

Deepwater Horizon Oil Spill
Draft Phase IV Early Restoration Plan and Environmental Assessments

May 2015

Executive Summary

ES.1 Executive Summary 1

ES.1.1 Introduction 1

ES.1.2 Early Restoration Framework Agreement 3

ES.1.3 Relationship of Phase IV ERP/EA to the Final Phase III ERP/PEIS 4

ES.1.4 Natural Resource Damage Assessment Restoration Planning 5

ES.1.5 Early Restoration Project Selection Process 5

ES.1.6 Previous Phases of Early Restoration 7

ES.1.7 Notice of Change to Phase III Early Restoration Project 7

ES.1.8 Phase IV Projects 7

ES.1.9 Brief Project Descriptions 9

ES.1.9.1 Texas Rookery Islands 9

ES.1.9.2 Restore Living Shorelines and Reefs in Mississippi Estuaries 10

ES.1.9.3 Bike and Pedestrian Use Enhancements at Davis Bayou, Mississippi District, Gulf Islands National Seashore 10

ES.1.9.4 Bon Secour National Wildlife Refuge Trail Enhancement, Alabama 10

ES.1.9.5 Osprey Restoration in Coastal Alabama 10

ES.1.9.6 Point aux Pins Living Shoreline 10

ES.1.9.7 Shell Belt and Coden Belt Roads Living Shoreline 11

ES.1.9.8 Seagrass Recovery Project at Gulf Islands National Seashore, Florida District 11

ES.1.9.9 Sea Turtle Early Restoration 11

ES.1.9.10 Pelagic Longline Bycatch Reduction Project 12

ES.1.10 Severability of Proposed Phase IV Early Restoration Projects 12

ES.1.11 Public Participation 12

ES.1.12 Administrative Record 13

ES.1.13 Remaining Milestones 13

ES.1.1 Introduction

On or about April 20, 2010, BP Exploration and Production Inc. (BP) was using Transocean's mobile offshore drilling unit *Deepwater Horizon* to drill a well in the Macondo prospect (Mississippi Canyon 252 – MC252) when the well blew out, and the drilling unit exploded, caught fire and subsequently sank in the Gulf of Mexico (the Gulf). This incident resulted in an unprecedented volume of oil and other discharges from the rig and from the wellhead on the seabed. Tragically, 11 workers were killed and 19 injured. The *Deepwater Horizon* oil spill is the largest maritime oil spill in U.S. history, discharging millions of barrels of oil over a period of 87 days (hereafter referred to as "the Spill," which includes activities in response to the spilled oil). In addition, well over one million gallons of dispersants[1] were applied to the waters of the spill area in an attempt to disperse the spilled oil. An undetermined amount of natural gas was also released to the environment as a result of the Spill (National Commission on the BP Deepwater Horizon Oil Spill and Offshore Drilling, 2011)[2].

The U.S. Coast Guard responded and directed federal efforts to contain and clean up the Spill. At one point nearly 50,000 responders were involved in cleanup activities in open water, beach and marsh habitats. The scope, nature and magnitude of the Spill caused impacts to coastal and oceanic ecosystems ranging from the deep ocean floor, through the oceanic water column, to the highly productive coastal habitats of the northern Gulf, including estuaries, shorelines and coastal marshes. Affected resources include ecologically, recreationally, and commercially important species and their habitats in the Gulf and along the coastal areas of Texas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, and Florida. These fish and wildlife species and their supporting habitats provide a number of important ecological and recreational use services.

Pursuant to the Oil Pollution Act (OPA), Title 33 United States Code (U.S.C.) § 2701 *et seq*. and the laws of individual affected states, federal and state agencies, Indian tribes and foreign governments act as trustees on behalf of the public to assess injuries to natural resources and their services that result from an oil spill incident, and to plan for restoration to compensate for those injuries. OPA further instructs the designated trustees to develop and implement a plan for the restoration, rehabilitation, replacement, or acquisition of the equivalent of the injured natural resources under their trusteeship (hereafter collectively referred to as "restoration"). This process of injury assessment and restoration planning is referred to as natural resource damage assessment (NRDA). OPA defines "natural resources" to include land, fish, wildlife, biota, air, water, ground water, drinking water supplies and other such resources belonging to, managed by, held in trust by, appertaining to, or otherwise controlled by the United States (including the resources of the Exclusive Economic Zone), any State or local government or Indian tribe, or any foreign government (33 U.S.C. § 2701(20)).

[1] Dispersants do not remove oil from the ocean. Rather, they are used to help break large globs of oil into smaller droplets that can be more readily dissolved into the water column.

