

Draft Environmental Assessment

# East Ward Technology Center Relocation

Harrison County, Mississippi

*May 2007*



**FEMA**

**U.S. Department of Homeland Security**  
FEMA-1604-DR-MS  
Transitional Recovery Office – Biloxi, MS

*This document was prepared by*



200 Orchard Ridge Drive, Suite 101  
Gaithersburg, MD 20878

Contract No. HSFEHQ-06-D-0489  
Task Order No. HSFEHQ-06-J-0003

15708003.00100

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

1.0	INTRODUCTION .....	4
2.0	PURPOSE AND NEED .....	4
3.0	ALTERNATIVES .....	4
3.1	Alternatives Evaluated.....	5
4.0	AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT AND IMPACTS .....	5
4.1	Geology and Soils .....	7
4.2	Water Resources.....	7
4.3	Transportation .....	9
4.4	Environmental Justice .....	9
4.5	Air Quality.....	10
4.6	Noise .....	10
4.7	Biological Resources .....	11
4.8	Cultural Resources.....	12
5.0	CUMULATIVE IMPACTS .....	12
6.0	PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT .....	13
7.0	AGENCY COORDINATION AND PERMITS.....	13
8.0	CONCLUSIONS .....	13
Appendix A	Figures	
Appendix B	Agency Coordination	



## ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

---

ABFE	Advisory Base Flood Elevation
ACHP	Advisory Council on Historic Preservation
amsl	above mean sea level
APE	Area of Potential Effect
BMP	Best Management Practice
CAA	Clean Air Act
CEQ	Council on Environmental Quality
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
CO	carbon monoxide
CWA	Clean Water Act
CZMA	Coastal Zone Management Act
dB	decibel
DNL	Day-Night Average Sound Level
EA	Environmental Assessment
EO	Executive Order
EPA	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency
FIRM	Flood Insurance Rate Map
FPPA	Farmland Protection Policy Act
MDAH	Mississippi Department of Archives and History
MDEQ	Mississippi Department of Environmental Quality
MDMR	Mississippi Department of Marine Resources
MOA	Memorandum of Agreement
NAAQS	National Ambient Air Quality Standards
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
NFIP	National Flood Insurance Program
NHPA	National Historic Preservation Act
NISTAC	Nationwide Infrastructure Support Technical Assistance Consultants
NOAA	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
NO <sub>2</sub>	nitrogen dioxide
NPDES	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
NRHP	National Register of Historic Places
O <sub>3</sub>	ozone
OSHA	Occupational Safety and Health Administration
PA	Public Assistance Program
Pb	lead
PM <sub>2.5</sub>	particulate matter less than 2.5 microns



## ACRONYMS AND ABBREVIATIONS

---

PM <sub>10</sub>	particulate matter less than 10 microns
SHPO	State Historic Preservation Office
SO <sub>2</sub>	sulfur dioxide
SWPPP	Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan
THPO	Tribal Historic Preservation Officer
USACE	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
USFWS	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
USDA	U.S. Department of Agriculture
USGS	U.S. Geological Service
VOC	Volatile Organic Compound



---

## **1.0 INTRODUCTION**

On August 29, 2005, Hurricane Katrina struck the Mississippi Gulf Coast, causing extensive damage. A Presidential Disaster Declaration, FEMA-1604-DR-MS, was subsequently signed for Katrina.

The Gulfport School District (District) has submitted an application for Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) funding under FEMA's Public Assistance Program being administered in response to FEMA-1604-DR-MS. In accordance with the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act, PL 93-288, as amended, and implementing regulations at 44 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) Part 206, FEMA is required to review the environmental effects of the proposed action prior to making a funding decision. This Environmental Assessment (EA) has been prepared in accordance with FEMA's National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) regulations found in 44 CFR Part 10.

