DETERMINATION OF LEVEL OF REVIEW ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW RECORD Project Name: City of Yale New Well Project CDBG Contract Number: 22-WS-023 Project Location: City of Yale

Project Description (Attach additional descriptive information, as appropriate to the project, including narrative, maps, photographs, site plans, budgets and other information.): This project will entail the construction of a new 100-foot depth, 75-gallon per minute well to replace the failing well that currently exists. This new well will also include a backwash pond, as well as a backup generator, which the current wells lack. This well will add 75 Gallons per Minute to the current water supply in Yale. The failing well will then be abandoned. The complete project description and location can be found in the Preliminary Engineering Report.

The subject project has been reviewed pursuant to HUD regulations 24 CFR Part 58 "Environmental Review Procedures for Entities Assuming HUD Environmental Responsibilities," and the following determination with respect to the project is made:

Exempt from NEPA review requirements per 24 CFR 58.34(a)()

Categorically Excluded NOT Subject to §58.5 authorities per 24 CFR 58.35(b)()

Categorically Subject to §58.5 authorities per 24 CFR 58.35(a)() (A Statutory Checklist for the §58.5 authorities is attached.)

An Environmental Assessment (EA) is required to be performed in accordance with subpart E of 24 CFR Part 58 is attached.

An Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is required to be performed.

The ERR (see §58.38) must contain all the environmental review documents, public notices and written determinations or environmental findings required by Part 58 as evidence of review, decision making and actions pertaining to a particular project. Include additional information including checklists, studies, analyses and documentation as appropriate.

Chief Elected Official:		
<u>Tom Godwin</u> Print Name	Signature	
Mayor	12/6/2022	
Title	Date	
	Updated 3/8/2012	

opulled 5/6/2012

All projects will need to submit this form with their ERR to IEDA prior to a release of funds being is issued.

Environmental Assessment Determinations and Compliance Findings for HUD-assisted Projects 24 CFR Part 58

This is a suggested format that may be used by Responsible Entities to document completion of an Environmental Assessment.

Project Information

Project Name: City of Yale New Well Project

Responsible Entity: City of Yale, IA

Grant Recipient (if different than Responsible Entity):

State/Local Identifier:

Preparer: Luke Hamill, Regional Planner

Certifying Officer Name and Title: Tom Godwin, Mayor

Grant Recipient (if different than Responsible Entity):

Consultant (if applicable):

Direct Comments to: Luke Hamill, Regional Planner, Region XII Council of Governments, 712-792-9914, lhamill@region12cog.org

Project Location: 900 South Street, Yale, IA

Description of the Proposed Project [24 CFR 50.12 & 58.32; 40 CFR 1508.25]:

This project will entail the construction of a new 100 foot depth, 75 gallon per minute well to replace the failing well that currently exists. This new well will also include a backwash pond, as well as a backup generator, which the current wells lack. This well will add 75 Gallons per Minute to the current water supply in Yale. The failing well will then be abandoned.

Statement of Purpose and Need for the Proposal [40 CFR 1508.9(b)]:

The purpose of the project is to replace the failing well that currently exists in the City of Yale with a new well. The existing well has been found to be contaminating the water in the town. The replacement of the city's well will make the city's water supply compliant with Iowa DNR standards.

Existing Conditions and Trends [24 CFR 58.40(a)]:

The City of Yale currently has two wells that are used for water distribution. It was found in the Preliminary Engineering Report conducted by Short Elliott Hendrickson that one of the two wells has started to fail and does not produce usable water anymore. The Iowa DNR requires that public water suppliers have two sources of water supply. With this failing well, the City also lacks the firm capacity standards recommended by the Great Lakes Upper Mississippi River Board. Additionally, the backwash is discharged to a draintile that does not meet the requirements of an NPDES discharge permit.

Funding Information

Grant Number	HUD Program	Funding Amount
22-WS-023	CDBG	\$267,000

Estimated Total HUD Funded Amount: \$267,000

Estimated Total Project Cost (HUD and non-HUD funds) [24 CFR 58.32(d)]: **Total Cost:** \$676,620; **HUD Funds:** \$267,000; **Non-HUD Funds:** \$409,620

Compliance with 24 CFR 50.4, 58.5, and 58.6 Laws and Authorities

Record below the compliance or conformance determinations for each statute, executive order, or regulation. Provide credible, traceable, and supportive source documentation for each authority. Where applicable, complete the necessary reviews or consultations and obtain or note applicable permits of approvals. Clearly note citations, dates/names/titles of contacts, and page references. Attach additional documentation as appropriate.

Compliance Factors : Statutes, Executive Orders, and Regulations listed at 24 CFR §58.5 and §58.6	Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?	Compliance determinations
---	---	---------------------------

Airport Hazards 24 CFR Part 51 Subpart D	Yes	No ×	Project is NOT located within 2,500 feet of the end of a civil airport runway or 15,000 feet of the end of a military Airfield runway. HUD policy is to promote compatible land uses in RCZ/CZ/APZ. Airport map can be found in Appendix A.
Coastal Barrier Resources Coastal Barrier Resources Act, as amended by the Coastal Barrier Improvement Act of 1990 [16 USC 3501]	Yes	No X	No coastal zone management programs exist in the states of HUD Region VII, as established by Nat'l Oceanic & Atmospheric Administration, Office of Ocean and Coastal Resource Management.
Flood Insurance Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 and National Flood Insurance Reform Act of 1994 [42 USC 4001-4128 and 42 USC 5154a]	Yes	No ⊠	Project is NOT located within a 100 year or 500 year floodplain, so Flood Insurance is not necessary for this project. The Yale FIRM can be found in Appendix G. Map Panel Number: 19077C0088D
STATUTES, EXECUTIVE ORD	ERS, A	AND R	EGULATIONS LISTED AT 24 CFR 50.4 & 58.5
Clean Air Clean Air Act, as amended, particularly section 176(c) & (d); 40 CFR Parts 6, 51, 93	Yes		Project is not located in an EPA-designated non- attainment area or maintenance area for one or more of six "criteria pollutants," called National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS). Map documentation is included in Appendix B.
Coastal Zone Management Coastal Zone Management Act, sections 307(c) & (d)	Yes	No ⊠	No coastal zone management programs are in the states of HUD Region VII, per Nat'l Oceanic & Atmospheric Administration, Office of Ocean and Coastal Resource Management. www.coastalmanagement.noaa.gov/mystate/welcome.html
Contamination and Toxic Substances 24 CFR Part 50.3(i) & 58.5(i)(2)	Yes	No	Project Location will not be affected by any contaminated or toxic substances. A field inspection, land use search, and review of environmental compliance were conducted using the All sites in proximity were in compliance. All sites in proximity were in compliance according to the previous searches. EPA EnviroMapper also found that all sites in proximity were in compliance. The IDNR storage database for LUST sites was searched and no leaking sites and no tanks were registered on the site. There were also no sites reported on the State of Iowa Contaminated Sites database. Documentation for these searches can be found in Appendix C.
Endangered Species Endangered Species Act of 1973, particularly section 7; 50 CFR Part 402	Yes	No X	Project will not affect any Federally listed endangered or threatened species or its habitat because the project location does not have habitat suitable for the listed species. Species list and habitat information can be found for Iowa by county at: A list of species in the project location county is in Appendix D.

Environmental Justice Executive Order 12898	Yes	No X	Project site does not suffer from adverse health or environmental effects which disproportionately impact a minority or low-income population relative to the community at large. Project will assist low to moderate income person's for a better quality of life. See census statistics in Appendix E and here: <u>www.data.census.gov</u>
Explosive and Flammable Hazards 24 CFR Part 51 Subpart C	Yes	No ⊠	Since this project is constructing a new water well within the City of Yale, it is exempt from review under this criteria.
Farmlands Protection Farmland Protection Policy Act of 1981, particularly sections 1504(b) and 1541; 7 CFR Part 658	Yes	No X	Project is located within prime farmland, LESA Assessment was conducted at the site and score above 160. However, it was found that other alternative sites would have received a similar score, thus DNR determined that no mitigation was required. Map, AD-1006 and DNR response can be found in Appendix F and map can also be found here: <u>http://websoilsurvey.nrcs.usda.gov/app/</u>
Floodplain Management Executive Order 11988, particularly section 2(a); 24 CFR Part 55	Yes	No ⊠	Project location is not on the 100 or 500 year floodplain. FIRMette found in Appendix G. Map panel number: 19077C0088D
Historic Preservation National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, particularly sections 106 and 110; 36 CFR Part 800	Yes	No X	This project is jointly funded with other federal funds. As such, SRF consulted with the State historic preservation office on 8/11/2022 with a finding of No Historic Properties Affected and the State Historic Preservation Office concurred with their finding on 8/15/2022. SRF sent correspondence to tribes with an interest in the area on 7/6/2022, and no comments were received back. Documentation can be found in Appendix H.
Noise Abatement and Control Noise Control Act of 1972, as amended by the Quiet Communities Act of 1978; 24 CFR Part 51 Subpart B	Yes	No ⊠	This project is exempt from noise considerations as it falls under the stormwater purview. Information Sheet C, Page 43 of Appendix 3 of Iowa CDBG Management Guide is located in Appendix I.
Sole Source Aquifers Safe Drinking Water Act of 1974, as amended, particularly section 1424(e); 40 CFR Part 149	Yes	No ⊠	Project is NOT located within area of an EPA- designated sole source aquifer. Map found in Appendix J and at www.epa.gov/dwssa/map-sole- source-aquifer-locations
Wetlands Protection Executive Order 11990, particularly sections 2 and 5	Yes	No ⊠	Project is NOT located within, or has an impact upon, a wetland. Map found in Appendix K and here: <u>https://fwsprimary.wim.usgs.gov/wetlands/apps/wetlands-mapper/</u>

Wild and Scenic Rivers Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 1968, particularly section 7(b) and (c)	Yes	No ⊠	Project is not located within one mile of a designated Wild & Scenic River, or river being studied as a potential component of the Wild & Scenic River System. Iowa does not have any designated rivers, but does have 1 study river and 7 potential rivers listed in the NRI (Sections of the Boone River, Cedar River, Maquoketa, Middle Raccoon River, Turkey River, Upper Iowa River, Wapsipinicon, Yellow River). www.nps.gov/ncrc/programs/rtca/nri/states/ia.html This information can be found in Appendix I
			This information can be found in Appendix L.

