Short Environmental Assessment Form for AIRPORT DEVELOPMENT PROJECTS

Airport Name: Greenbrier Valley Airport          Identifier: LWB

Project Title: New Fuel Farm

This Environmental Assessment becomes a Federal document when evaluated, signed, and dated by the Responsible FAA official.

Responsible FAA Official _______________________________ Date ________________
INSTRUCTIONS

THIS FORM IS FOR LIMITED USE ON SPECIFIC TYPES OF PROJECTS. AIRPORT SPONSORS MUST CONTACT YOUR LOCAL AIRPORTS DISTRICT OFFICE (ADO) ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION SPECIALIST (EPS) BEFORE COMPLETING THIS FORM.

This form was prepared by FAA Eastern Region Airports Division and can only be used for proposed projects in this region.

Introduction: This Short Environmental Assessment (EA), is based upon the guidance in Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) Orders 1050.1F – Environmental Impacts: Policies and Procedures, and the Environmental Desk Reference for Airport Actions and 5050.4B – NEPA Implementing Instructions for Airport Actions. These orders incorporate the Council on Environmental Quality's (CEQ) regulations for implementing the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), as well as US Department of Transportation environmental regulations, and other applicable federal statutes and regulations designed to protect the Nation's natural, historic, cultural, and archeological resources. The information provided by sponsors, with potential assistance from consultants, through the use of this form enables the FAA ADO offices to evaluate compliance with NEPA and the applicable special purpose laws.

Use: For situations in which this form may be considered, refer to the APPLICABILITY Section below. The local ADO has the final determination in the applicability of this form to a proposed Federal Action. Proper completion of the Form will allow the FAA to determine whether the proposed airport development project can be processed with a short EA, or whether a more detailed EA or EIS must be prepared. If you have any questions on whether use of this form is appropriate for your project, or what information to provide, we recommend that you contact the environmental specialist in your local ADO.

This Form is to be used in conjunction with applicable Orders, laws, and guidance documents, and in consultation with the appropriate resource agencies. Sponsors and their consultants should review the requirements of special purpose laws (See 5050.4B, Table 1-1 for a summary of applicable laws). Sufficient documentation is necessary to enable the FAA to assure compliance with all applicable environmental requirements. Accordingly, any required consultations, findings or determinations by federal and state agencies, or tribal governments, are to be coordinated, and completed if necessary, prior to submitting this form to FAA for review. Coordination with Tribal governments must be conducted through the FAA. We encourage sponsors to begin coordination with these entities as early as possible to provide for sufficient review time. Complete information will help FAA expedite its review. This Form meets the intent of a short EA while satisfying the regulatory requirements of NEPA for an EA. Use of this form acknowledges that all procedural requirements of NEPA or relevant special purpose laws still apply and that this form does not provide a means for circumvention of these requirements.

Submittal: When using this form for an airport project requesting discretionary funding, the documentation must be submitted to the local ADO by April 30th of the fiscal year preceding the fiscal year in which funding will be requested. When using this form for an airport project requesting entitlement funding, the documentation must be submitted to the local ADO by November 30th of the fiscal year in which the funding will be requested.

Effective 11/19/2015
Availability: An electronic version of this Short Form EA is available on-line at http://www.faa.gov/airports/eastern/environmental/media/C10.DOC. Other sources of environmental information including guidance and regulatory documents are available on-line at http://www.faa.gov/airports_airtraffic/airports/environmental.

APPLICABILITY

Local ADO EPSs make the final determinations for the applicability of this form. If you have questions as to whether the use of this form is appropriate for your project, contact your local EPS BEFORE using this form. Airport sponsors can consider the use of this form if the proposed project meets either Criteria 1 or Criteria 2, 3, and 4 collectively as follows:

1) It is normally categorically excluded (see paragraphs 5-6.1 through 5-6.6 in FAA Order 1050.1F) but, in this instance, involves at least one, but no more than two, extraordinary circumstance(s) that may significantly impact the human environment (see paragraph 5-2 in 1050.1F and the applicable resource chapter in the 1050.1F Desk reference).

2) The action is one that is not specifically listed as categorically excluded or normally requires an EA at a minimum (see paragraph 506 in FAA Order 5050.4B).

3) The proposed project and all connected actions must be comprised of Federal Airports Program actions, including:

   (a) Approval of a project on an Airport Layout Plan (ALP),
   (b) Approval of Airport Improvement Program (AIP) funding for airport development,
   (c) Requests for conveyance of government land,
   (d) Approval of release of airport land, or
   (e) Approval of the use of Passenger Facility Charges (PFC).

4) The proposed project is not expected to have impacts to more than two of the resource categories defined in the 1050.1F Desk Reference.

This form cannot be used when any of the following circumstances apply:

1) The proposed action, including all connected actions, requires coordination with or approval by an FAA Line of Business of Staff Office other than the Airports Division. Examples include, but are not limited to, changes to runway thresholds, changes to flight procedures, changes to NAVAIDs, review by Regional Counsel, etc.

2) The proposed action, including all connected actions, requires coordination with another Federal Agency outside of the FAA.

3) The proposed action will likely result in the need to issue a Record of Decision.

4) The proposed action requires a construction period exceeding 3 years.
5) The proposed action involves substantial public controversy on environmental grounds.

6) The proposed project would have impacts to, or require mitigation to offset the impacts to more than two resources\(^1\) as defined in the 1050.1F Desk Reference.

7) The proposed project would involve any of the following analyses or documentation:
   a. The development of a Section 4(f) Report for coordination with the Department of the Interior,
   b. The use of any Native American lands or areas of religious or cultural significance,
   c. The project emissions exceed any applicable \textit{de minimis} thresholds for criteria pollutants under the National Ambient Air Quality Standards, or
   d. The project would require noise modeling with AEDT 2b (or current version).

