



Draft Environmental Assessment

Richards Taft

Temporary Housing Site

Escambia County, Florida

FEMA-1551-DR-FL

October 2004



FEMA

U.S. Department of Homeland Security
3003 Chamblee-Tucker Road
Atlanta, Georgia 30341-4112

This document was prepared by

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Temporary Housing Planning and Response Team, Environmental Group
Emergency Response and Recovery Office
33 Brent Lane
Pensacola, FL 32503

The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) proposes to fund an emergency temporary housing project, placing up to 40 manufactured homes (trailer homes) on about 9 acres in Pensacola, Escambia County, in the Florida panhandle. The proposed site is on the eastside of Old Palafox Highway and between Richards Road and Taft Drive about 0.5 miles south of I-10. These trailer homes would temporarily house people, displaced by Hurricane Ivan in September 2004, for 18 to 24 months.

This Environmental Assessment (EA) documents the proposed project's purpose and need (Section 1), the investigation and evaluation of proposed project alternatives (Section 2), the existing human and natural environment (Section 3), and the proposed alternatives' expected environmental consequences (Section 4).

This EA has been prepared in compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969, the President's Council on Environmental Quality regulations implementing NEPA (40 CFR 1500-1800), and FEMA's regulations implementing NEPA (44 CFR 10.9). Based on the evaluation described herein, FEMA has concluded that the proposed project would not have significant adverse environmental consequences.

1. Proposed Project Purpose and Need

Hurricane Ivan, a Category Three hurricane with a storm surge 10 to 15 feet above normal high-tide levels, moved across the Florida panhandle and the Alabama gulf coast in September 2004. The center of Hurricane Ivan moved on shore near Gulf Shores, Alabama at around 3:00 AM on Thursday, September 16, 2004. Maximum sustained winds at landfall were estimated to be near 130 miles per hour. About 16,000 homes were damaged or destroyed, leaving displaced residents in need of housing.

President Bush declared a third major disaster within a 6-week period for Florida due to damages sustained by Hurricane Ivan and signed a disaster declaration (FEMA-1551-DR-FL) on September 16, 2004, authorizing FEMA to provide federal assistance in designated areas of Florida and Alabama.

FEMA proposes to administer federal disaster assistance funds per the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act, 42 USC 5121-5206, as amended (Stafford Act). Stafford Act Section 408 authorizes FEMA's Individual Assistance Program to provide emergency temporary housing for disaster victims whose homes are uninhabitable. More than \$33 million of temporary housing assistance has been approved to date for Hurricane Ivan. FEMA has identified the need to provide temporary housing for residents in Escambia County, where the proposed project is located.

2. Proposed Project Alternatives

NEPA requires investigation and evaluation of reasonable project alternatives as part of the project environmental review process. Two alternatives are addressed in this EA: the No Action Alternative, where FEMA would not build temporary housing, and the Proposed Action, where

FEMA would build temporary housing on land owned by a private owner, on Old Palafox Highway in Pensacola, Escambia County, Florida. Other locations within Escambia County were identified and evaluated for development. Factors considered in choosing a site include: site topography, property owner willingness, location with respect to the floodplain, distance to occupants' homes, and past land use. It was determined that the Richards Taft Site was a suitable site available under emergency temporary housing time constraints that offered the adequate access to the impacted community in consideration of the site selection factors.

2.1 Alternative 1 – No Action Alternative

Under the No Action Alternative, FEMA would not fund the proposed project. Most hurricane victims would stay with their family and friends, or in schools, churches, motels, or other locations until they can find other housing. This would result in further economic and personal hardships for affected residents, disrupt school attendance and the school system, and further strain the county social and economic infrastructure.

2.2 Alternative 2 – Build Temporary Housing at the Richards Taft Site (Proposed Action)

The proposed site is located on Old Palafox Highway between Richards Road and Taft Drive in Pensacola, Escambia County, Florida (Figures 1 and 2). The site covers about 9 acres. FEMA tasked the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) to build a new manufactured home park (hereafter "Park") of up to 40 units. At this time, Park occupancy is expected to not exceed 24 months. Each home is about 14 x 70 feet.

