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Executive Summary

Since the early 2000s, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) has implemented flood risk management measures in the Town of Martin, Kentucky to reduce flooding impacts and damages for residences and businesses. A Final Environmental Assessment of July 2000, was prepared concurrent with the development of the Detailed Project Report for the Town of Martin Nonstructural Project, for which a Finding of No Significant Impact was issued on August 8, 2000. As part of the approved project, a Phase I Redevelopment Site was created in 2006 for relocation of essential public and commercial facilities to a flood safe location.

This Supplemental Environmental Assessment (SEA) has been developed pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps), Huntington District, to document the potential effects associated with Phase II flood risk management measures proposed for implementation. The proposed action is part of the Town of Martin Nonstructural Project in Floyd County, Kentucky and the SEA tiers from the 2000 Final Environmental Assessment.

The Proposed Action Alternative would entail continued acquisition/demolition of structures; construction of a second redevelopment site; inclusion of land underlying the low-income housing facility into the project area; raising Kentucky State (KY) Route 1428, Ice Plant Hollow Road, and the Emergency Access Road; construction of access roads as a detour for 1428 and for the green space; removal of Water Street Bridge, and installation of utilities. The existing Mayo Hollow spoil/borrow site would be used for fill material in construction of the measures above.


This SEA is prepared pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), Council on Environmental Quality Regulations (40 CFR 1500-1508), and Corps implementing regulation, ER 200-2-2. The SEA has concluded there are no significant adverse impacts to the human environment associated with the implementation of the proposed Phase II project for the Town of Martin Nonstructural Project.
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIS</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>EO</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAA</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMA</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>FIRM</td>
<td>Flood Insurance Rate Map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>Finding of No Significant Impact</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDD</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEC-RAS</td>
<td>Hydrologic Engineering Center – River Analysis System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HTRW</td>
<td>Hazardous, Toxic, and Radioactive Waste</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KYDOW</td>
<td>Kentucky Division of Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KYSHPO</td>
<td>Kentucky State Historic Preservation Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LOMR</td>
<td>Letter of Map Revision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOA</td>
<td>Memorandum of Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAA</td>
<td>No Action Alternative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAGPRA</td>
<td>Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NEPA</td>
<td>National Environmental Policy Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NFIP</td>
<td>National Flood Insurance Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRCS</td>
<td>Natural Resource Conservation Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHPA</td>
<td>National Historic Preservation Act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRHP</td>
<td>National Register of Historic Places</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPDES</td>
<td>National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NWI</td>
<td>National Wetland Inventory Map</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PA</td>
<td>Programmatic Agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDT</td>
<td>Project Delivery Team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PAA</td>
<td>Proposed Action Alternative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROE</td>
<td>Right of Entry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEA</td>
<td>Supplemental Environmental Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SFHA</td>
<td>Special Flood Hazard Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USEPA</td>
<td>U.S. Environmental Protection Agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USFWS</td>
<td>U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WRDA</td>
<td>Water Resource Development Act</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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 was performed by AECOM and analysis in this document was performed by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps).

1.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

1.1 Project Background and Authorizations

The Town of Martin Nonstructural Project was created as a result of the April 1977 Flood in the Levisa Fork Basin. Due to millions of dollars in damages and losses from this flood, the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act of 1981 (P.L. 96-367) and subsequent legislation provided authorization for development of flood protection measures for the Levisa and Tug Forks of the Big Sandy River Basin. Section 202 of that legislation directed the Secretary of the Army (acting through the Chief of Engineers) to design and construct flood risk management measures in those areas affected by the 1977 Flood. Nonstructural flood control measures implemented would prevent future losses occurring either from a flood equal in magnitude to the April 1977 flood, or the one percent annual chance flood (also known as the 100 year flood), whichever is greater. A Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) for the Levisa Fork Basin/Haysi Dam Flood Damage Reduction Plan, was completed in 1998.

Pursuant to its Section 202 authority, the Corps identified and evaluated alternative flood risk management measures in the “Town of Martin Nonstructural Project Detailed Project Report (DPR), Appendix T, Section 202 General Plan”, dated March 2000. All appropriate levels of review were completed and the Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works approved the DPR in March 2001. Pursuant to the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), 42 U.S.C. § 4321, et seq., as amended, the Corps prepared a Final Environmental Assessment (FEA) in July 2000 with an August 2000 Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) for the Federal action proposed to carry out flood risk management measures in the Town of Martin, Kentucky.

Due to availability of funding, only portions of the proposed flood risk management measures identified in the approved DPR have been constructed. Flood risk management measures implemented include: a Flood Warning System (2003), Phase I Redevelopment Site (2006), fire station construction/relocation (2013), town hall/police station construction/relocation (2017), alternative school construction/relocation (2019), and emergency access road (2019).

In 2018, the Town of Martin Nonstructural Project received supplemental funding to complete flood risk management measures pursuant to the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2018. As a result of this funding, the Corps has the opportunity to complete additional components of the proposed plan as documented in the DPR completed in 2000. However, given the lapse of time, the Corps performed a reevaluation of design, construction, and sequencing. Included for implementation with Bipartisan Budget Act funding, includes: continued acquisition/demolition of structures; creation of a second redevelopment site by raising the area between KY 1428 and the mountain...
to the east to an elevation above the one percent annual chance flood; inclusion of land underlying the low-income housing facility into the project area; raising Kentucky State (KY) Route 1428, Ice Plant Hollow Road, and Emergency Access Road; creation of a green space access road and a detour road; removing the Water Street Bridge, and installation of utilities. These anticipated remaining measures proposed for implementation of flood risk management measures and align with the scope identified in the approved DPR. Due to the lapse in time and adjustments in project design, a Supplemental Environmental Assessments (SEA) is being prepared pursuant to NEPA, Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) Regulations (40 CFR 1500-1508), and Corps implementing regulation, ER 200-2-2.

The proposed project is conducted consistent with a PPA between the Floyd County Fiscal Court and the Corps. The project is authorized by Section 202 of the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act of 1981 (Public Law 96-367), as amended; by Section 367 of the Water Resource Development Act of 1999 (Public Law 106-541), as amended; by Section 107 of the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act of 2010 (Public Law 111-85); and by the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2018.

1.2 Purpose, Need, and Scope

The purpose of the Town of Martin Nonstructural Project is to implement flood risk management measures to reduce flooding impacts and damages for the residences and businesses of Martin, Kentucky. In the absence of flood risk management measures for the project area, the potential for future development and growth is limited and residents would be subjected to future floods and damage similar to those that have occurred in previous years.

This SEA is being prepared by the Corps to analyze the potential environmental impacts of the proposed project and to determine whether to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) or a FONSI. This SEA concisely documents environmental considerations and assists in determining whether significant impacts may be associated with the proposal pursuant to 40 CFR 1508.9(a) and tiers pursuant to 40 CFR 1508.28 to the previous EA prepared July 2000. The EA prepared in July 2000 was prepared concurrently with the development of the feasibility study for the Town of Martin Nonstructural Project; a FONSI was issued for that effort in August 2000. An EIS is typically conducted where significant human or natural resources exist and the implementation of a proposed project may have significant negative effects to those resources. An EA typically involves projects where no significant resources occur or the project is expected to have less than significant impacts to the human and natural environment. In both EISs and EAs, additional project actions can be implemented to help avoid, minimize, or mitigate for potential project impacts.

