



Draft Environmental Assessment

Village of Atkinson Fire Protection District Fire Station

Village of Atkinson, Illinois
May 2010



FEMA

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

Prepared by
McClure Engineering Associates, Inc.
4700 Kennedy Drive
East Moline, IL 61244

Prepared for
FEMA Region V
536 South Clark Street
Chicago, IL 60605

Atkinson Fire Protection District Environmental Assessment

Table of Contents

	<u>Page</u>
Table of Contents	2, 3
Acronyms	4
SECTION 1: BACKGROUND	5
1.1 Project Authority	5
1.2 Project Location	5
1.3 Purpose and Need	6
1.4 Existing Facility	6
SECTION 2: ALTERNATIVES ANALYSIS	7
2.1 ALTERNATIVE 1 – NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE	7
2.2 ACTION ALTERNATIVE 2	7
2.3 ALTERNATIVE 3	8
SECTION THREE: AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT AND CONSEQUENCES	8
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	13
3.3 HAZARDOUS MATERIALS	14
3.4 SOCIOECONOMICS	15
3.4.1 Zoning and Land Use	15
3.4.2 Visual Resources	16
3.4.3 Noise	17
3.4.4 Public Services and Utilities	18
3.4.5 Traffic and Circulation	18
3.4.6 Environmental Justice	19
3.4.7 Safety and Security	20
3.5 HISTORIC AND CULTURAL RESOURCES	21
3.5.1 Historic Resources	21
3.6 COMPARISON OF ALTERNATIVES	22

Table of Contents (continued)

	<u>Page</u>
SECTION FOUR: CUMULATIVE IMPACTS	25
SECTION FIVE: PUBLIC PARTICIPATION	26
SECTION SIX: MITIGATION MEASURES AND PERMITS	26
SECTION SEVEN: CONSULTATIONS AND REFERENCES	27
SECTION 8: LIST OF PREPARERS	28
<u>APPENDICES</u>	
Appendix A	List of Tables/Figures
	Figure 1. Project Location Map
	Figure 2. Existing Facility Location Map
	Figure 3. Proposed Project Site Layout – Draft
	Figure 4. Earthquakes in Illinois 1795-2008 Map
	Figure 5. USGS Topographic Map of Area
	Figure 6. FIRM Map
	Figure 7. USDA Web Soil Survey Soil Map
	Figure 8. MWI Map
Appendix B	Existing Site, Proposed Site and Surrounding Area Photographs
Appendix C	Agency Correspondence
Appendix D	Water and Air Quality Documentation
Appendix E	Census Bureau Fact Sheet
Appendix F	Public Notice

ACRONYMS

ADA	Americans with Disabilities Act
ALS	Advanced Life Saving
APE	Area of Potential Effects
BLS	Basic Life Saving
CAA	Clean Air Act
CEQ	Council on Environmental Quality
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
CO	Carbon Monoxide
CWA	Clean Water Act
dB	Decibel
DHS	Department of Homeland Security
EA	Environmental Assessment
EIS	Environmental Impact Statement
EMA	Emergency Management Agency
EMS	Emergency Medical Service
EO	Executive Order
EOC	Emergency Operations Center
ESA	Endangered Species Act
EPA	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency
FIRM	Flood Insurance Rate Map
FONSI	Finding of No Significant Impact
ILDNR	Illinois Department of Natural Resources
IEMA	Illinois Emergency Management Agency
IHPA	Illinois Historic Preservation Agency
NAAQS	National Ambient Air Quality Standards
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
NFIP	National Flood Insurance Program
NHPA	National Historic Preservation Act
NO₂	Nitrogen Dioxide
NRCS	Natural Resources Conservation Service
NWI	National Wetlands Inventory
O₃	Ozone
OSHA	Occupational Safety and Health Administration
Pb	Lead
PPE	Personal Protective Equipment
RCRA	Resource Conservation and Recovery Act
SHPO	State Historic Preservation Office
SO₂	Sulfur Dioxide
SWPPP	Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan
USDA	United States Department of Agriculture
USFWS	United States Fish and Wildlife Service

SECTION 1: BACKGROUND

1.1 PROJECT AUTHORITY

The American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA) is an economic stimulus package that was designed to jumpstart the U.S. economy, create or save millions of jobs, and put a down payment on addressing long-neglected challenges nationally. Funds received under this Act are intended to support these goals, and unprecedented levels of transparency, oversight, and accountability are required of the expenditure of Act dollars. The purpose of the FY 2009 ARRA Fire Station Construction Grant (SCG) Program is to create or save jobs in recession-hit areas and achieve other purposes stated in ARRA, and achieve AFG goals of firefighter safety and improved response capability/capacity based on need through the construction, renovation or modification of fire stations.

In awarding ARRA funds, DHS prioritizes shovel-ready projects that infuse resources into local economies quickly while meeting critical security needs. DHS grant programs funded under ARRA will further strengthen the nation's ability to protect critical infrastructure facilities and transit systems and assist fire departments in improving their response capability/capacity and strengthening firefighter safety.

The Village of Atkinson, Illinois was awarded a \$1.3 million grant as part of the Fire Station Construction Grant program for the fiscal year 2009, administered by Department of Homeland Security (DHS). This grant will be used to construct a new 15,500 square foot facility to replace the existing 56 year old undersized facility.

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 proposed project is located within the limits of The Village of Atkinson, (Henry County) Illinois, which is approximately 34 miles east of the Quad Cities and 140 miles west of Chicago. Atkinson lies approximately 0.5 miles north of Interstate 80, and has a population of approximately 1,000.

For the Village of Atkinson as a whole, the local median income is 15% lower than the state average, with increasing unemployment rates (8.9%), declining home/property values (-3% last year), a population change of -4%, and local job reductions of 5.2%, all impacting the area served by the Atkinson Fire Protection District in its ability to upgrade and expand the services provided. The U.S. Census Bureau for Atkinson, Illinois as taken from the 2000 Census, reports that of the population of 2001, 98.5% of the population is white, 0.4% African American, 0.1% Asian, 0.3% some other race and 1.2% two or more races. This is roughly consistent with the diversity of Henry County as a whole. See Appendix E for a Fact Sheet for the Village of Atkinson and Henry County.

The Atkinson Fire Protection District is based in Atkinson, Illinois with a primary response area of 77 square miles and a resident population of about 2,600. The service area and civilian population is composed of both the town proper and the surrounding unincorporated areas.

The Atkinson Fire Protection District is an all risk, all hazard emergency service department. Services provided include: fire response and suppression, emergency medical services at the ALS and BLS levels, EMS transport, rescue services, hazmat first response, public safety outreach programs and fire prevention. On an annual basis, approximately 150 emergency calls for service are responded to and managed. In addition the district is a very strong advocate and participant in an aggressive automatic-aid and mutual-aid program.

In addition to providing emergency services to the town's citizens and their personal property, the district also provides emergency response service to the following critical infrastructure: (3) energy transmission pipelines (natural gas 20", 24", and 36"), major hazardous materials transportation routes (I-80, US Route 6, and 92 miles of rural roads), 8 miles of railway, major telecommunications features (microwave radio tower and regional fiber optic trunk line), and major livestock and agricultural production areas.

