

**DRAFT FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT
CALUMET CITY STORM WATER PUMP STATION INFRASTRUCTURE
IMPROVEMENTS
CALUMET CITY, COOK COUNTY, ILLINOIS**

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Chicago District (Corps) has conducted an environmental analysis in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, as amended. The Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) dated DATE OF EA, for the Calumet City Storm Water Pump Station Infrastructure Improvement Project addresses residential flooding near the site and will increase the operational efficiency of the storm water pump station of the Yates Pond Pump Station and surrounding area within the city of Calumet City, Cook County, Illinois.

The Final EA, incorporated herein by reference, evaluated various alternatives that would improve the efficiency of storm water removal and reduce the flood risk to nearby areas in the project area. The recommended plan follows:

Replacement of Pumps Nos. 1, 2, & 3 – This option would replace the two vertical turbine pumps (Nos. 2 & 3) and the submersible pump (No. 1). It also includes the installation of new access hatches and guiderail pump removal systems for the three pumps. Ancillary equipment for the three pumps would also be updated, including the replacement of the existing float switches with new transducer and backup float switches; the replacement of the existing generator with a new diesel generator with automatic transfer switch sized to stagger start all the pumps; the installation of a SCADA panel and integration with the master computer for alarm notification and operational system status; and the construction of site improvements, including restoration and fencing. This plan will effectively mitigate pump damage and malfunction/failure, with the result of substantially reduce the flooding at and near the site and will increase the operational efficiency of the storm water pump station.

There were three alternatives considered to address the deteriorating Yates Pond Pump Station that were evaluated.¹ The alternatives included:

- 1. No Action Plan** – Under this alternative, No pumps would be replaced or upgraded and no new equipment would be installed at the site. The existing system would continue to deteriorate and reoccurring cases of flooding at the pump station will continue to affect the efficiency of the storm water removal process and ultimately result in property damage to nearby residents.
- 2. Replacement of Pumps Nos. 2 & 3** – This alternative would replace existing vertical turbin pumps Nos. 2 and 3. It also includes the installation of new access hatches and upgrades to the guiderail pump removal systems for both pumps; replacement of existing float switches with a new transducer and backup float switches; replacement of the existing generator with new diesel generator with automatic transfer switch; installation of a Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition (SCADA) panel and integration with the

master computer for alarm notification and operational system status; and construction of site improvements, including restoration and fencing.

- 3. Replacement of Pumps Nos. 1, 2, & 3** – This option would replace the two vertical turbine pumps (Nos. 2 & 3) and the submersible pump (No. 1). It also includes the installation of new access hatches and guiderail pump removal systems for the three pumps. Ancillary equipment for the three pumps would also be updated, including the replacement of the existing float switches with new transducer and backup float switches; the replacement of the existing generator with a new diesel generator with automatic transfer switch sized to stagger start all the pumps; the installation of a SCADA panel and integration with the master computer for alarm notification and operational system status; and the construction of site improvements, including restoration and fencing. This plan will effectively mitigate pump damage and malfunction/failure, with the result of substantially reducing flooding at and near the site and will increase the operational efficiency of the storm water pump station.

For all alternatives, the potential effects were evaluated, as appropriate. A summary assessment of the potential effects of the recommended plan are listed in Table 1.

Table 1: Summary of Potential Effects of the Recommended Plan

	Insignificant effects	Insignificant effects as a result of mitigation	Resource unaffected by action	Positive Effects
Aesthetics	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Air quality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Aquatic resources/wetlands	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Invasive species	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Fish and wildlife habitat	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Threatened/Endangered species/critical habitat	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Historic properties	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other cultural resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Floodplains	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Hazardous, toxic & radioactive waste	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Hydrology	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Land use	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Navigation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Noise levels	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Public infrastructure	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Socio-economics	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Environmental justice	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Soils	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	Insignificant effects	Insignificant effects as a result of mitigation	Resource unaffected by action	Positive Effects
Tribal trust resources	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Water quality	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Climate change	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

All practicable and appropriate means to avoid or minimize adverse environmental effects were analyzed and incorporated into the recommended plan. Best management practices (BMPs) as detailed in the IFR/EA will be implemented, if appropriate, to minimize impacts. ²

No compensatory mitigation is required as part of the recommended plan.

Public review of the draft EA and FONSI was completed on **DATE DRAFT EA AND FONSI REVIEW PERIOD ENDED**. All comments submitted during the public review period are responded to in the Final EA and FONSI.

ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT

Pursuant to section 7 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers determined that the recommended plan is not likely to adversely affect the following federally listed species or their designated critical habitat: the threatened northern long-eared bat (*Myotis septentrionalis*), piping plover (*Charadrius melodus*), rufa red knot (*Calidris canutus rufa*), the hine’s emerald dragonfly (*Somatochlora hineana*), the eastern Massasauga (*Sistrurus catenatus*), the rattlesnake-master borer moth (*Papaipema eryngii*), the rusty patched bumble bee (*Bombus affinis*), the threatened eastern prairie fringed orchid (*Platanthera leucophaea*), and the threatened prairie bush clover (*Lespedeza leotostachya*). The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) has been sent a letter regarding this project

NATIONAL HISTORIC PRESERVATION ACT

Pursuant to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers determined that the recommended plan has no potential to cause adverse effects on historic properties. The Illinois State Historic Preservation Office has been sent a letter regarding this project.

All applicable laws, executive orders, regulations, and local government plans were considered in evaluation of alternatives. Based on this report, the reviews by other Federal, State and local agencies, Tribes, input of the public, and the review by my staff, it is my determination that the recommended plan would not cause significant adverse effects on the quality of the human environment; therefore, preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement is not required.

Date

Aaron Reisinger
Colonel, Corps of Engineers
District Commander