Clardy Fox Pump Station El Paso, Texas

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

Prepared for El Paso Water Utilities



And

United States Army Corps of Engineers Albuquerque District



Prepared by

ESSCO ENVIRONMENTAL, INC.



March 2025



TABLE OF CONTENTS

1.0	PURPOSE AND NEED OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT	5
1.1	Project Description	5
1.2	Alternatives to the Proposed Action	6
1.3	No Action Alternative	6
1.4	Significant Assumptions	7
1.5	Uncertainty and Risk	7
2.0	SITE DESCRIPTION	8
2.1	Location	8
2.2	Climate Setting	8
2.3	Site and Vicinity Characteristics	8
2.4	Geology	8
2.5	Soils	8
2.6	Topography	8
2.7	Historic and Current Uses of Property	9
2.8	Description of Structures & Improvements	9
2.9	Current Uses of Adjacent Properties	9
3.0	AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES	10
3.1	Land Use	10
3	1.1 Affected Environment	10
3	.1.2 Environmental Consequences	10
3.2	Floodplains	12
3	.2.1 Affected Environment	12
3	2.2 Environmental Consequences	12
3.3	Wetlands	13
3	.3.1 Affected Environment	13
3	.3.2 Environmental Consequences	13
3.4	Historic Properties/Cultural Resources	14
3	.4.1 Affected Environment	14
3	.4.2 Environmental Consequences	14
3.5	Biological Resources	16
3	.5.1 Affected Environment	16
3	.5.2 Environmental Consequences	16
3.6	Water Resources	17
3	.6.1 Affected Environment	17
3	.6.2 Environmental Consequences	18
	ENGINEERING & SCIENCE SERVICES COMPANY	



3.7	7	Coastal Resources	19
3.8	8	Socio-Economic Considerations	20
	3.8.1	Affected Environment	20
	3.8.2	Environmental Consequences	22
3.9	9.	Air Quality	23
	3.9.1	Affected Environment	23
	3.9.2	Environmental Consequences	23
3.1	10	Transportation	25
	3.10.	1 Affected Environment	25
	3.10.2	2 Environmental Consequences	25
3.′	11	Noise and Aesthetics	26
	3.11.	1 Affected Environment	26
	3.11.2	2 Environmental Consequences	26
3.1	12	Hazardous Materials	27
	3.12.	1 Affected Environment	27
3.′	13	Climate	29
	3.13. ⁻	1 Affected Environment	29
	3.13.2	2 Environmental Consequences	29
4.0	SU	IMMARY OF FINDINGS	31
4.′	1	Land use	31
4.2	2	Floodplains	31
4.3	3	Wetlands	31
4.4	4	Historic Properties/Cultural Resources	31
4.5	5	Biological Resources	31
4.6	6	Water Resources	31
4.7	7	Coastal Resources	31
4.8	8	Socio-economic Considerations	32
4.9	9.	Air Quality	32
4.1	10	Transportation	32
4.1	11	Noise and Aesthetics	32
4.1	12	Hazardous Materials	32
4.1	13	Climate	33
5.0	BE	ST MANAGEMENT PRACTICES	34
6.0	PU	IBLIC REVIEW	36
7.0	CO	DRRESPONDENCE	38
7.′	1	Consultation	38



8.0	LIST OF PREPARERS AND REVIEWERS	.39
9.0	REFERENCES	.40

Appendices

Appendix A – Standard Maps

- A-1 Site Location Map
- A-2 Site Plan Map/Project Footprint
- A-3 Geologic Map
- A-4 USGS Topographic Map
- A-5 Aerial Maps
- A-6 Flood Zones Map
- A-7 National Wetlands Inventory Map

Appendix B – Environmental Setting and Impacts Attachments

- B-1 NRCS Soil Survey & Prime and Important Farmland
- B-2 Photographic Documentation
- B-3 Cultural Resources
- B-4 U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Information for Planning and Consultation (IPaC) Report
- B-5 Biological Resources
- B-6 Banks Environmental Database
- B-7 Public Review
- B-8 Contacted Agencies



1.0 PURPOSE AND NEED OF THE PROPOSED PROJECT

On behalf of the United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), Albuquerque District, and El Paso Water (EPWater), ESSCO Environmental, Inc. (ESSCO) has prepared a draft Environmental Assessment (EA) for the Clardy Fox Pump Station in South Central El Paso, Texas. The pump station is located just south of TX Loop 375 and the Clardy Fox subdivision, hereon referred to as the PROJECT SITE (*A-1 – Site Location Map*). The pumping station receives and processes stormwater runoff from several streets situated up-gradient from the PROJECT SITE into the Rio Grande River Channel. The project is intended to design and construct improvements to the current Clardy Fox pump station along the border in south central El Paso, TX. The work would enable the pump station to operate up to its designed maximum capacity which could handle runoff from a 100-year flood. The facility is currently operating at less than 50% capacity. Improvements required consist of the installation of three new pumps and pump cans, a new backup generator, relocation of the existing transformer, a new electrical building, and a new fence around the expanded facility.

The purpose of the EA is to identify potential environmental effects within the area prior to improvements to the pump facility and to enable informed decision-making and public participation in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).

This EA was prepared in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969, as amended (42 U.S.C. § 4321 et seq.), the United States Army Corps of Engineers NEPA implementing regulations (33 C.F.R. part 230), and Council on Environmental Quality's (CEQ) 2024 NEPA implementing regulations (40 C.F.R. parts 1500 – 1508). The CEQ has provided notice in the Federal Register dated February 25, 2025, to initiate eventual removal of their NEPA regulations at 40 C.F.R. Parts 1500 – 1508 from the Code of Federal Regulations. However, the preparation of this EA began, and the draft EA was circulated for public review, prior to the CEQ's notice. As such, this EA follows the 2024 CEQ NEPA regulations that were in effect when this EA was prepared.

ESSCO conducted field surveys for critical habitat and landforms, and potential environmental impacts, and consulted with Regulatory Agencies regarding any specific stipulations they may have for the project to develop this EA documenting the findings.

The City of El Paso has been funding projects involving improvements to the infrastructure within the Clardy Fox Subdivision. Improvements include a new sanitary sewer, water main, storm sewer, roads, and sidewalks. Stormwater from the Clardy Fox subdivision is currently drained via existing canals into the Clardy Fox Pump Station. With the addition of a new storm sewer, the existing pump station must undergo improvements to handle additional runoff from the Clardy Fox subdivision.

1.1 Project Description

ESSCO conducted the analyses outlined in this EA in a manner consistent with the level of care ordinarily exercised by members of the environmental profession currently practicing under similar conditions. The analyses performed during the preparation of this EA include:



1. Review of historical documents to document the historical use of the PROJECT SITE including:

Aerial Photographs.

2. Review of standard scientific information to determine the physical characteristics of the PROJECT SITE and local, state, and federal regulatory agency records relevant to the PROJECT SITE, including the following:

- FEMA Floodplain Maps,
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Information for Planning and Consultation (IPaC) Web application,
- National Wetland Inventory,
- Hydrological Surveys,
- NCRS Soil Surveys,
- State Leaking Underground Storage Tank (LUST) Registry,
- United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) National Priorities List,
- USEPA Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Information System (CERCLIS),
- USEPA Resource Conservation Recovery Information System (RCRIS),
- USGS Quad Maps, and
- Others such as Landfills, Spills, Releases, Leaks, etc.

