



Draft Environmental Assessment

# Town of Dunn Storm Shelter

Town of Dunn, Dane County, Wisconsin

PDMC-PJ-05-WI-2007-004

*November 2008*



**FEMA**

**U.S. Department of Homeland Security**  
**Department of Homeland Security**  
500 C Street, SW  
Washington, DC 20472

*This document was prepared by*

URS Group, Inc.  
200 Orchard Ridge Drive, Suite 101  
Gaithersburg, MD 20878

Contract No. HSFEHQ-06-D-0162  
Task Order No. HSFEHQ-06-J-0048

15707048.00100

*Prepared for*

FEMA Region V  
536 South Clark Street  
Chicago, IL 60605



# TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS .....	iii
SECTION ONE INTRODUCTION .....	1-1
1.1 Project Authority.....	1-1
1.2 Project Location .....	1-1
1.3 Project Description.....	1-1
SECTION TWO PURPOSE AND NEED.....	2-1
SECTION THREE ALTERNATIVES .....	3-1
3.1 Alternatives Considered and Dismissed .....	3-1
3.2 Alternatives Evaluated.....	3-1
3.2.1 Alternative 1: No Action.....	3-1
3.2.2 Alternative 2: Construction of a Storm Shelter and Driveway from Charles Lane (Proposed Action) .....	3-1
3.2.3 Alternative 3: Construction of a Storm Shelter and Driveway from Pike Lane.....	3-2
SECTION FOUR AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT AND IMPACTS.....	4-1
4.1 Geology and Soils.....	4-3
4.2 Water Resources .....	4-4
4.2.1 Surface Water.....	4-4
4.2.2 Floodplains.....	4-5
4.2.3 Waters of the U.S. including Wetlands.....	4-5
4.3 Transportation .....	4-7
4.4 Public Services and Utilities .....	4-8
4.5 Public Health and Safety.....	4-8
4.6 Hazardous Materials .....	4-9
4.7 Environmental Justice.....	4-10
4.8 Air Quality .....	4-10
4.9 Noise .....	4-11
4.10 Biological Resources .....	4-11
4.11 Cultural Resources .....	4-13
SECTION FIVE CUMULATIVE IMPACTS .....	5-1
SECTION SIX PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT .....	6-1
SECTION SEVEN AGENCY COORDINATION AND PERMITS .....	7-1

**TABLE OF CONTENTS**

---

SECTION EIGHT CONCLUSIONS ..... 8-1

SECTION NINE REFERENCES ..... 9-1

Tables

Table 1: Impact and Mitigation Summary ..... 4-1

Appendices

- Appendix A Figures
- Appendix B Site Photographs
- Appendix C Agency Coordination
- Appendix D Public Notice of Draft EA

## Acronyms and Abbreviations

---

ACHP	Advisory Council on Historic Preservation
ADA	Americans with Disabilities Act
amsl	above mean sea level
APE	Area of Potential Effects
BMP	Best Management Practice
BRRTS	Bureau for Remediation and Redevelopment Tracking System
CAA	Clean Air Act
CEQ	Council on Environmental Quality
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
CO	carbon monoxide
CWA	Clean Water Act
dB	decibel
DNL	Day-Night Average Sound Level
EA	Environmental Assessment
EIS	Environmental Impact Statement
EO	Executive Order
EPA	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency
FIRM	Flood Insurance Rate Map
FONSI	Finding of No Significant Impact
FPPA	Farmland Protection Policy Act
JD	Jurisdictional Determination
LUST	Leaking Underground Storage Tank
NAAQS	National Ambient Air Quality Standards
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
NFIP	National Flood Insurance Program
NHPA	National Historic Preservation Act
NOAA	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
NO <sub>2</sub>	nitrogen dioxide
NRCS	Natural Resources Conservation Service
NRHP	National Register of Historic Places
O <sub>3</sub>	ozone
OSHA	Occupational Safety and Health Administration
Pb	lead
PDM-C	Pre-Disaster Mitigation–Competitive
PM <sub>2.5</sub>	particulate matter less than 2.5 microns

## Acronyms and Abbreviations

---

PM <sub>10</sub>	particulate matter less than 10 microns
SHPO	State Historic Preservation Office
SO <sub>2</sub>	sulfur dioxide
SWPPP	Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan
THPO	Tribal Historic Preservation Office
USACE	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
USDA	U.S. Department of Agriculture
USFWS	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
UST	Underground Storage Tank
VOC	volatile organic compound
WDNR	Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources
WHS	Wisconsin Historical Society
WPDES	Wisconsin Pollutant Discharge Elimination System

**SECTION ONE INTRODUCTION****1.1 PROJECT AUTHORITY**

The Town of Dunn has applied to the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) for assistance with a Pre-Disaster Mitigation Project under application number PDMC-PJ-05-WI-2007-004. FEMA grants funds under the Pre-Disaster Mitigation – Competitive (PDM-C) program, under Section 406 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act, for pre-disaster mitigation activities that reduce overall risks to the population and structures, as well as reliance on funding from actual disaster declarations.

In accordance with 44 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) for FEMA, Subpart B, Agency Implementing Procedures, Part 10.9, an Environmental Assessment (EA) is being prepared pursuant to Section 102 of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969, as implemented by the regulations promulgated by the President’s Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ; 40 CFR Parts 1500-1508). The purpose of the EA is to analyze the potential environmental impacts of the proposed project, and to determine whether to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) or a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI).

**1.2 PROJECT LOCATION**

The Town of Dunn is a rural community located directly south of the capital city of Madison, in Dane County in south-central Wisconsin (Figure 1, Appendix A). The Town of Dunn has a total area of 34.4 square miles (mi<sup>2</sup>) and a population of 5,270 (U.S. Census Bureau, 2000a).

The proposed project site is located within the Bay View Heights Mobile Home Park at U.S. Highway 51 and Charles Lane in the Town of Dunn (see project area photographs in Appendix B). The mobile home park accommodates 228 manufactured homes and 577 residents, 11 percent of the Town’s population. Geographic coordinates of the proposed project site are latitude 42.95510, longitude -89.28700. The proposed project site is bordered by Charles Lane to the north, Norman Drive to the west, and Pike Lane to the east. A wetland/floodplain forest is located south of the project site. The proposed project site is located approximately 1,700 feet west of Lake Kegonsa, and an unnamed tributary to Lake Kegonsa is located 1,050 feet south of the proposed project site.

**1.3 PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

The proposed project would construct a safe room/storm shelter compliant with FEMA 361, *Design and Construction Guidance for Community Shelters*, to provide shelter to the residents of the Bay View Heights Mobile Home Park during severe weather events.

### SECTION TWO PURPOSE AND NEED

The Town of Dunn and Dane County are located within FEMA Wind Zone IV, which designates areas prone to having winds over 250 miles per hour (FEMA, 2008).

The purpose and need for the proposed project is to provide an emergency facility to protect the residents of the Bay View Heights Mobile Home Park during severe weather events such as tornadoes.