[2] National Commission on the BP Deepwater Horizon Oil Spill and Offshore Drilling. 2011. Deep Water: The Gulf Oil Disaster And The Future Of Offshore Drilling. Available at: http://www.gpo.gov/fdsys/pkg/GPO-OILCOMMISSION/pdf/GPO-OILCOMMISSION.pdf

The Federal Trustees are designated pursuant to section 1006(b)(2) of OPA (33 U.S.C. § 2706(b)(2)) and Executive Orders 12777 and 13626. The following federal agencies are the designated natural resource Trustees under OPA for this Spill:[3]

- The United States Department of the Interior (DOI), as represented by the National Park Service (NPS), United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), and Bureau of Land Management;
- The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), on behalf of the United States Department of Commerce;
- The United States Department of Agriculture (USDA); and
- The United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

State Trustees are designated by the governors of each state pursuant to section 1006(b)(3) of OPA (U.S.C. § 2706(b)(3)). The following state agencies are designated natural resources Trustees under OPA and are currently acting as Trustees for the Spill:

- Texas Parks and Wildlife Department (TPWD), Texas General Land Office (TGLO) and Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ);
- The State of Louisiana's Coastal Protection and Restoration Authority (CPRA), Oil Spill Coordinator's Office (LOSCO), Department of Environmental Quality (LDEQ), Department of Wildlife and Fisheries (LDWF) and Department of Natural Resources (LDNR);
- The State of Mississippi's Department of Environmental Quality (MDEQ);
- The State of Alabama's Department of Conservation and Natural Resources (ADCNR) and Geological Survey of Alabama (GSA); and
- The State of Florida's Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP) and Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission (FWC).

This document, prepared jointly by State and Federal Trustees, serves as a Draft Phase IV Early Restoration Plan under OPA, and also contains the associated assessment for each proposed project under the National Environmental Policy Act (collectively, "Draft Phase IV ERP/EA"). Consistent with the Phase III Early Restoration Plan and Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (Final Phase III ERP/PEIS), the DOI is the lead federal agency for preparing the Draft Phase IV ERP/EA. The Federal co-Trustees are cooperating agencies pursuant to NEPA (40 C.F.R. §1508.5). These cooperating agencies intend to adopt these EAs, once completed. This document is prepared in accordance with 40 C.F.R. Parts1500-1508, "CEQ's Regulations for Implementing NEPA", and DOI NEPA implementing regulations (43 C.F.R. Part46).

[3] The U.S. Department of Defense is a trustee under OPA of natural resources at its Gulf Coast facilities potentially affected by the Spill but is not a member of the Trustee Council and did not participate in the preparation of this document.

In addition to acting as Trustees for this incident under OPA, the States of Texas, Louisiana, Mississippi, Alabama, and Florida are also acting pursuant to their applicable state laws and authorities, including but not limited to:

- The Texas Oil Spill Prevention and Response Act of 1991, Tex. Nat. Res. Code, Chapter 40;
- The Louisiana Oil Spill Prevention and Response Act of 1991, La. R.S. §§ 30:2451 *et seq.*, and accompanying regulations, La. Admin. Code 43:101 *et seq.*;
- The Mississippi Air and Water Pollution Control Law, Miss. Code Ann. §§ 49-17-1 through 49-17-43;
- Alabama Code §§ 9-2-1 *et seq.* and§§ 9-4-1 *et seq.*;
- The Florida Pollutant Discharge Prevention and Removal Act, Fla. Stat., Section 376.011 *et seq*.

This Draft Phase IV ERP/EA proposes 10 Early Restoration projects with a total estimated cost of approximately $134 million. Any additional projects that are proposed for and selected will be included in subsequent Early Restoration plans to be released at a future date.

The Trustees are actively seeking public comments regarding proposed Phase IV Early Restoration projects. A Notice of Availability of this document and the request for input is available at: www.gulfspillrestoration.noaa.gov. The Draft's release opens a 30-day public comment period. The Trustees will hold a series of public meetings at locations across the Gulf States. All meetings will begin with an interactive open house during which Trustee staff will be available to discuss project details.

Please visit www.gulfspillrestoration.noaa.gov to download an electronic copy of the draft and to view a list of public libraries and community locations across the Gulf in which copies of the draft have been placed for public review. In addition to verbal comments at public meetings, the public may submit written comments:

- Online: www.gulfspillrestoration.noaa.gov
- Online: https://parkplanning.nps.gov/nrda/
- By U.S. Mail: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, P.O. Box 49567, Atlanta, GA 30345.

ES.1.2 Early Restoration Framework Agreement

The early restoration planning process is designed to be a cooperative endeavor between the Trustees and parties responsible for oil spills. On April 20, 2011, BP agreed to provide up to $1 billion toward Early Restoration projects in the Gulf of Mexico to address injuries to natural resources caused by the Spill. This Early Restoration agreement, entitled "Framework for Early Restoration Addressing Injuries Resulting from the *Deepwater Horizon* Oil Spill" (Framework Agreement), represents a preliminary step toward the restoration of injured natural resources. The Framework Agreement is intended to expedite the start of restoration in the Gulf in advance of the completion of the injury assessment process. The Framework Agreement provides a mechanism through which the Trustees and BP can work together "to commence implementation of Early Restoration projects that will provide meaningful benefits to

accelerate restoration in the Gulf as quickly as practicable" prior to the resolution of the Trustees' natural resource damages claim. Early restoration is not intended to, and does not fully address all injuries caused by the Spill.

The early restoration planning process is part of the NRDA, but is also shaped in part by the Framework Agreement with BP. The Framework Agreement is a partial, interim settlement under which BP is making up to $1 billion available for early restoration, in return for agreed offsets ("NRD Offsets" explained later in this document) to be applied by the Trustees in the future as credit against the Trustees' final assessment of total injury to resources impacted by the Spill. This provides an opportunity for the Trustees to make progress towards restoration while the steps needed to determine the full amount of injury and natural resource damage unfold. At the same time, under the Framework Agreement, a proposed early restoration project may be funded only if all of the Trustees, the U.S. Department of Justice, and BP agree on, among other things, the amount of funding to be provided by BP and the Offsets against injury or service losses attributable to that project. The need for project-specific agreements inevitably affects which projects are practical to pursue in the early restoration process.

