



## **Draft Environmental Assessment**

# **Colona Central Fire Station**

**Colona, Illinois**

**EMW-2009-FC-02802**

**May 2010**



**FEMA**

U.S. Department of Homeland Security  
FEMA Region V  
536 South Clark Street  
Chicago, IL 60605

*Prepared by*  
Snarr Giffin & Associates, Inc.  
327 Edward Street  
Henry, IL 61537

# Table of Contents

	<u>Page</u>
Table of Contents	2
List of Acronyms	4
<b>SECTION 1: BACKGROUND</b>	<b>5</b>
1.1 Project Authority	5
1.2 Project Location	5
1.3 Purpose and Need	6
1.4 Existing Facility	7
<b>SECTION 2: ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS</b>	<b>7</b>
2.1 ALTERNATIVE 1 – NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE	7
2.2 ACTION ALTERNATIVE 2	7
2.3 ALTERNATIVE 3	8
2.4 ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED AND ELIMINATED	8
<b>SECTION 3: AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT AND CONSEQUENCES</b>	<b>8</b>
3.1 PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT	8
3.1.1 Geology, Seismicity and Soils	8
3.1.2 Water Resources and Water Quality	10
3.1.3 Floodplain Management	11
3.1.4 Air Quality	11
3.2 BIOLOGICAL ENVIRONMENT	12
3.2.1 Terrestrial and Aquatic Environment	12
3.2.2 Wetlands	13
3.2.3 Threatened and Endangered Species	14
3.3 HAZARDOUS MATERIALS	14
3.4 SOCIOECONOMICS	15
3.4.1 Zoning and Land Use	15
3.4.2 Visual Resources	15
3.4.3 Noise	16
3.4.4 Public Services and Utilities	17
3.4.5 Traffic and Circulation	18
3.4.6 Environmental Justice	18
3.4.7 Safety and Security	19
3.5 HISTORIC AND CULTURAL RESOURCES	19
3.6 COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES	20
<b>SECTION 4: CUMULATIVE IMPACTS</b>	<b>23</b>
<b>SECTION 5: PUBLIC PARTICIPATION</b>	<b>24</b>
<b>SECTION 6: MITIGATION MEASURES AND PERMITS</b>	<b>24</b>

## **Table of Contents (continued)**

<b>SECTION 7: CONSULTATIONS AND REFERENCES</b>	<b><u>Page</u></b> <b>25</b>
<b>SECTION 8: LIST OF PREPARERS</b>	<b>26</b>

## **List of Appendices**

<b>Appendix A</b>	<b>Figures</b>
<b>Appendix B</b>	<b>Site Photographs</b>
<b>Appendix C</b>	<b>Site &amp; Building Plans</b>
<b>Appendix D</b>	<b>Agency Coordination</b>
<b>Appendix E</b>	<b>Public Notice</b>

# LIST OF ACRONYMS

DHS	Department of Homeland Security
EA	Environmental Assessment
EMA	Emergency Management Agency
EOC	Emergency Operations Center
ESA	Endangered Species Act
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency
FIRM	Flood Insurance Rate Map
FONSI	Finding of No Significant Impact
IDNR	Illinois Department of Natural Resources
IEMA	Illinois Emergency Management Agency
IHPA	Illinois Historic Preservation Agency
LESA	Land Evaluation and Site Assessment
NRCS	Natural Resources Conservation Services
NWI	National Wetlands Inventory
USFWS	United States Fish and Wildlife Service

# **SECTION 1: BACKGROUND**

## **1.1 PROJECT AUTHORITY**

On September 23, 2009, Colona, Illinois was awarded a \$562,387 grant from the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) for the fiscal year 2009 American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) Assistance to Firefighters Fire Station Construction Grant (SCG), EMW-2009-FC-02802. This grant will be used to address the City's fire protection and emergency service deficiencies through construction of a new fire station.

In accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations implementing NEPA (40 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] Parts 1500 through 1508), and FEMA regulations for NEPA compliance (44 CFR Part 10), FEMA must fully understand and consider the environmental consequences of actions proposed for federal funding. The purpose of this Environmental Assessment (EA) is to meet FEMA's responsibilities under NEPA and to determine whether to prepare a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) or a Notice of Intent (NOI) to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) for the proposed project.

## **1.2 PROJECT LOCATION**

The City of Colona is located approximately 11 miles southeast of Moline, in Henry County, in Northwestern Illinois (refer to Figures in Appendix A). The new Fire Station will be constructed in the City of Colona, which provides fire protection for an area of approximately 3.6 miles. Henry County has a population of 51,020 (2000 US Census) and is Illinois' 29th largest county by land area (823 sq. miles). The City of Colona has a population of 5,173 (2000 US Census). Colona is located at latitude N41.465 and longitude W90.320 and is bisected by Interstate I-80. Colona, Illinois is located the following distances from the major cities listed:

◆	Moline, IL	11 miles
◆	Davenport, IA	16 miles
◆	Peoria, IL	78 miles
◆	Rockford, IL	114 miles
◆	Bloomington, IL	123 miles
◆	Springfield, IL	157 miles
◆	Chicago, IL	160 miles

As stated earlier, the project is located within the corporate limits of the City of Colona, Illinois. Refer to the Appendices A and B for location, site maps and photographs of the project location.

## **1.3 PURPOSE AND NEED**

The Colona Fire Department (CFD) provides fire services as well as emergency medical services, water rescue services, and hazardous material response to a population of approximately 5,000 people in an area encompassing approximately 3.6 square miles in Henry County. The fire department currently has mutual aid agreements with all surrounding agencies to help protect over 200,000 people. The Colona Fire Department has also been selected by the Department of Homeland Security to be on the statewide deployment call up list for intra-state and national responses.

The objective of the Federal Emergency Management Agency's (FEMA) Department of Homeland Security's Assistance to Firefighters Fire Station Construction Grant (SCG) is to provide financial assistance directly to fire departments to build new or modify existing fire stations in order for departments to enhance response capabilities and protect the community from fire and fire-related hazards.

