Reviewer Name: Brandon M. Clark

Applicant: Port of New Orleans

Disaster/Emergency/Program/Project Title: DR1603LA / Hurricane Katrina / Public Assistance Program / Frances Road Terminal, Berth 4,

Gatehouse/Operations Building

Record of Environmental Consideration

See 44 Code of Federal Regulation Part 10.

Project Name/Number: Frances Road Terminal, Berth 4, Gatehouse/Operations Building / PW 4132

<u>Project Location</u>: Frances Road Terminal, Berth 4, Gatehouse/Operations Building, Port of New Orleans (Industrial Canal), New Orleans, Louisiana, Orleans Parish (N29.98713, W-90.02614)

<u>Project Description</u>: Project includes total replacement of the facility by the 50% rule under 44 CFR 206.226(D)2 to pre-disaster condition and upgrading to current codes and standards. Project activities include demolishing and disposing the structure above the foundation along with 115 cubic yards of concrete foundation, purchasing and installing 1400 square feet of building slab, 1510 square feet masonry blocks, steel roof trusses, wood doors, wall mount urinals, electrical components, acoustical ceiling panels, lights, and refurbishing truck scale.

<u>Do</u>	cumentation Requirements
	No Documentation Required (Review Concluded)
	(Short version) All consultation and agreements implemented to comply with the National Historic Preservation Act, Endangered Species Act, and Executive Orders 11988, 11990 and 12898 are completed and no other laws apply. (Review Concluded)
\boxtimes	(Long version) All applicable laws and executive orders were reviewed. Additional information fo compliance is attached to this REC.
<u>Na</u>	tional Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Determination
	Statutorily excluded from NEPA review. (Review Concluded) Programmatic Categorical Exclusion - Category (Review Concluded) Categorical Exclusion - Category No Extraordinary Circumstances exist. Are project conditions required? Yes (see section V) No (Review Concluded) Extraordinary Circumstances exist (See Section IV). Extraordinary Circumstances mitigated. (See Section IV comments) Are project conditions required? Yes (see section V) No (Review Concluded) Environmental Assessment Supplemental Environmental Assessment (Reference EA or PEA in comments) Environmental Impact Statement
Com	ments: 7/19/2006 - This project meets the criteria for an Alternative Arrangement (Government and Court

Administration Buildings) type of project. This project has conditions and requires mitigation under the other EHP laws.

Disaster/Emergency/Program/Project Title: DR1603LA / Hurricane Katrina / Public Assistance Program / Frances Road Terminal, Berth 4, Gatehouse/Operations Building							
Reviewer and Approvals							
Project is Non-Compliant (See attached documentation justifying selection).							
FEMA Environmental Reviewer.							
Name: Brandon M. Clark, Environmental Specialist							
Signature Brandon Clark . Date 7/19/2006 .							
FEMA Regional Environmental Officer or delegated approving official. Name: Donald R. Fairley, ELO							
Signature							
I. Compliance Review for Environmental Laws (other than NEPA)							
A. National Historic Preservation Act Not type of activity with potential to affect historic properties. (Review Concluded) Applicable executed Programmatic AgreementOtherwise, conduct standard Section 106 review. Activity meets Programmatic Allowance # Are project conditions required? Yes (see section V) No (Review Concluded)							
HISTORIC BUILDINGS AND STRUCTURES No historic properties that are listed or 45/50 years or older in project area. (Review Concluded) Building or structure listed or 45/50 years or older in project area and activity not exempt from review. Determination of No Historic Properties Affected (FEMA finding/SHPO/THPO concurrence on file) Are project conditions required? Yes (see section V) No (Review Concluded) Determination of Historic Properties Affected (FEMA finding/SHPO/THPO concurrence on file) Property a National Historic Landmark and National Park Service was provided early notification during the consultation process. If not, explain in comments No Adverse Effect Determination (FEMA finding/SHPO/THPO concurrence on file). Are project conditions required? Yes (see section V) No (Review Concluded) Resolution of Adverse Effect completed. (MOA on file) Are project conditions required Yes (see section V) No (Review Concluded)							
ARCHEOLOGICAL RESOURCES ☐ Project affects only previously disturbed ground. (Review Concluded) ☐ Project affects undisturbed ground. ☐ Project area has no potential for presence of archeological resources ☐ Determination of no historic properties affected (FEMA finding/SHPO/THPO concurrence or consultation on file). (Review Concluded) ☐ Project area has potential for presence of archeological resources ☐ Determination of no historic properties affected (FEMA finding/SHPO/THPO concurrence on file) Are project conditions required ☐ Yes (see section V) ☐ No (Review Concluded) ☐ Determination of historic properties affected ☐ NR eligible resources not present (FEMA finding/SHPO/THPO concurrence on file). Are project conditions required ☐ Yes (see section V) ☐ No (Review Concluded) ☐ NR eligible resources present in project area. (FEMA finding/ SHPO/THPO concurrence on file) Are project conditions required? ☐ Yes (see section V) ☐ No (Review Concluded) ☐ Adverse Effect Determination. (FEMA finding/ SHPO/THPO concurrence on file) ☐ Resolution of Adverse Effect completed. (MOA on file) ☐ Resolution of Adverse Effect completed. (MOA on file) ☐ Are project conditions required? ☐ Yes (see section V) ☐ No							
Record of Environmental Consideration 2 07/19/06							

