



Illinois
Department of Commerce
& Economic Opportunity
OFFICE OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT
Bruce Rauner, Governor

December 2, 2016

Honorable Brenda Stadsholt
Mayor
City of Havana
227 W. Main Street
Havana, IL 62644-1137

COPY

Re: Grant # 15-243004 – Tier I Target Area Level Review of Illinois CDBG Single Unit, Owner-Occupied LMI Housing Rehabilitation (HR) Project covering nine (9) Homes in a target area in the south-central portion of Havana, documenting compliance with 13 of 16 bodies of Federal environmental law.

Dear Honorable Stadsholt:

This is to inform you that the above-referenced Grantee has satisfied the Tier I level target area special Grant condition regarding environmental record review (ERR) requirements identified in the Grant award letter you previously received.


At the Tier I level, all conditions regarding compliance with 24 CFR 58 have been met. Leverage-funded non-construction costs may be incurred as of the date of this letter. CDBG-funded activity delivery and housing inspection costs may be incurred as of the date of the completed *HUD Environmental Review for Activity/Project that is Exempt or Categorically Excluded Not Subject to 58.5* included in your community's ERR.

In addition, since there were no other special Grant conditions, or they have also been satisfied, this notice constitutes our Department's formal release of funds. Your community is authorized to use Community Development Block Grant Program (CDBG) funds granted by the Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity (DCEO) for the activity delivery and housing inspection costs in the target area. Release of funds for housing rehabilitation construction costs will occur only after a case-by-case review by DCEO of each proposed home's Tier II home-specific *HUD Environmental Review for Activity/Project that is Categorically Excluded Subject to 58.5* covering the remaining three (3) bodies of Federal environmental law (i.e., Contamination & Toxic Substances; Historic Preservation; and Noise Abatement & Control).

The Department will produce a Grant Agreement for your signature and execution by the State. After Grant Agreement execution, your community would then be able to draw CDBG HR Grant funds for activity delivery and housing inspection purposes.

If you should have any questions, please feel free to contact Mr. Kirk Kumerow at 217-558-2842.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'David Wortman', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

David Wortman, Deputy Director
Bureau of Community Development

Cc: Jeff Cozadd

DETERMINATION OF LEVEL OF CDBG ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

PART A

Grantee/Applicant Community: **Havana**

Grant # or Program Year: **15-243004**

Project Name: State of Illinois CDBG Housing Rehabilitation – Single Family Owner-Occupied LMI

Project Location (City, State): Havana, Mason County, IL – the 200 and 300 blocks of E Dearborn (South side of street only), the 300 block of E Windsor, the 200 through 400 blocks of E Oren, Raymond, and E Mason Streets, the 600 through 900 blocks of S Pearl (East side of street only), S Lincoln, S Coleman Streets, and the 700 through 1000 blocks of S Promenade Street (West side of street only)

Project Description:

Rehabilitation of 9 single family owner-occupied low and very-low income households. Rehabilitation to eliminate code violations, health and safety issues, eliminate lead hazards, preserve integrity of unit and increase energy efficiency of home. Rehabilitation may include: electrical, plumbing/sewer, roofing, foundation, structural repair, HVAC, lead hazard abatement, energy efficiency measures, gutters and down spouts, siding, window and door replacement, handrails and decks/porches, flooring, painting, and accessibility needs, well and cistern repair/removal, and sidewalk replacement.

PART B

The subject project has been reviewed pursuant to HUD regulations 24 CFR Part 58—*Environmental Review Procedures for Entities Assuming HUD Environmental Responsibilities*, and the following determination with respect to the project, and its component activities, is made (more than one level of review may apply, depending on project's activities):

- Exempt from NEPA review requirements per 24 CFR 58.34(a)(1)(3)(5)(6)**
*See attached Finding of Exempt Activity
- Categorically Excluded NOT Subject to §58.5 authorities per 24 CFR 58.35(b) () () ()**
*See attached Finding of Categorical Exclusion Not Subject to §58.5
- Categorically Excluded Subject to §58.5 authorities per 24 CFR 58.35(a) (3)(i) ()**
*See attached Finding of Categorical Exclusion Subject to §58.5
- An Environmental Assessment (EA) is required to be performed**
- An Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is required to be performed (Contact DCEO ERO to confirm)**

Completed by (signature):



Name, Title, Organization:

Jeff Cozadd, Housing Programs Manager,
Western II. Regional Council

Date:

6-1-16

Finding of Exempt Activity [24 CFR 58.34(a)]

- 1. Environmental and other studies, resource identification and the development of plans and strategies [58.34(a)(1)]
- 2. Information and financial services [58.34(a)(2)]
- 3. Administrative and management activities [58.34(a)(3)]
- 4. Public services that will not have a physical impact or result in any physical changes, including but not limited to services concerned with employment, crime prevention, child care, health, drug abuse, education, counseling, energy conservation and welfare or recreational needs [58.34(a)(4)]
- 5. Inspections and testing of properties for hazards or defects [58.34(a)(5)]
- 6. Purchase of insurance [58.34(a)(6)]
- 7. Purchase of tools [58.34(a)(7)]
- 8. Engineering or design costs [58.34(a)(8)]
- 9. Technical assistance and training [58.34(a)(9)]
- 10. Assistance for temporary or permanent improvements that do not alter environmental conditions and are limited to protection, repair, or restoration activities necessary only to control or arrest the effects from disasters or imminent threats to public safety including those resulting from physical deterioration [58.34(a)(10)]
- 11. Payment of principal and interest on loans made or obligations guaranteed by HUD [58.34(a)(11)]
- 12. Any of the categorical exclusions listed in §58.35(a) provided that there are no circumstances which require compliance with any other Federal laws and authorities cited in §58.5 [58.34(a)(12)]

FINDING OF CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION SUBJECT TO §58.5 [24 CFR 58.35(a)]

- 1. Acquisition, repair, improvement, reconstruction, or rehabilitation of public facilities and improvements (other than buildings) when the facilities and improvements are in place and will be retained in the same use without change in size or capacity of more than 20 percent (e.g., replacement of water or sewer lines, reconstruction of curbs and sidewalks, repaving of streets) [58.35(a)(1)]
- 2. Special projects directed to the removal of material and architectural barriers that restrict the mobility of and accessibility to elderly and handicapped persons [58.35(a)(2)]
- 3. Rehabilitation of buildings and improvements when the following conditions are met:
 - i. In the case of a building for residential use (with one to four units), the density is not increased beyond four units, the land use is not changed, and the footprint of the building is not increased in a floodplain or in a wetland [58.35(a)(3)(i)]
 - ii. In the case of multifamily residential buildings, unit density is not changed more than 20 percent, the project does not involve changes in land use from residential to non-residential, and the estimated cost of rehabilitation is less than 75 percent of the total estimated cost of replacement after rehabilitation [58.35(a)(3)(ii)]
 - iii. In the case of non-residential structures, including commercial, industrial, and public buildings, the facilities and improvements are in place and will not be changed in size or capacity by more than 20 percent, and the activity does not involve a change in land use, such as from non-residential to residential, commercial to industrial, or from one industrial to another [58.35(a)(3)(iii)]
- 4(i). An individual action on up to four dwelling units where there is a maximum of four units on any one site. The units can be four one-unit buildings or one four-unit building or any combination in between [58.35(a)(4)(i)]. [This section does not apply to rehabilitation of a building for residential use (with one to four units)].
- 4(ii). An individual action on a project of five or more housing units developed on scattered sites when the sites are more than 2,000 feet apart and there are not more than four housing units on any one site [58.35(a)(4)(ii)]. [This section does not apply to rehabilitation of a building for residential use (with one to four units)].
- 5. Acquisition (including leasing) or disposition of, or equity loans on an existing structure, or acquisition (including leasing) of vacant land provided that the structure or land acquired, financed, or disposed of will be retained for the same use [58.35(a)(5)]
- 6. Combinations of the above activities [58.35(a)(6)]



RECEIVED NOV 16 2016

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban
Development
451 Seventh Street, SW
Washington, DC 20410
www.hud.gov
espanol.hud.gov

**Environmental Review
for Activity/Project that is Exempt or
Categorically Excluded Not Subject to Section 58.5
Pursuant to 24 CFR Part 58.34(a) and 58.35(b)**

Project Information

Project Name: Rehabilitation Administration and Activity Delivery for Housing Rehabilitation project in the City of Havana

Responsible Entity: City of Havana, Mason County, Illinois

Grant Recipient (if different than Responsible Entity):

State/Local Identifier: Grant # 15-243004

Preparer: Jeff Cozadd

Certifying Officer Name and Title: Brenda Stadsholt, Mayor

Consultant (if applicable):

Project Location: 227 W Main St. Havana, IL 62644

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

Rehabilitation administration and activity delivery costs necessary for eventual rehabilitation of 9 single family owner-occupied low and very-low income households in a target area within the cooperate boundaries of the City of Havana.

Level of Environmental Review Determination:

Activity/Project is Exempt per 24 CFR 58.34(a): 1,3,5,6

Activity/Project is Categorically Excluded Not Subject To §58.5 per 24 CFR 58.35(b):

Funding Information

Grant Number	HUD Program	Exempt Amount	Categorically Excluded Amount
15-243004	State CDBG	\$58,000	

Estimated Total HUD Funded Amount: \$58,000

This project anticipates the use of funds or assistance from another Federal agency in addition to HUD in the form of (if applicable):

Estimated Total Project Cost (HUD and non-HUD funds) [24 CFR 58.32(d)]: \$58,000 to be spent as follows:

<u>Cost Category</u>	<u>Budget Amount</u>
Rehabilitation Administration	\$ 30,780
Project Delivery	\$ 27,220

Compliance with 24 CFR §50.4 and §58.6 Laws and Authorities

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

Compliance Factors: Statutes, Executive Orders, and Regulations listed at 24 CFR 50.4 and 58.6	Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?	Compliance determinations
STATUTES, EXECUTIVE ORDERS, AND REGULATIONS LISTED AT 24 CFR §58.6		
Airport Runway Clear Zones and Accident Potential Zones 24 CFR Part 51 Subpart D	Yes No <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No sale or acquisition of property will occur.
Coastal Barrier Resources Coastal Barrier Resources Act, as amended by the Coastal Barrier Improvement Act of 1990 [16 USC 3501]	Yes No <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<i>Illinois is not a covered state under these Acts.</i>

24 CFR Part 51 Subpart D		
Coastal Barrier Resources Coastal Barrier Resources Act, as amended by the Coastal Barrier Improvement Act of 1990 [16 USC 3501]	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<i>Illinois is not a covered state under these Acts.</i>
Flood Insurance Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 and National Flood Insurance Reform Act of 1994 [42 USC 4001-4128 and 42 USC 5154a]	Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<i>The project is exempt pursuant to Section 58.6(a)(3), because it is funded through a HUD formula grant made to a state.</i>

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

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

Law, Authority, or Factor	Mitigation Measure

Preparer Signature: Jeff Cozadd Date: 6-1-16

Name/Title/Organization: Jeff Cozadd, Housing Programs Manger, WIRC

Responsible Entity Agency Official Signature:

Brenda Stadsholt, Mayor Date: 6-2-16

Name/Title: Brenda Stadsholt / Mayor

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

Request for Release of Funds and Certification

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
Office of Community Planning and Development

OMB No. 2506-0087
(exp. 07/31/2017)

RECEIVED NOV 16 2016

This form is to be used by Responsible Entities and Recipients (as defined in 24 CFR 58.2) when requesting the release of funds, and requesting the authority to use such funds, for HUD programs identified by statutes that provide for the assumption of the environmental review responsibility by units of general local government and States. Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 36 minutes per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. This agency may not conduct or sponsor, and a person is not required to respond to, a collection of information unless that collection displays a valid OMB control number.

Part 1. Program Description and Request for Release of Funds (to be completed by Responsible Entity)

1. Program Title(s) State of IL CDBG Housing Rehabilitation	2. HUD/State Identification Number 15-243004	3. Recipient Identification Number (optional)
4. OMB Catalog Number(s) 14.228	5. Name and address of responsible entity City of Havana 227 W Main Havana, IL 62644	
6. For information about this request, contact (name & phone number) Jeff Cozadd, 309-837-3941	7. Name and address of recipient (if different than responsible entity)	
8. HUD or State Agency and office unit to receive request Illinois Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity; 2nd Floor; 500 E Monroe Springfield, IL 62701		

The recipient(s) of assistance under the program(s) listed above requests the release of funds and removal of environmental grant conditions governing the use of the assistance for the following

9. Program Activity(ies)/Project Name(s) Havana, Mason County, State of IL CDBG Housing Rehabilitation of 9 single family owner-occupied LMI households	10. Location (Street address, city, county, State) Havana, Mason County, IL – the 200 and 300 blocks of E Dearborn (South side of street only), the 300 block of E Windsor, the 200 through 400 blocks of E Oren, Raymond, and E Mason Streets, the 600 through 800 blocks of S Pearl (East side of street only), S Lincoln, S Coleman Streets, and the 700 through 1000 blocks of S Promenade Street (West side of street only)
---	--

11. Program Activity/Project Description

Housing rehabilitation (eligible activities may include the following: installation or repair of HVAC; plumbing; electrical; roofing; weatherization; lead safe practices; sump pumps; siding and/or accessibility for persons with disabilities) of nine (9) to-be-identified single-family, owner-occupied homes of low-to-moderate income residents located in a target area of Havana, IL

This Request for Release of Funds follows the Tier 1 Categorically Excluded (Subject to 58.5) environmental record review (ERR) of the entire target area, and will cover the release of \$342,000.00 in State of Illinois CDBG Housing Rehabilitation funds to the City of Havana in the form of a Sub Grant Agreement. The Tier 1 ERR documented compliance with 13 of the 16 bodies of Federal statutes, executive orders, and regulations listed at 20 CFR 50.4, 58.5 & 58.6. Havana will not commit grant funds to the rehabilitation of individual homes until (a) each target area qualified home is identified and (b) the City of Havana has submitted a Tier 2 Categorically Excluded (Subject to 58.5) environmental record review (ERR) to the State of Illinois DCEO, and DCEO has approved it, for the remaining 3 bodies of Federal environmental law (i.e., Contamination & Toxic Substances; Historic Preservation; and Noise Abatement & Control) not documented during the Tier 1 ERR. Selection of the individual homes to be rehabilitated will be conducted by the City's contractual grant administrator procured after the completion of the 06/02/2016 Exempt environmental review for \$58,000.00 in Activity Delivery and Rehabilitation Administration costs.

Part 2. Environmental Certification (to be completed by responsible entity)

With reference to the above Program Activity(ies)/Project(s), I, the undersigned officer of the responsible entity, certify that:

1. The responsible entity has fully carried out its responsibilities for environmental review, decision-making and action pertaining to the project(s) named above.
2. The responsible entity has assumed responsibility for and complied with and will continue to comply with, the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, as amended, and the environmental procedures, permit requirements and statutory obligations of the laws cited in 24 CFR 58.5; and also agrees to comply with the authorities in 24 CFR 58.6 and applicable State and local laws.
3. The responsible entity has assumed responsibility for and complied with and will continue to comply with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, and its implementing regulations 36 CFR 800, including consultation with the State Historic Preservation Officer, Indian tribes and Native Hawaiian organizations, and the public.
4. After considering the type and degree of environmental effects identified by the environmental review completed for the proposed project described in Part 1 of this request, I have found that the proposal did did not require the preparation and dissemination of an environmental impact statement.
5. The responsible entity has disseminated and/or published in the manner prescribed by 24 CFR 58.43 and 58.55 a notice to the public in accordance with 24 CFR 58.70 and as evidenced by the attached copy (copies) or evidence of posting and mailing procedure.
6. The dates for all statutory and regulatory time periods for review, comment or other action are in compliance with procedures and requirements of 24 CFR Part 58.
7. In accordance with 24 CFR 58.71(b), the responsible entity will advise the recipient (if different from the responsible entity) of any special environmental conditions that must be adhered to in carrying out the project.

As the duly designated certifying official of the responsible entity, I also certify that:

8. I am authorized to and do consent to assume the status of Federal official under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 and each provision of law designated in the 24 CFR 58.5 list of NEPA-related authorities insofar as the provisions of these laws apply to the HUD responsibilities for environmental review, decision-making and action that have been assumed by the responsible entity.
9. I am authorized to and do accept, on behalf of the recipient personally, the jurisdiction of the Federal courts for the enforcement of all these responsibilities, in my capacity as certifying officer of the responsible entity.

