CONTINUING AUTHORITIES PROGRAM SECTION 14 EMERGENCY STREAMBANK AND SHORELINE PROTECTION, JAMES RIVER SHORELINE NEWPORT NEWS, VIRGINIA

DRAFT INTEGRATED FEASIBILITY REPORT AND ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

VIRTUAL PUBLIC MEETING NOVEMBER 19, 2020

Richard Harr Project Manager Planning and Policy Branch Norfolk District Please stand by – Meeting starts at 5:30 pm

To listen to tonight's presentation please call: 844-800-2712 Meeting Number: 199 460 5423

L<u>ÉAR</u> BULKHEADS CAR BE XS & DAW

ESTRESSED CONCRETE JINNON GIRDER

"The views, opinions and findings contained in this report are those of the authors(s) and should not be construed as an official Department of the Army position, policy or decision, unless so designated by other official documentation."





VIRTUAL MEETING FORMAT

- Formal Presentation
 - Approximately 25-30 minutes
- Question and Answer Session
 - The chat feature will be enabled to allow questions to be asked via the chat feature; phone lines may also be opened for questions
 - Project team members will be available to provide responses
 - Please ensure your phone is muted

Formal comments on the draft report can be submitted via email to: justine.r.woodward@usace.army.mil or mail to: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Norfolk District, c/o Justine Woodward, 803 Front Street, Norfolk, Virginia 23510.

** Comments are due by 07 December 2020.

Project Website: https://www.nao.usace.army.mil/About/Projects/JamesRiverNewportNewsShoreline/





STUDY AUTHORITY

- Section 14 of the Flood Control Act of 1946, as amended
- Program designed to implement projects to protect public facilities and facilities owned by non-profit organizations
- Eligible facilities are highways, highway bridge approaches, public works facilities such as water and sewer lines, churches, and public and private nonprofit hospitals and schools





SPONSOR AND USACE ROLES

- The Non-Federal Sponsor is the City of Newport News.
- Support for the study:
 - Submitted a Letter of Intent to USACE on 15 May 2015;
 - Signed the Feasibility Cost Share Agreement in FY19; and
 - Active and participating member of the Project Delivery Team.

Feasibility Cost Share Federal/non-Federal Implementation Cost Share Federal/non-Federal Federal Project Limit

\$5,000,000.00

Federal 100% (First \$100,000)

Above \$100,000 are costshared 50% Federal (\$222,339.50) and 50% non-Federal (\$222,339.50)

Total = \$444,679.00





STUDY LOCATION







SITE VISIT DECEMBER 6, 2019



Photo 1: View facing southeast of eroding shoreline at project site along James River



Photo 3: View facing southeast of project site and crack in ground surface along James River



Photo 2: View facing northwest of eroding shoreline at project site along James River



Photo 4: View facing northwest of insitu debris





6

RELOCATION OF ROAD

- The 600-foot section of riverbank along James River will continue to erode by the combined effects of natural erosion processes; river flow, water level rise, and tidal, storm, and wind driven wave action;
- The existing 25-foot-high receding sandy bluff is an imminent threat to existing public facilities including River Road, public water and sewer lines, as well as creating dangerous conditions associated with the steep slope; and
- Assumes future damages to River Road and water/sewer utilities along the full length of the study area and relocation thereof.



PROBLEMS, OPPORTUNITIES, OBJECTIVES, AND CONSTRAINTS

PROBLEMS

- River bank is severely eroded so there is risk to River Road and various utilities in the vicinity
- Continued erosion could compromise an existing Federal project (government ditch)
- Public safetyunsafe 25-foot bluff creates a public

OPPORTUNITIES

- Create safe bank conditions
- Prevent damage to the Gov. Ditch
- Develop passive Community recreational area (green space)
- Improve community cohesion/pride
- Improve environmental landscape
- Protect cultural resource sites
- Provide pedestrian access to public property
- Improve nearshore habitat

OBJECTIVES

 Stabilize eroding shoreline to reduce the risk that River Road and the various public utilities in the vicinity will be damaged and ultimately compromised by continued erosion over the period of analysis

