Message

From: Donnelly, Peggy [Donnelly.Peggy@epa.gov]
Sent: 4/11/2019 5:00:25 PM
To: Burdick, Melanie [Burdick.Melanie@epa.gov]
CC: Pelloso, Elizabeth [Pelloso.Elizabeth@epa.gov]; Hicks, Scott [scott_hicks@fws.gov]; Westlake, Kenneth [westlake.kenneth@epa.gov]; Tschampa, Andrew [tschampa.andrew@epa.gov]; Simon, Roy [Simon.Roy@epa.gov]
Subject: Re: NRCS compliance with NEPA - Lower Grand River Watershed Habitat Restoration RCPP

Melanie, can you please keep me updated as you continue to consult with the state on this? Just a CC on email messages, when appropriate, would be great. I'm sometimes in contact with folks in Grand Rapids on other Urban Waters projects there, so it would be helpful for me to stay informed, so I'm not thrown off-guard if they bring up other R5 decisions or comments.

Thanks much!

On Apr 11, 2019, at 8:00 AM, Burdick, Melanie <Burdick.Melanie@epa.gov> wrote:

I have been involved in discussions about the MDEQ CWA 404 permit (Michigan Part 303 wetlands and 301 inland lakes and streams) requirements for the two parts of the Grand River dam removal/river restoration. Based on a very conceptual plan, the state and EPA agreed that it was reasonable to split the project's state 404 permitting into two parts (NRCS vs. Corps project). However, because the first part of the project (NRCS) may limit alternatives within the second (Corps) and because there would be cumulative impacts to the two projects, MDEQ and EPA did request a reasonable amount of detail regarding the Corps project before we would be able to make a decision on the NRCS permit. MDEQ was particularly interested in how floodplain permitting would be implemented.

Let me know if you have any questions,

Melanie Burdick
Watersheds and Wetlands
U.S. EPA (ww-16j)
77 W. Jackson Blvd
Chicago, Illinois 60604
e-mail: burdick.melanie@epa.gov
phone: 312-886-2255
fax: 312-697-2598

From: Donnelly, Peggy
Sent: Wednesday, April 10, 2019 4:11 PM
To: Pelloso, Elizabeth <Pelloso.Elizabeth@epa.gov>
Cc: Hicks, Scott <scott_hicks@fws.gov>; Westlake, Kenneth <westlake.kenneth@epa.gov>; Burdick, Melanie <Burdick.Melanie@epa.gov>; Tschampa, Andrew <tschampa.andrew@epa.gov>; Simon, Roy <Simon.Roy@epa.gov>
Subject: Re: NRCS compliance with NEPA - Lower Grand River Watershed Habitat Restoration RCPP

Hi Liz -

Thanks for looping us into this conversation. Scott is correct that both Andy and I have been involved with the Grand Rapids Urban Waters Federal Partnership location since it started. Our participation has mostly been on the periphery. We have been to a few meetings of all the watershed partners there over the past 5 or so years, and participated in a few conference calls - but they have been about general water quality issues, hopes for restoration, ways to improve

water quality throughout the watershed, etc. I've been a little more involved in green infrastructure planning and installations around the city, and up into the rural parts of the watershed. This is mostly things like rain gardens, curb cuts, and planting native species in places like Plaster Creek. I have not participated in dam removal planning or specific details, I just know it is something several in Grand Rapids wish to see done. Four or five years ago, I saw a concept plan for removing the dam(s?), which involved riparian restoration, in hopes of improving water quality. But, I don't know the specifics of how that plan has progressed over the years. Hopefully it still considers water quality, and important species of concern and their habitats. I would be very interested in seeing the current plan and hearing the status / kept informed. If you need a water quality perspective on anything, I'm glad to review and provide comments where that applies.

Since Roy works in our HQ office, I don't believe he has been too involved in the project - but maybe he has something more to share?

Peg Donnelly
U.S. EPA, Water Division
312.886.6109 office
312.914.4794 cell

On Apr 10, 2019, at 3:01 PM, Pelloso, Elizabeth <Pelloso.Elizabeth@epa.gov> wrote:

Scott,

Thanks – your clarification is helpful for me. I could have been clearer; what I meant is that the EPA NEPA program has no record of involvement thus far (in scoping, early coordination, etc.).

