

DRAFT - Subject to Change



Draft Environmental Assessment

Minot School District #1

Ramstad Middle School

City of Minot, North Dakota
April 2012

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
FEMA Region VIII
Denver Federal Center
Building 710, P.O. Box 25267
Denver, CO 80225-0267

Prepared by
Braun Intertec Corporation
1826 Buerkle Road
St. Paul, MN 55110

Prepared for
FEMA Region VIII
and
Kraus Anderson Construction Company

Table of Contents

Description	Page
Acronyms.....	A
A. Introduction.....	1
A.1. Project Authority.....	1
A.2. Background.....	1
B. Purpose and Need.....	2
C. Alternatives Analysis.....	3
C.1. Alternative 1-No Action (Remain in Temporary Schools).....	3
C.2. Alternative 2-Locally Preferred Alternative (New School).....	3
C.3. Alternative 3 – Rehabilitation of Ramstad School – Flooded Facility.....	5
D. Affected Environment and Impacts.....	5
D.1. Physical Environment.....	5
D.1.a. Geology, Seismicity, and Soils.....	5
D.1.b. Water Resources and Water Quality.....	7
D.1.c. Floodplain Management.....	8
D.1.d. Air Quality.....	8
D.2. Biological Environment.....	10
D.2.a. Terrestrial and Aquatic Environment.....	10
D.2.b. Wetlands.....	11
D.2.c. Threatened and Endangered Species.....	12
D.3. Hazardous Materials.....	14
D.4. Socioeconomics.....	15
D.4.a. Zoning and Land Use.....	15
D.4.b. Transportation.....	15
D.4.c. Noise.....	16
D.4.d. Public Services and Utilities.....	16
D.4.e. Environmental Justice.....	17
D.4.f. Safety and Security.....	18
D.5. Historic and Cultural Resources.....	19
D.5.a. Historic Structures and Archaeological Resources.....	19
D.5.b. Tribal Coordination and Religious Sites.....	20
D.6. Comparison of Alternatives.....	21
E. Cumulative Impacts.....	25
F. Public Participation.....	25
G. Government Coordination and Permits.....	26
H. References.....	27
I. List of Preparers.....	28

Table of Contents (*Continued*)

Figures and Appendices

Figures

- 1a: State of North Dakota
- 1b: Locations of Three Alternatives
- 2: Flooded Ramstad School
- 3: Proposed New Ramstad Middle School
- 4: Seismicity in North Dakota
- 5: USGS Topographic Map
- 6: USDA NRCS Soil Survey
- 7: NWI Map
- 8: FIRM Map for Minot Municipal Auditorium
- 9: FIRM Map for New Ramstad Middle School
- 10: FIRM Map for Old Ramstad Middle School
- 11: Attainment Area Map

Appendix

- A: Preliminary Schematic Design Manual

- B: Correspondence
 - USACE
 - USFWS
 - USDA NRCS
 - SHPO
 - Tribal Requests
 - Tribal Response

- C: Phase I ESA

- D: Class III CRI and TCP

- E: Public Notice

DRAFT - Subject to Change

Acronyms

A/E	Architectural and engineering firm
AHERA	Asbestos Hazard & Emergency Response Act
amsl	Above mean sea level
APE	Area of Potential Effects
BGEPA	Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act
bgs	Below Ground Surface
BMP	Best Management Practice
CAA	Clean Air Act
CEQ	Council on Environmental Quality
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
CO	carbon monoxide
CRI	Cultural Resources Inventory
CWA	Clean Water Act
dB	decibel
DPI	North Dakota Department of Public Instruction
EA	Environmental Assessment
EIS	Environmental Impact Statement
EO	Executive Order
ESA	Endangered Species Act
ESA	Environmental Site Assessment
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency
FIRM	Flood Insurance Rate Map
FONSI	Finding of No Significant Impact
FPPA	Farmland Protection Policy Act
LEED	Leadership in Energy & Environmental Design
MBTA	Migratory Bird Treaty Act
MSD#1	Minot School District #1

NAAQS National Ambient Air Quality Standards
NCA Noise Control Act
NDDES North Dakota Department of Emergency Services
NEPA National Environmental Policy Act
NFIP National Flood Insurance Program
NHPA National Historic Preservation Act
NO₂ nitrogen dioxide
NPDES National Pollutant Discharge and Elimination System (permit)
NRCS Natural Resources Conservation Service (local field office of USDA)
NRHP National Register of Historic Places
NDGFD North Dakota Game & Fish Department
NDDH North Dakota Department of Health
NDDES North Dakota Department of Emergency Services
NDSHPO North Dakota State Historic Preservation Office
NWI National Wetland Inventory

O₃ ozone
OSHA Occupational Safety and Health Administration

Pb lead
PM_{2.5} particulate matter less than 2.5 microns
PM₁₀ particulate matter less than 10 microns

REC Recognized Environmental Condition
ROE Regional Office of Education

SHPO State Historic Preservation Officer
SO₂ sulfur dioxide

SWM Storm Water Management
SWPPP Storm water Pollution Prevention Plan

TCP Traditional Cultural Properties
THPO Tribal Historic Preservation Officer

USACE U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
USDA U.S. Department of Agriculture (local field office is NRCS)

USEPA U.S. Environmental Protection Agency

USFWS U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service

USGS U.S. Geological Survey

VOC volatile organic compound

A. Introduction

A.1. Project Authority

The Minot Public School District #1 (MSD#1) in the City of Minot, North Dakota has applied through the North Dakota Department of Emergency Services (NDDDES) to the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) for funding assistance. This funding is for the replacement of a flooded intermediate school (Ramstad Middle School) at a new location. In accordance with 44 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) for FEMA, Subpart B, Agency Implementing Procedures, Part 10.9, this Environmental Assessment (EA) is being prepared pursuant to Section 102 of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969, as implemented by the regulations promulgated by the President's Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ); 40 CFR Parts 1500-1508. The purpose of the EA is to analyze the potential environmental impacts of the proposed project, and to determine whether to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) or a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI).

The applicant has requested an Improved Project to construct a new Ramstad Middle School at a new location. MSD#1 must obtain approval for the Improved Project from the District Superintendent, North Dakota Department of Public Instruction, Regional Office of Education (DPI, ROE) prior to the start of construction. Federal funding for this Improved Project is limited to the costs associated with rebuilding the same square footage and use-type as the damaged school facility. The remaining funding balance for the Improved Project is a non-Federal responsibility.

A.2. Background

The City of Minot, in Ward County, is a community located in north-central North Dakota, (Figure 1) located within the Minot Micropolitan Statistical Area. Major national and state transportation corridors within the area include U.S. Highway 2, U.S. Highway 52, U.S. Highway 83, and the Burlington Northern Santa Fe (BNSF) and Soo Line railroads.

On June 25, during the declared incident period (2/14/11 to 7/20/11), areas in Minot were flooded by the Souris/Mouse River, severely damaging several schools, numerous businesses, and thousands of residences. President Obama declared a major disaster for North Dakota due to damages from the severe flooding and signed a disaster declaration (FEMA-1981-DR-ND) on May 10, 2011, with seven amendments authorizing FEMA to provide federal assistance in designated areas. This EA addresses one of the flooded schools, Ramstad Middle School, currently located at 501 Lincoln Avenue, where approximately 505 sixth through eighth grade students attend school.