If a project is initiated using this form and any of the preceding circumstances are found to apply, the development of this form must be terminated and a standard Environmental Assessment or Environmental Impact Statement (if applicable) must be prepared.

\[**********\]

\(^1\) A resource is any one of the following: Air Quality; Biological Resources (including Threatened and Endangered Species); Climate; Coastal Resources; Section 4(f); Farmlands; Hazardous Materials, Solid Waste, and Pollution Prevention; Historical, Architectural, Archaeological, and Cultural Resources; Land Use; Natural Resources and Energy Supply; Noise and Noise-Compatible Land Use; Socioeconomics; Environmental Justice; Children’s Environmental Health and Safety Risks; Visual Effects; Wetlands; Floodplains; Surface Waters; Groundwater; Wild and Scenic Rivers; and Cumulative Impacts.
Complete the following information:

**Project Location**
Airport Name: Greenbrier Valley Airport
Identifier: LWB
Airport Address: 558 Airport Road
City: Lewisburg County: Greenbrier State: WV Zip: 24901

**Airport Sponsor Information**
Point of Contact: Mr. Stephen Snyder, Airport Director
Address: 558 Airport Road
City: Lewisburg State: WV Zip: 24901
Telephone: (304) 645-3961 ext. 223 Fax: 
Email: Stephen@gvairport.com

**Evaluation Form Preparer Information**
Point of Contact: Ms. Laura Stevens, AICP
Company (if not the sponsor): Parrish and Partners, LLC
Address: 140 Stoneridge Drive, Suite 500
City: Columbia State: SC Zip: 29210
Telephone: (803) 978-7611 Fax: (803) 403-9317
Email: LStevens@parrishandpartners.com

1. Introduction/Background:
The Greenbrier Valley Airport (Airport), which is also known by the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) identifier LWB, is located in Greenbrier County, West Virginia, approximately three miles north of Lewisburg in the southeastern portion of the state (refer to Attachment A, Figure 1). The Airport can be accessed directly off U.S. 219 (Seneca Trail) via Airport Road and is located north of the interchange of Interstate 64 with US 219.

This publicly owned and towered Airport, located at the coordinates of N 37° 51′ 29.90″, W 80° 23′ 58.10″, is served by the 7,003-foot long Runway 4-22, which currently supports over 19,000 annual operations and 5,000 enplanements.² Airport users include commercial, corporate, general aviation, and military aircraft.

This Environmental Assessment (EA) will document the potential impacts associated with the proposed construction of a new fuel farm and decommissioning of the existing fuel farm at Greenbrier Valley Airport. As LWB is a federally-obligated airport, the project is being evaluated to ensure that the action meets the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). In accordance with FAA Order 1050.1F, Paragraph 3-1.2.b.(5), an EA is normally the appropriate level of NEPA documentation for establishment of fuel storage and distribution systems.

2. Project Description (List and clearly describe ALL components of project proposal including all connected actions). Attach a map or drawing of the area with the location(s) of the proposed action(s) identified:
The existing fuel farm at Greenbrier Regional Airport is located north of the terminal building. This facility consists of six underground storage tanks (USTs), including: three 10,000-gallon Jet-A tanks, one 20,000-gallon Jet-A tank, one 10,000-gallon Avgas/100LL tanks, and one 1,000-gallon 90 Octane tank. In addition, there is one above ground storage tank (AST) at the existing fuel farm that stores diesel fuel for vehicles. Currently, the fuel vendor accesses the site through the secured terminal ramp area approximately twice weekly to supply fuel. Fuel is then dispensed to aircraft as needed using fuel trucks operated by Airport personnel.

The proposed fuel farm is located west of the terminal and south of Airport Road (refer to Attachment A, Figures 2 and 3). The new site would include an approximately 71-foot by 71-foot, 6-inch thick concrete pad that would accommodate two 20,000-gallon, one 12,000-gallon, and one 2,000-gallon ASTs, with room for a future 20,000-gallon tank (refer to Attachment A, Figure 4). The proposed tanks would be double-walled for secondary containment. The concrete pad would include an approximately 20-foot by 71-foot truck delivery area that is separated from the access road by a speed bump and from the ASTs by a row of approximately seventeen, 4-foot tall, 6-inch diameter, concrete-filled steel bollards. The proposed access road would allow for a full-sized tanker truck to turn off of the main road, into the new fuel farm area to transfer fuel, and exit the fuel farm area. The fuel farm would be fenced for security. It is currently anticipated that the fuel farm pad would be surrounded by an 8-foot high chain link fence with three strands of barbed wire at the top and gates positioned near the access road for entry by the fuel delivery tanker trucks and the Airport fuel trucks.

Construction activities would generally consist of installation of temporary erosion control measures, grading of the site, installation of drainage infrastructure (refer to Attachment A, Figure 3), provision for existing utilities adjacent to Airport Road, paving of the access road, construction of the concrete pad, and installation of the ASTs and fuel distribution system.

The proposed fuel farm was sized to meet the current fueling demands of the Airport users and additional space is being provided for future expansion capability.

3. Project Purpose and Need:
The six existing USTs have been in operation since the Airport opened in 1968. Due to their age, they can no longer be insured and are being decommissioned. There is a critical need for uninterrupted aviation fuel service at LWB, which has scheduled commercial flights and supports approximately 50 aircraft operations daily. The purpose of the Proposed Action is to provide replacement fueling facilities at a location that is secure, accessible by fuel trucks, and allows for future airport expansion.

4. Describe the affected environment (existing conditions) and land use in the vicinity of project:
As shown in Attachment B, the proposed site is a previously disturbed and infrequently mowed area that contains no structures or other airport facilities. The site is located entirely within Airport property, which is zoned "Industrial" (refer to Attachment C).
The proposed project site is lower in elevation than the surrounding area. Based on review of
topographic contours (refer to Attachment A, Figure 5), it appears as if the proposed site may be
located within an area that was excavated during construction of the Airport. There is a steep slope
to the west along the Airport property line and to the east, along the airfield and associated
development. The proposed fuel farm would be located approximately 15 feet lower than the ground
elevation at the Airport’s western property boundary and approximately 30 to 35 feet below the
airfield. Ground elevation continues to rise to the west in the direction of a single family residence
and wooded area. The single family residence is located approximately 300 feet to the west of the
proposed fuel farm and buffered by mature trees on non-Airport property. Other adjacent land uses
include Airport Road and undeveloped, wooded property to the north, the airfield and associated
development to east, and undeveloped airport property to the south.