Signature of Certifying Officer of the Responsible Entity

Title of Certifying Officer

Mayor

Date signed

x *Brenda Stabsholtz Mayor*

11-14-16

Address of Certifying Officer

227 W Main St. Havana, IL 62644

Part 3. To be completed when the Recipient is not the Responsible Entity

The recipient requests the release of funds for the programs and activities identified in Part 1 and agrees to abide by the special conditions, procedures and requirements of the environmental review and to advise the responsible entity of any proposed change in the scope of the project or any change in environmental conditions in accordance with 24 CFR 58.71(b).

Signature of Authorized Officer of the Recipient

Title of Authorized Officer

Date signed

X

Warning: HUD will prosecute false claims and statements. Conviction may result in criminal and/or civil penalties. (18 U.S.C. 1001, 1010, 1012; 31 U.S.C. 3729, 3802)

**NOTICE OF INTENT TO
REQUEST RELEASE OF FUNDS**

November 2, 2016
City of Havana
227 West Main Street
Havana, IL 62644-1137
309-543-6580

On or about November 10, 2016 the City of Havana will submit a request to the State of Illinois Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity (DCEO) for the release of Community Development Block Grant Program (i.e., CDBG) Housing Rehabilitation (i.e. HR) funds under Title 1 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, as amended, to undertake a project known as Havana Housing Rehabilitation for the purpose of rehabilitation of nine single family, owner-occupied homes of low to moderate income residents located in a target area of Havana. The estimated cost of the actual rehabilitation work to be undertaken with Grant funds is \$400,000.

The activities proposed are categorically excluded under HUD regulations at 24 CFR Part 58 from National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) requirements. An Environmental Review Record (ERR), for a Tier 1 review of the entire target area that documented environmental determinations of 13 of 16 relevant bodies of Federal environmental law for this project, is on file at WIRC, 223 South Randolph St. Macomb, IL and may be examined or copied weekdays from 8:00 A.M to 4:00 P.M.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Any individual, group, or agency may submit written comments on the Tier 1 ERR to the WIRC at 223 South Randolph Street Macomb, IL 61455. All comments received by November 9, 2016 will be considered by the City of Havana prior to authorizing submission of a request for release of funds.

ENVIRONMENTAL CERTIFICATION

The City of Havana certifies to the State of Illinois DCEO that Brenda Stadsholt in her capacity as Mayor consents to accept the jurisdiction of the Federal Courts if an action is brought to enforce responsibilities in relation to the environmental review process and that these responsibilities have been satisfied. DCEO's approval of the certification satisfies its responsibilities under NEPA and related laws and authorities and allows the City of Havana to use Program funds.

OBJECTIONS TO RELEASE OF FUNDS

The State of Illinois DCEO will accept objections to its release of funds and the City of Havana's certification for a period of fifteen days following the anticipated submission date or its actual receipt of the request (whichever is later) only if they are on one of the following bases: (a) the certification was not executed by the Certifying Officer of the City of Havana; (b) the City of Havana has omitted a step or failed to make a decision or finding required by HUD regulations at 24 CFR part 58; (c) the grant recipient or other participants in the development process have committed funds, incurred costs or undertaken activities not authorized by 24 CFR Part 58 before approval of a release of funds by the State of Illinois DCEO; or (d) another Federal agency acting pursuant to 40 CFR Part 1504 has submitted a written finding that the project is unsatisfactory from the standpoint of environmental quality. Objections must be prepared and submitted in accordance with the required procedures (24 CFR Part 58, Sec. 58.76) and shall be addressed to State of Illinois DCEO, located at 2nd Floor, 500 E. Monroe, Springfield IL 62701. Potential objectors should contact State of Illinois DCEO to verify the actual last day of the objection period.

Once this target area-wide Tier 1 Environmental Review Record (ERR) is determined to be acceptable by the State of Illinois DCEO, City of Havana will be directed to prepare and submit to the State Tier 2 ERR's for individual homes identified to be rehabilitated with Program funds. Each Tier 2 review will document environmental determinations for the following bodies of Federal environmental law: Contamination and Toxic Substances; Historic Preservation, and Noise Abatement and Control.

Brenda Stadsholt, Mayor

**THE MASON COUNTY
DEMOCRAT**

Robert L. Martin, Jr. Publisher

State of Illinois, }
County of Mason, } ss.

I, R.L. Martin, Jr., do hereby certify that I am the publisher of the Mason County Democrat, a weekly newspaper of general circulation in Mason County, Illinois, and printed, published and placed in general circulation in the City of Havana, Illinois; that The Mason County Democrat is a newspaper which meets the requirements of Section 10 of an Act of the General Assembly of the State of Illinois, entitled "An Act to Revise the Law in Relation to Notices", as amended by an act approved and in effect July 17, 1959, and that said newspaper has been regularly and continuously so printed, published and in general circulation, for more than one year prior to the date of the first publication of the notice hereto attached, and that the said notice, a true copy of which is hereto attached, has been published in said newspaper in

every copy or impression thereof, for 1 weeks successively, the date of the first newspaper edition containing the same being the 2 day of November 2016 Number 44 of Volume 167, and the date of the last newspaper edition containing the same being the 2 day of November, 2016, in Number 44 of Volume 167.

Dated at Havana, Illinois, this 2 day of November 2016.

R. L. Martin Jr Publisher.

Printer's Fee \$ 210.⁰⁰

(When above amount is filled in this certificate of publication also constitutes a statement of account.)



RECEIVED NOV 16 2016

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban
Development
451 Seventh Street, SW
Washington, DC 20410
www.hud.gov
espanol.hud.gov

**Environmental Review for Activity/Project that is Categorically
Excluded Subject to Section 58.5
Pursuant to 24 CFR 58.35(a)**

Project Information

Project Name: Havana, Mason County, State of Illinois CDBG Housing Rehabilitation - CEST review is a Tier 1 level review of entire project target area

Responsible Entity: City of Havana

Grant Recipient (if different than Responsible Entity):

State/Local Identifier: Grant # 15-243004

Preparer: Jeff Cozadd, Housing Programs Manager, Western Il. Regional Council

Certifying Officer Name and Title: Brenda Stadsholt, Mayor

Grant Recipient (if different than Responsible Entity):

Consultant (if applicable):

Direct Comments to: Jeff Cozadd

Project Location: Havana, Mason County, IL – the 200 and 300 blocks of E Dearborn (South side of street only), the 300 block of E Windsor, the 200 through 400 blocks of E Oren, Raymond, and E Mason Streets, the 600 through 900 blocks of S Pearl (East side of street only), S Lincoln, S Coleman Streets, and the 700 through 1000 blocks of S Promenade Street (West side of street only)

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

Rehabilitation of 9 single family owner-occupied low and very-low income households. Rehabilitation to eliminate code violations, health and safety issues, eliminate lead hazards, preserve integrity of unit and increase energy efficiency of home. Rehabilitation may include: electrical, plumbing/sewer, roofing, foundation, structural repair, HVAC, lead hazard abatement, energy efficiency measures, gutters and down spouts, siding, window and door replacement, handrails and decks/porches, flooring, painting, and accessibility needs, well and cistern repair/removal, and sidewalk replacement.

Level of Environmental Review Determination:

Categorically Excluded per 24 CFR 58.35(a), and subject to laws and authorities at §58.5: (3) (i)

Funding Information

Grant Number	HUD Program	Categorically Excluded Amount
15-243004	State CDBG	\$342,000

Estimated Total HUD Funded Amount: \$342,000

Estimated Total Project Cost (HUD and non-HUD funds) [24 CFR 58.32(d)]: \$342,000 all for minor rehabilitation of nine (9) single family owner-occupied low and very low income homes.

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

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

Compliance Factors: Statutes, Executive Orders, and Regulations listed at 24 CFR §58.5 and §58.6	Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?	Compliance determinations
STATUTES, EXECUTIVE ORDERS, AND REGULATIONS LISTED AT 24 CFR 50.4 & 58.6		
Airport Hazards 24 CFR Part 51 Subpart D	Yes No <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No sale or acquisition of property will occur. Target area in not within 15,000 feet of a civilian airport or military airfield. Attached map of search results.

<p>Coastal Barrier Resources</p> <p>Coastal Barrier Resources Act, as amended by the Coastal Barrier Improvement Act of 1990 [16 USC 3501]</p>	<p>Yes No</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><i>Illinois is not a covered state under these Acts.</i></p>
<p>Flood Insurance</p> <p>Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 and National Flood Insurance Reform Act of 1994 [42 USC 4001-4128 and 42 USC 5154a]</p>	<p>Yes No</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><i>The project is exempt pursuant to Section 58.6(a)(3), because it is funded through a HUD formula grant made to a state.</i></p>
<p>STATUTES, EXECUTIVE ORDERS, AND REGULATIONS LISTED AT 24 CFR 50.4 & 58.5</p>		
<p>Clean Air</p> <p>Clean Air Act, as amended, particularly section 176(c) & (d); 40 CFR Parts 6, 51, 93</p>	<p>Yes No</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><i>The Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Website, under Green Book, website lists non-attainment areas for the State of Illinois. The attached print out of the Illinois non-attainment areas evidences that Havana is not located within any designated non-attainment areas. (Illinois Non-Attainment Areas List and National Non-Attainment List and Map).</i></p>
<p>Coastal Zone Management</p> <p>Coastal Zone Management Act, sections 307(c) & (d)</p>	<p>Yes No</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><i>Information regarding the Illinois Coastal Zone Management Program can be found through the Illinois Department of Natural Resources. According to the Final Environmental Impact Statement for the Illinois Coastal Management Program, signed March 12, 2012, the Illinois Coastal Zone is limited to Lake and Cook Counties. The proposed project is not located in a community listed in the Coastal Barrier Resources System (CBRS) maps or on the Illinois Coast Management Program Plan. Please see attached Illinois Coastal Management map excerpted from document referenced above. (Coastal Zone Map and a copy of the Plan).</i></p>
<p>Contamination and Toxic Substances</p> <p>24 CFR Part 50.3(i) & 58.5(i)(2)</p>	<p>Yes No</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><i>Will be documented and cleared under individual Tier II reviews for each property selected for rehabilitation.</i></p>
<p>Endangered Species</p> <p>Endangered Species Act of 1973, particularly section 7; 50 CFR Part 402</p>	<p>Yes No</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><i>Compliance with Endangered Species Act generally concerns new construction or conversion of vacant land or a major construction action. This project does not deal with the before mentioned issues and should have no impact on Endangered Species in this area. (IDNR Letter dated November 18, 2013). See attached US Fish and Wildlife Endangered Species list for Mason County, IL. None of the 4 listed species is usually found in homes.</i></p>

<p>Explosive and Flammable Hazards</p> <p>24 CFR Part 51 Subpart C</p>	<p>Yes No <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><i>A search of the US EPA Multifacts website has been conducted and a map is included. Only one facility is listed within the target area. The facility report for this business shows a 3 year compliance status of no findings. Residential housing within the target area will not be negatively impacted by the presence of this business.</i></p>
<p>Farmlands Protection</p> <p>Farmland Protection Policy Act of 1981, particularly sections 1504(b) and 1541; 7 CFR Part 658</p>	<p>Yes No <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><i>See Release from Dept. Of Agriculture dated March 4, 2016. The Farmland Protection Policy Act protects against the unnecessary and irreversible conversion of farmland to nonagricultural use. The Illinois Department of Agriculture determined the project complies with the Farmland Protection Policy Act. Also see attached USDA web soil survey (WSS) search results, no farmland will be converted.</i></p>
<p>Floodplain Management</p> <p>Executive Order 11988, particularly section 2(a); 24 CFR Part 55</p>	<p>Yes No <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><i>Target area's FEMA Firmette and completed, HUD proposed housing rehabilitation to be undertaken in target area is only considered to be minor improvement under 24CFR 55 2(b)(10)(iii), and thus is not subject to the decision making process under 24CFR 55.1.</i></p>
<p>Historic Preservation</p> <p>National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, particularly sections 106 and 110; 36 CFR Part 800</p>	<p>Yes No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><i>3/25/2016 IHPA letter attached satisfies the Tier I requirements for the target area as a whole. Tier II letters will be obtained for each individual property rehabilitated.</i></p>
<p>Noise Abatement and Control</p> <p>Noise Control Act of 1972, as amended by the Quiet Communities Act of 1978; 24 CFR Part 51 Subpart B</p>	<p>Yes No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><i>Will be documented and cleared under individual Tier II reviews for each property selected for rehabilitation.</i></p>
<p>Sole Source Aquifers</p> <p>Safe Drinking Water Act of 1974, as amended, particularly section 1424(e); 40 CFR Part 149</p>	<p>Yes No <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><i>Designated sole source aquifers are listed on the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) web site. Please see attached list of Designated Sole Source Aquifers in EPA Region 5 downloaded as a pdf from the EPA site and designated sole source aquifer in region 5 page and completed HUD sole source aquifer worksheet. Project only involves rehabilitation of existing building. (for map and list of EPA Region V Sole Source Aquifers)</i></p>
<p>Wetlands Protection</p> <p>Executive Order 11990, particularly sections 2 and 5</p>	<p>Yes No <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p><i>The purpose of Executive Order 1190 is to avoid any long and short term adverse impacts associated with destruction or modification of wetlands, and to avoid direct or indirect support of new construction in the wetlands. The target area is free of any wetlands as evidenced by the attached wetland map. Therefore there will be no adverse impact on Wetlands. (See DNR blanket release letter). See attached US Fish</i></p>

		<i>and Wildlife wetlands mapper results. No wetlands in target area.</i>
Wild and Scenic Rivers Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 1968, particularly section 7(b) and (c)	Yes No <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<i>Designated wild and scenic rivers are listed on the National Park Service web site. No river is currently designated as Wild and Scenic located in this area of Illinois. The attached scenic river map from the Illinois Department of Natural Resources website shows that the only designated scenic river in Illinois is the middle fork of the Vermilion river located in east-central Illinois. The target area of this project is more than 150 miles from this river and would have no effect. (Designated Wild and Scenic River Map).</i>
ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE		
Environmental Justice Executive Order 12898	Yes No <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<i>An environmental justice analysis using census, geographic information and other data is used to determine if a low-income/minority population is disproportionately impacted. This project will not disproportionately impact low-income/minority populations. This information can be found on the EPA website, Environmental Justice Home page. (See Attached Minority and Pollutants Maps)</i>

Field Inspection (Date and completed by):

Summary of Findings and Conclusions:

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

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

Law, Authority, or Factor	Mitigation Measure

Determination:

- This categorically excluded activity/project converts to **EXEMPT** per Section 58.34(a)(12), because it does not require any mitigation for compliance with any listed statutes or authorities, nor requires any formal permit or license; **Funds may be committed and drawn down after certification of this part for this (now) EXEMPT project; OR**
- This categorically excluded activity/project cannot convert to Exempt status because one or more statutes or authorities listed at Section 58.5 requires formal consultation or mitigation. Complete consultation/mitigation protocol requirements, **publish NOI/RROF and obtain "Authority to Use Grant Funds" (HUD 7015.16) per Section 58.70 and 58.71 before committing or drawing down any funds; OR**
- This project is not categorically excluded OR, if originally categorically excluded, is now subject to a full Environmental Assessment according to Part 58 Subpart E due to extraordinary circumstances (Section 58.35(c)).

