Draft Environmental Assessment

Tipsinah Mounds Campground Safe Room

City of Elbow Lake, Minnesota
November 2010

Prepared by:
Ulteig Engineers, Inc
3350 38th Avene South
Fargo, North Dakota 58104

City of Elbow Lake
P.O. Box 1079
Elbow Lake, Minnesota 56531

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

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ATTACHMENTS

Acronyms and Abbreviations

ACHP	Advisory Council on Historic Preservation
APE	Area of Potential Effect
BMP	Best Management Practice
CAA	Clean Air Act
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
CEQ	Council on Environmental Quality
CWA	Clean Water Act
dB	decibel
EA	Environmental Assessment
EIS	Environmental Impact Statement
EO	Executive Order
EPA	Environmental Protection Agency
ESA	Endangered Species Act
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency
FIRM	Flood Insurance Rate Map
FONSI	Finding of No Significant Impact
FPPA	Farmland Protection Policy Act
JD	Jurisdictional Determination
MnDNR	Minnesota Department of Natural Resources
MN SHPO	Minnesota State Historic Preservation Office
NAAQS	National Ambient Air Quality Standards
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
NHPA	National Historic Preservation Act
NPDES	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
NRCS	Natural Resources Conservation Service
NWI	National Wetland Inventory
SWPPP	Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan
USACE	United States Army Corps of Engineers
USDA	United States Department of Agriculture
USFWS	United States Fish and Wildlife Service

1. Introduction

1.1 Project Authority

The City of Elbow Lake, Minnesota (MN) has applied to the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) for assistance within the Hazard Mitigation Grant Program (HMGP) under disaster number DR-1772-MN. FEMA grants funds under the HMGP, under Section 406 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act, to implement long-term hazard mitigation measures after a major disaster declaration. Administration of the grants is made under the provisions of Section 404 of the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act (44 CFR 206.430).

On June 25, 2008, President Bush declared that a major disaster exists in the State of Minnesota due to severe storms and flooding. This declaration made the HMGP assistance, requested by Governor Tim Pawlenty on June 17, 2008, available for hazard mitigation measures statewide.

This Environmental Assessment (EA) documents the results of analysis of the proposed project's potential environmental impacts, and has been prepared in compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969; the President's Council on Environmental Quality regulations implementing NEPA (40 Code of Federal Regulations [CFR] Parts 1500-1508); and Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) regulations implementing NEPA (44 CFR Part 10.9). In compliance with NEPA and its implementing regulations, FEMA has prepared this EA to analyze potential environmental impacts associated with several alternatives to meet the stated purpose and need.

1.2 Project Location

The discussed alternatives are located in Grant County at the Tipsinah Mounds Campground (Campground) adjacent to the Pomme de Terre Lake (see Figure 1). The Campground is located approximately 3 miles east of the City of Elbow Lake, MN. The location is approximately at 45° 59'55.7"N, -95° 53'15.2"W.

1.3 Project Description

The proposed project consists of constructing a 20-foot by 80-foot Safe Room to protect the users of Tipsinah Mounds Campground from adverse weather. Construction will be compliant with Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) 361, *Design and Construction Guidance for Safe Rooms*.

2. Purpose and Need

The purpose of the Hazard Mitigation Grant Program is to reduce the loss of life and property due to natural disasters and to enable mitigation measures to be implemented during the recovery from a disaster. The Hazard Mitigation Grant Program provides grants to States and local governments to implement long-term hazard mitigation measures after a major disaster declaration

Grant County, MN has significant risk from tornados and has experienced 14 tornados from 1950 to 2009, accounting for approximately $5.5 million dollars in property damage and no deaths. During the same time period, Grant County has experienced 86 severe thunderstorms and high wind storms, accounting for approximately $996,000 in property damages and $360,000 in crop damages. Currently,

Tipsinah Mounds Campground, located in Grant County, has no protection for users if adverse weather should arise. There is only one road leading in and out of the Campground and the nearest public shelter is at the public library in Elbow Lake approximately 4 miles away. The need for the project is to provide a measure of protection to Campground users during adverse weather conditions.