Soils for the project area are predominantly (95 percent or 2.5 acres) mapped as Udorthents, with a
small area (5 percent or 0.1 acre) of Frankstown silt loam (refer to Attachment D). The Udorthents
soil is further classified as smoothed-rock outcrop complex, comprised of 65 percent Udorthents soil,
35 percent rock outcrop, and 5 percent minor soil components. The rock outcrops are described as
having lithic bedrock located at 0 to 4 inches.

5. Alternatives to the Project: Describe any other reasonable actions that may feasibly
substitute for the proposed project, and include a description of the “No Action” alternative.
If there are no feasible or reasonable alternatives to the proposed project, explain why (attach
alternatives drawings as applicable):

Build Alternatives
As discussed previously, the six USTs at the existing fuel farm have been in operation since the Airport
opened in 1968, are no longer insurable, and must be decommissioned. The Airport is currently
completing a Master Plan Update (MPU) and challenges presented be the current fuel farm location
have been identified. As shown on Attachment A, Figure 2, the existing fuel farm is located north
of the terminal building. This location is not ideal for activity on the terminal ramp, for rental car
operations, or for fuel truck deliveries due to the tight turning radius and location within the secured
area. In addition, utilization of the existing fuel farm location would not allow for the proposed above
ground tanks to be installed concurrently with the decommissioning of the six USTs, which is
necessary for providing uninterrupted fuel service at LWB. Review of the 2005 Airport Layout Drawing
(ALD) identifies a future fuel farm location west of the airfield and south of Airport Road (refer to
Exhibit 1). As part of the planning efforts underway for the current MPU, the 2005 ALD location has
been slightly modified to provide for closer access to Airport Road, while maintaining the original
planning intent to have the fuel farm located proximate to the future general aviation and corporate
development area (refer to Attachment A, Figure 2). Therefore, the 2005 ALD Alternative location
was eliminated from further study and the 2017 MPU Alternative location has been identified as the
Preferred Alternative. This Preferred Alternative site is optimal for fuel delivery, minimizes earthwork
costs, and allows for future airport development. Under the Preferred Alternative, the new fuel
facilities would be located at the approximately 2.5-acre site as depicted on Attachment A, Figure

3 USDA - NRCS, “Custom Soil Resource Report for Greenbrier County,” West Virginia,
which includes an approximately 2.35-acre construction area comprised of approximately 1,856 cubic yards of cut, 3,022 cubic yards of fill, and construction of approximately 0.36 acre (15,875 square feet) of additional paved surfaces for the concrete pad and asphalt access road.

**No Action Alternative**
The No-action Alternative describes the existing condition of the Airport and is used as a baseline for comparison with the Preferred Alternative to determine potential impacts. Under the No-action Alternative, no new fuel facilities would be constructed, the existing site would be decommissioned; and the Airport would no longer provide fuel service. Once the existing fuel farm insurance coverage ends the Airport will no longer be able to provide fuel to its users and thereby would lose a critical service component. If a replacement facility is not operational with minimal to no gap in the provision of fuel services at LWB, the Airport would experience significant financial losses from reduced aircraft operations. With this Alternative, no action would be taken to meet the Purpose and Need for the proposed project, and LWB could no longer provide a critical service to its users. Without the availability to provide fuel, the Airport could be in jeopardy of losing a significant number of aircraft operations.

**Proposed Action**
The Preferred Alternative was selected as the Proposed Action for this EA in that it best addresses the Purpose and Need of the project; providing new fuel facilities at a location that is secure, accessible by fuel trucks, and allows for future airport expansion.

The Proposed Action includes:
- installation of temporary erosion control measures
- installation of drainage infrastructure necessary to maintain existing drainage patterns
- impact to an approximately 2.35-acre construction area
- approximately 1,856 cubic yards of cut
- 3,022 cubic yards of fill
- construction of approximately 0.36 acre of additional paved surfaces (approximately 50-foot by 75-foot concrete AST pad and 18-foot wide asphalt access road)
• installation of the ASTs and fuel distribution system (two 20,000-gallon, one 12,000-gallon, and two 1,000 gallon ASTs, with room for a future 20,000-gallon tank)
• installation of security fencing around the fuel farm, which would likely be 8-foot high chain link fence with three strands of barbed wire at the top

6. Environmental Consequences – Special Impact Categories (refer to the Instructions page and corresponding sections in 1050.1F, the 1050.1F Desk Reference, and the Desk Reference for Airports Actions for more information and direction. Note that when the 1050.1F Desk Reference and Desk Reference for Airports Actions provide conflicting guidance, the 1050.1F Desk Reference takes precedence. The analysis under each section must comply with the requirements and significance thresholds as described in the Desk Reference).

(A) AIR QUALITY
(1) Will the proposed project(s) cause or create a reasonably foreseeable emission increase? Prepare an air quality assessment and disclose the results. Discuss the applicable regulatory criterion and/or thresholds that will be applied to the results, the specific methodologies, data sources and assumptions used; including the supporting documentation and consultation with federal, state, tribal, or local air quality agencies.

NO. The Proposed Action would not affect aircraft operations at LWB. In addition, the number of deliveries from the fuel vendor to the Airport would be unchanged and the distance travelled by the Airport fuel trucks to the aircraft would be approximately the same from the proposed sites as from the current site.

Construction-related air emissions are considered “direct” sources of emissions under the Clean Air Act General Conformity Rule and in attainment areas, such as Greenbrier County, can be reported for disclosure purposes under NEPA. Sources of construction-related emissions include the exhaust from heavy equipment, delivery trucks, and construction worker vehicles traveling to and from the site; dust from earthwork/grading; equipment movement on unpaved areas; and, fugitive emissions from the storage/transfer of raw materials.