3. Perform a field survey to obtain pertinent information (i.e., general landforms, vegetation) and complete the required information for submittal to the following agencies:

- Texas Historical Commission (THC),
- Texas Parks and Wildlife Department (TPWD), and
- United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS).
- 4. Request consultation with the following regulatory agencies:
 - United States Army Corps of Engineers,
 - Texas Historical Commission,
 - Texas Parks and Wildlife Department,
 - United States Department of Agriculture,
 - Federal Emergency Management Agency, and
 - Texas Commission on Environmental Quality

1.2 Alternatives to the Proposed Action

Alternatives to the Proposed Action include only the No Action alternative as the existing pump station is essential to the Clardy Fox subdivision and must remain in operation at some capacity to process stormwater into the Rio Grande river channel.

1.3 No Action Alternative

EPWater would not improve the existing pump station with upgrades to handle increased stormwater collected from recently the installed/upgraded stormwater collection system lining much of the Clardy Fox subdivision. The pump station would only effectively be able to process stormwater arriving from existing collection points. The No Action Alternative could potentially render newly installed stormwater collection systems ineffective.



1.4 Significant Assumptions

No significant assumptions were made in the preparation of this EA.

1.5 Uncertainty and Risk

This EA was prepared by ESSCO on behalf of EPWater and USACE to document environmental conditions in the Clardy Fox project area. Some degree of uncertainty always exists in conducting an EA concerning the presence or absence of a recognized environmental condition. During the preparation of this EA, ESSCO relied on documents, statements, and information gathered from outside sources and through observations and interviews collected by qualified environmental professional(s). The conclusions and recommendations presented within this EA are based upon readily available information collected and evaluated by qualified environmental professionals along with surveys conducted at the PROJECT SITE.



2.0 SITE DESCRIPTION

2.1 Location

As depicted on the Site Location Map (*A-1* – *Site Location Map*), the PROJECT SITE is situated just south of TX-375 Loop, also known as Cesar E. Chavez Border Highway, and southeast of the Chamizal National Memorial Park in the south-central portion of the City of El Paso, El Paso County, Texas.

2.2 Climate Setting

The PROJECT SITE is in the Chihuahuan Desert of North America, a semi-arid, warm desert climate with hot summers and mild, dry winters. Precipitation averages 8.74-inches per year, mainly occurring July through August, with small amounts of frozen precipitation occurring December though January.

Summer high temperatures typically range in the upper 90 degrees Fahrenheit (°F) with an average high of 97°F (36°C) to an average low of 68°F (20°C). Winters are mild with average highs of 55°F (13°C) to average lows of 28°F (-2°C). Predominantly southwesterly winds are a mechanism for aeolian transportation of sediment resulting in strong dust storms during the spring season. Fall typically has mild temperatures and little wind.

2.3 Site and Vicinity Characteristics

The PROJECT SITE was observed by ESSCO as a square, fenced in portion of land currently in use by EPWater as the site of a stormwater pumping station (*A-2 – Site Plan Map/Project Footprint*). The station occupies approximately 0.85 acres of land just to the south of an east-west trending segment of the Cesar E. Chavez border highway and north of the Rio Grande River Channel and United States/Mexico border wall. A retention pond and parking lot comprises the western portion of the PROJECT SITE and another retention pond comprises the eastern portion of the PROJECT SITE.

2.4 Geology

Based on the 2000 Geologic Map of West Hueco Bolson, El Paso Region, Texas (*A-3 – Geologic Map*), the geologic formation that includes the PROJECT SITE is described as Alluvium of Rio Grande Floodplain (Qarg).

2.5 Soils

Based on the United States Department of Agriculture Web Soil Survey and the El Paso County Soil Survey, the soils located within the PROJECT SITE are comprised of 100% Made Land Gila soil material (*B-1 – NRCS Soil Survey & Prime and Important Farmland*).

2.6 Topography

Based on USGS Topographic Map (*A-4 – USGS Topographic Map*), the surface topography of the PROJECT SITE contains an approximate elevation of 3690 feet above mean sea level. The

March 11, 2025 EPWU-23-13



surface of the PROJECT SITE is relatively flat and consists of reworked, graded silty clay loam and concrete and asphalt paved surfaces.

2.7 Historic and Current Uses of Property

Aerial photography of the PROJECT SITE obtained from Google Earth and Banks Environmental Data (BED), and a field reconnaissance depict the PROJECT SITE as a stormwater pump station. ESSCO reviewed aerial photographs dated 1936, 1946, 1956, 1967, 1974, 1984, 1995, 2004, 2010, 2016, and 2022 to determine the historical land use of the PROJECT SITE. Historically, the aerial photographs depict the PROJECT SITE as graded land until 1995 when the Clardy Fox Pump Station was built (*A-5 – Aerial Maps*).

According to online resources, The Clardy Fox pump station has a rated flow capacity of 665 cubic feet per second — 300,000 gallons per minute — or in other words, about an 8.5-foot-deep swimming pool the size of a college basketball court moved per minute. It included approximately 4,000 linear feet of channel shaping and lining and approximately 3,700 linear feet of storm sewer conduit and associated inlets. Photographs taken during the field reconnaissance depicting the current use of the PROJECT SITE are presented in **B-2** – **Photographic Documentation**.

2.8 Description of Structures & Improvements

Improvements on the PROJECT SITE at the time of this report consisted of graded and paved land as well as stormwater retention ponds.

2.9 Current Uses of Adjacent Properties

<u>North</u> – The adjacent properties to the north of the PROJECT SITE include the Cesar Chavez Memorial Highway (TX Loop 375) and the Clardy Fox subdivision of residential dwellings.

<u>South</u> – The adjacent properties to the south of the PROJECT SITE include the Rio Grande River channel and Rio Grande River as well as the United States/Mexico border wall.

<u>East</u> – The adjacent properties to the west include the Rio Grande River channel and Rio Grande River as well as the United States/Mexico border wall.

<u>West</u> – The adjacent properties to the east consist primarily of graded land and the Rio Grande River channel.



3.0 AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

To understand the potential impacts of the Proposed Action and other alternatives, a snapshot of the existing environment was created and summarized in the following subsections. Additionally, the potential primary impacts, short-term impacts, secondary impacts (indirect impacts) were evaluated, and the cumulative environmental and socio-economic impacts were also assessed. Best Management Practices (BMPs) are described as how to prevent and/or reduce impacts to the environment, local population, and cultural resources.

Impacts can be potentially positive, neutral, or negative to the affected resource, though assessment of the negative attributes with regards to the depletion or destruction of a resource are those which are most focused upon for the purposes of mitigation. Primary impacts are potentially long-term impacts that occur at the corresponding time and place of the action, such as the conversion of undeveloped land into developed infrastructure. Short-term impacts are those which occur at the same time as the primary impacts, but are diminished by the passing of time, such as emissions of equipment during construction that cease emitting once the action is completed. Secondary impacts are those which occur at a later time, but are further removed from the time of the initial action, but are still reasonably foreseeable, such as the depletion of a finite resource that is currently in abundance. Cumulative impacts are those impacts which results from the action and the combined effect of other potential past, present, and future impacts, such as the combined effect of emissions on the planet's atmosphere.

This EA assesses the impacts of the Proposed Action and other alternatives on the greater El Paso community, including portions of the locale immediately adjacent to project construction areas within the PROJECT SITE.

