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I. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED ACTION

The proposed Iowa 2 Sidney east bypass extends easterly on new alignment around Sidney and then northwesterly to tie to U.S. 275 north of Sidney. Total distance of the proposed bypass is 6.0 kilometers (km) ( 3.8 miles). A project location map is shown on Figure 1, page 2.

The purpose of the proposed improvement is to construct a two-lane ruraltype roadway around Sidney to help alleviate limited operational constraints on traffic currently using present Iowa 2 and U.S. 275 at Sidney. The facility would be built to Priority III access standards (access to the highway allowed at at-grade locations). See page 24 for more detail on Priority III access control.

This project has been programmed for construction in the 1999-2003 Iowa Transportation Improvement Program. Estimated costs of $\$ 12,790,000$ are shown for the project.

One construction alternative and a "no-build" alternative are being studied for the improvement. A variety of alternatives were developed initially. These alternatives were analyzed and subjected to a screening process which removed the alternatives from further consideration which did not satisfy the project need. One "build" alternative is being evaluated and is included in this document. This alternative would involve constructing a two-lane bypass east of Sidney with access control. The "no-build" alternative does not address the improvement needs but is being retained as a baseline for comparison to the "build" alternative.
II. PROJECT HISTORY

The Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act of 1991 (ISTEA) provided $\$ 8.7$ million of demonstration funding toward reconstruction of Iowa 2 between I-29 and Sidney. To determine the need for this improvement, a public information meeting was held April 4, 1995, in Sidney to discuss the relocation of Iowa 2 from I-29 at Percival east to Sidney, including north and south bypass alternatives of Sidney. Questions and comments at the meeting concerned the need for a possible bypass of Sidney, and the potential environmental impacts to the Loess Hills.


A second public information meeting was held February 22, 1996, in Sidney. This meeting addressed comments received at the April 4, 1995, public meeting, and further discussed the need for an Iowa 2 improvement. Five construction alternatives and a "no-build" alternative were discussed. The construction alternatives included the original north and south Sidney bypass alternatives, and an improvement within Sidney. (See Figure 6.) The people in favor of relocating Iowa 2 expressed a need for a more direct route to I-29 for shipment of materials to enhance economic development. Those opposed had concerns relating to land loss and impacts to the Loess Hills. An area of general agreement seemed to be the need for some type of Iowa 2 improvement.

On July 30, 1996, the Iowa Transportation Commission considered the approval of an alternative for the Iowa 2 project at Sidney. Iowa Department of Transportation (DOT) staff presented results of the information meetings and recommended to upgrade existing Iowa 2 rather than relocate it through the Loess Hills. The recommendation also included the construction of the south half of the Iowa 2 relocation (Sidney Bypass) on the east side of Sidney.

The recommendation was based on traffic forecasts, environmental concerns and funding considerations. The Commission deferred action for six months at the request of the Southwest Iowa Coalition. The purpose of the deferment was to allow time for the coalition and others to work with Iowa DOT staff to develop a plan everyone could support and to explore ways to reduce the cost of the project.

On September 3, 1996, Iowa DOT staff met with the Southwest Iowa Coalition and others in Sidney. It was suggested that the Iowa DOT consider following the existing gravel county road alignment (near the North Bypass Alternative) to reduce right of way costs and grading costs. (See Figure 6.) This was considered and actually would have increased the project costs by approximately $\$ 400,000$ because of home displacements. No grading costs would have been saved because the existing road has severe grades and would have required as much grading as a route on new location.

Iowa DOT staff was also asked to consider moving the proposed Iowa 2 Sidney bypass closer to Sidney. This was considered early in the process, but was
abandoned because it would have resulted in more displacements and costs similar to the original north and south bypass alternatives.

On October 18, 1996, Iowa DOT staff met with the Sidney Business Coalition in Sidney. The coalition strongly voiced their support for relocation of Iowa 2 on the north alignment, either as originally proposed or in the vicinity with plan refinements. (See Figure 6.) They did not support a south relocation alignment. They urged Iowa DOT staff to do everything they could to make the relocation of Iowa 2 on a north alignment a reality.

After the October 18, 1996 meeting, Iowa DOT staff estimated the cost of a grade separation over the railroad at Percival. It was determined to be warranted, and was also requested by the Southwest Iowa Coalition and Sidney Business Coalition. The cost to provide the separation would have increased the cost of the north alignment by $\$ 1.1$ million, for a total cost of $\$ 15.9$ million.

Iowa DOT staff also estimated the cost of upgrading Iowa 145 from I-29 to U.S. 275. The estimated cost was based on reconstruction of the I-29 interchange, a railroad grade separation, resurfacing the existing route from I-29 to Thurman, approximately two miles of pavement widening, shoulder widening and resurfacing east of Thurman, and approximately 3.2 km (two miles) of reconstruction east of Thurman. The estimate also included eliminating two $90^{\circ}$ turns in Thurman. Total cost of this alternative was estimated to be $\$ 9.8$ million. The $\$ 8.7$ million in demonstration funds would not have been eligible to be spent on Iowa 145 as the provision was written.

At the May 20, 1997, Iowa Transportation Commission Meeting, the Commission directed the Iowa DOT to upgrade Iowa 2 from I-29 east to near the south junction of U.S. 275/Iowa 2 and to construct the entire east bypass around Sidney. At this meeting, Iowa DOT Director Rensink announced that the Iowa DOT would partner with local citizens to incorporate their needs for the proposed east bypass. In addition, the Commission directed the Iowa DOT to work with the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) to establish the eligibility of the north segment of the East Sidney Bypass for ISTEA funding. On August 15, 1997, FHWA concurred that the entire proposed project concept approved by the Transportation Commission would be eligible for ISTEA funding.

A first partnering meeting was held October 14 and 15,1997 , in Sidney. It was agreed at the partnering meeting that the Iowa DOT and consultant (HGM) would review the Sidney east bypass alignment developed by the Iowa DOT along with a bypass alignment provided by local participants. That review and response was the main agenda item for the December 1, 1997, partnering meeting in Sidney. Later on February 17, 1998, a partnering meeting was held with the public to discuss the east bypass alignment. Periodic partnering meetings have been held to further involve the citizens of the area with the planning of the project.

## III. NEED FOR THE PROJECT

The primary need for this improvement is to improve the flow of goods and services within and outside the local Sidney and regional trade area without impacting the unique natural environment of the Loess Hills.

The proposed project would provide an improved level of service on Iowa 2 within the limits of the study corridor, and would meet existing and predicted future traffic demands. An improved Iowa 2 two-lane facility would provide continuity within the larger Iowa 2 corridor in western Iowa, providing for future economic growth and traffic service demands.

The primary beneficial impacts of the proposed improvement would be the increase in operating safety, capacity, and convenjence provided by an upgraded roadway. Construction of the proposed east bypass of Sidney would remove through traffic and improve highway efficiency by eliminating the stop conditions which exist in the community. Traffic conflicts due to turning movements would also be avoided, which would have a positive effect on accident rates.

## A. Present Facility

Iowa 2 from I-29 east to the south junction of U.S. 275 was paved in 1931 to a width of 5.5 meters ( 18 feet). It was widened and resurfaced to 7.3 meters ( 24 feet) in 1967 and resurfaced again in 1992. The section of Iowa 2/U.S. 275 from the south junction of U.S. 275 to the south corporate limits of Sidney was paved to 7.3 meters ( 24 feet) in 1964 and resurfaced in 1984. Iowa 2 from the south corporate limits of Sidney to
the east corporate limits was paved to 5.5 meters ( 18 feet) in 1929. It was widened to 7.6 meters ( 25 feet) with curb (except one-way pairs) and was resurfaced in 1958 and 1984. The section of Iowa 2 from the east corporate limits of Sidney east was paved to a width of 5.5 meters (18 feet) in 1930. It was widened to 7.3 meters ( 24 feet) and resurfaced in 1958 and 1984. See Table 1, page 7, for pavement widths and lengths in Sidney.

Iowa 2 in Fremont County is classified as a minor arterial under the state's functional classification system.

## B. Sufficiency Ratings

Sufficiency ratings in Iowa consist of three major components:

- The Roadway's Structural Adequacy
- Motorist's Safety
- Capability to Accommodate Traffic Volumes with a Minimum of Conflict

Sufficiency ratings are classified as follows:

| Range | Descriptive <br> Classification |
| ---: | :--- |
| $90-100$ | Excellent |
| $80-89$ | Good |
| $65-79$ | Fair |
| $50-64$ | Tolerable |
| $0-49$ | Poor |

The 1998 sufficiency ratings for the various segments of Iowa 2 and U.S. 275 in and near the study area are shown in Figure 2, page 8. The ratings for the portion of Iowa 2 between I-29 east to U.S. 275 range from good to fair. South of Sidney, Iowa 2/U.S. 275 is classified as good and east of Sidney, Iowa 2 is rated as fair. Iowa 2 and U.S. 275 in Sidney are rated as excellent and U.S. 275 north of Sidney is also classified as excellent.

## TABLE 1

| DESCRIPTION | LENGTH | SURFACE WIDTH |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| South Limits of Sidney to Hillcrest Drive | $\begin{gathered} 0.40 \mathrm{~km} \\ (0.25 \text { mile }) \end{gathered}$ | 7.3 w with 30 m Shoulder <br> ( 24 foot with 10 -foot Shoulder) |  |
| Hillcrest Drive to Douglas Street | $\begin{gathered} 0.56 \mathrm{~km} \\ (0.35 \mathrm{mile}) \end{gathered}$ | 7.6 m - curb (25 foot - curb) |  |
| Douglas Street to Clay Street | $\begin{gathered} 0.19 \mathrm{~km} \\ (0.12 \mathrm{mile}) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 9.5 \text { w - curb } \\ & \text { (31 foot - curb) } \end{aligned}$ |  |
| *Clay Street to Illinois Street | $\begin{gathered} 0.02 \mathrm{~km} \\ (0.01 \text { mile }) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 33.6 \text { m - curb } \\ & \text { (110 foot - curb) } \end{aligned}$ |  |
| Clay Street to Filmore Street (Iowa 2) | $\begin{gathered} 0.18 \mathrm{~km} \\ (0.11 \text { mile }) \end{gathered}$ | 16.8 km - curb <br> ( 55 foot - curb) |  |
| Filmore Street (Iowa 2) to Webster Street | $\begin{gathered} 0.06 \mathrm{~km} \\ (0.04 \mathrm{mile}) \end{gathered}$ | 13.7 ■ curb <br> ( 45 foot - curb) |  |
| Webster Street to plotted North Street (by school) | $\begin{aligned} & 0.06 \mathrm{~km} \\ & (0.04 \mathrm{mile}) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 9.5 \text { m-curb } \\ & \text { ( } 31 \text { foot - curb) } \end{aligned}$ |  |
| Plotted street to North Limits of Sidney | $\begin{gathered} 0.51 \mathrm{~km} \\ (0.32 \mathrm{mile}) \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 7.6 \mathrm{~m}-\text { curb } \\ & \text { (25 foot - curb) } \end{aligned}$ |  |

*Note: Clay Street to Indiana Street, Indiana Street from Clay Street to Filmore Street, and Filmore Street from Indiana Street to Illinois Street are not on the state primary road system. In the area surrounding the courthouse, a mixture of diagonal and parallel parking is utilized.

| IOWA 2 IN SIDNEY EAST |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DESCRIPTION | LENGTH | SURFACE WIDTH |
| Indiana Street to Ohio Ştreet | $\begin{aligned} & 0.06 \mathrm{~km} \\ & (0.04 \text { mile }) \end{aligned}$ | 13.7 m - curb <br> (45 foot - curb) |
| Ohio Street to East Street | $\begin{aligned} & 0.10 \mathrm{~km} \\ & (0.06 \mathrm{mile}) \end{aligned}$ | 9.5 m - curb <br> (31 foot - curb) |
| East Street to End of Curbed Section | $\begin{aligned} & 0.68 \mathrm{~km} \\ & (0.42 \text { mile) } \end{aligned}$ | 7.6 m - curb <br> (25 foot - curb) |
| End of Curbed Section to East Limits of Sidney | $\begin{aligned} & 0.80 \mathrm{~km} \\ & (0.50 \mathrm{mile}) \end{aligned}$ | 7.3 m - 0.6 m Shoul <br> (24-foot - two-foot |

## 1998 SUFFICIENCY RATINGS



FIGURE 2

## C. Iraffic Forecasts

Existing 1996 average annual daily traffic (AADT) volumes for Iowa 2 and U.S. 275 are shown in Figure 3, page 10. Current volumes range from 1,300 to 3,600 vehicles per day (vpd). Trucks and buses consist of between 7 and 14 percent of these current volumes.

Program year 2005 and design year 2025 AADT volumes for the proposed Sidney east bypass are shown in Figure 4, on page 11. This figure also reflects residual traffic, which is the traffic projected to use the U.S. 275 and existing Iowa 2 routes after the bypass is open to traffic.

Figure 5, page 12, reflects the anticipated 2005 and 2025 traffic volumes which would use existing Iowa 2/U.S. 275 through Sidney if the bypass is not built.

## D. Accident Data

The accident statistics for Iowa 2/U.S. 275 in the project area for the years 1991 through 1995 are shown in Table 2, pages 13 and 14. As shown in the table, the average accident rates of all segments of
Iowa 2/U.S. 275 exceeded the statewide average except the segments within Sidney. Rural accident rates ranged from 128 accidents per 100 million vehicle miles (HMVM) to 231 accidents per HMVM. Municipal rates ranged from 439 accidents per HMVM to 454 accidents per HMVM. This compares to a statewide rural rate for primary highways of 124 accidents per HMVM and a statewide municipal rate of 527 accidents per HMVM. One fatality occurred in the project area from 1991 to 1995.

In reviewing the accident rates within Sidney, it is evident that many of the project area accidents are occurring in the downtown area where higher traffic volumes and more congestion occur. The proposed bypass facility would help divert traffic from this busy corridor through the community, with an anticipated corresponding decrease in accidents.

