credits, anticipated ecological benefits resulting from the proposed activity often are expressed in units that reflect the present (current) value over a project’s lifespan. For purposes of the proposed Early Restoration projects included in this document, the Trustees expressed HEA-estimated habitat benefits as “discounted service acre years” (“DSAYs”) of the specific habitat types to be restored.<sup>2</sup> For example, the Trustees estimated the present value of Offsets associated with a proposed Early Restoration project focused on primary dune restoration in terms of “primary dune DSAYs”.

---

<sup>1</sup> As stated in Chapter 1, examples of ecological services include biological diversity, nutrient cycling, food production for other species, habitat provision, and other services that natural resources provide for each other.

<sup>2</sup> <sup>1</sup> “DSAY” = the discounted (to a specified base year) services provided by one acre of habitat for one year.

**Table 7-2. Proposed Phase III Early Restoration Projects: Estimated Costs and Offsets.**

	PROJECT	LOCATION	COST	OFFSET <sup>1</sup>								
				BACK BARRIER MARSH HABITAT	SALT MARSH HABITAT	BEACH/DUNE HABITAT	SUBMERGED AQUATIC VEGETATION HABITAT	OYSTER SECONDARY PRODUCTIVITY	BENTHIC SECONDARY PRODUCTIVITY	PELICAN, TERN/SKIMMER AND GULL FLEDGLINGS	RECREATIONAL USE	
1	Freeport Artificial Reef Project	TX	\$2,155,365									X
2	Matagorda Artificial Reef Project	TX	\$3,486,398									X
3	Mid/upper Texas Coast Artificial Reef Ship Reef Project <sup>2</sup>	TX	\$1,785,765									X
4	Sea Rim State Park Improvements	TX	\$210,100									X
5	Galveston Island State Park Beach Redevelopment	TX	\$10,745,060									X
6	Louisiana Outer Coast Restoration	LA <sup>3</sup>	\$318,363,000	X		X					X	
7	Louisiana Marine Fisheries Enhancement, Research, and Science Center	LA	\$22,000,000									X
8	Mississippi Hancock County Marsh Living Shoreline Project	MS	\$50,000,000		X					X		
9	Restoration Initiatives at the INFINITY Science Center	MS	\$10,400,000									X
10	Popp's Ferry Causeway Park	MS	\$4,757,000									X
11	Pascagoula Beach Front Promenade	MS	\$3,800,000									X
12	Alabama Swift Tract Living Shoreline	AL	\$5,000,080		X					X		
13	Gulf State Park Enhancement Project	AL	\$85,505,305									X
14	Alabama Oyster Cultch Restoration	AL	\$3,239,485					X				
15	Beach Enhancement Project at Gulf Island National Seashore	FL <sup>4</sup>	\$10,836,055									X
16	Gulf Islands National Seashore Ferry Project	FL <sup>4</sup>	\$4,020,000									X
17	Florida Cat Point Living Shoreline Project	FL	\$775,605		X					X		
18	Florida Pensacola Bay Living Shoreline Project	FL	\$10,828,063		X					X		
19	Florida Seagrass Recovery Project	FL	\$2,691,867				X					
20	Perdido Key State Park Beach Boardwalk Improvements	FL	\$588,500									X
21	Big Lagoon State Park Boat Ramp Improvement	FL	\$1,483,020									X
22	Bob Sikes Pier Parking and Trail Restoration	FL	\$1,023,990									X
23	Florida Artificial Reefs	FL	\$11,463,587									X
24	Florida Fish Hatchery	FL	\$18,793,500									X
25	Scallop Enhancement for Increased Recreational Fishing Opportunity in the Florida Panhandle	FL	\$2,890,250									X

	PROJECT	LOCATION	COST	OFFSET <sup>1</sup>								
				BACK BARRIER MARSH HABITAT	SALT MARSH HABITAT	BEACH/DUNE HABITAT	SUBMERGED AQUATIC VEGETATION HABITAT	OYSTER SECONDARY PRODUCTIVITY	BENTHIC SECONDARY PRODUCTIVITY	PELICAN, TERN/SKIMMER AND GULL FLEDGLINGS	RECREATIONAL USE	
26	Shell Point Beach Nourishment	FL	\$882,750									X
27	Perdido Key Dune Restoration Project	FL	\$611,234			X						
28	Florida Oyster Cultch Placement Project	FL	\$5,370,596					X				
29	Strategically Provided Boat Access Along Florida's Gulf Coast	FL	\$3,248,340									X
30	Walton County Boardwalks and Dune Crossovers	FL	\$743,276									X
31	Gulf County Recreation Projects	FL	\$2,118,600									X
32	Bald Point State Park Recreation Areas	FL	\$470,800									X
33	Enhancement of Franklin County Parks and Boat Ramps	FL	\$1,771,385									X
34	Apalachicola River Wildlife and Environmental Area Fishing and Wildlife Viewing Access Improvements	FL	\$262,989									X
35	Navarre Beach Park Gulfside Walkover Complex	FL	\$1,221,847									X
36	Navarre Beach Park Coastal Access	FL	\$614,630									X
37	Gulf Breeze Wayside Park Boat Ramp	FL	\$309,669									X
38	Developing Enhanced Recreational Opportunities on the Escribano Point Portion of the Yellow River Wildlife Management Area	FL	\$2,576,365									X
39	Norriego Point Restoration and Recreation Project	FL	\$10,228,130									X
40	Deer Lake State Park Development	FL	\$588,500									X
41	City of Parker- Oak Shore Drive Pier	FL	\$993,649									X
42	Panama City Marina Fishing Pier, Boat Ramp, and Staging Docks	FL	\$2,000,000									X
43	Wakulla Mashas Sands Park Improvements	FL	\$1,500,000									X
44	Northwest Florida Estuarine Habitat Restoration, Protection, and Education- Fort Walton Beach	FL	\$4,643,547									X
		Total	\$626,998,302									



	PROJECT	LOCATION	COST	OFFSET <sup>1</sup>							
				BACK BARRIER MARSH HABITAT	SALT MARSH HABITAT	BEACH/DUNE HABITAT	SUBMERGED AQUATIC VEGETATION HABITAT	OYSTER SECONDARY PRODUCTIVITY	BENTHIC SECONDARY PRODUCTIVITY	PELICAN, TERN/SKIMMER AND GULL FLEDGLINGS	RECREATIONAL USE
<p><sup>1</sup> Offset Types indicated in this table provide general information about Offsets, for overview purposes only. Important, detailed information about Offsets is provided in project-specific write-ups included in Chapters 8-12.</p> <p><sup>2</sup> As described in more detail in Chapter 8, the Trustees include an alternative (the Corpus Artificial Reef Project) to the Mid/upper Texas Coast Artificial Reef Ship Reef Project, to be implemented in the event the Ship Reef Project becomes technically infeasible (e.g., an appropriate ship cannot be acquired with available funding). The Corpus Artificial Reef Project 'Alternative' has its own project description, description of Affected Environment and analysis of environmental consequences in Chapter 8; is categorized within the same Programmatic Alternative as the Ship Reef Project; and would provide similar Offsets.</p> <p><sup>3</sup> One component of this proposed project would be implemented on federally-managed lands and managed by DOI.</p> <p><sup>4</sup> These proposed projects would be implemented on federally-managed lands and managed by DOI.</p>											

REA-estimated benefits are expressed in resource-specific units, rather than on a habitat basis. For example, the Trustees estimated the present value of Offsets associated with Early Restoration projects focused on construction of living shorelines in terms of discounted kilogram years (DKg-Y) of benthic secondary productivity (in addition to a habitat credit for living shorelines, estimated as DSAYS of salt marsh habitat).<sup>3</sup>

The Trustees considered a variety of project-specific factors when applying HEA and REA methods to estimate the ecological benefits of restoration projects, including, but not limited to:

- The date at which ecological services from a restoration project are expected to begin to accrue;
- The rate of ecological service accrual over time;
- The time period over which ecological services will be provided;
- The quantity and quality of ecological services provided by the restored habitat or resource relative to those not affected by the Spill; and
- The size of the restoration action.