The City of Colona faces a number of significant hazards; a comprehensive emergency response capability is necessary. The City of Colona:

- ◆ Has traffic flows that are hampered by The Santa Fe and Burlington Railroad Tracks, which circle the city completely in all directions and at all three of the existing fire station's exists. The location of the railroad infrastructure results in blocked exits and adding five to seven minutes to delay times. Lives have been lost and fires have become more defensive because of the longer response times.
- ◆ Has Emergency Management Service (EMS) responders hampered by the Iowa Interstate Railroad, which passes East and West on the North side of town.
- ◆ Has experienced a category 4 tornado in 1981. Colona has a tornado history slightly above the state average.
- ◆ Is in close proximity to one operable nuclear plant located in the Quad Cities, which is within fifteen miles of the City of Colona.
- ◆ Is in close proximity to the Mississippi River and bordered by the Rock River, Hennepin Canal and the Green River. The Green River and the Hennepin Canal are used today for recreational activities and enjoyment. The Mississippi River is utilized at times for transport of hazardous materials, which the Colona Fire District is on the response plan to protect.
- ◆ Includes two major interstate highways (I-80 and I-74), both of which involve the transporting of hazardous materials.

The City has one fire station, located at 401 First Street. There are numerous deficiencies related to the existing fire station facility, the most significant is the extended emergency response times caused by surrounding infrastructure including railroads and interstates. An estimated thirty-eight trains a day use the railroads in the City of Colona, this calculates to be over three hours a day that the crossings within the city limits are blocked. These crossings are blocked for approximately 5 to 7 minutes, resulting in significant delays in responding to fires and other community safety concerns. To complicate things even further, the northeast response-serving zone has the Interstate Railroad System passing east and west, which also cuts the fire department off from the existing station. Even though the Colona Fire Department has partnered with Henry County Emergency Services, they must travel from further away to cover the fire district, which also hinders response times. Additional limitations to fire department response time include the Hennepin Canal Parkway and three interstate systems through the county. The size of the existing facility, has limited space for storing equipment and other apparatus. This limited storage space hampers potential functionality of the facility by restricting free flow of EMS vehicles through the facility from the front doors to the rear doors.

The purpose of the action alternatives presented in this Environmental Assessment is to evaluate the best possible alternatives to improve the emergency response capabilities of the Colona Fire Department. The need for the project is to provide a new facility in a better geographic location for the CFD to effectively address the City's emergency management needs and reduce response time.

In accordance with federal laws and FEMA regulations, the EA process for a proposed federal action must include an evaluation of alternatives and a discussion of the potential environmental impacts. This EA was prepared in accordance with FEMA's regulations as required under NEPA. As part of this NEPA review, the requirements of other environmental laws and executive orders are addressed.

## **1.4 EXISTING FACILITY**

The existing facility is located at 401 First Street in Colona, Illinois. (Refer to Appendix A). While it is centrally located, the site is landlocked with no additional property currently owned by the City on any side for expansion. The existing facility has major emergency traffic flow problems due to temporary road closures at railroad crossing, dead end roads due to interstate highways and the inability to move freely due to the Hennepin Canal, Rock River and Green River. The current fire station is bordered on the West side by the Rock River. The other three existing points of access are completely surrounded by train tracks that are owned by Santa Fe and Burlington Railroads. All responders must travel east from the existing station when responding to call.

## **SECTION 2: ALTERNATIVE ANALYSIS**

As part of preparing the Environmental Assessment, alternatives to the Proposed Action must be evaluated. There were three alternatives considered for addressing the operational deficiencies: No Action Alternative, Proposed Action Alternative, and Expansion of the Existing Facility Alternative.

### **2.1 ALTERNATIVE 1 – NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE**

Under the “No Action” alternative, the Colona Fire Department would continue to utilize its existing facilities. The response times for emergencies would continue to be delayed by less than ideal traffic flows as a result of the existing railways, interstates, and rivers. The need for the new facility in a better geographical location would not be met. Risks to human health and safety associated with longer response times would not be mitigated.

### **2.2 ALTERNATIVE 2 – NEW FIRE STATION (PROPOSED ACTION)**

The proposed site is located on a 3 acre parcel, currently in agricultural use, in Section 13 Township 17 North Range 1 East of Colona Township. The new fire station will be located on the west side of Green River Road approximately 1,200 feet south of Poppy Garden Road at longitude of -90.320221 and latitude of 41.46556. This property does not have the same limiting factors such as proximity to railroad tracks, interstate highways and waterways. The new facility would provide expedient access to all major highway systems in the event of a response to any of the nearby high priority infrastructure including the Quad-City Nuclear Power generating plant, Rock Island Arsenal, Locks and Dams and major communication centers as well as the various transportation hub that surrounds Colona.

The proposed action is to construct a new 7,500 sq. ft. fire station that would include a two-door bay area with an attached support facility including kitchen, restrooms with shower decontamination, combination day-room / training area and four small sleeping rooms. This new station would also incorporate environmental controls with a CO filtration system; a non-skid bay floor and incorporation of building codes that will adhere to life safety standards. Water and sewer lines will be trenched in from the west side of the property and gas and electric will be trenched in from the east side of the property. Normal earth moving and excavating machinery will be utilized during construction activities.

The disturbed area will be contained to an area of approximately 125'x125'. Construction duration is estimated to be 90 to 150 days.

### **2.3 ALTERNATIVE 3 – EXPANDING EXISTING FACILITY**

The existing fire department facility is a structure built in 1984 and is located at 401 1<sup>st</sup> Street between 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> Avenue. The facility is generally centrally located within the city limits. The existing facility has four apparatus bays that must be stacked or entered from the street side. There is drive through capability

with rear doors; however, the rear doors cannot be used because of limited space for the storage of other equipment and apparatus are blocking the doors.

With this alternative there would be minimal environmental impacts associated with the expansion of the existing facility. However, in order to accommodate the need for additional floor space, expansion of the current Colona Central Fire Station would require the acquisition of additional property, negotiations with numerous property owners, and reconfiguration of the existing facility with the addition of new bays and additional floor space. Due to the configuration of the existing site and location of the station, it would be a major expansion/remodeling project. This alternative, however, would not reduce response times because it would still be within the area restricted by rail, rivers and interstates.

## **SECTION 3: AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT AND CONSEQUENCES**

### **3.1 PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT**

#### **3.1.1 Geology, Seismicity and Soils**

The project area is located in northwest Henry County, Illinois; this part of the county has generally rolling topography. The City of Colona is located in the Galesburg Plain formed during the Hudson Episode (Berg & Kempton 1987). The Galesburg Plain starts in Henry County just south of the Green River Lowland Plain and runs west and south to the Mississippi River and Hancock County then to the East to the Illinois River. The substrate is in the Hudson Episode and consists of the Cahokia Fm; river sand, gravel and silt. The bedrock geology is in the Pennsylvanian Tradewater Formation (ISGS 2005). This area generally contains bedrock deeper than 50 feet and as deep as 200 feet. The Illinois Episode glaciers left deposits of sand and gravel and scoured the landscape leaving multiple river and waterway valleys.