By its nature, the early restoration process is not intended to accomplish full restoration. Because final determinations of injury will not be completed for some time, it would be premature to say now what proportion of any particular type of injury would be addressed by the projects proposed in this Draft Phase IV ERP/EA. Early restoration projects represent an initial step toward fulfilling the responsible parties' obligation to pay for restoration of injured natural resources. Ultimately, the responsible parties are obligated to compensate the public for the full scope of natural resource injuries caused by the Spill, including the cost of assessment and restoration planning.

ES.1.3 Relationship of Phase IV ERP/EA to the Final Phase III ERP/PEIS

The Trustees are proposing, in this Draft Phase IV ERP/EA, 10 projects in accordance with OPA and under the Framework Agreement that are meant to continue implementation of Early Restoration for the purpose of accelerating meaningful restoration of injured natural resources and their services resulting from the Spill. Given the potential magnitude and breadth of further Early Restoration, the Trustees previously prepared a Programmatic Early Restoration Plan and Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement (Final Phase III ERP/PEIS) under OPA and NEPA to analyze alternative approaches to continuing Early Restoration and to consistently guide remaining Early Restoration decisions.

The regulations that guide NRDAs under OPA require that restoration planning actions undertaken by Federal Trustees comply with NEPA, 42 U.S.C. §§ 4321 *et seq.*, and the regulations guiding its implementation at 40 C.F.R. Parts 1500-1508 (15 C.F.R. § 990.23). NEPA and its implementing regulations outline the responsibilities of federal agencies, including the preparation of environmental impact analysis such as an environmental impact statement.

When a federal agency prepares a programmatic NEPA analysis, such as a programmatic EIS, the agency may "tier" subsequent narrower environmental analyses on site-specific plans or projects from the programmatic analysis (40 C.F.R. §§ 1502.20, 1508.28). Federal agencies are encouraged to tier subsequent narrower analyses from a programmatic NEPA analysis to eliminate repetitive discussions of

the same issues and to focus on the issues ripe for decision at each level of environmental review (40 C.F.R. § 1502.20).

This Draft Phase IV ERP/EA is tiered from the programmatic portions of the Phase III ERP/PEIS (40 C.F.R. § 1508.28) which is incorporated here by reference (40 C.F.R. § 1502.21).[4] The programmatic analyses included in the Final Phase III ERP/PEIS streamline Early Restoration planning by evaluating broad issues and impacts associated with all project types included in the programmatic plan, thereby allowing the Trustees to tier project-specific analyses from the programmatic analyses. Tiering project-specific analyses reduces or eliminates duplicative documentation by focusing project analyses on project-specific issues and incorporating by reference the issues evaluated in the broad programmatic analyses. For proposed Phase IV Early Restoration projects, the Trustees have considered the extent to which additional NEPA analyses may be necessary for the projects that tier from the PEIS. These considerations include whether the analyses of relevant conditions and environmental effects described in the PEIS are still valid or whether projects have been considered in separate analyses under NEPA for purposes of other federal processes. These considerations are addressed in the project-specific environmental reviews included in this document (see Chapters 5-14).

ES.1.4 Natural Resource Damage Assessment Restoration Planning

Restoration activities are intended to restore or replace habitats, species, and services to their baseline condition (primary restoration) and to compensate the public for interim losses from the time natural resources are injured until they recover to baseline conditions (compensatory restoration). NRDA restoration planning has two basic components: (1) injury assessment and (2) restoration selection. Given its expansive geographic scale and complexity, the *Deepwater Horizon* NRDA process may continue for several more years. Therefore, for the purpose of accelerating meaningful restoration of injured natural resources and their services resulting from the Spill, the Trustees propose to continue implementation of Early Restoration in accordance with OPA and the Final Phase III ERP/PEIS, using funds made available in the Framework Agreement. Having completed three emergency restoration projects as well as three previous phases of Early Restoration, with 54 projects totaling $698 million, the Trustees are herein proposing an additional 10 Early Restoration projects worth approximately $134 million for Phase IV of Early Restoration. Early Restoration is being initiated prior to completion of the full NRDA, and is not intended to fully address all injuries caused by the Spill.

Additional projects will continue to be proposed in both subsequent phases of Early Restoration as well as in the complete NRDA.

ES.1.5 Early Restoration Project Selection Process

The Early Restoration selection process was developed by the Trustees to be responsive to the purpose and need for conducting Early Restoration. In summary, Early Restoration project selection is a step-wise process comprised of: (1) project solicitation; (2) project screening; (3) negotiation with BP; and (4) evaluation and environmental review of proposed projects under OPA and NEPA, including public review and comment.

[4] The Final Phase III ERP/PEIS is available at: http://www.gulfspillrestoration.noaa.gov/restoration/early-restoration/phase-iii/.

The Trustees' Early Restoration project selection process initially results in a set of potential projects that, consistent with the Framework Agreement, are submitted to BP for review and discussion. The Framework Agreement requires the Trustees and BP to agree on: (1) the funding amount for a proposed project; and (2) Offsets. If the Trustees and BP reach agreement in principle on project terms, those projects are incorporated into a draft Early Restoration Plan and are subject to NEPA review. Projects can be considered ready for implementation only after consideration of comments submitted during the public review process, finalization of the Early Restoration Plan, completion of all required permits and environmental compliance reviews including NEPA, and execution and filing of the project stipulations.