HEA- and REA-based Offsets negotiated by the Trustees and BP use 2010 (the year of the Spill) as the base year and a 3.0 percent annual discount rate for calculation of present values.<sup>4</sup> For each of the proposed Phase III ecological Early Restoration projects, the Trustees and BP either agreed to:

<sup>3</sup> 1 "DKG-Y" = the discounted (to a specified base year) kilograms of biomass generated by the project in one year, reflecting the expected survival and growth of that biomass during that year.

<sup>4</sup> It is standard practice to use a 3.0 percent annual discount rate for this type of analysis; please see (NOAA 1999) for a detailed discussion of the basis for its use.

- A primary Offset;
- A primary Offset, plus specified agreements on methods for “converting” Offset units if needed to better match units ultimately used in the Trustees’ final assessment of injury;
- A “primary” Offset to be applied against a specified injury, and a “secondary” Offset to be applied only if the “primary” Offsets are at the time of final case resolution determined to be in excess of the injury ultimately determined and quantified in the Trustees’ final assessment of injury; or
- More than one Offset, reflecting project-specific evaluation of the types of benefits expected to be generated by a particular project.

Detailed information about Offsets negotiated for each proposed Phase III Early Restoration project is provided in subsequent chapters of this document.

### 7.2.2 Monetized Offsets

The expected benefits of some restoration projects can be monetized, or expressed in terms of the dollar value of expected benefits to the public, rather than in terms of ecological gains. As with HEA and REA, monetization approaches are used to estimate Offsets over a restoration project’s expected lifespan. For this Draft Phase III ERP/PEIS, the Trustees used a monetizing approach to estimate Offsets for proposed recreational use projects designed to achieve a range of goals, including:

- Enhancing public access to natural resources for recreational use;
- Enhancing recreational experiences; and/or
- Promoting environmental and cultural stewardship, education and outreach.

More specifically, the Trustees relied on a benefit-to-cost ratio (“BCR”) approach to estimate Offsets for the proposed Phase III Early Restoration recreational use projects. This approach uses existing economic literature and preliminary estimates of project inputs (see below for additional detail) to develop BCRs representing average benefit-to-cost ratios. For example, a project with an estimated cost of \$10 and a BCR of 1.5 would be assigned a monetized Offset of \$15.<sup>5</sup> This monetized Offset would later be applied to monetized estimates of recreational use losses attributable to the Spill.

Estimated project inputs considered by Trustees as part of the process for developing BCRs for recreational use losses include, but are not limited to:

- The number of participants expected to benefit from each project;
- The benefit these individuals are expected to derive from a new experience or enhanced experience;
- The time frame over which the benefits will be provided, in terms of both start date as well as expected duration of benefits; and
- The discount rate used to calculate the present value of future benefits (3.0 percent, expressed in 2010 dollars).

---

<sup>5</sup> \$15 = \$10 \* 1.5

The BCR is applied to the amount of Early Restoration funds that are provided by BP for a project, but not to funds provided from other sources.

Based on review and analysis of relevant economics literature and project-specific information, the Trustees developed BCRs applicable to two groupings of the proposed projects, based on their expected levels of benefits relative to their costs. Specifically, one BCR was established for projects expected to yield lower levels of benefits relative to costs (to represent the lower end of the range of project-specific BCR), and a second BCR was established for projects expected to have higher levels of benefits relative to costs (to represent the higher end of the BCR range).

The Trustees and BP agreed to apply a BCR of 1.5 to the proposed recreational use projects expected to have lower benefit-to-cost ratios and a BCR 2.0 to the remaining proposed recreational use projects. Thus proposed projects in the lower BCR category would provide BP with a monetized Offset equal to 1.5 times the project funding provided by BP, to be applied against monetized injuries to recreational use arising from the Spill. For the remaining proposed projects, BP would receive a monetized Offset equal to 2.0 times the project funding provided by BP.

### **7.3 Performance Monitoring**

NRDA regulations call on Trustees, when developing a draft restoration plan under OPA, to establish restoration objectives that are specific to the injuries (15 C.F.R. § 990.55(b)(2)). These objectives should clearly specify the desired project outcome, and the performance criteria by which successful restoration under OPA will be determined (15 C.F.R. § 990.55(b)(2)). The monitoring component of a draft restoration plan is further described in 15 C.F.R. § 990.55(b)(3).

Performance monitoring for proposed Early Restoration projects will be designed to evaluate the effectiveness of the restoration actions in meeting the restoration objectives and to assist in determining the need for corrective actions. While the Trustees intend to strive for consistency in performance monitoring parameters, frequency, and duration for similar project types, flexibility in monitoring design is necessary to account for inherent differences between restoration projects.

### **7.4 Consistency with Project Evaluation Criteria**

Chapters 8-12 of this document provide project-specific information addressing each project's consistency with project evaluation criteria identified in Chapter 2. These criteria are summarized again below for reference.

The following evaluation criteria are from the OPA regulations (15 C.F.R. § 990.54):

- The cost to carry out the alternative;
- The extent to which each alternative is expected to meet the Trustees' goals and objectives in returning the injured natural resources and services to baseline and/or compensating for interim losses (the ability of the restoration project to provide comparable resources and services; that is, the nexus between the project and the injury is an important consideration in the project selection process);
- The likelihood of success of each alternative;
- The extent to which each alternative will prevent future injury as a result of the incident, and avoid collateral injury as a result of implementing the alternative;

- The extent to which each alternative benefits more than one natural resource and/or service; and
- The effect of each alternative on public health and safety.

If the Trustees conclude that two or more alternatives are equally preferable, the most cost-effective alternative must be chosen (15 C.F.R. § 990.54(b)).

The Framework Agreement states Early Restoration projects are to meet all of the following criteria:

- Contribute to making the environment and the public whole by restoring, rehabilitating, replacing, or acquiring the equivalent of natural resources or services injured as a result of the Spill, or compensating for interim losses resulting from the incident;
- Address one or more specific injuries to natural resources or services associated with the incident;
- Seek to restore natural resources, habitats, or natural resource services of the same type, quality, and of comparable ecological and/or recreational use value to compensate for identified resource and service losses resulting from the incident;
- Are not inconsistent with the anticipated long-term restoration needs and anticipated final restoration plan; and
- Are feasible and cost-effective.

In addition, the introductions to chapters 8-12 include additional, Trustee-specific information about their Early Restoration project screening process, beyond the general project screening information provided in Chapter 2. Finally, to limit repetition in the discussion of OPA criteria in the proposed Phase III project information portions of Chapters 8-12, the Trustees note that:

- The potential of each proposed project to cause collateral injury (15 C.F.R. §990.54(a)(4)) is addressed via each proposed project’s environmental consequence analysis; and
- The potential impact of each proposed project on public health and safety (15 C.F.R. §990.54(a)(6)), is addressed in each proposed project’s environmental consequence analysis where applicable for individual projects.

## **7.5 Environmental Compliance**

Chapters 8-12 of this document provide detailed information and OPA and NEPA analyses for each proposed Phase III Early Restoration project, its expected environmental consequences and its consistency with the programmatic alternative(s). In addition, the Trustees have started coordination and reviews to ensure compliance with a variety of other legal authorities potentially applicable to proposed Phase III Early Restoration projects. While these efforts are still in process, progress to date suggests that all proposed projects will be able to meet permitting and other environmental compliance requirements; all projects will be implemented in accordance with all applicable laws and regulations.

Examples of applicable laws or executive orders include, but are not necessarily limited to, the following:

### **7.5.1 Endangered Species Act (16 U.S.C. §§ 1531 et seq.)**

Numerous species throughout the Gulf of Mexico are listed as threatened or endangered and protected by the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (ESA). Section 7(a)(2) of the ESA requires every Federal agency, in consultation with and with the assistance of the Secretaries of the Interior and Commerce, to ensure

that any action it authorizes, funds, or carries out, in the United States or upon the high seas, is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of any listed species or result in the destruction or adverse modification of critical habitat

To comply with the ESA, the Trustees have started coordination and reviews with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) to evaluate the effects the proposed Phase III Early Restoration projects may have on listed, proposed, and candidate species and their designated or proposed critical habitats.

