### DRAFT Environmental Assessment

For

Proposed New Community Center Gulfport, Mississippi

FEMA-1604-DR-MS

For Capital Improvement Program, also include the health center H80 or H8A grant number and the project site address. For Capital Improvement Program, should read: HRSA-09-244 CIP Grant #: xxxxxx

**Prepared for:** 

Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA)

For Capital Improvement Program, should read: Health Resources and Services Administration (HRSA)

## **Table of Contents**

1.0 Introduction	PAGE 4
1.1 Disaster Background and Overview	4
1.2 Purpose and Need	6
2.0 Alternatives Considered	7
2.1 Alternatives Analyzed and Dismissed	7
2.2 Alternatives Further Evaluated	7
3.0 Affected Environments and Potential Impacts of the Alternatives Considered	13
3.1 Geology, Seismicity and Soils	13
3.2 Land Use & Zoning	15
3.3 Floodplain Encroachment	15
3.4 Traffic and Parking to Residential and Commercial Area to Traffic Patterns	16
3.5 Public Health and Safety (e.g. Hazardous Waste)	17
3.6 Socioeconomic Issues	19
3.7 Air Quality	20
3.8 Noise	21
3.9 Public Services and Utilities	22
3.10 Water Resources/Water Quality	23
3.11 Biological Resources	25

## Table of Contents (cont.)

	PAGE
Wetlands	24
Threatened and Endangered Species (animal, plant, aquatic) Affected Environments	25
3.12 Cultural Resources, Historic Properties and Archeological Resources	27
3.13 Agency Coordination and Permits	28
4.0 Public Involvement	30
5.0 List of Preparers	
References	

Appendices

Environmental Assessment Proposed New Community Center FEMA-1604-DR-MS

#### 1.0 INTRODUCTION

#### 1.1 Disaster Background and Overview

Federal Emergency Management Agency (FE MA) proposes to provide assistance for this project through the Public Assistance Program (PA) under Presidential Disaster Declaration FEMA-1604-DR-MS. In accordance with 44 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) for FEMA, Subpart B, Agency Implementing Procedures, Part 10.9, an Environmental Assessment (EA) was 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 (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).

Hurricane Katrina made landfall on the southeastern coast of Louisiana and the southwestern coast of Mississippi on August 29, 2005, with maximum sustained winds of 140 mph. Hurricane-force winds extended outward up to 105 m iles from the center of the storm. Coastal storm surge flooding of 20 to 30 feet above normal tide levels, along with large and dangerous battering waves, occurred near and to the east of where the center of the storm made landfall. Widespread dam age occurred, including beach erosion and damage and/or destruction of homes and public infrastructure.

Like many other public and private buildings on the Mississippi Gulf Coast, the wind and

extraordinary storm surge associated with Hurricane Katrina caused extensive structural damage to the former Recreati onal Center located at Information Gulfport, Mississippi. The former Recreational Center was located approximately 400 feet west of the corner of 17th Street and Highway 49.

The proposed project site for the new Community Center consists of approximately 1.0 acre, as shown on the tax parcel attached as Fi gure 1 (Parcel #0711I-03-067.001) and as shown on proposed building layout as Figure 2 in Appendix A. The legal description identifies the project site as be ing in Section 8, Township 8 South, Range 11 West in a residential area of Gulfport, Harrison County, Mississippi. The center of the project site is located at Latitude 30°, 21', 44.73" and Longitude 89°, 06', 35.13". The proposed project site w as the form er locations of the Mississippi Highway Patrol District 8, Troop K Office and Gulf Coast Mental Health Center. According to an interview with Mississippi Highway Patrol Capt ain Jimmy O'Banner, the Highway Patrol facility housed administrative offices and a vehicle maintenance facility until it was severely dam aged by Hurricane Katrina. The above referenced structures have since been demolished and the parcel cleared.

The proposed project site is bounded on the north by 9<sup>th</sup> Street, across which are located single family residences; on the east by 40<sup>th</sup> Avenue, across which are located single family residences; on the south by 8<sup>th</sup> Street, across which are located single family residences; on the west by 41<sup>st</sup> Avenue, across which are single family residences. The proposed new Community Center will be located approximately 1.14 miles southwest from the location of the former recreational center.