CONSTRAINTS/ CONSIDERATIONS

- Do not induce erosion to the left or the right of the project area
- Avoid and minimize environmental and cultural resource impacts





US Army Corps of Engineers *

FORMULATION OF MEASURES

Measure Description	Carried Forward?	Notes
Vertical steel sheet piling	N	Cost criterion - prohibitive
Rock sill to stabilize base of slope	Y	Typical measure used to solve similar study problems
Vegetated slope	Y	Typical measure used to solve similar study problems
Rock-filled timber cribs	N	Lifecycle criterion – 25 years
Stone revetment	Y	Typical measure used to solve similar study problems
Vegetative erosion control (Living Shoreline)	Y	5 years monitoring (cost concern), long fetch, previously used along James River
Precast modular retaining walls	Ν	Environmental/ EN Feasibility criteria
Longitudinal peaked stone toe protection	Y	Typical measure used to solve similar study problems
Breakwaters	N	Requires modeling, doesn't combat wind erosion, real estate issues

FINAL ARRAY OF ALTERNATIVES

Alternative	Components
Road Relocation	N/A; the baseline to which all other alternatives are compared
A0 (No Action)	There would be no federal action. This is also the same as future without project condition
A1	Rock Sill with Vegetated Slope
A2	Full Rock Revetment
A3	Partial Rock Revetment with Vegetated Slope
A4	Living Shoreline with Vegetated Slope



ALTERNATIVE 1: ROCK SILL WITH VEGETATED SLOPE





ALTERNATIVE 2: FULL ROCK REVETMENT





ALTERNATIVE 3: PARTIAL ROCK REVETMENT WITH VEGETATED SLOPE





ALTERNATIVE 4: LIVING SHORELINE WITH VEGETATED SLOPE





ALTERNATIVES COST

(A1) Rock Sill with Vegetated Slope	(A2) Full Rock Revetment	(A3) Partial Rock Revetment with Vegetated Slope	(A4) Living Shoreline with Vegetated Slope	Relocation of Road
\$2,277,000	\$2,447,000	\$2,865,000	\$2,932,000	\$4,319,000
\$100,000	\$83,000	\$83,000	\$95,000	\$4,489,000
\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
\$436,000	\$490,000	\$572,000	\$589,000	\$862,000
\$466,000	\$489,000	\$572,000	\$586,000	\$863,000
\$3,278,000	\$3,509,000	\$4,092,000	\$4,202,000	\$10,533,000
	(A1) Rock Sill with Vegetated Slope \$2,277,000 \$100,000 \$00 \$436,000 \$4436,000 \$3,278,000	(A1) Rock Sill with Vegetated Slope (A2) Full Rock Revetment \$2,277,000 \$2,447,000 \$100,000 \$83,000 \$100,000 \$83,000 \$436,000 \$490,000 \$4466,000 \$489,000 \$3,278,000 \$3,509,000	(A1) Rock Sill with Vegetated Slope (A2) Full Rock Revetment (A3) Partial Rock Revetment Slope \$2,277,000 \$2,447,000 \$2,865,000 \$2,277,000 \$2,447,000 \$2,865,000 \$100,000 \$83,000 \$83,000 \$436,000 \$490,000 \$572,000 \$466,000 \$489,000 \$572,000 \$3,278,000 \$3,509,000 \$4,092,000	(A1) Rock Sill with Vegetated Slope (A2) Full Rock Revetment (A3) Partial Rock Revetment (A4) Living Shoreline with Vegetated Slope \$2,277,000 \$2,447,000 \$2,865,000 \$2,932,000 \$2,277,000 \$2,447,000 \$2,865,000 \$2,932,000 \$100,000 \$83,000 \$83,000 \$83,000 \$95,000 \$436,000 \$490,000 \$572,000 \$589,000 \$466,000 \$489,000 \$572,000 \$586,000 \$3,278,000 \$3,509,000 \$4,092,000 \$4,202,000

* The least cost alternative plan is to be justified if the total cost of the proposed alternative is less than the cost to relocate the threatened facility.