The scope of this SEA is limited to considerations surrounding the Phase II project area and the disposition of the low-income housing facility which resides within the Phase II project footprint. This document would be tiered from the 2000 Final Environmental Assessment and Finding of No Significant Impact (as appropriate) and be, consistent with NEPA when 1) sufficient design information, and investigations progress on other Project components; and 2) when those components are ripe for consideration.
1.3 Project Location

The Town of Martin, Floyd County, is located in eastern Kentucky. Floyd County is bordered on
the North by Johnson County, West by Magoffin County and East and South by Pike County.
The Levisa Fork River flows through Floyd County, where it is fed by one of its major
tributaries, Beaver Creek. The Town of Martin, Kentucky lies along the banks of Beaver Creek.
In the past, the Town of Martin’s close proximity to the confluence of Beaver Creek and the
Levisa Fork make it susceptible to both flooding events from Beaver Creek and backwater
flooding from the Levisa Fork. Due to the steep topography of the project area, the majority of
the town lies within the floodplain. The location of the project area generally includes the areas
from Beaver Creek to the base of the mountains to the east, see Figure 1 below. Project location
mapping can be found in Appendix A.
2.0 PROPOSED ACTION AND ALTERNATIVES

2.1 Proposed Action Alternative (PAA)

The PAA would entail implementation of flood risk management measures to reduce flooding impacts and damages for the residences and businesses of Martin, Kentucky. These measures include: continued acquisition/demolition of structures within the project area; creation of a second redevelopment site; inclusion of land underlying the low-income housing facility into the project area; raising KY-1428, Ice Plant Hollow Road, and the Emergency Access Road; creation of a green space access road and a detour road; removing Water Street Bridge, and installation of utilities.
The proposed Phase II Redevelopment Site would generally include the areas between existing KY-1428 and the base of the mountain to the east. A Conceptual Layout Plan and Preliminary Subdivision Plat have been developed for the proposed Phase II Redevelopment Site. The non-Federal Sponsor, Floyd County Fiscal Court, and the Big Sandy Area Development District (BSADD) are responsible for development of the site and actual land usage. The site would likely be used for both commercial and residential purposes in the future.

In order to provide developable land in this area, which is above the 1% annual chance flood elevation, this portion of town would effectively be raised by placement of fill to an elevation of not less than 662 feet, which is 3.5 feet above the 1% annual chance flood elevation of 658.5 feet. More specifically, the Phase II Redevelopment Site east of KY-1428 would be raised to a minimum elevation of 663 feet and KY-1428 would be raised to a centerline elevation of at least 662 feet. The existing KY-1428 within the project area consists of two 12-foot lanes with left turn lanes and a right turn lane onto KY-80. The area west of KY-1428 would remain undeveloped and maintained as green space.

The existing roadway would be elevated approximately 2,510 linear feet in its existing horizontal location and would transition to meet the existing alignments at the north and south ends of KY-1428 within the project area. The road would consist two lanes, one each direction with approximate lane widths of 12 feet, a 14 foot wide center turn lane, a three foot paved shoulder on the western side and an eight foot parking lane on the eastern side. Additionally, the entire western side of the roadway would have a guardrail installed. Coordination with Kentucky Transportation Cabinet (KYTC) will be ongoing throughout the project to discuss typical lane
width section and design criteria. Near the northern and southern project limits there is limited space between Beaver Creek and KY-1428. Similarly, there is limited space between KY-1428 and the hill slopes to the west. Retaining walls would be required in these locations in order to elevate the roadway while avoiding filling within the boundaries of the Beaver Creek floodway.

To facilitate the placement of fill over existing KY-1428, a detour road would be required. The detour road would connect with KY-1428 outside of the proposed vertical realignment limits and direct traffic to the east at the edge of the proposed Phase II site. Upon completion of construction, the detour road is anticipated to be incorporated as an additional street within the Phase II Redevelopment Site. Once construction of the detour begins, access to Ice Plant Hollow Road would be temporarily blocked. During this period of time, traffic would be diverted through the existing Phase I Redevelopment Site via the Emergency Access Road which is currently under construction. The lower portion of Ice Plant Hollow Road would also be elevated, as required, to maintain a suitable profile where connecting to the elevated KY-1428.

Similar to the existing KY-1428, Ice Plant Hollow Road and the Emergency Access Road are existing roadways that would be altered as part of this project. Both roadways would largely follow their existing horizontal alignments and be raised vertically to be above the minimum design elevation of 662 feet. Ice Plant Hollow Road would be elevated approximately 635 linear feet with two lanes, one in each direction and three feet approximate lane widths and two feet paved shoulders. Around 100 linear feet of the Emergency Access Road would be elevated with two 15-foot paved lanes and two paved shoulders.

As mentioned above, the area west of KY-1428 would remain undeveloped and maintained as green space and would generally remain at its current elevation. Following construction, this area would be owned and maintained by the Floyd County Fiscal Court. A sanitary sewer lift station would be located within the southern area of the green space along with an access road, which would connect KY-1428 to the lift station area and provide access for maintenance. The green space access road would be placed on the west side of KY-1428 across from the new Ice Plant Hollow Road intersection and would consists of approximately 178 linear feet of roadway.

Mayo Hollow would be used as the borrow/spoil site. This site was created during the construction of the Phase I Redevelopment Site in the early 2000s and has an existing haul road for access at the site. It is estimated that the project would need to borrow an estimated 355,000 cubic yards of fill and spoil approximately 7,000 cubic yards of material at Mayo Hollow. Construction traffic would utilize a one-mile section of KY-1428 to transport material from Mayo Hollow to the Phase II construction site. An existing sediment pond is located on the site for erosion and sediment control measures. Following borrow and spoil, restoration of Mayo Hollow and fulfillment of mitigation commitments in the 401 Water Quality Certification would occur.

All drainage features within the project area would be designed in accordance with the KYTC Drainage Manual. The project’s storm system is divided into seven separate storm sewer systems, each with its own headwall outlet which daylights on the fill slope of elevated KY-1428. Outfall protection, riprap would be installed at each outlet to dissipate the energy of the
discharged runoff and allow that runoff to continue along the green space as surface runoff. To account for future drainage from the Phase II Redevelopment Site, five tentative manhole locations have been identified to collect the stormwater runoff from future storm drain systems. The drainage areas upslope of the proposed redevelopment sites would be conveyed via diversion ditches between itself and the redevelopment sites. The drainage area from Ice Plant Hollow would be conveyed via diversion ditches and into a separate storm drain. In order to convey drainage from Ice Plant Hollow Road, approximately 460 feet of precast box culvert would be installed, generally in the same location as the existing unnamed wet weather creek. The structure would extend through the proposed fill, below the emergency access road, the detour and relocated KY-1428, and daylight on the west side of the elevated KY-1428. From there, a rock lined channel would be constructed to convey the drainage to Beaver Creek.

Structures and surface improvements within the downtown area, including asphalt, would be acquired through direct acquisition with the exception of the low-income housing facility and demolished prior to fill placement. An agreement was executed in September 2019 with the Martin Housing Authority to construct a replacement Low-Income Housing Facility the existing Phase I Redevelopment Site. The full analysis was documented in the July 2019 SEA and a FONSI was issued in August 2019.

As construction on the Phase II Redevelopment Site progresses, properties located along Old Post Office Street and Old Railroad Street would be acquired and demolished. Once these areas are acquired, the bridge on Water Street, which crosses Beaver Creek would be removed, including piers however, bridge abutments would remain in-place. Coordination would be required for the removal or relocation on an existing monitoring station supported by the bridge structure prior to demolition; this monitoring station is part of the Flood Warning System, installed as an overall Section 202 project component, and is owned and operated by the Commonwealth of Kentucky Department of Military Affairs, Division of Emergency Services.

Existing utilities that would not remain in use or be improved during the construction of Phase II would be removed or decommissioned. Water, sewer, electric, gas, and communications utilities would require relocation outside of the fill limits. It is anticipated new permanent utilities would be installed through the future green space area. Upon completion of fill placement, utilities would be placed along KY-1428, the former detour route, and Ice Plant Hollow Road making connections to provide service to the Phase II site.

The proposed sanitary sewer collection system would generally consist of re-directing all flow from the proposed Phase II Redevelopment Site upstream of the wastewater pump station one, relocating and upgrading pump station one, installing new force main, abandonment of existing pump station two, replacement of the existing Beaver Creek sanitary gravity crossing with a force main. The system would utilize a minimum eight-inch diameter gravity sewer system. Additionally, the proposed water distribution system would generally consist of an eight-inch trunk line and mains. Similar to the existing natural gas distribution system, the proposed natural gas distribution system is likely to be comprised of pipe ranging in size from two-inch to three-inch lines. Electrical service would be maintained by continuing the overhead electrical lines from across Beaver Creek to the Ice Plant Hollow area and continuing the along the hillside of
the redevelopment area outside of the fill limits to connect to the existing system. It is anticipated that communication utilities including telephone and cable television follow electrical line and utilize their poles.

