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NAME OF ACTION
The proposed action includes both the purchase of a 5.8-acre property and subsequent use of the property (with existing improvements) as a new Recycling Center for the Federal Law Enforcement Training Centers (FLETC). Therefore, this Environmental Assessment (EA) will assess potential impacts from the Federal acquisition of the property and from operation of a Recycling Center on this property.

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED ACTION
The proposed real estate acquisition is needed for a Recycling Center for operations and maintenance activities at FLETC. The subject property is privately owned by F and F Properties LLC, as part of the Glynco Industrial Park. In the 1984 to 1988 timeframe, the existing warehouse complex was built and has since been used by various businesses for general warehouse related activities. After property acquisition, a security fence would be extended from the adjacent FLETC boundary to incorporate this property into the FLETC enclave. This security fence would provide secure and controlled access to the new Recycling Center and 24 hour surveillance.

There would be no substantial increase or decrease in employment or change in impacts to the local community. The proposed action would avert new construction that would be required for a Recycling Center on the FLETC campus. Since the proposed action involves use of an existing and relatively modern facility, it would save a large Federal investment for siting, designing, and building a new facility. The proposed Recycling Center would be expected to improve the overall environmental quality of operations at the FLETC.

The land and existing facilities (warehouse, office space, paved areas) would be used for a Recycling Center without any major demolition activities. The conversion of existing improvements into a Recycling Center would not require any encroachment or clearing of undeveloped areas of this property. The proposed land use would remain light industrial; therefore, no change in land use would occur from this project.

ALTERNATIVES
In the initial evaluation of alternatives, the FLETC took into consideration specific selection criteria. Only those alternatives that met these criteria were considered suitable for detailed analysis. The selection criteria were:

- conformity to all Federal and state laws and regulations;
- technical feasibility;
- logistical feasibility;
- cost efficiency/budget constraints; and
- environmental compliance and conformity.
Due to a lack of adverse environmental impacts identified from the proposed action, only two alternatives were considered and assessed.

ANTICIPATED ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS
The analysis of the proposed action in the attached EA did not indicate any adverse impacts to the environment. Specifically, no significant adverse effects are anticipated from the proposed action on threatened and endangered species, jurisdictional wetlands, or cultural resources from the proposed action. However, the EA did identify beneficial impacts to land use on the subject property and cost savings from project implementation.

MITIGATION
The attached National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) evaluation did not identify any significant adverse impacts from implementation of the proposed action. Therefore, separate mitigation measures are not warranted for this project.

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT
The EA for this project was prepared and evaluated pursuant to NEPA (Public Law 91-190, 42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.) and the Department of Homeland Security’s (DHS) Environmental Planning Program (Federal Register, Volume 71, No. 64; dated April 4, 2006). The EA concluded that the proposed action does not constitute a “major Federal action significantly affecting the quality of the human environment” when considered individually or cumulatively in the context of the referenced act including both direct and indirect impacts; therefore, an Environmental Impact Statement is not required.

PUBLIC/AGENCY COMMENT
The EA and Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) has been coordinated with appropriate parties having an interest in the project. In addition, a Public Notice of Availability (NOA) has been published in the Brunswick News, announcing the availability of the Draft EA. To date, there have not been any comments received that were averse to the proposed action. Coordination with all appropriate parties is detailed in Section 6.0 and Appendix C of the EA.

POINT OF CONTACT
Comments and inquiries for further information about this EA and FONSI should be directed to Mr. Mark Harvison, Lead Environmental Protection Specialist, Federal Law Enforcement Training Centers, 1131 Chapel Crossing Road, Glynnco, Georgia 31524; telephone number (912) 267-3484.

Reviewed and Approved by:

Bryan R. Lemons
Deputy Assistant Director
Mission and Readiness Support Directorate
Federal Law Enforcement Training Centers

9/12/16
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1 Proposed Action

1.1 Background

The Federal Law Enforcement Training Centers (FLETC) is the nation’s leading organization for interagency training of Federal law enforcement personnel. Its mission is to provide high quality, cost-effective training to Federal law enforcement officers and agents. Approximately 81 Federal agencies participate in training at FLETC, a component of the Department of Homeland Security (DHS). In addition, state and local law enforcement agencies from all 50 states, U.S. Territories, and some foreign countries train and re-qualify at the FLETC facilities.

The Center is headquartered at the Glynco, Georgia facility, near the port city of Brunswick, halfway between Savannah, Georgia, and Jacksonville, Florida. In addition to the Glynco facility, the FLETC operates two other residential training sites in Artesia, New Mexico, and Charleston, South Carolina. The FLETC also operates an in-service re-qualification training facility in Cheltenham, Maryland, for use by agencies with large concentrations of personnel in the Washington, DC, area.

The FLETC has oversight and program management responsibility for the International Law Enforcement Academy (ILEA) in Gaborone, Botswana; San Salvador, El Salvador; and Lima, Peru. FLETC also supports training at other ILEAs in Hungary and Thailand.

The DHS Strategic Plan is used to ensure coordinated actions to prepare for and prevent terrorism to protect the United States and its interests abroad. Consolidation of law enforcement training permits the Federal Government to provide training excellence in a cost-effective manner. Professional instruction and practical application provide students with the skills and knowledge necessary to meet the demanding challenges of a Federal law enforcement career. Personnel learn the responsibilities of a law enforcement officer, and, through interaction with students from other Federal agencies, also become acquainted with the missions and duties of their colleagues. This interaction within the FLETC campus provides the foundation for a more cooperative Federal law enforcement effort.

This Environmental Assessment (EA) follows the guidelines and regulations established by the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA). This EA documents the analyses that were conducted of the environmental impacts that would result from implementation of the proposed action and alternatives. This EA also discusses any mitigation and permit requirements, and findings and conclusions in accordance with NEPA. Such information provides the basis for DHS to determine whether to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) or a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI). The use of the term “significant” (and derivations thereof) in this EA is consistent with the definition and guidelines provided in the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) regulations [40 Code of
Federal Regulations (CFR) 1508.27], which require consideration of both the context and intensity of impacts.

### 1.2 Description of the Proposed Action

The proposed action includes both the purchase of a 5.8-acre property and subsequent use of the property (with existing improvements) as a new Recycling Center for the FLETC. Therefore, this EA will assess potential impacts from the Federal acquisition of the property and from operation of a Recycling Center on this property.