The proposed new **Community** Center is a new 10,783 square foot facility with brick façade and standing seam m etal roof. The building will consist of a weight room, meeting room, multipurpose area, kitchen and bathroom facilities.

#### 1.2 <u>Purpose and Need</u>

There is an immediate need to replace the former Re creational Center to provide the citizens, especially the lower income families, in the immediate area of Gulfport with accessible facilities for recreation and community activities. Most of Gulfport's recreational and community facilities, especially south of Interstate I-10 were either destroyed or severely damaged by Hurricane Katr ina. This proposed project, the Community Center, will be another tangible sign of Gulfport's re-building efforts.

## 2.0 <u>AFFECTED E NVIRONMENTS AND PO TENTIAL IMPACT S OF TH E</u> <u>ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED</u>

#### 2.1 Alternatives Evaluated

*Repair/Re-construction of Recreational Center* 

Re-construction of the existing Recreational Center building was considered, but repa ir/reconstruction cost was greater than relocation and building a new recreational center. It was also thought that combining the proposed new recreational center with the proposed senior citizen center on the west adjacent land parcel along with a nearby park would provide the community a greater benefit. The future use of the former Recreational Center location is yet to be determined, but may be a new site for construction of other public service infrastructure needs (fire, police, etc.).

#### 2.2 Alternatives Considered for Further Review

#### Alternative 1: No Action Alternative

Under the No Action alternative, FEMA would not fund the proposed project and the new Community Center to replace the former **Construction** Recreational Center would not be constructed. This would further delay the City of Gulfport from providing the citizens with community and recreational avenues, and delay the city from demonstrating its resolve in healing and rebuilding the community.

Alternative 2: Relocation of Recreational Center (Proposed)

The City of Gulfport Department of Leisure Services is proposing the permanent relocation of the former **Community** Recreational Center as an improved project in the form of a new **Community** Center, which will also be adjacent to a proposed Senior Ci tizen Community Center. The proposed new **Community** Center will replace the former **Recreational** Center that was severely damaged by Hurricane Katrina. Photographs of the former recreation center depict the structural damage. Site photographs are included in Appendix B.

Affected Environment	Impacts	Mitigation
Geology,	No impacts to geology or	Area soils would likely be disturbed
Topography	topography. There maybe	during construction. Soil loss may
and Soils	short-term impacts to soils	occur directly from disturbance or
	during the construction	indirectly via wind or water. Best
	period.	management practices will be
		developed and implemented, such as
		erosion and sedimentation control
		(e.g. silt fences, hay bales, re-
		vegetating disturbed soils, and
		maintaining site soil s tockpiles, to
		prevent soils from eroding and
		dispersing off-site).
1		

Affected Environment	Impacts	Mitigation
Water	No impacts to groundwater	None
Resources	resources are anticipated.	
Surface Water	Temporary short-term	Appropriate BMPs, such as
	impacts to surface water are	installing silt fences and re-
	possible during construction	vegetating bare soils would
	activities.	minimize surface water runoff.
Floodplains	No impacts to floodplains are anticipated.	None
	-	
Groundwater	No impacts to groundwater	None
	resources are anticipated.	
	The new facility will use the	
	available public water	
	system.	
Biological	No impacts to biological	None
Resources	resources (e.g. threatened	
	and endangered species) are	
	anticipated. The proposed	
	parcels have contained civic	
	buildings since the mid-	
	1960's (e.g. Mississippi	
	Highway Patrol Offices)	

Affected Environment	Impacts	Mitigation
Air Quality	Short-term impacts to air quality may occur during the construction period.	Construction contractors would be required to water down construction areas (e.g. exposed soil) as necessary and fuel-burning equipment running times would be kept to a minimum and engines would be properly maintained.
Transportation	There may be a minor temporary increase in the volume of construction traffic on roads in the immediate vicinity of the proposed project site.	Construction vehicles and equipment would be stored on-site during project construction and appropriate signage would be posted on affected roadways.
	No impacts to daily traffic are anticipated during normal intended usage. There maybe some increased traffic on occasions when the facility is utilized for community meetings, etc.	None

Affected Environment	Impacts	Mitigation
Noise	Short-term impacts to noise	Construction would take place
	may occur at the proposed	during normal business hours (e.g.
	project site during the	daytime hours) and equipment and
	construction period.	machinery installed at the proposed
		high school would meet all local,
		state, and federal noise regulations.
	No impacts to archeological	None
Cultural	or historic resources are	
Resources	anticipated. No archeological	
	or historic resources were	
	identified on the proposed	
	land parcels.	
Socioeconomic	No impacts to	None
Resources	socioeconomic resources are	
	anticipated.	
Environmental	No disproportionately high	None
Justice	or adverse effects on	
	minority or low-income	
	populations are anticipated.	