It is anticipated construction of the above mentioned measures would be broken up into three places; A, B, and C. Construction is anticipated to begin in fall 2020 and completed in September 2023 Below is a conceptual construction phasing plan:

![Conceptual Construction Phasing Plan](image)

**Figure 4: Conceptual Construction Phasing Plan**

Phase A - Phase A largely involves the construction of most of the KY-1428 detour road. This includes the construction of the north bump-out and associated fill/retaining walls, the detour tie-ins, Ice Plant Hollow culvert extension, and raising of Ice Plant Hollow Road and the Emergency Access Road. In addition, three portions of the detour route, associated fill, concrete diversion ditches, and portions of the proposed utilities would also be constructed including construction of the new pump station.

Phase B – The existing low-income housing facility is currently scheduled for demolition in March 2021. An important part of the project’s phasing is scheduled construction of the detour route so that it begins following conclusion of demolition of the facility. Phase B consists largely of low-income housing facility demolition, construction of the south bump out, completion of the KY-1428 detour road, and portions of proposed utilities would also be constructed.
Phase C - Phase C consists of finishing the site fill, constructing the new KY-1428, construction of the green space access road and green space, miscellaneous site work, demolition of Water Street Bridge, and final utility hookups.

2.2 No Action Alternative (NAA)

The without project condition assumes no action by the Federal Government to implement comprehensive flood risk management measures in the project area. It reflects the continuation of existing economic, social, and environmental conditions and trends in the project area. Inherent with this condition would be the continuation of federally subsidized flood insurance coverage for property owners that is currently available through the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) and the enforcement of local floodplain zoning ordinances. This condition would result in no expenditure of Federal funds to implement a comprehensive flood risk management plan in the project area; however, Federal expenditures to subsidize the flood insurance program and to assist in flood recovery operations would continue.

In the absence of the proposed measures for the project area, the potential for future growth and development is limited. It is expected that the residents of the project area would be subjected to future floods and flood damages; similar to those that have occurred in previous years. The housing in the project area would continue to deteriorate. Flood insurance, now available for flood plain occupants, does provide some economic protection, but would not necessarily guarantee a decent, safe, and sanitary residential environment.

This alternative was considered unacceptable due to the potential safety hazards resulting from future floods and flood damagers. However, it is included in the alternatives analysis to establish a baseline condition for existing human and natural environmental conditions, to allow comparison between future without and with project actions, and to determine potential environmental effects of proposed project alternatives.

3.0 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING AND CONSEQUENCES

Certain resources were eliminated from further analysis in this SEA because they were either determined to be addressed adequately in the 2000 FEA or there would be no effect to resources as a result of the PAA. No further analysis was determined on the following resources: Prime and Unique Farmland, Health and Safety, Recreation, and Climate. The following discussion focuses only on consideration of those resources determined to have potential for impacts associated with the alternatives, thus complying with the concise document requirement of 40 CFR 1508.9 (a).

This section discusses the existing conditions by resource category and any potential environmental impacts associated with the NAA as well as with implementation of the PAA. The Corps took context and intensity into consideration in determining potential impact significance, as defined in 40 CFR part 1508.27. The intensity of a potential impact is the impact’s severity and includes consideration of beneficial and adverse effects, the level of controversy associated
with a project’s impacts on human health, whether the action establishes a precedent for future actions with significant effects, the level of uncertainty about project impacts and whether the action threatens to violate federal, state, or local laws established for the protection of the human and natural environment. The severity of an environmental impact is characterized as none/negligible, minor, moderate, significant, or beneficial. The impact may also be short-term or long-term in nature.

- **None/negligible** – No measurable impacts are expected to occur.
- **Minor** – A measurable and adverse effect to a resource. A slight impact that may not be readily obvious and is within accepted levels for permitting, continued resource sustainability, or human use. Impacts should be avoided and minimized if possible, but should not result in a mitigation requirement.
- **Significant** – A measurable and adverse effect to a resource. A major impact that is readily obvious and is not within accepted levels for permitting, continued resource sustainability, or human use. Impacts likely result in the need for mitigation.
- **Beneficial** – A measurable and positive effect to a resource. May be minor to major, resulting in improved conditions, sustainability, or viability of the resource.
- **Short-Term** – Temporary in nature and does not result in a permanent long-term beneficial or adverse effect to a resource. For example, temporary construction-related effects (such as, an increase in dust, noise, traffic congestion) that no longer occur once construction is complete. May be minor, significant, adverse or beneficial in nature.
- **Long-Term** – Permanent (or for most of the project life) beneficial or adverse effects to a resource. For example, permanent conversion of a wetland to a parking lot. May be minor, significant, adverse or beneficial in nature.

The Corps used quantitative and qualitative analyses, as appropriate, to determine the level of potential impact from proposed alternatives. Based on the results of the analyses, this EA identifies whether a particular potential impact would be adverse or beneficial, and to what extent. CEQ regulations also require that a proposed action’s cumulative impact be addressed as part of a NEPA document. Cumulative impacts are discussed in section 3.14 below.

### 3.1 Land Use

Land use in the immediate project area is a mixture of commercial and residential. According to the National Land Cover Dataset developed low, medium, and high intensity primarily occur within the project area along with small areas of open space, deciduous forest, and hay/pasture.

The proposed project entails acquisition and demolition of commercial and residential structures in the project area. Land use would only be temporarily impacted during construction. The proposed Phase II Redevelopment Site would likely be used for both commercial and residential purposes in the future. A Conceptual Layout Pan and Preliminary Subdivision Plat (see appendix A) have been developed for the proposed Phase II Redevelopment Site. The non-Federal Sponsor, Floyd County Fiscal Court, and the BSADD are responsible for development of the site.
and actual land usage. The area west of KY-1428 which consisted of primarily residential structures and a few small commercial structures would be converted to open space and remain undeveloped and maintained as green space. Therefore, no significant adverse impacts to land use are anticipated as a part of the PAA.

Figure 5: Conceptual Development Layout Plan

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

3.2 Terrestrial Habitat

The PAA would be constructed primarily in previously disturbed areas comprised of upland conditions including existing roadways (Main Street, Short Street, Hill Street, Ice Plant Hollow, Water Street, Jenny’s Street, Farmer Street, and CS-3009, and Cross Street), maintained right-of-ways and shoulders, and stormwater drainage features. Beaver Creek is located along the western study area boundary. Trees adjacent to the roadway and along the riparian area adjacent to Beaver Creek include a young forest area with stress-tolerant species capable of persisting on compacted, steep slopes including red maple, American sweetgum, southern red oak, white oak, and boxelder.

The vast majority of the Mayo Hollow study area is comprised of upland conditions including an access road, clear cut areas, erosion control silt fences, stormwater drainage features, and a large stormwater basin. This area is relatively disturbed with predominantly herbaceous and shrub species including Chinese privet, dogfennel, orchard grass, tree-of-heaven, Virginia wild rye, beakgrass, bearded short-husk, and sawtooth blackberry.

Approximately up to four acres of tree clearing is anticipated for the proposed action. Largely, the riparian area along Beaver Creek would remain undisturbed. The majority of tree removal is required for American Electric Power (AEP) utility relocation. No tree clearing is anticipated at the Mayo Hollow. Following construction, planting of native vegetation at Mayo Hollow would
occur Therefore, no significant adverse impacts to terrestrial habitat are anticipated as part of the PAA.

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

### 3.3 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 Maps (FIRM) were reviewed and the majority of the proposed construction work limits are located within the floodplain including the floodway (https://www.fema.gov/floodplain-management/flood-zones).

Effective, existing, and proposed condition hydraulic models were analyzed to determine the impact of the proposed project on the effective Base Flood Elevations (BFE) and floodway within the 0.45 mile study area along Beaver Creek. Utilizing the effective hydraulic model, updates were made to cross sections in order to create Hydrologic Engineering Center – River Analysis System (HEC-RAS) models to map the floodway, 100-year, and 500-year floodplains for existing and proposed conditions.

The proposed conditions model incorporated the following; removed water street bridge; incorporated the proposed graded fill and access road into the existing conditions topography; and modified Manning’s n values to incorporate proposed changed to the landscape, including changing select residential areas to open green space and adding appropriate values for the proposed access road and new road. Findings of the study indicate that the proposed project is expected to result in no rise in BFE compared to existing conditions (See Appendix C). Prior to construction, a Conditional Letter of Map Revision (CLOMR) will be submitted to FEMA for review and approval. A CLOMR is FEMA’s comment on a proposed project that would, upon construction, affect the hydrologic or hydraulic characteristics of a flooding source and thus result in the modification of the existing regulatory floodway, the effective BFEs, or the Special Flood Hazard Area (SFHA). The CLOMR does not revise an effective FIRM map, it indicates whether the project, if built as proposed, would be recognized by FEMA.

