



## DRAFT FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

### TANGIPAHOA PARISH, LOUISIANA FEASIBILITY STUDY TANGIPAHOA PARISH, LOUISIANA

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, St. Louis District (Corps) has conducted an environmental analysis in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, as amended. The draft Integrated Feasibility Report and Environmental Assessment (IFR/EA) dated 5 June 2025, for the Tangipahoa Parish, Louisiana Feasibility Study addresses riverine flood risk reduction opportunities and feasibility in the Tangipahoa Parish, Louisiana. The final recommendation will be contained in the report of the Chief of Engineers, dated approximately 17 July 2026.

The Draft IFR/EA, incorporated herein by reference, evaluated various alternatives that would reduce flood risk to structures, infrastructure and risk to human life resulting from riverine flooding in the study area. The tentatively selected plan is the Total Net Benefits Plan and includes:

- The proposed plan is Plan 3b: Nonstructural National Economic Development (NED) Plan + increment 2 (Total Net Benefits Plan) if the NED plan policy exception is approved. The Total Net Benefits Plan includes voluntary elevation of approximately 1,006 residential structures and voluntary floodproofing of approximately 82 nonresidential structures in Tangipahoa Parish in Louisiana. If the NED plan policy exception is not approved then the proposed plan would become the NED plan. The NED plan includes voluntary elevation of approximately 539 residential structures and voluntary floodproofing of approximately 58 nonresidential structures in Tangipahoa Parish in Louisiana.

In addition to a “no action” plan (Plan 0), four alternatives were assessed for potential impacts: the nonstructural-only NED plan (Plan 1) and three incremental plans that include all structures eligible within Plan 1 and expand eligibility to include additional structures in areas experiencing social vulnerability with similar flood characteristics (Plans 3a, 3b & 3c). Impacts to important relevant resources were assessed, including impacts to wildlife, threatened and endangered species, plant communities, geology, soil and water bottoms, prime and unique farmland, water quality, cultural and historic resources, aesthetics, recreation, and socioeconomics. The proposed action would not adversely affect the relevant resources. No significant cumulative impacts are anticipated.

For all alternatives, the potential effects were evaluated, as appropriate. A summary assessment of the potential effects of the recommended plan are listed in Table 1:

Table 1: Summary of Potential Effects of the Recommended Plan

	Less than significant effects	Less than significant effects as a result of mitigation*	Resource unaffected by action
Aesthetics	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Air quality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Aquatic resources/wetlands	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>



	Less than significant effects	Less than significant effects as a result of mitigation*	Resource unaffected by action
Fish and wildlife	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Threatened/Endangered species/critical habitat, and Protected Species	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Historic properties	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other cultural resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Hazardous, toxic & radioactive waste	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Noise levels	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Socioeconomics resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Geology, Soils and Prime and Unique Farmland	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Tribal trust resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Water quality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Upland Resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Recreation	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

All practicable and appropriate means to avoid or minimize adverse environmental effects were analyzed and incorporated into the recommended plan. Best management practices (BMPs) as detailed in the IFR/EA will be implemented, if appropriate, to minimize impacts.<sup>1</sup> Implementation of nonstructural measures would be limited to the developed area around eligible structures for elevation or floodproofing to limit impacts to potential habitat for wildlife and to avoid impacts to potential archaeological resources and eligible historic properties as well as properties of religious or cultural significance to Federally-Recognized Tribes in the study area. Removal of trees would only occur if it prevented safe installation of nonstructural measures. No compensatory mitigation is required as part of the recommended plan.

Public review of the draft IFR/EA and FONSI was completed on 23 September 2024. All comments submitted during the public review period will be responded to in the Final IFR/EA and FONSI. A 30-day state and agency review of the draft IFR/EA was completed on 23 September 2024. Comments from state and federal agency review did not result in any changes to the final IFR/EA. The draft IFR/EA and FONSI is available for a second public review starting on 5 June 2025 for 30 days. Comments received by 5 July 2025 will be reviewed and responded to in the Final IFR/EA and FONSI.

Pursuant to section 7 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers determined that the recommended plan may affect but is not likely to adversely affect the following federally listed species or their designated critical habitat: West Indian manatee, gulf sturgeon, gopher tortoise, Pearl River map turtle, and red-cockaded woodpecker. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) concurrence with the Corps' determination is pending approval of the Tentatively Selected Plan through a National Economic Development Plan exception.

Pursuant to section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers determined that historic properties may be adversely affected by the recommended plan. The Corps, the Louisiana State Historic Preservation Office, and the

<sup>1</sup> 40 CFR 1505.2(a)(3) all practicable means to avoid and minimize environmental harm are adopted.



Choctaw Nation of Oklahoma intend to enter a Programmatic Agreement that will establish procedures to satisfy the Corps Section 106 responsibilities with regard to the study. A public review of the PA will be undertaken after its development. All terms and conditions resulting from the agreement shall be implemented in order to minimize adverse impacts to historic properties.<sup>2</sup>

A determination of consistency with the Louisiana Coastal Zone Management program pursuant to the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 will be obtained from the Louisiana Department of Energy and Natural Resources Office of Coastal Management prior to construction. In a letter dated 2 June 2025, the Louisiana Department of Energy and Natural Resources stated that the recommended plan appears to be consistent with state Coastal Zone Management plans, pending confirmation based on information to be developed during the pre-construction engineering and design phase. All conditions of the consistency determination shall be implemented in order to minimize adverse impacts to the coastal zone.

All applicable environmental laws have been considered and coordination with appropriate agencies and officials has been completed.

Technical, environmental, economic, and cost effectiveness criteria used in the formulation of alternative plans were those specified in the Water Resources Council's 1983 Economic and Environmental Principles and Guidelines for Water and Related Land Resources Implementation Studies. All applicable laws, executive orders, regulations, and local government plans were considered in evaluation of alternatives.<sup>3</sup> Based on this report, the reviews by other Federal, State and local agencies, Tribes, input of the public, and the review by my staff, it is my determination that the recommended plan would not cause significant adverse effects on the quality of the human environment; therefore, preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement is not required.<sup>4</sup>

---

Date

---

NAME

RANK, Corps of Engineers

---

<sup>2</sup> Required by 36 CFR 800.6(c)(3) meeting the terms and conditions of the MOA

<sup>3</sup> 40 CFR 1505.2(a)(2) requires identification of relevant factors including any essential to national policy which were balanced in the agency decision.

<sup>4</sup> 40 CFR 1508.1(l) stated the FONSI is a document by a Federal agency briefly presenting the reasons why an action, not otherwise categorically excluded (§ 15018.4), will not have a significant effect on the human environment and for which an environmental impact statement therefore will not be prepared.