

PUBLIC NOTICE
Trustees Issue Draft Restoration Plan and Environmental Assessment

On July 1, 2015 the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service, on behalf of the Natural Resource Trustees, issued a Draft Restoration Plan and Environmental Assessment for the Yeoman Creek Landfill Superfund Site located in Waukegan, Lake County, Illinois and the Kerr-McGee Kress Creek/West Branch DuPage River Superfund Site located in West Chicago, DuPage County, Illinois. The Plan addresses restoration for natural resources injured due to releases of hazardous substances from these sites. Comments will be accepted through July 30, 2015 and may be submitted to U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 1250 S. Grove, Suite 103, Barrington, IL, 60010; or by electronic mail to edward_karecki@fws.gov.

DRAFT RESTORATION PLAN

AND

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

FOR THE

YEOMAN CREEK LANDFILL SUPERFUND SITE

AND

**KERR-MCGEE KRESS CREEK/WEST BRANCH DUPAGE RIVER
SUPERFUND SITE**

Prepared by:

U.S. Department of the Interior
Fish and Wildlife Service
In cooperation with
National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration

July 2015

CONTENTS

Section

1.0	INTRODUCTION	1
1.1	Trustee Responsibilities	1
1.2	Summary of the Settlement	2
1.3	Summary of Hazardous Substance Release and Injury	2
1.4	Restoration Goals	3
1.5	Need for Restoration	4
1.6	Compliance with Other Authorities	4
1.6.1	Clean Water Act.....	4
1.6.2	Fish and Wildlife Conservation Act	4
1.6.3	Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act.....	4
1.6.4	Migratory Bird Treaty Act.....	4
1.6.5	National Environmental Policy Act	5
1.6.6	Endangered Species Act	5
1.6.7	National Wildlife Refuge System Administration Act.....	5
1.6.8	National Wildlife Refuge System Improvement Act of 1997	5
1.7	Coordination and Scoping	5
1.7.1	Public Notification	6
1.7.2	Public Meetings and Summary of Scoping	6
1.7.3	Responsible Party Involvement.....	6
1.7.4	Administrative Record	6
2.0	PROPOSED RESTORATION ACTION/PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE	7
2.1	Criteria for Identifying and Selecting the Proposed Restoration Action/Preferred Alternative.....	7
2.2	Description of the Alternatives	7
2.2.1	Alternative A: No Action.....	8
2.2.2	Alternative B: On-Site Restoration.....	8
2.2.3	Alternative C: Off-Site Restoration (Preferred).....	8
3.0	AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT	8
4.0	ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES OF THE ALTERNATIVES.....	9
4.1	Evaluation of Alternative A (No Action).....	9
4.2	Evaluation of Alternative B (On-Site).....	10
4.3	Evaluation of Alternative C (Preferred).....	10
4.4	Table Comparison of Restoration Actions by Alternative	11
4.5	Table Comparison of Alternatives by Restoration Criteria.....	11

5.0	LEAD OFFICE.....	12
6.0	LIST OF AGENCIES, ORGANIZATIONS, AND PARTIES CONSULTED FOR INFORMATION	12
7.0	PUBLIC COMMENTS AND TRUSTEE RESPONSES.....	12
7.1	Public Comments	12
7.2	Trustee Responses to Public Comments	12
8.0	LITERATURE CITED	13

ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

CERCLA	Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
CWA	Clean Water Act
DOC	U.S. Department of Commerce
DOI	U.S. Department of the Interior
EA	Environmental Assessment
EIS	Environmental Impact Statement
EPA	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
FONSI	Finding of No Significant Impact
FWS	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
IDNR	Illinois Department of Natural Resources
IEPA	Illinois Environmental Protection Agency
KMS	Kerr-McGee Kress Creek/West Branch DuPage River Superfund Site
MBTA	Migratory Bird Treaty Act
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
NPDES	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
NRDA	Natural Resource Damage Assessment
NRDAR	Natural Resource Damage Assessment and Restoration
ROD	Record of Decision
RP	Restoration Plan
RP/EA	Restoration Plan/Environmental Assessment
USC	United States Code
YCL	Yeoman Creek Landfill Superfund Site

