

Draft Environmental Assessment  
Section 531 Elkhorn City  
Wastewater Treatment Plant  
Pike County, Kentucky



U.S. Army Corps of Engineers  
Huntington District  
Huntington, West Virginia  
September 2016

**Environmental Assessment**  
**Section 531**  
**Elkhorn City**  
**Wastewater Treatment Plant**  
**Pike County, Kentucky**

**Executive Summary**

Elkhorn City in Pike County, Kentucky has owned and operated a wastewater collection and treatment system since the early 1960's. In 1972 the current wastewater treatment plant was constructed near the mouth of John Moore Branch (43 years old). The existing treatment works was rehabilitated in 1997. The proposed work for this project is to rehabilitate the existing treatment plant and expand its capacity. No sewer line rehabilitation or new construction is proposed as a part of this project.

Elkhorn City seeks to replace the process contributing flow elements of the existing wastewater treatment plant as the plant is hydraulically overloaded and above capacity. Upgrading the wastewater treatment plant would prevent overloaded spilling wastewater into the Russell Fork and in the future, increase capacity for new businesses and residences in the area.

The Proposed Action Alternative would expand the plant capacity from 150,000 gallons per day to 385,000 gallons per day by installing a new dual basin sequencing batch reactor plant. Additionally, new basins would be concrete rather than steel and less susceptible to corrosion.

The proposed project is a partnership agreement between the Elkhorn City and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), established under the authority of Section 531 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1996. The Section 531 program provides design and construction assistance for water related environmental infrastructure projects to Non-Federal interests in southern and eastern Kentucky. Under this program the Corps may provide support in the form of design and construction assistance for water-related environmental infrastructure, water resource protection and development, and environmental restoration. Examples of possible projects that would qualify under this program include wastewater treatment and related facilities, water supply, water storage, water treatment, water distribution facilities, and surface water resource protection and development. Funding, as established under Section 531, shall be shared 75% Federal and 25% Non-Federal (State and Local). This Environmental Assessment is prepared pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act, Council on Environmental Quality Regulations (40 CFR 1500-1508), and Corps implementing regulation, ER 200-2-2.

The Draft Environmental Assessment has concluded there are no significant impacts to the human environment associated with the implementation of the proposed Elkhorn City Wastewater Treatment Plant upgrade.





SECTION 531  
ELKHORN CITY  
WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANT  
PIKE COUNTY, KENTUCKY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

<b>1.0</b>	<b>Project Description</b>	1
1.1	Project Background	1
1.2	Purpose, Need, and Authorization	1
<b>2.0</b>	<b>Alternatives Dismissed from Further Consideration</b>	2
2.1	New Site Alternative	2
2.2	Oxidation Ditch Alternative	2
<b>3.0</b>	<b>Proposed Actions and Alternatives</b>	2
3.1	Proposed Action	2
3.2	No Action Alternative	2
<b>4.0</b>	<b>Environmental Setting and Consequences</b>	2
4.1	Location	3
4.2	Land Use	3
4.3	Climate	3
4.4	Terrestrial Habitat	3
4.5	Floodplains	4
4.6	Prime and Unique Farmland	4
4.7	Aquatic Habitat/Water Quality	4
4.8	Wetlands	5
4.9	Wild and Scenic Rivers	5
4.10	Hazardous, Toxic, and Radioactive Wastes	5
4.11	Cultural Resources	5
4.12	Threatened and Endangered Species	6
4.13	Air Quality	6
4.14	Noise	6
4.15	Socioeconomic Conditions	7
4.16	Aesthetics	8
4.17	Transportation and Traffic	8
4.18	Health and Safety	8
4.19	Cumulative Effects	8



<b>5.0</b>	<b>Status of Environmental Compliance</b>	10
<b>6.0</b>	<b>Required Coordination</b>	11
6.1	Agencies Contacted	11
6.2	Public Review and Comments	11
<b>7.0</b>	<b>Conclusion</b>	11

List of Tables

Table 1	Permissible Non-Department of Defense Noise Exposures	7
Table 2	Status of Environmental Compliance	10

List of Appendices

Appendix A	Exhibits
Appendix B	Agency Coordination
Appendix C	Mailing List



*The brief and concise nature of this document is consistent with the 40 CFR requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) to reduce paperwork and delay by eliminating duplication with existing environmental documentation, incorporating pertinent material by reference, and by emphasizing interagency cooperation. The majority of data collection and analysis in this document was performed by Environmental Assessment Services, LLC in conjunction with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps).*

## **1.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

### **1.1 Project Background**

This Environmental Assessment (EA) examines the potential environmental impacts of the Elkhorn City Wastewater Treatment Plant Upgrade project as proposed by Elkhorn City. The purpose of the EA is to analyze the potential environmental impacts of the proposed project and to determine whether to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) or a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI).