The magnitude of the damage sustained by this school rendered it inhabitable for the 2011 - 2012 school year. Schools are a critical facility to the community and the school district's governing body is mandated to provide and maintain facilities for the purpose of the students' continuing education. The Minot School District has leased building space in the existing Minot Municipal Auditorium facility, located at 424 3rd Ave SW, Minot, ND. The lease commenced on August 23, 2011, with an expiration date of July 1, 2012; the lease includes access to the parking lot for the placement of temporary portable units.

Over a series of meetings between the MSD #1, NDDDES, and FEMA, project alternatives were presented and discussed, and the Ramstad Middle School site damage analysis was finalized. In early October, FEMA completed their repair versus replace analysis that stated the repair cost exceeds 50 percent of the estimated replacement cost. The facility's actual replacement cost is eligible for federal funding. In accordance with 44 CFR 206.226(f), a facility is eligible for replacement when the repair cost exceeds 50 percent of the replacement cost.

Additionally, in a December 2, 2011 City of Minot letter to the Minot Public Schools Superintendent concerning Ramstad School, the inspector declared, "...the school was found to be in violation of Chapter 9, Article 2 Dangerous Buildings, or the City of Minot Code or Ordinances... Because of the building's condition and due to the fact it is detrimental to public health and safety, this building must be demolished and the site be abated to be made safe for the public." (Appendix B)

After reviewing and evaluating numerous properties, the MSD#1 chose a 20-acre site west of 36th Avenue Northwest and North Broadway along the outskirts of Minot for construction of a new school. This site provides the required acreage for Ramstad School's replacement facility and offers an area for potential future growth. The schematic design process to date has been inclusive, with input gathered from the Minot Public Schools design team including select staff and administration, with constructability and budgetary input from Kraus-Anderson Construction Co., civil engineering from Ackerman-Estvold Engineering, MEP systems from Prairie Engineering, and technology systems from Elert & Associates.

B. Purpose and Need

The purpose of this project is to provide a sustainable classroom environment for the students of Ramstad Middle School. The need for this project is based on a current shortage of long-term classroom facilities.

C. Alternatives Analysis

C.1. Alternative 1-No Action (Remain in Temporary Schools)

Under the No Action Alternative, the MSD#1 would remain in the existing, temporary and modular classrooms that have been constructed at the Minot Municipal Auditorium. The temporary classrooms are located at 424 3rd Avenue SW, Minot, North Dakota on the auditorium property, in a predominantly commercial area (Figure 1b). As these classrooms were designed to be temporary in nature, they do not meet current MSD#1 permanent school facility requirements. If this alternative is selected, there would be remodeling of the interior of the Municipal Auditorium facility.

C.2. Alternative 2-Locally Preferred Alternative (New School)

Under the Locally Preferred Alternative, construction of a new school facility would provide a new home for the displaced 6th through 8th grade students that previously attended the flooded Ramstad Middle School. MSD#1 is considering the purchase of approximately 20 acres of undeveloped agricultural land west of 36th Avenue NW and N Broadway.

The proposed location is located in the southwest quarter of Section 2, Township 155 North, Range 83 West, West of the Black Hills meridian, with geographic coordinates of 48.2748°N, 101.3115°W. Wetlands are present at the Site; however, the USACE has designated these wetlands as non-jurisdictional (Appendix B). The nearest waterway is the Mouse River, about 2.25 miles to the south. A map showing the project site for the proposed school in relation to the City of Minot is provided in Figure 1b.

The new 103,683 square foot (sf), school facility would be located in the eastern portion of the 20-acre parcel (Figure 3). The new school would provide two sections per grade level for 6th, 7th, and 8th grade students. Each section would include classrooms for Reading, Language Arts, Social Studies, and Math, plus Teacher Planning and Small Group Instruction rooms. The sections would also include Team Resource rooms, Science Labs with adjacent Prep Rooms; an Art Room with storage and kiln, Family and Consumer Sciences rooms, two Technology Labs, a Band Room, a Choral Room, two practice rooms, and two Special Education rooms with resource and offices. Additionally, the school would include administration offices with a secured access main entrance, including offices for principal, assistant principal, counselor, etc.; a Media Center with a computer lab/resource center and support areas; a cafeteria/stage with kitchen; a gymnasium and locker rooms with two-section capability, weights/fitness room and a pool; multi-user restrooms, and custodial and miscellaneous accessory spaces. Other site improvements include two softball fields with football/soccer practice fields overlapping the outfields, a 400-meter track around the

football/soccer field, and paved parking areas (including student drop off/pick up areas) to facilitate staff and visitor needs (see Appendix A for the Schematic Design Manual).

The basic structural system being considered is a steel frame skeleton with steel floor and roof joists. The masonry shell and interior walls are non-load bearing, and the columns would be embedded in the masonry walls. A centralized hydronic heat pump system and a geothermal well field would be employed to supply the heating, ventilation, and air conditioning in the school building.

A municipal water connection is planned at 36th Avenue Northwest and on the avenue bordering the site to the south. A municipal sanitary sewer connection is planned at the south side of the site. The connection would be designed to meet the capacity for the school as well as the adjacent planned residential development. Other utilities would be available to the site boundary; specifics on utility connections have not yet been determined.

Design of the building would comply with all Leadership in Energy & Environmental Design (LEED) construction controls and criteria as required to facilitate the achievement of a LEED certified building. LEED is an internationally recognized green building certification system providing third-party verification that a building or community was designed and built using strategies aimed at improving performance across all the metrics that matter most: energy savings, water efficiency, CO₂ emissions reduction, improved indoor environmental quality, and stewardship of resources and sensitivity to their impacts.

Before beginning construction, an individual(s) would be designated for emergency response. The individual(s) would be available to repair and maintain erosion control devices on a 24-hour per day basis. Erosion control measures would be in general accordance with the procedures and standards for urban soil erosion and sedimentation control, Best Management Practices (BMP). Erosion and/or sediment control measures would be installed prior to the commencement of any earth-disturbing activity.

During construction, the general contractor would be responsible for conducting inspections of the erosion control system as required by the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit and Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). A notice of intent would be submitted to the North Dakota Department of Health (NDDH) prior to the anticipated start of construction operations.

During construction, existing vegetation and root zone would be stripped to a minimum depth of 16" within the construction limits. Topsoil would be temporarily removed from the building footprint, proposed parking lot areas, and stormwater pond; topsoil would be stockpiled within the disturbed areas, then used for various construction activities (i.e. for the retention pond), with any excess spread on-site prior to revegetation. No topsoil is anticipated to be hauled off-site. Appropriate best management practices (BMPs) such as perimeter protection, prompt planting of vegetation, and completion of landscaping would be used to minimize runoff.

C.3. Alternative 3 – Rehabilitation of Ramstad School

Following the flooding, a damage assessment was made to assess the damage to the flooded Ramstad Middle School. While the exterior of the school did not appear to be badly damaged, the inside of the school suffered extensive water damage (Figure 2a and 2b) and the building was deemed a Dangerous Building that was required to be demolished (Appendix B).

This alternative would be to clean up and repair and/or reconstruct the flooded Ramstad Middle School, located at 501 Lincoln Avenue in Minot, North Dakota (Figure 1b). Students would return to the facility after reconstruction of the facility; and all conditional issues involving ROE, NDDH, and other applicable permits were met.