New utilities would be installed, including connecting potable water and sanitary sewer service to existing county infrastructure. A new electric substation or on-site generator would be installed for Park power supply. If an electric substation is chosen, an electric generator may be temporarily installed to provide power during substation construction. A new access road from Old Palafox Highway would be built for Park residents' direct ingress and egress. The Park would have necessary gravel access roads for built-up areas, and a gravel pad for each home. A 20-foot buffer of undisturbed vegetation would be retained around the Park perimeter. A swale system would be installed to convey stormwater from topographic low points through drainage ditches to an existing retention pond at the east end of the site. A safety fence would also be installed and maintained around the perimeter, electric generator, and around an existing stormwater retention pond located on the property.

When the temporary housing need has ended, FEMA expects that the trailers would be hauled from the site, to suitable locations elsewhere (to be determined on case-by-case basis). The Park site would then be seeded and restored to previous conditions and/or used by the landowner in a manner consistent with county zoning classification.

3 Affected Environment

3.1 Project Location

The proposed project site is located in Pensacola, Escambia County, in the panhandle of northwestern Florida. The site is located about ½ mile south of I-10 on Old Palafox Highway between Richards Road and Taft Drive in Section 27, Township 1 South, Range 30 West. The site is bordered on the north and south by residential housing, on the east by a railroad, and on the west by Old Palafox Highway. The site is about 60 miles east of Mobile, Alabama. It is about 102 miles northwest of Panama City, Florida and 195 miles west of Tallahassee, Florida.

3.2 Geology and Soils

Pensacola is located within the Gulf Coastal Lowlands physiographic region, which has a surface geology characterized by three types of materials: limestones, organics and clastics (i.e., silt, clay, sand, gravel) (Wolfe et al. 1988). The Gulf Coast Lowlands are characterized by nearly level poorly drained land extending about 12 miles inland from the coast. Pensacola region ground elevations range from sea level to over 50 feet above mean sea level (amsl).

Area soils are typically acidic because of the dominant types of vegetation and lack of underground drainage. The site's dominant soil type is Bonifay loamy fine sand, a very deep, well drained soil, with sandy surface and subsurface layers and sandy clay loam subsoil. This soil has a perched water table at about 3.5 to 5.0 feet below the surface during the rainy season and during periods of unseasonably wet conditions. However, it is suited for most urban uses (Escambia County Soil Survey, NRCS 1960). The State Soil Conservationist determined that no prime or unique soils exist on the project site in October 7, 2004 correspondence (Appendix).

3.3 Hydrology and Floodplains

The Escambia County climate is subtropical, with mild winters and hot, humid, breezy summers. Pensacola has a year round average temperature of 67.6 degrees Fahrenheit (°F) (19.8° Celsius). Frost occurs in the eastern part of the county in about three out of four winters. The dry season is usually November through May, and the wet season is usually June through September. The county average annual rainfall is 63 inches and can vary considerably from site to site. About 60 percent of the rain falls between June and September.

The proposed site is located within the Perdido-Escambia River Basin, which drains directly into the Pensacola and Perdido Bay systems. The Escambia River, the area's largest stream, flows southward from Alabama. The river divides Escambia County from Santa Rosa County and empties into Escambia Bay. Escambia Bay outlets to Pensacola Bay in the south. Stormwater runoff is expected to drain to the center of the project site.

The Pensacola region is underlain, in descending order, by the Sand and Gravel aquifer, the Intermediate System (a regional confining unit) and the Florida aquifer.

The FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Map shows that the proposed project site is outside of the 100-year floodplain (Figure 3). The FEMA Region IV Federal Insurance and Mitigation Division

confirmed that this site was outside of the Special Flood Hazard Area in a written flood determination dated October 8, 2004 (Appendix).

3.4 Wetlands

USACE-Jacksonville District, Pensacola Regulatory Field Office wetlands biologists reviewed maps and an aerial photo of the site and determined that no jurisdictional wetlands are present. A formal wetlands determination for the site was completed on October 7, 2004 (Appendix). As depicted in Figure 4, there are no wetlands mapped by the National Wetlands Inventory within the project site.

3.5 Water Quality

The proposed project site is within the Pensacola Bay watershed, which has been designated as an “impaired water” by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and the State of Florida due to levels of fecal coliform bacteria, low dissolved oxygen, turbidity, nutrients, total suspended solids, mercury, biological oxygen demand, lead, and copper (EPA, 2004a). Based upon the survey results in Section 3.4, it is believed that the proposed project site is not hydrologically connected through surface water to Pensacola Bay. Water that enters the site through either rainfall or runoff is expected to remain on the site until it evaporates or returns to the shallow aquifer.