### **7.5.2 Migratory Bird Treaty Act (16 U.S.C. §§ 703-712)**

There are more than 400 species of migratory birds and millions of individual resident birds that reside along the Gulf Coast for all or part of the year. The Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1918 (MBTA) implements various treaties and conventions between the U.S., Canada, Japan, Mexico, and the former Soviet Union for the protection of migratory birds. Under MBTA, unless permitted by regulations, it is unlawful to pursue, hunt, take, capture or kill; attempt to take, capture or kill; possess, offer to or sell, barter, purchase, deliver or cause to be shipped, exported, imported, transported, carried, or received any migratory bird, part, nest, egg or product, manufactured or not. USFWS regulations broadly define “take” under MBTA to mean “pursue, hunt, shoot, wound, kill, trap, capture, or collect, or attempt to pursue, hunt, shoot, wound, kill, trap, capture, or collect” (50 C.F.R. §10.12).

Each proposed Phase III Early Restoration project has been reviewed by the USFWS to ensure “take,” pursuant to the MBTA, does not occur. If migratory birds may be present in a project area, avoidance measures would be implemented to ensure these birds (parts, nests, eggs, or products) are not wounded or killed during construction or use of the project area. Avoidance measures, where applicable, are described within each specific project description.

### **7.5.3 Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (16 U.S.C. §§ 1801 et seq.)**

The 1996 Magnuson-Stevens Fishery and Conservation and Management Act (MSA) requires cooperation among NMFS, anglers, and federal and state agencies to protect, conserve, and enhance essential fish habitat (EFH). EFH encompasses waterbodies, habitats, and substrates necessary for fish that are managed by federal or regional fishery management councils to complete various life history stages such as breeding, spawning, feeding or growth, and survival to maturity. EFH for multiple fish species is present throughout the Gulf Coast. To comply with requirements of the MSA, the Trustees obtained information on areas that are designated as EFH from NMFS at <http://www.habitat.noaa.gov/protection/efh/newInv/index.html>, and from text descriptions in Fishery Management Plans also available at that website. An assessment of potential effects to EFH from each proposed project is ongoing, and any required consultations regarding potential impacts to EFH will be completed with NMFS concurrent with the development of the Final Phase III ERP/PEIS.

### **7.5.4 Marine Mammal Protection Act (16 U.S.C. §§ 1361-1421h)**

There are more than 22 species of marine mammals in the Gulf of Mexico, including dolphins, whales, and the West Indian manatee. The Marine Mammal Protection Act, as amended, prohibits the taking of marine mammals, where “take” is defined as “the act of hunting, killing, capture, and/or harassment of any marine mammal; or, the attempt at such” 16 U.S.C. § 1362(13). The Marine Mammal Protection Act

does provide a mechanism (section 101(a)(5) (A-D)) for allowing, upon request, the "incidental", but not intentional, taking of small numbers of marine mammals by U.S citizens who engage in a specified activity (other than commercial fishing) within a specified geographic region. Proposed projects were analyzed to evaluate the potential for any such non-fishery interactions with marine mammals. Based on that analysis, either: 1) no incidental take of marine mammals is anticipated, and a Marine Mammal Protection Act authorization will not be required or sought for the proposed project; or 2) if there is potential that marine mammals may be incidentally harassed or otherwise "taken" during the construction or implementation phases of a project, discussions of whether any best management practices can be implemented to avoid or reduce the potential for take are underway. Should incidental take be anticipated, the appropriate authorization would be sought and obtained for the relevant aspects of the project.

#### **7.5.5 Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act (16 U.S.C. § 668-668c)**

Bald eagles are present along the Gulf Coast. The Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act of 1940 prohibits anyone, without a permit issued by the Secretary of the Interior, from "taking" bald eagles, including their parts, nests, or eggs. The Bald and Golden Eagle Act defines "take" as "pursue, shoot, shoot at, poison, wound, kill, capture, trap, collect, molest, or disturb" 16 U.S.C. § 668c. Under the regulations implementing the Bald and Golden Eagle Act, "disturb" means: to agitate or bother a bald or golden eagle to a degree that causes, or is likely to cause, based on the best scientific information available: 1) injury to an eagle, 2) a decrease in its productivity, by substantially interfering with normal breeding, feeding, or sheltering behavior, or 3) nest abandonment, by substantially interfering with normal breeding, feeding, or sheltering behavior 50 C.F.R. § 22.3. In addition to immediate impacts, this definition also covers impacts that result from human-induced alterations initiated around a previously used nest site during a time when eagles are not present, if, upon the eagle's return, such alterations agitate or bother an eagle to a degree that interferes with or interrupts normal breeding, feeding, or sheltering habits, and causes injury, death, or nest abandonment. Each proposed project has been reviewed to evaluate bald eagle status in the action area and determine if best management practices need to be put into place to avoid unintentional "taking" or "disturbing" of bald eagles. Although very rare, golden eagles are occasionally observed along the Gulf coast during migration, and it is likely that any measures taken to protect bald eagles will also protect golden eagles.

#### **7.5.6 Coastal Zone Management Act (16 U.S.C. §§ 1451-1456)**

The goal of the Coastal Zone Management Act (CZMA) is to encourage states to preserve, protect, develop, and where possible, to restore and enhance the resources of the nation's coastal zone. The CZMA encourages coastal states to develop and implement comprehensive management programs that balance the need for coastal resource protection with the need for economic growth and development in the coastal zone. Coastal management plans developed by a coastal state must be approved by the Secretary of the U.S. Department of Commerce. Once a coastal management plan is approved, the CZMA requires federal agency activities affecting the land or water uses or natural resources of a state's coastal zone to be consistent, to the maximum extent practicable, with the applicable, enforceable policies of that state's federally approved coastal management program. This requirement is addressed through processes that provide for state review of a federal agency's determination of consistency with the relevant state's approved program. Restoration activities proposed to be undertaken or authorized by federal agencies are subject to review for "federal consistency" under the CZMA.

The Federal Trustees involved in development of this Draft Phase III ERP have reviewed the specific restoration projects proposed herein, have made appropriate determinations as to consistency and are submitting those determinations to the appropriate state agencies for review and concurrence. The Federal Trustees expect that review process to be complete before projects are selected for inclusion in the Final Phase III ERP.

#### **7.5.7 Clean Air Act (42 U.S.C. §7401 et seq.)**

The Clean Air Act (CAA) requires the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to set National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) for pollutants considered harmful to public health and the environment. NAAQS have been set for six common air pollutants (also known as criteria pollutants), consisting of particle pollution or particulate matter, ozone, carbon monoxide, sulfur dioxide, nitrogen dioxide, and lead. Particulate matter is defined as fine particulates with a diameter of 10 micrometers or less (PM<sub>10</sub>), and fine particulates with a diameter of 2.5 micrometers or less (PM<sub>2.5</sub>). When a designated air quality area or airshed in a state exceeds an NAAQS, that area may be designated as a “nonattainment” area. Areas with levels of pollutants below the health-based standard are designated as “attainment” areas. To determine whether an area meets the NAAQS, air monitoring networks have been established and are used to measure ambient air quality. The EPA also regulates 187 hazardous air pollutants (HAPs) that are known or suspected to cause cancer or other serious health effects. The Trustees are ensuring that all projects are in compliance with the CAA, and no violations of NAAQS are expected to occur.

#### **7.5.8 Federal Water Pollution Control Act (Clean Water Act, 33 U.S.C. §§ 1251 et seq.) and/or Rivers and Harbors Act (33 U.S.C. §§ 401 et seq.)**

Waters of the United States, as defined by the Clean Water Act and implementing regulations, and navigable waterways, regulated by the Rivers and Harbors Act, are present throughout the Gulf Coast and could potentially be affected by proposed projects. Section 404 of the Clean Water Act requires U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) authorization prior to discharging dredged or fill material into waters of the United States. Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act requires Corps authorization prior to any work in, under or over navigable waters of the United States, or which affects the course, location, condition or capacity of such waters. There may be other provisions of the Clean Water Act or Rivers and Harbors Act within the Corps’ responsibility that are also applicable to proposed Early Restoration projects depending on site-specific circumstances. For proposed projects with activities which might be subject to either Clean Water Act Section 404 or Rivers and Harbors Act provisions, project sponsors are coordinating with the appropriate Corps of Engineers District office responsible for authorizing such activities to help identify whether a Corps permit is needed and, if so, what type. Early coordination helps facilitate information-sharing and communication, thus maximizing available efficiencies in the permitting process. Early coordination also allows for advance discussion of measures to avoid and minimize potential project impacts and helps inform sponsors on additional factors the Corps considers in its decision-making process. Corps authorization under Clean Water Act Section 404 or Rivers and Harbors Act Section 10 has already been completed for some of the proposed projects considered in this document. For those proposed Early Restoration projects still requiring Corps authorization, coordination between project sponsors and the Corps is ongoing and authorization will ultimately be completed prior to project implementation.