With respect to the 10 projects proposed in this Draft Phase IV ERP/EA, as with previous phases of Early Restoration, the Trustees identified potential projects from many sources, including but not limited to: submissions from the public; Gulf restoration reports, research, management plans and related efforts; and Trustee information collection activities. The Trustees applied a screening process to be responsive to the purpose and need for conducting Early Restoration based on specified evaluation criteria and practical considerations that, while not legally mandated, are nonetheless useful and permissible to help screen potential projects.

The Trustees also established websites to provide the public information about injury and restoration processes,[5] and public solicitation of restoration projects has been ongoing since publication of the Notice of Intent to Conduct Restoration Planning for the *Deepwater Horizon* Oil Spill (2010 NOI), which was published in the Federal Register on October 1, 2010 and announced publicly by the Trustees (Discharge of Oil from Deepwater Horizon/Macondo Well, Gulf of Mexico (Intent to Conduct Restoration Planning, 75 Fed. Reg. 60,800 (October 1, 2010)). The Trustees have received hundreds of proposals, all of which can be viewed at several web pages (see footnote 5). The public provided ideas and comments at public scoping meetings focused on the PEIS for the final, comprehensive damage assessment and restoration plan[6] as well as during public meetings held during each phase of Early Restoration.

[5] The Trustees established the following websites:

- NOAA, Gulf Spill Restoration, available at http://www.gulfspillrestoration.noaa.gov/;
- NOAA, DIVER, available at https://dwhdiver.orr.noaa.gov/
- DOI, *Deepwater Horizon* Oil Spill Response, available at http://www.fws.gov/home/dhoilspill/;
- Texas Parks and Wildlife Department, *Deepwater Horizon* Oil Spill, available at http://www.tpwd.state.tx.us/landwater/water/environconcerns/damage_assessment/deep_water_horizon.phtml/;
- Louisiana, *Deepwater Horizon* Oil Spill Natural Resource Damage Assessment, available at http://losco-dwh.com/;
- Mississippi Department of Environmental Quality, Natural Resource Damage Assessment, available at http://www.restore.ms/;
- Alabama Department of Conservation and Natural Resources, NRDA Projects, available at http://www.alabamacoastalrestoration.org; and
- Florida Department of Environmental Protection, *Deepwater Horizon* Oil Spill Response and Restoration, available at www.deepwaterhorizonflorida.com.

[6] A final Damage Assessment and Restoration Plan will outline the total injury that occurred as a result of the Spill and the plan to fully compensate the public for those losses; it will be the result of the comprehensive NRDA effort currently in process.

ES.1.6 Previous Phases of Early Restoration

The Trustees previously selected 54 Early Restoration projects for implementation, including: eight projects documented in the April 2012 final "*Deepwater Horizon* Oil Spill Phase I Early Restoration Plan and Environmental Assessment"; two projects documented in the December 2012 final "*Deepwater Horizon* Oil Spill Phase II Early Restoration Plan and Environmental Review"; and 44 projects documented in the June 2014 final "*Deepwater Horizon* Oil Spill: Programmatic and Phase III Early Restoration Plan and Early Restoration Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement".

As summarized in Table ES- 1, the total estimated cost of Early Restoration projects selected for implementation to date is approximately $698 million (including contingencies). Ecological projects comprise $460 million (66%) of this total, and recreational projects comprise the remaining $238 million (34%). Within the ecological project category, barrier island restoration and dune projects account for $321 million of estimated project costs, followed by marsh living shoreline projects ($92 million), oyster projects ($35 million), sea turtle and bird habitat enhancement projects ($9 million), and seagrass projects ($3 million).

Table ES- 1. Summary of Funds Spent on Phase I, II, and III Early Restoration Project Categories

PROJECT CATEGORY	ESTIMATED COST FOR ALL PROPOSED PROJECTS IN THAT CATEGORY
Barrier Islands and Dunes	$321,098,721
Recreational	$237,628,642
Marsh and Living Shoreline	$92,283,748
Oyster	$35,192,681
Sea Turtle and Bird Habitat Enhancement	$8,979,283
Seagrasses	$2,691,867
Total	**$697,874,942**

ES.1.7 Notice of Change to Phase III Early Restoration Project

The Draft Phase IV ERP/EA also includes a notice of change and supporting analysis for one Phase III Early Restoration Project, "Enhancement of Franklin County Parks and Boat Ramps – Eastpoint Fishing Pier Improvements." This is discussed in more detail in Chapter 1, section 1.7.

ES.1.8 Phase IV Projects

Table ES- 2 lists the 10 proposed Phase IV projects, identifies the state(s) in which each is located, identifies the implementing Trustee(s), lists the proposed project cost, and relates each project back to the programmatic Early Restoration project type(s) from the Final Phase III ERP/PEIS. Figure ES-1 shows the locations of the proposed projects. Detailed discussions of the projects, their benefits, and associated environmental assessments are included in Chapters 5-14 of this document. Brief summaries of each project follow the table.