State 401 Water Quality Certification Application includes floodplain development review as part of the application process. A 401 Water Quality Certification Application would be submitted to Kentucky Division of Water (KYDOW) for approval prior to construction. Following construction, the Sponsor will submit a Letter of Map Revision (LOMR) to FEMA. The LOMR allows for official modification to the effective FIRM and results in a physical change to the existing regulatory floodway, effective BFEs, or the SFHA.

The eight steps associated with the decision making process in EO 11988 were considered in the evaluation of the PAA. See Table 1 below for more detail on how each step was considered. Based on the findings and determination discussed in this report, the selected alternative is in compliance with EO 11988.
Therefore, no significant impacts to floodplains are anticipated to occur from the PAA or NAA.

Table 1 – Eight Step Decision Making Process

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Determine if a proposed action is in the base floodplain.</td>
<td>Yes, portions of the proposed alternatives are within the regulatory floodplain and designated as floodway, Zone AE, and SFHA.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conduct early public review, including public notice.</td>
<td>Early coordination with the public was conducted during Public Meetings held October 25, 2018, March 14, 2019, and July 30, 2019 and for which a public notice was issued in advance of each meeting. Additionally, a 30-day public review period will be conducted on the draft NEPA documentation. Also, public notice will be issued during filing of the KYDOW Floodplain Development Permit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify and evaluate practicable alternatives to locating in the base floodplain, including alternative sites outside of the floodplain.</td>
<td>The purpose of the proposed project is to implement flood risk management measures to reduce flooding impacts and damages for the residences and businesses of Martin, Kentucky. The 2000 FEA evaluated providing flood protection either by floodplain evacuation or flood proofing structures. It was determined that without the project and due to lack of easily developable land nearby, the community of Martin is unlikely to move outside the flood impact area and there are no practicable alternative locations outside of the floodplain. Flood risk management measures such as creation of a redevelopment site and raising roads will elevate portions of the project area to an elevation outside of the floodplain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identify impacts of the proposed action.</td>
<td>Based on the current effective FEMA model, the majority of the project is located within the regulatory floodway. Effective, existing, and proposed condition hydraulic models were analyzed to determine the impact of the proposed project on the effective BFEs and floodway within the study area. Based on the study and model results, the proposed project is not expected to result in a BFE rise. The Corps will submit a CLOMR to FEMA and a Floodplain Development Permit to KYDOW.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If impacts cannot be avoided, develop measures to minimize the impacts and restore and preserve the floodplain, as appropriate.</td>
<td>The HEC-RAS models and associated study show changes to the floodway with the current effective model and no rise to the BFE. Therefore, no specific impacts have been identified.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Reevaluate alternatives. | Alternatives were developed during formulation and all environmental impacts were considered and the impacts are considered minimal.

Present the findings and a public explanation. | The public has been involved throughout the development of the project throughout the years including this proposal. Also, our direct coordination with the local Floodplain Coordinator, FEMA, and KYDOW has been conducted.

Implement the action. | It is anticipated the action would begin in fall of 2020.

### 3.4 Aquatic Habitat/Water Quality

The proposed project area is located within the Lower Left Fork Beaver Creek, part of the Lower Levisa Watershed. Several water bodies within the watershed are listed in the Environmental Protection Agency’s Waterbody Quality Assessment Report. The major sources of impairment in Beaver Creek is pathogens, metals, nutrients, organic enrichment/oxygen depletion, sediment, salinity, total dissolved solids, and turbidity. Implementation of the PAA would not result in any new discharge of pollutants.

In the past, habitat reconnaissance were conducted, which included fish, water quality, and macro invertebrate sampling. Water quality was sampled at Beaver Creek in May of 2005. Relatively high conductivity reflects disturbances in the watershed upstream of the site, but all of the physical parameters collected were within the limits that would support aquatic life. Sampling of aquatic species in the early 2000’s indicated that Beaver Creek is an impaired body of water with habitat quality ranging from mostly fair to poor.

In August 2019, the Corps Planning Staff, performed a site visit to identify waters on-site, A Wetland and Waters Delineation Report was prepared by AECOM for the project to identify and assess impacts and is located in Appendix D. Wetlands are discussed in section 3.4 below. Based on the investigation, four water features were identified within the study area and are described below.

- **Beaver Creek**: Located on the redevelopment portion of the site and flows north approximately five miles to confluence with Levisa Fork. Within the project area, Beaver Creek is approximately 30 feet wide at bankfull and depths of the channel vary from approximately four to six feet. The stream substrate was observed as sand with cobbles ranging from two to eight inches in size. Pool and riffle complexes, depositional bars, and alluvial deposits were observed throughout the channel.

- **Stream SC**: Located on the redevelopment portion of the site and is an unnamed tributary of Beaver Creek. It initially parallels Ice Plant Hollow Road before flowing through several small culverts and then into a culvert at the old Town Hall. From the old Town Hall building it is culverted through its remaining length before discharging into
Beaver Creek. Its length through the study area is about 870 feet, of this, 520 feet is open channel and 350 feet is already culverted. SC is approximately one foot wide at bankfull and less than one foot deep. Surface water flow varies throughout the channel ranging from no flow observed to approximately one to three inches of flowing water. The stream substrate varies throughout the channel from sandy mud to cobbles and gravels ranging from two to four inches in size. There were a few areas of vegetation, devoid of surface water, observed within the channel. Dominant vegetation within the channel was observed as Canadian wildginger (Asarum canadense) and beak grass (Diarrhena americana). Based on the characteristics observed throughout SC, the entire reach is classified as intermittent.

- **Stream SA**: Located in Mayo Hollow, this stream is south of KY-1428 and flows north. The stream is approximately 1,661 linear feet (intermittent) and 484 linear ft (perennial) to an existing stormwater basin at the northern project boundary. Within the project area, SA is approximately two feet wide at bankfull and less than one foot deep. Surface water flow varies throughout the channel ranging from no flow observed to approximately two to four inches of flowing water. The stream substrate varies throughout the channel from sandy mud to cobbles and gravels ranging from two to 12 inches in size. Based on the characteristics observed throughout SA, the upper reach of SA is classified as intermittent and the lower reach is classified as perennial.

- **Stream SB**: This stream is located in Mayo Hollow and is a tributary of SA. SB flows west approximately 89 linear feet to its confluence with SA. SB is approximately two feet wide at bankfull and less than one foot deep. Surface water was observed as approximately 2 inches of flowing water. The stream substrate was observed as cobbles and gravels ranging from 2 to 6 inches in size. Based on the characteristics observed throughout SB, the entire reach is classified as intermittent.
### Table 2: Summary of Surface Waters in the Study Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature ID</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Waters Classification*</th>
<th>Linear Feet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Beaver Creek</td>
<td>Sand to cobble substrate, moderate flow, perennial Stream</td>
<td>R2 Riverine</td>
<td>3,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stream SA</td>
<td>Unnamed Tributary to Beaver Creek. Sandy mud to large cobble substrate, weak to moderate sinuosity, ponded and flowing water, heavily vegetated banks.</td>
<td>R3/R4 Riverine</td>
<td>2,144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stream SB</td>
<td>Unnamed Tributary of SB, gravel substrate, weak sinuosity, flowing water, moderately incised channel.</td>
<td>R4 Riverine</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stream SC</td>
<td>Tributary of Beaver Creek, vegetated to large cobble substrate, weak sinuosity, ponded and flowing water, moderately vegetated banks.</td>
<td>R4 Riverine</td>
<td>870 (350 ft in existing culvert)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Total Linear Footage 6,143

Figure 6: Identification of Waters and Wetlands in the Phase II Project Area
Figure 7: Identification of Waters and Wetlands at Mayo Hollow
Construction of the PAA would have permanent and temporary in-stream impacts. A four-inch forced main and a three inch gas line are proposed to cross Beaver Creek. The current installation method for both these utilities is anticipated to be by Horizontal Directionally Drilling (HDD) trenchless technique. If this occurs there will be no impacts to Beaver Creek from the installation of these two utilities. However there is a possibility that they will be installed by cutting a trench across the creek. If they are installed by this method, there would be temporary impacts from the trench as well as the trenching equipment. Beaver creek is 85 feet wide and the work construction corridor would be about 15 feet wide. Temporary impacts consist of disturbance of the bottom of the stream which would be returned to its original elevation following installation of utilities.