Affected Environment	Impacts	Mitigation
Hazardous	No impacts from hazardous	Construction activities could expose
Materials	materials or wastes are	or otherwise affect unknown
	anticipated.	subsurface hazardous wastes or
		materials. Many elements of a
		Phase I Environmental Site
		Assessment (ESA) have been
		conducted for the site and no
		recognized environmental conditions
		were discovered, indicating a
		minimal risk.
		Any hazardous materials discovered,
		generated, or used during
		construction would be disposed of
		and handled in accordance with
		applicable local, state, and federal
		regulations.

## 3.0 AFFECTED ENVIRONMENTS AND POTENTIAL IMPACTS OF THE ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

#### 3.1 Geology, Seismic Activity and Soils

#### **Soils Existing Conditions**

A soils clas sification of the site a ccording to the National Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) on-line data base indicates that the following soils are present on the subject property: Site so ils consist of Eutis (EtB) sandy loam soils series mixed with remaining fill materials and concrete slabs of previous structures. The Eutis (EtB) series consists of excessively drained soils on ridge tops with a 0-5 percent slope. It is primarily composed of loamy sands. The soil is strong ly acidic or very strongly acidic. Permeability is moderately rapid, and available water capacity is low with little or no run-off.

Local topography indicates that drainage in this area is accomplished by infiltration and surface run-off south towards the Gulf of Mexico, located approximately <sup>1</sup>/<sub>4</sub> m ile from the proposed project site.

Executive Order 12699 directs Federal agencies to incorporate cost-effective seismic safety measures in all new buildings that are constructed, leased, assisted, or regulated by the Federal Government. The area of southern Mississippi is not in an active seismic area and the concerns of seismic activity as related to this proposed project is relatively low.

#### **Impacts to Soils**

#### Alternative 1-No Action Alternative:

Normal occurrences of soil erosion would be expected to occur if the site is not developed. The proposed site location is not located within a 100-year floodplain and is not subject to flooding, due to its elevation and topography.

#### Alternative 2 – Construct the new Community Center (Proposed Action)

Area soils would likely be disturbed during construction. Soil loss would occur directly from disturbance or indirectly via wind or water. Best management practices will be developed and implemented, such as implementing an erosion and sedimentation control plan using silt fences or hay bales, re-vegetating disturbed soils (e.g. part of proposed landscaping activities), and maintaining site soil stockpiles during construction, to prevent soils from eroding and dispersing off-site.

Implementation of appropriate Best Managem ent Practices (BMPs) would be required at the construction location. BMPs include, but are not limited to; the installation of silt fences and re-vegetating bare soils to minimize erosion. The proposed project site does not contain soils classified as prime.

#### 3.2 Land Use and Zoning

The proposed project location is located on a vacant parcel and its history has been previously described in this report. The proposed project location and surrounding area is listed zoned R-2 in the City of Gulfport. R-2 zone is defined as Single-family residence district-medium density.

*Alternative 1-No Action Alternative:* No impact.

*Alternative 2 – Construct the new* 

Community Center (Proposed Action)

No impact.

#### 3.3 Floodplain Encroachment

Executive Order (EO) 11988 (Flood plain Management) requires that a Federal agency avoid direct or indirect support of developm ent within the 100-year floodplain whenever there is a practicable alternative. FE MA uses Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRMs) to identify the regulatory 100-year floodplain for r the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP). The proposed project site for the new Community Center is located in Zone X which is not within a 100-year floodplain per the FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Map Num ber 285255 300 76D dated October 4, 2002. The FEMA and FIRM Maps are included in Appendix D. The proposed project site is not in the 3 foot breaking wave zone and just above the ABFE zone as shown in the online City of Gulfport Atlas.

#### **3.3.1** Impacts to Floodplains

Alternative 1-No Action Alternative:

No impact.

*Alternative 2 – Construct the new* 

Community Center (Proposed Action)

No impact.