A high percentage of rural accidents north and south of Sidney involved animals. The section of present Iowa 2 from I-29 east to the south junction of U.S. 275 and also the section of U.S. 275 from Sidney north




## TABLE 2

## IOWA 2/U.S. 275 AT SIDNEY

## 1991-1995 Project Area Accident Data

| Year | Total Accidents | Property Damage Accidents | Personal Injury Accidents (Total Injuries) | Total Fatalities | Accident Rate* |  | Percent <br> Above/Below Statewide Rate |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | Project | Statewide |  |


| Iowa 2 from l-29/Iowa 2 interchange East to Iowa $239-8.7 \mathrm{~km}$ (5.4 miles) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1991 | 6 | 3 | $3(3)$ | 0 | 264 | 127 | $108 \%$ above |
| 1992 | 5 | 3 | $2(2)$ | 0 | 220 | 121 | $82 \%$ above |
| 1993 | 5 | 1 | $4(7)$ | 0 | 220 | 124 | $77 \%$ above |
| 1994 | 4 | 3 | $1(1)$ | 0 | 176 | 122 | $44 \%$ above |
| 1995 | 6 | 5 | $1(1)$ | 0 | 264 | 127 | $108 \%$ above |
| TOTALs | 26 | 15 | $11(14)$ | 0 | Avg $=229$ | Avg $=124$ | $85 \%$ above |


| Iowa 2 from lowa 239 East to South Junction of U.S. 275/lowa $2-3.0 \mathrm{~km}$ (1.9 miles) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1991 | 1 | 1 | $0(0)$ | 0 | 136 | 127 | $77 \%$ above |
| 1992 | 1 | 1 | $0(0)$ | 0 | 136 | 121 | $12 \%$ above |
| 1993 | 4 | 3 | $1(1)$ | 0 | 545 | 124 | $340 \%$ above |
| 1994 | 0 | 0 | $0(0)$ | 0 | 0 | 122 | $100 \%$ below |
| 1995 | 1 | 1 | $0(0)$ | 0 | 136 | 127 | $7 \%$ above |
| Totals | 7 | 6 | $1(1)$ | 0 | Avg $=190$ | Avg $=124$ | $53 \%$ above |

South Junction of U.S. 275/lowa 2 North to SCL of Sidney - 5.4 km (3.4 miles)

| 1991 | 4 | 4 | $0(0)$ | 0 | 185 | 127 | $46 \%$ above |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1992 | 5 | 3 | $2(5)$ | 0 | 231 | 121 | $91 \%$ above |
| 1993 | 6 | 5 | $1(2)$ | 0 | 278 | 124 | $124 \%$ above |
| 1994 | 7 | 5 | $1(2)$ | 1 | 324 | 122 | $166 \%$ above |
| 1995 | 3 | 3 | $0(0)$ | 0 | 139 | 127 | $9 \%$ above |
| Totals | 25 | 20 | $4(9)$ | 1 | Avg $=231$ | Avg $=124$ | $86 \%$ above |

[^0]| Year | Total Accidents | Property Damage Accidents | Personal Injury Accidents (Total Injuries) | Total Fatalities | Accident Rate* |  | Percent Above/Below Statewide Rate |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  | Project | Statewide |  |


| 1991 | 8 | 5 | $3(3)$ | 0 | 957 | 547 | $75 \%$ above |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1992 | 1 | 1 | $0(0)$ | 0 | 119 | 525 | $77 \%$ below |
| 1993 | 5 | 5 | $0(0)$ | 0 | 598 | 531 | $13 \%$ above |
| 1994 | 3 | 3 | $0(0)$ | 0 | 358 | 528 | $32 \%$ below |
| 1995 | 2 | 2 | $0(0)$ | 0 | 239 | 504 | $53 \%$ below |
| TOTALS | 19 | 16 | $3(3)$ | 0 | Avg $=454$ | Avg $=527$ | $14 \%$ below |

Iowa 2 from Filmore/Illinois Streets in Sidney to ECL of Sidney - 1.3 km ( 0.8 mile)

| 1991 | 6 | 5 | $1(1)$ | 0 | 824 | 547 | $51 \%$ above |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| 1992 | 1 | 1 | $0(0)$ | 0 | 137 | 525 | $74 \%$ below |
| 1993 | 4 | 2 | $2(2)$ | 0 | 549 | 531 | $3 \%$ above |
| 1994 | 3 | 3 | $0(0)$ | 0 | 412 | 528 | $22 \%$ below |
| 1995 | 2 | 2 | $0(0)$ | 0 | 274 | 504 | $46 \%$ below |
| Totals | 16 | 13 | $3(3)$ | 0 | Avg $=439$ | Avg $=527$ | $17 \%$ below |

Iowa 2 from the ECL of Sidney East to the Nishnabotna River - 2.8 km (1.8 miles)


[^1]to Iowa 145 involved $43 \%$ animal-related accidents. The remaining section of Iowa 2/U.S. 275 from the south junction of U.S. 275 north to Sidney involved 76\% animal-related accidents.

## IV. PREVIOUS ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

To determine the need for this improvement, a public information meeting was held April 4, 1995, in Sidney to discuss the relocation of Iowa 2 from I-29 at Percival east to Sidney, including north and south bypass alternatives of Sidney.

Questions and comments at the meeting concerned the need for a more direct route from I-29 to Sidney, a possible bypass of Sidney, and the potential environmental impacts to the Loess Hills.

A second public information meeting was held February 22, 1996, in Sidney. This meeting addressed comments received at the April 4, 1995, public meeting and further discussed the need for an Iowa 2 improvement. Five construction alternatives and a "no-build" alternative were discussed. The construction alternatives included the original north and south Sidney bypass alternatives, an improvement along the present Iowa 2 alignment, an east Sidney bypass, and an improvement within Sidney. It was also determined that a combination of these construction alternatives could be utilized for the final improvement. See Figure 6, page 16, for the location of alternatives.

The people in favor of relocating Iowa 2 expressed a need for a more direct route to I-29 for shipment of materials to enhance economic development. Those opposed had concerns relating to land loss and impacts to the Loess Hills. An area of general agreement seemed to be the need for some type of Iowa 2 improvement.

Three of these alternatives were eliminated based on consideration of major environmental and engineering constraints in the corridor. These constraints included especially the significant impacts on the Loess Hills. Also considered were the needs of Sidney regarding a location of a bypass and traffic congestion in Sidney.
9 ヨצกํํ

$-m-m$ SIDNEY NORTH BYPASS
SIDNEY SOUTH BYPASS

Eliminated from consideration were the Sidney North Bypass Alternative, Sidney South Bypass Alternative, and Sidney Improvement Alternative. These previous alternatives are described in the following paragraphs.

With both the Sidney North and South Bypass Alternatives, a common alignment segment would have been utilized for both alternatives. This common alignment would have routed Iowa 2 on I-29 from the existing I-29/Iowa 2 interchange north to the County Road J-26 interchange near Percival. Iowa 2 would have then preceded east 4.8 km ( 3.0 miles ) generally along County Road $\mathrm{J}-26$, crossing Possum Creek, to 0.8 km ( 0.5 mile ) west of the County Road J-26/L-44 intersection. From this point easterly, the North and South Bypass Alternatives separated and are described as follows:

## A. Sidney North Bypass Alternative

This alternative would have left the County Road J-26 alignment and continued east for 5.3 km ( 3.3 miles ) on new alignment, intersecting County Road J-26 and County Road L-44. The alternative would have turned northeasterly to parallel a local road 0.3 km ( 0.2 mile ) to the north and the roadway would have extended 3.4 km ( 2.1 miles ) on new alignment. After crossing the U.S. $275 /$ local road intersection north of Sidney, the alternative would have swung southeasterly 3.4 km ( 2.1 miles ) to end at existing Iowa 2 about 0.6 km ( 0.4 mile ) east of County Road L-63 east of Sidney. Total length of this alternative would have been 26.5 km ( 16.5 miles), including the 8.7 km ( 5.4 miles ) of common alignment with I-29.

The North Bypass Alternative would have utilized the existing right of way of County Road J-26 for the initial 5.5 km ( 3.4 miles ) and would have been constructed on new right of way for the remaining portion of the alternative. The roadway would have provided a 7.2 -meter ( 24 -foot) wide pavement with 3.0 -meter ( 10 -foot) wide shoulders. County road connections would have been modified at County Road L-44 and County Road L-63. Other county road intersections would have been reconstructed as necessary. Climbing lanes would have been constructed as needed.

As previously discussed, this alternative would have shared a common alignment with the Sidney North Bypass Alternative from the I-29/Iowa 2 interchange north and east to 0.8 km ( 0.5 mile ) west of the County Road J-26/L-44 intersection. The alternative would have left the County Road J-26 alignment and would have turned southeast along the west side of County Road L-44 for 2.4 km ( 1.5 miles ). It would have then turned easterly, crossing County Road L-44 near the south junction with County Road J-26. Relocated Iowa 2 would have continued easterly on new alignment, crossing County Road J-34. The south alternative would have then crossed Iowa 2/U.S. 275 south of Sidney and would have turned northeasterly to connect to existing Iowa 2 about 1.6 km ( 1.0 mile ) east of Sidney. Total length of this alternative would have been 27.7 km ( 17.2 miles), including the 8.7 km ( 5.4 miles) of common alignment with I-29.

The South Bypass Alternative would have utilized the existing right of way of County Road J-26 for the initial 5.5 km ( 3.4 miles) and would have been constructed on new right of way for the remaining portion of the alternative. The roadway would have provided a 7.2 -meter ( 24 -foot) wide pavement with 3.0 -meter ( 10 -foot) wide shoulders. County road intersections would have been reconstructed as necessary and climbing lanes would have been constructed as needed.

## C. Sidney Improvement Alternative

The Sidney Improvement Alternative would have begun near the south corporate limits of Sidney on Iowa 2/U.S. 275 (Main Street) and would have extended north on present alignment 0.7 km ( 0.4 mile ) to Filmore Street, where U.S. 275 and Iowa 2 separate. U.S. 275 extends north on Illinois Street 0.6 km ( 0.4 mile ) to the north corporate limits of Sidney. Iowa 2 extends east on Filmore Street 1.6 km ( 1.0 mile ) to the east corporate limits of Sidney.

Currently, a one-way pairs system is being utilized at the Sidney courthouse square. Two blocks of Indiana Street (city-owned) are northbound and two blocks of Illinois Street are southbound. Clay and

Filmore Streets are also used. Present Iowa 2/U.S. 275 in Sidney is typically a 7.6 -meter ( 25 -foot) curbed section.

The Sidney Improvement Alternative would have consisted of three improvement options. Option 1 would have included reconstruction of Iowa 2/U.S. 275 and two intersection modifications to improve turning movements near the courthouse. With this option, it was proposed to reconstruct this roadway as a 9.4 -meter ( 31 -foot) wide section with curb. This alternative also would have included two intersection modifications to improve turning movements which exist at the one-way pairs in Sidney. No other work would have been done in the vicinity of the one-way pairs. Only the Iowa 2/U.S. 275 pavement currently under 9.4 meters ( 31 feet) wide in Sidney would have been reconstructed. Total length of this option was 2.9 km ( 1.8 miles).

Option 2 included milling, patching and resurfacing of Iowa 2/U.S. 275 in Sidney. In this option, no work would have been done in the vicinity of the one-way pairs. Total length of this option was 2.9 km ( 1.8 miles).

The Option 3 proposal included two intersection modifications to improve turning movements which exist at the one-way pairs. Two modifications would have been made. The turning radius would have been flattened on the north-to-east turning movement from Indiana Street to Filmore Street (Iowa 2). A similar improvement would have been made on the west-tonorth turning movement from Filmore Street to Illinois Street. The remaining portion of Iowa 2 and U.S. 275 in the courthouse area would have been used as constructed. As discussed previously, Option 3 could have been built either by itself or in conjunction with Option 1, the Sidney reconstruction option.

## D. Sidney West Bypass

This alternative was suggested by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency in their February 19, 1998, letter to the Iowa DOT. This possible alignment on the west side of Sidney seemed to offer the advantages of a shorter project distance and fewer stream crossings. However, a west bypass would not have been consistent with the traffic patterns of the ,project area.

Currently, U.S. 275 runs north and south through Sidney and Iowa 2 runs. easterly from Sidney. The two highways combine as Iowa 2/U.S. 275 and run south from Sidney.

A bypass west of Sidney would not facilitate traffic movements involving Iowa 2 east of Sidney without going through the community. This concept would contradict the purpose of a Sidney bypass.

## V. PROPOSED ALTERNATIVES

At the May 20, 1997, Transportation Commission Meeting, the Commission directed the Iowa DOT to upgrade Iowa 2 from near I-29 east to near the south junction of U.S. 275/Iowa 2 and to construct the entire east bypass around Sidney.

On December 31, 1997, the FHWA and the Iowa DOT determined that both sections of the Iowa 2 project offer independent utility, and that processing these sections in two separate environmental documents would provide the most expedient method to accomplish Iowa 2 upgrading.

A categorical exclusion is being prepared for the Iowa 2 present alignment shouldering improvement project from near I-29 easterly to near U.S. 275. This improvement would be classified as a Type III project in the Iowa Action Plan, which includes repair, replacement, operational improvement, or other projects.

The impacts of the easterly Iowa 2 Sidney bypass are analyzed in this Environmental Assessment (EA). See Figure 1, page 2, for the project location map.

## A. Sidney East Bypass Alternative

One construction alternative and the "no-build" alternative are currently being evaluated in this EA. The Sidney East Bypass extends easterly on new alignment around Sidney and then northwesterly to tie to U.S. 275 north of Sidney. See Figure 7, page 21, for a map showing the bypass.


At the May 20, 1997, Iowa Transportation Commission Meeting, the Commission directed the Iowa DOT to construct the entire east bypass around Sidney. At that meeting, the Iowa DOT Director announced that the Iowa DOT would partner with local citizens to incorporate their needs for the proposed east bypass. Partnering meetings were held in October and December of 1997 to refine the location of the alignment. On February 17, 1998, a partnering meeting was held with the public to discuss the location of the bypass alignment. Other partnering meetings have been held periodically throughout 1998 and 1999 to further share the planning of the project with the citizens in the Sidney area.

A typical cross section for the proposed east bypass is shown in Figure 8, page 23. Aerial Photographic Plates 1 through 5 showing the proposed improvement are shown in Appendix A. A description of the Sidney East Bypass is detailed in the following paragraphs.

The proposed Sidney East Bypass begins about 0.5 km ( 0.3 mile ) north of the Fremont County Golf Course south of Sidney on Iowa 2/U.S. 275. The alignment extends northerly about 0.6 km ( 0.4 mile ), leaving present alignment and crossing 220th Street. The bypass continues northeasterly just south of the sewage lagoons and intersects 290th Street, a distance of about 1.5 km ( 1.0 mile ).

The bypass extends northeasterly and northerly for 1.5 km ( 0.9 mile ) to intersect existing Iowa 2 just east of the Sidney corporate limits. The remaining portion of the proposed bypass north of existing Iowa 2 to the end of the bypass would be designated as an unnumbered primary highway.

The bypass continues northerly and northwesterly around Sidney about 1.0 $\mathrm{km}(0.6 \mathrm{mile})$ to 290 th Avenue. The alignment then extends northwesterly about 0.8 km ( 0.5 mile ) to near the intersection of 285th Avenue and 200th Street. Finally, the bypass continues westerly 0.6 km ( 0.4 mile ) along and just north of 200th Street to tie to existing U.S. 275 north of Sidney.

The total length of this proposed east bypass is 6.0 km ( 3.8 miles ). The bypass would be constructed on new alignment to generally provide a 7.2 -

## IOWA 2

## SIDNEY EAST BYPASS ALTERNATIVE

## TYPICAL CROSS SECTION


meter (24-foot) wide pavement with 3.0 -meter ( 10 -foot) wide shoulders. The north and south ends of the bypass would be connected to the existing highway. See Figure 7, page 21, and Aerial Photographic Plates in Appendix A for more detail.

