Chicago to Iowa City Intercity Passenger Rail Service Project

Federal Railroad Administration

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

1.0 BACKGROUND

The Illinois Department of Transportation (IDOT) and the Iowa Department of Transportation (IaDOT) (together, the DOTs) propose to reestablish passenger rail service between Chicago, Illinois, and Iowa City, Iowa (the Project) via the Quad Cities of Illinois and Iowa. The Project is part of the Midwest Regional Rail Initiative (MWRRI). The Federal Railroad Administration (FRA) selected the grant application for the Project, submitted by IaDOT and IDOT, for funding under the High-Speed Intercity Passenger Rail (HSPIR) program for an award up to $230 million. In cooperation with FRA, the DOTs prepared a Tier 1 Service Level Environmental Assessment (EA) for the Project in compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) (42 U.S.C. § 4321 *et seq.*) and FRA's Procedures for Considering Environmental Impacts (64 FR 28545). The DOTs will prepare Tier 2 Project Level analyses as described in the EA. The DOTs also prepared a Supplement to the Tier 1 Service Level EA (Supplement) as part of the Tier 1 Service Level analysis. The EA and Supplement evaluated both the initial service resulting from the Project (two round-trip trains per day (TPD)) and the service anticipated upon the full build-out proposed in the MWRRI (five round-trip TPD). In addition, the EA and Supplement evaluated two alternative routes and the No-Build Alternative. The Supplement provides additional information on the Eola Yard and the Wyanet Connection, and updates information presented in the EA. At this time, the DOTs are proposing a phased implementation of the service under the HSIPR program, with Phase 1 consisting of two round trips between Chicago and Moline, IL.

Paper copies of the EA were distributed to 14 libraries located in Illinois and Iowa along the Route A and Route B alternatives. The document was also distributed electronically to the public and government agencies through publication on the internet. The public was notified via press releases in both English and Spanish to media outlets in Illinois and Iowa; paid advertisements were placed in newspapers serving locations with potential stations. The Supplement was distributed electronically to the public and government agencies through publication on the internet. Additionally, during the development of the EA and the Supplement, coordination letters were sent to federal and state agencies. Comments received were addressed in the EA and the Supplement. More information regarding the public and agency outreach can be found in Section 6.0 of this document.

2.0 STATEMENT OF PURPOSE AND NEED

2.1 Purpose

The purpose of the Project is to reintroduce passenger rail service between Chicago and Iowa City, through the Quad Cities (Rock Island, Moline, and East Moline, Illinois; and Davenport and Bettendorf, Iowa), in order to increase regional mobility, reduce roadway congestion, meet future

travel demands, and provide an affordable alternative mode of transportation for the communities served.

2.2 Need

The Project will serve the following needs: to reduce the congestion and the transportation-related effects of continued population growth over the long term; to provide a transportation alternative for tourists to the Quad Cities area, University of Iowa students, and patients destined for the nationally recognized hospitals in Iowa City; and to provide a modal alternative for travel from Chicago to Iowa City through the Quad Cities.

3.0 ALTERNATIVES

The DOTs identified the No-Build Alternative and two build alternatives (Route A and Route B) for detailed evaluation in the EA and in the Supplement. These alternatives were evaluated based on their ability to meet the Project purpose and need, to satisfy engineering design criteria, and to avoid or minimize adverse environmental impacts. The build alternatives, which are described in detail below, use a combination of existing passenger rail and freight rail alignments. Route A was selected by the DOTs as the Preferred Alternative. For the reasons further described within this document, FRA concurs with the DOTs preference and selects Route A for implementation.

3.1 No-Build Alternative

The No-Build Alternative consists of routine maintenance and repairs to the existing track, and provides no appreciable change to the current track configuration or the operating conditions. The No-Build Alternative does not meet the Project purpose and need because it does not reestablish passenger rail service between Chicago and the Quad Cities or Iowa City and, as a result, it does not increase mobility in the region, establish an alternative to highway or airline travel, reduce highway or airline travel congestion, address future travel demand needs, nor provide an affordable alternative mode of transportation for the communities served. The No-Build Alternative was retained for detailed analysis to allow an equal comparison to the two round-trip TPD and five round trip TPD scenarios and to help decision-makers and the public understand the consequences of taking no action.

3.2 Build Alternatives

Consistent with the incremental approach adopted by the MWRRI for the development of the Midwest Regional Rail System (MWRRS), the DOTs propose to initiate passenger service on the Chicago to Iowa City corridor at two and five round-trip passenger TPD. Three alternatives were identified through previous feasibility studies for this scenario, as follows: (1) Route A (Amtrak-BNSF Railway Company (BNSF)-Iowa Interstate Railroad (IAIS)); (2) Route B (Amtrak-Canadian National (CN)-Northeast Illinois Regional Commuter Railroad Corporation (Metra) Rock Island-CSX Transportation (CSX)-IAIS); and (3) Route C (an alternative route through Chicago to New Lenox and to Metra/Rock Island). Route C was eliminated from further consideration because it will require a connection between the Southwest Service route and the Metra Rock Island District route as these two routes are grade separated. In addition, the land needed to construct the connection includes part of a public park (a 4(f) resource), and local officials indicated vigorous opposition to the use of this parkland for the proposed connection. As

a result, build alternatives Route A and Route B were carried forward in the EA and Supplement analysis.

a. Route A Alternative (Preferred Alternative)

The Route A Alternative connects Chicago's Union Station to Iowa City using rail lines owned by Amtrak, BNSF, and IAIS. This alternative requires track upgrades, construction of an additional mainline track, new or reconfigured crossovers in Eola Yard, a new connection between the BNSF and IAIS rail lines near Wyanet, Illinois, installation of a Centralized Traffic Control (CTC) system including wayside signal system and remote control switches, and the construction of station facilities at Geneseo, Illinois, the Quad Cities, and Iowa City. The Route A Alternative reestablishes passenger rail service to Geneseo, Illinois, the Quad Cities (with a proposed Amtrak station at Moline), and Iowa City. In addition, the Route A Alternative expands intercity passenger service at existing stations in La Grange Road, Naperville, Plano, Mendota, and Princeton, Illinois.

