

DRAFT

FEMA Environmental Assessment

SOUTH END COMMUNITY CENTER

Marble Street, Springfield, MA

DR 1994 MA, Public Assistance Grant Program

December 15, 2015

U.S. Department of Homeland Security (DHS)
Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA)
Region I, Environmental & Historic Preservation Office (R1-EHP)
99 High St., 6th Floor
Boston, MA 02110

Prepared by:

U.S. Department of Homeland Security (DHS)
Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA)
Region I, Environmental & Historic Preservation Office (R1-EHP)
99 High St., 6th Floor
Boston, MA 02110

Contacts:

David Robbins, Regional Environmental Officer (978) 914-0378;
david.robbins@fema.dhs.gov

Lydia Kachadoorian, Deputy Regional Environmental Officer (617) 956-7610;
lydia.kachadoorian@fema.dhs.gov

**ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT
SOUTH END COMMUNITY CENTER**

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1	INTRODUCTION	5
1.1	Disaster Background and Overview.....	5
1.2	Purpose and Need.....	5
2	ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED	5
2.1	Alternative 1 - The No Action Alternative.....	5
2.2	Alternative 2 – Build a new Facility at Emerson Wight Park (Proposed Alternative).....	6
2.3	Other Alternatives Considered and Eliminated.....	6
3	AFFECTED ENVIRONMENTS AND POTENTIAL IMPACTS CONSIDERED	6
3.1	Geology and Soils	9
3.1.2	Need for Mitigation.....	9
3.2	Air Quality.....	9
3.2.1	Potential Impacts	9
3.2.2	Need for Mitigation.....	9
3.3	Climate Change	10
3.3.1	Potential Impacts	10
3.3.2	Need for Mitigation.....	10
3.4	Water Quality	10
3.4.1	Potential Impacts	10
3.4.2	Need for Mitigation.....	10
3.5	Floodplains	10
	The Proposed Alternative will have no effect on floodplains.	10
3.5.1	Potential Impacts	10
3.5.2	Need for Mitigation.....	11
3.6	Wetlands.....	11
3.6.1	Potential Impacts	11
3.6.2	Need for Mitigation.....	11
3.7	Threatened and Endangered Species.....	11
3.7.2	Need for Mitigation.....	11
3.8	Historic PROPERTIES and Cultural RESOURCES	11
3.8.1	Potential Impacts	12

3.9	Executive Order (EO) 12898 Environmental Justice.....	13
3.9.1	Potential Impacts.....	13
3.9.2	Need for Mitigation.....	13
3.10	Traffic Impacts.....	13
3.10.1	Potential Impacts.....	13
3.10.2	Need for Mitigation.....	14
3.11	Cumulative Effects.....	14
3.11.1	Potential Impacts.....	14
3.11.2	Need for Mitigation.....	14
4	PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT.....	14
4.1	PLANNING AND Public Meetings.....	14
4.2	public access to draft documents and comments provided.....	14
5	Conclusions.....	15
6	List of Preparers.....	15
7	REFERENCES.....	15
8	APPENDICES.....	16

LIST OF TABLES

Table 3-1 Project Alternatives: Summary of Potential Effect, Coordination and Mitigation Applied

LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix A Maps and Figures

Figure A-1 Topographic Map
Figure A-2 Area of Potential Effect Map
Figure A-3 Project Location Map & Design Plans
Figure A-4 Floodplain Insurance Rate Map
Figure A-5 Wetlands Map
Figure A-6 NRCS Soils Map

Appendix B Site Photographs

Appendix C Permits and Other Supporting Documents

Figure C-1 USFWS Federally Listed Species
Figure C-2 SHPO Consultation & Concurrence
Figure C-3 Traffic Impact Study
Figure C-4 Public Involvement Documents

Appendix D Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI)

Acronyms and Abbreviations

ACM	Asbestos Containing Material
ADA	Americans with Disabilities Act
BMP	Best Management Practice
CEQ	Council on Environmental Quality
CAA	Clean Air Act
CERCLA	Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act
C.F.R.	Code of Federal Regulations
CMS	Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Reimbursement
CWA	Clean Water Act
EA	Environmental Assessment
EIS	Environmental Impact Statement
EO	Executive Order
ESA	Endangered Species Act
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency
FIRM	Flood Insurance Rate Map
FONSI	Finding of No Significant Impact
GIS	Geographic Information System
MSA	Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
NESHAPS	National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollution
NFIP	National Flood Insurance Program
NHPA	National Historic Preservation Act
NPDES	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
NPL	National Priority List
NRCS	Natural Resources Conservation Service
PA	Public Assistance
RCRA	Resource Conservation and Recovery Act
SHPO	State Historic Preservation Officer
USACE	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
USEPA	U. S. Environmental Protection Agency
USDA	U.S. Department of Agriculture
USFWS	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