County road intersections would be reconstructed or reconnected at selected locations to accommodate the proposed bypass. Three intersections would be reconnected for this project. These connections include existing Iowa 2/U.S. 275/220th Street south of Sidney, 290th Avenue south of Sidney, and 290th Avenue north of Sidney. Existing Iowa 2 would be reconstructed at the intersection with the proposed bypass just east of Sidney. In addition, 200th Street (near the north end of the bypass) would be closed from 285th Avenue west to U.S. 275.

Three transitions to allow for possible turning lanes are being analyzed. These turning lanes would be located at the intersections of the proposed bypass with 220th Street, present Iowa 2, and U.S. 275 (north end of bypass). The design of these single turning bays will be further developed as partnering meetings with the citizens of Sidney continue to progress.

Priority III access control is proposed for this project, where access would be allowed at at-grade locations. The minimum allowable spacing between access locations is 300 meters ( 1,000 feet) in a rural designed area and 200 meters ( 600 feet) in an urban-designed area. In a ruraldesigned area, spacing of 400 meters ( 1,320 feet) is preferable.

No bridges would be constructed for this proposed bypass. However, the bypass would obstruct the flow of seven well-defined drainage basins in the area. Structures used for crossing of waterways would include three reinforced box culverts and four pipes.

A Predesign Agreement was signed by the city of Sidney and the Fremont County Board of Supervisors in December of 1998, and is located in Appendix E of this document. This agreement describes the proposed Sidney Bypass and outlines the transfer of jurisdiction of bypassed portions of existing Iowa 2 to Sidney and Fremont County. The details of
that transfer, including any necessary construction to place the existing Iowa 2 roadway in a state of good repair, would be the subject of future transfer-of-jurisdiction agreements.

| Grading | $\$ 6,502,000$ |
| ---: | ---: |
| Paving | $3,545,000$ |
| Outside Services | 975,000 |
| Structures | 983,000 |
| Right of Way | 350,000 |
| Erosion Control | 232,000 |
| Traffic Signals | 79,000 |
| Traffic Signs | 68,000 |
| Lighting | 56,000 |
| TOTAL | $\$ 12,790,000$ |

## B. "No-Build" Alternative

The "No-Build" Alternative is also under consideration as an option for this improvement. This alternative does not address the needs of the improvement, but is being retained as a baseline for comparison to the build alternative, the Sidney East Bypass. With this alternative, no bypasses or reconstruction would take place within the study corridor.

Several areas with traffic congestion and lower levels of service occur within this highway network. If no changes are made with the existing Iowa 2 network, it is expected that traffic congestion and trafficrelated accidents would increase in proportion to future traffic volume increases. Any improvements would be minimal and limited to short-term restoration to maintain existing Iowa 2.

In order to preserve the integrity of the existing street and highway system, existing pavements and traffic control devices would need to be maintained; maintenance costs would likely increase as traffic volumes increase.

## C. Project Status/Related Iowa 2 Project

The proposed bypass discussed in this document is shown in the 1999-2003 Iowa Transportation Improvement Program. According to this program, right of way would be tentatively acquired in Fiscal Years 1999 and 2000 , grading and structures would be accomplished in Fiscal Year 2001, and paving would be completed in Fiscal Year 2002. Total amount allocated to the bypass is $\$ 12,790,000$.

Also, south of Sidney is a shoulder widening improvement of existing Iowa 2 from just east of I-29 east 10.2 km ( 6.3 miles ) to near the south junction of Iowa 2 and U.S. 275. This improvement was previously discussed on page 20. This improvement project is found in the 1999-2003 Iowa Transportation Improvement Program. According to the program, right of way would tentatively be acquired in Fiscal Year 2000, and shoulder grading and pavement rehabilitation would occur in Fiscal Year 2001. Total money allocated to that improvement is $\$ 2,042,000$.

## VI. PROJECT IMPACTS

## A. Socio-Economic Impacts

This segment of Iowa 2 passes through Fremont County in southwest Iowa. The project area is characterized as a rural agricultural zone punctuated by small farming communities. Primary crops include corn, soybeans and hay. Livestock production centers on cattle and hogs. In and near Sidney, residential and commercial land uses dominate.

The general population affected by the proposed improvement is predominantly Caucasian. There would be no neighborhoods or elderly, minority, ethnic or religious concentration that would be impacted by construction activities.

Public service facilities would not be adversely impacted by the planned improvement. Any adjustments required as a result of project construction would be coordinated with local utilities in order to maintain essential services during the construction period. Temporary inconveniences could occur during the construction period. However,
access through the project corridor would be provided at all times during construction by utilizing the existing roadway.

The proposed action is not expected to present significant adverse impacts to the social or economic character of the project corridor. There are no unique social or economic conditions in the area, except for the distinction that Iowa 2 serves as the principal connector route between Shenandoah and western Iowa and also is an important link in the statewide Iowa 2 corridor which extends from I-29 east to Fort Madison.

## 1. Right of Way Impacts

The anticipated right of way impacts for the proposed Sidney East Bypass are summarized in Table 3. These estimates are based on preliminary design and are subject to modification pending additional review.

## TABLE 3

## Summary of Anticipated Right of Way Impacts

| Length | Right of way <br> Requirements | Prime <br> Farmland | Displacements |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| 6.0 km <br> $(3.0 \mathrm{mi})$. | 55.9 ha <br> (138 acres) | 13.0 ha <br> ( 32 acres $)$ | None |

The greatest socio-economic impact of this proposed improvement would be the proposed conversion of agricultural land to transportation use, along with the subsequent disruption to area farming operations.

Measures to minimize harm to area farms and agricultural land were incorporated into preliminary highway design for this construction alternative. These measures included alignment modification to avoid farms and farmsteads where feasible and utilizing a minimal right of way cross-section to reduce overall acquisition needs. Despite these measures, conversion of agricultural land and changes in farming operations would be an unavoidable impact of project construction.

This results in modifications to present farm access patterns at a minimum and, in the worst case, would include the removal of cropland from production. These impacts constitute a necessary tradeoff in order to provide upgraded transportation facilities for residents of the study area and the traveling public as a whole.

Within the study corridor for the east bypass, land use is primarily agricultural. Estimated right of way need areas for transportation use would be 55.9 hectares ( 138 acres). Of this area, a conversion of farmland to transportation use would be 49.5 ha ( 122.1 acres). Necessary acquisition of woodlands would be 6.4 ha ( 15.9 acres). These land areas are based on a generalized cross-section to determine right of way needs. Because of the topography of the Sidney vicinity, these areas may be modified at the time of final design. The diagonal portions of the proposed bypass alignment would result in some severance of farmland which can create impacts on agricultural operations (loss of prime farmland, out-of-distance travel, triangular parcels, etc.). The project would require the severance of approximately seven farm properties.

Exact numbers of displacements would depend on final survey and design. It is anticipated at this stage of project development that no farmsteads, homes, or businesses would be displaced. Most of the homes within the highway corridor are either rural farmstead dwellings or houses on acreages, and are primarily owner occupied.

Local contacts were made to ascertain the availability of current replacement housing in the area. From this review of the area's current real estate market, it was determined that there would be sufficient replacement housing available, if necessary.

Relating to any residential and commercial displacements, the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, as amended, provides for payment of just compensation for property acquired for a federal-aid project. In addition, the Iowa Department of Transportation has developed an early acquisition
program to assist those individuals that meet certain hardship criteria.

However, it is the policy of the state of Iowa that displaced individuals receive fair and equitable treatment, and do not suffer disproportionately from highway programs intended for the public as a whole. Persons required to move as a result of a highway construction project, whether owners or tenants, will be eligible for relocation assistance advisory services, and are eligible for moving payments. Replacement housing payments and reimbursement for certain expenses incurred in purchasing replacement housing (such as increased interest costs caused by higher mortgage interest rates) will be available on a case-by-case basis depending on eligibility. Every attempt will be made to provide comparable (equal or better) housing for all relocatees. Relocation assistance agents are employed by the Iowa Department of Transportation to explain all of the available options. Business displacees will be eligible for a moving payment and may qualify for reestablishment expenses.

Finally, any difficulties in locating replacement housing should be minimized by incorporating additional lead time into the relocation planning process. Complicated relocation problems that may arise will be addressed by the state's commitment to the provisions of 49 CFR 24.404 (Replacement Housing of Last Resort).

## 2. Farmland Protection Policy Act

A Farmland Conversion Impact Rating form was used to determine farmland impacts and project impacts to prime and unique farmland within the project limits. The results of this review are shown in Table 4, page 30.

## TABLE 4

## Prime Farmland Impacts

Total Right of Way hectares (acres)
55.9 (138)

Prime Farmland hectares (acres) 13.0 (32)

The completed Form AD-1006 for Fremont County is found in Appendix C, Farmland Conversion Impact Ratings.

## 3. Economic Impacts

The construction of a two-lane Iowa 2 bypass facility is anticipated to help create jobs and stimulate the economy of southwest Iowa by attracting new businesses and industry. Because of the declining quality of rail service, industry must depend more on the highway system to carry their commodities to market.

The primary beneficial impact of the proposed improvement would be the increase in operating safety and an improved level of service. Additionally, the two-lane facility would provide continuity with existing Iowa 2 across the state. The construction of a higher volume highway facility may enhance not only the area's attraction for new business and industry, but also reduce travel time for commuters to area employment centers, shopping areas and area colleges and universities. The improved access would make Sidney a more attractive place in which to reside or from which to commute, and would provide an overall net positive impact within the study corridor.

## 4. Environmental Justice

The 1994 Executive Order 12898 ensures that approaches are taken so that disproportionately high and adverse health or environmental effects on minority communities and low-income communities are identified and addressed.

No disproportionate impacts on minority and low income housing would result from the proposed construction of the Sidney East Bypass. In addition, the construction of the proposed improvement should have no adverse effect upon minority groups residing within the study area since none of the residential developments have been established with a cultural, racial, or religious identity.

No displacements are anticipated for this proposed project. Analyses indicate that an adequate number of relocation sites are available for replacement housing, if necessary.

## B. Secondary Impacts

Secondary impacts are precipitated as a result of highway construction and are evident as changes in land use near the relocated highway. Secondary impacts could also comprise industrial or commercial development outside the immediate project corridor as a result of an improved transportation system. Secondary impacts may also result from encouraging the location of expansion of major transportation routes. This has become more important to regional prosperity as Iowa's rail corridors continue to diminish.

Although the improvement of Iowa 2 is being carried forward in part as a method to enhance economic conditions in the corridor, the intent is to generate controlled expansion and limited land use changes within the area. Fremont County is zoned, which can be used to control any potential future development.

A11 attempts would be made to assure that land use would remain consistent with existing local and regional plans. See Figures 9 and 10 , pages 32 and 33 , for Fremont County and Sidney zoning maps.

## 1. Economic Impacts of Highway Bypasses

As previously stated, an important consideration to businesses and industries which rely on highways for produce movement is to be located in communities with access to free flowing highway corridors. In Iowa, this factor continues to grow in importance as the state's
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rail network is reduced through abandonments. This factor has placed added emphasis on the state's highways as the principal mode of surface transportation to move bulk commodities, raw materials, and finished products with speed and economy.

Highway bypasses are an integral part of the comprehensive highway planning process when safe and efficient transportation facilities are to be provided. Although highly desired by highway users because they provide motorists with the option of avoiding congested areas, bypasses are not generally welcomed by local businesses because of the potential for lost commerce represented by diverted traffic.

Recent studies conducted in Iowa, together with interviews of business and community leaders, suggest such expectations may not be warranted. Over 85 bypassed communities were included in the various evaluations associated with these studies. The results indicated that while actual beneficial and adverse consequences of a highway bypass will be unique to each community, the general experience has been that bypasses are economically and socially desirable, and represent a stimulus for regional economic development.

In predicting secondary impacts, the studies cited above and past experience with bypassed communities in Iowa indicate that potential adverse impacts would be minimal, and limited to the short term. The enhanced climate for regional economic growth provided by improved traffic flow and greater community access would result in offsetting economic gains that would, over the long term, represent a positive economic influence on area commerce.

## C. Environmental Impacts

The Loess Hills are a unique characteristic within the natural setting just west of the proposed Iowa 2 project. Although the Loess Hills would not be impacted by the project, they are discussed in this document because of their importance and character to the area.

## 1. Natural Setting Near the Project - The Loess Hills

When approaching the western border of Iowa, travelers are often intrigued by the view of a most extraordinary landscape of prairie and forest covered steep bluffs, narrow ridges and rolling hills. This unique landscape is known as Iowa's Loess Hills. The Loess Hills possess natural features rarely duplicated elsewhere. In only one other part of the world, the Yellow River Valley of China, has winddeposited silt, or loess accumulated to such depths as to form the 1 andscape so spectacularly.

The loess deposits that make up the Loess Hills were initially left by glacial melt waters onto the floodplain of the Missouri River and then blown upward by strong winds and re-deposited along the eastern side of the river valley. The steep, sharply ridged topography of the Loess Hills is the product of tens of thousands of years of deposition and erosion of this wind-blown silt. The rugged landscape and strong local contrasts in weather and soil conditions provide refuge for a number of rare plants and animals, many of which can be found in Iowa only in the Loess Hills.

Iowa's Loess Hills form a north-south band approximately 322 km (200 miles) in length along the eastern edge of the Missouri River and are shown on Figure 11, page 36. The Loess Hills are best developed in a strip between 4.8 and 16.1 km ( 3 and 10 miles) wide where the loess deposits reach up to 61 meters ( 200 feet) in depth. The Loess Hills are located in the following seven Iowa Counties: Fremont, Harrison, Mills, Monona, Plymouth, Pottawattamie, and Woodbury. Figure 12, page 37, shows the location of the Loess Hills in Fremont County. As seen on the map, the Loess Hills landform region is located just west of Sidney and the proposed Sidney East Bypass project.

Humans arrived in the Loess Hills region just as major loess deposition was ending, about 12,000 years ago. Prior to Euro-American presence in the region, the Loess Hills was a hunting ground and home for several Native American, or Indian cultures. The region's
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earliest inhabitants were members of these prehistoric and early historic cultures including the Paleo, Archaic and Woodland Indians; Great Oasis, Mill Creek, and Glenwood people; and Oneota, Ioway, Omaha, Sioux, and Potawatomi tribes.

The first written records for the region surrounding the Loess Hills predate the Lewis and Clark expedition journals by about a century and were recorded by French traders and explorers in the early 1700 s. During their famous expedition, Lewis and Clark recorded in their journals descriptions and reactions to the remarkable loess bluffs and hills.

Euro-American settlement of the region that followed took place slowly until 1846 when the Mormons started their migration toward the Great Salt Lake Valley. After that, permanent settlement of the Loess Hills region occurred rapidly as towns developed to serve the needs of a growing farm population.