Liz Pelloso, PWS
NEPA Implementation Section
USEPA - Region 5
Phone: 312-886-7425
Email: pelloso.elizabeth@epa.gov

From: Hicks, Scott <scott_hicks@fws.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, April 10, 2019 2:54 PM
To: Pelloso, Elizabeth <Pelloso.Elizabeth@epa.gov>
Subject: Re: [EXTERNAL] FW: NRCS compliance with NEPA - Lower Grand River Watershed Habitat Restoration RCPP

Liz,
Thanks for sharing this and for the conversation this morning.

One line in your e-mail jumped out to me, which was the "EPA we have no record of involvement with the project..." as an Urban Waters Federal Partnership site, EPA staff have been involved at various times or at least were aware of this project (e.g., from EPA -- Andrew Tschampa, Peggy Donnelly, Tim Henry, Roy Simon,...) and Melanie Burdick has been part of discussions re: 404 permitting.

Honestly EPA's urban waters designation is what drove the fairly high level of involvement of several Federal agencies through the many early years of this effort.

Also in the past some DEQ folks have specifically not wanted to involve EPA staff in some permitting discussions (as it is a state assumed program decisions,....), in any case, having your involvement/perspectives regarding NEPA related questions will be a great resource for folks.

Thanks again,
Scott

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Michigan Ecological Services Field Office
2651 Coolidge Road, Suite 101
East Lansing, Michigan 48823

Phone: 517-351-6274

From: Pelloso, Elizabeth
Sent: Wednesday, April 10, 2019 2:12 PM
To: Charles Uhlarik <Charles.A.Uhlarik@usace.army.mil>; amanda.r.meyer@usace.army.mil; 'jason.a.chrumka@usace.army.mil' <jason.a.chrumka@usace.army.mil>
Cc: Scott Hanshue <hanshues1@michigan.gov>; 'Jessica_Pruden@fws.gov' <Jessica_Pruden@fws.gov>; Scott Hicks <Scott_Hicks@fws.gov>; 'ErtelP@michigan.gov' <ErtelP@michigan.gov>; Luke Trumble (trumblel@michigan.gov) <trumblel@michigan.gov>; 'WesleyJ@michigan.gov' <WesleyJ@michigan.gov>; Amy Lounds <LOUNDSA@michigan.gov>; 'MatousekB@michigan.gov' <MatousekB@michigan.gov>; 'OCCHIPINTIM@michigan.gov' <OCCHIPINTIM@michigan.gov>
Subject: FW: NRCS compliance with NEPA - Lower Grand River Watershed Habitat Restoration RCPP

Charlie, Amanda, and Jason,

It was good to see you Monday in Grand Rapids (and also to see nearly everyone on the CC list!) at USACE's open house/scoping meeting for the Grand River Habitat Restoration and Invasive Species Control Project. At Monday's meeting, I learned about the adjacent proposed Lower Grand River Watershed Habitat Restoration - Farmland Conservation Project, which is being undertaken with a lot of partners, including the Grand Valley Metro Council and the City of Grand Rapids. That project is being partially funded by NRCS under their Regional Conservation Partnership Program (RCPP), and as such, must comply with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). I had not been aware of this proposed project until Monday.

Having said that, I was curious as to how the environmental impacts/effects of two adjacent projects with two different federal lead agencies, even if they are determined to have "independent utility," are not being studied jointly under NEPA. USACE's project is being reviewed as an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), while NRCS's project is currently moving forward as an Environmental Assessment (EA). It also appears there is some project overlap in the area just north of I-196.

I spent some time on the phone this morning with Betsy Dierberger (NRCS MI) and the email below to her is the follow-up to the conversation we had. I suggested that she work with both USACE and USFWS, in addition to the state agencies, as NEPA progresses. I also would like to know, from NRCS's standpoint, why they are utilizing an EA as their NEPA document.

This is more of just an FYI for you. For folks on CC, if your agencies have previously sent or plan to send any correspondence out to either NRCS or to USACE on these two projects that relates to 404/water permitting, dam safety, fisheries, flooding concerns, etc., I would appreciate a copy of any prior correspondence, and also to be cc'd on any correspondence you may send out during the current scoping period.