1.3 PURPOSE AND NEED

The objectives of the Department of Homeland Security's grant program is to improve emergency management and preparedness capabilities by supporting flexible, sustainable, and secure Fire Stations, focusing on identified deficiencies and needs. The purpose of the action alternatives presented in this Environmental Assessment are to provide sufficient space for the storage, distribution and management of equipment, materials and personnel to safely and effectively serve the needs of the community. The need for the project is to upgrade the existing facilities capabilities and increase the available space for efficient, safe and acceptable service.

A needs assessment was prepared as part of the grant application. In it, the existing facility built in 1953 was identified as having reached the end of its lifespan, with structural issues for the building itself (leaking roof, no insulation, wall cracks and structural separation), a lack of space for expansion to meet both current and future needs, and safety concerns for both the responders and the public. The building lacks an exhaust system in the apparatus bay to vent carbon monoxide, floor drains to direct and catch leaking fluids, an industrial gear washer and dryer to wash PPE and contain potential contaminants, a commercial fire alarm system and fire suppression/sprinkler system, and is not ADA compliant. Responders are put at risk as they must retrieve PPE from one station and then cross the street to mount apparatus. In addition, there is no off street parking in close proximity to either structure and the stations are located at the edge of the business district and can have a fairly heavy traffic flow at certain times of the day. The existing facility does not have adequate space for classroom training, an in-station fitness room, or staff sleeping quarters, nor is there the ability to expand the buildings at their current location.

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 Atkinson Fire Protection District provides emergency services to a population of approximately 2,600 in the Village of Atkinson and a 77 square-mile service area. The District plays an active role in providing public assistance and mitigation during community disasters. The existing facility is located at 103 W Center Street in the Village of Atkinson (refer to the figures provided in Appendix A). The existing facility is a masonry structure built in 1953, with a separate metal building located across Center Street. The main building houses 2 ambulances, 1 brush truck and 1 pumper truck. It also stores the firefighting PPE. The second building stores 1 rescue equipment truck, 1 pumper truck

and 1 tanker truck. While it is centrally located, the site is landlocked with no additional property available on any side for expansion.

SECTION TWO: ALTERNATIVE ANALYSIS

Three (3) alternatives were considered for addressing the Village Of Atkinson Fire Protection District's operational deficiencies: The No Action Alternative, The Proposed Action Alternative for construction of a new facility, and The Expansion and Remodeling of the existing facility.

2.1 ALTERNATIVE 1 – NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE

If no action is taken, the current 57 year old main building and secondary building across the street from the Station would continue to be utilized. These facilities are undersized and potentially unsafe and provide inefficient and potentially ineffective response to disasters. Use of the current space would mean some necessary equipment would continue to be stored off site and not be available as quickly as may be necessary to respond to a natural or man-made disaster. The separation of the personnel and equipment also puts the responders at risk as they cross the street to access needed equipment. Photographs of the existing buildings and surrounding area are included in Appendix B.

2.2 ALTERNATIVE 2 – (PROPOSED ACTION) CONSTRUCTION OF A NEW VILLAGE OF ATKINSON FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT STATION

The proposed location for the new facility is at the southeast corner of the intersection of Highway 6 (Henry Street) and County Highway 5 (State Street), the two main routes through Atkinson. School Street borders the property to the east. The site is approximately at latitude N 41° 25' 1.47" and longitude W 90° 0' 55.31" in Henry County. A proposed project location map is shown in Figure 1 in Appendix A. Photographs of the proposed project site and surrounding area are included in Appendix B. The surrounding area is a mix of residential and commercial properties, with a school located approximately 1 block to the southwest. The proposed location is zoned B-2 (Business District General).

The project is proposed to be constructed upon approximately 1 acre of vacant property which originally consisted of Lot 1 and Lot 2, Block 1 of Riley's 2nd Addition to the Village of Atkinson with a 20 foot wide public alley separating the two parcels. The alley was vacated between the properties and a new 20 foot wide public alley was dedicated along the south property line of Lot 2 in January, 2010. While the property has been vacant for the past several years, past uses include automobile sales with a small office building, and a landscaping business with a small storage shed since the 1980's. Prior to these uses, the sites were residential dating back to about 1900 with the residences demolished in the 1980's. The small storage shed is no longer on the site and the former office building currently houses an older model fire truck and miscellaneous items. It is intended that this building, which was constructed in the 1980's, will be relocated off site by others prior to new development.

The proposed action is the construction of an approximately 15,500 square foot building which will include the following features: (5) double apparatus bays with approved floor drains/traps, space for 25-35 gear lockers, adequate kitchen/dining area, gender specific restrooms with showers, space for future dormitory sleeping quarters for 4-6 personnel, fitness workout space, training room, and appropriate space for equipment storage. Furthermore, plans include PPE washer/dryer hook-ups, station supply storage room, fire alarm and sprinkler system, and approved exhaust system. The intention is to provide a facility that can accommodate the needs of the District for the next fifty years.

In addition to providing for the functional needs of the District, it is intended that the new building will be constructed under LEED design, engineering and construction practices. This will produce a building which is environmentally conscious, energy efficient and aesthetically suited to the community. Exterior amenities will include increased green space areas and landscaping near the building, parking areas and perimeter of the site. See Figure 3 in Appendix A for a draft of the Proposed Project Site Layout.

The two existing facilities the District currently owns and operates will be sold once the proposed action is completed.

2.3 ALTERNATIVE 3 – EXPAND AND REMODEL EXISTING FACILITY

Currently the District Station is located at 103 W Center Street. The masonry structure was built in 1953 with the garage/metal outbuilding located across the street built at a later date. Expansion of the current Station at its present location would be challenging since all available space in the buildings is being utilized. In addition, the buildings themselves encompass almost the entire lot they are on with buildings, utilities or other development immediately adjacent to these structures. Therefore, there is no land space immediately available adjacent to the existing facilities for building additions. Also, the nature of the current buildings is not conducive to building additions given their age, condition, and materials. Any new additions would necessitate costly upgrades to the existing buildings as well to be in compliance with current codes. However, one option to expand and remodel the existing facility would call for the street (Center Street) separating the two buildings to be closed, utilizing this space for the expansion of the two buildings, and the addition of new parking areas for the responders. The street has a relatively short distance between cross streets and therefore alternative routes would be readily available if this block section was closed. Added expansion of the current facility could also occur if the Village were to purchase adjacent properties, with the structures currently on those sites demolished to make room for the expanded fire station.

SECTION THREE: AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT AND CONSEQUENCES

3.1 PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT

3.1.1 Geology, Seismicity and Soils

The project area is located in east central Henry County, Illinois. The terrain is relatively flat, with the nearest river being approximately 2 miles north of The Village of Atkinson. According to the Soil Survey of Henry County, Illinois by the United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service, the soils in and around the project area are of the Plano-Elburn association. These soils are characterized as nearly level to sloping, well drained and somewhat poorly drained, silty soils that formed in loess and the underlying glacial outwash.