The proposed real estate acquisition is needed for a Recycling Center for operations and maintenance activities at FLETC. The subject property is privately owned by F and F Properties LLC, as part of the Glynco Industrial Park. In the 1984 to 1988 timeframe, the existing warehouse complex was built and has since been used by various businesses for general warehouse related activities. After property acquisition, a security fence would be extended from the adjacent FLETC boundary to incorporate this property into the FLETC enclave. This security fence would provide secure and controlled access to the new Recycling Center and 24 hour surveillance. The proposed land use would remain light industrial; therefore, no change in land use would occur from this project.

The land and existing facilities (warehouse, office space, paved areas) would be used for a Recycling Center without any major demolition activities. The conversion of existing improvements into a Recycling Center would not require any encroachment or clearing of undeveloped areas of this property. The Recycling Center would be used for sorting, consolidation, and packaging of recyclable materials (e.g. paper, plastics, and cardboard) prior to their transport from the FLETC campus. Approximately 3 to 5 FLETC personnel would staff the facility during operating hours, which would be core FLETC operations hours (6am to 6pm; Monday through Friday).

There would be no substantial increase or decrease in employment or change in impacts to the local community. The proposed action would avert new construction that would be required for a Recycling Center on the FLETC campus. Since the proposed action involves use of an existing and relatively modern facility, it would save a large Federal investment for siting, designing, and building a new facility. The proposed Recycling Center would be expected to improve the overall environmental quality of operations at the FLETC.

### 1.3 Need for the Proposed Action

The proposed real estate acquisition is needed for a Recycling Center for operations and maintenance activities at the FLETC. Without the proposed action, a new Recycling Center would be constructed on campus. New construction would require a large expenditure of funds for siting, designing, and building a new facility. In addition, new construction may involve damage or loss to resources such as wetlands, timber, vegetation, cultural and historic resources, etc. The proposed action would improve the overall environmental quality of operations at the FLETC.
1.4 Location of the Proposed Action

The FLETC Glynco campus is located in Glynn County in southeast Georgia and consists of 1,620 acres, which was formerly part of the 4,200-acre Glynco Naval Air Station (NAS). This FLETC campus is mostly developed land consisting of student dormitories, classrooms, office and warehouse space, firing ranges, driving courses, and roads. The remaining undeveloped portion of the campus is primarily wetlands (188 acres) and timberland (natural and planted pine plantation).

The subject property consists of an approximate 5.8-acre property is situated adjacent to the FLETC northeast boundary line (Appendix A; Figures 1 and 2). The topography of the subject property ranges from elevation 11 to 14 feet NAVD 88 at the following coordinates: Coordinates: Latitude 31 degrees, 14.9 minutes N seconds; Longitude 81 degrees, 27.3 minutes W seconds.
2 Description of the Proposed Alternatives

In the initial evaluation of alternatives, DHS considered the following specific selection criteria:

- conformity to all Federal and state laws and regulations;
- technical feasibility;
- logistical feasibility;
- cost efficiency/budget constraints; and
- environmental compliance and conformity.

Only those alternatives that met all of these criteria were considered suitable for detailed analysis. Due to a lack of adverse environmental impacts identified from the proposed action, only two alternatives were considered and assessed.

2.1 No-Action Alternative

The CEQ regulations for NEPA require inclusion of a No Action Alternative as the benchmark against which proposed Federal actions are evaluated. Under the No Action Alternative, the proposed acquisition of the 5.8-acre parcel and subsequent use for a Recycling Center would not occur. In this scenario, a new Recycling Center would be constructed on the FLETC campus to meet the requirement for recycling.

Prior to discovery of the availability of the subject property, the FLETC had planned to build a new Recycling Facility on campus. However, this alternative would be much more costly ($1.2 million) compared to the preferred alternative of acquiring the subject property and utilizing the existing facilities.

New construction would require a large expenditure of funds for siting, designing, and building a new facility. In addition, since this alternative would require finding a suitable site for construction, it may involve damage or loss to cultural and/or historic resources and natural resources such as wetlands, timber, vegetation, etc.

2.2 Proposed Action at the Fogelman Property (Preferred Alternative)

The FLETC is proposing to acquire the subject property and use the site for a Recycling Center. The FLETC plans to use the existing facilities for the Recycling Center without any associated major new construction or demolition activities. The land use for the proposed action would remain light industrial; therefore, no change in land use would occur from this project.

There would be no substantial increase or decrease in employment or change in impacts to the local community. The proposed action would avert new construction that would be
required for a Recycling Center on campus. The new construction for a Recycling Center is estimated to cost 1.2 million dollars. Therefore, this alternative would save a large Federal investment for siting, designing, and building a new facility. The proposed Recycling Center would be expected to improve the overall environmental quality of operations at the FLETC.
3 Affected Environment

This chapter describes the surrounding area associated with the alternative actions, and the condition of the existing environment at the location of the proposed action. The characterization of existing conditions provides a baseline for assessing the potential environmental impacts from activities associated with the proposed action. A general overall description is followed by information concerning significant resources that would be affected by implementing any of the alternatives. This discussion does not include information on all significant resources of the study area, since many of these would not be impacted by alternatives under consideration.

3.1 Physiographic Setting

The proposed project is located in Glynn County, Georgia, one of the southernmost counties in the State. Glynn County falls within Georgia's coastal zone, and more specifically the Barrier Island Sequence physiographic district. The Barrier Island Sequence covers 1,405,533.6 hectares, or 15.1 percent of Georgia (Elliott and Sassman 1995). The area is comprised of marshes, tidal creeks, lagoons, islands, mainland coast and maritime forests. This physiographic region developed over a period of time as a result of fluctuating sea levels that created a series of shorelines. As the water level changed, a new shoreline, or terrace, formed that was lower and more easterly than the previous one. The older shorelines are visible today as sand ridges, while the younger shorelines comprise the coastal islands (USDA 1980).

Glynn County is situated within the Altamaha River watershed that is comprised of the Altamaha, Ocmulgee, Oconee, and Ohoopee Rivers. The Altamaha watershed covers the largest area in the State, and its waters drain into the Atlantic Ocean.

The FLETC Glynco campus is located three miles north of Brunswick, Georgia. The climate is mild with hot humid summers and abundant yearly rainfall. Brief frost and freeze events occur in winter. Snowfall is rare, occurring on average less than once per year.

3.2 Groundwater

The most productive aquifers in Georgia are in the Coastal Plain Province in the southern part of the state. Coastal plain aquifers are generally confined, except near their northern limits, where they crop out or are near land surface. Aquifers in the Coastal Plain Province include the Floridan aquifer system and the Brunswick aquifer systems.

