

**D R A F T**

**DRAFT  
ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT**

**PROPOSED DOWNTOWN  
FEDERAL BUILDING  
KANSAS CITY, MISSOURI**

*Prepared for*



U.S. General Services Administration  
1500 East Bannister Road  
Kansas City, Missouri 64131-3088

January 2012



URS Corporation  
8300 College Boulevard, Suite 200  
Overland Park, Kansas 66210  
913-344-1000

In association with

SFS Architecture  
1150 Grand Boulevard, Suite 400  
Kansas City, Missouri 64106

## **Environmental Assessment**

### **Proposed Downtown Federal Building Kansas City, Missouri**

The U.S. General Services Administration (GSA) plans to dispose of the existing Federal Building located at 1500 East Bannister Road in Kansas City, Missouri. The City of Kansas City, Missouri has expressed a desire for the GSA to locate a new facility in the City's East Village within the Central Business District to further support and compliment downtown redevelopment. The purpose of this project is to relocate federal tenants to a new location within Congressional District 5 and the urban core of Kansas City, Missouri. The preferred alternative is to construct a new facility at a site that meets the space needs of the tenants while fulfilling all technical, financial, security, and sustainability requirements established by GSA.

This Environmental Assessment (EA) has been prepared in accordance with the National Environmental Policy Act and the National Historic Preservation Act to evaluate the impacts of the project on the human and physical environment and provide an opportunity for the public to review and comment on the project. This EA serves as notification to the public of proposed actions, consistent with Section 800.2(d) of Title 36 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR), and seeks the views of the public and consulting parties on the effects, if any, on historic properties, in accordance with Section 800.5 of Title 36 CFR.

This page intentionally left blank.

## **TABLE OF CONTENTS**

ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS .....	V
INTRODUCTION .....	1
Purpose and Need For Action .....	1
Scope of the Document .....	2
Environmental Issues .....	2
DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED ACTION AND ALTERNATIVES.....	5
Alternative 1 – No Action Alternative .....	5
Alternative 2 – Construct a New Federal Building on the South End of the East Village (Preferred Alternative).....	5
Alternatives Considered but Dismissed .....	6
ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS: AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT AND IMPACTS.....	9
Methodology for Assessing Impacts .....	9
Land Use .....	9
Socioeconomics .....	11
Environmental Justice .....	15
Traffic and Transportation .....	17
Public Services and Utilities .....	19
Water Resources .....	21
Air Quality .....	23
Noise .....	25
Visual Resources.....	27
Cultural Resources .....	28
Hazardous Materials and Waste.....	32
Cumulative Impacts .....	35
CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION .....	39
Agencies and Organizations.....	39
Federal Agencies .....	39
State Agencies .....	39
City Agencies .....	39
Public Involvement .....	39
Public Scoping.....	39
Draft Environmental Assessment.....	40
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	41
LIST OF PREPARERS.....	42

**TABLES**

Table 1: Comparative Summary of Environmental Impacts ..... 7  
Table 2: Social Characteristics of the Affective Area – Age ..... 12  
Table 3: Social Characteristics of the Affected Area – Race & Ethnicity ..... 12  
Table 4: Social Characteristics of the Affected Area – Household Income..... 13  
Table 5: Housing Characteristics of the Affected Area – Tenure and Vacancy Status ..... 13  
Table 6: National Ambient Air Quality Standards..... 23  
Table 7: Typical Noise Levels ..... 25

**APPENDICES**

APPENDIX A: FIGURES ..... A-1  
    Figure 1: Site Location Map  
    Figure 2: Flood Insurance Rate Map  
    Figure 3: Project Site Map  
    Figure 4: Alternative Sites Map  
    Figure 5: East Village Redevelopment Area  
    Figure 6: Kansas City Zoning Map  
    Figure 7: U.S. Census Tracts  
    Figure 8: Cultural Resources  
    Figure 9: Previous Archeological Surveys  
  
APPENDIX B: FEASIBILITY STUDY ..... B-1  
APPENDIX C: CONSULTATION ..... C-1  
APPENDIX D: PHOTOGRAPHIC LOG ..... D-1  
APPENDIX E: ENVIRONMENTAL DATABASE REPORT ..... E-1