The project area is located in an area with minimal earthquake activity as evidenced by the Earthquakes In Illinois 1795-2008 map that has been prepared by the Illinois State Geological Survey (See Figure 4). During this time period, the three closest earthquakes were recorded east of the Village of Atkinson, two (2) of which were recorded in western LaSalle County, and one (1) in south central Ogle County, all at least 70 miles east of Atkinson. Henry County is 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.

The topographic quad map for the area (See Figure 5) indicates that the proposed property is approximately 660' above sea level and is not in a floodplain (see Figure 6, floodplain map.) Surface

topography generally slopes from west to east. According to the Illinois Department of Natural Resources (see Appendix C, IDNR Coordination letter dated March 26, 2010), the proposed project is unlikely to have any adverse effects on any protected natural resources in the vicinity of the proposed project.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), Soil Conservation Service (SCS) was consulted to determine the type of soil(s) within the project site. Per the Soil Map included in Figure 7 of Appendix A, site soils consist of Elburn silt loam with 0 to 2 percent slopes. 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. The soil survey was referenced to determine if any prime or unique soils exist in the project area. Per Table 5, Prime Farmland, of the Soil Survey of Henry County, Illinois, since this site is located in an urban or built up area, it is not considered to be prime farmland.

While the soil is not considered to be a hydric soil, the potential for groundwater, particularly during seasonal highs, needs to be addressed in any building development, particularly those with basement levels. The hydrologic soil group is B.

In addition to consulting the SCS soil survey, soil borings performed as part of a subsurface investigation in 2007 were reviewed for the apparent soil profile on the site. Per a report by Seneca Companies dated July 11, 2007, where five (5) soil borings were taken on the proposed project site, the subsurface profile generally consists of gravel or grass underlain by dark brown to brown silty clay underlain by tan silty sand to sand to silty clay. All five (5) borings were extended to a depth of about 12 feet below ground surface and groundwater was generally encountered at a depth of about 6 feet below ground surface.

Alternative 1. No Action

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

Alternative 2. Proposed Action

Available data on the site soils and topography including USGS maps, SCS maps and previous soil borings were reviewed to evaluate the potential impacts to the proposed site. The proposed construction activities are considered appropriate considering the site has historically been a developed area for the past 100+ years, is within the limits of the Village of Atkinson, is surrounded with complimentary development, and is not part of a larger farm tract. The proposed development will not negatively impact the geology, seismicity and soils. In addition, no direct, permanent impacts to surface waters or groundwater are anticipated. All construction activity will incorporate practices to minimize soil erosion during construction and the project is being designed, constructed and operated using LEED principals and “green” materials and operating systems when possible. Due to the size of the construction site, a stormwater pollution prevention plan (SWPP) will be prepared and followed during construction activities to minimize soil loss. Typical mitigation measures may include the temporary installation of silt fences and/or straw bales, directing the flow of construction equipment in current gravel covered areas of the site rather than in grass covered areas where soil may be tracked off site, and the proper transport of any excess excavated soils off site rather than stockpiling unneeded soils on site.

While the site grading plans are not complete for this proposed action, the site disturbance is estimated to be approximately 1,500 cubic yards of earthwork. The majority of the site will be in a fill condition requiring engineered fill or granular material to be hauled in to raise the site. On-site materials that could require removal from the site include the existing aggregate base and any unsuitable soils that are

encountered. The amount of this material is considered to be minimal. It would be the contractor's responsibility to properly dispose of the soils off site. No material may be stored in floodplain or wetland areas. However, the disposal site is anticipated to be at a location as approved by the Village.

Alternative 3. Expand and Remodel Existing Facilities

As expansion of the existing buildings would occur on currently developed land, whether with other buildings or pavement, no impacts to geology, seismicity, and soils would occur. Any remodeling would take place within an existing building, therefore no impacts to surface water or groundwater would occur. Demolition and construction materials generated as part of the remodeling would be properly contained either within the existing building or taken to a dumpster area during construction and properly disposed of off-site.

3.1.2 Water Resources and Water Quality

There is no visible surface water detected on the site. Drainage was generally by sheet flow of the surface runoff from west to east, with likely some small areas of temporary ponding water where there are minor depressions on site. The Village roadways appear to be a combination of streets with curb, gutter and storm sewer as well as streets with roadside ditches to convey stormwater. In discussions with Village personnel, a stormwater collection system does exist for the Village of Atkinson as a whole. As such, the run-off from the site surface drains to the southeast into a roadside ditch and ultimately discharges to nearby creeks and tributaries. The proposed construction will collect surface drainage via storm inlets located at low points in the parking lot and green space areas. The runoff will then be conveyed through the storm sewer to the southeast corner of the property and discharge into the existing ditch. Stormwater detention will not be required for this site due a decrease in the post development peak discharge compared to the pre development peak discharge. This decrease is a result of the proposed construction including additional green space and less impervious surface area.

There are no known aquifers in the vicinity of the site. The Village of Atkinson provides water for the site and surrounding area with the water tower located to the north of the proposed project. Nearby watershed information was obtained from the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's STORET database with results from the Green River contained in Appendix D. Per the Phase I ESA report performed in April 2007, "the groundwater is anticipated to flow toward the south at an estimated depth of 10-25 feet. However, it is possible that groundwater may not be present in unconsolidated material above bedrock in the area or may be seasonally present along bedrock surfaces. Local features may influence groundwater flow direction; therefore, a complete hydrogeologic investigation would be required to adequately determine groundwater flow direction at the Property."

Since there are no known or observed water bodies on the site or in the immediate vicinity, a Joint Permit from the COE and EPA regarding impacts to water bodies or 401 water quality certification is not required. An NPDES permit for construction will be obtained for the proposed action as it will disturb equal to or greater than 1 acre of land. A Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) will be prepared and the contractor be held responsible for its implementation as part of the NPDES permit.

Alternative 1. No Action

Under the No Action Alternative, no direct impacts related to water resources or water quality would occur. However, there is the potential for indirect impacts due to the fact that the current facility does not have an industrial gear washer and dryer. This forces responders to wash their PPE at off-site locations which causes unneeded exposure risks to the responders and the public, and potentially releases untreated contaminants into the storm water system.

Alternative 2. Proposed Action

The Proposed Action consists of constructing a new 15,500 square foot building with a parking lot, access drives and sidewalks also on the site. New curb and gutter and storm sewer will be constructed to drain runoff from the building and paved areas. Stormwater detention will not be required for this site due a decrease in the post development peak discharge compared to the pre development peak discharge. This decrease is a result of the proposed construction including additional green space and less impervious surface area. Additional details are provided in Appendix A on Figure 3, Proposed Project Site Layout – Draft.

Under this alternative, there would likely be little to no direct permanent impacts to surface waters because the runoff would be treated on site, with the new site layout providing for more containment and treatment than which currently exists. Temporary, short term, impacts during the construction will be treated by utilizing the SWPP plan and may include silt fence, hay bales, entrance checks and re-establishing vegetation wherever possible.