The Floridan aquifer system has been divided into the Upper and Lower Floridan Aquifers. The Upper Floridan is the aquifer of choice in the coastal area because it lies at a relatively shallow depth of 40-900 feet, has high water-yielding capabilities (1000-5000 gallons per minute), and yields water of good quality. This aquifer supplies 50 percent of the groundwater used in Georgia. Because of concerns about the high withdrawal rates, the Georgia Department of
Natural Resources has limited pumping levels from the Floridan aquifer and restricts new withdrawals from that aquifer.

The Lower Floridan Aquifer contains highly permeable zones; however use is limited by the excessive depth and poor water quality. In the southern part of Georgia, the Lower Floridan Aquifer contains an extremely permeable water-bearing zone called the Fernandina permeable zone. The Fernandina permeable zone contains highly saline water in the southern part of coastal Georgia, and is the source of saltwater contamination in the Brunswick area.

Overlying the Floridan Aquifer are the sandy upper and lower Brunswick Aquifers, which are present mostly in the Glynn County area. This aquifer, which is at a depth of 85-390 feet is not a major source of water in coastal Georgia, but considered a supplemental water supply to the Floridan Aquifer. Most wells are multi-aquifer, tapping the upper and lower Brunswick aquifers and the Upper Floridan Aquifer. The common yield range is 10-30 gallons per minute. The Brunswick aquifers supply water for irrigation, public, and some industry use.

The Surficial Aquifer, which overlies the Brunswick Aquifers, is present throughout the coastal area. The Surficial Aquifer has a common range of 11-72 feet in depth and supplies water mostly for domestic and small-scale irrigation uses. The common range for yield is 2-25 gallons per minute. Based on topographic maps, surficial and groundwater flow on the subject property appears to be directed southeast (USGS 1979 and USGS 1993).

### 3.3 Natural Resources

The 1620-acre FLETC Glynco campus is mostly developed and consists of student dormitories, classrooms, office and warehouse space, firing ranges, driving courses and roads. The remaining undeveloped portion of the campus is primarily wetlands (198 acres) and timberland (natural and planted pine).

One acre of the subject 5.8-acre tract is developed, and the remaining 4.8 acres is undeveloped pine forest (Appendix A; Figures 2 and 3) that has never been developed (USACE 2016c).

### 3.3.1 Jurisdictional Waters/Floodplains

**Floodplains:** The site of the proposed action is not located within the 100-year floodplain [Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) 2006]. The subject site is relatively level ranging from elevation 11 to 14 feet NAVD 88 and contains no surface water bodies. The vicinity is gently sloped land draining to the southeast. Therefore, there is no significant potential for flooding on this site.

**Jurisdictional Waters of the United States:** There are no wetlands located within the project impact area and the site has been impacted from the extensive construction of canals in the area. The developed portion of the site currently consists of mowed grass with paved areas associated with the warehouse.
3.3.2 Soils

Elevations on the site range from an elevation of 11 to 14 feet NAVD 88. On inspection, the developed portion of the property was observed to be mostly mowed grass with some pavement and relatively flat across its entire expanse. According to the Soil Survey of Camden and Glynn Counties by the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) (USDA 2016), the subject property includes two primary soil types, as described below:

- **Mandarin Fine Sand** - Poorly drained soil with rapid permeability and low available water capacity. The water table is commonly at depths from 18 to 40 inches below land surface (BLS).

- **Rutlege Fine Sand** - Very poorly drained hydric soil (USACE 1991) frequently flooded with high available water capacity. The water table for this soil type is commonly at depths from 0 to 6 inches below BLS (USDA 2014). However, this site is atypical and has good drainage due to extensive construction of canals in the area (USACE 2016c).

A customized soil map (USDA 2016) for the subject property is below.
Custom Soil Map
3.4 Protected Species

Threatened and Endangered Species Surveys
In the last two decades, numerous surveys for State and Federally protected species have been conducted in the vicinity of the proposed action. In 1995, Mr. Charles Seyle, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), and Ms. Robin Goodloe (USFWS), surveyed the site and vicinity of the new Alcohol, Tobacco, and Firearms (ATF) Facility (USACE 2000b) and concluded that there was no available habitat for protected species.

Numerous other surveys within the last few years have been conducted on the FLETC property by USACE staff near the site of this proposed action. Protected species surveys for the following projects have been completed in the vicinity of the proposed project site:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROJECT NAME</th>
<th>PROJECT NAME</th>
<th>PROJECT NAME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

These EAs have not revealed the presence of any protected species at the FLETC. An investigation of this project’s impact area (USACE 2016b) indicates that there is no suitable habitat for any listed protected species. The project impact area is within the developed area of the existing warehouse. Specifically, there were no gopher tortoise burrows, which are a primary habitat requirement for the indigo snake; and neither species has ever been sighted at the FLETC. The project impact area is mostly paved with some cleared areas consisted of mowed grass.

On September 21, 2001, Dr. Gregg Masson (USFWS Field Supervisor), Ms. Kathleen Morgan, and Ms. Susan Shaw of FLETC discussed the programmatic exclusion of the FLETC from further Section 7 coordination under NEPA. During this conference call, the
above parties agreed that there was no critical habitat or protected species on the FLETC, and therefore, no need for coordination with the USFWS (Masson 2001) for proposed actions at FLETC. Subsequently, during a phone conversation between the FLETC and USFWS staff on November 22, 2002, it was decided that the agreement should be amended to not include wood storks (*Mycteria americana*) in the exemption from further coordination.

The USFWS was contacted on July 14, 2006 (USFWS 2006) to ensure the 2002 agreement was still relevant. Mr. Robert Brooks confirmed the agreement via e-mail (Appendix C-7) stating that further coordination is not needed if there are no endangered or threatened species using the area (USFWS 2006). A 2016 site investigation (USACE 2016b) did not reveal evidence of any listed protected species or their habitat within the impact area of the project. The canals and ditches nearby could possibly be used as foraging habitat by the wood storks; however, these areas would not be impacted by the proposed action.