## **ABBREVIATIONS AND ACRONYMS**

ADM	Administrative Policy
APE	Area of Potential Effects
bgs	Below Ground Surface
BMP	Best Management Practice
BVCP	Brownfield Voluntary Cleanup Program
CAA	Clean Air Act
CBD	Central Business District
CEQ	Council on Environmental Quality
CFR	U.S. Code of Federal Regulations
CO	carbon monoxide
dB	Decibel
dBA	A-weighted Decibel
DOE	U.S. Department of Energy
DTL	Default Target Level
EA	Environmental Assessment
EDR	Environmental Data Resources
EPA	United States Environmental Protection Agency
ESA	Environmental Site Assessment
EM	Electromagnetic
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency
FHWA	Federal Highway Administration
FIRM	Flood Insurance Rate Map
GHG	Greenhouse Gas
GPS	Global Positioning System
GSA	U.S. General Services Administration
KCATA	Kansas City Area Transit Authority
LDTL	Lowest Default Target Levels
LEED	Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design
LOS	Level of Service
MDNR	Missouri Department of Natural Resources
µg/m <sup>3</sup>	Micrograms per Cubic Meter
mg/m <sup>3</sup>	Milligrams per Cubic Meter
MOA	Memorandum of Agreement
MRBCA	Missouri Risk-Based Corrective Action

***Proposed Downtown Federal Building  
Environmental Assessment***

---

NAAQS	National Ambient Air Quality Standards
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
NHPA	National Historic Preservation Act
NNSA	National Nuclear Security Administration
NO <sub>2</sub>	nitrogen dioxide
NOA	Notice of Availability
NOI	Notice of Intent
NO <sub>x</sub>	nitrogen oxides
NPDES	National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
NRHP	National Register of Historic Places
O <sub>3</sub>	ozone
Pb	lead
PBS	Public Buildings Services
PID	Photo-ionization Detector
PM <sub>10</sub>	particulate matter less than 10 microns in diameter
PM <sub>2.5</sub>	particulate matter less than 2.5 microns in diameter
ppm	parts per million
ppb	parts per billion
RCRA	Resource Conservation and Recovery Act
REC	Recognized Environmental Condition
RDTL	Residential Default Target Levels
SHPO	State Historic Preservation Officer
SO <sub>2</sub>	sulfur dioxide
SO <sub>x</sub>	sulfur oxides
std	Standard
SVOC	Semi Volatile Organic Compound
TPO-DRO	Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons – Diesel Range Organics
TPO-GRO	Total Petroleum Hydrocarbons – Gasoline Range Organics
URD	Urban Redevelopment District
USC	U.S. Code
UST	Underground Storage Tank
UTM	Universal Transverse Mercator
VOC	Volatile Organic Compound

## **INTRODUCTION**

The U.S. General Services Administration (GSA) Public Buildings Services (PBS) provides work environments for more than one million federal employees nationwide. The Heartland Region of the PBS serves as a builder, developer, lessor, and manager of federally owned and leased facilities for federal agencies throughout Iowa, Kansas, Missouri and Nebraska. GSA proposes to ‘own-construct’ a new Federal Building in downtown Kansas City, Missouri (Appendix A, Figure 1). The proposed project area is bounded by 11<sup>th</sup> Street on the north, 12<sup>th</sup> Street on the south, Charlotte Street on the east, and Cherry Street on the west. The area is located on the east side of downtown Kansas City, Missouri. The site is currently bisected by Holmes Street, but this block of Holmes Street would be vacated as a part of the proposed project.

The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969 (42 U.S. Code [USC] 4321 et seq.) requires federal agencies to consider alternatives to proposed actions and to analyze impacts of those alternatives on the human and physical environment. NEPA is implemented through regulations of the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) (40 CFR 1500-1508). GSA has in turn adopted procedures to comply with NEPA and the CEQ regulations, as found in GSA Order ADM 1095.1F Environmental Consideration in Decision Making (GSA, 1999a); and the GSA PBS NEPA Desk Guide (GSA, 1999b).

This draft Environmental Assessment (EA) has been prepared to assess whether the proposed action would have potentially significant effects on the environment, in which case an Environmental Impact Statement would need to be prepared. If the impacts of the proposed action after mitigation are determined to be less than significant, then a Finding of No Significant Impact will be prepared.

### **PURPOSE AND NEED FOR ACTION**

GSA and other federal tenants are currently housed in the Federal complex located at 1500 Bannister Road, in the vicinity of Bannister Road and Troost Avenue in Kansas City, Missouri. Most of the buildings at the Bannister Federal Complex are original to the Complex and were built in 1942 to support the efforts of World War II. The buildings, while basically sound, have considerable deficiencies and obsolescence. The Complex has also been impacted by the relocation of two major tenants: The Department of Energy’s (DOE) National Nuclear Security Administration (NNSA), and the Defense Finance and Accounting Service. The loss of these tenants has caused GSA to consider future options for the complex, which may include redeployment. Due to tenant relocations from the Bannister Federal Complex and the large reinvestment needs, the Complex will be declared excess to the needs of the Federal Government. The purpose of this project is to relocate federal tenants to a new location within Congressional District 5 and the urban core of Kansas City, Missouri. The preferred alternative is to construct a new facility at a site in downtown Kansas City, Missouri that meets the space needs of the tenants while fulfilling all technical, financial, security, and sustainability requirements established by GSA. Due to the uncertainty of the timeframe for the funding of the project, public concerns over deficits, and the need for GSA to relocate in the near future, it may be necessary for GSA to lease existing space at one or more sites until the preferred alternative could be completed.