Alternative 3. Expand and Remodel Existing Facilities

As expansion of the existing buildings would occur on ground which is currently impervious (roadway) or has a different building, and any remodeling would take place within an existing building, no impacts to water resources or water quality are anticipated. Demolition and construction materials generated as part of the remodeling would be properly contained either within the existing building or taken to a dumpster area during construction and properly disposed of off-site. Unless the remodeled space includes areas for an industrial gear washer and dryer, the same potential impacts outlined in Alternative 1 above remain.

3.1.3 Floodplain Management (Executive Order 11988)

Neither the proposed project area nor the existing facility are within either a 100-year floodplain or 500-year floodplain as indicated in the FIRM (Flood Insurance Rate Map), panel # 170739 0001 - 0375 for Henry County, Illinois, see Figure 6 in Appendix A. No water bodies were observed on the project site or within the vicinity of the project site. Therefore, the effect to the floodplain for activities involving the No Action, Proposed Action, and Action Alternative are dismissed.

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 (NO₂), Ozone (O₃), Lead (Pb), Particulate Matter (PM₁₀), and Sulfur Dioxide (SO₂).

According to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, the project area is classified in an attainment area for ozone pollution and in an attainment area for particulate matter. Please refer to Appendix D for documentation.

Alternative 1. No Action

Under the No Action Alternative, no new impacts related to air quality would occur because no construction would occur. However, the lack of an exhaust system in the apparatus bay would continue to pose a carbon monoxide exposure risk to the responders.

Alternative 2. Proposed Action

Under the Proposed Action, short-term impacts to air quality would occur during the construction of the fire station. To reduce the temporary impacts to air quality, the applicant will water down construction areas when necessary.

Alternative 3. Expand and Remodel Existing Facilities

Under the Expand and Remodel Existing Facilities Alternative, short-term impacts to air quality may occur during the remodeling of the existing fire station. To reduce the temporary impacts to air quality, the contractor will be required to seal off any areas where significant air particulates are generated, regularly clean and maintain the work areas, and properly maintain equipment utilized during the construction process.

3.2 BIOLOGICAL ENVIRONMENT

3.2.1 Terrestrial and Aquatic Environment

The existing facility and proposed alternative site are both located within the Village of Atkinson, Illinois with the existing facility centrally located on W Center Street and the proposed alternative located at the southeast corner of the intersection of Highway 6/Henry and State Streets. Both locations have been developed since the early 1900's and served in various residential, commercial and municipal uses. These areas are considered to have limited value for plant and wildlife species. While the existing facility remains in use, the proposed alternative site has been vacant for the past several years. Two structures, one across Center Street from the other, are part of the existing facility while only one structure, serving as a storage garage, remains on the proposed alternative site. As both sites are developed and have very little, if any, grass covered areas, no indication of wetland plants or animal habitats were observed. In addition, no indications of wetland plants or animal habitats were noted on any of the references researched. See Figures 7 and 8 in Appendix A for area soils and wetland mapping, or rather the absence of these indicators. In addition, the USFWS was contacted via the internet. Their Illinois List of Federally Endangered, Threatened, Proposed and Candidate Species by County was referenced for the presence or absence of terrestrial or aquatic environments, and the area was determined to have minimal potential for either. See Appendix C for the Illinois list referenced above as well as for the termination of consultation letter from the IDNR EcoCAT inquiry. In addition, Appendix C contains a copy of the Endangered Species determination memo from FEMA dated May 13, 2010 in which it was determined the proposed site will have "no effect" on the federally listed species, their habitats or proposed or designated critical habitats.

Alternative 1. No Action

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

Alternative 2. Proposed Action

Under the Proposed Action, short-term impacts to water quality could occur during the construction of the new facility. The short term impact could affect the turbidity of the runoff water leaving the site and soil tracked off site from construction equipment. To reduce the temporary impacts to water quality, a SWPP plan is being developed which the contractor will be required to implement. In addition, the site's new landscaping will include trees and bushes that will provide potential habitat for wildlife.

Alternative 3. Expand and Remodel Existing Facilities

Under this alternative, impacts to the terrestrial or aquatic environment would not be a concern. The existing facility and properties surrounding it are fully developed and consist of commercial and residential properties. In addition, short-term impacts during building expansion or remodeling are anticipated to be similar to those outlined in Alternative 2 above and would be treated similarly.

3.2.2 Wetlands (Executive Order 11990):

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. [This EO uses the same analysis as EO 11988.]

No wetlands or surface waters have been identified on-site or adjacent to it. In addition, there are no mapped wetlands within the vicinity of the project area as seen on Figure 8 in Appendix A.

Alternative 1. No Action

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

Alternative 2. Proposed Action

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

Alternative 3. Expand and Remodel Existing Facilities

Under the Expand and Remodel Alternative, no impacts to wetlands are anticipated.

3.2.3 Threatened and Endangered 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).

The existing facility and proposed alternative are both located within the Village of Atkinson, Illinois, with the existing facility centrally located on W Center Street and the proposed alternative located at the southeast corner of the intersection of Highway 6/Henry and State Streets. Both locations have been developed since the early 1900's and served in various residential, commercial and municipal uses. These areas are considered to have limited value for threatened and endangered species. While the existing facility remains in use, the proposed alternative site has been vacant for the past several years.

Two structures are part of the existing facility while only one structure, serving as a storage garage, remains on the proposed alternative. As both sites are developed and have very little, if any, grass covered areas, no indication of animals or animal habitats were observed or noted on any of the references researched. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) lists the following endangered and threatened species for Henry County: Indiana bat and Eastern prairie fringed orchid. Based upon the location and the lack of trees and other flowering plants, adverse effects on any threatened and endangered species would be unlikely. In addition, Appendix C contains a copy of the Endangered Species determination memo from FEMA dated May 13, 2010 in which it was determined the proposed site will have “no effect” on the listed species, their habitats or proposed or designated critical habitats.

Alternative 1. No Action

Under the No Action Alternative, there would be no impacts related to threatened and endangered species.

Alternative 2. Proposed Action

Under the Proposed Action, there would be no impacts related to threatened and endangered species. In addition, the site’s new landscaping will include green space, trees and bushes that will provide habitat for wildlife.

Alternative 3. Expand and Remodel Existing Facilities

Under this alternative, there would be no impacts related to threatened and endangered species.

3.3 HAZARDOUS MATERIALS

A Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) for the Atkinson Fire Protection District was performed by Seneca Companies in a report dated April 4, 2007 for the Proposed Action Alternative. As part of that report, no hazardous materials were noted to have been currently or historically stored on site or impacting the proposed site from historic site activities. In addition, there were no known superfund or other documented contaminated sites in the vicinity with the exception of several former gasoline stations which had at one time been present nearby the site. During the site observations for the preparation of this report, only one building remained on site which was being used to store an old fire truck and some miscellaneous equipment. Otherwise the site was not in use and the use of the surrounding properties did not appear to have changed since the preparation of the Phase I ESA.