### **1.2 Purpose, Need, and Authorization**

The purpose of this project is to upgrade the existing wastewater treatment plant for Elkhorn City and expand the plant's capacity to the necessary quantity for current conditions and future growth. Upgrading the wastewater treatment plant would eliminate the impediments to growth posed by an overloaded wastewater treatment plant. The proposed project would expand the plant capacity from 150,000 gallons per day (GPD) to 385,000 GPD. The need to upgrade the wastewater treatment plant is due to increased demand and to ensure compliance with the Clean Water Act. Currently, the plant exceeds its capacity and is overloading. Furthermore, future increased demand will outgrow the facilities current capabilities as the city and its new industrial park begin to expand. Increased capacity would provide the necessary reserve demanded by industrial tenants evaluating sites for new business and would provide capacity reserve to allow future project phases to extend collector sewers to the un-sewered population of the planning area.

The proposed project is a partnership agreement, between Elkhorn City and the Corps, established under the authority of Section 531 of the Water Resources Development Act (WRDA) of 1996 (Public Law No. 104- 303), as amended, which provides authority for the Corps to establish a program to provide environmental assistance to Non-Federal interests in southern and eastern Kentucky. This law provides design and construction assistance for water related environmental infrastructure projects, including projects for wastewater treatment and related facilities, water supply, water storage, water treatment, water distribution facilities, and surface water resource protection and development.

This EA is prepared pursuant to NEPA, Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) Regulations (40 CFR 1500-1508), and Corps implementing regulation, ER 200-2-2.

## **2.0 ALTERNATIVES DISMISSED FROM FURTHER CONSIDERATION**



## **2.1 New Site Alternative**

This alternative explored the option of locating the wastewater treatment plant at a new site. The nearest property suitable for the facility and out of the floodway is roughly three miles downstream. Even if a new plant could be constructed for the same price as expanding the existing plant on the existing site – the additional costs to purchase, site, and construct three miles of transmission sewer would render this alternative ‘not cost effective’. Therefore, this alternative was dismissed from further consideration due to lack of suitable sites and total project cost.

## **2.2 Oxidation Ditch Alternative**

This alternative explored the option of upgrading the existing wastewater treatment plant with an oxidation ditch. This alternative has high operation and maintenance costs and requires more space than readily available at the existing site. Therefore, this alternative was dismissed from further consideration due to cost and practicality.

## **3.0 PROPOSED ACTIONS AND ALTERNATIVES**

### **3.1 Proposed Action Alternative (PAA)**

The PAA would expand the plant by replacing the aging 150,000 GPD plant with a new dual basin sequencing batch reactor (SBR) plant rated for 385,000 GPD. The new basins would be concrete rather than steel and less susceptible to corrosion. The existing outfall pipe would be upgraded adjacent to the Russel Fork. The majority of construction activity will be within the footprint of the existing wastewater treatment plant.

The proposed action alternative will meet the project’s purpose and need.

### **3.2 No Action Alternative (NAA)**

Under the NAA, the Corps would not provide funding for the project. The wastewater treatment plant facility is currently hydraulically overloaded and has no process redundancy (only one aeration basin and only one clarifier). Additionally Elkhorn City cannot attract tenants to the future John Moore Branch industrial site if the treatment plant has no reserve capacity for new development. Extending sewers to un-sewered areas within the city’s planning area could not be extended without an increase in the hydraulic capacity of its treatment plant. Continued overloading of the plant will result in Clean Water Act violations. This alternative is considered unacceptable due to health and safety hazards for the community in the proposed project area.

## **4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING AND CONSEQUENCES**

### **4.1 Location**



This project is located within the city limits Elkhorn City between John Moore Branch Road and the Russell Fork of the Levisa Fork of the Big Sandy River (N 37.309378°, W -82.354546°). Project location mapping can be found in Appendix A.

#### **4.2 Land Use**

The land use in the vicinity of the PAA is rural, consisting primarily of industrial properties and forested area. The proposed project would be constructed within the footprint of the existing wastewater treatment plant. No forestland will be affected by the proposed project, and nearby areas are currently being developed for commercial and residential uses.

There would be no impacts to land use as a result of either the PAA or NAA.