Reviewer Name: Brandon M. Clark

Applicant: Port of New Orleans

Reviewer Name: Brandon M. Clark

Applicant: Port of New Orleans

Disaster/Emergency/Program/Project Title: DR1603LA / Hurricane Katrina / Public Assistance Program / Frances Road Terminal, Berth 4,

Gatehouse/Operations Building

(Review Concluded)

Comments: 3/23/06 -Building was constructed in 1978. The structure does not meet the 50-year-criterion, nor does it possess the level of exceptional importance required by Criterion G of the National Register Guidelines to be considered eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. Therefore, the proposed work will have no effect on historic properties. - Amy Barnes, Historic Specialist

7/19/2006 - Archaeological review complete: Scope of work indicates ground disturbing activities associated with the demolition and rebuild of the structure within its pre-disaster footprint. Upon consultation of SHPO data, there are no known archaeological sites within .5 miles of the project area. Demolition must follow the lower impact demolition stipulations & additional protocols which are attached. The stipulations and protocols should be explicit in the demolition contract. Failure to comply with these stipulations & additional protocols will jeopardize receipt of federal funding. If during the course of work, archaeological artifacts (prehistoric or historic) or human remains are discovered, the applicant shall stop work in the vicinity of the discovery and take all reasonable measures to avoid or minimize harm to the finds. The applicant shall inform their Public Assistance (PA) contacts FEMA, who will in turn contact FEMA Historic Preservation staff. The applicant will not proceed with work until FEMA Historic Preservation staff have completed consultation with the Louisiana State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO). In addition, if unmarked graves are present, compliance with the Louisiana Unmarked Human Burial Sites Preservation Act (R.S. 8:671 et seq.) is required. The applicant shall notify the law enforcement agency of the jurisdiction where the remains are located within twenty-four hours of the discovery. The applicant shall also notify FEMA and the Louisiana Unmarked Burial Sites Board (call the Louisiana Division of Archeology at 225-342-8170) within seventy-two hours of the discovery. If this scope of work and/or the footprint/location of the new building changes, this project will need to be resubmitted for further section 106 review prior to ground disturbing activities taking place outside of the pre-disaster footprint of the building. -Katherine Zeringue, Historic Preservation Specialist/Archaeologist Correspondence/Consultation/References:

B. Endangered Species Act No listed species and/or designated critical habitat present in areas affected directly or indirectly by the Federal action. (Review Concluded) Listed species and/or designated critical habitat present in the areas affected directly or indirectly by the Federal action. No effect to species or designated critical habitat. (See comments for justification) Are project conditions required? Yes (see section V) No (Review Concluded) May affect, but not likely to adversely affect species or designated critical habitat (FEMA determination/USFWS/NMFS concurrence on file) (Review Concluded) Are project conditions required? \(\subseteq \text{Yes (see section V)} \) \(\subseteq \text{No (Review Concluded)} \) Likely to adversely affect species or designated critical habitat Formal consultation concluded. (Biological Assessment and Biological Opinion on file) Are project conditions required? YES (see section V) NO (Review Concluded) Comments: None Correspondence/Consultation/References: C. Coastal Barrier Resources Act Project is not on or connected to CBRA Unit or Otherwise Protected Area (Review Concluded). Project is on or connected to CBRA Unit or Otherwise Protected Area. (FEMA determination/USFWS consultation on file) Proposed action an exception under Section 3505.a.6? (Review Concluded) Proposed action not excepted under Section 3505.a.6. Are project conditions required? YES (see section V) NO (Review Concluded) Comments: None Correspondence/Consultation/References: D. Clean Water Act Project would not affect any waters of the U.S. (Review Concluded) Project would affect waters, including wetlands, of the U.S.