## **2.0 PURPOSE AND NEED**

On August 29, 2005, Hurricane Katrina's storm surge severely damaged the District's East Ward Community Education and Technology Support Service Center (Technology Center) in Gulfport, Mississippi (Figure 1). The District utilized the facility as its computer technology hub and community education center, accommodating approximately 25 employees and 100 to 200 students. The building was constructed around 1920 and additional wings were added in 1935-36, 1953-54, 1960-62, and 1985-86. The total area of the building pre-disaster was 27,295 square feet. The building is located in Zone X, outside of the floodplain, but was within the surge inundation zone, with some areas receiving up to 25 feet of water (FEMA, 2006). The building is scheduled for demolition. In accordance with FEMA's policy for FEMA-1604-DR-MS, the site will be returned to grade and revegetated.

FEMA has determined through consultation with the Mississippi State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) that the existing Technology Center is considered eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). FEMA has concluded that demolition of the building would adversely affect the historic property and has entered into a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) with the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP), the Mississippi Emergency Management Agency, and the District for the recordation of the Technology Center prior to its demolition. The recordation will comply with the stipulations set forth in the MOA.

The District currently utilizes space at multiple schools within the district for its technology hubs and community education centers, and therefore operates less efficiently and at a reduced capacity. The need for this project is to enable the District to restore its infrastructure and operations to pre-disaster conditions.

## **3.0 ALTERNATIVES**

This section describes the alternatives that were considered in addressing the purpose and need stated in Section 2 above. Two alternatives were evaluated: the No Action Alternative, and the



Proposed Action Alternative, which is the relocation and rebuilding of the Technology Center on higher ground.

### 3.1 Alternatives Evaluated

#### Alternative 1: No Action

Under the No Action Alternative, the East Ward Technology Center would not be rebuilt. The District currently utilizes space at multiple schools within the district for its technology hubs and community education centers.

#### Alternative 2: Relocate and Rebuild East Ward Technology Center (Proposed Action)

Under the Proposed Action Alternative, the District proposes to construct a new Technology Center and parking lot on a 0.83-acre parcel located at 2014 Pass Road in Gulfport. An additional parking lot would be constructed on an adjacent 0.34-acre parcel located on 21<sup>st</sup> Avenue (see Figures 2 and 3). The two parcels comprise the proposed project site, which is located outside of the surge zone. The proposed project site is approximately 0.80 mile northwest of the existing Technology Center and is owned by the Gulfport School District. The District intends to construct a new 21,000-square-foot, 2-story building on the southern portion of the 0.83-acre parcel of the proposed project site. Pass Road, to the south, would provide access. The proposed project site is bordered by commercial businesses to the north, east, and west, and Pass Road to the south.

## 4.0 AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT AND IMPACTS

The following table summarizes the potential impacts of the Proposed Action Alternative and conditions or mitigation measures to offset those impacts. Following the summary table, any areas where potential impacts were identified will be discussed in greater detail.

Affected Environment	Impacts	Mitigation
<b>Geology and Soils</b>	No impacts to geology; temporary impacts to soils during the construction period	Appropriate Best Management Practices (BMPs), such as installing silt fences and revegetating bare soils immediately upon completion of construction to stabilize soils.
<b>Surface Water</b>	Temporary impacts to offsite surface waters are possible during construction activities.	A Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit must be obtained prior to construction; appropriate BMPs, such as installing silt fences and revegetating bare soils, would minimize runoff.



<b>Affected Environment</b>	<b>Impacts</b>	<b>Mitigation</b>
<b>Groundwater</b>	No impacts to groundwater are anticipated.	None
<b>Floodplains</b>	No impacts to the floodplain are anticipated.	None
<b>Waters of the U.S. including Wetlands</b>	No impacts to wetlands are anticipated.	None
<b>Transportation</b>	Minor temporary increase in the volume of construction traffic on roads in the immediate vicinity of the proposed project site.	Construction vehicles and equipment would be stored on-site during project construction and appropriate signage would be posted on affected roadways.
<b>Public Health and Safety</b>	No impacts to public health and safety are anticipated.	All construction activities would be performed using qualified personnel and in accordance with the standards specified in Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) regulations; appropriate signage and barriers should be in place prior to construction activities to alert pedestrians and motorists of project activities.
<b>Hazardous Materials</b>	No impacts to hazardous materials or wastes are anticipated.	Excavation activities could expose or otherwise affect subsurface hazardous wastes or materials; any hazardous materials discovered, generated, or used during construction would be disposed of and handled in accordance with applicable local, state, and federal regulations.
<b>Socioeconomic Resources</b>	No adverse socioeconomic impacts are anticipated.	None
<b>Environmental Justice</b>	No disproportionately high or adverse effect on minority or low-income populations is anticipated.	None
<b>Air Quality</b>	Temporary impacts to air quality would occur during the construction period.	Construction contractors would be required to water down construction areas when necessary; fuel-burning equipment running times would be kept to a minimum; engines would be properly maintained.