The topographic quad map for the area (See Appendix A) indicates that the proposed property is at approximately 612 feet above sea level and is not in a floodplain (See Appendix A). The surface is generally flat to slightly sloping.

The project area is located in an area with minimal earthquake activity as evidence by the “Earthquakes In Illinois 1795-2008” map and the “Illinois Seismic Hazard Map” that have been prepared by the Illinois State Geological Survey. (See Appendix A) During the period from 1795-2008, there have been two seismic events within 15 miles of the City of Colona with a magnitude of less than 4.0. The nearest fault line is the Plum River Fault Zone located in Carroll County approximately 45 miles north of the site. Henry County is generally not regarded as one of the counties in Illinois with a high risk for seismic activity. All architectural and engineering design best practices will be followed to conform to all local codes and ordinances regarding seismic design.

The Farmland Protection Policy Act (FPPA) (P.L. 97-98, Sec. 1539-1549; 7 U.S.C. 4201, et seq.), which states that federal agencies must “minimize the extent to which federal programs contribute to the unnecessary conversion of farmland to nonagricultural uses,” was considered in this EA. On February 22, 2010 the NRCS was contacted to determine the type of soil(s) and to analyze if any prime or unique soils exist in the project area. It was determined from coordination with a Resource Conservationist at the NRCS that a Land Evaluation and Site Assessment (LESA) would be performed to determine the potential for impacts to prime or unique farmland. In a response dated April 27, 2010 the Henry County Soil and Water Conservation District indicated that a Resource Conservationist completed the LESA and

found 2.9 acres of the 3.0-acre site to contain soils considered prime farm ground; however, based upon the LESA score of 131.5, it was determined not to be highly valued for preservation and the proposed use would be appropriate. According to the LESA system a score of 160 or more is the criteria that would indicate land that should be considered for preservation as farm ground. Included in Appendix C is an analysis of the soil(s) on the property as well as the completed LESA.

Below is a tabulation of the soil(s) and their characteristics (this is included in the attachments section with more detailed information regarding properties such as slope, etc.).

<u>Map Unit Symbol</u>	<u>Map Unit Name</u>	<u>Acres</u>	<u>Percent of Acres</u>
261A	Niota silt loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes	0.2	6.6%
262A	Denrock silt loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes	2.7	90.6%
800C	Psamments, sloping	0.1	2.8%
<b>TOTALS</b>		<b>3.0</b>	<b>100.0%</b>

Alternative 1, No Action

Under the No Action Alternative, no impacts related to geology, seismicity or soils would occur.

Alternative 2, New Fire Station (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 and approximately 3,000 S.Y. of the site would be disturbed. Temporary stockpiles of topsoil and other construction materials will be utilized during construction and any excess sediment will be re-deposited on the site during final grading. Appropriate best management practices (BMPs) such as temporary sediment basin, silt fence, prompt planting of vegetation, and completion of landscaping would be used to minimize runoff and erosion.

In compliance with FPPA, the proposed conversion was scored using the Farmland Conversion Impact Rating Form (AD-1600). The combined rating was 131.5. The FPPA states that sites with a rating less than 160 do not need any further consideration. A coordination letter from the NRCS is included in Appendix D.

Alternative 3, Expanding Existing Facility

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 such as temporary sediment basins, silt fence, prompt planting of vegetation, and completion of landscaping would be used to minimize runoff and erosion.

**3.1.2 Water Resources and Water Quality**

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

Existing site topography is shown on the project maps in Appendix A. The 3.0-acre site currently is vacant and chisel plowed as agricultural land. There are no rivers, creeks, or other defined drainages on the project site; however, there is a road drainage ditch along the east side of the property. Storm water leaves the site as sheet flow and generally flows to the south and west towards Mineral Creek that ultimately drains into the Green River.

The geographic region includes deep bedrock, shallow bedrock and other major sand and gravel aquifers. There are no known threats to the regions aquifers from this development or similar developments in the area. The drinking water for the area comes primarily from the regions aquifers. The watershed is the Green River watershed, which includes impaired waters as defined by the EPA. It is not anticipated that this development would contribute to the long-term impaired status of the watershed and Best Management Practices (BMPs) will be utilized during the short-term construction to minimize any impacts. Refer to the information in Appendix D regarding water tests for the Green River Watershed.

#### Alternative 1, No Action

Under the No Action Alternative, no adverse impacts to surface or ground water would occur.

#### Alternative 2, New Fire Station (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 because of soil erosion. To reduce impacts to surface water, the applicant would prepare as part of the construction plans for the proposed project a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) to be implemented during construction. Also, the applicant will use appropriate BMPs, such as installing silt fences, temporary sediment basins and prompt replanting of bare soils.

The existing site is an agricultural field and the proposed site will be a combination of pavement/roofs (impervious) and grass/landscape (pervious) area. The runoff rate will actually be reduced on this site because a majority of the existing agricultural field will be converted to grass and despite the additional impervious area, total storm water runoff for a given period of time because the grassed area will be a slower runoff rate than the existing agricultural field. Because of the reduced runoff rate of the proposed development, detention will not be required with the site improvements. However, BMPs will be utilized until final vegetation is established. In summary, the overall hydraulic conditions of the site would be improved with the proposed action.

A NPDES Permit for Storm Water Discharges from Construction Site Activities does not appear to be warranted for this project, because the construction activities impact an area of less than one acre. If it is determined that more than one acre will be disturbed during construction the applicant will submit to the Illinois EPA for a permit.

#### Alternative 3, Expanding Existing Facility

Under this 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 because of soil erosion. To reduce impacts to surface water, the applicant would implement appropriate BMPs, such as installing silt fences and prompt replanting of bare soils.

The hydrologic conditions would be negatively impacted under this alternative, because there would be additional impervious area without new detention facilities. A NPDES Permit for Storm Water Discharges from Construction Site Activities does not appear to be warranted for this project, because the construction activities impact an area of less than one acre. If it is determined that more than one acre will be disturbed during construction the applicant will submit to the Illinois EPA for a permit.

### **3.1.3 Floodplain Management (Executive Order 11988)**

Executive Order (EO) 11988 requires federal agencies to take action to minimize occupancy and modification of the floodplain. Specifically, EO 11988 prohibits federal agencies from funding construction in the 100-year floodplain unless there are no practicable alternatives. FEMA's regulations for complying with EO 11988 are promulgated in 44 CFR Part 9.