#### **4.3 Climate**

Executive Order (E.O.) 13653 requires Federal actions to address climate change. The Big Sandy River Watershed basin's mid-latitude position makes it susceptible to highly variable weather throughout the year. The watershed's climate is greatly influenced by oceanic and atmospheric interactions. The watershed experiences seasonal weather patterns throughout the year, with climatic conditions typical of summer, fall, winter, and spring seasons for the Mid-Atlantic and Southeast Regions of the United States. Variability in weather tends to be greater during the late winter, spring, and fall seasons within the watershed. Summers are usually characterized by warm to hot weather with periods of high humidity. Winters within the watershed are typically mild, with areas at higher elevations experiencing slightly harsher winters and greater snowfall. Fall is typically the driest season, while spring is usually the wettest season within the watershed.

The PAA would not involve any activity that could affect the environment in regard to climate change. This region is not projected to experience severe drought conditions and is instead expected to experience more precipitation in the future as larger and more intense rainfalls have become more frequent. As a result, the condition of the PAA would not likely influence future climate change. For the same reasons, there are also no impacts expected with respect to climate as a result of the NAA.

#### **4.4 Terrestrial Habitat**

The majority of the PAA would be constructed on previously disturbed areas; therefore, potential impacts to vegetation would be minimal and temporary. If necessary some vine and undergrowth may be cleared but no trees would be cut. Construction areas would be reseeded in order to return to pre-construction conditions upon completion of construction activities. Only short-term temporary impacts during construction are anticipated to occur from the PAA. Long-term beneficial positive impacts would occur from the PAA with the elimination of sewage discharges and water quality improvements.

As the selection of the NAA would entail no changes to the project area, there are no impacts to terrestrial habitat anticipated as part of the NAA.



#### **4.5 Floodplains**

Executive Order 11988 requires Federal agencies to consider the potential effects of their proposed actions to floodplains. In order to determine the PAA's potential floodplain impact, the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) was reviewed and the proposed project area is located within the 1% annual chance of flood hazard area and 0.2% annual chance flood hazard area or an area of 1% annual chance of flood hazard with depths less than 1 foot (<https://www.fema.gov/floodplain-management/flood-zones>). The proposed wastewater treatment plant upgrades would occur within the existing facility and would result in no change in grade or elevation.

Therefore, no impacts to floodplains are anticipated to occur from the PAA or NAA.

#### **4.6 Prime and Unique Farmland**

The Farmland Protection Policy Act (FPPA) requires Federal agencies to minimize the conversion of prime and unique farmland to non-agricultural uses. The project area is on previously disturbed or developed land. Based upon review of the project, the Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS) determined that the project area is considered converted farmland and the project would not be impacting additional prime farmland or statewide important farmland, therefore the FPPA would not apply to this proposed project. Based upon the NRCS determination, a Farmland Conversion Impact Rating does not need to be completed and the PAA would have no impact on Prime or Unique, Statewide, or Locally important farmland (Appendix B).

There are no impacts to Prime and Unique Farmland anticipated as part of the NAA.

#### **4.7 Aquatic Habitat/Water Quality**

Elkhorn City is located within the Big Sandy River Watershed. The Russel Fork within the watershed is listed on Kentucky's 2012 Section 303(d) list of impaired waters for fecal coliform and Total Dissolved Solids (TSS). Implementation of the PAA would not result in any new discharges of a pollutant. The PAA will protect the overall quality of water in the area. Best Management Practices (BMPs) would be used throughout the project to prevent runoff from the project into adjacent surface waters.

Construction of the PAA will avoid any permanent and temporary in-stream impacts. The PAA proposes to update the existing outfall and regrade the surrounding area. No discharge will occur within Waters of the United States. Therefore, under the Clean Water Act, a 404(b)(1) analysis is not needed for this action.

In the long term, the implementation of the PAA is expected to have a positive impact on the aquatic habitat and water quality within the proposed project area. Implementation of the PAA would ensure the reduction of untreated sewage reaching ground water or area streams.



Under the NAA, aquatic impacts would continue in nearby streams and groundwater due to the exposure to untreated sewage. Water quality in the project area would remain impaired and Elkhorn City would be out of compliance with the Clean Water Act.

#### **4.8 Wetlands**

National Wetland Inventory Maps (NWI) were reviewed for the proposed project area and a site reconnaissance was conducted to determine validity of NWI Maps. NWI maps indicated that there are no wetlands adjacent to the project area aside from the Russell Fork of the Levisa Fork of the Big Sandy River, which will not be impacted by the proposed project. The site reconnaissance also indicated no wetlands are located within the proposed project area. No impacts to wetlands are anticipated as part of the PAA or NAA.