Track Upgrades

The existing Amtrak track, which travels from Chicago's Union Station to a connection with the BNSF track (1.6 miles), and the BNSF track from Chicago to Wyanet, Illinois (115.3 miles) are in excellent condition and do not require any upgrade to support passenger train service at speeds of up to 79 mph. The IAIS track, which travels from Wyanet to Iowa City, is currently a mixture of jointed rail and continuous welded rail (CWR). Approximately 9 miles of this IAIS track consists of jointed rail, which will be replaced with CWR. There are also a few joints still remaining within the existing CWR sections that will be welded, and there is worn CWR at two curve locations that will be replaced prior to implementing the proposed passenger rail service. Many of the crossties will be replaced and the track will be resurfaced (correcting the alignment of the rails to make them smooth by compacting the ballast and straightening the leveling the track). Most of the existing curves will require an increase in superelevation to allow for higher train speeds. At-grade crossing protection will be upgraded to support the proposed 79 mph operation.

Most of the track rehabilitation from Chicago to Iowa City will be completed within the existing railroad right-of-way (ROW). However, some ditching, minor bridge and culvert work, elimination of mud spots in the track, and shoulder work, as warranted to support speed upgrades, may be required outside of the existing railroad right-of-way.

Wyanet Connection

Approximately 1 mile southwest of Wyanet, the BNSF track is grade-separated over the IAIS track; there is currently no connection between the tracks. As such, to permit efficient train movements, a connection track (approximately 4,000 feet long) will be constructed in the northwest quadrant of the intersection. The connection will be designed to accommodate a train speed of 50 mph. Approximately 7 acres of ROW will be required for the proposed 1-mile connection.

Wayside Signals and Remote Control Switches

The existing IAIS track from Wyanet to the Quad Cities, and from the Quad Cities to Iowa City, is non-signalized Track Warrant Control (TWC) territory. A CTC wayside signal system, compatible with future positive train control (PTC) overlay equipment, will be installed along these route sections. Dispatcher-controlled power switches will be installed at existing and new freight sidings for passenger service. Tree and brush clearing will be performed as needed to provide necessary sight distances for the wayside signal system. Upgrades as warranted will be implemented to the IAIS's dispatching center. Both BNSF and IAIS's dispatching offices will be automatically notified as trains from one railroad are routed onto the other railroad.

At-Grade Roadway Crossings

The existing Amtrak track from Chicago's Union Station to its connection with the BNSF track and the BNSF track from Chicago to Wyanet will not require any at-grade crossing upgrade to support passenger train service at speeds of up to 79 mph. Due to the increased speed (from 40 mph freight train speeds to 79 mph passenger train speeds) on the Wyanet to Iowa City section, approximately 180 public and private at-grade crossings will be improved. Tree and brush clearing will be performed at crossings where needed to address sight distance issues. Public at-grade crossing warning devices will be upgraded to constant warning time devices (CWTD), and at a minimum, flashing light signals with gates will be provided.

Additional safety measures (for example, medians or quad gates) will be considered for locations with problematic geometric conditions or chronic accident histories. Potential crossing closures/consolidations or grade separations will be identified for areas with multiple crossings nested together within a short distance. All private at-grade crossings will be upgraded to provide, at a minimum, passive warning signage. Private industrial or other heavily used private at-grade crossings will use flashing light signals with gates where warranted by traffic volumes and site conditions. Farm and other low-volume private at-grade crossings will use passive warning signage at all locations and will also include locked gates at locations where there are multiple tracks, sight distance issues, or other significant risk factors. Crossings with humps will be graded to eliminate the potential for hanging up low-clearance equipment. Crossing improvements or closings will be evaluated in subsequent Tier 2 Project Level NEPA documents.

Station Facilities

The proposed passenger rail service will continue to use existing stations at La Grange Road, Naperville, Plano, Mendota, and Princeton, Illinois. Amtrak stations are proposed at Geneseo and Moline, Illinois; and Iowa City, Iowa. A site for an Amtrak station in Geneseo has not yet been determined. Construction and operation of the Geneseo Amtrak station will be evaluated in subsequent Tier 2 Project Level NEPA documents.

The Rock Island County Metropolitan Mass Transit District, along with the City of Moline, is planning to construct an Amtrak station near the existing bus station in downtown Moline as part of Centre Station, a transit oriented development. The Centre Station site is also being studied for a commuter rail station and could develop into an intermodal transit facility, linking passenger rail, commuter rail, local and regional bus, water taxi, and other non-transit modes of

transportation such as automobiles and bicycles.

The potential for re-acquiring and remodeling the former passenger rail service terminal in Iowa City, near Wright Street and Dubuque Street, for use as an Amtrak station is being explored. The former station is currently being used for non-rail purposes. An overnight train storage track location in Iowa City, and an interim location for Phase 1 within Moline, will be identified. A small building facility will be needed for train crews, storage of cleaning equipment, and communications. Standby power and potable water will also be required. Several sites for the storage track are being explored and will be evaluated in subsequent Tier 2 Project Level NEPA documents.

Other Infrastructure Improvements

The IAIS crossing of the BNSF track at Colona will be improved to increase the operating speed of the proposed passenger rail service trains. Currently, train speeds at this crossing are limited to 10 mph. Improvements will also be implemented at the Rock Island Yard to reduce congestion from switching operations. Relocation of the Rock Island Yard to Silvis is also under consideration.

b. Route B Alternative

The Route B Alternative connects Chicago's Union Station to Iowa City using tracks owned by Amtrak, CN, Metra, CSX, and IAIS. The Route B Alternative does not require any new connections. It does provide passenger rail service to Morris, LaSalle, and Geneseo; the Quad Cities (with a proposed Amtrak station at Moline); and Iowa City. In addition, the Route B Alternative does provide expanded passenger service to the existing station in Joliet, Illinois.

The Route B Alternative includes track upgrades, installation of a wayside signal system and remote control switches, and the provision of station facilities at Morris, La Salle, Geneseo, and Moline, Illinois, and Iowa City, Iowa. A station stop is also proposed for the existing Amtrak station at Joliet. A connection track would not be required near Wyanet, as the existing IAIS track continues both east and west of Wyanet.