The need for a storm shelter at Bay View Heights has been identified as a high priority in the adopted and approved *Dane County Natural Hazard Mitigation Plan* (Dane County, 2004). The Town of Dunn has also identified the construction of a storm shelter at Bay View Heights as a high priority hazard mitigation project. Currently, the mobile home park does not have adequate shelter from tornadoes and high wind events, which are frequent in the area. The mobile home park is in an isolated, rural area, which limits the alternatives available for nearby shelter. The mobile home park is densely populated, and individuals and families seek refuge from storms by driving to neighboring communities or remaining in their homes. Between 1844 and 2006, 63 tornadoes were recorded in Dane County. More tornadoes have occurred in Dane County than any other county in the state (Dunn, 2007a). The construction of this storm shelter would provide protection for residents in an area of the state prone to high winds.

## SECTION THREE ALTERNATIVES

This section describes the alternatives that were considered in addressing the purpose and need stated in Section 2. One alternative was considered and dismissed, as discussed in Section 3.1. Three alternatives were evaluated further, as discussed in Section 3.2: the No Action Alternative; the Proposed Action Alternative, which includes a 40-foot by 84-foot storm shelter with an access driveway from Charles Lane; and Alternative 3, which includes a 40-foot by 84-foot storm shelter with an access driveway from Pike Lane.

### 3.1 ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED AND DISMISSED

#### *Underground Prefabricated Shelter Units*

Installing multiple underground fiberglass or steel prefabricated shelter units was an alternative considered. Protecting the approximately 577 residents of the mobile home park would require 57 shelters with a 10-person capacity or up to 18 shelters with a 32-person capacity. The shelter units would be placed in 10 to 14 different locations within the mobile home park. While installing multiple shelters would shorten the walking distance for some residents, the security of these multiple locations would be difficult to manage. The units would have to be locked to prevent misuse, and opened quickly in the event of severe weather. Approximately 10 mobile homes would need to be removed to accommodate the shelter units. Since there are no other mobile home sites available within the mobile home park, 10 households would be displaced. The owners of the mobile home park would not agree to lease or donate the land for this alternative because it would result in reduced revenues, create security problems, and would be difficult to educate residents due to high resident turnover and language barriers. Soil maps indicate that installing underground structures in some areas of the mobile home park would not be feasible (Dunn, 2007a). For these reasons, this alternative was not considered to be feasible and was dismissed from further consideration.

### 3.2 ALTERNATIVES EVALUATED

#### 3.2.1 Alternative 1: No Action

Under the No Action Alternative, a storm shelter would not be constructed at the Bay View Heights Mobile Home Park. The residents would continue to be unprotected during severe weather events.

#### 3.2.2 Alternative 2: Construction of a Storm Shelter and Driveway from Charles Lane (Proposed Action)

Under the Proposed Action Alternative, the Town of Dunn proposes to construct a 3,360-square-foot storm shelter and gravel access driveway within the Bay View Heights Mobile Home Park. Under its current design, the maximum shelter occupancy is approximately 550. The proposed site plan for the storm shelter is shown in Figure 2 in Appendix A.

The 1.08-acre site is currently vacant, mowed land adjacent to the developed mobile home park. Prior to the development of the mobile home park in 1970, the land was under agricultural use. From 1970 to 1989, the land was used for two of the original septic systems and drain fields for the mobile home park, and the land was maintained as a mowed grassy open space over the drain fields. The septic systems were abandoned in 1989 when the mobile home park was connected to

municipal sewer. From 1989 to the present, the land has been maintained as a mowed, grassy open space. The Town has secured a lease option agreement with the land owner for the donation of a 98-year lease for the land.

The proposed storm shelter would be a 40-foot by 84-foot, single-story, slab-on-grade structure constructed with reinforced masonry designed to withstand 250-mile-per-hour winds. The proposed structure would include a safe room, six restroom facilities, a mechanical room, and an emergency backup generator (Figure 3 in Appendix A). A gravel driveway would provide access to the storm shelter. The approximately 700-foot long driveway would extend to the east from the dead end at Norman Drive and turn north to connect to Charles Lane. A gravel parking area located on the north side of the shelter would provide a limited number of parking and handicapped parking spaces. The driveway would be 22 feet wide to accommodate two-way traffic. The proposed facility would tie into existing public utilities and infrastructure located on site.

Approximately 1,930 tons of gravel would be used during construction of the driveway. Approximately 1,160 cubic yards of material would be excavated and used as fill at the mobile home park. Excess material would not be placed within a floodway, floodplain, or wetland and will be disposed of in a licensed landfill.

The shelter would be compliant with FEMA 361 standards for community shelters, including capacity, design, and construction. The proposed project would be designed in accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), providing accessibility to all residents of the Bay View Heights Mobile Home Park.

### **3.2.3 Alternative 3: Construction of a Storm Shelter and Driveway from Pike Lane**

Alternative 3 consists of the construction of the 3,360-square-foot storm shelter within the Bay View Heights Mobile Home Park in the same location as the Proposed Action Alternative; however, access to the shelter facility would be via an alternate route. The 1,300-foot-long driveway under this alternative would extend to the east from the dead end at Norman Drive to Pike Lane. Due to the driveway's longer length, the proposed project site increases to 1.65 acres. The proposed site plan for this alternative is shown in Figure 4 in Appendix A.

The gravel parking area would be located in the same location as the Proposed Action and would provide a limited number of parking and handicapped parking spaces for the storm shelter. The driveway would be 22 feet wide to accommodate two-way traffic. The proposed facility would tie into existing public utilities and infrastructure located on site.

Approximately 2,700 tons of gravel would be used during construction of the driveway. Approximately 1,600 cubic yards of material would be excavated and used as fill at the mobile home park. Excess material would not be placed within a floodway, floodplain, or wetland.

The shelter would be compliant with FEMA 361 standards for community shelters, including capacity, design, and construction. The proposed project would be designed in accordance with the ADA, providing accessibility to all residents of the Bay View Heights Mobile Home Park.

**SECTION FOUR    AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT AND IMPACTS**

This section describes the potential impacts of the proposed alternatives and the No-Action Alternative. Where potential impacts exist, conditions or mitigation measures to offset these impacts are detailed in the body of the document. A summary table is provided below.

**Table 1: Impact and Mitigation Summary**

<b>Affected Environment</b>	<b>Impacts</b>	<b>Mitigation</b>
<b>Geology and Soils</b>	Alternative 2, Proposed Action: No impacts to geology; short-term impacts to soils during the construction period.	Appropriate Best Management Practices (BMPs), such as installing silt fences and revegetating bare soils immediately upon completion of construction to stabilize soils would minimize runoff.
	Alternative 3: No impacts to geology; short-term impacts to soils during the construction period.	
<b>Surface Water</b>	Alternative 2, Proposed Action: Temporary short-term impacts to surface water are possible during construction activities.	A Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and a Wisconsin Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (WPDES) permit must be obtained prior to construction; appropriate BMPs, such as installing silt fences and revegetating bare soils, would minimize runoff.
	Alternative 3: Temporary short-term impacts to surface water are possible during construction activities.	
<b>Groundwater</b>	Alternative 2, Proposed Action: No impacts to groundwater are anticipated.	None
	Alternative 3: No impacts to groundwater are anticipated.	
<b>Floodplains</b>	Alternative 2, Proposed Action: No impacts to the floodplain are anticipated.	None
	Alternative 3: No impacts to the floodplain are anticipated.	
<b>Waters of the U.S. Including Wetlands</b>	Alternative 2, Proposed Action: No direct impacts to waters of the U.S., including wetlands, would occur because none are present on the proposed project site.	To mitigate potential impacts to water resources in the area during construction, appropriate BMPs would be required at the construction site. BMPs include, but are not limited to, the installation of silt fences and revegetating bare soils to minimize erosion.