<b>Affected Environment</b>	<b>Impacts</b>	<b>Mitigation</b>
<b>Noise</b>	Temporary impacts to noise levels would occur at the proposed project site during the construction period.	Construction would take place during normal business hours and equipment would meet all local, state, and federal noise regulations.
<b>Biological Resources</b>	No impacts to biological resources are anticipated.	None
<b>Cultural Resources</b>	No impacts to archeological or cultural resources are anticipated.	None

#### 4.1 Geology and Soils

The proposed project site is located approximately 25 feet above mean sea level (amsl) and consists of Eustis loamy sand, Latonia loamy sand, and Plummer loamy sand. The Eustis series soils are characterized by deep, somewhat excessively drained soils that formed in coarse-textured marine or fluvial sediments on smooth to strongly dissected parts of the Coastal Plain. Slopes are mainly 0 to 12 percent (USDA, 2001). The Latonia series soils are characterized by deep, well-drained, moderately rapidly permeable soils. They formed in marine or alluvial sediments that are loamy in the upper part and sandy in the lower part. They are on marine or stream terraces of the Southern Coastal Plain and Gulf Coast Flatwoods (USDA, 1997). Slopes range from 0 to 5 percent. The Plummer series soils are characterized by very deep, poorly and very poorly drained soils. Permeability is moderate and slopes range from 0 to 5 percent (USDA, 2003).

The Farmland Protection Policy Act (FPPA) states that federal agencies must “minimize the extent to which federal programs contribute to the unnecessary conversion of farmland to nonagricultural uses...” The proposed project site does not contain soils classified as prime or unique farmland (USDA, 1997, 2001, 2003).

No Action Alternative – Under the No Action Alternative, no impacts to geology or soils would occur.

Proposed Action Alternative – Under the Proposed Action Alternative, no impacts to geology would occur; temporary impacts to soils would occur during the construction period. Appropriate BMPs would be used, such as installing silt fences and revegetating bare soils immediately upon completion of construction, to stabilize soils.

#### 4.2 Water Resources

##### 4.2.1 Surface Water

The Clean Water Act (CWA), as amended in 1977, established the basic framework for regulating discharges of pollutants into the waters of the United States. The proposed project site slopes southwest from an elevation of 33 feet amsl to 23 feet amsl. There are no streams or ponds located on or adjacent to the proposed project site. A Nationwide Infrastructure Support



---

Technical Assistance Consultants (NISTAC) biologist conducted a site visit on March 21, 2007, and verified these findings.

No Action Alternative – Under the No Action Alternative, no adverse impacts to surface water would occur.

Proposed Action Alternative – Under the Proposed Action Alternative, temporary impacts to offsite surface waters could occur during the construction period due to soil erosion. The applicant would be required to submit a SWPPP and NPDES permit application prior to construction. To reduce impacts to surface water, the applicant would implement appropriate BMPs, such as installing silt fences and revegetating bare soils.

#### 4.2.2 Floodplains

Executive Order (EO) 11988 (Floodplain Management) requires federal agencies to avoid direct or indirect support of development within the 100-year floodplain whenever there is a practicable alternative. FEMA uses Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRMs) to identify the regulatory 100-year floodplain for the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP). Consistent with EO 11988, FIRMs were examined during the preparation of this EA (FEMA, 2002; Community Panel Number 285253 0039D).

No Action Alternative – Under the No Action Alternative, no impacts to the floodplain would occur.

Proposed Action Alternative – As indicated on the FIRM, the proposed project site is located in Zone X, outside of the 100-year floodplain, and is also outside of the Advisory Base Flood Elevation (ABFE). Under the Proposed Action Alternative, no impacts to the floodplain are anticipated.