Preparer Signature: Jeff Cozadd Date: 12-27-16

Name/Title/Organization: Jeff Cozadd, Housing Programs Manager, WIRC

Responsible Entity Agency Official Signature:

Brenda Stadsholt, Mayor Date: 10-27-16

Name/Title: Brenda Stadsholt, Mayor, Havana

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

Compliance Documentation Checklist for Categorically Excluded (Subject to 58.5) or Environmental Assessment (EA)



Grantee	Havana	Grant #	15-243004
Compliance Documentation Items and Explanations – Please place items behind completed HUD Environmental Review document for the Categorical Exclusion (subject to 58.5) or the HUD Environmental Assessment (EA), in the order they are listed in either of those documents.			
YES	NO	DOCUMENTATION	
X		Project Location Map	
X		Project Summary (may use application's Project Summary. Must include additional description found at: https://www.hudexchange.info/environmental-review/orientation-to-environmental-reviews/)	
STATUTES, EXECUTIVE ORDERS, AND REGULATIONS LISTED AT 24 CFR 50.4 AND 58.6			
Airport Clear Zones and Accident Potential Zones			
X		Airport database search results of project area	
Coastal Barrier Resources			
		Illinois is not covered by this Federal body of Law	
Flood Insurance			
		HUD/HEROS – Flood Insurance (CEST and EA) Worksheet – Not required for funding from HUD formula grant made to a state (e.g., State of IL CDBG).	
STATUTES, EXECUTIVE ORDERS, AND REGULATIONS LISTED AT 24 CFR 50.4 AND 58.5			
Clean Air Act			
n/a		IEPA clearance letter;	
X		US EPA Illinois (by County by Year) Non-Attainment Status list; and	
X		National Non-Attainment Status list.	
Coastal Zone Management Act			
X		Illinois Coastal Zone Boundaries Map with Grantee's location marked on Illinois inset map to show approximate distance from coastal zone in NE Illinois.	
Contamination and Toxic Substances			
T2		Completed US EPA Envirofacts documentation of project area	
T2		HUD – Contamination and Toxic Substances (Single Family Properties) Worksheet (CDBG HR Tier 2 Reviews Only)	
<i>OR If Non-Residential property is being acquired or developed by a CDBG ED or RLF project, complete:</i>			
n/a		HUD – Contamination and Toxic Substances (Multi-Family and Non-Residential Properties) Worksheet	
n/a		Completed US EPA Envirofacts documentation of project area	
n/a		Phase I ASTM Survey by a licensed professional.	
Endangered Species Act			
X		IL DNR EcoCat Endangered Species Release from Consultation	
Explosive and Flammable Hazards			
X		Completed US EPA Envirofacts documentation of project area	
n/a		HUD – Explosive and Flammable Hazards (CEST and EA) Worksheet (For ED/RLF Projects Only)	
Farmland Protection Policy Act			
X		IDOA Clearance Letter	
Floodplain Management			
X		FEMA Firmette with Project Location clearly marked	
n/a		HUD – Floodplain Management (CEST and EA) Worksheet	
	X	Completed 8-Step Floodplain Review Document (if applicable). Include both publications and publisher's certificates and any comments received. No project activities in a Floodway, unless a DCEO pre-approved functionally-dependent use.	
Historic Preservation			
X		IL Historic Preservation Agency Section 106 Clearance Letter	
X		HUD – Section 106 Tribal Consultation Checklist	
n/a		If required, Tribal Consultation Documentation:	
n/a		HUD TDA tribal contact page listing tribes interested in project's county/counties or indicates that no tribes are interested in said county(ies).	
n/a		Copies of letter(s) signed by Grantee's chief elected official, on Grantee letterhead, addressed to tribal official(s) listed on TDA;	
n/a		Fax or e-mail confirmation sheets;	
n/a		Allow 35 full days if mailed, 30 full days if e-mailed or faxed	
Noise Abatement and Control			
n/a		PI, EPI, DF, ED or RLF Projects: A statement on the CEST or EA Env. Rev. form that the project does not involve housing construction or rehabilitation.	
T2		HUD – Noise Abatement and Control CEST Level Review Worksheet (for CDBG HR Tier 2 Reviews Only)	
Sole Source Aquifers			
X		US EPA Region 5 Sole Source Aquifers Map with Grantee's location marked in relation to the Mahomet Sole Source Aquifer in Central Illinois.	
n/a		Note: If community is near or in that designated aquifer, then a copy of the US EPA Mahomet Sole Source Aquifer Project Review Area map must also be included, with community's location marked.	
n/a		If any portion of project is in the designated aquifer, then also attach completed US EPA Region 5 clearance documentation.	
Wetland Protection			
X		IL DNR EcoCat Wetlands Release from Consultation	
Wild and Scenic Rivers Act			
X		Illinois Wild and Scenic Rivers Map with Grantee's location marked on Illinois inset map in relation to the Middle Fork Vermilion River, near Danville.	
ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE			
Environmental Justice			
X		Completed US EPA EJScreen documentation of project location.	

DOCUMENTATION

Location Maps

&

Project Summary



City of Havana
 Housing Target Area 2015

PROJECT SUMMARY

The City of Havana is submitting a grant application to the Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity through the Community Development Assistance Program for \$400,000 to implement a housing rehabilitation program. Plans are to rehabilitate nine LMI single-family, owner occupied homes using CDAP grant funds. The grant request is for \$400,000 in CDAP funds.

The City of Havana is located in Mason County and according to the 2010 census of population and housing the city has a population of 3,301 and 1,538 housing units. The 2010 census states there are 1,371 occupied units (945 owner-occupied, 426 rental and 164 vacant units). The 2009 – 2013 American Community Survey 5 year estimate shows the median value of owner-occupied housing units in Havana to be \$75,100. This compares to the State of Illinois' median value of \$182,300.

The 2009 – 2013 American Community Survey 5 year estimate, shows that 37.2 percent of the housing stock in Havana was constructed pre-1940, compared to the state average of 27.6 percent. The median household income in Havana is \$30,417 compared to the state average of \$56,576.

A random survey was conducted for the City of Havana in 2012. The only exclusions in the random count were three public housing developments, two private apartment complexes and the target area for the 2013 CDAP Housing Program. The results of that survey will be discussed in the following pages. Based on the results of the random survey in Havana a targeted area was chosen. The proposed project area chosen by the city is a 12-block area in the southeast quadrant of the city, which includes 76 housing units. The target area is: the 200 and 300 blocks of E Dearborn (South side of street only), the 300 block of E Windsor, the 200 through 400 blocks of E Oren, Raymond, and E Mason Streets, the 600 through 900 blocks of S Pearl (East side of street only), S Lincoln, S Coleman Streets, and the 700 through 1000 blocks of S Promenade Street (West side of street only). The exact location of the target area is noted on the enclosed map found on page 42.

There are fifty-four occupied, thirteen vacant units and three trailers within the target area. Six households did not answer the survey. A resident of Havana was trained by WIRC staff to conduct a door-to-door income and housing survey of every home in the target area.

PROJECT NEEDS

Extent of Housing Deficiencies

a. Substandard LMI households in Need of Rehabilitation

Based on the door-to door income and housing survey of the targeted area, there are **Thirty-eight eligible Owner-occupied LMI housing units in need of minimal, moderate or major rehabilitation in a targeted area of 76 homes. Seventy-six income and housing surveys are enclosed in Attachment A.**

The housing deficiencies were based on two factors. First of all, surveyors visited each home in the targeted area and completed an income and housing survey. The interviewer asked each household about what work was needed on the home. Secondly, the WIRC's housing staff visited each home to give them a good idea of the nature of the type of work needed on each home. This made them more familiar of the housing conditions and an overall average costs to rehabilitate housing in the target area. They were mostly concerned in seeing how much siding and roofing work would be needed; also checking for obvious things such as 60 amp services, illegal plumbing vents, hazardous or illegal furnace venting, obvious lead hazards, bad foundations and deteriorated doors and windows.

The WIRC housing staff used the CDAP Housing Survey Guide to score the conditions of the homes. Homes that scored 0 top 20 were rated as minimal rehab needed, 21 to 48 were rated as moderate rehab needed and 49 and above were rated as major rehab needed. We then assigned a dollar figure for purposes of the detailed cost estimates provided in **Attachment B**. Homes that require less than \$20,000 in rehab work is considered minimal, \$21,000 to \$30,000 is considered moderate rehab needed, and \$31,000 to \$40,000 as major rehab needed.

In order to better determine the funding level for the application, we have identified nine homes that are most likely to be considered for the program. Those names and addresses are listed and included in **Attachment C**. These homes were chosen based on being very-low income, elderly, disabled and housing conditions. Of those nine homes, two homes need minimal rehab, seven homes need moderate rehab and one home needs major rehab.

b. Percentage of target area surveyed

The WIRC trained one resident of Havana to conduct the door-to-door income and housing survey of the target area. WIRC staff followed up to find additional residents that had not answered the survey. There are 76 units in the target area. All 76 units were surveyed. Of those 76 units, thirteen were found to be vacant. Of the 63 occupied units, we received 43 responses from owner occupied units. There were also 8 units identified as rentals and 3 trailers. Thus 85% of the occupied units answered a survey.

c. Mapping the Target Area

After completing the survey of the target area and compiling the information from those surveys, five maps have been drafted. The maps show all homes in the target area delineating owner-occupied, rental, vacant, and trailers. The target area maps show

legible street names and numerical block addresses within the target area. The following maps are included:

1. Housing Status;
2. Housing Conditions;
3. Eligible Homeowners in need of rehabilitation;
4. Eligible Homeowners in attendance at public hearing;
5. Random Survey Showing Income Status;

d. Previous Housing Rehabilitation Activities

This is the city's second CDAP housing rehabilitation grant application.

Havana was funded for a CDAP Housing Rehabilitation Grant in 2013 that rehabilitated **seven homes**. An IHDA Single Family Owner-Occupied Grant was funded in 2012 and rehabilitated **four homes**.

Since 2012 the Community Action Partnership of Central Illinois (CAPCIL) Home Weatherization Program has weatherized **39 homes** in Havana. Approximately \$163,800 was expended for the weatherization of these homes.

Rural Development has been active with their programs in Havana since 2010. There has been **six 504 repair loan and twelve guaranteed purchase loans**. (See Attachment E, Letter from Rural Development). Thus **45 homeowners** in the community have been assisted through other housing programs in the past three years.

2. PROJECT IMPACT

a. Random Survey

The Western Illinois Regional Council conducted a random housing and income survey of the City of Havana. We did not include the following developments because they are public housing and private rental apartment complexes.

- Public housing units at 201 East Hurst Street – 50 units
- Havana apartments at 800 North Promenade for seniors, disabled - 16 units
- Timothy Terrace at 701 N. promenade for seniors, disabled - 24 units
- Private Apt. complex at Randolph Street – 13 units and
- Private Apt. complex at South McKinley – 12 units
- 2013 CDAP Housing Rehabilitation Program Target Area

One hundred fifteen (115) units were eliminated from the random survey. Of the 1,371 occupied units in the community (per the 2010 census), 1,256 were considered to be part

of the random survey due to the above reasoning. Eight hundred forty surveys were mailed out to random households in the community. We followed a pattern of sending to every other home in the neighborhoods, so that we received a good representation of the community. There are 206 returned surveys or 16.40% of the 1,256 units.

The basis of the survey was to determine where the concentration of low-income, elderly, disabled, and deteriorated housing of the community was located. The survey asked the respondent to check their various housing needs. Also after compiling the random survey data, we visited all the neighborhoods in Bushnell to determine the area with the worst housing conditions.

The random survey had the following income results:

- Thirty-one (31) households were 30% AMI
- Thirty-nine (39) households were 50% AMI
- Thirty-eight (38) households were 80% AMI
- Ninety-seven (97) households were >80%AMI

We took all the income data from random surveys and mapped the over 30%AMI, 50% AMI, 80%AMI and >80% AMI. We then had the GIS Center at Western Illinois University plot all of the surveys to the addresses in Havana. Two hundred six (206) responses were plotted. The map definitely shows that the area south of U.S. Highway 136 (Dearborn Street) was an area of lower income. We received a majority of the surveys from north of Dearborn and it showed higher concentrations of higher income in this area. Any area south of Dearborn Street could be a target area. Thus we limited our decision to target south of Dearborn. The final factor was that the farther west you went in this sector, the worst the housing conditions. So we decided to target the area west of South Water Street.

Target Area Surveyed

Once the target area was determined and addresses determined, the target area was drawn, and each home in the target area was surveyed door-to-door. There are 76 housing units in the target area. Repeated trips were made to each home until an answer from each occupied household was received. We have six households that did not answer or could not be found at home. There are thirteen vacant units in the target area.

Once all the surveys were collected, the WIRC's Housing Program Manager resurveyed the target area to review the "Interviewer" section of the housing conditions survey. This allows us to ensure that accurate descriptions are provided and correct data is provided. This also gives us a good feel for the type of housing that we may potentially address.

Based on the 43 occupied households that answered, the survey revealed the following:

1. 88 percent or 38 of the households in the target area have low-to-moderate income;
2. Of those 38 LMI households, 19 percent or 8 households are 30 percent of area median income; 35 percent or 15 households are 50 percent of area median income; and 33 percent or 14 households are 80 percent of area median income.
3. 56 percent or 24 of all households have an elderly member;
4. 33 percent or 14 of all households have a disabled member;
5. 29 percent or 22 of the 76 total units need minimal rehab;
6. 51 percent or 39 of the 76 total units need moderate rehab;
7. 20 percent or 15 of the 76 total units need major rehab;
8. 38 LMI eligible owner-occupied households are in need of rehab;
9. 32 percent or 12 of the 38 LMI owner-occupied households need minimal rehab;
10. 61 percent or 23 of the 38 LMI owner-occupied households need moderate rehab;
11. 8 percent or 3 of the 38 LMI owner-occupied household need major rehab.

Seventy-six surveys are included in the application (See Attachment A). Nine LMI households or 12 percent of the total units (including vacant, no answer and rental homes) will be addressed in the target area. Nine of the 38 LMI owner-occupied households in need of rehabilitation in the target area will be addressed or 24 percent.

3. COORDINATION OF RESOURCES

The City of Havana will work with various agencies to maximize the effectiveness of the proposed housing rehabilitation program. The city understands that funding many times falls short of the demand for assistance. The city will work with the Community Action Partnership of Central Illinois Weatherization Program and USDA Rural Development for support and financial assistance.

a. Letters of Support

A Letter of support has been received from the Mason County Housing Authority. The Housing Authority of Mason County operates 90 units within in Havana serving low income, elderly, and disabled individuals/families. The letter of support from Mason County Housing Authority is included in Attachment D.

b. Letters of Intent

The program administrator will refer all eligible homeowners to the Community Action Partnership of Central Illinois (CAPCIL) Home Weatherization Program. Whenever an applicant is 200% of poverty (very low income) they will be referred to the CAPCIL Weatherization Program (See Attachment E, Letter of Intent from CAPCIL Weatherization Program). The Program Administrator has coordinated the Weatherization Program with many past CDAP's and IHDA HOME Programs in

communities throughout Hancock, Henderson, Warren, Fulton, and McDonough counties.

The City of Havana and Program Administrator will also coordinate with the Rural Development office in Galesburg. The program administrator has worked with Rural Development in Hancock, McDonough, Fulton, Warren, Knox and Henderson counties to secure grant funds and 1% loans for low and very-low income residents. For households that are very low income and elderly and can present a hardship i.e., medical, environmental hazards, a grant may be provided. The Western Illinois Regional Council has contacted Rural Development in Galesburg, Illinois and they are very willing to coordinate their resources with this proposed CDAP program (**See Attachment E, Letter of Intent from Rural Development**).

c. Letter of Commitment


There is no Letter of Commitment for the City of Havana's application.

Attachment 1: Airport Clear Zones and Accident Potential Zones

Illinois Airport Map and NEPA Assist Airport Map

Click airport symbol to view information

- ⊗ General Aviation
- ⊠ Heliport
- ⊗ Commercial Service
- ⊗ Military Joint Use



Airport Map

NEPassist



Search for address or place

Print | Background | Imagery | Measure | Draw | Erase | Identify | Note Data

Select Map Contents

- EPA Facilities
- Water Monitoring Stations
- Places
- Transportation
 - Airport Plots
 - Airport Polygons
- Permits
- Water Features
- Management Areas
- Boundaries
- Soil Survey Map
- Critical Habitat
- NW1 Wetlands
- FEMA Flood
- Land Cover

15,000 ft.

