



**US Army Corps
of Engineers®**
Little Rock District

JORDAN CREEK FLOOD RISK MANAGEMENT STUDY SPRINGFIELD, MISSOURI

DRAFT FEASIBILITY REPORT AND ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

February 2013

Written in Conjunction with:



Page intentionally left blank

JORDAN CREEK FLOOD RISK MANAGEMENT STUDY

SPRINGFIELD, MISSOURI

Executive Summary

1 STUDY INFORMATION

The purpose of the report is to analyze flood risk management issues in Springfield, Missouri. The City of Springfield, Missouri (City), the non-Federal Sponsor, requested assistance from the Corps of Engineers to study and provide recommendations for reducing significant flood damages in and around Jordan Creek.

This report was prepared as an interim response to the White River Basin, Arkansas and Missouri Comprehensive Study Resolution passed on 11 May 1962 by the US Senate Committee on Public Works.

2 PROBLEM

The overall objective of the planning study is to improve flood risk management and improve the overall quality of life for the residents of Springfield, Missouri. The City experiences damages from flash floods because of insufficient flow capacity along Jordan Creek. The area along Jordan Creek is heavily urbanized and includes extensive infrastructure associated with both commercial and industrial areas.

Jordan Creek, Wilsons Creek, North Branch Jordan Creek and South Branch Jordan Creek are classic urban streams throughout most of their respective lengths. The upstream reaches of North and South Branch consist of grass ditches with small culverts capable of carrying only small frequent storm events through the surrounding residential neighborhoods. They flow through an industrial area and several college campuses into Jordan Creek, which includes concrete and natural channels, some regional detention and large-diameter culverts capable of conveying a 1/5 – 1/10 Annual Chance Exceedance (ACE). When large rainfall events occur, the water exceeds the channel capacity, and flows through the downtown over streets and through buildings moving with it the debris it picks up along the way.

The downstream portion of Jordan Creek is primarily natural channel with an assortment of conveyance improvements: bridges, culverts, utility crossings and grade control structures. Jordan Creek ultimately merges with Fassnight Creek to create Wilsons Creek. Substantial damage to the area occurs at about 1/10 – 1/25 ACE.

3 Plans Considered

The planning objectives are as follows:

- Reduce overall flood damages in the project area from 2020 to 2070.

- Reduce residual risk to property by removing properties from the floodplain in the project area from 2020 to 2070.
- Reduce risk to transportation and life, health and safety by reducing flood levels in the project area from 2020 to 2070.

A wide variety of management measures were developed that would address one or more of the planning objectives. These measures were then evaluated and screened. Fifteen plans that included one or more of the management measures were developed and considered. The plans were evaluated for cost efficiency and flood risk reduction effectiveness, which resulted in an array of four plans:

- No Action – This was used as a basis to determine how the other plans perform.
- Detention Basins Only Plan– This was the smallest plan presented. It included five detention basins in the upper reaches of the watershed.
- Plan G2 – This was the plan that provided the most residual risk reduction while still being cost effective. This plan included 1/500 ACE protection at the confluence with Wilsons Creek, 1/25 ACE through the downtown industrial area and detention basins in the upper reaches of the watershed. This was the local sponsor’s preferred plan.
- Plan J – This plan included 1/500 ACE protection at the confluence with Wilsons Creek and detention basins in the upper reaches of the watershed.

The National Economic Development (NED) Plan and Tentatively Selected Plan (TSP) are both Plan J.

4 PROJECT IMPACTS

Due to the highly developed, urban environment of the project footprint, the resulting environmental impacts are minimal. No compensatory mitigation is required. The lower reach has four Hazardous, Toxic or Radioactive Waste (HTRW) sites on three properties with suspected or documented environmental issues. Low range cost of cleanup is \$67,500 and the high range is \$1,340,000. Not all of the properties are in the actual construction footprint, so actual costs may be substantially lower. The City is working with the Missouri Department of Natural Resources on the HTRW issues and is required to provide a clean corridor for channel construction. There are no known cultural resource sites in the proposed channel construction footprint.

Construction of the proposed five detention basins, totaling approximately 36 surface acres, has the greatest environmental benefits. The proposed basins could provide ground water recharge.

5 Benefits and Costs

Plan J, as the TSP and NED plan, has an investment cost of \$20,610,800; an annual cost of \$1,153,100 (including operations, maintenance, repair, rehabilitation and replacement costs of \$234,400 per year); annual benefits of \$3,134,400; net benefits of \$1,981,300; and a benefit-to-cost ratio of 2.6 at an

interest rate of 3.75 percent. Including NED benefits upstream of the limit of Federal interest, the net benefits are \$1,981,300 with a benefit-to-cost ratio of 2.7.

The fully funded total project cost is estimated to be \$20,527,000 with a sponsor contribution of \$7,477,700 and a Federal contribution of \$13,049,260. The estimated cost of lands, easements, rights-of-way, relocations, and disposal areas (LERRD) is \$6,451,390. The sponsor's required cash contribution is \$1,026,350, and the sponsor is responsible for 100 percent of the Operations, Maintenance, Repair, Rehabilitation and Replacement (OMRR&R) costs.

6 Timeline

Public Review will end on March 4, 2013. After evaluation of comments received, Final Report and Civil Works Review Board will occur on May 31, 2013. The Chief's Report is August 29, 2013.

JORDAN CREEK FLOOD RISK MANAGEMENT STUDY

SPRINGFIELD, MISSOURI

Draft Integrated Feasibility Report and Environmental Assessment

Table of Contents

1	STUDY INFORMATION.....	1
1.1	PROBLEM DESCRIPTION.....	1
1.2	STUDY AUTHORITY	2
1.3	PURPOSE AND SCOPE (PURPOSE AND NEED)*	2
1.4	LOCATION OF THE STUDY AREA.....	3
1.5	HISTORY OF THE INVESTIGATION	4
1.6	PRIOR REPORTS AND EXISTING PROJECTS.....	4
1.7	PLANNING PROCESS AND REPORT ORGANIZATION	6
2	PROBLEM DESCRIPTION AND OBJECTIVES OF THE PROPOSED ACTION	7
2.1	NATIONAL OBJECTIVES	7
2.2	PUBLIC CONCERNS.....	7
2.3	PROBLEMS AND OPPORTUNITIES	7
2.4	EXISTING FLOODING	8
2.4.1	Historical Flooding	8
2.4.2	Flooding by Reach	10
2.4.3	Existing Flood Risk Management	16
2.4.4	Federal Interest.....	17
2.5	PLANNING OBJECTIVES	17
2.6	PLANNING CONSTRAINTS	18
3	ALTERNATIVES	19
3.1	PLAN FORMULATION RATIONALE.....	19
3.2	MANAGEMENT MEASURES TO ADDRESS IDENTIFIED PLANNING OBJECTIVES	19
3.2.1	Detention Basins (Flood Storage):	22
3.2.2	No Action Measure	24

3.2.3	Channel Modifications	24
3.2.4	Conclusions from Screening the Measures.....	24
3.3	PLAN FORMULATION AND EVALUATION	25
3.3.1	Iteration 1: Different Types of Plans	26
3.3.2	Iteration 2:	31
3.3.3	Iteration 3.....	35
3.3.4	Iteration 4.....	36
3.3.5	Formulation Criteria.....	40
3.3.6	Results of Plan Formulation and Evaluation	42
3.4	FINAL ARRAY OF PLANS COMPARISON	42
3.4.1	Planning Objective Matrix.....	42
3.4.2	Economic Viability of the Plans.....	44
3.4.3	Action Versus No Action	45
3.4.4	Risk and Uncertainty	45
3.4.5	Loss of Life.....	48
3.4.6	Environmental Considerations.....	48
3.4.7	Failure of the Project.....	48
3.4.8	System of Accounts.....	48
3.5	PLAN SELECTION	49
3.5.1	Rationale for Designation of the NED Plan	49
3.5.2	Rationale for Tentatively Selected Plan	49
3.6	DESCRIPTION OF THE TENTATIVELY SELECTED PLAN	49
3.6.1	Plan J Components.....	49
3.6.2	Design and Construction Considerations.....	50
3.6.3	Real Estate Requirements	51
3.6.4	Local Betterments	51
3.6.5	Operations, Maintenance, Repair, Rehabilitation and Replacement Considerations	51
3.6.6	Economic Summary.....	52
3.6.7	Sensitivity of the TSP to the Future Conditions	53
3.6.8	Environmental Compliance	53

3.7	IMPLEMENTATION REQUIREMENTS	55
3.7.1	Institutional Requirements	55
3.7.2	Cost Apportionment	56
3.7.3	Fully Funded Cost Estimate	56
3.7.4	Permits	56
3.7.5	Views of Non-Federal Sponsor	56
4	AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT*	57
4.1	ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING OF THE STUDY AREA	57
4.2	FLOODING	57
4.2.1	Flood Problem Overview	58
4.3	PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT	59
4.3.1	Land Use	59
4.4	CLIMATE	61
4.4.1	Topography, Physiography and Soils	62
4.5	WATER RESOURCES	63
4.5.1	Watershed Description	63
4.5.2	Groundwater and Public Water Sources	64
4.5.3	Water Quality	65
4.5.4	Wetlands	66
4.6	BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES	68
4.6.1	Vegetation	68
4.6.2	Fish and Wildlife	68
4.7	HAZARDOUS, TOXIC AND RADIOACTIVE WASTES	72
4.8	AIR QUALITY	72
4.9	NOISE	72
4.10	CULTURAL RESOURCES	72
4.10.1	Affected Environment	73
4.11	SOCIOECONOMIC	76
5	EFFECTS ON SIGNIFICANT RESOURCES*	78
5.1	PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT	79

Jordan Creek FRM Study, Springfield, MO
Draft Integrated Feasibility Report and Environmental Assessment

5.1.1	Land Use.....	79
5.1.2	Climate	79
5.1.3	Topography, Physiography and Soils	79
5.1.4	Water Resources	79
5.2	BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES.....	80
5.2.1	Vegetation.....	80
5.2.2	Wetlands	81
5.2.3	Fish and Wildlife.....	81
5.2.4	Threatened and Endangered Species	82
5.3	HAZARDOUS, TOXIC AND RADIOACTIVE WASTE	82
5.4	Air Quality	84
5.5	NOISE	84
5.6	CULTURAL RESOURCES	84
5.7	SOCIOECONOMIC RESOURCES.....	85
5.8	CONCLUSIONS OF ANALYSIS	85
6	PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT, REVIEW AND CONSULTATION*	86
6.1	PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT PROGRAM.....	86
6.2	INSTITUTIONAL INVOLVEMENT	86
6.2.1	Study Team	86
6.2.2	Agency Coordination.....	86
6.3	ADDITIONAL REQUIRED COORDINATION	87
6.4	PUBLIC VIEWS AND RESPONSES	87
6.4.1	Federal	87
6.4.2	State and Local Agencies.....	87
7	LIST OF PREPARERS.....	88
8	INDEX	89
9	RECOMMENDATIONS	90
10	Plates.....	94

Plates

Plate 1: Plan A	95
Plate 2: Plan B	95
Plate 3: Plan C	95
Plate 4: Plan D	95
Plate 5: Plan E.....	95
Plate 6: Plan F.....	95
Plate 7: Plan G	95
Plate 8: Plan G2	95
Plate 9: Plan H	95
Plate 10: Plan I.....	95
Plate 11: Plan J	95

Figures

Figure 1-1 - Study Location Map	3
Figure 1-2: July 2000 Flood: South Branch of Jordan Creek at Fremont Avenue.	4
Figure 2-1: Economic Reaches of Jordan Creek	9
Figure 2-2: Reach E1.....	10
Figure 2-3: Reach E2.....	11
Figure 2-4: Reach E3.....	12
Figure 2-5: Inundation Map in the 1/100 to 1/500 ACE in Reach E3.....	13
Figure 2-6: Reach E4.....	14
Figure 2-7: Reach E5.....	15
Figure 2-8: Reach E6.....	16
Figure 3-1: Plan Formulation Process	19
Figure 3-2: Preliminary Regional Detention Basins.....	22
Figure 3-3: Regional Detention Basins (Refined Analysis)	23
Figure 3-4: Iterations of Plan Formulation.....	25
Figure 3-5: Difference between Plan A and Plan B	31
Figure 4-1: Flooding on Sherman Street	58
Figure 4-2: Land Use Map	61
Figure 4-3: National Wetland Inventory Wetland Distribution	67
Figure 4-4: HTRW Assessment Areas	72
Figure 5-1: Plan G2 Cost Ranges for HTRW Remediation	83

Tables

Table 2-1: Bridges in Reach E2	12
Table 3-1: Measures Analyzed	20
Table 3-2: Outputs from Initial Evaluation.....	28
Table 3-3: Output from Second Round of Buyout Analysis	29
Table 3-4: Plan G2 Net Benefits and Costs.....	37
Table 3-5: Plan J Benefits and Costs by Reach	39
Table 3-6: Comparison of Plans	40
Table 3-7: Matrix of How Plans Met Objectives	43
Table 3-8: Final Array of Costs	44
Table 3-9: Summary of Residual Risks.....	46
Table 3-10: Summary of OMRR&R Costs for Plan J.....	52
Table 3-11: Economic Analysis for Plan J	53
Table 3-12: Status of Project with Applicable Laws and Statutes.....	54
Table 3-13: Project Schedule	55
Table 3-14: Cost Apportionment	56
Table 3-15: Cost Estimate by Feature Code.....	56
Table 4-1: Land Use Tables for Sub-Watersheds	60
Table 4-2: Relative Abundance and Some Characteristics of Soil Types Found in the Study Area.....	63
Table 4-3 - Jordan Creek Seasonal Fish Collections 2005-2006	69
Table 4-4: Wilsons Creek Seasonal Fish Collections 2005-2006	70
Table 4-5 - Metric Values for Stream Condition Indices	71
Table 4-6: Species/Habitats with Federal restrictions within two-mile buffer of project area	71
Table 4-7: Structures within the project area eligible for listing or listed in the National Register of Historic Places. Adapted from Jones et al. 2007	75
Table 4-8: 2010 Population Characteristics of Springfield, MO	77
Table 4-9: Population Change 2000-2010.....	77
Table 5-1: Summary of the Potential Effects of Plans G2, J and No Action	78

Appendices

Appendix A – Economic Analysis Appendix

Appendix B - Real Estate Plan

Appendix C – Engineering Appendix

The following Attachments are located on the Little Rock District Website.

Attachment A: Hydrology and Hydraulics Report

Attachment B: Cost Analysis, Construction Schedule and MCACES Cost Estimate

Attachment C: Cost & Schedule Risk Analysis

Attachment D: Hazardous Toxic and Radioactive Wastes

Appendix D – Draft Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI)

Appendix E – Response Letters

JORDAN CREEK FRM STUDY, *SPRINGFIELD MO* DRAFT FEASIBILITY REPORT AND ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

1 STUDY INFORMATION

The purpose of the report is to analyze flood risk management issues in Springfield, MO. The City of Springfield, MO (City) requested assistance from the US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) to study and provide recommendations for reducing significant flood damages around Jordan Creek.

1.1 PROBLEM DESCRIPTION

The overall objective of the planning study is to improve flood risk management and improve the overall quality of life for the residents of Springfield, Missouri. The City experiences damages from flash floods because of insufficient flow capacity and urbanization along Jordan Creek. The area along Jordan Creek is heavily urbanized and includes extensive infrastructure associated with both commercial and industrial development.

Jordan Creek, Wilsons Creek, North Branch Jordan Creek and South Branch Jordan Creek are classic urban streams throughout most of their respective lengths. The upstream reaches of North and South Branch consist of grass ditches with small culverts capable of carrying only small frequent storm events through the surrounding residential neighborhoods. They flow through an industrial area and a few universities into Jordan Creek which includes concrete and natural channels, some regional detention and large-diameter culverts capable of conveying a 1/5 – 1/10 Annual Chance Exceedance (ACE). When large rainfall events occur, the water exceeds the capacity of the enclosed channel and flows through the downtown over streets and through buildings moving with it the debris it picks up along the way.

The downstream portion of Jordan Creek is primarily natural channel with an assortment of conveyance improvements, bridges, culverts, utility crossings and grade control structures. Jordan Creek ultimately merges Fassnight Creek to create Wilsons Creek. Substantial damage to the area occurs at about 1/10 – 1/25 ACE.

1.2 STUDY AUTHORITY *

This report was prepared as an interim response to the White River Basin, Arkansas and Missouri Comprehensive Study Resolution passed on 11 May 1962 by the US Senate Committee on Public Works.

The resolution states the following:

Resolved by the Committee on Public Works of the United States Senate, that the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors, created under Section 3 of the River and Harbor Act, approved June 12, 1902, be and is hereby, requested to review the reports on the White River and Tributaries, Missouri and Arkansas, printed in House Document Numbered 499, Eighty-third Congress, second session, and other reports, with a view to determining the advisability of modifying the existing project at the present time, with particular reference to developing a comprehensive plan of improvement for the basin in the interest of flood-control, navigation, hydro-electric power development, water supply, and other purposes, coordinated with related land resources.

The Conference Report recommendation accompanying the Energy and Water Development Appropriations Act, 2002, Public Law 107-66, 12 November 2001, included \$100,000 for a General Investigation for Watershed Restoration for Springfield, Missouri.

The existing project refers to the dams in the White River Basin. The Flood Control Act of 1938 approved a comprehensive plan for flood control and other purposes on the White River Basin.

In response to the study authority, the Section 905(b) analysis was initiated 18 March 2002 with a meeting between the City of Springfield officials and the Little Rock District. A Reconnaissance Report, completed on 31 October 2002, recommended a feasibility study.

The approved Reconnaissance Report indicates a Federal interest in both flood risk management and aquatic ecosystem restoration. However, upon further analysis, it was determined that any aquatic ecosystem restoration benefits would be ancillary to the flood risk management benefits due to the objectives of the local sponsor.

The Federal Water Project Recreation Act of 1965 (Public Law 89-72), as amended, requires an agency to fully consider recreational features that may be associated with Federal flood risk management projects. Recreation features were considered but were eliminated due to cost.

1.3 PURPOSE AND SCOPE (PURPOSE AND NEED)*

The purpose of this report is to present the findings of a feasibility investigation that was conducted to determine if there was a Federal interest in providing flood risk management improvements along Jordan Creek in Springfield, Missouri. This report analyzes the problems and opportunities and expresses desired outcomes as planning objectives. Alternatives were then developed to address these objectives.

*Designates a Chapter that is traditionally found in an Environmental Assessment.

These alternatives include a plan of no action and various combinations of structural and nonstructural measures. The economic and environmental impacts of the alternatives were then evaluated and a feasible plan was tentatively selected. The report also presents details on USACE and sponsor participation needed to implement the plan. The report concludes with a recommendation for authorization.

1.4 LOCATION OF THE STUDY AREA

The study area is located within the White River Basin, extending approximately six miles along Jordan Creek. Jordan Creek, including North Branch and South Branch Jordan Creek, has a 13.75 square mile drainage basin. The project area is generally centered on the Chestnut Expressway between US Highway 65 to the east and US Highway 160 to the west in the northern half of the City of Springfield, Missouri. The study area (shown in Figure 1-1 - Study Location Map) includes Jordan Creek, North Branch Jordan Creek, South Branch Jordan Creek and the upstream portion of Wilsons Creek. Wilsons Creek is a tributary of the James River, which eventually flows into White River.




Figure 1-1 - Study Location Map

The upstream end of a project area in an urban setting starts at the limits of Federal interest, which is defined as the point on the creek at which flow of at least 800 cubic feet per second (cfs) at the 1/10 ACE occurs. Upstream of that point is considered a local drainage issue and benefits accrued upstream

*Designates a Chapter that is traditionally found in an Environmental Assessment.

of the limit of Federal interest are not used to justify Federal involvement. The red triangles in Figure 1-1 - Study Location Map designate the limits of Federal interest.

1.5 HISTORY OF THE INVESTIGATION

In July 2000, one of the most damaging floods on record in the watershed occurred. Six inches of rainfall fell (a majority of which fell in the first two hours), which resulted in floodwaters four to six feet deep in some places, damage to at least 124 homes, and displacement of more than 100 people with an estimated \$2 million in damages to public property alone. The picture in Figure 1-2 (courtesy of the City) was taken during the 2000 flood. It was a 1/100 to 1/50 ACE flood.



Figure 1-2: July 2000 Flood: South Branch of Jordan Creek at Fremont Avenue.

In response to the flood, the City requested a reconnaissance study, which was initiated on March 18, 2002. This phase of the study confirmed a Federal interest in continuing the study into the feasibility phase. The City, as the non-Federal sponsor (NFS), and USACE initiated the feasibility phase by signing a Feasibility Cost Sharing Agreement (FCSA) on May 12, 2004.

On 18 February 2011, Jordan Creek was chosen as a pilot study to help USACE transform the Pre-Authorization Study (Planning) Process. The USACE suggested that the study be a part of the pilot program to expedite the planning process and approval. The core principles of planning

will stay the same; however, USACE is evaluating ways to streamline the feasibility level analysis and decision making to deliver decisions in a more efficient manner. The USACE hopes to gain lessons learned from this study to apply nationwide to other studies.

1.6 PRIOR REPORTS AND EXISTING PROJECTS

A number of prior reports and studies by the USACE as well as other agencies were reviewed and utilized in this report as they relate to Jordan Creek. Information from the following documents was deemed the most significant to problem identification and plan formulation:

- Total Maximum Load, Wilsons and Jordan Creeks (MO 2375 and 3374), Christian Counties, Missouri. United States Environmental Protection Agency, Region 7. 2011
- Annual Report July 2008- June 2009. Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) Springfield, City of. 2009.

- Jordan Creek Baseline Water Quality Project. Missouri State University and Ozarks Environmental and Water Resource Institute, Final Report. March 2007.
- Springfield Urban Streams, Clear Creek, Jordan Creek, Wilson Creek and Galloway Creek, Greene County, Missouri. Missouri Department of Natural Resources, Biological Assessment Report. 2007
- Biological Assessment Report – Springfield Urban Streams – Clear Creek, Jordan Creek, Wilson Creek, and Galloway Creek, Greene County: March 2007: Missouri Department of Natural Resources. An assessment of urban stream biology, water quality and habitat to determine if the aquatic life protection designated use of Springfield urban streams was supported.
- Final Report to the City of Springfield on the Biological Assessment of Urban Streams II, Missouri State University. July 2005- June 2006.
- Jordan Creek – South Branch Sinkhole Assessment Project. SMU. Spring 2005. It is an evaluation of Sinkhole Flooding, Stability & Non-point Sources.
- Jordan Creek Baseline Water Quality Project. Ozarks Environmental and Water Resources Institute and Missouri State University, Aug 2004 – July 2005. This report provided baseline water quality trends for the upper Wilsons-Jordan Creek watershed.
- Hydrology and Hydraulics Report South Branch Jordan Creek – Box Culvert from National Avenue to Sherman Avenue. Harrington and Cortelyou. Dec 2004. This report sized an enclosed structure between National Avenue and Sherman Avenue.
- Missouri Department of Natural Resources. Semi-quantitative Macroinvertebrate Stream Bioassessment Project Procedure. MDNR-FSS-030. Missouri Department of Natural Resources, Environmental Services Program, P.O. Box 176, Jefferson City, Missouri 65102. 24 pp. 2003
- Stage 1, Reconnaissance Report (905(b) Analysis) for the Jordan Creek General Investigations Study. Little Rock District, Corps of Engineers. Oct 2002. This report identified potential projects within the Jordan Creek, Springfield, Missouri Watershed that have a potential Federal interest.
- Flood Insurance Study. City of Springfield, Missouri, 2002. The city revised the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) preliminary flood insurance studies. The city developed a detailed hydrologic and hydraulic model and used recent aerial photos, two-foot contours, and GIS technology to produce improved mapping.
- Brownfields Assessment Demonstration Pilot Jordan Valley Area-Wide Assessment, Springfield, Missouri. The Forrester Group. May 2002. This assessment was conducted on over 600 properties as a tool to prioritize and direct the future use of grant funds. The report includes a database list search, a historical Sanborn map review, a geographical information system (GIS), and a current assessment.
- Jordan Creek Greenway Preliminary Feasibility Study. Ozark Greenways, Inc. City of Springfield. Oct 2001. The report studies the feasibility of establishing a greenway from Boonville to Scenic streets of Jordan Creek as identified by Vision 20/20. The plan defines the corridor, analyzes existing conditions, identifies issues, and proposes alternatives for greenway development and amenities such as a trail, facilities, and landscaping. Jordan Creek is central to the proposed greenway system, which traverses Jordan Valley Park and the downtown area.
- Jordan Creek: Story of an Urban Stream, Watershed Committee of the Ozarks. Bullard, Loring Bullard. 2001. This paper provided a 200-year account of the history of Jordan Creek.
- Preliminary Report on Flood Damage Resulting From 7/12/2000 Rain Event. Wagner, Todd, P. E. 2000. Summary of the rainfall and flood damage that occurred during the July 12, 2000 flood.