1.0 INTRODUCTION

This draft Restoration Plan and Environmental Assessment (RP/EA) presents and evaluates proposed restoration actions to address natural resources injured or lost due to the release of hazardous substances from the Yeoman Creek Landfill Superfund Site (YCL) and Kerr-McGee Kress Creek/West Branch DuPage River Superfund Site (KMS). The YCL is located in Waukegan, Lake County, Illinois. The KMS is located near West Chicago, DuPage County, Illinois.

In 2007, a settlement agreement for the YCL was reached between the responsible parties (Browning-Ferris Industries LLC; BFI Waste Systems of North America Inc.; the City of Waukegan, Illinois; Abbott Laboratories; Waukegan Community School District No. 60; the Goodyear Tire & Rubber Company; and Invitrogen Corporation) and the United States Department of the Interior (DOI), the United States Department of Commerce (DOC), the Illinois Department of Natural Resources (IDNR) and the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency (IEPA) to resolve claims under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA). The claim alleged that the release of hazardous substances from the site caused injury to natural resources.

In 2005, a settlement agreement for the KMS was reached between the responsible party (Kerr-McGee Chemical LLC) and the DOI, the IDNR and the IEPA to resolve claims under CERCLA. The claim alleged that the release of hazardous substances from the site caused injury to natural resources.

The purpose of this RP/EA is to document the selected restoration alternative that will restore, rehabilitate, replace, or acquire the equivalent natural resources (and services provided by those resources) that approximate those injured as a result of the hazardous substance release.

1.1 Trustee Responsibilities

Under CERCLA, Federal agencies that administer natural resources, states, and federally-recognized Indian tribes are designated as natural resource trustees for those natural resources under their statutory authorities and responsibilities. These designated natural resource trustees have the responsibility to restore, rehabilitate, replace, or acquire the equivalent of natural resources injured as a result of a hazardous substance release.

The trustees at the YCL are the DOI, DOC, IDNR and IEPA. The trustees at the KMS are the DOI, IDNR and IEPA. For the purpose of these incidents, the Region 3 Regional Director of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) has been designated as DOI's authorized official, to act as the natural resource trustee on behalf of the DOI Secretary. The DOC has designated the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) to act as the natural resource trustee on behalf of the DOC Secretary.

The trustees are responsible for the development of a restoration plan, and for the implementation and oversight of activities aimed at restoring natural resources injured by the release of hazardous substances from the YCL and KMS. As lead administrative

natural resource trustee, FWS is also responsible for administering the natural resource injury-related settlement funds and soliciting public input into the restoration process.

Under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), FWS and NOAA must also assess the potential environmental impacts associated with the proposed restoration actions. Therefore, the requirements of a restoration plan and a NEPA environmental analysis are combined in this RP/EA document.

1.2 Summary of the Settlement

A Consent Decree was filed with the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Illinois, by the United States; State of Illinois; Browning-Ferris Industries LLC; BFI Waste Systems of North America Inc.; the City of Waukegan, Illinois; Abbott Laboratories; Waukegan Community School District No. 60; the Goodyear Tire & Rubber Company; and Invitrogen Corporation April 4, 2007. The portion of the Consent Decree dealing with settlement of Trustee's natural resource damage claims required the settling defendants to pay \$200,000 to the DOI NRDAR Fund to pay for Trustee sponsored natural resource restoration projects. Under the Natural Resource Damage Assessment (NRDA) provisions of CERCLA, these funds will be used to restore, replace, or acquire the equivalent of the injured natural resources.