### **7.5.9 National Historic Preservation Act (16 U.S.C. §§ 470 et seq.)**

People have lived in the coastal region of the Gulf of Mexico for more than ten thousand years. Today many unique and diverse cultures call the Gulf Coast home. These cultures, past and present, are often closely linked to the environmental and natural resources which comprise the Gulf Coast ecosystem and which these projects seek to help restore. The National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (NHPA) charges the Federal Government with protecting the cultural heritage and resources of the nation. A complete review of proposed projects under Section 106 of the NHPA would be completed as environmental review continues. Projects will be implemented in accordance with all applicable laws and regulations concerning the protection of cultural and historic resources.

In addition to potentially applicable laws and regulations

### **7.5.10 Executive Order 13112: Invasive Species**

The potential introduction of terrestrial and aquatic non-native invasive species of plants, animals, and microbes is a constant concern. Non-native invasive species could alter existing terrestrial or aquatic ecosystems, may cause economic damages and losses (Pimentel et al. 2005), and are frequently the second most common reason for protecting species under the Endangered Species Act. To address these concerns, the prevention, management, and control of non-native invasive species, as it pertains to federal agencies, was formally addressed in Executive Order 13112. The executive order directs federal agencies to work together to “prevent the introduction of invasive species and provide for their control and to minimize the economic, ecological, and human health impacts that invasive species cause.” Therefore, all projects would provide an evaluation of the possible transport and spread of non-native invasive species due to planned activities and provide measures to avoid and minimize habitat and trust resource impacts. The amount of measures taken will vary for each project based on the potential risk of invasive species introduction, the presence of transport vectors, and the sensitivity of receiving areas.

Additional, project-specific information and analyses regarding the environmental compliance status of proposed Phase III Early Restoration projects are provided below and in subsequent chapters of this document.

## **7.6 Overview of Proposed Phase III Early Restoration Projects**

The following subsections list and briefly describe each proposed project. The list is organized by the state in which the proposed project will take place.

### **7.6.1 Texas**

#### **7.6.1.1 Freeport Artificial Reef Project**

The proposed Freeport Artificial Reef Project will increase the amount of reef materials in a currently permitted artificial reef site (BA-336), the George Vancouver (Liberty Ship) Artificial Reef, located within Texas state waters in the Gulf of Mexico and approximately 6 miles from Freeport, Texas. The current reef site is permitted for 160 acres, but only has materials in 40 acres. The proposed Project will place predesigned concrete pyramids in the remaining portions of the 160-acre permitted area onto sandy substrate at a water depth of 55 feet. These improvements would enhance recreational fishing and diving opportunities. The estimated cost for this Project is \$2,155,365.



### ***7.6.1.2 Matagorda Artificial Reef Project***

The proposed Matagorda Artificial Reef Project will create a new artificial reef site (BA-439) within Texas state waters in the Gulf of Mexico, approximately 10 miles offshore of Matagorda County, Texas. The proposed Project will create 160 acres of artificial reef, through deployment of predesigned concrete pyramids onto sandy substrate at a water depth of 60 feet. These improvements would enhance recreational fishing opportunities. The estimated cost for this Project is \$3,486,398.

### ***7.6.1.3 Mid/upper Texas Coast Artificial Reef Ship Reef Project<sup>6</sup>***

The proposed Ship Reef Project will enhance fishing and diving opportunities for Texas by sinking a ship to create an artificial reef about 67 miles offshore of Galveston, Texas in the Gulf of Mexico. Texas will acquire and sink a ship that is at least 200 feet long in waters that are approximately 135 feet deep. The ship will be cleaned of hazardous substances to meet EPA criteria, as well as pass all required federal and state inspections, including EPA, TPWD, and USCG. The Project area (HI-A-424) is 80 acres of sandy substrate in the Gulf of Mexico. This Early Restoration project proposal would fund a portion of the costs to implement this project. The estimated cost for the portion of this Project funded by Early Restoration is \$1,785,765.

### ***7.6.1.4 Sea Rim State Park Improvements***

Sea Rim State Park is located along the upper Texas Coast in Jefferson County, Texas, southwest of Port Arthur, Texas. The proposed Sea Rim State Park Improvements Project would construct two wildlife viewing platforms (Fence Lake and Willow Pond), one comfort station, and one fish cleaning shelter in the Park. These improvements would enhance visitor use and enjoyment of Park resources. The estimated cost for this Project is \$210,100.

### ***7.6.1.5 Galveston Island State Park Beach Redevelopment***

Galveston Island State Park is a 2,000-acre park in the middle of Galveston Island, southwest of the City of Galveston in Galveston County, Texas. The proposed Galveston Island State Park Beach Development Project includes the building of multi-use campsites, tent campsites, dune access boardwalks, equestrian facilities, as well as restroom and shower facilities on the beach side of the Park. These improvements would enhance visitor use and enjoyment of Park resources. The estimated cost for this Project is \$10,745,060.

## **7.6.2 Louisiana**

### ***7.6.2.1 Louisiana Outer Coast Restoration***

The Trustees propose to restore habitat at four barrier island locations in Louisiana. From west to east, the four locations are Caillou Lake Headlands (also known as Whiskey Island), Cheniere Ronquille, Shell

---

<sup>6</sup> Should the proposed project become technically infeasible, the Trustees will implement the “Texas Artificial Reef (mid/upper Coast)- Corpus Reef ” Project: The proposed Corpus Reef Project will increase the amount of reef materials in a currently permitted artificial reef site (MU-775) located within Texas state waters in the Gulf of Mexico and approximately 11 miles from Packery Channel (near Corpus Christi Bay, Texas). Previous deployments at the reef site placed artificial reef materials into the northwest quadrant and in the center of the 160-acre reef site. The proposed Project will place predesigned concrete pyramids in the remaining portions of the 160-acre project area onto sandy substrate at a water depth of 73 feet. These improvements would enhance recreational fishing opportunities. The estimated cost for this Project is \$1,785,765.

Island (West Lobe and portion of East Lobe), and North Breton Island (Breton National Wildlife Refuge). Each of these locations has experienced land loss and shoreline retreat. The goal of the proposed project is to restore more than 2000 acres of beach, dune, and back-barrier marsh habitats, as well as brown pelicans, terns, skimmers, and gulls. The total estimated Early Restoration contribution toward implementation of Louisiana Outer Coast Restoration is \$318,363,000.

#### ***7.6.2.2 Louisiana Marine Fisheries Enhancement, Research, and Science Center***

The Louisiana Marine Fisheries Enhancement, Research, and Science Center (“the Center”) would establish state of the art facilities to responsibly develop aquaculture-based techniques for marine fishery management. The proposed project would include two sites (Calcasieu Parish and Plaquemines Parish) with the shared goals of fostering collaborative multi-dimensional research on marine sport fish and bait fish species; enhancing stakeholder involvement; and providing fisheries extension, outreach, and education to the public. The estimated cost for this project is \$22,000,000.

### **7.6.3 Mississippi**

#### ***7.6.3.1 Mississippi Hancock County Marsh Living Shoreline Project***

The proposed Hancock County Marsh Living Shoreline project is intended to employ living shoreline techniques that utilize natural and artificial breakwater material to reduce shoreline erosion by dampening wave energy while encouraging reestablishment of habitat that was once present in the region. The project would provide for construction of up to 5.9 miles of living shoreline (breakwater). An additional component includes, approximately 46 acres of marsh would be constructed to protect and enhance the existing shoreline and 46 acres of sub-tidal oyster reef would be created in Heron Bay to increase secondary productivity in the area. The project, to be managed by both the state of Mississippi and NOAA, would include shoreline erosion reduction, creation of habitat for secondary productivity, and protection and creation of marsh habitat. The estimated cost for this project is \$50,000,000.