If the building was to be re-occupied, all elements of the Asbestos Hazard Emergency Response Act (AHERA) for schools would be required to be followed. The requirement to continue to manage in place or remove the materials would be driven by the condition of the materials and/or potential impact from construction/renovation activities. For example, the extent of the damage to the floor tile would require that it be abated and replaced. All friable/regulated asbestos-containing materials would need to be encapsulated and removed for disposal. Any asbestos-contaminated soil would need to be removed or encapsulated.

D. Affected Environment and Impacts

D.1. Physical Environment

D.1.a. Geology, Seismicity, and Soils

The project area is located in the eastern portion of Ward County in north-central North Dakota. The project area is located in an area with minimal earthquake activity as evidence by the Seismicity

of North Dakota Map 1900 to present (Figure 4) as prepared by the United States Geological Survey (USGS). Additionally, North Dakota is well within the area with the lowest potential ground-shaking hazard of 0 to 2% force of gravity (g). As such, seismicity issues are through to have generally equal risk for all three alternatives. All A/E design will use BMPs and will follow applicable codes and ordinances.

Alternative 1 - No Action (Remain in Existing Building) – Surficial geology within the No Action Alternative is Quaternary River Terrace Deposits and bedrock geology is Tertiary Paleocene Cannonball Formation. Under the No Action Alternative, most activities would take place in the interior of the existing building, and no impacts to geology or soils are anticipated.

Alternative 2 - Locally Preferred Alternative (New Middle School) – Under the Locally Preferred Alternative, temporary and permanent impacts would occur to on-site soils.

The USGS topographic map, Burlington SE, North Dakota (Figure 5) indicates topography at the Site is variable, ranging from 1725 feet above mean sea level (amsl) to 1745 feet amsl. The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) online Soil Survey (USDA, 2012) of Ward County, North Dakota 2010 (Figure 6) indicates the proposed project site, just outside the corporate limits of the City of Minot, contains soils consisting of the Barnes-Hamerly loam, undulating complex (BhB); Barnes loam, gently sloping complex (BaC); and Barnes loam, level complex (BaA).

Soils in the proposed project area are classified as prime farmland, which is generally subject to the Farmland Protection Policy Act (FPPA) of 1981. The FPPA requires that consideration be given to impacts involving the conversion of farmland to non-agricultural uses. An evaluation of the impacts to Federal activities to prime or unique farmlands, or farmlands of unique local or state importance, is required by the implementing regulations 7 CFR 658.

FEMA coordinated with the Department of Agriculture (USDA) and the NRCS to complete a Farmland Conversion Impact Rating form (AD-1006) to assess the potential impact of the project to prime or unique farmland (Appendix B). This resulted in a site assessment score of 146. In general, projects with a rating of 225 points or higher are denied, projects from 224-200 points are approved with limitations, and projects rated below 200 points are approved without limitations.

Surficial geology within the Locally Preferred Alternative Alternative is Quaternary Till and bedrock geology is Tertiary Paleocene Cannonball Formation.

Alternative 3 – Rehabilitation of Ramstad School - Surficial geology at the current Ramstad school is Quaternary Floodplain Alluvium and bedrock geology is Tertiary Paleocene Cannonball Formation.

Under this Alternative, short-term impacts due to soil disturbance would occur during the clean up and repair period on the site. Appropriate BMPs such as perimeter protection, prompt planting of vegetation, and completion of landscaping, as appropriate, would be used to minimize runoff.

D.1.b. Water Resources and Water Quality

The Clean Water Act (CWA), as amended in 1977, established the basic framework for regulating discharges of pollutants into waters of the United States. In addition, Executive Order (EO) 11990 (Protection of Wetlands) requires Federal agencies to avoid, to the extent possible, adverse impacts of wetlands.

Alternative 1 - No Action (Remain in Temporary School) - Under the No Action Alternative, no adverse impacts to water resources would occur.

Alternative 2 - Locally Preferred Alternative (New Middle School) – Under the Locally Preferred Alternative Alternative, there would likely be few direct adverse impacts to water resources other than the anticipated impacts to the on-site wetlands (as discussed in section D.2.b). The 20-acre site is currently comprised of agricultural land and wetland areas, and the site would be impacted, in part, by the new building and parking lot. To reduce impacts to surface waters (including nearby wetlands) during the construction period, the applicant would implement appropriate BMPs, such as installing perimeter protection and promptly covering bare soils and would obtain a National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit for this project.

Surface runoff in the area would include some surface drainage and a system of underground storm sewers that will collect and direct these flows to the storm system independently being completed for the larger 400-acre parcel surrounding the project site. Additionally, storm water would be managed either on-site (through a dry-bottom, grassy, detention pond would be located along the western portion of the project site) or through the use of a regional storm water pond within the planned adjacent residential development.

Alternative 3 – Rehabilitation of Ramstad School - Under this Alternative, reoccupying the school would have no direct permanent impacts to surface waters. However, temporary short-term impacts to downstream surface waters could occur due of potential soil erosion during reconstruction. To reduce impacts to surface water, the applicant would implement appropriate BMPs, such as installing perimeter protection and prompt replanting of bare soil areas.

D.1.c. Floodplain Management

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. Specifically, EO 11988 prohibits federal agencies from funding construction in the 100-year floodplain unless there are no practicable alternatives. FEMA's regulations for complying with EO 11988 are promulgated in 44 CFR Part 9.

FEMA uses Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRMs) to identify the regulatory 100-year floodplain for the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP).

Alternative 1 - No Action (Remain in Temporary School) – Under the No Action alternative, the most recent FIRM Map #38101C0781D dated January 19, 2000 (Figure 8) shows the Municipal Auditorium outside of the 500 and 100-year floodplain. No impacts to the floodplain would occur.

Alternative 2 - Locally Preferred Alternative (New Middle School) - Under the Locally Preferred Alternative, the most recent FIRM Map #38101C0595D, dated January 19, 2000 (Figure 9) shows the proposed new school location outside of the 500 and 100-year floodplain. No impacts to the floodplain would occur.

Alternative 3 – Rehabilitation of Ramstad School - Under this Alternative, the most recent FIRM Map #38101C0781D, dated January 19, 2000 (Figure 10) shows the current Ramstad School within zone X, areas of 500-year flood and 100-year flood with average depths of less than 1 foot or with drainage areas less than 1 square mile, and areas protected by levees from 100-year flood. As this location already contains building structures, it is unlikely that additional significant impacts to the floodplain would occur.

D.1.d. Air Quality

The Clean Air Act (CAA) requires that states adopt ambient air quality standards. The standards have been established to protect the public from potentially harmful amounts of pollutants. Under the CAA, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA) 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 buildings and crops. The EPA has set national ambient air quality standards (NAAQS) for the following six criteria pollutants: ozone (O₃), particulate matter (PM_{2.5}, PM₁₀), nitrogen dioxide (NO₂), carbon monoxide (CO), sulfur dioxide (SO₂), and lead (Pb).

According to USEPA (USEPA 2012), all of Ward County is in an attainment area for all CAA NAAQS (Figure 11).

Alternative 1 - No Action (Remain in Existing Building) - Under the No Action Alternative, there would be only temporary impacts to air quality during mostly interior remodeling/construction activities.