Table ES-2. Proposed Phase IV Early Restoration Projects

PROJECT TITLE	LOCATION	IMPLEMENTING TRUSTEE(S)	COST	PROJECT TYPE[1]
Texas Rookery Islands	TX	TX Trustees, DOI	$20,603,770	Restore and Protect Birds
Restore Living Shorelines and Reefs in Mississippi Estuaries	MS	MS	$30,000,000	Restore Oysters Protect Shorelines and Reduce Erosion
Bike and Pedestrian Use Enhancements at Davis Bayou, Mississippi District, Gulf Islands National Seashore	MS[2]	DOI	$6,996,751	Enhance Public Access to Natural Resources for Recreational Use; Enhance Recreational Experiences
Bon Secour National Wildlife Refuge Trail Enhancement Project , Alabama	AL[2]	DOI	$545,110	Enhance Public Access to Natural Resources for Recreational Use; Enhance Recreational Experiences; Promote Environmental and Cultural Stewardship, Education and Outreach
Osprey Restoration In Coastal Alabama	AL	AL	$45,000	Restore and Protect Birds
Point aux Pins Living Shoreline	AL	AL	$2,300,000	Protect Shorelines and Reduce Erosion
Shell Belt and Coden Belt Roads Living Shoreline	AL	AL	$8,050,000	Protect Shorelines and Reduce Erosion
Seagrass Recovery Project at Gulf Islands National Seashore, Florida District	FL[2]	DOI	$136,700	Restore and Protect Submerged Aquatic Vegetation
Sea Turtle Early Restoration	Gulf-wide	NOAA, TX Trustees, DOI	$45,000,000	Restore and Protect Sea Turtles
Pelagic Longline Bycatch Reduction Project	Gulf-wide	NOAA	$20,000,000	Restore and Protect Finfish and Shellfish
		Total	**$133,677,331**	

[1] Relevant project type from the Trustees' preferred programmatic alternative (see Chapter 5 of the Final Phase III ERP/PEIS).
[2] These proposed projects would be implemented on federally managed lands and managed by DOI.

Figure ES- 1. Location of Proposed Phase IV Projects



ES.1.9 Brief Project Descriptions

ES.1.9.1 Texas Rookery Islands

The Texas Rookery Islands project would restore and protect three rookery islands in Galveston Bay and one rookery island in East Matagorda Bay using coastal engineering techniques. The primary goal of the project is to increase nesting of colonial waterbirds, including brown pelicans, laughing gulls, terns (royal and sandwich terns), and wading birds (great blue herons, roseate spoonbills, reddish egrets, great egrets, snowy egrets, tricolored herons, and black-crowned night herons). Restoration actions at each rookery island would increase the amount of available nesting habitat by increasing the size of the island, enhance the quality of habitat through the establishment of native vegetation, and increase the longevity of the habitat through the construction of protective features, such as breakwaters or armoring. These restoration actions would result in an increase in the numbers of nesting colonial waterbirds. Rookery islands in Galveston Bay include Dickinson Bay Island II, located within Dickinson Bay; Rollover Bay Island, located in East (Galveston) Bay; and Smith Point Island, located west of the Smith Point Peninsula. Dressing Point Island lies in East Matagorda Bay, and is part of the Big Boggy National Wildlife Refuge.

ES.1.9.2 Restore Living Shorelines and Reefs in Mississippi Estuaries

The proposed Restoring Living Shorelines and Reefs in Mississippi Estuaries project would restore intertidal and subtidal reefs and use living shoreline techniques in four bays. Projects are proposed in Grand Bay, Graveline Bay, Back Bay of Biloxi and vicinity, and St. Louis Bay, all located in Jackson, Harrison, and Hancock counties. The proposed project would provide for the construction of more than four miles of breakwaters, five acres of intertidal reef habitat and 267 acres of subtidal reef habitat across the Mississippi Gulf Coast.

ES.1.9.3 Bike and Pedestrian Use Enhancements at Davis Bayou, Mississippi District, Gulf Islands National Seashore

This proposed project would involve implementing roadway improvements for pedestrians and bicyclists in the Davis Bayou Area of Gulf Islands National Seashore. In response to prior public scoping meetings conducted outside of the Early Restoration process, NPS developed two action alternatives for this project. The NPS Preferred Alternative would widen the existing road surface on Park Road and Robert McGhee Road to accommodate multiple-use bicycle-pedestrian lanes. The other alternative would reduce the amount of automobile traffic in the park by limiting access to VFW Road during certain times of the day. Both alternatives would include two traffic-calming medians on Park Road.

ES.1.9.4 Bon Secour National Wildlife Refuge Trail Enhancement, Alabama

This proposed project would involve repairing and improving, to an American with Disabilities Act (ADA) standard, an existing trail (Jeff Friend Trail) on Bon Secour National Wildlife Refuge (NWR). The NWR is located on the Gulf Coast, 8 miles west of the city of Gulf Shores, Alabama, in Baldwin and Mobile counties. This aged boardwalk and gravel trail would be repaired and improved to ensure safe public access and to enhance the quality of visitor experience. An observation platform would also be constructed along the trail, and two handicapped parking spaces would be widened to better accommodate visitors. The project is not expected to significantly increase visitation, but rather to provide a safe and enhanced experience for visitors to the Refuge.

ES.1.9.5 Osprey Restoration in Coastal Alabama

The proposed restoration project would install five osprey nesting platforms along the coast in Mobile and Baldwin Counties, Alabama in order to provide enhanced nesting opportunities for pisciverous (fish-eating) raptors.