3. Alternatives

This section describes the alternatives that were considered in addressing the purpose and need stated in Section II. Two alternatives were evaluated and carried forward: the No Action Alternative and the Proposed Action Alternative, which includes a 20-foot by 80-foot Safe Room. A third alternative was discussed but dismissed in the evaluation process - the Installation of an Early Warning System.

3.1 Alternatives Evaluated

3.1.1 Alternative 1 – No Action Alternative

Under the **No Action Alternative**, the Applicant would do nothing; no improvements would be made to reduce the risk to campground users associated with severe weather.

3.1.2 Alternative 2 – Construction of a Safe Room (Proposed Action)

Under the Proposed Action Alternative, the City of Elbow Lake proposes to construct a 1,600-square-foot Safe Room to reduce the risk of users of Tipsinah Mounds Campground from exposure to adverse weather conditions. The proposed site plan for the Safe Room is shown in Figure 2.

The proposed site is currently used by the Campground as primitive campsites. It is centrally located in the Campground, adjacent to a parking lot.

The proposed safe room would be a 20-foot by 80-foot, single story, slab-on-grade structure constructed with reinforced masonry designed to withstand 250 mile-per-hour winds. Ground disturbance should be limited to a depth of 5 feet and an area of 30-foot by 90-foot or slightly larger than the actual building footprint being proposed. This structure will be accessible 24 hours per day and is designed to accommodate 300 people during emergencies. The required site work will consist of the clearance of vegetation within the proposed project site. The proposed facility will tie into existing utilities and infrastructure located on-site.

Visitors would be informed of the availability of the safe room through signage and information received during check-in.

The safe room would be compliant with FEMA 361 standards for community safe rooms, including capacity, design, and construction. The proposed project would be designed in accordance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA), providing accessibility to all users of Tipsinah Mounds Campground.

3.1.3 Alternative Considered but Dismissed – Installation of an Early Warning System

A third alternative was discussed through the project planning process but was considered and dismissed. This alternative would include the installation of an early warning siren that would sound to encourage users of the campground to leave by automobile. The siren would be installed on an existing power pole centrally located in Tipsinah Mounds Campground. This alternative was dismissed because

it offers limited protection to the campground users. Encouraging users to evacuate the campground could cause traffic congestion and create additional hazards such as traffic accidents due to high risk driving in adverse weather conditions.

4. Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences

This section is organized by individual resources; it includes a description of the existing conditions at each of the alternative sites, and provides an analysis of potential environmental consequences for each alternative. Information for this section was derived from a review of relevant literature and websites, as well as communication with resource agencies.

4.1 Geology and Soils

The project area is located in northeast Grant County, in the west-central part of Minnesota. The major types of existing soils in the project area are approximately 95 percent Arvilla sandy loam and 5 percent Sioux loamy coarse sand (Natural Resources Conservation Service, 1978). These are not classified as hydric soils or Prime Farmland (Natural Resource Conservation Service consultation letter; June 24, 2010; Appendix B).

Alternative 1 – No Action Alternative
Under the **No Action Alternative**, no construction would occur. Therefore, geology and soils would not be affected.

Alternative 2 – Construction of a Safe Room (Proposed Action)
Under the **Proposed Action Alternative**, construction activities would not be deep enough to impact underlying geological resources. Soils on the proposed project site would be disturbed to construct the safe room. Implementation of appropriate Best Management Practices (BMPs) would be required at the construction site including the installation of silt fence to minimize the potential for soil erosion and the re-vegetation of soils immediately upon completion of construction to stabilize soils. It is not expected that there will be any spoil resulting from the project, as the existing site is level. Excavated soil and waste will be managed and disposed of in accordance to applicable local, state, and federal regulations. If contaminated materials are discovered during the construction activities, the work will cease until the appropriate procedures and permits can be implemented.

A consultation letter, dated June 23, 2010, was submitted to the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) requesting agency review and comments regarding the proposed project. In a response letter dated June 24, 2010, NRCS stated that the project should have no adverse impacts to the environment (see Appendix B).