Track Upgrades

The existing Metra/Rock Island District track from Chicago's Union Station to its connection with the CSX track in Joliet is in excellent condition and would not require any upgrade to support train service at speeds of up to 79 miles per hour (mph). The CSX track from Joliet to the IAIS track in Bureau is in various states of condition; the majority of this track is jointed rail with crossties that are insufficient to support the higher speed of the proposed passenger rail service. All of the jointed rail and crossties in poor condition would need to be replaced to support the proposed passenger rail service. The entire line from Joliet to Bureau would be resurfaced, which would include increasing the superelevation of curves for higher speeds as required. With the exception of a short section of jointed rail at Bureau, the IAIS track from Bureau to Wyanet consists of CWR track. The jointed rail would be upgraded to CWR tracks would be replaced.

Most of the track rehabilitation from Chicago to Wyanet would be completed within the existing

railroad grade, but some ditching, minor bridge and culvert work, elimination of mud spots in the track, and shoulder work, as warranted to support curve speed upgrades, may be required outside the existing railroad grade.

The Route B Alternative uses the existing IAIS track from Wyanet to Iowa City (the same track as under the Route A Alternative). Track upgrades along this section would be the same as described under the Route A Alternative.

Wyanet Connection
A connection track would not be required for the Route B Alternative, as this alternative uses the existing IAIS line from Utica, Illinois to Iowa City.

Wayside Signals and Remote Control Switches
The existing CSX and IAIS track from Joliet to Wyanet is non-signalized. A CTC wayside signal system compatible with the future PTC overlay would be installed along these route sections. Remote controlled switches would be installed at ten siding tracks.

At-Grade Roadway Crossings
The existing Amtrak-owned track from Chicago's Union Station to its connection with CN's St. Charles Airline (0.8 miles) and the CN section to 16th Street Tower have no at-grade highway/rail crossings. Metra's Rock Island Subdivision between 16th Street Tower and Joliet has several at-grade road crossings. The route is in excellent condition and would not require any at-grade crossing upgrade to support train service at speeds of up to 79 mph. Due to the increased speed (from 40 mph to 79 mph) from Joliet to Utica on CSX's New Rock Subdivision and from Utica to Iowa City, more than 180 at-grade public and private at-grade crossings would be improved. Tree and brush clearing would be performed at crossings where needed to address sight distance issues. Public at-grade crossing warning devices would be upgraded to CWTD, and, at a minimum, flashing light signals with gates would be provided.

Additional safety measures (for example, medians or quad gates) would be considered for locations with problematic geometric conditions or with a chronic accident history, similar to considerations for the Route A Alternative.

Station Facilities
The proposed passenger rail service would continue to use an existing Amtrak station at Joliet. Additional stations are proposed for Morris and La Salle on the CSX section. Similar to the Route A Alternative, Amtrak stations are proposed at Geneseo, Moline, and Iowa City along the IAIS track. Also, similar to the Route A Alternative, Route B would require an overnight train storage track location and a small building facility for train crews, storage of cleaning equipment, and communications. Standby power and potable water would also be required.

Other Infrastructure Improvements
The IAIS crossing of the BNSF track at Colona and access through the Rock Island Yard area would be improved to increase the operating speed of the proposed passenger rail service trains,

as discussed for the Route A Alternative. Relocation of the Rock Island Yard to Silvis would be considered during Tier 2 Project-level NEPA documents.

3.3 Full Build - Five round-trip trains per day

The service plan identified in the MWRRI calls for an ultimate service level of five round-trips per day (for a total of 10 passenger trains per day [TPD]); however, consistent with the incremental approach adopted by the MWRRI, the DOTs are proposing an initial service level of two round-trips per day (four passenger TPD). In addition, the MWRRI envisions an ultimate train speed of 90 miles per hour for the maximum authorized track speed on the section from Chicago to Wyanet and a maximum authorized track speed of 79 mph from Wyanet to Iowa City when operating five round-trip TPD. For the initial service the DOTs are proposing 79 mph on the entire route. The initial service was evaluated by Amtrak in its feasibility studies (Franke et al., 2008a; Franke et al., 2008b).

The five passenger round TPDs are anticipated to operate at 90 mph from Chicago to Iowa City on Route A. However, the Tier 1 Service Level EA and Supplement may need to be re-evaluated before implementation of the five round-trip passenger TPD with increased train frequency and train speed to assess the additional improvements for increased speeds not evaluated in the current EA. Implementation of the initial service level of two round-trip TPD will have independent utility, will not necessitate the need for the five round-trip TPD, and will not foreclose future opportunities for passenger rail service in the region.

3.4 Benefits of the Preferred Alternative

Both the Route A and Route B Alternatives would reestablish passenger rail service between Chicago and Iowa City, diverting a substantial number of passengers from automobiles and other vehicles to passenger trains, and providing some congestion relief on the regional highway and aviation systems. In the EA and Supplement, IDOT and IaDOT identified the Route A Alternative as the Preferred Alternative because it requires fewer miles of track improvements, is a shorter and faster route, provides better ridership, has fewer adverse environmental impacts, and provides more benefits than the Route B Alternative. For reasons stated in the following discussion, FRA concurs with this determination and finds that the Route A Alternative is best able to achieve the Project's purpose and need.

The Route A Alternative is 219 miles long and will require approximately 102 miles of track upgrades, whereas the Route B Alternative is 238 miles long and will require 196 miles of track upgrades.

The Route A Alternative will attract a higher ridership than the Route B Alternative because of the more competitive travel time. Route A will attract a projected ridership of 187,000, compared to 147,000 on Route B. The Route A Alternative is projected to divert 117,000 vehicle trips, 16,000 bus passenger trips, and 42,000 plane passengers per year, reducing fuel usage and non-passenger rail transportation system congestion in the Project area. The Route B Alternative is projected to divert 92,000 vehicle trips, 12,000 bus passenger trips, and 33,000 plane passengers per year, reducing fuel usage and non-passenger rail transportation system congestion to a lesser extent than the Route A Alternative.

While the Route A Alternative will require construction of an additional mainline track and new or reconfigured crossovers in Eola Yard, and a new connection at Wyanet, it requires fewer improvements to the overall track structure and grade crossings than the Route B Alternative. Almost half of the Route A Alternative (110 miles out of a total of 219 miles) currently supports 79 mph intercity passenger service and will not require any improvements. Far less of the Route B Alternative (42 miles out of a total of 238 miles) currently supports passenger trains.

Both the Route A and Route B alternatives would provide economic benefits through job creation, the potential for joint development, and increased economic activity. Neither route would have disproportionate impacts on minorities and low-income populations. The passenger rail service will provide increased mobility and employment opportunities throughout the Project area.