A complete list of endangered and threatened species for Glynn County from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) is enclosed in Appendix B. The species that have potential for occurrence at FLETC (or migration into the vicinity) are detailed below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Listing Status</th>
<th>Type</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Species</strong></td>
<td><strong>Federal</strong></td>
<td><strong>State</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ball-moss (<em>Tillandsia recurvata</em>)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Threatened</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pondspice (<em>Litsea aestivalis</em>)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Threatened</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern indigo snake (<em>Drymarchon corais couperi</em>)</td>
<td>Threatened</td>
<td>Threatened</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood stork (<em>Mycteria americana</em>)</td>
<td>Threatened</td>
<td>Threatened</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red-cockaded woodpecker (<em>Picoides borealis</em>)</td>
<td>Endangered</td>
<td>Endangered</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ball-moss (*Tillandsia recurvata*) Family: Bromeliaceae (Air Plant Family)**
This epiphytic perennial herb is sometimes found persisting on fallen limbs. Plants are 4–23 cm tall when in flower, with densely bunched stems, resembling loose “balls of moss”. This species is found mostly on the branches of live oak (Quercus virginiana) in Georgia, (especially near the coast) in urban or more natural settings (e.g. evergreen hammocks and swamp forests). There is no suitable habitat for this species on the site of the proposed action; and there is no record of this species’ occurrence at the FLETC.

**Pond Spice (Litsea aestivalis) Family: Lauraceae (Laurel Family)**

This deciduous shrub grows up to three meters tall and is found on margins of swamps, cypress ponds, sandhill depression ponds, and in hardwood swamps. There is no suitable habitat for this species on the site of the proposed action. There is no recent record of this species’ occurrence at FLETC.
Red-cockaded Woodpecker (*Picoides borealis*)

The wooded portions of the FLETC campus would provide only marginal foraging habitat for this species. There is no recent record of this species’ occurrence at the FLETC, and the nearest colonies are on Fort Stewart (approximately 60 miles to the north) and Okefenokee National Wildlife Refuge (approximately 60 miles to the southwest). No evidence for the presence of this species has been observed in the vicinity of this site.

Eastern Indigo Snake (*Drymarchon corais couperi*)

The eastern indigo snake is a large, docile, non-poisonous snake growing to a maximum length of about eight feet. This species is currently known to occur throughout Florida and in the coastal plain of Georgia. Historically, the range also included southern Alabama, southern Mississippi, and the extreme southeastern portion of South Carolina. The indigo snake seems to be strongly associated with high, dry, well-drained sandy soils, which closely...
parallels the sandhill habitat preferred by the gopher tortoise (*Gopherus polyphemus*). During warmer months, indigos also frequent streams and swamps, and individuals are occasionally found in flat woods. Gopher tortoise burrows and other subterranean cavities are commonly used as dens and for egg laying.

The decline in this species is attributed to a loss of habitat due to farming, construction, forestry, pasture, etc., and to over-collecting for the pet trade. The snake’s large size and docile nature have made it much sought after as a pet. The effects of rattlesnake roundups on the indigo snake are speculative. Both indigos and rattlers utilize the burrows of gopher tortoises at certain times. Rattlesnake hunters often pour gasoline down these burrows to drive out the snakes. While some indigos may be killed by this practice, the actual degree of impact on the population is unknown.

Neither this species, nor the gopher tortoise (with which this species has a communal relationship with), has ever been observed at the FLETC; nor is there any suitable habitat for this species on the site of the proposed action.

**Wood Stork (*Mycteria americana*)**
Wood storks are the largest wading birds that breed in North America; they nest up to 60 feet off the ground (in cypress, blackgum, southern willow, and buttonbush trees) in wetland areas of Georgia, South Carolina and Florida. Only three other species in the world are similar to wood storks; two live in Southeast Asia and one in Africa. Wood storks are large, long-legged wading birds, about 50 inches tall, with a wingspan of 60 to 65 inches.

**Habitat:** Storks are birds of freshwater and brackish wetlands, primarily nesting in cypress or mangrove swamps. They feed in freshwater marshes, narrow tidal creeks, ditches, or flooded tidal pools. Particularly attractive feeding sites are depressions in marshes or swamps where fish become concentrated during periods of falling water levels. There is no suitable foraging or nesting habitat for this species on the site of the proposed action (USACE 2016b)

### 3.5 Cultural Resources

Previous research and survey in and around the FLETC has shown a moderate density of cultural resources associated with prehistoric and historic timeframes. Research of the Georgia Archaeological Site Files revealed a total of seven archaeological sites within a one mile radius of the project area. Two of the sites have been determined ineligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places; the remaining five sites have unknown eligibility. None of the sites are located within the land to be acquired.
One building is located within one of the tracts that will be acquired. The metal frame building is used as a warehouse and was constructed in the 1980s.

### Table 1. Cultural resources within a 1-mile radius

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Type</th>
<th>Site Name</th>
<th>NRHP Eligibility</th>
<th>Within Land to be Acquired</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prehistoric House/Shell Midden/Artifact Scatter</td>
<td>Thornhill Creek A</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prehistoric Isolated Artifact</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Ineligible</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Artifact Scatter</td>
<td>Bachelor's Redoubt</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Artifact Scatter</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Road Bed</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Ineligible</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>House or Structure</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historic Cemetery</td>
<td>Brunswick Memorial Park Cemetery</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 3.6 Hazardous Materials

The proposed project area lies within the boundary of the former 4,200-acre Glynco NAS. The NAS operated from 1942 until 1974 when the Department of Defense decommissioned the station. After the air station closed, the property was subdivided into large parcels transferred to the Department of Treasury (1525 acres), Glynn County (over 2000 acres for the current Glynco Airport), the Glynn County Development Authority (354 acres); and smaller parcels were transferred to other entities. The FLETC and the Glynco Airport contain remnants of the former NAS. These two tracts, when transferred in the 1970s, contained all of the buildings and structures (landing mats, runways, etc.) of the NAS.

Site investigations in 1989 and 2000 under the Defense Environmental Restoration Program - For Formerly Used Defense Sites (DERP-FUDS) (USACE 1989 and 2000d) on the former Glynco Naval Air Station did not identify any hazardous materials on or near the site of the proposed project or site vicinity.

An Environmental Baseline Survey (EBS) conducted in 2016 (USACE 2016c) determined that the subject property has not had any incidents related to environmental liabilities. This EBS also concluded that the subject property meets the criteria for a Category 1 Environmental Condition of Property (ECOP). A Category 1 ECOP is the classification for properties that have no history of releases or disposal of hazardous or petroleum substances (including no migration of these substances from adjacent areas). Property category codes
are used to indicate the degree of contamination that is associated with properties prior to a real estate transfer. In accordance with ASTM Standard D 5746 - 98 (ASTM 2002), it is permissible to proceed with a planned real estate transaction if a property falls within ECOP categories 1 through 4. Therefore, no further action is recommended for DHS to proceed with the proposed real estate action.