4.2 Water Quality: Floodplain, Hydrology, and Wetlands

4.2.1 Floodplains and Hydrology

Executive Order (E.O.) 11988 requires Federal agencies to minimize the occupancy and modifications of floodplains. Specifically, E.O. 11988 prohibits Federal agencies from funding activities in or affecting the 100-year floodplain unless there are no practical alternatives. Potential impacts related to floodplain management include damages to structures located in the floodplain and changes to the

extent, elevation, or other features of the floodplain as a result of flood protection measures or other structures being sited in or removed from the floodplain. The project is located adjacent to Pomme de Terre Lake.

Alternative 1 – No Action Alternative
Under the **No Action Alternative**, no construction would occur. Therefore, the **No Action Alternative** would not affect the floodplain.

Alternative 2 – Construction of a Safe Room (Proposed Action)
A review of the Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRM) for the **Proposed Action Alternative** site indicates that it is located outside the 100 and 500-year floodplains (FIRM panel number 2705490002A). The proposed site is located approximately 500 feet from the nearest 100-year floodplain (Pomme de Terre Lake). Under this alternative, no adverse impacts to the floodplain are anticipated, nor would the facility be subject to flooding hazards.

The proposed project would increase the amount of impervious surface at the new site; however, the resulting increase in runoff from the proposed building is not anticipated to be significant because of the minimal size of the proposed safe room. The added impervious surface area would be approximately 1600 square feet. In order to minimize erosion during construction, the Applicant would be required to implement erosion and sedimentation control measures and Best Management Practices (BMPs), which would be included as a condition of FEMA funding.

4.2.2 Wetlands

The United States Army Corps of Engineers regulates the discharge of dredged or filled material into waters of the U.S., including wetlands, pursuant to Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. Additionally, EO 11990 (Protection of Wetlands) requires Federal agencies to avoid, to the extent possible, adverse impacts on wetlands that may result from federally funded actions and take actions to avoid, or minimize potential impacts. "Wetlands" are defined as those areas that are inundated or saturated by surface or groundwater for a majority of the growing season during most years. This wetland hydrology must occur with a frequency and duration sufficient to support a dominance of vegetation species adapted to living in wet (saturated or seasonally saturated) soil conditions. The three primary indicators that must be present for an area to be considered as a Federal jurisdictional wetland are wetland hydrology, wetland vegetation, and hydric soil conditions.

Alternative 1 – No Action Alternative
Under the **No Action Alternative**, no construction would occur and there would be no impacts to wetlands.

Alternative 2 – Construction of a Safe Room (Proposed Action)
Per the National Wetlands Inventory (NWI) map (Appendix A) as managed by the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), the closest wetland (including drainage-ways, streams, rivers, ponds, marshes, bogs, and swamps) is located approximately 500 feet from the **Proposed Action Alternative** site (USFWS, 2010). Due to the distance from the proposed site, this alternative would not affect any wetlands or waters of the U.S.

A consultation letter, dated June 23, 2010, was submitted to the United States Army Corps of Engineers St. Paul District (USACE) requesting agency review and comments regarding the proposed project. In

an official response letter dated July 7, 2010, the USACE stated that the project is not within the regulatory jurisdiction of the Corps of Engineers and a USACE permit is not required (Appendix B).

4.3 Air Quality

Heavy construction is a source of air emissions that can have a temporary impact on local air quality. Emissions associated with construction are from two sources: fumes from construction vehicles and fugitive dust from ground-disturbing activities. The quantity of dust emissions from construction operations is related to the construction area, level of activity, the type of soil, and the type of construction vehicles.

Under the Clean Air Act (CAA), the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) established National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) for air quality contaminants considered harmful to public health and the environment. Grant County is in an attainment zone, or area where the NAAQS are being met.

Alternative 1 – No Action Alternative
Under the **No Action Alternative**, no construction or operations would occur. Therefore, the **No Action Alternative** would have no effects to air quality, and would be in compliance with the CAA.

Alternative 2 – Construction of a Safe Room (Proposed Action)
The proposed safe room would not emit any air pollutants. Under the **Proposed Action Alternative**, no long-term impacts to air quality would occur. Short-term impacts to air quality may occur during construction of the facility.