Project exempted as in kind replacement or other exemption. (Review Concluded)

Reviewer Name: Brandon M. Clark Applicant: Poblisaster/Emergency/Program/Project Title: DR1603LA / Hurricane Katrina / Public Assistance Program / Frances Road T	ort of New Orleans
Gatehouse/Operations Building	
Project requires Section 404/401/or Section 9/10 (Rivers and Harbors Act) permit, includ	ing qualification
under Nationwide Permits.	
Are project conditions required? YES (see section V) NO (Review Concluded)	,
Comments: Project is adjacent to the industrial canal; however, no activities take place in the waterway	y.
Correspondence/Consultation/References:	,
E. Coastal Zone Management Act	
Project is not located in a coastal zone area and does not affect a coastal zone area (Review conclu	<u>ıded)</u>
Project is located in a coastal zone area and/or affects the coastal zone State administering agency does not require consistency review. (Review Concluded).	
State administering agency requires consistency review.	
Are project conditions required? YES (see section V) NO (Review Concluded)	
Company to the state of the control	-4 1 4h - T
Comments: FEMA has determined that this project is consistent with the Coastal Zone Management A Coastal Management Plan (LCMP).	ct and the Louisiana
Correspondence/Consultation/References:	
Con appointment Consumation Mayor Consum	
F. Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act	
Project does not affect, control, or modify a waterway/body of water. (Review Concluded)	
Project affects, controls or modifies a waterway/body of water.	
Coordination with USFWS conducted	
No Recommendations offered by USFWS. (Review Concluded)	
Recommendations provided by USFWS. Are project conditions required? YES (see section V) NO (Review Co	ncluded)
Are project conditions required: 125 (see section v) 15 140 (Review Co	<u>nciaded)</u>
Comments: Project is adjacent to the industrial canal; however, no activities take place in the	waterway.
Correspondence/Consultation/References:	
G. Clean Air Act	
Project will not result in permanent air emissions. (Review Concluded)	
Project is located in an attainment area. (Review Concluded) Project is located in a non-attainment area.	
Coordination required with applicable state administering agency	
Are project conditions required? YES (see section V) NO (Review Concluded)	
Comments: Project will not result in permanent air emissions. Correspondence/Consultation/References:	
Correspondence Consultation References.	
H. Farmland Protection Policy Act	
Project does not affect designated prime or unique farmland. (Review Concluded)	
Project causes unnecessary or irreversible conversion of designated prime or unique farmland.	
Coordination with Natural Resource Conservation Commission required.	
Farmland Conversion Impact Rating, Form AD-1006, completed.	
Are project conditions required? YES (see section V) NO (Review Co	ncluded)
Comments: None	
Correspondence/Consultation/References:	
I. Migratory Bird Treaty Act	
Project not located within a flyway zone. (Review Concluded)	
Project located within a flyway zone.	
Project does not have potential to take migratory birds. (Review Concluded)	
Are project conditions required? Yes (see section V) No (Review Concluded)	
Project has potential to take migratory birds. Contact made with USFWS	
The state of the s	/19/06