3.7 Coastal Zone Management

The State of Georgia’s mission in administering the Coastal Zone Management (CZM) Program is aimed at balancing economic development in Georgia’s coastal zone with preservation of natural, environmental, historic, archaeological, and recreational resources for the benefit of future residents. The CZM Program complies with the Coastal Zone Management Act (16 U.S.C. 1451 et seq.) and includes Glynn County along with ten other coastal counties in Georgia.

Construction projects are also subject to consistency with the Shore Protection Act (O.C.G.A. 2-5-230, et seq.) and the Coastal Marshlands Protection Act (O.C.G.A. 12-5-280, et seq.) if there are impacts to tidal wetlands or shoreline features. The site of the proposed action is within the jurisdiction of the Georgia CZM program, but it is not located within or adjacent to tidal waters or the shoreline.

3.8 Traffic Circulation/Campus Security

Due to security concerns, all non-commercial traffic entering and exiting the FLETC is restricted to two gates. In emergency evacuations, additional side gates may be opened to facilitate evacuations. Currently, there are no existing traffic circulation issues on the FLETC campus or in the vicinity of the proposed action (Fife 2015).

Day-to-day maintenance and operations conducted by the FLETC are performed in accordance with Public Law (PL) 91-596, Occupational Health and Safety Act of 1970; 29 CFR Part 1960, Safety and Health Provision for Federal Employees; Executive Order (EO) 12196, Occupational Safety and Health of Federal Employees; and Homeland Security Directive 70-75, Safety Policy of the Center. The FLETC has a Safety Program that addresses both safety and occupational health concerns for facilities, storage, and handling of materials and munitions, driver training activities, fire response, and firearms training.

3.9 Air Quality

Air quality at any given location is a function of several factors, including quantity and dispersion rates of pollutants, local climate, topographic and geographic features, and also windblown dust and wildfires. Air pollution can threaten the health of human beings, animals, plants, lakes; as well as damage the ozone layer and buildings, and cause haze that reduces visibility.
The Clean Air Act of 1970, as amended, has established air quality standards for the U.S. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has set six National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) that regulate six pollutants: carbon monoxide (CO), lead (Pb), nitrogen oxide (NOₓ), ozone (O₃), sulfur dioxide (SO₂), and particulate matter (PM₂.₅ and PM₁₀). Geographic areas have been officially designated by EPA as being in attainment or non-attainment for air quality based on an area’s compliance with the NAAQS. Brunswick is currently in attainment for the NAAQS for all criteria pollutants (GADNR EPD 2016).

3.10 Land Use

The 1620-acre Glynco campus is mostly developed and consists of student dormitories, classrooms, office and warehouse space, firing ranges, driving courses and roads. The remaining undeveloped portion of the campus is primarily forested wetlands (198 acres) and timberland (natural and planted pine). Much of this undeveloped forested land lies along the perimeter of the FLETC campus and provides a buffer for adjacent residential communities from visual and noise impacts of campus training activities.

The subject property is privately owned by F and F Properties LLC, as part of the Glynco Industrial Park. In the 1984 to 1988 timeframe, a 16,824 square foot Warehouse/Office Complex was built and has since been used by various businesses for general warehouse related activities. Most of the 5.8-acre property (4.8 acres) is undeveloped and heavily wooded. There have not been any other development activities at the subject site throughout its history (USACE 2016c).

The property has been leased since 2012 by Troy Acoustics Corporation for the storage and distribution of firing range acoustics. Under the proposed action, land use would not change, as the existing warehouse facility would be utilized for the FLETC Recycling Center.
4 Environmental Impacts

This chapter discusses the potential environmental impacts of the preferred site of the proposed action, including potential short-term or long-term impacts associated with the implementation of this alternative. A foreseeable effect is defined as possible modification in the existing environment brought about by some activity. It is also important to note that impacts may be beneficial or adverse.

4.1 Natural Resources

The conversion of existing improvements into a Recycling Center would not require any encroachment or clearing of undeveloped areas of this property. Therefore, there would be no expected adverse impacts to natural resources from this project.

4.2 Floodplains/Jurisdictional Waters of the United States

This proposed action would not impact jurisdictional wetlands or floodplains, as none are located within the project impact area. Operation of the new facility would not involve activities that would impact wetlands that may lie outside of the property.

4.3 Protected Species

Based on the completed surveys for protected species and habitat previously described in Section 3.4, the project impact area and vicinity are not expected to contain any listed species or critical habitat. Consequently, the proposed action is not likely to adversely affect any protected species.

4.4 Cultural Resources

The proposed action would not impact historic properties or other cultural resources as none are located within the project area. One metal-frame building is located within the land to be acquired. The National Register Criteria for Evaluation exclude properties that achieved significance within the past 50 years unless they are of exceptional importance. This warehouse is not of exceptional importance on the local, state, or national level. The modifications that are required to convert the warehouse to use as a Recycle Center would have no effect on historic properties as the warehouse is less than 50-years old and is not of exceptional importance.

4.5 Hazardous Materials

Since existing facilities would be used on the property, there would not be any hazardous materials generated from the construction activities, and there would not be any hazardous materials generated or stored from operation of the proposed Recycling Center. Positive impacts to human health or safety may occur from improvements to the recycling program at the FLETC. In regard to this issue, there have been no adverse impacts identified in this study from the proposed action.
4.6 Social and Economic Issues

There would be no increase or decrease in employment or change in impacts to the local community from the proposed action. The proposed action would avert new construction that would be required for a Recycling Center on campus. The new construction for a Recycling Center has been estimated to cost 1.2 million dollars. Therefore, since the proposed action involves use of an existing and relatively modern facility, it would result in cost savings from the investment of a large expenditure of Federal funds for siting, designing, and building a new facility. The proposed Recycling Center would be expected to improve the overall environmental quality of operations at the FLETC.

4.7 Coastal Zone Management

Since the impacts of this project would not be within or adjacent to tidal waters or the shoreline, there are no likely impacts to coastal resources. Therefore, this proposed action would be consistent with Georgia’s CZM policies.

4.8 Traffic Circulation/Campus Security

The proposed use of the subject property as a Recycling Center would result in only a few vehicles accessing the property each day and would be similar to the previous use by past tenants of the property. After property acquisition, a security fence would be extended from the adjacent FLETC boundary to incorporate this property into the FLETC enclave. This security fence would provide secure and controlled access to the new Recycling Center and 24 hour surveillance. Therefore, the proposed action would not result in any adverse impacts in regard to campus security or traffic circulation within the vicinity.