RECOMMENDED PLAN

Rock Sill with Vegetated Slope – ALT 1

- Longitudinal rock sill running the length of project area at a height of 5-feet (NAVD88)
- Earthen sloped berm graded on a 1:3
- 2900 tons of VDOT CLIII riprap and 800 tons of VDOT No.1 stone
- 4300 CY of fill
- 1600 SY of geotextile filter fabric
- 35,000 SF of seeding
- 700 CY of debris removal





RESOURCE AREAS EVALUATED

Resource Area	Resources Area
Aesthetics	Noise and Vibration
Air Quality	Occupational Health and Safety
Bathymetry, Hydrology, and Tidal Processes	Recreation
Climate Change and Greenhouse Gas Emissions	Socioeconomics
Cultural Resources	Special Status Species
Fishery Resources and Essential Fish Habitat	Vegetation, Wetlands, and Submerged Vegetation
Floodplains and Flood Risk Management	Water Quality
Geology, Physiography, and Topography	Wildlife
Hazardous, Toxic, and Radioactive Waste	Transportation

* No significant impacts anticipated to any resource areas evaluated

SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

Implementation of Alternative 1, the proposed construction of a rock sill and vegetated slope, would result in:

- Minor, temporary to permanent, adverse impacts are anticipated to all resource areas
- Minor, beneficial impacts to aesthetics, floodplains and flood risk management, and transportation
- The potential for minor to moderate permanent impacts to recreation
- No impacts to known cultural resources

For further details regarding environmental consequences please refer to Chapter 6 of the draft report.



ENVIRONMENTAL COMPLIANCE

Law/Statute	Compliance Status
NEPA National Environmental Policy Act	Public comment period in progress; compliance anticipated with signature of 'Finding of No Significant Impact'
ESA Endangered Species Act	U.S. Fish and Wildlife verification letter received 08/21/20, National Marine Fisheries Service concurrence received 09/21/20
FWCA Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act	Coordination with USFWS ongoing; will be addressed through NEPA process
MSFCA Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act	Concurrence from National Marine Fisheries Service Received on 09/29/20
CBRA Coastal Barrier Resources Act	N/A; no Coastal Barrier Resource Units in vicinity of project site
CWA Clean Water Act	Section 404: No impacts to vegetated wetlands or Submerged Aquatic Vegetation (SAV); no mitigation costs anticipated
NHPA National Historic Preservation Act	Concurrence received from Virginia Department of Historic Resources on 09/29/20
CZMA Coastal Zone Management Act	Federal Consistency Determination submitted to Virginia Department of Environmental Quality on 09/29/20



REAL ESTATE



- Real Estate considerations are based on the range of alternatives, featuring both permanent and temporary easements
- To obtain the estimated cost, an impact percentage was assigned to the standard estates that would be required and applied to the value of each parcel
- Approximate number of parcels impacted for the Recommended Plan: 7 parcels
- Real estate actions if needed:
 - May include permanent and temporary easements
 - ROW documents for equipment and access
 - Public utility relocations if needed



PROJECT MILESTONE SCHEDULE

MILESTONE	STATUS	DATE
Federal Interest Determination (FID)	Actual	13 March 2017
FCSA Execution	Actual	21 May 2019
Project Management Plan (PMP)	Actual	26 June 2019
MSC Decision Meeting (MDM)	Actual	16 April 2020
Draft Report Submittal to North Atlantic Div.	Actual	05 November 2020
Public Review Period Start	Actual	05 November 2020
Final Report Submittal to North Atlantic Div.	Planned	29 January 2021
Approval of Final CAP Decision Document	Planned	26 February 2021



CONSTRUCTION START ?





PROPOSED CONSTUCTION START:

LATE 2021



How to Submit Comments

Comment Deadline: 07 December 2020

Email: justine.r.woodward@usace.army.mil

Mail: U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Norfolk District c/o Justine Woodward 803 Front Street Norfolk, Virginia 23510

- For any accessibility issues or additional assistance, please contact Justine Woodward at (757) 201-7728.
- Tonight's presentation and the draft report are available on the project website:

https://www.nao.usace.army.mil/About/Projects/JamesRiverNewportNewsShoreline/

Thank You for Your Attendance.



DISCUSSION & QUESTIONS