#### 3.4 Traffic

The Mississippi Department of Transportation (MDOT) is responsible for the design, construction and m aintenance of the State of Mississippi's Highway System as well as the portion of federal interstate highways within Mississippi's boundaries. Arterials, connectors, rural roads, and local roads are constructed and maintained by county or city governments.

The proposed project site is bounded on the north by 9 <sup>th</sup> Street, across which are located single family residences; on the east by 40 <sup>th</sup> Avenue, across which are located single family residences; on the south by 8 <sup>th</sup> Street, across which are located single family residences; on the west by 41 <sup>st</sup> Avenue, across which are single family residences. Based on conversations with City of Gulfport personnel, the typical usage of a community center is sporadic throughout the hours of operation, unless a special event is scheduled that m ay cause a short term influx of vehicles. The normal vehicular traffic at the proposed recreational center should not be in a volume to cause traffic concerns. Increased vehicular traffic congestion issue.

#### 3.4.1 Impacts to Traffic Patterns

Alternative 1-No Action Alternative:

No impact.

Alternative 2 – Construct the new Community Center (Proposed Action) The impact to traffic would be short term during the time of active site preparation and construction activities.

#### 3.5 Hazardous Materials Current Conditions (Public Health & Safety)

CERCLA (commonly referred to as Superfund) is the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act. It requires community relations components during the assessment of hazardous substances at inactive waste sites. Key communication pieces include a community relations plan, public access to the complete adm inistrative record, an information repository, and advertisement of public involvement opportunities. Health and ecological impact may be determined requiring worker and public notification. Emergency removal actions may be required.

RCRA is the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, which establishes regulatory standards for the generation, transportation, storage, treatment, and disposal of hazardous wastes. In regulatory term s, a RCRA hazardous waste is a waste that appears on one of the four hazard ous wastes lists (F-list, K-list, P-list, or U-list), or exhibits at least one of four characteristics—ignitability, corrosivity, reactivity, or toxicity. Hazardous waste is regulated under the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) Subtitle C.

Hazardous material means as any material that, because of its quantity, concentration, or physical and chemical characteristics, poses a significant present or potential hazard to human health and safety or to the environment if released into the workplace or environment.

An environmental database review, historic aerial photograph review, a telephone interview with for mer parcel occupant and site reconnaissance was conducted by Covington and Associates personnel in February 2007. The site visit and records review revealed no evidence of *recognized environmental conditions* on the subject property. The records database report is included as Appendix E of this report.

The former Mississippi Highway Patrol Office present on the project site was listed as having an Underground Storage Tank (UST). The UST was a 1,000 gallon tank for gasoline dispensing of repaired vehicles, it was not utilized as a primary fuel dispensing point for fleet vehicles. The UST was removed in December 1989 and no reported violations were listed for the above referenced facility. Refer to EDR regulatory records search included in Appendix E.

#### 3.5.1 **Impacts from Hazardous Materials**

Alternative 1-No Action Alternative:

No Impact

Alternative 2 – Construct the new Community Center (Proposed Action):

The impact of the proposed action would be negligible with respect to the presence of hazardous materials and potential exposure, because no hazardous or toxic materials or wastes have been identified for the proposed project site. No impact anticipated.

#### 3.6 Socioeconomic Issues

EO12898 is the Executive Order 12898 Environmental Justice in Minority Populations. This requires federal agencies, departments, and their contractors to consider any potentially disproportionate human health or environmental risks their activities, policies, or program s may pose to minority or low-income populations.

EO 13045 (Protection of Children from Envi ronmental Health Risks and Safety Risks) required federal agencies to identify and assess health risks and safety risks that may disproportionately affect children. As with EO 12898, FEMA and most federal lead agencies determine impacts to children as p art of the NEPA compliance process. Agencies must ensure that its policies, program s, activities, and standards a ddress disproportionate risks to children that results from environmental health risks or safety risks.

Based on U.S. Census Bureau inform ation for the year 2005, the percent populations of zip code 39501 (which is the zip code for the proposed new Community Center) are 75% White, 12.7% Black or African American, 2% Asian, 10.4% Hispanic or Latino, and 0.7% American Indian or Alaska Native. The median household income (in 2005 adjusted dollars) for the area is \$55,832 and 10.2 % of all families are below the poverty level.