In general, under both build alternatives, the Project is not anticipated to influence changes to existing adjacent land uses. The proposed Amtrak station in Moline is expected to enhance transportation oriented development (TOD) adjacent to the rail line at an existing bus station. Construction of the Wyanet Connection for the Route A Alternative will require the acquisition of approximately seven acres of land, including approximately two acres of farmland.

Both build alternatives would improve public health and safety by upgrading grade crossing signal equipment and providing a safe, efficient modal choice for travel from Chicago to Iowa City through the Quad Cities. Under both build alternatives, noise impacts would increase; the areas affected between Chicago and Wyanet would differ, but the total number of impacts would be approximately the same.

The Route A Alternative has fewer environment impacts, as described in the EA and Supplement, and as summarized below:

- Air pollutants and energy use will be reduced to a greater extent with the Route A Alternative as compared to the Route B Alternative. Specifically, the Route A Alternative will reduce annual emissions of hydrocarbons (HC) and carbon monoxide (CO) to a greater extent (7 tons and 199 tons, respectively) when compared to the Route B Alternative (5 tons and 155 tons, respectively). Under both build alternatives, annual emissions of nitrogen oxides (NOx), particulate matter (PM-10) and fine particulate matter (PM-2.5) would increase.
- Fewer hazardous material sites exist near the Route A Alternative (approximately 239 sites compared to 364 sites near the Route B Alternative). The safety of hazardous material transportation by freight trains would improve under both build alternatives because of track and crossing upgrades.
- No impacts on cultural resources, parks, or Illinois Natural Areas Inventory (INAI) sites are expected under either build alternative.
- The Route A Alternative will cross approximately 120 waterways, compared to 128 crossed by the Route B Alternative. Based on a review of the National Wetland Inventory (NWI), there are 144 wetlands within 100 feet of the Route A Alternative and 263

wetlands within 100 feet of the Route B Alternative. Both build alternatives would cross several floodplains, but impacts would be temporary and would cease when construction is completed.

- The same threatened and endangered species have been identified within the counties that would be crossed by both build alternatives. However, the Route B Alternative is also adjacent to critical habitat of the threatened Indiana bat.

4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

In the EA and the Supplement, the DOTs analyzed both the context and intensity of the Project's environmental impacts. FRA has also independently evaluated the environmental impacts, and has concluded that the Route A Alternative, including the proposed mitigation measures, will not have a significant effect on the human environment. Tier 2 Project Level NEPA documents will be required prior to Project implementation. The following sections summarize the analysis provided in the EA and Supplement for the improvements contemplated and operations based upon five round trip passenger train trips per day.

4.1 Transportation

The Route A Alternative will provide a transportation benefit by developing a new mode of travel for potential riders, and by expanding existing, and developing new, regional passenger rail service to help meet future travel demands. Travelers will be diverted from automobile (or other personal vehicles), bus, and airplane (the majority of diversions will be from personal vehicles). In addition, the Route A Alternative will generate demand (additional trips made by rail) because of the convenience and low cost of the new rail service. The proposed new service will add one morning pair (one westbound and one eastbound) and one afternoon pair of Amtrak intercity passenger trains each day, for a total of four new trains.

FRA finds that the transportation impacts are not significant.

4.2 Socioeconomic Resources

The Route A Alternative will provide benefits to socioeconomic resources through the creation of jobs at stations, opportunities for joint development near the stations, and increased economic activity in the communities with stations, especially in the rural counties that are dependent on limited economic and employment opportunities. In addition, the Project's construction activities will cause a temporary boost in employment in many counties, including economically distressed LaSalle County, Illinois. The impacts from specific construction activities will be evaluated in subsequent Tier 2 Project Level NEPA documents.

FRA finds that the impacts to socioeconomic resources are not significant.

4.3 Environmental Justice

Minority populations are substantially higher than the State average in seven counties in the Project area (Cook, De Kalb, Du Page, and Kane in Illinois, and Johnson, Muscatine, and Scott in Iowa). A percentage of the population in Johnson County, Iowa is recorded below the State's average poverty level.

Analysis results show that municipalities in the Quad Cities, identified as the area where the greatest concentration of poverty, low income and minority populations exist, are likely to experience an incremental increase in train noise levels and corresponding impacts associated with the Route A Alternative. These areas experience low train speeds and volumes, and quiet zones do not currently exist in these locations. The incremental increase in train noise and vibration has been determined to be not significant for this analysis (See 6.6, Noise).

Minority and low-income populations along the Route A Alternative route will not be subject to disproportionate adverse impacts. The Route A Alternative will provide increased mobility and employment opportunities to cities and rural areas along the proposed route, and will benefit all residents, including minority and low income populations. Impacts from specific construction activities will be evaluated in subsequent Tier 2 Project Level NEPA documents.

FRA finds that the environmental justice impacts are not significant.

4.4 Land Use, Zoning, and Property Acquisitions

In general, existing adjacent land uses will likely continue, and future land use patterns will not change, as a result of the Route A Alternative. The proposed Amtrak station in Moline is expected to enhance TOD opportunities adjacent to the rail line at an existing bus station. Construction of the approximately 1-mile Wyanet Connection will require acquisition of approximately seven acres of land, including approximately two acres of farmland. Some incremental loss of farmland could also occur in areas where the ROW will need to be expanded for track upgrades. Impacts from specific construction activities will be evaluated, and the completion of the Farmland Protection Policy Act (FPPA) Form AD-1006 will be completed, in the Tier 2 Project Level NEPA documents.

FRA finds that the impacts to land use, zoning, and property acquisition are not significant.

4.5 Public Health and Safety

The Route A Alternative will improve public health and safety by upgrading grade crossing signal equipment and by providing a safe, efficient modal choice for travel from Chicago to Iowa City, through the Quad Cities. The warning systems at the at-grade crossings will be improved, as needed, by installing gates and flashing lights at public crossings and by upgrading to constant-time warning circuitry. Such improvements will allow communities to pursue establishment of quiet zones. The impacts from specific construction activities will be evaluated in subsequent Tier 2 Project Level NEPA documents.

FRA finds that the impacts to public health and safety are not significant.