Alternative 2 - Locally Preferred Alternative (New Middle School) - Under the Locally Preferred Alternative, short-term impacts to air quality would occur during construction activities. To reduce impacts, the construction contractors would be required to wet down construction areas as needed to mitigate fugitive dust. Emissions from fuel-burning engines (e.g., heavy equipment and earthmoving machinery) could also temporarily increase the levels of some of the criteria pollutants, such as CO, NO₂, O₃, PM₁₀, and noncriteria pollutants such as volatile organic compounds (VOCs). To mitigate these emissions, BMPs would be used such as run times for fuel burning equipment would be kept to a minimum and equipment would be properly maintained. Long-term impacts would occur from emissions from fuel-burning engines (busses, cars, snow-removal equipment, lawn maintenance equipment).

Alternative 3 – Rehabilitation of Ramstad School - Under this Alternative, short-term impacts to air quality would occur during clean up and repair of the existing facility. All elements of the Asbestos Hazard Emergency Response Act (AHERA) for schools would be required to be followed, including specific ROE regulations and requirements. The requirement to continue to manage in place or remove the materials would be driven by the condition of the materials and/or potential impact from construction/renovation activities. For example, the extent of the damage to the floor tile would require that it be abated and replaced. All friable regulated, asbestos-containing materials would need to be encapsulated and removed for disposal. To reduce impacts, the construction of demolition contractors would be required to wet down construction areas as needed to mitigate fugitive dust. Emissions from fuel-burning engines (e.g., heavy equipment and earthmoving machinery) could also temporarily increase the levels of some of the criteria pollutants, such as CO, NO₂, O₃, PM₁₀, and noncriteria pollutants such as VOCs. To mitigate these emissions, fuel-burning equipment run times would be kept to a minimum and equipment would be properly maintained.

D.2. Biological Environment

D.2.a. Terrestrial and Aquatic Environment

Alternative 1 - No Action (Remain in Temporary School) – The Municipal Auditorium is located in a developed area within the City of Minot. Potential short-term negative impacts to the aquatic environment of the Mouse River could result during clean-up and repairs. The most likely potential negative impact could result from a decrease in the quality of storm water runoff from the site. If any outside work were to be performed, appropriate erosion and sediment control BMPs would be employed to minimize storm water runoff from the site. Thus, under the No Action Alternative, there would be no anticipated significant impacts to the terrestrial or aquatic environments.

Alternative 2 - Locally Preferred Alternative (New Middle School) - The proposed project site is just outside of the city limits and is an undeveloped farm field along the northern edge of Minot. Wildlife common to rural agricultural land, including song-birds and small mammals, have been observed in the area. Additionally, three wetland areas are located at the site (see Section D.2.b below).

In a letter dated September 21, 2011, Mr. Jeffrey Towner (USFWS) provided comments regarding the proposed project and development of the land surrounding the proposed project under the authority of and in accordance with the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (16 USC 703 *et seq*) (MBTA) and the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act (16 USC 668-668d, 54 Stat. 250) (BGEPA) (Appendix B). Mr. Towner offered the following USFWS recommendations to minimize disturbance to fish and wildlife resources in the project area:

- To the extent practicable, schedule construction for late summer or fall/early winter so as not to disrupt waterfowl or other wildlife during the breeding season (February 1 through July 15);
- If work takes place during the breeding season, implement all practicable measures (such as maintaining buffers and suspending construction where necessary) to avoid all take of bald or golden eagles;
- Locate construction to avoid placement of fill in wetlands along the migratory route;
- Replace unavoidable loss of wetland habitat with functionally-equivalent wetlands;
- Install and maintain appropriate erosion control measures to reduce sediment transport to adjacent wetlands and stream channels.

Under the Locally Preferred Alternative, impacts to the terrestrial environment would result from the development of the site. While the site's existing terrestrial and wetland environments would

be disturbed, no endangered resources are anticipated to be impacted (See section D.2.c below). Existing vegetation and topsoil would be removed, and some birds and animals that make home in farmlands would be displaced. The site's new landscaping will include grasses, trees, bushes, and a storm water retention pond that may provide habitat for wildlife.

Construction would occur throughout the year (including the breeding season). Efforts will be made to avoid take of bald and/or golden eagles. Should bald and/or golden eagle be identified at the project site, the USFWS will be contacted prior to continuation of work in the area of the bird sighting.

Based on the current layout of the proposed project, three wetlands at the proposed site will be impacted. Mitigation of the impacted wetlands is not currently planned. Additional discussion of the impacts of the site on wetlands is discussed in Section D.2.b.

Alternative 3 – Rehabilitation of Ramstad School - The existing Ramstad School and properties surrounding it are fully developed and consist of commercial and public properties. Potential short-term negative impacts to the aquatic environment of the Mouse River could result during clean-up and repairs. The most likely potential negative impact could result from a decrease in the quality of storm water runoff from the site. If any outside work were to be performed, appropriate erosion and sediment control BMPs would be employed to minimize storm water runoff from the site. Thus, under this Alternative, there would be no anticipated significant impacts to the terrestrial or aquatic environments.

D.2.b. Wetlands

The USACE regulates the discharge of dredged or filled material into waters of the U.S., including wetlands, pursuant to Section 404 of the CWA. In addition, EO 11990 (Protection of Wetlands) requires Federal agencies to avoid, to the extent possible, adverse impacts on wetlands that may result from federally funded actions.

Alternative 1 - No Action (Remain in Temporary School) - Under the No Action Alternative, no impacts to wetlands would occur.

Alternative 2 - Locally Preferred Alternative (New Middle School) - According to the National Wetlands Inventory Map (USFWS 2012) four wetlands are mapped at the site (Figure 7). In 2011, a wetland delineation was performed on the proposed site and land surrounding the proposed 20-acre site. The wetland delineation identified three wetlands at the site (two of the NWI-identified wetlands were considered a single wetland). The wetlands consist of a 1.20-acre palustrine,

emergent, seasonally flooded, drained or ditched (PEMCd) wetland, a 2.02-acre palustrine emergent/aquatic bed semi-permanently flooded (PEM/ABF) wetland, and a portion of a 5.78-acre PEMCd wetland. The wetland delineation report was submitted to the USACE; the USACE determined that the wetlands were not jurisdictional waters of the US, and that no permit pursuant to Section 404 of the CWA was required from the USACE (Appendix B).

In a letter dated September 21, 2011, Mr. Jeffrey Towner (USFWS) provided comments regarding the proposed project and development of the land surrounding the proposed project under the authority of and in accordance with the National Wildlife Refuge System Improvement Act of 1997 (Public Law 105-57) (Appendix B). Mr. Towner noted that North Dakota's "prairie potholes" and their surrounding grasslands are highly productive habitats for breeding and migratory birds and other wetland and native grassland-dependent species. The USFWS recommended avoidance of construction in these habitats whenever possible, and requested that a mitigation plan be prepared to compensate for all unavoidable impacts to wetlands.

Under the Locally Preferred Alternative, construction of the building and parking area footprints would occur on the eastern half of the site and would impact one wetland. Construction of the ball fields on the western half of the site would impact two wetlands, with a total of approximately seven acres of wetlands proposed to be filled. At the time of this EA, mitigation for the impacted wetlands is not planned. Thirty-five additional wetlands were delineated on the larger approximately 400-acre parcel located to the west, east, and south of the proposed site.