Environmental Assessment Factors [24 CFR 58.40; Ref. 40 CFR 1508.8 &1508.27] Recorded below is the qualitative and quantitative significance of the effects of the proposal on the character, features and resources of the project area. Each factor has been evaluated and documented, as appropriate and in proportion to its relevance to the proposed action. Verifiable source documentation has been provided and described in support of each determination, as appropriate. Credible, traceable and supportive source documentation for each authority has been provided. Where applicable, the necessary reviews or consultations have been completed and applicable permits of approvals have been obtained or noted. Citations, dates/names/titles of contacts, and page references are clear. Additional documentation is attached, as appropriate. **All conditions, attenuation or mitigation measures have been clearly identified.**

Impact Codes: Use an impact code from the following list to make the determination of impact for each factor.

(1) Minor beneficial impact

(2) No impact anticipated

(3) Minor Adverse Impact – May require mitigation

(4) Significant or potentially significant impact requiring avoidance or modification which may require an Environmental Impact Statement

Environmental	Impact	
Assessment Factor	Code	Impact Evaluation
LAND DEVELOPME	NT	
Conformance with	2	The project will not have any impact on the conformance with
Plans / Compatible		comprehensive and neighborhood plans. No mitigation is
Land Use and Zoning		necessary. (SEH, Inc., New Public Water Supply Preliminary
/ Scale and Urban		Engineering Report, Addendum No. 1, Page 2, June 2022.)
Design		

Soil Suitability/		The project will not have any impact on soil suitability, slope,
Slope/ Erosion/	2	erosion, drainage, or storm water runoff. No mitigation is
Drainage/ Storm		necessary. (SEH, Inc., New Public Water Supply Preliminary
Water Runoff		Engineering Report, Addendum No. 1, Page 2-3, June 2022.)
Hazards and	1	The project will create a second active well which will eliminate
Nuisances		the major deficiency in the City's water system. The second well
including Site Safety		will bring the city's water system to an acceptable level of
and Noise		reliability reducing the risk of the city being without water from
		a well. No mitigation is necessary. (SEH, Inc., New Public
		Water Supply Preliminary Engineering Report, Page 7, February
		2022.)
Energy Consumption	1	The new well will reduce the amount of filtration needed which
		will reduce the energy consumed during water treatment. No
		mitigation is necessary. (SEH, Inc., New Public Water Supply
		Preliminary Engineering Report, Page 7-8, February 2022.)

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation
Employment and Income Patterns	2	The project will have no impact on employment or income patterns in the City of Yale. No mitigation is necessary. (SEH, Inc., New Public Water Supply Preliminary Engineering Report, Page 7-8, February 2022.)
Demographic Character Changes, Displacement	2	The project will have no impact on community demographics with no changes directly related to this project. The project will not cause any residential or commercial displacements within the community. No mitigation is necessary. (SEH, Inc., New Public Water Supply Preliminary Engineering Report, Figure 2, February 2022.)
Environmental Justice	1	Project site or neighborhood does not suffer from adverse health or environmental effects, which disproportionately impacts a minority or low-income population relative to the community at large. Project will assist low to moderate-income people for a better quality of life. No mitigation is necessary. (SEH, Inc., New Public Water Supply Preliminary Engineering Report, Page 7-8, February 2022.)

1		

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation
COMMUNITY FACE	LITIES AND	SERVICES
Educational and		
Cultural Facilities	2	There are no educational facilities in Yale; therefore, the project will have no impact on any educational facilities. No mitigation is necessary. (SEH, Inc., New Public Water Supply Preliminary Engineering Report, Page 7-8, February 2022.)
Commercial Facilities	2	This project will have no impact on the commercial facilities within the City of Yale. No mitigation is necessary. (SEH, Inc., New Public Water Supply Preliminary Engineering Report, Page 7-8, February 2022.)
Health Care and Social Services	2	This project will have no impact on health care or social service facilities within the City of Yale. No mitigation is necessary. (SEH, Inc., New Public Water Supply Preliminary Engineering Report, Page 7-8, February 2022.)
Solid Waste Disposal / Recycling	2	The project will have no impact on the solid waste facilities within the City of Yale. No mitigation is necessary. (SEH, Inc., New Public Water Supply Preliminary Engineering Report, Page 7-8, February 2022.)
Wastewater / Sanitary Sewers	2	This project will have no impact on the wastewater utility within the City of Yale. No mitigation is necessary. (SEH, Inc., New Public Water Supply Preliminary Engineering Report, Page 7-8, February 2022.)
Water Supply	1	This project will construct a new water well to replace the city's aging well that is currently out of operation. This will increase the city's water supply. No mitigation is necessary. (SEH, Inc., New Public Water Supply Preliminary Engineering Report, Page 6, February 2022.)
Public Safety - Police, Fire and Emergency Medical	2	The project will have no impact on the policing or the Emergency Medical services within the City of Yale. The project will benefit Fire services, as it will improve the water supply within the City of Yale. No mitigation is necessary. (SEH, Inc., New Public Water Supply Preliminary Engineering Report, Page 7-8, February 2022.)
Parks, Open Space and Recreation	2	The project will have no impact on the Parks, Open Space, or Recreation within the City of Yale. No mitigation is necessary. (SEH, Inc., New Public Water Supply Preliminary Engineering Report, Page 7-8, February 2022.)
Transportation and Accessibility	2	The project will have no impact on transportation within the City of Yale. No mitigation is necessary. (SEH, Inc., New Public

Water Supply Preliminary Engineering Report, Page 7-8,
February 2022.)

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation
NATIDAL FRATID	FC	
NATURAL FEATUR	ES	
Unique Natural	1	The project will reduce the amount of water lost due to replacing
Features,		the well that causes bacteria-filled water, which is unusable. The
Water Resources		project will have no impact on the unique natural features within
		the community No mitigation is necessary (SFH Inc. New
		Dublic Woter Supply Droliminary Engineering Deport Dogo 4)
	-	Public water Supply Preliminary Engineering Report, Page 4.)
Vegetation, Wildlife	2	The Project will have no impact on vegetation and wildlife. No
		mitigation is necessary. (FWS Wetlands Map Aerial in
		Appendix K.)
Other Factors	2	The project will have no impact on other natural features within
		the community. No mitigation is necessary. (FWS Wetlands
		Man Aerial in Appendix K)
	1	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation
CLIMATE CHANGE	/ ENERGY	
Impact on occupants,	2	This project will have no impact on the occupants within the
alteration of future		City of Yale. The project will not alter any future sites of
site, effect on/from		development. This project will not have any impact on how
weather related		weather-related disasters affect the city of Yale. No mitigation is
disasters		necessary. (SEH, Inc., New Public Water Supply Preliminary
		Engineering Report, Page 7-8, February 2022.)
Energy efficiency,	2	The most efficient materials will be utilized during construction
Green building		and the system is designed to reduce waste. (SEH, Inc., New
practices		Public Water Supply Preliminary Engineering Report, February
_		2022.)
Energy usage,	2	This project will be replacing a current well in the city's water
Emissions		system, which will provide little to no change in energy usage
		by the city. No mitigation is necessary. (SEH, Inc., New Public
		Water Supply Preliminary Engineering Report, Page 7-8,
		February 2022.)

Additional Studies Performed:

A preliminary engineering report was completed: New Public Water Supply Preliminary Engineering Report, City of Yale, Iowa, February 2022.

Field Inspection (Date and completed by): Luke Hamill, Regional Planner November 23, 2022

List of Sources, Agencies and Persons Consulted [40 CFR 1508.9(b)]: Iowa DNR City of Yale Fish and Wildlife Services SEH, Inc. National Park Service FEMA State Historic Preservation Office

List of Permits Obtained:

State of Iowa DNR Water Supply Construction Permit

Public Outreach [24 CFR 50.23 & 58.43]:

A public hearing was conducted to give the public an opportunity to provide input on the project. No questions or comments were received before or during the hearing.

Cumulative Impact Analysis [24 CFR 58.32]:

Overall, this project will have no adverse environmental impact. There are no concerns with contaminated substances. No endangered species will be impacted by the project.

Alternatives [24 CFR 58.40(e); 40 CFR 1508.9]

The first alternative was the installation of a 8" 100' depth water well. This will lead to the abandonment of the current failing well. This alternative also includes a new backwash pond so that the water supply can be treated properly, as well as a backup generator that the current wells were lacking. This alternative is estimated to cost \$656,620. As this alternative will provide the best answer to the city's current issues, as well as being the most self and cost-efficient, this alternative was selected.

The second alternative was the option to connect to a neighboring water supply system. This is specifically the Xenia Rural Water System, which is 3.1 miles away from Yale. By connecting to this water system, Yale would also have to install a booster station to increase water pressure from the Xenia System. The estimated cost for this alternative is \$1,012,100. This alternative was not selected, as it was less cost-efficient than the first alternative, and the city would have to rely on a water supply that they do not own.

No Action Alternative [24 CFR 58.40(e)]:

The no action alternative would require the City of Yale to only rely on the one functioning water well in town. This would not provide enough water supply to the town and its residents according to Great Lakes

Upper Mississippi River Board standards. Additionally, by not having a second water supply source, the city's water supply would be non-compliant with Iowa DNR. Although this alternative would be the cheapest option, this alternative presents hazards to the community's health and safety, and it was not selected.