4.6 Noise and Vibration

4.6.1 Noise

The EA Noise and Vibration assessment was completed consistent with procedures provided by the FRA *High-Speed Ground Transportation Noise and Vibration Impact Assessment* guidance

manual (U.S. Department of Transportation (USDOT) Federal Railroad Administration, October, 2005). Both existing and future rail traffic were evaluated in the EA in order to assess the incremental, Project-related effects of airborne noise. Analysis results identified a limited number of potential noise impacts throughout the Project corridor. Noise from horns and wheel-rail interaction (wayside noise) contribute to the projected noise impacts. The methodology used to assess Project-related noise is based on guidance provided by the FRA for use in Tier 1 NEPA review.

Route A and Route B Alternatives would have an increase in rail traffic of four additional passenger trains per day, which would add to the existing train related noise and vibration effects. However, in several locations the track structure would be improved which would reduce the noise impact. In addition, improvements to the track in the Quad Cities area would allow for an increase in the train speed through the communities which would further reduce noise impacts. The warning systems at the at-grade crossings would be improved as needed by installing gates and flashing lights at public crossings and upgrading to constant time warning circuitry. This would allow communities to pursue quiet zones if desired.

The presence or absence of quiet zones has a large effect on the predicted number of train noise impacts. Locomotive horn use at public-at grade crossings causes the majority of the predicted noise impacts. Therefore, minimizing locomotive horn use in the Project area represents the greatest opportunity to mitigate potential Project-related noise impacts. The Project would upgrade some electronic circuitry due to installation of constant time circuitry (warning lights) at public at-grade roadway-rail crossings. In effect, the Project would install the electronic infrastructure for quiet zones. Municipalities predicted to experience an increase in train noise impacts can chose to initiate the process of developing quiet zones, and to take advantage of the infrastructure provided by the proposed Project.

In the Quad Cities, track signals will be improved through East Moline, Moline, Rock Island, and Davenport to allow for an increase in passenger train speeds from the current 10 to 15 mph constraint to 40 mph. In addition, a passenger train by-pass of the Rock Island yard will be constructed to reduce the delays to the passenger trains through the yard. In Colona, the crossing of the BNSF and IAIS rail lines will be reconstructed to increase the track speed on the IAIS from the current 10 mph to 40 mph. These improvements in the Quad Cities and Colona will also improve the speed for the current freight trains. The speed increases will reduce the number of noise receptors that will be impacted because the duration of a locomotive horn use (pass-by) event will be shorter.

FRA finds that though the track improvements and safety measures proposed in this Project that the noise impacts are not significant.

4.6.2 Ground-borne Vibration

The Tier 1 Service Level NEPA review assessed only Project-related ground-borne vibration (GBV) at land uses where people sleep (primarily residences). This study assessed ground-borne

noise (which is different than both air-borne noise and ground-borne vibration) and is consistent with vibration analyses performed for FRA on other Tier 1 service-level projects. Existing and proposed (future) operations were both evaluated to assess the potential vibration impact along Routes A and B. The future use scenario includes passenger trains moving at 79 miles per hour (mph), along with existing freight train traffic, on welded track. A potential 90 mph passenger train scenario on Route A was partially analyzed for a future 5 trains per day scenario, and potential impact distances are provided for comparison purposes.

Analysis results identified minimal vibration impacts associated with the Route A Alternative and also indicate that the proposed improvements may result in vibration impacts at residences near the existing Eola Yard; however, the incremental increase in GBV associated with the proposed improvements in the yard will be quite small, and it is possible that the Project-related vibration levels will be comparable to the vibration events created by railcar movements in the existing yard. On this basis, vibration mitigation is not recommended.

FRA finds that the vibration impacts are not significant.

4.7 Air Quality

The Route A Alternative will have no significant impact on current or future air quality standards, nor will it lead to the establishment of a nonattainment area. Implementation of two round-trip TPDs on the Route A Alternative route will potentially improve the air quality in the region by diverting approximately 117,000 vehicle trips from the roads and highways and 8.4 million airline passenger-miles per year between Chicago and Iowa City. Fuel consumption is expected to decrease by approximately 266,000 gallons per year.

Emissions from the Route A Alternative will be well below the General Conformity *de minimis* threshold for all nonattainment and maintenance areas within the Project area and a general conformity analysis is not required. The air toxic effects from implementing the proposed passenger rail service will be minimal. Impacts from specific construction activities will be evaluated in subsequent Tier 2 Project Level NEPA documents.

FRA finds that the air quality impacts are not significant.

4.8 Hazardous Materials

The addition of two round-trip TPDs on the existing rail lines will not impact the existing hazardous material sites. Specific construction activities, such as reconstruction of the rail line between Wyanet and Iowa City and construction of the Eola Mainline Improvements and Wyanet Connection, have the potential to affect or be affected by hazardous material sites. However, any potential impacts to these sites will be evaluated, and mitigation measures will be developed, in the Tier 2 Project Level NEPA documents.

If any contamination is encountered during construction of the Route A Alternative, the proper agencies will be notified and the contaminated soil will be excavated and disposed of in accordance with Illinois or Iowa law, depending on the location. Detailed hazardous

material/special waste studies will be conducted in a manner consistent with IDOT and IaDOT protocols, and will be documented in subsequent Tier 2 Project Level NEPA documents.

FRA finds that the hazardous materials impacts are not significant.

4.9 Cultural Resources

The replacement of existing rail, ties, and ballast, a common practice that is essential to operation and maintenance of any railroad, and is not anticipated to result in any adverse effects on historic properties. Alternatives for construction of the Eola Mainline Improvements, the Wyanet Connection, and the station facilities defined, and the Project-related consultation among FRA, IDOT, IaDOT, and the consulting parties, will occur as part of the Tier 2 Project Level NEPA process. Similarly, the impacts from specific construction activities will be evaluated in the Tier 2 Project Level NEPA documents, which will include appropriate consultation pursuant to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. Avoidance, minimization, and mitigation measures will also be evaluated.

FRA finds that the impacts to cultural resources are not significant.

4.10 Parks and Natural Areas

Most impacts of the Route A Alternative on parks and natural areas will be temporary (i.e., during construction). Five prairie areas were identified within the Wyanet Connection section of the Project area. One of these prairie areas is of high quality. These prairie remnants and other parks and natural areas identified during the Tier 1 analysis will be avoided, if possible. If impacts are unavoidable, coordination will take place with agencies having jurisdiction over these areas as part of the Tier 2 Project Level NEPA analyses. Should impacts to the high quality prairie remnants be unavoidable, Iowa DNR recommends that the impact area could be mitigated through relocation to a suitable site. Tree replacement for the Wyanet Connection could take place in the agricultural areas within the seven acres that will be purchased for the Project.