Alternative 3 - Rehabilitation of Ramstad School - Under this Alternative, no impacts to wetlands would occur because none are present on or near the current Ramstad School site. During clean up and repairs, the use of BMPs would minimize erosion at the site and mitigate potential impacts to the Mouse River. Appropriate BMPs would be required at the site including, but not limited to, the installation of perimeter protection and the revegetation of bare soils to minimize erosion.

D.2.c. Threatened and Endangered Species

In accordance with Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act (ESA) of 1973, the project area was evaluated for the potential occurrences of federally listed threatened and endangered species through review of published information as well as direct consultation with USFWS. The ESA requires any federal agency that funds, authorizes or carries out an action to ensure that their action is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of any endangered or threatened species or result in the destruction or adverse modification of designated critical habitats (FEMA 1996). In compliance with Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act, a review of the potential impacts to federally-listed endangered, threatened and candidate species has been completed.

Research was performed using the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service (USFWS) species reports (USFWS 2012) to identify any potential federally Threatened, Endangered, Proposed, or Candidate species for Ward County. The research identified the following Endangered, Proposed, or Candidate species in Ward County: piping plover (threatened), least tern (endangered), western prairie fringed orchid (threatened), gray wolf (endangered), black-footed ferret (endangered), whooping crane (endangered), pallid sturgeon (endangered), Dakota skipper (candidate), greater sage-grouse (candidate), Sprague's pipit (candidate), and the Poweshiek skipperling (candidate). No suitable habitat for the federally listed endangered, threatened, or candidate species is present at the proposed project location.

Alternative 1 - No Action (Remain in Temporary School) - Under the No Action Alternative, no impacts to the listed species, their habitats, or proposed or designated critical habitat would occur.

Alternative 2 - Locally Preferred Alternative (New Middle School) – In a letter dated September 21, 2011, Mr. Jeffrey Towner (USFWS) provided comments regarding the proposed project and development of the land surrounding the proposed project under the authority of and in accordance with the Endangered Species Act, as amended (16 USC 1531 *et seq*) (ESA) (Appendix B). Mr. Towner stated that the project site is located within the migration corridor of the Aransas Wood Buffalo Population of whooping cranes. The letter stated that the highest known source of mortality to fledged whooping cranes is from striking power lines; it further stated that the USFWS recommended that any power lines constructed in association with the project be placed underground to avoid collision mortality. Accordingly, to address this potential issue, the project proposer is anticipating that all new power lines associated with the proposed project will be buried.

The USFWS identified the Dakota skipper, a small to medium-sized butterfly as a candidate species for listing under the ESA. The Dakota skipper is associated with high-quality prairie habitat. As the proposed project site is agricultural land, it is unlikely that the Dakota skipper would be impacted by the proposed project.

The USFWS also identified the Sprague's pipit, a migratory bird, as a candidate species for listing under the ESA. Sprague's pipits require large patches of grassland habitat for breeding, and they prefer grass height between four and 12 inches. As the proposed project site is currently cultivated agricultural land (wheat, soybeans, and canola), it is unlikely that the Sprague's pipit would be impacted by the proposed project.

After reviewing the potentially federally Threatened, Endangered, Proposed, and Candidate species for Ward County, and after conducting numerous site visits of the proposed project site, FEMA staff made the determination of “No Effect” for the proposed project. A letter dated April 20, 2012 was sent to the USFWS North Dakota Field Office to document this determination (Appendix B). Thus, under the Locally Preferred Alternative, impacts to the listed species, their habitats, or proposed or designated critical habitat are not anticipated to occur.

Alternative 3 - Rehabilitation of Ramstad School - Under this Alternative, no impacts to the above-listed species, their habitats, or proposed or designated critical habitat would occur.

D.3. Hazardous Materials

Alternative 1 - No Action (Remain in Temporary School) - Under the No Action Alternative, there would be temporary, mostly interior construction activities on the Municipal Auditorium. Any hazardous materials discovered, generated, or used during construction would be handled and disposed of in accordance with applicable local, State, and Federal regulations. There would be no significant impacts anticipated related to hazardous materials or waste.

Alternative 2 - Locally Preferred Alternative (New Middle School)- A Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA), dated August 17, 2011 was performed on the proposed site and land surrounding the proposed 20 acres. At the time of the Phase I ESA, the 400-acre parcel consisted of undeveloped and cultivated land. No potentially hazardous objects or conditions were noted during the site reconnaissance, and no recognized environmental conditions (RECs) or historic RECs were identified in the report (See Appendix C for a copy of the Phase I ESA).

Under the Locally Preferred Alternative, no hazardous materials or waste related impacts would be anticipated. Proposed construction activities are temporary, and should not expose hazardous materials or produce hazardous wastes. Any hazardous materials discovered, generated, or used during construction would be handled and disposed of in accordance with applicable local, State, and Federal regulations. There would be no significant impacts anticipated related to hazardous materials or waste.

Alternative 3 - Rehabilitation of Ramstad School - Under this Alternative, asbestos waste is the primary concern within the building. Any asbestos or other hazardous materials discovered, generated, or used during clean up and repairs would be handled and disposed of in accordance with applicable local, State, and Federal regulations. As such, there would be no significant impacts anticipated related to hazardous materials or waste.

D.4. Socioeconomics

D.4.a. Zoning and Land Use

Alternative 1 - No Action (Remain in Temporary School) - Under the No Action Alternative, no zoning changes would be required. The temporary classrooms are located at the Municipal Auditorium in an area designated as Public. Elementary schools are considered a permitted use under this designation according to the city zoning ordinance adopted May 12, 2004.

Alternative 2 - Locally Preferred Alternative (New Middle School) – The proposed project site is located west of the intersection of 36th Avenue Northwest and North Broadway, just outside of the city limits of Minot. The proposed project site and surrounding parcels immediately to the east, south, west, and north are undeveloped farm fields. This area currently has no zone designation.

Under the Locally Preferred Alternative, MSD#1 would apply to the City of Minot to annex the 20 acres into its boundaries. Zoning for this property would change to the appropriate city designation (Public). Transition of the land from agricultural to non-agricultural is consistent with the 2011 Draft Comprehensive Plan for the City of Minot.

Alternative 3 – Rehabilitation of Ramstad School – The current Ramstad Middle School is located in an area zoned “Public” and is surrounded by an area zoned “R-2”. The city of Minot has declared the building unsafe and the property to be made safe for the public. In addition, with the land/building within the 100-year floodplain, use of the land would require approval through the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, the City of Minot, and FEMA. These zoning approvals are unlikely.

D.4.b. Transportation

Alternative 1 - No Action (Remain in Temporary School) - Under the No Action Alternative, there would be short term increases to transportation impacts during construction upgrades, but return to current levels with completion of construction activities.

Alternative 2 - Locally Preferred Alternative (New Middle School) – Under the Locally Preferred Alternative, there would be a temporary increase in the volume of construction-related traffic in the immediate vicinity of the proposed project site. Appropriate traffic control and signage would be utilized and mobilization of construction equipment would occur on an as-needed basis. Over the long term, there would be a significant increase of vehicle traffic at the proposed project site, but there would be a decrease in traffic in the vicinity of the former Ramstad Middle School. As the proposed location is currently undeveloped, there would be minimal traffic impacts to nearby property owners.