Dramatic changes to the Loess Hills landscape resulted from the agricultural activities, urban development and construction of transportation routes that accompanied the region's settlement. The distribution and abundance of many plant and animal species native to the Loess Hills were greatly reduced. Physical impacts to the Loess Hills region took place as the erosion of farmland occurred; 1 imestone, shale and gravel mines were excavated; fill dirt for construction was removed; and streams were straightened to reduce flooding in river valleys.

As previously discussed, the proposed Sidney East Bypass is located east of the Loess Hills and would have no impact on this natural area.

## 2. Natural Areas and Wetland Impacts

The proposed Iowa 2 bypass corridor traverses well drained Monona soils which exist on upland areas. These soils were formed in loess and are used for cultivated crops with steep areas more suitable for
pasture. The soils are subject to erosion which increases with increasing slope.

Napier soils occur in narrow drainageways crossed by the proposed bypass alignment. These are often referred to as Napier-gullied land complex which lies downslope from steep Monona soils. The gullies generally have steep banks and are overgrown by trees and brush along the edges which are suitable for wildlife habitat.

The Iowa 2 bypass study corridor crosses five such wooded drainageways. These narrow areas are the extent of natural features encountered by the bypass•alignment.

Although the soils of the study corridor are not listed as hydric by the Natural Resources Conservation Service, the narrow Napier drainageways might be considered jurisdictional wetlands for wetland regulatory purposes by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. Regardless of the regulatory status, these drainageways are unavoidable within the desired easterly bypass corridor that can serve Iowa 2 traffic.

Under existing regulatory policy and current federal wetland definition, it is expected that the construction of the highway on the Sidney East Bypass Alternative would result in an estimated 6.1 hectares ( 15 acres) of jurisdictional wetland conversion. The exact area of impacts on vegetated drainageway will be identified during the design phase of project development and the federal Section 404 permitting process for wetland conversion. Coordination with the local county conservation board will assist in identifying mutually suitable sites for satisfying U.S. Army Corps of Engineers wetland mitigation requirements.

There is a possibility that private property not otherwise needed for the highway project would have to be acquired to accommodate the mitigation requirements of current wetland regulatory policy.

## 3. Woodland Impacts

An effect to the natural environment that would be expected to result from the Iowa 2 bypass construction in the corridor under study is the woodland clearing that would be required. Construction of a two-lane highway would result in a sudden and permanent conversion of natural area to transportation use.

The Sidney East Bypass as proposed would result in the clearing of approximately 6.4 hectares ( 15.9 acres) of woodland to allow Iowa 2 construction.

The significance of this woodland lies in its habitat value for wildlife and its natural aesthetics, both of which contribute to a natural area experience to Sidney.

The wooded corridors in the project area provide wildlife protection and travel routes that are not afforded by cultivated lands. Common animal species expected to be found in the study area include game species such as pheasant, quail, ducks, geese, cottontail rabbit, squirrel, and white-tailed deer. Other animals include opossum, raccoon, weasel, woodchuck, badger, fox, coyote, and skunk. No known protected animal species or special habitat types were observed or known to be found in the project area.

## 4. Threatened and Endangered Species

No protected plant species or its suitable habitat was observed or is known to exist in the project corridor. The following common species were recorded from the uncultivated areas:
Siberian Elm
Black Locust
Honey Locust
Wild Black Cherry
Rough Leaved Dogwood
Black Willow
Black Walnut
American Ash .

Smooth Brome Grass
Kentucky Blue Grass
Timothy
Canary Reed Grass
Orchard Grass
Common Milkweed
Canada Goldenrod
Common Sunflower

Silver Maple
Elderberry
Multiflora Rose
Gooseberry
Eastern Red Cedar
Boxelder
Hackberry
White Oak
Bur Oak
Cottonwood
Shagbark Hickory
Red Oak
Buck Brush
Prickly Ash
B1ack Oak
Kentucky Coffee Tree
Basswood

Tal1 Ragweed
Western Ragweed
Heath Aster
New England Aster
Silky Aster
Horse Gentian
Rattlesnake Fern
Grape Fern
Wild Grape
Carrion Flower
Greenbriar
Little Blue Stem Grass
Indian Grass
Prairie Dropseed Grass
Foxtail Grass
Bittersweet
Smooth Sumac

## 5. Water Quality Impacts/River and Floodplain Crossings

Culverts would be utilized at all creeks and drainageways traversed by the project. Drainage issues have been coordinated with the Iowa DOT preliminary bridge staff. Necessary permits from the Iowa DNR would be obtained when precise design stage information is developed.

Iowa Department of Transportation specifications for erosion control will be followed. As a result, the water quality of the West Nishnabotna River [which drains some 4,144 square km ( 1,600 square miles) near the project area] would not be expected to be significantly affected by the project in either the short or long term.

Fremont County participates in the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) and is thus required by state and federal statutes to adopt and enforce floodplain management regulations that meet or exceed NFIP criteria. These regulations must be applied to all development in the floodplain of a regulated area, including the proposed highway improvement.

Floodplain studies for the proposed Iowa 2 alignment were completed in consultation with the Federal Emergency Management Agency, U.S. Army

Corps of Engineers, Iowa DNR, county engineers, and areawide planning agencies. The results of this research indicates that in the opinion of the regulatory agencies concerned, highway construction within the study corridor would not present a flooding risk. Additionally, there would be no long-term impacts on the natural and beneficial values of area floodplains; nor would project construction be an incompatible development with respect to the base (100) year floodplain within the construction corridor.

Project construction would not require a federal floodplain development permit and would be consistent with national floodplain insurance requirements. After design details are formalized, application materials would be forwarded to obtain floodplain construction permits from the Iowa DNR as well as 404 and 401 permits where applicable.

## 6. Biodiversity

Highway construction is often associated with the removal of natural areas and a reduction in biodiversity by insertion of a transportation corridor through woodlands, wetlands or even pasturelands that, if left undisturbed, might revert to a native prairie character. With the growing awareness of the value of such natural areas and their relative scarcity compared to cultivated farmland, today's highway engineers try to utilize existing highway right of way to the maximum extent possible. When new transportation corridors are required, such as the Iowa 2 Sidney East Bypass Alternative, they are located so that effects on natural areas are avoided or minimized.

Because of this desire to avoid natural areas, construction of highway bypasses around Iowa cities, towns and communities, and construction of highways on new location, usually affects Iowa cropland. This conversion of cultivated areas to transportation use can frequently result in enhanced biodiversity. The monoculture of planted crop is replaced by a transportation corridor two-thirds of which is a permanent ground cover that includes native grasses. This grassy zone between the highway itself and the cultivated farmland serves as
permanent habitat for small mammals, small game species, and a variety of insects including butterflies. Because of this habitat value, the highway right of way is a major food source for raptors such as the red-tailed hawk and the American kestrel. Lower lying portions of the highway right of way might also display wetland features such as cattail stands. At other locations mature trees might be preserved within the right of way or tree plantings included to provide nesting sites for song birds and add to aesthetic variety. Borrow areas excavated for highway fill usually occur on cultivated cropland as well. These borrows are constructed in a manner which results in large, more identifiable and functional created wetland areas that help compensate for unavoidable wetland loss and also provide scenic views from the highway. Thus, although the new highway environment is not one of natural solitude and vast biological variety, its contribution to biodiversity in Iowa's agricultural areas, where the natural biodiversity has been greatly reduced, is noteworthy.

The Iowa DOT has recently published an informational brochure on the potential for enhanced use of the right of way by the American kestrel, a small bird of prey that is experiencing a dwindling of natural nesting sites. This publication demonstrates an example of the value of the highway right of way's contribution to biodiversity in Iowa's agricultural landscape. (Varland, Andrews, and Ehresman, Establishing a Nest Box Program for American Kestrels Along an Interstate Highway - Recommendations based on the Iowa Program, 1992)

## 7. Air Quality

Because traffic would be expected to be diverted from the more congested existing route through Sidney to the more operationally efficient bypass route, motor vehicle emissions would be reduced in the more developed area of the study corridor as compared to the "no-build" conditions. Given the relatively low traffic volumes in the project study corridor and the limited extent of very congested traffic conditions, this difference in air quality would not be expected to be appreciable, and general air quality effects of the project are not considered a significant issue.

The Sidney area, like the remainder of Iowa, is in attainment of the transportation related air pollutants, carbon monoxide and ozone; therefore the conformity requirements of the Clean Air Act Amendments of 1990 do not apply to the Iowa 2 project.

Short-term air quality effects would be expected during the construction period. Standard construction specifications require adherence to state air quality regulations, including limits placed on the generation of fugitive dust.

## 8. Traffic Noise

Like air quality considerations, the expected diversion of traffic from the more developed portion of the Sidney area to the bypass facility would also be expected to reduce traffic noise levels adjacent to the existing Iowa 2 and U.S. 275 routes through Sidney. Again, as a result of the moderated traffic volumes and low heavy truck percentages, this effect would not be expected to be immediately appreciable, but with time the environmental advantages of the bypass from a traffic noise perspective in Sidney would be more substantial.

New traffic noise would be introduced into the bypass corridor where none now exists. The number of affected properties would be small, but the bypass traffic would create a noise impact at rural residences. The level of traffic noise expected from the bypass route is not expected to be high enough to warrant special noise abatement design features, but the existing quietude of now remote rural residential properties would be affected. The technical traffic noise data is summarized on the noise analysis form in Appendix B.

## 9. Acceptability of Expected Effects Upon the Natural Environment

Based on the general consideration of the existing natural environment of the proposed Iowa 2 bypass corridor, no significant, long term effects upon natural systems are expected. Quality of life for Sidney residents and for area travelers is expected to be enhanced by the bypass project. The most adverse effects are expected to be conversion of productive farmland to transportation use and
modification of farming operations caused by the new highway. There remains the possibility that unforeseen environmental effects might by brought out in the public hearing/public review process.

## 10. Hazardous Waste

Hazardous waste is an important issue in highway projects since current legislation requires the identification of known sites where hazardous substances are present. To avoid costly cleanup liabilities and project delays, early location of any hazardous sites should be brought to the attention of highway planners. As a result of this study, no known sites were determined to be located within the proposed Sidney East Bypass corridor.

As part of the early coordination process for this EA, the following public entities were contacted regarding the identification of potential hazardous waste sites within the project corridor. Refer to Appendix F, Agency Comment Letters.

- Iowa RCRA Section of U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
- Environmental Protection Division of the Iowa DNR
- Fremont County Engineer
- Sidney Mayor

The proposed corridor was the subject of Limited Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (Limited ESA) for the identification of sites along the corridor that are, or could be, contaminated with hazardous substances or petroleum products. The potential ramifications associated with the acquisition of such sites include financial liability for investigation and remediation of affected portions of the environment, safety concerns, and project delays associated with investigation/remediation activities. By knowing the location of these sites when alignment locations are selected, expensive cleanup liabilities and project delays can be avoided.

The Limited ESA consisted of an environmental records search and site visit for the study area which included the land 0.8 km ( 0.5 mile ) on
either side of the proposed Sidney East Bypass. The environmental records which were searched include:

- CERCLA (Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act)
- RCRA (Resource Conservation and Recovery Act)
- ERNS (Emergency Response Notification System)
- RST/LRST (Registered Underground Storage Tank/Leaking Registered Underground Storage Tank)
- Solid Waste Disposal sites and Hazardous Waste Disposal sites


## CERCLA Sites

Sites in this category are those which have been, or are currently, investigated for a release or threatened release of hazardous substances. Sites with the most serious releases or potential releases may ultimately be placed on the National Priorities List (NPL). Sites which have been removed from the CERCLA lists are identified by the No Further Remedial Action Planned (NFRAP) list of sites.

The Sidney DX \& Grocery that was once located at 501 Filmore in Sidney was shown to have undergone a preliminary assessment of groundwater contamination from an alleged release of paint solvents from USTs investigated under CERCLA. This site is located outside the bypass study area. No other sites in the study area appeared as CERCLA sites.

## RCRA Sites

Sites in this category are facilities which either transport, store, dispose, or generate known hazardous waste. The facilities are identified according to the applicability of the hazardous waste handling methods listed above.

The Iowa DOT Maintenance Facility, located at $1305 \frac{1}{2}$ Filmore in Sidney, is listed as a RCRA small quantity generator. This site is located outside the bypass study area. No other sites within the study area are listed as RCRA sites.

## RST/LRST Sites

Sites in this category are known to have registered RST's on their property or have reported releases of hazardous or petroleum substances from RST's on site.

Eight sites were identified as having at least one registered RST on site. Of these eight sites, four are listed as permanently closed sites (with regard to the RST only) and four are listed as currently in use.

Of the eight sites identified as having at least one registered RST on site, six of these were reported as LRST sites, three of which the release has been stopped; one is classified as "high risk" by the Iowa DNR and is undergoing semi-annual groundwater monitoring; one release was not verified and no further action is required; and for the remaining site the release assessment is on hold. These sites are outside the bypass study area.

## ERNS Sites

Sites in this category have experienced sudden and/or accidental releases of hazardous substances, including petroleum, into the environment. No sites in the study area appeared as ERNS sites.

## Solid Waste/Hazardous Waste Disposal Sites

Sites in this category are either permitted solid waste landfills and processing facilities currently in operation or known hazardous waste or hazardous substance disposal sites. No sites in the study area appeared as solid waste/hazardous waste disposal sites.

## Site Visit

A site visit to the study area was conducted in November 1997 to locate various facilities listed on the environmental records search and to identify additional sites which may represent potential environmental concern within the study area.

## City of Sidney Area

The city of Sidney consists of various local businesses and residences. It was noted that S\&S Gas and Auto Repair is now known as A\&A Repair. It does not appear that this business provides gasoline service. A local auto repair shop, Dotys Body Shop, is located east of Casey's. None of these businesses are in the vicinity of the bypass corridor.

## Bypass Alternative Area

In general, the land within the study area is either under cultivation, is in pastureland, or is used for rural residential purposes.

The study area includes developed portions of Sidney, which consists of industrial/light industrial operations, including the following facilities:

- Holt Gas Company
- Janssen Motors
- Bill's Body Shop
- Gregory Welding
- Ferrelgas

The sites of primary concern are Janssen Motors, Bill's Body Shop, and the Fremont Country Roads Department, due to the likely use of oils and solvents as well as a large number of vehicles parked/stored on the property. Information on the operation and environmental status of these sites is not known. There was no information on these sites resulting from the environmental file search. All of these sites are just north of the Sidney corporate limits, generally along existing U.S. 275. These sites are outside the bypass study area.

Any sites that could potentially be impacted will be evaluated in more detail during the project development phase and the appropriate action will be taken to meet all federal and state hazardous waste requirements.