4.9 Air Quality

The volume and frequency of vehicular activity in the site vicinity from this proposed action would be similar to the previous use by existing and past tenants of the property. The recycling operations would not generate any air emissions that would exceed levels associated with light commercial activity. Vehicles used for recycling operations would be maintained according to FLETC standards.

Brunswick is currently in attainment for the NAAQS for all criteria pollutants (GADNR-EPD 2016). Therefore, operation of the proposed Recycling Center would not be expected to contribute to a change in this designation.

4.10 Land Use

The proposed land use of the subject property as a Recycling Center would result in only a few vehicles accessing the property each day and would be similar to the previous use by past tenants of the property. By using the existing warehouse facility, the proposed action would avert new construction that would be required for a Recycling Center on the FLETC campus. Since the
proposed action involves use of the existing warehouse facility without major changes, the land use of the property would continue unchanged from past use.

After property acquisition, a security fence would be extended from the adjacent FLETC boundary to incorporate this property into the FLETC enclave. This security fence would provide secure and controlled access to the new Recycling Center and 24 hour surveillance. The proposed Recycling Center would be expected to improve the overall environmental quality of operations at FLETC.

Therefore, the proposed action is not expected to result in any adverse impacts to land use.

4.11 Noise/Aesthetic Impacts
The volume and frequency of vehicular activity in the site vicinity would be similar to the operations of past tenants at the existing warehouse facility. The recycling operations will not generate any noise that would exceed levels associated with light commercial activity. Vehicles used for recycling operations would be maintained according to FLETC standards. Therefore, no adverse impacts are expected in regard to this issue on campus or off-campus from this project.

4.12 Environmental Justice - Executive Order 12898
The alternatives considered involve locations within industrial areas or areas of high security with restricted access (FLETC campus), which are outside of where minority/low income populations reside. In addition, the nature of the proposed land use (recycling center) would not be expected to have any effect on minority or low-income populations. Therefore, minority or low-income populations would not be expected to be disproportionately affected by the alternatives under consideration; and the preferred alternative would be in compliance with Executive Order 12898 on Environmental Justice.

4.13 Environmental Health and Safety of Children - Executive Order 12045
Children would not be expected to be in the vicinity of the proposed action, since it is an industrial park. After property acquisition, a security fence would be extended from the adjacent FLETC boundary to incorporate this property into the FLETC enclave. This security fence would provide secure and controlled access to the new Recycling Center and 24 hour surveillance. Therefore, children would not be expected to be on the acquired property and the proposed action would not be expected to have any effect on the environmental health and safety of children and is in compliance with this Executive Order.

4.14 Mitigation
Due to the lack of environmental impacts expected from implementation of the proposed action, no separate mitigation measures are warranted.
### Table 2: Summary of Impacts of Proposed Action

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FACTORS</th>
<th>NO EFFECT</th>
<th>NEGLIGIBLE</th>
<th>UNDETERMINED</th>
<th>BENEFICIAL</th>
<th>ADVERSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SIGNIFICANT</td>
<td>MINOR</td>
<td>SIGNIFICANT</td>
<td>MINOR</td>
<td>SIGNIFICANT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Resources</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Resources</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jurisdictional Waters/Floodplains</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protected Species</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical/Archaeological/Architectural</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazardous Materials</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social and Economic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Zone Management</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Circulation and Campus Security</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air Quality</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Use</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aesthetics/Noise</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Justice</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Health and Safety of Children</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 5 Compliance with State/Federal Authorities

Table 5 below summarizes status of compliance of proposed action with applicable Federal/State laws.

### Table 3: Relationship of project to environmental requirements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FEDERAL POLICIES</th>
<th>SELECTED ALTERNATIVE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Anadromous Fish Conservation Act, 16 U.S.C. 757, et seq.</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean Air Act, as amended, 42 U.S.C. 7401-7671q, et seq.</td>
<td>In compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean Water Act, as amended (Federal Water Pollution Control Act) 33 U.S.C. 1251, et seq.</td>
<td>In compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Barrier Resources Act, as amended, 16 U.S.C. 3501, et seq.</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coastal Zone Management Act, as amended, 16 U.S.C. 1451 et seq.</td>
<td>In compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endangered Species Act, as amended, 16 U.S.C. 1531, et seq.</td>
<td>In compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Health and Safety of Children; E.O. 13045</td>
<td>In compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Justice; E.O. 12898</td>
<td>In compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estuary Protection Act, 16 U.S.C. 1221, et. seq.</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Water Project Recreation Act, as amended, 16 U.S.C. 4601-12, et seq.</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act, as amended, 16 U.S.C. 661, et seq.</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Floodplain Management; E.O. 11988</td>
<td>In compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Hazardous Waste Management Act (OCGA 12-8-60)</td>
<td>In compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia Rules for Hazardous Waste Management; (391-3-11)</td>
<td>In compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magnuson-Stevens Act, as amended, Public Law 104-297.</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migratory Bird Treaty Act of July 3, 1918, as amended.</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection of Wetlands; E.O. 11990</td>
<td>In compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rivers and Harbors Act, 33 U.S.C. 401 et seq.</td>
<td>Not applicable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6 Consultation and Coordination

NEPA regulations require that Federal, state, and local agencies with jurisdiction or special expertise regarding environmental impacts be consulted and involved in the NEPA process. The Draft EA was made available for review by appropriate parties. A Public Notice of Availability (NOA) has been published in the Brunswick News, announcing the availability of the Draft EA (Appendix C). To date, there have not been any comments received that were averse to the proposed action.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service:
In September 2001, the USFWS and FLETC discussed the programmatic exclusion of the FLETC Glynco campus from further Section 7 coordination under NEPA. That discussion concluded with an agreement that there was no critical habitat or protected species on the FLETC Glynco campus. Therefore, there is no need for further coordination with the USFWS on endangered species issues (Masson 2001). Subsequently, during a phone conversation between FLETC and USFWS staff in November 2002, it was decided that the agreement should be amended to exclude wood storks (Mycteria americana) from the exemption from further coordination.

Mr. Robert Brooks of the USFWS was contacted on July 14, 2006 (USFWS 2006) to ensure the 2002 agreement was still valid. Mr. Brooks confirmed the agreement by stating further coordination is not needed if there are no endangered or threatened species using the area (USFWS 2006). In addition, Ms. Gail Martinez was contacted in regard to specific habitat requirements for protected species that have the potential for occurrence at FLETC (USFWS 2016).