FRA finds that the impacts to parks and natural areas are not significant.

4.11 Section 4(f) Properties

No Section 4(f) properties have been identified that will be impacted by the Route A Alternative, including construction of the Eola Main Line Improvements and the Wyanet Connection. However, there are a number of Section 4(f) properties (parks, historic sites, and wildlife refuges) found in the vicinity of the Route A Alternative. At this time, it is likely that there will be no use of any Section 4(f) properties within the rail corridor ROW as a result of the implementation of the Route A Alternative. As specific construction activities are identified during the Tier 2 Project Level NEPA process, FRA, IDOT, and IaDOT will continue to work closely with the relevant officials having jurisdiction over Section 4(f) properties.

If there is use of a Section 4(f) property proposed during Tier 2 Project Level NEPA studies, a Section 4(f) evaluation will be completed to determine if there are feasible and prudent alternatives to the use, and to ensure all possible planning to minimize harm to the property.

FRA finds that the impacts to Section 4(f) properties are not significant.

4.12 Waterways

Impacts on waterways will primarily be minor or temporary, and will result from construction of any needed bridge or culvert replacements, stations, and other facilities. Temporary impacts will cease immediately after construction is completed and will be minimized through the implementation of best management practices (BMPs).

Construction of the Eola Main Line Improvements will require a portion (approximately 4,920 linear feet) of linear conveyances to be filled and relocated to a culvert or enclosed conduit. Mitigation for the potential impacts on the stormwater drainage features could be accomplished through a combination of on and offsite restoration. Onsite mitigation could include replacement of the affected stormwater channels by enclosed conduits, which will maintain the hydraulic capacity and connectivity. Offsite mitigation could include enhancement of the up-stream Eola and Night Heron marshes and could include downstream aquatic habitat within the southern branch of Indian Creek.

Construction of the Wyanet Connection will require approximately 2,050 linear feet of Pond Creek to be crossed, causing a permanent impact. As the railroad embankment is constructed, a new channel will be excavated north of the new embankment. Construction of the Wyanet Connection may also result in downstream impacts on biota and habitat. During construction, changes in the hydrological flow may cause indirect effects on downstream habitat. Mitigation for the impacts on Pond Creek could be accomplished by a combination of restoration options, including on-site replacement of the current functions of Pond Creek through development of a more natural channel, offsite enhancement of downstream habitat within the Pond Creek watershed, onsite wetland development within a newly developed riparian corridor, and purchase of stream/wetland mitigation credits from an approved mitigation bank within the service area.
IaDOT and the Iowa Department of Natural Resources (Iowa DNR) met on July 27, 2010 to discuss general concept-level mitigation for impacts that will result from construction of the Eola Main Line improvements and the Wyanet Connection. Iowa DNR concurred with the general mitigation approach, understanding that detailed, site-specific mitigation plans will be developed during the Tier 2 Project Level NEPA process. The Tier 2 Project Level NEPA analysis for the Eola Main Line Improvements and the Wyanet Connection will include the full range of alternatives evaluation, impact assessment, and mitigation development, including permit applications to avoid, minimize, and mitigate impacts on aquatic resource features.

The Route A Alternative will not impact waterways during operations. Permits and approvals will be needed from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency (Illinois EPA), and the Iowa DNR prior to any construction impacts on waterways. Specific construction impacts will be identified during the Tier 2 Project Level analysis.

FRA finds that the impacts to waterways are not significant.

4.13 Wetlands

Approximately 1.7 acres of wetland impacts will result from construction of the Eola Main Line Improvements. Mitigation for the Eola Main Line Improvements could occur onsite or offsite. Onsite mitigation will include replacement of the affected stormwater channels where practical. Additional offsite mitigation will include enhancement of upstream Eola and Night Heron marshes. Operation of the Route A Alternative will not impact wetlands. Impacts from specific construction activities, such as the Eola Main Line Improvements and the Wyanet Connection, will be identified and evaluated during the Tier 2 Project Level analyses, including avoidance and minimization of impacts, identification of mitigation alternatives, and the potential need for permits and approvals.

FRA finds that the impacts to wetlands are not significant.

4.14 Water Quality

The Route A Alternative will not result in permanent impacts on water quality, but may have some temporary impacts during construction. Impacts to water quality will be minimized through the use of BMPs during construction and through adherence to local and state permitting requirements. Specific construction impacts will be evaluated during the Tier 2 Project Level analyses.

FRA finds that the water quality impacts are not significant.

4.15 Floodplains

The Route A Alternative will cross several floodplains, including those associated with the Mississippi and Des Plaines Rivers. Approximately 2,300 feet of the 13,500-foot Eola Main Line Improvements will be constructed in the existing floodplain. In addition, approximately 2,400 feet of the 4,000-foot Wyanet Connection will be constructed in the existing floodplain. Floodplain permits from Kane and Du Page Counties will be obtained prior to construction. Impacts on the stream and floodplain will be minimized as the design process advances and will be further assessed in a Tier 2 Project Level NEPA document.

Track improvements will be designed during the Tier 2 Project Level NEPA process to avoid permanent impacts on floodplains. Iowa DNR, Illinois EPA, and USACE floodplain permits will be needed to address floodplain impacts. Impacts on the stream and floodplain will be minimized as the design process advances and will be further assessed in a Tier 2 Project Level NEPA document. Temporary floodplain disruptions may also occur during construction.
FRA finds that the impacts to floodplains are not significant.

4.16 Threatened and Endangered Species

Operation of the two round-trip TPDs along the Route A Alternative will not affect threatened and endangered species. Additional analyses and coordination will be completed during the Tier 2 Project Level NEPA process for site-specific construction activities.

A preliminary assessment of the prairie remnants in the vicinity of the Wyanet Connection was conducted, indicating that no federally or state-listed species were present.

Eight federally listed endangered, threatened, or candidate species were identified as occurring within DuPage and Kane Counties. There are also three state-listed species with habitat near the Eola Main Line Improvements section of the Project area. A survey to characterize the affected environment for aquatic resources was conducted and habitat for these species is not likely present within the Eola Main Line Improvements section of the Project area.