#### **4.9 Wild and Scenic Rivers**

No designated State Wild or Scenic Rivers are present within the Project Area. Therefore, no impacts to these resources are anticipated as part of the PAA or NAA.

#### **4.10 Hazardous, Toxic, and Radioactive Waste (HTRW)**

A Phase 1 HTRW Environmental Site Assessment was conducted for the City of Elkhorn City Wastewater Treatment Plant Project to identify environmental conditions and to identify the potential presence of HTRW contamination located in the project's construction work limits. Below are the following Phase 1 HTRW findings:

The Corps HTRW staff determined the Phase 1 HTRW showed no evidence of recognized environmental conditions with the property and no further HTRW action is required. Therefore, no impacts to HTRW are anticipated with the PAA.

The NAA would not result in ground disturbing activities, and would not disturb areas of HTRW contamination; therefore, there are no HTRW impacts associated with the NAA. A clearance memorandum was signed by Corps HTRW staff July 20, 2016.

#### **4.11 Cultural Resources**

Coordination with the Kentucky Heritage Council (KHC) under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) was initiated by Summit Engineering, Inc. KHC determined that there will be no historic properties affected by the proposed undertaking. In a letter dated January 11, 2016, KHC concurred with the determination that no further consultation under Section 106 of the NHPA is necessary (Appendix B). There are no architectural resources eligible for or listed in the National Register of Historic Places that would be impacted by this project; therefore, no additional consultation is necessary for architectural resources.

Pursuant to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended, the Corps has made the determination that no historic properties will be affected by the PAA. Additionally, there would be no impacts associated with the NAA.



#### **4.12 Threatened and Endangered Species**

According to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) the project area is within the range of the Indiana Bat (*Myotis sodalis*) and Northern Long-eared bat (*Myotis septentrionalis*). In correspondence dated November 18, 2015, the USFWS stated “we do not believe that the proposed project will affect habitat used by these bat species and, therefore, believe that the proposed project is not likely to result in negative effects to the Indiana bat or the Northern long-eared bat” (Appendix B). The proposed wastewater treatment plant upgrade would primarily occur in previously disturbed areas and would not require tree removal. Therefore, the Corps’ Huntington District has determined that the proposed action would have no effect on the Indiana Bat or Northern Long-eared Bat given no tree clearing would occur and the area is previously disturbed.

The USFWS also states the Big Sandy crayfish (*Cambarus callainus*) is currently proposed for listing under the ESA and a listing decision may be made as soon as June of 2016. This species has been observed in the Russell Fork and its tributaries near Elkhorn City. The Corp’s Huntington District has determined that the proposed action would have no effect on the Big Sandy crayfish as no in-water work would occur. No further Section 7 consultation under the Endangered Species Act is required.

No impacts to threatened or endangered species are anticipated to occur from the PAA or the NAA.

#### **4.13 Air Quality**

According to U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) website, Pike County, Kentucky is classified as “in attainment” (maintaining applicable standards) for all criteria pollutants. Emissions from construction equipment would occur during the construction period. Contractors would operate all equipment in accordance with local, State, and Federal regulations. The PAA is exempted by 40 CFR Part 93.153 from making a conformity determination, since estimated emissions from construction equipment would not be expected to exceed *deminimis* levels, direct emissions of a criteria pollutant, or its precursors. Any impacts would be short-term, localized, and would occur only during construction phase activities. Impacts to air quality under the PAA would be temporary during construction and minor.

No impacts to air quality are anticipated to occur as part of the NAA.

#### **4.14 Noise**

Noise associated with the PAA would be limited to that generated during construction. Construction noise would be short in duration and would only occur during daylight hours. Noise is measured as Day Night average noise levels (DNL) in “A-weighted” decibels that the human ear is most sensitive to (dBA). There are no Federal standards for allowable noise levels. According to the Department of Housing and Urban Development Guidelines, DNLs below 65 dBA are normally acceptable levels of exterior noise in residential areas. The Federal Aviation



Administration (FAA) denotes a DNL above 65 dBA as the level of significant noise impact. Several other agencies, including the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, use a DNL criterion of 55 dBA as the threshold for defining noise impacts in suburban and rural residential areas. According to Dr. Paul Schomer in his 2001 Whitepaper, while there are numerous thresholds for acceptable noise in residential areas, research suggests an area's current noise environment, which has experienced noise in the past, may reasonably expect to tolerate a level of noise about 5 dBA higher than the general guidelines. The Corps Safety and Health Requirements Manual provides criteria for temporary permissible noise exposure levels (see Table 3.1 below), for consideration of hearing protection or the need to administer sound reduction controls.