#### ***7.6.3.2 Restoration Initiatives at the INFINITY Science Center***

The proposed project, Restoration Initiatives at the INFINITY Science Center, would provide the public increased access to coastal natural resources injured by the Spill and response actions. The project is intended to restore recreational uses that were lost as a result of the Spill through the provision of increased access to coastal estuarine habitats, enhancement and creation of wildlife viewing areas and creation of educational features. The project will enhance and expand a state-of-the-art interactive science, education, interpretive, and research center for use by visitors seeking to experience and learn about the coastal natural resources of the Gulf of Mexico. The INFINITY Science Center is located in Hancock County, Mississippi and adjacent to coastal estuarine habitats. The project is a partnership between public and private entities such as NASA, the State of Mississippi, and private funders. The project also would serve as a launching point for a comprehensive scenic byway trail system that can take visitors to beaches and tidal coastal estuarine environments. The estimated cost for this project is \$10,400,000.

#### ***7.6.3.3 Popp's Ferry Causeway Park***

The proposed Popp's Ferry Causeway Park Project would improve a portion of a site in Back Bay, Mississippi that is owned by the City of Biloxi by providing a park environment where local residents and

visitors can experience the coastal estuarine ecosystem. The project is intended to restore lost recreational use resulting from the Spill. The project would provide for construction of an interpretive center, nature trails, boardwalks, and other recreational enhancements and would enhance visitor access to the adjacent coastal estuarine environment while updating and constructing amenities allowing visitors to fish, crab and observe nature. The estimated cost for this project is \$4,757,000.

#### ***7.6.3.4 Pascagoula Beachfront Promenade***

The proposed Pascagoula Beachfront Promenade project is intended to restore lost recreational use resulting from the Spill would enhance recreational shoreline access via the construction of a lighted concrete beachfront pedestrian pathway adjacent to a sand beach in Pascagoula, Mississippi. Project funds would be used to help complete a portion of a two-mile, 10-foot wide lighted concrete pathway complete with amenities. This Early Restoration project proposal would fund a portion (8,200 feet) of the 10-foot wide promenade, a portion of which has already been constructed. The estimated cost for this project is \$3,800,000.

### **7.6.4 Alabama**

#### ***7.6.4.1 Alabama Swift Tract Living Shoreline***

The proposed Alabama Swift Tract Living Shoreline project is intended to employ living shoreline techniques that utilize natural and/or artificial breakwater material to stabilize shorelines along an area in the eastern portion of Bon Secour Bay, Alabama. This project would create breakwaters to dampen wave energy and reduce shoreline erosion while also providing habitat that was once regionally present. The project would provide for construction of up to 1.6 miles of breakwaters. Over time, the breakwaters are expected to develop into reefs that support benthic secondary productivity, including, but not limited to, bivalve mollusks, annelid worms, shrimp, and crabs. NOAA would be the lead implementing Trustee for this project. The estimated cost for this project is \$5,000,080.

#### ***7.6.4.2 Gulf State Park Enhancement Project***

The proposed Visitor Enhancements at Gulf State Park would implement ecologically-sensitive improvements to Gulf State Park (GSP) to: (1) rebuild the Gulf State Park Lodge and Conference Center; (2) build an Interpretive Center; (3) build a Research and Education Center; (4) add visitor enhancements including trail improvements and extensions, overlooks, interpretive kiosks and signage, rest areas, bike racks, bird watching blinds, or other visitor enhancements; and (5) conduct ecological restoration and enhancement of degraded dune habitat. Early Restoration funds would contribute \$85.5 million, a portion of the total project funding.

#### ***7.6.4.3 Alabama Oyster Cultch Restoration***

The proposed Alabama Oyster Cultch project would increase the productivity of oyster reefs in Alabama coastal waters. The project would place approximately 30,000-40,000 cubic yards of suitable oyster shell cultch over approximately 319 acres of subtidal habitat in Mobile County, Alabama, in proximity to other oyster reefs currently managed by the Alabama Department of Conservation and Natural Resources (ADCNR) and within the historic footprint of oyster reefs in the area. The estimated cost for this project is \$3.2 million.

## **7.6.5 Florida**

### ***7.6.5.1 Beach Enhancement Project at Gulf Island National Seashore***

This project involves removing fragments of asphalt and road-base material (limestone aggregate and some chunks of clay) that have been scattered widely over the Fort Pickens, Santa Rosa, and Perdido Key areas of the Florida District of Gulf Islands National Seashore. These materials originated from roads damaged during several storms and hurricanes. The asphalt- and road-base-covered conditions are clearly unnatural and impact the visitor experience both aesthetically and physically in these National Seashore lands. This project would enhance visitor experience in the cleaned-up areas. The National Park Service, as a bureau of DOI, would serve as the lead implementing Trustee for this project. The estimated cost for this project is \$10,837,000.

### ***7.6.5.2 Gulf Islands National Seashore Ferry Project***

The proposed National Park Service Ferry Purchase project involves the purchase of 2-3 ferries to be used to ferry visitors (no automobiles) between the City of Pensacola, Pensacola Beach, and the Fort Pickens area of Gulf Islands National Seashore in Florida. The need for an alternative means to access the Fort Pickens area of the park was made especially apparent when hurricanes and storms in 2004 and 2005 destroyed large segments of the road, eliminating vehicle access through this eight-mile-long area. A viable ferry service to this area of the park would allow visitors to enjoy the park not only if the road were to be destroyed again, but also while the road is still there by allowing additional visitors access to the park that they otherwise would not have. The National Park Service, as a bureau of DOI, would serve as the lead implementing Trustee for this project. The estimated cost for this project is \$4,020,000.

### ***7.6.5.3 Florida Cat Point Living Shoreline Project***

The proposed Cat Point (Franklin County) Living Shoreline project is intended to employ living shoreline techniques that utilize natural and/or artificial breakwater material to reduce shoreline erosion and provide habitat off Eastpoint, Florida. Combining these objectives, this project would create breakwaters to reduce wave energy, increase benthic secondary productivity, and create salt marsh habitat. Proposed activities include expanding an existing breakwater creating up to 0.3 miles of new breakwater and creating 1 acre of salt marsh habitat. The total estimated cost for this project is \$775,605.

### ***7.6.5.4 Florida Pensacola Bay Living Shoreline Project***

The proposed Pensacola Bay Living Shorelines project is intended to employ living shoreline techniques that utilize natural and/or artificial breakwater material to reduce shoreline erosion and provide habitat at two sites within a portion of Pensacola Bay. Combining these objectives, this project would create breakwaters to reduce wave energy, increase benthic secondary productivity, and create salt marsh habitat. Proposed activities include completing and expanding an existing breakwater at the Project GreenShores Site II, constructing approximately 2,400 feet of breakwater at the Sanders Beach site, and creating salt marsh habitat at both sites. In total, approximately 18.8 acres of salt marsh habitat and 4 acres of breakwaters would be constructed. Florida and NOAA would be the implementing Trustees for this project. The estimated cost for this project is \$10,828,063.

#### ***7.6.5.5 Florida Seagrass Recovery Project***

The proposed St. Joseph Bay Seagrass Recovery project will address boat damage to shallow seagrass beds in the Florida panhandle by restoring scars located primarily in turtle grass (*Thalassia testudinum*) habitats located in St. Joseph Bay Aquatic Preserve in Gulf County, with additional potential sites in Alligator Harbor Aquatic Preserve in Franklin County, and St. Andrews Aquatic Preserve, in Bay County. A boater outreach and education component of the project will install non-regulatory Shallow Seagrass Area signage, update existing signage and buoys where applicable, and install educational signage and provide educational brochures about best practices for protecting seagrass habitats at popular boat ramps in St. Joseph Bay, Alligator Harbor, and St. Andrews Bay. The project would restore approximately 2 acres of seagrass habitat. The total estimated cost for this project is \$2,691,867.

#### ***7.6.5.6 Perdido Key State Park Beach Boardwalk Improvements***

The proposed Perdido Key project would improve a number of existing boardwalks along Perdido Key in Escambia County. The proposed improvements include removing and replacing six existing boardwalks leading to the beach from two public access areas. The total estimated cost for this project is \$588,500.