© 2010 NAVTEQ © AVI © 2010 Microsoft Corporation

EverMap

Clear Zones (CZ) and Accident Potential Zones (APZ)

Checklist for HUD or Responsible Entity

General requirements	Legislation	Regulation
Promote compatible land uses around civil airports and military airfields	Section 2 of the Housing Act of 1949 as amended, 42 U.S.C 1331, affirmed by Section 2 of the Housing and Urban Development Act of 1969, P.L. No 90-448; Section 7(d) of the Dept HUD Act of 1965, 42 U.S.C. 3535 (d).	24 CFR Part 51 Subpart D 32 CFR Part 256

1. Is the Project located within 3000 feet of a civil airport or within 15,000 feet of a military airfield?

Maintain in your ERR a map that identifies airports. The regulations only apply to military and civil primary and commercial service airports. The Federal Aviation Administration updates the list of applicable airports annually:
http://www.faa.gov/airports_airtraffic/airports/planning_capacity/passenger_allcargo_stats/passenger

- No: STOP here. The project is not within a Clear Zone (also known as Runway Protection Zone) or Accident Potential Zone. Record your determination.
 Yes: PROCEED to #2

2. Is the Project in the CZ or APZ?

Contact the airport operator and obtain written documentation of the Clear Zone (also known as Runway Protection Zone) and for military airfields, the Accident Potential Zone, and a determination of whether your project is in the APZ or CZ.

- No: STOP here. Record your determination that the project is not in a CZ or APZ.
 Yes: PROCEED TO #3

3. For Civil and Military Airports, is the activity for new construction, major rehabilitation*, or any other activity which significantly prolongs the physical or economic life of existing facilities? For Accident Potential Zones at Military Airfields, does the project change the use of a facility so that it becomes one which is no longer acceptable in accordance with Department of Defense standards (Please see 32 CFR Part 256 for *Land Use Compatibility Guidelines for Accident Potential Zones*), significantly increase the density or number of people at the site, or introduces explosive, flammable or toxic materials to the area?

- No: STOP here. The project is not subject to the regulations. Record your determination.
 Yes: PROCEED to #4

4. Will the project frequently be used or occupied by people?

- Yes: **The project cannot be assisted with HUD funds. STOP HERE.**
 No: Obtain written assurance from the airport operator to the effect that there are no plans to purchase the land involved with the project as a portion of a Runway Clear Zone or Clear Zone acquisition program. Maintain copies of all of the documents you have used to make your determination

* Rehabilitation is major when the estimated cost of the work is 75% or more of the total estimated cost of replacement after rehab (Please see 24 CFR 58.35(a) for complete definition of major rehabilitation thresholds.)

DISCLAIMER: This document is intended as a tool to help Region X HUD grantees and HUD staff complete environmental requirements. This document is subject to change. This is not a policy statement. Legislation and Regulations take precedence over any information found in this document.

Attachment 2: Clean Air Act

**EPA Illinois Nonattainment Areas List and Summary Nonattainment
Area Population Exposure Report**



Green Book

You are here [EPA Home](#) [Green Book](#) Illinois Nonattainment/Maintenance Status for Each County by Year for All Criteria Pollutants

Illinois Nonattainment/Maintenance Status for Each County by Year for All Criteria Pollutants

As of October 01, 2015 The 8-hour Ozone (1997) standard was revoked on April 6, 2015 and the 1 hour Ozone (1979) standard was revoked on June 15, 2005.

Listed by County, Pollutant, then Area

Select a State: [AK](#) | [AL](#) | [AR](#) | [AZ](#) | [CA](#) | [CO](#) | [CT](#) | [DC](#) | [DE](#) | [FL](#) | [GA](#) | [GU](#) | [IA](#) | [ID](#) | [IL](#) | [IN](#) | [KS](#) | [KY](#) | [LA](#) | [MA](#) | [MD](#) | [ME](#) | [MI](#) | [MN](#) | [MO](#) | [MS](#) | [MT](#) | [NC](#) | [NE](#) | [NH](#) | [NJ](#) | [NM](#) | [NV](#) | [NY](#) | [OH](#) | [OR](#) | [PA](#) | [PR](#) | [RI](#) | [SC](#) | [TN](#) | [TX](#) | [UT](#) | [VA](#) | [WA](#) | [WI](#) | [WV](#) | [WY](#) |

Important Notes

County	Pollutant	Area Name	Nonattainment In Year	Redesignation to Maintenance	Classification	City NA Whole/Part	Population (2010)	FIPS State/Cnty
ILLINOIS								
Cook Co	1-Hr Ozone (1979) -NAAQS revoked	Chicago-Gary-Lake County, IL-IN	92939495969798990001020304	//	Severe 17	Whole	5,194,675	17/031
Cook Co	8-Hr Ozone (1997) -NAAQS revoked	Chicago-Gary-Lake County, IL-IN	0405060708091011	08/13/2012	Moderate	Whole	5,194,675	17/031
Cook Co	8-Hr Ozone (2008)	Chicago-Naperville, IL-IN-WI	12131415	//	Marginal	Whole	5,194,675	17/031
Cook Co	Lead (2008)	Chicago, IL	1112131415	//		Part	35,696	17/031
Cook Co	PM-10 (1987)	Southeast Chicago, IL	92939495969798990001020304	11/21/2005	Moderate	Part	3,117	17/031
Cook Co	PM-10 (1987)	Lyons Twsp, IL	92939495969798990001020304	11/21/2005	Moderate	Part	111,688	17/031
Cook Co	PM-2.5 (1997)	Chicago-Gary-Lake County, IL-IN	0506070809101112	10/02/2013	Former Subpart 1	Whole	5,194,675	17/031
Cook Co	Sulfur Dioxide (2010)	Lemont, IL	131415	//		Part	21,113	17/031
Du Page Co	1-Hr Ozone (1979) -NAAQS revoked	Chicago-Gary-Lake County, IL-IN	92939495969798990001020304	//	Severe 17	Whole	916,924	17/043
Du Page Co	8-Hr Ozone (1997) -NAAQS revoked	Chicago-Gary-Lake County, IL-IN	0405060708091011	08/13/2012	Moderate	Whole	916,924	17/043
Du Page Co	8-Hr Ozone (2008)	Chicago-Naperville, IL-IN-WI	12131415	//	Marginal	Whole	916,924	17/043
Du Page Co	PM-2.5 (1997)	Chicago-Gary-Lake County, IL-IN	0506070809101112	10/02/2013	Former Subpart 1	Whole	916,924	17/043
Grundy Co	1-Hr Ozone (1979) -NAAQS revoked	Chicago-Gary-Lake County, IL-IN	92939495969798990001020304	//	Severe 17	Part	14,735	17/063
Grundy Co	8-Hr Ozone (1997) -NAAQS revoked	Chicago-Gary-Lake County, IL-IN	0405060708091011	08/13/2012	Moderate	Part	20,519	17/063
Grundy Co	8-Hr Ozone (2008)	Chicago-Naperville, IL-IN-WI	12131415	//	Marginal	Part	20,519	17/063
Grundy Co	PM-2.5 (1997)	Chicago-Gary-Lake County, IL-IN	0506070809101112	10/02/2013	Former Subpart 1	Part	20,519	17/063
Jersey Co	1-Hr Ozone (1979) -NAAQS revoked	Jersey Co, IL	929394	04/13/1995	Marginal	Whole	22,985	17/083
Jersey Co	8-Hr Ozone (1997) -NAAQS revoked	St. Louis, MO-IL	0405060708091011	06/12/2012	Moderate	Whole	22,985	17/083
Kane Co	1-Hr Ozone (1979) -NAAQS revoked	Chicago-Gary-Lake County, IL-IN	92939495969798990001020304	//	Severe 17	Whole	515,269	17/089
Kane Co	8-Hr Ozone (1997)	Chicago-Gary-Lake	0405060708091011	08/13/2012	Moderate	Whole	515,269	17/089

County	Pollutant	Area Name	Nonattainment In Year	Redesignation to Maintenance	Classification	City NA Whole/Part	Population (2010)	FIPS State/Cnty
	-NAAQS revoked	County, IL-IN						
Kane Co	8-Hr Ozone (2008)	Chicago-Naperville, IL-IN-WI	12131415 //		Marginal	Whole	515,269	17/089
Kane Co	PM-2.5 (1997)	Chicago-Gary-Lake County, IL-IN	0506070809101112	10/02/2013	Former Subpart 1	Whole	515,269	17/089
Kendall Co	1-Hr Ozone (1979) -NAAQS revoked	Chicago-Gary-Lake County, IL-IN	92939495969798990001020304	//	Severe 17	Part	30,355	17/093
Kendall Co	8-Hr Ozone (1997) -NAAQS revoked	Chicago-Gary-Lake County, IL-IN	0405060708091011	08/13/2012	Moderate	Part	52,377	17/093
Kendall Co	8-Hr Ozone (2008)	Chicago-Naperville, IL-IN-WI	12131415 //		Marginal	Part	52,377	17/093
Kendall Co	PM-2.5 (1997)	Chicago-Gary-Lake County, IL-IN	0506070809101112	10/02/2013	Former Subpart 1	Part	52,377	17/093
La Salle Co	PM-10 (1987)	Oglesby, IL	92939495	10/07/1996	Moderate	Part	3,862	17/099
Lake Co	1-Hr Ozone (1979) -NAAQS revoked	Chicago-Gary-Lake County, IL-IN	92939495969798990001020304	//	Severe 17	Whole	703,462	17/097
Lake Co	8-Hr Ozone (1997) -NAAQS revoked	Chicago-Gary-Lake County, IL-IN	0405060708091011	08/13/2012	Moderate	Whole	703,462	17/097
Lake Co	8-Hr Ozone (2008)	Chicago-Naperville, IL-IN-WI	12131415 //		Marginal	Whole	703,462	17/097
Lake Co	PM-2.5 (1997)	Chicago-Gary-Lake County, IL-IN	0506070809101112	10/02/2013	Former Subpart 1	Whole	703,462	17/097
Madison Co	1-Hr Ozone (1979) -NAAQS revoked	St. Louis, MO-IL	9293949596979899000102	05/12/2003	Serious	Whole	269,282	17/119
Madison Co	8-Hr Ozone (1997) -NAAQS revoked	St. Louis, MO-IL	0405060708091011	06/12/2012	Moderate	Whole	269,282	17/119
Madison Co	8-Hr Ozone (2008)	St. Louis-St. Charles-Farmington, MO-IL	12131415 //		Marginal	Whole	269,282	17/119
Madison Co	Lead (2008)	Granite City, IL	101112131415 //			Part	38,901	17/119
Madison Co	PM-10 (1987)	Granite City, Nameokl Twsp, IL	929394959697	05/11/1998	Moderate	Part	35,652	17/119
Madison Co	PM-2.5 (1997)	St. Louis, MO-IL	0506070809101112131415 //		Moderate	Whole	269,282	17/119
Mc Henry Co	1-Hr Ozone (1979) -NAAQS revoked	Chicago-Gary-Lake County, IL-IN	92939495969798990001020304	//	Severe 17	Whole	308,760	17/111
Mc Henry Co	8-Hr Ozone (1997) -NAAQS revoked	Chicago-Gary-Lake County, IL-IN	0405060708091011	08/13/2012	Moderate	Whole	308,760	17/111
Mc Henry Co	8-Hr Ozone (2008)	Chicago-Naperville, IL-IN-WI	12131415 //		Marginal	Whole	308,760	17/111
Mc Henry Co	PM-2.5 (1997)	Chicago-Gary-Lake County, IL-IN	0506070809101112	10/02/2013	Former Subpart 1	Whole	308,760	17/111
Monroe Co	1-Hr Ozone (1979) -NAAQS revoked	St. Louis, MO-IL	9293949596979899000102	05/12/2003	Serious	Whole	32,957	17/133
Monroe Co	8-Hr Ozone (1997) -NAAQS revoked	St. Louis, MO-IL	0405060708091011	06/12/2012	Moderate	Whole	32,957	17/133
Monroe Co	8-Hr Ozone (2008)	St. Louis-St. Charles-	12131415 //		Marginal	Whole	32,957	17/133

County	Pollutant	Area Name	Nonattainment in Year	Redesignation to Maintenance	Classification	Cty NA Whole/Part	Population (2010)	FIPS State/Cnty
		Farmington, MO-IL						
Monroe Co	PM-2.5 (1997)	St Louis, MO-IL	0506070809101112131415	//	Moderate	Whole	32,957	17/133
Peoria Co	Sulfur Dioxide (1971)	Hollis Township, IL	929394	06/05/1995		Part	2,032	17/143
Peoria Co	Sulfur Dioxide (1971)	Peoria, IL	929394	06/05/1995		Part	127,507	17/143
Peoria Co	Sulfur Dioxide (2010)	Pekin, IL	131415	//		Part	1,881	17/143
Randolph Co	PM-2.5 (1997)	St Louis, MO-IL	0506070809101112131415	//	Moderate	Part	1,453	17/157
St Clair Co	1-Hr Ozone (1979) -NAAQS revoked	St Louis, MO-IL	9293949596979899000102	05/12/2003	Serious	Whole	270,056	17/163
St Clair Co	8-Hr Ozone (1997) -NAAQS revoked	St Louis, MO-IL	0405060708091011	06/12/2012	Moderate	Whole	270,056	17/163
St Clair Co	8 Hr Ozone (2008)	St Louis-St. Charles-Farmington, MO-IL	12131415	//	Marginal	Whole	270,056	17/163
St Clair Co	PM-2.5 (1997)	St Louis, MO-IL	0506070809101112131415	//	Moderate	Whole	270,056	17/163
Tazewell Co	Sulfur Dioxide (1971)	Groveland Township (Tazewell County), IL	929394	06/05/1995		Part	22,991	17/179
Tazewell Co	Sulfur Dioxide (2010)	Pekin, IL	131415	//		Part	39,313	17/179
Will Co	1-Hr Ozone (1979) -NAAQS revoked	Chicago-Gary-Lake County, IL-IN	92939495969798990001020304	//	Severe 17	Whole	677,560	17/197
Will Co	8-Hr Ozone (1997) -NAAQS revoked	Chicago-Gary-Lake County, IL-IN	0405060708091011	08/13/2012	Moderate	Whole	677,560	17/197
Will Co	8-Hr Ozone (2008)	Chicago-Naperville, IL-IN-WI	12131415	//	Marginal	Whole	677,560	17/197
Will Co	PM-2.5 (1997)	Chicago-Gary-Lake County, IL-IN	0506070809101112	10/02/2013	Former Subpart 1	Whole	677,560	17/197
Will Co	Sulfur Dioxide (2010)	Lemont, IL	131415	//		Part	147,803	17/197

Important Notes



Green Book

You are here: [EPA Home](#) [Green Book](#) Current Nonattainment Counties for All Criteria Pollutants

Current Nonattainment Counties for All Criteria Pollutants

As of October 01, 2015

Listed by State, County then Pollutant The 8-hour Ozone (1997) standard was revoked on April 6, 2015 and the 1-hour Ozone (1979) standard was revoked on June 15, 2005.

[View Notes](#)

State, County, Pollutant, * Part County NAA, NAA Area Name - Classification Standard

State, County, Pollutant, * Part County NAA, NAA Area Name - Classification Standard

ILLINOIS

Cook Co

Lead (2008)

* Chicago, IL

Sulfur Dioxide (2010)

* Lemont, IL

8-Hr Ozone (2008)

Chicago-Naperville, IL-IN-WI - (Marginal)

Du Page Co

8-Hr Ozone (2008)

Chicago-Naperville, IL-IN-WI - (Marginal)

Grundy Co

8-Hr Ozone (2008)

* Chicago-Naperville, IL-IN-WI - (Marginal)

Kane Co

8-Hr Ozone (2008)

Chicago-Naperville, IL-IN-WI - (Marginal)

Kendall Co

8-Hr Ozone (2008)

* Chicago-Naperville, IL-IN-WI - (Marginal)

Lake Co

8-Hr Ozone (2008)

Chicago-Naperville, IL-IN-WI - (Marginal)

Madison Co

Lead (2008)

* Granite City, IL

PM-2.5 (1997)

St. Louis, MO-IL - (Moderate)

8-Hr Ozone (2008)

St. Louis-St. Charles-Farmington, MO-IL - (Marginal)

Mc Henry Co

8-Hr Ozone (2008)

Chicago-Naperville, IL-IN-WI - (Marginal)

Monroe Co

PM-2.5 (1997)

St. Louis, MO-IL - (Moderate)

8-Hr Ozone (2008)

St. Louis-St. Charles-Farmington, MO-IL - (Marginal)

Peoria Co

Sulfur Dioxide (2010)

* Pekin, IL

Randolph Co

PM-2.5 (1997)

* St. Louis, MO-IL - (Moderate)

St Clair Co

PM-2.5 (1997)

St. Louis, MO-IL - (Moderate)

8-Hr Ozone (2008)

St. Louis-St. Charles-Farmington, MO-IL - (Marginal)

Tazewell Co

Sulfur Dioxide (2010) * Pekin, IL

Will Co

Sulfur Dioxide (2010) * Lemont, IL

8-Hr Ozone (2008) Chicago-Naperville, IL-IN-WI - (Marginal)

Summary Nonattainment Area Population Exposure Report

As of October 01, 2015

Ordered by state code(s)

The NO₂ nonattainment area became a maintenance area on September 22, 1998.