3.1 Land Use

The PROJECT SITE has historically been vacant land along the Rio Grande River until the period between 1984 and 1995 when the existing pump station was constructed.

3.1.1 Affected Environment

The PROJECT SITE consists of historically unutilized land along the Rio Grande River channel.

3.1.2 Environmental Consequences

3.1.2.1 Proposed Action

Since construction will be limited to public right-of-way, the Proposed Action is not anticipated to impact land use conversion. To avoid impacts to land use, the amount of surface disturbance would be kept to the minimum necessary to construct the project. A traffic control plan would be implemented during appropriate hours of operation to reduce the impact of construction-related disturbance by using traffic control measures such as flaggers, traffic signs and other traffic-control devices. No land use conversion or disturbance of classified lands or important farmlands is expected from the Proposed Action



3.1.2.2 No Action Alternative

The No Action Alternative will have no environmental impacts on land use within the PROJECT SITE. However, potential environmental concerns and impacts to land use could arise from the inadequate drainage of stormwater within the Clardy Fox subdivision.



3.2 Floodplains

Executive Order 11988 (Floodplain Management) requires federal agencies to avoid actions, to the extent practicable, which would result in the location of facilities in floodplains and/or would affect floodplain values. Facilities located in a floodplain may be damaged or destroyed by a flood or may change the flood-handling capability of the floodplain or the pattern or magnitude of the flood flow.

Review of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) National Wetlands Inventory map depicts the PROJECT SITE situated adjacent to Riverine systems (i.e. Tributaries) of the Rio Grande. However, the PROJECT SITE is not located in the floodplain of the Rio Grande, due to the levee bordering the river channel.

3.2.1 Affected Environment

ESSCO accessed the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Rate Insurance Map (FIRM) Geographic Information System (GIS) database, and the El Paso County Viewer Flood Zones Map and plotted the PROJECT SITE for evaluation. Based on available data, the PROJECT SITE lies within the 100 year flood plain, and although it is not located within a flood zone, it is located adjacent to the flood zone of the Rio Grande River, therefore, the PROJECT SITE may experience temporary flooding during extreme precipitation events (*A-6 – Flood Zones Map*).

3.2.2 Environmental Consequences

3.2.2.1 Proposed Action

The PROJECT SITE lies within the 100 year flood plain of the Rio Grande. However, the Proposed Action would not affect floodplain values or contribute to unwise use of the floodplain. Due to the channelization of the river, the existence of retention ponds and the development of the PROJECT SITE, there is minimal risk of flooding at the PROJECT SITE.

3.2.2.2 No Action Alternative

The No Action Alternative will have no environmental impacts on floodplains.



3.3 Wetlands

Wetlands perform valuable functions in restoring and maintaining the quality of the nation's waters, including floodwater storage, sediment trapping, nutrient removal, chemical detoxification, aquatic food chain support, fish and wildlife habitat, and groundwater recharge. Wetlands may be located in man-made irrigation ditches and other types of man-made waters designed primarily for flood control and irrigation. They may be lined with vegetation communities that support wildlife and may serve as travel corridors for some species.

3.3.1 Affected Environment

Wetlands in the vicinity of the PROJECT SITE were evaluated via the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Services National Wetlands Inventory (*A-7 – National Wetlands Inventory Map*). However, extensive man-made barriers are present between the PROJECT SITE and existing Wetlands and any impact should be negligible. No wetlands are located in or around the vicinity of the PROJECT SITE.

3.3.2 Environmental Consequences

3.3.2.1 Proposed Action

Due to the absence of wetlands in the project area, no wetland areas would be impacted as a result of construction activities associated with the Project.

3.3.2.2 No Action Alternative

No wetlands would be impacted by the No Action Alternative.



3.4 Historic Properties/Cultural Resources

Cultural resources are prehistoric and historic archeological sites, structures, districts, artifacts, and/or any materials that have been made or modified through past human activity that embodies cultural significance. In this document, the term "cultural resources" refers specifically to prehistoric and historic archeological sites, the materials associated with these sites, and historic architectural resources. A cultural resources evaluation of the proposed Area of Potential Effect is required to meet legal responsibilities under existing federal and state guidelines, including Sections 106 and 110 of the National Historic Preservation Act, the Archeological and Historic Preservation Act, the American Indian Religious Freedom Act, and the Native American Graves Repatriation Act.

The National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) compliance has been completed with the Texas Historical Commission (THC) and the State Historic Preservation Offices (SHPO) concurrence of No Adverse Effects to Historic Properties, dated November 18, 2024.

3.4.1 Affected Environment

ESSCO performed a search of the Texas Historical Commission (THC) On-Line Atlas listing potential and known historically significant sites in conjunction to a formal request for consultation submitted to the THC. A response dated April 26, 2024 from THC contained the following recommendations (*B-3 – Cultural Resources*):

Above-Ground Resources

- Property/properties are eligible for listing or already listed in the National Register of Historic Places.
- No adverse effect on historic properties provided the following conditions are met: ESSCO sends THC copies of the design for this infrastructure or related improvements as they are created.

Archeology Comments

 No historic properties affected. However, if cultural materials are encountered during construction or disturbance activities, work should cease in the immediate area; work can continue where no cultural materials are present. Please contact the THC's Archeology Division at 512-463-6096 to consult on further actions that may be necessary to protect the cultural remains.

As part of the THC submittal, Native American tribes with a vested interest in El Paso County were also contacted. At the time of reporting, ESSCO received a response from the White Mountain Apache Tribe of Oklahoma and the Ysleta del sur Pueblo Tribe in El Paso County. Neither tribe has vested interest in the PROJECT SITE. Upon receipt of any further tribal correspondence, ESSCO will evaluate and issue an addendum if warranted.

3.4.2 Environmental Consequences

Due to the developed nature of the PROJECT SITE, the Proposed Action would have minimal impact on cultural resources within the PROJECT SITE. However, the project sponsor and its contractor should contact the Texas Historical Commission in the event historical materials are encountered.



3.4.2.1 Proposed Action

Cultural resources will not be adversely affected by the Proposed Action, however, if cultural materials are encountered during project activities, work should cease in the immediate area. Work can continue in areas where no cultural materials are present. The Texas Historical Commission should be contacted to consult on further actions that may be necessary to protect cultural remains.

3.4.2.2 No Action Alternative

Cultural resources will not be impacted by the No Action Alternative.



3.5 Biological Resources

3.5.1 Affected Environment

The Endangered Species Act of 1973 gives the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) authority for the protection of threatened and endangered (T&E) species, including prohibiting the killing or harassment (take) of T&E species and destruction or adverse modification of critical T&E habitat. The Texas Parks and Wildlife Department (TPWD) Code has established a state regulatory mandate for protection of state-listed T&E species by prohibiting the take of such species. TPWD maintains the authority to protect state-listed T&E species.

ESSCO consulted United States Fish and Wildlife Service Threatened and Endangered Species Critical Habitat Mapper and did not locate any mapped areas of critical habitats in the vicinity of the PROJECT SITE. The Information for Planning and Consultation (IPaC) Web application was also consulted for a list of T&E species. According to **B-4** – **U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Information for Planning and Consultation (IPaC) Report**, none of the T&E species with potential to occur in El Paso County would be expected to occur at the PROJECT SITE due to its developed condition and absence of any natural habitat.