Alternative 3 - Rehabilitation of Ramstad School - Under this Alternative, the clean up of Current Ramstad School and the associated activities would slightly increase transportation impacts in the short-term, with a return to pre-flood transportation impact levels in the long-term.

D.4.c. Noise

Noise is generally defined as undesirable sound and is federally regulated by the Noise Control Act of 1972 (NCA). Although the NCA gives the USEPA the authority to prepare guidelines for acceptable ambient noise levels, it only charges those federal agencies that operate noise-producing facilities or equipment to implement noise standards. The USEPA guidelines, and those of many federal agencies, state that outdoor sound levels in excess of 55 decibels (dB) are “normally unacceptable” for noise-sensitive land uses such as residences, schools, and hospitals. All temporary construction activities would follow applicable city ordinances.

Alternative 1 - No Action (Remain in Temporary school) - Under the No Action Alternative, only temporary construction activities would increase noise impacts during daylight hours, with no increased long-term noise impacts.

Alternative 2 - Locally Preferred Alternative (New Middle School) - Under the Locally Preferred Alternative, only temporary short-term increases in noise levels would be anticipated during construction. To reduce noise levels during that period, construction activities would be restricted to normal business hours. Equipment and machinery utilized at the site would meet all local, State, and Federal noise regulations. Over the long term, noise levels would be increased due to school traffic and outdoor activities.

Alternative 3 - Rehabilitation of Ramstad School - Under this Alternative, temporary short-term increases in noise levels would be anticipated during clean up and repairs. To reduce noise levels during that period, these activities would be restricted to normal business hours. Equipment and machinery utilized at the site would meet all local, State, and Federal noise regulations. Over the long term, vehicle traffic would increase back to pre-flood levels with students returning to Ramstad School.

D.4.d. Public Services and Utilities

Public services to all of the alternative locations are provided by the City of Minot. These include police, fire, water, sewer, utilities, and road connections.

Alternative 1 - No Action (Remain in Temporary School) - Under the No Action Alternative, city services would continue to be provided with no anticipated impact.

Alternative 2 - Locally Preferred Alternative (New Middle School) - Under the Locally Preferred Alternative, there would be increases to public services and utilities due to the construction of the school in a former agricultural area. A municipal water connection is planned at 36th Avenue Northwest and on the avenue bordering the site to the south. A municipal sanitary sewer connection is planned at the south side of the site. The connection will be designed to meet the capacity for the school as well as the adjacent planned residential development. Other utilities will be available to the site boundary; specifics on utility connections have not yet been determined.

Construction of the proposed project should not increase the demand for police/fire services, rather the need for these services would be transferred from the current school location to the proposed school location. Construction of the proposed project is not predicted to create the need for construction of new water or wastewater treatment facilities.

Alternative 3 – Rehabilitation of Ramstad School - Under this Alternative, there would be slight increases to public services or utilities during construction improvements made to the existing building. There would then be a return of public services and utilities to pre-flood service levels.

D.4.e. 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 area were analyzed through direct observation by FEMS staff in the alternative areas to determine if a disproportionate number of minority or low-income persons have the potential to be adversely affected by the proposed project.

The U.S. Census Bureau data for Minot, North Dakota, states that 90.2% of the population is white, 3.2% American Indian or Alaska Native, 2.7% Hispanic or Latino, 2.3% African American, 0.9% Asian, and 2.7% some other race or two or more races (U.S. Census, 2010). Based on observations of the City of Minot by FEMA staff, no concentration of minority or low income populations were identified near the proposed project site.

Alternative 1 - No Action (Remain in Temporary School) - Under the No Action Alternative, there would be no known or anticipated disproportionately high and adverse effects on minority or low-income populations.

Alternative 2 - Locally Preferred Alternative (New Middle School) - Under the Locally Preferred Alternative, there would be no known or anticipated disproportionately high and adverse impacts on minority or low-income populations.

Alternative 3 - Rehabilitation of Ramstad School - Under this Alternative, there would be no known or anticipated disproportionately high and adverse impacts on minority or low-income populations.

D.4.f. Safety and Security

To minimize risks to safety and human health, all construction activities would be performed using qualified personnel trained in the proper use of the appropriate equipment, including all appropriate safety precautions. Additionally, all activities would be required to be conducted in a safe manner in accordance with the standards specified in Occupational Safety and Health Act (OSHA) regulations. EO 13045, Protection of Children, requires federal agencies to make it a high priority to identify and assess environmental health and safety risks that may disproportionately affect children. Safety and security of all populations would follow all applicable local, State (particularly ROE and IDPH), and Federal regulations.

Alternative 1 - No Action (Remain in Temporary School) - Under the No Action Alternative, temporary building upgrade activities would require the work area to be fenced off from the public to minimize risks to safety and human health. Construction activities would present safety risks to those performing the activities. Appropriate signage and barriers would be in place prior to construction to alert school children, pedestrians, and motorists in the area. By following all safety precautions during construction activities, activities would impose no disproportionate health and safety risks to children. In the long term, the interim school would return to current safety impacts.

Alternative 2 - Locally Preferred Alternative (New Middle School) - Under the Locally Preferred Alternative, most construction would occur on unimproved farms fields. The construction area will be fenced off and work areas kept separate from the public. Construction activities would present safety risks primarily to those performing the activities. Access to the site would be restricted to protect the public and to minimize risks to public safety and human health. The appropriate signage and barriers would be in place prior to construction activities to alert pedestrians and motorists of project activities. By following all safety precautions, activities would impose no disproportionate health and safety risks to children.

Alternative 3 – Rehabilitation of Ramstad School - Under this Alternative, reoccupying Ramstad School would involve temporary building upgrade activities that would require the work area to be fenced off from the public to minimize risks to safety and human health. Construction activities would present safety risks to those performing the activities. Appropriate signage and barriers would be in place prior to construction to alert school children, pedestrians, and motorists in the area. By following all safety precautions during construction activities, activities would impose no disproportionate health and safety risks to children. In the long term, the interim school would return to pre-flood MSD#1 safety and security measures.

D.5. Historic and Cultural Resources

In addition to review under NEPA, consideration of effects to historic properties is mandated under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), as amended, and implemented by 36 CFR Part 800. Requirements include identification of historic properties that may be affected by the Locally Preferred Alternative, typically those within the Area of Potential Effects (APE). Historic properties are defined as archaeological sites, standing structures, or other historic resources listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) (36 CFR 60.4).

As defined in 36 CFR Part 800.16(d), the Area of Potential Effect (APE), “is the geographic area or areas within which an undertaking may directly or indirectly cause changes in the character or use of historic properties, if such properties exist.” In addition to identifying historic properties that may exist in the proposed project’s APE, FEMA must also determine, in consultation with the appropriate State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) or Tribal Historic Preservation Officer (THPO), what effect, if any, the action will have on historic properties. Moreover, if the project would have an adverse effect on these properties, FEMA must consult with the SHPO or THPO on ways to avoid, minimize, or mitigate the adverse effect.

D.5.a. Historic Structures and Archaeological Resources

Alternative 1 - No Action (Remain in Temporary School) - Under the No Action Alternative, no impacts to historic structures and/or archaeological resources are anticipated since there are no historic structures and/or archaeological resources known at the site.