#### 3.6.1 Socio-Economics Impacts

Alternative 1-No Action Alternative:

Although there is no requirem ent for compliance with EOs 12898 and 1304 when there are no federal actions, low-income and minority families and children would be adversely affected if the Community Center were not constructed, due to insufficient

permanent community and recreational facilities in the City of Gulfport from the damage caused by Hurricane Katrina.

Alternative 2 – Construct the new Community Center (Proposed Action)

The propos ed action will benefit the community by providing a permanent facility for recreational and community activities.

#### 3.7 Air Quality

Under the Clean Air Act, the U.S. Environ mental Protection Agency (EPA) establishes primary and secondary air quality standards. Primary air quality standards protect the public health, including the health of "sensitive populations, such as people with asthma, children, and older adults." Secondary air quality standards protect public welfare by promoting ecosystems health, preventing decreased visibility, and damage to crops and buildings. EPA has set national ambient air quality standard s (NAAQS) for six of the following criteria pollutants; ozone (O<sub>3</sub>), particulate m atter (PM <sub>2.5 and 10</sub>), nitrogen dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>), carbon monoxide (CO), sulfur dioxide (SO<sub>2</sub>), and lead (Pb). According to the MDEQ, the entire state of Mississippi is classified as in attainment, meaning criteria air pollutants do not exceed the NAAQS.

#### 3.7.1 Impacts to Air Quality

Alternative 1-No Action Alternative:

No impact.



Alternative 2 – Construct the new Community Center (Proposed Action)

Increase in vehicle exhaust emissions and dust is anticipated during construction. Federal and state air attainment levels would not be exceeded. Best management practices would be developed and implemented to cover and/or wet area soils during construction to minimize dust. This proposed project site is located in an attainment area.

#### 3.8 Noise

#### **Noise Current Conditions**

Sound is most comm only measured in decibels (dB) on the A-weighted scale, which is the scale m ost sim ilar to the range of sounds that the hum an ear can hear. The Day-Night Average Sound Level (DNL) is an average measure of sound. The DNL descriptor is accepted by federal agencies as a standard for estimating sound impacts and establishing guidelines for compatible land uses.

Noise, defined herein as undesirable sound, is federally regulated by the Noise Control Act of 1972 (NCA). Although the NCA gives the EPA 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. EPA guidelines, and those of many other federal agencies, state that outdoor sound levels in excess of 55 dB DNL are "normally unacceptable" for noise-sensitive land uses such as residences, schools, and hospitals.

The proposed project site is an area of primarily single family residences. A noise ordinance does exist for the City of Gulfport, City Ordinance: Chapter 7, Article 1, Section 7-10.

The general language of the City of Gulfport, Noise Ordinance refers to an exceedance as: *"noises interfering with en joyment of property or public peace and comfort prohibited"*. A copy of the City of Gulfport Noise Ordinance is included as Appendix G.

#### 3.8.1 Impacts to Noise Conditions

Alternative 1-No Action Alternative:

No impact.

Alternative 2 – Construct the new Community Center (Proposed Action)

Construction noise impacts would be short-term and limited to the duration of construction activities. The increase in vehicle s from recreational center use m ay increase the level of vehicular noise in the area throughout operating hours, but the increase in noise level from vehicle traffic and from outside activities at the recreational center should not exceed the city noise ordinance.

#### 3.9 Public Services and Utilities

The proposed project location and surrounding area has all normal public services and utility services available. The water, sanitary sewer, storm water drainage, police, fire and emergency medical services are provided by the City of Gulfport. The electric power service is provided Mississippi Power. Natural Gas is provided by Center Point Gas.

#### 3.9.1 Impact Public Services and Utilities

*Alternative 1-No Action Alternative:* No impact.

Alternative 2 – Construction of the new Community Center (Proposed Alternative) Any impact would be short term during active site preparation and construction activities. All normal construction permits and best management practices will be undertaken to minimize and/or eliminate any disruption to public utility services in the area.

#### 3.10 Water Resources/Water Quality

#### 3.10.1 Groundwater Existing Conditions

The proposed project site is located above the coastal lowlands aquifer system. Recharge of the aquifer in the vicinity of the proposed project site occurs in areas of higher elevations because water flows southwest toward the Gulf of Mexico. Dissolved solids, such as salinity, increase as the velocity of the water decreases as it approaches the water of the Gulf of Mexico. Freshwater parts of the aquifer are typically located about 500 feet below sea level.

