

## **DRAFT FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

### **Section 340 Town of Fort Gay Wastewater System Improvements 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 **DATE**, for the Section 340 Town of Fort Gay Wastewater System Improvements Project addresses the existing wastewater system which causes unsanitary and unsafe conditions to residents in the area of Wayne County, West Virginia. The need for improving the wastewater system is to provide residents with reliable and safe wastewater infrastructure.

The Final EA, incorporated herein by reference, evaluated various alternatives that would provide residents with reliable safe wastewater infrastructure in the study area. Section 3.0 of the EA discusses the proposed action and alternatives and the proposed action alternative includes:

- Mapping the collection system for rehabilitation of existing manholes; replacement of approximately 2,500 LF of 8-inch gravity sewer; performing a sewer system evaluation study (SSES); various upgrades and rehabilitation to 9 existing wastewater pump stations and 3 existing wastewater grinder pump stations; and replacement of the lagoon with a new modernized concrete WWTP. The SSES would determine if additional improvements are needed in the existing wastewater collection system. These additional improvements could include replacement of the existing flow meter, flow meter calibration, replacement of 6 existing surface aerators in the lagoon, purchase of a spare surface aerator, cleaning of the lagoon, installation of 2 new floating baffle dividers, installation of a new T-simmer, security fence repair, installation of dichlorination drip feed, and cleaning the existing chlorine tank.

#### **SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL EFFECTS:**

For all alternatives, the potential effects to the following resources 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"/>
Aquatic resources/wetlands	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Invasive species	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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"/>
Hydrology	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Land use	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Navigation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Noise levels	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Public infrastructure	<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"/>
Soils	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Tribal trust resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Water quality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Climate change	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Prime and Unique Farmland	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Wild and Scenic Rivers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

All practical 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 to minimize impacts. For additional details of the proposed action alternative, see Section 4.0 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 recommended plan will have no effect to the following federally listed species or their designated critical habitat: Indiana bat, Northern long-eared bat, Gray bat, Clubshell, Snuffbox mussel, or Big Sandy crayfish. No further coordination with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) is necessary.

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 West Virginia Division of Culture and History (WVDCH) concurred with the determination on 7 July 2017.

A 30-day public, state, and agency review of the Draft EA and FONSI was completed on **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 these 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 significantly affect the human environment; therefore, preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement is not required.<sup>1</sup>

---

Date

---

Jason A. Evers, PE, PMP  
Colonel, U.S. Army  
Commanding