INTRODUCTION

Transportation projects have the potential to impact the natural and man-made environments. MAP-21 requires long range transportation plans to consider these impacts at the policy or program level. Projects included in a long range transportation plan are often years away from final design and alignment. Accordingly, a detailed environmental review is not feasible at this stage of the planning process. However, the Iowa Northland Region can consult with resource agencies to discuss potential impacts to natural and historic resources, and develop policies or strategies to ensure that transportation projects have minimal impacts on the environment.

FEDERAL REQUIREMENTS

When a federally funded transportation project reaches the engineering stage, compliance with several laws is required including the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969. NEPA is a national policy to protect and enhance the environment, and contains a process for developing major federal actions (such as federal funding for a transportation project) that requires environmental review documents as part of the project development. Complying with NEPA is typically the responsibility of the project sponsor. The NEPA process includes the consideration of alternatives for the project and their environmental effects, as well as public involvement and interagency collaboration.

The type and scope of environmental document required by NEPA depends on the nature of a project and the significance of its impacts. The three document types are a Categorical Exclusion (CE), an Environmental Assessment (EA), and an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). A CE is the simplest process and is applicable if the project meets certain criteria that have been previously determined to have no significant environmental impact. An EA is performed if a project’s environmental impact is unclear, and determines whether or not the project would significantly affect the environment. If the project will not, a finding of no significant impact (FONSI) is issued. Conversely, if the EA determines that there may be significant environmental consequences from the project, an EIS must be prepared. This document is a more detailed evaluation of the proposed project and its alternatives, and includes additional opportunities for other agencies and the public to comment. Figure 8.1 is a flowchart of the NEPA document process.
In addition to NEPA, other actions concerning federal aid transportation projects that are mandated via either federal or state legislation are described below. The text is from the Iowa DOT’s *Transportation Planning and the Environment* resource document.

- The Federal Water Pollution Control Act was enacted in 1972, amended in 1977, and became commonly known as the Clean Water Act. This Act focuses on restoring and maintaining the chemical, physical, and biological integrity of the nation’s waters so that they can support the protection and propagation of fish, shellfish, and wildlife and recreation in and on the water.
  - Section 401 requires that a Federal license or permit must be obtained when any activity, including the construction or operation of transportation facilities, may result in any discharge into navigable waters.
  - Section 404 permits may be issued after adequate opportunity for public comment for the discharge of dredged or fill material into the navigable waters at specified disposal sites.
  - National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit program controls water pollution by regulating point sources that discharge pollutants into any surface waters. Iowa is authorized to approve NPDES permits, regulate federal facilities, approve pretreatment programs, and approve general permits.
The Endangered Species Act of 1973 addressed the fact that various species of fish, wildlife, and plants have been rendered extinct as a consequence of economic growth and development untampered by adequate concern and conservation. This Act seeks to conserve endangered and threatened species and to resolve water resource issues in concert with the conservation of endangered species.

- Section 7 addresses interagency cooperation and consultation to insure that any transportation project authorized, funded, or carried out is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of any endangered species or threatened species or result in the destruction or adverse modification of habitat of such species.
- The U.S. Department of Transportation Act of 1966 included a special provision to preserve the beauty and integrity of publicly owned parks and recreation areas, waterfowl and wildlife refuges, and historic sites considered to have national, state, or local significance.
- Section 4(f) mandates that FHWA and State DOTs cannot approve the use of land from a significant publicly owned park, recreation area, wildlife or waterfowl refuge, or any significant historic site unless there is no feasible and prudent alternative to the use of land and the transportation project includes all possible planning to minimize harm to the property.

The National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 focuses on using measures, including financial and technical assistance, to preserve our prehistoric and historic resources and fulfill the social, economic, and other requirements of present and future generations. Section 106 requires that prior to the approval of any federal funds for a transportation project, a detailed assessment must be undertaken which takes into account the project’s impact on any district, site, building, structure, or object that is included in or eligible for inclusion in the National Register.

Iowa State Code and Administrative Code have several legislative mandates concerning the environment.