The Phase I Cultural Resources Investigation of the proposed Iowa 2 Sidney Bypass examined an approximate total of 716 acres ( 286.4 hectares), with 287 subsurface tests and one backhoe trench excavated. All of the archaeological and architectural sites in this investigation were determined ineligible for the National Register of Historic Places and warrant no further investigation. Ten archaeological and eight architectural sites were encountered within or very near the project area. The archaeological sites included five historic habitation sites, two historic/prehistoric habitation sites, one railroad grade segment, one road segment, and one abandoned highway segment. The architectural sites included four farmsteads, three single-family dwellings, and one barn. In addition, one previously recorded archaeological site, 13FM31, was re-examined as part of the current investigation. See Tables 5 and 6, pages 50 and 51, for archaeological and architectural site summaries.

On January 5, 1999, the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) concurred with the determination that the identified and investigated archaeological sites and architectural properties do not meet any of the eligibility criteria for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. Please refer to the letter from SHPO in Appendix D for their concurrence in the noneligibility of these sites and properties.

The distribution of the archaeological sites is notable. The most common location for historic habitation sites was on the summit and shoulder slope positions of the high upland divides and interfluves, although two habitation sites, one mid-nineteenth century and one late-nineteenth century in temporal range, were located on lower slope positions adjacent to a tributary valley. The four historic sites contained interesting early mid-nineteenth century components indicating early settlement era log cabin sites. At least one of these early sites may have been situated along an old trail, a short segment of which was represented on the 1852 original survey plat for this township. The location of the earliest sites, away from the

## TABLE 5

## Archaeological Site Summary

| Site Number | Site Type | Temporal/ Cultural Affiliation | National Register Eligible? | Recommendation |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 13FM31 | historic habitation | mid-late $19^{\text {th }}$ century | No | No further investigation |
| 13FM79 | historic highway remnant | $\begin{aligned} & \text { early-mid } \\ & 20^{\text {th }} \text { century } \end{aligned}$ | No | No further investigation |
| 13FM80 | historic farmstead | $\begin{aligned} & \text { late } 19^{\text {th }} \text { - } \\ & 20^{\text {th }} \text { centuries } \end{aligned}$ | No | No further investigation |
| 13FM81 | historic habitation/ undetermined prehistoric | mid-19 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ century/ undetermined prehistoric | No | No further investigation |
| 13FM82 | historic habitation/ undetermined prehistoric | mid-19 ${ }^{\text {th }}$-early $20^{\text {th }}$ century/ undetermined prehistoric | No | No further investigation |
| 13FM83 | historic habitation | mid-late $19^{\text {th }}$ century | No | No further investigation |
| 13FM84 | historic habitation | late $19^{\text {th }}$ century | No | No further investigation |
| 13FM85 | historic habitation | $\begin{aligned} & \text { mid-late } \\ & 19^{\text {9h }} \mathrm{c} . \end{aligned}$ | No | No further investigation |
| 13FM86 | historic farmstead | $\begin{aligned} & \text { late } 19^{\text {th }}- \\ & \text { late } 20^{\text {th }} \mathrm{c} \end{aligned}$ | No | No further investigation |
| 13FM87 | historic railroad grade | $\begin{aligned} & \text { late } 19^{\text {th }}- \\ & \text { late } 20^{\text {th }} \mathrm{c} . \end{aligned}$ | No | No further investigation |
| 13FM88 | historic road remnant | $\begin{aligned} & \operatorname{mid}-19^{\mathrm{th}}- \\ & \text { mid }-20^{\mathrm{th}} \mathrm{c} \end{aligned}$ | No | No further investigation |

## TABLE 6

Architectural Site Summary

| Site <br> Number | Property <br> Type | Range of <br> Construction | National <br> Register <br> Eligible? | Recommendation |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $36-00078$ | farmstead | late $19^{\text {th }}$ - <br> late $20^{\text {th }} \mathrm{c}$. | No | No further <br> investigation |
| $36-00079$ | barn | early-mid <br> $20^{\text {th }}$ century | No | No further <br> investigation |
| $36-00080$ | farmstead | late $19^{\text {th }}-$ <br> late $20^{\text {th }} \mathrm{c}$ | No | No further <br> investigation |
| $36-00081$ | dwelling | modern | No | No further <br> investigation |
| $36-00082$ | dwelling | modern | No | No further <br> investigation |
| $36-00083$ | dwelling | 1890 s- <br> early 1900 s | No | No further <br> investigation |
| $36-00084$ | farmstead | late $19^{\text {th }}-$ <br> late $20^{\text {th }} \mathrm{c}$. | No | No further <br> investigation |
| $36-00085$ | farmstead | late $19^{\text {th }}$ ( <br> late $20^{\text {th }} \mathrm{c}$. | No | No further <br> investigation |

later road system as it developed in the late nineteenth century, probably accounts for their abandonment by the late nineteenth century. It became much more important in the late nineteenth century to have access to the farm-to-market road system as farming became more market oriented. Thus, being situated near a spring or near a grove became much less important as the century continued.

Two of the archaelogical sites contained prehistoric components in addition to a historic component (i.e., sites 13FM81 and 13FM82). In both cases, the prehistoric material was sparse and confined to nondiagnostic lithic material. One of the property owners along the corridor noted that he and his brother had found "ax heads and grinding stones" in the creekbed below their family farmstead; however, an intensive inspection and subsurface testing of this locality failed to produce any additional material during the Phase I investigation. It was concluded that the erosion within the tributary valleys that are crossed by the project corridor has been severe and likely destroyed any prehistoric archaeological sites along their margins. Local collectors in the Sidney vicinity tend to hunt for artifacts almost exclusively in the creek valleys on the west side of Sidney. Those western creeks drain into the Missouri River valley and were likely more intensively utilized by prehistoric peoples than the interior tributary valleys. However, even the sparse prehistoric site evidence encountered during the present investigation demonstrated that during the prehistoric period, peoples were traversing the high upland divide and interior tributary valleys. It should be noted that the extensive and intensive upland terracing has likely destroyed some sites in the process.

Should the proposed project work uncover an item(s) which might be of archaeological, historical or architectural interest, or if important new archaeological, historical or architectural data come to light in the project area, reasonable efforts will be made to avoid or minimize harm to the property until the significance of the discovery can be determined.

## D. Project Impacts Comparison

The impacts of the Sidney East Bypass are summarized in Table 7.

## TABLE 7

| Summary of Sidney East Bypass Impacts |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| Length, km (miles) |  |
| Total New Right-of-Way, ha (ac) | $6.0(3.8)$ |
| Prime Farmland Acquired, ha (ac) | $13.0(32.9(138)$ |
| Farmsteads/Homes/Businesses Displaced | 0 |
| Wetland Impacts, ha (ac) | 6.1 (15) |
| Woodland Impacts, ha (ac) | 6.4 (15.9) |
| Estimated Total Cost | $\$ 12,790,000$ |

## Advantages of Sidney East Bypass

- Would provide continuity within the larger Iowa 2 corridor in western Iowa, providing for the future economic growth and traffic service demands.
- Would increase operating safety, capacity, and convenience provided by an upgraded roadway.
- Would remove through traffic and improve highway efficiency by eliminating the stop conditions which exist in Sidney.
- Traffic conflicts due to turning movements at Sidney would be avoided, which would have a positive effect on accident rates.
- Would allow Sidney and Fremont County to grow with new housing developments, industry expansion, and new commercial development.
- Would allow growth in the bypass area while limiting congestion on the highway itself.
- Would require no displacements of farmsteads, homes, or businesses in constructing the bypass.


## Disadvantages of Sidney East Bypass

- Would require the acquisition of about 55.9 hectares ( 138 acres), of which $23 \%$ is prime farmland.

Would require the severance of approximately 7 farm properties.

- Would result in an estimated 6.1 hectares ( 15 acres) of jurisdictional wetland conversion.
- Would impact approximately 6.4 hectares ( 15.9 acres) of woodland areas.


## VII. ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT SUMMARY

This EA concludes that the proposed improvement is necessary for safe and efficient travel within the project corridor and it is anticipated that the improvement will have no significant adverse social, economic or environmental impacts of a level that would warrant preparation of an environmental impact statement. Following completion of the public review period and a location-design public hearing, the Iowa DOT Commissioners will advance the alternative for further development. Unless significant impacts are identified as a result of the public availability of this document or a result of the public hearing, a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) will be prepared for this proposed action as a basis for federal-aid corridor location approval.

## A. Agency Coordination

Appropriate federal, state, and local agencies were contacted by letter on December 19, 1997, as part of early coordination for their comments concerning this Iowa 2 Sidney bypass project. Comment letters received are in Appendix F. Those agencies contacted are as follows:

```
- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency - Region VII
- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency - Air, RCRA, and Toxics Division
- U.S. Department of Agriculture-State Soil Conservationist
- U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
    U.S. Department of Interior - Environmental Policy and Compliance
- U.S. Department of Interior - National Park Service
* U.S. Department of Interior - Fish and Wildlife Service
    U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
- Federal Emergency Management Agency
- Iowa Department of Natural Resources - Environmental Protection Division
- Iowa Department of Natural Resources - Administration
- State Historical Society of Iowa
- Iowa Department of Economic Development
- Southwest Iowa Planning Council
    Fremont County Engineer
    Fremont County Conservation Board
- Fremont County Board of Supervisors
- City of Sidney
```

- Commenting Agencies


## B. Public Coordination

To determine the need for this improvement, a public information meeting was held by Iowa DOT staff on April 4, 1995, in Sidney to discuss the relocation of Iowa 2 from I-29 at Percival east to Sidney, including north and south bypass alternatives of Sidney. Attendance totaled 159 people.

Questions and comments at the meeting concerned the need for a more direct route from I-29 to Sidney, a possible bypass of Sidney, and the potential environmental impacts to the Loess Hills.

The written comments received at and after the public meeting showed that 40 people wanted only to improve existing highways, 26 people preferred the north bypass alternative, 26 people wanted to construct only an east bypass of Sidney connecting existing Iowa 2 and U.S. 275, seven people favored a highway relocation but had no preference of alternative, and no one preferred the south alternative around Sidney.

A second public information meeting was held February 22, 1996, in Sidney. This meeting addressed comments received at the Apri1 4, 1995, public meeting and further discussed the need for an Iowa 2 improvement. Attendance totaled 109 people. Five construction alternatives and a "no-build" alternative were discussed. The construction alternatives included the original north and south Sidney bypass alternatives, an improvement along the present Iowa 2 alignment, an east Sidney bypass, and an improvement within Sidney.

The people in favor of relocating Iowa 2 expressed a need for a more direct route to I-29 for shipment of materials to enhance economic development. Those opposed had concerns relating to land loss and impacts to the Loess Hills. An area of general agreement seemed to be the need for some type of Iowa 2 improvement. Of the 25 individuals who spoke at the meeting, 12 people favored the north bypass alternative and seven people favored a present alignment/Sidney improvement combination. Four individuals wanted an Iowa 2 improvement, but had no preference for an alternative.

At the May 20, 1997, Iowa Transportation Commission Meeting, the Commission directed the Iowa DOT to upgrade Iowa 2 from I-29 east to near the south junction of U.S. 275/Iowa 2 and to construct the entire east bypass around Sidney. At this meeting, Iowa DOT Director Rensink announced that the Iowa DOT would partner with local citizens to incorporate their needs for the proposed east bypass.

A first partnering meeting was held October 14 and 15, 1997, in Sidney. It was agreed at the partnering meeting that the Iowa DOT and consultant (HGM) would review the Sidney East Bypass alignment along with a bypass alignment provided by local participants. That review and response was the main agenda item for the December 1, 1997, partnering meeting in Sidney. Later on February 17, 1998, a partnering information meeting was held with the public to discuss the east bypass alignment. Subsequent partnering meetings have been held since then to incorporate the needs of the public with the proposed bypass.

This document will be made available to all appropriate federal, state and local agencies for review and comment. These responses from reviewing agencies will be considered during further development of the project. A Notice of Availability will be published at the time the EA is made available for public review. Later a location-design public hearing will be held to discuss the proposed bypass with the public.
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NOTE: The above symbols represent approximate locations and are not to scale.






## APPENDIX B

## TRAFFIC NOISE ANALYSIS

# Iowa Department of Transportation 

Office of Project Planning
Traffic inoise Analysis Form for Low Impact Highway Projects

This form has been prepared to provide summary noise data for highway projects processed with Environmental Assessment (EA) procedures and where traffic noise effects are not extensive nor are special noise abatement strategies normally recommended. The following data were developed in accordance with the procedures set out in Title 23 of the United States Code of Federal Regulations Part 772 using the Federal Highway Administration traffic noise prediction model.

Project Description:
Iowa 2 Sidney Bypass

Adjacent Noise Sensitive Land Use: Rural residential

Number and Type of Sensitive Receiver Sites: Scattered individual houses

For Worse Case Receiver
distance from existing near lane centerline: N/A
existing noise level estimated: 40 dBA
distance from proposed near lane centerline: 200 feet
predicted design Year (2025) hourly Leq noise level: 59 dBA
predicted peak design year hourly Leq, no build: 40 dBA

Calculated maximum distance from project main line near lane centerline to design year 67 dBA Leq contour: 60 feet. It is recommended that future noise sensitive development occur beyond this distance from the highway.

## Discussion and Recommendation:

The Sidney bypass facility would be expected to affect a small number of scattered rural residents that are not now affected by highway traffic noise. Because of the moderate traffic volumes such impacts are not considered severe and no special traffic noise abatement features are recommended.