ESSCO also consulted with the Texas Parks and Wildlife Department and has received a response via email as of March 5th, 2024 (*B-5 – Biological Resources*) with the following statement:

Based on review of the documentation and description provided, the Environmental Review Team does not anticipate significant adverse impacts to rare, threatened, or endangered species, or other fish and wildlife resources. However, please note it is the responsibility of the project proponent to comply with all federal, state, and local laws that protect fish and wildlife. Provided the project plans do not change, TPWD considers coordination to be complete.

3.5.2 Environmental Consequences

3.5.2.1 Proposed Action

Due to the prior development, including construction of paved roadways and the existing pump station, and absence of any suitable habitat in the project area, impacts to wildlife habitats and native flora from the Proposed Action are anticipated to be minimal. ESSCO consulted with TPWD to determine if the Proposed Action will impact state-listed threatened and endangered species. TPWD does not believe the Proposed Action will affect any threatened or endangered species. There would be no impacts to biological resources including federally- or state-listed T&E species from the proposed project.

3.5.2.2 No Action Alternative

Due to absence of habitat and the highly developed character of the proposed PROJECT SITE, biological resources would not be impacted by the No Action Alternative.



3.6 Water Resources

Sections 303(d) and 305(b) of the Clean Water Act (CWA) require all states to identify and characterize waters that do not meet, or are not expected to meet, applicable water quality standards. The Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ) is the agency responsible for ensuring that all waters of the state remain in compliance with applicable surface water quality standards (30 TAC 307). The TCEQ Texas Integrated Report for CWA Sections 303(d) and 305(b) describes the compliance status of Texas natural waters based on historical data and identifies water bodies that do not meet standards set for their use for inclusion on the 303(d) list, an inventory of impaired waters.

Projects that disturb more than 1 acre of land require a TCEQ General Storm Water Permit for Construction Activities. This permit is designed to minimize or eliminate the introduction of harmful pollutants into storm water runoff and subsequent discharge into local surface waters such as streams, rivers, lakes or wetlands. The project anticipates to disturb approximately 4.5 acres, therefore a TCEQ Storm Water Permit will be required.

3.6.1 Affected Environment

Surface water from the Rio Grande River is comprised of snowmelt from the mountains in New Mexico and Colorado that is captured in Elephant Butte Reservoir to then be regulated downstream for irrigation purposes, and from local tributary stormwater runoff. Additionally, stormwater drained into the Rio Grande River channel would be suitable for re-introduction to naturally occurring waters. Best Management Practices (BMPs) during construction should be implemented, and a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) will be required to minimize environmental impacts.

The major aquifer underlying the project area is the Hueco Bolson Aquifer. The aquifer is approximately 9,000 feet thick and consists of silt, sand, and gravel in the upper portion, and clay and silt in the lower portion. The upper several hundred feet of the aquifer contains fresh to slightly saline water. The chemical quality of groundwater differs according to location and depth.

Dissolved solids concentrations in the upper portion of the aquifer range from less than 500 milligrams per liter (mg/L) to more than 1,500 mg/L, with an average concentration of 640 mg/L. Historical, large-scale groundwater withdrawals, especially in municipal wells in the downtown areas of El Paso, have caused major decreases in water levels. The decreases have considerably changed the direction of flow, rate of flow, and quality of groundwater chemistry within the aquifer. Declining groundwater levels also have resulted in a minor amount of land surface subsidence.

An additional, unnamed, shallow aquifer is located in the vicinity of the PROJECT SITE and is associated with the Rio Grande River system.

The groundwater in this vicinity is considered a portion of the Rio Grande Alluvium aquifer, which is comprised of Holocene age fluvial deposited sediments that were deposited after the Rio Grande dissected into the Hueco Bolson during the last glacial period. The Rio Grande Alluvium Aquifer is not considered a significant aquifer and typically consists of poor water quality primarily used for irrigation purposes.

Specific data regarding groundwater under the PROJECT SITE was not readily available, however, groundwater data for the vicinity and region was obtained from available environmental

March 11, 2025 EPWU-23-13



reports from the TCEQ. Based on the available groundwater data, static groundwater under the PROJECT SITE may be encountered at an elevation of approximately 3,660 feet above Mean Sea Level or approximately 30 feet or greater below ground surface (bgs). However, perched zones may be encountered at shallower depths. Regional groundwater gradient is to the west-southwest, towards the Rio Grande River.

3.6.2 Environmental Consequences

3.6.2.1 Proposed Action

The Proposed Action would reduce standing surface water from stormwater flows within the Clardy Fox subdivision and drain treated stormwater into the Rio Grande River channel.

The United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) defines a sole source aquifer as one which supplies at least 50 percent of the drinking water consumed in the area overlying the aquifer. Since the aquifer listed above has not been designated as a sole source aquifer by USEPA, water quality would not be affected by the Proposed Action.

As groundwater may be encountered 30 feet or greater below ground surface, groundwater would not be affected by the Proposed Action.

3.6.2.2 No Action Alternative

Water resources would not be impacted by the No Action Alternative.



3.7 Coastal Resources

The PROJECT SITE is located within the Basin and Range Physiographic province of the southwestern United States and the project limits are not located within the boundaries of any Texas Coastal Zone. Coastal resources are not present in the PROJECT SITE and were not analyzed.



3.8 Socio-Economic Considerations

Socio-economic characteristics of the project area obtained from census data are used to avoid the disproportionate placement of any adverse environmental, economic, social, or health impacts from federal actions and policies on a community, and to allow all portions of the population an opportunity to participate in the development of, compliance with, and enforcement of federal laws, regulations, and policies affecting human health of the environment regardless of race, color, national origin, or income.

3.8.1 Affected Environment

3.8.1.1 Population

The Proposed Action is located within the boundaries for El Paso County, Texas. Information regarding socio-economic conditions in the project area was obtained from census data. The population within a 1.5 mile buffer zone of the PROJECT SITE was 13,431. 92% of the population is of Hispanic or Latino origin with an average per capita income of \$13,327. On average, approximately 73% of the population tracts is living below poverty level.

Table 3.8.1.1 presents data from the Census data search conducted March 15, 2024 for the PROJECT SITE.

Population	ion White Black Native Asian Islander Other/ 2 Or More Races		% Hispanic					
13431 2 0 2 0 1 2						92		
% Population in Affected Census Tracts Below Poverty Line %								

Table 3.8.1.1 – Race and Poverty Conditions for Population for El Paso County

Margin of error is at least 10 % of the total value on these statistics.



3.8.1.2 Morbidity

Morbidity rates for El Paso County exceed the state morbidity rate for strokes, certain cancers (breast, colon, rectum, anus, and male prostate), diabetes, Alzheimer's, chronic liver diseases and cirrhosis, and fetal deaths. Morbidity rates for El Paso County are lower than the state morbidity rate for heart disease, all cancers, chronic lower respiratory disease, nephritis, nephrotic syndrome, influenza and pneumonia, septicemia, and infant deaths. Suicides and accidents are also lower than the state rate.