## Affected Environment and Impacts

Affected Environment	Impacts	Mitigation
	Alternative 3: No direct impacts to waters of the U.S., including wetlands, would occur because none are present on the proposed project site. However, based on the revised wetland boundary, the eastern end of the access road would likely fall within the 100-foot wetland/floodplain buffer, which would require coordination with the Town of Dunn	To mitigate potential impacts to water resources in the area during construction, appropriate BMPs would be required at the construction site. BMPs include, but are not limited to, the installation of silt fences and revegetating bare soils to minimize erosion.
<b>Transportation</b>	Alternatives 2 and 3: Minor temporary increase in the volume of construction traffic on roads in the immediate vicinity of the proposed project site.	Construction vehicles and equipment would be stored on site during project construction and appropriate signage would be posted on affected roadways.
<b>Public Services and Utilities</b>	Alternative 2, Proposed Action: No impacts to public services or utilities.	None
	Alternative 3: The eastern portion of the access driveway has the potential to impact a lift station. Shifting the access driveway to avoid the lift station may further encroach upon the wetland buffer, which would require coordination with the Town of Dunn.	To mitigate potential impacts to water resources in the area during construction, appropriate BMPs would be required at the construction site. BMPs include, but are not limited to, the installation of silt fences and revegetating bare soils to minimize erosion.
<b>Public Health and Safety</b>	Alternatives 2 and 3: No impacts to public health and safety are anticipated.	All construction activities would be performed using qualified personnel and in accordance with the standards specified in Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) regulations; appropriate signage and barriers should be in place prior to construction activities to alert pedestrians and motorists of project activities.
<b>Hazardous Materials</b>	Alternatives 2 and 3: No impacts related to hazardous materials or wastes are anticipated.	Proposed construction activities would require only minimal excavation. Any hazardous materials discovered, generated or used during construction would be handled and disposed of in accordance with applicable local, State, and Federal regulations.

## Affected Environment and Impacts

Affected Environment	Impacts	Mitigation
<b>Socioeconomic Resources</b>	Alternatives 2 and 3: No adverse socioeconomic impacts are anticipated.	None
<b>Environmental Justice</b>	Alternatives 2 and 3: No disproportionately high or adverse effect on minority or low-income populations is anticipated.	None
<b>Air Quality</b>	Alternatives 2 and 3: Short-term impacts to air quality would occur during the construction period.	Construction contractors would be required to water down construction areas when necessary; fuel-burning equipment running times would be kept to a minimum; engines would be properly maintained.
<b>Noise</b>	Alternatives 2 and 3: Short-term impacts to noise would occur at the proposed project site during the construction period.	Construction would take place during normal business hours and equipment would meet all local, State, and Federal noise regulations.
<b>Biological Resources</b>	Alternative 2, Proposed Action: 1.08 acres of mowed grass would be cleared for construction of the shelter and access road.	None
	Alternative 3: 1.65 acres of mowed grass would be cleared for construction of the shelter and access road.	
<b>Cultural Resources</b>	Alternatives 2 and 3: No impacts to archaeological or cultural resources are anticipated.	None

### 4.1 GEOLOGY AND SOILS

The project area is located in south-central Dane County, Wisconsin, which lies along the Western extreme of the Eastern Ridges and Lowlands province. This province is bordered on the west by the Central Plain and Western Upland provinces, and on the east by Lake Superior (Martin, 1965). The Eastern Ridges and Lowlands Province is dominated by relatively level topography with distinct but shallow features. The most common topographic features in this region are massive upland cuestas, or steeply escarped ridges, and the associated lowland plains called vales. Dane County encompasses a portion of the Magnesian cuesta. The bedrock of this landform is comprised largely of Magnesian limestone, while the upper stratum is dominated by Cambrian dolomite (Martin, 1965).

According to the U.S. Geological Survey 7.5-minute topographic map for the Cottage Grove, Madison East, Rutland, and Stoughton quadrangles, the approximate elevation of the proposed

project site is 850 to 860 feet above mean sea level (amsl). Surface topography slopes slightly to the south and west.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) online Web Soil Survey, indicates the proposed project site contains soils consisting of Batavia silt loam, gravelly substratum; Hayfield silt loam (Alternative 3 only); and Marshan silt loam (Alternative 3 only). The Batavia, gravelly substratum component has slopes ranging from 2 to 6 percent consisting of well-drained soil. This soil is not considered to be a hydric soil. The Hayfield component has slopes ranging from 0 to 3 percent consisting of somewhat poorly drained soil. This soil is not considered to be a hydric soil. The Marshan component has slopes ranging from 0 to 2 percent consisting of very poorly drained soil. This soil is considered to be a hydric soil (USDA, 2008).

Soils in the proposed project area are classified as prime farmland (USDA, 2008), which is generally subject to the Farmland Protection Policy Act (FPPA). The FPPA states that Federal agencies must “minimize the extent to which Federal programs contribute to the unnecessary conversion of farmland to nonagricultural uses...” A Farmland Conversion Impact Rating form (AD-1006) was completed (Appendix C) and resulted in a site assessment score of 58. The NRCS does not require the submission of Form AD-1006 in cases where the site assessment criteria score (Part VI of the form) is less than 60 points for each alternative (Wacker, personal communication, April 2008, Appendix C); therefore, it has been determined that FPPA would not apply to the proposed project.

Alternative 1, No Action – Under the No Action Alternative, no impacts to geology or soils would occur.

Alternative 2, Proposed Action – Under the Proposed Action Alternative, construction activities would not be deep enough to impact underlying geologic resources. Short-term impacts to soils would occur during the construction period. Appropriate BMPs would be used, such as installing silt fences and revegetating bare soils immediately upon completion of construction to stabilize soils.

Alternative 3 – Under this alternative, construction activities would not be deep enough to impact underlying geologic resources. Short-term impacts to soils would occur during the construction period. Appropriate BMPs would be used, such as installing silt fences and revegetating bare soils immediately upon completion of construction to stabilize soils.

## 4.2 WATER RESOURCES

### 4.2.1 Surface Water

The Clean Water Act (CWA), as amended in 1977, established the basic framework for regulating discharges of pollutants into waters of the United States.

The proposed project site slopes to the south and west; elevations on site range from 860 feet amsl on the northeastern portion of the site to 850 feet amsl in the southwestern portion of the site. Surface water flows south and southwest to an adjacent approximately 350-foot-long ditch off Norman Drive, which then flows southeast toward the wetland/floodplain (located south of the project site) and unnamed tributary to Lake Kegonsa. During a preliminary visit of the project site, the ditch contained water and supported wetland vegetation.