According to the National Flood Insurance Program's Flood Insurance Rate Map (Community- Panel Number 170739 0100 B and 170285 001 C), the existing project site and proposed project site are designated as Zone C and are not located within the 100-year or 500-year floodplain. Since the fire station is considered a critical facility, it cannot be located within the 500-year floodplain. Please see Appendix A for the floodplain maps.

#### Alternative 1, No Action

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

#### Alternative 2, New Fire Station (Proposed Action)

Under the Proposed Action Alternative, the site is not located within the floodplain and no impacts related to the floodplain are anticipated.

#### Alternative 3, Expanding Existing Facility

Under this Alternative, the site is not located within the floodplain and no impacts related to the floodplain are anticipated.

### **3.1.4 Air Quality**

The Clean Air Act requires the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to set National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) for pollutants considered harmful to public health and the environment; the Clean Air Act established two types of national air quality standards; primary standards set limits to protect public health, including the health of "sensitive" populations such as asthmatics, children, and the elderly; secondary standards set limits to protect public welfare, including protection against decreased visibility, damage to animals, crops, vegetation and buildings; current criteria pollutants are: Carbon Monoxide (CO), Nitrogen Dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>), Ozone (O<sub>3</sub>), Lead (Pb), Particulate Matter (PM<sub>10</sub>), and Sulfur Dioxide (SO<sub>2</sub>). According to the EPA, Henry County is in attainment for all six criteria pollutants, meaning that criteria air pollutants do not exceed the NAAQS (EPA, 2010).

#### Alternative 1, No Action

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

#### Alternative 2, New Fire Station (Proposed Action)

Under the Proposed Action Alternative, short-term impacts to air quality would occur during construction activities. To reduce impacts, the construction contractors would be required to wet down construction areas as needed to mitigate dust. Emissions from fuel-burning engines (e.g., heavy equipment and earthmoving machinery) could also temporarily increase the levels of some of the criteria pollutants, such as CO, NO<sub>2</sub>, O<sub>3</sub>, PM<sub>10</sub> and non-criteria pollutants such as volatile organic compounds (VOCs). To mitigate these emissions, fuel-burning equipment run times would be kept to a minimum and equipment would be properly maintained.

### Alternative 3, Expanding Existing Facility

Under this Alternative, short-term impacts to air quality would occur during remodeling/construction activities at the existing facility. To reduce impacts, the construction contractors would be required to wet down construction areas as needed to mitigate dust. Emissions from fuel-burning engines (e.g., heavy equipment and earthmoving machinery) could also temporarily increase the levels of some of the criteria pollutants, such as CO, NO<sub>2</sub>, O<sub>3</sub>, PM<sub>10</sub> and non-criteria pollutants such as VOCs. To mitigate these emissions, fuel-burning equipment run times would be kept to a minimum and equipment would be properly maintained.

## **3.2 BIOLOGICAL ENVIRONMENT**

### **3.2.1 Terrestrial and Aquatic Environment**

The proposed project site is an agriculture field on the eastern side of the City of Colona. The site and surrounding lands to the east have been primarily used in agricultural production over the last 50 years. The area to the west and north has been used as a campground for a number of decades. There is a single-family home just to the south of the proposed site that was built approximately 60 years ago. The proposed site supports wildlife common to rural agricultural land, including song birds, reptiles, amphibians, small mammals, and white tailed deer. Because the site and surrounding area has been farmed and developed, the area would be considered to have limited value for plant and wildlife species.

Coordination with the IDNR was initiated with an EcoCAT application submitted by Snarr, Giffin and Associates, Inc. to the IDNR dated January 11, 2010. The initial findings of the EcoCAT did show protected resources within the “vicinity” of the project. The identified resource is the Green River East & West Railroad Prairie INIA Site; however, a letter from the IDNR dated March 19, 2010, concluded after further evaluation, adverse affects to these resources are unlikely. The letter also provided concurrence with the preliminary finding of no wetlands, waterways, or other endangered resource impacts at the project site (refer to agency correspondence in Appendix D).

### Alternative 1, No Action

Under the No Action Alternative, there would be no impacts to the terrestrial or aquatic environments.

### Alternative 2, New Fire Station (Proposed Action)

Under the Proposed Action Alternative, impacts to nearby aquatic environments would not be a concern. The nearest stream is an unnamed tributary or roadside ditch to Mineral Creek nearly 1250 feet from the site. Some impacts to the terrestrial environment would result from the development of the site. About 3,000 SY of the site’s existing vegetation and topsoil would be disturbed. According to a letter from the IDNR, adverse affects are unlikely, but some vegetation and small animals would be temporarily

displaced. The final site and landscaping could provide areas for the plants and animals to return upon completion of the project.

### Alternative 3, Expanding Existing Facility

Under this Alternative, impacts to the terrestrial environment would not be a concern. The existing fire station and properties surrounding it are fully developed and consist of commercial and residential properties. Potential for short-term negative impacts to the aquatic environment of Hennepin Canal could result during construction. The most likely potential impact would result in a decrease in the quality of storm water runoff from the construction site. BMPs would be used to minimize impacts to storm water during construction.

### **3.2.2 Wetlands (Executive Order 11990)**

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, Executive Order (EO) 11990, Protection of Wetlands, requires federal agencies to take action to minimize the loss of wetlands. The NEPA compliance process requires federal agencies to consider direct and indirect impacts to wetlands, which may result from federally funded actions.

The National Wetland Inventory (NWI) Maps were consulted, it was determined that no wetlands exist on the proposed site. (See Appendix A) The closest known wetland is on a property to the south approximately 300 feet away. Also, a letter dated March 19, 2010, from the IDNR states that adverse effects to wetlands are unlikely.

### Alternative 1, No Action

Under the No Action Alternative, no impacts to wetlands are anticipated.

### Alternative 2, New Fire Station (Proposed Action)

Under the Proposed Action Alternative, no impacts to wetlands are anticipated.

### Alternative 3, Expanding Existing Facility

Under this Alternative, no impacts to wetlands are anticipated.

### **3.2.3 Threatened and Endangered Species**

The proposed project site is a farm field on the Eastern side of the city limits of Colona. The site and surrounding lands to the east have been primarily used in agricultural production in the last 50 years. The area to the west and north has been used as a campground for a number of decades. There is a single-family home just to the south of the proposed site that was built approximately 60 years ago. The proposed site supports wildlife common to rural agricultural land, including song birds, reptiles, amphibians, small mammals, and white tailed deer. Because the site and surrounding area has been farmed and developed, the area would be considered to have limited value for plant and wildlife species.