- Major Rainfall Events of 2000 – Springfield, Missouri. Wagner, Todd P.E. 2000. This report summarized the rainfall events and flooding from the July 2000 rains.
- Flood Insurance Study, City of Springfield, Missouri, FEMA. Michael Baker, Jr., Inc. June 2000. This study revised and updated the previous Flood Insurance Study/Flood Insurance Rate Map for Springfield, Greene, and Christian counties, Missouri. The information was used to update existing floodplain regulations and further promote sound land use and floodplain development.
- Springfield-Greene County Comprehensive Plan, Parks, Open Space, and Greenways Plan Element, Vision 20/20, Creating the Future. Sept 1998. This plan was in response to traffic congestion, rapidly diminishing natural resources and increasing urban development in Springfield, Missouri. The goal is to create a safe, accessible, comprehensive system of parks, open space and greenways with sufficient land and facilities that unite public and private areas while preserving the environment.
- James River – Wilsons Creek Study, Springfield, Missouri. US Department of the Interior. June 1969. The purpose of this study was to assess pollution problems associated with fish kills, storm runoff and odorous and unsightly conditions in Wilsons Creek. The project included measurements of physical and chemical parameters, biological studies, and a groundwater study.
- Floodplain Information, Wilsons Creek and Tributaries, Springfield, Missouri, Part I. US Army Corps of Engineers, Little Rock District. Nov 1968. This report provided information relative to areas that are subject to flooding in and near Springfield, as well as the frequency and depths of the flooding. The flood information was based on historic and technical records for this area.
- Comprehensive Storm Water Report, Crawford Murphy Tilly. City of Springfield. 1964. This report contained analysis and proposed improvements for all of the watersheds in Springfield. Recommended criteria for detailed design of drainage facilities was also included.

1.7 PLANNING PROCESS AND REPORT ORGANIZATION

The planning process consists of six major steps: (1) Specification of water and related land resources problems and opportunities; (2) Inventory, forecast and analysis of water and related land resources conditions within the study area; (3) Formulation of alternative plans; (4) Evaluation of the effects of the alternative plans; (5) Comparison of the alternative plans; and (6) Selection of the recommended plan based upon the comparison of the alternative plans. The chapter headings and order in this report generally follow the outline of an Environmental Assessment (EA). Chapters of the report relate to the six steps of the planning process as follows:

- The second chapter of this report, Problem Description and Objectives of the Proposed Action, covers the first step in the planning process (Specification of water and related land resources problems and opportunities).
- The third chapter of this report, Alternatives, is the heart of the report and is therefore placed before the more detailed discussions of resources and impacts. It covers the third step in the planning process (Formulation of alternatives), the fifth step in the planning process (Comparison of alternative plans), and the sixth step of the planning process (Selection of the recommended plan based upon the comparison of the alternative plans).

- The fourth chapter of this report, Affected Environment, covers the second step of the planning process (Inventory, forecast and analysis of water and related land resources in the study area).
- The fifth chapter of this report, Affects on Environmental Resources, covers the fourth step of the planning process (Evaluation of the effects of the alternative plans).

This report was written as a part of a pilot project. Information contained in the report shows the decision-making process. For more information on the detailed analysis, please refer to the appendices.

2 PROBLEM DESCRIPTION AND OBJECTIVES OF THE PROPOSED ACTION

This chapter presents the results of the first step of the planning process, the specification of water and related land resources problems and opportunities in the study area. The chapter concludes with the establishment of planning objectives and planning constraints, which is the basis for the formulation of alternative plans.

2.1 NATIONAL OBJECTIVES

The national or Federal objective of water and related land resources planning is to contribute to national economic development. In addition, it must be consistent with protecting the nation's environment, pursuant to national environmental statutes, with applicable executive orders, and with other Federal planning requirements. Contributions to National Economic Development (NED) are increases in the net value of the national output of goods and services, expressed in monetary units. Contributions to NED are the direct net benefits that accrue in the planning area and in the rest of the nation.

2.2 PUBLIC CONCERNS

A number of public concerns were identified during the course of the study. Initial concerns were expressed in the study authorization. Additional input was received through coordination with the sponsor and other agencies through public meetings. A discussion of public involvement is included in Chapter 6, Public Involvement, Review and Consultation. The public concerns that were related to the establishment of planning objectives and planning constraints are:

- Flood damage losses to private, commercial, light industrial and public property
- Inadequate flood risk management near Jordan Valley Park
- The loss of aquatic life due to poor water quality
- Lack of recreational opportunities in the study area

2.3 PROBLEMS AND OPPORTUNITIES

This section describes the needs in the context of problems and opportunities that can be addressed through water and related land resource management. The problems and opportunities are based upon the project conditions that are described in Chapter 4, Affected Environment.

The primary problem this study is addressing is flooding along the Jordan Creek corridor; however, the opportunity exists to address aquatic ecosystem degradation factors.

Jordan Creek is an urban stream that is prone to flash flooding. The time to peak flood heights for a critical 1-hour storm is 30 minutes. This means, that almost simultaneously, the water is rising in the urban areas as the rain is falling. The flooding events are quick and unpredictable, preventing the City from constructing a flood warning system. The water backs up along the creek and spreads throughout the floodplain rapidly. During large flood events, the City has to block busy thoroughfares inhibiting the delivery of police, fire and street department resources to occupants. An opportunity exists to implement a flood risk management system that uses both structural and nonstructural measures.

Over the last decade, Springfield has had a flood that causes significant damage to its downtown and its infrastructure every few years. From the existing conditions modeling, it is estimated that the flows through downtown are between five and six feet deep with a velocity of about six feet per second. At this velocity, it takes less than 14-inches of water to push a full size truck off the road. There exists an opportunity to reduce damage to the existing buildings and contents as well as damage to infrastructure within the floodplain.

Another problem, directly related to channel design, is the ecological condition of Jordan Creek. There is little instream habitat in Jordan Creek because a majority of the creek is a concrete-lined channel. An opportunity exists to remove concrete in the channel and reduce total flow for frequent storm events. Removing concrete in the channel increases residence time, allows contact of storm water with sunlight and vegetation and allows the natural stream processes to improve water quality and aquatic habitat.

The existing trail system within the City does not provide the public suitable access to Jordan Creek. Additionally, the system lacks connectivity and has safety issues with road and railroad crossings. The opportunity exists to provide ancillary benefits from the FRM study for recreation: replaced bridges can be widened to allow an area for building trails, and maintenance roads can double as multi-use paths.

2.4 EXISTING FLOODING

2.4.1 Historical Flooding

In 2000, six inches of rainfall fell (a majority of which fell in the two hours), which resulted in floodwaters four to six feet deep in some places, sweeping through at least 124 homes and displacing more than 100 people with an estimated two million dollars in damages to public property alone. The storm produced a 1/50 to 1/100 ACE with a flow rate of 3,200 cubic feet per second (cfs). The storm inundated structures, trapped motorists, and swept building materials from local supply yards. In 2002, a 1/5 ACE occurred when 3.5 inches of rain fell in six hours. In 2005 two short and intense rainfall events, 2.25 inches in one hour and 1.86 inches over 1.5 hours, resulted in the 1/2 to 1/5 ACE. The two events were three hours apart. Even as recent as 2008, people were rescued along the creek during intense flooding. In 2009, Chestnut Street, the main east/west thoroughfare situated about 500 feet from the channel, was closed due to flooding.




Figure 2-1: Economic Reaches of Jordan Creek

2.4.2 Flooding by Reach

The characteristics of this watershed lead to damages at the frequent events. The confined river channel contains numerous crossings, and the watershed is prone to flash-flood events. This causes water to leave the channel at frequent events and flow overland causing damage to property and posing a safety risk. See Figure 2-1 for a depiction of the reaches.



Figure 2-2: Reach E1

Reach E1 (Figure 2-2): Reach E1 is at the confluence of Jordan and Fassnight Creeks. This reach is industrial. The Archimica Pharmaceutical plant, Advantage Waste and an old municipal landfill sustain damages during flood events. Water flows over the Archimica floodwall between the 1/10 ACE and the 1/25 ACE. At the 1/500 ACE, there can be anywhere from two to four feet of water in the buildings. There are significant life, health and safety issues associated with this plant during flood events. During the 2000 flood, people were rescued from rooftops. There are 32 buildings within the 1/500 ACE floodplain, 22 buildings in the protected area and an additional 10 structures not protected by the floodwall. A structural analysis completed on the floodwall determined that it was structurally sound.

Downstream of the Archimica plant is Scenic Bridge. The Scenic Bridge overtops somewhere between the 1/25 and 1/50 ACE in the existing conditions. The bridge connects the fire station to neighborhoods on the south side of town. In the event of a storm, the fire engines and rescue vehicles are significantly delayed and are not able to respond in their mandatory 5 to 9 minute window.

Bennett Street, located on Jordan Creek, overtops between the 1/10 and 1/25 ACE in the existing conditions modeling. The roadway adjacent to the bridge is lower and overtops between the 1/5 and 1/10 ACE posing a significant safety hazard. There is a potential for cars to be swept off the road. Bennett Street is the bridge that the emergency vehicles take to reach communities to the east of the fire station. When it is overtopping, emergency response is delayed.

There are three properties in this reach containing Hazardous, Toxic, or Radioactive Wastes (HTRW). The City owns two of these properties, both sites of former municipal landfills. The largest city-owned parcel, Ewing Park, borders Wilsons Creek on the north and is currently used as a sports complex. The Archimica Pharmaceutical Company owns the third property consisting of two parcels of land.



Figure 2-3: Reach E2

Reach E2 (Figure 2-3): Reach E2 is mainly industrial, but it includes a small neighborhood that starts to sustain damages around the 1/5 ACE. This portion of the stream is mostly natural channel with an assortment of conveyance improvements, bridges, culverts and grade control structures. The 1/10 ACE causes damages to about 15 of the 54 structures in the inventory.

There are seven crossings in this reach, all of which restrict flow. The severity changes depending on the storm event, flow and downstream conditions. Overtopping of bridges is a severe safety issue in this

the old warehouses and factories, and it is starting to become a pedestrian- and cyclist- friendly neighborhood.

The upstream end of Reach E3 is at the confluence of North and South Branch where Jordan Creek flows into a set of box culverts capable of conveying the 1/5 to 1/10 ACE. The 30 feet wide, 10 feet tall, dual box culverts extend 3,400 feet underneath most of the downtown area. Once the capacity of these structures has been exceeded, water flows over land, through buildings and over roads, until it reaches the areas south of downtown where it can return to the channel.




Figure 2-5: Inundation Map in the 1/100 to 1/500 ACE in Reach E3

The City's industrial and commercial heart is situated in the Jordan Creek Valley. Along Jordan Creek, it is relatively flat. However, about a city block out on either side of the stream, the terrain gets substantially steeper. This topography concentrates the floodwaters through a narrow corridor. In Figure 2-5, there is a steep rise from a largely flat area in the 1/100 to 1/500 ACE floodplain. At 1/5 ACE, damages are \$570,000. There are high damages at the high-frequency events.

Reach E3 includes an area called the West Meadows, which is a brownfield site the City has been working with the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) to cleanup. The numerous HTRW sites throughout the reach are a remnant of the City's industrial past.




Figure 2-6: Reach E4

Reach E4 (Figure 2-6): Most of the damages in Reach E4 are to properties on a local university campus and a community college campus. Ozark Technical College has a parking lot that is subject to the 1/50 ACE in the existing conditions. Two buildings receive structure damage and one receives damage to contents at the 1/5 ACE. The City has worked to daylight some of the channel in this area to help alleviate some of the flooding. Although the channel is no longer in a box culvert, both banks of the channel are vertical walls due to real estate restrictions.




Figure 2-7: Reach E5

Reach E5 (Figure 2-7): In Reach E5, a park pavilion close to the channel is frequently flooded but with few damages. At the 1/100 ACE, about six houses are damaged with no single structure receiving more than \$400 worth of damage. The majority of the channel in this reach runs through parkland or open space.




Figure 2-8: Reach E6

Reach E6 (Figure 2-8): The upstream part of Reach E6 is mainly residential. Once Glenstone Street is crossed, it becomes more industrial. Frequent damages occur at the Loft’s Parking Lot and Harry Cooper Supply, a local pipe wholesaler.

The upstream reaches of South Branch of Jordan Creek consist of grass ditches with small culverts capable of carrying a storm that is expected to occur every year. Once the water is out of the ditches, it starts to flow overland. Even at frequent events, the flooding affects buildings. Mostly, the water ponds in intersections before flowing back into the creek. Approximately 80 residential properties in the upstream reaches are within the 1/100 ACE floodplain. Water surrounds many of the homes once the capacity of the channel is exceeded.

2.4.3 Existing Flood Risk Management

Springfield manages flood risk through its storm water protection program. The City has stringent storm-water policies and is recognized statewide for its work in storm-water reduction. The City has worked with the EPA on innovative programs to help the citizens become aware of where their runoff goes.

In 1989, the City entered into the National Flood Insurance Program; however, the buildings damaged during storm events were built prior to the City's inclusion into the program. There are stretches of floodway delineated through the downtown; however, in the areas where the culvert is underground, that floodway does not exist. Currently, if development is permitted within the 100-year floodplain, it has to meet two criteria:

1. The development cannot increase the water surface elevation.
2. The first-floor elevation must be 2 feet higher than the 100-year floodplain.

After the flood in 2000, FEMA offered buyouts to homeowners who would accept them. The City has offered buyouts to businesses downtown that are frequently inundated; however, the city did not have the funds available to buy all inundated properties. As buildings become available in the floodplain, the City buys them and either retrofits them to meet floodplain regulations or demolishes the structure.

The City's storm-water management permit mandates that new construction buildings not increase the peak flow from a 1/5, 1/10, 1/50, 1/100 ACE. During construction, the landowner is not allowed to induce flooding on neighboring properties.

Springfield has a large public awareness campaign on the importance of good storm-water management for quality and quantity. The City has a "rain barrel" program to encourage the use of rain barrels, and have removed pavement and installed pervious pavement in public areas to increase infiltration. Springfield is known statewide for its proactive Storm-water Program.

2.4.4 Federal Interest

The Federal government investigates prospective projects from a national point of view. When determining the need for Federal investment in a project, the primary analysis centers on significance of the problem and the benefits of possible solutions. In the case of this study, the focus is primarily on flood risk management benefits. It is also in the Federal and non-Federal sponsor's interest to select a cost-efficient plan, specifically one in which the benefits exceed costs. It is important to note that benefits can include non-monetary benefits such as reducing life-safety issues and improving the environmental quality. Federal interest in the project is identified when both requirements are satisfied.

Based on historical records, Springfield has a flood that produces significant damage every couple of years. It is within USACE and Federal interest to study the flood risk management issues with Jordan Creek because there are significant flood damages that result in residential and commercial property loss. Impacts from frequent flooding in the past include significant economic costs. Developing a project that will reduce the frequency of these damages and protect human life is within the Federal interest and a primary mission of USACE.

2.5 PLANNING OBJECTIVES

The water and related land resource problems and opportunities identified in this study are stated as specific planning objectives to provide focus for the formulation of alternatives and development of

criteria. These planning objectives represent desired positive changes in the without project conditions. The base year, the year the project is assumed to be fully operational, is 2020, and the period of analysis is through the year 2070. The planning objectives are as follows:

- Reduce overall flood damages in the project area from 2020 to 2070.
- Reduce residual risk to property by removing properties from the floodplain in the project area from 2020 to 2070.
- Reduce risk to transportation and life, health and safety by reducing flood levels in the project area from 2020 to 2070.

2.6 PLANNING CONSTRAINTS

Unlike planning objectives that represent desired positive changes, planning constraints represent restrictions that should not be violated. The planning constraints identified in this study are as follows:

- Avoid potential contamination sites.
- Minimize disruption of community cohesion and community services.
- Avoid interruption to railroad service.
- Avoid adverse impacts to historic properties.

3 ALTERNATIVES

This chapter describes the development of alternative plans that address the planning objectives, the comparison of those plans and the *tentative* selection of a plan. It also describes the *tentatively* selected plan and its implementation requirements.

3.1 PLAN FORMULATION RATIONALE

A wide variety of management measures were developed that would address one or more of the planning objectives. These measures were evaluated and screened as described below. Alternative plans were then developed which included one or more of the management measures. Through the planning process, plans formulated as a result of analysis. See Figure 3-1: Plan Formulation Process for the process used.




Figure 3-1: Plan Formulation Process

3.2 MANAGEMENT MEASURES TO ADDRESS IDENTIFIED PLANNING OBJECTIVES

A management measure is a feature or activity at a site, which addresses one or more of the planning objectives. Measures for inclusion in the Jordan Creek study were evaluated based on their potential for flood risk reduction, relative development cost, environmental impacts and acceptability by the sponsor. No Federal Action, detention basins, and channel modification underwent a thorough analysis. The descriptions and results of the evaluations of the remaining measures considered in this study are presented in Table 3-1: Measures Analyzed.

Table 3-1: Measures Analyzed

Measures	Description	Location	Analysis	Flood Risk Reduction Effectiveness	Development Cost	Positive Environmental Impacts	Acceptability	Conclusion	Risk Associated with Elimination
Elevate Structures	Elevation is the process of raising a structure so that the main living area (main floor) will be above a design flood elevation.	No real alternatives	Most of the flooding occurs in industrial areas. Generally, commercial buildings are on concrete pads. Raising the business is not practical, because it involves tearing down the building, removing the concrete pad, adding fill, recreating the concrete pad and rebuilding the building. We cannot add fill anywhere in Reaches E6 and E3 because there is no delineated floodway. FEMA will not allow fill in the floodplain unless no impacts are shown to the water-surface elevation. The buildings have to maintain a zero surcharge. If a structure goes through a major remodel, the City's regulations say it has to be 2 feet above the 100-year floodplain.	High for the individual buildings but medium overall - risk is only reduced on a per-structure basis	High	Low	Low - may cause business to shut down for a period while building is being elevated.	Removed from consideration	Low – Cost is high for the number of structures affected.
Move Buildings from Within the Floodplain to Outside of It	This measure allows for moving structures out of the floodplain and buying the land upon which the structures are located.	No real alternatives	Most of the flooding occurs in industrial areas. There is limited railway access for businesses outside of the floodplain.	High for the individual buildings but medium overall - risk is only reduced on a per-structure basis	High	Low	Low - may cause business to shut down for a period while building is being relocated.	Removed from consideration	Low – Cost is high for the number of structures affected.
Floodplain Evacuation (Buy-Outs)	Floodplain Evacuation or buyout, as it is commonly known, results in the acquisition, demolition and removal of structures from the floodplain.	Throughout the watershed	The high-frequency events cause high damage. Removing the properties from the floodplain would eliminate the damages at all events as opposed to a structural measure that can be exceeded. However, the feasibility of moving people out of the downtown corridor without significant legal costs is low. Community cohesiveness may be affected because the government is moving established businesses out of the downtown corridor, which is the industrial heart of the City.	High for the individual buildings but medium overall - risk is only reduced on a per-structure basis	Medium initially but high due to litigation	Low but potentially positive because the land through the urban core can be restored to something more natural	Some people would want to be bought out while others would fight it.	May be economical for use in formulation of alternative plans	Not removed from consideration
Flood Warning/ Flood Forecasting System	Flood warning systems warn property owners of impending floods and therefore allow, time to evacuate and relocate property subject to flood damage.	Various locations throughout the watershed	The downtown flooding occurs simultaneously with the rainfall event. The time to peak is about 30 minutes on a 1-hour critical storm.	Low - Due to short response time	High	Low	High	Removed from consideration	No risk associated with a measure that will not work.
Dry Flood Proofing Buildings	Dry Flood Proofing is the process of making any combination of structural or nonstructural changes or adjustments incorporated in the design, construction or alteration of individual buildings or properties in order to reduce flood damages. Dry flood proofing keeps the water out of the building.	Throughout the watershed	Flood proofing of buildings was ruled out early because of the nature of the floods. According to the Nonstructural Center of Expertise, dry flood proofing is not recommended due to the flashy nature of the floods. Not enough warning occurs to seal the doorways of the buildings, which leaves an opening to the floodwaters.	High for the individual building but medium overall because it is an individual building	Medium to High depending on the individual measure	N/A	High	Removed from consideration	Low - the measure is not expected to work.
Wet Flood Proofing Buildings	Wet flood proofing allows water to flow into and through buildings without causing damage to the buildings or the contents. Contents are generally elevated.	Throughout the watershed	Wet flood proofing may be a viable option for some buildings remaining in the floodplain. However, due to the industrial nature of the buildings and short response period, it is not feasible for most of the buildings. Businesses would need either to abandon the first-floor of their buildings or move their tools and materials several feet off the ground. Neither one of these options is practical in an industrial setting.	High for the individual building but medium overall because it is an individual building	Low	Low - May release some contaminants into the stream	Low - most people would not want to elevate everything in their building; however vacating the first-floor of a building may be an option.	May be economical for use in formulation of alternative plans	Not removed from consideration

Measures	Description	Location	Analysis	Flood Risk Reduction Effectiveness	Development Cost	Positive Environmental Impacts	Acceptability	Conclusion	Risk Associated with Elimination
Floodwalls	For structures that are too large to elevate, a concrete wall may be considered around the structure's property, where space and aesthetics permit.	Protection of manufacturing plant at the confluence of Wilsons and Jordan Creek	There is a levee that protects the plant that currently is overtopped at the 1/25 ACE. In the future without project conditions, that wall is overtopped in a 1/10 ACE. The team examined increasing the height of the wall. To increase the wall height, the wall had to be removed and completely rebuilt. The protection of the area is limited by the height of the road entering the site. To raise the entrance requires raising the road and increasing the bridge height. Doing some rough calculations during the Value Engineering meeting, it was found to be more economical to build a channel than rebuild the wall.	High	Medium	High	High	May be economical for use in formulation of alternative plans	Not removed from consideration
		Offer a lower level protection channel and flood proof building for higher levels of protection.	Adding walls around numerous structures would increase the flood heights downstream. There were no buildings where floodwalls could be added without leaving an opening that would need to be closed during a flood event.	Medium	Low	N/A	N/A	Removed from Consideration	No risk associated with a measure that will not work.
Diversions	Existing underground culverts may be used to divert high flows. Flood flows contained within the culvert would bypass the developed area and re-enter the creek downstream. Once the water reaches a critical height in the channel, the weir in the diversion channel is overtopped that allows flows into the culvert.	Lower Jordan Creek	This twin cell box culvert conveys storm-water nearly 3,400 feet through the Springfield downtown area with portions of the tunnel measuring approximately 30 feet wide and 10 feet tall. The box structures were constructed in the late 1920s and early 1930s. This existing structure can be used when there are high flows.	High	Low	N/A	High	May be economical for use in formulation of alternative plans	Not removed from consideration
		North Branch of Jordan Creek	975 feet single cell box culvert tunnel located under an industrial area. This existing structure can be used when there are high flows.	High	Low	N/A	High	May be economical for use in formulation of alternative plans	Not removed from consideration
		South Branch of Jordan Creek - area between National Street and Fremont.	Structure is degraded and may need to be replaced. Real estate restrictions exist in this area so building a new diversion and daylighting the channel may be a less expensive option.	Medium	Medium	N/A	High	May be economical for use in formulation of alternative plans	Not removed from consideration
Remove Impervious Surfaces in the Watershed	Remove parking lots and large areas of concrete throughout the watershed.	Throughout the watershed	There are several large parking lots in the watershed that if removed, could promote infiltration; however, there is not much reduction in flow for parking lot removal.	Low	Low	High	Medium	Removed because it was not cost effective	No risk associated with removal.
Levees	Levees provide protection against floodwaters but depending on their height may require substantial real estate.	Throughout the watershed	There are numerous real estate restrictions along Jordan Creek. It is preferable to build a larger channel to convey flow and keep the flow line at a lower elevation. In those areas where there is a real estate restriction and the channel cannot be practically enlarged, a wall is preferable to a levee because its footprint is smaller.	Medium	High	Low	Low	Removed from Consideration	Low - There are not areas where a levee is practical in an urban area.