Alternative 2 - Locally Preferred Alternative (New Middle School) - FEMA consulted the State Historical Society of North Dakota (ND SHPO) on February 16, 2012 to determine if any historic properties would be affected by the proposed project. We received a letter dated March 12, 2012 requesting that a Class III Cultural Resources Inventory (CRI) of the proposed project area be performed(Appendix B).

On March 19, 2012, Ms. Raina Hanley (Beaver Creek Archaeology) conducted a literature search at the ND SHPO office. The file search revealed no sites, no site leads, no isolated finds, and four manuscripts recorded within the project vicinity. On March 23, 2012, Ms. Christina Burns and Mr. Ryan Howell (Beaver Creek Archaeology) conducted a field visit using parallel pedestrian transects spaced no more than 15-20 meters apart. The inventoried area was found to consist of plowed wheat field. Ms. Burns and Mr. Howell recommended a determination of *No Historic Properties Affected* and that no further archaeological investigation be required (See Appendix D for a copy of the Class III CRI).

On April 2, 2012, FEMA requested that ND SHPO concur with a “No Historic Properties Affected” determination with the proposed project; ND SHPO subsequently concurred with the determination (Appendix B). Thus, under the Locally Preferred Alternative, no impacts to historic structures and/or archaeological resources are anticipated since there are no historic structures and/or archaeological resources known at the site.

During construction, ground-disturbing activities will be monitored. Should human skeletal remains or historic or archaeological materials be discovered during construction, all ground-disturbing activities on the project site would cease and the coroner’s office (in the case of human remains), FEMA, and the North Dakota State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) would be notified.

Alternative 3 – Rehabilitation of Ramstad School - Under this Alternative, no impacts to historic structures and/or archaeological resources are anticipated since there are no historic structures and/or archaeological resources known at the site.

D.5.b. Tribal Coordination and Religious Sites

Fourteen federally-recognized Native American Tribes have past land claims in Ward County. All fourteen tribes received requests (Appendix B) for their evaluation of the presence or absence of known archaeological and religious sites within the proposed project areas. Three tribal governments responded to the requests. The Rosebud Sioux Tribe responded (Appendix B) in an email dated February 23, 2012 and requested notice if archaeological surveys are being conducted in the project area, and/or inadvertent discoveries were found within the area, and if any traditional cultural properties (TCP’s) that we are aware of may be affected by this undertaking.

The Flandreau Santee Sioux tribe of South Dakota responded in an email dated February 23, 2012 that the Tribe defers all comments related to this project to the Turtle Mountain THPO. The Turtle Mountain tribe did not respond to the request.

The Crow Nation THPO, Mr. Hubert B. Two Leggins, responded in an email dated March 6, 2012 that a Traditional Cultural Properties (TCP) survey should be done at the project area if the area has not previously been surveyed by the Tribes. Through an agreement between the Crow Nation and the Mandan Hidatsa Arikara tribe, Mr. Jeff Smith with the Mandan Hidatsa Arikara Tribe performed a TCP at the proposed project site on March 23, 2012. Mr. Smith noted that the site was a plowed field and that no resources were observed at the site (See Appendix D for a copy of the TCP).

D.6. Comparison of Alternatives

This section describes the potential impacts of the proposed alternatives and the No-Action Alternative. Where potential impacts exist, conditions or mitigation measures to offset these impacts are detailed in the body of the document above. A summary table is provided below:

Impact and Mitigation Summary		
Affected Environment	Impacts	Mitigation
Geology, Seismicity, and Soils	<p>Alt 1: No impacts to geology or soils.</p> <p>Alt 2 (proposed): Impacts to soils during and after construction.</p> <p>Alt 3: Clean up and repairs of the facility grounds would have short-term impacts to soils in the immediate area.</p>	Appropriate BMPs: perimeter protection, prompt planting of vegetation and landscaping to minimize runoff.
Water Resources and Water Quality	<p>Alt 1: No impact to water resources. Potable water is supplied to the site by the city.</p> <p>Alt 2 (proposed): Short-term impacts to surface water are possible during construction, and minor long-term impacts through a new source of urban runoff. No impact to ground water resources. Potable water is supplied to the site by the city.</p> <p>Alt 3: Short-term impacts to surface water are possible during clean up and repairs, with no impact to ground water resources. Potable water is supplied to</p>	A NPDES and Storm water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) are required.

Impact and Mitigation Summary		
Affected Environment	Impacts	Mitigation
	the site by the city.	
Floodplain Management	Alts 1, 2 (proposed), and 3: No impacts anticipated.	None.
Air Quality	Alts 1 and 3: Short-term impacts from dust and emissions from equipment would occur during construction or clean up and repairs. Alt 2 (proposed): Short-term impacts from dust and emissions from equipment would occur during construction or clean up and repairs. Minor long-term impacts to air quality at new location from increased traffic.	Dust control measures such as watering down construction or demolition areas would be implemented as needed. Fuel-burning equipment run times could be minimized and equipment properly maintained. Applicable asbestos handling and disposal methods would be employed.
Terrestrial and Aquatic Environments	Alt 1: No impacts are anticipated to the terrestrial or aquatic environments. The site is bordered by residential development. Alt 2 (proposed): Minor impacts are anticipated to aquatic environments during construction; minor impacts to terrestrial environment upon project completion. Alt 3: Minor impacts are anticipated to aquatic environments during clean up and repair; existing vegetation and topsoil will be disturbed at the site.	Alt 1: None. Alt 2: Employ erosion and sediment control BMPs during construction. Alt 3: Employ erosion and sediment control BMPs during clean up and repair.
Wetlands	Alt 1: No impacts anticipated. Alt 2 (proposed): Three wetlands would be impacted the proposed project. Alt 3: No impacts anticipated.	Alt 1: None. Alt 2: Employ erosion and sediment control BMPs during construction. Alt 3: None
Threatened and Endangered Species	Alts 1, 2 (proposed), and 3: No impacts anticipated.	None.
Hazardous Materials	Alt 1: No impacts anticipated. No	Any hazardous materials

Impact and Mitigation Summary		
Affected Environment	Impacts	Mitigation
	<p>hazardous materials are anticipated.</p> <p>Alt 2 (proposed): No impacts anticipated. No hazardous materials are anticipated.</p> <p>Alt 3: Potential impacts could be anticipated during clean up or repair activities in handling asbestos.</p>	<p>discovered during project implementation would be handled and disposed of in accordance with applicable local, State, and Federal regulations.</p>
Zoning and Land Use	<p>Alts 1 and 3: No impacts anticipated.</p> <p>Alt 2 (proposed): Long-term impacts through rezoning of agricultural land to urban use</p>	<p>Alts 1 and 3: None.</p> <p>Alt 2: Rezoning anticipated in City Land Use Plan</p>
Transportation	<p>Alt 1: Short-term increase in construction-related traffic in the vicinity of the site would occur, with no long-term impact changes.</p> <p>Alt 2 (proposed): Short-term increase in construction-related traffic in the vicinity of the site would occur. Long-term increase in traffic at this site but traffic at Alt 1 and 3 would be reduced.</p> <p>Alt 3: Short-term increase in clean up/construction-related traffic in the vicinity of the site would occur. Long-term impacts of reopening the school would return to pre-flood conditions.</p>	<p>To mitigate potential traffic congestion at the site, construction/demolition vehicles and equipment would be mobilized to the site only as needed. Appropriate traffic control and signage would be utilized.</p>
Noise	<p>Alt 1: Short-term impacts from construction equipment would occur. No long-term impacts anticipated.</p> <p>Alt 2 (proposed): Short-term impacts from heavy equipment would occur during construction. Long-term impacts anticipated due to additional students and associated noise at location.</p>	<p>All clean up and/or construction would be limited to normal business hours and associated equipment would meet local, State, and Federal noise regulations.</p>