Mortality Rates									
	Deaths	County	State			Deaths	County	State	
Deaths from all Causes	4,524	757.8	808.8		Accidents	214	31.7	41.4	
Heart Disease	884	152.4	194.3		Motor Vehicle Accidents	83	11.5	15.3	
Cerebrovascular Disease (Stroke)	335	58.9	49.4		Diabetes	209	35.4	25.4	
All Cancer	987	162.8	172.4		Alzheimer's	166	30.7	28.7	
Respiratory/Lung Cancer	174	28.9	47.0		Influenza and Pneumonia	60	10.0	18.3	
Female Breast Cancer	81	23.1	22.3		Assault (Homicide)	20		5.9	
Colon, Rectum and Anus	105	17.4	16.4		Suicide	63	9.0	11.0	
Male Prostate Cancer	75	32.4	20.8		Septicemia	88	14.7	14.8	
Chronic Lower Respiratory Disease	234	41.4	45.8		Chronic Liver Disease & Cirrhosis	133	20.8	11.7	
Nephritis, Nephrotic Syndrome and Nephrosis	101	17.0	17.9		Infant Deaths	74	5.3	6.1	
					Fetal Deaths	83	5.9	5.6	

|--|

Notes:

• Infant death rates are per 1,000 live births.

• Fetal deaths rates are per 1,000 live births plus fetal deaths.

• All other death rates were age-adjusted to the 2000 standard per 100,000 population. No age-adjusted rates were calculated if based on 20 or fewer deaths. Infant and fetal death rates were not calculated if 20 or fewer births or births plus fetal deaths occurred.

• Missing rates are indicated by "---"

• Current mortality rates by cause are not comparable with data reported prior to 1999.



3.8.2 Environmental Consequences

3.8.2.1 Proposed Action

The improvements to the existing pump station as detailed in the Proposed Action would provide long-term benefits to the economically disadvantaged Clardy Fox neighborhood by ensuring the Clardy Fox subdivision does not flood in the event of heavy precipitation events. Best Management Practices (BMPs) would be used during construction to minimize the disruption to residents' daily lives, including dust suppression, limiting construction to daytime hours, and a traffic control plan. The proposed action would have a positive impact to socio-economic conditions.

3.8.2.2 No Action Alternative

The No Action Alternative could potentially cause ineffective drainage into the Rio Grande channel, disproportionately impacting the community, and would have a negative impact on socioeconomic conditions in the Project Area.



3.9 Air Quality

3.9.1 Affected Environment

In August 2018, the City of Sunland Park, New Mexico and environmental petitioners challenged the EPA's attainment/unclassifiable designation for El Paso County. On July 10, 2020, the D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals issued its opinion to remand (without vacatur) the El Paso County attainment designation to the EPA and require the EPA to issue a revised El Paso County designation for the 2015 eight-hour ozone National Ambient Air Quality (NAAQS) as expeditiously as practicable.

On December 21, 2020, the TCEQ submitted supplemental information to the EPA in support of retaining El Paso County's original attainment designation. The EPA sent a 120-day letter to Texas on May 25, 2021 notifying the governor that the EPA intends to modify the designation for El Paso County to nonattainment as part of the existing Doña Ana partial-county (Sunland Park) ozone nonattainment area.

On July 26, 2021, the TCEQ submitted a response requesting that the EPA not modify El Paso County's existing attainment/unclassifiable designation consistent with all the information submitted by the state. On November 30, 2021, the EPA published a final nonattainment designation for the 2015 eight-hour ozone NAAQS for El Paso County, effective December 30, 2021. The EPA expanded the Sunland Park marginal nonattainment area to include all of El Paso County and renamed the area as the "El Paso-Las Cruces, Texas-New Mexico nonattainment area.

For Particulate Matter 10 (PM10), El Paso is designated as Moderate Nonattainment. Modeling of U.S. emissions along the border with Mexico in the El Paso area indicated that the nonattainment area would have been in attainment if not for emissions transported from outside the U.S., based on Section 179B of the Federal Clean Air Act, which provides that an area does not have to meet the moderate nonattainment if the state demonstrates attainment if not for emissions from another country.

3.9.2 Environmental Consequences

3.9.2.1 Proposed Action

Construction of the Proposed Action will cause minor, temporary impacts to air quality such as fugitive dust and emissions from construction vehicles. Measures for dust control during construction would adhere to EPA standards for the protection of air quality. Pursuant to regulations, excavations, embankments, stockpiles, access roads, plants sites, waste site, borrow areas and all other work areas within or without the project boundaries must be free from dust which could cause the PM Standards for air pollution to be exceeded, and which would cause a hazard or nuisance to others.

As this project will include earth moving equipment (i.e., excavators, backhoes, dump trucks), ESSCO has prepared an Air Emission Inventory spreadsheet demonstrating emissions are well below allowable levels. Air pollution emissions from the *Proposed Action* will come from a combination of construction activities and earth-moving equipment with exhaust pipe emissions. Construction and other vehicle information was obtained from engineering design plans, the schedule for the *Proposed Action* and from local contractors and included information on number



of vehicles, emissions of construction equipment and duration of construction activities. The Air Emission Inventory results are presented in **Table 3.9.2.1**:

Emissions Process	VOC ⁽²⁾	NOX ⁽²⁾	CO ⁽²⁾	PM 2.5 ⁽²⁾	PM 10 ⁽²⁾
Earthwork and Pipe Installation	283,650	3,961,500	850,680	283,560	133,440
Paving Operations	2,826,541	1,445,600	330,820	100,080	50,040
Ancillary Sources	133,440	1,801,440	311,360	133,440	66,720
Total Emissions (grams)	3,243,541	7,208,540	1,492,860	517,080	250,200
Total Emissions (tons)	3.6	7.9	1.6	0.6	0.3

NOTE: Based upon standard 8-hour workday.

Standard dust suppression techniques, such as watering of active construction areas, stockpiled material, and cleared areas, as well as limiting unnecessary idling of construction vehicles, limiting unnecessary project-related travel, maintaining vehicles in proper working condition, and shutting down construction machines that are not in use would minimize air quality impacts from construction activities.

3.9.2.2 No Action Alternative

The No Action Alternative is not expected to impact air quality in El Paso, Texas.



3.10 Transportation

The PROJECT SITE is situated just south of TX-375 Loop and the Clardy Fox subdivision, north of the United States/Mexico border and Rio Grande River, in the south-central portion of the City of El Paso, El Paso County, Texas.

3.10.1 Affected Environment

The Clardy Fox Pump Station PROJECT SITE is adjacent to the Cesar E. Chavez Border Highway, which experiences significant traffic typical of inner-city highway. Peak traffic is expected to increase during rush hour commuting times. Construction activities within the PROJECT SITE would likely cause temporary delays during the transportation of heavy construction equipment and materials to the PROJECT SITE.

3.10.2 Environmental Consequences

3.10.2.1 Proposed Action

The Proposed Action would have temporary minor impacts on local transportation notably during the delivery of construction materials and heavy equipment. A traffic control plan should be implemented when necessary, along with a dedicated staging area for construction materials, and coordination with the Texas Department of Transportation (TX-DOT).

3.10.2.2 No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, the current pump station would be retained and no construction would occur. No impacts to transportation systems would occur.



3.11 Noise and Aesthetics

Noise is defined as sound that is undesirable. Federal and local governments have established noise guidelines and regulations for protecting citizens from potential hearing damage and from various other adverse physiological, psychological, and social effects associated with noise. The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development has developed noise guidelines in terms of day-night average sound level (DNL) metered in decibels (dB). In general, the noise environment at a site will be considered:

- "Unacceptable" where the noise exposure to noise-sensitive receptors exceeds DNL 75 dB,
- "Normally unacceptable" where the noise exposure to noise-sensitive receptors is between DNL 65 and 75 dB, and "acceptable" where the noise exposure to noise-sensitive receptors is DNL 65 dB or less

Noise-sensitive receptors are land uses associated with indoor or outdoor activities that may be subject to stress or substantial interference from noise. These land uses generally include residences, hotels/motels, nursing homes, schools, and libraries.