Duration/day (hours)	Noise level (dBA)
8	90
6	92
4	95
3	97
2	100
1.5	102
1	105

Construction noise would be similar to that of farm equipment and other small machinery used in the local area. A backhoe, end loader, road grader and/or vibratory roller are examples of equipment that is likely to be used during construction. Each emits noise levels around 85 dBA at 45 feet. Construction equipment would be operated during daylight hours.

With only industrial and rural land surrounding the project area and daytime construction with short and limited duration of elevated noise levels associated with the PAA, impacts from noise to local residences would be temporary and minor. There would be no change in noise with the NAA.

#### **4.15 Socioeconomic Conditions**

Executive Order (E.O.) 12898 requires Federal actions to address environmental justice in minority populations and low-income populations. According to the U.S. Census Bureau, the 2014 population estimate for Pike County, Kentucky was 63,034 and does not contain significant minority populations. The 2014 census indicates Pike County is 98% white and has a median household income of \$32,961 compared with the median household income of \$42,958 for the State of Kentucky. Individuals residing in the county below the poverty level is 23.0% compared to 18.8% statewide.

Implementation of the PAA would aid in protection of water quality in the Russel Fork of the Levisa River by helping eliminate septic tanks and straight pipe discharges, thereby improving the living environment for all residents. No homes or buildings would be impacted by the proposed project; therefore, the PAA meets the directive of EO 12898 by avoiding any disproportionately high adverse human health or environmental effects on minority or low income populations.



No impacts to minority or low income populations are anticipated to occur from the NAA.

#### **4.16 Aesthetics**

The project area is rural, primarily consisting of industrial properties and forested areas. Temporary disturbance of the local aesthetics would be negligible.

Neither the PAA nor NAA would significantly impact local aesthetics.

#### **4.17 Transportation and Traffic**

Transportation to the wastewater treatment plant project is provided via US Highway 80 along with existing city streets. Local traffic using the small streets and access roads in the area may be temporarily disrupted during construction. Construction on and near road surfaces would be in compliance with Kentucky Transportation Cabinet (KYTC) guidelines. All appropriate KYTC guidelines for traffic control would be implemented and emergency access would be maintained. Necessary warnings and traffic control devices will be used, as necessary, to ensure safety of the public and construction workers. Impacts anticipated to occur from the PAA would be minimal and temporary.

No impacts to transportation and traffic are anticipated to occur from the NAA.

#### **4.18 Health and Safety**

The PAA has been designed to help the current issue of hydraulic overloading of the treatment plant. The upgrade to the system will increase capacity by 30% allowing more residence and businesses to move into the area without the worry of improperly treated wastewater. Additionally, the proposed upgrade would allow future planning efforts by Elkhorn City to extend collection sewers to the un-sewered population in the area to prevent sewage from reaching ground water and polluting streams. Therefore, the PAA is anticipated to have a long term beneficial impact on health and safety of the project area.

Under the NAA, the current system could be overloaded spilling wastewater into the Russell Fork, perpetuating health and safety concerns.

#### **4.19 Cumulative Effects**

The Corps must consider the cumulative effects of the proposed project on the environment as stipulated in the NEPA. Cumulative effects are "the impact on the environment which results from the incremental impact of the action when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions regardless of what agency (Federal or Non-Federal) or person undertakes such actions". Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor but collectively significant actions taking place over a period of time (40 CFR Part 1508.7 Council on Environmental Quality [CEQ] Regulations).



The cumulative effects analysis is based on the potential effects of the proposed project when added to similar impacts from other projects in the region. An inherent part of the cumulative effects analysis is the uncertainty surrounding actions that have not yet been fully developed. The CEQ regulations provide for the inclusion of uncertainties in the analysis and states that "when an agency is evaluating reasonably foreseeable significant adverse effects on the human environment...and there is incomplete or unavailable information, the agency shall always make clear that such information is lacking" (40 CFR 1502.22).

Temporal and geographical limits for this project must be established in order to frame the analysis. These limits can vary by the resources that are affected. The upgrade of the wastewater treatment plant would have temporary and insignificant negative impacts of the environment. Resources which would show long term beneficial effects from the project would be health and safety. The temporal limits for assessment of this impact would initiate in 1972 with the passage of the Clean Water Act and end 50 years after completion of this project. The geographical extent would be broadened to consider effects beyond the PAA. The geographical extent considered is the Big Sandy River Basin Watershed.