- Sovereign Lands Construction Permit – requires that a person, association, or corporation shall not build or erect any pier, wharf, sluice, piling, wall, fence, obstruction, building, or structure of any kind upon or over any state-owned land or water without first obtaining a written permit. That form can be used to apply for one, two, or all three of the following permits for the activities and jurisdiction as defined in the Iowa Code as stated above.
- Flood Plain Development Permit – requires that a person who desires to construct or maintain a structure, dam, obstruction, deposit, or excavation in any flood plain or floodway must first seek approval. Approval is based on the protection of life and property from floods and to promote the orderly development and wise use of the flood plains.
- The DNR regulates the construction, operation, and closure of facilities and projects that manage, process, and dispose solid waste – this includes the reuse of soils.
• Open burning requires that burning of landscape waste produced in clearing, grubbing, and construction operations shall be limited to areas located at least one-fourth mile from any building inhabited by other than the landowner or tenant conducting the open burning.
• State permitting and air reporting system required for air quality permits.
• Iowa’s endangered and threatened species law was enacted in 1975. The current law, entitled Endangered Plants and Wildlife, is Chapter 481B of the Code of Iowa.
• Iowa law requires transportation agencies to protect woodlands, wetlands, public parks, and prime agricultural lands (Iowa Code 314.23) and to avoid impacts to the natural and historic heritage of the state (Iowa Code 314.24).

An additional federal requirement that transportation projects must adhere to is Executive Order 12898 – Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations. This order was signed in 1994 and protects minority and low-income populations from receiving disproportionately high and adverse impacts as a result of federally funded projects. In addition to reviewing projects from a natural environment viewpoint, projects are also reviewed in relation to data from the U.S. Census Bureau to ensure proposed projects would not violate this order.

Environmental analysis in a long range transportation plan is not meant to be equal to or substitute for NEPA or other federal and state regulatory processes. However, there are several benefits to linking transportation planning and environmental concerns, including the early identification of potential environmental issues and consultation with various resource groups. Ultimately, compliance with NEPA and other federal and state regulations will be carried out individually for each federally-funded project when that project is in development. However, the environmental analysis overview in this chapter can provide a sense of the resources in the region, and the potential of planned transportation projects to affect those resources.

Protecting and enhancing the natural and built environment is an important concern for the RTA. Project sponsors are encouraged to begin coordination with environmental, regulatory, and resource agencies early in the project development process to ensure the best possible project outcome. While it is ultimately the project sponsor’s responsibility to fulfill compliance with government regulations, it is in the RTA’s best interest to promote sound planning that considers environmental factors and works to preserve, and when possible, enhance the environment.
ENVIRONMENTAL STRATEGIES AND POLICIES

Overall Strategy

The RTA encourages jurisdictions to follow federal guidance as an environmental strategy. The steps used to define mitigation in 40 CFR 1508.20 should be followed by project sponsors. In order of preference, these are:

- Avoiding the impact altogether by not taking a certain action or parts of an action.
- Minimizing impacts by limiting the degree or magnitude of the action or parts of an action
- Rectifying the impact by repairing, rehabilitating, or restoring the affected environment.
- Reducing or eliminating the impact over time by preservation and maintenance operations during the life of the action.
- Compensating for the impact by replacing or providing substitute resources or environments.

Avoidance of damage to the environment should always be the primary goal. However, when this cannot be achieved, minimizing impacts and compensating for them can help mitigate any negative environmental impacts from transportation projects.