Summary of Findings and Conclusions:

Overall, this project will have little to no impact on the community, its natural resources, the local climate, or other evaluated areas. Any impact that this project will have on the community will be beneficial in nature which leads to no mitigation measures being necessary.

Mitigation Measures and Conditions [40 CFR 1505.2(c)]

Summarize below all mitigation measures adopted by the Responsible Entity to reduce, avoid, or eliminate adverse environmental impacts and to avoid non-compliance or non-conformance with the above-listed authorities and factors. These measures/conditions must be incorporated into project contracts, development agreements, and other relevant documents. The staff responsible for implementing and monitoring mitigation measures should be clearly identified in the mitigation plan.

Law, Authority, or Factor	Mitigation Measure

Determination:

Finding of No Significant Impact [24 CFR 58.40(g)(1); 40 CFR 1508.27] The project will not result in a significant impact on the quality of the human environment.

Finding of Significant Impact [24 CFR 58.40(g)(2); 40 CFR 1508.27] The project may significantly affect the quality of the human environment.

Preparer Signature: Date:12/6/2022

Name/Title/Organization: Luke Hamill, Regional Planner, Region XII Council of Governments

10 Certifying Officer Signature: Date:12/6/2022

Name/Title: Tom Godwin, Mayor of Yale

ł

This original, signed document and related supporting material must be retained on file by the Responsible Entity in an Environmental Review Record (ERR) for the activity/project (ref: 24 CFR Part 58.38) and in accordance with recordkeeping requirements for the HUD program(s).

Appendix A



lowa

Appendix B



Guam - Piti and Tanguisson power stations are designated nonattainment for the SO2 (1971) NAAQS Piti and Cabras power stations are designated nonattainment for the SO2 (2010) NAAQS

* The National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) are health standards for Carbon Monoxide, Lead (1978 and 2008), Nitrogen Dioxide, 8-hour Ozone (2008), Particulate Matter (PM-10 and PM-2.5 (1997, 2006 and 2012), and Sulfur Dioxide.(1971 and 2010)

** Included in the counts are counties designated for NAAQS and revised NAAQS pollutants. Revoked 1-hour (1979) and 8-hour Ozone (1997) are excluded. Partial counties, those with part of the county designated nonattainment and part attainment, are shown as full counties on the map.

Appendix C

12/2/22, 11:09 AM	Tanks					
Þ RR	lowa Departme and Public Safe Storage Tanks	ent of Natural Resources ty State Fire Marshal Office Leading Iowans in caring for our natural resources				
12/2/2022 11:09:18 AM	user: Login					
Advanced search US	T Registration Number 💙 for	Go				
- Advanced Search –	OUST C	UST OAST OUST 3rd Party Inspections OUST Certifications				
	Leak Risk Classification:	High Risk 🗸				
	Site Name:					
	Site Address:					
	Site City:	YALE 🗸				
	County:	County 🗸				
	Site Status:	Status Type 🗸				
		<u>Search</u>				
_	Export Results					

No Lust Records Found

DISCLAIMER: The information on this website represents data provided to the DNR from outside entities. Although believed to be generally reliable, its accuracy cannot be guaranteed. No warranty, expressed or implied, is provided for the data herein, or its use. The Tanks database does not display nor contain all the records submitted for a site. Additional information may be obtained from the DNR Records Center at 515-725-8480 or DNR.Records@dnr.iowa.gov.

The Above Ground Storage Tank (AST) information on this website is no longer maintained. The DNR does not regulate ASTs. For additional information on ASTs, please contact the State Fire Marshal office at (515)-725-6145.

4.1.525.13227

 State of Iowa Home
 DNR Home
 Site Policy

 webmaster@dnr.iowa.gov
 © Iowa Department of Natural Resources



Customize Columns	Download Data	Quick CSV Downloa	nd	Sou	urce Data	Res	ults Guide	Reports L	egend	ered by ▼ Current Search	
Facility Name	Mapped	Street Address	City	State	FRS ID	Reports	Count of EJ Indexes Above 80th Percentile (US - Block Group)	Compliance Monitoring Activity (5 years)	Significant Violations	Qu Noi	Media Program: All Media Progams City, State, and/or ZIP Code: yale, ia Active/Operating: Yes Explore Enforcement and Compliance Criteria
MID-IOWA CO-OP		RAILROAD STREET	YALE	IA	110022403077		0	0	No		0 Facilities with Current Violations
<u>STOECKER</u> <u>FARMS</u> (WILKERSON)		2035 B AVE	YALE	IA	110002349904		0	0	No		0 Facilities with Significant Violations 0 Facilities with Violations (3 years) 0 Facilities with Formal
YALE WATER SUPPLY- TREATMENT PLANT #1		ATTN MICHAEL GLIEM WATER SUPT	YALE	IA	110013105399			0	No		Enforcement Actions (5 years) 0 Facilities with Informal Enforcement Actions (5 years)
•										•	Modify Search

▼ Filter Facilities

_

Not Filtering on 3 Facilities
Only Show Matches

Facility Characteristics

Facility Type

0 Major **3** Minor

Facility Permit/ID

0 Has Water Permit (ICIS-NPDES)
2 Has ICIS-Air ID
0 Has RCRA ID
0 Has TRI Releases

Enforcement and Compliance Characteristics

0 Facilities with Violations (1 or more quarters within the past 3 years)

0											
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12

Facilities with Formal Enforcement Actions (5 yrs)

ſ

0 Yes 3 No										
0	0	0	0	0						
1	2	3	4	5						

Facilities with Informal Enforcement Actions (5 yrs)

\bigcirc 0 Yes \bigcirc 3 No										
0	0	0	0	0						
1	2	3	4	5						

Facilities with Compliance Monitoring Activities within Date Range

0 Yes 3 N	No -
mm/dd/yyy	mm/dd/yyyy

Community Characteristics

3 Facilities Located in Areas with EJ Indexes Above 80th Percentile (US)

Any 1 or More or More 7 or 10 or More More

▼ Layers

-

Each map layer requires a specific map scale for display. Layers are only available for selection if the map is zoome in to a sufficient scale. Zoom in further to enable selection of additional layers. Note

that adding multiple overlapping map layers may cause performance issues in the browser and display.

Do not show again

Current Zoom: 61%

- EJSCREEN Maps
- Air Maps
- ► Water Maps
- Places
- ► Boundaries
- Endangered Species Act Critical Habitat

LAST UPDATED ON SEPTEMBER 21, 2022

DATA REFRESH INFORMATION



CONTAMINATED SITES

Site Search

Sites may be searched by entering text in one text boxes at the base of the columns (name, address, city or program). Other search criteria may also be entered the general text box including county, zip code, project manager, alternative name, or ownership type.

The system will start sorting as a search is initiated in the general text search box; pressing an enter or return key isn't necessary. The best results are obtained by using the column text boxes in combination with the general text box to narrow the search list.

							Сору	CSV	Print	Clear	
Show 1	0 entries										
	Search:										
ID ÷	Name	▲ ▼	Address	A V	City		Prog	am			A V
	No matching records found										
	Search		Search		yale		(A	ll)		``	•

Showing 0 to 0 of 0 entries (filtered from 2,437 total entries)

Previous	Next
----------	------

State of Iowa DNR Home Site Policy Leading Iowans in caring for our natural resources

Version: 4.1.3.13154

Appendix D



FISH & WILDLIFE SERVICE

ENDANGERED SPECIES CONSULTATION

NO EFFECTS DETERMINATION

A determination has been made that the project named below will have no affect on any federally listed species or their habitats.

This determination is based on upon one or more of the following factors: (check all that apply)

· ·	The	project	involves	no	new	construction	activities
-----	-----	---------	----------	----	-----	--------------	------------

- The project involves the replacement, reconstruction or resurfacing of existing infrastructure components without disturbance of previously undisturbed soil
- ☐ The project involves the removal of blight through demolition with no storage or disposal of removed materials in or adjacent any listed species habitats
- The project involves the rehabilitation of existing buildings/facilities without a significant increase in capacity or change in use
- ☐ The project site is within an already developed area containing pavement, structures and/or regularly mowed or maintained grass or landscaped area and will not involve the removal of any native vegetation, including trees
- The project will not directly or indirectly effect any habitat area utilized by a listed endangered or threatened species

CDBG Project Name: City of Yale New Well Project

Nature of Project: Constructing a New City Well	
Signature of Certifying Person:	
Date: 2/2/2022	



United States Department of the Interior

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE Illinois-Iowa Ecological Services Field Office Illinois & Iowa Ecological Services Field Office 1511 47th Ave Moline, IL 61265-7022 Phone: (309) 757-5800 Fax: (309) 757-5807



November 03, 2022

In Reply Refer To: Project Code: 2023-0011970 Project Name: City of Yale Water Well Project

Subject: List of threatened and endangered species that may occur in your proposed project location or may be affected by your proposed project

To Whom It May Concern:

The attached species list identifies federally threatened, endangered, proposed and candidate species that may occur within the boundary of your proposed project or may be affected by your proposed project. The list also includes designated critical habitat, if present, within your proposed project area or affected by your project. This list is provided to you as the initial step of the consultation process required under section 7(c) of the Endangered Species Act, also referred to as Section 7 Consultation.

Under 50 CFR 402.12(e) (the regulations that implement Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act) **the accuracy of this species list should be verified after 90 days**. This verification can be completed formally or informally. You may verify the list by visiting the ECOSPHERE Information for Planning and Consultation (IPaC) website https://ipac.ecosphere.fws.gov at regular intervals during project planning and implementation and completing the same process you used to receive the attached list.