In accordance with Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act (ESA) of 1973, the project area was evaluated for the potential occurrences of federally listed threatened and endangered species. The ESA

requires any federal agency that funds, authorizes or carries out an action to ensure that their action is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of any endangered or threatened species (including plant species) or result in the destruction or adverse modification of designated critical habitats (FEMA 1996).

Research was performed to identify any potential Threatened, Endangered, Proposed, or Candidate species at the proposed project site. The following resources were reviewed: the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) listing of Threatened, Endangered, Proposed, or Candidate species for Henry County. On the USFWS Web Site, the Section 7 Technical Assistance Step by Step Instructions was followed to determine if any species or critical habitats may be present within the action area. Evaluation of Henry County found that the Indiana Bat and Eastern Prairie Fringed Orchid were listed as Endangered and Threatened, respectively. However, suitable habitats are not present and no further consultation is warranted. Refer to documentation provided in Appendix D.

In January 2010, the IDNR was sent an EcoCAT to initiate a consultation regarding Endangered Species. In a letter dated March 19, 2010, from the IDNR the consultation was terminated stating that adverse affects were unlikely. (See Appendix D).

#### Alternative 1, No Action

Under the No Action Alternative, no impacts to threatened and endangered species are anticipated.

#### Alternative 2, New Fire Station (Proposed Action)

Under the Proposed Action Alternative, based on the letter dated March 19, 2010 from the IDNR, no impacts to threatened and endangered species are anticipated.

#### Alternative 3, Expanding Existing Facility

Under this Alternative, no impacts to threatened and endangered species are anticipated.

### **3.3 HAZARDOUS MATERIALS**

There are no known hazardous materials on the proposed site. The property has been utilized for agricultural cropland for the past 50 years. The site is currently a non-vegetated agricultural field. There are no underground tanks, nor any other documented hazardous materials on the site.

#### Alternative 1, No Action

Under the No Action Alternative, no impacts due to hazardous materials are anticipated.

#### Alternative 2, New Fire Station (Proposed Action)

Under the Proposed Action Alternative, no impacts due to hazardous materials are anticipated. Proposed construction would require excavation for utilities, site grading, and the building foundation, but no hazardous materials would be anticipated. 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, Expanding Existing Facility

Under this Alternative, no impacts due to hazardous materials are anticipated. Proposed construction 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.

### **3.4 SOCIOECONOMICS**

#### **3.4.1 Zoning and Land Use**

The project site is a 3-acre site that contains no structures and is used agriculturally as farmland. The area surrounding the proposed site contains various types of buildings such as recreational and residential in the City of Colona, Henry County, IL. This property is on the eastern edge of Colona's corporate boundary. The site has been utilized for agricultural crops for nearly 100 years. The property was rezoned within the last 5 years from A-1 (agricultural) to B-4 (Business). A building permit would be required by the City of Colona and would be granted following a site design review by the City.

##### Alternative 1, No Action

Under the No Action Alternative, no impacts to zoning or land use are anticipated.

##### Alternative 2, New Fire Station (Proposed Action)

Under the Proposed Action Alternative, a building permit will be required by the local jurisdiction. The permit will be obtained from the City of Colona prior to commencing work on the project. The proposed development is appropriate for the site and consistent with the surrounding land use; therefore, no impacts are anticipated.

##### Alternative 3, Expanding Existing Facility

Under this Alternative, a building permit will be required by the local jurisdiction. The permit will be obtained from the City of Colona prior to commencing work on the project. No impacts are anticipated.

#### **3.4.2 Visual Resources**

The proposed site is a vacant agricultural parcel. South of the parcel is one single family home and just south of the single family home there is a low lying wooded area. North and west of the parcel is a campground, which includes a small pond. East of the parcel is property in current agriculture production. Because of the different type of uses in the immediate area of the proposed site, the landscape character varies from property to property.

##### Alternative 1, No Action

Under the No Action Alternative, no impacts to visual resources are anticipated.

##### Alternative 2, New Fire Station (Proposed Action)

Under the Proposed Action Alternative, no impacts to visual resources are anticipated. The proposed site will be a new building surrounded by a drive, small parking and a large grassy yard. There are no significant visual resources and the building will be consistent, as much as possible, with other buildings in the area.

### Alternative 3, Expanding Existing Facility

Under this Alternative, no impacts to the visual resources are anticipated due to expanding the existing facility.

#### **3.4.3 Noise**

Noise is defined as undesirable sound and is federally regulated by the Noise Control Act of 1972. An average measure of sound is known as the day-night average sound level (Ldn), and is used by agencies for estimating sound impacts and establishing guidelines for compatible land uses. An EPA document, "Information on Levels of Environmental Noise Requisite to Protect Public Health and Welfare with an Adequate Margin of Safety" (EPA, 1974) provides a basis for State and local governments' judgments in setting standards. The document identifies a 24-hour exposure level of 70 decibels (dB) as the level of environmental noise that will prevent any measurable hearing loss over a lifetime. Also, levels of 55 dB outdoors and 45 dB indoors are identified as preventing activity interference and annoyance. These levels are considered those, which will permit spoken conversation and other activities such as sleeping, working and recreation. The levels are not single event, or "peak" levels, but rather, they represent averages over long periods of time. An occasional higher noise level would be consistent with a 24-hour average of 70 dB, as long as a sufficient amount of relative quiet is experienced.

The sound level of a typical sound outdoors falls off in level at 6 dB per doubling distance. Assuming a typical siren is 115 dB at a distance of 10 feet, at 20' it will be 109 dB, at 40 feet it will be 103 dB, at 80 feet it will be 97 dB, at 160 feet it will be 91 dB, at 320 feet it will be 85 dB, at 640 feet it will be 79 dB, at 1280 feet it will be 73 dB, at 2560 feet it will be 67 dB. The proposed project site on Green River Road is located adjacent to a residential lot, existing agricultural cropland, and a recreational campground.

### Alternative 1, No Action

Under the No Action Alternative, no impacts related to noise are anticipated.

### Alternative 2, New Fire Station (Proposed Action)

Under the Proposed Action Alternative, temporary short-term increases in noise levels would be anticipated during construction. To reduce noise levels during that period, construction activities would be restricted to normal business hours. Equipment and machinery utilized at the site would meet all local, State, and Federal noise regulations.