Construction equipment is generally considered as aesthetically unpleasant, however, they are only present during the duration of the project, therefore they are a short-term negative impact to aesthetics.

3.11.1 Affected Environment

The area in the vicinity of the Proposed Action is situated next to a highway and therefore is in an area of heavy traffic, which is subjugated to constant noise. Levels of highway traffic noise typically range from 70 to 80 dB(A) at a distance of 15 meters (50 feet) from the highway (Corbisier, 2003).

3.11.2 Environmental Consequences

3.11.2.1 Proposed Action

Under the Proposed Action, construction activities temporarily would increase ambient noise levels due to additional construction vehicle traffic. However, this is not expected to be a nuisance to residents of the Clardy Fox subdivision.

During project construction activities, measures such as limiting unnecessary idling of construction vehicles, maintaining vehicles in proper working condition, and shutting down construction machines that are not in use would be employed to minimize additional noise impacts from construction activities. It is anticipated that construction activities would occur between 7:30 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. five days per week during construction activities, minimizing noise impacts to residences located near the PROJECT SITE.

3.11.2.2 No Action Alternative

No facilities would be built nor would land be disturbed by construction activities as part of the No Action Alternative; thus, no noise impacts are anticipated.



3.12 Hazardous Materials

The Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) and the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act regulate hazardous materials and waste sites. There are two general types of potential hazardous materials impacts: 1) encountering existing hazardous materials during construction activities that, in turn, has the potential to expose workers or the public; or 2) introducing hazardous materials into the PROJECT SITE as part of project activities (e.g., storage and use of hazardous materials at the proposed maintenance facility or accidental spills of hazardous materials during construction). In general, hazardous materials and hazardous wastes include substances that, because of their quantity, concentration, or physical, chemical, or infectious characteristics, may present substantial danger to public health or welfare or to the environment when released or otherwise improperly managed.

On behalf of ESSCO, Banks Environmental Data (BED) conducted a search of available environmental database listings for the PROJECT SITE within applicable search radiuses, dated February 13, 2024. The BED report complies with minimum requirements presented in ASTM E 1527- 21 Standard Practice for Environmental Site Assessments: Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Process. The following is a synopsis of pertinent information presented in the BED report regarding the PROJECT SITE and sites located within appropriate search radiuses.

The BED search identified 2 mapped sites of interest related to ASTM E 1527-21 within the appropriate search radiuses of the PROJECT SITE. Sites listed include one (1) RCRA Generator site, and one (1) HW site, each within or potentially within one mile of the PROJECT SITE, however, ESSCO does not believe these sites represent a recognized environmental condition to the PROJECT SITE due to its position across TX Loop 375 and its inactive status. Refer to the BED report in **B-6** – **Banks Environmental Database** for acronym definitions and additional details.

3.12.1 Affected Environment

The area in the vicinity of the Proposed Action most likely to be affected is contained in public rights-of-way.

3.12.1.1 Proposed Action

Potential impacts from the routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials such as fuels, solvents and gases during construction or operation of the proposed project are anticipated to be minimal since construction activities would involve relatively limited use of hazardous materials and any such use would be regulated by existing federal and state requirements. Spill prevention measures would be implemented during construction equipment refueling, thus minimizing potential impacts from spills during fuel transfer activities.

If hazardous materials or contaminated groundwater or soil are encountered at any time during construction efforts, the contractor would cease all work and notify the TCEQ and other pertinent agencies to determine the required course of action.

Routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials such as fuels, solvents and gases during construction or operation of the proposed project would be regulated by existing federal and state requirements. Spill prevention measures would be implemented during construction equipment refueling, minimizing potential impacts from spills during fuel transfer activities.



3.12.1.2 No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, no facilities would be built, nor land would be disturbed by construction activities beyond repairs, as needed; therefore, the No Action Alternative would have no direct, indirect or cumulative effects from hazardous materials.



3.13 Climate

The USACE evaluated climate and potential vulnerabilities from changing conditions for the Central area of El Paso as part of the El Paso, TX Flood Risk Management Study (USACE 2024). According to the study, the region (and likely the PROJECT SITE) is experiencing increasing temperatures, increasing evapotranspiration, and is at risk for flash flooding and debris flows such as the events that occurred in 2016.

3.13.1 Affected Environment

El Paso, TX, has an arid climate characterized by hot, dry summers and cool, dry winters. Summer temperatures peak in June with average maximum temperatures around 96°F; the coolest winter month is typically January with average maximum temperatures around 58°F, and average minimum temperatures just below freezing (31.6°F). Annual precipitation averages 8.56 inches, with most of the precipitation falling in brief but intensive convective storms during the summer monsoon season (late June through early October). Precipitation in July, August and September averages approximately 1.5 inches per month (Western Regional Climate Center, 2021).

Changing conditions have already been observed in the project area, including increases in average temperature in all seasons of the year. Changes in precipitation over recent decades are less clear. Several studies point to small recent increases in the intensity of one-day rainfall, but these changes are small relative to precipitation variability.

West Texas is anticipated to become more arid in the future overall, although monsoon season precipitation may increase slightly. Monsoon storms may become more intense: some studies projected increases of 9%-20% in the 20-year return period event by mid-century (Wuebbles, et al., 2017).

Based on results of USACE Climate Vulnerability Assessment tool, the primary factor contributing to future flood risk for the project area is the expectation that flood flows may be larger in the future. This is due to two factors: an increase in the frequency of larger storms, and an increase in the amount of precipitation that runs off. Under all scenarios, a larger share of the precipitation runs off compared to today, potentially increasing flood risk in the project area. This highlights the importance of the stormwater improvements EPWater has been making and the importance of improving the pump station.

3.13.2 Environmental Consequences

3.13.2.1 Proposed Action

The Proposed Action would produce minor amounts of carbon emissions (as CO_2) during construction, as presented in **Table 3.9.2.1**. BMPs to prevent air quality impacts, such as limiting idling of vehicles, would also help minimize CO_2 emissions.

The Proposed Action would make stormwater infrastructure in the Clardy Fox subdivision more resilient to changing conditions by enabling the pump station to handle the larger storm events that are expected to occur in the future.



3.13.2.2 No Action Alternative

Without the proposed improvements, the Clardy Fox subdivision would potentially experience poor drainage and increased street flooding from the more severe storms and increased runoff that are expected in the future. As noted above, this would also be an impact to socio-economic conditions.



4.0 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

4.1 Land use

No land use conversion or disturbance of classified lands or important farmlands is expected from the Proposed Action.

4.2 Floodplains

No floodplains would be affected by the Proposed Action.

4.3 Wetlands

No areas of wetlands are expected to be disturbed from the Proposed Action.

4.4 Historic Properties/Cultural Resources

No cultural resources are expected to be adversely affected by the Proposed Action. If cultural materials are encountered during project activities, work should cease in the immediate area. However, work can continue in areas where no cultural materials are present. The Texas Historical Commission would be contacted to consult on further actions that may be necessary to protect cultural remains.