A Consent Decree was filed with the U.S. District Court for the Northern District of Illinois, by the United States, the Attorney General of the State of Illinois, and Kerr-McGee Chemical LLC in 2005. The portion of the Consent Decree dealing with settlement of Trustee's natural resource damage claims required the settling defendant to pay \$200,000 to the DOI NRDAR Fund to pay for Trustee sponsored natural resource restoration projects. Under the Natural Resource Damage Assessment (NRDA) provisions of CERCLA, these funds will be used to restore, replace, or acquire the equivalent of the injured natural resources.

1.3 Summary of Hazardous Substance Release and Injury

The YCL is located in Waukegan, Lake County, Illinois southeast of the intersection of Sunset Avenue/Golf Road and Lewis Avenue. The site is approximately 70 acres in size. The site operated as a landfill from 1959 to 1969. The landfill has no bottom liner, and the underlying soils are permeable. Leachate from the landfill contains volatile organic compounds ("VOCs"), polychlorinated biphenyls ("PCBs"), bis(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate, and elevated concentrations of lead, manganese, iron, chloride, and ammonia. Some groundwater samples contained low concentrations of VOCs, bis(2-ethylhexyl) phthalate, and elevated concentrations of lead, chloride, and ammonia. Leachate from the site entered Yeoman Creek and adjacent wetlands. Sediments from Yeoman Creek at the landfill, and farther downstream at Yeoman Park, contain PCBs and other organic chemicals. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) placed the YCL on the National Priorities (Superfund) List on March 31, 1989 (EPA 2011).

The YCL is located within the drainage basin of the Waukegan River and its tributary, Yeoman Creek, flows adjacent to the site. The Waukegan River discharges to Lake Michigan approximately 2.7 miles from the site. The landfill is bordered by palustrine

emergent wetlands totaling approximately 105 acres. The YCL and surrounding area provides habitat that supports a variety of migratory birds. A cursory survey conducted by the FWS identified more than 11 species of migratory birds including waterfowl, songbirds and herons using the site. Yeoman Creek and the Waukegan River provide habitat for freshwater fish, including fish that migrate from Lake Michigan. Injury to these trust resources occurred as a result of the release of hazardous substances from the site.

The KMS is located in West Chicago, DuPage County, Illinois and includes almost seven miles of creek and river sediment, banks and floodplain soils contaminated with radioactive thorium residue. The Kress Creek site includes about a mile and a half of Kress Creek stretching from a storm sewer outlet to where the creek empties into the West Branch DuPage River. From there the site stretches about five miles down the West Branch DuPage River past the Warrenville Dam to the McDowell Dam. The waste was generated by a processing facility that operated in West Chicago between 1932 and 1973. The facility was originally owned by Lindsay Light and Chemical Co. but changed ownership several times. Kerr-McGee owned and operated the facility from 1967 to 1973 when it closed the plant. Thorium and other elements were separated from ores at the plant using an acid process. This process created waste materials known as mill tailings that were stored at the facility. Wastes from the facility entered Kress Creek through a storm sewer, contaminating sediments in the creek and the West Branch DuPage River. The thorium was also deposited onto floodplains during high water periods. Waste from the facility was also used as fill material at a sewage treatment plant and eroded into the West Branch DuPage River. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency placed the KMS on the National Priorities (Superfund) List in 1990 (sewage treatment plant) and 1991 (creek and river) (EPA 2014).

The KMS is located within the drainage basin of the West Branch DuPage River, which flows through the site. Kress Creek and adjacent wetlands and uplands provide habitat that supports a variety of migratory birds including waterfowl, songbirds and other wildlife. Injury to these trust resources occurred as a result of the release of hazardous substances from the site.

1.4 Restoration Goals

The purpose of the proposed restoration actions are to restore, rehabilitate, replace, or acquire the equivalent of trust resources (migratory birds, fish and other wildlife and their supporting habitat) that were injured or destroyed by the hazardous substance release from the YCL and KMS pursuant to applicable federal and state laws and regulations.

1.5 Need for Restoration

The proposed restoration actions are needed to facilitate the restoration and recovery of natural resources injured by the hazardous substance releases.