1 INTRODUCTION

As a result of damages sustained on June 1, 2011, the President declared a major disaster for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts under the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act. This major disaster declaration, referenced as FEMA-1994-DR-MA, authorized the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) to provide Public Assistance (PA) grant funding to local governments, state agencies and eligible private non-profit organizations in Massachusetts. The City of Springfield, Massachusetts has applied through the Massachusetts Emergency Management Agency (MEMA) to the FEMA for funding assistance to establish a new South End Community Center (SECC). This Environmental Assessment (EA) is being prepared in accordance with 44 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) for FEMA, Subpart B, Agency Implementing Procedures, Part 10.9, and pursuant to Section 102 of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969, as implemented by the regulations promulgated by the President's Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ); 40 CFR Parts 1500-1508. The purpose of an EA is to analyze the potential environmental impacts of proposed alternatives to a project and to determine whether to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement or a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI).

1.1 DISASTER BACKGROUND AND OVERVIEW

The City of Springfield, Massachusetts (the City) is located in western Massachusetts, in Hampden County, near the Massachusetts/Connecticut border. Springfield is the third largest city in Massachusetts with an estimated population of 153,000 per the 2010 Census.

On June 1, 2011, tornadoes struck portions of Western Massachusetts causing widespread property damage. The largest tornado passed through the City and caused significant damage to the Springfield Armory; the building that housed the SECC. The City has proposed to construct a new facility to re-establish a permanent location for the SECC.

The proposed facility would be used for athletic/recreation activities, sports clinics, community meetings, and special events. Additionally, the SECC would serve as a base of operations for an after school program to support academic achievement and life skills development for children in grades K-8. The SECC would also host special events such as teen dances, family recreation nights and community information forums. To support this vision, the SECC would require significant space for classrooms, offices and administrative storage, athletic/recreational space, showers and lockers and auditorium space.

1.2 PURPOSE AND NEED

The purpose of the project is to provide community services for City residents in a permanent Facility. The need for the facility stems from the loss of access to the Springfield Armory which was severely damaged by a tornado. The new facility at a new location will provide an opportunity to update accommodations and utilize a location in a less urban landscape where there will be recreational facilities.

2 ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

2.1 ALTERNATIVE 1 - THE NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE

Under the No Action Alternative, SECC services would continue to be provided in a temporary location. However, the temporary facility is too small to accommodate all programs offered at the previous facility, there is limited space for parking and outdoor activities, and no area for food service.

2.2 ALTERNATIVE 2 – BUILD A NEW FACILITY AT EMERSON WIGHT PARK (PROPOSED ALTERNATIVE)

The *Proposed Alternative* is construction of a new two-story building at Emerson Wight Park. Once constructed, the approximately 26,000 square foot facility would house all SECC services including a gymnasium, classrooms, and office space. Site access is proposed via two driveways. A bus drop-off and pick-up area and bike rack would be provided in front of the SECC.

Emerson Wight Park is aligned southwest to northeast in the section of Springfield known as the South End, in close proximity to the Six Corners section (N42.09415, W-72.57844 or UTM Zone 18: 0700258 E, 4663067 N). The Park is bordered by Maple Street to the north, Wendell Place and Rutledge Avenue to the west, Acushnet Avenue to the south, and residential lots from Maple and Pine streets to the east. See topographic map and area of potential effect map at Appendix A; Figures A-1 and A-2. The proposed building location is south/southeast of the northern entrance on Marble Street and across from Dwight Street Extension. Improvements to traffic flow in the immediate area are also proposed. Since this is a congested area, and construction of the SECC will result in increased vehicular and pedestrian traffic, especially during mid-late afternoon, a plan has been included to expand the width of Marble Street, extend it to the northeast and curve it to the northwest to connect with Ashmun Street. Construction of the roadway project is anticipated to begin in 2016.