### **EVALUATION CRITERIA**

Several site criteria were established for evaluating sites such as size, geographic location, parking requirements, energy reduction/conservation requirements, access requirements, and various environmental and socioeconomic requirements.

Technical evaluation criteria considered whether the site could accommodate the appropriate program requirements, provide functional space in an optimum floor plate, provide secure access, meet established design requirements, allow for expansion, have access to public amenities and transportation, and be compatible with the planning objectives of the City of Kansas City, Missouri.

The financial analysis considered costs associated with land acquisition, new construction, geotechnical conditions, sustainability goals, and relocation expenses.

Security evaluation criteria included designating a level of security for the facility, a security setback dimension of 50 feet, entrance security requirements, parking security requirements, and a design blast pressure for the multi-tenant building.

In addition to the technical, financial, and security criteria, sustainability goals are being considered for the new Federal Building site. The site selected must support the design of a high performance building that would be capable of and consistent with the GSA's goals for Leadership in Energy and Environmental Design (LEED) Gold certification, its Strategic Sustainability Performance Plan, the Guiding Principles for Sustainable New Construction and Major Renovations and a zero environmental footprint for all federal buildings.

## **SCOPING**

Scoping is a process to identify resources that may be affected by a project proposal and to explore possible alternative ways of achieving the proposal while minimizing impacts. GSA conducted internal scoping (project kickoff meeting) with appropriate GSA staff and its contractors.

An interdisciplinary team consisting of GSA employees, SFS Architecture, and URS Corporation, a planning consulting firm, conducted internal scoping. Team members held several team meetings in 2010 to discuss the purpose and need for the project; resource issues, values, and concerns; past, present, and foreseeable impacts; possible mitigation measures for the proposed action; and reasonable alternatives to be addressed in the EA.

A Feasibility Study was completed for GSA for this project (SFS, 2010). The Feasibility Study identified and evaluated preliminary viable alternatives and concluded with a preferred alternative as a basis for preparing a Program Development Study, submitted at the time of construction prospectus funding, which would meet the housing needs of the GSA, the U.S. Department of Homeland Security, U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement, and U.S. Customs and Border Protection beginning in 2018. A copy of the Feasibility Study is included in Appendix B.

A Notice of Intent (NOI) to prepare an EA which outlined the project and invited public comment was published in the Federal Register on December 17, 2010 (Vol. 75, No. 242, Pages 78994-78995). In addition, a public scoping meeting was held on January 19, 2011 at the St. Mary's Episcopal Church, 1307 Holmes, Kansas City, Missouri. A notice of the public scoping meeting was published in the Kansas City Star and mailed to adjacent property owners, public officials, public agencies, and other interested parties.

## **ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES**

NEPA, which is implemented through regulations of the CEQ (40 CFR 1500-1508), requires federal agencies to consider alternatives to proposed actions and to analyze impacts of those alternatives. GSA has in turn adopted procedures to comply with NEPA and the CEQ regulations, as found in GSA Order ADM 1095.1F Environmental Consideration in Decision Making (GSA, 1999a); and the GSA PBS NEPA Desk Guide (GSA, 1999b).

Potential impacts of the proposed alternatives described in this document were assessed in accordance with GSA Order ADM 1095.1F. The GSA NEPA Desk Guide requires that impacts to resources be analyzed in terms of their context, duration, and intensity. In order to help the public and decision-makers understand the implications of impacts, they are described in the short and long term, cumulatively, and within context, based on an understanding and interpretation by resource professionals and specialists.

As a result of resource information specific to the proposed study area, resources that could be affected by the alternatives being considered were identified. Environmental issues analyzed in this EA include:

- Land Use
- Socioeconomics
- Environmental Justice
- Traffic and Transportation
- Public Services and Utilities
- Water Resources
- Air Quality
- Noise
- Visual Resources
- Cultural Resources
- Hazardous Materials and Waste

The following environmental issues were initially considered, but were determined to not be relevant to the proposed action being considered. Consequently, they have been dismissed from consideration because, with the application of standard measures such as avoidance or the application of best management practices (BMPs), they would not be impacted by the proposed project.