#### 4.2.3 Waters of the U.S. including Wetlands

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) regulates the discharge of dredged or filled material into waters of the U.S., including wetlands, pursuant to Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (CWA). Additionally, Executive Order 11990 (Protection of Wetlands) requires federal agencies to avoid, to the extent possible, adverse impact of wetlands.

According to the National Wetlands Inventory map, no wetlands are located on or adjacent to the proposed project site (USFWS, 2007a). A site visit conducted by a NISTAC biologist on March 21, 2007, verified these findings.

The Coastal Zone Management Act (CZMA) enables coastal states, including Mississippi, to designate state coastal zone boundaries and develop coastal management programs to improve protection of sensitive shoreline resources and guide sustainable use of coastal areas. According to the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), the proposed project site is located within the Mississippi Coastal Zone (NOAA, 2007).

On March 14, 2007, a letter requesting project review was sent to the Mississippi Department of Marine Resources (MDMR), Bureau of Wetlands Permitting regarding the proposed project and potential impacts on the coastal zone and wetlands (see Appendix B). A letter requesting project review was not sent to the USACE, Mobile District, because the District has a moratorium on conducting jurisdictional wetland determinations and would not be able to review the proposed project (Zedryk, pers. comm.).



---

No Action Alternative – Under the No Action Alternative, no impacts to waters of the U.S. including wetlands would occur.

Proposed Action Alternative – Under the Proposed Action Alternative, no impacts to waters of the U.S. including wetlands would occur. Temporary impacts to downstream surface waters would occur during the construction period from erosion of soils. To reduce impacts to surface water, the applicant would implement appropriate BMPs, such as installing silt fences and revegetating bare soils.

In a letter dated April 2, 2007, MDMR stated that it had no objections to the proposed Technology Center relocation and rebuilding as long as there are no direct or indirect impacts to coastal wetlands (see Appendix B). In a response dated March 19, 2007, the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) stated that no wetland impacts would occur (see Appendix B).

### **4.3 Transportation**

The proposed project site is located north of Pass Road. Pass Road is a four-lane divided roadway that runs east to west, parallel to the southern property limits of the proposed project site. There are no residential communities adjacent to the proposed project site. The commercial properties adjacent to the proposed project site have individual parking lots with access from Pass Road or secondary alleys.

No Action Alternative- Under the No Action Alternative, there would be no changes to transportation.

Proposed Action Alternative – Under the Proposed Action Alternative, no significant adverse impacts to transportation, site access, or traffic levels are anticipated. Traffic devices including lights and/or stop signs may have to be installed at the intersection of the access road and 21<sup>st</sup> Avenue, as well as at the intersection of 21<sup>st</sup> Avenue and Pass Road. Speed limits in the area may have to be decreased during selected hours, especially when students are arriving at and departing from the Technology Center.

There would be a minor temporary increase in the volume of construction traffic on roads in the immediate vicinity of the proposed project site that could potentially result in a slower traffic flow for the duration of the construction phase. To mitigate potential delays, construction vehicles and equipment would be stored on site during project construction and appropriate signage would be posted on affected roadways.

### **4.4 Environmental Justice**

EO 12898 (Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations) mandates that federal agencies identify and address, as appropriate, disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of their programs, policies, and activities on minority and low-income populations. Socioeconomic and demographic data for the project site area were analyzed to determine if a disproportionate number of minority or low-income persons have the potential to be adversely affected by the proposed project.

No Action Alternative – Under the No Action Alternative, there would be no disproportionately high and adverse effects on minority or low-income populations. All populations could



---

potentially be adversely affected by the reduced efficiency and capacity which currently exists because of the District's use of space at multiple schools.

Proposed Action Alternative – Under the Proposed Action Alternative, there would be no disproportionately high and adverse impacts on minority or low-income populations. Implementation of the Proposed Action Alternative would benefit all populations that utilize the Technology Center.