The potential for an off site hazardous material source in the form of former gas stations was further investigated and reported on in a report by Seneca Companies dated July 11, 2007. Of the five (5) soil borings drilled and sampled on the proposed project site, only one (1) location had a field reading on the photo ionization detector (PID), with select samples from two (2) of the borings sent to a laboratory for further testing. One of the boring samples resulted in non-detectable levels for the gasoline indicator compounds tested, while the other boring sample had detectable levels for three (3) of the four (4) gasoline indicator compounds tested. However, the levels detected were below Illinois Tiered Approach to Corrective Action Objectives (TACO) for all but benzene which exceeded the Tier 1 standard for soil to class 1 groundwater. The letter report by Seneca further described the results as “a condition that might impair potential uses of groundwater at the property. It should be noted however, that use of the property’s groundwater is prevented by current Atkinson City ordinances that prohibit the installation of wells.”

Alternative 1. No Action

Under the No Action Alternative, there would be no construction and therefore no impacts related to hazardous materials.

Alternative 2. Proposed Action

Under the Proposed Action, no impacts due to hazardous materials are anticipated. Although gasoline indicator compounds were detected in one boring at the northeast corner of the proposed project site, the levels were below the TIER 1 standards for inhalation or ingestion. Therefore, if encountered during construction activities requiring excavation for site grading and the building foundations, these materials are not anticipated to be at hazardous levels. Regardless, these activities should be monitored during construction and if hazardous materials are encountered they should be handled and disposed of in accordance with applicable local, State and Federal regulations. This would also apply for any materials generated or used during construction. In addition, if the excavated soils are determined to contain hazardous materials or contaminants, they should be properly disposed of off site and the excavation backfilled with clean, approved material.

Alternative 3. Expand and Remodel Existing Facilities

Under this alternative, no impacts related to hazardous materials are anticipated. The existing facility use and that of the surrounding sites do not suggest the potential to expose hazardous materials in an excavation. Any hazardous materials discovered, generated or used during expansion and remodeling 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 proposed project site is located on the southeast corner of the intersection of Highway 6 (Henry Street) and State Street in the Village of Atkinson, Henry County, Illinois. Former addresses for the properties previously occupying the site were 105 E. Henry Street (Hwy 6) and 100 S. State Street. The proposed project's legal description, as obtained from the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) dated April 4, 2007 and performed by Seneca Companies, is Lots 1 & 2 of Block 1 of Riley's 2nd Addition to the Village of Atkinson, excluding the east 33 feet of Lot 2. The entire proposed site encompasses approximately 1 acre. Recently, the Village of Atkinson has vacated a 20 foot wide public alley through the middle of the site and a new 20 foot wide public alley was dedicated along the east half of the south property line. The current zoning for the site is B-2 (Business District General). A Proposed Project Site Layout is shown in Figure 3 of Appendix A.

Historically, the proposed property was developed for residential use about 1900. According to information obtained from the Phase I ESA referenced above and that gathered during the preparation of this Environmental Assessment, the "houses on lots 1 and 2 were demolished in the 1980's when lot 1 and part of lot 2 were converted to use as a used car lot and lot 1 converted to use for storage of building and landscape materials. Nearby properties appear to have been developed for commercial use in the first half of the 20th Century."

The existing station has been in operation at that location since the 1950's and is surrounded by both residential and commercial sites. It is more centrally located in the Village of Atkinson. The Existing Facility Location Map is provided in Figure 2 of Appendix A.

Alternative 1. No Action

Under the No Action Alternative, there are no impacts anticipated related to zoning and land use.

Alternative 2. Proposed Action

Under the Proposed Action, a building permit would be required by the local jurisdiction. The permit will be obtained prior to any work commencing on the project. The proposed development is appropriate for the site and consistent with surrounding land use and zoning. No other short-term or long-term effects to zoning and land use patterns in the project area are anticipated.

Alternative 3. Expand and Remodel Existing Facilities

Under this alternative, no impacts related to zoning and land use are anticipated. A building permit would be required for any building addition and for any plumbing or electrical upgrades performed to the existing facility, or the treatment and removal of asbestos, if encountered. These permits, if required, would be obtained prior to any work commencing on the project.

3.4.2 Visual Resources

The proposed site is vacant with the exception of a small, single story, storage building. The remainder of the site is predominantly aggregate covered with a small portion of the property on the eastern end of the site grass covered. Sidewalks border the site on the north, east and west, with overhead utility lines also running along the northern and western boundaries of the property. Bordering the property to the north is Highway 6 followed by residential properties and a mini storage facility (Atkinson Storage). School Street is located immediately to the east of the proposed site followed by Rte 6 Auto Service. The south side of the proposed site is bordered by a residential development. To the west of the proposed site is State Street, followed by residences, with a small used car lot to the northwest, some vacant or agricultural ground to the south west and a school south of that parcel. See Figures 1-3 in Appendix A for a general layout of the area.

Alternative 1. No Action

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

Alternative 2. Proposed Action

Under the Proposed Action, no impacts to visual resources are anticipated. The development would include visual amenities such as increased green space and surrounding landscaping with the overall building development proposed which would enhance the use of the space and the aesthetics of the area.

Alternative 3. Expand and Remodel Existing Facilities

Under this alternative, no impacts related to visual resources are anticipated. A building addition would provide a similar visual experience as the current conditions, and improvements made to the interior of the existing facility would not impact the area's overall visual resources.

3.4.3 Noise

Noise is defined herein as undesirable sound and is federally regulated by the Noise Control Act of 1972 (NCA). Although the NCA gives the EPA authority to prepare guidelines for acceptable ambient noise levels, it only charges those federal agencies that operate noise-producing facilities or equipment to implement noise standards. The EPA's guidelines, and those of many federal agencies, state that outdoor sound levels in excess of 55 decibels (dB) or 45 dB indoors are "normally acceptable" for noise-sensitive land uses such as residences, schools and hospitals. The levels are not single event, or "peak" levels, but rather they represent averages over long periods of time. In addition, 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' judgements in setting standards. The document identifies a 24-hour exposure level of 70 dB as the level of environmental noise that will prevent any measurable hearing loss over a lifetime.

The sound level of a typical sound outdoors falls off in level at 6 dB per doubling of distance. Assuming a typical siren is 115 dB at a distance of 10 feet, at 20 feet 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, and at 1280 feet it will be 73 dB. The District warning sirens will remain at the existing locations once construction is complete (under Alternatives 2 or 3) and will be operated remotely from the new location under Alternative 2. This area is in the downtown portion of the Village and is mostly commercial properties with some adjacent residential. No noise barriers to reduce noise impacts to neighboring residential areas are proposed at this time.

Alternative 1. No Action

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

Alternative 2. Proposed Action

Under the Proposed Action, temporary short-term impacts due to noise may include the use of construction equipment and associated construction activities. To reduce noise levels during the construction period, construction activities would take place during normal business hours, and equipment and machinery installed at the proposed project site would meet Federal, State, and local noise regulations.

Once the new facility is in operation, impacts due to noise may include an increase in vehicle traffic, particularly when equipment and personnel are utilized in either training or response situations. 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 be in excess of the EPA's 24-hour exposure levels for all but the closest residences to the south and west.