Disaster/Emergency/Program/Project Title: DR1603LA/Hurricane Katrina/Public Assistance Program/Frances Road Terminal, Berth 4,					
Gatehouse/Operations Building Are project conditions required? YES (see section V) NO (Review Concluded)					
Comments: See letter from Don Fairley to Mr. Russ Watson with USF&WS, dated 09/14/2005. Specifically, FEMA has					
determined that restoration projects funded with federal resources will not have adverse impacts on migratory birds or other					
fish and wildlife reserves. These determinations are based on the understanding that the conditions outlined in the Louisiana					
Endangered Species Summary are met. Correspondence/Consultation/References: http://pacificflyway.gov/Documents/Mississippi map.pdf					
Correspondence Constitution References. http://pacticityway.gov/bocuments/wississippi_map.pur					
J. Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act ☐ Project not located in or near Essential Fish Habitat. (Review Concluded) ☐ Project located in or near Essential Fish Habitat.					
Project does not adversely affect Essential Fish Habitat. (Review Concluded)					
Are project conditions required? Yes (see section V) No (Review Concluded)					
Project adversely affects Essential Fish Habitat (FEMA determination/USFWS/NMFS concurrence on file)					
NOAA Fisheries provided no recommendation(s) (Review Concluded).					
Are project conditions required? Yes (see section V) No (Review Concluded)					
NOAA Fisheries provided recommendation(s)					
 Written reply to NOAA Fisheries recommendations completed. Are project conditions required? ☐ YES (see section V) ☐ NO (Review Concluded) 					
Comments: None					
Correspondence/Consultation/References:					
 K. Wild and Scenic Rivers Act ☑ Project is not along and does not affect Wild or Scenic River (WSR) - (Review Concluded) ☐ Project is along or affects WSR ☐ Project adversely affects WSR as determined by NPS/USFS. FEMA cannot fund the action. (NPS/USFS/USFWS/BLM consultation on file) (Review Concluded) ☐ Project does not adversely affect WSR. (NPS/USFS/USFWS/BLM consultation on file) Are project conditions required? ☐ YES (see section V) ☐ NO (Review Concluded) 					
Comments: None					
Correspondence/Consultation/References:					
L. Other Relevant Laws and Environmental Regulations II. Compliance Review for Executive Orders					
A F O 11088 - Floodplains					
A. E.O. 11988 - Floodplains No Effect on Floodplains/Flood levels and project outside Floodplain - (Review Concluded)					
Located in Floodplain or Effects on Floodplains/Flood levels					
No adverse effect on floodplain and not adversely affected by the floodplain. (Review Concluded),					
Are project conditions required? Yes (see section V) No (Review Concluded)					
Beneficial Effect on Floodplain Occupancy/Values (Review Concluded).					
Possible adverse effects associated with investment in floodplain, occupancy or modification of floodplain					
environment					
8 Step Process Complete - documentation on file					
Are project conditions required? XES (see section V) NO (Review Concluded)					
Comments: 07/18/2006 - In compliance with EO 11988 an 8-step process has been completed and attached to this PW. All					
Comments: 07/18/2006 - In compliance with EO 11988 an 8-step process has been completed and attached to this PW. All new construction must be coordinated in comply with the local ordinance. Elevations are to be to or above the advisory					
new construction must be coordinated in comply with the local ordinance. Elevations are to be to or above the advisory base flood elevations. In compliance with 44 CFR 9.12, a final public notice is to be published then forwarded to LA					
new construction must be coordinated in comply with the local ordinance. Elevations are to be to or above the advisory					