#### **4.5 Air Quality**

The Clean Air Act (CAA) requires that states adopt ambient air quality standards. The standards have been established in order to protect the public from potentially harmful amounts of pollutants. Under the CAA, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) establishes primary and secondary air quality standards. Primary air quality standards protect the public health, including the health of “sensitive populations, such as people with asthma, children, and older adults.” Secondary air quality standards protect public welfare by promoting ecosystems health, and preventing decreased visibility and damage to crops and buildings. EPA has set national ambient air quality standards (NAAQS) for the following six criteria pollutants: ozone (O<sub>3</sub>), particulate matter (PM<sub>2.5</sub>, PM<sub>10</sub>), nitrogen dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>), carbon monoxide (CO), sulfur dioxide (SO<sub>2</sub>), and lead (Pb). According to the Mississippi Department of Environmental Quality (MDEQ), the entire state of Mississippi is classified as in attainment, meaning that criteria air pollutants do not exceed the NAAQS (MDEQ, 2006).

No Action Alternative – Under the No Action Alternative, there would be no short- or long-term impacts to air quality because no construction would occur.

Proposed Action Alternative – Under the Proposed Action Alternative, temporary impacts to air quality would occur during the construction period. To reduce temporary impacts to air quality, the construction contractors would be required to water down construction areas when necessary. Emissions from fuel-burning internal combustion engines (e.g., heavy equipment and earthmoving machinery) could temporarily increase the levels of some of the criteria pollutants, including CO, NO<sub>2</sub>, O<sub>3</sub>, PM<sub>2.5</sub> and 10, and non-criteria pollutants such as Volatile Organic Compounds (VOCs). To reduce the emission of criteria pollutants, fuel-burning equipment running times would be kept to a minimum and engines would be properly maintained.

#### **4.6 Noise**

Noise is generally defined as unwanted sound. Sound is most commonly measured in decibels (dB) on the A-weighted scale, which is the scale most similar to the range of sounds that the human ear can hear. The Day-Night Average Sound Level (DNL) is an average measure of sound. The DNL descriptor is accepted by federal agencies as a standard for estimating sound impacts and establishing guidelines for compatible land uses. EPA guidelines, and those of many other federal agencies, state that outdoor sound levels in excess of 55 dB DNL are “normally unacceptable” for noise-sensitive land uses such as residences, schools, or hospitals.

Two sensitive receptors are located about 1 mile from the proposed project site; Central Elementary School is located at 1043 Pass Road and Saint John Catholic School is located at 2415 17<sup>th</sup> Street. No other sensitive receptors are located within 1 mile of the proposed project site.



---

No Action Alternative – Under the No Action Alternative, no impacts to noise would occur.

Proposed Action Alternative – Under the Proposed Action Alternative, temporary increases in noise levels are anticipated during the construction period. To reduce noise levels during that period, construction activities would take place during normal business hours. Equipment and machinery installed at the proposed Technology Center site would meet all local, state, and federal noise regulations. Temporary impacts to sensitive noise receptors could occur during construction, because two schools are located about 1 mile from the proposed project site.

#### 4.7 Biological Resources

The proposed project site is located in an urban area consisting of alleys, parking lots, and several small areas of maintained grass with several mature oak trees. An open field with several stands of trees is located to the north of the proposed project site. The proposed project site provides little habitat for wildlife.

The USFWS lists the following federally endangered (E) and threatened (T) species for Harrison County (USFWS, 2007):

Common Name	Scientific Name	Status
Louisiana black bear	<i>Ursus americanus luteolus</i>	T
West Indian manatee	<i>Trichechus manatus</i>	E (P)
Bald eagle	<i>Haliaeetus leucocephalus</i>	T
Brown pelican	<i>Pelecanus occidentalis</i>	E
Piping plover	<i>Charadrius melodus</i>	T (CH)
Red-cockaded woodpecker	<i>Picoides borealis</i>	E
Eastern indigo snake	<i>Drymarchon corais couperi</i>	T (P)
Gopher tortoise	<i>Gopherus polyphemus</i>	T
Green turtle	<i>Chelonia mydas</i>	T (P)
Kemp's Ridley	<i>Lepidochelys kempii</i>	E
Loggerhead turtle	<i>Caretta caretta</i>	T
Mississippi gopher frog	<i>Rana capito sevosa</i>	E
Gulf sturgeon	<i>Acipenser oxyrhynchus desotoi</i>	T (CH)
Louisiana quillwort	<i>Isoetes louisianensis</i>	E
Alabama red-bellied turtle	<i>Psuedemys alabamensis</i>	E

(P) = potential to occur; (CH) = listed with critical habitat

A site visit was conducted by a NISTAC biologist on March 21, 2007, confirmed that the proposed project site does not contain habitat for any federally listed flora and fauna species; therefore, it is unlikely that any threatened and endangered species are present. On March 14, 2007, a letter requesting project review was sent to USFWS.