#### ***7.6.5.7 Big Lagoon State Park Boat Ramp Improvement***

The proposed Big Lagoon State Park project would involve enhancing an existing boat ramp and surrounding facilities in the Big Lagoon State Park in Escambia County. These improvements would include adding an additional lane to the boat ramp, expanding boat trailer parking, improving traffic circulation at the boat ramp, and providing a new restroom facility to connect the park to the Emerald Coast Utility Authority (ECUA) regional sanitary sewer collection system. The total estimated cost for this project is \$1,483,020.

#### ***7.6.5.8 Bob Sikes Pier Parking and Trail Restoration***

The proposed Bob Sikes Pier project would improve access to a fishing pier in the Pensacola area in Escambia County as well as enhancing the quality of the experience for its recreational users. The proposed improvements include renovating parking areas, enhancing bicycle/pedestrian access, and aesthetic improvements to the surrounding area. The estimated cost for this project is \$1,023,990.

#### ***7.6.5.9 Florida Artificial Reefs***

The proposed Florida Artificial Reef Creation and Restoration project involves creating artificial reefs in the Escambia, Santa Rosa, Okaloosa, Walton, and Bay counties. These proposed improvements include emplacing artificial reefs in already permitted areas. The total estimated cost for this project is \$11,463,587.

#### ***7.6.5.10 Florida Fish Hatchery***

The proposed Florida Gulf Coast Marine Fisheries Hatchery/Enhancement Center project would involve constructing and operating a saltwater sportfish hatchery in Pensacola, Florida. This project would enhance recreational fishing opportunities. The total estimated cost for this project is \$18,793,500.

#### ***7.6.5.11 Scallop Enhancement for Increased Recreational Fishing Opportunity in the Florida Panhandle***

The proposed Scallop Enhancement project would involve enhancing local scallop populations in targeted areas in the Florida Panhandle. The proposed improvements include the harvesting and

redistribution of naturally-occurring juvenile scallops supplemented with stocking from a commercial scallop hatchery. The total estimated cost for this project is \$2,890,250.

#### ***7.6.5.12 Shell Point Beach Nourishment***

The proposed Shell Point Beach Nourishment project would involve the renourishment of Shell Point Beach in Wakulla County. The proposed improvements include the placement of approximately 15,000 cubic yards of sand on the beach from an approved upland borrow area to restore the width and historic slope/profile of this beach. The total estimated cost for this project is \$882,750.

#### ***7.6.5.13 Perdido Key Dune Restoration Project***

The proposed Perdido Key Dune Restoration project will restore appropriate dune vegetation to approximately 20 acres of degraded beach dune habitat in Perdido Key, Florida, including habitat used by the federally endangered Perdido Key Beach Mouse. The project will consist of planting appropriate dune vegetation (e.g., sea oats, panic grasses, cord grasses, sea purslane, beach elder) approximately 20 – 60' seaward of the existing primary dune to provide a buffer to the primary dune and enhance dune habitats. In addition, gaps in existing dunes within the project area will be re-vegetated to provide a continuous dune structure. The total estimated cost for this project is \$611,234.

#### ***7.6.5.14 Florida Oyster Cultch Placement Project***

The proposed Florida Oyster Cultch project would enhance and improve the oyster populations in Pensacola Bay, St. Andrew Bay and Apalachicola Bay. The proposed improvements include the placement of a total of 42,000 cubic yards of suitable cultch material over 210 acres of previously constructed oyster bars for the settling of native oyster larvae and oyster colonization in three Florida Bays. The total estimated cost for this project is \$5,370,596.

#### ***7.6.5.15 Strategically Provided Boat Access along Florida's Gulf Coast Project Components***

##### ***7.6.5.15.1 City of Mexico Beach Marina Project***

The proposed FWC City of Mexico Beach Marina project would improve the existing Mexico Beach Canal Park boat ramp in the City of Mexico Beach. The proposed improvements include replacing the boardwalk dock with a concrete surface and increasing the width, removing and replacing eighteen existing finger piers, and replacement of the existing retaining wall. The total estimated cost of the project is \$1,622,912.

##### ***7.6.5.15.2 Panama City St. Andrews Marina Docking Facility Expansions***

The proposed FWC Panama City St. Andrews Marina Docking Facility Expansions project would improve the existing St. Andrews Marina docking facility in Panama City. The proposed improvements include adding three boat slips, replacing the boat ramp, and replacing a fixed wooden dock with a concrete floating dock. The total estimated cost of the project is \$250,029.

##### ***7.6.5.15.3 Strategically Provided Boat Access - City of Parker, Donaldson Point Boat Ramp Improvements***

The proposed FWC City of Parker Donaldson Point Boat Ramp Improvements project would improve the existing Donaldson Point boat ramp in the City of Parker. The proposed improvements include adding a dock at the boat ramp. The total estimated cost of the project is \$60,569.

#### ***7.6.5.15.4 City of Parker, Earl Gilbert Dock and Boat Ramp Improvements***

The proposed FWC City of Parker Earl Gilbert Dock and Boat Ramp Improvements project would improve the existing Earl Gilbert dock and boat ramp in the City of Parker. The proposed work includes improving the existing dock and expanding the existing parking. The total estimated cost of the project is \$109,360.

#### ***7.6.5.15.5 City of Port St. Joe, Frank Pate Boat Ramp Improvements***

The proposed FWC City of Port St. Joe Frank Pate Boat Ramp Improvements project would improve the existing Frank Pate boat ramp in the City of Port St. Joe. The proposed improvements include constructing an additional boarding dock, boat trailer parking, access drive, staging area, and a fish cleaning station. The total estimated cost of the project is \$806,972.

#### ***7.6.5.15.6 City of St. Marks Boat Ramp Improvements***

The proposed FWC City of St. Marks Boat Ramp Improvements project would improve the existing City of St. Marks boat ramp. The proposed improvements include adding a boarding dock to the one-lane boat ramp. The total estimated cost of the project is \$50,006.

#### ***7.6.5.15.7 Walton County, Choctaw Beach Boat Ramp Improvements***

The proposed FWC Walton County Choctaw Beach Boat Ramp Improvements project would improve the existing Choctaw Beach boat ramp in Walton County. The proposed improvements include replacing the boat ramp, installing two boarding docks, removing existing inadequate restrooms and constructing new ones, and constructing a new paved and marked parking lot. The total estimated cost of the project is \$140,642.

#### ***7.6.5.15.8 Walton County, Lafayette Creek Boat Dock Improvements***

The proposed FWC Walton County Lafayette Creek Boat Dock Improvements project would improve the existing Lafayette Creek boat dock in Walton County. The proposed improvements include expanding the dock by 400 feet at the boat ramp to accommodate larger vessels and additional vessels. The total estimated cost of the project is \$207,850.

#### ***7.6.5.16 Walton County Boardwalks and Dune Crossovers***

##### ***7.6.5.16.1 Ed Walline Beach Access Improvements***

The proposed Walton County Ed Walline Beach Access Improvements project would improve the Ed Walline regional beach access facility in Walton County. The proposed improvements include replacing pavilions and restroom fixtures and upgrading all interior plumbing. The total estimated cost of the project is \$117,700.

##### ***7.6.5.16.2 Gulfview Heights Beach Access Improvements***

The proposed Walton County Gulfview Heights Beach Access Improvements project would improve the Gulfview Heights beach access facility in Walton County. The proposed improvements include replacing restroom fixtures, updating all interior plumbing, and repairing all soffits on pavilions. The total estimated cost of the project is \$87,981.

#### ***7.6.5.16.3 Grayton Dunes Beach Access Boardwalk Improvements***

The proposed Walton County Grayton Dunes Beach Access Boardwalk Improvements project would improve the Grayton Dunes beach access and boardwalk facility in Walton County. The proposed improvements include replacing the dune walkover allowing beach visitors to access the beach. The total estimated cost of the project is \$168,076.

#### ***7.6.5.16.4 Dothan Beach Access Boardwalk Improvements***

The proposed Walton County Dothan Beach Access Boardwalk Improvements project would improve the Dothan Beach Access Boardwalk in Walton County. The proposed improvements include replacing the dune walkover allowing beach visitors to access the beach. The total estimated cost of the project is \$188,909.

#### ***7.6.5.16.5 Palms of Dune Allen West Beach Access Improvements***

The proposed Walton County Palms of Dune Allen West Beach Access Improvements project would improve the Palms of Dune Allen West beach access facility in Walton County. The proposed improvements include constructing a dune walkover, allowing beach visitors to access the beach. The total estimated cost of the project is \$112,109.