A total of 92 parking spaces will be provided at the facility; greater than the City requirement of 3 spaces per 1,000 square feet for this type of land use. Vendors would unload in an area near where employees would park; immediately east of the outdoor basketball court. See design plans and photographs at Appendix A; Figure A-3 and Appendix B.

2.3 OTHER ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED AND ELIMINATED

Repair the Armory to re-establish use for the SECC and Senior Center. This Alternative was considered and eliminated when the City determined that the public good would not be best served by restoring the damaged facility or by solely restoring the function of a damaged facility.

A new building constructed at a former manufacturing location; the “Gemini” site. This alternative was considered and eliminated because the City did not own the site and additional cost would have been incurred through necessary environmental testing and the possible need for site remediation.

3 **AFFECTED ENVIRONMENTS AND POTENTIAL IMPACTS CONSIDERED**

In the following section:

Alternative 1 - the No Action Alternative is not evaluated further since there would be no added adverse effect to the environment if this alternative were chosen.

Alternative 2 – Build a New Facility at Emerson Wight Park (Proposed Alternative) is analyzed for the direct effect the proposed facility will have on the surrounding resources.

Alternative 3 – Repair the Springfield Armory or Build a New Facility at the old Gemini Site will not be analyzed in any further sections of this document since the City has decided not to pursue either alternative.

Table 3-1 summarizes the effects described and analyzed in this chapter. Levels of potential effect are defined as follows:

- * 1 - Negligible: The resource area would not be affected. Changes would be non-detectable or if detected, effects would be slight and local. Impacts would be well below regulatory limits.
- * 2 - Minor: Changes to the resource would be measurable, but the changes would be small and localized. Impacts would be within or below regulatory limits. Mitigation measures may be necessary to reduce potential effects.
- * 3 - Moderate: Changes to the resource would be measurable and have localized and potentially regional scale impacts. Impacts would be within or below regulatory limits, but historical conditions would be altered on a short-term basis. Mitigation measures may be necessary to reduce potential effects.
- * 4 - Major: Changes would be readily measurable and would have substantial consequences on a local and potentially regional level. Impacts would exceed regulatory limits. Mitigation measures to offset the effects would be required to reduce impacts, although long-term changes to the resource would be possible.

Table 3-1.

**PROJECT ALTERNATIVES: SUMMARY OF POTENTIAL EFFECT,
COORDINATION AND MITIGATION APPLIED**

Geology & Soils

Proposed Alternative

IMPACT: 1 - Negligible

Agency Coordination/ Permits: N/A

Mitigation/BMPs: N/A

Comments: No Impacts Identified.

Air Quality

Proposed Alternative

IMPACT: 1- Negligible

Agency Coordination/ Permits: N/A

Mitigation/BMPs: N/A

Comments: Negligible Impact.

Climate Change

Proposed Alternative

IMPACT: 1- Negligible

Agency Coordination/ Permits: N/A

Mitigation/BMPs: N/A

Comments: No Impacts Identified.

Water Quality

Proposed Alternative

IMPACT: 1 - Negligible

Agency Coordination/ Permits: N/A

Mitigation/BMPs: Best Management Practices during construction will adequately address potential water quality impacts and control the release of sediment.

Comments: No Impacts Identified.

Floodplains

Proposed Alternative

IMPACT: 1- Negligible

Agency Coordination/ Permits: N/A

Mitigation/BMPs: N/A

Comments: Site is not located within a floodplain.

Wetlands

Proposed Alternative

IMPACT: 1- Negligible

Agency Coordination/ Permits: N/A

Mitigation/BMPs: N/A

Comments: No Impacts Identified.

Threatened and Endangered Species

Proposed Alternative

IMPACT: 1- Negligible

Agency Coordination/ Permits: N/A

Mitigation/BMPs: N/A

Comments: No Impacts Identified

Historic Properties and Cultural Resources

Proposed Alternative

IMPACT: 1- Negligible

Agency Coordination/ Permits: SHPO Consulted, Concurrence Obtained

Mitigation/BMPs: Unanticipated Discoveries condition added to project grant.

Comments: No Adverse Effect.

Environmental Justice

Proposed Alternative

IMPACT: 1- Negligible

Agency Coordination/ Permits: N/A

Mitigation/BMPs: N/A

Comments: Beneficial Impacts.

Traffic Impacts

Proposed Alternative

IMPACT: 1- Negligible

Agency Coordination/ Permits: N/A

Mitigation/BMPs: N/A

Comments: Negligible impact.