No Action Alternative – Under the No Action Alternative, there would be no impacts to biological resources.

---

Proposed Action Alternative – Under the Proposed Action Alternative, no impacts to threatened and endangered species would occur. In a response dated March 19, 2007, USFWS stated that no listed or proposed candidate species are present in the project area (see Appendix B). Small areas of grass would be converted to Technology Center use.

#### **4.8 Cultural Resources**

Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), as amended, and implemented by 36 CFR Part 800, requires federal agencies to consider the effects of their actions on historic properties and provide the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) an opportunity to comment on federal projects that will have an effect on historic properties prior to implementation. Historic properties are defined as archeological sites, standing structures, or other historic resources listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP).

On March 21, 2007, a FEMA archaeologist and a historic building specialist visited the proposed project site to establish an Area of Potential Effect (APE) and determine what effects, if any, the proposed project would have on above ground and buried cultural resources. The APE has been utilized for many years as a commercial building site and has been highly disturbed as a result.

No Action Alternative – Under the No Action Alternative, no impacts to archeological or cultural resources would occur.

Proposed Action Alternative – Under the Proposed Action Alternative, no impacts to archeological or cultural resources are anticipated. In letters dated April 4, 2007, to the Mississippi Department of Archives and History (MDAH) and Tribal Historic Preservation Officer (THPO) for the Mississippi Band of Choctaw Indians, FEMA determined that no historic properties will be affected by the proposed project (see Appendix B). In a letter dated April 16, 2007, MDAH concurred that the project would not affect cultural resources. In correspondence dated April 26, 2007, the THPO stated it had no concerns with the proposed project (see Appendix B). If, during the course of the work, archeological artifacts or human remains are inadvertently discovered, the applicant shall stop work in the vicinity of the discovery and take all reasonable measures to avoid or minimize further harm to the finds. Work will not proceed until FEMA Historic Preservation staff have completed consultation with the Mississippi State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) and the THPO.

#### **5.0 CUMULATIVE IMPACTS**

According to the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations, cumulative impacts represent the “impact on the environment which results from the incremental impact of the action when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions, regardless of what agency (federal or non-federal) or person undertakes such other actions. Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor but collectively significant actions taking place over a period of time (40 CFR 1508.7).” In accordance with NEPA and to the extent reasonable and practical, this EA considered the combined effect of the Proposed Action Alternative and other actions occurring or proposed in the vicinity of the proposed project site.

Gulfport and the entire Mississippi Gulf coast are undergoing recovery efforts after Hurricane Katrina caused extensive damages. The recovery efforts in Gulfport include demolition,



---

reconstruction, and new construction. These projects and the proposed project may have a cumulative temporary impact on air quality in Gulfport by increasing criteria pollutants during construction activities. No other cumulative effects are anticipated.

## **6.0 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT**

FEMA is the lead federal agency for conducting the NEPA compliance process for the Technology Center relocation and rebuilding project in Gulfport, Mississippi. It is the goal of the lead agency to expedite the preparation and review of NEPA documents and to be responsive to the needs of the community and the purpose and need of the proposed action while meeting the intent of NEPA and complying with all NEPA provisions.

The Gulfport School District will notify the public of the availability of the draft Environment Assessment through publication of a public notice in a local newspaper. FEMA will conduct an expedited public comment period commencing on the initial date of publication of the public notice.

## **7.0 AGENCY COORDINATION AND PERMITS**

The following agencies and organizations were contacted by letter requesting project review during the preparation of this EA. If required for NEPA documentation, agencies (marked with \*) were asked to submit a formal response. Responses received to date are included in Appendix B.