#### ***7.6.5.16.6 Bayside Ranchettes Park Improvements***

The proposed Walton County Bayside Ranchettes Park Improvements project would improve the Bayside Ranchettes Park in Walton County. The proposed improvements include constructing a parking area, a picnic table, a dock, and steps into the water allowing access to the bay. The total estimated cost of the project is \$68,501.

### **7.6.5.17 Gulf County Restoration Projects**

#### ***7.6.5.17.1 Highland View Boat Ramp***

The proposed Gulf County Highland View Boat Ramp project would improve the existing Highland View boat ramp in Gulf County. The proposed improvements include repairing and enhancing the existing boat ramp, replacing existing access and termination piers, and improving the parking to provide better facilities. The total estimated cost of the project is \$176,550.

#### ***7.6.5.17.2 Indian Pass Boat Ramp***

The proposed Gulf County Indian Pass Boat Ramp would improve the existing Indian Pass boat ramp in Gulf County. The proposed improvements include repairing and enhancing the existing boat ramp and replacing existing access and termination piers to provide better facilities for the public. The total estimated cost of the project is \$176,550.

#### ***7.6.5.17.3 Improvements at Beacon Hill Veterans' Memorial Park***

The proposed Gulf County Beacon Hill Veterans' Memorial Park Improvements project would improve and enhance the existing facilities at the Beacon Hill Veterans' Memorial Park Gulf County. The proposed improvements include building, pavilions, restrooms, a nature trail, a parking area, and a small amphitheater. The total estimated cost of the project is \$588,500.



#### ***7.6.5.17.4 Windmark Beach Fishing Pier Improvements***

The proposed Gulf County Windmark Beach Fishing Pier Improvements project would construct a fishing pier at Windmark Beach in Gulf County. The proposed improvements include constructing a fishing pier into the Gulf of Mexico. The total estimated cost of the project is \$1,177,000.

#### ***7.6.5.18 Bald Point State Park Recreation Areas***

The proposed Bald Point State Park Recreation Areas project would improve the existing visitor areas at Bald Point State Park in Franklin County. The proposed improvements would include construction of picnic pavilions, boardwalks, restroom and aerobic treatment system and drainfield, and a boardwalk and floating dock for use as a canoe/kayak launch. The total estimated cost of the project is \$470,800.

#### ***7.6.5.19 Enhancement of Franklin County Parks and Boat Ramps***

##### ***7.6.5.19.1 Abercrombie Boat Ramp Project***

The proposed Franklin County Abercrombie Boat Ramp project would improve the existing Abercrombie boat launch facility in Franklin County. The proposed improvements include constructing additional docks to enhance water access. The total estimated cost of the project is \$176,550.

##### ***7.6.5.19.2 Waterfront Park***

The proposed Franklin County Waterfront Park project would improve the existing Waterfront Park in Apalachicola. The proposed improvements include enhancing existing parking and adjacent tie-up docks to enhance water access. In addition an existing onsite building would be enhanced to serve as an information center and dockmaster office. The total estimated cost of the project is \$294,250.

##### ***7.6.5.19.3 Indian Creek Park***

The proposed Franklin County Indian Creek Park project would improve the existing Indian Creek Park boat launch facility in Franklin County. The proposed improvements include constructing restroom facilities, connecting them to an existing central wastewater facility nearby, and renovating the existing boat ramp, bulkhead, and parking area to enhance water access. The total estimated cost of the project is \$353,100.

##### ***7.6.5.19.4 Eastpoint Fishing Pier Improvements***

The proposed Franklin County Eastpoint Fishing Pier Improvement project would add restroom facilities to the base of the existing public East Point Fishing Pier in Franklin County. The proposed improvements include not only constructing new restrooms, but a holding tank that would be pumped out regularly. The total estimated cost of the project is \$294,250.

##### ***7.6.5.19.5 St. George Island Fishing Pier Improvements***

The proposed Franklin County St. George Island Fishing Pier Improvements project would enhance the existing public St. George Island Fishing Pier in Franklin County. The proposed improvements include constructing new restrooms and a holding tank that would be pumped out regularly since there is no central wastewater facility on the island. The proposed improvements also include renovating the existing bulkhead that leads up to the pier, and protects the road to the pier. The total estimated cost of the project is \$653,235.

### **7.6.5.20 Apalachicola River Wildlife and Environmental Area Fishing and Wildlife Viewing Access Improvements**

#### **7.6.5.20.1 Cash Bayou**

The proposed Apalachicola Cash Bayou project would improve public access at Cash Bayou in the Apalachicola River Wildlife and Environmental Area. The proposed improvements include constructing a fishing and wildlife observation structure and parking area. The total estimated cost of the project is \$209,171.

#### **7.6.5.20.2 Sand Beach**

The proposed Apalachicola Sand Beach project would improve public access at Sand Beach in the Apalachicola River Wildlife and Environmental Area. The proposed improvements include constructing a boardwalk. The total estimated cost of the project is \$53,818.

### **7.6.5.21 Navarre Beach Park Gulfside Walkover Complex**

The proposed Navarre Beach Park Gulfside Walkover Complex project would enhance access to the shoreline at Navarre Beach Park to enhance recreational use of the natural resources. The proposed improvements include constructing an entrance, driveway, and parking area; constructing a restroom facility; constructing pavilions with boardwalk connections; and constructing a dune walkover that will provide access to the beach. The total estimated cost of the project is \$1,221,847.

### **7.6.5.22 Florida Navarre Beach Park Coastal Access**

The proposed Navarre Beach Park Coastal Access project would improve access for the public seeking to access the beach and water of Santa Rosa Sound from the existing pavilion/parking lot areas. In addition, construction of a new canoe/kayak launch would increase access opportunities to the waters of the sound for recreational boaters. The enhancement of the recreational experience from these infrastructure improvements would also be complemented by the restoration of a roughly 1 acre parcel of degraded dune habitat in the project area. The estimated cost for this project is \$614,630.

### **7.6.5.23 Gulf Breeze Wayside Park Boat Ramp**

The proposed Gulf Breeze Wayside Park Boat Ramp Improvements project would improve the existing boat ramp at Wayside Park in the City of Gulf Breeze, Santa Rosa County, FL. The proposed improvements include repairing the existing boat ramp and seawall cap, constructing a public restroom facility, and repairing and enhancing the parking area to improve access. The total estimated cost of the project is \$309,669.

### **7.6.5.24 Developing Enhanced Recreational Opportunities on the Escribano Point Portion of the Yellow River Wildlife Management Area**

The proposed Escribano Point project would improve public access and enjoyment of natural resources at the Escribano Point portion of the Yellow River Wildlife Management Area. The proposed improvements include a one-time assessment and mapping activities necessary for developing the site for outdoor recreation purposes, hurricane debris removal and road repair, constructing an entrance kiosk, information facilities, parking facilities, a parking area, interpretive fishing facility, interpretive picnicking facilities, primitive camping sites, wildlife viewing areas, and bear-proof containers for trash and food storage. The total estimated cost of the project is \$2,576,365.

#### **7.6.5.25 Norriego Point Restoration and Recreation Project**

The proposed Norriego Point Restoration and Recreation project would involve stabilizing and re-establishing recreational activities available at Norriego Point. Improvements would include constructing erosion control structures and new park amenities including a picnic pavilion with restrooms, showers, and drinking fountains; educational signage; a multi-use trail; bike racks; and vehicle parking along the access road adjacent to the park land. The total estimated cost of the project is \$10,228,130.

#### **7.6.5.26 Deer Lake State Park Development**

The proposed Deer Lake State Park Recreation Areas project would improve the existing visitor areas at Deer Lake State Park in Walton County. The proposed improvements would include adding a paved access road, parking, picnic shelters, and a restroom. The total estimated cost of the project is \$588,500.

#### **7.6.5.27 City of Parker – Oak Shore Drive Pier**

The proposed City of Parker Oak Shore Drive Pier project would construct a fishing pier at Oak Shore Drive in the City of Parker, Bay County Florida. The proposed work includes construction of a 500 foot long fishing pier. The total estimated cost of the project is \$993,649.