- Floodplains – Executive Order 11988, “Floodplain Management,” requires all federal agencies to avoid construction within the 100-year floodplain unless no other practicable alternative exists. According to the current Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM), revised August 5 1986, the project area is located outside of the 100-year and 500-year floodplains; therefore, floodplain management was dismissed as an environmental issue. A copy of the FIRM is included in Appendix A, Figure 2.
- Wetlands – Executive Order 11990, “Protection of Wetlands,” requires federal agencies to avoid, where possible, adversely impacting wetlands. Proposed actions that have the potential to adversely impact wetlands must be addressed in a statement of findings. National Wetland Inventory maps were reviewed and no wetlands are located in the area of the proposed site (USFWS, 2011). The proposed project would be located on a site in an urban area that has been previously developed, and no wetlands would be affected; therefore, wetlands were dismissed as an environmental issue.
- Vegetation – The proposed project would be located on a site in an urban area that has been previously developed. Only a small amount of vegetation (grass cover to prevent erosion) is currently present at the site and it does not provide any quality habitat. Therefore, vegetation was dismissed as an environmental issue.

- Wildlife – The proposed project would be located in an urban area that is highly developed. With the exception of urban species such as pigeons and mice, wildlife generally does not exist within the project area; therefore wildlife was dismissed as an environmental issue.
- Threatened and Endangered Species – The Endangered Species Act (1973) requires the analysis of impacts to all federally listed threatened or endangered species that could be affected by the proposed project. According to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, no threatened, endangered, or candidate species exist within the proposed project area (Appendix C). Due to the highly developed urban nature of the proposed project area, no habitat for any of these species is present within the project area; therefore, threatened and endangered species was dismissed as an environmental issue.
- Geology and Soils – Some excavation and grading would occur during construction of the proposed building. However, since the project area has been previously developed the proposed project would have little to no effect on the geology and soils of the area; therefore, geology and soils were dismissed as an environmental issue.

## **DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED ACTION AND ALTERNATIVES**

The alternatives in this document are the result of scoping and have been analyzed in accordance with NEPA. All alternatives considered must meet the purpose and need for the proposed action. Three alternatives are analyzed for potential impacts in this EA – the No Action Alternative and two action alternatives. Alternatives that were considered but eliminated are discussed on Page 6. Table 1 at the end of this chapter summarizes the impacts of the three alternatives.

In accordance with GSA Order ADM 1095.1F (GSA, 1999a), GSA is required to identify a Preferred Alternative in all environmental documents, including EAs. Alternative 2 is the Preferred Alternative because it would best meet the objectives associated with the purpose and need for action as identified during scoping and planning.

### **ALTERNATIVE 1 – NO ACTION ALTERNATIVE**

Under the No Action Alternative, the operations and tenants would remain at the 1500 East Bannister Road complex. The buildings themselves would continue to provide the same level of service (LOS) to the tenants as they do today. The DOE's NNSA has received authorization to relocate at a new facility in a separate location. Efforts would be made to dispose of the existing vacated complex, or the area would be mothballed.

While this alternative does not satisfy the purpose and need for a new facility, it is included in the environmental analysis to provide a baseline for comparison with the proposed action and is analyzed in accordance with CEQ regulations for implementing NEPA. Although this alternative would eliminate unavoidable adverse, short-term impacts associated with the proposed action, the No Action Alternative would not satisfy the purpose and need for this project.

### **ALTERNATIVE 2 – CONSTRUCT A NEW FEDERAL BUILDING ON THE SOUTH END OF THE EAST VILLAGE (PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE)**

Under Alternative 2, GSA would develop a new U.S. Federal Building under an own-construct agreement on approximately 4.91 acres located on a site bounded by 11th Street on the north, 12th Street on the south, Charlotte Street on the east, and Cherry Street on the west, in Kansas City, Jackson County, Missouri (Appendix A, Figure 3).

The proposed two block project site (Block 99 and 100) is currently bisected by Holmes Street. The west block (Block 99) of the site is completely asphalt paved and is currently used as a surface parking lot. A former bus terminal building that occupied the entire area of the east block (Block 100) was recently demolished and the block is currently vacant with grass cover. Block 100 and the southwest quarter of Block 99 are currently owned by the City of Kansas City, Missouri. The Scott M. Morin Trust currently owns the northwest corner of Block 99 and CPC Realty, LLC currently owns the eastern half of Block 99.

On February 4, 2010 the Mayor and City Council of Kansas City, Missouri passed resolution 100084 expressing their support for GSA to locate a new federal building in the south end of the East Village Redevelopment Area.

### **ALTERNATIVE 3 – LEASE EXISTING SPACE IN THE CENTRAL BUSINESS DISTRICT**

Under Alternative 3, GSA would lease space in an existing facility located within the Central Business District (CBD) of Kansas City, Missouri. For this study, the CBD is generally defined as an area bordered by the Missouri State line on the west, 27<sup>th</sup> Street on the south, Prospect Avenue and I-29/I-35 on the east, and the Missouri River and 6<sup>th</sup> Street on the north as shown in Appendix A, Figure 1. Under this alternative, GSA would relocate tenants to one or more existing facilities within the CBD.