3.2.1 Detention Basins (Flood Storage):

Detention basins are used to reduce the peak flood flows by temporarily storing (detaining) floodwater, then releasing it slowly. This reduced peak water-surface elevations and helped to minimize flood damages downstream. Initially over 24 sites were identified as potential detention basins (See Figure 3-2). The detention basins sites were chosen based on available real estate. Basin size was maximized to fit the available real estate.




Figure 3-2: Preliminary Regional Detention Basins

The detention basins were initially analyzed and screened by routing water through the basins, both individually and in a series. The basins with that provided the largest drop in the water surface elevation downstream of the basins and through the downtown area provided the most benefits. The detention basins that provided the largest drop in water surface elevations are show in Figure 3-2: Preliminary Regional Detention Basins. The analysis identified five basins that provided a significant reduction in flow, two on the North Branch and three on the South Branch. More information on the detention basin analysis is found in Appendix B: Attachment A: Hydrology and Hydraulics Report.

The basins were also analyzed for economic efficiency. North Branch basins alone, South Branch basins alone and the North and South Branch basins combined were analyzed to determine which grouping of basins provided the maximum net benefits in the study area. The results indicated that all five basins working together provided the most benefits. See the Economic Analysis Appendix for more information on the economic analysis of the detention basins.

The results from the basin analysis showed a seven-to-eight-percent drop in flows through the downtown area resulting in an \$800,000 reduction in annual damages downstream of the basins both in the project area as well as outside the project area. The detention basins measure was carried forward as an efficient component of a recommended plan. The selected basins are pictured below in Figure 3-3: Regional Detention Basins (Refined Analysis).




Figure 3-3: Regional Detention Basins (Refined Analysis)

3.2.2 No Action Measure

USACE is required to consider the option of “No Action” to comply with the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and planning policy. With the No Action measure, which is synonymous with the “Future Without Project Condition,” it is assumed that no measure would be implemented by the Federal Government to achieve the planning objectives. Any reasonable activities to be pursued by state and local interests in the absence of a Federal project are assumed to be undertaken.

3.2.3 Channel Modifications

Channel modifications provide an effective way to move large amounts of water through the city. Routing of the stream was determined by following the existing stream whenever possible. For those areas that were currently in a box culvert, an open channel was preferred over replacing the box culvert. The goal was to remove the impervious surfaces from the stream corridor to give the stream natural characteristics.

Through the downtown area, it was not possible to follow the existing alignment because buildings and railroads were built over the box culverts containing the stream. Six options were analyzed based on real estate restrictions and engineering feasibility. Two final alignments were analyzed which included creating a large box culvert under Phelps’s street. The two alignments were compared in Plans A and B. The alignment with the shorter tunnel under Phelps’s street cost less to construct; however, it involved more realignment of the railroad tracks.

The preferred cross section was a grass-lined channel with flat slopes because it is lower maintenance, provides more habitat and is aesthetically more pleasing than other options like concrete or rock-lined channels. The cross section size was determined by adjusting the existing cross section until the water surface elevation dropped below the finished floor elevation of the surrounding buildings. A standard cross section with a low flow channel that includes a bench with a maintenance road that doubled as a recreation trail was selected to improve both habitat and recreation in the area. In some areas, there is a real estate restriction limiting the width of the channel. In those areas, the slopes were steepened to provide sufficient cross-sectional area. Those slopes were protected with a concrete block wall, selected because it is easy to install and readily available.

The design of the modified channel reduced damages to buildings. Channel design modification brings the water surface elevation to just below the finished floor of the buildings for a particular flood event.

3.2.4 Conclusions from Screening the Measures

From the preliminary analysis, it was determined that channel modifications and detention basins will make up the bulk of the alternatives. Channels are an efficient way of moving water through the downtown area and removing a large amount of damages. The basins were added to the channel improvement plans to reduce the size of the channels needed. Even a small channel offered protection in the high intensity events. Due to infrastructure and real estate constraints, the options for channel

alignments were limited. Formulation of specific plans was based on channel effectiveness (benefit outputs) and river reaches. Measures remaining from the preliminary screening were combined to form different plans.

3.3 PLAN FORMULATION AND EVALUATION

Plans were formulated using a combination of measures. Four different iterations of formulation occurred before selection of the final plans for analysis as shown in Figure 3-4: Iterations of Plan Formulation.




Figure 3-4: Iterations of Plan Formulation

The benefits categories used to compare the plans included flood damages reduced (structure, content, auto) and infrastructure damages reduced (road, bridge, utility). Other benefit categories, such as emergency costs and transportation delays, were investigated but determined to yield low additional benefits; therefore, they were excluded from the calculation and had no bearing on the choice of a selected plan. For further discussion on benefit categories, see the Economic Analysis Appendix.

The alternative plans were screened by four formulation criteria established in the Principles and Guidelines for Water Resources Projects (P&G). These criteria are completeness, effectiveness, efficiency and acceptability. A description of the criteria and a chart depicting how the plans meet those criteria is in Paragraph 3.3.5.

Fifteen plans were analyzed, but only four plans were included in the Final Array of Plans.

*Designates a Chapter that is traditionally found in an Environmental Assessment.

3.3.1 Iteration 1: Different Types of Plans

The purpose of the first iteration was to determine which plans to investigate further. The initial plans were formed at the Value Engineering (VE) meeting. Copies of the VE Report, written in accordance with ER 11-1-321, are available upon request. The following alternative plans were considered...

- No Action (Future without project conditions)
- Detention Basins Only
- Nonstructural (Buyouts) – Consisted of buying out structures that sustained high damage and removed them from the floodplain.
- Detention Basins and Buyouts
- Detention Basins and Channels (Plan A) – Provided property protection against the 1/100 ACE storm.

3.3.1.1 No Action* (Future Without Project Condition)

The No Action plan assumes the conditions that would occur in the absence of a Federal Project. USACE is required to consider the option of “No Action” as one of the alternatives in order to comply with the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) and planning policy (Engineering Regulation 1105-2-100). With the No Action plan, which is synonymous with the “Future Without Project Condition,” it is assumed that no project would be implemented by the Federal Government to achieve the planning objectives. Any reasonable activities to be pursued by state and local interests in the absence of a Federal project are assumed to be undertaken. The No Action Plan forms the basis against which all other alternative plans are measured.

The planning period for both the economic and environmental analysis is 50 years. Assuming a minimum of 9 years for planning and implementation, projections for socioeconomic and environmental resource conditions were based on the year 2020. The period of analysis would extend through the year 2070.

When examining the No Action plan, it was necessary to project what course of action local entities may take given the lack of Federal involvement. Due to budgetary concerns, the major funding requirements associated with the Jordan Creek FRM Project would not likely be accomplished under a local initiative. Significant long-term risk of flooding would remain over the period of analysis.

Critical assumptions used in defining the No Action plan included...

- The current zoning map for the City would be followed and all areas marked for development would be developed.
- Some channel improvements would be made over the period of analysis to help alleviate flooding. Channel improvements would cause the water to flow faster. The improvements modeled were relatively minor and only focused on the channels that were considered

unimproved. The model did not specifically account for channel widening or lining channels with concrete.

- Thirty-eight regional detention ponds would be placed throughout the watershed to help alleviate some of the flow downtown. The detention ponds would retard the flow to comply with a peak-flow reduction requirement. The future condition would balance the increased peak flow conditions by adding regional detention in the open spaces and on new developments.
- Redevelopment would occur. Water would run off faster on redeveloped properties than it did previously. Not all of the developed areas would be completely redevelop; some areas would develop to a much higher density than modeled while others would not develop at all.
- Topography, physiography and soils would remain relatively unchanged for the near future. These would remain as described in Section 4.4.1.
- Development within the floodplain would comply with FEMA regulations. No new buildings would be placed in the 1/100 ACE per FEMA regulations.

There was reasonable risk associated with the project assumptions. Predictions of damages were based on 20 years of rainfall data, and did not take into account global climate change, which had the potential to increase the intensity of rainfall events in Missouri. For each of the project assumptions, there was uncertainty for both under and over estimating the future flow. When all of the assumptions were modeled, the flow increase was relatively small and seemed reasonable given the characteristics of the watershed.

The Jordan Creek Valley is very sensitive to economic damages with increased flows. From the hydrologic models, these base assumptions increased the flow through the Jordan Creek Valley by 10 percent over the existing conditions, but it caused an increase in damages of between 50 and 60 percent. The Jordan Creek Valley was constrained by development and was prone to flash flooding. The relatively small increase in flow causes water surface elevations to increase dramatically sooner at areas where the flow was blocked by a bridge or culvert. For example, the large culvert under the downtown section reaches capacity at the 1/5 ACE in the existing conditions. In the future conditions, the same culvert would overtop in the 1/2 ACE; instead of staying in the culvert the water would spill into the streets of downtown Springfield causing damage in its wake. In the future conditions, damage would occur sooner.

The future without project condition would have 193 structures subject to flooding in the 1/500 ACE floodplain with an estimated value of between \$70 and \$80 million. The average annual damages would be between \$4 and \$5 million. It was clear that, without a Federal investment, flood risk would increase over the next 50 years.

3.3.1.2 Detention Basins Only Plan

This plan consisted of five detention basins that were deemed efficient in the preliminary analysis. There were no channel improvements with this plan. See Paragraph 3.2.1 for location and analysis.

This plan decreased the peak flows through downtown by about seven to eight percent. They were reduced from about 6000 cubic feet per second to about 5600 cubic feet per second. However, the reduction was not sufficient to prevent damage in downstream reaches.

This plan was brought into the final array to provide a low-cost but high-performance solution.

The total cost for this plan was \$10 million. It provided \$800,000 in benefits per year yielding \$170,000 in net benefits.

3.3.1.3 Nonstructural Plan (Buyouts)

Buyouts were the only nonstructural measure remaining because of the flashy nature of the flooding and the real estate restriction.

The high-frequency events contribute most of the damages to the EAD calculations. Four mandatory buyout plans were examined that targeted the high-frequency events. Included in the plans were those properties that sustained more than \$500 worth of damages for a 1/2, 1/5, 1/10 or 1/25 ACE. It was assumed that damages less than \$500 dollars were insignificant and may be a modeling error. Each property was examined using an Estimated Annual Damages (EAD) spreadsheet designed by USACE. The output of the spreadsheet was the EAD per building summed to create a total for the plan.

The cost to buy and move a property was roughly estimated by the real estate appraisers to be 2.5 times the appraised value of the structure only. This estimate included the cost to buy the structure and property, to relocate the property and for administrative and legal fees. That cost was then annualized.

The EAD and cost were used to create a BC ratio for each plan. If the BC ratio was greater than .8, the plans were considered viable. A ratio that assumed a higher cost than benefits was chosen as the screening criteria to reduce the chance of inadvertently screening out viable plans. See Table 3-2 **Error! Reference source not found.** for outputs of the first round of analysis.

Table 3-2: Outputs from Initial Evaluation

	Structure Count	EAD	Average Annual Cost	BCR	Net Benefits
1/2 ACE	26	\$938,835	\$2,055,391	0.46	(\$1,116,556)
1/5 ACE	55	\$1,560,445	\$2,667,778	0.58	(\$1,107,332)
1/10 ACE	98	\$4,285,810	\$4,140,341	1.04	\$145,468
1/25 ACE	129	\$4,427,333	\$5,914,661	0.75	(\$1,487,328)

The damages were determined on a per structure basis. For the initial evaluation, only the structures that sustained damages were included in the buyout plan.

To further refine the analysis, on the 1/10 ACE plan, all of the structures needed to operate the business were included in the cost of the buyout. The assumption was that the government would not purchase only one building on the property, it would purchase them all. Again, a 2.5 multiplier was used to

estimate the cost of buying the property. The additional structures were run through the same EAD spreadsheet for only the 1/10 ACE plan. The results are presented below in Table 3-3.

Table 3-3: Output from Second Round of Buyout Analysis

	Structure Count	EAD	Average Annual Cost	BCR	Net Benefits
1/10 ACE	110	\$4,277,894	\$5,082,223	0.84	(\$804,329)

Even though the costs were slightly better than previously calculated, the benefits calculations were estimates.

The 1/10 ACE plan remained above the cutoff of 0.8, so a Hydrologic Engineering Center- Flood Damage Analysis (HEC-FDA) model was created to calculate the actual EAD of the buildings to refine the benefits. HEC-FDA is the model that USACE uses to determine benefits in a project. From HEC-FDA, the EAD was \$4,202,339, which is close to the spreadsheet-estimated value. The 1/10 ACE plan was eliminated from consideration because it does not have a benefit-to-cost ratio greater than 1.

Eliminated from Consideration - Buyouts as a stand-alone plan were determined to be neither efficient nor economically feasible; the costs exceeded the benefits. They were also unacceptable because they would negatively affect the downtown community cohesiveness. For these reasons work on formulating stand-alone buyout plans ceased.

3.3.1.4 Detention Basins and Buyouts

This plan consisted of five regional detention basins in combination with buyouts or flood proofing selected structures in the higher-frequency floodplain. General plan components included...

- Detention Basins (same as in the Detention Basin Only Plan).
- Buying key properties to remove them from the floodplain.

Eliminated from Consideration - Both detention basins and buyouts are effective for high-frequency events. The buyouts remove the high-frequency properties from the floodplain, which is what the detention basin plan targets. Combined, detention basin and buyouts reduced the benefits of the stand-alone plans while increasing the cost. This plan was eliminated from consideration because it is not economically efficient.

3.3.1.5 Plan A

Plan A consisted of detention basins and a channel sized to protect a majority of the structures from the 1/100 ACE storm. By design, water would inundate the streets and parking lots. General plan measures included...

- Five regional detention basins - These were the same detention basins in the stand-alone detention plan.

- There were about four miles of channel improvements. Channel improvements on the North Branch started 2000 feet upstream of the junction of North and South Branch. On the South Branch, channel improvements started about 4600 feet upstream of the junction. Channel widths varied from 10 feet on South Branch to about 37 feet on the lower end of Jordan Creek and on Wilsons Creek. Side slopes varied from 3:1 to 5:1 depending on real estate restrictions. In one area, the channel width extended to 100 feet and the walls were vertical.
- The original path of the stream was followed whenever possible.
- There were 34 existing crossings in the project area. Six of those crossings would be removed and five crossings would not require a change. Modifications or replacements would occur to 20 of the structures. Due to channel modifications, six new bridges were added. There were 26 crossings modified or built.
- A 10-foot-wide Operation and Maintenance road is included along most of the daylighted or improved channel. The road doubled as a recreation trail. The new stream crossings were wide enough to allow pedestrian or bicycle traffic to cross safely under them. There was no trail near the Archimica Plant in the southern part of the project nor was there trail along the Phelp's Street box culvert.
- This plan contained channel modifications in all of the reaches.

Eliminated from Consideration - This plan was eliminated because it provided the same protection as Plan B but at a higher cost. This plan was not cost efficient.

3.3.1.6 Results of Iteration 1

Plan A and the Detention Basins Only plan were complete and economically efficient plans. In an effort to formulate an equally effective but more cost efficient plan, value-engineering options were evaluated against Plan A. HEC-FDA model and a preliminary cost estimate were created for Plan A. The following modifications to Plan A (displayed in Figure 3-5: Difference between Plan A and Plan B) resulted in the creation of Plan B:

- 880 linear feet of Phelp's Street culvert were to open channel in Plan B. The project saved significant money by moving adjacent railroad tracks and daylighting the channel. In Plan A, the underground portion ran 1800 feet from Robberson to junction of North and South Branch. In Plan B, the underground portion was 550 feet and ran between Robberson and Jefferson Street. Open channel replaced the portion from Jefferson Street to Washington Street, but beyond that, the channel remained covered (370 linear feet).
- Two railroad bridge replacements were eliminated in Plan B. The damage prevented by replacing those bridges and reducing backwater effects was minimal.
- Two bridge replacements in Smith Park were eliminated in Plan B. The original bridges caused water to back up and damage a pavilion, but the cost of replacing the bridges was more than the cost of the damage the replacements prevented.
- Grand Street Bridge improvements were removed from further examination because they did not prevent enough damage to warrant replacement.




Figure 3-5: Difference between Plan A and Plan B

Detentions Basins and the No Action plan were used in the final array. Plan A, the Nonstructural Plan, and Detention Basins and Buyouts were eliminated from consideration.

3.3.2 Iteration 2:

The purpose of Iteration 2 was to determine an efficient scale for a plan. Plan B protected structures to approximately the 1/100 ACE. Three more scales of Plan B were created to examine how different sizes of channels and bridges affected the efficiency. A HEC-FDA model and an MII cost estimate were created to compare the plans.

- Plan B – Offered protection against the 1/100 ACE storm. This plan includes detention basins and channels.
- Plan C – Offered protection against the 1/50 ACE storm. This plan included detention basins and smaller channels than Plan B.
- Plan D – Offered protection against the 1/500 ACE storm. This plan included detention basins and larger channels than Plan B.
- Plan E – Offered protection against the 1/25 ACE storm. This plan included detention basins and the smallest channels of all the plans.

3.3.2.1 Plan B

This plan provided the minimum improvements necessary to keep the 1/100 ACE below the first-floor elevation of buildings. Plan B measures for construction included...

- Five regional detention basins - These were the same detention basins in the stand-alone detention plan.
- Channel improvements were similar to (or exactly like) those in Plan A. There were about three and half miles of channel improvements. Channel improvements on the North Branch started 2000 feet upstream of the junction of North and South Branch. On the South Branch, channel improvements started about 4600 feet upstream of the junction. Channel bottom widths varied from 10 feet on South Branch to about 37 feet on the lower end of Jordan Creek and on Wilsons Creek. Side slopes varied from 3:1 to 5:1 depending on real estate restrictions. For the Mount Vernon bridge transition, there was an area where the channel width extended to 100 feet and the walls were vertical.
- This plan contained channel modifications in Reaches E1, E2, E3, E4 and E6.
- As part of the channel rerouting through the downtown, the new alignment followed Phelps's Street underground. The underground portion of Phelps's Street was approximately 30 feet wide and 920 feet long.
- There were six new stream crossing and twelve replaced crossings. These replaced crossings were either bridges or box culverts. Three bridge foundations were modified to reinforce the piers that were in the channel. Six crossings in the stream would be removed and not replaced. Thirteen structures in the watershed would remain unchanged.
- There was approximately 2.5 miles of concrete maintenance road added along the side slope of the channel where it was feasible. A concrete road in the channel would require significantly less maintenance over time than other materials. The road doubled as a recreation trail. The new and replaced stream crossings were wide enough to allow pedestrian or bicycle traffic to cross safely under them.

Plan B cost approximately \$99 million to construct. See Plate 2 for a map of the area.

Eliminated from Consideration - This plan was eliminated, because it was not efficient. In the plan, reaches E2, E3 and E4 were not economically justified; however, parts of Plan B were used to formulate Plans F and G.

3.3.2.2 Plan C

This plan identified the minimum improvements necessary to keep the 1/50 ACE below the first-floor elevation of buildings. General plan components include:

- Five regional detention basins - These were the same detention basins in the stand-alone detention plan.

- Channel modifications included narrowing the channel and decreasing linear feet of modified channel to accommodate a lower level of protection than Plan B. Channel improvement occurs along about 3 miles of channel. Channel widths varied from 10 feet on South Branch to a range of about 37 feet on the lower end of Jordan Creek and on Wilsons Creek. Side slopes varied from 3:1 to 5:1 depending on real estate restrictions. The 920-foot-long box culvert under Phelp's was reduced in size. It was 20-foot wide.
- This plan contained channel modifications in Reaches E1, E2, E3, E4 and E6.
- There were six new stream crossings and twelve replaced crossings. The replaced crossings were either bridges or box culverts. Four bridge foundations were modified to reinforce the piers that were in the channel. Six crossings that were currently in the stream would be removed. Fifteen structures in the watershed would remain unchanged.
- Where feasible, there was approximately 2.2 miles of concrete maintenance road added along the side slope of the channel. A concrete road in the channel would require significantly less maintenance over time than other materials. The road would double as a recreation trail. The new and replaced stream crossings were wide enough to allow pedestrian or bicycle traffic to cross safely under them.

Plan C cost \$88 million. See Plate 3 for a map of the area.

Eliminated from Consideration - This plan was eliminated because reaches E2, E3 and E4 were not economically justified. It was not efficient. It was also not effective because there were too many residual damages in the lower reaches. Parts of this plan were used to formulate plans F and G.

3.3.2.3 Plan D

This plan provided the minimum improvements necessary to keep the 1/500 ACE below the first-floor elevation of buildings. General plan components include:

- Five regional detention basins - These were the same detention basins in the stand-alone detention plan.
- Channel modifications included increasing the channel size creating the highest level of protection of all of the plans. Approximately 3.5 miles of channel improvements were included in the plan. Channel bottom widths varied from 10 feet on South Branch to a range of about 48 to 84 feet on the lower end of Jordan Creek and on Wilsons Creek. Side slopes varied from 3:1 to 5:1 depending on real estate restrictions.
- This plan contained channel modifications in Reaches E1, E2, E3, E4 and E6.
- As part of the channel rerouting through the downtown, the new alignment follows Phelp's Street underground. The Phelp's Street culvert was 920-foot-long and 45 feet wide with vertical walls. Additional channel improvements were added in Wilsons Creek to improve conveyance.
- There were six new stream crossing and twelve replaced crossings. These replaced crossings were either bridges or box culverts. Four bridge foundations were modified to reinforce the

piers that were in the channel. Six crossings that were currently in the stream would be removed. Twelve structures in the watershed would remain unchanged.