Alternative 3. Expand and Remodel Existing Facilities

Under this alternative, temporary short-term impacts due to noise may include the use of construction equipment and associated construction activities which will be mitigated as discussed in Alternative 2. Otherwise, no impacts related to noise are anticipated since the existing facilities operation will generally remain the same.

3.4.4 Public Services and Utilities

Both the existing and proposed facilities are served by the Village of Atkinson for sewer, water, police and fire. Gas and electric services are provided by Mid American Energy. An elementary school is located to the southwest of the proposed project site.

Alternative 1. No Action

Under the No Action Alternative, no impacts related to public services or utilities are anticipated. However, no improvements would be made to the existing facility either and although the Atkinson Fire Protection District would strive to provide as effective and efficient service as possible, the existing facility is in need of major upgrades (sprinkler and exhaust systems) and repairs (new roof) as well as additional space to provide for the needs of the equipment and personnel. Therefore, in the long term, without a new or improved facility, there would be a negative impact on the Atkinson Fire Protection District. In the short-term (and long-term if left unimproved), the existing facility contains no insulation in the structure which creates excessive heating fuel usage. This is both a drain on natural resources as well as on financial resources.

Alternative 2. Proposed Action

Under the Proposed Action, there would be no negative impacts to public services and utilities. Utility connections are present at the site and will only require some underground lines and connections to existing services. While the single structure remaining on the proposed project site has gas, electric and water services, these services will likely be relocated during the construction of the proposed facility. This relocation is not anticipated to result in additional ground disturbance beyond what would normally occur due to the new building construction. Both overhead and underground utilities run along the streets bordering the proposed site to the north (Highway 6) and west (State Street). No trenching outside of the project area is anticipated.

The new facility will be constructed using “green” principles where energy efficient space, materials and equipment will be utilized wherever possible. In addition, the proposed action will significantly improve the services provided by the Atkinson Fire Protection District including fire response, emergency medical services, EMS transport, rescue services, hazmat first response, public safety outreach programs and fire prevention.

Alternative 3. Expand and Remodel Existing Facilities

Under this alternative, no impacts to public utilities or services are anticipated since there would be no significant change to the existing utilities due to the expansion and remodeling efforts. However, since the existing facility may not provide sufficient adequate space for expansion to serve the existing and future needs of both the equipment and personnel, in the long term, there may be a negative impact on the Atkinson Fire Protection District.

3.4.5 Traffic and Circulation

The proposed site is bordered by Highway 6 (Henry Street) on the north end of the property and State Street on the west end of the property. Highway 6 (Henry Street) is a well traveled two lane county highway with State Street being a major two lane roadway connecting to exits for Interstate 80 less than 0.5 mile to the south. Another street, School Street, borders the site to the east, but is less traveled than the northern and western bounding streets. However, access to the site could potentially be from any of the bordering streets.

Alternative 1. No Action

Under the No Action Alternative, traffic and circulation is currently negatively impacted and will continue to be given that the facility is actually located in two separate buildings or stations across the street (Center Street) from one another. In addition, there is no off street parking in close proximity to either structure, with the stations located at the edge of the business district which can have fairly heavy traffic flow at certain times of the day. This puts the volunteer responders at risk as they drive to the station, need to park their personal vehicles off site, then access one station to obtain their personal protective equipment (PPE) and cross the street to get access to the other apparatus.

Alternative 2. Proposed Action

Under the Proposed Action, there would likely be minor temporary increases in the volume of construction traffic and possibly also cause slower traffic flow for the duration of the construction phase, particularly as entrances and exits are cut out and paving provided, utility lines relocated and connected, and with the general construction equipment flows into and out of the new site. It is anticipated that some construction vehicles and materials may be able to be stored on site during project construction. In addition, appropriate traffic control and signage would be utilized.

Over the long term, vehicle traffic would increase at the proposed project site, primarily when personnel are training or responding to traffic accidents, fires, severe weather, or other emergency events. However, no significant adverse impacts to transportation, site access, or traffic levels are anticipated.

Alternative 3. Expand and Remodel Existing Facilities

Under this alternative, minor impacts to traffic and circulation are anticipated depending on whether the street can be closed or if adjacent properties are purchased for the building expansion. If the portions of Center Street on the block containing the Fire Station are closed to traffic, it will require traffic be rerouted to other streets, increasing the traffic patterns on those streets nearby. In addition, commercial and residential access which is currently within the immediate area of the fire station may have to be relocated, causing anything from a minor inconvenience during construction to potential major business consequences as patrons have trouble accessing stores and/or finding parking nearby.

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...”

For the Village of Atkinson as a whole, the local median income is 15% lower than the state average, with increasing unemployment rates (8.9%), declining home/property values (-3% last year), a population change of -4%, and local job reductions of 5.2% all impacting the area served by the Atkinson Fire Protection District in its ability to upgrade and expand the services provided. The U.S. Census Bureau for Atkinson, Illinois as taken from the 2000 Census, reports that of the population of 2001, 98.5% of the population is white, 0.4% African American, 0.1% Asian, 0.3% some other race and 1.2% two or more races. This is roughly consistent with the diversity of Henry County as a whole. See Appendix E for a Fact Sheet for the Village of Atkinson and Henry County. No concentration of minority or low income

populations were identified near the proposed project site, nor is the proposed project anticipated to negatively impact any of these population groups.

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 improvements to the facility.

Alternative 2. Proposed Action

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

Alternative 3. Expand and Remodel Existing Facilities

Under this alternative, there would be no disproportionately high and adverse impacts on minority or low-income populations. Improvements 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.

Alternative 1. No Action

Under the No Action Alternative, there would be no construction and therefore no disproportionate or adverse effects to the population in general would occur. If an emergency event were to occur, the area residents would continue to be served by the existing Atkinson Fire Protection District. However, as stated previously in the report, the deficiencies in the existing facility would continue to exist and continue to endanger the personnel responding to the call for aid. Specifically, this occurs due to the lack of on site parking for personal vehicles and the need for responders to cross the street between the station's buildings to access their PPE and mount apparatus. The lack of an exhaust system in the apparatus bay creates a carbon monoxide exposure risk to the responders as well as the lack of floor drains/trap systems to direct and catch leaking fluids, resulting in a slip hazard on the floor. The current facilities also do not have an approved commercial fire alarm or sprinkler system, nor is there an industrial gear washer and dryer on site, forcing the responders to wash their PPE at off-site locations, causing unnecessary exposure risks to both responders and the public. In addition, the current structures are not handicapped accessible and the only admittance for wheelchairs is through the service bay doors, which presents a potential safety issue to the user due to entering and departing trucks and equipment.

Alternative 2. Proposed Action

Under the Proposed Action, no adverse impacts to safety and security are anticipated. In addition, the negative impacts with the existing facility will be mitigated. The construction of the new facility will enhance the safety and security of the district served by providing adequate space to house all operations, keeping various aspects separated, provide for handicapped accessible entrances, provide a fire alarm and

sprinkler system, a washer/dryer hookup for cleaning contaminated/soiled PPE, and an approved exhaust system in the apparatus bay. This will allow for a more efficient and quick response by the district.

Construction activities would present safety risks to those performing the activities. Access to the site would be restricted to protect the public and to 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.