While this alternative does not satisfy the purpose and need for a new facility, it may be required as either a temporary or mid-term alternative dependent on the timeline of leaving the current facility and funding for the preferred alternative. Although this alternative would eliminate unavoidable adverse, short-term impacts associated with the preferred alternative, the Lease Existing Space Alternative would not satisfy all of the technical, financial, and security criteria, as well as the sustainability goals established under the purpose and need for this project.

### **ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED BUT DISMISSED**

A Feasibility Study (Appendix B) and an environmental screening were conducted to identify benefits and constraints of various potential sites. As a result, the following alternatives were considered but dismissed for the reasons described below. A map showing the alternative sites considered is included in Appendix A, Figure 4.

#### **Construct New Building at Block 49 and 50**

This alternative site is located at the northern edge of the East Village area of downtown Kansas City. The site is bounded by 8th Street on the north, 9th Street on the south, Charlotte Street on the east, and Cherry Street on the west. This alternative was dismissed at the midpoint of the Feasibility Study. The advantages of this site were similar to the proposed site but the proposed site benefited from the closer proximity to the Bolling Federal Building and the ability to share amenities. This site also contained an existing National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) listed building (the Blackstone Hotel) and is directly adjacent to one NRHP listed building (the Kansas City Public Library) and one NRHP eligible building (Old St. Patrick's Church).

#### **Construct a New building at Block 100**

This alternative site is located on a one-block parcel bounded by 11<sup>th</sup> Street on the north, 12<sup>th</sup> Street on the south, Charlotte Street on the east, and Holmes Street on the west. This alternative was dismissed because the 2.10 acre site is less than the preferred 4 acres and would necessitate a taller building with a smaller footprint to accommodate the space and security needs. This would not accommodate a secured entry outside of the security setback, or provide space for on-site visitor parking and allow for future expansion. This would also result in an 8 to 10 percent increase in construction costs and an estimated 10 percent increase in annual heating and cooling costs.

**TABLE 1: COMPARATIVE SUMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS**

Environmental Issue	Alternative 1 – No Action Alternative	Alternative 2 – Construct New Building (Preferred Alternative)	Alternative 3 – Lease Existing Space in CBD
Land Use	No impact to land use.	Beneficial impacts since the alternative contributes to the realization of the community's plans and vision for the area.	No impact to land use.
Socioeconomics	No impact to socioeconomics.	Adverse, short-term impacts to retail businesses near current facilities.	Adverse, short-term impacts to retail businesses near current facilities.
Environmental Justice	No impact to environmental justice populations.	No adverse impacts to environmental justice populations.	No adverse impacts to environmental justice populations.
Traffic and Transportation	No impact to traffic and transportation.	Adverse, short-term impacts due to construction activities, and increases in traffic. Long-term impact due to the closure of the 1100 block of Holmes Street.	No impact to traffic and transportation.
Public Services and Utilities	No impact to public services and utilities.	No adverse impacts to public services and utilities.	No adverse impacts to public services and utilities.
Water Resources	No impact to water resources.	No adverse impacts to water resources.	No impact to water resources.
Air Quality	No impact to air quality.	Adverse, short-term impacts due to construction activities.	No impact to air quality.
Noise	No impact to noise.	Adverse, short-term impacts due to construction activities.	No impact to noise.
Visual Resources	No impact to visual resources.	Beneficial impact to visual resources.	No impact to visual resources.
Cultural Resources	No impact to cultural resources.	No adverse impact to above-ground National Register of Historic Places listed or eligible properties. Additional investigation for potential historic archeological information will be required on Block 99.*	No impact to cultural resources.
Hazardous Materials and Waste	No impact to hazardous materials and waste.	No impacts to hazardous materials, as long as any hazardous materials at the site are remediated prior to development.	No impact to hazardous materials and waste.

\* No excavations would be allowed in Block 99 of the proposed site until the additional investigations have completed and all regulatory issues have been resolved.

This page intentionally left blank.

# **ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS: AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT AND IMPACTS**

## **METHODOLOGY FOR ASSESSING IMPACTS**

This section describes the affected environment (existing conditions) for land use, socioeconomics, environmental justice, traffic and transportation, public services and utilities, water resources, air quality, noise, visual resources, cultural resources, and hazardous materials and waste for the preferred alternative, as well as the potential impacts resulting from the implementation of the three alternatives. This section concludes by addressing any cumulative impacts associated with the proposed action.

Due to the size and varied conditions of the study area for the Lease Existing Space Alternative (i.e., the CBD as depicted in Appendix A, Figure 1), as well as the undetermined location(s) that GSA would lease space, the existing conditions for the entire CBD have not been provided.

Potential impacts were identified and assessed for each environmental issue by assigning standards of significance for comparison against existing conditions, which is the No Action Alternative. Proposed mitigation measures are also included for each environmental issue as appropriate, to reduce potential impacts.