ES.1.9.6 Point aux Pins Living Shoreline

The proposed Point aux Pins Living Shoreline project would employ living shoreline techniques that utilize natural and/or artificial breakwater materials to stabilize shorelines along an area in Portersville Bay in the Mississippi Sound near Point aux Pins in Mobile County, Alabama. The proposed project would be located adjacent to an existing living shoreline project previously constructed by the ADCNR utilizing other funding sources.

Construction activities would include placement of breakwater materials along the shoreline to dampen wave energy and reduce shoreline erosion while also providing habitat and increasing benthic secondary

productivity. The specific breakwater elevations, construction techniques and design would be developed to maximize project success and meet regulatory requirements. Over time, the breakwaters are expected to provide habitat that supports benthic secondary productivity, including, but not limited to, bivalve mollusks, annelid worms, shrimp, crabs, and small forage fishes.

ES.1.9.7 Shell Belt and Coden Belt Roads Living Shoreline

The proposed Shell Belt and Coden Belt Roads Living Shoreline project would employ shoreline restoration techniques to increase benthic productivity and enhance the growth of planted native marsh vegetation. The proposed project would be located in the Portersville Bay portion of Mississippi Sound, seaward of the southernmost portions of Shell Belt and Coden Belt Roads in Coden, Alabama. This project would be constructed to dampen wave energy and protect newly planted emergent vegetation while also providing habitat and increasing benthic secondary productivity. The specific breakwater elevations, construction techniques and design would be developed to maximize project success and meet regulatory requirements. 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. Marsh vegetation is expected to become established further enhancing both primary and secondary productivity adjacent to the breakwaters.

ES.1.9.8 Seagrass Recovery Project at Gulf Islands National Seashore, Florida District

The proposed Seagrass Recovery project at Gulf Islands National Seashore's Florida District would restore shallow seagrass beds in the Florida panhandle. It would restore .02 acres of seagrass injured by propeller scars, blow holes and human foot traffic, primarily in turtle grass (*Thalassia testudinum*) habitats on DOI-managed lands located along the south side of the Naval Live Oaks Preserve in Santa Rosa Sound, in Santa Rosa County, Florida. Project activities would include harvesting and transplanting seagrass, installing bird stakes to condition sediments to promote seagrass survival, and installing signage to educate visitors about the restoration project and the ecological importance of seagrass.

ES.1.9.9 Sea Turtle Early Restoration

The Sea Turtle Early Restoration project is a multi-faceted approach to restoration that collectively addresses identified needs for a variety of species and life stages of sea turtles, consistent with long-term recovery plans and plan objectives for sea turtles in the Gulf of Mexico. The Sea Turtle Early Restoration project consists of four complementary project components:

- The Kemp's Ridley Sea Turtle Nest Detection and Enhancement project component would provide needed additional staff, infrastructure, training, education activities, equipment, supplies, and vehicles over a 10-year period in both Texas and Mexico for Kemp's ridley sea turtle nest detection and protection.

- The Enhancement of the Sea Turtle Stranding and Salvage Network (STSSN) and Development of an Emergency Response Program project component would enhance the existing STSSN beyond current capacities for 10 years in Texas and across the Gulf as well as develop a formal Emergency Response Program within the Gulf of Mexico.

- The Gulf of Mexico Shrimp Trawl Bycatch Reduction component would enhance two existing NOAA programs which would work to reduce the bycatch of sea turtles in shrimp trawls in the Gulf of Mexico. The two programs are the Gear Monitoring Team (GMT) and the Southeast Shrimp Trawl Fisheries Observer Program (Observer Program).

- The Texas Enhanced Fisheries Bycatch Enforcement component would enhance TPWD enforcement activities for fisheries that incidentally catch sea turtles while they operate primarily in Texas State waters within the Gulf of Mexico, for a 10-year period.

ES.1.9.10 Pelagic Longline Bycatch Reduction Project

The proposed Pelagic Longline Bycatch Reduction Project would restore open-ocean (pelagic) fish that were affected by the spill. The Gulf pelagic longline (PLL) fishery primarily targets yellowfin tuna and swordfish, but incidentally catches and discards other fish, including marlin, sharks, bluefin tuna, and smaller individuals of the target species. The project aims to reduce the number of fish accidentally caught and killed in fishing gear by compensating PLL fishermen who agree to voluntarily refrain from PLL fishing in the Gulf during an annual six-month repose period that coincides with the bluefin tuna spawning season. The project would also provide participating fishermen with two alternative gear types to allow for the continued harvest of yellowfin tuna and swordfish during the repose period when PLL gear is not used.

ES.1.10 Severability of Proposed Phase IV Early Restoration Projects

In the Draft Phase IV ERP/EA, the Trustees propose 10 specific Early Restoration projects expected to cost approximately $134 million. The proposed Phase IV projects presented in this Draft Phase IV ERP/EA are independent of each other and may be selected independently by the Trustees. A decision not to select one or more of the proposed projects in the Final Phase IV ERP/EA should not affect the Trustees' selection of the remaining Phase IV Early Restoration projects.

ES.1.11 Public Participation

The Draft Phase IV ERP/EA is being made available for public review and comment for 30 days. The public is encouraged to review and comment on the proposed Phase IV projects. The deadline for submitting written comments on the document, as specified in a public notice published in the Federal Register, is 30 days from the date of this Draft Phase IV ERP/EA. Public comments will be considered by the Trustees prior to making project selection decisions and finalizing the Phase IV plan. Comments on the Draft Phase IV ERP/EA can be submitted during the comment period by one of following methods:

- Via the internet: http://www.gulfspillrestoration.noaa.gov

- Via hard copy, write: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, P.O. Box 49567, Atlanta, GA 30345.