Local Mitigation Examples

The RTA encourages on-site, in-kind mitigation when possible. This involves compensatory mitigation, which replaces wetlands, streams, or natural habitat or functions lost as a result of a transportation project with the same or similar land use adjacent or contiguous to the site of the impact. If this is not possible, purchasing land from a wetland bank is an example alternative. On-site mitigation can also involve enhancing public recreation opportunities adjacent to transportation projects. An example of this in the region is the Hayes Street bridge replacement project over Otter Creek in Hazleton. This project involved permanent conversion of 0.11 acres of the Otter Creek Wildlife Area to highway right-of-way. The mitigation effort included a fishing pier, parking spot, and access between the fishing pier and parking spot. Another example of mitigation in the region is the US-63 reconstruction and widening project near the Bremer County and Chickasaw County line. The project included raising the highway to prevent roadway flooding by the Wapsipinicon River. This involved a substantial amount of fill dirt which was originally planned to be provided from a farm the Iowa DOT had purchased. This would require the soil being stripped from the farm, making parts of it unsuitable for crop production. It would also require side dump tractor trailers to continuously make an eight mile round trip on US-63. This heavy volume of slow moving truck traffic was a serious traffic safety concern. Instead, the contractor acquired fill from an adjacent lot that was intended to be converted from farmland into wetland. The end result was the development of the 254-acre Heffernan Wildlife Management Area which features bottomland timber, grassland, and wetland.
Consultation

The RTA conducted an environmental analysis by comparing the locations of proposed transportation projects with a variety of resources. To achieve this, maps and plans from local agencies, the Iowa Department of Natural Resources, the Natural Resources Conservation Service, the Office of the State Archaeologist, and other agencies were utilized. Maps 8.1 – 8.24 show the environmental analysis for projects included in the LRTP.

In addition, certain agencies were notified when the draft LRTP document was available for review in November 2015. Feedback on topics relevant to their field of expertise was requested. Agencies notified include the following:

- Iowa Department of Transportation
- Federal Highway Administration
- Federal Transit Administration
- Iowa Department of Natural Resources
- County Conservations
- County Engineers

Example Mitigation Activities

The project sponsor and regulating agencies will ultimately determine the type of mitigation performed for a particular transportation project. As mentioned previously, avoidance of damage to the environment should continually be the primary goal. Nonetheless, this is not always possible. There are many types of activities that can be utilized as mitigation, depending on the size and scope of the project and the environmental resource(s) it may affect. Table 8.1 outlines suggestions for potential mitigation activities for transportation projects.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource</th>
<th>Potential Mitigation Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Air quality                                  | • Transportation control measures  
• Transportation emission reduction measures  
• Control loose exposed soils with watering or canvas sheets  
• Minimize idling of heavy construction vehicles |
| Cultural resources                           | • Landscaping for historic properties  
• Preservation in place or excavation for archeological sites  
• Memorandum of Agreement with State/Federal resource authorities  
• Education activities  
• Photo documentation and/or historic archival recording |
| Endangered and threatened species            | • Time of year restrictions  
• Construction sequencing  
• Species research and/or fact sheets  
• Memorandum of Agreement for species management  
• Bridge sensitive areas instead of laying pavement directly onto the ground  
• Design measures to minimize potential fragmenting of animal habitats  
• Enhancement or restoration of degraded habitat  
• Creation of new habitat  
• Establish buffer areas around existing habitats  
• Modifications of land use practices  
• Restrictions on land access |
| Farmland                                      | • Protect one farmland acre for every acre converted  
• Agricultural conservation easements on farmland |
| Forested and other natural areas             | • Replacement property for open space easements of equal fair market value and equivalent usefulness  
• Minimize removal and/or selective cutting in forested areas except for what is needed to establish roadways and associated rights of way  
• Preserve and/or reestablish vegetation whenever possible within open areas |
| Neighborhoods, communities, homes, and businesses | • Context sensitive solutions for communities  
• Minimize noise impact with sound barriers  
• Prevent the spread of hazardous materials with soil testing and treatment  
• Develop sidewalks, bike lanes, recreational areas, etc.  
• Property owners paid fair market value for property acquired  
• Residential and commercial relocation |
| Noise                                        | • Depressed roads  
• Noise barriers  
• Plant trees |
| Parks and recreation areas                   | • Construct bicycle/pedestrian pathways  
• Replace impaired functions |
| Viewshed impacts                             | • Vegetation and landscaping; screening; buffers; earthen berms |
| Wetlands and water resources                 | • Preserve, create, replace, or restore wetland areas  
• Vegetative buffer zones  
• Bridge sensitive areas instead of laying pavement directly onto the ground  
• Improve storm water management  
• Make perpendicular crossings of streams and riparian buffers rather than lateral encroachments  
• Restore streams and/or stream buffers  
• Strict erosion and sedimentation control measures. |
ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS

A general environmental analysis has been conducted to help raise environmental awareness early in the project development process and to provide the public and decision makers with an overview of potential environmental impacts of projects. To conduct this analysis, a Geographic Information System (GIS) has been used to create a database of environment-related layers. Transportation projects were then added to determine what environmental characteristics may be an issue in the project right-of-way. *Table 8.2* shows the layers and their data sources. This is not an exhaustive list of resources, but rather a starting point to review some of the most common environmental concerns. Some types of environmental data, such as cultural and historic sites, are generally available at the section level, and detailed information is not available without a more in-depth review.

**Table 8.2 – Environmental Analysis Layers and Related Information**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Layer</th>
<th>Data Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cemeteries</td>
<td>Iowa Department of Natural Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and Trails</td>
<td>Local Jurisdictions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Underground and Leaking Storage Tanks</td>
<td>Iowa Department of Natural Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Feature or Wetland</td>
<td>Iowa Department of Natural Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.0 Percent and 0.2 Percent Annual Chance of Flooding</td>
<td>Iowa Department of Natural Resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Justice – Percent Minority</td>
<td>U.S. Census Bureau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Justice – Percent Poverty</td>
<td>U.S. Census Bureau</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Maps 8.1 – 8.24* show the environmental analysis for transportation projects included in the LRTP. This inventory is not meant to substitute for a project sponsor’s responsibilities; rather, it is meant to create awareness of possible environmental impacts early in the planning process. The NEPA process must be completed and other applicable federal and state regulations must be met for each project before any federal funds for transportation improvements are expended for construction.

The alignment for each project has been based on information provided by the jurisdictions. The majority of projects shown in the Plan are reconstruction or resurfacing projects, and will likely take place in existing right-of-way with minimal environmental impacts. However, a project may end up requiring more right-of-way than currently planned, or have a different alignment in final design, in which case other environmental impacts may be observed. Regardless, this environmental analysis provides a starting point for discussion on potential environmental effects of proposed transportation projects. It can also be utilized to review potential impacts of projects proposed in the non-motorized chapter.
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Black Hawk County Transportation Projects in Relation to Flood Zones
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Map 8.3

Buchanan County Transportation Projects in Relation to Flood Zones
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Butler County Transportation Projects in Relation to Flood Zones
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Chickasaw County Transportation Projects in Relation to Flood Zones
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Grundy County Transportation Projects in Relation to Flood Zones
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Black Hawk County Transportation Projects in Relation to Environmentally Sensitive Areas

Data Source:
Cemeteries, Underground Storage Tanks (Iowa Department of Natural Resources)
Parks (INRCOG)
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Bremer County Transportation Projects in Relation to Environmentally Sensitive Areas

Data Source:
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- Parks (INRCOG)
Buchanan County Transportation Projects in Relation to Environmentally Sensitive Areas
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Chickasaw County Transportation Projects in Relation to Environmentally Sensitive Areas
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Black Hawk County Transportation Projects in Relation to Environmental Justice - Race
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Bremer County Transportation Projects in Relation to Environmental Justice - Race
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Butler County Transportation Projects in Relation to Environmental Justice - Race
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<thead>
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<tr>
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Grundy County Transportation Projects in Relation to Environmental Justice - Race

2010 Census Block Group
Percent Non-White Population

- 2.00% or Less
- 2.01%-5.00%

City Boundary

Race Data Source:
U.S. Census Bureau
Census Block Groups 2010
Map 8.19

Black Hawk County Transportation Projects in Relation to Environmental Justice - Poverty
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Butler County Transportation Projects in Relation to Environmental Justice - Poverty
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Chickasaw County Transportation Projects in Relation to Environmental Justice - Poverty
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Grundy County Transportation Projects in Relation to Environmental Justice - Poverty
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage Range</th>
<th>Legend Color</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5.00% or Less</td>
<td>Light Purple</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.01% - 10.00%</td>
<td>Dark Purple</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Poverty Level Data Source:
U.S. Census Bureau Census Tracts 2010