Impacts may be direct or indirect and are described in terms of type, context, duration, and intensity, which is consistent with the CEQ regulations. “Direct effects” are caused by an action and occur at the same time and place as the action. “Indirect effects” are caused by the action and occur later in time or are farther removed from the place of impact, but are reasonably foreseeable. Impacts are defined in general terms and are qualified as adverse or beneficial, and as short term or long term.

## **LAND USE**

### **AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT**

#### **Existing Land Use Conditions**

The proposed project site for the preferred alternative is located in the CBD and urban core of downtown Kansas City, Missouri. The two square block site covers approximately 4.91 acres and consists of an asphalt surfaced parking lot on the west (Block 99) and a vacant vegetated lot on the east (Block 100). The site is bounded by Cherry Street to the west. Further to the west are the, municipal court building, a communications center and the police headquarters. The north side is bounded by 11<sup>th</sup> Street. Further to the north is a vacant lot with surface parking on the northwest, and a block with a residential apartment building, a school, and a surface parking lot on the northeast. The east side is bounded by Charlotte Street. Further to the east is a small bank building and then the east side of the downtown interstate highway loop. The south side is bounded by 12<sup>th</sup> Street. Further to the south is a vacant lot with surface parking on the southeast, and the Bolling Federal Building on the southwest.

The site is located on the east side of downtown, in an area referred to as the East Village. The East Village is a 9 block area in the CBD that consists of approximately 18 acres generally bound by Charlotte Street on the east, 12th Street on the south, Cherry Street on the west, and 8th Street on the north. The area also includes Block 81 where the recently completed JE Dunn Construction building is located. The area consists of a variety of land uses including office,

commercial/retail, and parking structures. A map outlining the East Village area is included in Appendix A, Figure 5.

Blocks 65 and 100 in the East Village have recently seen the demolition of dilapidated structures in preparation of the sites for the future development of the area. Currently the City of Kansas City retains ownership of all of Blocks 65, 66, and 100 as well as various parcels on Blocks 49, 82, and 99.

East Village LLC, an affiliate of Swope Community Builders, was established in 2006 to serve as the Master Developer for the East Village area. The development team consists of Swope Community Builders as the managing entity as well as architectural, civil, and tax credit consultants. The goals established at the conception of East Village LLC included:

- Redevelop 5 blocks into mid- and high-rise mixed income housing.
- Redevelop 3 blocks into commercial office, hotel, and transit/parking uses.
- Create a vibrant pedestrian friendly environment that attracts day and nighttime activities.
- Support the other development activities in Downtown Kansas City.

### **Zoning**

The East Village area contains two zoning classifications within its boundaries: C-3b and Urban Redevelopment District (URD). The zoning classifications are detailed in Chapter 80 of the Code of Ordinances of Kansas City Missouri and are generally defined as follows:

*The C-3b District is an Intermediate Business Transitional District which is designed primarily to permit a transitional height provision for multiple-family dwellings and commercial buildings which will support and complement the uses in the central business district.*

The URD is designed to encourage and accommodate development and redevelopment of underdeveloped and blighted sections of the city and to encourage the latitude and flexibility in design to ensure the stated purposes of a redevelopment plan.

The Project Site is currently located in an area designated C-3b. However, as part of this project, Swope Community Builders is in the process of initiating rezoning the project site to an URD.

Figure 6 in Appendix A shows the current zoning designations (as defined by the City of Kansas City) for the study area.

### **STANDARDS OF SIGNIFICANCE**

The proposed project would result in adverse land use impacts if it were judged to be in conflict with adopted plans and policies for the site, or if it violated the zoning for the site.

### **IMPACTS**

#### **Alternative 1 (No Action Alternative)**

Under Alternative 1, no adverse impacts to the study area would result. If the Federal Building tenants stayed at their current sites in the Bannister complex and did not relocate to a new office building at the proposed site, the site would remain undeveloped by GSA.

#### **Alternative 2 (Preferred Alternative)**

The proposed project development under Alternative 2 is compatible with the current and future zoning and land use plans for the site. The immediate area includes several existing Municipal,

County, and Federal buildings as well as commercial buildings similar in use to the proposed project.

**Alternative 3 (Lease Existing Space Alternative)**

Under Alternative 3, there would be no adverse impacts to land use at any existing facility chosen within the CBD study area. Any location where the Federal tenants would be relocated would be in existing developed areas which were designed and zoned for office use.

**MITIGATION MEASURES**

Because there would be no adverse impacts regarding Land Use, no mitigation measures are proposed.

**CONCLUSION**

There would be no adverse impacts to land use as a result of the proposed project construction. The implementation of Alternative 2 would contribute to the realization of the community's plans and vision for redevelopment in the area, resulting in a beneficial long-term impact.