1.6 Compliance with Other Authorities

The following environmental laws, regulations, and executive orders were considered in the restoration planning process because they may impose limits or standards for restoration completion.

1.6.1 Clean Water Act

The Clean Water Act, 33 USC 1251, et seq., is the principal law governing pollution control and water quality of the nation's waterways. Section 404 of the law authorizes the permit program that allows for the disposal of dredged or fill material into navigable waters. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers administers this program. Restoration projects that move material into or out of waters or wetlands require individual Section 404 permits or may be addressed under nationwide permits.

1.6.2 Fish and Wildlife Conservation Act

The Fish and Wildlife Conservation Act, 16 USC 2901-2911, authorizes federal financial and technical assistance to the states for the development, revision, and implementation of conservation plans and programs for nongame fish and wildlife.

1.6.3 Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act

The Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act, 16 USC 661, et seq., states that wildlife conservation shall receive equal consideration with other features of water resource development. The Act requires federal permitting and licensing agencies to consult with the FWS and state wildlife agencies before permitting any activity that in any way modifies any body of water to minimize the adverse impacts of such actions on fish and wildlife resources and habitat.

1.6.4 Migratory Bird Treaty Act

The Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA), 16 USC 715, et seq., provides for the protection of migratory birds. The MBTA may be used to consider time of year restrictions for construction activities on sites where it is likely migratory birds may be nesting, and to stipulate maintenance schedules that would avoid disturbances during the nesting seasons of migratory birds.

1.6.5 National Environmental Policy Act

The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), 42 USC 4321 *et seq.*, established a national policy for the protection of the environment. NEPA applies to all major federal agency actions that affect the human environment. Federal agencies are obligated to comply with NEPA regulations issued by the Council on Environmental Quality. NEPA requires that for activities not categorically excluded, an analysis be conducted to determine whether proposed actions will have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment. If an impact is considered significant, then an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) is prepared and a Record of Decision (ROD) is issued. If the impact is considered not significant, then an Environmental Assessment is prepared and a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) is issued.

1.6.6 Endangered Species Act

The purpose of the Endangered Species Act (ESA) is to protect and recover imperiled species and the ecosystems upon which they depend. It is administered by the Interior Department's U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) and the Commerce Department's National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS). Section 7 of the Act requires agencies to consult with the FWS and NMFS, as appropriate, on actions that may affect federally listed species.

1.6.7 National Wildlife Refuge System Administration Act

The 1966 Act provides guidelines and directives for administration and management of all areas in the system, including "wildlife refuges, areas for the protection and conservation of fish and wildlife that are threatened with extinction, wildlife ranges, game ranges, wildlife management areas, or waterfowl production areas."

1.6.8 National Wildlife Refuge System Improvement Act of 1997

Public Law 105-57, approved October 9, 1997, (111 Stat. 1253) gives guidance to the Secretary of the Interior for the overall management of the Refuge System. The Act's main components include: a strong and singular wildlife conservation mission for the Refuge System; a requirement that the Secretary of the Interior maintain the biological integrity, diversity and environmental health of the Refuge System; a new process for determining compatible uses of refuges; a recognition that wildlife-dependent recreational uses involving hunting, fishing, wildlife observation and photography, and environmental education and interpretation, when determined to be compatible, are legitimate and appropriate public uses of the Refuge System; that these compatible wildlife-dependent recreational uses are the priority general public uses of the Refuge System; and a requirement for preparing comprehensive conservation plans.

1.7 Coordination and Scoping

A proposed restoration site will be identified cooperatively by the federal and state Trustees. The project acquisition and restoration cost will be funded from the DOI

NRDAR fund. The USFWS will own and manage the site as a national wildlife refuge. The site will be open for refuge compatible public recreation including wildlife observation, hunting and fishing.