Alternative 1, No Action – Under the No Action Alternative, no adverse impacts to surface water would occur.

Alternative 2, Proposed Action – Under the Proposed Action Alternative, there would be no direct permanent impacts to surface waters. However, temporary short-term impacts to downstream surface waters could occur during the construction period due to soil erosion. The applicant would be required to submit a SWPPP and WPDES permit application prior to construction. To reduce impacts to surface water, the applicant would implement appropriate BMPs, such as installing silt fences and revegetating bare soils. Although impacts to the ditch off Norman Drive are not currently anticipated, if this ditch were to be affected, a detailed wetland/stream delineation and coordination with the USACE would be required to determine if it is considered waters of the United States and if there is a need for a Section 404 permit (see Figure 2).

Alternative 3 – Under Alternative 3, there would be no direct permanent impacts to surface waters. However, temporary short-term impacts to downstream surface waters could occur during the construction period due to soil erosion. The applicant would be required to submit a SWPPP and WPDES permit application prior to construction. To reduce impacts to surface water, the applicant would implement appropriate BMPs, such as installing silt fences and revegetating bare soils. Although impacts to the ditch off Norman Drive are not currently anticipated, if this ditch were to be affected, a detailed wetland/stream delineation and coordination with the USACE would be required to determine if it is considered waters of the United States and if there is a need for a Section 404 permit (see Figure 4).

### 4.2.2 Floodplains

Executive Order (EO) 11988 (Floodplain Management) requires Federal agencies to avoid direct or indirect support of development within the 100-year floodplain whenever there is a practicable alternative. FEMA uses Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRMs) to identify the regulatory 100-year floodplain for the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP). Consistent with EO 11988, FIRMs were examined during the preparation of this EA (FEMA, 2003; Community Panel Number 550250 0625 F). The proposed project site is located in Zone X, areas outside 500-year floodplain. The 100-year floodplain boundary is shown on Figures 2 and 4.

Alternative 1, No Action – Under the No Action Alternative, no impacts to the floodplain would occur.

Alternative 2, Proposed Action – Under the Proposed Action Alternative, no impacts to the floodplain are anticipated.

Alternative 3 – Under Alternative 3, no impacts to the floodplain are anticipated.

### 4.2.3 Waters of the U.S. including Wetlands

The USACE regulates the discharge of dredged or filled material into waters of the U.S., including wetlands, pursuant to Section 404 of the CWA. Additionally, EO 11990 (Protection of Wetlands) requires Federal agencies to avoid, to the extent possible, adverse impacts on wetlands. Wetlands in Wisconsin are also protected by the Department of Natural Resources (WDNR).

During a site visit on August 21, 2007, a URS biologist identified a wetland near the project site. Portions of the wetland are located approximately 100 feet from the eastern end of the project

site (Figures 2 and 4). This wetland was not formally delineated or surveyed. The wetland is estimated to be approximately 105 acres based on Dane County wetland data (Dunn, 2007b). The wetland encompasses an area designated as WDNR-protected land (Dunn, 2007c). Additionally, the Town maintains a 100-foot wetland/floodplain buffer to discourage filling or developing wetland and floodplain areas (Dunn, 2007b).

Based on review of aerial photographs and preliminary field observations, the wetland boundary from the Wisconsin Wetland Inventory map appears to be inaccurate. Wetland boundaries from secondary sources such as these are not always accurate. While the wetland was not delineated, an approximate revised wetland boundary is depicted on Figures 2 and 4 in addition to the Wisconsin Wetland Inventory boundary. Based on this information, there are no wetlands within the project site.

As mentioned in Section 4.2.1, Surface Water, an approximately 350-foot-long drainage ditch at the western boundary of the project site is located at the terminus of Norman Drive and runs southeasterly to the wetland/floodplain south of the project site.

The proposed project site is approximately 1,700 feet west of Lake Kegonsa. An unnamed tributary to Lake Kegonsa is located approximately 1050 feet south of the proposed project site, within an area of wetland as described above.

Alternative 1, No Action – Under the No Action Alternative, no impacts to waters of the U.S., including wetlands, would occur.

Alternative 2, Proposed Action – Under the Proposed Action Alternative, no direct impacts to waters of the U.S., including wetlands, would occur because none are present on the proposed project site. Wetlands near the proposed project site are outside of the area to be disturbed by grading or filling and would not be directly impacted by construction.

Both the USACE and the WDNR Science Services Bureau were sent information describing the proposed project in January 2008 (Appendix C). This initial project review request described the storm shelter's access road as crossing a drainage ditch on the western portion of site and requiring a culvert. On January 18, 2008, the USACE replied via e-mail with a request for additional information due to potential impacts to the ditch (Appendix C). The USACE's response further indicated a Jurisdictional Determination (JD) and permit authorization, if necessary, could take up to 6 months to receive. To avoid potential delays associated with the JD and permitting process, the proposed project was further refined to avoid the ditch and eliminate the need for a culvert. The proposed gravel driveway to the storm shelter was shifted to the north and away from the ditch. In March 2008, a revised project description and site plan was submitted to the USACE for review. In an e-mail response dated March 28, 2008, the USACE stated it had no objections to the proposed action as long as the drainage ditch from Norman Drive would be avoided (Appendix C). In an e-mail response on February 28, 2008, the WDNR did not identify any concerns with the proposed project (Appendix C).

During construction, minor adverse impacts to waters of the United States, including wetlands, could occur at the proposed project site. Implementation of BMPs would minimize erosion at the project location. To mitigate potential impacts to water resources in the area, appropriate BMPs would be required at the construction site. BMPs include, but are not limited to, the installation of silt fences and revegetating bare soils to minimize erosion.

Alternative 3 – Under Alternative 3, no direct impacts to waters of the U.S., including wetlands, would occur because none are present on the proposed project site. Based on the revised wetland boundary, however, the eastern end of the access road would likely fall within the 100-foot wetland/floodplain buffer, which would require coordination with the Town of Dunn (Figure 4).

During construction, minor adverse impacts to waters of the U.S., including wetlands, could occur at the proposed project site. Implementation of BMPs would minimize erosion at the project location. To mitigate potential impacts to water resources in the area, appropriate BMPs would be required at the construction site. BMPs include, but are not limited to, the installation of silt fences and revegetating bare soils to minimize erosion.

### 4.3 TRANSPORTATION

The proposed project site is located south of Charles Lane, east of Norman Drive and west of Pike Lane. These are local roadways within the mobile home park that provide access to residences and U.S. Highway 51.

Alternative 1, No Action – Under the No Action Alternative, there would be no changes to transportation.

Alternative 2, Proposed Action – Under the Proposed Action Alternative, there would be a minor temporary increase in the volume of construction traffic in the immediate vicinity of the proposed project site, potentially resulting in a slower traffic flow for the duration of the construction phase. To mitigate potential delays, construction vehicles and equipment would be stored on site during project construction and appropriate signage would be posted on affected roadways.