- Where feasible, there was approximately 2.5 miles of concrete maintenance road added along the side slope of the channel. A concrete road in the channel would require significantly less maintenance over time than other materials. The road would double as a recreation trail. The new and replaced stream crossings were wide enough to allow pedestrian or bicycle traffic to cross safely under them.

Plan D cost \$112 million. See Plate 4 for a map of the area.

Eliminated from Consideration - This plan was eliminated, because it was not efficient. Reaches E2, E3 and E4 were not economically justified; however, parts of Plan D were used to formulate Plans F and G.

3.3.2.4 Plan E

This plan identified the minimum improvements necessary to keep the 1/25 ACE below the first-floor of buildings. General plan components included...

- Five regional detention basins - These were the same detention basins in the stand-alone detention plan.
- Channel modifications included narrowing the channel and decreasing linear feet of modified channel to accommodate a lower level of protection than Plan C. Channel improvements occur along about 2.5 miles of channel. Channel widths varied from 5 feet on South Branch to about 37 feet on the lower end of Jordan Creek and on Wilsons Creek. Side slopes varied from 3:1 to 5:1 depending on real estate restrictions. The box culvert under Phelp's Street was 15 feet wide and 920-feet-long. Overall, Plan E has about a 50 percent reduction in bottom width from Plan A and B.
- This plan contained channel modifications in Reaches E1, E2, E3, E4 and E6.
- There were six new stream crossing and eight replaced crossings. These crossings were either bridges or box culverts. Three bridge foundations were modified to reinforce the piers that were in the channel. Six crossings that were currently in the stream would be removed. Seventeen structures in the watershed would remain unchanged.
- Where feasible, there was approximately 2.0 miles of concrete maintenance road added along the side slope of the channel. A concrete road in the channel would require significantly less maintenance over time than other materials. The road would double as a recreation trail. The new and replaced stream crossings were wide enough to allow pedestrian or bicycle traffic to cross safely under them.

Plan E cost \$74 million. See Plate 5 for a map of the area.

Eliminated from Consideration - This plan was eliminated because reaches E2, E3 and E4 were not economically justified. It was not efficient. It was also not effective because there are too many residual damages in the lower reaches. Parts of this plan were used to formulate Plan G.

3.3.2.5 Results of Iteration 2

The plans formulated in Iteration 2 were removed from consideration; however, reaches of these plans were included in the plans formed in Iteration 3.

3.3.3 Iteration 3

To create additional high-performance plans, a reach-by-reach analysis was completed with the varying levels of protection. A HEC-FDA model and an MII cost estimate were created to compare the plans. Plans F and G were created by combining the reaches from Plans B-through-E to optimize for both performance and efficiency. The remaining risk to people, roads and structures, incidental flooding, resiliency and the frequency of high damages for any given event were considered. Those plans are listed below:

- **Plan F** – Offered protection against property damage for a 1/500 ACE in Reach E1 and a 1/100 ACE in Reaches E3 and E6. This plan contains detention basins and channel improvements.
- **Plan G** – Offered protection against property damage for a 1/500 ACE in Reach E1 and a 1/25 ACE in Reaches E3 and E6. This plan contains detention basins and channel improvements.

3.3.3.1 Plan F

Plan F provided varying performance outputs. It focused on the reaches of Plans B through E that provided the most effective benefits.

- Five regional detention basins - These are the same detention basins in the stand-alone detention plan.
- Channel modifications included modifications in lower Jordan Creek and Wilsons Creek (Reach E1) to accommodate a 1/500 ACE. Channel improvements occur along about 2.4 miles of channel. Channel improvements also occur along Reaches E3 and E6 to accommodate about a 1/100 ACE. Channel widths varied from 5 feet on South Branch to about 37 feet on the lower end of Jordan Creek and on Wilsons Creek. Side slopes varied from 3:1 to 5:1 depending on real estate restrictions. The underground portion of Phelp's Street was approximately 30 feet wide and 920-feet-long.
- This plan contained channel modifications in Reaches E1, E3 and E6. Channel improvements are not planned for Reaches E2, E4 and E5.
- There are six new stream crossings and eight replaced crossings. These crossings are either bridges or box culverts. Three bridge foundations are modified to reinforce the piers that are in the channel. Six crossings that are currently in the stream would be removed. Seventeen structures in the watershed would remain unchanged.
- The trail was not included in the Federal project, but the cross section was created so the City could add the trail later. The new and replaced stream crossings are wide enough to allow pedestrian or bicycle traffic to cross safely under them.

The plan cost about \$77 million. See Plate 6 for a map of the plan.

Eliminated from Consideration - This plan was eliminated because it was not efficient.

3.3.3.2 Plan G

Plan G provided varying levels of protection. It was built by combining the most efficient reaches into a new plan.

- Five regional detention basins - These are the same detention basins in the stand-alone detention plan.
- Channel improvements occur along about 2.2 miles of channel. This plan offers protection at around a 1/500 ACE for Reach E1. Channel widths varied from 5 feet on South Branch to about 37 feet on the lower end of Jordan Creek and on Wilsons Creek. Side slopes varied from 3:1 to 5:1 depending on real estate restrictions. Work through the downtown reaches (Reaches 3 and 6) provide substantial protection against a 1/25 ACE.
- This plan contained channel modifications in Reaches E1, E3 and E6. Channel improvements are not planned for Reaches E2, E4 and E5.
- There are five new stream crossing and six replaced crossings. These crossing are either bridges or box culverts. One bridge foundation was modified to reinforce the piers that are in the channel. Five crossings that are currently in the stream would be removed. Twenty-three structures in the watershed would remain unchanged.
- The maintenance road was not included in the Federal project, but the cross section was created so the City could add it later. The new and replaced stream crossings are wide enough to allow pedestrian or bicycle traffic to cross safely under them.

This plan cost approximately \$65 million. It provided \$4 million in benefits per year, which was slightly over the annual cost of the project. See Plate 7 for a map of the plan.

Eliminated from Consideration - Minor improvements to this plan were added to create Plan G2, which provided the same level of protection but with lower cost. This plan was eliminated because it was not as efficient as other plans.

3.3.3.3 Results of Iteration 3

Both Plans F and G were effective; however, plan F was not efficient. It had more cost per year than the benefits it provided. Plan G was efficient, and it served as a basis for formulation in Iteration 4. Plan G was eventually eliminated from consideration because other plans were more efficient and provided approximately the same level of protection.

3.3.4 Iteration 4

One last iteration of analysis occurred on Plan G. Plans G2 through J are variations of plan G. The analysis in Iteration 4 created a better understanding of how the different components in plan G performed. A HEC-FDA model and an MII cost estimate were generated to compare the plans. Those plans are listed below:

- Plan G2 – Offered protection against property damage for a 1/500 ACE in Reach E1 and a 1/25 ACE in Reaches E3 and E6. This plan contains detention basins and channel improvements. Unlike Plan G, this plan does not contain the Main Street or Boonville Street Bridge.
- Plan H – Similar to Plan G, but it does not contain the Phelp’s Street culvert, which is costly.
- Plan I – Similar to Plan G, but it does not contain the detention basins.
- Plan J – Contains only the detention basins and the 1/500 ACE protection for Reach E1.

3.3.4.1 Plan G2

Plan G2 was similar to plan G except that in the downtown area, two bridge replacements were eliminated. The current bridges would be removed to allow flow through the channel. These bridges had low traffic counts, but they contributed greatly to the annual cost of the project. The bridge replacements removed from Plan G were the Main Street Bridge and the box culvert under Boonville. The box culvert for railroad crossing near Boonville would remain. This plan was the local sponsor’s preferred plan. Table 3-4 Plan G2 Net Benefits and Costs shows costs and benefits by reach.

Table 3-4: Plan G2 Net Benefits and Costs

Reach	E1	E2	E3	E4	E5	E6	Total
ACE	1/500		1/25			1/25	
Net Benefits per year	1,808,200	5,900	(729,000)	10,800	1,000	(378,400)	719,500
Total Cost	8,363,400	499,000	27,492,800	297,200	44,000	23,346,100	60,043,300

- Regional Detention
- Channel improvements occur along about 2.2 miles of channel. This plan offers substantial protection against a 1/500 ACE for Reach E1. Channel widths varied from 5 feet on South Branch to about 37 feet on the lower end of Jordan Creek and on Wilsons Creek. Side slopes varied from 3:1 to 5:1 depending on real estate restrictions. Work through the downtown reaches (Reaches E3 and E6) provide substantial protection against a 1/25 ACE.
- This plan contained channel modifications in Reaches E1, E3 and E6. Channel improvements were not planned for Reaches E2, E4 and E5.
- There were five new stream crossing and four replaced crossings. These crossing were either bridges or box culverts. One bridge foundation was modified to reinforce the piers that were in the channel. Five crossings that were currently in the stream would be removed. Twenty-three structures in the watershed would remain unchanged.
- The maintenance road was not included in the Federal project, but the cross section was created so the City could add it later. The new and replaced stream crossings were wide enough to allow pedestrian or bicycle traffic to cross safely under them.

The total cost for this plan was \$60 million. It provided \$4.2 million in benefits per year yielding \$700,000 in net benefits. See Plate 8 for a map of the plan. This plan was not eliminated from consideration. It was the sponsor's preferred plan.

3.3.4.2 Plan H

Plan H targeted the areas of high economic damages while removing the more expensive Phelp's Street Culvert. Plan H was based on Plan G.

- Five regional detention basins - These are the same detention basins in the stand-alone detention plan.
- Channel improvements occur along about 2.2 miles of channel. This plan offers substantial protection against a 1/500 ACE for Reach E1. Channel widths varied from 5 feet on South Branch to about 37 feet on the lower end of Jordan Creek and on Wilsons Creek. Side slopes varied from 3:1 to 5:1 depending on real estate restrictions. Work through the downtown reaches (Reaches E3 and E6) provide substantial protection against a 1/25 ACE; however, the Phelp's Street culvert was not included in this plan. Water was allowed to flow over the streets through the downtown and was collected near Boonville Street.
- This plan contained channel modifications in Reaches E1, E3, and E6. Channel improvements are not planned for Reaches E2, E4, and E5.
- There are five new stream crossing and six replaced crossings. These crossing are either bridges or box culverts. One bridge foundation was modified to reinforce the piers that are in the channel. Five crossings that are currently in the stream would be removed. Twenty-three structures in the watershed would remain unchanged.
- The trail was not included in the Federal project, but the cross section was created so the City could add the trail later. The new and replaced stream crossings are wide enough to allow pedestrian or bicycle traffic to cross safely under them.

This plan cost \$41 million to construct. It provided \$3.7 million in annual benefits, which was \$1.2 million over the annual cost of the project. See Plate 9 for a map of the plan.

Eliminated from Consideration - Eliminating the Phelp's Street culvert was engineeringly feasible, but it had the potential to induce damages in the downtown area. Removing the culvert did not provide substantial economic efficiency over Plan G. The plan was removed from consideration because it induced damages and was inefficient in Reach E3 and Reach E6.

3.3.4.3 Plan I

Plan I was similar to Plan G except it did not contain detention ponds.

- No regional detention
- Channel improvements occur along about 2.2 miles of channel. This plan offers protection at around a 1/500 ACE for Reach E1. Channel widths varied from 5 feet on South Branch to about 37 feet on the lower end of Jordan Creek and on Wilsons Creek. Side slopes varied from 3:1 to

5:1 depending on real estate restrictions. Work through the downtown Reaches (Reaches E3 and E6) provide substantial protection against a 1/25 ACE.

- This plan contained channel modifications in Reaches E1, E3 and E6. Channel improvements are not planned for Reaches E2, E4 and E5.
- Stream Crossings - There are five new stream crossing and six replaced crossings. These crossing are either bridges or box culverts. One bridge foundation was modified to reinforce the piers that are in the channel. Five crossings that are currently in the stream would be removed. Twenty-three structures in the watershed would remain unchanged.
- The maintenance road was not included in the Federal project, but the cross section was created so the City could add it later. The new and replaced stream crossings are wide enough to allow pedestrian or bicycle traffic to cross safely under them.

The cost to construction to project was approximately \$53 million. It provided \$3.8 million in benefits per year, which was \$800,000 more than the annual cost. See Plate 10 for a map of the plan.

Eliminated from Consideration - This plan was eliminated from consideration because it did not contain detention basins, which provide many benefits to upstream residential housing. This plan was inefficient in Reach E3 and Reach E6; therefore, it did not move into the final array. Plan J was more efficient.

3.3.4.4 Plan J

Plan J was the most economically efficient plan. It includes only the increments that produce the most net benefits. Table 3-5: Plan J Benefits and Costs by Reach details the benefits and cost for Plan J.

Table 3-5: Plan J Benefits and Costs by Reach

Reach	E1	E2	E3	E4	E5	E6	Total
ACE	1/500						
Net Benefits per year	1,740,800	17,100	143,100	10,300	1,600	172,600	1,876,300
Total Cost	9,949,200	489,100	4,107,400	291,300	44,000	4,642,500	19,523,500

- Regional Detention
- Channel modifications occurred only in the first reach to protect against the 1/500 ACE.
- Stream Crossings –One stream crossing was replaced for the railroad. Another stream crossing was modified to accommodate a wider channel.

The total cost for this plan was \$20 million. It provided \$3.0 million in benefits per year yielding \$1.9 million in net benefits. See Plate 11 for a map of the plan. This plan was not eliminated from consideration, and it was included in the final array.

3.3.4.5 Results of Iteration 4

All of the plans were efficient and effective. Plans I and H were both eliminated from consideration. Plans G2 and J proceeded into the final array.

3.3.5 Formulation Criteria

The alternative plans were screened by four formulation criteria established in the P&G. These criteria are completeness, effectiveness, efficiency and acceptability.

- **Completeness** - Completeness is a determination of whether or not the plan includes all elements necessary to achieve the objectives of the plan. For a project to be successful in this area, it must meet all of the objectives for the project listed in Section 2.5.
- **Effectiveness** - All of the plans in the final array provide some contribution to the planning objectives. Effectiveness is defined as a measure of the extent to which a plan achieves its objectives.
- **Efficiency** - All of the plans in the final array provide positive net benefits. The cost effectiveness of a plan is expressed in net benefits and is a measure of its efficiency.
- **Acceptability** - All of the plans in the final array must be in accordance with Federal law and policy. Acceptability is defined as acceptance of the plan to the local sponsor and the concerned public.

Table 3-6: Comparison of Plans describes shows how each of the plans meet the criteria.

Table 3-6: Comparison of Plans

	Completeness	Effectiveness	Efficiency	Acceptability
No Federal Project (no action)	No - Does not completely meet any of the Planning objectives.	No - This plan was the baseline of effectiveness against which all the other plans are measured.	Yes - This plan had zero net benefits because it was the plan by which the other plans are compared.	No - It was not acceptable to continue to incur the damages the City is incurring.
Detention Basins Only	No - The plan reduced some risk to property and lives, but it did not meet the minimum requirement of the 1/25 ACE. It also did not provide recreation nor increase in environmental benefits.	No - The plan did remove some of the risks from flooding, but it did not do so effectively.	Yes	Yes- The detention basins took up little room but significantly reduced the flows in the project area and beyond the limits of Federal interest.

	Completeness	Effectiveness	Efficiency	Acceptability
Detention and Buyouts	No - The plan reduced some risk to property and lives, but it did not meet the minimum requirement of the 1/25 ACE. Some buyout areas could have been used for recreation and environmental restoration.	Yes	No - Buying properties to the 1/25 ACE gave negative net benefits.	No - It would not be acceptable to the public to buy large portions of the downtown and move them further out of the City.
Buyouts (Nonstructural Plan)	Yes - A plan could be formulated that provided a minimum of 1/25 ACE.	Yes	No - Analysis proved that a number of buyout plans cost more on a yearly basis than they provided in benefits.	No – Buyouts through the downtown would affect community cohesiveness.
Plan A	Yes	Yes	No - This plan was improved upon to create plan B. Plan B provided a significant reduction in cost but approximately the same benefits.	Yes
Plan B	Yes	Yes	No – It had a BC less than 1.	Yes
Plan C	Yes	No – It left substantial flooding in the lower reaches of the watershed.	No – It had a BC less than 1.	Yes
Plan D	Yes	Yes	No – It had a BC less than 1.	Yes
Plan E	Yes	No – It left substantial flooding in the lower reaches of the watershed.	Yes	Yes
Plan F	Yes	Yes	No - It had a BC less than 1.	Yes
Plan G	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Plan G2	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes

	Completeness	Effectiveness	Efficiency	Acceptability
Plan H	Yes	Yes	Yes	No - Removing the work through the downtown area caused concern about induced flooding, even though the model predicted minimal flooding.
Plan I	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Plan J	Yes	Yes - It was effective for high-frequency events. For the low-frequency events, this plan was not effective.	Yes	Yes

3.3.6 Results of Plan Formulation and Evaluation

The results of the analysis determined the following plans would be included in the Final Array:

- No Action Plan
- Detention Basins Only
- Plan G2
- Plan J

3.4 FINAL ARRAY OF PLANS COMPARISON

Comparison is the fifth step in the planning process. It is based on the evaluation of the impacts of the plans, the fourth step in the planning process. The more detailed evaluations of the impacts of the plans are presented in Chapter 5, Environmental Consequences.

3.4.1 Planning Objective Matrix

Table 3-7: Matrix of How Plans Met Objectives, shows how the No Action Plan, Plan J, Plan G2 and the Detention Basins Only plan met the original planning objectives. See Section 2.5 for a discussion on how the planning objectives were determined. The plans were compared against one another for their ability to fulfill the objectives of the project. A thorough discussion of each objective follows the matrix.

Table 3-7: Matrix of How Plans Met Objectives

Objective	No Action Plan	Plan J	Plan G2	Detention Basins Only
Reduce overall flood damages in the project area from 2020 to 2070.	Flooding increased over time. \$4.6 million in estimated annual damages (EAD)	Reduced 63 percent of the damages, but significant damages start to incur at 1/5 ACE. \$1.7 million in EAD.	Reduced 89 percent of damages, but there were still considerable damages before the 1/25 ACE. \$500,000 in EAD.	Reduced 15 percent of the damages. This plan was not effective. \$3.9 million in EAD.
Reduce residual risk to property by removing properties from the floodplain.	Risk Increased over time. 162 buildings were flooded at the 1/100 ACE.	Twenty five percent (41 buildings) removed from the 1/100 ACE. Better than detention alone, but not as well as Plan G2.	Fifty percent (81 buildings) of the buildings were removed from the 1/100 ACE floodplain.	Ten percent of the buildings were removed. This plan did not meet this objective.
Reduce risk to transportation and life, health, and safety by reducing flood levels.	The city streets started to be inundated at a 1/2 ACE. The downstream damages were incurred at the 1/10 ACE.	The city streets started to be inundated at a 1/5 ACE. Reach E1 damages were virtually eliminated.	The city streets started to be inundated at 1/25 ACE. Reach E1 damages were virtually eliminated.	The city streets started to be inundated at a 1/5 ACE. Reach E1 damages were incurred at the 1/10 ACE.

Reduce Overall Flood Damages in the Project Area - Plan J reduced 63 percent of the average annual damages, and plan G2 reduced 89 percent of the average annual damages. Plan J more efficiently reduced damaged than Plan G2. Detention basins only provided a 15 percent reduction in average annual damages, much lower than either Plan J or Plan G2.

Reduce Residual Risk to Properties by Removing Properties from the Floodplain – Removing properties from the floodplain reduced risk to the people who, during flood events, transverse the floodplain to other destinations. Fifty percent (81 buildings) of the buildings were removed from the one percent ACE floodplain in Plan J while only 25 percent (41) of the buildings were removed with the Plan J. Ten percent of the properties were removed with the Detention Basin Only Plan, which was dramatically less than Plan J or Plan G2.

Reduced Risk to Transportation and Life, Health, and Safety - The channel plans were designed to protect building contents from specific flood events while allowing roadways and parking lots to flood. Road inundation increases the probability of loss of life. Residual flooding was significantly less with the Plan G2 than with the Plan J and the Detention Basin Only Plan. Using the hydrology from 2003, at the 1/100 ACE, there was two-to-three foot drop from Plan J to Plan G2 in the downtown area, but at the 1/10 ACE, it could be anywhere from three to six feet. There was a large reduction at the 1/10 ACE because most of the water was carried by the channel. With Plan G2 there was no flooding of the streets until about the 1/25 ACE, but with Plan J, there was flooding at about the 1/2 ACE. Plan J and the detention basins performed similarly through the downtown area. Plan J and Plan G2 perform the same in the lower reaches of the watershed and far outperformed the detention basins only plan.

The Detention Basins only plan did not sufficiently remove risk; therefore, it was removed from consideration.

3.4.2 Economic Viability of the Plans

The costs of the plans were presented in Table 3-8: Final Array of Costs. These costs include only benefits achieved within the limits of Federal interest.

Table 3-8: Final Array of Costs

	Plan G2	Plan J
LERRD	\$ 24,543,377	\$ 6,012,132
Sponsor's Cash	\$ 3,002,164	\$ 1,006,379
Sponsor's Share	\$ 27,545,541	\$ 7,018,511
Federal Share	\$ 32,497,737	\$ 13,109,069
Total Project Cost	\$ 60,043,300	\$ 19,523,500
Annual OMRR&R Costs	\$ 642,600	\$ 234,400
Annualized Cost	\$ 3,433,100	\$ 1,153,100
Annualized Benefits	\$ 4,152,600	\$ 3,029,400
BC Calculation	1.21	2.6
Net Benefits	\$ 719,500	\$ 1,876,300

The total project costs were significantly lower with Plan J. Plan J, would deliver two-and-a-half dollars of return for every dollar spent. The addition of channelization through downtown (the difference between Plans J and G) would yield a 60-cent return for every dollar spent.

The net benefits for Plan J far exceeded those of Plan G2 because the channels through the downtown area were not incrementally justified. The net benefits for Plan G2 were \$719,500. The net benefits for

Plan J were \$1,876,300 per year. Plan J provided over \$1.1 million net benefits a year more than Plan G2.

3.4.3 Action Versus No Action

There was a high risk that continual flooding in Jordan Creek would result in adverse impacts to the community. Without Federal involvement in the modification to the existing flood risk management system, the study area would continue to be at risk from large flooding events and the affected community would be faced with continued economic development concerns, potential loss of life and physical, as well as environmental, damage to the study area. The problem would worsen with time with no action taken because natural growth and redevelopment in the watershed will increase flows and flood damages.

The No Action plan did nothing to alleviate risks to public health and safety. While some local emergency preparedness plans can be updated and general awareness of the risks can be increased, this could be considered an inappropriate small-scale response to significant life and safety risks.

The economic implications of the No Action plan were broadly negative. The investment at risk was so large that no Federal action would subject the study area to the possibility of an overall long-term adverse impact on the local economy. With an absence of flooding, the current trends in place for the local economy, tax base, population and employment may remain intact. However, if major flooding occurs, the long-term effects were likely to include diminished economic stability, business interruptions that could jeopardize worker's jobs and wages, potential losses in population and employment, reductions in the tax base and generally diminished property values.

Without Federal intervention, there was significant risk that the aquatic ecosystem would remain stagnant or decline in Jordan Creek. Total flows would increase, even with added regional detention, which will exacerbate the decline in habitat quality. General channel improvements would occur over the period of analysis to increase flow, but, because of cost factors and real estate restrictions, the improvements would be minor. The likely improvement option was a grass-lined channel that would be mowed or a concrete channel that would provide no habitat options.