Section 7 Consultation

Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 requires that actions authorized, funded, or carried out by Federal agencies not jeopardize federally threatened or endangered species or adversely modify designated critical habitat. To fulfill this mandate, Federal agencies (or their designated non-federal representative) must consult with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) if they determine their project "may affect" listed species or designated critical habitat. Under the ESA, it is the responsibility of the Federal action agency or its designated representative to determine if a proposed action may affect endangered, threatened, or proposed species, or designated critical habitat, and if so, to consult with the Service further. Similarly, it is the responsibility of the Federal action agency or project proponent, not the Service to make "no effect" determinations. If you determine that your proposed action will have

no effect on threatened or endangered species or their respective designated critical habitat, you do not need to seek concurrence with the Service.

Note: For some species or projects, IPaC will present you with *Determination Keys*. You may be able to use one or more Determination Keys to conclude consultation on your action.

Technical Assistance for Listed Species

1. For assistance in determining if suitable habitat for listed, candidate, or proposed species occurs within your project area or if species may be affected by project activities, you can obtain information on the species life history, species status, current range, and other documents by selecting the species from the thumbnails or list view and visiting the species profile page.

No Effect Determinations for Listed Species

- 1. If there are *no* species or designated critical habitats on the Endangered Species portion of the species list: conclude "no species and no critical habitat present" and document your finding in your project records. No consultation under ESA section 7(a)(2) is required if the action would result in no effects to listed species or critical habitat. Maintain a copy of this letter and IPaC official species list for your records.
- 2. If any species or designated critical habitat are listed as potentially present in the action area of the proposed project the project proponents are responsible for determining if the proposed action will have "no effect" on any federally listed species or critical habitat. No effect, with respect to species, means that no individuals of a species will be exposed to any consequence of a federal action or that they will not respond to such exposure.
- 3. If the species habitat is not present within the action area or current data (surveys) for the species in the action area are negative: conclude "no species habitat or species present" and document your finding in your project records. For example, if the project area is located entirely within a "developed area" (an area that is already graveled/paved or supports structures and the only vegetation is limited to frequently mowed grass or conventional landscaping, is located within an existing maintained facility yard, or is in cultivated cropland conclude no species habitat present. Be careful when assessing actions that affect: 1) rights-of-ways that contains natural or semi-natural vegetation despite periodic mowing or other management; structures that have been known to support listed species (example: bridges), and 2) surface water or groundwater. Several species inhabit rights-of-ways, and you should carefully consider effects to surface water or groundwater, which often extend outside of a project's immediate footprint.
- 4. Adequacy of Information & Surveys Agencies may base their determinations on the best evidence that is available or can be developed during consultation. Agencies must give the benefit of any doubt to the species when there are any inadequacies in the information. Inadequacies may include uncertainty in any step of the analysis. To provide adequate information on which to base a determination, it may be appropriate to conduct surveys to determine whether listed species or their habitats are present in the action area. Please contact our office for more information or see the survey guidelines that the Service has made available in IPaC.

May Effect Determinations for Listed Species

 If the species habitat is present within the action area and survey data is unavailable or inconclusive: assume the species is present or plan and implement surveys and interpret results in coordination with our office. If assuming species present or surveys for the species are positive continue with the may affect determination process. May affect, with respect to a species, is the appropriate conclusion when a species might be exposed to a consequence of a federal action and could respond to that exposure. For critical habitat, 'may affect' is the appropriate conclusion if the action area overlaps with mapped areas of critical habitat and an essential physical or biological feature may be exposed to a consequence of a federal action and could change in response to that exposure.

- 2. Identify stressors or effects to the species and to the essential physical and biological features of critical habitat that overlaps with the action area. Consider all consequences of the action and assess the potential for each life stage of the species that occurs in the action area to be exposed to the stressors. Deconstruct the action into its component parts to be sure that you do not miss any part of the action that could cause effects to the species or physical and biological features of critical habitat. Stressors that affect species' resources may have consequences even if the species is not present when the project is implemented.
- 3. If no listed or proposed species will be exposed to stressors caused by the action, a 'no effect' determination may be appropriate be sure to separately assess effects to critical habitat, if any overlaps with the action area. If you determined that the proposed action or other activities that are caused by the proposed action may affect a species or critical habitat, the next step is to describe the manner in which they will respond or be altered. Specifically, to assess whether the species/critical habitat is "not likely to be adversely affected."
- 4. Determine how the habitat or the resource will respond to the proposed action (for example, changes in habitat quality, quantity, availability, or distribution), and assess how the species is expected to respond to the effects to its habitat or other resources. Critical habitat analyses focus on how the proposed action will affect the physical and biological features of the critical habitat in the action area. If there will be only beneficial effects or the effects of the action are expected to be insignificant or discountable, conclude "may affect, not likely to adversely affect" and submit your finding and supporting rationale to our office and request concurrence.
- 5. If you cannot conclude that the effects of the action will be wholly beneficial, insignificant, or discountable, check IPaC for species-specific Section 7 guidance and conservation measures to determine whether there are any measures that may be implemented to avoid or minimize the negative effects. If you modify your proposed action to include conservation measures, assess how inclusion of those measures will likely change the effects of the action. If you cannot conclude that the effects of the action will be wholly beneficial, insignificant, or discountable, contact our office for assistance.
- 6. Letters with requests for consultation or correspondence about your project should include the Consultation Tracking Number in the header. Electronic submission is preferred.

For additional information on completing Section 7 Consultation including a Glossary of Terms

used in the Section 7 Process, information requirements for completing Section 7, and example letters visit the Midwest Region Section 7 Consultations website at: <u>https://www.fws.gov/library/collections/midwest-region-section-7-consultations</u>.

You may find more specific information on completing Section 7 on communication towers and transmission lines on the following websites:

- Incidental Take Beneficial Practices: Power Lines https://www.fws.gov/story/incidentaltake-beneficial-practices-power-lines
- Recommended Best Practices for Communication Tower Design, Siting, Construction, Operation, Maintenance, and Decommissioning. - <u>https://www.fws.gov/media/</u> recommended-best-practices-communication-tower-design-siting-construction-operation

Northern Long-eared Bat Update

Please note that on March 23, 2022, the Service published a proposal to reclassify the northern long-eared bat (NLEB) as endangered under the Endangered Species Act. The U.S. District Court for the District of Columbia has ordered the Service to complete a new final listing determination for the NLEB by November 2022 (Case 1:15-cv-00477, March 1, 2021). The bat, currently listed as threatened, faces extinction due to the range-wide impacts of white-nose syndrome (WNS), a deadly fungal disease affecting cave-dwelling bats across the continent. The proposed reclassification, if finalized, would remove the current 4(d) rule for the NLEB, as these rules may be applied only to threatened species. Depending on the type of effects a project has on NLEB, the change in the species' status may trigger the need to re-initiate consultation for any actions that are not completed and for which the Federal action agency retains discretion once the new listing determination becomes effective (anticipated to occur by December 30, 2022). If your project may result in incidental take of NLEB after the new listing goes into effect this will first need to addressed in an updated consultation, please contact our office for additional guidance.

Other Trust Resources and Activities

Bald and Golden Eagles

Although no longer protected under the Endangered Species Act, be aware that bald eagles are protected under the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act and Migratory Bird Treaty Act, as are golden eagles. Projects affecting these species may require measures to avoid harming eagles or may require a permit. If your project is near an eagle nest or winter roost area, please contact our office for further coordination. For more information on permits and other eagle information visit our website https://www.fws.gov/library/collections/bald-and-golden-eagle-management. We appreciate your concern for threatened and endangered species. Please feel free to contact our office with questions or for additional information.

Attachment(s):

- Official Species List
- USFWS National Wildlife Refuges and Fish Hatcheries

- Migratory Birds
- Wetlands

Official Species List

This list is provided pursuant to Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act, and fulfills the requirement for Federal agencies to "request of the Secretary of the Interior information whether any species which is listed or proposed to be listed may be present in the area of a proposed action".

This species list is provided by:

Illinois-Iowa Ecological Services Field Office

Illinois & Iowa Ecological Services Field Office 1511 47th Ave Moline, IL 61265-7022 (309) 757-5800

Project Summary

Project Code:	2023-0011970
Project Name:	City of Yale Water Well Project
Project Type:	Water Supply Facility - New Constr
Project Description:	This project entails the installation of a new water supply well in Yale, IA,
	as well as a backup generator and a backwash pond.

Project Location:

Approximate location of the project can be viewed in Google Maps: <u>https://www.google.com/maps/@41.7718738,-94.35421899255945,14z</u>



Counties: Guthrie County, Iowa

Endangered Species Act Species

There is a total of 4 threatened, endangered, or candidate species on this species list.

Species on this list should be considered in an effects analysis for your project and could include species that exist in another geographic area. For example, certain fish may appear on the species list because a project could affect downstream species.

IPaC does not display listed species or critical habitats under the sole jurisdiction of NOAA Fisheries¹, as USFWS does not have the authority to speak on behalf of NOAA and the Department of Commerce.

See the "Critical habitats" section below for those critical habitats that lie wholly or partially within your project area under this office's jurisdiction. Please contact the designated FWS office if you have questions.

1. <u>NOAA Fisheries</u>, also known as the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), is an office of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration within the Department of Commerce.

Mammals

NAME	STATUS
Indiana Bat <i>Myotis sodalis</i> There is final critical habitat for this species. Your location does not overlap the critical habitat. Species profile: <u>https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/5949</u>	Endangered
Northern Long-eared Bat <i>Myotis septentrionalis</i> No critical habitat has been designated for this species. Species profile: <u>https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/9045</u>	Threatened
Insects NAME	STATUS
Monarch Butterfly <i>Danaus plexippus</i> No critical habitat has been designated for this species. Species profile: <u>https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/9743</u>	Candidate
Flowering Plants	STATUS
Western Prairie Fringed Orchid <i>Platanthera praeclara</i> No critical habitat has been designated for this species. Species profile: <u>https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/1669</u>	Threatened

Critical habitats

THERE ARE NO CRITICAL HABITATS WITHIN YOUR PROJECT AREA UNDER THIS OFFICE'S JURISDICTION.