3.6 Air Quality

Escambia County is currently in attainment for the six criteria pollutants (ozone, lead, particulate matter, nitrogen dioxide, sulfur dioxide and carbon monoxide) under the Clean Air Act (CAA) (EPA, 2004b). Escambia County has been in attainment for the criteria pollutants since records have been kept. The ambient air quality at the project site is very good given Escambia County’s proximity to the Gulf of Mexico’s strong air circulation and northwest Florida’s low, open topography. Sensitive receptors in the area include asthmatics and seniors in adjacent residences, and patients at the Veterans Administration Outpatient Clinic about 1 mile southwest of the project site.

3.7 Vegetation and Wildlife

A field survey was conducted by USACE biologists Dan Kelner and Win Seyle (Section 6, qualifications) on September 29, 2004. Most of the site is abandoned pasture that appears to be periodically mowed. Site perimeter vegetation includes a tree layer of mostly live oak (*Quercus Virginiana*), Chinese tallow (*Sapium sebiferum*) and slash pine (*Pinus elliottii*). Figure 5 includes a representative photo of site vegetation.

Wildlife species are typical of those in the urban/wildland interface, including: eastern cottontail (*Sylvilagus floridanus*), squirrel (*Sciurus* spp.), mouse (*Reithrodontomys* spp.), opossum (*Didelphis* spp.), common raccoon (*Procyon lotor*), and songbirds, such as thrushes, bluejay (*Cyanocitta cristata*), and northern mockingbird (*Mimus polyglottos*). Reptiles and amphibians would include box turtles (*Trachemys* spp.), green anole (*Anolis carolinensis*), corn snake (*Elaphe guttata*), and toads (*Bufo* spp.).

3.8 Threatened and Endangered Species

Per the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (ESA) Section 7, USACE consulted with the USFWS Panama City Field Office. USACE biologists conducted a field survey for special status species on September 29, 2004, and did not identify any endangered or threatened species, or their habitat, within the proposed project site. In a communication dated October 5, 2004, the USFWS found that special status species have a low potential to occur at the project site. However, as a precautionary measure, the USFWS requested that the contractor implement the USFWS's standard construction protocol for threatened eastern indigo snakes (*Drymarchon corais couperi*) to minimize any potential impacts on the snakes. A copy of this consultation and recommendations are in the Appendix.

As a courtesy, the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission (FFWCC) was consulted on October 7, 2004 regarding this project, and did not express any concerns regarding state-listed species (Appendix).

3.9 Cultural Resources

No structures were found on the site during the September 29, 2004 survey. The site is surrounded by residential homes. The Florida State Historic Preservation Office (FLSHPO) was contacted on October 6, 2004 to determine the potential for historic or archaeological resources at the site. FLSHPO found that no historic properties were recorded on the property, determined that it is unlikely that any are located there, and issued an opinion on October 6, 2004 that the proposed project would "not likely effect" historic properties (Appendix).

3.10 Socioeconomics

Escambia County population was estimated to be 294,410 people in 2000 (Census Bureau, 2004). Most of these people reside within the Pensacola city limits. County median household income in 2000 was estimated at \$35,234, with 9.2 percent of the population below the poverty line. County resident median age is 35.4 years. U.S. median age is 36 years and Florida median age is 38.7 years.

As of September 23, 2004, FEMA had determined that Hurricane Ivan had destroyed or damaged about 16,000 homes. Most of the destroyed homes (about 8,300) were in Escambia County, followed by Santa Rosa (about 6,100), Okaloosa (about 600), Walton (about 650) and Bay (about 100) counties.

Presidential Executive Order (EO) 12898 (Environmental Justice) requires federal agencies to identify and address the effects of its programs, policies, and activities on minority and low-income populations, to avoid disproportionately high and adverse public health or environmental impacts on these populations. EO 12898 also requires federal agencies to ensure that public notifications regarding environmental issues are brief, understandable, and highly accessible. Within the declared disaster area, the overall population is approximately 72 percent white and 28 percent minority (Table 1).

Table 1. Escambia County, Florida Racial Composition

<i>Location</i>	<i>Race (percent)</i>				
	<i>White</i>	<i>Black</i>	<i>Hispanic or Latino</i>	<i>Asian</i>	<i>Other</i>
Escambia County	72.4%	21.4%	2.7%	2.2%	1.3%
Florida	65.4%	14.6%	16.8%	1.7%	1.5%

Source: United States Census Bureau, Census 2000. <http://factfinder.census.gov>

Escambia County's largest employment sector is professional, business, and other services (about 40 percent of jobs) followed by healthcare and social assistance (about 15 percent), education (about 10 percent), construction and real estate (about 9 percent), and government including military (about 8 percent). Lesser employment sectors include manufacturing, transportation, warehousing, and wholesale trade; and finance and insurance (Enterprise Florida, Inc., 2002).

Escambia County has about 127,300 housing units. Two-thirds are owner-occupied and the rest are leased properties. The median value of owner-occupied housing units was \$85,700 in 2000 (FedStats, 2004).

The project site is zoned commercial (Personal communication, October 6, 2004, Tamara Hansen, Escambia County).

3.11 Safety and Security

Safety and security issues considered include the health and safety of area residents, the public at large, and personnel involved in activities related to the proposed site development, operation, and closure.

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.

3.12 Hazardous Materials and Toxic Wastes

Hazardous materials and toxic wastes are primarily regulated under the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation and Liability Act (CERCLA), the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA), and their reauthorizing amendments, the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act (SARA), and the Hazardous and Solid Waste Amendments (HSWA).

USACE personnel Dan Kelner and Win Seyle conducted a site survey on September 29, 2004 (Section 6, qualifications). No apparent hazardous contamination was found on or near the site.

An abbreviated Phase I Environmental Site Assessment for hazardous and toxic waste was done on the proposed project site. This assessment consisted of a search of existing state and federal databases for known problem sites and spill locations. The database search was conducted on

October 6, 2004, through Environmental Data Resources, Inc (EDR). The EDR Report (EDR 2004) indicates there are six sites located within ¼ mile of the proposed project site that are either small-quantity generators or contain underground storage tanks (UST).

Wholesale Transmission, MAACO Auto Painting, and Vertec, Inc are regulated small quantity generators (i.e., generating between 220 and 2,200 pounds of hazardous waste per month). “A” Food Store operates a steel double-walled 12,000-gallon UST containing unleaded gas. The UST was installed in 1995 and is still in operation. Lacoste Electric Company operated a 4,000 gallon leaded gasoline UST that was closed in place in 1987. None of these five facilities have reported violations as documented in the EDR Report.

A sixth site, Miracle Strip Auto Sales, operated a 500-gallon unleaded gasoline UST listed as a leaking UST by the Northwest District of FDEP in 1988. The tank was removed in 1990 and no cleanup was required (EDR 2004).

All six of the sites are located at a lower elevation than the proposed project site indicating that potential future spills are unlikely to migrate in the direction of the site. A copy of the EDR report can be obtained by contacting the USACE at (850) 444-2895.

3.13 Traffic and Transportation

The proposed project site is located off Old Palafox Highway between Richards Road and Taft Drive. The Park access road would adjoin Old Palafox Highway. Old Palafox Highway and the connecting Palafox Street is a main road through Pensacola. Richards Road and Taft Drive are residential streets. An active railroad, owned by CSX, runs along the site’s eastern side. The existing traffic load on Old Palafox Highway, Richards Road, and Taft Drive are at acceptable levels (Personal communication, October 8, 2004, Dennis Moxley, Escambia County).

4. Environmental Consequences

4.1 Soils

Proposed activities would disturb site soils during construction of utilities, roads, and housing pads, and with resident and visitor foot traffic. Due to the site’s low topography the potential for soil erosion and sedimentation is low. Use of best management practices (BMPs) (e.g., installation of silt fences or straw bales) in construction would reduce these adverse impacts. If fill were stored on site as part of home installation or removal, the contractor would be required to appropriately cover it to reduce erosion.

4.2 Hydrology and Floodplains

This site lies outside of the 100-year floodplain. In order to convey stormwater runoff, Park drainage features would be installed. The contractor would be required to design drainage features so that stormwater flows would not flood Park residents or surrounding residences. The drainage system would be required to meet local and county requirements, including easement acquisition if applicable.

4.3 Wetlands

Based upon the USACE determination (Appendix), no jurisdictional wetlands were found at the proposed project site. Therefore, no Clean Water Act (CWA) Section 404 permit would be required.

4.4 Water Quality

Stormwater runoff from Park development may enter the city sewer and treatment system, which eventually drains into the Pensacola Bay watershed. In order to minimize pollutants from entering the Pensacola Bay watershed, USACE and/or its contractor would consider the feasibility of developing an on-site drainage and retention system. To further minimize water quality impacts, the contractor would be required to implement BMPs and develop a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan that meets Florida Department of Environment (FDEP) specifications.

4.5 Air Quality

If an electric generator is required at the project site, it would be required to meet local, state and federal standards. Any CAA compliance permits for operating generators would be obtained prior to construction.

The proposed project would include activities that would produce a minor, temporary, localized increase in vehicle emissions and dust particles. Tractor-trailers would transport manufactured homes to the site. Grading equipment would be required for site preparation. While such equipment use would temporarily increase emissions, no long-term air quality impacts are anticipated in Escambia County. Federal or state air quality attainment levels would not likely be exceeded.

Roads would be constructed of permeable asphalt millings, gravel, or similar material to reduce airborne particulates. Periodic wetting during construction would reduce fugitive dust. Open areas of the temporary housing site would be covered with grass or other material to reduce dust. These mitigation measures would help reduce air quality impacts on asthmatics, seniors, and other sensitive residents, such as patients of the Veterans Administration Outpatient Clinic, located about one mile southwest of the project site. During home removal, the contractor would periodically wet-down the site to reduce dust. If any fill is stored on-site for home installation or removal, the contractor would be required to appropriately cover it to reduce erosion.

4.6 Vegetation and Wildlife

A minimum 20-foot buffer of trees and vegetation would be incorporated into site design. Any trees or grasses located outside of this buffer would likely be removed. After housing is removed, the site would be seeded or allowed to naturally re-vegetate with a variety of grasses, slash pine, and oak trees, depending on how the property owner chooses to redevelop the site.

4.7 Threatened and Endangered Species

Based on USACE recommendations, FEMA determined that endangered and threatened species in Escambia County would not be adversely affected by construction of the proposed housing site. In correspondence dated October 5, 2004, USFWS concurred with the determination that

the project “may effect, but is not likely to adversely effect” any ESA-listed species in Escambia County, Florida” (Appendix). The “may effect” ruling is based on concern for the Federal- and State-listed threatened eastern indigo snake. As a protective measure, the contractor should implement the USFWS’s standard construction protocol for eastern indigo snakes (Appendix).

4.8 Cultural Resources

No cultural resources at the site are expected to be affected by the proposed project. FLSHPO concurred with this determination on October 6, 2004 (Appendix). Although no historic properties were identified at the site, in accordance with the National Historic Preservation Act, should unanticipated historic or cultural materials be found during construction, all construction activities shall cease immediately within 100 feet of the materials until their cultural affiliation and ultimate disposition are determined in consultation with FLSHPO and other interested parties.

4.9 Socioeconomics

The proposed project would benefit people affected by Hurricane Ivan. It would also benefit the County by keeping area individuals rebuilding their communities, working, attending school, and paying taxes that support County and community social and economic infrastructure. All forms of FEMA disaster housing assistance are available to any affected household that meets the eligibility conditions. No federal entity or official (or their agent) may discriminate against any individual based on race, color, religion, sex, age, national origin, disability, or economic status.

In compliance with EO 12898 (Environmental Justice), the Proposed Action Alternative site selection would pose no disproportionately high and adverse effect on minority and low-income populations.

The land use designation for the project site is commercial. However, in Escambia County commercial zoning allows for residential development on commercially zoned properties (Personal communication, October 6, 2004, Tamara Hansen, Escambia County). Therefore, the proposed project would not require any zoning changes or waivers.

City and county representatives were contacted on October 8, 2004 regarding the possibility of a 24-hr construction schedule at the project site. The schedule could result in adverse noise impacts to sensitive receptors in the neighborhoods to the north and south of the proposed site. These representatives stated that project activities would not conflict with local noise ordinances, and that in consideration of the emergency status of the project, a 24-hour schedule would be acceptable.

However, noise impacts should be reduced to the maximum extent possible. Noise reduction measures include (1) restricting the 24-hour schedule to the first two weeks of construction; (2) using a 7 AM to 7PM construction schedule; (3) completing construction closest to the adjoining residences first; and (4) completing noisier activities during the day if a 24-hour schedule is used.

4.10 Hazardous/Toxic Materials

As described in Section 3.12, there are six sites that are listed as being small quantity generators or operators of USTs within ¼ of the project site. None of the sites are currently in violation of federal or state regulations governing hazardous wastes (EDR 2004). Additionally, all six of the sites are located at a lower elevation than the proposed project site indicating that potential future spills are unlikely to migrate in the direction of the site. Based on these findings, there is a low potential for exposure of Park residents to hazardous materials.

No drinking water wells would be installed because the Park would be connected to the city water supply through existing infrastructure.

Although no hazardous materials were found on-site, if any are found between start of construction and final Park closure, all hazardous materials shall be either remediated, abated, or disposed of as appropriate, and otherwise handled in accordance with applicable local, state, and federal laws and regulations. Alternatively, the site could be abandoned in view of finding another site that better meets the identified project purpose and need.

4.11 Safety and Security

Under EO 13045 (Protection of Children), the contractor would place fencing around the site perimeter to keep children separated from vehicular traffic on Old Palafox Highway, and from any train traffic along the railroad tracks to the north of the property; around the Park electrical generator to prevent shock and electrocution; and around the existing stormwater retention pond to prevent access to the water by children and protect them from drowning and other water-related hazards.

To minimize worker and public health and safety risks from project construction and closure, all construction and closure work would be done using qualified personnel trained in the proper use of the appropriate, properly maintained equipment, including all appropriate safety precautions. Additionally, all activities would be conducted in a safe manner in accordance with the standards specified in Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) regulations and the USACE Safety Manual.

The contractor would post appropriate signage and fencing to minimize potential adverse safety impacts. Appropriate signage and barriers should be in place before starting construction activities, to alert pedestrians and motorists of project activities and traffic pattern changes.

4.12 Traffic and Transportation

Additional project area traffic would include project construction workers and supply trucks, as well as Park residents and their visitors. This would result in up to 30 percent local traffic increase during project construction, operation, and closure. These traffic increases would be localized and are not expected to exceed current transportation network infrastructure capacity (Personal communication, October 8, 2004, Dennis Moxley, Escambia County). The surrounding neighborhood may experience temporary traffic delays during Park preparation and placement and removal of the manufactured housing units. This may include temporary closures along Old Palafox Highway. The contractor would post appropriate signage and fencing to minimize potential adverse safety impacts. Appropriate signage and barriers should be in place

prior to construction activities in order to alert pedestrians and motorists of project activities and changes in traffic patterns.

5.0 Agencies and Persons Consulted

Mr. Lyal “Cliff” Payne
US Army Corps of Engineers
Jacksonville District – Regulatory Field Office
North Permits Branch –North Permits Section
Pensacola Regulatory Office
41 North Jefferson Street
Suite 111
Pensacola, Florida 32501-5794
Ph: 850-433-8732
Fax: 850-433-8160
Lyal.C.Payne@saj02.usace.army.mil

Mr. Stan Simpkins
US Fish and Wildlife Service
Panama City Field Office
1601 Balboa Ave.
Panama City, FL 32405
Ph: 850-769-0552 x234
Fax: 850-763-2177
Stan_Simpkins@fws.gov

Ms. Laura Kammerer
Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer
Division of Historic Resources
500 South Bronough Street – Room 423
Tallahassee, Florida 32399-0250
Ph: 850-245-6333
Fax: 850-245-6437
Lkammerer@dos.state.fl.us

Ms. Karen M. Lamonte
Regional Nongame Biologist, Northwest Region
Florida Fish & Wildlife Conservation Commission
1101 East Gregory Street
Pensacola, FL 32501
Ph: 850-595-8978
Fax: 850-595-8981
Karen.Lamonte@MyFWC.com

Mr. Gerald Miller
Senior Ecologist
NEPA Program Office
US Environmental Protection Agency
Region 4
Sam Nunn Atlanta Federal Center
61 Forsyth Street, SW
Atlanta, GA 30303-3104
Ph: 404-562-9626
Miller.Gerald@EPA.gov

Mr. Horace Jones and Ms. Tamara Hansen
Escambia County Zoning
Escambia County Department of Planning and Engineering
1190 W. Leonard St., Suite 1
Pensacola, FL 32501-1116
Ph: 850-595-3434
Fax: 850-595-3557
Horace_Jones@co.Escambia.fl.us
Tamara_Hansen@co.Escambia.fl.us

Mr. Lance Laird
Northwest Florida Water Management District
81 Water Management Drive
Havana, FL 32333
Ph: 850-539-5999
Lance.Laird@nfwmd.state.fl.us

Mr. Warren G. Henderson, Jr.
State Soils Scientist
Natural Resources Conservation Service
P.O. Box 141510
2614 N.W. 43rd Street
Gainesville, Florida 32614
Ph: 352-338-9535
Fax: 352-338-9578
Warren.Henderson@fl.usda.gov

Mr. Dennis Moxley
 Escambia County Traffic Engineer
 Escambia County Department of Planning and Engineering
 1190 W. Leonard St., Suite 1
 Pensacola, FL 32501-1116
 Ph: 850-595-3434
 Fax: 850- 595-3444
Dennis_Moxley@co.escambia.fl.us

Mr. Dan Mayo
 Building Official
 Escambia County Department of Building Inspection
 3300 N. Pace Boulevard, Suite 300
 Pensacola, FL 32505
 Phone - 850-595-3550
Don_Mayo@co.escambia.fl.us

6.0 Authors and Reviewers

Name	Role	Expertise/Experience
Terri Jordan	Primary Author	Biologist, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (11 years NEPA experience)
Daniel Kelner	Primary Author	Biologist, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Two years NEPA experience)
Win Seyle	Preliminary Site Assessment	Biologist, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (15 years of NEPA experience)
Susan Volkmer	Independent Technical Review	Environmental Scientist, URS Corporation (12 years NEPA experience)
Ruth Horton	Reviewer	Deputy Environmental Liaison Officer, Disaster Field Office, FEMA Regional 4 (Four years NEPA experience)
Brett Bowen	Reviewer	Environmental Liaison Officer, Disaster Field Office, FEMA Region 4 (Seven years NEPA experience)
William Straw, PhD	Final DHS/FEMA Reviewer	Regional Environmental Officer, FEMA Region 4 (15 years NEPA experience)

7.0 Public Comment and Agency Coordination

A public notice announcing this EA's availability was placed in the Pensacola News Journal and ran from October 12 to October 14, 2004. This EA was available for public review at the Disaster Recovery Center (DRC) at 33 Brent Lane; the DRC in Cantonment at the Winn Dixie on U.S. Highway 29; the Pensacola Public Library Main Branch on Gregory Street, and the Lucia M. Tryon Branch Library on North Ninth Avenue in Pensacola, Florida. Electronic copies of the EA were sent to the USEPA, USFWS, NRCS, National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) Protected Resources and Habitat Divisions, Florida Department of Environmental Protection and Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission. The draft EA was also posted on FEMA's website at <http://www.fema.gov/ehp/docs.shtm>.

8.0 Literature Cited and References

Enterprise Florida, Inc. 2002. Escambia County Profile.

<http://www.eflorida.com/profiles/CountyReport.asp?CountyID=41&Display=all>. Accessed October 8, 2004.

Environmental Data Resources, Inc. 2004. Environmental Risk management information data search. Report Number 01283037.2r.

FedStats. 2004. Escambia County MapStats from FedStats.

<http://www.fedstats.gov/qf/states/12/12033.html>. Accessed October 8, 2004.

U.S. Census Bureau, 2004. Website viewed on October 1, 2004.

<http://quickfacts.census.gov/qfd/states/12/12027.html>

U.S. Department of Agriculture, 1960. Walker, J.H. and V.W. Carlisle Soil Survey of Escambia County, Florida. USDA/SCS in cooperation with the University of Florida, Agricultural Experimental Stations.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 2004a. Watershed Website viewed on October 6, 2004

http://cfpub.epa.gov/surf/huc.cfm?huc_code=03140105

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 2004b. Air Quality Website viewed on October 6, 2004

<http://www.epa.gov/oar/oaqps/greenbk/anay.html>

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 2004. Website viewed on September 29, 2004.

<http://southeast.fws.gov/es/T&E%20Species.htm>

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 2004. Panama City Field Office. Website viewed on September 24, 2004. <http://panamacity.fws.gov/resources/specieslist.html>

Wolfe, S. H., J. A. Reidenauer, and D.B. Means, 1988, An Ecological Characterization of the Florida Panhandle, United States Fish and Wildlife Biological Report 88 (12), Mineral Management Service OSC Study/MMS 88-0063, 277 pp.

Appendix