- U.S. Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service
- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Region 4, Water Management Division
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Jackson Field Office\*
- Mississippi Department of Agriculture and Commerce
- Mississippi Department of Archives and History\* (TRO will do consult)
- Mississippi Department of Environmental Quality, Office of Pollution Control, Environmental Permits Division\*
- Mississippi Department of Marine Resources, Bureau of Wetlands Permitting
- Mississippi Department of Transportation, Environmental Division
- Mississippi Soil and Water Conservation Commission

In accordance with applicable local, state, and federal regulations, the applicant would be responsible for acquiring any necessary permits prior to commencing construction at the proposed project site. These would include SWPPP and NPDES permits.

## **8.0 CONCLUSIONS**

No impacts to geology, groundwater, floodplains, wetlands, public health and safety, hazardous materials, socioeconomic resources, environmental justice, biological resources and cultural resources are anticipated with the Proposed Action Alternative. During the construction period,



---

short-term impacts to soils, surface water, transportation, air quality, and noise are anticipated. All short-term impacts require conditions to minimize and mitigate impacts to the proposed project site and surrounding areas.



---

## 9.0 REFERENCES

- BellSouth (BS). <http://www.bellsouth.com/index.html>. Accessed March 16, 2007.
- Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). [www.fema.gov](http://www.fema.gov). Accessed March 15, 2007.
- FEMA. 1996. National Environmental Policy Act, FEMA Desk Reference. May 14, 1996.
- FEMA. 2002. Flood Insurance Rate Map, City of Gulfport, Harrison County, Mississippi. Community Panel Number 285253 0039 D. Map revised October 4, 2002. [www.fema.gov](http://www.fema.gov). Accessed March 15, 2007.
- FEMA. 2006. Hurricane Katrina Surge Inundation and Advisory Base Flood Elevation Maps dated January 6, 2006. [http://www.fema.gov/hazard/flood/recoverydata/katrina/katrina\\_ms\\_harrison.shtm](http://www.fema.gov/hazard/flood/recoverydata/katrina/katrina_ms_harrison.shtm). Accessed May 2, 2007.
- Gulfport Police Department (GPD). <http://www.ci.gulfport.ms.us/police/>. Accessed March 15, 2007.
- Gulfport Fire Department (GFD). <http://www.ci.gulfport.ms.us/fire/>. Accessed March 15, 2007.
- Mississippi Department of Environmental Quality (MDEQ). 2007. [http://www.deq.state.ms.us/MDEQ.nsf/page/Air\\_AirQualityPlanningandEmissionStandards?OpenDocument](http://www.deq.state.ms.us/MDEQ.nsf/page/Air_AirQualityPlanningandEmissionStandards?OpenDocument). Accessed March 16, 2007.
- National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA). 2007. State Coastal Zone Boundaries. <http://coastalmanagement.noaa.gov/mystate/docs/StateCZBoundaries.pdf#search=%22coastal%20zone%20mississippi%20noaa%22>. Accessed March 15, 2007.
- Southwest Water Company (SWC). 2007. <http://www.swwc.com/?fa=casestudies&id=7>. Accessed March 15, 2007.
- U.S. Census Bureau. 2005. American Fact Finder, Gulfport, Mississippi. <http://factfinder.census.gov/home/saff/main.html?lang=en>. Accessed March 16, 2007.
- U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), Natural Resource Conservation Service. 1997. <http://websoilsurvey.nrcs.usda.gov/app/>. Accessed March 15, 2007.
- USDA. 2001. <http://websoilsurvey.nrcs.usda.gov/app/>. Accessed March 15, 2007.
- USDA. 2003. <http://websoilsurvey.nrcs.usda.gov/app/>. Accessed March 15, 2007.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). 2007. [http://ecos.fws.gov/tess\\_public/StateListingAndOccurrence.do?state=MS](http://ecos.fws.gov/tess_public/StateListingAndOccurrence.do?state=MS). Accessed March 15, 2007.
- USFWS. 2007a. *Wetlands Online Mapper*. <http://wetlandsfws.er.usgs.gov/wtlnds/launch.html>. Accessed March 15, 2007.
- Zedryk, Tad. 2006. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Mobile District. Personal communication with Angela Chaisson of NISTAC on November 28, 2006.

## Appendix A

### Figures

## Appendix B

### Agency Coordination