Please note that if you include your address, phone number, email address, or other personal identifying information in your comment, your entire comment, including your personal identifying information, could be made publicly available.

The Trustees will hold a series of public meetings to facilitate the public review and comment process for the proposed Phase IV projects. Meeting locations, dates, and times are set forth below. They are also specified in the Federal Register notice announcing release of this document. After the close of the public comment period, the Trustees will consider all input received during the public comment period, and then finalize this Draft Phase IV ERP/EA, as may be appropriate. A summary of comments received and the Trustees' responses will be included in the Final Phase IV ERP/EA. After the close of the public comment period, the Trustees will consider all public input received. The Draft Phase IV ERP/EA will then be finalized as may be appropriate.

ES.1.12 Administrative Record

Pursuant to 15 C.F.R. § 990.45, the Trustees opened a publicly available Administrative Record for the NRDA for the Spill, including restoration planning activities, concurrently with the publication of the 2010 Notice of Intent to Conduct Restoration Planning. DOI is the lead Federal Trustee for maintaining the Administrative Record, which can be found at http://www.doi.gov/deepwaterhorizon/adminrecord.[7] Information about early restoration project implementation is being provided to the public through the Administrative Record and other outreach efforts, including http://www.gulfspillrestoration.noaa.gov.

ES.1.13 Remaining Milestones

The following is a list of milestones that would occur prior to project implementation.

- Draft Phase IV ERP/EA release for public review and comment
- Public comment period
- Public meetings (occurring during the public comment period) to solicit input- all meetings from 6-9 PM local time
    - June2 : Crowne Plaza Pensacola Grand Hotel, 200 East Gregory Street, Pensacola, FL 32502
    - June 3: Renaissance Mobile Riverview Plaza Hotel, 64 South Water Street Mobile, AL 36602
    - June 4: University of Southern Mississippi, Long Beach, FEC Auditorium 730 East Beach Boulevard, Long Beach, MS 39560
    - June 8: Belle Chasse Auditorium, 8398 Louisiana 23, Belle Chasse, LA 70037
    - June 10: Texas A&M University at Galveston, Seawolf Parkway on Pelican Island Auditorium, Class Room Lab Building – Building #3007 on campus map Galveston, TX 77554
    - June 11: Harte Research Institute for Gulf of Mexico Studies Texas A&M University at Corpus Christi, 6300 Ocean Drive Corpus Christi, TX 78412

[7] Additionally, Louisiana is also maintaining an Administrative Record (see http://losco-dwh.com/AdminRecord.aspx) in accordance with state regulations (La. Admin. Code 43:127).

- Review public comments
- Consider and prepare responses to comments
- Revise the Draft Phase IV ERP/EA (as appropriate), including responses to comments
- Issue Final Phase IV ERP/EA and NEPA decisions
- File Stipulation Agreements with the Court

Table of Contents

Executive Summary

Chapter 1: Introduction, Purpose and Need, and Public Participation

Chapter 2: Affected Environment and Environmental Setting

Chapter 3: The Deepwater Horizon Oil Spill Natural Resource Injury Assessment

Chapter 4: Introduction to Proposed Phase IV Early Restoration Projects

Chapter 5: Proposed Texas Rookery Islands Project

Chapter 6: Proposed Restoring Living Shorelines in Mississippi Estuaries Project

Chapter 7: Proposed Bike and Pedestrian Use Enhancements at Davis Bayou, Mississippi District, Gulf Islands National Seashore

Chapter 8: Proposed Bon Secour National Wildlife Refuge Trail Enhancement Project

Chapter 9: Proposed Osprey Restoration in Coastal Alabama

Chapter 10: Proposed Point aux Pins Living Shoreline Project

Chapter 11: Proposed Shell Belt and Coden Belt Roads Living Shoreline Project

Chapter 12: Proposed Seagrass Recovery Project at Gulf Islands National Seashore, Florida District

Chapter 13: Proposed Sea Turtle Early Restoration Project

Chapter 14: Proposed Pelagic Longline Bycatch Reduction Project

List of Preparers

List of Repositories

Appendices:

Appendix A: Evaluation of Change to the Phase III Early Restoration Project: Enhancement of Franklin County Parks and Boat Ramps – Eastpoint Fishing Pier Improvements

Appendix B: Phase IV Early Restoration Project Monitoring Plans

Appendix C: Additional Phase IV Project Offset Information

Appendix D: Guidelines for NEPA Impact Determinations from the Final Phase III ERP/PEIS

Appendix E: Statements of Findings Related to DOI Bike and Pedestrian Use Enhancement Project at Gulf Islands National Seashore

Appendix F: 2011 National Park Service EA "Expansion of Facilities Supporting Sea Turtle Science and Recovery, Construction of Patrol Cabins and Expansion of Incubation Laboratory, 2011"