The existing Water Street Bridge over Beaver Creek is also proposed for demolition and removal. There would be temporary impacts associated with the removal of the bridge. The two-lane bridge is made up of two abutments, 16 concrete piers with caps located within the waterway (four sets of four piers), concrete beams, and the deck slab with asphalt pavement, concrete sidewalk, and concrete railings. After protection measures are in place, the bridge would be stripped and removed piece by piece however, bridge abutments would remain in-place. Larger pieces may require the use of a crane to be loaded and removed from the site.

Once the deck and superstructure are removed, the piers would be removed to a point one foot of top of rock, or five feet below the bottom of creek. Temporary impacts consisting of temporary fill would occur from the removal of the 16 piers. To remove the piers, it would be necessary to build a temporary causeway across the streambed so that large equipment could access the base of the piers. The causeway would be constructed of rock and would be built in two stages. In the first stage it would extend about halfway across the stream to allow for removal of two sets of piers. Piping would be placed beneath the causeway to help maintain flows in the stream. After the first set of piers are removed, the causeway would be removed and the streambed restored. In the second stage the causeway would be extended from the opposite bank, and the second set of piers removed. Following removal of the piers the causeway would be removed and the streambed restored. The causeway would be 35 feet wide (to access all four piers) and extend from the bank 40 feet on each side (80 feet total length).

To minimize impacts to the streambed, geotextile fabric would be placed between the streambed and the causeway material to assist in removal of the causeway and restoration of the streambed. Sediment and erosion control measures may include silt fencing or silt socks, dewatering filters, sandbags and concrete barriers to aid in any channeling of flow away from active work areas. Permanent impacts to the streambank would occur adjacent to the abutments. It would be necessary to slope the streambank next to the abutment to gain access to the streambed for placement of the causeway. Once the piers and the causeway have been removed, the streambank would be rebuilt and stabilized/armored with rip-rap. There would be four locations where this would occur, 20 feet on each side of the abutment and both sides of the stream. Placement of the rip rap below the ordinary high-water line would be a permanent impact to the stream.
As mentioned above, as part of the project, Ice Plant Hollow Road will be elevated to maintain a suitable vertical profile where connecting to the elevated KY-1428. At the east end of the project were Ice Plant Hollow Road ties into the project, Stream SC will be relocated to the south due to the slight widening and raising of the road. Relocation of Stream SC would involve an open channel relocation of 75 feet before it enters an existing culvert under the emergency access road. Then the stream enters the existing culvert under the emergency access road and would be placed into a 460-foot long 6 ft. x 3 ft. precast box culvert. The structure would extend from below the emergency access road, through the proposed fill, the detour and relocated KY-1428, and daylight on the west side of the elevated KY-1428. From there, a 270 foot rock lined channel would be constructed to convey the stream flows to Beaver Creek. There would be approximately 660 linear feet of permanent impacts to Stream SC as a result of the proposed project.

At Mayo Hollow, Stream SA has already been impacted by the placement of fill generated during construction activities associated with the Phase I Redevelopment Site, and was relocated to the edge of the fill area. Some of the fill currently being stored at Mayo Hollow would be removed to place fill in the Phase II project area. As fill is removed from the lower portion of the borrow area the ground surface would be lower than the existing stream channel. Both Streams SA and SB would remain in their current locations and would not be impacted by the removal of fill. The existing sediment pond would be converted to a wetland following construction activities at Mayo Hollow as part of the current Water Quality Certification conditions.

### Table 3: Impacts to Surface Waters in the Study Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature ID</th>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Temporary or Permanent Impact</th>
<th>Impact Type</th>
<th>Width (ft)</th>
<th>Length (ft)</th>
<th>Area (sq ft)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stream SC</td>
<td>Roadway Improvements</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>Relocation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stream SC</td>
<td>Phase II Development</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>Culvert</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stream SC</td>
<td>Phase II Development</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>Rip-rap Channel</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>270</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaver Creek</td>
<td>Bridge Demolition</td>
<td>Temporary</td>
<td>Causeway</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>2,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaver Creek</td>
<td>Bridge Demolition</td>
<td>Permanent</td>
<td>Bank Stabilization</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>(100 at 4 locations)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaver Creek</td>
<td>Sewer Line</td>
<td>Temporary</td>
<td>Equipment</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Under the Clean Water Act, the Corps will submit a 401 Water Quality Certification Application for the proposed Phase II project to the Kentucky Division of Water and it shall be obtained prior to construction. Currently, Mayo Hollow is certified under Water Quality Certification # 2004-0037-1M. Coordination with KY DOW to update the existing Water Quality Certification would occur during the submittal of the 401 application for Phase II project activities. A 404(b)(1) analysis was conducted by the Corps under the FEA. A National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit would be required due to the size of construction area. Best Management Practices (BMPs) would be used throughout the project to prevent runoff from the project into adjacent surface waters. Based on the above, implementation of the PAA would not result in significant adverse environmental impacts to aquatic habitat and water quality.

Under the NAA, potential impacts to aquatic habitat could occur from sedimentation and pollution during periodic flood events. Therefore, impacts to aquatic habitat and water quality would continue to occur in the project area.

3.5 Wetlands

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) National Wetland Inventory (NWI) mapping was used to assess the possibility of wetlands occurring on site and potential impacts (USFWS, 2019). NWI mapping only identified riverine habitat and did not identify any wetlands within the study area. A site reconnaissance was conducted in 2019 to determine the validity of the NWI maps. Within the Phase II project area, one basin wetland area (WA) was identified. At Mayo Hollow, wetland fringe (WB) around the existing stormwater basin pond and wetland (WC) located adjacent to the haul road was also identified. Wetland delineation field work was performed in accordance with the 1987 U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Wetlands Delineation Manual (USACE, 1987), and the Regional Supplement to the Corps of Engineers Wetland Delineation Manual: Eastern Mountains and Piedmont (Version 2.0, USACE 2012). The Wetland and Waters Delineation Report and Wetland Determination Data Forms are included in Appendix D.

Wetland WA is located on the southern portion of the site, north of Farmer Street and was delineated as 0.06 acres. It is an isolated floodplain pool wetland within the eastern floodplain of Beaver Creek. Wetland WA is characterized by primary hydrologic indicators including surface water and secondary indicators including sparsely vegetated concave surface and geomorphic position. Vegetation within the wetland is sparse however, the dominant fringe vegetation includes box elder (Acer negundo), Japanese stilt grass (Microstegium vimineum), and kudzu (Pueraria montana). Soils observed in the wetland consisted of saturated, low chroma, clay loam consistent with the depleted below dark surface hydric soil indicator. The adjacent uplands are located on a gently-sloped forested area. Adjacent upland soils were observed as unsaturated, high chroma, loam therefore, no hydric soil indicators were observed. Wetland WA would not
be impacted by construction of the project, installation of any utilities, or any tree clearing associated with improving overbank flows within the floodplain.

At Mayo Hollow, wetland WB includes the area of wetland fringe around the existing stormwater basin north of the project boundary within the construction work limits boundary. As part of the existing Water Quality Certification, the stormwater basin would be developed into a wetland following construction per certification conditions established during creation of the borrow/spoil site. There would be temporary impacts to wetland WB during conversion of the sediment basin to a wetland. Once the fill has been removed from Mayo Hollow, the sediment basin would be converted to a wetland area. It would be necessary to impact a portion of the wetland fringe (WB) to remove the standpipe and fill in the deeper part of the basin with soil. These impacts would occur during the restoration activities and once the pond has been drained. Impacts would consist of disturbance of the vegetation and soils from equipment accessing the central portion of the basin. The wetland fringe is narrowest along the northern edge of the basin where the dam to create the basin was constructed. These impacts can be minimized if the contractor accesses the basin in this area. These impacts would be localized and temporary and the entire basin would be converted to a wetland area and re-vegetated. It is estimated that approximately 700 square feet (0.02 acres) of the fringe wetlands would be temporarily impacted.

Additionally Wetland WC, located adjacent to the haul road for removing fill, would likely be impacted by activities associated with removal and hauling of material from the hollow for the
Phase II redevelopment. These impacts would be permanent. Wetland WC is less than 0.01 acres in size.