If necessary, the Applicant would be required to periodically wet down the site during construction to reduce fugitive dust. Emissions from fuel-burning combustion engines (e.g., heavy equipment, earthmoving machinery, and motor vehicles) could temporarily increase air pollutants; to minimize the potential for these impacts, the Applicant would be required to properly maintain the engines, and fuel-burning equipment run times would be kept to a minimum. These mitigation measures would help reduce air quality impacts. Any impacts that could potentially occur as a result of construction activities would be limited to the immediate project vicinity, would last only as long as the duration of construction, and would not result in any long-term impacts.

4.4 Biological Resources

Threatened and Endangered Species

The Endangered Species Act of 1973 (ESA) requires that Federal agencies determine the effect of their actions on threatened and endangered species of fish, wildlife, and their habitats, and take steps to conserve and protect these species. There are no federally listed threatened or endangered species in Grant County, MN. The MN Department of Natural Resources (MnDNR) database contains one record of listed species, the Cypripedium candidum (Small White Lady's-slipper), in the project vicinity. The Small White Lady's-slipper was last observed in the area on June, 5, 1980 (see correspondence dated July 20, 2010 from MnDNR in Appendix B)

The Small White Lady's-slipper is a state special concern plant found in calcareous groundwater seeps and wet prairies. Measuring about 1 foot tall, with 3 to 4 slightly ascending leaves, it blooms a single flower with a white inflated pouch, 2 long curly brownish petals at the sides, 1 narrow sepal above and 2 fused sepals below the pouch (MnDNR website, accessed July 29, 2010, http://www.dnr.state.mn.us/wildflowers/smallwhiteladysslipper.html).

Alternative 1 – No Action Alternative
Under the **No Action Alternative**, no construction would occur, and there would be no impact to any habitat; therefore no impacts are anticipated to the Small White Lady's-slipper.

Alternative 2 – Construction of a Safe Room (Proposed Action)
Under the **Proposed Action Alternative**, the proposed project site would be cleared and graded, removing some grasses.

Consultation letters, date June 23, 2010, were submitted to the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources (MnDNR) requesting agency review and comments regarding the proposed project. In a response letter dated July 20, 2010, the MnDNR stated that the proposed project will not negatively affect any known occurrences of rare features (see Appendix B). No response from the USFWS has been received to date.

4.5 Cultural Resources

National Historic Preservation Act:

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.

Alternative 1 – No Action Alternative
Under the **No Action Alternative**, no construction would occur. Therefore, the **No Action Alternative** would not have any effects to cultural resources, and would be in compliance with the NHPA.

Alternative 2 – Construction of a Safe Room (Proposed Action)
Under the **Proposed Action Alternative**, no historic properties would be affected. Previous archaeological surveys within the vicinity of the proposed project site have identified prehistoric burial

mounds and a village site in the general location. However, no impacts to these burial mounds or village site are anticipated. In the event that archeological deposits are discovered, the project shall be halted. The applicant shall stop all work immediately in the vicinity of the discovery and take reasonable measures to avoid or minimize harm to the finds. The applicant will inform FEMA immediately and FEMA will consult with the SHPO or Tribal Historic Preservation Office (THPO) and Tribes and work in sensitive areas cannot resume until consultation is completed and appropriate measures have been taken to ensure that the project is in compliance with the NHPA. FEMA determination letter dated August 19, 2010. SHPO concurrence letter dated September 13, 2010 (see Appendix B).

A consultation letter, dated June 23, 2010, was submitted to the MN State Archaeologist requesting agency review and comments regarding the proposed project. In a response letter dated June 30, 2010, the State Archaeologist recommended an archaeological survey of the project area be completed due to previously identified prehistoric burial mounds and a village site in the general location of the project. It was determined that the survey was unnecessary due to the current use of the site. Upon further phone consultation with the State Historic Preservation Office National Register Archaeologist it was determined that there are no archaeological issues with the proposed project because the proposed site has been disturbed and there would be no need for the Archaeological Survey.

Tribal Coordination:

Consultation letters, dated July 12, 2010, were submitted to area Tribes requesting review and comments regarding the proposed project. No responses have been received to date.

