

**DEPARTMENT OF DEFENSE
DEPARTMENT OF THE NAVY**

**FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT FOR THE APRA HARBOR WATERFRONT
REPAIRS, NAVAL BASE GUAM**

Pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and the United States (U.S.) Department of the Navy (Navy) NEPA regulations (32 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] Part 775), the Navy gives notice that an Environmental Assessment (EA) has been prepared, and an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is not required for the Apra Harbor Waterfront Repairs in the vicinity of Apra Harbor, Guam. This action will be implemented as set out in Alternative 1.

Proposed Action:

The Navy, Naval Base Guam (NBG) proposes to perform necessary long-term repairs and modernizations to the Admiral Glass Breakwater (Glass Breakwater), Sumay Marina U.S. Coast Guard (USCG) Port Operations/Navy Security docks and wave attenuator, and Sumay Point shoreline protection in the vicinity of Apra Harbor, Guam.

Repair activities would involve restoring the Glass Breakwater, Sumay Marina floating docks, wave attenuator, and Sumay Point shoreline protection to at least their original state and improving function and resiliency. The Navy estimates that repairs would begin in mid-2025 and would continue on a phased progression through 2030. Upon completion of construction activities, the coastal and marina infrastructure would be managed and maintained consistent with existing practices.

Purpose and Need:

The purpose of and need for the Proposed Action is to complete necessary long-term repairs and modernization to the Glass Breakwater and Sumay Cove infrastructure with the goal of improving safety, accessibility, usability, functionality, and resiliency of the area for the Navy, USCG, Port Operations, Military Sealift Command (MSC), and Morale, Welfare, and Recreation (MWR) users, as well as for all citizens of Guam.

As a result of Super Typhoon Mawar in May 2023 and other storm events, the Glass Breakwater, docks, wave attenuator, and shoreline protection are severely damaged and functionally deficient. The Proposed Action is needed to prevent the imminent breach of the breakwater, thereby safeguarding the harbor, shoreline, and vital Navy and Port of Guam infrastructure that is essential to sustain critical military missions and civilian activities on Guam. Without the Proposed Action, there remains a risk of breaching the Glass Breakwater, which would result in major impacts on Navy mission readiness and operational capabilities. The degraded condition of the breakwater, exacerbated by ongoing normal wave action, storms, and typhoons, heightens the likelihood of breach. Continued exposure to even normal wave action not only increases the risk of breach but also poses a risk of potentially devastating environmental damage to the underwater habitat areas of Endangered Species Act (ESA)-listed threatened hard coral species (*Acropora globiceps*) in Apra Harbor.

The proposed repairs in Sumay Cove are needed to improve the safety, accessibility, usability, and functionality of the area for the USCG, Port Operations, Navy Security Forces, and critically important emergency response operations that are based there. The Proposed Action seeks to improve safety while minimizing environmental impacts on natural and cultural resources.

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT FOR THE APRA HARBOR BREAKWATER REPAIRS, NAVAL BASE GUAM

Alternatives Analyzed: Alternatives were developed for analysis based upon the following reasonable alternative screening factors: timeliness, construction style, longevity, and criteria compliance. Based on the alternative screening factors for meeting the purpose and need of the Proposed Action, one action alternative (Alternative 1) was identified and was analyzed in the EA, along with the No Action Alternative.

No Action Alternative: Under the No Action Alternative, the proposed critical repairs identified for the Proposed Action would not be completed, and the breakwater, at risk of imminent breach, would continue to degrade. Failure to execute critical repairs would continue to expose the breakwater to more serious damage, including partial breach of the breakwater head and breach of the breakwater trunk. If there were even a partial breach, future breakwater repairs would be extremely costly and difficult to execute. The degraded condition of the breakwater, exacerbated by normal wave action, storms, and typhoons, heightens the likelihood of breach. Continued exposure to even normal wave action stressors not only increases the risk of breach but also poses a severe risk of potential environmental damage to submerged habitat areas of the ESA-listed coral species. Strong waves, especially during typhoon conditions, would expose more of the slope, leading to inevitable breach of the breakwater. During a breach, large segments of the breakwater would break away, and damaging waves would significantly and adversely impact multiple environmental resources, Navy ships, submarines, facilities, and infrastructure, as well as Port of Guam operations within Apra Harbor. If the breakwater is not repaired, the position of the existing USCG aid to navigation (ATON) would be damaged or lost, affecting the safety of all incoming and outgoing vessels through the mouth of the Outer Apra Harbor.