![Figure 9: Mayo Hollow Wetland](image)

These wetland areas and associated impacts will be submitted in the 401 Water Quality Certification Application to KYDOW. Based on the above, implementation of the PAA would result in negligible adverse impacts to wetlands due to size and quality.

No impacts to wetlands are anticipated as part of the NAA.

### 3.6 Hazardous, Toxic, and Radioactive Waste (HTRW)

Phase I Hazardous, Toxic and Radioactive Waste (HTRW) Investigations [i.e., Phase I Environmental Site Assessments (ESAs)] have been conducted since 1999 to the present day for the Town of Martin, KY project. To date, 66 tracts have been investigated and/or reassessed, depending upon the age of the most recent Phase I ESA. Primary guidance for conducting the Phase I ESAs is the *Standard Practice for Environmental Assessments; Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Process* (Designation: E1527-13 and E 1528-14), prepared by American Society for Testing of Materials (ASTM).

The majority of the tracts investigated have been recommended for No Further Action, in regards to recognized environmental conditions (RECs) or presence of HTRW contamination. However,
based upon the findings from their Phase I HTRW Investigations/Phase I ESAs, Phase II(A)
HTRW Investigations have been recommended for Tracts 202, 503, 623, 627 and 628.

A January 1999 Phase I HTRW report recommended further investigation for Tract 202 to
determine if clean closure had been obtained for two (2) underground storage tank(s) (USTs) that
the owner reported had been removed some years earlier. An August 1998 environmental
database report listed two USTs, 1,000-gallon and 2,000-gallon, as being removed in April 1990,
but the report stated the removal was “Unverified”, likely due to owner self-reporting. The
Huntington District performed a Phase II(A) HTRW Investigation in 2004 under Contract No.
DACW69-03-D-0007, Work Order No. 0009. Results from the investigation were submitted to
the Kentucky Department for Environmental Protection (KYDEP) in September 2004, and a No
Further Action status was requested. In their November 16, 2004 letter to the property owner,
the KYDEP stated that the site had satisfied the requirements of Kentucky Revised Statutes
224.60-105 and the requirements of 401 KAR Chapter 42, and therefore, No Further Action
was required.

The owner of Tract 503 had previously filed a Notice of Intent with the KYDEP to close USTs
on their property. The KYDEP initiated a Corrective Action (CA) to remediate contaminated
groundwater at the property and has informed EC-CE that the groundwater remediation was
successful and the CA completed. The KYDEP plans to remove and abandon the groundwater
monitoring wells which had been installed for their investigation and the CA.

Tracts 623, 627 and 628 underwent a Phase I ESA reassessment in June 2018 and Phase II(A)
HTRW Investigations were recommended due to the presence of burn pits on Tracts 623 and
628, an abandoned railroad spur on Tract 627, and the potential presence of a former lumber yard
on Tract 628. EC-CE performed soil sampling for the Phase II(A) HTRW Investigations on 4
December 2019 and the Phase II(A) HTRW Investigation report is scheduled for completion in
March 2020.

3.7 Cultural Resources

The Corps previously executed a Programmatic Agreement (PA) with the Kentucky State
Historic Preservation Office (KYSHPO) for the Levisa Basin in 2003. Due to availability of
funding, only portions of the proposed flood risk management measures identified in the
approved DPR have been constructed and the original PA expired in 2008. The original PA
contained mitigation measures for adverse effects already identified when it was executed, and
not all of these mitigation measures were completed. Because of the phased nature of the current
Project, a new PA between the Corps and KYSHPO is underway and intended to provide a
means of compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as
amended (NHPA),
Background research and literature review recognized that previous cultural resource identification efforts have been performed, including archaeological survey of the Phase I Redevelopment Site (Hoyer 1999). In accordance with 36 CFR 800.4(a)(1) and 36 CFR 800.16(d), the Corps identified the current Area of Potential Effect (APE) for the Project through coordination with the Project Delivery Team (PDT). The APE includes all areas where demolition of resources will occur, as well as all areas that will suffer ground disturbance or visual effects related to construction, demolition, soil borrow areas, spoil disposal, equipment laydown areas, infrastructure relocation and installation, or restoration actions in Mayo Hollow.

In 2019, a historic resource survey of structures within the APE was conducted and a total of 13 resources were identified as eligible for inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). In consultation with KYSHPO, a portion of the Project Area was determined to be a historic district. The Corps and KYSHPO have concurred that the historic district is eligible for inclusion on the NRHP under Criteria A, properties that are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history. In this case, the downtown historic district demonstrates the pattern of development of an eastern Kentucky railroad town. The undertaking will result in complete demolition of this district, which constitutes an adverse effect. Following execution of the PA, a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) would be prepared in consultation with KYSHPO and other Consulting Parties to resolve adverse effect to the historic district resulting from the project, through appropriate mitigation measures.

The Corps has determined that full accountability for potentially significant archaeological resources is not possible on the entire APE during the Planning, Project Development, and/or subsequent project phases, due to issues in gaining legal Right of Entry (ROE) to additional parcels which have not yet been acquired. The identification and evaluation of archaeological sites must be deferred to future project phases as the presence or absence of NRHP eligible archaeological sites can only be determined in areas of the APE where access to areas of the undertaking may be legally gained. Currently Phase 1 Archeological Survey for those tracts within the project area where ROEs have been obtained is underway. All parcels will be evaluated prior to the initiation of any ground disturbing activities to determine if they contain archeological sites that are eligible for listing in the NRHP. If NRHP archaeological sites are identified during survey, any potential adverse effects will be avoided or mitigated through further MOAs in consultation with the KYSHPO and Consulting Parties identified in the PA.

Additionally, the Corps has conducted public outreach, public meetings, and tribal coordination. Through coordination and public meetings, the Corps has identified seven consulting parties, including the Floyd County (KY) Judge Executive. The Cherokee Nation of Oklahoma and Shawnee Tribe have chosen not to be an Invited Signatory or Consulting Party to the PA but retain all legal rights under Section 106 of the NHPA and the Native American Graves Protection and Repatriation Act (NAGPRA) to be notified and consulted with regarding inadvertent discoveries of human remains and/or properties to which the responding tribes attach religious or cultural significance.

If unanticipated archeological deposits or human remains are discovered, all work near the location of the discovery shall cease and the Resource Manager and District Archeologist shall
be contacted immediately. The Kentucky State Police, county Coroner, and the KYSHPO shall also be notified immediately if human remains are discovered.

In accordance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended (36 CFR 800), through the PA, the Corps has fulfilled its obligation under Section 106. The PA will be executed prior to issuance of a FONSI. The draft PA is located in Appendix E.

There would be no archeological impacts associated with the NAA. There is potential under the NAA for architectural impacts as the majority of structures within the project area are vacant or rundown and could be subject to demolition or collapse.

### 3.8 Threatened and Endangered Species

According to the U.S. Fish and Wild Service (USFWS) Information for Planning and Consultation (IPaC) website, there are four threatened and endangered listed species in the vicinity of the proposed project. They are the Big Sandy crayfish (*Cambarus callainus*), Indiana bat (*Myotis sodalis*), Grey bat (*Myotis grisescens*), and Northern Long-Eared bat (*Myotis septentrionalis*).

In April 2019, Corps Planning Staff met with USFWS Kentucky Field Office to discuss the project and any potential impacts to federally listed Threatened and Endangered Species. At this meeting USFWS indicated that in-water work at these locations would not be within the range of the Big Sandy Crayfish due to recent surveys and habitat requirements. The Big Sandy Crayfish needs clean, medium-sized streams and rivers. The crayfish is usually found in fast moving sections of the water and in areas with little sedimentation or pollution and in areas with large boulders and rocks. Beaver Creek is an impaired stream with sedimentation and other water quality impairments. The other streams within the project area are small, disturbed, and some experience periods of no flow. Since streams within the project area do not exhibit the habitat needed for the crayfish and surveys did not show the presence of the species in Beaver Creek, the Corp’s Huntington District has determined that the proposed action would have no effect on the Big Sandy Crayfish.