**SOCIOECONOMICS**

**AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT**

The primary source for socioeconomic data is the U.S. Census Bureau. The study area for the socioeconomic analysis of the preferred alternative consists of Jackson County Census Tract 015900 (Appendix A, Figure 7). Income data from the 2010 Census was not available at the Census Tract level at the time this report was compiled. Therefore, income data for Census Tract 001400 from the 2000 Census was used for this evaluation. In the 2000 Census, Census Tract 001400 included the project area. In the 2010 Census, the Census Tract boundaries were changed and Census Tracts 001400 and 001300 from 2000 were combined to create Census Tract 015900 for the 2010 Census.

The total resident population for Kansas City, Missouri, according to the 2010 U.S. Census, was 459,787. The resident population for the study area was 1,683 or approximately 0.4 percent of the city total. Of the 1,683 residents, 744 are listed as institutionalized population (e.g. Kansas City and Jackson County Jails), 163 are in non-institutional group quarters, and 776 reside in 567 households (Census, 2010). The land use within the study area is primarily commercial/office space with a small amount of urban residential.

Of the 1,683 people living in the study area, 72 percent were male and 28 percent were female. Not only is the study area population male-dominated, but is generally a younger population than the city as a whole, dominated by persons under 45 years of age (Census, 2010). Table 2 shows the distribution of both the study area and city populations by major age categories.

**TABLE 2: SOCIAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THE STUDY AREA - AGE**

Area	Total Population	Percentage of Population by Age					Total
		Under 15 Years	15 to 24 Years	25 to 44 Years	45 to 64 Years	65 Years and Over	
Study Area (Census Tract 015900)	1,683	3.9%	21.7%	52.6%	19.0%	2.9%	100%
City of Kansas City, MO	459,787	20.4%	13.7%	29.2%	25.2%	11.0%	100%

Source: U.S. Census Age Data (2010)

The population of the study area tends to be more racially and ethnically diverse than the city as a whole. Citywide, of those claiming only one race, about 59 percent identify themselves as Non-Latino White whereas in the study area, approximately 47 percent identify themselves as Non-Latino White. Racial categories with a "percent of population" higher in the study area than citywide include Black or African American Alone, and Asian Alone. Within the study area, 88 residents (or 5.2 percent) identify as Hispanic or Latino compared to 45,953 (or 9.9 percent) of the city as a whole (Census, 2010). Table 3 shows the racial and ethnic breakdown for study area and the city.

**TABLE 3: SOCIAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THE STUDY AREA – RACE & ETHNICITY**

Area	Total Population	Percentage of Population by Race & Ethnicity							Total
		Non-Latino White Alone	Black or African American Alone	American Indian or Alaska Native Alone	Asian Alone	Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander Alone	Some Other Race Alone	Two or More Races	
Study Area (Census Tract 015900)	1,683	46.8%	43.7%	0.1%	4.8%	0.0%	2.4%	2.3%	100%
City of Kansas City, MO	459,787	59.2%	29.9%	0.5%	2.5%	0.2%	4.5%	3.2%	100%

Source: U.S. Census Race and Ethnicity (2010)

Economically, the population of the study area tends to contain persons at the lower end of the income spectrum, compared to the city as a whole. On a per capita income basis, the study area population has a per capita income that is approximately 23 percent of the average per capita income of Kansas City, Missouri as a whole (\$5,601 for the study area compared to \$20,753 for the city) (Census, 2010). Table 4 shows the distribution by household income for the study area and the city.

**TABLE 4: SOCIAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THE STUDY AREA - HOUSEHOLD INCOME**

Household Income (1999)	Total Households	Less than \$10,000	\$10,000 to \$24,999	\$25,000 to \$49,999	\$50,000 to \$74,999	\$75,000 to \$99,999	\$100,000 or more	Total
Study Area (Census Tract 001400)	32	55.5%	44.5%	0%	0%	0%	0%	100%
City of Kansas City, MO	183,981	11.6%	20.7%	32.0%	18.7%	8.7%	8.3%	100%

Source: U.S. Census Household Income Data (2000)

Note: 2010 Census Data for Household Income Not Available at Census Tract Level.

In 2010, the study area contained 665 total housing units available, compared to 221,860 for the entire city. The study area contained 567 occupied housing units, compared to 202,334 for the entire city, resulting in an average household size of 1.37 for the study area, compared to 2.34 for the city as a whole (Census, 2010). Table 5 shows the distribution of housing units for the study area and the whole city, based on both tenure and vacancy status.