The potential for affecting threatened and endangered species, along with detailed site-specific botanical surveys for federally and state-listed species and potential mitigation measures will be evaluated in detail in the Tier 2 Project Level NEPA analysis for the Eola Main Line Improvements. Any potential impacts to threatened and endangered species identified during the Tier 2 Project Level analyses will be minimized through the use of BMPs and construction timing restrictions.

FRA finds that the impacts to threatened and endangered species are not significant.

4.17 Energy

The Route A Alternative will have a beneficial effect on energy use, resulting from an estimated decrease of personal vehicle traffic by 16.5 million passenger-miles per year and a reduction of airline travel by 8.4 million passenger-miles per year. Fuel consumption is expected to decrease by approximately 266,000 gallons per year.

FRA finds that the adverse impacts to energy use that will result from the Project are not significant.

4.18 Construction Impacts

The Route A Alternative will include the following construction activities that will result in temporary impacts on the environment: signal improvements; track upgrades; construction of the Eola Mainline Improvements and the Wyanet connection; and bridge and culvert repair, rehabilitation, and replacement. These impacts will be minimized through the use of BMPs. As discussed in the EA (Section 3.19, Construction Impacts), ground disturbance may result in the removal of vegetation from some areas and BMPs will be implemented to minimize both wind and water erosion of exposed soil. Areas will be revegetated as soon as practicable to maintain long-term stability. Temporary crossing closures will affect traffic patterns while the track is upgraded. Construction impacts, temporary detour routes, and specific BMPs to be employed will be examined in more detail in the Tier 2 Project Level NEPA analyses.

FRA finds that the construction impacts are not significant.

4.19 Irreversible and Irretrievable Commitment of Resources

The Route A Alternative will result in the irreversible and irretrievable commitment of construction materials, such as steel, concrete, ballast rock, and wood. Though largely

irretrievable, these resources are not in short supply and many of the materials could be recycled for other projects when they no longer meet the design needs of the passenger or freight rail service. In addition, energy resources and financial resources will be committed to the Project for construction, operation, and maintenance. Land for the Wyanet Connection will also be irretrievably and irreversibly committed for conversion to railroad ROW.

FRA finds that the irreversible and irretrievable commitments of resources are not significant.

4.20 Indirect and Cumulative Impacts

The Route A Alternative has the potential for beneficial indirect effects along the route, including reduced traffic congestion on existing roadways, reduced vehicle emissions, and increased potential for TOD of other services near the proposed stops. The Route A Alternative will have a slight beneficial contribution to cumulative impacts by improving overall air quality, reducing roadway congestion, and increasing the potential for TOD. Tier 2 Project Level NEPA studies will provide more detailed information on site-specific indirect and cumulative effects.
FRA finds that the indirect and cumulative impacts are not significant.

5.0 ENVIRONMENTAL COMMITMENTS

5.1 Applicable Regulations and Permits

Since the focus of the Tier 1 Service Level EA focuses on the broader impacts of the Project as a whole, the Tier 2 Project Level NEPA documents are expected to identify additional state and local level permits and approvals that are needed based upon specific activities to be completed. State and local permits and approvals will therefore be discussed in the Tier 2 Project Level NEPA documents. The following Federal regulations, statutes, and orders apply to this Project:

- Clean Water Act of 1977 (33 USC § 1251-1376)
- Endangered Species Act (50 CFR 17)
- Executive Order 11988, Floodplain Management (42 Federal Register [FR] 26951)
- Executive Order 11990, Protection of Wetland (42 FR 26961)
- Executive Order 12898, Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations (59 FR 7629)
- Executive Order 13166, Improving Access to Services for Persons with Limited English Proficiency (65 FR 50121)
- Federal Railroad Administration Procedures for Considering Environmental Impacts (64 FR 28545)
- National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (42 USC § 4321 et seq.)
- Regulations for Implementing the Procedural Provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act (40 CFR 1500–1508)
- Section 4(f) of the U.S. Department of Transportation Act of 1966 (49 USC § 303)
- Section 6(f) of the Land and Water Conservation Act of 1965 (16 USC § 460)
- Sections 9 and 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899 (33 USC § 401)
- Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, as amended (16 USC § 470)
- Section 404 of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act (33 USC § 1344)
- Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, as

amended (42 USC § 61)
- Use of Locomotive Horns at Highway-Rail Grade Crossings, Final Rule (40 CFR 222 and 229)

5.2 Commitments and Mitigation Measures

The following Project commitments and mitigation measures have been identified to further reduce impacts of the Route A Alternative. These measures will be further refined during Tier 2 Project level analyses. Additional measures may also be identified in these subsequent studies.

Transportation

A specific Tier 2 Project Level NEPA evaluation, "Illinois Track Improvements," will be conducted for the proposed alignment in Illinois to address the infrastructure and operations requirements for the new service, the existing freight service, and the potential commuter rail service.

Environmental Justice

Impacts to low income and minority communities will continue to be evaluated. Implementation of quiet zones in these communities where noise impacts occur will be evaluated. Impacts from specific construction activities will also be evaluated.

Land Use, Zoning, and Property Acquisitions

Impacts from specific construction activities will be evaluated in subsequent Tier 2 Project Level NEPA documents. The Farmland Protection Policy Act (FPPA) Form AD-1006 will be completed.

Noise and Vibration

Impacts from specific construction activities, and mitigation of impacts will be evaluated in subsequent Tier 2 Project Level NEPA documents. Potential quiet zones will be evaluated, when locomotive horn use at public at-grade crossings, which causes the majority of the predicted noise impacts. Track improvements to improve the fluidity of the passenger trains and to increase the passenger rail speed through the communities, thereby reducing noise duration, will also be considered.

Hazardous Materials

If any contamination is encountered during construction of the Route A Alternative, the proper agencies will be notified and the contaminated soil will be excavated and disposed of in accordance with Illinois or Iowa law, based on location. Detailed hazardous material/special waste studies will be conducted in a manner consistent with IDOT and IaDOT protocols, and will be documented in subsequent Tier 2 Project Level NEPA documents.

Cultural Resources

As part of Tier 2 Project Level NEPA studies, consultation in accordance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act will be initiated with appropriate consulting parties, including the Illinois SHPO and the Iowa SHPO. During consultation, historic properties will be identified,

and a determination of effect will be made for the Tier 2 project. If appropriate, adverse effects will be resolved in a Memorandum of Agreement pursuant to 36 CFR § 800.6.