Cumulative Impacts

Proposed Alternative

IMPACT: 1- Negligible

Agency Coordination/ Permits: N/A
Mitigation/BMPs: N/A
Comments: Negligible impact.

SUMMARY

The Proposed Alternative will have No to Minor Changes to resources that could be measurable, but the changes would be small and localized. Impacts would be within or below regulatory limits. Mitigation measures may be necessary to reduce potential effects.

IN THE FOLLOWING SECTION:

The *No Action Alternative* is not evaluated further since there would be no added adverse effect to the environment if this alternative were chosen.

The *Proposed Alternative* will have direct effect on the project location and is discussed further.

3.1 GEOLOGY AND SOILS

Soils at the site have been classified as “602-Urban land” (100%) by the Natural Resources Conservation Service based on observations, descriptions and transects of the area. Urban land consists of paved areas or areas of highly disturbed land. However, the land may still have some of the characteristics of the soil components that existed in the area before it was disturbed. See the soils map at Appendix A; Figure A-6.

3.1.1. Potential Impacts

The *Proposed Alternative* will have no impact to geology or soils.

3.1.2 Need for Mitigation

None identified.

3.2 AIR QUALITY

The Clean Air Act establishes National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) for six principle air pollutants. These pollutants include: Carbon Monoxide, Lead, Nitrogen Dioxide, Particulate Matter (PM) with a diameter less than or equal to ten micrometers, PM with a diameter less than 2.5 micrometers, Ozone, and Sulfur Dioxide.

3.2.1. Potential Impacts

The *Proposed Alternative* will have “below de-minimis level” effects on air quality; projected impacts were evaluated against the NAAQS. KB Environmental Sciences, Inc. concluded that vehicular emissions from a projected increase in traffic associated with the proposed facility would be below “de-minimis” levels specified in the Clean Air Act and would not likely cause or contribute to a potential Carbon Monoxide exceedance of the National Ambient Air Quality Standards; “South End Community Center Project Air Quality Report” (May 22, 2015).

3.2.2. Need for Mitigation

None identified.

3.3 CLIMATE CHANGE

The CEQ has issued a draft NEPA guidance document that encourages federal agencies to include consideration of the effects on greenhouse gas emissions and climate change in their evaluation of proposals subject to NEPA documentation (CEQ 2010).

The ***Proposed Alternative*** will only have temporary “below de-Minimis level” effects on climate change.

3.3.1 *Potential Impacts*

Given the conclusion documented by KB Environmental Services, Inc. in the “South End Community Center Project Air Quality Report” (May 22, 2015) concerning “below de-minimis level” contribution from vehicular emissions associated with a projected increase in traffic from use of the proposed facility, we conclude there would be negligible contribution to greenhouse gases and impact to climate. There may be a temporary rise in the volume of greenhouse gas due to the running of construction equipment. This volume will be temporary and low. Use of the building after construction will have no additional permanent effect on the volume or intensity of greenhouse gas emissions.

3.3.2 *Need for Mitigation*

None identified.

3.4 WATER QUALITY

The Clean Water Act provides standards and regulatory authority to control a wide variety of activities that can affect water quality, e.g. discharge of dredged or fill material, point source discharges and non-point source discharges. Regulatory authority is held by a variety of different agencies, e.g. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, U.S. Coast Guard, and U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, as determined by the type and location of an activity that may affect water quality.

The ***Proposed Alternative*** will have limited, temporary effects on water quality during construction.

3.4.1. *Potential Impacts*

Construction of the facility should have virtually no impact on water quality, e.g. from surface water runoff, as long as all applicable state and local permit conditions are followed.

3.4.2 *Need for Mitigation*

Adherence to Best Management Practices during construction will adequately address potential water quality impacts and control the release of sediment.

3.5 FLOODPLAINS

A floodplain is an area of land adjacent to a stream or river that stretches from the banks of its channel to the base of the enclosing valley walls and experiences flooding during periods of high discharge. Executive Order 11988 directs federal agencies to assume leadership in avoiding direct or indirect support of development in the 100 year floodplain.

*The **Proposed Alternative** will have no effect on floodplains.*

3.5.1 *Potential Impacts*

None; the Proposed Alternative is not in a Special Flood Hazard Area (i.e. 100-year event area). See the floodplain map in Appendix A; Figure A-4.