Alternative 3. Expand and Remodel Existing Facilities

Under this alternative, impacts to safety and security due to remodeling activities include a potential for slower or less efficient response time during the construction activities. In addition, due to site limitations, not all of the needed upgrades for space may be able to be met and therefore many of the safety and security issues outlined under the no action alternative may continue to be present. Specifically, if Center Street cannot be closed and adjacent properties are purchased instead, there may still be a lack of on site parking for personal vehicles and the need for responders to cross the street between the station's buildings to access their PPE and mount apparatus. While an exhaust system may be able to be installed in the apparatus bay, a floor drain may not be and therefore the slip hazard on the floor will remain. Also, space and/or the current utility capacity may not allow for an industrial gear washer and dryer on site, forcing the responders to continue to wash their PPE at off-site locations, causing unnecessary exposure risks to both responders and the public.

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.

The only building on the proposed action site is a small single story structure of relatively recent construction. Otherwise, the remainder of the site is vacant. The Illinois Historic Preservation Agency (IHPA) was consulted regarding the site and indicated that there are no known historic resources that would be adversely affected by the proposed action. The IHPA clearance letter is dated April 23, 2010 and contained in Appendix C.

3.5.1 Historic Structures and Archaeological Resources

On April 9, 2010, a letter and supporting documentation was submitted to the IHPA with a request for IHPA comment and consultation on a Federal Undertaking. The request included documentation

gathered by MEAI on the area of the existing and proposed project site. On April 23, 2010, the IHPA signed the request for IHPA comment and consultation on a Federal Undertaking form, providing concurrence with the determination that no historic properties will be affected by the proposed project. (See Appendix C.)

Alternative 1. No Action

Under the No Action Alternative, there would be no construction and no impacts to historical or cultural resources.

Alternative 2. Proposed Action

Under the Proposed Action, no impacts to historic or archaeological or cultural resources are anticipated. The site has been developed for residential and commercial use since the 1900’s, but no historic properties on or adjacent to the site are known to exist. During construction, ground disturbing activities would be monitored. If human remains are discovered during the course of the project, all ground-disturbing activities on the project site would cease and the coroner’s office, FEMA, and the IHPA would be notified and all reasonable measures taken to avoid or minimize harm until FEMA concludes consultation with the IHPA Officer or, if warranted, other consulting parties.

The two existing facilities the District currently owns and operates will be sold once the proposed action is completed.

Alternative 3. Expand and Remodel Existing Facilities

Under this alternative, no impacts to historic or archaeological or cultural resources are anticipated. The existing buildings are not considered to be historic structures. See Appendix B for existing site photographs. The site and surrounding area have been developed since the 1900’s and the use of the property would not change under this alternative. Improvements to the existing facility would not impact any historic or cultural resources.

3.6 Comparison of Alternatives

This section summarizes the potential impacts of the three (3) alternatives presented in the report. Refer to the sections noted in the body of the report for more detailed information on each of the environments considered and the impacts, including mitigation measures, of the alternatives presented.

AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT	POTENTIAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATION SUMMARY	
	IMPACTS	MITIGATION
3.1 Physical Environment		
3.1.1 Geology	Alt. 1: No impacts to geology Alt. 2: No impacts to geology short-term impacts to soils due to const. 1500cy of earth/1 acre site Alt. 3: No impacts to geology short-term impacts to soils due to const. smaller scale than Alt. 2	None required A SWPP plan is required Stormwater Mngt. & Erosion Control Plan with BMPs will minimize runoff Stormwater BMPs will minimize runoff, proper containment & disposal of demo. materials

3.1.2 Water Resources	<p>Alt. 1: Continued potential impact due to no laundry on site</p> <p>Alt. 2: Positive, provide more runoff containment and treatment than what currently exists</p> <p>Short-term impacts to water due to const. No impacts to groundwater resources</p> <p>Potable water supplied by Village</p> <p>Alt. 3: Potential negative, same as Alt. 1 depending on what improvements are made</p>	<p>Wash PPE at off site locations with water treatment facilities</p> <p>A SWPP plan is required</p> <p>Stormwater Mngt. & Erosion Control Plan with BMPs will minimize runoff</p> <p>Same as Alt. 1</p>
3.1.3 Floodplain Mngt.	<p>Alt. 1: No impacts to floodplain</p> <p>Alt. 2: No impacts to floodplain</p> <p>Alt. 3: No impacts to floodplain</p>	<p>None required</p> <p>None required</p> <p>None required</p>
3.1.4 Air Quality	<p>Alt. 1: Potential impacts from CO in bay</p> <p>Alt. 2 & 3: Short-term impacts from const. w/ dust control and/or exhaust</p>	<p>Take action to ventilate</p> <p>Dust control measures such as watering down const. areas would be implemented as needed. Minimize equip. run times & maintain equip. Seal areas generating dust indoors</p>
3.2 Biological Environment		
3.2.1 Terrest.&Aquatic	<p>Alt. 1: No impacts anticipated</p> <p>Alt. 2: Positive impacts w/ landscape</p> <p>Short-term impacts due to const. About 1500cy of earth/1 acre site will be disturbed</p> <p>Alt. 3: No impacts anticipated</p>	<p>None required</p> <p>Topsoil will be replaced in areas of site & landscaping will include grass, trees & bushes.</p> <p>A SWPP plan is required</p> <p>Topsoil will be replaced in areas of landscaping including trees and bushes to restore some of the envir.</p> <p>None required</p>
3.2.2 Wetlands	<p>Alt. 1: No impacts to wetlands</p> <p>Alt. 2: No impacts to wetlands</p> <p>Alt. 3: No impacts to wetlands</p>	<p>None required</p> <p>None required</p> <p>None required</p>
3.2.3 Species	<p>Alt. 1: No impacts to species</p> <p>Alt. 2: Positive impacts w/ landscape</p> <p>Alt. 3: No impacts to species</p>	<p>None required</p> <p>Landscaping will include grass, trees & bushes to provide habitat</p> <p>None required</p>
3.3 Hazardous Matl.	<p>Alt. 1: No impacts anticipated.</p> <p>Alt. 2 & 3: No impacts anticipated. No hazardous materials are anticipated at either location & no releases of contaminants above Action Levels are thought to be present at either site</p>	<p>None required</p> <p>Any hazardous substances generated, used, or found would be handled and disposed of in accordance with applicable local, State and Federal regulations.</p>
3.4 Socioeconomics		
3.4.1 Zoning	<p>Alt. 1: No zoning impacts anticipated</p> <p>Alt. 2 & 3: No impacts anticipated. A building permit would be obtained.</p>	<p>None required</p> <p>Obtain required building permits from the Village. Also, if asbestos is encountered, removal permits will be obtained & it will be treated per 3.3</p>