All Carbon Monoxide areas were redesignated to maintenance areas as of September 27, 2010.

The 8-hour Ozone (1997) standard was revoked on April 6, 2015 and the 1-hour Ozone (1979) standard was revoked on June 15, 2005.

State (s)	General Area Name (see note)	2010 Population in 1000s (area count)								
		8-Hr Ozone (2008)	PM-2.5 (2012)	PM-2.5 (2006)	PM-2.5 (1997)	PM-10	SO2 (2010)	SO2 (1971)	Lead (2008)	Lead (1978)
AK	Fairbanks			87(1)						
AL	Troy								2(1)	
AZ	Ajo					9(1)				
AZ	Douglas/Paul Spur (Cochise County)					17(1)				
AZ	Hayden/Miami					26(2)	20(2)	5(1)	5(1)	
AZ	Nogales			31(1)		30(1)				
AZ	Phoenix-Mesa	3,850(1)				3,853(1)				
AZ	Rillito (Pima County)					1(1)				
AZ	West Central Pinal			52(1)		283(1)				
AZ	Yuma					101(1)				
CA	Amador and Calaveras Cos (Central Mountain Cos)	46(1)								
CA	Chico	220(1)		218(1)						
CA	Imperial County	175(1)	154(1)	154(1)		147(1)				
CA	Los Angeles-South Coast Air Basin	15,723(3)	15,716(1)	15,716(1)	15,716(1)				9,437(1)	
CA	Mariposa and Tuolumne Cos (Southern Mountain Cos)	18(1)								
CA	Mono County					7(2)				
CA	Nevada Co. (Western Part)	82(1)								

State (s)	General Area Name (see note)	2010 Population in 1000s (area count)								
		8-Hr Ozone (2008)	PM-2.5 (2012)	PM-2.5 (2006)	PM-2.5 (1997)	PM-10	SO2 (2010)	SO2 (1971)	Lead (2008)	Lead (1978)
CA	Owens Valley					7(1)				
CA	Plumas County		6(1)							
CA	Sacramento Metro	2,241(1)		2,206(1)						
CA	San Diego	3,095(1)								
CA	San Francisco-Bay Area	6,973(1)		6,971(1)						
CA	San Joaquin Valley	3,938(2)	3,842(1)	3,842(1)	3,842(1)	126(1)				
CA	San Luis Obispo-Paso Robles	2(1)								
CA	Searles Valley					4(1)				
CA	Southeast Desert Modified AQMA	1,294(2)				495(2)				
CA	Tuscan Bluffs	0(1)								
CA	Ventura County	823(1)								
CO	Denver-Boulder-Greeley-Ft. Collins-Loveland Area	3,330(1)								
CT	Greater Connecticut	1,629(1)								
DC-MD-VA	Washington	5,136(1)								
FL	Jacksonville						6(1)			
FL	Tampa-St. Petersburg-Clearwater						17(1)		4(1)	
GA	Atlanta	4,753(1)			5,265(1)					
GU	Piti Power Plant							1(1)		
GU	Tanguisson Power Plant							1(1)		
IA	Council Bluffs								13(1)	
IA	Muscatine County						30(1)			
ID	Pocatello					1(1)				
ID	Shoshone County		7(1)			11(2)				

State (s)	General Area Name (see note)	2010 Population in 1000s (area count)									
		8-Hr Ozone (2008)	PM-2.5 (2012)	PM-2.5 (2006)	PM-2.5 (1997)	PM-10	SO2 (2010)	SO2 (1971)	Lead (2008)	Lead (1978)	
IL	Peoria						41(1)				
IL-IN-WI	Chicago-Joliet-Napier	9,180(1)					169(1)		36(1)		
IN	Evansville						6(1)				
IN	Indianapolis						410(2)				
IN	Muncie								1(1)		
IN	Terre Haute						54(1)				
KS	Salina								0(1)		
KY-IN	Louisville				1,019(1)		3(1)				
LA	Baton Rouge	733(1)									
LA	New Orleans						36(1)				
MA-NH	Boston-Worcester-Manchester	17(1)					124(1)				
MD	Baltimore	2,663(1)									
MI	Belding								2(1)		
MI	Detroit-Ann Arbor						254(1)				
MN	Minneapolis-St. Paul								9(1)		
MO	Iron								0(1)		
MO-IL	St. Louis	2,571(1)			2,573(1)		62(1)		44(2)	3(1)	
MO-KS	Kansas City						57(1)				
MT	Billings/Laurel						3(1)	7(1)			
MT	Butte					34(1)					
MT	Columbia Falls (Flathead County)					5(1)					
MT	East Helena							3(1)		3(1)	
MT	Kalispell (Flathead County)					18(1)					
MT	Lame Deer					1(1)					
MT	Libby				9(1)	3(1)					
MT	Missoula					60(1)					
MT	Polson (Lake County)					4(1)					
MT	Ronan (Lake County)					3(1)					
MT	Thompson Falls					1(1)					

State (s)	General Area Name (see note)	2010 Population in 1000s (area count)								
		8-Hr Ozone (2008)	PM-2.5 (2012)	PM-2.5 (2006)	PM-2.5 (1997)	PM-10	SO2 (2010)	SO2 (1971)	Lead (2008)	Lead (1978)
MT	Whitefish (Flathead County)					6(1)				
NC-SC	Charlotte-Gastonia	1,901(1)								
NM	Anthony					3(1)				
NV	Reno					421(1)				
NY	Jamestown	135(1)								
NY-NJ-CT	New York-N. New Jersey-Long Island	20,217(1)				1,586(1)				
OH	Cleveland-Akron-Elyria	2,882(1)	1,581(1)				230(1)		8(1)	
OH	Columbus	1,755(1)								
OH	Delta								3(1)	
OH-KY-IN	Cincinnati-Middletown-Wilmington	1,989(1)					32(1)			
OH-WV	Steubenville-Weirton						58(1)			
OR	Klamath Falls			47(1)						
OR	Oakridge			4(1)		4(1)				
PA	Clearfield and Indiana Counties						93(1)			
PA	Harrisburg-Lebanon-Carlisle		134(1)							
PA	Lancaster	519(1)								
PA	Pittsburgh-New Castle	2,356(1)	1,223(1)	2,164(2)	2,164(2)		142(2)	5(1)	18(1)	
PA	Reading	411(1)							49(2)	
PA	Warren County						18(1)			
PA-DE-NJ-MD	Philadelphia-Wilmington-Trenton	7,634(2)	559(1)							
PA-NJ	Allentown-Bethlehem-Easton	712(1)						109(1)		
PR	Arecibo								32(1)	
TN	Johnson City-Kingsport-Bristol						15(1)		2(1)	
TN	Knoxville			682(1)	682(1)					

State (s)	General Area Name (see note)	2010 Population in 1000s (area count)								
		8-Hr Ozone (2008)	PM-2.5 (2012)	PM-2.5 (2006)	PM-2.5 (1997)	PM-10	SO2 (2010)	SO2 (1971)	Lead (2008)	Lead (1978)
TN	Memphis	1,127(1)								
TN-GA-AL	Chattanooga				471(1)					
TX	Dallas-Fort Worth	6,280(1)							4(1)	
TX	El Paso					649(1)				
TX	Houston-Galveston-Brazoria	5,892(1)								
UT	Ogden					83(1)				
UT	Provo			518(1)		517(1)				
UT	Salt Lake City			1,665(1)		1,030(1)		1,030(1)		
UT	Tooele County							58(1)		
UT-ID	Logan			125(1)						
WI	Rhineland							18(1)		
WI	Sheboygan	116(1)								
WV-OH	Parkersburg-Marietta							4(1)		
WV-OH	Wheeling							20(1)		
WY	Sheridan					17(1)				
WY	Upper Green River Basin	11(1)								
2010 Population in 1000s (area count) by Pollutant										
Total Estimated 2010 Population (in 1000s) Nonattainment		8-Hr Ozone (2008)	PM-2.5 (2012)	PM-2.5 (2006)	PM-2.5 (1997)	PM-10	SO2 (2010)	SO2 (1971)	Lead (2008)	Lead (1978)
Across All Criteria Pollutants: 130,886		122,430 (45)	23,223 (9)	34,482 (17)	31,741 (10)	9,564 (39)	1,924 (29)	1,217 (9)	9,667 (21)	5 (2)

The Summary Population Exposure Report is a summary of the population living in an area that is in nonattainment for at least one of the NAAQS.


Area Name:

The "State(s) Area Name" column contains a common or general name for the nonattainment areas on the row, but may not reflect the exact name of any area on the row. This column cannot be exact since the nonattainment area for one pollutant may not contain the same counties, cities, or states as the nonattainment area for another pollutant on the same row.

The abbreviations listed in the "State(s)" column reflect all states identified in row. However, some states on a row may be nonattainment for some pollutants and not for others in the general area. A multi-state area with states that have not all been redesignated to maintenance is counted as a nonattainment area until all of the states in the area are redesignated, with the whole area population displayed.

Counties Designated "Nonattainment"

for Clean Air Act's National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) *



Guam - Piti and Tanguisson Counties are designated nonattainment for the SO₂ NAAQS

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

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


Attachment 3: Coastal Zone Management Act

Illinois Coastal Zone Map & Copy of Plan

Wisconsin

Kenosha County

Illinois Coastal Zone Boundaries



State of Illinois
 Illinois Department of Natural Resources



Illinois DNR Coastal Management Program

Coastal Management Program (ICMP)



Overview

On January 31, 2012, the Illinois Coastal Management Program (ICMP) received Federal approval from the National Oceanic Atmospheric Administration, Office of Ocean and Coastal Resources Management. Illinois joins a total of 29 coastal states and five island territories that have developed CZM programs and represent more than 99.9 percent of the nation's 95,331 miles of oceanic and Great Lakes coastline.

Illinois is dedicated to protecting and managing the natural and cultural resources along our magnificent 63 mile stretch of Lake Michigan shoreline. During the last two centuries, Illinois' coast has undergone nearly a complete metamorphosis with its monumental hydrologic modifications, enormous industrial impacts, building of an excellent transportation infrastructure, and creation of skyscrapers that grace our shoreline. With all these changes, it is remarkable that our coastal resources still contain some of the richest, rarest and most diverse complex of plant and animal species and natural habitat areas in the state.

Our shoreline is highly urbanized and has been subject to considerable stress from intense land use and competition to serve the economic and workforce needs and demands of this densely populated area. Lake and Cook counties are currently home to 6 million people and are projected to be home to nearly 6.8 million people by 2030. It is estimated that more than 20 million visitors visit the Lake Michigan shoreline each year. Illinois Beach State Park alone has over 2 million visitors annually. Lake Michigan provides water supply to nearly 7 million Illinois residents (over half of the state's entire population).

The environmental legacy of our industrial sites and the needs and demands of a growing and vibrant urban community create a complex set of issues to balance as we invest in programs that seek to restore our ecosystems and meet the increasing demands for open space, recreation, and public access.



Coastal Management Program Priorities

The ICMP will initially focus on efforts to address the following program areas which are also outlined in the Great Lakes Regional Collaboration Strategy. The ICMP will describe desired outcomes, prioritize strategies for achieving them, and suggest site specific projects:

- **Invasive Species.** The ICMP will include mitigation and long term sustainable solutions to terrestrial invasive species. Strategies for controlling aquatic invasive species will initially focus on the Chicago and Sanitary Ship Canal hydrologic/ecological separation of the Illinois River basin from the Lake Michigan basin.
- **Habitat, Ecosystems and Natural Area Restoration.** The ICMP will address the undeveloped portions of shoreland in Cook and Lake Counties immediately north of Chicago to the Wisconsin state line. These areas include, North Shore Marina & Illinois Beach State Park including the Dead River & Kellogg Creek Watersheds, Waukegan Beach Bluff forest preserve, and wooded ravines along the Lake Michigan bluffs. The Chicago River & North Shore River Corridors & Wilmette Harbor are increasingly important habitat corridors and will be included in the ICMP. On the South Side of the City of Chicago, the Little Calumet & Grand Calumet River corridors, Lake Calumet, and the surrounding wetland areas are an important habitat area but also contain some of the most degraded industrial areas. These areas will also be addressed.
- **Areas of Concern.** Waukegan harbor is the one designated AOC in Illinois. Six of 14 use impairments have been identified for the Waukegan AOC. The impairments include restrictions on fish and wildlife consumption, benthic degradation, restrictions on dredging, beach closings, degradation of phytoplankton populations and loss of fish and wildlife habitat. The ICMP will develop a priority list for projects in Waukegan Harbor, Waukegan Lakefront & Waukegan River Watershed to remove these impairments.
- **Persistent Bio-accumulative Toxins.** Toxic issues in northeastern Illinois are generally legacy issues from our industrial past. They are mostly well documented and tend to be concentrated in the river sediments, brownfields, and superfund sites. The ICMP will develop site specific strategies for each property and develop priorities for long term restoration strategies as appropriate.
- **Sustainable Development.** The Illinois coast is primarily urban with the few exceptions mentioned previously. The ICMP will focus on the development of strategies to mitigate and adapt to climate change, including reducing individual carbon footprints, and the expanding the use of our natural resources to act as natural carbon sinks.
- **Non-point source.** Non-point source pollution is primarily related to storm-water management which for the most part is managed, treated and ultimately discharged away from the Lake Michigan Basin. Despite the investment of billions of dollars over the decades, basement flooding, and diversions of untreated sewage into Lake Michigan are not uncommon across the region. The ICMP will facilitate an important discussion of expanding the use of green infrastructure to control storm-water, promote groundwater recharge and reduce flooding.
- **Information and Indicators.** The ICMP will identify existing and ongoing data collections and indicators. It will identify gaps in data and develop priorities for future data collection efforts. The ICMP will also assist in the collaborative development of sustainability indicators for the region.
- **Public Access and Recreation.** Illinois' shoreline is increasingly used for recreation at unprecedented levels. The demand for public access to the lake and recreation resources has outstripped the supply and this demand will continue to grow in the future. There will always be a need for expanded and improved recreational facilities and services. The ICMP will provide technical and financial assistance to acquire new, add or improve public recreation sites and facilities, and to create new or improve public access sites.
- **Economic Development.** Our coastal communities are essential components of a strong Illinois economy. The ICMP will provide assistance to improve management programs and support state and local government efforts to identify and designate areas especially suited for water-related economic development and in redeveloping port and waterfront areas. The ICMP will provide technical and financial assistance in the regional planning process for identifying transmission and transportation routes.

How can the ICMP benefit coastal communities?

Illinois is eligible to receive approximately \$2 million per year, which will fund a grants program to implement coastal protection projects. Local and state agencies and non-profit organizations would be eligible to apply for and receive funds. Examples of how other States/communities have used these funds include:

- low-cost construction projects such as dune walkovers and boat launches
- planning and creation of beach access points
- reinvigorating economically depressed waterfront areas
- preventing and monitoring beach erosion
- providing technical assistance on shore protection and bluff stabilization
- providing assistance for local planning in coastal areas

The types of activities that can be funded are broadly defined and will be left to the creativity of state and local governments and organizations, as long as the goals of the ICMP are addressed and the projects occur within the coastal zone.

Boundary.