(intehouse/()	ergency/Program/Project Title: DR1603LA / Hurricane Katrina / Public Assistance Program / Frances Road Terminal, Berth 4,						
	perations Building 1. 11990 - Wetlands						
 No Effects on Wetland(s) and project located outside Wetland(s) - (Review Concluded) 							
	d in Wetland or effects Wetland(s)						
	Beneficial Effect on Wetland - (Review Concluded)						
L	Possible adverse effect associated with constructing in or near wetland						
	Review completed as part of floodplain review 8 Step Process Complete - documentation on file						
	Are project conditions required? YES (see section V) NO (Review Concluded)						
Comments	: None dence/Consultation/References:						
Correspon	dened Consultation Rejerences.						
⊠ No Lo	C. E.O. 12898 - Environmental Justice For Low Income and Minority Populations No Low income or minority population in, near or affected by the project - (Review Concluded) Low income or minority population in or near project area No disproportionately high and adverse impact on low income or minority population- (Review Concluded) Disproportionately high or adverse effects on low income or minority population Are project conditions required? YES (see section V) NO (Review Concluded)						
Comments							
Correspon	dence/Consultation/References:						
	III. Other Environmental Issues						
	THE Other Environmental issues						
_	other potential environmental concerns in the comment box not clearly falling under a law or order (see environmental concerns scoping checklist for guidance).						
Comments Correspon	: None dence/Consultation/References:						
	IV. Extraordinary Circumstances						
	the review of compliance with other environmental laws and Executive Orders, and in ation of other environmental factors, review the project for extraordinary circumstances.						
* A "Yes" under any circumstance may require an Environmental Assessment (EA) with the exception of (ii) which should be applied in conjunction with controversy on an environmental issue. If the circumstance can be mitigated, please explain in comments. If no, leave blank.							
P	nould be applied in conjunction with controversy on an environmental issue. If the circumstance can be mitigated,						
Yes	nould be applied in conjunction with controversy on an environmental issue. If the circumstance can be mitigated,						
·	nould be applied in conjunction with controversy on an environmental issue. If the circumstance can be mitigated, lease explain in comments. If no, leave blank. (i) Greater scope or size than normally experienced for a particular category of action						
Yes	nould be applied in conjunction with controversy on an environmental issue. If the circumstance can be mitigated, lease explain in comments. If no, leave blank. (i) Greater scope or size than normally experienced for a particular category of action (ii) Actions with a high level of public controversy						
Yes	nould be applied in conjunction with controversy on an environmental issue. If the circumstance can be mitigated, lease explain in comments. If no, leave blank. (i) Greater scope or size than normally experienced for a particular category of action						
Yes	iould be applied in conjunction with controversy on an environmental issue. If the circumstance can be mitigated, lease explain in comments. If no, leave blank. (i) Greater scope or size than normally experienced for a particular category of action (ii) Actions with a high level of public controversy (iii) Potential for degradation, even though slight, of already existing poor environmental conditions; (iv) Employment of unproven technology with potential adverse effects or actions involving						
Yes	iould be applied in conjunction with controversy on an environmental issue. If the circumstance can be mitigated, lease explain in comments. If no, leave blank. (i) Greater scope or size than normally experienced for a particular category of action (ii) Actions with a high level of public controversy (iii) Potential for degradation, even though slight, of already existing poor environmental conditions; (iv) Employment of unproven technology with potential adverse effects or actions involving unique or unknown environmental risks; (v) Presence of endangered or threatened species or their critical habitat, or archaeological,						
Yes	iould be applied in conjunction with controversy on an environmental issue. If the circumstance can be mitigated, lease explain in comments. If no, leave blank. (i) Greater scope or size than normally experienced for a particular category of action (ii) Actions with a high level of public controversy (iii) Potential for degradation, even though slight, of already existing poor environmental conditions; (iv) Employment of unproven technology with potential adverse effects or actions involving unique or unknown environmental risks;						
Yes	iould be applied in conjunction with controversy on an environmental issue. If the circumstance can be mitigated, lease explain in comments. If no, leave blank. (i) Greater scope or size than normally experienced for a particular category of action (ii) Actions with a high level of public controversy (iii) Potential for degradation, even though slight, of already existing poor environmental conditions; (iv) Employment of unproven technology with potential adverse effects or actions involving unique or unknown environmental risks; (v) Presence of endangered or threatened species or their critical habitat, or archaeological, cultural, historical or other protected resources; (vi) Presence of hazardous or toxic substances at levels which exceed Federal, state or local regulations or standards requiring action or attention;						
Yes	iould be applied in conjunction with controversy on an environmental issue. If the circumstance can be mitigated, lease explain in comments. If no, leave blank. (i) Greater scope or size than normally experienced for a particular category of action (ii) Actions with a high level of public controversy (iii) Potential for degradation, even though slight, of already existing poor environmental conditions; (iv) Employment of unproven technology with potential adverse effects or actions involving unique or unknown environmental risks; (v) Presence of endangered or threatened species or their critical habitat, or archaeological, cultural, historical or other protected resources; (vi) Presence of hazardous or toxic substances at levels which exceed Federal, state or local regulations or standards requiring action or attention; (vii) Actions with the potential to affect special status areas adversely or other critical resources						
Yes	iould be applied in conjunction with controversy on an environmental issue. If the circumstance can be mitigated, lease explain in comments. If no, leave blank. (i) Greater scope or size than normally experienced for a particular category of action (ii) Actions with a high level of public controversy (iii) Potential for degradation, even though slight, of already existing poor environmental conditions; (iv) Employment of unproven technology with potential adverse effects or actions involving unique or unknown environmental risks; (v) Presence of endangered or threatened species or their critical habitat, or archaeological, cultural, historical or other protected resources; (vi) Presence of hazardous or toxic substances at levels which exceed Federal, state or local regulations or standards requiring action or attention; (vii) Actions with the potential to affect special status areas adversely or other critical resources such as wetlands, coastal zones, wildlife refuge and wilderness areas, wild and scenic rivers,						
Yes	iould be applied in conjunction with controversy on an environmental issue. If the circumstance can be mitigated, lease explain in comments. If no, leave blank. (i) Greater scope or size than normally experienced for a particular category of action (ii) Actions with a high level of public controversy (iii) Potential for degradation, even though slight, of already existing poor environmental conditions; (iv) Employment of unproven technology with potential adverse effects or actions involving unique or unknown environmental risks; (v) Presence of endangered or threatened species or their critical habitat, or archaeological, cultural, historical or other protected resources; (vi) Presence of hazardous or toxic substances at levels which exceed Federal, state or local regulations or standards requiring action or attention; (vii) Actions with the potential to affect special status areas adversely or other critical resources						
Yes	iould be applied in conjunction with controversy on an environmental issue. If the circumstance can be mitigated, lease explain in comments. If no, leave blank. (i) Greater scope or size than normally experienced for a particular category of action (ii) Actions with a high level of public controversy (iii) Potential for degradation, even though slight, of already existing poor environmental conditions; (iv) Employment of unproven technology with potential adverse effects or actions involving unique or unknown environmental risks; (v) Presence of endangered or threatened species or their critical habitat, or archaeological, cultural, historical or other protected resources; (vi) Presence of hazardous or toxic substances at levels which exceed Federal, state or local regulations or standards requiring action or attention; (vii) Actions with the potential to affect special status areas adversely or other critical resources such as wetlands, coastal zones, wildlife refuge and wilderness areas, wild and scenic rivers, sole or principal drinking water aquifers;						