#### 3.10.1.1 Impacts to Groundwater

*Alternative 1-No Action Alternative:* No impact.

Alternative 2 – Construct the new Community Center (Proposed Alternative) The water supply for the proposed Community Center will tie into the public utilities; therefore it will be not impact existing groundwater conditions.

#### 3.10.2 Surface Water Existing Conditions

The Clean Water Act (CWA), as amended in 1977, established the basic framework for regulating discharge of pollutants into the waters of the United States. Based on the local topography, excessive stormwater run-off would drain from the proposed project location site to the south towards the Mississippi Sound (Gulf of Mexico). There are no on-site surface water features (e.g. ponds, lakes or drainage ditches) present at the proposed project location.

#### 3.10.2.1 Impacts to Surface Waters

*Alternative 1-No Action Alternative:* No impact.

There are no anticipated im pacts to nearby surface water. A storm water drainage system will consist of both a sheet and sub-surface drainage component.

#### 3.11 Biological Resources

#### 3.11.1 Wetlands Existing Conditions

A wetlands determination was performed for the 1.5-acre project site in February 2007, and is included in Appendix D of this report. The wetlands determination was performed in accordance with appropriate US Army Corps of Engineers (COE) Section 404 wetlands delineation procedures. The conclusion of the wetlands determination is that the COE and other agencies would consider <u>none</u> of the project site to be "jurisdictional" wetlands. Based on the wetlands determination conducted, no further permit coordination is required from the Army Corps of Engineers, Mobile District nor the Mississippi Department of Marine Resources.

#### 3.11.1.2 Impacts to Wetlands

Alternative 1-No Action Alternative:

There were no wetlands identified in the wetlands determination survey. No Impact.

Alternative 2 – Construct the new Community Center (Proposed Action)

There were no wetlands iden tified in the wetlands determination survey. No impact anticipated.

#### 3.11.2 Threatened or Endangered Species

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service lists 14 fe derally protected species for Harrison County, Mississippi. However, further review of the list shows that six of the species are directly related to the Mississippi Sound, beach and associated riverine habitats. These six species are in italics and are eliminated from further analysis.

Harrison County (source: http://southeast.fws.gove/es/county%20lists.htm)

- E Red-cockaded woodpecker Picoides borealis
- T Bald eagle Haliaeetus leucophalus
- T Eastern indigo snake Drymarchon corais couperi (P)
- E Brown pelican <u>Pelecanus occidentalis</u>
- T Gopher tortoise <u>Gopherus polyphemus</u>
- T Louisiana black bear Ursus a. luteolus
- T Piping Plover <u>Charadrius melodus</u>
- E Kemp's ridley Lepidochelys kempii
- T Green turtle <u>Chelodania mydas (P)</u>
- T Loggerhead turtle<u>Caretta caretta</u>
- T- Gulf sturgeon, Acipenser oxyrhynchus desotoi
- E Louisiana quillwort Isoetes louisianensis
- PE Mississippi gopher frog (proposal under review)
- C Black pine snake <u>Pituophis mealanoleucus</u> ssp. <u>Lodingi</u>
- A Threatened and Endangered Species survey was conducted by

for

on the proposed project location on February 8,

2007. None of the listed species for Harrison County were recorded during the survey. The Threatened and Endangered Species survey report is provided in Appendix B.

In addition a protected species data request was m ade to the Mississippi Natural Heritage Program (MNHP), Department of Wildlife, Fish eries and Parks. The MNHP response letter indicated no State threatened or endangered species present within or adjacent to the proposed project site. The Mississippi Natural Heritage Program response is contained in Appendix B.

#### 3.11.2.1 Impacts to Threatened or Endangered Species

Alternative 1-No Action Alternative:

No impact.

Alternative 2 – Construct the new Community Center (Proposed Action)

No threatened and endangered species were observed during the survey conducted by f or f or f on the proposed project site. The Mississippi Natural Heritage Program, Department of Wildlife, Fisheries and Parks response concurred that there were no threatened and endangered species present on the proposed project site. No impacts are anticipated.