1.7.1 Public Notification

Under the CERCLA NRDA regulations and NEPA, the natural resource trustees shall notify the public and any federal, state, and local government agencies that may have an interest in the activities analyzed in the RP/EA. A notice of the availability of the draft RP/EA will be published in the following local newspaper:

The Daily Herald
155 E Algonquin Road
Arlington Heights, IL 60005

Copies of the draft RP/EA will be made available at the following location:

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Chicago Field Office
1250 S. Grove, Suite 103
Barrington, IL 60010

The public comment period will be 30 days. Parties to whom comments may be sent, and the due date for receipt of comments, will be published in the notice of availability of the draft RP/EA.

1.7.2 Public Meetings and Summary of Scoping

A public meeting will be scheduled if sufficient interest exists as determined by the public comments received on this draft RP/EA. If a public meeting is scheduled, notice will be provided in the same newspaper listed in Section 1.7.1.

1.7.3 Responsible Party Involvement

The responsible parties will not participate in restoration planning and implementation.

1.7.4 Administrative Record

The administrative record contains the official documents pertaining to the YCL and KMS case settlements, restoration planning, and restoration implementation. The administrative record for this case is housed at the FWS Chicago Field Office, 1250 S. Grove, Suite 103, Barrington, IL 60010.

2.0 PROPOSED RESTORATION ACTION/PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE

The purpose of this section is to describe each of the proposed restoration actions, identify the preferred alternative, and describe the environmental effects of each alternative.

2.1 Criteria for Identifying and Selecting the Proposed Restoration Action/Preferred Alternative

The primary restoration goal is to restore, rehabilitate, replace, or acquire fish and wildlife supporting habitats that were injured or destroyed by the hazardous substance releases from the YCL and KMS.

Drawing upon the factors within the DOI NRDA regulations and DOI policy for selecting a restoration alternative, a preferred restoration alternative was selected based on relevant considerations, including general consideration of the following factors:

- Technical feasibility.
- Relationship of the expected costs of the proposed actions to the expected benefits from the restoration, rehabilitation, replacement, or acquisition of equivalent resources.
- Cost-effectiveness.
- Potential for additional injury resulting from the proposed actions, including long-term and indirect impacts to the injured resources or other resources.
- Ability of the resources to recover with or without the alternative actions.
- Potential effects of the action on human health and safety.
- Consistency with relevant federal and state policies.
- Compliance with applicable federal and state laws.
- Public access and potential for fish and wildlife based recreation.

The preferred restoration alternative described in this RP/EA is based on conceptual plans for which some costs have been estimated. The size and design of the recommended restoration actions may change based on additional scientific findings or other factors. If, during implementation, it is determined that significant changes to the selected restoration alternative are needed, additional public review and comment will be sought, as appropriate. No restoration activities will be conducted that would incur ongoing expenses to the trustee agencies in excess of those than can be funded by settlement monies.

2.2 Description of the Alternatives

The alternatives considered, including the no action and preferred, are discussed in this section.

2.2.1 Alternative A: No Action Alternative

A no action alternative is considered to fulfill requirements under NEPA, and is consistent with the damage assessment process under the CERCLA NRDA regulations. Under this alternative, no action would be taken to restore migratory birds, wildlife and fish and their supporting habitats that were injured from hazardous substance releases to Yeoman Creek, Kress Creek, West Branch DuPage River and adjacent wetlands and uplands, or to replace or acquire the equivalent of the ecological resources lost. The underlying assumption of this alternative is that adequate numbers and diversity of migratory bird species, fish and other wildlife are present within the geographic area, and given adequate time and a stable habitat, recovery of the resources and resource function would occur. This assumption would be completely dependent upon natural processes.

2.2.2 Alternative B: On-Site Restoration

This alternative involves restoring the river, creeks and associated wetlands and uplands at the YCL and KMS Sites. Wetlands at the YCL have been affected by landfilling activities. On site restoration would restore the riverine habitat and associated wetlands and uplands.