3.4.4 Risk and Uncertainty

The Plan J would remove 63 percent of the average annual damages in the study area; however, it would provide minimal protection to the downtown area that contained both industrial and educational facilities. Two college campuses that include both a technology center and a pharmacy school have renovated buildings. Although the cost of channel modification was greater than the property damages reduced in Plan G2, the residual risk was high with Plan J because these structures were population concentrations. Varieties of nonstructural and structural options were analyzed, but flash flooding and requirements for infrastructure in the Jordan Creek Valley, rendered channelization the only effective alternative to managing the flood risk through the downtown area.

Risk reduction to people and property were the focus of this project. The three project objectives focus on reducing risk. With Plan G2, flooding would still occur in the downtown area, but fewer people and less property were affected. With Plan G2, the elevation of the water through the downtown would drop to 3 to 4 feet through the downtown area as opposed 3 to 6 inches with Plan J. See Table 3-9: Summary of Residual Risks for a breakdown of how the plans would perform.

Table 3-9: Summary of Residual Risks

	No Action	Plan G2	Plan J
Residual Annual Damages	\$4.6 million	\$ 498,700	\$1.62 million
Damages Prevented		\$4.15 million	\$3.03 million
Reduction in Damages		89.3%	65.3%
Acres Removed from the 1/100 ACE	657	118	
Buildings Remaining in the 1/100 ACE	162	80	121
Buildings Removed from the 1/100 ACE	0	82	41
Depth Reduction Through Downtown During 1/100 ACE (Future Hydrology)	5 to 6 feet of flooding (no reduction)	3 to 4 feet	3 to 6 inches

What follows is a list of the residual risks and their performance under each of the plans.

1. **Project Performance** – There would be minimal performance of Plan J through the downtown area for events greater than the 1/10 ACE. The only protection offered to the downtown area would be the detention basins. Damage reduction in the downtown reaches (E3, E4 and E6) with a 1/10 ACE would be 44 percent. However, the damage reduced with a 1/25 ACE would be only 27 percent. Detention basins reduce high-frequency event flood damages, but they provide less protection for storms greater than the 1/10 ACE. With Plan J, once the detention basins were overwhelmed, there would be significantly less protection provided to the downtown area. With the downtown channel in Plan G2, the 1/25 ACE would yield an 89 percent reduction in damages. Project exceedance for the No Action, Detention Ponds, Plan G2, and Plan J are all presented in Section 4.7 of the Economic Analysis Appendix.
2. **Residual Flooding** – The channel plans were designed to protect building contents from specific flood events while allowing roadways and parking lots to flood; however, road inundation increases the probability of loss of life. The residual flooding was significantly less with Plan G2 than with the Plan J. Using the hydrology from 2003, at the 1/100 ACE, there was a two-to-three foot drop from Plan J to Plan G2, but at the 1/10 ACE, it could be anywhere from three to six feet. There was a large reduction at the 1/10 ACE because most of the water was carried by the channel. Even during the high-frequency events, there was significant conveyance of the

water and reduction of residual flooding. With Plan G2 there was no flooding of the streets until about the 1/25 ACE, but with Plan J, there was flooding at about the 1/2 ACE. Single event residual damage tables can be found in Section 4.2 of the Economic Analysis Appendix.

3. **Long Term Risk to the Project Area** - Long-term risk reduction was greater with Plan G2 as opposed to Plan J. In the next 10 years, there was a 65 percent chance of exceeded capacity with Plan G2. With Plan J, which would start to show damages at the 1/2 ACE, the chances of exceeding the capacity of the project in the next 10 years was greater than 99 percent. The effectiveness of Plan J was dramatically reduced after the 1/10 ACE. Plan J would not provide complete protection to the industrial and education centers. Long-term risk tables can be found in Section 4.7 of the Economic Analysis Appendix.
4. **Population at Risk** – Removing properties from the floodplain reduced risk to the people who, during flood events, transverse the floodplain to other destinations. Fifty percent (82 buildings) of the buildings were removed from the one percent ACE floodplain in Plan G2 while only 25 percent (41) of the buildings were removed with the Plan J. Ten percent of the properties were removed with the Detention Basin Only Plan, which was dramatically less than Plan J or Plan G2.
5. **Flooding in Recent History** – Twenty years of data was used to determine how the watershed would perform. With Plan J, little protection would be offered to the downtown area during the high-intensity events, because between a 1/10 and 1/25 ACE, the detention ponds exceed their capacity. In the last 15 years, the City has encountered two 1/25 ACE events, a 1/50 ACE, and a 1/100 ACE. Plan G2 would offer the downtown area, Reach E3, 13 times more protection from a 1/100 ACE than would Plan J. The City would not have been protected against large damages in the large floods of recent memory with Plan J.

Uncertainty in the Analysis – Risk and uncertainty are intrinsic in water resources planning and design. All measured or estimated values in project planning and design were best estimates of key variables, factors, parameters and data components. These estimates were the “most likely” values. The true values of planning and design variables and parameters were frequently not known with certainty and could take on a range of values. They were based on short periods of record, small sample sizes and measurements that were subject to error. However, uncertainty was shared across the plans equally making the likelihood of a wrong decision low.

The likelihood of a parameter taking on a particular value by a probability distribution could be described. In the economic analysis, areas of uncertainty in the analysis included first floor elevations from surveys, structure values, content values, vehicle values, Hydrology and Hydraulic exceedance probabilities, H&H stage-discharge function and the depth-percent damage functions. Ranges of uncertainty for all of these functions were entered into the HEC-FDA program. Values for EAD were calculated with uncertainty as described in the Economic Analysis Appendix Section 4.6.

3.4.5 Loss of Life

An HEC-FIA was run on the preliminary array of plans. The calculated the loss of life as negligible in the future without project conditions. As a result, there was no calculated loss of life reduction with any of the plans evaluated.

The HEC-FIA model associated people with a particular building type. The model did not account for people traveling across or within the floodplain. In previous floods, numerous water rescues occurred when people tried to cross flooded roads and bridges.

3.4.6 Environmental Considerations

The Environmental Impacts of the No Action Plan, Plan G2 and Plan J were discussed in Section 5 Effects on Significant Resources.

3.4.7 Failure of the Project

A floodplain management plan would be developed for the project constructed, and it would include advising the public of the residual risk.

The project will consist of detention basins, channel modifications, and widening of bridge openings. Because of the static nature of the system, the only probable failure would be that of a detention pond levee. Should that happen, the water flowing through that pond would reach points further downstream faster, causing a slight rise in water level that could damage buildings. Failure of the system in this way will not worsen than the existing conditions because the channel conveyance and bridge openings would allow more water to flow through them at any given time.

Should the system encounter a rainfall event that exceeds design capacity, bridges could be overtopped and roadways flooded. The scales of both the project and the rainfall event would determine the scale of the safety risk posed.

3.4.8 System of Accounts

A method of displaying the positive and negative effects of various plans was to use the System of Accounts as suggested by the U.S. Water Resources Council. The accounts are categories of long-term impacts, defined in such a manner that each proposed plan can be easily compared to one another. The four accounts used to compare proposed water resource development plans were the national economic development (NED), environmental quality (EQ), regional economic development (RED) and other social effects (OSE) accounts.

3.4.8.1 National Economic Development (NED)

The intent of comparing alternative flood control plans in terms of national economic development was to identify the beneficial and adverse effects that the plans may have on the national economy. Beneficial effects were considered to be increases in the economic value of the national output of goods and services attributable to a plan. Increases in NED were expressed as the plans' economic benefits and the adverse NED effects are the investment opportunities lost by committing funds to the

implementation of a plan. The NED benefits for Plans G2 and J were described in Section 3.4.2. Plan J had the most net benefits.

3.4.8.2 Environmental Quality(EQ)

The environmental quality account was another means of evaluating the alternatives to assist in making a plan recommendation. The EQ account was intended to display the long-term effects that the alternative plans may have on significant environmental resources. The Water Resources Council defined significant environmental resources as those components of the ecological, cultural and aesthetic environments that, if affected by the alternative plans, could have a material bearing on the decision-making process. The EQ account was described in Section 5. Plans G2 and J had similar effects and benefits. The No Action plan had negative impact to HTRW and biological resources.

3.4.8.3 Regional Economic Development (RED)

The regional economic development account was intended to illustrate the effects that the proposed plans would have on regional economic activity, specifically, regional income and regional employment. RED benefits are similar across both plans. Plan G2 had more construction in the downtown reaches which had a short-term multiplier effect to the regional economy.

3.4.8.4 Other Social Effects (OSE)

The other social effects (OSE) account typically includes long-term community impacts in the areas of public facilities and services, recreational opportunities, transportation and traffic and man-made and natural resources. Plan G2 has more health safety features and potential for trails than Plan J.

3.5 PLAN SELECTION

3.5.1 Rationale for Designation of the NED Plan

Federal policy requires that the feasibility study must identify the plan that reasonably maximizes net National Economic Development (NED) benefits consistent with protecting the environment. This “NED” plan must be recommended for implementation unless there are overriding reasons for recommending another plan.

The NED plan was determined by evaluating the net economic benefits for each separable reach. The NED plan is Plan J.

3.5.2 Rationale for Tentatively Selected Plan

The Tentatively Selected Plan (TSP) is the NED plan because it provides the greatest net benefits.

3.6 DESCRIPTION OF THE TENTATIVELY SELECTED PLAN

3.6.1 Plan J Components

Channel improvements: Channel improvements only occur in Reach E1 and were designed to keep structural damage from a 1/500 ACE to a minimum. On Wilsons Creek, approximately 2100 feet of channel widening will occur. The widening will start at the confluence of Wilsons and Jordan Creeks and

will end approximately at station 310+00, 100 feet west of the Scenic Bridge. The channel top width varies from 100 feet to 360 feet and runs mostly through City owned property. Modification to Scenic Bridge will likely be required because of channel excavation beneath the bridge. The modification may include installing new piers and a mat foundation. Because the railroad bridge over Wilsons Creek at the southeast corner of the ball fields causes a restriction to stream flow, it will be replaced.

The sponsor will remove two pedestrian walkways on Jordan Creek to increase the channel width from approximately 45 to 100 feet. While no modifications will be made to the bridge on Bennett Street, the street (which is lower than the bridge) will be raised approximately two feet to keep water from flanking the bridge. Channel work will end approximately 350 feet north of the Bennett Street Bridge.

The Archimica plant is located at the confluence of Fassnight and Jordan Creeks. Raising the floodwall would require substantial excavation and rebuilding, as a result, no work is planned to raise the floodwall.

Reach E1 contains three HTRW areas, the two of which are City-owned sites of former municipal landfills. The largest City-owned parcel, Ewing Park, borders Wilsons Creek on the north and is currently used as a sports complex. The completed Phase I study of this 35.5-acre parcel recommended further assessment. The other City-owned property is an eleven-acre parcel along Bennett Street. The remaining HTRW property consists of two parcels of land owned by the Archimica Pharmaceutical Company. While, there is no toxic or radioactive waste known in the project area, estimated remediation costs for cleanup of these properties range from \$67,500 to \$1,340,000. Actual costs may be significantly lower, depending on the area of remediation required for the project footprint. The sponsor is responsible for cleaning the site to a level suitable for channel widening. USACE will continue to work with the City and the Missouri Department of Natural Resources (MDNR) to discuss HTRW issues on these site.

Detention Basins: Five regional detention basins are included in the NED plan. Those basins are B6, B6B, B9B, B11, and B11C. Refer to Paragraph Number 3.2.1 for a description of the basins.

Due to the highly developed, urban environment of the project footprint, and the fact that channel construction activity will be confined to the highly industrialized lower reach, the resulting environmental impacts are minimal. No compensatory mitigation is required.

3.6.2 Design and Construction Considerations

Construction of the proposed channel will occur within the existing, operating channel and some of the detention basins. This will present a challenge to the construction contractor regarding the movement of equipment, personnel and supplies within the construction areas. Erosion will be minimized during the construction process.

The railroad bridge over Wilsons Creek will be replaced using a “Saddlecap” method; that is, the new bridge will be constructed underneath the existing bridge. This will eliminate the need to construct an

alternate railway, commonly called a shoofly. Once the new structure is in place, the rails from the old bridge can be installed on the new structure within an allowable downtime.

There will be several required utility relocations along Rockhurst Street, which is downstream of Basin B7. The flow line of the basin will be lowered to provide additional storage capacity. This change in grade will require two 48" diameter reinforced concrete pipes to be placed along Rockhurst Street to convey the storm-water downstream. Affected utilities likely include water, sanitary sewer, natural gas, communication, and electrical. Because the drainage and utility construction occur underneath the existing street, reconstruction of the street will be required. During design and construction, special consideration will be given to unknown site conditions such as unidentified utilities, rock formations and other artificial subsurface obstructions.

Given the flow velocities, proposed channel side slopes (1:4) and use of turf reinforcement mats; sedimentation within the channel should be minimal and should not affect the flow capacity of the channel over time. A small amount of sediment removal is accounted for in the operations and maintenance plan for the channel and is included in the project costs.

A Cost Schedule Risk Analysis (CSRA) was conducted on the project to determine the contingencies to add to the cost estimate. Based on unknowns in construction, contracting, real estate and funding sources, the team assigned a 23 percent contingency to the construction items in the project. The real estate was assigned a 20 percent contingency.

3.6.3 Real Estate Requirements

Real estate requirements include the acquisition of an approximate ten-acre channel improvement easement and an approximate one-acre temporary construction easement for Reach E1. Five detention basins are part of this study. Approximately a two-acre utility/pipeline easement connecting with detention basin B7 will be acquired. An easement or fee-simple acquisition of detention basin 9B will also be needed. The City has drainage easements on detention basins B6, B7, B11 and B11C. Depending on the conditions or provisions for each of the easements, the non-Federal sponsor may need to acquire a fee-simple interest in detention basins B6, B11 and B11C. The land area for the proposed detention basin B7 is under the administration of the City Parks Department. An interdepartmental land transfer of authority over this basin area may be required. The City will provide right-of-ways free of HTRW to the government.

3.6.4 Local Betterments

There are no betterments.

3.6.5 Operations, Maintenance, Repair, Rehabilitation and Replacement Considerations

A summary of the Operation, Maintenance, Repair, Rehabilitation and Replacement (OMRR&R) cost estimate appears in Table 3-10: Summary of OMRR&R Costs for Plan J. This estimate was calculated to account for the net increase in project costs to operate and maintain the project features and to recognize costs for the repair, replacement and rehabilitation, primarily bridges and culverts. This cost

will be a required minimum in the future to maintain the improved project for its expected life. The basis of the OMRR&R is a visual inspection of the project area via aerial photography. Woody growth along the creek banks indicated a lack of regular maintenance. Regular mowing and clearing is assumed in the estimate. The difference in maintenance of bridges and culverts is due to the change in physical size of the structure.

Table 3-10: Summary of OMRR&R Costs for Plan J

Item Description	Annual Cost
Wilsons Creek and South Branch 0+00 to 37+92	\$76,087
Detention Ponds on North Branch of Jordan Creek	\$63,020
Detention Ponds on South Branch of Jordan Creek	\$123,117
Total	\$234,400

3.6.6 Economic Summary

The estimated project construction costs and OMRR&R costs were developed using the MII cost estimating system. These costs, along with annualized costs, annualized benefits, net economic benefits and the benefit-to-cost ratios are shown in Table 3-11: Economic Analysis for Plan J. These values are based on October 2012 price levels, an interest rate of 3.75 percent, a 50-year period of analysis and a 3-year construction period.

During the formulation of an alternative, USACE computes benefits within the project area to compare the plans to one another. However, benefits may accrue upstream of the project area's limit of Federal interest. The NED benefits that accrue upstream of the limit of Federal interest in this project were calculated, included in the final analysis and reported in Table 3-11. For further discussion on this, please see Economic Analysis Appendix Section 7: Benefits Outside of Federal Interest.

Table 3-11: Economic Analysis for Plan J

Item	Benefits within the Federal Interest	Benefits Including Upstream of the Limit of Federal Interest
Interest Rate,%	3.750%	3.750%
Interest Rate, Monthly	0.307%	0.307%
Construction Period, Years	3.0	3.0
Period of Analysis, Years	50	50
Total Project Cost	\$19,523,500	\$19,523,500
Interest During Construction	\$1,087,300	\$1,087,300
Investment Cost	\$20,610,800	\$20,610,800
Annual Cost		
Interest	\$772,900	\$772,900
Amortization	\$145,800	\$145,800
OMRR&R	\$234,400	\$234,400
Total Annual Cost	\$1,153,100	\$1,153,100
Annual Benefits		
Structures, Contents, Other	\$2,967,800	\$3,064,800
Infrastructure	61,300	69,600
Total Annual Benefits	\$3,029,300	\$3,134,400
Benefit-to-Cost Ratio	2.6	2.7
Net Benefits	\$1,876,300	\$1,981,300

The selected plan, Plan J, has an investment cost of \$20,610,800; an annual cost of \$1,153,100; annual benefits of \$3,134,400; excess net benefits of \$1,981,300; and a benefit-to-cost ratio of 2.7, which becomes the new Federal Benefit-to-Cost ratio.

3.6.7 Sensitivity of the TSP to the Future Conditions

The benefits are based on assumptions about the future; however, there is a possibility that the future conditions may never occur. There is a large increase in the estimated damage from the existing conditions to the future without project conditions. Sensitivity analysis, conducted on the NED plan, shows it is not sensitive to the future without project conditions assumptions. The NED plan is justified in the existing conditions.

3.6.8 Environmental Compliance

No significant environmental impacts have been detected to date. See Table 3-12: Status of Project with Applicable Laws and Statutes for the status of compliance.

Table 3-12: Status of Project with Applicable Laws and Statutes

Item	Compliance
<u>Federal Statutes</u>	
Archaeological and Historic Preservation Act, as amended, 16 U.S.C. 469, et seq.	Full
Clean Air Act of 1977, as amended, 42 U.S.C. 7609, et. seq.	Full
Clean Water Act, as amended, (Federal Water Pollution Control Act), 33 U.S.C. 1251, et. seq.	Ongoing
Coastal Zone Management Act, 16 U.S.C. 1451, et. seq.	N/A
Endangered Species Act, 16 U.S.C. 1531, et. seq.	Ongoing
Estuary Protection Act, 16 U.S.C. 1221, et. seq.	N/A
Federal Water Project Recreation Act, 16 U.S.C. 460-12, et. seq.	Full
Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act, 16 U.S.C. 661, et. seq.	Ongoing
Land and Water Conservation Fund Act, 16 U.S.C. 460/ -460/-11, et. seq.	N/A
Marine Protection, Research and Sanctuary Act, 33 U.S.C. 1401, et. seq.	N/A
National Environmental Policy Act, 42 U.S.C. 4321, et. seq.	Ongoing
National Historic Preservation Act, 16 U.S.C. 470a, et. seq.	Full
Rivers and Harbor Act, 33 U.S.C. 401, et. seq.	N/A
Watershed Protection and Flood Prevention Act, 16 U.S.C. 1001, et. seq.	N/A
Wild and Scenic Rivers Act, 16 U.S.C. 1271, et. seq.	Full
<u>Executive Orders, Memorandums, etc.</u>	
Executive Order 11988, Floodplain Management, May 24, 1977 (42 CFR 26951; May 25, 1977)	Full
Executive Order 11990, Protection of Wetlands, May 24, 1977 (42 CFR 26961; May 25, 1977)	Full
Council on Environmental Quality Memorandum of August 11, 1980: Analysis of Impacts on Prime or Unique Agricultural Lands in Implementing the National Environmental Policy Act.	Full
Executive Order 12114, Environmental Effects Abroad of Major Federal Actions.	N/A
Executive Order 12898, Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations, February 11, 1994.	Full
<u>State and Local Policies</u>	
Missouri Water Quality Standards	Ongoing

Note: The compliance categories used in this table were assigned based on the following definitions:

Full Compliance (Full): Having met all requirements of the statute, Environmental Order (E.O.) or other environmental requirements for the current stage of planning.

Ongoing: Coordination ongoing, and should be completed prior to signature of FONSI.

Not Applicable (N/A): No statute, E.O. or other environmental requirement for the current stage of planning.

3.7 IMPLEMENTATION REQUIREMENTS

3.7.1 Institutional Requirements

All USACE project must comply with all applicable environmental statutes and policies. Table 3-12: Status of Project with Applicable Laws and Statutes illustrates this project’s status of compliance.

The schedule for project implementation assumes authorization in the proposed Water Resources Development Act of 2014. After project authorization, the project will be eligible for construction funding. It will be considered for inclusion in the President’s budget based on national priorities, magnitude of the Federal commitment, economic and environmental feasibility, level of local support, willingness of the non-Federal sponsor to find its share of the project cost and the budget constraints that may exist at the time of funding.

Once Congress appropriates Federal construction funds, USACE and the non-Federal sponsor would enter into a Project Partnership Agreement (PPA). This PPA would define the Federal and non-Federal responsibilities for implementing, operating and maintaining the project.

Following the signing of the PPA and the design approval, USACE would officially request the sponsor to acquire the necessary real estate. The advertisement of the construction contract would follow the certification of the real estate acquisition and right- of-entry. The final acceptance and transfer of the project to the non-Federal sponsor will follow the delivery of an operation and maintenance manual and as-built drawings.

Assuming full funding, the project will be fully constructed by the year 2020 as displayed in Table 3-13: Project Schedule.

Table 3-13: Project Schedule

Task	Date
Release Draft Report	January 31, 2013
Independent External Peer Review	February 1 – March 1, 2013
Agency Technical Review	February 1 – March 1, 2013
Headquarter Review	February 1 – March 1, 2013
Decision Point 3 (Civil Works Review Board)	May 2013
Decision Point 4 (Chief’s Report)	August 2013
Water Resources Development Act	2014
Planning, Engineering and Design	2014-2015
Construction	2016-2020

3.7.2 Cost Apportionment

The sponsor is responsible for the Lands, Easements, Right of ways, Relocations and Disposal Area (LERRD), which is included in the sponsor’s share of the construction cost. Table 3-14: Cost Apportionment

shows the cost breakdown for both Federal and non-Federal sponsors cost share. This cost included the contingency from the Cost Schedule Risk Analysis and inflation.

Table 3-14: Cost Apportionment

	Non-Federal Sponsor Contribution	Federal Contribution
LERRD	\$ 6,451,390	
Cash	\$1,026,350	
Total	\$ 7,477,740	\$13,049,260
Cost Share	36%	64%

3.7.3 Fully Funded Cost Estimate

Table 3-15 is the cost estimate by Feature Code. The cost estimator assigns the Features codes. This cost estimate includes contingency and inflation.

Table 3-15: Cost Estimate by Feature Code

Feature Code	Cost Shared	LERRD	Subtotal
01 – Lands and Damages	\$55,610	\$4,647,390	\$4,703,000
02 - Relocations channels		\$509,000	\$509,000
02 – Relocations basins	\$0	\$,1295,000	\$1,295,000
09- Channels and Canals	\$7,368,000		\$7,368,000
15 – Floodway Control and Diversion Structures	\$4,399,000		\$4,399,000
30- Planning Engineering and Design	\$1,120,000		\$1,120,000
31 – Corps Contract Supervision and Administration	\$1,133,000		\$1,133,000
Total	\$14,075,610	\$6,451,390	\$20,527,000

3.7.4 Permits

Requirements for Section 404 of the Clean Water Act of 1972, as amended, will be met prior to any construction activity, as will any permit requirements of MDNR for the construction activity in the stream channel.

3.7.5 Views of Non-Federal Sponsor

The non-Federal sponsor fully supports the Tentatively Selected Plan, and is willing and financially capable of cost sharing it.