11/03/2022

USFWS National Wildlife Refuge Lands And Fish Hatcheries

Any activity proposed on lands managed by the <u>National Wildlife Refuge</u> system must undergo a 'Compatibility Determination' conducted by the Refuge. Please contact the individual Refuges to discuss any questions or concerns.

THERE ARE NO REFUGE LANDS OR FISH HATCHERIES WITHIN YOUR PROJECT AREA.

Migratory Birds

Certain birds are protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act^{1} and the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act^{2} .

Any person or organization who plans or conducts activities that may result in impacts to migratory birds, eagles, and their habitats should follow appropriate regulations and consider implementing appropriate conservation measures, as described <u>below</u>.

- 1. The Migratory Birds Treaty Act of 1918.
- 2. The <u>Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act</u> of 1940.
- 3. 50 C.F.R. Sec. 10.12 and 16 U.S.C. Sec. 668(a)

The birds listed below are birds of particular concern either because they occur on the USFWS Birds of Conservation Concern (BCC) list or warrant special attention in your project location. To learn more about the levels of concern for birds on your list and how this list is generated, see the FAQ below. This is not a list of every bird you may find in this location, nor a guarantee that every bird on this list will be found in your project area. To see exact locations of where birders and the general public have sighted birds in and around your project area, visit the E-bird data mapping tool (Tip: enter your location, desired date range and a species on your list). For projects that occur off the Atlantic Coast, additional maps and models detailing the relative occurrence and abundance of bird species on your list are available. Links to additional information about Atlantic Coast birds, and other important information about your migratory bird list, including how to properly interpret and use your migratory bird report, can be found below.

For guidance on when to schedule activities or implement avoidance and minimization measures to reduce impacts to migratory birds on your list, click on the PROBABILITY OF PRESENCE SUMMARY at the top of your list to see when these birds are most likely to be present and breeding in your project area.

NAME	BREEDING SEASON
Bald Eagle <i>Haliaeetus leucocephalus</i> This is not a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) in this area, but warrants attention because of the Eagle Act or for potential susceptibilities in offshore areas from certain types of development or activities.	Breeds Dec 1 to Aug 31
Black Tern <i>Chlidonias niger</i> This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) throughout its range in the continental USA and Alaska. <u>https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/3093</u>	Breeds May 15 to Aug 20

Probability Of Presence Summary

The graphs below provide our best understanding of when birds of concern are most likely to be present in your project area. This information can be used to tailor and schedule your project activities to avoid or minimize impacts to birds. Please make sure you read and understand the FAQ "Proper Interpretation and Use of Your Migratory Bird Report" before using or attempting to interpret this report.

Probability of Presence (

Each green bar represents the bird's relative probability of presence in the 10km grid cell(s) your project overlaps during a particular week of the year. (A year is represented as 12 4-week months.) A taller bar indicates a higher probability of species presence. The survey effort (see below) can be used to establish a level of confidence in the presence score. One can have higher confidence in the presence score if the corresponding survey effort is also high.

How is the probability of presence score calculated? The calculation is done in three steps:

- 1. The probability of presence for each week is calculated as the number of survey events in the week where the species was detected divided by the total number of survey events for that week. For example, if in week 12 there were 20 survey events and the Spotted Towhee was found in 5 of them, the probability of presence of the Spotted Towhee in week 12 is 0.25.
- 2. To properly present the pattern of presence across the year, the relative probability of presence is calculated. This is the probability of presence divided by the maximum probability of presence across all weeks. For example, imagine the probability of presence in week 20 for the Spotted Towhee is 0.05, and that the probability of presence at week 12 (0.25) is the maximum of any week of the year. The relative probability of presence on week 12 is 0.25/0.25 = 1; at week 20 it is 0.05/0.25 = 0.2.
- 3. The relative probability of presence calculated in the previous step undergoes a statistical conversion so that all possible values fall between 0 and 10, inclusive. This is the probability of presence score.

Breeding Season (=)

Yellow bars denote a very liberal estimate of the time-frame inside which the bird breeds across its entire range. If there are no yellow bars shown for a bird, it does not breed in your project area.

Survey Effort ()

Vertical black lines superimposed on probability of presence bars indicate the number of surveys performed for that species in the 10km grid cell(s) your project area overlaps. The number of surveys is expressed as a range, for example, 33 to 64 surveys.

No Data (-)

A week is marked as having no data if there were no survey events for that week.

Survey Timeframe

Surveys from only the last 10 years are used in order to ensure delivery of currently relevant information. The exception to this is areas off the Atlantic coast, where bird returns are based on all years of available data, since data in these areas is currently much more sparse.



Additional information can be found using the following links:

- Birds of Conservation Concern <u>https://www.fws.gov/program/migratory-birds/species</u>
- Measures for avoiding and minimizing impacts to birds <u>https://www.fws.gov/library/</u> <u>collections/avoiding-and-minimizing-incidental-take-migratory-birds</u>
- Nationwide conservation measures for birds <u>https://www.fws.gov/sites/default/files/</u> <u>documents/nationwide-standard-conservation-measures.pdf</u>

Migratory Birds FAQ

Tell me more about conservation measures I can implement to avoid or minimize impacts to migratory birds.

<u>Nationwide Conservation Measures</u> describes measures that can help avoid and minimize impacts to all birds at any location year round. Implementation of these measures is particularly important when birds are most likely to occur in the project area. When birds may be breeding in the area, identifying the locations of any active nests and avoiding their destruction is a very helpful impact minimization measure. To see when birds are most likely to occur and be breeding in your project area, view the Probability of Presence Summary. <u>Additional measures</u> or <u>permits</u> may be advisable depending on the type of activity you are conducting and the type of infrastructure or bird species present on your project site.

What does IPaC use to generate the list of migratory birds that potentially occur in my specified location?

The Migratory Bird Resource List is comprised of USFWS <u>Birds of Conservation Concern</u> (<u>BCC</u>) and other species that may warrant special attention in your project location.

The migratory bird list generated for your project is derived from data provided by the <u>Avian</u> <u>Knowledge Network (AKN)</u>. The AKN data is based on a growing collection of <u>survey</u>, <u>banding</u>, <u>and citizen science datasets</u> and is queried and filtered to return a list of those birds reported as occurring in the 10km grid cell(s) which your project intersects, and that have been identified as warranting special attention because they are a BCC species in that area, an eagle (<u>Eagle Act</u> requirements may apply), or a species that has a particular vulnerability to offshore activities or development.

Again, the Migratory Bird Resource list includes only a subset of birds that may occur in your project area. It is not representative of all birds that may occur in your project area. To get a list of all birds potentially present in your project area, please visit the <u>Rapid Avian Information</u> <u>Locator (RAIL) Tool</u>.

What does IPaC use to generate the probability of presence graphs for the migratory birds potentially occurring in my specified location?

The probability of presence graphs associated with your migratory bird list are based on data provided by the <u>Avian Knowledge Network (AKN)</u>. This data is derived from a growing collection of <u>survey, banding, and citizen science datasets</u>.

Probability of presence data is continuously being updated as new and better information becomes available. To learn more about how the probability of presence graphs are produced and how to interpret them, go the Probability of Presence Summary and then click on the "Tell me about these graphs" link.

How do I know if a bird is breeding, wintering or migrating in my area?

To see what part of a particular bird's range your project area falls within (i.e. breeding, wintering, migrating or year-round), you may query your location using the <u>RAIL Tool</u> and look at the range maps provided for birds in your area at the bottom of the profiles provided for each bird in your results. If a bird on your migratory bird species list has a breeding season associated with it, if that bird does occur in your project area, there may be nests present at some point within the timeframe specified. If "Breeds elsewhere" is indicated, then the bird likely does not breed in your project area.

What are the levels of concern for migratory birds?

Migratory birds delivered through IPaC fall into the following distinct categories of concern:

- 1. "BCC Rangewide" birds are <u>Birds of Conservation Concern</u> (BCC) that are of concern throughout their range anywhere within the USA (including Hawaii, the Pacific Islands, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands);
- 2. "BCC BCR" birds are BCCs that are of concern only in particular Bird Conservation Regions (BCRs) in the continental USA; and
- 3. "Non-BCC Vulnerable" birds are not BCC species in your project area, but appear on your list either because of the <u>Eagle Act</u> requirements (for eagles) or (for non-eagles) potential susceptibilities in offshore areas from certain types of development or activities (e.g. offshore energy development or longline fishing).

Although it is important to try to avoid and minimize impacts to all birds, efforts should be made, in particular, to avoid and minimize impacts to the birds on this list, especially eagles and BCC species of rangewide concern. For more information on conservation measures you can implement to help avoid and minimize migratory bird impacts and requirements for eagles, please see the FAQs for these topics.

Details about birds that are potentially affected by offshore projects

For additional details about the relative occurrence and abundance of both individual bird species and groups of bird species within your project area off the Atlantic Coast, please visit the <u>Northeast Ocean Data Portal</u>. The Portal also offers data and information about other taxa besides birds that may be helpful to you in your project review. Alternately, you may download the bird model results files underlying the portal maps through the <u>NOAA NCCOS Integrative Statistical</u> <u>Modeling and Predictive Mapping of Marine Bird Distributions and Abundance on the Atlantic Outer Continental Shelf</u> project webpage.