Construction activities would impact approximately 2.35 acres, last for approximately two months, and include approximately 1,856 cubic yards of cut, 3,022 cubic yards of fill, and construction of approximately 0.36 acres (15,875 square feet) of additional paved surfaces for the concrete pad and asphalt access road. Based on Equations A6-3 and A6-4 for Particulate Matter less than 10 μm and 2.5 μm (PM_{10} and PM_{2.5}) from the Aviation Emissions and Air Quality Handbook, fugitive dust emissions from general construction activities were calculated to be:
• PM_{10} = 1.06 tons/year
• PM_{2.5} = 0.106 tons/year

As described previously, the proposed project site is located in an area that is in attainment for all NAAQs. Given the attainment status, short construction duration (2 months), and small area

---

5 Ibid.
6 Ibid., p. 49
of impact (2.35 acres), it was deemed sufficient to evaluate potential construction-related emissions comparatively based on prior modeling results. For this effort, the emissions inventory performed with the NONROAD2008a model for a much larger airport project was reviewed. Modeling completed for this prior airport project determined that construction-related emissions associated with reconstruction of a 9,000-foot runway (31 acres) would be well below the de minimis levels for non-attainment pollutants (and their precursors). The total annual emissions calculated included: Particulate Matter-2.68 tons, Nitrogen Oxide-38.96 tons, Sulfur Oxides-1.22 tons, and Volatile Organic Compounds-2.94 tons. The allowable de minimis level of each of these pollutants in a non-attainment area is 100 tons/year. Based on these results from a much larger project, it is anticipated that no adverse impacts to air quality would occur during construction of the proposed 2.35-acre fuel farm at LWB.

(2) Are there any project components containing unusual circumstances, such as emissions sources in close proximity to areas where the public has access or other considerations that may warrant further analysis? If no, proceed to (c); if yes, an analysis of ambient pollutant concentrations may be necessary. Contact your local ADO regarding how to proceed with the analysis.

NO

(3) Is the proposed project(s) located in a nonattainment or maintenance area for the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) established under the Clean Air Act?

NO, the proposed site is located within Greenbrier County, which is in attainment for all NAAQS.

4) Are all components of the proposed project, including all connected actions, listed as exempt or presumed to conform (See FRN, vol.72 no. 145, pg. 41565)? If yes, cite exemption and go to (B) Biological Resources. If no, go to (e).

YES. The proposed project could be considered Presumed to Conform as a project category that is proven to be “reliably and consistently de minimis.” In accordance with FRN, vol.72 no. 145, pg. 41565, Section III, the project could be classified as construction that “does not modify or increase airport capacity or change the operational environment of the airport in such a way as to increase air emissions above de minimis thresholds.”

(5) Would the net emissions from the project result in exceedances of the applicable de minimis threshold (reference 1050.1F Desk Reference and the Aviation Emissions and Air Quality Handbook for guidance) of the criteria pollutant for which the county is in non-attainment or maintenance? If no, go to (B) Biological Resources. If yes, stop development of this form and prepare a standard Environmental Assessment.

NO, the proposed site is located within Greenbrier County, which is in attainment of all NAAQS.

---

7 FAA, Final Environmental Assessment, Runway 5L-23R Reconstruction Program at McGhee Tyson Airport, (prepared by Michael Baker International), July 2014, p. 94.
(B) BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Describe the potential of the proposed project to directly or indirectly impact fish, wildlife, and plant communities and/or the displacement of wildlife. Be sure to identify any state or federal species of concern (Candidate, Threatened or Endangered).

1) Are there any candidate, threatened, or endangered species listed in or near the project area?

Pursuant to Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended, the project area was evaluated for the presence of federally protected species or their suitable habitats. The United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) list of federally protected species known to occur or potentially occur in Greenbrier County was reviewed.\(^9\) Potentially occurring, listed species include:

- **Indiana bat** (*Myotis sodalis*), Endangered, known winter habitat includes Greenbrier County;
- **Northern long-eared bat** (*Myotis septentrionalis*), Threatened, may occur throughout West Virginia;
- **Shale barren rock cress** (*Boerchera serotina*), Endangered, Greenbrier County;
- **Small whorled pogonia** (*Isotria medeoloides*), Threatened, Greenbrier County; and,
- **Virginia spirea** (*Spirea virginiana*), Threatened, along Greenbrier River in Greenbrier County.

The USFWS Information for Planning and Conservation (IPaC) website was also reviewed. IPaC identified Indiana bat, Northern long-eared bat, small whorled pogonia, and running buffalo clover (*Trifolium stoloniferum*) as species that may be affected by the Proposed Action (refer to **Attachment E**). Review of additional USFWS sources indicates that aquatic habitats supporting known or potential distributions of Virginia spirea in Greenbrier County are limited to Greenbrier River, which is located over 2 miles east of the proposed fuel farm site.\(^10\) In addition, the proposed project would not involve tree clearing or a site that consists of caves or mine portals, thus, no impacts to the Indiana or Northern long-eared bat would occur. The shale barren rock cress is highly habitat restricted and the shale barrens that it requires are not present at the proposed site. Potentially suitable habitat for the small whorled pogonia, which is a member of the orchid family, includes older hardwood stands with an open understory, often with acidic soils, a thick layer of dead leaves, and on slopes near small streams. This habitat is not present at the proposed site. Finally, running buffalo clover is not known to exist within Greenbrier County\(^11\) and is most frequently found in recently disturbed habitats with filtered sunlight. Because the proposed site has been previously disturbed, there are no trees and thus, only direct sunlight.

---


Based on an absence of potentially suitable habitat, it is anticipated that the Proposed Action would have no effect on federally protected species.

As described on the WV Department of Natural Resources’ website, West Virginia does not have state threatened and endangered species legislation; therefore, the species listed as State threatened or endangered are those found on the USFWS’s list of federally threatened and endangered species and no impacts are anticipated.\( ^{12} \)

(2) Will the action have any long-term or permanent loss of unlisted plants or wildlife species?

\textbf{NO}

(3) Will the action adversely impact any species of concern or their habitat?

\textbf{NO}

(4) Will the action result in substantial loss, reduction, degradation, disturbance, or fragmentation of native species habitats or populations?

\textbf{NO}

(5) Will the action have adverse impacts on a species’ reproduction rates or mortality rate or ability to sustain population levels?

\textbf{NO}

(6) Are there any habitats, classified as critical by the federal or state agency with jurisdiction, impacted by the proposed project?

\textbf{NO}

(7) Would the proposed project affect species protected under the Migratory Bird Act? (If \textbf{Yes}, contact the local ADO).