3.5.2 Need for Mitigation

None identified.

3.6 WETLANDS

A wetland is a land area that is saturated with water, either permanently or seasonally, such that it takes on the characteristics of a distinct ecosystem. Executive Order 11990 requires federal agencies to avoid adverse impacts to wetlands to the extent possible.

The ***Proposed Alternative*** will have no effect on wetlands.

3.6.1 Potential Impacts

None; the Proposed Alternative is not in or near a mapped wetlands area. See the wetlands map in Appendix A; Figure A-5.

3.6.2 Need for Mitigation

None identified.

3.7 THREATENED AND ENDANGERED SPECIES

The Endangered Species Act serves as the primary federal protection for species and habitat by providing a formal designation and implementing programs through which the conservation of both populations and habitats may be achieved.

A proposed endangered species, the Northern Long-eared Bat, is located statewide in Massachusetts. Habitat for this species is considered to be mines and caves in the winter and wide variety of forests in the summer. Emerson Wight Park is cleared of trees and does not contain mines or caves.

The ***Proposed Alternative*** will have no effect on threatened and endangered species.

3.7.1. Potential Impacts

No impact to federal or state listed threatened or endangered species or their habitat for the Proposed Alternative. See the USFWS Information for Planning and Conservation (IPaC) Trust Resource Report Appendix C, Figure C-1.

3.7.2 Need for Mitigation

None identified.

3.8 HISTORIC PROPERTIES AND CULTURAL RESOURCES

The National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) of 1966 defines a historic property as "any prehistoric or historic district, site, building, structure, or object included in, or eligible for inclusion on the National Register". Criteria for listing a property on the National Register of Historic Places can be found in 36 C.F.R. Part 60. Cultural properties include a broader category of physical assets, such as archaeological, architectural, and historical properties, that do not meet National Register criteria, but which may have cultural value.

As defined in the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation's (ACHP) regulations, the Area of Potential Effect (APE) for a project is defined as, the "geographic area or area within which an undertaking may directly or indirectly cause changes in the character of or use of historical properties, if any such properties exist" (36 CFR 800.16[d]). The APE is based upon the "potential" for effect, which may differ for aboveground resources (historic structures and landscapes) and subsurface resources (archaeological sites). Factors with potential to cause effects include but are not limited to; noise, vibration, visual (setting), traffic, atmosphere, construction, indirect and cumulative.

For this undertaking, the APE is be the entire boundary of Emerson Wight Park, the parcels fronting on Marble Street, the parcels immediately adjacent to the park on the southwest and the southeast, and a 50-foot buffer along the northeast side of the park. Also included in the APE will be the right-of-way for the Marble Street Extension, plus 25 feet on each side of the right-of-way, and any temporary right-of-way acquired for the project.

Emerson Wight Park is not listed in any local, state, or federal registers of historic places. It was surveyed by the Springfield Preservation Trust in May 1983. The park, established in 1908, was the first playground built under the Massachusetts Playground Act, and is associated with Springfield's recreational history. FEMA identified two (2) National Register historic districts in the vicinity of Emerson Wight Park: the Hollywood Historic District (Outing Park Historic District, NRHP #12000068), and Ames Hill/Crescent Hill Historic District (NRHP #74000368) which is also a locally designated historic district known as the Maple Hill Historic District.

Maps dating as far back as 1857 show undeveloped land at the location of Emerson Wight Park until the park's development in 1908. In 1871, the Wall and Gray map indicates the addition of Marble Street to an area labeled Crescent Hill. Atlases of 1899, 1910, and 1920 show the area's development over time, including street patterns and buildings. Historic topographical USGS maps from 1895 and 1938 also give some insight into the growth of Springfield's South End.

Emerson Wight Park is credited as being the city's first "public playground." A wading pond was built in 1917, and during the 1930s, a large swimming pool and bathhouse facilities were added. The bathhouse was located at the end of Wendell Place, where it obstructed the view looking northeast down the street toward Wight Park. Images on Google Earth indicate that this bathhouse was removed sometime between 1997 and 2001.

Over the years, various amenities added to and subtracted from the park. Currently, the park consists of a baseball diamond, playground, basketball court, swimming pool, pavilion and open space. Past amenities included a bathhouse, tennis court, and running track. Over the past several years, many facilities in the park have remained the same; the basketball court, pool, pavilion, and playground have all been in their current configuration since at least 1997.