The degraded state of the floating docks and failed wave attenuator in Sumay Marina would continue to present a dangerous situation for USCG, Port Operations, Navy Security Forces and Emergency Response teams, MSC, and MWR vessels, personnel, and other users, likely leading to a required relocation of the docks and/or construction of a new marina. The degraded state of the Sumay Point revetment exposes the upland to erosion and wave overtopping with potential for destabilization of the Sumay Channel.

The No Action Alternative would not meet the purpose of and need for the Proposed Action; however, as required by NEPA, the No Action Alternative is carried forward for analysis in the EA. The No Action Alternative is used to analyze the consequences of not undertaking the Proposed Action and serve to establish a comparative baseline for analysis.

Alternative 1: Alternative 1 would include repairs to restore the breakwater's functionality and long-term resilience. This alternative would ensure the breakwater maintains its structural integrity and protects Apra Harbor from severe wave action. This would safeguard both military and commercial maritime operations. Project work would begin in late summer to early fall of 2025 and would be projected to last approximately five years. It is anticipated that the Alternative 1 would require 70 (to 85 at peak) construction personnel, with the workforce comprised of approximately 20 percent local workers and approximately 80 percent off-island workers; an average of approximately 70 personnel would be supporting phased development activities over the five-year construction timeframe.

Alternatives Considered but Dismissed from Further Consideration: The following alternatives were considered, but not carried forward for detailed analysis in the EA because they do not meet the purpose and need for the project or satisfy the reasonable alternative screening factors:

- Construction of a new breakwater
- Repair using armor rocks
- Steel sheet pile repair
- Monolithic construction repair

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT FOR THE APRA HARBOR BREAKWATER REPAIRS, NAVAL BASE GUAM

Environmental Effects: With employment of conservation and mitigation measures as specified through interagency coordination and consultation efforts, significant impacts to biological resources (ESA-listed *A. globiceps*) would be mitigated to less than significant. No significant direct, indirect, or cumulative impacts on any other environmental resources would result from implementing the Proposed Action. Because potential impacts were considered negligible or nonexistent, the following resources were not evaluated in detail in the EA: airspace and land use.

Potential environmental impacts on air quality, biological resources, cultural resources, geological resources, hazardous materials and waste, infrastructure and transportation, noise, health and safety, socioeconomics, and water resources are summarized in the following paragraphs.

Air Quality: Alternative 1 would result in less than significant impacts to air quality. Alternative 1 would not introduce any new permanent stationary sources of air emissions. Short-term, temporarily emitted air emissions (e.g., fugitive dust, combustion of fossil fuels) would be generated during the construction period, which is estimated to be 5 years and assumes work activities would be conducted 7 days per week, 12 hours per day. Best Management Practices (BMPs) would be implemented to minimize fugitive dust during construction. Example BMPs include watering of active work areas, using wind screens, keeping adjacent paved roads clean, covering of open-bodied trucks, limiting the area that is disturbed at any given time and/or mulching or chemically stabilizing inactive areas that have been worked. Additional emission reduction measures include limiting heavy-duty diesel vehicle idling times, use of diesel particulate filters and diesel oxidation catalysts in equipment, and application of chemical dust suppressants.

Emissions from the tailpipes of on-road and nonroad mobile sources as well as fugitive dust lack plume rise. Thus, air emissions are expected to initially disperse in the immediate vicinity of activities and then be transported downwind of release. Observations at the Guam International Airport indicate wind directions are mostly from the east, which would transport emissions away from public areas and sensitive receptors most of the time. Transport of air emissions to public areas and sensitive receptors would be infrequent and when they occur, air pollutant concentrations are expected to be low, commensurate with the activity level. Anticipated air quality impacts from Alternative 1 are not expected to interfere with the attainment of ambient air quality standards or appreciably increase human health risks from hazardous air pollutants exposure in areas where sensitive receptors and/or public presence are expected.

The Navy completed an applicability analysis to comply with the General Conformity requirements. The Proposed Action is subject to the General Conformity rule because of its location within the Piti-Cabras sulfur dioxide (SO₂) nonattainment area but a conformity determination is not required. Annual SO₂ emissions from Alternative 1 would not exceed the SO₂ de minimis level of 100 tons per year. The Record of Non-Applicability is provided in Appendix B of the EA and documents the completion of the General Conformity applicability analysis.