4 AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT*

4.1 ENVIRONMENTAL SETTING OF THE STUDY AREA

The major characteristics of the study area's natural and human resources are provided to promote a general understanding of the area. The Jordan Creek drainage basin is within the city limits of Springfield, in south-central Missouri. The City has experienced numerous floods because of insufficient flow capacity and urbanization along the reaches of Jordan Creek. The study area includes Jordan Creek, North Branch Jordan Creek, South Branch Jordan Creek and a portion of Wilsons Creek.

Jordan Creek, including North Branch and South Branch Jordan Creek, at its confluence with Wilsons Creek has a 13.75 square mile drainage basin. The total drainage area of the project area is 19.3 square miles and includes Fassnight Creek, which is not included in the Jordan Creek study area. The Jordan Creek watershed study area encompasses approximately six miles along Jordan Creek, generally centered on the Chestnut Expressway between US Highway 65 to the east and US Highway 160 to the west in the northern half of the City.

The study corridor is a heavily urbanized environment and has an extensive infrastructure associated with areas of high-density housing, low-density housing, commercial areas, industrial areas and some open spaces. The City is currently developing a civic park, Jordan Valley Park, in the central portion of the area.

Several railroad tracks, serving the Burlington Northern Santa Fe, Missouri & Northern Arkansas, Union Pacific, Arkansas-Missouri and Kansas City Southern railroads, are in current operation and traverse the project area.

4.2 FLOODING

The flood of 1909 inspired thoughts of engineering the creek to control floodwaters, and between 1933 and 1935 thoughts turned to action. Most infrastructure development in this study area occurred in the 1930s–1940s. It was common at that time (not only in The City, but also nationally) to reserve insufficient space for the conveyance of flood flows. To the extent that drainage design occurred in the 1930s-1940s, there was rarely provision for an adequate, safe pathway for flows through urbanized areas. Typically, natural drainage channels were placed in pipes or narrowed through fill placement, and there was little recognition of the space that floodwaters would occupy (i.e. the floodplain). Jordan Creek was channelized through downtown, from Main Street to Washington (3,520 feet), with two parallel boxes eleven feet wide and ten feet tall. These enclosed channel culverts are not large enough to convey flood flows. As a result, water spills out of the channel culverts and moves through the neighborhoods via streets, alleys and yards, while frequently inundating crawl spaces and basements.

*Designates a Chapter that is traditionally found in an Environmental Assessment.

In an effort to reduce flood damages, large-scale channelization of the central portion of Jordan Creek began with a funding measure in 1927. Large storm drains were installed with viaducts for vehicular traffic. Funding from a bond measure and subsequent Public Works Administration money obtained during the Depression provided the central part of Jordan Creek with a concrete tunnel nearly two-thirds of a mile long, conveying floodwaters directly under downtown streets and buildings. Many of these channelization projects were completed in the 1930s.

Historically, the Jordan Creek area has experienced numerous floods because of insufficient drainage



Figure 4-1: Flooding on Sherman Street

capacity and urbanization. Prior to 1900, major flood events occurred in 1844, 1859, 1866, 1868, 1871 and 1876. Since 1900, recorded major flood events have occurred 1909, 1932, 1951, 1993, 2000, 2002, 2005, 2008 and 2009.

Within the past 10 years, one of the most damaging floods of

record in the watershed occurred on 12 July 2000. The picture in Figure 4-1: Flooding on Sherman Street (courtesy of the City) was taken during the 2000 flood near the corner of East Chestnut Expressway and Sherman Street. Floodwaters were 4 to 6 feet deep in some places, sweeping through at least 124 homes and displacing more than 100 people. The City has grown accustomed to dealing with flooding; but, due to the flashy nature of the flooding, time is usually not available to prepare for flood fighting. The flooding events are unpredictable, preventing the City from constructing emergency flood warning systems.

Significant costs are incurred during emergency flood fighting efforts. Businesses, residents, Federal agencies and local and state governments, all contribute to the flood fight rescue and clean-up efforts.

4.2.1 Flood Problem Overview

A description of the flooding problem is covered in Section 2.3: Problems and Opportunities.

*Designates a Chapter that is traditionally found in an Environmental Assessment.

4.3 PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT

4.3.1 Land Use

The North, South and main Branch channels of Jordan Creek run through a mix of residential and industrial areas. The North Branch runs through two parks and a residential area. The South Branch is mostly an industrial setting following railroad lines. Most of the channel is lined with either natural stone or concrete. Reaches of the channel are walled with flat stone thought to be the work of the Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC).

The City's 2001 land use classification was used to create a land-use map for the study area. The study area contains the highly urbanized core of the city so the resulting classification is highly skewed towards commercial and residential uses (Table 4-1: Land Use Tables for Sub-Watersheds, Figure 4-2: Land Use Map). Pasture and forest exists only in the far eastern headwaters area of the study area and in the riparian zone near the watershed outlet along Fassnight Creek. Land use for the study area and each sub-watershed was calculated using the City's 2001 land use map. The watershed polygons created in Arc Hydro, a geographic information systems tool used for water resources, were used to clip portions of the land use map, and the land use areas were calculated using those clipped polygons. Land uses among the watersheds were quite similar and were highly skewed toward urban types such as residential and commercial. The land use map did not classify roadways, and the area difference between classified land use and total watershed area for each watershed was classified as "Roadway area" (MSU 2007).

Table 4-1: Land Use Tables for Sub-Watersheds

	¹ NB1		NB2		² SB1		SB2		³ JC1	
	Roadway	219.7	12.4%	316.8	14.9%	462.1	15.5%	591.3	16.7%	1073.2
Commercial	733.9	41.5%	788.0	37.1%	997.6	33.6%	1216.0	34.3%	2366.0	37.5%
Multi-Family Res	1.2	0.1%	16.1	0.8%	53.6	1.8%	95.9	2.7%	134.7	2.1%
SF High-Density	17.1	1.0%	26.7	1.3%	36.3	1.2%	48.7	1.4%	92.9	1.5%
SF Low-Density	392.2	22.2%	538.4	25.4%	870.5	29.3%	1012.4	28.6%	1597.3	25.3%
Forest	265.4	15.0%	273.5	12.9%	322.7	10.9%	345.0	9.7%	639.8	10.1%
Grass	33.9	1.9%	58.3	2.7%	226.6	7.6%	228.3	6.5%	305.4	4.8%
Pasture	104.0	5.9%	104.0	4.9%	3.0	0.1%	3.0	0.1%	107.0	1.7%
Total Area (acre)	1767.0		2122.1		2972.2		3540.8		6316.5	
Total Area (square miles)	2.8		3.3		4.6		5.5		9.9	

	JC2		JC3		⁵ JC4		⁴ WC1	
	Roadway	1371.2	18.6%	1445.6	18.9%	1582.5	19.0%	1783.4
Commercial	2673.9	36.3%	2800.9	36.6%	2873.1	34.5%	4593.2	37.1%
Multi-Family Res	153.7	2.1%	154.7	2.0%	214.5	2.6%	358.3	2.9%
SF High-Density	113.7	1.5%	117.1	1.5%	150.0	1.8%	163.8	1.3%
SF Low-Density	1937.3	26.3%	2009.7	26.2%	2309.2	27.7%	3815.5	30.8%
Forest	696.3	9.4%	703.0	9.2%	754.2	9.0%	1049.2	8.5%
Grass	321.5	4.4%	321.5	4.2%	347.7	4.2%	479.1	3.9%
Pasture	107.0	1.4%	107.0	1.4%	107.0	1.3%	152.2	1.2%
Total Area (acre)	7374.6		7659.5		8338.3		12394.5	
Total Area (square miles)	11.5		12.0		13.0		19.4	

¹North Branch Jordan Creek

²South Branch Jordan Creek

³Main Fork Jordan Creek

⁴Wilsons Creek

⁵ JC4 Total area (square miles) does not include a small portion of the watershed area between JC4 and the Wilsons Creek confluence and may not correspond exactly with other sections of this document.




Figure 4-2: Land Use Map

4.4 CLIMATE

The study area is generally hot in summer, especially at low elevations, and moderately cool in winter, especially at high elevation. Rainfall is moderate and well distributed throughout the year. Snow falls nearly every winter, but snow cover lasts only a few days. Two active weather stations are located near Wilsons and Jordan Creeks in Greene County. The Springfield Weather Station and the Springfield Regional Airport Weather Station are west of the City and approximately 10 miles from Wilsons Creek. Both stations record daily precipitation, maximum and minimum temperature, snowfall and snow depth. The annual average precipitation and temperature over the most recent 30-year period is 44.97 inches and 56.2 degrees Fahrenheit, respectively. These two weather stations provide useful

information for understanding when critical conditions occur and establishing a general understanding of the hydrology of the watershed (EPA 2011).

4.4.1 Topography, Physiography and Soils

The City area is located on the Springfield Plateau of the Ozarks physiographic region. The area is underlain by Mississippian Age limestone, which is highly susceptible to solutional weathering. This geology is commonly referred to as “karst” and is characterized by numerous sinkholes, losing streams, springs, caves and other related features. As a result, a complex and often-fragile interaction exists between surface and groundwater, requiring special consideration and protection. Karst geology can present certain hazards to urban development, such as unstable soil foundation for structures, flood hazards, groundwater contamination and public safety hazards related to collapses.

The Springfield Plateau consists of undulating to rolling plains. Elevation ranges from about 900 to 1,500 feet above sea level. The area around The City is within Missouri’s primary karst area. Sinkholes are common and are known to convey storm-water to streams. Slope ranges from two to twenty percent (EPA 2011). Bedrock is present at varying depths and consists of sedimentary rock, mostly limestone, dolomite, sandstone and shale. Limestone, some of which is cherty, is predominant. Faults are common.

4.4.1.1 Soils

Unconsolidated surficial deposits include residuum, loess, colluvium and alluvium. Soil, a important natural resource, is formed in these deposits. Residuum and colluvium are dominant in the survey area except for relatively small areas that have a loess cap or alluvium. The consolidated bedrock exposed in the survey area is conspicuous but significant in area only in some localities.

Upland soils consist primarily of the Wilderness-Viraton association and comprise approximately two-thirds of the watershed. This association consists of broad upland ridges, narrow floodplains and terraces. Slope of the major soils ranges from two to nine percent. These soils are formed from cherty limestone and the surface layer is from two to seven inches thick. This association has a fragipan or hardpan layer that restricts root growth in the subsoil. These soils are mostly used for grasses and legumes with some areas suitable for growing small grain crops (EPA 2011).

Soils within the study area are primarily developed from the red clay residuum that results from the weathering of the underlying limestone bedrock, although some glacial loess does occur as a parent material in some upland area soils. The study area however, is south of the primary area of loess deposition (MSU 2006).

Urban soils undergo progressive cycles of development and redevelopment involving wholesale earthmoving, erosion or removal of topsoil, compaction of subsoils and the filling of depressions, wetlands and natural rainfall storage areas. Consequently, the soils of urban pervious areas often lack the fertility, tilth and recharge characteristics of their non-urban counterparts. From a practical

standpoint, the hydrology of many urban pervious areas is more similar to impervious areas than natural ones (Schueler 2005). For a list of the characteristics of the soils in the watershed, refer to Table 4-2.

Table 4-2: Relative Abundance and Some Characteristics of Soil Types Found in the Study Area

Soil Name	Percent Area	Slope (%)	Landform	Parent Material	Infiltration rate (in/hr)	Depth to Impervious Layer (in)
Creldon silt loam	31.4	1 to 3	uplands	loess/ residuum	0.6 - 2	24
Viraton silt loam	19.1	2 to 5	upland /terrace	loess/ residuum	0.6 - 2	22
Pembroke silt loam	12.9	1 to 5	upland/ terrace	loess/ residuum	0.6 - 2	72+
Wilderness cherty silt loam	6.9	2 to 9	uplands	residuum	2.0 - 6	10
Keeno and Eldon chert silt loams	5.1	2 to 14	uplands	residuum	2.0 - 6	19-28
Peridge silt loam	3.8	2 to 5	upland/ terrace	loess/ residuum	0.6 - 2	72+
Newtonia silt loam	3.8	1 to 3	uplands	loess/ residuum	0.6 - 2	72+
Goss cherty silt loam	3.4	2 to 20	uplands	residuum	2.0 - 6	20
Hepler silt loam	2.9	0 to 2	upland/ terrace	alluvium	0.6 - 2	30
Lanton silt loam	2.7	0 to 2	floodplain	alluvium	0.6 - 2	10
Wilderness & Goss chert silt loam	2.6	2 to 9	uplands	residuum	2.0 - 6	24
Sampsel silty clay loam	2.3	1 to 5	uplands	residuum	2.0 - 6	13

4.5 WATER RESOURCES

4.5.1 Watershed Description

The study area is primarily urban and includes approximately 13.75 square miles of watershed area, which includes Jordan Creek, North Branch Jordan Creek, South Branch Jordan Creek and the upstream portion of Wilsons Creek. Jordan Creek, including the lower reach and South and North Branches, includes 9.6 miles of existing channel. The North Branch of Jordan Creek drains 3.59 square miles and is the smallest major sub-watershed in the study. North Branch has moderate stream slopes (although the highest in the study) and a high degree of urbanization. Most of the development in the sub-watershed is evenly divided between industrial/commercial in the upper portions of the sub-watershed and residential in the lower portions of the sub-watershed. The stream travels in a pair of roadside ditches for the first 4000 feet and passes through a regional detention basin on its way through the sub-watershed. Just before the joining South Branch, the stream passes through a 1,000 foot tunnel located

under an industrial area. One unique characteristic of this sub-watershed is the railroad line that crosses through the northeast portion. The culverts under this rail line are relatively small. The railroad embankment provides detention of runoff from the uppermost 0.5 square mile (14 percent) of the sub-watershed, thereby reducing peak flow. The North Branch sub-watershed includes approximately 14 additional storm-water detention basins that were specifically constructed for that purpose.

The South Branch of Jordan Creek is a moderately sloped reach. The sub-watershed has a high degree of urbanization divided between industrial/commercial and residential development. South Branch is the largest major sub-watershed in the study, drainage of 5.95 square miles. However, due to a number of sinkholes, much of the sub-watershed contributes little storm runoff. The South Branch sub-watershed includes 16 constructed storm-water detention basins.

The North and South Branches converge to form the Lower Branch of Jordan Creek, which carries runoff from 4.21 square mile in addition to that contributed by the North and South Branch sub-watersheds. The stream has a moderate slope similar to the South Branch. The sub-watershed is highly urbanized with a high number of industrial/commercial developments on the upstream side of the sub-watershed and a large percentage of residential development on the downstream end. Just downstream of the confluence of the North and South Branches, the stream enters a large tunnel, which conveys storm-water nearly 3400 feet through the City's downtown area. Different portions of this tunnel, which measures approximately 30 feet wide and 10 feet tall, were constructed around the 1930s. The Lower Branch sub-watershed includes three constructed detention basins.

Jordan Creek and Fassnight Creek converge to form Wilsons Creek approximately 2,000 feet upstream of Scenic Avenue, with Fassnight Creek adding runoff from 5.52 square miles of drainage area.

Wilsons Creek flows to the west at the confluence of Jordan Creek and Fassnight Creek. Due to limited floodplain development, only a short reach of Wilsons Creek has been included in the study. US Highway 160 establishes the downstream study limits for Wilsons Creek. Wilsons Creek is a natural channel and a tributary to the James River, which drains into Table Rock Lake.

4.5.2 Groundwater and Public Water Sources

Deep wells provide ground water for some homes, farms, towns, industries and part of the water supply for the City. Adequate water of good quality for home and farm use can be obtained from the Roubidoux Formation; however, the largest yields of water come from wells in Greene County that tap the entire Potosi Formation. Many of these wells are at a depth of 1,400 feet or more. The yield varies from 500 to 1,385 gallons per minute with an average of 700 gallons per minute.

The carbonate nature of the bedrock produces many karst features such as caves, sinkholes and springs, which are common within the study area and throughout the state of Missouri. These features complicate surface drainage by producing "losing" and "gaining" sections of streams in which water either enters the stream from springs or leaves the stream at karst fissures.

In some cases, sinkholes function as storm-water conduits. The recharge areas for many of these springs include past and present industrial sites with the potential to contaminate streams. Karst features and springs have been known to contribute pollutants to Jordan Creek in some locations and to facilitate the loss of water in other areas. This hydrology involves a high level of interaction between surface water and ground water.

Fellows and McDaniel Lakes are located on the Little Sac River (north of the Jordan Creek project) area and provide part of the public water supply for the City. Water from Lake Springfield is used by the City for industrial purposes, and a limited supply of water is stored in shallow lakes or pumped from the larger streams to be used for irrigation. Ground water from springs sustains the flow of perennial streams.

4.5.3 Water Quality

As an urban stream, Jordan Creek has a long history of anthropogenic impacts. Once a source of water for early settlers' livestock, the creek became a flood-prone liability in the early 1900s, serving as a conduit for all kinds of trash and pollutants produced in The City's original Industrial area. The creek was considered such a liability that by the late 1920s, city leaders had it confined to concrete channels and tunnels as it flowed through downtown. Now, Jordan Creek is at the heart of an effort to redevelop the Jordan Creek Valley with parks and rehabilitated buildings.

The United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) is establishing the Wilsons Creek and Jordan Creek Total Maximum Daily Loads (TMDLs) in accordance with Section 303(d) of the Clean Water Act (CWA) to meet applicable water quality standards (WQS) and to allocate loads to the pollutant sources. Typically, the purpose of a TMDL is to determine the maximum amount of a pollutant (the load) that a water body can assimilate without exceeding the WQS for that pollutant. The water quality limited segments are included on the EPA approved 2008 Missouri 303(d) List. They are listed as impaired by multiple point sources and urban nonpoint sources. Here, the pollutant causing the impairment is listed as unknown; however, toxicity from multiple pollutants and changes in hydrology from increased impervious surfaces are the suspected cause of the impairment. It is appropriate to characterize these TMDLs as phased TMDLs. In the first phase of the Wilsons Creek and Jordan Creek TMDLs, EPA recommends that monitoring be conducted to assess the effect of implementation of the TMDL on the water quality of the watersheds. The phased TMDL approach recognizes that additional data and information may be necessary to validate the assumptions of the TMDL and to provide greater certainty that the TMDL will achieve the WQS (EPA 2011). This USACE Flood Risk Management study for the Jordan Creek watershed is not designed to address directly the issues identified in the TMDL although measures implemented in this study are likely to aid in water quality improvement. Water quality is not an authority of USACE; however, quality is tied to aquatic habitat and ecosystem function through the TMDL.

4.5.4 Wetlands

The US Fish and Wildlife Service spearheads the National Wetland Inventory and has completed a draft inventory of wetlands in Greene County. For the most part, these are small and isolated wetland areas. Local representatives of state and Federal agencies indicate that wetlands in Greene County are located primarily in the floodplains of rivers and streams but could also be present in the floors of sinkholes and other depression areas. See Figure 4-3: National Wetland Inventory Wetland Distribution

Error!
Reference source not found. for locations.




Figure 4-3: National Wetland Inventory Wetland Distribution

4.6 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

The biological resources of the Jordan Creek Watershed are indicative of urban watersheds and generally consist of moderate-to low-value habitat. The biological resources specifically listed in this Feasibility Report and Environmental Assessment (EA) include vegetation, fish and wildlife, threatened and endangered species and wetlands.

4.6.1 Vegetation

Vegetation within the study area consists of small areas of riparian corridors along riprapped banks and intermittent shrubs and grasses along the creek bank. In general the stream is lined with a variety of invasive species with little of the tree cover in a good quality condition. Lack of structured pruning, impacts from wind and ice damage and the harsh ground conditions of the area have allowed for a rather degenerated condition of the current tree cover. A large percentage of the tree cover is growing into or out of the bank retaining structure. The south side of the creek contains a thin tree corridor, with a large degree of the tree cover being invasive species of trees, vines and weeds. Normally the creek contains only a sparse vegetated corridor dominated by invasive species of trees, vines and weeds.

4.6.2 Fish and Wildlife

Due to its urban setting, the Jordan Creek watershed provides minimal habitat for terrestrial wildlife species; however, some wooded areas along the southern portion and the minimal riparian habitat of the watershed provide terrestrial habitat for songbirds and small mammals.

Jordan Creek is managed by the MDNR as a warm-water fisheries habitat and for livestock and wildlife watering. Jordan Creek is on the EPA 303(d) list of impaired streams. It flows directly into Wilsons Creek, which is also a listed impaired stream. To improve and protect the quality and biological integrity of these streams, urban stream best management practices are recommended. Further monitoring could provide insight into the impairment of these streams. This would include sediment analysis, particularly for metals, pesticides, Polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons, and toxicity (MDNR 2007). Sediment studies are not part of this USACE feasibility study.

Urban streams in the City are exposed to a number of stressors that affect the health of the organisms living in them. With growth and urbanization of the City, the amount of impervious surfaces (such as roads, parking lots and rooftops) has increased. These changes increase runoff volume and rate into the streams, increasing the physical disturbances from rain events. The streams also potentially receive more organic and inorganic pollutants from point and non-point sources than a stream in a rural area. Still, many organisms in Jordan and Wilsons Creeks survive and flourish despite the anthropomorphic stressors on their environment. The organisms that live in a stream can provide us with information about the health of the stream; biological communities reflect overall ecological integrity. One tool used to explain and quantify the health of a stream, as indicated by the biota collected, is the Index of Biotic Integrity (IBI). The IBI is based on categories or metrics and can be adapted for different eco-regions. Metrics reflect aspects of the community such as diversity, sensitive species richness and percent tolerant individuals. The metrics provide a score similar to a report card;

the score signifies the level of impairment in comparison to a reference condition. For this study, the fish and benthic macroinvertebrate communities were sampled to evaluate ecological integrity with established, regionally-modified IBIs. Higher scores indicate greater biotic integrity and stream health (MSU 2006).

4.6.2.1 Fisheries

In a study completed by Missouri State University (MSU) from samples collected from July 2005 – June 2006, the results suggest that the biotic communities are impaired in Jordan and Wilsons Creek. IBI values for Jordan and Wilsons Creek remained relatively stable from fall to spring. A *moderately impaired* classification typically indicates that the most sensitive fishes are absent and that the trophic structure is highly skewed towards omnivores, herbivores and tolerant species. Species classified as sensitive included the Striped Shiner and Longear Sunfish, neither of which were found in the study area. Invertivores included the Duskystripe Shiner, Blackspotted Topminnow and Longear Sunfish. See Table 4-3 and Table 4-4 for the results of their collections.