4.6 Socioeconomics and Environmental Justice

Executive Order 12898 (Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations) mandates that federal agencies identify and address, as appropriate, disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of their programs, policies, and activities on minority and low-income populations.

According to the 2000 American Community Survey (US Census Bureau, 2000), approximately 6 percent of families and 8.4 percent of individuals in Grant County are below the poverty level; these levels are slightly below the national average of approximately 9.2 percent for families and 12.4 percent for individuals. The population of Grant County is composed of approximately 98.3 percent Caucasian, 0.3 percent American Indian and Alaskan Native and 0.3 percent of Hispanic (some other races). The percentage of Caucasians in the County is well above the national average; the percentages of American Indian and Alaskan Native and Hispanic populations are much lower (US Census Bureau, 2000).

Alternative 1 – No Action Alternative
Under the **No Action Alternative**, no construction would occur. Therefore, the **No Action Alternative** would not change social and economic resources when compared with existing conditions within the project area.

Alternative 2 – Construction of a Safe Room (Proposed Action)
The **Proposed Action Alternative** would provide a safe room that would be accessible by and a benefit to all users of the Campground. There would be no disproportionately high or adverse impact on

minority or low-income portions of the population. All populations would benefit from the protection provided by the safe room.

Zoning and Land Use:

Alternative 1 – No Action Alternative
The **No Action Alternative**, no construction would occur; therefore, no impacts to zoning and land use are anticipated.

Alternative 2 – Construction of a Safe Room (Proposed Action)
Under the **Proposed Action Alternative,** the site has been zoned by Grant County as a campground through a conditional use permit. The proposed building construction would be consistent with zoning and land use designations at the site. Therefore, no impacts are anticipated under this alternative.

Visual Resources:

Alternative 1 – No Action Alternative
Under the **No Action Alternative,** no construction would occur; therefore, no impacts to visual resources are anticipated.

Alternative 2 – Construction of a Safe Room (Proposed Action)
The **Proposed Action Alternative** proposes to construct a building on a parcel located on the Campground property. The construction of the proposed building would remove the vegetation and potential wildlife habitat, and would adversely impact aesthetics and visual resources, but due to the small size of the building, potential impacts to aesthetics resulting from the **Proposed Action** would be minimal.

4.7 Noise

Noise can be considered unwanted sound and sound is typically measured in decibels (dB). 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 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 levels would be consistent with a 24-hour average of 70 dB, as long as a sufficient amount of relative quiet is experienced.

Alternative 1 – No Action Alternative
Under the **No Action Alternative**, no construction would occur. Therefore, no additional noise would be generated.

Alternative 2 – Construction of a Safe Room (Proposed Action)

The proposed action alternative site is not located near sensitive noise receptors (nursing homes, hospitals, etc.). Under the **Proposed Action Alternative**, temporary short-term increases in noise levels are anticipated during the construction period. To reduce noise levels during that period, construction activities would take place during normal business hours. Equipment and machinery installed at the proposed project site would meet all local, state, and federal noise regulations.

4.8 Traffic and Transportation

The proposed project site is centrally located in the Tipsinah Mounds Campground. Access to the site is provided from the southwest by Judy's Road and from the southeast by local campground roads.

Alternative 1 – No Action Alternative
Under the **No Action Alternative**, no construction would occur. Therefore, the No Action Alternative would not have any effects to traffic and transportation.

Alternative 2 – Construction of a Safe Room (Proposed Action)
Under the Proposed Action Alternative, there would be a minor temporary increase in the volume of construction traffic on roads in the immediate vicinity of the proposed project site that could potentially result in a slower traffic flow during the construction phase. To mitigate potential delays, construction vehicles and equipment would be stored on site during the project construction and appropriate signage would be posted on affected roadways.

Over the long term, vehicle traffic would increase at the proposed project site only during severe weather and other emergency events as users of the campground drive to the safe room. The safe room would be accessible by car in the center of the Campground. Cars would park in the Campground parking lot, once the lot is full, some vehicles may need to park on the adjacent campground roads surrounding the safe room site. The proposed project will increase safety as users of the Campground will not be driving in hazardous weather.

