



DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
HUNTINGTON DISTRICT, CORPS OF ENGINEERS
502 EIGHTH STREET
HUNTINGTON, WEST VIRGINIA 25701-2070

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

Section 594 Town of Devola Sanitary Sewer Improvements Phase II Project Washington County, Ohio

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Huntington District (Corps) has conducted an environmental analysis in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, as amended. The Environmental Assessment (EA) dated **DATE**, for the Section 594 Devola Sanitary Sewer Improvements Phase II Project addresses the existing wastewater system which causes unsanitary and unsafe conditions to residents in the area of Washington County, Ohio. The need for improving the wastewater system is to provide residents with reliable and safe wastewater infrastructure.

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

- Installation of a low-pressure central sanitary sewer system that would include approximately eight miles of sewer main network to be installed at a minimum depth of three feet below the frost line via borings or directional drillings; connections to approximately 556 properties; individual effluent pump units at the exterior of each property to lift sewage and pressurize the system, thereby eliminating the potential need for a new major lift station; new meandering septic tanks, control panels and lateral connections to the sewer mains at each property; and disconnection and abandonment of the existing individual septic systems that are currently failing. Upon completion of the project, areas impacted by construction would be returned to their pre-existing conditions via right-of-way/driveway repair, seeding, and mulching.

SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL EFFECTS:

For all alternatives, the potential effects to the following resources were evaluated, as appropriate. The evaluation of effects was focused on key resources affected by the proposed alternatives. A summary assessment of the potential effects of the Proposed Action Alternative are listed in Table 1:

Table 1: Summary of Potential Effects of the Proposed Action

Resource	Insignificant effects	Insignificant effects as a result of mitigation	Resource unaffected by action
Aesthetics	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Air quality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Aquatic resources/wetlands	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Invasive species	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Fish and wildlife habitat	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Threatened/Endangered species	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Historic properties	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other cultural resources	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Floodplains	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Hazardous, toxic & radioactive waste	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Hydrology	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Land use	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Navigation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Noise levels	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Public infrastructure	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Socioeconomics	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Environmental justice	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Soils	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Tribal trust resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Water quality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Climate change	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Prime and Unique Farmland	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Wild and Scenic Rivers	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

All practical means to avoid or minimize adverse environmental effects were analyzed and incorporated into the Proposed Action Alternative. Best management practices (BMPs) as detailed in the final EA will be implemented to minimize impacts. For additional details of the proposed action alternative, see Section 3.0 of the final EA.

Pursuant to Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers determined that the recommended plan may affect, but is not likely to adversely effect, the following federally listed species of their designated critical habitat: Indiana bat, Northern long-eared bat, Fanshell mussel, Pink mucket pearly mussel, Rabbitsfoot, Sheepnose mussel, and Snuffbox mussel. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) concurred with the determination on 27 January 2022.

Pursuant to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers determined that historic properties would not be adversely affected by the recommended plan. The Ohio State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) concurred with the determination on **DATE**.

A 30-day public, state, and agency review of the Draft EA and Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) was completed on **DATE**. All comments submitted during the public review period were responded to in the Final EA and FONSI.

Technical, environmental, economic, and cost effectiveness criteria used in the formulation of alternative plans were those specified in the Water Resources Council's 1983 Economic and Environmental Principles and Guidelines for Water and Related Land Resources Implementation Studies. All applicable laws, executive orders, regulations, and local government plans were considered in evaluation of alternatives. Based on these reports, the reviews by other Federal, State, and local agencies, Tribes, input of the public, and the review by my staff, it is my determination that the recommended plan would not significantly affect the human environment; therefore, preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement is not required.

Date

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