\textbf{NO}, although the IPaC report (refer to Attachment E) lists 19 migratory birds that may be affected by the Proposed Action, the proposed 2.35-acre site consists entirely of a previously mowed herbaceous area. Therefore, no structures or trees that could provide habitat for roosting or active nests would be impacted by the Proposed Action.

If the answer to any of the above is “Yes”, consult with the USWFS and appropriate state agencies, and provide all correspondence and documentation.

\textbf{(C) CLIMATE}

(1) Would the proposed project or alternative(s) result in the increase or decrease of emissions of Greenhouse gases (GHG)? If neither, this should be briefly explained and no further analysis is required and proceed to (D) Coastal Resources.

\textbf{NO}, the proposed project would not result in any impact to aviation activity at Greenbrier Valley Airport, nor would it generate a change in the amount of vehicle trips; thus, no measurable change in GHG emissions would be anticipated.

\textit{\( ^{12} \)Ibid.}
(2) Will the proposed project or alternative(s) result in a net decrease in GHG emissions (as indicated by quantitative data or proxy measures such as reduction in fuel burn, delay, or flight operations)? A brief statement describing the factual basis for this conclusion is sufficient.

N/A

(3) Will the proposed project or alternative(s) result in an increase in GHG emissions? Emissions should be assessed either qualitatively or quantitatively as described in 1050.1F Desk Reference or Aviation Emissions and Air Quality Handbook.

N/A

(D) COASTAL RESOURCES

(1) Would the proposed project occur in a coastal zone, or affect the use of a coastal resource, as defined by your state's Coastal Zone Management Plan (CZMP)?

NO Explain. West Virginia does not have any coastal resources.

(2) If Yes, is the project consistent with the State's CZMP? (If applicable, attach the sponsor's consistency certification and the state's concurrence of that certification).

N/A

(3) Is the location of the proposed project within the Coastal Barrier Resources System? NO (If Yes, and the project would receive federal funding, coordinate with the FWS and attach record of consultation).

N/A

(E) SECTION 4(f) RESOURCES

(1) Does the proposed project have an impact on any publicly owned land from a public park, recreation area, or wildlife or waterfowl refuge of national, state, or local significance, or an historic site of national, state, or local significance? Specify if the use will be physical (an actual taking of the property) or constructive (i.e. activities, features, or attributes of the Section 4 (f) property are substantially impaired.) If the answer is “No,” proceed to (F) Farmlands.

NO

(2) Is a De Minimis impact determination recommended? If “yes”, please provide; supporting documentation that this impact will not substantially impair or adversely affect the activities, features, or attributes of the Section 4 (f) property; a Section 106 finding of “no adverse effect” if historic properties are involved; any mitigation measures; a letter from the official with jurisdiction concurring with the recommended de minimis finding; and proof of public involvement. (See Section 5.3.3 of 1050.1F Desk Reference). If “No,” stop development of this form and prepare a standard Environmental Assessment.

N/A

(F) FARMLANDS

Does the project involve acquisition of farmland, or use of farmland, that would be converted to non-agricultural use and is protected by the Federal Farmland Protection Policy Act (FPPA)? (If Yes, attach record of coordination with the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS), including form AD-1006.)
NO. The entire site is encompassed within the existing Airport property boundary; thus, no potential farmland would be converted to non-agricultural use due to the Proposed Action. In addition, approximately 95 percent of the 2.35-acre site is mapped as Udorthents, which is not classified as prime or statewide important farmland (refer to Attachment D). Frankstown silt loam is classified as a farmland of statewide importance, however, this soil type only comprises 0.1 acre (approximately 5 percent) of the project area. Therefore, no significant impacts to farmland protected under the FPPA would result from the Proposed Action.

(G) HAZARDOUS MATERIALS, SOLID WASTE, AND POLLUTION PREVENTION
(1) Would the proposed project involve the use of land that may contain hazardous materials or cause potential contamination from hazardous materials? (If Yes, attach record of consultation with appropriate agencies).

NO. Explain. Based on review of the EPA NEPAssist website and input from Airport staff, the proposed site does not contain known hazardous material contamination. In addition, there have been no known spills or leaks at the existing fuel farm. Further coordination with the WV Department of Environmental Protection (WV DEP), Division of Water and Waste, UST Services Office would occur during future project design phases. The WV DEP will instruct the Airport’s contractor as to whether the existing USTs are to be filled and left in place or removed. Applicable regulations will be followed. If contaminated soil is encountered during construction or tank removal activities (if removal is required), the WV DEP will be notified by the contractor to determine if/what type of corrective actions are required.

(2) Would the operation and/or construction of the project generate significant amounts of solid waste? If Yes, are local disposal facilities capable of handling the additional volumes of waste resulting from the project?

NO. Explain. Construction or daily operation of the proposed fuel farm would not be anticipated to produce solid waste. The closest disposal facility is located on Harper Road in Lewisburg, WV. Any solid waste generated during construction would likely be disposed there. This facility, which was opened in 1976, has ample capacity remaining with an estimated closure of 2082.13

(3) Will the project produce an appreciable different quantity or type of hazardous waste? Will there be any potential impacts that could adversely affect human health or the environment?

NO

(H) HISTORIC, ARCHITECTURAL, ARCHEOLOGICAL, AND CULTURAL RESOURCES
(1) Describe any impact the proposed project might have on any properties listed in, or eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places. (Include a record of your consultation and response with the State or Tribal Historic Preservation Officer (S/THPO)).

Based on a site review and the WV SHPO Interactive GIS Map, there are no known archaeological sites, cemeteries, or historic structures or districts located on or adjacent to the project site. There are no structures present on the proposed site. Because the proposed fuel farm is consistent with existing aviation development at LWB and would be located at a lower elevation than adjacent

---

property, with a natural buffer of mature trees, no impacts to the viewshed of the nearby residence are anticipated. The Draft EA will be provided to the WV SHPO for review.

(2) Describe any impacts to archeological resources as a result of the proposed project. (Include a record of consultation with persons or organizations with relevant expertise, including the S/THPO, if applicable).