# APPENDIX C <br> FARMLAND CONVERSION IMPACT RATINGS 

## FARMLAND CONVERSION IMPACT RATING

| PART I (To be completed by Federal Agency) ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| ${ }^{\text {Prpposed Land Use }}$ |  |  | Coupty And StateFremont County, Iowaden |  |  |
| PART II (To be completed by SCS) |  |  | Date Request Received By SCS$6-4-98$ |  |  |
| Does the site contain prime, unique, statewide or local important farmland? (If no, the FPPA does not apply - do not complete additional parts of this form). |  |  |  | $0^{\text {Accres Irrigated }}$ | Average Farm Size $499$ |
| Mom / Com Beans | Farmable Land In Govt. Jurisdiction <br> Acres: $262,988 \% 78$ |  |  | Amount of Farmland As Defined in FPPA Acres: $183,630 \% 55$ |  |
| Name Of Land Evaluation System Used LESA | Name Of Local Site Assgssment System |  |  | Date Land Evaluation Returned By SCS$6-25-98$ |  |
| PART III (To be completed by Federal Agency) |  |  | Site A | Alternative Site Rating |  |
| A. Total Acres To Be Converted Directly |  |  | 138.0 A |  | Site C Site |
| B. Total Acres To Be Converted Indirectly |  |  | 0 |  |  |
| C. Total Acres In Site |  |  | 138.0 A |  |  |
| PART IV (To be completed by SCS) Land Evaluation Information |  |  |  |  |  |
| A. Total Acres Prime And Unique Farmland |  |  | 32 |  |  |
| B. Total Acres Statewide And Local Important Farmland |  |  | 0 |  |  |
| C. Percentage Of Farmland In County Or Local Govt. Unit To Be Converted |  |  | $<0.1 \%$ |  |  |
| D. Percentage Of Farmland In Govt. Jutisdiction With Same Or Higher Relative Value |  |  | 82\% |  |  |
| PART V (To be completed by SCS) Land Evaluation Criterion Relative Value Of Farmland To Be Converted (Scale of O to 100 Points) |  |  | 60 |  |  |
| PART VI (To be completed by Federal Agency) Site Assessment Criteria /These criteria are explained in 7 CFR 658.5(b) |  | Maximum Points |  |  |  |
| 1. Area In Nonurban Use |  | 15 | 15 |  |  |
| 2. Perimeter In Nonurban Use |  | 10 | 10 |  |  |
| 3. Percent Of Site Being Farmed |  | 20 | 20 |  |  |
| 4. Protection Provided By State And Local Government |  | 20 | 20 |  |  |
| 5. Distance From Urban Builtup Area |  | NA | NA |  |  |
| 6. Distance To Urban Support Services |  | NA | NA |  |  |
| 7. Size Of Present Farm Unit Compared To Average |  | 10 | 10 |  |  |
| 8. Creation Of Nonfarmable Farmland |  | 25 | 5 |  |  |
| 9. Availability Of Farm Support Services |  | 5 | 5 |  |  |
| 10. On-Farm Investments |  | 20 | 19 |  |  |
| 11. Effects Of Conversion On Farm Support Services |  | 25 | 0 |  |  |
| 12. Compatibility With Existing Agricultural Use |  | 10 | 1 |  |  |
| TOTAL SITE ASSESSMENT POINTS |  | 160 | 105 |  |  |
| PART VII (To be completed by Federal Agency) |  |  |  |  |  |
| Relative Value Of Farmland (From Part V) |  | 100 | 60 |  |  |
| Total Site Assessment (From Part V/ above or a local site assessment) |  | 160 | 105 |  |  |
| TOTAL POINTS (Total of above 2 lines) |  | 260 | 165 |  |  |
| Site Selected: | Date Of Selection |  |  | Was A Local Site Assessment Used?Yes $\square$ |  |

Reason For Selection:
NOTE: Site A is the Sidney East Bypass Alignment. No other alternatives are being considered.

# APPENDIX D <br> COORDINATION WITH STATE HISTORICAL PRESERVATION OFFICE 

ASSOCIATES INC.

December 29, 1998

## Mr. Doug Jones

State Historical Society
600 E Locust
Dis Moines, Iowa 50319-0290

Re: Highway 2 - Fremont County - Sidney Bypass
STP-2-1(40)-2C-36 (Consult)
Cultural Resources Investigation - Phase I .
HGM \#18017C (015)
Dear Doug,

Enclosed for your review is the report prepared by Ms. Leah D. Rogers for the Iowa D.O.T. project in Fremont County. Per her request the enclosed file folder with the original architectural site forms and photographs is also for your records.

Copies are being provided to the Office of the State Archaeologist in Iowa City and the Iowa D.O.T. in Ames (R. David Skogerboe) under separate cover letter.

Please contact Ms. Rodgers (319-895-8330) or myself if you have any questions. Thank you.
Sincerely,
MGM ASSOCIATES INC.
Paul m. Kline

Paul M. Kline, P.E.
cc: Leah D. Rodgers
Dave Skogerboe
Russell Sinram
Jon Meyer
c:\workfilel18017Net_memolDJ12298.doc
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January 5, 1999
In reply refer to:
R\&C\#: 971236085

Paul M. Kline, P.E.
HGM Associates, Inc.
$6405^{\text {th }}$ Avenue
P.O. Box 919

Council Bluffs, Iowa 51502
RE: FHWA - FREMONT COUNTY - STP-2-1[38]-2C-36 - PIN 95-36030-1 - IOWA 2/U.S. 275 - IMPROVEMENT FROM SOUTH OF SIDNEY \& EXTENDING EAST AROUND THE COMMUNITY ON NEW ALIGNMENT TO EXISTING US 275 JUST NORTH OF SIDNEY - PHASE I CULTURAL RESOURCE INVESTIGATION

Dear Mr. Kline,
Based on the information you provided, we concur with the consultant's recommendations that the identified and investigated archaeological sites (13FM31, 13FM79, 13FM80, 13FM81, 13FM82, 13FM83, 13FM84, 13FM85, 13FM86, 13FM87, and 13FM88) and architectural properties (36-$00078,36-00079,36-00080,36-00081,36-00082,36-00083,36-00084$ and $36-00085$ ) do not meet any of the eligibility criteria for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. Therefore, it appears that no historic properties will be affected by the proposed undertaking, and we recommend project approval. If other design modifications are designated for this project which would involve undisturbed new R.O.W. or easements, please forward additional information to our office for further comment.

Should the proposed project work uncover an items) which might be of archeological, historical or architectural interest, or if important new archeological, historical or architectural data come to light in the project area, you should make reasonable efforts to avoid or minimize harm to the property until the significance of the discovery can be determined.

Should you have any questions please contact me at the number below.
Sincerely,


Douglas W. Jones, Archaeologist
Community Programs Bureau
(515) 281-4358
cc: Judy McDonald, Office of Project Planning, IDOT
Dave Skogerboe, IDOT
Leah Rogers, Principal Investigator
Gerry Kennedy, FHWA
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www.uiowa.edu/-shsi/index.htm

## APPENDIX E

IOWA 2 PREDESIGN AGREEMENT WITH CITY OF SIDNEY AND FREMONT COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

# PREDESIGN AGREEMENT 



City $\qquad$ Sidney

Project No. STP-2-1(40,43)--2C-36
Iowa DOT
Agreement No. 99-P-066

This AGREEMENT, is entered into by and between the Iowa Department of Transportation, hereinafter designated the "DOT", the City of Sidney Iowa, hereafter designated the "CITY" and the Fremont County Board of Supervisors, hereinafter designated the "COUNTY" in accordance with 761 Iowa Administrative Code, Chapter 150 and Iowa Code sections 28E. 12 and 306A.7;

WITNESSETH; that
WHEREAS, the DOT proposes to establish or improve extensions of Primary Road No's. Iowa 2 and U.S. 275 as a controlled access facilities within Fremont County, Iowa; and

WHEREAS, the DOT, CITY and COUNTY are willing to jointly participate in said project (hereinafter the "Sidney bypass"), in the manner hereinafter provided; and

WHEREAS, this Agreement reflects the current concept of this project, subject to consideration of any changes in the major elements of planning or design which would affect the project's final concept;

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS AGREED as follows:

1. The proposed improvement will provide for an eastern bypass of the CITY (see Exhibit A attached). The bypass commences at existing U.S. 275 approximately 0.5 kilometer north of the CITY's north corporation line and extends easterly, southerly and westerly to existing Iowa 2 \& U.S. 275 approximately 0.69 kilometer south of the CITY's south corporation line. The bypass will cross existing Iowa 2
approximately 0.35 kilometer east of the CITY's east corporation line.
Upon completion of this improvement, Iowa 2 will be rerouted southerly and westerly along the bypass alignment to existing Iowa 2 \& U.S. 275. The proposed project is further described below:
A. The bypass will provide for a 7.2 -meter wide, two-lane paved roadway, with 3.0-meter wide granular shoulders.
B. No interchanges or grade sepàrations will be constructed as part of this project.
C. Right and left-turn lanes will be constructed at those side roads which meet traffic warrants.

IT IS FURTHER agreed that the division of responsibilities will be as follows:
2. The DOT will prepare project plans.
3. Right of Way - The CITY shall be responsible for providing, without cost to the DOT: All right of way which involves dedicated streets or alleys, and other cityowned lands except park land subject to the condition that the DOT shall reimburse the CITY for the value of improvements situated on such other city-owned lands (if any). The DOT shall be responsible for acquisition of all other right of way.
4. In connection with this project, all real estate and rights to real estate necessary for the relocation or reconstruction of public roads which are or which will be under the jurisdiction of the CITY and/or COUNTY(as well as any access roads or frontage road rights of way, if any) may be acquired by the DOT, acting on behalf of the State of Iowa, for and in the name of the CITY and/or COUNTY. The CITY and/or COUNTY shall receive title from the contract seller and does hereby agree to accept title thereto. Where acquired by condemnation, a single joint condemnation proceeding shall be instituted to acquire real estate and/or rights in real estate needed by the CITY for the CITY, needed by the COUNTY for the COUNTY, and/or needed by the DOT for the DOT.
5. Access rights may be acquired by the DOT along all side road intersections for a distance of approximately 50 meters from the near edge of the bypass. Access rights, if acquired, will be in the name of the State of Iowa and the COUNTY agrees not to sell or alter the rights acquired.
6. The COUNTY shall permit the removal of any trees within the existing and/or proposed limits of any established local side road or primary highway that will interfere with the construction of the project or establishment of the clear zone.
7. Upon completion of the project, the bypassed portions of existing Iowa 2 within the respective CITY and COUNTY jurisdictions, which are no longer necessary as part of the primary road extension system, shall be jurisdictionally transferred to the CITY and COUNTY. The details of said transfer including any necessary work to place the roadway in a state of good repair, shall be the subject of future transfer of jurisdiction agreements. The CITY and COUNTY shall thereafter assume all future ownership and maintenance responsibilities, of said transferred segments, all at no cost or obligation to the DOT.
8. Preconstruction Project Agreements which shall provide for marked primary road detours may be prepared by the DOT prior to project letting. These agreements shall also address any participation by the CITY and/or COUNTY in the costs of the project (if any).
9. It is the intent of all parties that no third party beneficiaries be created by this Agreement.
10. If any section, provision, or part of this Agreement shall be found to be invalid or unconstitutional, such judgment shall not affect the validity of the Agreement as a whole or any section, provision, or part thereof not found to be invalid or unconstitutional, except to the extent that the original intent of the Agreement cannot be fulfilled.
11. This Agreement may be executed in three counterparts, each of which so executed shall be deemed to be an original.
12. This Agreement as set forth in paragraphs 1 through 12 herein (inclusive) represents the entire Agreement between the CITY, COUNTY and DOT. Any subsequent change or modification to the terms of this Agreement shall be in the form of a duly executed Addendum to this Agreement.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, each of the parties hereto has executed Agreement No. 99-P-066 as of the date shown opposite its signature below.

## CITY OF SIDNEY :

 that $\qquad$ , who signed said Agreement for and on behalf
of the City was duly authorized to execute the same by virtue of a formal
Resolution duly passed and adopted by the City, on the $/ \iota^{\text {TR }}$ day of
$\qquad$
signed_ \&ajanne CDrivaus Date $\qquad$ .1998.

City Clerk of Sidney, Iowa

## FREMONT COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS:

By:
Datedrecen hes $\qquad$ 19


Title:
 , certify that I am the Auditor of the County, and that $\qquad$ , who signed said Agreement for and on behalf
of the County was duly authorized to execute the same by virtue of a formal Resolution duly passed and adopted by the County, on the $\quad 7^{\text {th }}$. day of


Signed Sucele Quent Date_19.19. 19.9

## IOWA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION:




| Division/Bureau/Office Office of Development Support -- Agreements |  | Staff Action No $5-99-622$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Submitted By George A. Forsyth | For Approval By <br> Girector* Director: Planning \& Prog. | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { Date } \\ 12 / 31 / 98 \end{array}$ |
| TITLIE: <br> Agreement with th | Sidney and Fremont County |  |

DISCUSSION/BACKGROUND :

The attached Agreement is submitted for approval:

Fremont $s T P-2-1(40,43)--2 C-36$

This Agreement has been signed by the City of Sidney and Fremont county for development of the Iowa 2 bypass of Sidney. This Agreement also has a provision for the future transfer of the bypassed portions of Iowa 2 within City and county jurisdiction.

There is no City or county reimbursement as part of this agreement.

Agreement No. 99-P-066

PROPOSAL/ACTION RECOMMENDATION:
It is recommended that the above agreement be approved.


## APPENDIX F <br> AGENCY COMMENT LETTERS

## APPENDIX F

## AGENCY COMMENT LETTERS
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January 7, 1998

Iowa Department of Transportation
Russell Sinram
Office of Project Planning
800 Lincoln Way
Ames, IA 50010
Russell:

Enclosed is the data from our GIS database for the Sidney area.

In the future, please send requests to:
Harriett Jones
ARTD/IRSP
US EPA Region 7
726 Minnesota Ave.
Kansas City, KS 66101
Jim Callier is no longer our Branch Chief, and I am the one who pulls the data for your requests.
I report to Harriett Jones.

Thanks,
Perce Cox, NOWCC/SEE
913-551-7126

SITE INFORNATION QUERY SYSTEM（Version 96．02．16）
Zanuary 07，：998

Site Neme：Hicchway 2 Bypass
Location ：s－cney，IA
Zip Code： 51652 （SIDNEY） EREMONT County，IA．
Socation in Lat／Long：$\leqslant 0 \leqslant 30 \quad 9538 \leqslant 5$（DNS）
Reçion T Aibers：$X=72087 \quad Y=582272$（ivete：s
！o：es：
Aneysis performed for distances up to a 2 mile radius of surrounding area． Read Notes on accuracy anc extent of all GIS database coveraces！l！

Note Version ic or top line as we are continuously upcracing cata layers quaity，anć ce：cuietion methods for this report anc associaied opraphics．

Discieimer：
This corpite：representaition has been compiled by the Environerntal Protection Age cy（EPA）from sources witich bave suppiec cize ou
rformation that has jot bee verifiec by the EPA．Tris cata
© offered here as a genera representation onily，and is not so be used
W for comiercial purposes without verification by an noceperdent
professio：：El qualifiec to verify such deza or hionmatior．The seh does no：quarantee the accuracy，completeness，or timelifess o the
informazion show，and shall not be liable for any loss or injury resulzinc fron reilance upon the informeion show．
＊＊＊Snci of Notes＊＊

＊＊＊＊＊＊＊＊＊＊＊＊＊＊＊＊＊＊＊＊＊＊＊＊＊＊＊＊＊＊＊＊＊＊＊＊＊＊＊＊＊＊＊＊＊＊＊＊＊＊＊）
EPA Facility Databases Information
stance ance Pron 0 to．
CERCLA： $1 \mathrm{stie}(\mathrm{s})$ in instance 0 to 1 mile（s）：
NOTE：The $G$ Lat／LOng Source is generatec by the 2085 GEOGRA？ Data Base from the ste＇s 210 code and is no：ar：
accurate site iocation．
Re\＃ 56 2．A
Name：sidney sinclair sime
LatiJonc： $044544 \quad 9538480$ Lat／Lonc Source：
NPL Status： K
rCRA Facilities： 1 site（s）in distance 0 to $2 m i l e(s)$ ． Rec\＃1598 EPA－ID：IAD982500564 Name：JOWA DEPT OF TRANSPORTATION