2.2.3 Alternative C: Off-Site Acquisition and Restoration at Hackmatack National Wildlife Refuge (Preferred Alternative)

This alternative involves acquiring land that contains riverine habitat and wetlands in McHenry County, Illinois and restoring them to provide increased habitat value for fish and wildlife. The purchased property would become part of the Hackmatack National Wildlife Refuge and be managed to provide optimal fish and wildlife habitat. The restoration area is located approximately 25 miles west of the YCL and 35 miles north of the KMS. The selected site will provide opportunities for wildlife based public recreation, including wildlife observation, hunting and fishing.

3.0 AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT AT ALTERNATIVE C

McHenry County contains a mix of urban and rural/agricultural areas in northeastern Illinois. The Nippersink Creek and Kishwaukee River Basins are located within the Illinois River watershed. Historically, the Illinois River and associated wetlands and uplands provided abundant migratory bird habitat. Although much of the habitat has been lost, the basin still provides a diverse complex of wetland, riparian and upland habitat types. These habitats provide important breeding and resting habitat for migratory birds. McHenry County's rivers and streams represent some of the highest quality stream resources in northeastern Illinois. According to the IEPA and the IDNR, most of these freshwater resources maintain healthy aquatic systems with biological integrity ratings of Class A or B (on a scale of A to E, with A being highest quality). The Kishwaukee River and Nippersink Creek, are examples of these high-quality streams. The waters of Nippersink Creek and its tributary streams, as well as the numerous glacial

lakes within the watershed, support eighteen fish species of critical or greatest conservation need including the Iowa darter, blacknose shiner, blackchin shiner, starhead topminnow, banded killifish, bowfin, lake chubsucker, river redhorse, redbfin shiner, large scale stoneroller, mottled sculpin, southern redbelly dace, blacknose dace, brook stickleback, brown bullhead, American brook lamprey, central mudminnow, and pugnose shiner. Additionally, these same aquatic resources also support eight mussel species identified as critical in the Illinois Wildlife Action Plan. These eight, the creek heelsplitter, rainbow, black sandshell, slippershell, spike, fluted shell, ellipse and purple wartyback are among 22 varieties of native mussels found in the Nippersink Creek watershed in Illinois (FWS 2012).

4.0 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES OF THE ALTERNATIVES

In accordance with NEPA, this RP/EA has been prepared to analyze the impacts of the alternatives considered, select a preferred alternative, and determine whether the preferred restoration alternative is expected to have a significant effect on the quality of the environment. If a significant effect is expected, an environmental impact statement (EIS) must be prepared. If no significant effects are expected from the proposed restoration alternative, the NEPA process concludes with the environmental assessment and issuance of a finding of no significant impact (FONSI).

In analyzing the potential significance of a proposed project, federal agencies must consider: (1) the nature of the impacts and whether they are beneficial or detrimental; (2) impacts on public health and safety; (3) unique characteristics of the geographic area of the project; (4) whether the project is likely to generate controversy; (5) whether the project involves uncertain impacts or unknown risks; (6) the type of precedent created by implementing the project; (7) cumulative impacts of the proposed action with known other future actions; (8) impacts on nationally significant cultural, scientific, or historic resources; (9) impacts on threatened or endangered species or their habitats; and (10) potential violations of federal, state, or local environmental protection laws.

4.1 Evaluation of Alternative A: No Action Alternative

The no action alternative relies on natural recovery to restore injured resources and the services provided by those resources and would not create additional injuries. This alternative would not restore migratory bird habitats that have been permanently destroyed by engineered controls at the sites or injured by hazardous substance releases. The resources permanently impacted by engineered landfill controls would not recover in the foreseeable future. This alternative is technically feasible but would not compensate the public for lost use of resources during the period of injury. There are no costs associated with this alternative and the expected benefits are low. This alternative has no impacts on human health and safety. This proposal is not consistent with relevant federal and state policies regarding restoration of injured natural resources. This alternative complies with federal and state laws. This proposal does not provide any public access or potential for fish and wildlife based recreation.