Greenhouse Gases. Alternative 1 would result in less than significant impacts to greenhouse gases (GHGs). The highest annual GHG emissions generated from the Proposed Action would be 15,085 metric tons of carbon dioxide equivalent (CO₂e) in 2028, and total GHG emissions from Alternative 1 are estimated to be approximately 55,134 metric tons of CO₂e over the course of the 5-year construction period. The GHG emissions temporarily generated from proposed site preparations and construction would be a minor increase of GHG emissions and no detectable weather changes will result from the emission levels associated with these activities.

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT FOR THE APRA HARBOR BREAKWATER REPAIRS, NAVAL BASE GUAM

Biological Resources: Alternative 1 has the potential to impact biological resources through exposure to elevated sound levels, increased suspended sediments, increased human activity and equipment operation, vessel collisions, wastes and discharges, entanglement, and unexploded ordnance. While marine species in the area are likely habituated to urban noise and vessel traffic, activities such as rock armor placement, pile driving, and vessel operations could cause temporary disturbances. Sediment plumes, especially from in-water work, may affect water clarity but are expected to dissipate quickly, particularly in energetic areas like the outer Glass Breakwater, and would be contained by silt curtains in more sheltered areas like Sumay Cove. Risks would be minimized through the use of BMPs. Vegetation clearing and earthwork would have negligible impacts, as the affected areas are already disturbed and lack protected species or high-quality habitats. Contractors would follow a Hazard Analysis and Critical Control Point (HACCP) Plan to prevent the spread of invasive species. While there is a potential to encounter WWII-era munitions and explosives of concern (MEC), any removal or detonation would be rare and carefully managed to minimize short-term impacts on marine species.

Marine Vegetation and Non-Coral Benthic Invertebrates: There would be short- and long-term, moderate, adverse impacts on marine vegetation and non-coral benthic invertebrates from temporary disturbance and permanent removal of up to 11.6 underwater acres at the Glass Breakwater (including up to 11.4 acres on the Philippine Sea side and 0.2 acres on the leeward side) and repair activities at Sumay Cove as a result of in-water construction activities. Impacts would be contained within the existing footprints; however, sessile species would be unable to voluntarily relocate and would thus be permanently removed.

Marine Wildlife. Alternative 1 would result in short- and long-term minor to moderate adverse impacts on native corals and clams, though these are not ESA-listed species. Impacts on native fish and other species would be short-term and minor, as these motile species are expected to avoid the area during construction and return afterward. Vessel strikes or entanglement with debris are possible but unlikely due to mitigation measures like turbidity curtains, marine observers, and a 46-meter (50-yard) shutdown zone. If and when impact pile driving occurs with 36" or smaller steel pipes, a shut-down zone of 120 m (131 yd) will be implemented. There are no known sea turtle nesting beaches near the project area, and the existing shoreline is unsuitable for nesting. A total of 37 (up to 47) colonies of *Acropora globiceps* would be translocated to avoid and minimize effects on the species. There could be a permanent loss of up to 83 colonies of the ESA-listed threatened hard coral. On July 28, 2025, a biological and conference opinion (BO; PIRO-2025-00832) was received from National Marine Fisheries Services (NMFS) which included an incidental take statement for up to 150 *A. globiceps* colonies and concluded that the Proposed Action would not appreciably reduce the likelihood of the survival and recovery of wild *A. globiceps*; therefore, implementation of the Proposed Action would not likely jeopardize the continued existence of the species (in EA Appendix C). Measures (listed in EA Section 2.5, Table 2-2) developed during consultation would be implemented as specified in the BO to avoid, minimize, and mitigate impacts on *A. globiceps*. Based on the rarity of marine mammal sightings within Apra Harbor, the limited size of the project area along outer shorelines of Glass Breakwater, and the 46-meter (50-yard) shutdown zone for marine mammals, no effects on marine mammals from the Proposed Action are anticipated. No critical habitat for marine mammals is designated in the project area.

Birds. The project areas do not provide suitable nesting habitat for protected bird species, including the ESA-listed Mariana common moorhen. As individual birds may occasionally forage nearby or fly over, construction noise may cause short-term, negligible disturbances. Birds are expected to relocate to nearby suitable habitats, and any moorhens present are likely habituated to human activity and noise. Therefore, impacts on birds, including MBTA-protected species, would be minimal. See EA Section 2.5 for measures to avoid or minimize effects on moorhen that may be near the project areas.