3.4.2 Visual Resources	Alt. 1: No impacts anticipated Alt. 2: Positive impacts w/ landscape Alt. 3: No impacts anticipated	None required No mitigation - Landscaping aesthetically pleasing None required
3.4.3 Noise	Alt. 1: No impacts anticipated Alt. 2 & 3: Short-term impacts from const. noise. Long-term impacts from Alt. 2 would include increased traffic & siren noise from vehicles	None required Const. limited to normal business hrs & equip. would meet local, State & Fed. noise regulations. The main sirens will remain at the current facility. The infrequent & short duration noise impacts from vehicles would not cause 24-hour exposure levels to be exceeded.
3.4.4 Pub. Serv. & Util.	Alt. 1: No impacts to utilities are anticipated. Short-term, current facility is outdated & inefficient & a drain on resources & budget. Long-term, facility will be less effective and efficient Alt. 2: Positive impacts w/improvements Potential disruption or delay of emergency response services during the transition from the exist. facility to the new facility Alt. 3: Potential disruption or delay in emergency response services during remodeling & const.	None required New facility will provide improved services overall and more efficient operations Thorough planning & staging of the transition of equip. and personnel from the exist. Facility to the new facility would be req'd to prevent disruption or delay to services Thorough planning & staging of the const. activities would be req'd to minimize disruption or delay of emergency response services.
3.4.5 Traffic	Alt. 1: Parking/access to site will continue to hinder traffic flow in the area Alt. 2: Short-Term increase in the volume of const. traffic and permanent increase in emergency related traffic on adjacent streets Alt. 3: Parking/access to site may continue to hinder traffic flow, and potential to close portion of the street	None without action alternates During const., vehicles and equip. stored on-site to extent possible. Traffic control & signage would be used as needed. Some added parking may be created Street closure would inconvenience as few persons and as little traffic flow as possible. Signage provided.
3.4.6 Envir. Justice	Alt. 1: No impacts anticipated. Lack of improvements may potentially impact all populations Alt. 2 & 3: No impacts anticipated. No disproportionately high or adverse effect on minority or low-income populations is anticipated.	None required None required

<p>3.4.7 Safety&Security</p> <p>Alt. 1: Current negative impacts – see text</p> <p>Off-site parking = pedestrian hazard, Lack of exhaust system = inhalation hazard, Lack of floor drains = fall hazard, Lack of ADA access, Lack of approved fire alarm/sprinkler system, Lack of washers & dryers for contaminated equip.</p> <p>Alt. 2. Positive impacts w/ improvements</p> <p>Short-term risks to const. workers</p> <p>Alt. 3: Potential negative impacts – see text</p> <p>Same items as in Alt. 1 above, if only have space available for a portion of the needed improvements</p>	<p>None without action alternates</p> <p>Corrects/mitigates the impacts noted in Alt. 1 above w/ new building design and land utilization</p> <p>Limit access to site to authorized persons only. Use appropriate signs and barriers and trained personnel.</p> <p>Mitigate through improved facility to the extent possible</p>
<p>3.5 Historic & Cultural</p> <p>Alt. 1: No impacts anticipated</p> <p>Alt. 2. & 3: No impacts anticipated.</p>	<p>None required</p> <p>None required. During const., ground disturbing activities shall be monitored. Should human skeletal remains or historic or archaeological materials be discovered during const., all ground-disturbing activities on the project site would cease and the coroner’s office (in the case of human remains), FEMA, and the IHPA would be notified.</p>

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

SECTION FIVE: PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

FEMA is the lead Federal agency for conducting the NEPA compliance process for The Village of Atkinson, (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 6. Agency responses are provided in Appendix D.

The proposed project has been discussed at numerous Village Council and Fire District Board Meetings that are open to the public.

The Village of Atkinson Fire Protection District will notify the public of the availability of the draft EA through publication of a public notice (see Appendix F) in a local newspaper. FEMA will conduct a public comment period commencing on the initial date of publication of the public notice.

SECTION SIX: MITIGATION MEASURES AND PERMITS

There are no proposed Mitigation Measures with the exception of the Stormwater Pollution Prevention (SWPP) Plan. This plan will be utilized during new construction activities disturbing at least 1 acre of ground, specifically the proposed action alternative. Typical mitigation measures in the SWPP may include the temporary installation of silt fences and/or straw bales, the protection of storm inlets, directing the flow of construction equipment in current gravel covered areas of the site rather than in grass covered areas where soil may be tracked off site, and the proper transport of any excess excavated soils off site rather than stockpiling unneeded soils on site.

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 C, D, E, and F.

1. Illinois Historic Preservation Agency
2. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
3. Illinois Department of Natural Resources
4. Village of Atkinson

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 may be required prior to construction:

1. National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES)
2. Building Permit (Village of Atkinson)
3. Driveway Construction Permit (Village of Atkinson)
4. Erosion Control and Stormwater Management Permit (IDNR and Henry County)
5. Sanitary District Permit (District)
6. Henry County Highway Department

SECTION SEVEN: CONSULTATIONS AND REFERENCES

Contact via Mail: Anne E. Haaker
Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer
Illinois Historic Preservation Agency
1 Old Stat Capitol Plaza
Springfield, IL 62701-1512
217.785.5027

U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), Natural Resources Conservation Service.
<http://websoilsurvey.nrcs.usda.gov> Accessed April 2010.

U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), Natural Resources Conservation Service.
Soil Survey of Henry County, Illinois, October 1984 Accessed April 2010

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS).
<http://www.fws.gov/midwest/endangered/lists/illinois-cty.html>. Accessed April 2010

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). National Wetlands Inventory
<http://www.fws.gov/wetlands/Data/Mapper>

USGS and Illinois State Geological Survey
<http://earthquake.usgs.gov/earthquakes/states/illinois/hazards.php>
<http://www.isgs.illinois.edu/research/earthquake-hazards/pdf-files/earthquakes-thru-08.pdf>

U.S. Census Bureau – Accessed April 2010
<http://www.factfinder.census.gov/servlet>
FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM)
http://msc.fema.gov/webapp/wcs/stores/servlet/info?storeId=10001&catalogId=10001&langId=-1&content=firnetteHelp_A&title=FIRMettes

Illinois EPA Air Quality
<http://www.epa.state.il.us/public-notice/2008/chicago-ozone-attainment/technical-report-figures.pdf>

U. S. Environmental Protection Agency – Watershed Information
http://cfpub.epa.gov/surf/huc.cfm?huc_code=07090007

Phase I Environmental Site Assessment of Nelson and Anderson et al. Properties by Seneca Companies, April 4, 2007 – Accessed April 2010

Soil Sampling Results 105 E. Henry Street and 100 S. State Street Atkinson, Illinois by Seneca Companies, July 11, 2007 – Accessed April 2010

Illinois Department of Natural Resources (DNR), Ecological Compliance Assessment Tool (EcoCAT) - Accessed May 13, 2010

FEMA Region V – Endangered Species determination memo – May 13, 2010

SECTION EIGHT: LIST OF PREPARERS

McCLURE ENGINEERING ASSOCIATES, INC. (MEAI)

Valerie A. Chambers, P.E. – Project Engineer
Brent O. Morlok, P.E. - Project Manager
Jerry L. Bishop – Project Manager

Valerie Chambers and Jerry Bishop were the principal preparers of this document in consultation with Brent Morlok as well as the other individuals and agencies identified in this document.