4.2 Evaluation of Alternative B: On-Site Restoration

The presence of landfill caps and residual contamination in soil and groundwater limits the potential restoration options at YCL. There is also the potential for residual contamination or future pollutant releases to cause injury to trust resources using on site habitats. This alternative is not technically feasible because some of the wetlands and creek habitat have been permanently destroyed by construction of landfill caps and cannot be fully restored. Resources permanently impacted by engineered controls would not recover in the foreseeable future and limited potential exists for expanding existing resources on site. At the KMS most of Kress Creek and West Branch DuPage River has been restored following removal of contamination, thereby limiting additional restoration options. There are no acquisition costs associated with this alternative. This alternative has no impacts on human health and safety. This proposal is not consistent with relevant federal and state policies regarding restoration of injured natural resources because sufficient restoration potential does not exist on site. This alternative complies with federal and state laws. This proposal does not provide suitable public access or potential for fish and wildlife based recreation because of the presence of a hazardous waste landfill.

4.3 Evaluation of Alternative C: Off-Site Acquisition and Restoration at Hackmatack National Wildlife Refuge (preferred alternative)

Off-site restoration provides several benefits that are not present in the other alternatives. Implementing this alternative would result in increased water quality and restore and permanently protect fish and wildlife habitat. This project will restore fish and wildlife habitat along the riparian corridor of Nippersink Creek or the Kishwaukee River in McHenry County, Illinois. This area is dominated by agricultural land use and injured trust resources will benefit from habitat restoration and protection. The FWS will hold title and assume management responsibilities for the site.

This alternative is technically feasible. There is low potential for additional injury resulting from this proposed action. This alternative has no impacts on human health and safety. This proposal is consistent with relevant federal and state policies regarding restoration of injured natural resources. This alternative complies with federal and state laws. This proposal provides suitable public access and potential for fish and wildlife based recreation.

4.4 Comparison of Habitat Restoration Actions by Alternative

Alternative	Opportunity to Increase Habitat	Cost per Acre	Probability for Success
A - No Action	None	N/A	Low
B – On Site Restoration	Low	High	Moderate
C - Off Site Hackmatack NWR	High	Moderate	High

4.5 Comparison of Alternatives by Restoration Criteria

Alternative	Technical Feasibility	Cost Effectiveness	Injury Potential	Recovery Without Action	Public Health Protection	Policy Consistency	Compliance with Laws	Public Use
A - No Action	Yes	Yes	Low	Low	Yes	No	Yes	No
B – On Site Restoration	No	No	Moderate	Low	Yes	Yes	Yes	Low
C - Off Site Hackmatack NWR	Yes	Yes	Low	Low	Yes	Yes	Yes	High

5.0 LEAD OFFICE

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Chicago Field Office
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
1250 S. Grove, Suite 103, Barrington, IL 60010

6.0 LIST OF AGENCIES, ORGANIZATIONS, AND PARTIES CONSULTED FOR INFORMATION

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
Illinois Environmental Protection Agency
Illinois Department of Natural Resources

7.0 PUBLIC COMMENTS AND TRUSTEE RESPONSES

The trustees welcome input from the public in evaluating the likely success of the Proposed Action in making the environment and the public whole for losses suffered from the hazardous substance releases. Information currently available suggests that the proposed restoration project will not have a significant effect on the quality of the human environment. If no new substantive information is received during the public comment period that would change the evaluation of the restoration alternatives and the selection of the preferred alternative, then the NEPA process will conclude with a FONSI.

The final RP/EA will be available for public review and comment for 30 days from the date of publication of the notice of availability.

7.1 Public Comments

Comments that are received during the 30-day public comment period for this draft document will be presented in this section of the final RP/EA.

7.2 Trustee Responses to Public Comments

Responses to the public comments will be presented in this section of the final RP/EA.

8.0 LITERATURE CITED

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 2011. NPL Fact Sheet, Yeoman Creek Landfill

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 2014. Kerr-McGee Superfund Sites Website.
<http://www.epa.gov/region5/cleanup/kerrmcgee/index.htm>

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2012. Environmental Assessment for Proposed Hackmatack National Wildlife Refuge.