A consultation letter, dated June 23, 2010, was submitted to the Minnesota Department of Transportation (MnDOT) requesting agency review and comments regarding the project. No response has been received to date.

4.9 Hazardous and Toxic Materials

Hazardous substances are defined as any solid, liquid, contained gaseous or semisolid waste, or any combination of wastes that pose a substantial present or potential hazard to human health and the environment. Hazardous substances are primarily generated by industry, hospitals, research facilities, and the government. Improper management and disposal of hazardous substances can lead to pollution of groundwater or other drinking water supplies, and the contamination of surface water and soil. The primary federal regulations for the management and disposal of hazardous substances are the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA) and the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA).

Alternative 1 – No Action Alternative

Under the **No Action Alternative** there would be no hazardous material impacts as there would be no work completed.

Alternative 2 – Construction of a Safe Room (Proposed Action)
Under the **Proposed Action Alternative**, no hazardous materials or waste impacts are anticipated. Any hazardous materials discovered, generated, or used during the construction of the safe room would be handled and disposed of in accordance with applicable local, state, and federal regulations.

4.10 Safety

Safety and security issues considered in the EA include the health and safety of the Campground users and the public-at-large, and the protection of personnel involved in activities related to the proposed construction of the Safe Room.

Executive Order 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 Alternative
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, users of Tipsinah Mounds Campground, including children, would be at risk of injury and death during severe weather events such as tornados.

Alternative 2 – Construction of a Safe Room (Proposed Action)
Under the **Proposed Action Alternative,** the Safe Room would provide protection for the users of the Campground, including children, during severe weather events. The Safe Room would accommodate 300 users.

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

4.11 Summary

Table 1 summarizes the results of the environmental review process.

Table 1: Potential Impacts Summary		
Potentially Affected Resource Areas	**Potential Impacts**	
	Alternative 1: No Action	**Alternative 2: Safe Room**
Geology and Soils	No impacts	Temporary construction-related impacts. BMPs and erosion control measures are anticipated to mitigate any potential impacts.
Surface Water	No impacts	Temporary short-term impacts to surface water are possible during construction activities.
Groundwater	No impacts	No impacts
Floodplains (E.O. 11988)	No impacts	Project site is not located in a floodplain.
Wetlands (E.O. 11990)	No impacts	There are no jurisdictional wetlands located in the project area
Water Quality	No impacts	No impacts
Air Quality	No impacts	Construction-related emissions would be temporary and not significant.
Threatened and Endangered Species (Endangered Species Act)	No impacts	No impacts
Cultural Resources (National Historic Preservation Act)	No impacts	No known historic resources exist at or near the proposed site.
Socioeconomic and Environmental Justice (E.O. 12898)	No impacts	No impacts
Noise	No impacts	Noise levels would increase temporarily during construction. Impacts would be minor as compared to existing noise levels, short-term, and limited to the duration of construction activities. Additional noise generated from the operation would be negligible.
Traffic and Transportation	No impacts	A slight increase in traffic could result from construction and operational activities; however impacts would be negligible.
Hazardous Materials and Toxic Wastes	No impacts	No impacts. If hazardous materials are discovered or used during project implementation, the hazardous materials will be removed and disposed of in accordance with local, state, and federal standards.
Safety	No increased level of protection from severe weather resulting in the possibility of injury and death	No disproportionate health and safety risks to children

5. Cumulative Effects

Cumulative adverse effects are the adverse effects on the environment, which may result from a number of actions taking place within the same geographical region. A significant adverse effect of this kind occurs when the accumulated adverse effects of all of the proposed actions are added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions.

To address cumulative impacts, FEMA has determined that the implementation of the Proposed Action would have an overall positive impact on human health and the environment as compared to the No Action, and Installation of a Warning System Alternatives. No other projects are ongoing or anticipated in the vicinity of the Proposed Action project area within the foreseeable future. There would be no significant cumulative adverse effects expected as a result of the implementation of the **Proposed Action** as evaluated in this EA.