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT FOR THE APRA HARBOR BREAKWATER REPAIRS, NAVAL BASE GUAM

Essential Fish Habitat. The Navy conducted Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) consultation with NMFS and determined that the proposed activities and their resulting impacts would reduce the quantity and quality of EFH, and accordingly would adversely affect EFH for bottomfish Management Unit Species (MUS) and pelagic MUS within Apra Harbor. The indirect adverse effects to EFH from Proposed Action-related degradation of water quality will be minimized through implementation of appropriate BMPs. Unavoidable loss of ecosystem function and services that supports MUS will be minimized through proposed coral translocation. Due to the containment of impacts to Apra Harbor, the quantity and quality of the EFH within the harbor, the size and scale of the impacts, implementation of temporary and permanent avoidance and minimization measures built into the Project, mitigation for unavoidable loss (i.e., coral translocation), and appropriate offset measures (i.e., coral nursery, mangrove restoration), the Navy determined that the anticipated impacts do not have the potential to cause substantial long-term adverse effects to EFH. Adverse effects will be minimized through the implementation of numerous BMPs, and considering the actions will be beneficial to EFH over the long-term, adverse effects will be minimal and temporary. These actions will prevent ecosystem losses from further breakwater degradation.

Stressors that were analyzed included exposure to the following: removal of marine invertebrate community; disturbance from direct physical contact, increased turbidity and suspended sediments; elevated underwater noise levels; wastes and discharges; aquatic invasive species; chemical contaminants; hypoxia; and unexploded ordnance. The Navy requested formal consultation per the Magnuson-Stevens Act and submitted an Essential Fish Habitat Assessment to NMFS on March 27, 2025. On April 30, 2025 the NMFS concurred with the Navy's March 28, 2025 EFH effects determination and recommended eleven additional conservation measures (listed in EA Section 2.5, Table 2-2) be implemented to avoid, minimize, offset for, or otherwise mitigate adverse effects on EFH. On May 28, 2025, the Navy agreed to implement the NMFS recommendations which concluded the EFH consultation as documented in the NMFS July 25, 2025 biological and conference opinion (PIRO-2025-00832) (in EA Appendix C).

Threatened and Endangered Species. The Navy initiated formal consultation with NMFS under ESA Section 7. In its assessment, the Navy considered potential impacts resulting from the Proposed Action on ESA-listed species that may occur within the project area from exposure to the following stressors: elevated underwater noise levels; increased suspended sediments; disturbance from human activity and equipment operation; direct physical contact; waste and discharge; and entanglement.

The Navy determined the Proposed Action also has the potential to result in adverse noise effects on the endangered Central-West Pacific Distinct Population Segment (DPS) of green turtle (*Chelonia mydas*), the endangered hawksbill turtle (*Eretmochelys imbricata*), and the threatened Indo-West Pacific DPS of scalloped hammerhead shark (*Sphyrna lewini*). Considering all consequences of the Project, the Navy determined the Proposed Action *may affect*, but is *not likely to adversely affect* ESA-listed green turtles, hawksbill turtles, and scalloped hammerhead sharks. The Navy also determined that the Proposed Action *will not destroy or adversely modify* proposed green turtle critical habitat because only pile driving noise in outer Apra Harbor will extend to areas proposed for designation, and underwater noise from pile driving is expected to attenuate to levels that do not measurably diminish the quality of marine habitat available for use by green turtles in the Action Area. Should habitat be designated prior to the completion of the Project, the Proposed Action *may affect*, but is *not likely to adversely affect*, designated critical habitat for green turtles.

The Navy determined the Proposed Action *may affect* and is *likely to adversely affect* the ESA-listed *A. globiceps* hard coral, including permanent habitat loss and mortality; however, it is not anticipated to jeopardize the species. With implemented BMPs, a wide global range, and commonly seen *A. globiceps* around Guam's wave exposed environments, the Navy believes the species will not be jeopardized by the

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT FOR THE APRA HARBOR BREAKWATER REPAIRS, NAVAL BASE GUAM

Proposed Action. The Navy determined the Proposed Action also *will not destroy or adversely modify* proposed *A. globiceps* critical habitat because no critical habitat for *A. globiceps* is designated or proposed in the Action Area.