The Russel Fork of the Big Sandy River Watershed is listed on Kentucky's 2012 Section 303(d) list of impaired waters due to fecal coliform and TSS. Some of the suspected leading causes of impaired water are mining and failing septic systems, etc. There is a need throughout the watershed to address inadequate waste water collection systems (Corps, 2014). There is limited current information on other programs that are currently targeting the river and its restoration. Watershed studies for the Big Sandy River Basin have been undertaken recently by both the Corps and the USDA, but currently, no programs are active in the Big Sandy Watershed. The Big Sandy Area Development District (BSADD) is a regional planning organization that serves Floyd, Johnson, Magoffin, Martin, and Pike Counties. BSADD performs services in water management and has a water management council that meets to discuss existing projects and needs within the service area. In the future, watershed programs may address obstruction to stream flow and other maintenance activities. Impairment of the Big Sandy River Watershed is expected to continue but if the proposed actions are implemented, a cleaner, healthier watershed would be promoted. Water quality standards and regulations are expected to remain as stringent today as in the future.

Section 4.0 documents the existing environment and potential environmental effects of the PAA and NAA with respect to existing conditions. The effects of the PAA, as discussed beforehand, are localized and minor. Past actions that may result in similar effects may include upgrading of other wastewater utilities in the watershed. No reasonably foreseeable future actions that would have similar impacts as the proposed action were identified. In scoping cumulative effects issues, no resources were identified as having a potential to be significantly affected. Only minor and temporary impacts to ecological resources would be sustained with the implementation of the PAA. These resources would be fully reestablished upon completion of construction.

The availability of Federal funds through programs, such as the 531 Program, to assist communities with installation and construction of water-related environmental infrastructure and resource protection and development projects in Kentucky is an additional benefit to the area. The significance of this action on health and safety would be positive. Given the current



program is in place for the foreseeable future and the overall beneficial effect from implementation of the PAA, there is expected to be a positive, though small, cumulative effect on health and safety based on past, present, and reasonably foreseeable actions.

### 5.0 Status of Environmental Compliance

The PAA is in full compliance with all local, State, and Federal statutes as well as Executive Orders is complete. This compliance is documented below in Table 2

<b>Table 2 - Environmental Compliance Status</b>			
Statute/Executive Order	Full	Partial	N/A
National Environmental Policy Act (considered partial until the FONSI is signed)		X	
Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act	X		
Endangered Species Act	X		
Clean Water Act	X		
Wild and Scenic Rivers Act	X		
Clean Air Act	X		
National Historic Preservation Act	X		
Archeological Resources Protection Act			N/A
Comprehensive, Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act	X		
Resource Conservation and Recovery Act	X		
Toxic Substances Control Act	X		
Quiet Communities Act	X		
Farmland Protection Act	X		
Executive Order 11988 Floodplain Management	X		
Executive Order 11990 Protection of Wetlands	X		
Executive Order 12898 Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations	X		

\*Anticipated FONSI signature to occur after public review

## 6.0 REQUIRED COORDINATION

### 6.1 Agencies Contacted



Direct coordination with the USFWS, USDA, and KHC was completed by Summit Engineering, Inc. prior to publication of the EA. Agency correspondence is included in Appendix B.

## **6.2 Public Review and Comments**

The EA and FONSI will be made available for public review and comment for a period of 30 days, as required under NEPA. A Notice of Availability will be published in the local newspaper, Appalachian News-Express, advising the public of this document's availability for review and comment. A copy of the EA will also be placed in the Pike County Public Library and made available on-line at <http://www.lrh.Corps.army.mil/Missions/PublicReview.aspx>. The mailing list for the EA is located in Appendix C.

## **7.0 CONCLUSION**

Elkhorn City areas' wastewater treatment facility is currently overloaded. The proposed project would upgrade the current system increasing its capacity by 30%. The proposed action would prevent overloaded spilling wastewater into the Russell Fork and increase capacity for new businesses and residences in the area. No significant adverse impacts have been identified as a result of implementation of the proposed wastewater treatment plant upgrade.

Construction would take place on previously disturbed land. Benefits to health and safety would occur with project implementation. Effects associated with construction would be minor and temporary. BMPs would be implemented during construction to minimize impacts to residents and the environment. Therefore, the PAA would not be expected to have significant impacts on the human environment.