KCAICACL LA	ame: Brandon M. Clark	Applicant: Port of New Orleans			
Disaster/Em	Disaster/Emergency/Program/Project Title: DR1603LA / Hurricane Katrina / Public Assistance Program / Frances Road Terminal, Berth 4,				
Gatehouse/Op	Operations Building				
	(x) Potential for significant cumulative impact when the proposed act	ion is combined with			
	other past, present and reasonably foreseeable future acti	ons, even though the impacts of the			
	proposed action may not be significant by the	emselves.			
Comments.	s: None				
Correspon	ndence/Consultation/References				

V. Environmental Review Project Conditions

Project Conditions:

- 1. If during the course of work, archaeological artifacts (prehistoric or historic) or human remains are discovered, the applicant shall stop work in the vicinity of the discovery and take all reasonable measures to avoid or minimize harm to the finds. The applicant shall inform their Public Assistance (PA) contacts FEMA, who will in turn contact FEMA Historic Preservation staff. The applicant will not proceed with work until FEMA Historic Preservation staff have completed consultation with the Louisiana State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO). In addition, if unmarked graves are present, compliance with the Louisiana Unmarked Human Burial Sites Preservation Act (R.S. 8:671 et seq.) is required. The applicant shall notify the law enforcement agency of the jurisdiction where the remains are located within twenty-four hours of the discovery. The applicant shall also notify FEMA and the Louisiana Unmarked Burial Sites Board (call the Louisiana Division of Archeology at 225-342-8170) within seventy-two hours of the discovery. If this scope of work and/or the footprint/location of the new building changes, this project will need to be resubmitted for further section 106 review prior to ground disturbing activities taking place outside of the pre-disaster footprint of the building.
- 2. All new construction must be coordinated in comply with the local ordinance. Elevations are to be to or above the advisory base flood elevations. In compliance with 44 CFR 9.12, a final public notice is to be published then forwarded to LA GOHSEP and FEMA for verification.

Monitoring Requirements: None