In accordance with ESA Section 7, the Navy requested formal consultation and submitted a biological assessment to NMFS on March 27, 2025. NMFS provided a biological opinion on July 28, 2025 outlining measures to be implemented to avoid, minimize, and mitigate impacts on *A. globiceps*, and also included recommended conservation and measures that may be implemented to support minimized effects on the species and habitats potentially affected by the action. The Navy also coordinated with NMFS to develop a Coral Mitigation Plan to document the Navy's plan to avoid, minimize, and mitigate to the extent possible impacts on corals within the project area. Correspondences for the ESA Section 7 consultation are provided in Appendix C of the EA.

Cultural Resources: The Navy concluded that no adverse effects on cultural, historical, or archaeological resources are expected during construction under Alternative 1. While one archaeological site is within the construction area, it is not eligible for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). Other construction areas do not overlap with known archaeological sites. The Pontoon Pier K Site, though within the project area, is also not NRHP-eligible. The NRHP-eligible Glass Breakwater will have its integrity restored without significant impact. The Navy determined no adverse effects on historic properties and received concurrence from the Guam State Historic Preservation Officer on this finding by letter dated March 21, 2025 (Reference No. RC2024-0091 (see correspondence in Appendix D of the EA). In the unlikely event that historic properties are inadvertently discovered within the area of potential effects during activities associated with the subject undertaking, then the Standard Operating Procedures contained within the *Final Integrated Cultural Resources Management Plan NBG, JRM* would be followed, as well as provisions of 36 CFR 800.13, *Post-Review Discoveries*.

Geological Resources: Alternative 1 would result in less than significant impacts to geological resources during the deconstruction and rebuilding of the Glass Breakwater and during piledriving and shoreline restoration activities at Sumay Cove. Long-term, moderate beneficial impacts from restored harbor protection and shoreline stabilization would support minimized erosion and sedimentation into nearby waters of Apra Harbor. At Glass Breakwater, work would occur within existing industrial areas and involve controlled deconstruction and repairs to minimize erosion using BMPs. At Sumay Cove, pile driving and revetment repairs would be done in previously disturbed and constructed man-made shoreline areas would cause short-term, localized impacts but would ultimately stabilize soils and reduce erosion, with no significant long-term adverse effects on geological resources.

Hazardous Materials and Waste: Alternative 1 would result in less than significant impacts related to hazardous materials and waste. Construction for Alternative 1 would include the use and storage of hazardous materials (HAZMAT) and petroleum, oils, and lubricants (POLs). Construction contractors would ensure the handling and storage of any HAZMAT and POLs is carried out in compliance with applicable laws and regulations. Construction equipment, vehicles, and vessels would be fueled by diesel or gasoline and use small quantities of HAZMAT and POLs such as solvents, hydraulic fluid, oil, antifreeze, and other HAZMAT. Should any HAZMAT or POL be released into the environment, adherence to applicable laws, regulations, and management plans such as the installation's Spill Prevention, Control, and Countermeasure Plan would reduce potential impacts. It is anticipated that the quantity of hazardous and petroleum wastes generated during construction would be negligible. All wastes generated during construction would be characterized and documented by contractors and site personnel in accordance with 40 CFR Section 262.11. Any wastes characterized as universal or hazardous would be disposed of in accordance with the installation's Hazardous Waste Management Plan, standard

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT FOR THE APRA HARBOR BREAKWATER REPAIRS, NAVAL BASE GUAM

operating procedures, and federal, state, and local laws and regulations. No impacts on HAZMAT and hazardous waste management would be anticipated following construction.

Although unexploded ordnance (MEC and/or material potentially presenting an explosive hazard [MPPEH]) may be present in underwater areas, an Explosive Site Survey (ESS) would be conducted to ensure safety. Any MEC or MPPEH identified during screening would be handled in accordance with procedures outlined in the ESS.

Infrastructure and Transportation: Under Alternative 1, repairs at Glass Breakwater and Sumay Cove would cause short-term, less than significant adverse impacts on infrastructure and transportation due to temporary increases in utility use, solid waste, and traffic during the 5-year construction period. Water, wastewater, and electricity demands would remain within system capacities, and no long-term utility disruptions are expected. Stormwater runoff and hydrology would remain unaffected.