Over the long term, vehicle traffic would increase at the proposed project site only during severe weather and other emergency events, as some residents would drive to the shelter. It is anticipated that most residents would walk to the shelter, as it is within a 5-minute walk for residents. The storm shelter would have a gravel access drive paralleling Charles Lane and extending north to Charles Lane. A gravel parking area would be located between the storm shelter and access driveway. No significant adverse impacts to transportation, site access, or traffic levels are anticipated.

Alternative 3 – Under Alternative 3, there would be a minor temporary increase in the volume of construction traffic in the immediate vicinity of the proposed project site, potentially resulting in a slower traffic flow for the duration of the construction phase. To mitigate potential delays, construction vehicles and equipment would be stored on site during project construction and appropriate signage would be posted on affected roadways.

Over the long term, vehicle traffic would increase at the proposed project site only during severe weather and other emergency events, as some residents would drive to the shelter. It is anticipated that most residents would walk to the shelter since it is within a 5-minute walk for residents. The storm shelter would have a gravel access drive paralleling Charles Lane and extending east to Pike Lane. A gravel parking area would be located between the storm shelter and access driveway. No significant adverse impacts to transportation, site access, or traffic levels are anticipated.

### 4.4 PUBLIC SERVICES AND UTILITIES

The mobile home park is located in a designated “limited service area,” which means the Town provides limited urban services. The project area includes water and sanitary sewer utility lines; a lift station, and overhead electrical line (Figures 2 and 4).

Alternative 1, No Action – Under the No Action Alternative, there would be no changes to public services or utilities.

Alternative 2, Proposed Action – Under the Proposed Action Alternative, the addition of the Town-owned storm shelter would be a new public facility to serve residents of the mobile home park. The storm shelter would connect to existing utility lines within the mobile home park.

Alternative 3 – Under Alternative 3, the addition of the Town-owned storm shelter would be a new public facility to serve residents of the mobile home park. The storm shelter would connect to existing utility lines within the mobile home park. The eastern portion of the access driveway has the potential to impact a lift station; however, shifting the access driveway to avoid the lift station may further encroach upon the wetland buffer and would require coordination with the Town of Dunn. During construction, minor adverse impacts to waters of the U.S., including wetlands, could occur at the proposed project site. To mitigate potential impacts to water resources in the area, appropriate BMPs would be required at the construction site. BMPs include, but are not limited to, the installation of silt fences and revegetating bare soils to minimize erosion.

### 4.5 PUBLIC HEALTH AND SAFETY

This analysis includes health and safety issues of the area residents, the public at-large, and the protection of personnel involved in activities related to the implementation of the proposed construction of the storm shelter.

EO 13045, Protection of Children, requires Federal agencies to make it a high priority to identify and assess environmental health and safety risks that may disproportionately affect children.

Alternative 1, No Action – Under the No Action Alternative, there would be no construction and no direct impacts to safety of the population would occur. If an emergency event were to occur, residents of the mobile home park, including children, would continue to be at risk of injury and death during severe weather events such as tornadoes.

Alternative 2, Proposed Action – Under the Proposed Action Alternative, the storm shelter would provide protection for residents of the mobile home park, including children, during severe weather events. At maximum capacity, the storm shelter would accommodate approximately 550 residents.

Construction activities could also present safety risks to those performing the activities. To minimize risks to safety and human health, all construction activities would be performed using qualified personnel trained in the proper use of the appropriate equipment, including all appropriate safety precautions. Additionally, all activities would be conducted in a safe manner in accordance with the standards specified in the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) regulations. The appropriate signage and barriers would be in place prior to construction activities to alert pedestrians and motorists of project activities. There would be no disproportionate health and safety risks to children.

Alternative 3 – Under this alternative, the storm shelter would provide protection for residents of the mobile home park, including children, during severe weather events. At maximum capacity, the storm shelter would accommodate approximately 550 residents.

Construction activities could also present safety risks to those performing the activities. To minimize risks to safety and human health, all construction activities would be performed using qualified personnel trained in the proper use of the appropriate equipment, including all appropriate safety precautions. Additionally, all activities would be conducted in a safe manner in accordance with the standards specified in the OSHA regulations. The appropriate signage and barriers would be in place prior to construction activities to alert pedestrians and motorists of project activities. There would be no disproportionate health and safety risks to children.

### 4.6 HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

To determine the presence and approximate location of known hazardous materials in the vicinity of the project area, an Environmental Data Resources radius search was conducted in May 2008 (EDR, 2008) for the proposed project site and a search was conducted of the WDNR Bureau for Remediation and Redevelopment Tracking System (BRRTS) database (WDNR BRRTS, 2008). The database searches queried recorded Federal, State, and local hazardous materials and underground storage tank (UST) criteria to identify sites of potential concern.

No sites were located within the project area. One leaking underground storage tank (LUST) was identified approximately 0.5 mile from the project site at 1965 Barber Drive. This is a closed status site and is at a lower elevation than the project site, so migration of contaminants to the project area from this site is not likely. Two spill incidents occurred near the project site. One spill incident occurred on January 27, 2005 within the Bay View Heights Mobile Home Park. The other spill incident occurred on October 22, 1999 at the University of Wisconsin, Madison Physical Science laboratory at 3725 Schneider Drive, approximately 0.5 mile from the project site. Both of these sites are listed as closed.

No subsurface materials testing was conducted in the project area as part of this analysis. Conclusions are based on database review and review of topographic maps and aerial photographs.

Alternative 1, No Action – Under the No Action Alternative, there would be no construction and there would be no impacts related to hazardous materials or waste.

Alternative 2, Proposed Action – Under the Proposed Action Alternative, no hazardous materials or waste-related impacts are anticipated. Proposed construction activities would require only minimal excavation and should not expose hazardous materials or produce hazardous wastes. Any hazardous materials discovered, generated, or used during construction would be handled and disposed of in accordance with applicable local, State, and Federal regulations.

Alternative 3 – Under Alternative 3, no hazardous materials or waste-related impacts are anticipated. Proposed construction activities would require only minimal excavation and should not expose hazardous materials or produce hazardous wastes. Any hazardous materials discovered, generated, or used during construction would be handled and disposed of in accordance with applicable local, State, and Federal regulations.

### 4.7 ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE

EO 12898 (Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations) mandates that Federal agencies identify and address, as appropriate, disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of their programs, policies, and activities on minority and low-income populations. Socioeconomic and demographic data for the project area were analyzed to determine if a disproportionate number of minority or low-income persons have the potential to be adversely affected by the proposed project.

The Town of Dunn (2007a) states that there is a concentration of minority or low income populations near the project area. A review of the 2000 Census (U.S. Census Bureau, 2000b) verified populations in the vicinity of the project area as 5 percent minority and 2.5 percent low income.

Alternative 1, No Action – Under the No Action Alternative, there would be no disproportionately high and adverse effects on minority or low-income populations. All populations could potentially be adversely affected by the lack of a storm shelter at the mobile home park.