Table 4-3 - Jordan Creek Seasonal Fish Collections 2005-2006

Common Name	Species	10/26/2005	5/12/2006
MINNOWS	CYPRINIDAE		
Stoneroller	Campostoma spp.	283	200
Duskystripe Shiner	Luxilus pilsbryi	4	0
Southern Redbelly Dace	Phoxinus erythrogaster	135	190
Creek Chub	Semotilus atromaculatus	52	65
Bluntnose Minnow	Pimphales notatus	0	5
SUCKERS	CATOSTOMIDAE		
White Sucker	Catostomus commersoni	14	35
CATFISHES	ICTALURIDAE		
Yellow Bullhead	Ameiurus natalis	5	8
KILLIFISHES	FUNDULIDAE		
Blackspotted Topminnow	Fundulus olivaceous	20	23
LIVEBEARERS	POECILIIDAE		
Mosquitofish	Gambusia affinis	45	11
SUNFISHES	CENTRARCHIDAE		
Bluegill	Lepomis macrochirus	4	2
Green Sunfish	Lepomis cyanellus	31	54
Hybrid Sunfish		0	1
	Total Individuals	593	594

Table 4-4: Wilsons Creek Seasonal Fish Collections 2005-2006

Common Name	Species	10/13/2005	4/21/2006
Stoneroller	Campostoma spp.	296	195
Duskystripe Shiner	Luxilus pilsbryi	27	23
Southern Redbelly Dace	Phoxinus erythrogaster	102	218
Creek Chub	Semotilus atromaculatus	46	82
Goldfish	Carassius auratus	1	0
Common Carp	Cyprinus carpio	11	4
SUCKERS	CATOSTOMIDAE		
Golden Redhorse	Moxostoma erythrurum	0	16
CATFISHES	ICTALURIDAE		
Yellow Bullhead	Ameiurus natalis	7	17
KILLIFISHES	FUNDULIDAE		
Blackspotted Topminnow	Fundulus olivaceous	56	10
LIVEBEARERS	POECILIIDAE		
Mosquitofish	Gambusia affinis	48	13
SCULPINS	COTTIDAE		
Banded Sculpin	Cottus carolinae	0	2
SUNFISHES	CENTRARCHIDAE		
Bluegill	Lepomis macrochirus	4	3
Green Sunfish	Lepomis cyanellus	41	21
Largemouth Bass	Micropterus salmoides	0	1
	Total Individuals	639	605

4.6.2.2 Benthic Macro Invertebrates

In 2007, MDNR completed a study following a standardized habitat procedure for Riffle/Pool stream types as described in the Stream Habitat Assessment Project Procedure (SHAPP) (MDNR 2003b). For comparison, a habitat assessment at the Pomme de Terre River biological criteria reference (BIOREF) station at Highway 65 was conducted during the sample period.

A standardized sample analysis procedure was followed as described in the Semi-quantitative Macroinvertebrate Stream Bioassessment Project Procedure (SMSBPP), which provides details on the calculation of metrics and scoring of the multimetric Macroinvertebrate Stream Condition Index (MSCI). The following four metrics were used: 1) Taxa Richness (TR); 2) total number of taxa in the orders Ephemeroptera, Plecoptera and Trichoptera (EPTT); 3) Biotic Index (BI); and 4) Shannon Diversity Index (SDI).

The instream habitat assessment score for Jordan Creek and other urban streams within The City exceeded the minimal 75 percent total score of the habitat assessment of the BIOREF (Pomme de

Terre) criteria used for comparison. It is therefore inferred that, based on habitat score, Jordan Creek should support biological communities comparable to those found in the reference site (MDNR 2007).

Macroinvertebrate Stream Condition Indices (MSCI) were calculated for each stream. MSCI sustainability scores of 20-16 qualify as fully sustaining, 14-10 as partially sustaining and 8-4 as non-sustaining of aquatic life. The four metrics, total scores and MSCI sustainability rankings during Spring 2007 are presented in Table 4-5.

Table 4-5 - Metric Values for Stream Condition Indices

Stream	TR	EPTT	BI	SDI	MSCI	Sustainability
Jordan Creek	41	4	7.51	2.34	6	Non
Wilson's Creek	41	6	6.55	2.33	8	Non

4.6.2.3 Threatened and Endangered Species

Coordination with the Missouri Department of Conservation (MDC) indicates that their database does not include any records of any threatened or endangered species or state-listed species of concern within the study area. However, due to the area's karst geology, an approximately two-mile side buffer around the designated drainage led to the following listings by the MDC (Table 4-6). Coordination with the US Fish and Wildlife Service (FWS) is consistent with the MDC information.

Table 4-6: Species/Habitats with Federal restrictions within two-mile buffer of project area

Scientific Name	Common Name	Federal/State Status	State Rank	Ownership	Section	Township/Range
<i>AMBLYOPSIS ROSAE</i>	OZARK CAVEFISH	E	S2	PRIVATE	04	28N022W
<i>AMBLYOPSIS ROSAE</i>	OZARK CAVEFISH	E	S2	PRIVATE	05	28N022W
<i>AMBLYOPSIS ROSAE</i>	OZARK CAVEFISH	E	S2	PRIVATE	32	29N022W
Species/Habitats with State Restrictions						
Scientific Name	Common Name	State Status	State Rank	Ownership	Section	Township/Range
<i>LEPUS CALIFORNICUS</i>	BLACK-TAILED JACKRABBIT	E	S1	PRIVATE	16	29N022W
<i>TYTO ALBA</i>	BARN OWL	E	S2	PRIVATE	31	29N021W
<i>ACCIPITER COOPERII</i>	COOPER'S HAWK		S3	PRIVATE	31	29N021W
<i>AGALINIS PURPUREA</i>	PURPLE FALSE FOXGLOVE		S2	PRIVATE	09	29N021W
<i>AMB. ROSAE RECHARGE AREA</i>	OZARK CAVEFISH RECHARGE AREA		S2	PRIVATE	17	29N022W
<i>BUTEO SWAINSONI</i>	SWAINSON'S HAWK		S2	PRIVATE	34	29N021W
<i>CAMBARUS SETOSUS</i>	BRISTLY CAVE CRAYFISH		S3	PRIVATE	27	29N021W
<i>CAMBARUS SETOSUS</i>	BRISTLY CAVE CRAYFISH		S3	PRIVATE	11	29N021W
<i>CAMBARUS SETOSUS</i>	BRISTLY CAVE CRAYFISH		S3	PRIVATE	32	29N022W
S1 = Critically Imperiled; S2 = Imperiled; or S3 = Rare and uncommon in the state.						

4.7 HAZARDOUS, TOXIC AND RADIOACTIVE WASTES

In 1999, the City received an EPA Brownfields Assessment Demonstration Pilot grant for a 0.8 square mile area surrounding Jordan Valley in the historic downtown area of the City. Since then, the City has expanded its assessment area and conducted initial HTRW screenings on 70 properties along the Jordan Creek corridor. Through the EPA Brownfields Program and other state-related programs, the City has received \$3,960,000 from Federal and state partners towards assessment and cleanup of properties within Springfield. Large portions of these funds have been used in the assessment and cleanup of properties along the Jordan Creek corridor.

Figure 4-4: HTRW Assessment Areas

The MDNR is currently reviewing site assessments and other documentation on the 70 properties to determine if, or where, additional action is needed. Five additional properties along the corridor have been identified as needing further assessments. Refer to Figure 4-4: HTRW Assessment Areas for a list of the HTRW areas.

USACE conducted one HTRW assessment on a former city landfill and 23 HTRW screenings on potential basin areas. Based on the available information about historical land use, the results of the screenings of the potential basin areas showed a low potential for contaminants; no further environmental assessments were recommended for the five selected basins. However, further assessment has been recommended for the landfill site in Reach E1. The City is working with MDNR in the evaluation of HTRW issues in this area. The City is aware that they are required to provide a clean corridor prior to any construction activity.

4.8 AIR QUALITY

The Springfield-Greene County Health Department maintains air-monitoring sites at five locations: Hillcrest High School, James River South on East Evans Road near the Battlefield Fire Station, 5012 South Charleston, 1555 South Glenstone and Southwest Missouri State University. Site placement is dictated under the guidance and monitoring objectives of the EPA. Air quality monitoring stations are strategically placed in areas believed to have higher concentrations of pollutants. The Springfield-Greene County area does not exceed any of the National Ambient Air Monitoring Standards set by the EPA.

4.9 NOISE

Noise levels in this area are indicative of an urban setting and arise primarily from sources such as vehicular traffic and industrial manufacturing.

4.10 CULTURAL RESOURCES

The project parcel lies within the West White Drainage Basin of the James River Watershed. A thorough review of the cultural history of this area can be found in *The Prehistory of Missouri* (O'Brien and Wood 1998), *The Archaeology of Missouri I and II* (Chapman 1975 and Chapman 1980) and the

project report resulting from a cultural resource survey of the project area, *Jordan Creek: History, Architectural History, and Archaeology* (Jones, et al. 2007) and needs not be repeated here. The general area in which this project is located has a rich history of historic settlement and Civil War activities as well as prehistoric land use. Wilsons Creek National Battlefield, which marks a major Civil War battle in Missouri, is just south of the project area. The rolling terrain made the area an ideal spot for historic settlement; ready sources of water and chert provided a good location for prehistoric settlement. The prehistory of southwest Missouri goes back to the earliest periods of human occupation in North America. That said, the historic and modern development of the City has destroyed much of the prehistory left behind by Native Americans, and only a small prehistoric component at two historic sites was recorded during the archeological survey conducted for this project.

4.10.1 Affected Environment

There have been 153 archaeological surveys carried out within Greene County, 30 of which have been done within one-mile of the project area. One of the more recent surveys studied the impact of this project on cultural resources. The report resulting from this project, *Jordan Creek: History, Architectural History, and Archaeology* (Jones, et al. 2007), outlines two multicomponent sites (23GR2023 and 23GR2024) and one historic site (23GR2026) located within or near the project area. The report states that further investigations are needed in order to determine spatial extent and integrity with respect to their eligibility for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). That said, the report states that the two multicomponent sites are located in an area where contaminants are present and that further testing would require special safety measures, so “it may be imprudent to implement further excavations at these sites” (Jones, et al. 2007:88). Depending on the impacts of the plan chosen, all three sites may require further testing. The historic significance and the prehistoric context will be determined for two sites rarely found within the city limits of Springfield. If significant impacts to any of these sites is unavoidable, the determination on what level of testing is reasonable (given the data that is currently available and the safety concerns involved) will be made in coordination with external stakeholders such as the Missouri State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) and Federally recognized Native American tribes. Currently there are no known sites within any of the detention basins, and the Phase I survey in these areas appears to be sufficient.

The City also has a significant historic structure component. During the cultural resources survey, 53 structures near the project area were evaluated to determine eligibility for listing on the NRHP. Of those 53 structures, 10 were recommended eligible. Seven structures had previously been listed on the NRHP, the abovementioned report (Jones, et al. 2007) suggests that they be either avoided or mitigated prior to ground-disturbing activities that could affect their historic integrity. Table 4-7 describes the listed and eligible properties. One of the seven previously listed structures/districts (Woods-Evertz Stove Company National Register Historic District) is currently in the process of being removed from the NRHP and will not require mitigation if delisted by the project start date. There are also multiple bridges that may be affected by various plans associated with this project. If

modifications or demolition is proposed for any bridge, further analysis will be required to determine whether the structure is historically significant and eligible for listing on the NRHP. All of these structures will be considered during the evaluation of plans as well as during the design of the actual project to avoid adverse impacts where feasible. If adverse impacts are unavoidable, consultation with the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) and interested historical groups will be carried out in order to identify appropriate mitigation procedures.

The SHPO has reviewed the cultural resources report for this project (Jones, et al. 2007) and has provided comments which were incorporated into the final document.

Table 4-7: [Structures within the project area eligible for listing or listed in the National Register of Historic Places.](#) Adapted from Jones et al. 2007

Property Name	Address	Criterion	Significance
Tindle Mills	701 E. Chestnut	C	Strongly embodies the setting and feel of a 1930s or 1940s mill.
The Edge Video Bar (vacated)	414 N. Boonville	C	This building is a good example of a turn-of-the-century retail commercial block with a high level of integrity.
MFA Grain Elevators	S. Marlan Avenue	C	This mill structure appears to be essentially as it was when built.
Cooper Maintenance/Receiving	2709 E. Pythian	C	Buildings 2 (barn), 4 (house) and 5 (garage) are good examples of Ozark rock masonry.
Quinn Hotel			
Supply Company	222 E. Water Street	C	Original structure retains integrity and is a good example of arcaded block, Victorian, functional
Springfield Furniture Company		A and C	Strongly retains the setting and feel of an 1890s factory, good example of arcaded block
unknown	1432 W. College	A and C	Good example of a Route 66 filling station.
unknown	1420 W. College Street	A and C	Good example of a Route 66 filling station.
Wholesale Lumber and Materials Company	404 N. Jefferson	C	Good example of Art Deco style with high integrity
United Iron Works Crescent Plant	SE corner of Tampa and Prospect	C	Good example of Neo-Romanesque details and clerestory windows with high integrity
National Audio, Inc.	309 E. Water		On NRHP
	351 N. Boonville Avenue		On NRHP
Country Corner Harry Cooper Supply Company	211 and 223 E. Water		On NRHP
Unknown	338 N. Boonville		On NRHP
Unknown	215 W. Mill		On NRHP
Ozarks Technical Community College	815 N. Sherman		On NRHP
Stove Works Lofts	505 N. Jefferson		On NRHP (submitted for removal from NRHP)

4.11 SOCIOECONOMIC

The City economy is based upon education, healthcare, retail, tourism and manufacturing. The City is the third-largest city in Missouri and is home to nine colleges and universities. Being the largest city in its area, it attracts shoppers from throughout the region. There is little to no agricultural production in the City as it is a highly developed area. This results in a stable workforce that is not influenced by seasonal agricultural labor demands.

As Table 4-8: 2010 Population Characteristics of Springfield, MO shows, the population in the study area is primarily white and is significantly younger than the United States population on average. Although the median per capita income in the City is only 70 percent of the national median, the population is not as poor as these numbers suggest. The median housing value is 66 percent of the national median. If housing values are used as a rough measure of cost of living, lower per capita income is offset by a reduction in the cost of living. The number of families in the City below the poverty level is only slightly higher than the national rate. In September 2012, Springfield had an unemployment rate of 5.5 percent compared to 6.9 percent for the national rate.

The City has a higher rate of those completing high school than the national rate. Of those aged 25 and higher, the rate of earning a bachelor's degree or above is slightly lower than the national rate.

Table 4-8: 2010 Population Characteristics of Springfield, MO

	Estimate	Percent	US
Total Population	159,498	-	-
White	141,526	88.7%	72.4%
Black or African American	6,524	4.1%	12.6%
American Indian or Alaska Native	1,233	0.8%	0.9%
Asian	3,015	1.9%	4.8%
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander	267	0.2%	0.2%
Some other race	1,889	1.2%	6.2%
Two or more races	5,044	3.2%	2.9%
Age			
Under 18 years	24,176	18.3%	24%
between 18 and 64 years	112,201	67.2%	63%
65 years and over	23,121	14.5%	13%
Income (2010 Dollars)*			
Median per capita income	20,793	-	27,334
Median housing value	103,800	-	188,400
Families below poverty level	-	21.7%	13.8%
Unemployment rate***		5.5%	7.8%
Education level for those over 25 years old*			
High school graduate and over	-	86.6%	85%
Bachelor's degree or higher	-	25.6%	27.9%
Data source: US Census 2010 estimates			
*Data source: US Census 2010 American Community Survey, Selected Social Characteristics, 5-year estimates: 2006 - 2010			

Table 4-9: Population Change 2000-2010 **Error! Reference source not found.** shows that Greene County's population grew over fourteen percent while Missouri grew seven percent. The national population grew just over nine percent along the same period. The City's population is expected to continue to grow.

Table 4-9: Population Change 2000-2010

	Population	Population	Population Change
Location	2000	2010	2000-2010
Greene County	240,391	275,174	14.47%
Missouri	5,595,211	5,988,927	7.04%
United States	281,421,906	307,006,550	9.09%
Data source: 2000 and 2010 US Census			

5 EFFECTS ON SIGNIFICANT RESOURCES*

Table 5-1: Summary of the Potential Effects provides a summary of the potential effects of Plans G2, J and No Action. Following this table is a narrative description of the anticipated impacts to the physical, biological, cultural and socioeconomic environment of the area.

Table 5-1: Summary of the Potential Effects of Plans G2, J and No Action

Resource	Plan G2	Plan J (NED)	No Action Plan
Land Use	Minimal impact-primarily parking lots and bridges in Reaches E1, E3 & E6	Minimal impact-primarily parking lots and bridges in Reach E1	No impact
Water Resources	Positive impact due to water retention in basins and stream, improved water quality from greater nutrient cycling; temporary increase in turbidity due to basins & channel construction	Positive impact due to water retention in basins and stream, improved water quality from greater nutrient cycling; temporary increase in turbidity due to basins & channel construction	No impact
Cultural Resources	Impact to two sites in Springfield Warehouse District & Industrial Historic District	No cultural resources impacts	No impacts
Biological Resources	Positive impact from creating wetland habitat in detention basins, flow retention, velocity reduction and groundwater recharge; possible negative impacts due to temporary construction related turbidity increase	Positive impact from creating wetland habitat in detention basins, flow retention, velocity reduction and groundwater recharge possible negative impacts due to temporary construction related turbidity increase;	Negative impact to biological resources continue to be degraded due to undersized channel, resulting in excessive scour and turbidity increases during storm events
HTRW	Positive impact due to expedited evaluation/cleanup of 30 sites in project footprint	Positive impact due to expedited evaluation/cleanup of 3 sites in project footprint	Negative impact to HTRW issues dealt with as deemed necessary and/or when funds become available to the City
Air Quality	Minimal temporary impact due to construction activity consisting of fugitive dust and exhaust emissions from construction equipment	Minimal temporary impact due to construction activity consisting of fugitive dust and exhaust emissions from construction equipment	No impact
Noise	Minimal impact, temporary increased levels typically associated with construction equipment	Minimal impact, temporary increased levels typically associated with construction equipment	No impact
Socioeconomic	Minimal temporary impact due to construction activity	Minimal temporary impact due to construction activity	No impacts

5.1 PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT

5.1.1 Land Use

Plan G2: This plan will have minimal impact on current land use along the Jordan Creek corridor. With the construction footprint primarily impacting a highly commercialized area along the creek and being limited to Reaches E1, E3 and E6; primary impacts will be to parking lots and urbanized stream corridor and these will involve modification/replacement of bridges and culverts. Detention basin construction will require removal of riparian vegetation along the creek channel in four of the five basins. A grassy swale will be leveed for creation of the fifth basin.

Plan J: This plan will have minimal impact on current land use along the Jordan Creek corridor. With the construction footprint affecting only the sparsely vegetated, urbanized stream corridor in Reach E1, primary impact will involve the modification/replacement of only two bridges, as well as the detention basin construction impacts noted in Plan G2.

No Action: Under the No Action plan, the land use will develop according to the floodplain management plan, with the continued flooding of businesses and residences due to the inability of the undersized channel, bridges and culverts to convey floodwaters.

5.1.2 Climate

None of the plans will have an effect on the climate in this area.

5.1.3 Topography, Physiography and Soils

No plan will have any significant effect on the topography or physiography of the area. Channel alterations from Plan G2 will result in minor changes to the slopes of the stream channels, but these will not result in any significant change. Even less change will take place with the implementation of Plan J.

Soils should benefit from the two construction actions by reducing the scouring affect of future flooding events. Under the No Action plan, flood scour will continue as is, and will likely increase in the future due to increased impervious surfaces constructed in the watershed.

5.1.4 Water Resources

Plan G2: This plan will result in positive impacts on the Jordan Creek water resources by retaining more in-stream quantity following storm events. This will accomplished by widening portions of the existing channel, constructing overflow channel running adjacent to existing sections of enclosed channel and reducing velocity affects by constructing five detention basins in the upper watershed of the stream. Water quality benefits will result from longer detention time from the basins as well as wider channel dimensions in the construction footprint. This will aid in complying with the storm-water TMDL that the EPA has established for Wilsons and Jordan Creeks. The water quality limited segments on these stream are listed as impaired by multiple point sources and urban non-point sources, with the source of the impairments listed as unknown. Implementation of this plan will help reduce the flashy, high-velocity flows that scour the increased impervious landscape created by continued development, thereby reducing in-stream toxicity by increasing both the in-channel volume and retention time as the flow moves downstream. There will be a

temporary construction related increase in turbidity during this phase of the project due to the excavation of the detention basins and channel creation/modifications in Reaches E1, E3 and E6..

Plan J: This plan will also result in positive impacts on the Jordan Creek water resources by retaining more in-stream quantity following storm events. This will be accomplished by widening the channel in Reach E1 and reducing velocity effects by constructing five detention basins in the upper watershed of the stream. Water quality benefits will result from longer detention time from the basins as well as wider channel dimensions in the lower reach construction footprint. This plan will result in a smaller amount of increased turbidity in the construction phase since channel modification is confined to the detention basins and the E1 reach.

No Action: The No Action plan will result in continued flash flood flows due to the existing undersized channel and the continued floodwaters scour of impervious surfaces in this primarily urbanized watershed. Current stream bank integrity may be jeopardized by the inability of the current drainage system to adequately contain and slow the discharge of storm flows, resulting in increased bank scour and erosion.

5.2 BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES

Plan G2: Biological resources will improve under this plan. Benefits will include larger areas of wetted perimeters in the constructed detention basins which will provide some ground water replenishment, allow limited wetland vegetation to develop and reduce the velocity and extend transport time of storm flows downstream. This reduction will allow the existing stream and constructed channel to retain greater volume after storm flows pass downstream. Daylighting portions of the existing box culvert system and constructing overflow channels will also increase the linear footage open to sunlight, allowing greater nutrient cycling activity along the stream corridor, as well as providing additional habitat and forage area for fishes and macroinvertebrates.

Plan J: Biological resources will improve from this plan. Benefits will include larger areas of wetted perimeters in the constructed detention basins which will provide some ground water replenishment, may allow limited wetland vegetation to develop and reduce the velocity and extend transport time of storm flows downstream. This reduction will allow the existing stream and constructed channel to retain greater volume after storm flows pass downstream. The widening of the downstream reach will allow more of the storm flow volume to remain in the channel , which will also aid nutrient cycling activity and provide additional habitat and forage area for fishes and macroinvertebrates.

No Action: Biological resources under the No Action plan will continue to degrade due to stream bank high velocity floodwater scour as well as poor water quality from excessive watershed pollutants. The lack of constructed detention basins and widened stream channel will result in the existing flashy nature of storm flow movement and impede the channel water retention needed for aquatic life community improvement.

5.2.1 Vegetation

Plan G2: This plan included widening the channel in Reaches E1, E3 and E6. Riparian corridor vegetation will be removed to accommodate the expanded channel, equipment access and staging areas for materials. In Reach E1, approximately 7.3 acres of woody vegetation and 0.75 acres of brush will be removed in order

to facilitate a total of 3236 feet of channel modification. Due to the degree of development in Reach E3, only 3.4 acres of brush, with no measurable woody vegetation, will be removed over a distance of 4747 linear feet of channel modification. In Reach E6, which is a highly commercialized/industrial area, a total of 2 acres of woody vegetation and 3.2 acres of brush will be removed over a distance of 4723 linear feet of channel construction/modification. Wherever available area exists, constructed stream banks will be revegetated with grasses and other herbaceous plants and possibly native tree species.

Plan J: Riparian corridor vegetation will be removed to accommodate the expanded channel, equipment access and staging areas for materials. This plan modifies the stream channel only in Reach E1. , Approximately 7.3 acres of woody vegetation and 0.75 acres of brush will be removed in order to facilitate a total of 3236 feet of channel modification.

No Action: Under this plan, the existing riparian vegetation will remain in place. Although sparse and degraded in some reaches, the woody species will continue to provide some measure of stream bank stability and shading. Continued high velocity floodwaters will eventually undercut adjacent streamside vegetation, causing woody debris stream blockage and stream bank scour.

5.2.2 Wetlands

Plan G2: This plan will result in filling a 0.4 acre isolated wetland in Reach E1, just above the Jordan Creek confluence with Wilsons Creek. The side slope on the 1/500 ACE channel will necessitate this fill.