#### **7.6.5.28 Panama City Marina Fishing Pier, Boat Ramp, and Staging Docks**

The proposed Panama City Marina Fishing Pier, Boat Ramp, and Staging Docks project would provide additional recreational fishing opportunities for the public in Panama City in Bay County. The proposed improvements include constructing a 400-foot long pier, replacing a poorly functioning boat ramp, and constructing new docks at the Panama City Marina. The total estimated cost of the project is \$2,000,000.

#### **7.6.5.29 Wakulla County Mashes Sands Park Improvements**

The proposed Wakulla County Mashes Sands Park Improvements project would improve recreation areas at the Wakulla County Mashes Sands Park. The proposed improvements include constructing observation platforms, boardwalks, and walking paths, improving the boat ramp area, and picnic areas, renovating the parking area, and the restroom facility, and constructing a canoe/kayak launch site. The total estimated cost of the project is \$1,500,000.

#### **7.6.5.30 Northwest Florida Estuarine Habitat Restoration, Protection, and Education- Fort Walton Beach**

The proposed Northwest Florida Fort Walton Beach Educational Boardwalk project would expand existing boardwalks as well as conducting several small natural resource and habitat enhancement projects in Fort Walton Beach. The proposed improvements include constructing a new educational and interactive boardwalk, expansion of an existing intertidal oyster reef, and restoration of a degraded salt marsh. The total estimated cost of the project is \$4,643,547.

### **7.7 Organization and Content of Proposed Phase III Project Chapters**

Chapters 8-12 provide information and analysis related to the specific projects listed above located in Texas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, and Florida respectively.

Within each chapter, there is a subsection for each proposed Phase III project. Each project-specific subsection begins with a general description of the project and relevant background information,

followed by: 1) a discussion of the project’s consistency with project evaluation criteria; 2) a description of planned performance criteria, monitoring and maintenance; 3) a description of the type and quantity of Offsets BP would receive if the project is selected for implementation; and 4) information about estimated project costs.

Following this project information is a project-specific environmental review, which provides information specific to each project’s affected environment and analysis about anticipated environmental consequences for individual, proposed projects.<sup>7</sup> Each of the proposed projects is consistent with proposed project types identified and evaluated in the Trustees’ programmatic alternatives (see Chapters 5 and 6). The Trustees have also undertaken project-specific environmental reviews in the following Chapters to analyze proposed project locations, methods, timing and other factors, project benefits, potential adverse consequences, and otherwise address environmental compliance needs.

## **7.8 Intent to Adopt Existing NEPA Analyses**

Four of the proposed projects or project components are the subject of existing NEPA analyses prepared by other federal agencies. These projects or components are analyzed in whole or in part in these NEPA documents. The DOI (or any of its bureaus) is not a cooperating agency on the NEPA analyses DOI intends to adopt. They are:

### **7.8.1 Louisiana**

- Louisiana Outer Coast Restoration Project components:
  - Chenier Ronquille Barrier Island – Environmental Assessment for the Chenier Ronquille Barrier Island Restoration Project (NOAA 2013).
  - Caillou Lake Headlands - Louisiana Coastal Area Integrated Feasibility Study and Final Environmental Impact Statement for the Terrebonne Basin Barrier Shoreline Restoration (USACE 2010).
  - Shell Island - Louisiana Coastal Area Barataria Basin Barrier Shoreline Restoration Final Integrated Construction Report and Final Environmental Impact Statement (USACE 2012).

### **7.8.2 Mississippi**

- Pascagoula Beachfront Promenade Project - Environmental Assessment for the Department of Housing and Urban Development for the Beachfront Promenade Project (HUD 2011)

Federal agencies are encouraged to coordinate and take appropriate advantage of existing NEPA documents and studies, including adoption and incorporation by reference. Under CEQ NEPA Regulations (40 C.F.R. § 1506.3), DOI NEPA Regulations (43 C.F.R. § 46.120), and individual DOI bureau NEPA procedures, DOI may adopt another federal agency’s NEPA analysis to streamline the NEPA compliance process.

---

<sup>7</sup> This format is not precisely followed for all Florida projects because some are grouped together for environmental review purposes.

DOI may adopt another federal agency's NEPA analysis or portion thereof if it meets the standards for an adequate analysis under the CEQ NEPA regulations, and if it adequately assesses the environmental effects of the proposed action and reasonable alternatives (40 C.F.R. 1506.3(a); 43 C.F.R. 46.120(c)). If DOI adopts another agency's NEPA analysis, the supporting record must include an evaluation of whether new circumstances, new information or changes in the action or its impacts not previously analyzed may result in significantly different environmental effects (43 C.F.R. 46.120(c)). The Spill was not previously considered in the Caillou Lake Headlands – Louisiana Coastal Area Integrated Feasibility Study and Final Environmental Impact Statement (Caillou Lake Headlands FIES) for the Terrebonne Basin Barrier Shoreline Restoration. The Spill was not considered as part of the affected environment in the Caillou Lake Headlands FEIS, and therefore the environmental consequences of the Caillou Lake Headlands alternatives were not considered in light of the Spill. However, the environmental consequences of the Caillou Lake Headlands alternatives would occur regardless of the Spill and the relative impacts of the alternatives considered would not materially change because of the Spill.

In addition to the requirements listed above, DOI may adopt another federal agency's NEPA analysis if DOI independently reviews the analysis and finds that the analysis complies with the DOI NEPA regulations, relevant provisions of the CEQ NEPA regulations and with other program requirements (43 C.F.R. 46.320(a)). DOI must also ensure that DOI's public involvement requirements are met before adopting another federal agency's NEPA analysis (43 C.F.R. 46.320(d)). When appropriate, the Responsible Official may augment the analysis to be consistent with the DOI's proposed action (43 C.F.R. 46.320(b)).

DOI has independently evaluated the existing NEPA analyses pertinent to the four proposed projects or project components listed above. DOI believes these existing NEPA analyses meet the standards for adequate NEPA analyses under the CEQ NEPA regulations, and that they adequately assess the environmental effects of the proposed restoration projects and reasonable alternatives.

Summaries of the adopted NEPA analyses for the Caillou Lake Headlands, Chenier Ronquille Barrier Island and Shell Island components of the proposed Louisiana Outer Coast Restoration project are found in Chapter 9, Proposed Phase III Early Restoration Projects: Louisiana, Sections 9.2, 9.3 and 9.4, respectively.

Chapter 10, Proposed Phase III Early Restoration Projects: Mississippi, includes the proposed Mississippi Pascagoula Beachfront Promenade restoration project (Section 10.7), and contains a summary of the NEPA analysis DOI intends to adopt. The Pascagoula Beachfront Promenade adopted EA required augmentation due to changes in the proposed action. The proposed action contained elements not analyzed in the 2011 HUD EA, requiring additional analysis (43 C.F.R. 46.320(b)). Elements that were added to the proposed action in the 2011 HUD EA (additional promenade and visitor amenities) are the subject of additional analysis in Section 10.7 to determine if they would "result in significantly different environmental effects" (43 C.F.R. 46.120(c)). These additional elements are not anticipated to result in significantly different environmental effects.

Accordingly, DOI intends to adopt these NEPA analyses and incorporate them in this PEIS.

## 7.9 References

HUD (U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development). 2011. Environmental Assessment for HUD-funded Proposals, Pascagoula Beach Promenade Project. Prepared by BMI Environmental Services, LLC., for the City of Pascagoula.

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA). 1999. Discounting and the Treatment of Uncertainty in Natural Resource Damage Assessment: Technical Paper 99-1. Silver Spring, MD. Available at: <http://www.whitehouse.gov/omb/circulars/a094/a094.pdf>.

----.2013. Chenier Ronquille Barrier Island Restoration Project Environmental Assessment Fed No. Ba-76.

United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE). 2010. Louisiana Coastal Area Integrated Feasibility Study and Final Environmental Impact Statement for the Terrebonne Basin Barrier Shoreline Restoration Terrebonne Parish, Louisiana. Available at: [http://www.lca.gov/Projects/3/final\\_reports.aspx](http://www.lca.gov/Projects/3/final_reports.aspx).

----. 2012. Louisiana Coastal Area Barataria Basin Barrier Shoreline Restoration Final Integrated Construction Report and Final Environmental Impact Statement. Available at: <http://www.lca.gov/Projects/4/Default.aspx>.