Alternative 2, Proposed Action – Under the Proposed Action Alternative, there would be no disproportionately high and adverse impacts on minority or low-income populations. Implementation of the Proposed Action Alternative would benefit all populations within the mobile home park by providing protection from severe weather.

Alternative 3 – Under this alternative, there would be no disproportionately high and adverse impacts on minority or low-income populations. Implementation of Alternative 3 would benefit all populations within the mobile home park by providing protection from severe weather.

### 4.8 AIR QUALITY

The Clean Air Act (CAA) requires that states adopt ambient air quality standards. The standards have been established to protect the public from potentially harmful amounts of pollutants. Under the CAA, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) establishes primary and secondary air quality standards. Primary air quality standards protect the public health, including the health of “sensitive populations, such as people with asthma, children, and older adults.” Secondary air quality standards protect public welfare by promoting ecosystems health, and preventing decreased visibility and damage to crops and buildings. EPA has set national ambient air quality standards (NAAQS) for the following six criteria pollutants: ozone (O<sub>3</sub>), particulate matter (PM<sub>2.5</sub>, PM<sub>10</sub>), nitrogen dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>), carbon monoxide (CO), sulfur dioxide (SO<sub>2</sub>), and lead (Pb). According to the EPA, Dane County is in attainment for all six criteria pollutants, meaning that criteria air pollutants do not exceed the NAAQS (EPA, 2008).

Alternative 1, No Action – Under the No Action Alternative, there would be no impacts to air quality because no construction would occur.

Alternative 2, Proposed Action – Under the Proposed Action Alternative, short-term impacts to air quality would occur during the construction of the proposed storm shelter. To reduce temporary impacts to air quality, the construction contractors would be required to water down construction areas when necessary to mitigate for fugitive dust. Emissions from fuel-burning internal combustion engines (e.g., heavy equipment and earthmoving machinery) could

temporarily increase the levels of some of the criteria pollutants, including CO, NO<sub>2</sub>, O<sub>3</sub>, PM<sub>10</sub>, and non-criteria pollutants such as volatile organic compounds (VOCs). To reduce the emission of criteria pollutants, fuel-burning equipment running times would be kept to a minimum and engines would be properly maintained.

Alternative 3 – Under the Proposed Action Alternative, short-term impacts to air quality would occur during the construction of the proposed storm shelter. To reduce temporary impacts to air quality, the construction contractors would be required to water down construction areas when necessary to mitigate for fugitive dust. Emissions from fuel-burning internal combustion engines (e.g., heavy equipment and earthmoving machinery) could temporarily increase the levels of some of the criteria pollutants, including CO, NO<sub>2</sub>, O<sub>3</sub>, PM<sub>10</sub>, and non-criteria pollutants such as VOCs. To reduce the emission of criteria pollutants, fuel-burning equipment running times would be kept to a minimum and engines would be properly maintained.

### 4.9 NOISE

Noise is generally defined as unwanted sound. Sound is most commonly measured in decibels (dB) on the A-weighted scale, which is the scale most similar to the range of sounds that the human ear can hear. The Day-Night Average Sound Level (DNL) is an average measure of sound. The DNL descriptor is accepted by Federal agencies as a standard for estimating sound impacts and establishing guidelines for compatible land uses. EPA guidelines, and those of many other Federal agencies, state that outdoor sound levels in excess of 55 dB DNL are “normally unacceptable” for noise-sensitive land uses such as residences, schools, or hospitals. The proposed project site is located within a residential area.

Alternative 1, No Action – Under the No Action Alternative, no impacts related to noise would occur.

Alternative 2, Proposed Action – Under the Proposed Action Alternative, temporary short-term increases in noise levels are anticipated during the construction period. To reduce noise levels during that period, construction activities would take place during normal business hours. Equipment and machinery installed at the proposed project site would meet all local, State, and Federal noise regulations.

Alternative 3 – Under Alternative 3, temporary short-term increases in noise levels are anticipated during the construction period. To reduce noise levels during that period, construction activities would take place during normal business hours. Equipment and machinery installed at the proposed project site would meet all local, State, and Federal noise regulations.

### 4.10 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

The proposed project site consists of an area of mowed grass. The proposed project site is surrounded by a residential mobile home community to the north and a wetland/floodplain to the south. The proposed project site supports wildlife common to undeveloped rural areas in Wisconsin, including songbirds, reptiles, amphibians, small mammals, and white-tailed deer (*Odocoileus virginianus*).

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) lists the following federally endangered (E) and threatened (T) species for Dane County (USFWS, 2008):

<b>Scientific Name</b>	<b>Common Name</b>	<b>Status</b>
<i>Grus americanus</i>	Whooping crane	Non-essential Experimental Population
<i>Lampsilis higginsii</i>	Higgins' eye pearly mussel	E
<i>Platanthera leucophaea</i>	Eastern prairie fringed orchid	T
<i>Lespedeza leptostachya</i>	Prairie bush-clover	T

A site visit conducted by a URS biologist on August 21, 2007, confirmed that the proposed project site does not contain habitat for any federally listed flora and fauna species; therefore, it is unlikely that any threatened and endangered species are present. URS requested USFWS comments on the proposed project with respect to potential impacts to federally threatened or endangered species or their critical habitat via letter on January 15, 2008 (Appendix C). In a letter dated February 11, 2008 (Appendix C) the USFWS responded that due to the project's location and on-site habitat, no federally listed species would be expected within the project area.

The WDNR Bureau of Endangered Resources was contacted on January 15, 2008 (Appendix C), for information regarding known occurrences of threatened, endangered, or otherwise significant plants, animals, natural plant communities, or other natural features. In a letter dated April 8, 2008 (Appendix C), the WDNR concluded that there are two known occurrences of rare species within 1 mile of the project site. The wild hyacinth (*Camassia scilloides*) has been recorded within the vicinity of the project site. This species' habitat is often located in moist prairie remnants, along roads and railroad rights-of-way. The WDNR stated that if suitable habitat exists on site, a survey is recommended. The WDNR further noted there does not appear to be suitable habitat on the proposed development property. Since the project site is a mowed, grassy field and the area adjacent to the project site is also a mowed, grassy field, a survey would not be necessary.

There are also historic records of the prairie vole, a State special concern mammal, in the vicinity of the project area. The WDNR concluded that since the project site is maintained by mowing, it is unlikely that the prairie vole is present. However, the WDNR indicated it may be present in surrounding areas with more suitable habitat and recommends limited use of chemicals and pesticides on grassland habitats. The use of chemicals and pesticides would not be associated with implementation of the proposed alternatives.

The WDNR Science Services Bureau was also contacted in January 2008 (Appendix C) for a project review. In an e-mail response on February 28, 2008, the WDNR did not identify any concerns with the proposed project (Appendix C).

Alternative 1, No Action – Under the No Action Alternative, no impacts to biological resources would occur.

Alternative 2, Proposed Action – Under the Proposed Action Alternative, 1.08 acres of mowed grass would be cleared for construction of the shelter and access road.

Alternative 3 – Under Alternative 3, 1.65 acres of mowed grass would be cleared for construction of the shelter and access road.