4.5 Biological Resources

No threatened or endangered species or critical habitats would be affected by the Proposed Action. ESSCO consulted with TPWD to determine if the Proposed Action will impact state-listed threatened and endangered species. A response received dated March 5, 2024 indicated no threatened or endangered species are expected to be discovered within the PROJECT SITE. Impacts to biological resources would be avoided by minimizing the amount of direct surface disturbance necessary to construct the project and by restoring disturbed areas back to preconstruction condition or better.

4.6 Water Resources

The Proposed Action would reduce standing surface water from stormwater flows within the Clardy Fox subdivision and drain treated stormwater into the Rio Grande River channel.

Since the aquifer listed above has not been designated as a sole source aquifer by USEPA, water quality would not be affected by the Proposed Action.

As groundwater may be encountered 30 feet or greater below ground surface, groundwater would not be affected by the Proposed Action.

4.7 Coastal Resources

Coastal resources are not present in the PROJECT SITE and were not analyzed.



4.8 Socio-economic Considerations

The proposed action would have a positive impact to socio-economic conditions in the neighborhoods surrounding the Project Area by providing improved stormwater drainage for an area that is economically at risk, whereas the No Action alternative would fail to serve this community.

4.9 Air Quality

The Proposed Action would have short-term, minor impacts on air quality that would be minimized through construction Best Management Practices. There would be no long-term impacts to air quality. Standard dust suppression techniques, such as watering of active construction areas, stockpiled material, and cleared areas, as well as limiting unnecessary idling of construction vehicles, limiting unnecessary project-related travel, maintaining vehicles in proper working condition, and shutting down construction machines that are not in use would minimize these air quality impacts from construction activities.

4.10 Transportation

The Proposed Action would have short-term, minor impacts on transportation that would be minimized through traffic control planning. There would be no long-term impacts to transportation. Ensuring accessibility to all residential, commercial and institutional facilities during construction would minimize transportation impacts. A traffic control plan would be implemented in appropriate areas and during appropriate hours of operation to reduce the impact of construction-related traffic by using traffic control measures such as flaggers and traffic signs.

4.11 Noise and Aesthetics

Because the PROJECT SITE is in a high-traffic, noisy area, additional noise impacts from construction activities under the Proposed Action would be short-term and minor. There would be no long-term change to background noise levels. During project construction activities, measures such as limiting unnecessary idling of construction vehicles, maintaining vehicles in proper working condition, and shutting down construction machines that are not in use would be employed to minimize additional noise impacts from construction activities. It is anticipated that construction activities would occur between 7:30 a.m. and 5:00 p.m. five days per week during construction activities, minimizing noise impacts to residences located near the PROJECT SITE.

4.12 Hazardous Materials

No hazardous materials are known to exist at the PROJECT SITE. If hazardous materials or contaminated groundwater or soil are encountered at any time during construction efforts, the contractor would cease all work and notify the TCEQ and other pertinent agencies to determine the required course of action.

Routine transport, use or disposal of hazardous materials such as fuels, solvents and gases during construction or operation of the proposed project would be regulated by existing federal and state requirements. Spill prevention measures would be implemented during construction equipment refueling, minimizing potential impacts from spills during fuel transfer activities.



4.13 Climate

The Proposed Action would make stormwater infrastructure in the Clardy Fox subdivision more resilient to expected future changes by enabling the pump station to handle the larger storm events that are expected to occur in the future.



5.0 BEST MANAGEMENT PRACTICES

Best management practices represent specific actions to minimize potential for impacts to natural and cultural resources. Best management practices for the Proposed Action include the following.

- The project contractor would be vigilant for the presence of cultural materials in construction areas. If cultural materials are encountered during construction, work must cease in the area and the Texas Historical Commission must be contacted to consult on the preservation of cultural materials. Work can continue in areas where cultural materials are not present.
- During construction activities, erosion controls would be maintained until disturbed areas are stabilized. Best management practices would be developed as part of the required SWPPP and in compliance with all federal, state, and local regulations, including Sections 402 and 404 of the CW A and rules established under the 30 TAC (Texas Water Code).
- Standard dust suppression techniques, such as watering of active construction areas, stockpiled material, and cleared areas, as well as limiting unnecessary idling of construction vehicles, limiting unnecessary project-related travel, maintaining vehicles in proper working condition, and shutting down construction machines that are not in use would minimize air quality impacts from construction activities.
- The amount of direct surface disturbance necessary to construct the project would be minimized. Following construction activities, unless otherwise requested by landowners, disturbed areas would be revegetated as soon as possible with a native plant species seed mixture appropriate for the land type. Prompt application of native vegetation would allow for efficient establishment and would include the use of regionally native vegetation and approved seed mixes for landscaping.
- The removal of shrubs, clearing of Right of Way (ROW), and construction would be conducted outside of the migratory bird breeding season and/or the ROWs would be surveyed for active nests prior to and during construction to ensure the preservation of the nests. If active nests are found during the survey, construction would not occur in the vicinity until the offspring fledge or the nest fails or is abandoned.
- If vegetation removal during migratory bird breeding season is necessary, a qualified environmental monitor would be provided during construction to survey for T&E species and nests of migratory birds to ensure the prevention of direct or indirect take of any federally or state-listed species.
- A traffic control plan would be implemented in appropriate areas and during appropriate hours of operation to reduce the impact of construction-related traffic to residences and business by using traffic control measures such as flaggers and traffic signs. Ensuring accessibility to all residential, commercial and institutional facilities during construction would minimize transportation impacts.
- Spill prevention measures would be implemented during construction equipment refueling, thus minimizing potential impacts from spills during fuel transfer activities. Routine transport, use and disposal of hazardous materials such as fuels, solvents and gases during



construction or operation of the proposed project would be regulated by existing federal and state requirements.

- If hazardous materials or contaminated groundwater or soil are encountered at any time during construction efforts, the contractor would cease all work and notify the TCEQ and other pertinent agencies to determine the required course of action.
- If cultural materials are encountered during construction or disturbance activities, work should cease in the immediate area; work can continue where no cultural materials are present. Please contact the THC's Archeology Division at 512-463-6096 to consult on further actions that may be necessary to protect the cultural remains.
- Comply with all federal, state, and local laws that protect fish and wildlife.
- If private land is to be acquired during the acquisition of previous developed property to facilitate the Proposed Action, fair market value should be paid to the owner of purchased lands.
- Equipment entering and leaving the site would be cleaned to prevent the spread of invasive species and noxious weeds (e.g. Salt Cedar), including invasive plant seeds or parts.



6.0 PUBLIC REVIEW

Public review of the Draft Environmental Assessment (DEA) was held from December 15, 2024, until January 15, 2025. The DEA was made available electronically at the Albuquerque District website and paper copies of the DEA were available for review at the Clardy Fox Library (5515 Robert Alva Ave, El Paso, TX 79905) and the TecH2O Center (10751 Montana Ave, El Paso, TX 79936). Letters inviting comment were sent to the agencies and entities listed below. The U.S. International Boundary and Waters Commission and the Texas Parks and Wildlife acknowledged receipt of the DEA but had no comments on the proposed project. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service provided recommendations to avoid or minimize impacts to birds protected by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (*B-7 - Public Review*).