OOO3 Toxic Reiease Inventory（TRI）
0 site（s）ir．cistance 0 to i mile（s）：IA
NPDES（Mostiy Majors）： 0 site（s）in distance 0 to $: m_{i} i \in(s)$ ：
Distance Ranç Frot i to 2 míc $(s)$ ：
CERCLA： 0 site（s）in distance i to 2 mile（s）
NOES：The $G$ iatiLong Source is cenerated by the i985 GzOGRA？ Data Base from the site＇s Zip coat and is not a： accurate site location
RCRD．アacilities：：sitef（s）in ciistance 1 to 2 rine（s）：
Rec\＃1344 ヨPA－ID：ニADさ341：398：Neme：MOYER SERVICE
993 Toxic Reicase Inventozy（？R－
0 s：te（s）in cistence I to 2 mine（s）：In
NPDEs（Mostiy Nejors）： 0 stels）in distance：＝0 ？mite（s）：


Populavior Paczors Using 2990 Census Deะa
$======================================$
Approximait Population and Demographic Analysis
No：es：
i）Basec on suming Cersus FractiBlock centroics within distence rances h portion of actual block may extend beyond distance（overcount）
or portions of some blocks may be within distance but centroid
2）Sore of Hisparic origin counts may aiso be of any other oricin inciuding other or whiee．Therefore，ist line is the sum of biack，anez ind，asian and rispanic，and then．subtracting other．2nd ine is similar except that other is aciced insteac of subtracted．The actual sotal minority s：atis：cics showid be in this rançe of numbers
Distance Rance from 0 to 1 rile（s）：
63 Census Tract／Block Centroics within distance of 0 ＝0 2 mile（s）： Houstodi units $=539$ Sotal Pop－Hation $=\quad 2365$


Averace ？op Jensity per sc mi $=$（Centroićsidistence Raćius Areá） Mi：Z＇Nax ？op Jersity per sc $\pi$ ：

0 ： 2700
Dis：ance Rançe Fzoll 0 to 2 mile（s）：
82 Census TractiBiock Centroiós within cistarce of 0 to 2 mile（s）： foushoid units

1373 Biack
Amer Inaian Asくえ：
othe： $\begin{array}{lllll}\text { Cotai Minority }= & i 1 & 0.8 \% & \text { See note 2，} & \text { Other } \\ \text { C3 } & 0.9 \% & \text { See note 2，－other }\end{array}$

Average Pop Density per sq $m i=208$（Centroicisi＇Distance Raćius Area） Nin／Max Pop Density per sq mi

Dubitc Grouncwater Suppiy InEormatio

Distance Rarge From 0 to ：mile（s）

Iowa Public Groundwater Supply Kells： 0 wells founc
Distance Range Frox ：to 2 milic（s）：
Iowe Public Groundazer Supply Wells： 2 welis 三ounc Kec\＃125？

Pubic Surface Water Supply Information


Distance Range Frot 0 to 1 rive（s）
Iowa Pubilc Surface Water Intakes： 0 intakes founc Distance Rence From ：to 2 mile（s）：

Lowe Public Surface Water Intakes： 0 intakes founc
＋＊＊ETC of Buborv＊＊＊＊
＋＋＊＊＋＊＊＋＊＊＊＋tท＊＊＊＊＊＊＊


# UNITED STATES ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION AGENCY 

REGION VII
726 MINNESOTA AVENUE KANSAS CITY, KANSAS 66101

February 19, 1998

Russell Sinram<br>Office of Project Planning<br>Iowa Department of Transportation<br>800 Lincoln Way<br>Ames, Iowa 50010

RE: Iowa 2 / U.S. 275 in Fremont County, Iowa (Sidney Bypass): STP-2-1(38) -- 2C-36

Dear Mr. Sinram:
I appreciate the opportunity to provide our preliminary comments on your proposed highway construction project. Again, I apologize for the our delay in responding to your request.

Although the information available at this time is somewhat limited, it appears that you may wish to consider other alternate routes for this proposed bypass highway. For example, an alignment on the west side of Sidney seems to offer the advantage of smaller distance and fewer stream crossings.

We have compared the general location of your proposed project against the known locations of facilities of interest to this Agency, and I have enclosed a copy of these results with this letter. This analysis indicates that there are no facilities along or immediately adjacent to your proposed alignment.

If you have any questions regarding these comments, or wish additional information, please do not hesitate to contact me at (913) 551-7456, or you may reach me by electronic mail at kring.lynn@epamail.epa.gov.


# Iowa Department of Transportation <br> 800 Lincoln Way, Ames, IA 50010 <br> 515-239-1577 

FAX: 515-239-1982

March 12, 1998

Ref. No. Fremont County STP-2-1(38)--2C-36
PIN 95-36030-1
Iowa 2/U.S. 275

Mr. Lynn Kring
NEPA Program Manager
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

Region VII
726 Minnesota Ave.
Kansas City, KS 66101
Dear Mr.I Kring:
Thank you for your preliminary comments on the Iowa 2/U.S. 275 Sidney east bypass in Fremont County.

We have noted your comment to consider other alternative routes for the proposed highway bypass. We have especially considered your suggestion to study a west bypass of Sidney, as it seemed to offer the advantages of a shorter project distance and fewer stream crossings.

However, a west bypass would not be consistent with the traffic patterns of the project area. As you can see on the enclosed map, U.S. 275 currently runs north and south through Sidney and Iowa 2 runs easterly from Sidney. The two highways combine as Iowa 2/U.S. 275 and run south from Sidney.

A bypass west of Sidney would not facilitate traffic movements involving Iowa 2 east of Sidney without going through the community. This concept would contradict the purpose of a Sidney bypass.

Again, thank you for the information that you have provided for this improvement. If you have any questions or need additional material concerning this project, please do not hesitate to contact me.


Russeli Sinram Office of Project Planning

RS:maa
Enclosure

Natural Federal Building

Mr. Russell Sinram
Office of Project Planning
Iowa Department of Transportation
800 Lincoln Way
Ames, Iowa 50010

Dear Mr. Sinram:
I have reviewed the proposed construction work plan of Iowa 2/U.S. 275 bypass in Fremont County.

I want to alert you to the possibility of contact with agricultural tile lines, threatened and endangered species, and cultural and historic sites. Efforts to minimize soil disturbance will reduce hazards of erosion from the construction site.

If you have any site specific questions, feel free to contact Astor Boozer, District Conservationist, 301 Main Street, Post Office Box 490, Sidney, Iowa 51652-0490, or call at (712) 374-2014.

Sincerely,


| TRANSMITTAL SLIP |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY <br> Rock Island District, Corps of Engineers Clock Tower Bldg., P.O. Box 2004 Rock Island, Illinois 61204-2004 |  |
| IN REPLY TO: <br> Your letter concerning preliminary design studies for improvement of Iowa 2/US 275 in Fremont County, Iowa, which was sent to, Rock Island District, Corps of Engineers. | DATE: December 29, 1997 |
| MAIL TO: <br> Iowa Department of Transportation <br> Mr. Russell Sinram <br> 800 Lincoln Way <br> Ames, Iowa 50010 <br> REMARKS: <br> This project is outside of the Rock Island District's Civil Works boundaries, but within our Regulatory Jurisdiction. By copy of this transmittal, we are forwarding a copy of your letter to the Omaha District for their review and comment. If they have comments, they should respond directly to you. If you have any questions, you may reach the Omaha District office at the following address: |  |
|  |  |
| Meanwhile, our offices will continue our review within Rock Island District's jurisdiction. |  |
| Enclosure |  |

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
ROCK ISLAND DISTRICT. CORPS OF ENGINEERS
CLOCK TOWER BUILDING - P.O. BOX 2004
ROCK ISLAND. ILLINOIS 61204-2004
January 14, 1998
Planning Division

Mr. Russell Sinram
Office of Project Planning
Iowa Department of Transportation
800 Lincoln Way
Ames, Iowa 50010
Dear Mr. Sinram:
I received your letter dated December 19, 1997, concerning the proposed improvement of Iowa 2/US 275 in Fremont County, Iowa. Rock Island District staff reviewed the information you provided and have the following comments:
a. The lands involved are within the regulatory boundaries, but outside the civil works boundaries of the Rock Island District (Enclosure 1). As stated in our transmittal dated December 29, 1997, a copy of your information was forwarded to the Omaha District to determine if your project involves any Corps of Engineers administered lands. . Their address is as follows:

District Engineer
U.S. Army Engineer District, Omaha

215 North 17th Street
Omaha, Nebraska 68102-4978
b. Any proposed placement of fill or dredged material into waters of the United States (including wetlands) requires Department of the Army authorization under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. We require additional details of your project before we can make a final determination. When detailed information is available, please complete and submit the enclosed application packet to the Rock Island District for processing (Enclosure 2). The application should include determinations of wetlands and other waters of the United States, size estimations of impacts to those areas, and wetland types and relative functions.

Prior to completing the permit review process and in compliance with the Clean Water Act Section 404(b)(1) guidelines, we also require sequential mitigation involving an alternatives analysis, minimization of impacts, and compensatory mitigation for any unavoidable impacts.

The alternatives analysis must demonstrate how you will avoid impacts by selecting the least environmentally damaging practicable alternative based on wetland sizes, locations, types, and relative functions. Minimization of impacts should consist of a list of appropriate and practicable steps to minimize unavoidable adverse impacts. Compensatory mitigation must include plans to restore or create wetlands to mitigate unavoidable project wetland impacts. If you have additional questions regarding this issue, please contact Mr. Neal Johnson of our Regulatory Division. Mr. Johnson may be reached by writing to our address above, ATTN: Regulatory Division (Neal Johnson) or by telephoning 309/794-5379.
c. You should coordinate with the Iowa State Historic Preservation Officer, Capitol Complex, Des Moines, Iowa 50319 to determine impacts to historic properties.
d. You also should contact the Rock Island Field Office of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to determine if any federally listed endangered species are being impacted and, if so, how to avoid or minimize impacts. The Rock Island Field Office address is: 4469-48th Avenue Court, Rock Island, Illinois 61201. Mr. Rick Nelson is the Field Supervisor. You may reach him by calling 309/793-5800.

No other concerns surfaced during our review. Thank you for the opportunity to comment on your proposal. If you need more information, please call Mr. Randy Kraciun of our Environmental Analysis Branch, telephone 309/794-5174.

Sincerely,


Enclosures


```
District Engineer
Army Corps of Engineers Centre
190 5th Street East
St. Paul, Minnesota 55101-1638
District Engineer
U.S. Army Engineer District, Chicago
111 North Canal Street, Suite 600
Chicago, Illinois 60606-7206
District Engineer
U.S. Army Engineer District, Kansas City
700 Federal Building
Kansas City, Missouri 64106-2896
District Engineer
U.S. Army Engineer District, St. Louis
1222 Spruce Street
St. Louis, Missouri 63103-2833
District Engineer
U.S. Army Engineer District, Omaha
215 North 17th Street
Omaha, Nebraska 68102-4978
```

Planning Division
Mr. Russell Sinram
Iowa Department of Transportation
800 Lincoln Way
Ames, Iowa 50010

Dear Mr. Sinram:

We have reviewed your letter dated December 19, 1997, on the proposed, Project \#STP-2-1(38) -2C-36, improvement of Iowa 2/U.S. 275 in Fremont County, Iowa and we offer the following comments.

The design of the proposed U.S. 275 project should ensure that the project is in compliance with flood plain management criteria of Fremont County and the State of Iowa. As a minimum, the design should insure that the 100-year flood water surface elevation of any stream affected is not increased more than one foot relative to pre-project conditions. It is desirable, however, that water surface elevations either remain the same or decrease as a result of this project.

If you have not already done so, we recommend that you consult with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the state agency responsible for fish and wildlife resources. In addition, the State Historic Preservation Office should be contacted for information and recommendations on potential cultural resources in the project area.

From the information and map provided it appears that construction activities will be near the Town of Sidney. The proposed activity may create fugitive dust from the excavation of borrow materials and construction of the pre-paved road surface during dry conditions. Fugitive dust may present a health risk if ingested into human lungs and may also cause hazardous visibility conditions. We recommend that procedures be incorporated into the proposed project to prevent the occurrence of fugitive dust by the continuous or intermittent misting of the project site with water. We also recommend that Best Management Practices (BMP) be incorporated into the project plans as to prevent materials from being introduced into wetlands or waterways.

In the event borrow material is needed, borrow should be extracted from areas that have no potential for cultural resources, in particular recent accretion lands and/or previously disturbed sites.

From the information and map provided with verification from the United States Geological Survey, 7.5 Minute Series, Tabor SW, and Sidney Quadrangle Maps, it appears that some of the construction will take place in waterways or wetlands which are classified as waters of the United States and are therefore regulated under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. For a detailed review of permit requirements, final project plans should be sent to:

Mr. Neil Johnson
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

Rock Island District
Clock Tower Building
P.O. Box 2004

Rock Island, Illinois 61204-2004
If you have any questions, please contact Mr. Robert Tusa of our staff at (402) 221-4594. Thank you for the opportunity to review this proposal.

Sincerely,
(candace thomas)
Candace M. Thomas
Chief, Environmental Analysis Branch
Planning Division

Planning Division

Mr. Russell Sinram
Office of Project Planning
Iowa Department of Transportation
800 Lincoln Way
Ames, Iowa 50010
Dear Mr. Sinram:
This is in reference to Fremont County Project STP-2-1(38)--2C-36, Iowa 2/U.S.275.
The Omaha District has no flood control structures in the vicinity of the proposed highway improvement project.

The design of the proposed project should be in compliance with flood plain management criteria of Fremont County and the State of Iowa. As a minimum, the design should insure that the 100-year flood water surface elevation of any stream affected is not increased more than one foot relative to pre-project conditions. It is desirable, however, that water surface elevations either remain the same or decrease as a result of this project.

Rock Island District of the Corps of Engineers has responded to your office in regard to Regulatory and NEPA matters. Their contact is Mr. Randy Kracim, telephone (309)794-5174.

Questions regarding this correspondence may be addressed to Mr. Dwight Olson, telephone (402)221-4628.


Chief, Environmental Analysis Branch
Planning Division

# United States Department of the Interior 

NATIONAL PARK SERVICE

Great Plains Systems Office
1709 Jackson Street
Omaha, Nebraska 68102-2571
19-00142 (MWSO-G)
JAN 161998

Mr. Russell Sinram
Office of Project Planning
Iowa Department of Transportation
800 Lincoln Way
Ames, Iowa 50010

Dear Mr. Sinram:
This is in reply to your letter of December 19 concerning proposed improvements to Iowa $2 / \mathrm{U} . \mathrm{S}$. Route 275 in Fremont County.