Bird tracking data can also provide additional details about occurrence and habitat use throughout the year, including migration. Models relying on survey data may not include this information. For additional information on marine bird tracking data, see the <u>Diving Bird Study</u> and the <u>nanotag studies</u> or contact <u>Caleb Spiegel</u> or <u>Pam Loring</u>.

What if I have eagles on my list?

If your project has the potential to disturb or kill eagles, you may need to <u>obtain a permit</u> to avoid violating the Eagle Act should such impacts occur.

Proper Interpretation and Use of Your Migratory Bird Report

The migratory bird list generated is not a list of all birds in your project area, only a subset of birds of priority concern. To learn more about how your list is generated, and see options for identifying what other birds may be in your project area, please see the FAQ "What does IPaC use to generate the migratory birds potentially occurring in my specified location". Please be aware this report provides the "probability of presence" of birds within the 10 km grid cell(s) that overlap your project; not your exact project footprint. On the graphs provided, please also look carefully at the survey effort (indicated by the black vertical bar) and for the existence of the "no data" indicator (a red horizontal bar). A high survey effort is the key component. If the survey effort is high, then the probability of presence score can be viewed as more dependable. In contrast, a low survey effort bar or no data bar means a lack of data and, therefore, a lack of certainty about presence of the species. This list is not perfect; it is simply a starting point for identifying what birds of concern have the potential to be in your project area, when they might be there, and if they might be breeding (which means nests might be present). The list helps you know what to look for to confirm presence, and helps guide you in knowing when to implement conservation measures to avoid or minimize potential impacts from your project activities, should presence be confirmed. To learn more about conservation measures, visit the FAQ "Tell me about conservation measures I can implement to avoid or minimize impacts to migratory birds" at the bottom of your migratory bird trust resources page.

Wetlands

Impacts to <u>NWI wetlands</u> and other aquatic habitats may be subject to regulation under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, or other State/Federal statutes.

For more information please contact the Regulatory Program of the local <u>U.S. Army Corps of</u> <u>Engineers District</u>.

Please note that the NWI data being shown may be out of date. We are currently working to update our NWI data set. We recommend you verify these results with a site visit to determine the actual extent of wetlands on site.

THERE ARE NO WETLANDS WITHIN YOUR PROJECT AREA.

IPaC User Contact Information

Agency:	Yale city
Name:	Luke Hamill
Address:	1009 E Anthony Street
Address Line 2:	PO Box 768
City:	Carroll
State:	IA
Zip:	51401
Email	lhamill@region12cog.org
Phone:	7127929914

Appendix E



EJScreen Report (Version 2.1)



1 mile Ring Centered at 41.772144,-94.354191, IOWA, EPA Region 7

Approximate Population: 278 Input Area (sq. miles): 3.14

Selected Variables	State Percentile	USA Percentile				
Environmental Justice Indexes						
EJ Index for Particulate Matter 2.5	8	13				
EJ Index for Ozone	4	16				
EJ Index for Diesel Particulate Matter*	8	7				
EJ Index for Air Toxics Cancer Risk*	0	6				
EJ Index for Air Toxics Respiratory HI*	0	4				
EJ Index for Traffic Proximity	N/A	N/A				
EJ Index for Lead Paint	16	24				
EJ Index for Superfund Proximity	18	7				
EJ Index for RMP Facility Proximity	28	30				
EJ Index for Hazardous Waste Proximity	3	2				
EJ Index for Underground Storage Tanks	16	23				
EJ Index for Wastewater Discharge	9	5				



This report shows the values for environmental and demographic indicators and EJSCREEN indexes. It shows environmental and demographic raw data (e.g., the estimated concentration of ozone in the air), and also shows what percentile each raw data value represents. These percentiles provide perspective on how the selected block group or buffer area compares to the entire state, EPA region, or nation. For example, if a given location is at the 95th percentile nationwide, this means that only 5 percent of the US population has a higher block group value than the average person in the location being analyzed. The years for which the data are available, and the methods used, vary across these indicators. Important caveats and uncertainties apply to this screening-level information, so it is essential to understand the limitations on appropriate interpretations and applications of these indicators. Please see EJSCREEN documentation for discussion of these issues before using reports.



EJScreen Report (Version 2.1)



1 mile Ring Centered at 41.772144,-94.354191, IOWA, EPA Region 7

Approximate Population: 278

Input Area (sq. miles): 3.14



Sites reporting to EPA	
Superfund NPL	0
Hazardous Waste Treatment, Storage, and Disposal Facilities (TSDF)	0



EJScreen Report (Version 2.1)



1 mile Ring Centered at 41.772144,-94.354191, IOWA, EPA Region 7

Approximate Population: 278

Input Area (sq. miles): 3.14

Selected Variables	Value	State Avg.	%ile in State	USA Avg.	%ile in USA
Pollution and Sources					
Particulate Matter 2.5 (µg/m ³)	7.61	8.22	14	8.67	24
Ozone (ppb)	40.6	41.8	6	42.5	35
Diesel Particulate Matter [*] (µg/m ³)	0.0931	0.165	12	0.294	<50th
Air Toxics Cancer Risk [*] (lifetime risk per million)	20	21	0	28	<50th
Air Toxics Respiratory HI*	0.2	0.24	0	0.36	<50th
Traffic Proximity (daily traffic count/distance to road)	N/A	390	N/A	760	N/A
Lead Paint (% Pre-1960 Housing)	0.23	0.4	24	0.27	51
Superfund Proximity (site count/km distance)	0.017	0.094	30	0.13	15
RMP Facility Proximity (facility count/km distance)	0.7	1.2	45	0.77	66
Hazardous Waste Proximity (facility count/km distance)	0.028	0.45	5	2.2	4
Underground Storage Tanks (count/km ²)	0.017	1.9	18	3.9	22
Wastewater Discharge (toxicity-weighted concentration/m distance)	1.6E-06	0.29	14	12	10
Socioeconomic Indicators					
Demographic Index	8%	22%	11	35%	7
People of Color	1%	15%	11	40%	5
Low Income	16%	28%	22	30%	28
Unemployment Rate	0%	4%	23	5%	0
Limited English Speaking Households	0%	2%	0	5%	0
Less Than High School Education	1%	8%	13	12%	14
Under Age 5	7%	6%	68	6%	70
Over Age 64	20%	17%	63	16%	69

*Diesel particular matter, air toxics cancer risk, and air toxics respiratory hazard index are from the EPA's Air Toxics Data Update, which is the Agency's ongoing, comprehensive evaluation of air toxics in the United States. This effort aims to prioritize air toxics, emission sources, and locations of interest for further study. It is important to remember that the air toxics data presented here provide broad estimates of health risks over geographic areas of the country, not definitive risks to specific individuals or locations. Cancer risks and hazard indices from the Air Toxics Data Update are reported to one significant figure and any additional significant figures here are due to rounding. More information on the Air Toxics Data Update can be found at: https://www.epa.gov/haps/air-toxics-data-update.

For additional information, see: www.epa.gov/environmentaljustice

EJScreen is a screening tool for pre-decisional use only. It can help identify areas that may warrant additional consideration, analysis, or outreach. It does not provide a basis for decision-making, but it may help identify potential areas of EJ concern. Users should keep in mind that screening tools are subject to substantial uncertainty in their demographic and environmental data, particularly when looking at small geographic areas. Important caveats and uncertainties apply to this screening-level information, so it is essential to understand the limitations on appropriate interpretations and applications of these indicators. Please see EJScreen documentation for discussion of these issues before using reports. This screening tool does not provide data on every environmental impact and demographic factor that may be relevant to a particular location. EJScreen outputs should be supplemented with additional information and local knowledge before taking any action to address potential EJ concerns.

Appendix F

YALE DWSRF NEW WELL PROJECT GUTHRIE COUNTY, IOWA FARMLAND CONVERSION IMPACT RATING EVALUATION August 24, 2022

The project includes the construction of a new public water supply well, backwash holding pond (approx. 160ft by 40 ft), a backup generator, and all necessary connections and appurtenances. As part of this project, approximately 2.78 acres of farmland will be converted in the Yale Quadrangle, Section 04, Township 80 N, Range 30 W.

As a result, a Farmland Conversion Impact Rating is required in accordance with Title 7 CFR 658. Part V of the form was completed by the local office of the Natural Resource Conservation Service (NRCS) and received a score of 89. Part VI, was completed by the Iowa Department of Natural Resources (IDNR) and received a score of 83. The total rating score is 172.

Title 7 CFR 658.4(c)(2) states "Sites receiving scores totaling 160 or more be given increasingly higher levels of consideration for protection." And Title 7 CFR 658.4(c)(4) states "When making decisions on proposed actions for sites receiving scores totaling 160 or more, agency personnel consider:

- (i) Use of land that is not farmland or use of existing structures;
- (ii) Alternative sites, locations and designs that would serve the proposed purpose but convert either fewer acres of farmland or other farmland that has a lower relative value;
- (iii) Special siting requirements of the proposed project and the extent to which an alternative site fails to satisfy the special siting requirements as well as the originally selected site."

Consideration to each point was given with the following evaluation.

(i) Use of land that is not farmland or use of existing structures;

The Yale New Well Project is located in Guthrie County. Guthrie County has an approximate land area of 377,984 acres. According to the 2017 US Census of Agriculture, approximately 332,211 (87.9%) acres of the total land area is farmland. The remaining 12.1% of the land area is either urbanized or non-cultivated.

Approximately 2.78 acres of agricultural land will be converted for the construction of the new public drinking water supply well. Public water supply well sites are required to meet several conditions which limit site selection. There must be a 200' radius which the City legally controls and there are minimum separation distances from various contamination sources which must be maintained for the life of the well. A primary factor in the selection of this site is its proximity to the City's existing drinking water treatment facility.