The proposed site is a previously disturbed and infrequently mowed area with no existing structures (refer to Attachment B). Based on review of the WV SHPO Interactive GIS Map and previous disturbance during construction of the Airport, no impacts to archaeological cultural resources are anticipated to result from the Proposed Action. The Draft EA will be provided to the WV SHPO for review.

(I) LAND USE
(1) Would the proposed project result in other (besides noise) impacts that have land use ramifications, such as disruption of communities, relocation of residences or businesses, or impacts to natural resource areas?

NO. Explain. The proposed fuel farm is located on existing Airport property and would not result in disruption of communities, relocation of residences or businesses, or impacts to natural resource areas.

(2) Would the proposed project be located near or create a wildlife hazard as defined in FAA Advisory Circular 150/5200-33, "Wildlife Hazards On and Near Airports"?

NO. Explain. No aspects of the proposed fuel farm would result in creation of a potential wildlife hazard near Greenbrier Valley Airport. The closest disposal facility is located on Harper Road in Lewisburg, which is over 10,000 feet from the Greenbrier Valley Airport and thus, complies with the guidelines established in FAA AC 150/5200-33.

(3) Include documentation to support sponsor’s assurance under 49 U.S.C. § 47107 (a) (10), of the 1982 Airport Act, that appropriate actions will be taken, to the extent reasonable, to restrict land use to purposes compatible with normal airport operations.

Refer to sponsor’s assurance included as Attachment F. The Proposed Action is located on existing Airport property and is compatible with airport activity.

(J) NATURAL RESOURCES AND ENERGY SUPPLY
What effect would the project have on natural resource and energy consumption? (Attach record of consultations with local public utilities or suppliers if appropriate)

The proposed new fuel farm would involve a minimal amount of additional lighting; however, no significant increase in energy demand at LWB would be expected to result from implementation of the Proposed Action. In addition, consumable natural resources to be used for construction of the proposed project would not be considered scarce or unusual. Sources of construction materials needed for the proposed project are available locally and regionally, and would not cause an undue demand on supplies in the area.

(K) NOISE AND NOISE-COMPATIBLE LAND USE
Will the project increase noise by DNL 1.5 dB or more for a noise sensitive area that is exposed to noise at or above the DNL 65 dB noise exposure level, or that will be exposed at or above the DNL
65 dB level due to a DNL 1.5 dB or greater increase, when compared to the no action alternative for the same timeframe? (Use AEM as a screening tool and AEDT 2b as appropriate. See FAA Order 1050.1F Desk Reference, Chapter 11, or FAA Order 1050.1F, Appendix B, for further guidance). Please provide all information used to reach your conclusion. If yes, contact your local ADO.

**NO.** The proposed project would not affect aircraft operations or the associated noise levels at LWB.

Impacts may be caused by construction of the proposed fuel farm, which would be temporary in nature and their degree of impact would subside as construction concludes. Construction of the Proposed Action is anticipated to take two months. Noise impacts during construction are primarily associated with an increase in ambient noise levels from the construction equipment. Typical noise levels generated by different types of construction equipment are presented in Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EQUIPMENT</th>
<th>dBA Leq @ 50 feet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Front Loader</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Back Hoe</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dozer</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tractor</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grader</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truck</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paver</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete Mixer</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pile Driver</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jackhammer</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock Drill</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saw</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


Above 65 dBA, noise sensitive land uses, such as residential, are typically discouraged. The project site is located on existing Airport property. The closest residence is located over 300 feet to the west. Distance would rapidly attenuate noise, and it is not anticipated that construction would occur close enough to existing residences to cause disturbances.

**(L) SOCIOECONOMICS, ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE, and CHILDREN’S HEALTH and SAFETY RISKS**

(1) Would the project cause an alteration in surface traffic patterns, or cause a noticeable increase in surface traffic congestion or decrease in Level of Service?

**NO.** No additional vehicle trips would result from the Proposed Action. Additional vehicle trips would be anticipated during the two-month construction period, as construction workers travel to and from the site. However, these impacts would be temporary in nature, ending when construction concludes, and would not be anticipated to result in significant traffic congestion in the vicinity of the airport.
(2) Would the project cause induced, or secondary, socioeconomic impacts to surrounding communities, such as changes to business and economic activity in a community; impact public service demands; induce shifts in population movement and growth, etc.?

**NO.** No negative socioeconomic impacts would be anticipated to result from the Proposed Action. Under the No-action alternative, without construction of a new fuel farm, the Airport would no longer be able to provide fuel for aircraft operations, which would have significant negative socioeconomic impacts on the Airport and its service region.

(3) Would the project have a disproportionate impact on minority and/or low-income communities? Consider human health, social, economic, and environmental issues in your evaluation. Refer to DOT Order 5610.2(a) which provides the definition for the types of adverse impacts that should be considered when assessing impacts to environmental justice populations.

**NO.** The proposed site is located on existing Airport property and would not result in any relocations or other residential impacts.

With regard to environmental justice populations, demographic and income data from the U.S. Census Bureau’s American Community Survey were reviewed for Census Tract (CT) 950400, which encompasses the Airport, and compared with the U.S. Census Bureau’s County and State QuickFacts data for Greenbrier County and West Virginia. As shown in Table 2, the percentages of minority and low income populations in the vicinity of LWB and the proposed site are lower than both Greenbrier County and West Virginia. Based on U.S. Census Data, no minority or low income populations are located within the vicinity of the Proposed Action; therefore, no disproportionate impacts to environmental justice populations would be anticipated to result from the Proposed Action.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>Airport Vicinity (CT 950400)*</th>
<th>Greenbrier County*</th>
<th>West Virginia*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Minority Population (%)</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Poverty Level (%)</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sources:** U.S. Census Bureau 2008 – 2012 American Community Survey (accessed via EPA’s NEPAssist website: https://nepassisttool.epa.gov/nepassist/nepamap.aspx?wherestr=Greenbrier+Valley+Airport%2cLewistown%2cWV)

*U.S. Census Bureau State & County QuickFacts

(4) Would the project have the potential to lead to a disproportionate health or safety risk to children?