Georgia State Historic Preservation Office (GA SHPO): Section 106 coordination with the GA SHPO has been completed by obtaining their concurrence (by letter dated July 22, 2016) with our determination of no effects to historic properties or cultural resources from the proposed action (Appendix C).

General: The individuals/agencies listed below were consulted during this study:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Role/Office</th>
<th>Organization/Contact info</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Keith Saltrick</td>
<td>Environmental Risk Analyst; Veracheck Inc.</td>
<td>(336) 499-3281</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. John Baden</td>
<td>DERP-FUDS Program Manager; Wilmington District</td>
<td>(910) 251-4754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Mark Harvison</td>
<td>FLETC Environmental and Safety Division</td>
<td>(912) 267-3484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Jennifer Dixon</td>
<td>Program Manager Environmental Preservation Planning</td>
<td>Historic Preservation Division</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mr. Robert Brooks</td>
<td>Biologist USFWS</td>
<td>(912) 265-9336 Extension 25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ms. Gail Martinez</td>
<td>Biologist USFWS Coastal Georgia Office</td>
<td>(912) 832-8739 Extension 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7 List of Preparers

The FLETC point of contact associated with the preparation of this EA is:

Mr. Mark Harvison  
Lead Environmental Protection Specialist  
NEPA Specialist  
Federal Law Enforcement Training Centers  
1131 Chapel Crossing Road  
Brunswick, Georgia 31524  
912-267-3484

The agency responsible for preparing this EA acting as an agent of FLETC:

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers  
Savannah Planning Division  
CESAS-PD  
100 West Oglethorpe Avenue  
Savannah, Georgia 31402-0889

The following individuals contributed to the preparation of this EA:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Role</th>
<th>Project Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Keith Thomas</td>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>Project/Fiscal Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Walker</td>
<td>NEPA Program Manager</td>
<td>NEPA document preparation/coordination; manage NEPA process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Bailey</td>
<td>Planning Division Chief</td>
<td>Quality Control; NEPA document review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julie Morgan</td>
<td>Archeologist; Section 106 Specialist</td>
<td>Cultural Resources; SHPO Coordination</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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APPENDIX A

FIGURES AND PHOTOS
Figure 3 - Subject Property Vicinity
APPENDIX B

THREATENED AND ENDANGERED SPECIES
GLYNN COUNTY, GEORGIA
## Protected Species in Glynn County

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Federal Status</th>
<th>State Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mammals</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Balaena glacialis</em></td>
<td>North Atlantic Right Whale</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Trichechus manatus</em></td>
<td>West Indian manatee</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Birds</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Charadrius melodus</em></td>
<td>Piping plover</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Mycteria americana</em></td>
<td>Wood stork</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Calidris canutus rufa</em></td>
<td>Red Knot</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Picoides borealis</em></td>
<td>Red-cockaded woodpecker</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Reptiles/Amphibians</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Caretta caretta</em></td>
<td>Loggerhead sea turtle</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Chelonia mydas</em></td>
<td>Green sea turtle</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Dermochelys coriacea</em></td>
<td>Leatherback sea turtle</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Drymarchon corais couperi</em></td>
<td>Eastern indigo snake</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Gopherus polyphemus</em></td>
<td>Gopher tortoise</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Notophthalmus perstriatus</em></td>
<td>Striped Newt</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fish/Shellfish</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Acipenser brevirostrum</em></td>
<td>Shortnose sturgeon</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Acipenser oxyrinchus oxyrinchus</em></td>
<td>Atlantic sturgeon</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Elliptio spinosa</em></td>
<td>Altamaha Spinymussel</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Plants</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Baptisia arachnifera</em></td>
<td>Hairy Rattleweed</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Litsea aestivalis</em></td>
<td>Pondspice</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sageretia minutiflora</em></td>
<td>Climbing buckthorn</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Tillandsia recurvata</em></td>
<td>Ball-moss</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

E - Endangered  T - Threatened  R - Rare  N - None

Source: The information in this table was obtained from the USFWS in March 2016.
APPENDIX C

COORDINATION, COMMENTS, AND RESPONSES
MEMORANDUM

TO:        Mark S. Harvison
            Lead Environmental Protection Specialist
            Environmental and Safety Division
            Federal Law Enforcement Training Centers
            U.S. Department of Homeland Security
            1131 Chapel Crossing Road
            Glynnco, Georgia 31524

FROM:     Barbara L. Fisher
            Environmental Review Historian
            Historic Preservation Division

RE:       Finding of "No Historic Properties Affected"

PROJECT:  FLET: Acquire Two (2) Parcels and Modify Building, Sidney
            Lanier Drive, Brunswick
            Federal Agency: DHS
            HP-160705-004

COUNTY:   Glynn

DATE:     July 22, 2016

The Historic Preservation Division (HPD) has reviewed the information received
concerning the above-referenced project. Our comments are offered to assist federal
agencies and their project applicants in complying with the provisions of Section 106 of
the National Historic Preservation Act, as amended.

Based on the information submitted, HPD has determined that no historic properties that
are listed or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places will be affected
by this undertaking, as defined in 36 CFR Part 800.4(d)(1). Please note that historic
and/or archaeological resources may be located within the project’s area of potential
effect (APE). However, at this time it has been determined that they will not be impacted
by the above-referenced project, due to the scope of work. Furthermore, any changes to
this project as proposed will require further review by our office for compliance with
Section 106.

Please refer to the project number assigned above in any future correspondence regarding
this project. If we may be of further assistance, please do not hesitate to contact me at
(770) 389-7854 or Barbara.Fisher@dnr.ga.gov.

cc:        Lupita McClennan, Coastal Regional Commission of Georgia
DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
SAVANNAH DISTRICT, CORPS OF ENGINEERS
100 W. COLETHERPE AVENUE
SAVANNAH, GEORGIA 31401-2604

CESAS-PD

MEMORANDUM FOR DE

SUBJECT: Authorization for Publication of Paid Advertisement

1. In accordance with U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Acquisition Instruction 5.502-100, request your approval to publish a paid advertisement in the Brunswick News. The article will advertise the availability of an Environmental Assessment for the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center (FLETC) to purchase a 5.8-acre property and subsequent use of the property as a new Recycling Center at the FLETC campus in Glynn County, Georgia. The document must be made available for public review and comment before FLETC makes its decision about proceeding with the proposed project.