Phase IV Early Restoration Plan List of Acronyms

ACRONYM	DEFINITION
ADA	Americans with Disabilities Act
ADCNR	Alabama Department of Conservation and Natural Resources
ADEM	Alabama Department of Environmental Management
ASA	American Sportfishing Association
ATCA	Atlantic Tunas Convention Act
BCR	Benefit-to-Cost Ratio
BGEPA	The Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act
BLM	Bureau of Land Management
BMPs	Best Management Practices
BP	British Petroleum Exploration and Production Inc.
CAAA	Clean Air Act Amendments
CCC	Civilian Conservation Corps
CCP	Comprehensive Conservation Plan
CEQ	Council on Environmental Quality
CH_4	Methane
CO	Carbon Monoxide
CO_2	Carbon Dioxide
CPRA	Louisiana Coastal Protection and Restoration Authority
CPUE	Catch-Per-Unit Effort
CWA/RHA	Clean Water Act Section 404 and Rivers and Harbors Act
CZMA	Coastal Zone Management Act
Dkg-Ys	Discounted Kilogram Years
DOI	The United States Department of the Interior
DPS	Distinct Population Segment
DSAYs	Discounted Service Acre-Years
dw	Dressed Weight
EA	Environmental Assessment
EEZ	Exclusive Economic Zone
EFH	Essential Fish Habitat
EIS	Environmental Impact Statement

ACRONYM	DEFINITION
EMS	Electronic Monitoring System
EO	Executive Order
EPA	The United States Environmental Protection Agency
ESA	Endangered Species Act
FAC	Florida Administrative Code
FDEP	Florida Department of Environmental Protection
Final Phase III ERP/PEIS	Final Programmatic and Phase III Early Restoration Plan and Early Restoration Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement
FMP	Fishery Management Plan
FWC	Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission
GBEP	Galveston Bay Estuary Program
GBNERR	Grand Bay National Estuarine Research Reserve
GCRL	University of Southern Mississippi Gulf Coast Research Laboratory
GHG	Greenhouse Gas
GIWW	Gulf Intracoastal Waterway
GMT	Gear Monitoring Team
GMFMC	Gulf of Mexico Fishery Management Council
GOM	Gulf of Mexico
GSA	Geological Survey of Alabama
GSMFC	Gulf States Marine Fisheries Commission
GUIS	Gulf Islands National Seashore
HAPC	Habitat Area of Particular Concern
HCD	National Marine Fisheries Service Habitat Conservation Division
HEA	Habitat Equivalency Analysis
HGB	Houston-Galveston-Brazoria Intrastate Air Quality Control Region
HMS	Highly Migratory Species
IBQ	Individual Bluefin Quota
ICCAT	International Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas
IPCC	The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
ITS	Incidental Take Statement
LDEQ	Louisiana Department of Environmental Quality
LDNR	Louisiana Department of Natural Resources
LDWF	Louisiana Department of Wildlife and Fisheries

ACRONYM	DEFINITION
LOSCO	Louisiana Oil Spill Coordinator's Office
MASH	Mobile Aquatic Sea Turtle Holding
MBTA	Migratory Bird Treaty Act
MDEQ	Mississippi Department of Environmental Quality
MDMR	Mississippi Department of Marine Resources
MDWFP	Mississippi Department of Wildlife Fisheries and Parks
MHHW	Mean Higher High Water
MLLW	Mean Lower Low Water
MMPA	Marine Mammal Protection Act
MMTCO2E	Million Metric Tons Of CO2 Equivalents
MRB	Mississippi River Basin
MSFCMA	Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act
MTL	Mean Tidal Levels
NAAQS	National Ambient Air Quality Standards
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
NGO	Non-governmental Organization
NHPA	National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended
NMFS	National Marine Fisheries Service
NO_2	Nitrogen Dioxide
NOAA	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
NOI	Notice of Intent
NPDES	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
NPS	National Park Service
NRDA	Natural Resources Damage Assessment
NRHP	National Register of Historic Places
NWR	National Wildlife Refuge
O_3	Surficial Ozone
OPA	Oil Pollution Act
OSHA	Occupational Safety and Health Administration
PAH(s)	Polycyclic Aromatic Hydrocarbons
PAIS	Padre Island National Seashore
PCE	Primary Constituent Element

ACRONYM	DEFINITION
PE	Professional Engineer
PEA	Programmatic Environmental Assessment
PEIS	Programmatic Environmental Impact Statement
Phase IV ERP/EA	Phase IV Early Restoration Plan and Environmental Assessments
PIT	Passive Integrated Transporter
PLL	Pelagic Longline
PM10	Fine Particulates With A Diameter Of 10 Micrometers Or Less
PM2.5	Fine Particulates With A Diameter Of 2.5 Micrometers Or Less
PPT	Parts Per Thousand
PVC	Polyvinyl chloride
REA	Resource Equivalency Analysis
RPA	Reasonable and Prudent Alternative
SAFE	Stock Assessment and Fisheries Evaluation
SAV	Submerged Aquatic Vegetation
SERO	NOAA Southeast Regional Office
SHPO	State Historic Preservation Officer
SO_2	Sulfur Dioxide
STSSN	Sea Turtle Stranding and Salvage Network
SWIM	Surface Water Improvement and Management
TCEQ	Texas Commission on Environmental Quality
TED	Turtle Excluder Device
THC	Texas Historical Commission
TGLO	Texas General Land Office
TPWD	Texas Parks and Wildlife Department
UME	Unusual Mortality Event
USACE	United States Army Corps of Engineers
USDA	United States Department of Agriculture
USFWS	United States Fish and Wildlife Service
UTV	Utility Terrain Vehicle
VMS	Vessel Monitoring System
WAUs	Wave Attenuation Units