6. Public Participation

FEMA is the lead Federal agency for conducting the NEPA compliance process for the proposed project in Tipsinah Mounds Campground (City of Elbow Lake). 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. The City of Elbow Lake will notify the public of the availability of the Draft Environmental Assessment through publication of a public notice in a local newspaper. FEMA will conduct a public comment period commencing on the initial date of publication of the public notice.

7. Agency Coordination

Various local, state, and federal agencies were contacted to request project review during the preparation of this Environmental Assessment. Responses received to date are included in Appendix B. The following Agencies and Tribes were consulted:

- U.S. Department of Agriculture
- MN Department of Commerce
- MN Environmental Quality Board
- MN Department of Health
- MN Department of Natural Resources, Environmental Review, Fisheries, Lands and Minerals, Natural Heritage and Nongame Research Program, and Waters
- MN Pollution Control Agency
- MN Department of Transportation
- MN Board of Water and Soil Resources
- MN State Archaeologists
- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
- U.S. Environmental Protections Agency
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
- City of Elbow Lake
- Grant County Planning and Zoning
- Grant County Soil and Water Conservation District
- Natural Resources Conservation Service

- USDA/SPHIS/Wildlife Services
- Bois De Sioux Watershed District
- MN State Historic Preservation Officer
- Upper Sioux Community of Minnesota
- Santee Sioux Tribe
- Spirit Lake Tribal Council
- Prairie Island Indian Community
- Flandreau Santee Sioux Executive Committee
- Lower Sioux Indian Community of Minnesota
- Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community of Minnesota

8. Conditions

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

- Grant County Conditional Use Permit

No Action Alternative:

1. Proposes that the Applicant does nothing; therefore there are no project conditions.

Proposed Action

1. The applicant is responsible for obtaining and complying with all required local, State and Federal permits and approvals including the Grant County Conditional Use Permit. Proof of permits will be required to be submitted to FEMA for project closeout.

2. The applicant will monitor ground disturbance during the construction phase; should human skeletal remains, or historic or archaeological materials be discovered during construction, all ground-disturbing activities on the project site shall cease and the applicant shall notify the coroner's office (in the case of human remains), FEMA, and the State Historic Preservation Office.

3. If deviations from the proposed scope of work result in substantial design changes, the need for additional ground disturbance, additional removal of vegetation, or in any other unanticipated changes to the physical environment, the Grantee must contact FEMA, and a re-evaluation under NEPA and other applicable environmental laws will be conducted by FEMA.

4. Construction vehicles and equipment would be stored on site during project construction and appropriate signage would be a posted on affected roadways. All construction activities will be performed using qualified personnel and in accordance with the standards specified in Occupational Safety and Health Administration regulations. Construction would take place only during normal business hours and all equipment will meet local, State and Federal noise regulations.

5. Proposed construction activities would require only minimal excavation. Any hazardous materials discovered, generated, or used during construction would be handled and disposed of in accordance with applicable local, State, and Federal Regulations.

9. References, and Agencies Consulted

See Appendix B for a list of all Agencies consulted for this project.

United States Census Bureau. 2000. *2000 American Community Survey*. Retrieved on July 29, 2010, from http://www.census.gov/

United States Fish and Wildlife Service, National Wetlands Inventory, June 2010. http://wetlandsfws.er.usgs.gov/. As Processed by: Ulteig Engineers, GIS Department, 2010. Accessed Using: ArcReader [GIS software]. Version 9.1.

10. EA Document Preparers

Name and Education	Contribution	Discipline / Experience
Bob Schliemen, PE B.S. Civil Engineering	Project Manager, Document Review, Quality Control	Ulteig Engineers, Inc. – 7 years of experience primarily in municipal engineering.
Jennifer Hanley, PE B.S. Civil Engineering MBA	Primary Author of EA	Ulteig Engineers, Inc. – 12 years of experience, primarily in transportation engineering and environmental documentation.
Mike Zimney B.S. Geography MBA MA	Graphics and GIS	Ulteig Engineers, Inc. – 7 years of experience as a Planner and GIS Specialist
Duane Castaldi	FEMA Environmental Protection Specialist	