Thanks much!
Liz Pelloso

Liz Pelloso, PWS
Wetland/Environmental Scientist
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency - Region 5
NEPA Implementation Section

77 W. Jackson Blvd. (Mail Code E-19J)
Chicago, IL 60604
Phone: 312-886-7425
Email: pelloso.elizabeth@epa.gov

From: Pelloso, Elizabeth
Sent: Wednesday, April 10, 2019 1:56 PM
To: Betsy.Dierberger@mi.usda.gov
Cc: kim.wieber@mi.usda.gov
Subject: NRCS compliance with NEPA - Lower Grand River Watershed Habitat Restoration RCPP
Importance: High

Hi Betsy,

Thanks for your time this morning on the phone to discuss the status of NEPA compliance for the Lower Grand River Watershed Habitat Restoration - Farmland Conservation Project (Project) and Watershed Project Plan (WPP) under PL-566. The project's local lead partner is the Grand Valley Metro Council (GVMC). GVMC is developing the WPP to be compliant with NRCS standards. GVMC is also coordinating funding obtained through USDA-NRCS's Regional Conservation Partnership Program (RCPP) for the project, and the WPP must be completed prior to full Project implementation.

As I noted during our call, I was in Grand Rapids this past Monday to attend the USACE's public scoping meeting/open house for the proposed Grand River Habitat Restoration and Invasive Species Control Project. The USACE Detroit District will be preparing an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) under NEPA, on behalf of the Great Lakes Fishery Commission. USACE's Federal Register Notice of Intent (NOI) was published March 15, 2019. The NOI states, "*the Draft EIS will consider*
the direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts of alternatives on affected resources that are identified during the scoping process, including, but are not limited to: Water quality, stream flows, air quality, fish and wildlife (including federally-listed endangered species and their designated critical habitat), floodplains, wetlands, climate, cultural resources, and social and economic resources such as noise, aesthetics, environmental justice."

In addition to information presented Monday by USACE about their proposed project, the open house also included representatives discussing the RCPP project. This included a table and large poster about the project, including the "Why Are We Doing This Watershed Project Plan" visual.

This visual explicitly states:
To support the NRCS funding decision three project alternatives were considered before choosing a preferred alternative:
- *No action*
- *Removal of four, low-head beautification dams without substrate improvements*
- *Removal of four, low-head beautification dams with substrate improvements*

The preferred alternative is removal of four, low-head beautification dams and creation of more substrate diversity that will create riffle habitat features with associated run, pool, and glide habitats.

When I saw this information at Monday's meeting, it seemed to me (from a NEPA perspective) that a decision on the RCPP project and a "preferred alternative" had already been made. It was not clear if the NEPA process had been concluded already, or if those public-facing statements are being made even though NEPA hasn't concluded. While this project seems to have a long history, here at EPA we have no record of involvement with the project, which is why I reached out this morning to find out what the status of NEPA is for the RCPP. When we spoke, you mentioned that NEPA is currently ongoing for the RCPP project. It is currently progressing as an Environmental Assessment (EA), although you stated that an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) was initially planned when the project was in earlier stages.

As you and I discussed, the RCPP project is downstream of USACE's proposed project. The two projects are adjacent, and both are located within a designated area called the "Grand River Revitalization and Rapids Restoration Project Boundary." NRCS's project starts at Fulton Street and continues north of I-196; it's about 3,300 feet. USACE's proposed project runs from I-196 to Ann Street. Project figures I have reviewed show a geographic overlap of the two projects, as NRCS's project boundary includes a portion of USACE's proposed project.

The reason I reached out to you today was to discuss the overlap of NRCS's and USACE's project. As you know, USACE's project has many similar environmental impacts to NRCS's proposed project, but is progressing as an EIS. NRCS's project proposes the removal of four dams; USACE's project only includes one dam, although they are undertaking the issue of preventing sea lamprey passage. Both projects are expected to have take and impacts to federally- and state-listed mussel species. NRCS's project has impacts to one federally-endangered mussel and 15 state-listed mussels.

The project as proposed will impact federally-listed and state listed mussel species, and USFWS is currently reviewing a Biological Opinion for impacts to the federally-endangered snuffbox mussel associated with the NRCS project. There will also be direct, indirect, and cumulative impacts due to the RCPP project, USACE's project, and the "River for All" initiative being undertaken. According to the NRCS Part 610 National Environmental Compliance Handbook, Subpart E, NRCS "*must prepare an EIS, rather than an EA...for proposed actions for which it is reasonable to anticipate cumulatively significant impacts*."