Key IDNR staff who assisted in developing the ICMP and preparing the necessary documents for program approval

Todd Main, Federal Consistency Coordinator

Diane Tecic, Coastal Program Manager

Rachel Sudimack, Green Marinas Program Coordinator

The ICMP will initially focus on efforts to address the following program areas which are also outlined in the Great Lakes Regional Collaboration Strategy. The ICMP will describe desired outcomes, prioritize strategies for achieving them, and suggest site specific projects: Illinois is eligible to receive approximately \$2 million per year, which will fund a program to implement local projects. Local and state agencies and non-profit organizations would be eligible to apply for and receive funds. A few examples of how other States/communities have used these funds include: The types of projects that can be funded are broadly defined and will be left to the creativity of state and local governments and organizations, as long as the goals of the ICMP are addressed and the projects occur within the ICMP Boundary. Key IDNR staff who assisted in developing the ICMP and preparing the necessary documents for program approval are:

Attachment 4: Explosive and Flammable Hazards

EPA Envirofacts Map and Report Documentation

Attachment 5: Endangered Species Act and Wetland Protection

IL DNR Release Letter



Illinois Department of
Natural Resources

One Natural Resources Way Springfield, Illinois 62702-1271
<http://dnr.state.il.us>

Pat Quinn, Governor
Marc Miller, Director

November 18, 2013

RECEIVED NOV 18 2013

Kirk Kumerow
IL Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity
500 E Monroe
Springfield, IL 62701-1643

RE: CDAP Housing

Dear Mr. Kumerow:

This letter is in reference to the CDAP Housing Program that the Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity administers. The rehabilitation of existing structures do not require review under the *Illinois Endangered Species Protection Act* [520 ILCS 10/11], the *Illinois Natural Areas Preservation Act* [525 ILCS 30/17], Title 17 *Illinois Administrative Code Part 1075*, the *Interagency Wetland Policy Act* [20 ILCS 830], and *17 Ill. Adm. Code 1090*. The Department does not believe these activities are likely to cause an adverse impact on protected natural resources.

Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

Karen Miller, Manager
Impact Assessment Section
Division of Ecosystems and Environment



U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service

ECOS Environmental Conservation Online System

Conserving the Nature of America

[ECOS](#) / [Species Reports](#) / Species By County Report

Species By County Report

The following report contains Species that are known to or are believed to occur in this county. Species with range unrefined past the state level are now excluded from this report. If you are looking for the Section 7 range (for Section 7 Consultations), please visit the [IPaC](#) application.

County: **Mason, Illinois**

Need to contact a FWS field office about a species? Follow [this link](#) to find your local FWS Office.

Group	Name	Population	Status	Lead Office	Recovery Plan	Recovery Plan Action Status	Rec Pla Sta
Flowering Plants	Decurrent false aster (<i>Boltonia decurrens</i>)	Wherever found	Threatened	Rock Island Ecological Services Field Office	Decurrent False Aster	Implementation Progress	Fin:
Flowering Plants	Eastern prairie fringed orchid (<i>Platanthera leucophaea</i>)	Wherever found	Threatened	Chicago Ecological Service Field Office	Eastern Prairie Fringed Orchid	Implementation Progress	Fin:
Mammals	Indiana bat (<i>Myotis sodalis</i>)	Wherever found	Endangered	Bloomington Ecological Services Field Office	Indiana Bat (Myotis sodalis) Draft Recovery Plan: First Revision	Implementation Progress	Dra Rev 1
Mammals	Northern Long-Eared Bat (<i>Myotis septentrionalis</i>)	Wherever found	Threatened	Twin Cities Ecological Services Field Office			

Attachment 6: Farmland Protection Policy Act

IL Dept. of Agriculture Blanket Release Letter

USDA Web Soil Survey



Bruce Rauner, Governor
Raymond Poe, Acting Director

Bureau of Land and Water Resources

State Fairgrounds • P.O. Box 19281 • Springfield, IL 62794-9281 • 217 782-6297 • TDD 217 524-6858 • Fax 217 557-0993

March 4, 2016

Mr. Kirk Kumerow
CDAP Grants Manager/Monitor
IL DCEO
2nd Floor, 500 E. Monroe
Springfield, Illinois 62701

RECEIVED MAR 07 2016

Re: Program Year (PY) 2015 Housing Grants
DCEO CDBG Single Family Housing Rehabilitation Program Funds

Dear Mr. Kumerow:

Thank you for notifying the Illinois Department of Agriculture (IDOA) of PY 2015's request for Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds from the Illinois Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity (DCEO). The request has been reviewed for its potential impact to agricultural land as well as its compliance with Illinois' Farmland Preservation Act (505 ILCS 75/1 et seq.).

CDBG funds will provide financial assistance to 16 communities (see attached) for architectural modifications to 134 single-family units. Improvements include elimination of code violations, health and safety issues, eliminate lead hazards, preserve structural integrity and increase energy efficiency.

Because these projects involve existing structures located within incorporated boundaries of cities and villages and one community adjacent to an existing village and agricultural land is not affected, they are exempt from further review in accordance with Section 2 of the IDOA-DCEO Cooperative Working Agreement on the protection of Illinois farmland.

We have determined the project meets the intent of the Illinois Farmland Preservation Act.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Steven D. Chard".

Steven D. Chard, Acting Chief
Bureau of Land and Water Resources

SDC:JL

cc: Agency project file

<u>Grantee</u>	<u>PY 15 Grants</u>	
	<u>Funded Amount</u>	<u>Rehabilitation Units</u>
City of Orient	\$400,000	9
City of West Frankfort	\$400,000	9
Village of Royalton	\$400,000	9
City of Zeigler	\$400,000	9
City of Havana	\$400,000	9
Village of Blandinsville	\$400,000	9
City of Cartersville	\$263,250	6
City of Hurst	\$400,000	8
City of Christopher	\$400,000	9
City of Neoga	\$400,000	8
City of LaHarpe	\$400,000	7
Village of Plymouth	\$400,000	8
City of Kinmundy	\$400,000	7
City of Mattoon	\$400,000	8
City of Olney	\$400,000	9
Williamson County for Community #9	\$400,000	10
Total	\$6,263,250.00	134

RECEIVED MAR 07 2016




United States
Department of
Agriculture

NRCS

Natural
Resources
Conservation
Service

A product of the National
Cooperative Soil Survey,
a joint effort of the United
States Department of
Agriculture and other
Federal agencies, State
agencies including the
Agricultural Experiment
Stations, and local
participants

Custom Soil Resource Report for Mason County, Illinois



Preface

Soil surveys contain information that affects land use planning in survey areas. They highlight soil limitations that affect various land uses and provide information about the properties of the soils in the survey areas. Soil surveys are designed for many different users, including farmers, ranchers, foresters, agronomists, urban planners, community officials, engineers, developers, builders, and home buyers. Also, conservationists, teachers, students, and specialists in recreation, waste disposal, and pollution control can use the surveys to help them understand, protect, or enhance the environment.

Various land use regulations of Federal, State, and local governments may impose special restrictions on land use or land treatment. Soil surveys identify soil properties that are used in making various land use or land treatment decisions. The information is intended to help the land users identify and reduce the effects of soil limitations on various land uses. The landowner or user is responsible for identifying and complying with existing laws and regulations.

Although soil survey information can be used for general farm, local, and wider area planning, onsite investigation is needed to supplement this information in some cases. Examples include soil quality assessments (<http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/nrcs/main/soils/health/>) and certain conservation and engineering applications. For more detailed information, contact your local USDA Service Center ([http // offices.sc.egov.usda.gov/locator/app?agency=nrcs](http://offices.sc.egov.usda.gov/locator/app?agency=nrcs)) or your NRCS State Soil Scientist (http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/nrcs/detail/soils/contactus/?cid=nrcs142p2_053951).

Great differences in soil properties can occur within short distances. Some soils are seasonally wet or subject to flooding. Some are too unstable to be used as a foundation for buildings or roads. Clayey or wet soils are poorly suited to use as septic tank absorption fields. A high water table makes a soil poorly suited to basements or underground installations.

The National Cooperative Soil Survey is a joint effort of the United States Department of Agriculture and other Federal agencies, State agencies including the Agricultural Experiment Stations, and local agencies. The Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) has leadership for the Federal part of the National Cooperative Soil Survey.

Information about soils is updated periodically. Updated information is available through the NRCS Web Soil Survey, the site for official soil survey information.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) prohibits discrimination in all its programs and activities on the basis of race, color, national origin, age, disability, and where applicable, sex, marital status, familial status, parental status, religion, sexual orientation, genetic information, political beliefs, reprisal, or because all or a part of an individual's income is derived from any public assistance program. (Not all prohibited bases apply to all programs.) Persons with disabilities who require alternative means

for communication of program information (Braille, large print, audiotape, etc.) should contact USDA's TARGET Center at (202) 720-2600 (voice and TDD). To file a complaint of discrimination, write to USDA, Director, Office of Civil Rights, 1400 Independence Avenue, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20250-9410 or call (800) 795-3272 (voice) or (202) 720-6382 (TDD). USDA is an equal opportunity provider and employer.

Contents

Preface	2
How Soil Surveys Are Made	5
Soil Map	7
Soil Map.....	8
Legend.....	9
Map Unit Legend.....	10
Map Unit Descriptions.....	10
Mason County, Illinois.....	12
54D—Plainfield sand, 7 to 15 percent slopes.....	12
88B—Sparta loamy sand, 1 to 6 percent slopes.....	13
266A—Disco sandy loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes.....	14
References	16

How Soil Surveys Are Made

Soil surveys are made to provide information about the soils and miscellaneous areas in a specific area. They include a description of the soils and miscellaneous areas and their location on the landscape and tables that show soil properties and limitations affecting various uses. Soil scientists observed the steepness, length, and shape of the slopes; the general pattern of drainage; the kinds of crops and native plants; and the kinds of bedrock. They observed and described many soil profiles. A soil profile is the sequence of natural layers, or horizons, in a soil. The profile extends from the surface down into the unconsolidated material in which the soil formed or from the surface down to bedrock. The unconsolidated material is devoid of roots and other living organisms and has not been changed by other biological activity.

Currently, soils are mapped according to the boundaries of major land resource areas (MLRAs). MLRAs are geographically associated land resource units that share common characteristics related to physiography, geology, climate, water resources, soils, biological resources, and land uses (USDA, 2006). Soil survey areas typically consist of parts of one or more MLRA.

The soils and miscellaneous areas in a survey area occur in an orderly pattern that is related to the geology, landforms, relief, climate, and natural vegetation of the area. Each kind of soil and miscellaneous area is associated with a particular kind of landform or with a segment of the landform. By observing the soils and miscellaneous areas in the survey area and relating their position to specific segments of the landform, a soil scientist develops a concept, or model, of how they were formed. Thus, during mapping, this model enables the soil scientist to predict with a considerable degree of accuracy the kind of soil or miscellaneous area at a specific location on the landscape.

Commonly, individual soils on the landscape merge into one another as their characteristics gradually change. To construct an accurate soil map, however, soil scientists must determine the boundaries between the soils. They can observe only a limited number of soil profiles. Nevertheless, these observations, supplemented by an understanding of the soil-vegetation-landscape relationship, are sufficient to verify predictions of the kinds of soil in an area and to determine the boundaries.

Soil scientists recorded the characteristics of the soil profiles that they studied. They noted soil color, texture, size and shape of soil aggregates, kind and amount of rock fragments, distribution of plant roots, reaction, and other features that enable them to identify soils. After describing the soils in the survey area and determining their properties, the soil scientists assigned the soils to taxonomic classes (units). Taxonomic classes are concepts. Each taxonomic class has a set of soil characteristics with precisely defined limits. The classes are used as a basis for comparison to classify soils systematically. Soil taxonomy, the system of taxonomic classification used in the United States, is based mainly on the kind and character of soil properties and the arrangement of horizons within the profile. After the soil scientists classified and named the soils in the survey area, they compared the

Custom Soil Resource Report

individual soils with similar soils in the same taxonomic class in other areas so that they could confirm data and assemble additional data based on experience and research.

The objective of soil mapping is not to delineate pure map unit components; the objective is to separate the landscape into landforms or landform segments that have similar use and management requirements. Each map unit is defined by a unique combination of soil components and/or miscellaneous areas in predictable proportions. Some components may be highly contrasting to the other components of the map unit. The presence of minor components in a map unit in no way diminishes the usefulness or accuracy of the data. The delineation of such landforms and landform segments on the map provides sufficient information for the development of resource plans. If intensive use of small areas is planned, onsite investigation is needed to define and locate the soils and miscellaneous areas.

Soil scientists make many field observations in the process of producing a soil map. The frequency of observation is dependent upon several factors, including scale of mapping, intensity of mapping, design of map units, complexity of the landscape, and experience of the soil scientist. Observations are made to test and refine the soil-landscape model and predictions and to verify the classification of the soils at specific locations. Once the soil-landscape model is refined, a significantly smaller number of measurements of individual soil properties are made and recorded. These measurements may include field measurements, such as those for color, depth to bedrock, and texture, and laboratory measurements, such as those for content of sand, silt, clay, salt, and other components. Properties of each soil typically vary from one point to another across the landscape.

Observations for map unit components are aggregated to develop ranges of characteristics for the components. The aggregated values are presented. Direct measurements do not exist for every property presented for every map unit component. Values for some properties are estimated from combinations of other properties.

While a soil survey is in progress, samples of some of the soils in the area generally are collected for laboratory analyses and for engineering tests. Soil scientists interpret the data from these analyses and tests as well as the field-observed characteristics and the soil properties to determine the expected behavior of the soils under different uses. Interpretations for all of the soils are field tested through observation of the soils in different uses and under different levels of management. Some interpretations are modified to fit local conditions, and some new interpretations are developed to meet local needs. Data are assembled from other sources, such as research information, production records, and field experience of specialists. For example, data on crop yields under defined levels of management are assembled from farm records and from field or plot experiments on the same kinds of soil.


Predictions about soil behavior are based not only on soil properties but also on such variables as climate and biological activity. Soil conditions are predictable over long periods of time, but they are not predictable from year to year. For example, soil scientists can predict with a fairly high degree of accuracy that a given soil will have a high water table within certain depths in most years, but they cannot predict that a high water table will always be at a specific level in the soil on a specific date.

After soil scientists located and identified the significant natural bodies of soil in the survey area, they drew the boundaries of these bodies on aerial photographs and identified each as a specific map unit. Aerial photographs show trees, buildings, fields, roads, and rivers, all of which help in locating boundaries accurately.

Soil Map

The soil map section includes the soil map for the defined area of interest, a list of soil map units on the map and extent of each map unit, and cartographic symbols displayed on the map. Also presented are various metadata about data used to produce the map, and a description of each soil map unit.

Custom Soil Resource Report Soil Map



Map Scale: 1:3,130 if printed on A portrait (8.5" x 11") sheet.

0 45 90 180 270 Meters

0 150 300 600 900 Feet

Map projection: Web Mercator Corner coordinates: WGS84 Edge ticks: UTM Zone 15N WGS84

MAP LEGEND

- Area of Interest (AOI)
- Soils
- Soil Map Unit Polygons
- Soil Map Unit Lines
- Soil Map Unit Points
- Special Point Features**
 - Blowout
 - Borrow Pit
 - Clay Spot
 - Closed Depression
 - Gravel Pit
 - Gravelly Spot
 - Landfill
 - Lava Flow
 - Marsh or swamp
 - Mine or Quarry
 - Miscellaneous Water
 - Perennial Water
 - Rock Outcrop
 - Saline Spot
 - Sandy Spot
 - Severely Eroded Spot
 - Sinkhole
 - Slide or Slip
 - Sodic Spot
- Water Features**
 - Streams and Canals
- Transportation**
 - Rails
 - Interstate Highways
 - US Routes
 - Major Roads
 - Local Roads
- Background**
 - Aerial Photography
- Spoil Area
- Stony Spot
- Very Stony Spot
- Wet Spot
- Other
- Special Line Features

MAP INFORMATION

The soil surveys that comprise your AOI were mapped at 1:15,800.

Warning: Soil Map may not be valid at this scale.

Enlargement of maps beyond the scale of mapping can cause misunderstanding of the detail of mapping and accuracy of soil line placement. The maps do not show the small areas of contrasting soils that could have been shown at a more detailed scale.

Please rely on the bar scale on each map sheet for map measurements.

Source of Map: Natural Resources Conservation Service
 Web Soil Survey URL: <http://websoilsurvey.nrcs.usda.gov>
 Coordinate System: Web Mercator (EPSG:3857)

Maps from the Web Soil Survey are based on the Web Mercator projection, which preserves direction and shape but distorts distance and area. A projection that preserves area, such as the Albers equal-area conic projection, should be used if more accurate calculations of distance or area are required.