At Glass Breakwater, construction would require water for casting concrete armor units (CAUs), but it would represent a small percentage of the average potable water production at the Fena Navy Water Treatment Plant (NWTP) and would not be expected to exceed the NWTP's capacity. Construction vehicles would remain mostly on existing paved roads and designated construction areas, minimizing the disruption of undeveloped land. Waterways and existing roads would experience temporary minor increase in barge and truck traffic, and generation of limited construction waste. Mitigation measures such as waste management plans and off-peak truck operations would further minimize impacts. Transportation impacts would cease following completion of the construction, and long-term, adverse impacts would not occur.

Impacts from Sumay Cove repairs would be similar to those at Glass Breakwater, and Sumay Cove repairs may cause brief utility disruptions and minimal vessel traffic effects during construction, but impacts would be temporary and coordinated.

Long-term, beneficial impacts include improved infrastructure resilience, better shoreline protection, and enhanced port and marina operations. Overall, no significant impacts on infrastructure or transportation are anticipated.

Noise: Alternative 1 would result in less than significant impacts related to increased noise. Construction of Alternative 1, including pile driving, in-water work, and vessel operations, would temporarily and adversely affect the in-water noise environment surrounding the Glass Breakwater and Sumay Cove.

Pile driving would exceed the standard threshold of 90 dBA for in-air noise at Glass Breakwater. Pile driving could produce short-term major adverse impacts on Family Beach or other recreational users due to the noise created by the action during construction; however, because the construction plan would install one pile per day, and the estimated time for installation of a pile is brief (approximately 15 minutes of impact hammering), these anticipated noise impacts would be minor.

The CAUs and armor rocks would be placed carefully, as each unit must interlock with its neighboring units to form a strong structure. Careful placement would minimize both in-air and in-water noise levels associated with armor placement. Therefore, in-water noise impacts from pile driving are of primary concern. ESA-listed corals may be affected by elevated noise levels during larval dispersal and settlement, and ESA-listed endangered hawksbill turtles and green turtles, as well as ESA-listed threatened scalloped hammerhead sharks may experience noise and vibration harassment that could cause a behavioral response, such as avoidance of an area or interrupt swimming, foraging, resting, or other behaviors.

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT FOR THE APRA HARBOR BREAKWATER REPAIRS, NAVAL BASE GUAM

The Navy determined that exposure to elevated noise levels from the Proposed Action *may affect* but is *not likely to adversely affect* ESA-listed *A. globiceps*. With the implementation of BMP-D described in Section 2.5 of the EA, potential acoustic effects on ESA-listed corals from exposure to elevated noise levels from proposed activities would be less than significant.

The Navy determined that exposure to elevated noise levels from the Proposed Action *may affect* but is *not likely to adversely affect* green sea turtles, hawksbill sea turtles, and scalloped hammerhead sharks. With the implementation of minimization measures and BMPs described in Table 2-2 in Section 2.5 (e.g., BMP-A1, BMP-A2, BMP-B, and BMP-C), and the regular occurrence of green sea turtles, rare occurrence of hawksbill sea turtles and scalloped hammerhead sharks, potential acoustic effects on ESA-listed sea turtles and sharks from exposure to elevated noise levels from proposed activities would be less than significant.

BMP-A in Table 2-2 in Section 2.5 establishes the standard shut-down zone of 46 m (50 yd) for all work which covers the requirements with an added buffer, as well as enacts a special shut-down zone of 120 m (131 yd) when impact pile driving any 36-inch or smaller steel pipe piles.

Health and Safety. Alternative 1 would result in less than significant impacts to public health and safety. Short-term, minor, adverse impacts on contractor, personnel, and marina user safety during breakwater and related waterfront repairs may include potential slips, falls, unfamiliar working environments, noise exposure, and specific hazards such as handling power tools and working with heavy equipment, trucks, and machinery.

Construction activities will follow Department of Defense and Navy safety protocols, Occupational Safety and Health Administration regulations, and BMPs, with workers provided proper training and personal protective equipment, such as hard hats, hearing protection, and safety harnesses. Additionally, increased traffic from the transport of construction materials could raise the potential for accidents or roadway mishaps. However, these impacts are expected to be minor.

Long-term, the repairs to the Glass Breakwater will enhance safety by preventing further deterioration and safeguarding shore facilities from severe weather, thus ensuring safe passage for both military and commercial vessels. Repairs at Sumay Cove will also improve the safety of vessel operations in the marina and emergency response times. Overall, the implementation of Alternative 1 will result in long-term beneficial impacts on public health and safety.