(ii) Alternative sites, locations and designs that would serve the proposed purpose but convert either fewer acres of farmland or other farmland that has a lower relative value;

Siting restrictions for the proposed well have been described above. The City of Yale is a small, rural community which is surrounded on all sides by agriculture. No alternative sites which would meet the minimum well site qualifications with lower farmland ratings have been identified. The applicant has no desire to convert more farmland than is needed for the project.

(iii) Special siting requirements of the proposed project and the extent to which an alternative site fails to satisfy the special siting requirements as well as the originally selected site."

Special siting requirements for the construction of public water supply wells are stated above. Other areas within one mile of the site that has been selected have the characteristics of the special siting requirements; however, due to the nature of the area surrounding the City of Yale, much of it is considered Prime or Important Farmland based on soil type. Therefore, selection of an alternate farmed site within the one mile area of the proposed site would have resulted in a similar rating score.

Other factors considered in the evaluation of this site included:

- Eighty-seven percent (332,211) of the entire land in this County is utilized for harvested cropland, primarily corn and soybeans. The total area being removed from farmland production is 2.78 acres. This is less than one hundredth of a percent of the area in the County utilized for harvested cropland. Removing this area from production should not have a significant impact on the production of crops in the area, nor should it have any significant impact on the agricultural industry in the area.
- This project will not attract future development within the immediate area.

F.	U.S. Departme	nt of Agri SION	culture	TING					
PART I (To be completed by Federal Agency) Date Of L			f Land Evaluation	Request					
Name of Project			Federal Agency Involved						
Proposed Land Use Cour			County and State						
PART II (To be completed by NRCS) Date Re			equest Received	t Received By Person Completing Form:					
Does the site contain Prime, Unique, Statev (If no, the FPPA does not apply - do not cor	vide or Local Important Farmland nplete additional parts of this form	n)	YES NO	Acres	Irrigated	Average	Farm Size		
Major Crop(s)	Farmable Land In Govt.	Jurisdictio	on	Amount of Acres:	Farmland As %	Defined in FP	PPA		
Name of Land Evaluation System Used	Name of State or Local S	Site Asse	ssment System	Date Land	Evaluation R	eturned by NF	RCS		
PART III (To be completed by Federal Age	ncy)			Cito A	Alternative	Site Rating	Cito D		
A. Total Acres To Be Converted Directly				Site A	Site B	Site C	Site D		
B. Total Acres To Be Converted Indirectly									
C. Total Acres In Site									
PART IV (To be completed by NRCS) Lan	d Evaluation Information								
A. Total Acres Prime And Unique Farmland									
B. Total Acres Statewide Important or Local	Important Farmland								
C. Percentage Of Farmland in County Or Lo	ocal Govt. Unit To Be Converted								
D. Percentage Of Farmland in Govt. Jurisdi	ction With Same Or Higher Relati	ive Value	•						
PART V (To be completed by NRCS) Land Relative Value of Farmland To Be Co	l Evaluation Criterion onverted (Scale of 0 to 100 Points	s)							
PART VI (To be completed by Federal Age (Criteria are explained in 7 CFR 658.5 b. For	ncy) Site Assessment Criteria Corridor project use form NRCS-	CPA-106	(15) Maximum	Site A	Site B	Site C	Site D		
1. Area In Non-urban Use			(10)						
2. Perimeter In Non-urban Use			(20)						
3. Percent Of Site Being Farmed	0		(20)						
4. Protection Provided By State and Local	Government		(15)						
5. Distance From Orban Built-up Area			(15)						
6. Distance To Orban Support Services	Average		(10)						
7. Size Of Present Farm Unit Compared To	Average		(10)						
6. Creation Of Non-farmable Farmand			(5)						
10 On Earm Invostments			(20)						
10. On-Farm investments	t Sonvicos		(10)						
12 Compatibility With Existing Agricultural			(10)						
	536		160						
PART VII (To be completed by Federal A	aency								
Relative Value Of Farmland (From Part V)	igency		100						
Total Site Assessment (From Part VI above	or local site assessment)		160						
TOTAL POINTS (Total of above 2 lines)			260						
Site Selected: Date Of Selection				Was A Loca YE	al Site Asses	sment Used?	1		
Reason For Selection:				I					

STEPS IN THE PROCESSING THE FARMLAND AND CONVERSION IMPACT RATING FORM

- Step 1 Federal agencies (or Federally funded projects) involved in proposed projects that may convert farmland, as defined in the Farmland Protection Policy Act (FPPA) to nonagricultural uses, will initially complete Parts I and III of the form. For Corridor type projects, the Federal agency shall use form NRCS-CPA-106 in place of form AD-1006. The Land Evaluation and Site Assessment (LESA) process may also be accessed by visiting the FPPA website, http://fppa.nrcs.usda.gov/lesa/.
- Step 2 Originator (Federal Agency) will send one original copy of the form together with appropriate scaled maps indicating location(s) of project site(s), to the Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) local Field Office or USDA Service Center and retain a copy for their files. (NRCS has offices in most counties in the U.S. The USDA Office Information Locator may be found at http://offices.usda.gov/scripts/ndISAPI.dll/oip public/USA map, or the offices can usually be found in the Phone Book under U.S. Government, Department of Agriculture. A list of field offices is available from the NRCS State Conservationist and State Office in each State.)
- Step 3 NRCS will, within 10 working days after receipt of the completed form, make a determination as to whether the site(s) of the proposed project contains prime, unique, statewide or local important farmland. (When a site visit or land evaluation system design is needed, NRCS will respond within 30 working days.
- Step 4 For sites where farmland covered by the FPPA will be converted by the proposed project, NRCS will complete Parts II, IV and V of the form.
- Step 5 NRCS will return the original copy of the form to the Federal agency involved in the project, and retain a file copy for NRCS records.
- Step 6 The Federal agency involved in the proposed project will complete Parts VI and VII of the form and return the form with the final selected site to the servicing NRCS office.
- Step 7 The Federal agency providing financial or technical assistance to the proposed project will make a determination as to whether the proposed conversion is consistent with the FPPA.

INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETING THE FARMLAND CONVERSION IMPACT RATING FORM (For Federal Agency)

Part I: When completing the "County and State" questions, list all the local governments that are responsible for local land use controls where site(s) are to be evaluated.

Part III: When completing item B (Total Acres To Be Converted Indirectly), include the following:

- 1. Acres not being directly converted but that would no longer be capable of being farmed after the conversion, because the conversion would restrict access to them or other major change in the ability to use the land for agriculture.
- 2. Acres planned to receive services from an infrastructure project as indicated in the project justification (e.g. highways, utilities planned build out capacity) that will cause a direct conversion.
- Part VI: Do not complete Part VI using the standard format if a State or Local site assessment is used. With local and NRCS assistance, use the local Land Evaluation and Site Assessment (LESA).
- 1. Assign the maximum points for each site assessment criterion as shown in § 658.5(b) of CFR. In cases of corridor-type project such as transportation, power line and flood control, criteria #5 and #6 will not apply and will, be weighted zero, however, criterion #8 will be weighed a maximum of 25 points and criterion #11 a maximum of 25 points.
- 2. Federal agencies may assign relative weights among the 12 site assessment criteria other than those shown on the FPPA rule after submitting individual agency FPPA policy for review and comment to NRCS. In all cases where other weights are assigned, relative adjustments must be made to maintain the maximum total points at 160. For project sites where the total points equal or exceed 160, consider alternative actions, as appropriate, that could reduce adverse impacts (e.g. Alternative Sites, Modifications or Mitigation).

Part VII: In computing the "Total Site Assessment Points" where a State or local site assessment is used and the total maximum number of points is other than 160, convert the site assessment points to a base of 160. Example: if the Site Assessment maximum is 200 points, and the alternative Site "A" is rated 180 points:

 $\frac{\text{Total points assigned Site A}}{\text{Maximum points possible}} = \frac{180}{200} \times 160 = 144 \text{ points for Site A}$

For assistance in completing this form or FPPA process, contact the local NRCS Field Office or USDA Service Center.

NRCS employees, consult the FPPA Manual and/or policy for additional instructions to complete the AD-1006 form.



USDA Natural Resources

Conservation Service



USDA

Map Unit Legend

Map Unit Symbol	Map Unit Name	Acres in AOI	Percent of AOI
L55	Nicollet loam, 1 to 3 percent slopes	0.5	13.6%
L107	Webster clay loam, Bemis moraine, 0 to 2 percent slopes	3.3	86.4%
Totals for Area of Interest	1	3.9	100.0%



Appendix G

National Flood Hazard Layer FIRMette



Legend



Basemap: USGS National Map: Orthoimagery: Data refreshed October, 2020



94°20'37.5"

FLOOD HAZARD INFORMATION

SEE FIS REPORT FOR DETAILED LEGEND AND INDEX MAP FOR FIRM PANEL LAYOUT

THE INFORMATION DEPICTED ON THIS MAP AND SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION ARE ALSO AVAILABLE IN DIGITAL FORMAT AT HTTP://MSC.FEMA.GOV



NOTES TO USERS

For information and questions about this map, available products associated with this FIRM including historic versions of this FIRM, how to order products or the National Flood Insurance Program in general please call the FEMA Map Information eXchange at 1-877-FEMA-MAP (1-877-336-2627) or visit the FEMA Map Service Center website at http://msc.fema.gov. Available products may include previously issued Letters of Map Change, a Flood Insurance Study Report, and/or digital versions of this map. Many of these products can be ordered or obtained directly from the website. Users may determine the current map date for each FIRM panel by visiting the FEMA Map Service Center website or by calling the FEMA Map Information eXchange.

Communities annexing land on adjacent FIRM panels must obtain a current copy of the adjacent panel as well as the current FIRM Index. These may be ordered directly from the Map Service Center at the number listed above.

For community and countywide map dates refer to the Flood Insurance Study report for this jurisdiction.