### 3.12 Cultural Resources

# **3.12.1** Cultural Resources Historic Properties and Archaeological Resources Current Conditions

A cultural resource survey was not conducted, because the proposed project site formerly contained the MS Highway Patrol, Troop K administrative offices and auto maintenance

facility from the mid 1960's (e.g. after Hurricane Camille) to August 2005. According to an interview with M ississippi Highway Patrol facility housed administrative offices and a vehicle maintenance facility until it was severely damaged by Hurricane Katrina on August 29, 2005. The above referenced structures have since been demolished and removed; the parcel is vacant and cleared. The above information was confirmed based on review of historic aerial photographs. A cultural resource assessment was requested and conducted by the Mississippi Department of Archives & History (MDAH). The MDAH cultural resource assessment had no reservations with the proposed project. The MDAH cultural resource assessment letter is contained in Appendix C.

## 3.12.1.2 Impacts to Cultural Resources, Historic Properties and Archaeological Resources

Alternative 1-No Action Alternative:

No impact.

Alternative 2 – Construction of the new

Community Center (Proposed Action)

No impacts anticipated.

#### 3.13 Coordination and Permits

All necessary permits and coordination with governing agencies will be the responsibility of

the architect and/or the contractor selected for site construction. All construction and required regulatory permits will be maintained and posted at the construction site.

Building permits will be obtained from the Harrison County Code Office.

State

- Mississippi Department of Archives & History (MDAH) letter report regarding construction affecting cultural resources for the proposed project location has been issued and is included in Appendix C. The MDAH letter report states no reservations with the proposed project site.
- Mississippi Natural Heritage Program (MNHP), Departm ent of Wildlife, Fisheries and Parks letter report regarding any state or federally listed species or species of special concern within a two mile radius of the proposed project has been issued and is included in Appendix C. The MNHP letter report states no records of occurrences of State threatened or endange red species within or adjacent to the proposed project site.

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

#### 4.0 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT, AGENCIES CONSULTED AND REFERENCES

The proposed action will be publicized during a fifteen-day public comment period in a local newspaper and will be made available to the public at the local Gulfport Library and City Hall. If no substantive comments are received, the Draft EA will become final and this initial Public Notice will also serve as the final P ublic Notice. Substantive comments will be addressed as appropriate in the final documents.

#### REFERENCES

Environmental Data Resources (EDR), Inc. 2007. EDR Environmental Database Report Number 1852975.1s

Environmental Data Resources (EDR), Inc. 2007. EDR NEPA Database Report Number1852975.2s

#### http:// www.epa.gov/safewater

Harrison County E-911 Addressing, correspondence regarding flood zone determination per Flood Insurance Rate Map 285255 0140E.

Mississippi Department of Environmental Quality (MDEQ), Solid Waste Files.

U.S. Census Bureau, http://factfinder.census.gov/servlet/SAFFFacts.

U.S.Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). 2006.

http://www.fws.gov/southeast/jackson/MsCo\_TE.html. Accessed 10/11/06.

U.S. Geological Survey (USG S). 2006. Ground Water Atlas of the United States, A rkansas, Louisiana, Mississippi HA 730-F. <u>http://capp.water.usgs.gov/gwa/ch\_f/F-text3.html</u>.

http://websoilsurvey.nrcs.usda.gov/app/

USGS 7.5-Minute Topographic Quadrangle Map for "Gulfport North, MS" (1994).

Site Photographs taken during site visit in February, 2007.

An on-site Wetlands Determination and Threatened & Endangered Species Assessment were conducted by PAC Services LLC on February 8, 2007.

Historic aerial photographs dated 1957, 1966, 1972, 1976, 1981, 1982 and circa 2004-2005 were obtained and reviewed.

#### 5.0 LIST OF PREPARERS



#### APPENDICES

Appendix A	Site Location Map, Aerial Photographs, Tax Parcel Map, Proposed Site Plan and Topographic Map
Appendix B	Site Photographs
Appendix C.1	Wetland Determination & Threatened and Endangered Species Survey
Appendix C.2	Mississippi Natural Heritage Program Threatened and Endangered Species Response
Appendix C.3	Mississippi Department of Archives & History Cultural Resources Response
Appendix D	FEMA & FIRM Flood Maps
Appendix E	EDR Regulatory Database
Appendix F	EDR NEPA Database
Appendix G	City of Gulfport Noise Ordinance