Socioeconomics: Alternative 1 would result in less than significant impacts related to socioeconomics. Construction for the Proposed Action would not result in an appreciable shift or change in socioeconomic conditions, population and community, housing, or cause notable adverse or beneficial effects on local income or industries. Construction-related impacts would be temporary, negligible to minor adverse as well as beneficial. In the long-term repairing Glass Breakwater and Sumay Marina would enhance harbor safety and infrastructure resilience, benefiting Guam's port operations and broader regional commerce through beneficial effects on Guam and the region's communities, services, workforce, and economy by maintaining a safe, accessible port.

Water Resources: Construction activities under Alternative 1 at both the Glass Breakwater and Sumay Cove are expected to result in short-term, minor, and localized adverse impacts on water resources, primarily due to sediment disturbance and stormwater runoff. At Glass Breakwater, site preparation and repair activities, including vegetation clearing, staging, and the construction of a concrete casting yard, would disturb soil and sediment. BMPs such as silt fences, stormwater pollution prevention plans, and sediment control plans would be implemented to minimize runoff and prevent contamination of marine

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT FOR THE APRA HARBOR BREAKWATER REPAIRS, NAVAL BASE GUAM

waters. In-water work, including excavation and the placement of large CAUs, would cause temporary turbidity but would be mitigated by silt curtains on the leeward side as applicable. While sediment curtains may be ineffective on the seaward side due to wave action, sediment plumes on the seaward side are expected to dissipate quickly. Over the long-term, the project would significantly benefit water quality and marine habitats by stabilizing the breakwater, reducing erosion, and minimizing future sediment-laden runoff.

At Sumay Cove, similar short-term, minor impacts would occur due to pile driving and revetment repairs, with sediment disturbance creating turbidity in the water column. However, the sheltered nature of Sumay Cove allows for effective use of silt curtains, which would contain suspended sediment and prevent plumes from affecting the wider Apra Harbor. As at Glass Breakwater, BMPs such as turbidity monitoring, erosion controls, and containment measures would be in place. The revetment repair would remain within its existing footprint, and no new fill or dredging is planned. Both projects would adhere to regulatory requirements, including an Individual Permit from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers under the Clean Water Act Section 404 and a Section 401 Water Quality Certification (WQC). Overall, the implementation of Alternative 1 would result in less than significant impacts to water resources in both areas, while providing long-term environmental benefits. Correspondences for Section 401 WQC are provided in Appendix F of the EA.

The entire island of Guam has been designated a "coastal zone" under the Federal Coastal Zone Management Act (CZMA) of 1972. The CZMA requires that all construction and operational activities be consistent, to the maximum extent practicable, with the Guam Coastal Management Program (GCMP) policies to guide the use, protection, and development of land and ocean resources within Guam's coastal zone. In accordance with the CZMA, the Navy determined that Alternative 1 is consistent to the maximum extent practicable with the federally approved enforceable policies of the GCMP. The Navy submitted Notification of a Consistency Determination to Guam Bureau of Statistics and Plans (GBSP) requesting their review and concurrence on March 27, 2025. The Navy received GBSP's concurrence on this determination via correspondence dated May 23, 2025 (see Appendix E of the EA).

Mitigation Measures: The Navy would implement conservation and mitigation measures, BMPs, and standard operating procedures as specified in Section 2.5, Table 2-2 and Appendix C of the EA (hereby incorporated by reference) to avoid or reduce potential impacts on the identified environmental resources areas. Mitigation measures in the NMFS' Biological Opinion and EFH Assessment (EFHA) recommendations for the project include a number of standard measures developed by the Navy for at-sea training and testing including vessel personnel monitoring for protected species to avoid potential vessel strikes during operations. Through consultation with NMFS, conservation and mitigation measures to protect the environment would be implemented for activities at Apra Harbor including:

- BMPs A through D avoid and minimize effects on ESA-listed sea turtles and sharks;
- BMPs E through I avoid and minimize effects on ESA-listed corals and EFH;
- BMP-J avoids and minimizes effects from water pollution;
- BMP-K avoids and minimizes effects on in-water sedimentation levels;
- BMPs L through O avoid and minimize effects from vessel transits to Guam for materials from South Korea and Canada;
- BMPs P through T avoid and minimize effects from the portion of the project occurring on the leeward side of the Glass Breakwater;
- BMPs U through V avoid and minimize additional effects from the mitigation actions associated with the project and the EFH assessment;

