

DRAFT FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

Section 531 Elkhorn City Water Storage Tank Replacement Project Pike County, Kentucky

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 Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) dated **DATE**, for the Section 531 Elkhorn City Water Storage Tank Replacement Project addresses the existing water storage system which causes unnecessary burden as well as unsanitary and unsafe conditions to residents in Elkhorn City in Pike County, Kentucky. The need for improving the water storage system is to provide residents with adequate water pressure and potable water.

The Draft EA, incorporated herein by reference, evaluated various alternatives that would provide residents with reliable and safe water storage infrastructure in the study area. Section 2.0 of the draft EA discusses the proposed action and alternatives and the proposed action alternative includes:

- Replacing an aging 200,000-gallon steel standpipe water storage tank with a new 200,000-gallon glass lined standpipe water storage tank that is less prone to rust and corrosion. The new tank would be taller than the existing tank to address pressure issues in the distribution system. The new tank would be equipped with a mixing system to eliminate dead water storage and other contaminants. Additionally, the new tank would be adjacent to the existing tank, and the access road leading to the project site would be improved with the addition of gravel and by grading uneven areas to improve access to the project site. Once the new tank has been constructed, the old tank would be removed and demolished. The demolition of the old tank would not be funded by the Corps.

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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"/>
Socioeconomics	<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 draft EA will be implemented to minimize impacts. For additional details of the proposed action alternative, see Section 3.0 of the draft 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 would have no effect to the following federally listed species or their designated critical habitat: Indiana bat, Northern long-eared bat, Gray bat, and Big Sandy Crayfish. No further coordination with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife (USFWS) under the Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act is required.

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 affected by the recommended plan. The Kentucky State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) concurred with the determination on 13 August 2021.

A 30-day public, state, and agency review of the Draft EA and Finding of No Significant Impact (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 reports, 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 or natural environment; therefore, preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement is not required.

Date

Jayson H. Putnam
Colonel, U.S. Army
Commanding

DRAFT