2. The advertisement will read as follows: The Federal Law Enforcement Training Center announces the availability of a Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) and Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) for the proposed purchase of a 5.8-acre property and subsequent use of the property as a new Recycling Center at the Glynco campus in Glynn County, Georgia. This EA assesses potential impacts from both the property acquisition and from operation of a Recycling Center on this property. The comment period will extend 30 days from the date of this publication. This document is available for review and may be obtained by contacting Mark Harvison, FLETC, Building 681, Glynco, GA 31524; 912-267-3484.

3. POC for this action is David Walker (912) 652-5793.

WILLIAM G. BAILEY
Chief, Planning Division

Approve

Disapprove

Date: __________

MARVIN L. GRIFFIN, P.E.
COL, EN
Commanding
PBESCHER'S AFFIDAVIT

Georgia, Glynn County

Personally appeared before the undersigned attesting authority, Timothy E. O'Briant, General Manager and Executive Editor of The Brunswick News, a daily newspaper published in aforesaid county, who on oath says that the attached legal notice was published in said newspaper on

09/28/2016

______________________________
Timothy E. O'Briant

Sworn to and subscribed before me

This 28 day of July, 2016.

______________________________
Winfred Williams
Notary Public
My commission expires ________________
NOTICE
The Federal Law Enforcement Training Center announces the availability of a Draft Environmental Assessment (EA) and Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) for the proposed purchase of a 5.8-acre property and subsequent use of the property as a new Recycling Center at the Glynco campus in Glynn County, Georgia. This EA assesses potential impacts from both the property acquisition and from operation of a Recycling Center on this property. The comment period will extend 30 days from the date of this publication. This document is available for review and may be obtained by contacting Mark Harvison, FLETC, Building 681, Glynco, GA 31524; 912-267-3484
Robert

I just wanted to touch base with you regarding the programmatic agreement referenced in an EA excerpt below between your office and the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center (FLETC) in Brunswick. The last time I talked with you in January 2005, you said that the agreement would still be valid.

"September 21, 2001, conference call between Dr. Gregg Masson (USFWS Field Supervisor), Ms. Kathleen Morgan, and Ms. Susan Shaw of FLETC discussed the programmatic exclusion of FLETC from Section 7 coordination under NEPA. During this conference call, the above parties agreed that there was no critical habitat or protected species on FLETC and therefore, no need for coordination with the USFWS for proposed actions at FLETC. Subsequently, during a phone conversation between FLETC and USFWS staff on November 22, 2002, it was decided that the agreement should be amended to not include wood storks (Mycteria americana) in the exemption from further coordination."

Please let me know if there should be any change in this agreement.

Thanks

David

David Walker
Biollogist
Mobile/Savannah Planning Center
Phone: 912-652-5783
Thanks.

Robert Brooks
USFWS, Brunswick, GA

"Walker, David A
SAMatSAS"
<David.A.Walker@as02.usace.army.mil>
To: <Robert_Brooks@fws.gov>
CC: 00

07/19/2006 11:29 AM
Subject: RE: FLETC protected species

Thanks Robert,

I'll look over the site well to see if there are any areas the storks might be using and get back with you, if appropriate.

David Walker
Biologist
Mobile/Savannah Planning Center
Phone: 912-652-5793

-----Original Message-----
From: Robert_Brooks@fws.gov [mailto:Robert_Brooks@fws.gov]
Sent: Wednesday, July 19, 2006 10:44 AM
To: Walker, David A SAMatSAS
Cc: Strant_Colwell@fws.gov
Subject: Re: FLETC protected species

David, since there are no endangered or threatened species that use the area, it would be a no effect determination - then there is no need to consult with us. However, if wood storks have been observed there, then if the project was going to impact some wet area that they have been using, then you might want to consult with us. If you have any questions, please let me know. Thanks.

Robert Brooks
USFWS, Brunswick, GA
Planning Division

Ms. Susan Anderson  
HDR Engineering, Inc.  
1101 King Street, Suite 400  
Alexandria, Virginia 22314

Dear Ms. Anderson:

Reference your facsimile transmission of May 22, 2001, (Enclosure 1) regarding the proposed Mock Port of Entry and Mock Border Patrol Station at the Federal Law Enforcement Training Center (FLETC). Reference also Enclosure 2, Listed Species in Glynn County, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Athens, Georgia. The proposed project would involve removal of approximately 5 acres of 30-50 year old, mixed pine-hardwood forest. No wetlands would be impacted.

The proposed project area is located between Bunker Land and Gunpowder Lane in the vicinity of ammunition storage bunkers dating from Navy ownership of the facility. The area is mixed pine-hardwood forest dominated by loblolly pine (Pinus taeda), slash pine (Pinus elliottii), and sweetgum (Liquidambar styraciflua) in the overstory. Pond cypress (Taxodium ascendens) is scattered throughout the overstory, relics of past times prior to the extensive ditching and drainage of the site. The midstory/understory is extremely dense and dominated by fetterbush (Lyonia lucida), inkberry (Ilex glabra), and patches of saw palmetto (Serenoa repens). Soil type at the site is mapped as Rutledge loamy sand.

The entire site was traversed by Savannah District biologists in 1995 during a basewide wetlands survey and again in 1999 during a timber marking and wetland boundary-marking project.

Of the Federally listed species in Enclosure 2, the site would provide only marginally suitable foraging habitat for the red-cockaded woodpecker (Picoides borealis). However, this species has never been observed at FLETC and the nearest colonies are on Fort Stewart to the north and Okefenokee National Wildlife Refuge to the southwest. Thus, the proposed project is unlikely to affect the red-cockaded woodpecker.

The project site could be considered suitable warm season foraging habitat for the eastern indigo snake (Drymarchon corais couperi). However neither this species nor the gopher tortoise with which it is intimately associated in Georgia have been observed at FLETC. This makes it highly unlikely that the indigo snake would be affected by the proposed project.
Wood storks (*Mycteria americana*) have been observed at FLETC in recent years, but not in the vicinity of the project site.

Of the remaining Federal endangered and threatened species, species of management concern, and state listed species in Enclosure 2, none have been observed at FLETC in the vicinity of the project site. As a result, the proposed project is unlikely to affect any Federal endangered and threatened species, species of management concern, or state listed species.

Please contact Mr. Win Seyle of my staff at (912)652-6017 or by e-mail at charles.w.seyle@sas02.usace.army.mil if you have further questions.

Sincerely,

David A. Coleman
Chief, Environmental Resources Branch

Enclosures