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT FOR THE APRA HARBOR BREAKWATER REPAIRS, NAVAL BASE GUAM

- BMP-W avoids and minimizes effects of fugitive dust;
- BMPs X through AA avoid and minimize effects of noise.
- BMPs BB through GG avoid and minimize effects on the Mariana moorhen.
- CZMA-Development Policy 8 and related agency comments avoid and minimize effects from erosion and siltation on coastal zone resources
- CZMA Resource Policy 1 measures avoid and minimize effects to support conservation of natural resources
- CZMA Resource Policy 2 measures avoid and minimize effects on air quality
- CZMA Resource Policy 3 measures avoid and minimize effects on water quality
- CZMA Resource Policy 4 measures avoid and minimize effects on fragile areas
- CZMA Resource Policy 7 measures avoid and minimize effects on recreational areas
- CZMA Resource Policy 8 measures avoid and minimize effects on public access
- EFH-1 and EFH-2 mitigate and offset unavoidably lost functions and services from removed coral and other biota through restoration of seagrass habitat and enhancement of habitat that promotes coral settlement with coralline crustose algae
- EFH-CR-1 through EFH-CR-11 measures may be implemented to further avoid, minimize, and support conservation of EFH
- ESA-BO-1 through ESA-BO-9 measures avoid, minimize, and mitigate effects on ESA-listed threatened *A. globiceps*
- ESA-BO-ITS-1 through ESA-BO-ITS-4 ensure the Navy establishes a monitoring and reporting program to verify the ITS take limits are not exceeded and includes reporting and continued coordination with NMFS to most effectively improve survivorship.

The Navy used a standard tiered approach to mitigation for this Proposed Action to avoid, minimize, and offset potential impacts. *Avoidance* measures include implementing avoidance BMPs discussed above and detailed in Section 2.5 (Table 2-2) and Appendix C of the EA, such as work restrictions during spawning events. Potential impacts were also avoided by changes to project design including use of a transfer barge and avoiding work to the relic toe of the breakwater. *Minimization* of impacts would be through BMPs, natural resource management actions, and implementation of a coral translocation plan outlining the relocation of up to 47 *A. globiceps* colonies of proper size and growth form to survive translocation. The Navy will also implement maintenance and monitoring of translocated colonies to obtain data that can be shared with NMFS on the survivability of these species subject to transit and placement in areas other than the project area. The Navy will seek to *offset* unavoidably lost function and services provided by coral and other biota through two mitigation actions: restoring seagrass habitat at Dadi Beach and enhancing habitat that promotes coral settlement with crustose coralline algae spreading at Glass Breakwater.

Public Outreach: The Navy prepared the Draft EA to inform the public of potential environmental impacts of the Proposed Action and to allow the opportunity for public review and comment. The 15-day public Draft EA public comment period began on March 28, 2025 with a public notice published in the local news media indicating the availability of the Draft EA and locations where public review copies were available. The Draft EA was also available on the following website: <https://pacific.navfac.navy.mil/About-Us/National-Environmental-Policy-Act/NEPA-Information>. No comments on the Draft EA were received during the public comment period that ended on April 12, 2025 (Chamorro Standard Time).

**FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT FOR THE APRA HARBOR BREAKWATER
REPAIRS, NAVAL BASE GUAM**

Finding: Based on the analysis presented in the EA, which has been prepared in accordance with the requirements of NEPA and Navy policies and procedures (32 CFR Part 775), the Navy finds that implementation of the Proposed Action as set out in Alternative 1 will not significantly impact the quality of the human environment with employment of conservation and mitigation measures contained herein and in Appendix C of the EA. This analysis fulfills the requirement of NEPA and Navy regulations; therefore, an EIS will not be prepared.

Electronic copies of this EA and Finding of No Significant Impact may be obtained by written request to:
Attention: Code EV2, Naval Facilities Engineering Systems Command Headquarters, 1322 Patterson
Avenue, SE, Suite 1000, Washington Navy Yard, DC 20374-5065.

9/9/25
Date


REAR ADMIRAL BRETT W. MIETUS
COMMANDER
JOINT REGION MARIANAS