Over the long-term, vehicle traffic would increase at the proposed project site, primarily when EMS personnel are training or responding to traffic accidents, fires, severe weather, or other emergency events. The increased traffic and sirens would increase the noise level, but these increases would be very short in duration and would occur very infrequently. It is anticipated that these noise peaks would not cause an exceedance of the EPA's 24-hour exposure levels.

### Alternative 3, Expanding Existing Facility

Under this Alternative, temporary short-term increases in noise levels would be anticipated during construction. To reduce noise levels during that period, construction activities would be restricted to normal business hours. Equipment and machinery utilized at the site would meet all local, State, and Federal noise regulations.

Over the long-term, no significant change in noise levels would be anticipated. The site is currently used as the fire station, in a residential/ commercial area on 1<sup>st</sup> Street. Because of the size the site and numerous constraints on expansion at the site, expansion of the facility would be limited. Therefore, no significant change of noise levels would be anticipated.

#### **3.4.4 Public Services and Utilities**

Public services to both the proposed Green River Road site and the existing 1<sup>st</sup> Street site are provided by the City of Colona. These include police, fire, sewer, and water. Electric and Gas service is provided by Mid-American Energy Company. The Green River Road site would access water and sewer utilities from the west and be trenched in approximately 400' and electric and gas would be trenched to the site from the east off the right of way of Green River Road approximately 150'.

##### Alternative 1, No Action

Under the No Action Alternative, there would be no changes to public services or utilities and no improvements would be made to the existing Colona Fire Station. In the short-term fire and other EMS would continue to be provided with reduced response times due to the geographic impediments such as the waterways, railroad tracks, and interstate highways.

##### Alternative 2, New Fire Station (Proposed Action)

Under the Proposed Action Alternative, there would be no changes to most public services and utilities, but significant improvements would be made to fire and EMS facilities. One of the most significant benefits of a new fire station is the ability to build the new station in a new strategic location outside of areas that previously have been hampered by railroads, bridges and interstates. The new location of the fire station would allow EMS vehicles to respond from the East side of the City, which would increase response capabilities from multiple directions during times of frequent trains or other restricted routes. This multi-directional response approach will significantly improve public safety. Also, the new station would relieve pressure on overcrowding of the existing facility.

##### Alternative 3, Expanding Existing Facility

Under this Alternative, there would be minimal changes to public services or utilities and only functional improvements would be made to the existing Colona Fire Station. In the short-term fire and other EMS would continue to be provided with reduced response times due to the geographic impediments such as the waterways, railroad tracks, and interstate highways.

#### **3.4.5 Traffic and Circulation**

The proposed site is located along Green River road, which is a two-lane road. Green River Road at the proposed site entrance has an Annual Average Daily Traffic count of 1850 vehicles. Poppy Garden Road is the intersection to the north of the site and State Route 6 is the intersection to the south. Because the proposed site is located at the eastern outermost side of the City of Colona and the relatively low traffic count, very little disruption is anticipated during mobilization of construction equipment. There is no known public transportation in the vicinity that would be impacted by the proposed alternative.

##### Alternative 1, No Action

Under the No Action Alternative, no impacts to traffic are anticipated.

### Alternative 2, New Fire Station (Proposed Action)

Under the Proposed Action Alternative, short-term impacts due to increased construction traffic are anticipated. To mitigate potential delays, construction vehicles will be stored on site during project construction. Long-term impacts to traffic are considered to be insignificant.

### Alternative 3, Expanding Existing Facility

Under this Alternative, short-term impacts due to increased construction traffic are anticipated; however, this would be very small due to all construction will take place in a relatively small footprint as an addition to the existing facility. Long-term impacts are not anticipated.

### **3.4.6 Environmental Justice (Executive Order 12898)**

On February 11, 1994, President Clinton signed Executive Order (EO) 12898, entitled, “Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations”. The EO directs federal agencies, “to make achieving environmental justice part of its mission by identifying and addressing, as appropriate, disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of its programs, policies, and activities on minority populations and low-income populations in the United States”. 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 2000 U.S. Census Bureau data for the City of Colona states that 96.3% of the population is white, 0.4% African American, 0.4% American Indian or Alaska Native, 0.2% Asian, 1.5% some other race, and 1.3% two or more races (Demographic Snapshot Report, 2009). No concentrations of minority or low-income populations were identified near the proposed project.

### Alternative 1, No Action

Under the No Action Alternative, there would be no disproportionate or adverse effects on minority or low-income population in the area anticipated.

### Alternative 2, New Fire Station (Proposed Action)

Under the Proposed Action Alternative, there would be no disproportionately high and adverse effects on minority or low-income populations. Implementation of the Proposed Action would benefit all populations within the City of Colona Fire Protection District.

### Alternative 3, Expanding Existing Facility

Under this Alternative, there would be no disproportionately high and adverse effects on minority or low-income populations. Implementation to the existing facility would benefit all populations.

### **3.4.7 Safety and Security**

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 Occupational Safety and Health Act (OSHA) regulations. 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, area residents would continue to be served by the existing Colona Fire Station.

#### Alternative 2, New Fire Station (Proposed Action)

Under the Proposed Action Alternative, construction of the new fire station would provide increased protection for area residents during emergency events. Construction activities would present safety risks to those performing the work activities. Access to the site would be restricted to protect the public and minimize risks to safety and human health. 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, Expanding Existing Facility

Under this Alternative, construction of the new fire station would provide increased protection for area residents during emergency events. Construction activities would present safety risks to those performing the work activities. Access to the site would be restricted to protect the public and minimize risks to safety and human health. 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.

### **3.5 HISTORIC AND CULTURAL RESOURCES**

In addition to review under NEPA, consideration of effects to historic properties is mandated under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), as amended, and implemented by 36 CFR Part 800. Requirements include identification of significant historic properties that may be affected by the Proposed Action. 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) (36 CFR 60.4).

As defined in 36 CFR Part 800.16(d), the Area of Potential Effect (APE), “is the geographic area or areas within which an undertaking may directly or indirectly cause changes in the character or use of historic properties, if such properties exist.”

In addition to identifying historic properties that may exist in the proposed project’s APE, FEMA must also determine, in consultation with the appropriate State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO)/Tribal Historic Preservation Officer (THPO), what effect, if any, the action will have on historic properties. Moreover, if the project would have an adverse effect on these properties, FEMA must consult with SHPO/THPO on ways to avoid, minimize, or mitigate the adverse effect.

There are no buildings historic or otherwise on the vacant parcel being proposed for the new fire station nor are there any other historic or cultural resources on the site. The Illinois Historic Preservation Agency (IHPA) was consulted regarding the site and indicated there are no known historic resources that would be adversely affected by the proposed action. (IHPA clearance letter dated January 12, 2010 within Appendix D)

### Alternative 1, No Action

Under the No Action Alternative, no impacts to archeological or cultural resources are anticipated.