My understanding is that representatives from the Michigan Department of Natural Resources (MDNR) and the Michigan Department of Environmental Quality (MDEQ) have ongoing and current concerns with the RCPP project as well as the USACE project. Through discussions with MDEQ and MDNR representatives, I have been made aware of their ongoing concerns on backwater issues, potential impacts to existing fisheries and passage of the host fish for the federally-endangered snuffbox mussel, and the potential for flooding from installation of in-channel structures associated with dam removals. Based on this history of this project and the magnitude of involved players, public interest, and environmental impacts, I would like to understand why NRCS is moving forward with an EA and not an EIS to satisfy the requirements of NEPA.

As NRCS moves forward with their NEPA review, I would urge you to review some additional NEPA information, including NRCS's NEPA implementing regulations (linked from CEQ's webpage) and the "Forty Most Asked Questions Concerning CEQ's NEPA Regulations", commonly called the 40 Questions document), also linked from CEQ's website (https://ceq.doe.gov/guidance/guidance.html). It may also be beneficial to coordinate with NRCS's Agency NEPA contacts.

I am happy to help you out as much as I can with understanding the NEPA process. I would also, at a minimum, suggest that you get in touch with the USACE representatives undertaking the EIS, and determine the best way to coordinate your efforts under NEPA. "*Under 40 CFR Section 1501.5(b), federal, state or local agencies, as long as they include at least one federal agency, may act as joint lead agencies to prepare an EIS. Section 1506.2 also strongly urges state and local agencies and the relevant federal agencies to cooperate fully with each other. This should cover joint research and studies, planning activities, public hearings, environmental assessments and the preparation of joint EISs under NEPA and the relevant "little NEPA" state laws, so that one document will satisfy both laws. The preparation of an area-wide or overview EIS may be particularly useful when similar actions, viewed with other reasonably foreseeable or proposed agency actions, share common timing or geography. For example, when a variety of energy projects may be located in a single watershed, or when a series of new energy technologies may be developed through federal funding, the overview or area-wide EIS would serve as a valuable and necessary analysis of the affected environment and the potential cumulative impacts of the reasonably foreseeable actions under that program or within that geographical area.*" (40 Questions). In this case, NRCS's project and USACE's project share overlapping geography and the two projects will affect each other, regardless of whether or not any federal agency has determined that a specific project may have independent utility. Further coordination with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service would also be beneficial, as they, as well as state regulatory agencies, could provide assistance to NRCS as cooperating agencies under NEPA. USACE may already be in discussions with USFWS regarding asking them to be a cooperating agency for their EIS.

"As a general rule, the CEQ NEPA regulations contemplate that agencies should use a broad approach in defining significance and should not rely on the possibility of mitigation as an excuse to avoid the EIS requirement. (See 40 CFR Sections 1508.8, 1508.27.) If a proposal appears to have adverse effects which would be significant, and certain mitigation measures are then developed during the scoping or EA stages, the existence of such possible mitigation does not obviate the need for an EIS. Therefore, if scoping or the EA identifies certain mitigation possibilities without altering the nature of the overall proposal itself, the agency should continue the EIS process and submit the proposal, and the potential mitigation, for public and agency review and comment. This is essential to ensure that the final decision is based on all the relevant factors and that the full NEPA process will result in enforceable mitigation measures through the Record of Decision."

I know this is a long email and a lot to take in. As I stated on the phone, I will be in the Lansing area next week and may be able to meet with you in person, should that work for your schedule(s). I can potentially meet with you on Monday afternoon (April 15th) or Thursday morning (April 18th). Let me know if an in-person meeting/discussion would be beneficial. Please feel free to call or email anytime to further discuss the project and NEPA procedures and requirements.

Thank you!
Liz Pelloso

Liz Pelloso, PWS
Wetland/Environmental Scientist
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency - Region 5
NEPA Implementation Section
77 W. Jackson Blvd. (Mail Code E-19J)
Chicago, IL 60604
Phone: 312-886-7425
Email: pelloso.elizabeth@epa.gov