This product is generated from the USDA-NRCS certified data as of the version date(s) listed below.

Soil Survey Area: Mason County, Illinois
 Survey Area Data: Version 9, Sep 25, 2015

Soil map units are labeled (as space allows) for map scales 1:50,000 or larger.

Date(s) aerial images were photographed: Aug 31, 2011—Oct 6, 2011

The orthophoto or other base map on which the soil lines were compiled and digitized probably differs from the background imagery displayed on these maps. As a result, some minor shifting of map unit boundaries may be evident.

Map Unit Legend

Mason County, Illinois (IL125)			
Map Unit Symbol	Map Unit Name	Acres in AOI	Percent of AOI
54D	Plainfield sand, 7 to 15 percent slopes	7.3	14.7%
88B	Sparta loamy sand, 1 to 6 percent slopes	23.0	46.5%
266A	Disco sandy loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes	19.2	38.8%
Totals for Area of Interest		49.5	100.0%

Map Unit Descriptions

The map units delineated on the detailed soil maps in a soil survey represent the soils or miscellaneous areas in the survey area. The map unit descriptions, along with the maps, can be used to determine the composition and properties of a unit.

A map unit delineation on a soil map represents an area dominated by one or more major kinds of soil or miscellaneous areas. A map unit is identified and named according to the taxonomic classification of the dominant soils. Within a taxonomic class there are precisely defined limits for the properties of the soils. On the landscape, however, the soils are natural phenomena, and they have the characteristic variability of all natural phenomena. Thus, the range of some observed properties may extend beyond the limits defined for a taxonomic class. Areas of soils of a single taxonomic class rarely, if ever, can be mapped without including areas of other taxonomic classes. Consequently, every map unit is made up of the soils or miscellaneous areas for which it is named and some minor components that belong to taxonomic classes other than those of the major soils.

Most minor soils have properties similar to those of the dominant soil or soils in the map unit, and thus they do not affect use and management. These are called noncontrasting, or similar, components. They may or may not be mentioned in a particular map unit description. Other minor components, however, have properties and behavioral characteristics divergent enough to affect use or to require different management. These are called contrasting, or dissimilar, components. They generally are in small areas and could not be mapped separately because of the scale used. Some small areas of strongly contrasting soils or miscellaneous areas are identified by a special symbol on the maps. If included in the database for a given area, the contrasting minor components are identified in the map unit descriptions along with some characteristics of each. A few areas of minor components may not have been observed, and consequently they are not mentioned in the descriptions, especially where the pattern was so complex that it was impractical to make enough observations to identify all the soils and miscellaneous areas on the landscape.

The presence of minor components in a map unit in no way diminishes the usefulness or accuracy of the data. The objective of mapping is not to delineate pure taxonomic classes but rather to separate the landscape into landforms or landform segments that have similar use and management requirements. The delineation of such segments

Custom Soil Resource Report

on the map provides sufficient information for the development of resource plans. If intensive use of small areas is planned, however, onsite investigation is needed to define and locate the soils and miscellaneous areas.

An identifying symbol precedes the map unit name in the map unit descriptions. Each description includes general facts about the unit and gives important soil properties and qualities.

Soils that have profiles that are almost alike make up a *soil series*. Except for differences in texture of the surface layer, all the soils of a series have major horizons that are similar in composition, thickness, and arrangement.

Soils of one series can differ in texture of the surface layer, slope, stoniness, salinity, degree of erosion, and other characteristics that affect their use. On the basis of such differences, a soil series is divided into *soil phases*. Most of the areas shown on the detailed soil maps are phases of soil series. The name of a soil phase commonly indicates a feature that affects use or management. For example, Alpha silt loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes, is a phase of the Alpha series.

Some map units are made up of two or more major soils or miscellaneous areas. These map units are complexes, associations, or undifferentiated groups.

A *complex* consists of two or more soils or miscellaneous areas in such an intricate pattern or in such small areas that they cannot be shown separately on the maps. The pattern and proportion of the soils or miscellaneous areas are somewhat similar in all areas. Alpha-Beta complex, 0 to 6 percent slopes, is an example.

An *association* is made up of two or more geographically associated soils or miscellaneous areas that are shown as one unit on the maps. Because of present or anticipated uses of the map units in the survey area, it was not considered practical or necessary to map the soils or miscellaneous areas separately. The pattern and relative proportion of the soils or miscellaneous areas are somewhat similar. Alpha-Beta association, 0 to 2 percent slopes, is an example.

An *undifferentiated group* is made up of two or more soils or miscellaneous areas that could be mapped individually but are mapped as one unit because similar interpretations can be made for use and management. The pattern and proportion of the soils or miscellaneous areas in a mapped area are not uniform. An area can be made up of only one of the major soils or miscellaneous areas, or it can be made up of all of them. Alpha and Beta soils, 0 to 2 percent slopes, is an example.

Some surveys include *miscellaneous areas*. Such areas have little or no soil material and support little or no vegetation. Rock outcrop is an example.

Mason County, Illinois

54D—Plainfield sand, 7 to 15 percent slopes

Map Unit Setting

National map unit symbol: 5z0n
Elevation: 340 to 1,360 feet
Mean annual precipitation: 32 to 45 inches
Mean annual air temperature: 48 to 57 degrees F
Frost-free period: 150 to 200 days
Farmland classification: Farmland of statewide importance

Map Unit Composition

Plainfield and similar soils: 95 percent
Minor components: 2 percent
Estimates are based on observations, descriptions, and transects of the mapunit.

Description of Plainfield

Setting

Landform: Knolls on dunes, knolls on outwash plains
Landform position (two-dimensional): Shoulder, backslope
Landform position (three-dimensional): Side slope
Down-slope shape: Convex
Across-slope shape: Linear
Parent material: Eolian sands

Typical profile

A - 0 to 7 inches: sand
B - 7 to 27 inches: sand
C - 27 to 60 inches: sand

Properties and qualities

Slope: 7 to 15 percent
Depth to restrictive feature: More than 80 inches
Natural drainage class: Excessively drained
Runoff class: Very low
Capacity of the most limiting layer to transmit water (Ksat): High to very high (6.00 to 20.00 in/hr)
Depth to water table: More than 80 inches
Frequency of flooding: None
Frequency of ponding: None
Available water storage in profile: Low (about 3.7 inches)

Interpretive groups

Land capability classification (irrigated): None specified
Land capability classification (nonirrigated): 6s
Hydrologic Soil Group: A
Hydric soil rating: No

Minor Components

Orio

Percent of map unit: 2 percent
Landform: Depressions on stream terraces
Landform position (three-dimensional): Talf

Custom Soil Resource Report

Down-slope shape: Concave, linear
Across-slope shape: Concave, linear
Hydric soil rating: Yes

88B—Sparta loamy sand, 1 to 6 percent slopes

Map Unit Setting

National map unit symbol: 5z1b
Elevation: 340 to 1,950 feet
Mean annual precipitation: 24 to 45 inches
Mean annual air temperature: 43 to 57 degrees F
Frost-free period: 110 to 200 days
Farmland classification: Farmland of statewide importance

Map Unit Composition

Sparta and similar soils: 91 percent
Minor components: 9 percent
Estimates are based on observations, descriptions, and transects of the mapunit.

Description of Sparta

Setting

Landform: Knolls on stream terraces
Landform position (two-dimensional): Summit, shoulder
Landform position (three-dimensional): Crest
Down-slope shape: Convex
Across-slope shape: Linear
Parent material: Eolian sands

Typical profile

H1 - 0 to 23 inches: loamy sand
H2 - 23 to 34 inches: loamy sand
H3 - 34 to 60 inches: sand

Properties and qualities

Slope: 1 to 6 percent
Depth to restrictive feature: More than 80 inches
Natural drainage class: Excessively drained
Runoff class: Very low
Capacity of the most limiting layer to transmit water (Ksat): High (2.00 to 6.00 in/hr)
Depth to water table: More than 80 inches
Frequency of flooding: None
Frequency of ponding: None
Available water storage in profile: Low (about 5.0 inches)

Interpretive groups

Land capability classification (irrigated): None specified
Land capability classification (nonirrigated): 4s
Hydrologic Soil Group: A
Hydric soil rating: No

Custom Soil Resource Report

Minor Components

Dakota

Percent of map unit: 3 percent
Landform: Stream terraces
Landform position (two-dimensional): Shoulder, summit
Hydric soil rating: No

Hoopeston

Percent of map unit: 3 percent
Landform: Outwash plains, stream terraces
Landform position (two-dimensional): Footslope
Hydric soil rating: No

Watseka

Percent of map unit: 2 percent
Landform: Outwash plains, stream terraces
Landform position (two-dimensional): Footslope
Hydric soil rating: No

Udolpho

Percent of map unit: 1 percent
Landform: Stream terraces
Down-slope shape: Concave
Across-slope shape: Concave
Hydric soil rating: Yes

266A—Disco sandy loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes

Map Unit Setting

National map unit symbol: 5yzn
Elevation: 460 to 820 feet
Mean annual precipitation: 29 to 45 inches
Mean annual air temperature: 49 to 56 degrees F
Frost-free period: 160 to 200 days
Farmland classification: All areas are prime farmland

Map Unit Composition

Disco and similar soils: 100 percent
Estimates are based on observations, descriptions, and transects of the mapunit.

Description of Disco

Setting

Landform: Outwash plains, stream terraces
Down-slope shape: Linear
Across-slope shape: Linear
Parent material: Wind re-worked loamy and sandy alluvial sediments

Typical profile

H1 - 0 to 34 inches: sandy loam

Custom Soil Resource Report

H2 - 34 to 41 inches: sandy loam

H3 - 41 to 80 inches: sand

Properties and qualities

Slope: 0 to 2 percent

Depth to restrictive feature: More than 80 inches

Natural drainage class: Well drained

Runoff class: Very low

Capacity of the most limiting layer to transmit water (Ksat): High (2.00 to 6.00 in/hr)

Depth to water table: More than 80 inches

Frequency of flooding: None

Frequency of ponding: None

Available water storage in profile: Moderate (about 6.6 inches)

Interpretive groups

Land capability classification (irrigated): None specified

Land capability classification (nonirrigated): 3s

Hydrologic Soil Group: A

Hydric soil rating: No

References

American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO). 2004. Standard specifications for transportation materials and methods of sampling and testing. 24th edition.

American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM). 2005. Standard classification of soils for engineering purposes. ASTM Standard D2487-00.

Cowardin, L.M., V. Carter, F.C. Golet, and E.T. LaRoe. 1979. Classification of wetlands and deep-water habitats of the United States. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service FWS/OBS-79/31.

Federal Register. July 13, 1994. Changes in hydric soils of the United States.

Federal Register. September 18, 2002. Hydric soils of the United States.

Hurt, G.W., and L.M. Vasilas, editors. Version 6.0, 2006. Field indicators of hydric soils in the United States.

National Research Council. 1995. Wetlands: Characteristics and boundaries.

Soil Survey Division Staff. 1993. Soil survey manual. Soil Conservation Service. U.S. Department of Agriculture Handbook 18. http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/nrcs/detail/national/soils/?cid=nrcs142p2_054262

Soil Survey Staff. 1999. Soil taxonomy: A basic system of soil classification for making and interpreting soil surveys. 2nd edition. Natural Resources Conservation Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture Handbook 436. http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/nrcs/detail/national/soils/?cid=nrcs142p2_053577

Soil Survey Staff. 2010. Keys to soil taxonomy. 11th edition. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service. http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/nrcs/detail/national/soils/?cid=nrcs142p2_053580

Tiner, R.W., Jr. 1985. Wetlands of Delaware. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and Delaware Department of Natural Resources and Environmental Control, Wetlands Section.

United States Army Corps of Engineers, Environmental Laboratory. 1987. Corps of Engineers wetlands delineation manual. Waterways Experiment Station Technical Report Y-87-1.

United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service. National forestry manual. http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/nrcs/detail/soils/home/?cid=nrcs142p2_053374

United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service. National range and pasture handbook. <http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/nrcs/detail/national/landuse/rangepasture/?cid=stelpdb1043084>

Custom Soil Resource Report

United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service. National soil survey handbook, title 430-VI. http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/nrcs/detail/soils/scientists/?cid=nrcs142p2_054242

United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service. 2006. Land resource regions and major land resource areas of the United States, the Caribbean, and the Pacific Basin. U.S. Department of Agriculture Handbook 296. http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/nrcs/detail/national/soils/?cid=nrcs142p2_053624


United States Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service. 1961. Land capability classification. U.S. Department of Agriculture Handbook 210. http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/Internet/FSE_DOCUMENTS/nrcs142p2_052290.pdf

Attachment 7: Floodplain Management

FEMA Firmette and HUD Floodplain Management Worksheet



MAP SCALE 1" = 500'



NFIP NATIONAL FLOOD INSURANCE PROGRAM

PANEL 0116D

FIRM FLOOD INSURANCE RATE MAP MASON COUNTY, ILLINOIS AND INCORPORATED AREAS

PANEL 116 OF 500
(SEE MAP INDEX FOR FIRM PANEL LAYOUT)

CONTAINS	COMMUNITY	NUMBER	PANEL	SUFFIX
	HAWANA, CITY OF	17045	0116	D
	MASON COUNTY	17043	0116	D

Notice to User: The Map Number shown below should be used when placing map orders. The Community Number shown above should be used on insurance applications for the subject community.



MAP NUMBER
17125C0116D
EFFECTIVE DATE
JANUARY 6, 2012

Federal Emergency Management Agency

This is an official copy of a portion of the above referenced flood map. It was extracted using FIRM On-Line. This map does not reflect changes or amendments which may have been made subsequent to the date on the title block. For the latest product information about National Flood Insurance Program flood maps check the FEMA Flood Map Store at www.msc.fema.gov



Attachment 8: Historic Preservation

Illinois Historic Preservation Agency Clearance Letter

&

Section 106 Tribal Consultation Documentation



**Illinois Historic
Preservation Agency**

1 Old State Capitol Plaza, Springfield, IL 62701-1512

FAX (217) 524-7525

www.illinoishistory.gov

Mason County

Havana

Rehabilitation

Sites Not Yet Selected

IHPA Log #009030916

March 25, 2016

Brenda Stadsholt, Mayor
City of Havana, Illinois
227 W. Main
Havana, IL 62644-1137

Dear Mayor Stadsholt:

We are in receipt of your project proposal dated March 8, 2016, concerning your Environmental Review Procedures for the CDBG HR Program.

Your proposal summary is acceptable to the Illinois Historic Preservation Agency provided that once individual sites are approved they will be submitted for review.

In order to review possible project effects on cultural resources for purposes of the National Historic Preservation Act, the following information must be provided to this office:

1. Description of proposed undertaking.
2. Name of managing, funding, or licensing agency (state or federal).
3. Name of satellite agencies involved in project (state & federal).
4. Project address(es) - street, municipality, and county.
5. Street map of project location.
6. Current photos of all standing structures within the project area (no xerox).

If you have any questions, please contact me at 217/785-5031.

Thank you for this opportunity to comment.

Sincerely,

Rachel Leibowitz, Ph.D.
Deputy State Historic
Preservation Officer

c: Jeff Cozadd, Western Illinois Regional Council
Kirk Kumerow, IL Department of Commerce and Economic Opportunity

For TTY communication, dial 888-440-9009. It is not a voice or fax line.

When to Consult with Tribes Under Section 106

Section 106 requires consultation with federally-recognized Indian tribes when a project may affect a historic property or religious and cultural significance to the tribe. Historic properties of religious and cultural significance include: archaeological sites, burial grounds, sacred landscapes or features, ceremonial areas, traditional cultural places, traditional cultural landscapes, plant and animal communities, and buildings and structures with significant tribal association. The types of activities that may affect historic properties of religious and cultural significance include: ground disturbance (digging), new construction in underdeveloped natural areas, introduction of incongruent visual, audible, or atmospheric changes, work on a building with significant tribal association, and transfer, lease or sale of properties of the types listed above.

If a project includes any of the types of activities below, invite tribes to consult.