**NO.**

If the answer is “YES” to any of the above, please explain the nature and degree of the impact. Also provide a description of mitigation measures which would be considered to reduce any adverse impacts.
N/A

(M) VISUAL EFFECTS INCLUDING LIGHT EMISSIONS

(1) Would the project have the potential to create annoyance or interfere with normal activities from light emissions for nearby residents?
   NO. The minimal amount of light emissions associated with the proposed fuel farm would not create an annoyance for adjacent properties. As discussed previously, the proposed site is located lower than adjacent property. In addition, the proposed site is located over 300 feet from the closest residence and would be buffered by a stand of trees.

(2) Would the project have the potential to affect the visual character of nearby areas due to light emissions?
   NO. The proposed fuel farm is consistent with the surrounding airport–related development.

(3) Would the project have the potential to block or obstruct views of visual resources?
   NO. As discussed previously, the proposed site is located lower than adjacent property and would not obstruct views.

If the answer is “YES” to any of the above, please explain the nature and degree of the impact using graphic materials. Also provide a description of mitigation measures which would be considered to reduce any adverse impacts.

(N) WATER RESOURCES (INCLUDING WETLANDS, FLOODPLAINS, SURFACE WATERS, GROUNDWATER, AND WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS)

(1) WETLANDS
   (a) Does the proposed project involve federal or state regulated wetlands or non-jurisdictional wetlands? (Contact USFWS or appropriate state natural resource agencies if protected resources are affected) (Wetlands must be delineated using methods in the US Army Corps of Engineers 1987 Wetland Delineation Manual. Delineations must be performed by a person certified in wetlands delineation. Document coordination with the resource agencies).
      NO. No USFWS National Wetland Inventory (NWI) wetlands or surface waters are identified on site (refer to Attachment F). As indicated in Attachment D, soils at the proposed site are mapped as Udorthents and Frankstown silt loam, which are non-hydric soils. As shown in Appendix B, the proposed site is a previously disturbed and infrequently mowed area that encompasses an existing service road. The site is located at a lower elevation than the runway to the east and a residential property to the west; however, discussions with Airport personnel indicate that stormwater runoff leaves the proposed fuel farm site and flows to the south and that no areas of standing water exist on the project site.

   (b) If yes, does the project qualify for an Army Corps of Engineers General permit? (Document coordination with the Corps).
      N/A

   (c) If there are wetlands impacts, are there feasible mitigation alternatives? Explain.
      N/A
(d) If there are wetlands impacts, describe the measures to be taken to comply with Executive Order 11990, Protection of Wetlands.

N/A

(2) FLOODPLAINS
(a) Would the proposed project be located in, or would it encroach upon, any 100-year floodplains, as designated by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA)?

NO

(b) If Yes, would the project cause notable adverse impacts on natural and beneficial floodplain values as defined in Paragraph 4.k of DOT Order 5620.2, *Floodplain Management and Protection*?

N/A

(c) If Yes, attach the corresponding FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) and describe the measures to be taken to comply with Executive Order 11988, including the public notice requirements.

N/A

(3) SURFACE WATERS
(a) Would the project impact surface waters such that water quality standards set by Federal, state, local, or tribal regulatory agencies would be exceeded or would the project have the potential to contaminate a public drinking water supply such that public health may be adversely affected?

NO. There are no surface waters located on or near the proposed site. The closest river is the Greenbrier River, which is located over 2 miles east of the site.

(b) Would the water quality impacts associated with the project cause concerns for applicable permitting agencies or require mitigation in order to obtain a permit?

NO. The project would be required to obtain a National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) General Permit for Construction. During construction, sediment transport and potential impacts to off-site surface waters would be minimized by implementing Best Management Practices (BMPs), such as silt fencing and the use of check dams in ditches to catch sediment. In addition, efforts would be made to schedule construction operations to minimize the exposure of excavated areas and re-vegetate these areas as soon as possible after grading.

If the answer to any of the above questions is “Yes”, consult with the USEPA or other appropriate Federal and/or state regulatory and permitting agencies and provide all agency correspondence.

N/A

(4) GROUNDWATER
(a) Would the project impact groundwater such that water quality standards set by Federal, state, local, or tribal regulatory agencies would be exceeded or would the project have the potential to contaminate an aquifer used for public water supply such that public health may be adversely affected?

NO
(b) Would the groundwater impacts associated with the project cause concerns for applicable permitting agencies or require mitigation in order to obtain a permit?

N/A

(c) Is the project to be located over an EPA-designated Sole Source Aquifer?

NO

If the answer to any of the above questions is “Yes”, consult with the USEPA or other appropriate Federal and/or state regulatory and permitting agencies and provide all agency correspondence as an attachment to this form.

N/A

(5) WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS

Would the proposed project affect a river segment that is listed in the Wild and Scenic River System or Nationwide River Inventory (NRI)? (If Yes, coordinate with the jurisdictional agency and attach record of consultation).

NO. There are no surface water located on or near the proposed site. The closest river is the Greenbrier River, which is located over 2 miles east of the site. The Greenbrier River is not classified as a Wild and Scenic River; however, the 109-mile river segment from the confluence of the East and West Forks in Pocahontas County, downstream to the I-64 Bridge in Caldwell, Greenbrier County, is included in the NRI. The proposed project would not impact this segment of the Greenbrier River.

(O) CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

Discuss impacts from past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects both on and off the airport. Would the proposed project produce a cumulative effect on any of the environmental impact categories above? Consider projects that are connected and may have common timing and/or location. For purposes of this Form, generally use 3 years for past projects and 5 years for future foreseeable projects.

NO. The proposed fuel farm is unlikely to contribute to any significant adverse cumulative impacts.

The cumulative impact analysis under NEPA requires the evaluation of a Proposed Action’s direct and indirect impacts on a particular resource to determine if those effects in combination with the effects of other projects on the same resource would be cumulatively significant. Accordingly, the resources of concern relative to the proposed fuel farm include potential water quality impacts associated with construction of additional impervious surfaces and increased stormwater runoff, as well as temporary impacts during construction.

Recent residential, commercial, and industrial development in the vicinity of the Airport has been limited. Population growth in Greenbrier County has been slow, increasing only 0.9 percent from 2010 to 2015, and is expected to continue this trend or even see a slight decline over the next 10
years.\textsuperscript{14} Generally speaking development pressure in the vicinity of the proposed project would not be anticipated to be high.

