

DRAFT FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

Prichard Waterline Project Wayne County, West Virginia

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Huntington District (Corps) has conducted an environmental analysis in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, as amended. The Environmental Assessment (EA) dated INSERT DATE, for the Prichard Waterline Project addresses replacing, upgrading, and extending water infrastructure in Wayne County, West Virginia. Improvements and upgrades are required in order to reduce water loss, provide fire protection service and quantity of water needed for potential economic development within the industrial area of Prichard including the Heartland Intermodal Gateway Facility. The need for the water infrastructure improvements and extension in the proposed area is to provide infrastructure into an area that has potential for economic development, provide a safe reliable water system, and reduce water loss.

The Final EA, incorporated herein by reference, evaluated various alternatives that would provide residents with a reliable safe wastewater system in the study area. Section 2.0 of the EA discusses the proposed action and alternatives and the proposed action alternative includes:

- Construction of approximately 64,060 linear feet (LF) of 12" water main, 30 LF of 8" water main, 920 LF of 6" water main, 70 LF of 4" water main, and 60 LF of 2" water main. All pipe will be laid directly adjacent to portions of Route 52, County Road 18, County Road 20, and Old Route 52. The project would also increase the size of the valves and waterline from the 500,000 gallon Prichard water storage tank from 6" to 12" diameter. The majority of the project would be constructed in previously disturbed areas between drainage ditches and Route 52, Old Route 52, County Road 18, and County Road 20. Additionally, a portion of the waterline will be placed in an industrial park adjacent to Old Route 52 which also exhibits disturbance.

SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL EFFECTS:

For all alternatives, the potential effects were evaluated, as appropriate. The evaluation of effects was focused on key resources affected by the proposed alternatives. A summary assessment of the potential effects of the Proposed Action Alternative are listed in Table 1:

Table 1: Summary of Potential Effects of the Proposed Action

Resource	Insignificant effects	Insignificant 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"/>
Noise levels	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Socio-economics	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Environmental justice	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Aquatic resources/wetlands	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Invasive species	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Fish and wildlife habitat	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Threatened/Endangered species	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Historic properties	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other cultural resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Floodplains	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Hazardous, toxic & radioactive waste	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Land use	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Climate	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Prime and Unique Farmland	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Wild and Scenic Rivers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Water quality	<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 proposed action alternative. Best management practices (BMPs) as detailed in the EA will be implemented, if appropriate, to minimize impacts. For additional details of the proposed action alternative, see Section 3.0 of the EA.

Pursuant to section 7 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers determined that the proposed action alternative will have no effect on the following federally listed species or their designated critical habitat: Indiana bat, Northern Long-eared bat, and Gray bat.

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 would not be adversely affected by the recommended plan. The Ohio State Preservation Office concurred with the determination on 16 January 2020.

A water quality certification pursuant to section 401 of the Clean Water Act will be obtained from the West Virginia Department of Environmental Protection (WVDEP) prior to construction. The recommended plan appears to meet the requirements of the water quality certification, pending confirmation based on information to be developed during the pre-construction engineering and design phase. All conditions of the water quality certification will be implemented in order to minimize adverse impacts to water quality.

A 30-day public, state, and agency review of the Draft EA and FONSI was completed on INSERT DATE. All comments submitted during the public review period were responded to in the Final EA and FONSI.

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. 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

Jason A. Evers
Colonel, Corps of Engineers
District Commander