### 4.11 CULTURAL RESOURCES

Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), as amended, and implemented by 36 CFR Part 800, requires Federal agencies to consider the effects of their actions on historic properties and provide the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) an opportunity to comment on Federal projects that will have an effect on historic properties prior to implementation. Historic properties are defined as archaeological sites, standing structures, or other historic resources listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP).

On January 15, 2008, a letter requesting a project review and project information was sent to the Wisconsin Historical Society (WHS) (Appendix C). On January 28, 2008, the WHS replied with a recommendation that an archaeological survey be conducted (Appendix C).

In March 2008, URS conducted a Phase 1A Assessment (URS, 2008a) to determine the potential for archaeological resources within the project and the need for a Phase IB Archaeological Survey. The assessment methods included archaeological site file and historical research, analysis of project area topography, and pedestrian survey.

As part of the Phase IA Assessment, a review of archaeological site files showed that a total of four prehistoric archaeological sites (47DA106 [mound complex], 47DA107 [prehistoric lithic scatter/village], 47DA108 [prehistoric lithic scatter/campsite], and 47DA569 [mound complex]) were identified within 1 mile of the project area.

No recorded historic structures were identified within the project area, but four historic structures are located within 1 mile of the project area. Review of historic maps by Suydam (1836), Greeley (1855) and Harrison and Warner (1873), did not show any historic residences or farmsteads located directly within or adjacent to the project area. The Dane County map produced in 1861 by Menges and Ligowsky, however, suggests that the residence of O.C. Thompson is located close to the project area. Review of the 1914 United States Geological Survey map of Dane County showed several residences in the vicinity of the project area, but none within 750 feet. Previous research conducted at the Dane County Land Information Office indicated that a portion of the project area was disturbed between 1970 and 1989. A 54-foot by 104-foot abandoned gravel drain field was located along the proposed route of the western gravel drive for the proposed storm shelter. No other disturbance, other than historic plowing, was noted.

A pedestrian survey was conducted to evaluate the extent of ground disturbance and to examine the ground surface in order to identify archaeological features and artifacts, if present. Special attention was paid during the survey to the margins of wetlands and topographic highpoints. The pedestrian survey did not identify any additional archaeological sites or standing structures within the project area. However, topographic features indicated that the project area has a high potential to contain archaeological resources. The project area lies on a shallow terrace that slopes gently to the south toward a wetland. The margins of wetlands were often exploited by prehistoric peoples as a rich resource base. The fertile soils of these terraces have been plowed since the mid-nineteenth century, and these fields often contain evidence of historic farming techniques that can help illustrate past land use.

Based on the results of background research and pedestrian survey, a Phase I survey was recommended for the project area. On April 18, 2008, FEMA submitted the Phase IA

Assessment to WHS for review. The WHS responded in a letter dated April 28, 2008 (Appendix C) that they agreed with the recommendation that an archaeological survey (Phase IB survey) be conducted in all areas of proposed new ground disturbing activity, including those areas of previous agricultural activity.

In May 2008, URS conducted a Phase IB survey (URS, 2008b) to evaluate the presence or absence of archaeological resources within the area of potential effect (APE) for the proposed project. As part of the Phase IB survey, research was conducted at the Wisconsin State Historical Society. Additionally, the Wisconsin Archaeological Sites Inventory, the Bibliography of Archaeological Reports, the Wisconsin State Archives, and the Wisconsin Architecture and History Inventory were consulted during this examination.

Systematic shovel testing at 10-meter intervals was employed to investigate the project area. A total of 40 shovel test pits were excavated during the survey and did not result in the identification of any archaeological sites. Since no archaeological or historical resources were identified during the Phase IB survey, no further work is recommended with the study area.

FEMA submitted the Phase IB survey to WHS in June 2008. WHS reviewed the report along with subsequent additional information and concurred with the determination of no historic properties within the project APE (Appendix C, email consultation dated October 17, 2008 and FEMA determination letter dated November 18, 2008).

Tribal consultation letters were sent on January 16, 2008 to all federally recognized Tribes in the State of Wisconsin. To date, no Tribes have commented on the proposed project.

Alternative 1, No Action – Under the No Action Alternative, no impacts to archaeological or cultural resources would occur.

Alternative 2, Proposed Action – Under the Proposed Action Alternative, no impacts to archaeological or cultural resources are anticipated.

Alternative 3 – Under Alternative 3, no impacts to archaeological or cultural resources are anticipated.

### SECTION FIVE CUMULATIVE IMPACTS

According to CEQ regulations, cumulative impacts represent the “impact on the environment which results from the incremental impact of the action when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions, regardless of what agency (Federal or non-Federal) or person undertakes such other actions. Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor but collectively significant actions taking place over a period of time (40 CFR 1508.7).” In accordance with NEPA and to the extent reasonable and practical, this EA considered the combined effect of the Proposed Action Alternative and other actions occurring or proposed in the vicinity of the proposed project site.

No actions by others were identified as occurring or proposed in the vicinity of the proposed project site; therefore, no cumulative impacts are anticipated.

**SECTION SIX PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT**

FEMA is the lead Federal agency for conducting the NEPA compliance process for the Storm Shelter in the Town of Dunn, Dane County, Wisconsin. It is the goal of the lead agency to expedite the preparation and review of NEPA documents and to be responsive to the needs of the community and the purpose and need of the proposed action while meeting the intent of NEPA and complying with all NEPA provisions.

Interagency reviews have been conducted in the form of agency consultation letters sent to the agencies listed in Section 7.0.

During the Dane County hazard mitigation planning process, input was received from the public and other agencies resulting in a high priority designation for a storm shelter at Bay View Heights. In addition, the Town's Mobile Home Park Commission, which consists of mobile home park residents, has held public meetings to discuss the proposed project. A request for a solution to the problem of inadequate shelter has been voiced by residents of the mobile home park (Dunn, 2007a).

The Town of Dunn will notify the public of the availability of the draft Environment Assessment through publication of a public notice (see Appendix D) in a local newspaper. FEMA will conduct a public comment period commencing on the initial date of publication of the public notice.

### SECTION SEVEN AGENCY COORDINATION AND PERMITS

The following agencies and organizations were contacted to request project review during the preparation of this EA. Responses received to date are included in Appendix C.

- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
- U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Green Bay Ecological Services Field Office
- Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources, Bureau of Science Services
- Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources, Bureau of Endangered Resources
- Wisconsin Historical Society, Office of Preservation Planning

In accordance with applicable local, State, and Federal regulations, the applicant would be responsible for acquiring any necessary permits prior to commencing construction at the proposed project site. The following permits and approvals would be required prior to construction:

- WPDES/SWPPP (WDNR)
- Building Permit for construction of the storm shelter (Town of Dunn)
- Driveway Construction Permit (Town of Dunn)
- Erosion Control and Stormwater Management Permit (Dane County)
- Sanitary District Permit (District)
- Zoning change (Dane County, with recommendation from Town of Dunn)

**SECTION EIGHT CONCLUSIONS**

No impacts to geology, groundwater, floodplains, public services and utilities, public health and safety, hazardous materials, socioeconomic resources, environmental justice, biological resources and cultural resources are anticipated with the Proposed Action Alternative. During the construction period, short-term impacts to soils, surface water, transportation, air quality, and noise are anticipated. All short-term impacts require conditions to minimize and mitigate impacts to the proposed project site and surrounding areas.