The ***Proposed Alternative*** will have no adverse effect on historic properties and cultural resources.

3.8.1 Potential Impacts

On June 29, 2015, the Massachusetts State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) concurred on a FEMA finding of "*No Adverse Effect*" for the Proposed Alternative. See SHPO concurrence at Appendix C; Figure C-2.

3.8.2 Need for Mitigation

To address the potential for subsurface discoveries of archaeological materials and/or human remains, FEMA will place the following condition on the grant:

In the event of the discovery of archaeological materials and/or human remains, the City and their contractor shall immediately stop all work in the vicinity of the discovery and take reasonable measures to avoid or minimize harm to the finds. The City and their contractor shall secure all human remains discoveries and restrict access to discovery sites. The City and their contractor shall follow the provisions of applicable state laws, including Massachusetts General Laws Chapter 38, section 6 (Discovery of skeletal remains likely to be Native American); Chapter 9, sections 26A (State archaeologist; duties; reservation of lands from sale; cooperation of governmental agencies) & 27C (Projects; notice; adverse effect; review); and Chapter 7, section 38A (Skeletal remains; preservation; excavation; analysis), or any amendments or supplanting laws and regulations. Violation of state law will jeopardize FEMA funding for this project. The City will inform the Office of the Chief Medical Examiner (617 - 267-6767), the State Archaeologist (Brona Simon, 617-727-8470), the MEMA Public Assistance Supervisor (Scott Macleod, 508-820-1400) and the FEMA Deputy Regional Environmental Officer (Lydia Kachadoorian, 857-205-2860). FEMA will consult with the SHPO and Tribes, if remains are of tribal origin. Work in sensitive areas may not resume until consultation is completed and appropriate measures have been taken to ensure that the project is in compliance with the National Historic Preservation Act.

3.9 EXECUTIVE ORDER (EO) 12898 ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE

EO 12898 requires that federal agencies identify and address disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects on minority or low income populations posed by their activities, policies, or programs.

The **Proposed Alternative** will have a beneficial effect on minority and low income populations.

3.9.1 Potential Impacts

The Proposed Alternative will restore the function of the South End Community Center which provided programs for minority and low income populations.

3.9.2 Need for Mitigation

None identified.

3.10 TRAFFIC IMPACTS

Improvements are being designed for streets that provide access to the proposed facility location and construction is anticipated to be complete before the facility opens. Improvements include an extension to Dale Street and removal of a small section of Morris Street. Reconstruction, and extension of Ashmun Street to connect with Marble Street, is also proposed. Demolition of a housing complex and two residences has been completed to allow for the connection of Ashmun and Marble Street.

The **Proposed Alternative** will have a negligible impact on traffic density and patterns.

3.10.1 Potential Impacts

A “Traffic Impact and Access Study” (Weston & Sampson Engineers, Inc., June 2015) for the proposed alternative found that projected impact on vehicular queues at study intersections would be negligible. See Traffic Impact and Access Study at Appendix C; Figure C-3.

3.10.2 Need for Mitigation

None Identified.

3.11 CUMULATIVE EFFECTS

Cumulative effects are those that result from the incremental effect of the Proposed Alternative when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions regardless of what agency or person undertakes such other action (40 C.F.R. 1508.7).

The *Proposed Alternative* will have a negligible cumulative impacts.

3.11.1 Potential Impacts

Based on guidelines, no significant cumulative impacts would occur from the Proposed Action Alternative. While there will be some modification to the playground open space, the facility will house “replacement” all weather (enclosed) sporting facilities.

3.11.2 Need for Mitigation

None identified.

4 PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

In addition to newspaper articles that mentioned, or featured, the project, the City has engaged the public through a variety of methods from website posts to formal planning and public presentations. A partial list of the planning efforts that include Wight Emerson Park and/or the SECC is included below. See public involvement documents at Appendix C; Figure C-4.

4.1 PLANNING AND PUBLIC MEETINGS

- The South End Urban Renewal Program (2009) included Wight Emerson Park initiatives.
- The “ReBuild Springfield Foundation” was created in response to the 2011 tornado.
- “ReBuild Springfield Foundation” meetings and planning resulted in the “ReBuild Springfield Plan” which included Wight Emerson Park initiatives.
- South End Revitalization Plan (May 2014)
- The Pioneer Valley Planning Commission’s regional “Sustainable Communities” effort.