Section 4(f) Properties
During the Tier 2 Project Level NEPA process, any unforeseen potential use of Section 4(f) properties will be identified. If necessary, a Section 4(f) evaluation will be completed should use of Section 4(f) properties be unavoidable.

Waterways, Wetlands, and Floodplains
Impacts from specific construction activities, such as the Eola Main Line Improvements and the Wyanet Connection will be identified and evaluated during the Tier 2 Project Level NEPA process. The Tier 2 Project Level NEPA analyses will include impact assessment and efforts to avoid, minimize, and mitigate impacts on aquatic resource features. Coordination will occur with the USACE, the Illinois EPA, and the Iowa DNR for permits and approvals prior to any waterway, wetland, or floodplain impacts. Compensatory mitigation measures may be identified during the permit coordination process.

6.0 COMMENTS AND COORDINATION

During preparation of the EA, the DOTs initiated early coordination and consultation with agencies, stakeholder groups, and the public to incorporate their comments and concerns into the development and analysis of the Project purpose and need, alternatives, and potential resultant environmental impacts. Public coordination included stakeholder meetings, briefings, and conference presentations, which are detailed in Section 4.0 of the EA. After publication of the September 2009 Service Level EA, the DOTs held a public meeting in Moline, solicited public comments, and conducted additional agency coordination. Comments were received from the public and agencies via the Project website, public meeting comment forms, a phone information line, email, and mail. Of the 96 comments received, 40 stated support for the Project, and four expressed opposition to the Route B Alternative. Of those comments supporting the proposed service and stating a preference for an alternative, most supported Route A. Five comments were received regarding transportation issues, three regarding noise, two regarding air quality, one regarding cultural resources, and two regarding natural resources.

The DOTs responded to comments on the EA within the Supplement, which is reflected within this FRA decision document. For more information on the comments and coordination process following the publication of the EA, see Section 3.0 of the Supplement.

Tier 2 Project Level NEPA
Tier 2 Project Level NEPA documents will be completed for specific activities needed to implement the Project when specific construction activities are defined. As funding becomes available, the design and the Tier 2 Project Level NEPA documentation will be advanced. The Tier 2 Project Level NEPA documents will assess the environmental effects of all reasonable alternatives and will document measures to avoid or to further minimize and mitigate impacts.
As described in the Supplement, the following Tier 2 Project Level NEPA analyses are anticipated; however, this list may be combined or modified.

- Illinois Track Improvements – This Tier 2 Project Level NEPA document will include the track, tie, culvert, and bridge improvement or replacement to bring existing track to the standards needed for passenger trains to ultimate operate at maximum speeds up to 90 mph from Halstead Street in Chicago to Wyanet along the alignment in Illinois.
- Iowa Track Improvements – This Tier 2 Project Level NEPA document will include the track, tie, culvert, and bridge improvement or replacement to bring existing track to the standards needed for 79 mph passenger trains along the alignment in Iowa.
- Geneseo, Illinois, Station – There is currently no passenger train station in Geneseo. This Tier 2 Project Level NEPA document will include the evaluation of station location alternatives and design.
- Iowa City, Iowa, Station – This Tier 2 Project Level NEPA document will include the evaluation of the repurchase and remodel of the existing station in Iowa City. Should acquisition not be possible, an evaluation of station locations and design will be conducted in-lieu of the analysis of remodeling the existing station.
- Moline, Illinois, Station – There is currently no passenger train station in Moline. This Tier 2 Project Level NEPA document will include the evaluation of station location alternatives and design.
- Iowa City, Iowa, Layover Facility – There is currently no layover facility in Iowa City. This Tier 2 Project Level NEPA document will include the evaluation of layover facility location alternatives and design. Alternatives considered may include areas outside of existing railroad ROW.
- Colona, Illinois, Improvements – This Tier 2 Project Level NEPA document will evaluate alternatives and design to improve the BNSF crossing in Colona.
- Rock Island, Illinois, Yard Bypass – This Tier 2 Project Level NEPA document will evaluate alternatives and design for a yard bypass track to allow passenger trains to avoid traveling through the Rock Island Yard.
- Silvis, Illinois, Bypass – If the Rock Island Yard bypass is not implemented, a Tier 2 Project Level NEPA document will evaluate alternatives and design for improvements to the existing track alignments in Silvis.
- Wyanet Connection – This Tier 2 Project Level NEPA document will present alternatives and design for the connection between the BNSF and IAIS railroads near Wyanet. See the EA (Section 2.3.1) for more information on this connection.
- Eola, Illinois, Main Line Improvements – This Tier 2 Project Level NEPA document will include the evaluation of alternatives and design to provide adequate main-track capacity to enable on-time operation of the proposed Chicago to Iowa City passenger rail service without disrupting the on-time schedule performance of other Amtrak intercity passenger trains and Metra commuter trains, and without affecting the operation of BNSF freight trains. The Eola Main Line Improvements will provide infrastructure at a bottleneck where main-track capacity is at present fully consumed by existing Amtrak long-distance and intercity passenger trains, Metra commuter passenger trains, and BNSF freight trains. See Supplement (Section 2.0) for additional information on the Eola Yard.

7.0 CONCLUSION

FRA finds that the Chicago to Iowa City Intercity Passenger Rail Service Project, as presented and assessed in the September, 2009 Tier 1 Service Level EA and the August, 2010 Supplement, satisfies the requirements of FRA's Procedures for Considering Environmental Impacts, including any identified mitigation measures outlined within, and has determined that this Project will have no foreseeable significant impact on the quality of the human and natural environment. This Finding of No Significant Impact is based on the EA and the Supplement, which were independently evaluated by FRA and determined to adequately and accurately discuss the need, environmental issues, impacts of the proposed Project, and the appropriate mitigation measures. The EA and Supplement provide sufficient evidence and analysis for determining that an Environmental Impact Statement is not required.

Joseph C. Szabo, Administrator
Federal Railroad Administration

11/16/11
Date

This document has been prepared in accordance with FRA's Procedures for Considering Environmental Impacts by the Office of Railroad Policy and Development, with assistance from the Office of Chief Counsel. This document was prepared in September/October, 2011. For further information regarding this document, contact:

Andréa E. Martin
Environmental Protection Specialist
1200 New Jersey Avenue SE
Washington, DC 20590
Phone: (202) 493-6201