### Alternative 2, New Fire Station (Proposed Action)

Under the Proposed Action Alternative, no impacts to archeological or cultural resources are anticipated. To ensure that ground disturbing activities will not adversely affect any buried cultural resources, and in accordance with 36 CFR 800.13, provisions are set forth to deal with unexpected discoveries that may be historically significant but were not identified as part of the initial review process. If human remains are discovered during the course of the project implementation, the City of Colona, FEMA and the IL SHPO immediately and will stop project activities in the vicinity of the discovery and take all reasonable measures to avoid or minimize harm until FEMA concludes consultation with the Illinois State Historic Preservation Officer or, if warranted, other consulting parties and the grantee.

### Alternative 3, Expanding Existing Facility

Under this Alternative, no impacts to archeological or cultural resources are anticipated. To ensure that ground disturbing activities will not adversely affect any buried cultural resources, and in accordance with 36 CFR 800.13, provisions are set forth to deal with unexpected discoveries that may be historically significant but were not identified as part of the initial review process. If human remains are discovered during the course of the project implementation, the City of Colona, FEMA and the IL SHPO immediately and will stop project activities in the vicinity of the discovery and take all reasonable measures to avoid or minimize harm until FEMA concludes consultation with the Illinois State Historic Preservation Officer or, if warranted, other consulting parties and the sub-grantee.

## **3.6 COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES**

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 impacts are detailed in the body of the document. A summary table is provided below.

<b>Affected Environment</b>	<b>Impacts</b>	<b>Mitigation</b>
<b>Geology and Soils</b>	Alt 2 (proposed): No impacts to geology, short-term impact to soils during construction. Construction would disturb about 3,000 SY of the site.	Appropriate BMPs: silt fence, prompt planting of vegetation and landscaping to minimize runoff and erosion.
	Alt 3: No impacts to geology, minimal, short-term impact to soils (where footprint of existing structure is expanded).	
<b>Water Quality (Including surface water and ground water)</b>	Alt 2 (proposed): Short-term impacts to surface water are possible during construction. No impact to ground water resources. The City supplies potable water.	A Storm water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) should be implemented as part of the construction plans for the proposed project. A storm water

	Alt 3: Short-term impacts to surface water are possible during construction. No impacts to ground water resources. Possible additional runoff added to downstream environment without addition of new detention.	Management and Erosion Control Plan and implementation of storm water BMPs will minimize runoff. An IEPA NPDES Permit for Storm Water Discharges from Construction Site Activities does not appear to be warranted for this project, (< 1 acre).
<b>Floodplains</b>	Alt 2 (proposed): No impacts are anticipated.	None.
	Alt 3: No impacts are anticipated.	
<b>Air Quality</b>	Alt 2 (proposed): Short-term impacts from dust and emissions from equipment would occur during construction.	Dust control measures such as watering down construction areas would be implemented as needed. Fuel-burning equipment run times should be minimized and equipment properly maintained.
	Alt 3: Short-term impacts from dust and emissions from equipment would occur during construction.	
<b>Terrestrial and Aquatic Environments</b>	Alt 2 (proposed): No impacts are anticipated to the aquatic environment. Some impacts to the terrestrial environment may occur because approximately 3,000 SY will be disturbed.	Topsoil will be replaced in areas outside of paved and building areas and re-vegetated with grass and landscaping, which will include: grasses, trees and bushes. This will restore some of the terrestrial environment.
	Alt 3: Short-term impacts from to the aquatic environment may occur because of the site is within 300' of the Hennepin Canal. No impacts to the terrestrial environment are anticipated.	Construction would need to use storm water BMPs to avoid disturbance of the water quality leaving the site.
<b>Wetlands</b>	Alt 2 (proposed): No impacts are anticipated.	None.
	Alt 3: No impacts are anticipated.	
<b>Threatened and Endangered Species</b>	Alt 2 (proposed): No impacts are anticipated.	None.
	Alt 3: No impacts are anticipated.	
<b>Hazardous Materials</b>	Alt 2 (proposed): No impacts are anticipated.	None.
	Alt 3: No impacts are anticipated.	
<b>Zoning &amp; Land Use</b>	Alt 2 (proposed): No impacts are anticipated.	None.
	Alt 3: No impacts are anticipated.	
<b>Visual Resources</b>	Alt 2 (proposed): No impacts are anticipated.	None.
	Alt 3: No impacts are anticipated.	

<b>Noise</b>	Alt 2 (proposed): Short-term impacts from heavy equipment would occur during construction. Long-term impacts would include increased traffic and siren noise from the EMS vehicles.	Construction would be limited to normal business hours and equipment would meet local, State, and Federal noise regulations. The infrequent and short duration noise impacts from EMS vehicles would not significantly impact the 24-hour exposure levels regulated by the EPA.
	Alt 3: Short-term impacts from heavy equipment would occur during construction.	
<b>Public Services and Utilities</b>	Alt 2 (proposed): No impacts to utilities are anticipated. No impacts to emergency response services are anticipated.	None.
	Alt 3: No impacts to utilities are anticipated. No impacts to emergency response services are anticipated.	
<b>Public Services and Utilities</b>	Alt 2 (proposed): No impacts to utilities are anticipated. Significant impacts to emergency response services are anticipated. The new facility will provide areas previously at risk to slow response times due to the many rail lines, waterways and interstates with access to EMS and decreased response times.	Increased safety. Better EMS response times.
	Alt 3: No impacts to utilities are anticipated. No impacts to emergency response services are anticipated.	Status Quo. Response times of EMS remain impaired.
<b>Traffic and Circulation</b>	Alt 2 (proposed): Short-term increase in the volume of construction-related traffic in the vicinity of the site. Also, a permanent increase in EMS vehicles on Green River Road.	During construction, vehicles and equipment would be stored on-site to the extent possible. The addition of EMS vehicles is not anticipated so negatively impact the overall traffic and circulation on Green River Road.
	Alt 3: Short-term increase in the volume of construction-related traffic in the vicinity of the site.	
<b>Environmental Justice</b>	Alt 2 (proposed): No disproportionately high or adverse effect on minority or low-income populations is anticipated.	None.
	Alt 3: No disproportionately high or adverse effect on minority or low-income populations is	

	anticipated.	
<b>Safety and Security</b>	Alt 2 (proposed): No disproportionately high or adverse effect on minority or low-income populations is anticipated.	None.
	Alt 3: No disproportionately high or adverse effect on minority or low-income populations is anticipated.	
<b>Historic and Cultural Resources</b>	Alt 2 (proposed): No impacts are anticipated.	None. During construction, ground activities would be monitored. Should any human skeletal remains or historic or archaeological materials be discovered during construction, all ground disturbing activities on the project site would cease and the coroner's office (in the case of human remains), FEMA, and the Illinois Historic Preservation Agency would be notified.
	Alt 3: No impacts are anticipated.	