4.2 PUBLIC ACCESS TO DRAFT DOCUMENTS AND COMMENTS PROVIDED

On [INSERT DATE], electronic copies of the Draft Environmental Assessment and a Draft Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) were made available for viewing online on FEMA’s website: <http://www.fema.gov/resource-document-library>.

On [INSERT DATE], these draft documents were made available for viewing online on the City’s website: <http://www3.springfield-ma.gov/cos/>.

On [INSERT DATE], hard/paper copies of these draft documents were made available for viewing in-person at the City of Springfield Office of Procurement located at Springfield City Hall, 36 Court Street Room 307, Springfield, MA 01103, Monday through Friday 8:15AM-4:30 PM.

On [INSERT DATE] the City of Springfield provided initial written notice to the public of draft document availability through announcement in [INSERT NAME OF LOCAL NEWSPAPER]. The notice of availability was also published on two subsequent days after the initial written notice in an effort to reach a wider audience.

The public comment period for the draft documents lasted for a period of 15 days from [INSERT INITIAL NEWSPAPER PUBLICATION DATE] until [INSERT DATE 15 DAYS FROM NEWSPAPER PUBLICATION DATE].

FEMA received [the following/no] comments from the public on the content of these documents. [IF COMMENTS WERE RECEIVED, FEMA WILL ACCOUNT FOR THE COMMENTS AND PROVIDE RESPONSES].

5 CONCLUSIONS

No significant impacts were identified during FEMA's analysis or during the public comment period. FEMA has updated the EA per comments received by FEMA Regional Counsel on [INSERT DATE]. The Agency has determined that it is reasonable to issue a FONSI with specific conditions for the Proposed Alternative. See Appendix D for a copy of the FONSI signed by Lydia Kachadoorian, Deputy Regional Environmental Officer on [INSERT DATE]. The conditions included in the FONSI will be added to FEMA's Record of Environmental Consideration (REC), which shall be provided to the City of Springfield as part of the grant award package. All of the conditions in the REC and FONSI will become conditions of this FEMA Public Assistance grant; the City of Springfield will be required to comply with these conditions in order to secure and maintain funding eligibility. Compliance with this conditions will be verified during grant close-out in conjunction with MEMA and the City.

FEMA has posted a copy of the final EA on its website at <http://www.fema.gov/resource-document-library>.

6 LIST OF PREPARERS

This document was prepared & edited by the following FEMA Region 1 staff:

David Robbins, Regional Environmental Officer
Lydia Kachadoorian, Deputy Regional Environmental Officer
Marcus Tate, Environmental Protection Specialist

7 REFERENCES

EO 11988. Executive Order No. 11988. Floodplain Management, May 24, 1977. 42 C.F.R. 26951.

EO 11990. Executive Order No. 11990. Protection of Wetlands, May 24, 1977. 42 C.F.R. 2691.

EO 12898. Executive Order No. 12898. Environmental Justice for Low Income and Minority

Populations. 1994. 59 C.F.R. 7629.

FEMA, 2010. Federal Emergency Management Agency Flood Insurance Maps, available online at: https://msc.fema.gov/webapp/wcs/stores/servlet/info?storeId=10001&catalogId=10001&langId=-1&content=firnetteHelp_A&title=FIRMettes

South End Community Center Traffic Impact and Access Study, Weston and Sampson Engineers, Inc., WSE Project No. 2140023, June 2015

South End Community Center Project Air Quality Report, KB Environmental Services, Inc. (for Weston & Sampson Engineers, Inc., May 22, 2015

South End Community Center Preliminary Program and Site Analysis, Timothy Murphy Architects, Holyoke & Justin Pope Frazier LLC, Northampton, February 11, 2013

8 APPENDICES

Appendix A Maps and Figures

- Figure A-1 Topographic Map
- Figure A-2 Area of Potential Effect Map
- Figure A-3 Project Location Map & Design Plans
- Figure A-4 Floodplain Insurance Rate Map
- Figure A-5 Wetlands Map
- Figure A-6 NRCS Soils Map

Appendix B Site Photographs

Appendix C Permits and Other Supporting Documents

- Figure C-1 USFWS Federally Listed Species
- Figure C-2 SHPO Consultation & Concurrence
- Figure C-3 Traffic Impact Study
- Figure C-4 Public Involvement Documents

Appendix D Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI)