DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
United States Marine Corps

PROPOSED FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT (FONSI) FOR
SHORELINE STABILIZATION AT PUULOA RANGE TRAINING FACILITY, OAHU, HAWAII

Pursuant to the Council on Environmental Quality Regulations (40 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] Parts 1500-1508) implementing the procedural provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) (42 USC 4321 et seq.), Environmental Compliance and Protection Manual, Chapter 12, Marine Corps Order (MCO) P5090.2 CH 3 of 26 August 2013, and U.S. Marine Corps (USMC) NEPA Manual (Version 2 of September 2011), the USMC gives notice that an Environmental Assessment (EA) has been prepared for the proposed Shoreline Stabilization at Puuloa Range Training Facility, Oahu, Hawaii. Based on the EA, the Proposed Action was determined to not result in significant impacts to the human or natural environment; therefore, an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is not required.

Proposed Action: The United States Marine Corps (USMC) proposes to initiate measures to mitigate coastal erosion of the fast land (i.e., above the tidal influence) in order to protect existing range structures (i.e., impact berms) at the Puuloa Range Training Facility (PRTF) small-arms training range at Puuloa, Ewa Beach, Oahu. The Proposed Action would consist of the installation of approximately 1,500 feet of sheet pile along the fast land boundary of the long-distance ranges (Ranges A and B); a maximum-feasible retreat/setback from the shoreline of the short-distance ranges (Ranges C-F); and revegetation of available fast land areas fronting all ranges as feasible. The sheet pile would be installed within fast land on the ocean side of the Range A and B impact berms to mitigate erosion to the berms. The maximum feasible retreat of the four short distance ranges (Ranges C-F) is estimated at 100-feet. Retreat of the ranges may require relocation of existing backstop berms, structures, and/or utilities.

The purpose of the Proposed Action is to protect the PRTF shoreline from continuing erosion that could compromise its use.

The need for the Proposed Action is to ensure long-term sustainability of the heavily used range for training and equipping combat-capable forces ready to deploy worldwide. In this respect, the Proposed Action furthers the USMC's execution of its congressionally mandated roles and responsibilities under 10 U.S.C. section 5063, as well as its range management responsibilities under Marine Corps Order P3550.10.

Alternatives Analyzed: In addition to the Proposed Action, one Action Alternative (Alternative 2) was also analyzed in this EA. Alternative 2 presents an alternative shoreline stabilization strategy to the Preferred Alternative. It is similar to the Preferred Alternative in regards to the proposed sheet pile installation along Ranges A and B and the revegetation efforts along all ranges; the difference is that Alternative 2 includes a combination of retreat from the shoreline and/or installation of up to 1,000 feet of additional sheet pile along the fast land boundary of one or more of Ranges C-F.

As required by NEPA, the No-Action Alternative was also analyzed within this EA. The No-Action Alternative would not meet the purpose of and need for the Proposed Action. The No-Action Alternative was used to analyze the consequences of not undertaking the Proposed Action, and served to establish a comparative baseline for analysis. Under the No-Action Alternative, the Proposed Action would not occur. The range complex would continue to be subjected to boundary erosion from wave action associated with storms, sea-level rise, and potential seismic-wave events. This could eventually lead to erosion of the earthen berms along the seaward boundaries of the ranges, seawater intrusion into the

ranges rendering them unusable, and increased potential for erosion and lead contamination of the beach and water.

Environmental Effects: Analysis was conducted on a broad range of potentially affected environmental components that determined the Proposed Action is not expected to result in any significant impacts to the following environmental component: air quality, water resources, geological resources, cultural resources, biological resources, recreational resources, land use, visual resources, noise, infrastructure, public health and safety, and hazardous materials and waste. The Proposed Action would not have disproportionate environmental health and safety effects to children or cause disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects on any minority or low-income populations. The Proposed Action was considered in connection with any past, present and reasonably foreseeable future projects in its vicinity and would result in no significant cumulative impacts. The following environmental components warrant additional discussion.

Water Resources: The project would have less than significant temporary construction period impacts due to ground disturbance and the potential for sediment and pollutant transport to nearshore marine waters. These potential short-term impacts would be avoided or mitigated by best management practices (BMPs) associated with the required National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit. During the operational period, the Proposed Action could result in long-term beneficial impacts to marine water quality due to the protection of the PRTF shoreline from erosion of the fast land which could otherwise contribute to a reduction in future marine water quality.

Geological Resources: The project would have less than significant impacts during construction due to site preparation and ground disturbing construction activities. Potential impacts to geological resources would be avoided or minimized through the implementation of BMPs required by the NPDES permit, and the project area topography would be returned to its pre-construction state to the maximum extent practicable. During the operational period, the proposed sheet pile bulkhead would protect the PRTF shoreline from future erosion. No significant impacts are expected to adjacent shoreline areas due to the predominant west to east longshore sand transport, the buffer areas provided at either end of the proposed sheet pile, and the design elements of the proposed sheet pile which would minimize impacts from end scour.

Cultural Resources: In accordance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), the USMC consulted with the Hawaii State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), the Office of Hawaiian Affairs, the Oahu Island Burial Council, the Temple of Lono, and the Historic Hawaii Foundation (see correspondence in Appendix C). The USMC determined that the Proposed Action would result in no historic properties affected in accordance with Section 106 Implementing Regulations at 36 CFR 800.4(d)(1). The SHPO concurred with the USMC's determination via letter dated June 30, 2017. The Proposed Action would not impact traditional Hawaiian (or other ethnic group's) rights related to gathering, access, or other customary activities exercised for subsistence, cultural and religious purposes.

Biological Resources: In accordance with Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act (ESA) the USMC conducted informal consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and the National

Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) regarding potential impacts to ESA-listed species including the green sea turtle and the Hawaiian monk seal. Additionally, in accordance with the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (MSFCMA) the USMC conducted consultation with NMFS regarding potential impacts to essential fish habitat (EFH). The USMC determined and the agencies (USFWS and NMFS) concurred that the Proposed Action may affect, but is not likely to adversely affect, biological resources (including listed species and EFH) with implementation of BMPs and conservation measures such as the following:

- During all construction activities, surveys shall be made prior to the start of work each day, and prior to resumption of work following any break of more than one half hour, checking for protected species presence, and also disturbance to the beach indicative of nighttime sea turtle nesting.
- All work shall be postponed or halted when ESA-listed marine species are within 150 feet (or 300 feet for seal/pup pairs) of the proposed work, and shall only begin/resume after the animals have voluntarily departed the area.
- Turbidity and siltation from project-related work shall be minimized and contained through the appropriate use of erosion control practices, effective silt containment devices, and the curtailment of work during adverse weather and tidal/flow conditions. If turbidity will result from construction activities, silt curtains shall be used to contain turbidity to the minimum area possible.
- An EFH monitoring plan will be implemented to monitor for potential impacts to EFH.

Coastal Zone Management: The Hawaii Coastal Zone Management (CZM) Office has acknowledged that Proposed Action within PRTF is an activity that is covered by the Navy and Marine Corps de minimis list under the Coastal Zone Management Act and would not result in any reasonably foreseeable direct or indirect effects to uses or resources within the Hawaii Coastal Zone.

Public Involvement: A Notice of Availability for the Proposed FONSI was published in the Honolulu Star Advertiser on August 29, 30 and 31. The public comment period was open from August 29 to September 13, 2019. The Proposed FONSI, as well as the EA were made available via the Marine Corps Base Hawaii public website **(**https://www.mcbhawaii.marines.mil/Resources/Featured-Information/Puuloa-Shoreline/**)** during the public comment period.

Finding: Based on the information gathered and the analysis conducted during the preparation of this EA, the USMC finds that implementation of the Proposed Action will not significantly impact the quality of the human or natural environment or generate significant controversy. BMPs will be implemented to further minimize both short-term construction and long-term effects on the environment. Consequently, an EIS is not required.

Interested parties may obtain a copy of the FONSI and the EA at the website listed above.

DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY
United States Marine Corps

PROPOSED FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT (FONSI) FOR
SHORELINE STABILIZATION AT PUULOA RANGE TRAINING FACILITY, OAHU, HAWAII

_____ _____

R. Lianez
Colonel, U.S. Marine Corps
Commanding Officer, Marine Corps Base Hawaii Date