### SECTION NINE REFERENCES

- Dane County Department of Emergency Management. 2004. *Dane County Draft Natural Hazard Mitigation Plan. Attachment 8: Town of Dunn*. September 30, 2004.
- Dunn, Town of. 2007a. Subgrant Project Application for Town of Dunn Storm Shelter.
- Dunn, Town of. 2007b. Town of Dunn Environmentally Sensitive Lands map, dated June 2007. [http://town.dunn.wi.us/LandUse/Map\\_Chapter%203%20Environmentally%20Sensitive%20Lands.pdf](http://town.dunn.wi.us/LandUse/Map_Chapter%203%20Environmentally%20Sensitive%20Lands.pdf). Accessed May 12, 2008.
- Dunn, Town of. 2007c. Town of Dunn Protected Lands map, updated October 16, 2007. <http://town.dunn.wi.us/maps/protected%20lands%20map.pdf>. Accessed January 2, 2008.
- Environmental Data Resources (EDR), Inc. 2008. *The EDR Radius Map Report with GeoCheck, Inquiry Number 2226564.1s*. Prepared for URS on May 22, 2008.
- Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA), 2008. Wind Zones in the United States, [http://www.fema.gov/plan/prevent/saferoom/tsfs02\\_wind\\_zones.shtm](http://www.fema.gov/plan/prevent/saferoom/tsfs02_wind_zones.shtm). Accessed May 9, 2008.
- FEMA. 2003, Flood Insurance Rate Map, Dane County, Wisconsin. Community Panel Number 550250 0625 F. Effective date: June 17, 2003.
- FEMA. 1996. National Environmental Policy Act, FEMA Desk Reference. May 14, 1996.
- Greeley, Horace. 1855. *Map of Madison and the Four Lakes Country, Dane County, Wisconsin*. Horace Greeley and Company. New York, NY.
- Harrison and Warner. 1873. Dunn Township Plat. *Atlas of Dane County Wisconsin*, pp. 33. Harrison and Warner and Company. Madison, WI.
- Martin, Lawrence. 1965. *The Physical Geography of Wisconsin*. University of Wisconsin Press. Madison, WI.
- Menges A and A. Ligowsky. 1861. *Map of Dane County, Wisconsin*. Menges and Ligowsky and Company. Madison, WI.
- National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA). 2004. State Coastal Zone Boundaries. April 22, 2004. <http://coastalmanagement.noaa.gov/mystate/docs/StateCZBoundaries.pdf>. Accessed June 2, 2008.
- Suydam, John B. 1836. *Map of the Four Lakes Country, United States Land Office*. P. Desofry Lithographer. New York, NY.
- U.S. Census Bureau. 2000a. Wisconsin – Place and County Subdivision. [http://factfinder.census.gov/servlet/GCTTable?\\_bm=y&-context=gct&-ds\\_name=DEC\\_2000\\_SF1\\_U&-mt\\_name=DEC\\_2000\\_SF1\\_U\\_GCTPH1\\_ST7&-](http://factfinder.census.gov/servlet/GCTTable?_bm=y&-context=gct&-ds_name=DEC_2000_SF1_U&-mt_name=DEC_2000_SF1_U_GCTPH1_ST7&-)

- CONTEXT=gct&-tree\_id=4001&-geo\_id=04000US55&-format=ST-7%7CST-7S&-lang=en. Accessed May 13, 2008.
- U.S. Census Bureau. 2000b. American Fact Finder. <http://factfinder.census.gov>. Accessed May 13, 2008.
- U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), Natural Resources Conservation Service. 2008. <http://websoilsurvey.nrcs.usda.gov>. Accessed January 7, 2008.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). 2008. <http://www.fws.gov/midwest/angered/section7/sppranges/wisc-cty.html>. Accessed April 15, 2008.
- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). 2008. Air Quality. from <http://www.epa.gov/air/oaqps/greenbk/ancl.html#WISCONSIN>. Accessed March 11, 2008.
- URS. 2008a. *Final Report: Town of Dunn Storm Shelter Phase IA Assessment, Dane County, WI*. March 26 2006. Report prepared by URS for the Federal Emergency Management Agency, Chicago, IL.
- URS. 2008b. *Final Report: Town of Dunn Storm Shelter Phase IB Archaeological Survey, Dane County, WI*. June 5, 2008. Report prepared by URS for the Federal Emergency Management Agency, Chicago, IL.
- Wacker, Carl. 2008. USDA, Natural Resources Conservation Service. Personal communication with Nancy Stavish of URS on April 8, 2008.
- Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources Bureau of Remediation and Redevelopment Tracking System (WDNR BRRTS). 2008. <http://dnr.wi.gov/org/aw/rr/brrts/>. Accessed May 2008.



**Federal Emergency Management Agency**

**PUBLIC NOTICE**

**Notice of Availability of the Draft Environmental Assessment**

**For Town of Dunn Storm Shelter**

**Dane County, Wisconsin**

Environmental Assessment (EA) for the Town of Dunn Storm Shelter, Dane County, Wisconsin PDMC- PJ-05-WI-2007-004.

Interested persons are hereby notified that the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA)/Department of Homeland Security (DHS) is proposing to assist in the funding of safe room/storm shelter within the Bay View Heights Mobile Home Park located at U.S. Highway 51 and Charles Lane in the Town of Dunn to provide shelter for residents during severe weather events. In accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969 and the implementing regulations of FEMA, an EA is being prepared to assess the potential impacts of each of the proposed alternatives on the human and natural environment. This also provides public notice to invite public comments on the proposed project in accordance with Executive Order 11988, Floodplain Management, and Executive Order 11990, Protection of Wetlands. In addition, this notice and the draft EA provide information to the public on potential impacts to historic and cultural resources from the proposed undertaking, as outlined in the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) of 1966.

The draft EA is available for review between [date] and [date] at the Stoughton Public Library, 304 S. Fourth Street, Stoughton, WI 53589 and the Dunn Town Hall, 4156 County Road B, McFarland, WI 53558 during normal hours of operation. The draft EA is also available for review online at the FEMA website <http://www.fema.gov/plan/ehp/envdocuments/ea-region5.shtm>.

Written comments regarding this environmental action should be received no later than 5 p.m. on [date], by Amanda Ratliff, Regional Environmental Officer, FEMA, 536 South Clark Street, 6<sup>th</sup> Floor, Chicago, IL 60605-1521, or at [Amanda.Ratliff@dhs.gov](mailto:Amanda.Ratliff@dhs.gov).

If no substantive comments are received by the above deadline, the draft EA and associated Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) will become final and be published by FEMA. Substantive comments will be addressed as appropriate in the final documents.

The public may request a copy of the final environmental documents from Amanda Ratliff at the address listed above.