Draft FINDING OF NO SINGIFICANT IMPACT
SECTION 206 – SPRING CREEK
AQUATIC ECOSYSTEM RESTORATION
FEASIBILITY STUDY

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Albuquerque District (USACE) has conducted an environmental analysis in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969 as amended (42 U.S.C. §§ 4321 *et seq*.) and in accordance with the Department of Defense NEPA Implementing Procedures as contained in 90 FR 29461.

The Integrated Feasibility Report/Environmental Assessment (IFR/EA) dated February 2026, for the Spring Creek Aquatic Ecosystem Restoration Study identifies and evaluates alternatives to rehabilitate the current degraded conditions of wetland and riparian ecosystems along the Spring Creek system, nestled within the City of Colorado Springs, CO. This feasibility study is being conducted under the authority of Section 206 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996.

The IFR/EA, incorporated herein by reference, evaluated alternatives to the study area. The USACE assessed effects of the following actions in the IFR/EA. The Recommended Plan, also referred to as the Tentative Selected Plan (TSP) is summarized below:

> The Recommended Plan involves a suite of ecosystem restoration measures across the three stream reaches of Spring Creek aimed at stabilizing banks, enhancing habitat, restoring hydrologic function, and improving public access.
>
> In Reach 1, bank stabilization would be implemented on the west bank using a boulder toe structure with native plantings installed behind it to reinforce stability and restore riparian vegetation layers. In-stream habitat complexity would increase through the placement of boulder clusters. On the east bank, invasive plant species would be targeted for removal to facilitate native vegetation recovery and establishment. Public access improvements include walking paths, vehicle access routes and a sitting area with a picnic table.
>
> In Reach 2, two constructed rock riffles (CRR1 & CRR2) would serve as grade control structures to address ongoing channel incision. Banks upstream of these riffles would be regraded and laid back at varied elevations and slopes to create permanently and seasonally inundated areas suitable for wetland plantings (BM1, BM2 & BM3). Three Fill-Areas have been identified and would be filled with excavated material from these bank modifications (F1, F2 & F3). Additional bank stabilization measures include placing stone at erosive bends (SBS1 & SBS2). Access trails into Reach 2 will be established from the west, south, and northeast corners of the site.
>
> In Reach 3, the west bank concrete slab would be removed, and the slope regraded to a 3:1 configuration with a 10-foot-wide riparian bench. This area would be armored with riprap and enhanced with native riparian plantings. A constructed rock riffle would be installed at the northern end of Reach 3, and additional in-stream habitat would be created using strategically placed boulders.

In addition to the Recommended Plan, twenty-five alternatives including a No-Action Alternative were evaluated. Please see Section 5-Alternative Evaluation of the IFR/EA for additional detail on the formulation of alternatives. 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.

Environmental Resources	Insignificant effects	Insignificant effects as a result of mitigation	Resource unaffected by action
Aesthetics	☒	☐	☐
Air quality	☒	☐	☐
Aquatic resources/Hydrology	☒	☐	☐
Fish and wildlife habitat	☒	☐	☐
Threatened/Endangered species & critical habitat	☐	☐	☒
Historic properties	☐	☐	☒
Other cultural resources	☐	☐	☒
Floodplain resources	☒	☐	☐
Wetlands	☐	☐	☒
Hazardous, toxic & radioactive waste	☐	☐	☒
Land use	☐	☐	☒
Noise levels	☒	☐	☐
Public infrastructure	☐	☐	☒
Socioeconomics	☐	☐	☒
Soils	☒	☐	☐
Vegetation Communities	☒	☐	☐
Tribal trust resources	☐	☐	☒
Water quality	☒	☐	☐
Climate	☐	☐	☒

All practicable and appropriate means to avoid or minimize adverse environmental effects were analyzed and incorporated into the recommended plan. Best management practices (BMPs) are detailed in the IFR/EA, listed below, and would be implemented, if appropriate, to minimize impacts:

- Activities would be limited to the designated or otherwise approved areas shown on the construction drawings for construction areas, staging, and access.

- Construction areas would be watered for dust control and comply with local sedimentation and erosion-control regulations.

- All fuels, oils, hydraulic fluids, and other similar substances would be appropriately stored out of the floodplain. Construction equipment would be inspected daily and monitored during operation to prevent leaking fuels or lubricants from entering any surface water.

- BMPs would be implemented regarding the treatment and disposal of waste material. Waste material would be disposed of properly at commercial disposal areas or landfills.

- A Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan would be required. According to the plan, water resources would be protected with silt fencing, geotextiles, or straw bales, to address and prevent runoff of sediment from areas disturbed by construction.

- Areas disturbed by construction and not developed would be revegetated with native grasses and other species that make up the vegetation community.

- In compliance with the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, impacts to nesting birds would be avoided by scheduling work outside of the migratory/nesting season or conducting a nest survey at least 3 days prior to any vegetation disturbance or removal.

No compensatory mitigation is required as part of the recommended plan.

Pursuant to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, as amended, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers is making a determination that the undertaking would result in no historic properties affected (36 CFR.4(d)(1). History Colorado (Colorado State Historic Preservation Office) concurred with this determination on February 27, 2025. Tribal consultation was conducted from February 28, 2025-March 28, 2025. No comments were received.

Public review of the draft IFR/EA and draft FONSI occurred from [Dates TBD]. All comments submitted during the public review period were responded to in the final IFR/EA and final FONSI. A comment-response table as well as the agency letters are included in Appendix J of the IFR/EA.

Pursuant to section 7 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended, the USACE determined that the recommended plan would have no effect on federally listed species or their designated critical habitat. All applicable environmental laws have been considered and coordination with appropriate agencies and officials have been completed.

Technical, environmental, 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. 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.

_____

Date

_____

Matthew T. Miller
Lieutenant Colonel, U.S Army
Albuquerque District