No caves are located within the project area. Water Street Bridge could offer potential summer habitat for the Grey Bat. Corps Planning Staff conducted a site visit and did not see any signs of Grey Bat roosting in the bridge during the summer. Removal of this bridge is anticipated as part of the project. The new Route 80 connector bridge in Martin, Kentucky approximately 1,000 linear feet from Water Street Bridge could provide the same summer habitat if utilized by the Gray Bat. Therefore, The Corps Huntington District has determined the proposed action may affect but is not likely to adversely affect the Gray bat.

As mentioned above in Section 3.1, approximately up to four acres of tree clearing is anticipated for the proposed action within the project area for the Phase II efforts. No tree clearing is anticipated at Mayo Hollow. Largely, the riparian area along Beaver Creek would remain undisturbed. The majority of tree removal is required for American Electric Power (AEP) utility relocation. Tree species within the project primarily include red maple, American sweetgum,
southern red oak, white oak, and boxelder. The Corps determined the project may affect, not likely to adversely affect the Indiana Bat and Northern-long eared bat. A Northern Long-eared Bat 4(d) rule streamlined consultation form will be submitted to USFWS.

Coordination with the USFWS is ongoing pursuant to Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act and the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act. This coordination will be completed prior to issuance of a FONSI.

The NAA would not result in additional ground disturbing activities. Therefore, there would be no effect to Threatened and Endangered Species associated with the NAA.

3.9 Air Quality

The air quality of Floyd County is in attainment for all criteria pollutants. Construction activities of the PAA would have the potential to cause localized temporary, nuisance air quality impacts which includes particulate emissions from construction equipment and fugitive dust from placement of fill and transportation of fill from Mayo Hollow. Emission sources include diesel exhaust and fuel odors associated with operation of heavy equipment, engine emissions associated with construction and construction activities. All construction would be performed in compliance with applicable control requirements established by the Kentucky Department for Environmental Protection Division for Air Quality. 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 localized, and would occur only during construction phase activities. During construction, the contractor shall meet all existing federal and state regulations regarding equipment emissions. Impacts to air quality under the PAA would be temporary during construction, minor and not have significant long-term adverse impacts. Following construction, it is not anticipated resultant growth and development and associated traffic and congestion would cause a decrease in ambient air quality beyond those limits set by the Environmental Protection Agency.

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

3.10 Noise

Ambient noise around the project area is representative of mixed commercial and residential. Heavier noise generated by commercial traffic on State Highway Route 80. Current construction noises consists of intermittent noise resulting from construction of the Emergency Access Road. This noise is short in duration and only occurs during daylight hours.

Noise associated with the PAA would be limited to that generated during construction except for noise at the pump station. The noise associated with construction 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. Ambient noise around the project area is representative of a mixed commercial and residential.

| Table 4 - Permissible Non-Department of Defense Noise Exposures |
|----------------|----------------|
| Duration/day (hours) | Noise level (dBA) |
| 8               | 90             |
| 6               | 92             |
| 4               | 95             |
| 3               | 97             |
| 2               | 100            |
| 1.5             | 102            |
| 1               | 105            |

Construction of the proposed project would have temporary long-term elevated noise levels for approximately three to four years. These impacts would vary depending on the construction sequencing and real estate acquisition in the project area.

Construction would temporarily increase ambient noise levels due to the operation of construction equipment. The noise levels at the site would fluctuate depending on the types of equipment are in use, the way the equipment is operated, real estate acquisition, and construction sequencing. Therefore noise levels would be variable throughout the workday and project duration. Construction projects are usually executed in stages, each having its own combination of equipment and noise characteristics and magnitudes. Construction activities of the proposed Project area expected to be typical of similar construction projects and will include mobilization, site preparation, limited excavation, equipment movement, etc.

During Phase A of construction sequencing, the majority of the noise would be associated with the bump-outs at the both ends of the project limits and the Ice Plant Hollow Road and Emergency Access Road areas. The majority of properties from KY-1428 to the hillside would be acquired and demolished prior to construction of Phase A with the exception of the low-income housing facility. Residents near Ice Plant Hollow Road and Old Post Office Street, and users of the existing facilities Phase 1 Redevelop site would be temporarily impacted by noise during construction of Phase A. There may be a temporary pump used on Ice Plant Hollow during construction however, it would be required that the pump would need to be silenced.
During this time, construction of the low-income housing replacement facility on the existing Phase 1 Redevelopment Site would occur.

The majority of Phase B noise impacts would consist of demolition of the existing low-income facility, construction of the KY-1428 road detour, and green space access road. During this Phase the majority of properties from Beaver Creek to the hillside within the project area would have already have been acquired. Noise impacts would temporarily occur to residences across Water Street Bridge and Ice Plant Hollow Rd. During Phase C, all properties within the project work limit have been acquired and work would consist of finishing the site fill, constructing the new KY-1428, constructing the green space, miscellaneous site work, demolition of Water Street Bridge, and final utility hookups.

Actual peak noise levels and associated vibration would vary at any given location during construction. Relatively high peak noise levels in the range of 78-90 dBA would occur on the active construction site, decreasing with distance from the construction area. Indirect impacts include noise from worker commuting and material transport, increasing noise levels. Nearby commercial and residential areas may experience increased traffic noise during day-time hours as trucks needed for construction transit to and from the site including Mayo Hollow.

Existing facilities on the Phase I Redevelopment Site would be impacted by noise during construction. The Town Hall/Police Station, Fire Station, and Alternative School would be in close proximity along with residential areas discussed above. Although noise levels would be disruptive, the intermittent nature of peak construction noise levels would not create the steady noise conditions for an extended duration that would lead to hearing damage. In addition, indoor noise levels would be expected to be 15-25 dB lower than outdoor levels. Short term noise impacts would be further mitigated to the extent feasible using Best Management Practices (i.e. mufflers on all construction equipment, monitoring) and complying with applicable state regulations. Therefore, impacts to noise from the PAA would be temporary and minor.

There would be no change in noise and thus no impact under the NAA.

3.11 Environmental Justice and Protection of Children

Executive Order (E.O.) 12898 requires Federal actions to address environmental justice in minority populations and low-income populations. The Town of Martin is located within Floyd County, Kentucky. Historically, Floyd County’s population has mirrored the growth and decline of coal mining and timber industries. Population growth occurred between 1900 and 1950 at varying rates and peaked in 1980 at 48,764. Since 1980, however, population has declined due to occupational shifts and the decrease in mining activities. Census data indicates Floyd County has a population of 35,845 and is 97.7% white and has a median household income of $31,196 compared with the median household income of $57,652 for the Commonwealth of Kentucky. Individuals residing in the county below the poverty level is 32.2% compared to 12.3% statewide.
The Town of Martin community has an estimated total population of 545, compared to a population of 694 identified in the 2000 FEA. Race within the community is 99% White and all other races make up less than 1% of the total population. The median income for a household is $21,250 and of this income 49.6% includes social security income, 2.4% public assistance cash, and 38% included Food Stamp/SNAP benefits. Out of the total population, 43.3% are living below the poverty level. A majority of the population, approximately 35.1%, is employed in service occupations including educational services, health care, and social assistance. Only 2.3% of the population is involved in industry and mining.

![Demographic Indicators for the Selected Area Compared to All People's Block Groups in the State/Region/US](image)

**Figure 10: Demographic Indicators for the Town of Martin, Kentucky (EJSCREEN. EPA)**

Community Cohesion in a community is a sense of shared values and purpose, and a tolerance and acceptance of other residents. Community cohesion can be assessed from learning about the education, religion, land tenure, organization membership status, family distribution, income/wealth, and social behavior of residents. During development of the 2000 FEA, a socio-economic analysis and social impact analysis was conducted in 1999 to provide an understanding on Community Cohesion impacts to the Town of Martin. The conclusions drawn at the time indicated that there was a moderate to moderately high degree of community cohesion exists within the study area, however the biggest concerns from the respondents entailed getting a fair price for their homes and moving expenses.

Additionally, EO 13045 requires each Federal agency “to identify and assess environmental health risks and safety risks that may disproportionately affect children” and “ensure that its policies, programs, activities, and standards address disproportionate risks to children that result from environmental health risks or safety risks.” This EO was prompted by the recognition that children, still undergoing physiological growth and development, are more sensitive to adverse environmental health and safety risks than adults. The potential for impacts on the health and safety of children is greater where projects are located near residential areas.
Implementation of the PAA would require the acquisition and demolition of approximately 50 structures, both residential and nonresidential. Since the 2000 FEA, there has been an increase in the number of vacant structures and a decrease in population within the project area. Decline in population can produce overall weakening of the social network within the community. The existing low-income housing facility operated by the Martin Municipal Housing Authority, a governmental non-profit organization which provides low-income housing under the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development standards will be relocated to the existing Phase 1 Redevelopment Site. Relocation of the low-income housing facility to mitigate for significant adverse impacts to low-income residents was evaluated in 2019 with a FSEA and FONSI signed in August 2019.