## **SECTION 4: 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 which 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.

Other projects in the vicinity of the project (within ¼ mile more or less) include the future construction of a 3,000 S.F. electrical warehouse on the lot just north of the proposed action alternative. Future impacts to resources due to this future project will have similar impacts as the proposed action alternative and when evaluated cumulatively should not significantly contribute to negatively impact resources in this area.

## **SECTION 5: PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

FEMA is the lead Federal agency for conducting the NEPA compliance process for the Colona Central Fire Station in the City of Colona, Henry County, Illinois. 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 and the responses received from the agencies. Agencies consulted are listed in Section 7. Agency responses are provided in Appendix D.

This project has been discussed at an Annexation Hearing on July 27, 2009 and a Planning Commission Meeting on December 2, 2009 and both meetings were open to the public.

The Colona Central Fire Station will notify the public of the availability of the draft EA through publication of a public notice (see Appendix E) in a local newspaper. FEMA will conduct a public comment period commencing on the initial date of publication of the public notice.

## **SECTION 6: MITIGATION MEASURES AND PERMITS**

During construction the applicant will use appropriate BMPs: silt fence, prompt planting of vegetation and landscaping to minimize runoff and erosion.

A Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) should be implemented as part of the construction plans for the proposed project. A Stormwater Management and Erosion Control Plan and implementation of stormwater BMPs will be implemented.

During construction the applicant will implement dust control measures such as watering down construction areas as necessary. Combustion equipment run times will be minimized to practical levels and idle equipment will be shut down if extended run times are anticipated. Equipment will be properly maintained.

During construction the applicant will limit all construction activities to normal business hours and equipment will meet local, State, and Federal noise regulations.

During construction the applicant will store vehicles and equipments on-site to the extent possible.

The only permit required by this project is a building permit issued by the City of Colona, Illinois and will be issued following review and approval of the site and building plans.

## **SECTION 7: CONSULTATIONS AND REFERENCES**

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

1. Illinois Department of Natural Resources, Division of Ecosystems and Environment.  
Michael Branham  
One Natural Resources Way  
Springfield, IL 62702-1271  
217-785-5500
2. Illinois Historic Preservation Agency  
Anne E. Haaker  
1 Old State Capitol Plaza  
Springfield, IL 62701-1512  
217-558-0516
3. Henry County Soil & Water Conservation District

- Monica Stevens  
301 East North Street  
Cambridge, IL 61238-1176  
309-937-5263, Ext 3
4. Colona Central Fire Station, Fire Chief  
John Swain  
401 First Street  
Colon, IL 61241
  5. City of Colona  
Linda Teichman, City Clerk  
100 E 9<sup>th</sup> Ave  
Colona, IL 61241  
309-792-0571
  6. FEMA (Federal Emergency Management Agency)  
Amanda C. Ratliff  
536 S. Clark, 6<sup>th</sup> Floor  
Chicago, IL 60605  
312-408-5440

The following are references used to help assemble the information included in this EA.

1. FEMA. 1996. National Environmental Policy Act, FEMA Desk Reference. May 14, 1996.
2. U.S. Census Bureau. 2000.  
[http://factfinder.census.gov/servlet/SAFFacts?\\_event=Search&geo\\_id=&\\_geoContext=&\\_street=&\\_county=Colona&\\_cityTown=Colona&\\_state=04000US17&\\_zip=&\\_lang=en&\\_sse=on&\\_pctxt=fph&\\_pgsl=010&\\_show\\_2003\\_tab=&\\_redirect=Y](http://factfinder.census.gov/servlet/SAFFacts?_event=Search&geo_id=&_geoContext=&_street=&_county=Colona&_cityTown=Colona&_state=04000US17&_zip=&_lang=en&_sse=on&_pctxt=fph&_pgsl=010&_show_2003_tab=&_redirect=Y). Accessed April 2010.
3. City of Colona Website. Demographic Quick Facts  
<http://colona.govoffice.com/vertical/Sites/{F8BC0CFC-6C8F-4277-AD18-5E08EC8B7DE9}/uploads/{CB41DDA3-5E8B-4FBE-94C9-BDE941F314B0}.PDF>.  
Accessed April 2010.
4. U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), Natural Resources Conservation Service. 2010.  
<http://websoilsurvey.nrcs.usda.gov/app/WebSoilSurvey.aspx>. Accessed April 2010.
5. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). 2010  
<http://www.fws.gov/midwest/endangered/lists/illinois-cty.html>. Accessed April 2010.
6. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). National Wetlands Inventory. 2010  
<http://www.fws.gov/wetlands/Data/Mapper.html>. Accessed April 2010.
7. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). 2010. Envirofacts Data Warehouse.  
[http://iaspub.epa.gov/waters10/attains\\_get\\_services.storet\\_station?p\\_org=IL\\_EPA&p\\_station=PB-04](http://iaspub.epa.gov/waters10/attains_get_services.storet_station?p_org=IL_EPA&p_station=PB-04). Accessed April 2010.

8. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). 2010. Air Quality.  
<http://www.epa.gov>. Accessed April 2010.
9. U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). 1974. *Information on Levels of Environmental Noise Requisite to Protect Public Health and Welfare with an Adequate Margin of Safety*.
10. Illinois Department of Natural Resources. 2010.  
<http://www.dnrecocat.state.il.us/ecopublic/>. Accessed April 2010.
11. Illinois Department of Natural Resources. 2010.  
<http://www.dnrecocat.state.il.us/ecopublic/>. Accessed April 2010.

## **SECTION 8: LIST OF PREPARERS**

---

Preparation and quality control review of the draft and final Environmental Assessment:

Wardney F. Snarr, P.E., Snarr Giffin & Associates, Inc. - Author  
Judd R. Giffin, P.E., Snarr Giffin & Associates, Inc. - Quality Control  
John Swan, Chief, Colona's Central Fire Station - Information only  
Amanda C. Ratliff, Regional Environmental Officer, FEMA RV - Document Direction