Federal Agencies

Federal Emergency Management Agency

Larry Voice, Senior Engineer, Mitigation Division, FEMA Region 6 <u>larry.voice@fema.dhs.gov</u> Office: (940) 898-5419 Mobile: (940) 435-9078

International Boundary and Water Commission, U.S. Section (USIBWC)

Dr. Gilbert Anaya <u>gilbert.anaya@ibwc.gov</u> 4191 N. Mesa, El Paso, TX 79902 915-832-4710

US Fish and Wildlife Service – Texas Coastal Ecological Services Field Office

Ms. Dawn Gardiner, Field Supervisor, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service <u>dawn_gardiner@fws.gov</u> Texas Coastal ES Field Office, Alamo sub-office 3325 Green Jay Road Alamo, Texas 78516

USEPA Region 6

Mr. Robert Houston, Staff Director <u>Houston.Robert@epa.gov</u> Communities, Tribes and Environmental Assessment Office of the Regional Administrator, U.S. EPA Region 6 1201 Elm Street, Suite 500 Dallas, Texas 75270-2102

<u>State</u>

Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ)

Kent Waggoner, Regional Director, Region 6, El Paso <u>kent.waggoner@tceq.texas.gov</u> (512) 239-3500 401 E. Franklin Ave, Ste 560 El Paso TX 79901-1212 915-834-4949

March 11, 2025 EPWU-23-13



Texas Department of Transportation

Tomas Trevino, P.E., District Engineer, El Paso <u>Tomas.trevino@txdot.gov</u> 915-790-4204 13301 Gateway West, El Paso, TX 79928 cc: Antonio Santana District Hydraulics Engineer <u>Antonio.Santana@txdot.gov</u>

Texas Parks and Wildlife Department

Jessica Schmerler, Ecological and Environmental Planning Program Jessica.Schmerler@tpwd.texas.gov

Lois Balin, Urban Wildlife Biologist lois.balin@tpwd.texas.gov

<u>Local</u>

City of El Paso Floodplain Administrator

Kareem Dallo, P.E., CFM, CNU-A Engineering Division Manager & Floodplain Administrator <u>dallokf@elpasotexas.gov</u> (915) 212-1560

County Commissioner Precinct 2

David Stout 915-546-2111

Commissioner2@epcounty.com

District 2 City Representative

Josh Acevedo 915-212-0002

District2@elpasotexas.gov

Nearest Library

Clardy Fox Library 5515 Robert Alva Ave., El Paso, TX 79905 915-212-0456

Neighborhood Associations

Washington- Delta Neighborhood Association Ms. Cynthia Renteria 915-637-3026 Mr. Brian Lopez 915-996-3778



7.0 CORRESPONDENCE

7.1 Consultation

ESSCO has requested consultation with the following regulatory agencies:

- City of El Paso Floodplain Administrator
- Federal Emergency Management Agency
- Federal Highway Administration
- Native American Tribes
- Open Space Advisory Board
- Texas Commission on Environmental Quality
- Texas Department of Transportation
- Texas Historical Commission
- Texas Parks and Wildlife Department
- United States Border Patrol
- United States Department of Agriculture Natural Resources Conservation Service
- United States Environmental Protection Agency
- United States Fish and Wildlife Service
- United States International Boundary and Water Commission

The contacted agencies can be found in **B-8 - Contacted Agencies**.



8.0 LIST OF PREPARERS AND REVIEWERS

The following persons contributed to the preparation and review of this EA and development of technical support studies regarding the Proposed Action.

Name Title		Education	Years of Experience
Zakk Holguin, G.I.T.	Project Geologist ESSCO Environmental	B.S., Geological Sciences	5
Yvette Pereyra, M.S., P.G.	Project Manager ESSCO Environmental	M.S., Geological Sciences	7
Johanes Makahaube, PhD., P.E.	Senior Project Manager ESSCO Environmental	Ph.D., Civil Engineering	31

Table 8.1 – List of Report Preparers

Table 6.2 – List of Report Reviewers						
Name	Affiliation	Role				
Brian Sanchez	CIV USARMY CESPA USACE	Project Manager				
Robert Grimes	CIV USARMY CESPA USACE	Project Manager				
Kaitlyn Fuqua	CIV USARMY CESPA USACE	Archaeologist				
MAJ Robert Zebrowski	A21 SPA USACE	Reviewer				
Dana Price	CIV USARMY CESPA USACE	Reviewer				
Trevor Stevens	CIV USARMY CESPA USACE	Reviewer				

Table 8.2 – List of Report Reviewers



9.0 REFERENCES

The following documents were utilized in the preparation of this Environmental Assessment:

- ASTM International (ASTM), 2021, ASTM E 1527-21, Standard Practice for Environmental Site Assessments: Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Process, ASTM International, West Conshohocken, Pennsylvania.
- Banks Environmental Data, Inc., Historical Serial Photographs, "EPW-23-13_Clardy Fox," Order Number ES-143536, dated February 13, 2024.
- Banks Environmental Data, Inc., Regulatory Database Report, "EPW-23-13_Clardy Fox," Order Number ES-143536, dated February 13, 2024.
- Collins, E.W., and Raney, The University of Texas at Austin, Bureau of Economic Geology, Geologic Map of West Hueco Bolson, El Paso Region, Texas, (map), 1:100,000, Miscellaneous Map MM-40, 2000. Publication Order Number: MM0040.
- Corbisier, Chris. 2003. "Living With Noise". In: Public Roads July/August 2023. Federal Highway Administration. <u>https://highways.dot.gov/public-roads/julyaugust-2003/living-noise.</u>
- El Paso County Viewer Flood Zones, 2024. (Online). Available at <u>El Paso County Viewer</u> (arcgis.com). (Accessed March 2024).
- Federal Emergency Management Agency Flood Insurance Rate Maps, 2024. (Online). Available <u>https://msc.fema.gov/portal/search?AddressQuery=clardy%20fox%2C%20el%20paso%</u> <u>2C%20tx</u>. (Accessed March 2024).
- Parkhill Portfolio Website, 2024. (Online). Available at <u>https://parkhill.com/portfolio/project_name/clardy-fox-area-drainage-improvements/</u> (Accessed March 2024).
- Texas Historical Commission Online Atlas database, 2024. Online. Available at <u>Search Atlas: Texas Historical Commission (state.tx.us)</u>. (Accessed March 2024).
- Texas Parks and Wildlife Department (TPWD), El Paso County Endangered Species List, 2019. (Online). Available at <u>https://tpwd.texas.gov/gis/rtest/</u>. (Accessed March 2024).
- Texas Parks and Wildlife Department (TPWD), Endangered Species List Consultation for El Paso Water Clardy Fox Pump Station Project, Inquiry TPWD #51684.
- United States Department of Agriculture (USDA), Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS), Web Soil Survey, 2024. (Online). Available at http://websoilsurvey.nrcs.usda.gov. (Accessed March 2024).
- United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), 2024. City of El Paso, TX, FRM Feasibility Study, Appendix A: Climate. USACE, Albuquerque District, February 2024.



- United States Fish and Wildlife Service, 2024. Information for Planning and Consultation (Web application). <u>https://ipac.ecosphere.fws.gov/</u> (Accessed October 2024).
- United States Geological Survey: El Paso Quadrangle, Texas Chihuahua (map), 1:24,000. 7.5 Minute Series (Topographic), 2012. El Paso, TX-CHH, sheet 20121206.
- Wuebbles, D. et al., 2017. *Climate Science Special Report: Fourth National Climate Assessment Volume I*, Washington, DC: U.S. Global Change Research Program.