Owners of land and/or structures in the mandatory acquisition area would be offered fair market value of the property. All displaced persons, regardless of race or income level, would be compensated for moving expenses and replacement housing in accordance with the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 (PL 91-646), as amended. Under this assistance, residential owners would be offered standard relocation benefits to assist in the purchase of a comparable replacement home outside of the floodplain. Displaced persons, including those who rent, would also be compensated for eligible moving expenses. These individuals could relocate to similar housing within Floyd County as available. If comparable replacement dwellings are not available in the implementation area, the last resort housing provisions of Section 206, P.L. 91-646 would be implemented as necessary on a case-by-case basis, utilizing the most feasible, cost-effective method available.

The proposed flood risk management measures including raising KY-1428 and creation of a second redevelopment site would create a flood safe area for residential and commercial redevelopment. New business may be attracted to locate within this area thereby potentially creating additional employment. Through the above measures, the PAA meets the directive of EO 12898 and EO 13045 by avoiding any disproportionately high adverse human health or environmental effects on minority or low income populations or children.

Under the NAA, no additional flood risk management measures would be implemented. Periodic flooding would continue and flood damage could also cause hardship for residents and businesses. No relocations would occur, existing neighborhoods remain intact however, and the current trend of vacant buildings would continue and have long-term indirect impacts on the community.

3.12 Aesthetics

The project area is rural, primarily consisting of residential properties and small commercial properties including the existing Phase 1 Redevelopment site. Disturbance of local aesthetics would be anticipated during construction of the Phase II project due to continued acquisition and demolition of structures within the project area. Following construction, it is anticipated the Phase II Redevelopment Site would consist of both residential and small commercial structures.
and return to a similar conditions. Therefore, the PAA would not have any adverse impacts to local aesthetics and only short-term impacts would occur.

Under the NA no impacts to local aesthetics would occur.

**3.13 Transportation and Traffic**

The project area is in the center of town in Martin, Kentucky. KY-1428 is the principle route through town and identified by Kentucky Transportation Cabinet as part of the state’s secondary system with classification as a major collector, rural, urban route. The location of the existing Phase I Redevelopment Site is adjacent to KY State Route 1428 and the New Bridge in Martin, Kentucky. The site consists of a fire station, town hall/police station, and alternative school. The low-income housing replacement facility is expected to start construction on the site in 2020. Currently, Redevelopment Drive is the only entrance and exit at the site. An Emergency Access Road connecting the site to Ice Plant Hollow Road is underway and anticipated to be completed in 2019 to provide emergency access for the redevelopment site and its users.

During construction of the project, a detour road will connect with KY-1428 outside of the proposed realignment limits and direct traffic to the east at the edge of the proposed Phase II site. Once construction of the detour begins, access to Ice Plant Hollow will be temporarily blocked. During this period of time, traffic will be diverted through the Phase I site via the Emergency Access Road which is currently under construction.

During Phase A, traffic interruptions will be limited to short durations where single lane operation will be necessary to facilitate construction. This will occur at both bump-out/tie-in locations, as well as the intersection of Ice Plant Hollow Road and the Emergency Access Road. The eastern portion of Ice Plant Hollow Road will be raised to the design elevation one-lane at a time. Initially, as the southern lane is raised, traffic will operate in one-lane operation on the northern lane via Ice Plant Hollow Road. Once the southern lane is raised traffic will be diverted up the Emergency Access Road in one-lane operation. Appropriate barriers will be in place to protect traffic from the grade differential. Once the northern lane is constructed traffic will return to two-lane operation via the Emergency Access Road. Once Ice Plant Hollow Road and the detour route are complete traffic will be transferred to the KY-1428 detour via the new Ice Plant Hollow Road. Construction traffic will utilize a one-mile section of KY-1428 to transport embankment material to the Phase II construction site. Once at Mayo Hollow, an existing haul road is accessible to reach the limits of the spoil and borrow area.
Maintenance of traffic, during construction, would be in accordance with the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices and Kentucky Transportation Cabinet Guidelines. Temporary increases in traffic could occur on the Phase 1 Redevelopment Site due to rerouting of traffic. After construction, all roadways in the project area would be operational. Impacts anticipated to occur from the PAA would be minor and temporary.

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

The Corps must consider the cumulative effects of the proposed project on the environment as stipulated by 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. Construction of flood risk management measures within the Phase II project area would have minimal and insignificant negative impacts on the environment. Long term benefits to the area as a result of a raising KY-1428 and creation of a second redevelopment site would result from the proposed action. The temporal limits for assessment of this impact would initiate in 1981 with the passage of the Section 202 of the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act and end 50 years after completion of this project. The geographical extent would be broadened to consider effects beyond the Proposed Action and is considered to be the Lower Levisa Watershed.

The Levisa Watershed is listed in the Environmental Protection Agency’s Waterbody Quality Assessment Report where it is listed as impaired for pathogens, metals, nutrients, organic enrichment/oxygen depletion, sediment, salinity, total dissolved solids, and turbidity. In the past, flood risk management measures such as creation the Phase I Redevelopment Site and Mayo Hollow disposal site, acquisition and demolition of structures, and construction of an Emergency Access road under the Section 202 authority has occurred. Additionally, other nonstructural and structural measures have occurred under the Section 202 authority in the Levisa Fork Watershed. These past actions had similar temporary impacts but no significant cumulative impact. The Lower Levisa Watershed is part of the Big Sandy River Basin. Watershed studies for the Big Sandy River Basin have been undertaken recently by both the Corps and the USDA, but currently, no watershed programs are active in the Big Sandy Watershed. The 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 and other Corps Section 202 flood risk management projects may be implemented. Impairment of the Levisa Watershed is expected to continue.
Section 3.0 documents the environmental effects of the PPA and NAA with respect to existing conditions. The effects of the PAA, as discussed beforehand, are localized and temporary. Past actions that may have resulted in similar effects include nonstructural and structural actions as well as construction of the redevelopment site. Past, present, and reasonably foreseeable projects outside of the immediate area have produced, or would likely produce, noise disturbances of various degrees. The additional traffic and construction equipment associated with the construction of the Phase II efforts would increase noise in the project area. Impacts would be moderate and temporary. Implementation of the proposed flood risk management measures in the project area for the Town of Martin Nonstructural Project would have similar impacts as the proposed action and actions identified in the 2000 FEA.

The availability of Federal funds through the 202 Program is an additional benefit to assist an area that has in the past received numerous flooding and damages. Given the current program is in place for the foreseeable future and the overall beneficial effect from implementation of the Proposed Action, there is expected to be a positive cumulative effect by providing flood protection from implementation of the PAA based on past, present, and reasonably foreseeable actions.

4.0 Status of Environmental Compliance

The PAA will be in full compliance with all local, state, and Federal statutes as well as Executive Orders prior to issuance of a FONSI. Compliance is documented below in Table 5.

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

5.1 Agencies Contacted

Direct coordination with the KYDOW, USFWS, and SHPO was completed prior to publication of the SEA. Agency correspondence is included in Appendix B.

5.2 Public Review and Comments

The SEA 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, Floyd County Chronicle & Times, advising the public of this document’s availability for review and comment. A copy of the SEA will also be placed in the Floyd County Public Library and would be made available on-line at [http://www.lrh.Cors.army.mil/Missions/PublicReview.aspx](http://www.lrh.Cors.army.mil/Missions/PublicReview.aspx).

The mailing list for the EA is located in Appendix F.

6.0 CONCLUSION

The proposed road would provide emergency access for the safety of all users and facilities at the redevelopment site in Martin, Kentucky. No significant adverse impacts have been identified as a result of implementation of the proposed improvements project. The majority of construction would take place on previously disturbed land. 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.
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U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Huntington District
Planning Branch
502 Eighth Street
Huntington, WV 25701

AECOM
12420 Milestone Center Drive
Suite150
Germantown, MD 20876
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