A small wetland area in the channel of South Branch Jordan Creek is included in detention basin B6. The constructed basin will have 8.25 surface acres and will likely exhibit wetland characteristics after post-construction rainfall events. Although excavation is planned for detention basin B11 (8.7 acres), the wetland at the mouth of this basin that will not be disturbed.

Plan J: Since this plan proposes stream modification only in Reach E1 and the construction of the five detention basins upstream (as in Plan G2), the wetland impacts will be the same as noted in Plan G2.

No Action: No existing wetlands in the Jordan Creek drainage basin will be impacted with the No Action plan.

5.2.3 Fish and Wildlife

Plan G2: Under this plan the greatest benefit to fish and wildlife will be the construction of approximately 36 surface acres of detention basins in the upper watersheds of North Branch Jordan and South Branch Jordan Creeks. These four basins (two in each creek) are in-channel construction, which will allow all upstream flow to accumulate and create a large wetted perimeter prior to discharge downstream during flood events. These basins will serve to reduce the stream velocity, as well as retain more of the storm flow in the basins and in the stream channel downstream. In a small watershed urban stream environment, flow retention is a critical component of aquatic life community development. A fifth detention basin, in an upland area between the north and south branches of this creek, is designed to temporarily retain storm flow and reduce overland velocity. This basin will be approximately 5.7 surface acres and drains into the South Branch Jordan Creek. While designed to temporarily retain storm flows and reduce downstream

velocities, these basins may retain some water, allowing hydrophytic vegetation to develop. This would produce habitat for macroinvertebrates and amphibians, as well as shore bird feeding areas. The basins, as well as the widened downstream constructed areas, will retain more volume following storm flow transport downstream. The increased stream volume will enhance aquatic community health in the stream reaches not targeted for channel modification. Channel construction/modification in Reaches E1, E3, and E6 will provide additional habitat and forage area for fishes and macroinvertebrates. Associated with construction will be a temporary increase in turbidity in, and downstream of the detention basins and modified channels.

Plan J: This plan will provide similar benefits to fish and wildlife as Plan G2, with the corresponding construction related increases in turbidity.

No Action: Under this plan the current stream corridor will remain as is, and the impacts of local storm flows will be exacerbated by continued watershed development. Increased stream velocities, excessive scour and bank erosion will continue to affect negatively the wildlife resources that currently exist in this stream.

5.2.4 Threatened and Endangered Species

Plan G2: According to a planning assistance letter received from the USFWS on June 28, 2012, the Service has made a preliminary determination that no Federally listed species are known to occur within the proposed project site on Jordan Creek. They further state that detention basin construction for storm-water mediation will provide habitat for amphibians and shore and wading birds.

Plan J: The situation will be the same as noted in Plan G2.

No Action: This plan will not cause any impacts to threatened and endangered species.

5.3 HAZARDOUS, TOXIC AND RADIOACTIVE WASTE

Plan G2: This plan will have a construction footprint in only three of the six economic reaches identified in the Jordan Creek drainage basin: E 1, E 3 and E 6. Since 1999, the City has had an ongoing program of assessment and cleanup of HTRW sites within its boundaries. A major portion of funds have been expended in the Jordan Creek corridor. Figure 4.4: HTRW Environmental Assessment Areas in Section 4 (AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT) provides a depiction of the environmental assessments and screenings completed as of April 2012.

Within Reaches E1, E3, and E6 impacted by this plan, there are 30 properties with suspected or documented HTRW issues. In April 2012, Seagull Environmental Technologies prepared an environmental review for the City. This review evaluated available information on 70 properties along the Jordan Creek corridor, along with a recommendation of additional assessment activities where needed. This review also provided a range of cost estimates for remedial activities. For properties without completed assessments, environmental conditions for surrounding properties, along with available historical documents were used to determine potential site conditions and remedial costs. The range of costs associated with remediation for these 30 sites is approximately \$287,500 to \$2,385,250.




Figure 5-1: Plan J Cost Ranges for HTRW Remediation

Plan J: This plan will have a construction footprint in only one reach: E 1. Only three properties are listed in this reach, significantly reducing the potential cleanup costs. In Figure 5-1: Plan J Cost Ranges for HTRW Remediation, the range for potential cleanup for reach E-1 is \$67,500-\$1,340,000; however, actual costs may be significantly lower since the stream runs along the border of these properties. The Archimica property west of Jordan Creek has the highest range associated with remediation (\$35,000-\$1,000,000), but this facility, which is currently involved in post-closure and corrective action activities under two hazardous waste permits (MDNR and EPA), is protected by an existing flood wall along the west bank of the creek. Plan J is designed to provide a 500 year ACE, which will result in no overtopping of this wall during this storm event. Refer to the HTRW section of the Engineering Appendix (Plate H-4) for a depiction of contaminated areas within this property. The other properties in this reach are former City landfills with unknown potential contaminants. HTRW risks for the project are considered to be minimal since the City is required to provide a clean corridor for channel construction.

No Action: The MDNR is currently reviewing completed environmental assessments and other documentation for the 70 properties identified along the Jordan Creek corridor. MDNR will determine

where additional action is required. Under the No Action plan, there will be continual cleanup of these properties as funding is available.

5.4 Air Quality

Plan G2: This plan will have only a temporary minimal impact on existing air quality in the Jordan Creek watershed. The primary impacts will be fugitive dust from construction equipment both in and out of staging areas set project footprint as well as exhaust emissions from construction equipment for the duration of the project.

Plan J: This plan will impact existing air quality even less than Plan G2 in the watershed since the construction footprint on the stream channel will be confined to reach E1 and the construction of the detention ponds.

No Action: This plan will have no impact to existing air quality in the Jordan Creek stream corridor.

5.5 NOISE

Plan G2: This plan will increase noise in the immediate project area over the normal existing industrial processes and vehicular traffic noise level due to construction equipment and materials transport vehicle usage.

Plan J: This plan will increase noise in the immediate project area over the normal existing industrial processes and vehicular traffic noise level, but to a lesser extent than Plan G2, based on a smaller and more localized construction footprint.

No Action: This plan will have no impact on existing noise levels along the Jordan Creek corridor.

5.6 CULTURAL RESOURCES

Plan G2: Under this plan, the primary impacts to any cultural resources from channel construction will occur in the Springfield Warehouse and Industrial Historic District where the Missouri State University Center for Archaeological Research identified two multi component prehistoric and historic sites, listed as 23GR2023 and 23GR2024. These sites are located in the proposed channel construction footprint and may require further testing and documentation prior to construction. Other potential impacts under this plan occur as a result of the detention basins construction. Testing of the proposed excavation may be required to ascertain the presence/absence of cultural artifacts in the five proposed basins. Documentation of any modified or removed bridges/culverts having historical significance will also be required prior to channel construction.

Plan J: Potential impacts to cultural resources under this plan may occur as a result of detention basin construction. Testing of the proposed excavation may be required to ascertain the presence/absence of cultural artifacts in the five proposed basins. Documentation of any modified or removed bridges/culverts having historical significance will also be required prior to channel construction.

No Action: This plan will have no impact on existing cultural resources in the Jordan Creek basin.

5.7 SOCIOECONOMIC RESOURCES

Plan G2: Under this plan, only temporary socioeconomic impacts are expected to occur from the proposed construction activity in the Jordan Creek corridor.

Plan J: Under this plan, only temporary socioeconomic impacts are expected to occur from the proposed construction activity in the Jordan Creek corridor.

No Action: This plan will have no impact on socioeconomic conditions along the Jordan Creek corridor.

5.8 CONCLUSIONS OF ANALYSIS

Plan J is the selected Plan. Jordan Creek is primarily an ephemeral/intermittent highly urbanized stream draining a 13.75 square miles watershed in downtown Springfield, Missouri. North Branch Jordan Creek and South Branch Jordan Creek join to form Jordan Creek, which connects to Wilsons Creek at the lower end of the proposed project area. Due to extensive development in the watershed, including low-density housing, high-density housing, commercial areas, and industrial areas, and severe modifications to the existing stream channel, the aquatic habitat has become increasingly more degraded over the years. Several miles of the stream exist as an enclosed box culvert, traversing under downtown streets and businesses.

While the selected plan (Plan J) will result in modification of 3236 feet of channel in Jordan and Wilson Creeks in Reach E1, the overall habitat quality in this stream corridor will remain in poor condition. Riparian corridor woody vegetation removal for channel construction activity will remove most of the limited shading that currently exists in the reach in the construction footprint. The constructed channel will be sized to convey a 1/500 ACE in this reach, so eventual low flow meander scour may be achieved over time in this reach. This will constrict available flow, creating more water depth, which will reduce water temperature. Replanting woody vegetation where possible along the constructed channel will enhance the aquatic environment.

Likely, the greatest environmental benefit from the proposed project will be the construction of five detention basins in the upper portions of the North and South Branches of this creek. Approximately 36 surface acres of basins will be constructed. They will detain storm flows and slow stream velocity. This will allow greater ground water recharge and the retention of a larger volume of water in the stream channel as the storm flow moves downstream. Other environmental benefits will be the enlargement of a wetted perimeter due to the construction of the basins, with possible associated hydrophytic vegetation development. These areas provide habitat for shore and wading birds, amphibians and macroinvertebrates. While Plan J will result in temporary impacts associated with construction to the environment, there will be no significant adverse impacts on the human environment from implementation of this project. Therefore, a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) has been drafted and included as Appendix D of this report.

6 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT, REVIEW AND CONSULTATION*

6.1 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT PROGRAM

To announce the start of the feasibility phase, a public notice was issued to: residents, interested groups as well as Federal, State and local agencies. The recipients were invited to comment on the results of the completed reconnaissance study and to provide input to the feasibility study, including the scoping of the environmental issues that should be address throughout the study. The notice announced a public workshop, which was held on 24 October 2004 at the Ozarks Technical Community College in Springfield, Missouri, where the public was given the opportunity to comment.

6.2 INSTITUTIONAL INVOLVEMENT

6.2.1 Study Team

Staff from the City participated directly in the feasibility study effort. The City's hydraulics and Hydrology engineer and other assisted with HTRW, cultural resources and plan formulation.

6.2.2 Agency Coordination

During the feasibility study, coordination with the USFWS was conducted in accordance with the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act.

MDNR participated with the HTRW. The SHPO and South Missouri University Center for Archeology Research participated in the Cultural Resources coordination.

The City has a close relationship with FEMA Region 7 and is a Cooperating Technical Partner (CTP). This means that the City has the technical, financial and staffing capabilities to map for FEMA. The City has discussed the potential for remapping with FEMA at the Region level. The City will be responsible for map revisions.

The following agencies were coordinated with in the EA development:

Mr. Mark Miles, Missouri Department of Natural Resources, State Historic Preservation Office, P.O. Box 176, Jefferson City, MO 65102

Mr. Stephen Mahfood, Director, Missouri Department of Natural Resources, Division of Environmental Resources, P.O. Box 176, Jefferson City, MO 65102

Mr. John Hoskins, Director, Missouri Department of Conservation, Policy Coordination Section, P.O. Box 180, Jefferson City, MO 65102-0180

Mr. David Skaer, Area Resource Soil Scientist, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resource Conservation Service, 1215 Fern Ridge Parkway, Suite 212, St. Louis, MO 63141

Mr. Earnest Quintana, Regional Director, National Park Service, Midwest Regional Office, 1709 Jackson St, Omaha, NE 68102

Missouri Department of Conservation, Southwest Regional Office, 2630 N. Mayfair, Springfield, MO 65803

Mr. Mark Green, District Conservationist, U.S. Natural Resources Conservation Service, Greene County Field Office, 688 S. State Hwy. B, Suite 200, Springfield, MO 65802

Ms. Linda Chorce, Manager, Missouri Department of Conservation, Nature Center, 4600 S. Chrisman, Springfield, MO 65804

Mr. Bob Schulz, Stream Team Coordinator, Missouri Stream Teams Ozark Unit, P.O. Box 180, Jefferson City, MO 65102

Mr. A.J. Lehman, Haz/Mat Coordinator, State Emergency Management Agency, Hazardous Materials Planning, P.O. Box 116, Jefferson City, MO 65102

Mr. Clay Goddard, Env/Community Health Planner, Springfield/Greene County EAB, 227 E. Chestnut Expressway, Springfield, MO 65802

Mr. Harold Bengsch, Director of Health, Springfield/Greene County Health Dept., 227 E. Chestnut Expressway, Springfield, MO 65802

Ms. Loring Bullard, Director, Watershed Committee of the Ozarks, 320 N. Main Springfield, MO 65806

The agency response letters are in Appendix E: Response Letters.

6.3 ADDITIONAL REQUIRED COORDINATION

This Section will be completed after the public comment period.

6.4 PUBLIC VIEWS AND RESPONSES

This Section will be completed after the public comment period.

6.4.1 Federal

6.4.2 State and Local Agencies

7 LIST OF PREPARERS

The individuals listed in the following table were primarily responsible for the preparation of this report.

Laura Cameron, P.E. – Plan formulation and Technical Lead

Todd Wagner, P.E. – Local Sponsor

Cherilyn Gibbs – Economics

Tyler Herriman – Economics

Nick Barner, P. E. – Civil Engineering and Engineering Lead

George Losak, P. E. – Cost Engineering

Errin Kemper, P.E. – Local Sponsor and Hydrology and Hydraulics

Robert Singleton – NEPA coordinator and NEPA lead

Rodney Parker – Archeology

Ronald Bridges – Real Estate

8 INDEX

<http://www.springfieldmo.gov/jvp/index.html>

EPA, 2011. Total Maximum Load, Wilson and Jordan Creeks (MO_2375 and 3374) Christian Counties, Missouri. United States Environmental Protection Agency, Region 7.

MDNR 2003. Missouri Department of Natural Resources. 2003. Semi-quantitative Macroinvertebrate Stream Bioassessment Project Procedure. MDNR-FSS-030. Missouri Department of Natural Resources, Environmental Services Program, P.O. Box 176, Jefferson City, Missouri 65102. 24 pp.

MDNR, 2007., Springfield Urban Streams, Clear Creek, Jordan Creek, Wilson Creek and Galloway Creek, Greene County, Missouri. Missouri Department of Natural Resources, Biological Assessment Report.

MSU, 2007. Jordan Creek Baseline Water Quality Project. Missouri State University and Ozarks Environmental and Water Resource Institute, Final Report/ March 2007.

MSU, 2006. Final Report to the City of Springfield and the Biological Assessment of Urban Streams II, July 2005- June 2006. Missouri State University. .

Springfield, City of. 2009. Annual Report July 2008- June 2009. Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4)

Springfield, City of. 2010. Annual Report July 2009- June 2010. City of Springfield. Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4)

Chapman, C. H. 1980 The Archaeology of Missouri, II. University of Missouri Press, Columbia.

Chapman, C. H. 1975 The Archaeology of Missouri, I. University of Missouri Press, Columbia.

Jones, A. J., G. S. Powell, D. A. Thompson and D. Quick. 2007 Jordan Creek: History, Architectural History, and Archaeology. Center for Archaeological Research, Report No. 1277. Missouri State University, Springfield, Missouri.

O'Brien, M. J. and W. R. Wood. 1998 The Prehistory of Missouri. University of Missouri Press, Columbia.

Springfield News-Leader, July 14, 2000.

9 RECOMMENDATIONS

As District Engineer, I have considered the environmental, social, and economic effects, the engineering feasibility, and comments received from the other resource agencies, the non-federal sponsors, and the public, and have determined that the tentatively selected plan presented in this report is in the overall public interest and is technically sound, environmentally acceptable, and economically feasible. I recommend that the tentatively selected plan and associated features described in this report be authorized for implementation as a federal project.

The tentatively selected plan is the National Economic Development Plan, which is Plan J, as generally described in this report. The plan includes flood risk management features including but not limited to five regional detention basins, channel modifications on Wilsons and Jordan Creeks and a railroad bridge replacement. All new railroad bridges, modifications to existing railroad bridges, track modification and associated features will be cost-shared as part of the project construction costs. The fully funded cost estimate is \$20,527,000, with the Federal and non-Federal shares of total first cost estimated at \$13,049,260 and \$7,477,740, respectively. The tentatively selected plan has an overall benefit-cost ratio of 2.7.

These recommendations are made with the provision that, prior to implementation, the non-federal sponsors will agree to comply with the following requirements:

Federal implementation of the tentatively selected plan would be subject to the non-federal sponsors agreeing to comply with applicable federal laws and policies, including but not limited to:

- a. Provide a minimum of 35 percent, but not to exceed 50 percent of total flood risk management costs as further specified below:
 1. Provide 25 percent of design costs allocated by the Government to flood risk management in accordance with the terms of a design agreement entered into prior to commencement of design work for the flood risk management features;
 2. Provide, during the first year of construction, any additional funds necessary to pay the full non-federal share of design costs allocated by the Government to flood risk management;
 3. Provide, during construction, a contribution of funds equal to 5 percent of total FCP flood risk management costs;
 4. Provide all lands, easements, and rights-of-way, including those required for relocations, the borrowing of material, and the disposal of dredged or excavated material; perform or ensure the performance of all relocations; and construct all improvements required on lands, easements, and rights-of-way to enable the disposal of dredged or excavated material all as determined by the Government to be required or to be necessary for the construction, operation, and maintenance of the flood risk management features;
 5. Provide, during construction, any additional funds necessary to make its total contribution for flood risk management equal to at least 35 percent of total FCP flood risk management costs;
 6. Provide 100 percent of all incremental costs of the Locally Preferred Plan.

- b. Shall not use funds from other federal programs, including any non-federal contribution required as a matching share therefore, to meet any of the non-federal obligations for the project unless the federal agency providing the Federal portion of such funds verifies in writing that expenditure of such funds for such purpose is authorized;
- c. Not less than once each year, inform affected interests of the extent of protection afforded by the flood risk management features;
- d. Agree to participate in and comply with applicable Federal floodplain management and flood insurance programs;
- e. Comply with Section 402 of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986, as amended (33 U.S.C. 701b-12), which requires a non-federal interest to prepare a floodplain management plan within one year after the date of signing a project cooperation agreement, and to implement such plan not later than one year after completion of construction of the flood risk management features;
- f. Publicize floodplain information in the area concerned and provide this information to zoning and other regulatory agencies for their use in adopting regulations, or taking other actions, to prevent unwise future development and to ensure compatibility with protection levels provided by the flood risk management features;
- g. Prevent obstructions or encroachments on the project (including prescribing and enforcing regulations to prevent such obstructions or encroachments) such as any new developments on project lands, easements, and rights-of-way or the addition of facilities which might reduce the level of protection the flood risk management features afford, hinder operation and maintenance of the project, or interfere with the project's proper function;
- h. Comply with all applicable provisions of the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, Public Law 91-646, as amended (42 U.S.C. 4601-4655), and the Uniform Regulations contained in 49 CFR Part 24, in acquiring lands, easements, and rights-of-way required for construction, operation, and maintenance of the project, including those necessary for relocations, the borrowing of materials, or the disposal of dredged or excavated material; and inform all affected persons of applicable benefits, policies, and procedures in connection with said Act;
- i. For so long as the project remains authorized, operate, maintain, repair, rehabilitate, and replace the project, or functional portions of the project, including any mitigation features, at no cost to the Federal Government, in a manner compatible with the project's authorized purposes and in accordance with applicable Federal and State laws and regulations and any specific directions prescribed by the Federal Government;
- j. Give the Federal Government a right to enter, at reasonable times and in a reasonable manner, upon property that the non-Federal sponsor owns or controls for access to the project for the purpose of completing, inspecting, operating, maintaining, repairing, rehabilitating, or replacing the project;

- k. Hold and save the United States free from all damages arising from the construction, operation, maintenance, repair, rehabilitation, and replacement of the project and any betterments, except for damages due to the fault or negligence of the United States or its contractors;
- l. Keep and maintain books, records, documents, or other evidence pertaining to costs and expenses incurred pursuant to the project, for a minimum of 3 years after completion of the accounting for which such books, records, documents, or other evidence are required, to the extent and in such detail as will properly reflect total project costs, and in accordance with the standards for financial management systems set forth in the Uniform Administrative Requirements for Grants and Cooperative Agreements to State and Local Governments at 32 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Section 33.20;
- m. Comply with all applicable Federal and State laws and regulations, including, but not limited to: Section 601 of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, Public Law 88-352 (42 U.S.C. 2000d) and Department of Defense Directive 5500.11 issued pursuant thereto; Army Regulation 600-7, entitled "Nondiscrimination on the Basis of Handicap in Programs and Activities Assisted or Conducted by the Department of the Army"; and all applicable Federal labor standards requirements including, but not limited to, 40 U.S.C. 3141- 3148 and 40 U.S.C. 3701 – 3708 (revising, codifying and enacting without substantial change the provisions of the Davis-Bacon Act (formerly 40 U.S.C. 276a *et seq.*), the Contract Work Hours and Safety Standards Act (formerly 40 U.S.C. 327 *et seq.*), and the Copeland Anti-Kickback Act (formerly 40 U.S.C. 276c *et seq.*);
- n. Perform, or ensure performance of, any investigations for hazardous substances that are determined necessary to identify the existence and extent of any hazardous substances regulated under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA), Public Law 96-510, as amended (42 U.S.C. 9601-9675), that may exist in, on, or under lands, easements, or rights-of-way that the Federal Government determines to be required for construction, operation, and maintenance of the project. However, for lands that the Federal Government determines to be subject to the navigation servitude, only the Federal Government shall perform such investigations unless the Federal Government provides the non-federal sponsors with prior specific written direction, in which case the non-federal sponsors shall perform such investigations in accordance with such written direction;
- o. Assume, as between the Federal Government and the non-federal sponsors, complete financial responsibility for all necessary cleanup and response costs of any hazardous substances regulated under CERCLA that are located in, on, or under lands, easements, or rights-of-way that the Federal Government determines to be required for construction, operation, and maintenance of the project;
- p. Agree, as between the Federal Government and the non-federal sponsors, that the non-federal sponsors shall be considered the operator of the project for the purpose of CERCLA liability, and to the maximum extent practicable, operate, maintain, repair, rehabilitate, and replace the project in a manner that will not cause liability to arise under CERCLA; and
- q. Comply with Section 221 of Public Law 91-611, Flood Control Act of 1970, as amended (42 U.S.C. 1962d-5b), and Section 103(j) of the Water Resources Development Act of 1986, Public Law 99-662, as amended (33 U.S.C. 2213(j)), which provides that the Secretary of the Army shall not

commence the construction of any water resources project or separable element thereof, until each non-federal interest has entered into a written agreement to furnish its required cooperation for the project or separable element.

This plan is being recommended with such modifications thereof as in the discretion of the Commander, HQUSACE, may be advisable.

The recommendation contained herein reflects the information available at this time and current departmental policies governing formulation of individual projects. It does not reflect program and budgeting priorities inherent in the formulation of a national civil works construction program nor the perspective of higher review levels within the executive branch. Consequently, the recommendation may be modified before it is transmitted to the Congress as a proposal for authorization and implementation funding. However, prior to transmittal to Congress, the non-federal sponsors, the State of Missouri, interested Federal agencies, and other parties will be advised of any modifications and will be afforded the opportunity to comment further.

Glen A. Masset
Colonel, Corps of Engineers
District Engineer

10 Plates




Plate 1: Plan A

Plate 1: Plan A




Plate 3: Plan C




Plate 4: Plan D




Plate 5: Plan E

Plate 5: Plan E




Plate 6: Plan F

Plate 6: Plan F




Plate 7: Plan G

Plate 7: Plan G




Plate 8: Plan G2

Plate 8: Plan G2




Plate 9: Plan H




Plate 10: Plan I




Plate 11: Plan J