The highway project may impact the Fremont County Golf Course south of Sidney. This outdoor recreation site was acquired with Land and Water Conservation. Fund (L\&WCF) assistance under projects 19-00142 and 19-00392. Section 6(f) (3) of the L\&WCF Act, as amended, states:
"No property acquired or developed with assistance under this section shall, without the approval of the Secretary [of the Interior], be converted to other than public outdoor recreation uses. The Secretary shall approve such conversion only if he finds it to be in accord with the then existing comprehensive statewide outdoor recreation plan and only upon such conditions as he deems necessary to assure the substitution of other recreation properties of at least equal fair market value and of reasonably equivalent usefulness and location . . ."

The L\&WCF program is administered at the State level in Iowa by the Department of Natural Resources. We suggest that you bring the highway project to the attention of Mrs. Kathleen Moench, Budget and Grants Bureau, Department of Natural Resources, Wallace State Office Building, East Ninth Street and Grand Avenue, Des Moines 50319, telephone 515-281-3013.

We hope that this information will be of value to you.
Sincerely,


James M. Grasso
Outdoor Recreation Planner

# United States Department of the Interior 

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE
Rock Island Field Office (ES)
4469-48th Avenue Court
Rock Island, Illinois 61201
Tel: 309/793-5800 Fax: 309/793-5804

January 5, 1998

Mr. Russell Sinram
Iowa Department of Transportation
800 Lincoln Way
Ames, Iowa 50010

Ref. No. Fremont County
STP-2-1(38) - - 2C - 36
Pin 95-36030-1
Iowa 2/U.S. 275

Dear Mr. Sinram:
This responds to your letter of December 19, 1997, requesting our comments on your plans for construction of a two-lane rural roadway which will serve as a bypass of the City of Sidney, Iowa. Total distance of the bypass is 4.5 miles beginning north of the Fremont County Golf Course south of Sidney on Iowa 2/U.S. 275 and extends northeasterly to existing Iowa 2 east of Sidney in Fremont County, Iowa.

To facilitate compliance with Section 7(c) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended, Federal agencies are required to obtain from the Fish and Wildlife Service information concerning any species, listed or proposed to be listed, which may be present in the area of a proposed action. Therefore, we are furnishing you the following list of species which may be present in the concerned area:

| Classification | Common Name | Scientific Name | Habitat |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Threatened | Bald eagle | Haliaeetus <br> leucocephalus | Breeding, Wintering |

The threatened bald eagle (Haliaeetus leucocephalus) is listed as breeding in Fremont County, Iowa. It is also listed as wintering along large rivers, lakes and reservoirs in Fremont County, Iowa. During the winter, this species feeds on fish in the open water areas created by dam tailwaters, the warm water effluents of power plants and municipal and industrial discharges, or in power plant cooling ponds. The more severe the winter, the greater the ice coverage and the more concentrated the eagles become. They roost at night in groups in large trees adjacent to the river in areas that are protected from the harsh winter elements. They perch in large shoreline trees to rest or feed on fish. There is no critical habitat designated for this species. The eagle may not be harassed, harmed or disturbed when present nor may nest trees be cleared.

The prairie bush clover (Lespedeza leptostachya) is listed as threatened. It is considered to potentially occur statewide in Iowa based on historical habitat. It occupies dry to mesic prairies with gravelly soil. There is no critical habitat designated for this species. Federal regulations prohibit any commercial activity involving this species or the destruction, malicious damage or removal of this species from Federal land or any other lands in knowing violation of State law or regulation, including State criminal trespass law. This species should be searched for whenever prairie remnants are encountered.

The western prairie fringed orchid (Platanthera praeclara) is listed as threatened. It is considered to potentially occur statewide based on historical records and habitat distribution. It occupies wet grassland habitats. There is no critical habitat designated for this species. Federal regulations prohibit any commercial activity involving this species or the destruction, malicious damage or removal of this species from Federal land or any other lands in knowing violation of State law or regulation, including State criminal trespass law. This species should be searched for whenever wet prairie remnants are encountered.

A review of National Wetland Inventory maps indicates that there are palustrine emergent and forested and riverine wetlands within the project boundaries. The Corps of Engineers is the Federal agency responsible for wetland determinations, and we recommend that you contact them for assistance in delineating any wetland types and acreages within the project boundary. Priority consideration should be given to avoid impacts to any wetland areas. Any future activities in the project area that would alter wetlands may require a Section 404 permit. Unavoidable impacts will require a mitigation plan to compensate for any losses of wetland functions and values. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Clock Tower Building, P.O. Box 2004, Rock Island, Illinois, 61201, should be contacted for information about the permit process.

These comments are provided under the authority of and in accordance with the provisions of the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (16 U.S.C. 661 et seq.; 48 Stat. 401), as amended; and the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended.

## Mr. Russell Sinram

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments early in the planning process. If you have any additional questions or concerns, please contact Heidi Woeber of my staff.

Sincerely,


Richard C. Nelson
Supervisor

# Federal Emergency Management Agency 

Region VII
2323 Grand Blvd., Suite 900
Kansas City, MO 64108-2670

## JAN I 31998

Russell Sinram
Office of Project Planning
Iowa Department of Transportation
800 Lincoln Way
Ames, Iowa 50010

Dear Mr. Sinram:
We have received and reviewed your letter dated December 19, 1997 requesting comments on your proposed project, Fremont County Iowa 2/U.S. 275 Improvement.

Based on the information provided, Fremont County is participating in the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP). As such, this community has adopted a floodplain management ordinance regulating all development in the floodplain. If the proposed highway project is located within the designated floodplain, a floodplain development permit issued by the community is required. If the proposed work is located within a regulatory floodway, a "norise" certificate provided by a registered professional engineer is required prior to the issuance of a floodplain development permit.

It is important that each participating community affected by this development be contacted for compliance with their local floodplain management programs. Enclosed is a current copy of the NFIP Community Status Booklet for the State of Iowa to assist you in identifying the participating communities in the project area.

If you have any questions about the NFIP, please contact Robert G. Bissell, Chief, Community Mitigation Branch at (816) 283-7004 or Ross Richardson, Natural Hazards Program Specialist at (816) 283-7005.

Sincerely,


Enclosure

cc: Ross Richardson, Natural Hazards Program Specialist<br>Bill Cappuccio, State NFIP Coordinator

TERRY E. BRANSTAD, GOVERNOR

January 9, 1998

Russell Sinram
Office of Project Planning
Iowa Department of Transportation
800 Lincoln Way
Ames, Iowa 50010
RE: Proposed Sidney bypass for Iowa 2/U.S. 275.
Dear Mr. Sinram:
The Sidney Sinclair site was evaluated under CERCLA authority in 1995. The contamination at the site was determined to be restricted to petroleum hydrocarbons and the site was referred back to the underground tank section for further action. There are no other CERCLA sites in the Sidney area.

The Sidney Sinclair site is located in the center of town. The proposed bybass is located near three other LUST sites on the north, east and south sides of Sidney. However, the bypass route appears to be outside of the areas of soil contamination associated with these three sites. These LUST sites are the Fremont County Garage on the north (7LTB27); the IDOT Maintenace Garage on the east (7LTH92); and Vogel Oil on the south (7LTD98).

If you have any questions, please call me at 515/242-5087.
Sincerely,



John Wedder
Environmental Specialist

January 12, 1998

Russell Sinram
lowa Department of Transportation
Office of Project Planning
800 Lincoln Way
Ames, lowa 50010
RE: Fremont County, STP-2-1(38)--2C-36, PIN 95-36030-1, Iowa 2/US 275
Dear Mr. Sinram:
Thank you for inviting our comments on the impact of the above referenced project on protected species and rare natural communities.

We have searched our records of the project area and found no records of rare species or significant natural communities. While our data are not the result of thorough field surveys, based on the information provided, we do not think the project will affect protected species or rare natural communities. However, if listed species or rare communities are found during the planning or construction phases, additional studies and/or mitigation may be required.

This letter is a record of review for protected species and rare natural communities in the project area. It does not constitute a permit and before proceeding with the project, you may need to obtain permits from the DNR or other state and federal agencies.

If you have any questions about this letter or if you require further information, please contact Kim Bogenschutz at (515) 281-8675.

Sincerely,


## LARRY J. WILSON, DIRECTOR

 IOWA DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCESLJW:ksb

## State Historical Society of Iowa

## The Historical Division of the Department of Cultural Affairs

December 30, 1997

Harry S. Budd, Director
Office of Project Planning
Planning \& Research Division
Iowa Department of Transportation
800 Lincoln Way
Ames, IA 50010

In reply please refer to:
R\&C\#: 971236085

RE: FHWA - FREMONT COUNTY - STP-2-1(38)-2C-36 - PIN 95-36030-1 - IOWA 2/U.S. 275 IMPROVEMENT FROM SOUTH OF SIDNEY 7 EXTENDING EAST AROUND THE COMMUNITY ON NEW ALIGNMENT TO EXISTING US 275 JUST NORTH OF SIDNEY

Dear Mr. Budd,
Thank you for providing information to our office on the proposed project. We look forward to receiving the forthcoming cultural resources reports for this project. When submitting correspondence and/or reports to our office for this project, please refer to the Review and Compliance Number provided above which has been assigned to this project in our records.

Should you have any further questions, please contact me at the number provided below.


Douglas W. Jones, Archaeologist
Community Programs Bureau
(515) 281-4358
cc: Randall Faber, Office of Project Planning, IDOT
Judy Torgeson, Office of Project Planning, IDOT
Alan Samson, Southwest Iowa Transportation Center, IDOT
Mike Slyby, Southwest Iowa Transportation Center, IDOT

600 E. Locust
Des Moines, Iowa 50319-0290
(515) 281-6412
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Montauk
Box 372

TERRY E. BRANSTAD, GOVERNOR
December 26, 1997

Harry S. Budd, Director
Office of Project Planning
Iowa Department of Transportation
800 Lincoln Way
Ames, Iowa 50010

RE: IA 981226-1114

Dear Mr. Budd:

The Iowa State Clearinghouse has performed the required review of your grant application for the Iowa $2 / \mathrm{U} . \mathrm{S} .275$ Improvement funding in accordance with the Iowa Intergovernmental Review System.

The review:
-- did not generate any comments from those who examined the file.
-- found no serious environmental problems which may result from the project or program.
-- indicated that the proposal conforms to pertinent planning to this area.
-- did not show that the proposal would result in duplicating any existing activity or project.

The Clearinghouse is pleased to recommend that the application be approved for funding. A copy of this letter must be sent to the federal agency as evidence that the review has been performed.

Sincerely,

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Sher } \\
& \text { Steven McCann } \\
& \text { Federal Funds Coordinator } \\
& 515 / 242-4719
\end{aligned}
$$
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## SOUTHWEST IOWA PLANNING COUNCIL

Economic Development-Community \& Regional Planning-Public Transit

March 26, 1998
Mr. Russell Sinram
Office of Project Planning
Iowa Department of Transportation
800 Lincoln Way
Ames, Iowa 50010
Dear Mr. Sinram,
Subject: Iowa 2/US 275 improvement from south of Sidney and extending east around the community on new alignment to existing US 275 just north of Sidney.

Southwest Iowa Planning Council has examined the proposed route of by-pass of the City of Sidney, and has visited with several residents in the area concerning the proposed project.

- The eastern intersection shown in Section 25 is too far west and is shown lying in the middle of the slope. As the intersection is now shown, visibility from the east is limited and doesn't provide adequate response vision to slowing or stopping. A couple residents in the area would prefer the intersection be further east to the top of the slope so that the north/south route begin on the ridge. From a residential/commercial development standpoint, moving the intersection further east makes sense.

Other than these comments, SWIPCO has heard no more about this project than a concern as to when it is actually going to happen.

Should you have any questions, please call me at 712-243-4196.

Sincerely,


Patrick Hall
Executive Director
cc. file

Russell Sinram
Office of Project Planning
Iowa Dept. of Transportation
800 Lincoln Way
Ames, IA. 50010

Dear Mr. Sinram,
This letter is being written in response to your request about the feelings of the Fremont County Board of Supervisors in regard to highway 2 in the Sidney area. We are assuming that the decision for the route around Sidney to the north and south is final. Now we need to find the route that is the most workable for those that are involved.

We have some concerns about the safety of the intersection east of Sidney as proposed by DOT. The intersection should be made so westbound traffic does not have to stop. One way would be to use a three way stop coming from the north, south, and west. then use turning lanes to keep the traffic coming from the east moving. Traffic heading north would have an exit type ramp from 2 to the bypass. Traffic heading south would use a turning lane on 2 . Traffic coming from the south heading east would have a ramp like on the north side.

We think the route for the north part should be brought south to follow the existing county road and the use of a ramp and turning lanes be used north of Sidney on 275. We realize this does not meet the 60 mph that the DOT seems to think they need. We don't understand the need for a high speed intersection. The DOT plan will make access to Sidney more difficult and will probably lead to people not wanting to come into town unless they really need to. It will also make for far more traffic congestion during the rodeo, which draws about 25,000 people, because you have basically eliminated one of the main routes used by traffic. This is a world class facility located on the west side of Sidney that has increasing use every year throughout the year thus, more traffic. Another thing that has to be looked at is the loss of farm ground which may not be of much value to you, but it is the economy of Fremont County. If that ground produced 150 bu . of corn per acre at $\$ 2.00$ per bu. that is $\$ 300.00$. Economic development people claim that each $\$ 1.00$ creates $\$ 7.00$ worth of economic activity; that equals $\$ 2100.00$ per acre per year. As you can see, it does have a value beyond the belief that it is "just farm land".

In conclusion, we think you should give these ideas strong consideration based on safety and the need the town of Sidney has for people to have easy access to town.

Respectfully,

Fremont County Board of Supervisors


"The Rodeo Town"
Sidney. Iowa 51652
April 14, 1998

Mosaic Panel On City Hall
Dear Mr. Sinram and the Dept. of Transportation:
As Mayor of Sidney, I feel it is necessary that I get this letter to you on behalf of the City of Sidney, the City Council, and all the people of Sidney. The initial idea of a new bypass around Sidney sounded kind of neat; but as people in the community have studied the impact of the bypass on Sidney, very little positive about it is heard.

The bypass, first of all, would permanently destroy much farm land and farm homes around Sidney. The loss of income to Sidney businesses would be enormous. Then after the bypass takes this income away from Sidney, the state wishes to unload 2.7 miles of new streets for the city to maintain. Those people who lose the initial income would have to help pay for the maintenance of these added streets. This would probably include additional hiring of new personnel and new equipment to maintain these added city streets. The City Council and I were informed last night that the new street up-keep not only includes new surfacing but many manholes, drains, inlets, even sidewalks, and most economically straining is the adding and maintaining of street curbs.

It is the opinion of most people in Sidney, the City Council of Sidney, and myself as Mayor that the bypass makes Sidney a three to four-time loser. We feel that the highways should be improved and continue to run through the town of Sidney.



[^0]:    * Accidents per 100 million vehicle miles (HMVM)

[^1]:    * Accidents per 100 million vehicle miles (HMVM)