Impact and Mitigation Summary		
Affected Environment	Impacts	Mitigation
	Alt 3: Short-term impacts from clean up/construction equipment would occur. No long-term impacts anticipated.	
Public Services and Utilities	<p>Alt 1: No impacts to utilities are anticipated.</p> <p>Alt 2 (proposed): Impacts to public services and utilities would increase to the new facility.</p> <p>Alt 3: Short-term impacts are anticipated for clean up/construction activities. Returning students to the facility would restore impacts to pre-flood levels.</p>	<p>Alt 1: None</p> <p>Alt 2: Long-term impacts include an increase of services and utilities during and after construction activities. Public service need would decrease at Alts 1 and 3.</p> <p>ALT 3: Short-term impacts include an increase of services and utilities during clean up/construction activities. Long-term impacts would be similar to pre-flood condition.</p>
Environmental Justice	Alts 1, 2 (proposed), and 3: No disproportionately high or adverse effect on minority or low-income populations are anticipated.	None.
Safety and Security	Alts 1, 2 (proposed), and 3: Fencing and city protection would be needed during clean up and/or any construction activities. No adverse public safety public safety public safety impacts are anticipated.	Measures would be taken to ensure safe clean up and/or construction activities and subsequent safety and security at the new facility would follow applicable requirements.
Historic and Cultural Resources	Alts 1, 2 (proposed), and 3: No impacts anticipated.	None. All ground-disturbing activities would be monitored. Should human skeletal remains, historic, or archaeological materials be discovered, all ground-disturbing activities on the project site would cease and the coroner's office (in the

Impact and Mitigation Summary		
Affected Environment	Impacts	Mitigation
		case of human remains), FEMA, and the North Dakota SHPO would be notified.

E. Cumulative Impacts

According to 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 Locally Preferred Alternative and other actions occurring or proposed in the vicinity of the proposed project site.

The Locally Preferred Alternative would likely spur further residential and business development in the immediate area of the proposed project. Development in the project area already is projected in the Future Land Use Plan (City of Minot Draft 2011 Comprehensive Plan). According to the current Draft 2011 Comprehensive Plan, the project area is designated as Medium Density Residential and Conceptual Parks and Greenway Connections. An area designated as Public is located to the east of the proposed project site.

No significant cumulative impacts are anticipated other than those listed above.

F. Public Participation

FEMA is the lead Federal agency for conducting the NEPA compliance process for the new MSD#1 Ramstad Middle School in the City of Minot, Ward County, North Dakota. It is the goal of the lead agency to expedite the preparation and review of NEPA documents, as well as be responsive to the needs of the community and the purpose and need of the Locally Preferred Alternative, while meeting the intent of NEPA and complying with all NEPA provisions.

Inter-government consultation and reviews have been conducted in the form of letters and responses, in-person and telephone conversations, emails with the applicable entities, and internet references. Governments consulted are listed in Section G. Government responses are provided in Appendix B.

The schematic design process to date has been inclusive, with input gathered from the Minot Public Schools design team including select staff and administration, with constructability and budgetary input from Kraus-Anderson Construction Co., civil engineering from Ackerman-Estvold Engineering, MEP systems from Prairie Engineering, and technology systems from Elert & Associates. The public were invited to monthly school board meetings where during each meeting, the school superintendent updated the board on the school district's flood recovery efforts. A question and answer period followed each discussion of the flood recovery efforts.

The MSD#1 will notify the public of the availability of the draft EA through publication of a public notice (Appendix E) in a local newspaper. FEMA will conduct a public comment period commencing on the initial date of publication of the public notice.

G. Government Coordination and Permits

The following government entities and organizations were contacted and/or consulted, which helped to provide project information and/or review in support of preparation for this EA. Relevant documentation received to date are included in Appendix B, or reside in the FEMA Region 8 and/or MSD#1 Superintendent Office.

1. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Ecological Services, North Dakota Field Office
2. North Dakota Historic Preservation Office, Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer
3. United States Department of Agriculture, Natural Resources Conservation Service
4. United States Army Corps of Engineers, North Dakota Regulatory Office
5. City of Minot
6. Minot School District #1
7. Spirit Lake Sioux Tribe
8. Mandan Hidatsa and Arikara Nation
9. Lower Sioux Indian Community
10. Turtle Mountain Band of Chippewa
11. Fort Peck Dakota and Assiniboine Tribes
12. Standing Rock Sioux Tribe

13. Sisseton/Wahpeton Oyate
14. Apsaalooke (Crow Tribe)
15. Northern Cheyenne Tribe
16. Wahpekute Band of Dakota
17. Rosebud Sioux Tribe
18. Ogalala Sioux Tribe
19. Santee Sioux Tribe
20. Santee Sioux Tribe of Nebraska

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. The following permits and approvals may be required prior to construction:

1. Building permits
2. Site Plan and associated approvals
3. Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plans and Erosion Control permits
4. Sanitary sewer inspection/permits

H. References

The following government references were used as guidance and/or consulted, which helped to provide project information and/or perspective in support of preparation for this EA. Other references used to support project-specific details (i.e., A/E requirements and ROE requirements) for the Locally Preferred Alternative reside in the FEMA Region 8 and/or MSD#1 Superintendent Office.

City of Minot. 2011. (Draft) 2011 Comprehensive Plan.

http://www.minotnd.org/index.php?option=com_content&view=article&id=113&Itemid=359

FEMA. 1996. National Environmental Policy Act, FEMA Desk Reference. May 14, 1996.

FEMA. 2004. (Draft) Guidelines for the Preparation of an Environmental Assessment. March 31, 2004.

U.S. Census Bureau. 2000/2010. Fact Finder 2.

<http://factfinder2.census.gov/faces/nav/jsf/pages/index.xhtml> Accessed April 2012.

U.S. Department of Agriculture. 2012. (USDA 2012). Natural Resources Conservation Service, Farmland Conservation Impact Rating. <http://policy.nrcs.usda.gov/programs/fppa/>. Accessed April 2012.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2012. (USFWS 2012).
http://www.fws.gov/northdakotafieldoffice/endspecies/endangered_species.htm Accessed April 2012.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 2012. (USEPA 2012). Air Quality. From <http://www.epa.gov/oaqps001/greenbk/rnc.html>. Accessed April 2012

I. List of Preparers

Preparation and quality control review of Draft EA:

M. Rebecca Forman, PhD, CE, Braun Intertec

Jennifer M. Jevnisek, Braun Intertec

Douglas J. Bergstrom, PG, CHMM, Braun Intertec

Adrian C. Stroupe, AICP, Fluor Government Group, Contractor (FEMA Region 8)

DRAFT - Subject to Change

Figures

Appendix A

Schematic Design Manual

Appendix B
Correspondence

Appendix C

Phase I ESA

Appendix D

Class III CRI and TCP

Appendix E

Public Notice