To determine if flood insurance is available in this community, contact your Insurance agent or call the National Flood Insurance Program at 1-800-638-6620.

Base map information shown on this FIRM was provided in digital format by the lowa Department of Natural Resources. This information was derived from digital orthophotography at a 2 foot ground resolution from imagery flown in April 2009.

SCALE

Map Projection: State Plane Iowa South (FIPS Zone 1402) Coordinate System, Lambert Conformal Conic Projection; North American Datum 1983, GRS 1980 spheroid; North American Vertical Datum of 1988







National Flood Insurance Program NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE PROGRAM **FEMA** FLOOD INSURANCE RATE MAP **GUTHRIE COUNTY, IOWA** And Incorporated Areas PANEL 88 OF 325 Panel Contains: COMMUNITY NUMBER PANEL SUFFIX GUTHRIE COUNTY 190871 0088 YALE, CITY OF 190828 0088 SZONE X **VERSION NUMBER** 19077C0088D

EFFECTIVE DATE APRIL 5, 2017

2.3.3.0

MAP NUMBER

D

D

Appendix H



Andersen, Hailey <hailey.andersen@dnr.iowa.gov>

R&C 220839055 - EPA - Guthrie - Yale New Well Project

1 message

Branden Scott <branden.scott@iowa.gov> To: "hailey.andersen@dnr.iowa.gov" <hailey.andersen@dnr.iowa.gov> Mon, Aug 15, 2022 at 1:23 PM

Ms. Anderson:

We have received your submittal for the above referenced federal undertaking. We provide the following response in accordance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 and its implementing regulations 36 CFR 800.

Regarding this project, please see the following comments:

R&C 220839055 - EPA - Guthrie - Yale New Well Project - The proposed project includes the construction of a new public water supply well, backwash holding pond (approx. 160ft by 40 ft), a backup generator, and all necessary connections and appurtenances.

Concur with the federal agency and/or their designated representative (No Historic Properties Affected - No Properties).

You will not receive a hard copy of this email. It is the submitter's responsibility to maintain the official file of record. If you have any questions or comments, please feel free to contact our office.

With kind regards,

Branden Scott Archaeologist, State Historic Preservation Office branden.scott@iowa.gov | 515.281.4013 | iowaculture.gov

Iowa Arts Council | Produce Iowa | State Historical Society of Iowa Iowa Department of Cultural Affairs

------From: Hailey Andersen [hailey.andersen@dnr.iowa.gov] Sent: 8/11/2022 11:53 AM To: hailey.andersen@dnr.iowa.gov Subject: Iowa Department of Cultural Affairs Case # 00036055:

Dear Hailey Anderson,

Thank you for submitting your question to us online. Case #00036055: "" has been created and State Historical Society of Iowa's Library & Archives team will respond to you within 1 business day for appointment requests or within 5 business days for all other requests.

Thank you, Library & Archives Team State Historical Society of Iowa

Appendix I

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION FOR EA AND CEST PROJECTS -SHEET C

Noise Assessment Guidelines

Noise: The Quiet Communities Act (24 CFR Part 51, Subpart B):

The Act establishes specific noise control requirements for CDBG-funded projects. Grant Recipients must take into consideration the noise criteria and standards in the environmental review process and consider ameliorative actions when noise sensitive land development is proposed in noise exposed areas.

The prime concern of a CDBG environmental impact assessment for noise should be the effect of existing and projected noise levels on the proposed activities and facilities.

If your project is not noise sensitive (e.g., water & sewer projects) then you can skip this assessment and note in the environmental review that the nature of the project, as described, is not noise sensitive.

An assessment will be needed if housing and other noise sensitive uses are proposed:

- 1. Document the following on a map (either your project meets this criteria or not):
 - Existing or proposed <u>commercial</u> or military airports within 15 miles of the site.
 - Roadways within 1,000 feet of the site with such characteristics (e.g., high traffic levels, high speed, heavy truck/bus usage, slope gradients, etc.) that would indicate high ambient vehicular noise levels.
 - Railroads within 3,000 feet of the site.
 - Other significant noise sources (e.g., industrial/manufacturing facilities, power generating stations, firing ranges) in proximity to the site.
- 2. If you project is within the distance criteria above, you must perform a noise calculation. It can be found here: <u>https://www.hudexchange.info/environmental-review/dnl-calculator/</u>.
 - a. Airports: contact Airport for noise contour maps
 - b. Road data: https://iowadot.gov/maps/digital-maps/traffic-maps/county
 - c. Railroads: <u>http://safetydata.fra.dot.gov/OfficeofSafety/publicsite/crossing/xingqryloc.aspx</u>
 - i. Some defaults:
 - 1. Diesel Engines: # of diesel = 2, # of rail cars = 50, Average Speed = 30, nighttime of ATO = .15 or 15%
 - Electric Engines: # of electric = 1, # of rail cars = 8, Average Speed = 30, nighttime of ATO = .15 or 15%

3. If your decibel level is above 65 dB – 75 dB:

- a. For new construction you MUST mitigate
- b. For Rehab you are strongly encouraged to mitigate

However, if above 75 dB you MUST contact leslie leager at IEDA for additional instructions.

Appendix J

Designated Sole Source Aquifiers in EPA Region VII

Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska



Return to: Sole Source Aquifer program home page

Appendix K



U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service **National Wetlands Inventory**

Yale Water Well Project



November 3, 2022

Wetlands

- Estuarine and Marine Wetland

Estuarine and Marine Deepwater

Freshwater Forested/Shrub Wetland

Freshwater Emergent Wetland

Freshwater Pond

Lake Other Riverine This map is for general reference only. The US Fish and Wildlife Service is not responsible for the accuracy or currentness of the base data shown on this map. All wetlands related data should be used in accordance with the layer metadata found on the Wetlands Mapper web site.

> National Wetlands Inventory (NWI) This page was produced by the NWI mapper

Appendix L

Conservation and Outdoor Recreation

National Park Service U.S. Department of the the Interior





Iowa Segments



Authorizations / History / Eligibility Descriptions / Outstandingly Remarkable Values /Potential Classification /Wild and Scenic Rivers System

Return to nri Page

Hector	Santiago

National Park Service Midwest Regional Office 601 Riverside Drive Omaha, Nebraska 68102 (402) 661-1848

River	County	Reach	Length (miles)	Year Listed/ Updated	<u>Potential</u> <u>Classification</u>	<u>ORVs</u>	Description	Other States
Boone	Hamilton and Webster	From Webster City to confluence with Des Moines River.	25	1995	S	S, R, F, W	lowa's first designated "Protected Water Area." Identified for it's scenic and natural qualities, including relatively undisturbed riparian habitat and excellent smallmouth bass fishery.	
Cedar River	Louisa, Muscatine	lowa River to Highway 6.	26	1982		F, W, C	Two federally listed endangered species of mussel and	

							one federally listed species of bat may be found along the river; potentially rich in cultural resources; nice streamside relief with bluffs and ridges.	
Maquoketa River	Jackson, Jones	Mississippi River to US 151 Bridge (omit small reservoir northwest of Maquoketa)	68	1982		S, R, G, F, W, H, C, O	River cuts narrow, gorge- like valley up to 150 feet deep through limestone; excellent water quality supporting productive smallmouth bass fishery; potentially rich in cultural resources; threatened northern wild monkshood has been found in basin.	
Middle Raccoon River	Gutherie and Dallas	City of Panora to the city of Redfield dam.	15	1995	S	S, R, F, W	A designated lowa "Protected Water Area." Beautiful canoe route with good access. Excellent smallmouth bass fishing and wildlife viewing.	
Turkey River	Clayton, Fayette, Winneshiek, Howard	Mississippi River to Vernon Springs.	110	1982		S, R, G, F, H, C, O	Gently rolling hills with dense stands of trees; good trout stream; high potential for significant cultural resources; northern wild monkshood, a federally listed endangered species, has	

							been found in the basin.
Upper Iowa River	Winneshick and Allamakee	City of Kendallville to Highway 76 crossing.	64	1995	W	S, R, G, F, W	A designated "Protected Water Area." The state's most scenic canoe river with towering limestone outcroppings and beautiful riparian habitat. Good bass and trout fishing.
Wapsipinicon River	Clinton, Scott, Cedar, Jones, Linn, Buchanan, Black Hawk, Bremer	Mississippi River to State Highway 334 at Frederika (omit reservoir northwest of Independence).	195	1982		S, G, F, W, H	A designated lowa "Protected Water Area." Wide, wooded flood plain with only limited development and agricultural encroachment; wide diversity of fish and wildlife habitat; exposed geologic fault; historically valuable Stone City quarries.
Yellow River	Allamakee	Entire segment within Effigy Mounds National Monument	1	1982/ 1993	S	S, R, G, W, H, C	One of fastest falling rivers in state, providing excellent fishing and canoeing opportunities. Numerous prehistoric Indian burial mounds. Site of Jefferson Davis Sawmill upstream from boundary.
Yellow River	Allamakee	Mississippi River to Highway W60 near Myron.	34	1982		S, R, F, W, H, C	Heavily wooded with marked relief, camping and backpacking opportunities; unusual ecological niches and

			plant life, including the northern wild monkshood, a federally listed threatened plant, has been found in the basin; good fishery; high potential for cultural resources (Effigy Mounds National Monument adjoins near mouth).
--	--	--	--

<u>Challenge Cost Share Program | Federal Lands to Parks | Hydropower Relicensing Program</u> <u>Land and Water Conservation Fund | National Center for Recreation and Conservation | National Trails System</u> <u>Partnership Wild and Scenic Rivers | Rivers and Trails Program | Urban Park and Recreation Recovery</u>

WebmasterLast Modified 2-27-09NPS.govU.S. Department of the InteriorFOIAPrivacyDisclaimerUSA.gov