Development projects at the Greenbrier Valley Airport within the past three years have consisted of apron reconstruction and taxilane relocation. This development program is currently under construction at LWB and includes the addition of 18,000 square feet (0.41 acre) of impervious surfaces for a new taxilane. Also within the past four years, Crosswinds Center, a residential rehabilitation facility, and Rainelle Medical Center (RMC) clinic were constructed within the West Side Business Park. These facilities added approximately 2 acres of impervious surfaces (both parking area and structures).

The list of potential future projects at LWB are included in Table 3.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>PROJECT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Airport Beacon Relocation/Installation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Airport Master Plan Update</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>General Aviation Ramp/Taxilane Improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Taxiway A Rehabilitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017-2020</td>
<td>East Side Expansion (planning, design, construction)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\textbf{SOURCE:} Airport Capital Improvement Program (ACIP), June 2016 (draft).

Cumulative impacts to the various resources of concern that could occur as a result of these past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects at LWB or in the vicinity, are evaluated in the following sections.

\textbf{Water Quality}

The development of the RMC clinic in 2016 added an estimated 36,111 square feet (0.83 acre) of impervious surfaces, in addition to 0.92 acre of impervious surfaces at the Crosswinds Center and the 0.41-acre taxiway currently under construction at LWB. Some of the proposed AICP projects listed in Table 3 would also add impervious surfaces to Airport property, including the East Side Expansion project, which would likely consist of manufacturing tenants and additional infrastructure, and the General Aviation Ramp/Taxilane Improvements.

The Airport’s Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) was reviewed (refer to Attachment H). As described, most of the facilities at the Airport drain to specific stormwater outfalls. However, stormwater from the two facilities closest to the proposed fuel farm appears to flow westward to a drainage swale that flows to the south end of the Airport’s property and into a

\textsuperscript{14}West Virginia University, Bureau of Business and Economic Research, College of Business and Economics, data released March 2014 (Greenbrier County population of 35,480 people in 2010 projected to be 35,828 people in 2015 and 35,670 people in 2025).
depression. There, it appears that the stormwater percolates into the ground. The proposed fuel farm facility would be located at a lower elevation than the airfield, at the uppermost reaches of this drainage swale. The fuel facility would be designed to maintain existing stormwater flows and avoid cumulative impacts.

Use of water quality protection and mitigation measures developed during permitting would help to ensure that water quality conditions in the Greenbrier River and associated tributaries are not impacted. Added runoff would be required to be treated through new or existing water detention ponds, which are dry basins that collect water during storm events and minimize potential contaminants from impacting the water quality by allowing total suspended solids and associated pollutants to settle out before the water is released into a stream or storm sewer system. Detention basins do not allow for permanent pooling of water and therefore, the Proposed Action would not be expected to create or add to any wildlife attractants at LWB, in compliance with FAA AC 150/5200-33, entitled Hazardous Wildlife Attractants On or Near Airports.

The Proposed Action and other improvements impacting greater than one acre of land would be required to obtain a NPDES General Permit for Construction from the WV Department of Environmental Protection. As part of this notice of intent, a specific Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) would have to be developed, defining the erosion and sediment control measures that would be in place during construction.

Cumulatively, no significant water quality impacts are anticipated as sediment and erosion control measures and BMPs would be implemented for both the current and future construction projects.

**Noise**

None of these past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects at LWB, or in the vicinity, increase airport capacity nor result in additional aircraft operations. Therefore, significant increases in cumulative noise levels within the project area are not anticipated. Due to the existing industrial/manufacturing and airport land uses in the area, construction noise impacts would not be anticipated to result in significant impacts.

**Air Quality**

As discussed above, none of the past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects would increase airport capacity or result in additional aircraft operations. However, similar to the Proposed Action, construction-related emissions would be considered for the ACIP projects. Based on the earlier evaluation of potential construction emissions associated with the Proposed Action, the areas to be disturbed, and anticipated duration of construction associated with the present and reasonably foreseeable future projects identified previously, cumulative impacts to air quality from construction emissions are not anticipated.

---

15 The LPA Group Incorporated, Greenbrier Valley Airport, *Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan and Spill Prevention Control and Countermeasures Plan Training Manual*, March 6, 2008,
7. PERMITS
List all required permits for the proposed project. Has coordination with the appropriate agency commenced? What feedback has the appropriate agency offered in reference to the proposed project? What is the expected time frame for permit review and decision?

Permits and approvals for the Proposed Action include:

FEDERAL
- National Environmental Policy Act review
- FAA Form 7460-1, Notice of the Proposed Construction
- Construction Safety Phasing Plan, AC 150/5370-2F

STATE
- State Pollution Discharge Elimination System General Permit for Construction Notice of Intent
- Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan

Coordination of these approvals would be completed prior to construction.

The Draft EA will also be provided to several environmental agencies for review and comment, including: WV SHPO, WV Division of Natural Resources (WVDNR), Wildlife Resources Section, and the WV Department of Environmental Protection, Division of Air Quality Planning and Division of Water and Waste.

8. MITIGATION
Describe those mitigation measures to be taken to avoid creation of significant impacts to a particular resource as a result of the proposed project, and include a discussion of any impacts that cannot be mitigated.

N/A. No significant impacts have been identified; thus, no mitigation is proposed. BMPs would be implemented during construction to minimize potential environmental impacts.

9. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT
Describe the public review process and any comments received. Include copies of Public Notices and proof of publication.

A draft version of this EA will be made available for public review and comment for 30 days. The document will be available on the Greenbrier Valley Airport’s website (www.gvairport.com/public-documents), at the Airport, and at the Greenbrier County Library in Lewisburg, West Virginia. Notice of the availability of the Draft EA will be advertised in the West Virginia Daily News.

10. LIST OF ATTACHMENTS
Attachment
A – Figures
B – Site Photographs
C – Zoning Map
D – NRCS Custom Soil Resource Report
E – USFWS Protected Species and Migratory Birds Information
F – Sponsor Assurances
G – NWI Information
H – Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (excerpt)
Project Title: New Fuel Farm, Greenbrier Valley Airport  Identifier: LWB
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