- Significant ground disturbance (digging)**
Examples: new sewer lines, utility lines (above and below ground), foundations, footings, grading, access roads
- New construction in undeveloped natural areas**
Examples: industrial-scale energy facilities, transmission lines, pipelines, or new recreational facilities, in undeveloped natural areas like mountaintops, canyons, islands, forests, native grasslands, etc., and housing, commercial, and industrial facilities in such areas.
- Incongruent visual changes**
Examples: construction of a focal point that is out of character with the surrounding natural area, impairment of the vista or viewshed from an observation point in the natural landscape, or impairment of the recognized historic scenic qualities of a rea.
- Incongruent audible changes**
Example: increase in noise levels above an acceptable standard in areas known for their quiet contemplative experience.
- Incongruent atmospheric changes**
Example: introduction of lights that create skyglow in an area with a dark night sky.
- Work on a building with significant tribal association**
Examples: rehabilitation, demolition or removal of a surviving ancient tribal structure or village, or a building or structure that there is a reason to believe was the location of a significant tribal event, home of an important person, or that served as a tribal school or community hall.
- Transfer, lease or sale of a historic property of religious and cultural significance**
Examples: transfer, lease or sale of properties that contain archaeological sites, burial grounds, sacred landscapes or features, ceremonial areas, plant and animal communities, or buildings and structures within significant tribal association.
- None of the above apply**

Project: Havana CDBG HR 15- 243004 (Community Name/Grant #s)

Reviewed By: Jeff Cozadd, WIRC Housing Programs Manager (Printed Name, Title)

Signature: Jeff Cozadd Date: 6/29/16


Attachment 9: Noise Abatement and Control

Will be documented in Tier 2 Review


Attachment 10: Sole Source Aquifers

EPA Region V Sole Source Aquifers Maps

Designated Sole Source Aquifers in Region 5



Mahomet Sole Source Aquifer Project Review Area



Sole Source Aquifers (CEST and EA)

General requirements	Legislation	Regulation
The Safe Drinking Water Act of 1974 protects drinking water systems which are the sole or principal drinking water source for an area and which, if contaminated, would create a significant hazard to public health.	Safe Drinking Water Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 201, 300f et seq., and 21 U.S.C. 349)	40 CFR Part 149
Reference		
https://www.hudexchange.info/environmental-review/sole-source-aquifers		

1. Is the project located on a sole source aquifer (SSA)¹?

No → *Based on the response, the review is in compliance with this section. Continue to the Worksheet Summary below. Provide documentation used to make your determination, such as a map of your project (or jurisdiction, if appropriate) in relation to the nearest SSA and its source area.*

Yes → *Continue to Question 2.*

2. Does your project consist solely of acquisition, leasing, or rehabilitation of an existing building(s)?

Yes → *Based on the response, the review is in compliance with this section. Continue to the Worksheet Summary below.*

No → *Continue to Question 3.*

3. Does your region have a memorandum of understanding (MOU) or other working agreement with EPA for HUD projects impacting a sole source aquifer?

Contact your Field or Regional Environmental Officer or visit the HUD webpage at the link above to determine if an MOU or agreement exists in your area.

Yes → *Provide the MOU or agreement as part of your supporting documentation. Continue to Question 4.*

No → *Continue to Question 5.*

4. Does your MOU or working agreement exclude your project from further review?

Yes → *Based on the response, the review is in compliance with this section. Continue to the Worksheet Summary below. Provide documentation used to make your determination and document where your project fits within the MOU or agreement.*

¹ A sole source aquifer is defined as an aquifer that supplies at least 50 percent of the drinking water consumed in the area overlying the aquifer. This includes streamflow source areas, which are upstream areas of losing streams that flow into the recharge area.

No → *Continue to Question 5.*

5. Will the proposed project contaminate the aquifer and create a significant hazard to public health?

Consult with your Regional EPA Office. Your consultation request should include detailed information about your proposed project and its relationship to the aquifer and associated streamflow source area. EPA will also want to know about water, storm water and waste water at the proposed project. Follow your MOU or working agreement or contact your Regional EPA office for specific information you may need to provide. EPA may request additional information if impacts to the aquifer are questionable after this information is submitted for review.

No → *Based on the response, the review is in compliance with this section. Continue to the Worksheet Summary below. Provide your correspondence with the EPA and all documents used to make your determination.*

Yes → *Work with EPA to develop mitigation measures. If mitigation measures are approved, attach correspondence with EPA and include the mitigation measures in your environmental review documents and project contracts. If EPA determines that the project continues to pose a significant risk to the aquifer, federal financial assistance must be denied. Continue to Question 6.*

6. In order to continue with the project, any threat must be mitigated, and all mitigation must be approved by the EPA. Explain in detail the proposed measures that can be implemented to mitigate for the impact or effect, including the timeline for implementation.

→ *Continue to the Worksheet Summary below. Provide documentation of the consultation (including the Managing Agency's concurrence) and any other documentation used to make your determination.*

Worksheet Summary

Compliance Determination

Provide a clear description of your determination and a synopsis of the information that it was based on, such as:

- Map panel numbers and dates
- Names of all consulted parties and relevant consultation dates
- Names of plans or reports and relevant page numbers
- Any additional requirements specific to your region

City of Havana's grant is only for residential rehabilitation to existing buildings, no clearance letter is required.

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

Yes

No

Attachment 11: Wild and Scenic Rivers Act

Illinois Wild and Scenic Rivers Map



U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

National Wetlands Inventory

Havana, Illinois



November 30, 2016


- Estuarine and Marine Deepwater
- Estuarine and Marine Wetland
- Freshwater Emergent Wetland
- Freshwater Forested/Shrub Wetland
- Freshwater Pond
- Lake
- Other
- Riverine

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



HOME | NATIONAL SYSTEM | MANAGEMENT | RESOURCES | PUBLICATIONS | CONTACT US | KID'S SITE |

5.



NATIONWIDE RIVERS INVENTORY | KID'S SITE | CONTACT US | PRIVACY NOTICE | Q & A SEARCH ENGINE | SITE MAP

Designated Rivers

About WSR Act
State Listings
Profile Pages

National System

WSR Table
Study Rivers
Stewardship
WSR Act Legislation

River Management

Council
Agencies
Management Plans
GIS Mapping

Resources

Q & A Search
Bibliography
Publications
GIS Mapping
Logo & Sign Standards
Display

Attachment 12: Environmental Justice

US EPA EJ Screen Documentation of Project Location


EJSCREEN

Minority Map



Esri | HERE | DeLorme | INCREMENT P | NGA | USGS | EPA | OEI | OGI

Low Income Map




the User Specified Area, ILLINOIS, EPA Region 5

Approximate Population: 232

Input Area (sq. miles): 0.05

Havana Target Area

Selected Variables	State Percentile	EPA Region Percentile	USA Percentile
EJ Indexes			
EJ Index for PM2.5	62	73	59
EJ Index for Ozone	62	73	59
EJ Index for NATA* Diesel PM	62	73	58
EJ Index for NATA* Air Toxics Cancer Risk	62	73	58
EJ Index for NATA* Respiratory Hazard Index	62	73	58
EJ Index for Traffic Proximity and Volume	63	74	60
EJ Index for Lead Paint Indicator	63	74	63
EJ Index for Superfund Proximity	63	75	65
EJ Index for RMP Proximity	63	74	60
EJ Index for Hazardous Waste Proximity*	N/A	N/A	N/A
EJ Index for Water Discharger Proximity	62	74	59



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

EJSCREEN Report (Version 2016)
the User Specified Area, ILLINOIS, EPA Region 5
Approximate Population: 232
Input Area (sq. miles): 0.05
Havana Target Area



Selected Variables	Value	State Avg.	%ile in State	EPA Region Avg.	%ile in EPA Region	USA Avg.	%ile in USA
Environmental Indicators							
Particulate Matter (PM 2.5 in $\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$)	10.1	11.2	5	10.6	25	9.32	66
Ozone (ppb)	51	50.8	74	50.3	59	47.4	69
NATA* Diesel PM ($\mu\text{g}/\text{m}^3$)	0.591	1.28	20	0.931	<50th	0.937	<50th
NATA* Cancer Risk (lifetime risk per million)	32	36	34	34	<50th	40	<50th
NATA* Respiratory Hazard Index	0.97	1.8	14	1.7	<50th	1.8	<50th
Traffic Proximity and Volume (daily traffic count/distance to road)	250	500	65	370	70	590	66
Lead Paint Indicator (% Pre-1960 Housing)	0.66	0.42	71	0.39	77	0.3	85
Superfund Proximity (site count/km distance)	0	0.095	7	0.12	9	0.13	16
RMP Proximity (facility count/km distance)	1.3	0.69	84	0.51	89	0.43	91
Hazardous Waste Proximity* (facility count/km distance)	N/A	0.12	N/A	0.11	N/A	0.11	N/A
Water Discharger Proximity (facility count/km distance)	0.42	0.38	74	0.31	79	0.31	81
Demographic Indicators							
Demographic Index	36%	35%	62	29%	73	36%	59
Minority Population	4%	37%	12	24%	22	37%	11
Low Income Population	68%	32%	92	33%	92	35%	91
Linguistically Isolated Population	0%	5%	44	2%	58	5%	44
Population With Less Than High School Education	27%	12%	86	11%	91	14%	85
Population Under 5 years of age	5%	6%	38	6%	40	6%	39
Population over 64 years of age	9%	13%	35	14%	28	14%	33

* The National-Scale Air Toxics Assessment (NATA) is EPA's ongoing, comprehensive evaluation of air toxics in the United States. EPA developed the NATA to prioritize air toxics, emission sources, and locations of interest for further study. It is important to remember that NATA provides broad estimates of health risks over geographic areas of the country, not definitive risks to specific individuals or locations. More information on the NATA analysis can be found at: <https://www.epa.gov/national-air-toxics-assessment>.

+ The hazardous waste environmental indicator and the corresponding EJ index will appear as N/A if there are no hazardous waste facilities within 50 km of a selected location.

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

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

Location: User-specified polygonal location
 Ring (buffer): .0-mile radius
 Description: Havana Target Area

Summary of ACS Estimates		2010 - 2014
Population		232
Population Density (per sq. mile)		4,399
Minority Population		10
% Minority		4%
Households		88
Housing Units		96
Housing Units Built Before 1950		61
Per Capita Income		12,842
Land Area (sq. miles) (Source: SF1)		0.05
% Land Area		93%
Water Area (sq. miles) (Source: SF1)		0.00
% Water Area		7%

	2010 - 2014 ACS Estimates	Percent	MOE (±)
Population by Race			
Total	232	100%	211
Population Reporting One Race	232	100%	276
White	222	96%	196
Black	10	4%	36
American Indian	0	0%	11
Asian	0	0%	11
Pacific Islander	0	0%	11
Some Other Race	0	0%	11
Population Reporting Two or More Races	0	0%	11
Total Hispanic Population	0	0%	11
Total Non-Hispanic Population	232		
White Alone	222	96%	196
Black Alone	10	4%	36
American Indian Alone	0	0%	11
Non-Hispanic Asian Alone	0	0%	11
Pacific Islander Alone	0	0%	11
Other Race Alone	0	0%	11
Two or More Races Alone	0	0%	11
Population by Sex			
Male	83	36%	83
Female	149	64%	158
Population by Age			
Age 0-4	11	5%	27
Age 0-17	49	21%	80
Age 18+	183	79%	158
Age 65+	22	9%	39

Data Note: Detail may not sum to totals due to rounding. Hispanic population can be of any race. N/A means not available.
 Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey (ACS) 2010 - 2014.



Location: User-specified polygonal location
 Ring (buffer): .0-mile radius
 Description: Havana Target Area

	2010 - 2014 ACS Estimates	Percent	MOE (±)
Population 25+ by Educational Attainment			
Total	149	100%	127
Less than 9th Grade	4	2%	19
9th - 12th Grade, No Diploma	36	24%	79
High School Graduate	62	42%	75
Some College, No Degree	35	24%	56
Associate Degree	11	7%	33
Bachelor's Degree or more	12	8%	47
Population Age 5+ Years by Ability to Speak English			
Total	221	100%	204
Speak only English	218	99%	206
Non-English at Home ¹⁺²⁺³⁺⁴	3	1%	19
¹ Speak English "very well"	3	1%	19
² Speak English "well"	0	0%	11
³ Speak English "not well"	0	0%	11
⁴ Speak English "not at all"	0	0%	11
³⁺⁴ Speak English "less than well"	0	0%	11
²⁺³⁺⁴ Speak English "less than very well"	0	0%	16
Linguistically Isolated Households*			
Total	0	0%	11
Speak Spanish	0	0%	11
Speak Other Indo-European Languages	0	0%	11
Speak Asian-Pacific Island Languages	0	0%	11
Speak Other Languages	0	0%	11
Households by Household Income			
Household Income Base	88	100%	77
< \$15,000	24	28%	53
\$15,000 - \$25,000	21	23%	59
\$25,000 - \$50,000	29	33%	65
\$50,000 - \$75,000	5	6%	22
\$75,000 +	9	10%	29
Occupied Housing Units by Tenure			
Total	88	100%	77
Owner Occupied	47	53%	53
Renter Occupied	41	47%	66
Employed Population Age 16+ Years			
Total	183	100%	182
In Labor Force	84	46%	101
Civilian Unemployed in Labor Force	14	8%	36
Not In Labor Force	99	54%	156

Data Note: Detail may not sum to totals due to rounding. Hispanic population can be of any race. N/A means not available. Source: U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey (ACS) 2010 - 2014

*Households in which no one 11 and over speaks English "very well" or speaks English only



Location: User-specified polygonal location
 Ring (buffer): .0-mile radius
 Description: Havana Target Area

	2010 - 2014 ACS Estimates	Percent	MOE (±)
Population by Language Spoken at Home*			
Total (persons age 5 and above)	221	100%	204
English	N/A	N/A	N/A
Spanish	N/A	N/A	N/A
French	N/A	N/A	N/A
French Creole	N/A	N/A	N/A
Italian	N/A	N/A	N/A
Portuguese	N/A	N/A	N/A
German	N/A	N/A	N/A
Yiddish	N/A	N/A	N/A
Other West Germanic	N/A	N/A	N/A
Scandinavian	N/A	N/A	N/A
Greek	N/A	N/A	N/A
Russian	N/A	N/A	N/A
Polish	N/A	N/A	N/A
Serbo-Croatian	N/A	N/A	N/A
Other Slavic	N/A	N/A	N/A
Armenian	N/A	N/A	N/A
Persian	N/A	N/A	N/A
Gujarathi	N/A	N/A	N/A
Hindi	N/A	N/A	N/A
Urdu	N/A	N/A	N/A
Other Indic	N/A	N/A	N/A
Other Indo-European	N/A	N/A	N/A
Chinese	N/A	N/A	N/A
Japanese	N/A	N/A	N/A
Korean	N/A	N/A	N/A
Mon-Khmer, Cambodian	N/A	N/A	N/A
Hmong	N/A	N/A	N/A
Thai	N/A	N/A	N/A
Laotian	N/A	N/A	N/A
Vietnamese	N/A	N/A	N/A
Other Asian	N/A	N/A	N/A
Tagalog	N/A	N/A	N/A
Other Pacific Island	N/A	N/A	N/A
Navajo	N/A	N/A	N/A
Other Native American	N/A	N/A	N/A
Hungarian	N/A	N/A	N/A
Arabic	N/A	N/A	N/A
Hebrew	N/A	N/A	N/A
African	N/A	N/A	N/A
Other and non-specified	N/A	N/A	N/A
Total Non-English	N/A	N/A	N/A

Data Note: Detail may not sum to totals due to rounding. Hispanic population can be of any race. N/A means not available. **Source:** U.S. Census Bureau, American Community Survey (ACS) 2010 - 2014.

*Population by Language Spoken at Home is available at the census tract summary level and up.



Western Illinois Regional Council

Providing Community Development for Over 30 Years

RECEIVED NOV 16 2016

November 14, 2016

Kirk Kumerow
Community Development – CDBG
500 East Monroe Street Room 208
Springfield, IL 62701

Re: Havana 15-243004

Enclosed please find the Request for Release of Funds for Havana's Housing Rehabilitation Grant. Also included is the required Environmental Review paperwork.

Should you have any questions regarding the above, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

Jeff Cozadd
Housing Programs Manager