**TABLE 5: HOUSING CHARACTERISTICS OF THE STUDY AREA - TENURE AND VACANCY STATUS**

Area	Total Housing Units	Occupied		Vacant			Total
		Owner Occupied	Renter Occupied	For Rent or for Sale	For Occasional Use	For Other Reasons	
Study Area (Census Tract 015900)	665	46.6%	38.6%	12.3%	1.7%	0.8%	100%
City of Kansas City, MO	221,860	48.7%	38.0%	8.0%	0.4%	4.9%	100%

Source: U.S. Census Tenure Data and Vacancy Status Data (2010)

In summary, the study area tends to be more male-dominated and younger than the city as a whole. However, the age, race and ethnicity statistics include the institutionalized population which comprises 44 percent of the study area population. A higher percentage of lower-income and minority populations are located the study area.

**STANDARDS OF SIGNIFICANCE**

The proposed project would result in adverse socioeconomic impacts if it caused a major shift in population, housing, or employment in Census Tract 015900 or the City of Kansas City, Missouri.

## **IMPACTS**

### **Alternative 1 (No Action Alternative)**

No adverse impacts to the study area would result under Alternative 1. If the employees remained at their current sites, the socioeconomic demographics for the downtown area would not change. Employment would not change, as current employees would remain at their current sites. Population, income, age, race and ethnicity, and other population or economic characteristics would not be affected by the No Action alternative.

### **Alternative 2 (Preferred Alternative)**

Relocating the GSA and other federal tenants to the proposed project site would have a direct beneficial impact to the socioeconomic profile of the study area. Employment in the downtown area and more specifically the East Village Redevelopment Area would be increased but would not constitute a major shift in employment in the area. The limited residential population of the study area would not be affected, as there would be no residential displacements associated with the proposed action. As a result, the proposed action would not have a disproportionately high or adverse impact any demographic or economic category.

The retail and service businesses located near the Bannister Federal Complex would likely experience a short-term and possible long-term adverse impacts due to employees relocating from that site. Businesses that are likely to be affected in this way rely on the proximity of their customers and include coffee shops, several restaurants, and other retail stores. The short-term and potential long-term adverse impacts for some of these retail and service businesses would also decrease if the Bannister Federal Complex is redeveloped. However, the short-term adverse economic impact to businesses near the existing Bannister Federal Complex would decrease over time and they would also be immediately offset by the increase in economic activity to businesses located near the proposed site.

### **Alternative 3 (Lease Existing Space Alternative)**

Under the Lease Existing Space Alternative, there would be no adverse socioeconomic impacts to any area chosen within the CBD study area. The study area for this alternative includes numerous and varied options for existing available office space. Relocating Federal tenants to existing space within the CBD would fill existing vacant space and increase occupancy levels in the area. There would be no displacements associated with this alternative. As a result, this alternative would not have a disproportionately high or adverse impact any demographic or economic category.

Similar to the preferred alternative, the retail and service businesses located near the Bannister Federal Complex would likely experience short-term and possible long-term adverse impacts due to employees relocating from that site. The short-term and potential long-term adverse impacts for some of these retail and service businesses would also decrease if the Bannister Federal Complex is redeveloped. These short-term adverse economic impacts to businesses near the existing Bannister Federal Complex would decrease over time and they would also be immediately offset by the increase in economic activity to businesses located in the area of the occupied existing lease space.

## **MITIGATION MEASURES**

No mitigation measures regarding Socioeconomics are proposed.

## **CONCLUSION**

Overall, there would be no long-term adverse impacts to socioeconomic conditions in the study area as a result of the proposed construction. There would be long-term positive impacts to the socioeconomic conditions of the study area. There would be adverse short-term impacts to surrounding businesses that are somewhat dependent on business from the existing Bannister Federal Complex.

## **ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE**

### **AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT**

Executive Order 12898, *Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations* (Federal Register, 1994), requires that all federal agencies address the effects of policies on minorities and low-income populations and communities, and to ensure that there would be no disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects to minority or low-income populations or communities in the area.

A “minority” is defined as a person who is Black, Hispanic (regardless of race), Asian American, or American Indian and Alaskan Native. “Low-income” is defined as a household income at or below the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services poverty guideline.

The study area for analysis of potential Environmental Justice issues was determined after reviewing the location of the proposed new building, and the boundaries of the Census Tracts established by the U.S. Census Bureau for the 2010 Census. Study area boundaries follow the boundaries for Census Tract 015900, which includes the entire area surrounding the project site (Appendix A, Figure 7).

Information regarding minority and low-income populations was obtained primarily from the U.S. Census Bureau. Minority populations in the study area are based on information from the U.S. Census Bureau and were compared to the population characteristics of the city and state. The CEQ guidance states that “minority populations should be identified where either (a) the minority population of the affected area exceeds 50 percent or (b) the population percentage of the affected area is meaningfully greater than the minority population percentage in the general population or other appropriate unit of geographical analysis.”

### **Low-Income Populations**

Low-income status was based upon comparing the study area income to federal poverty measures determined by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. The CEQ guidelines do not specifically state the percentage considered meaningful in the case of low-income populations.

Income data from the 2010 Census was not available at the Census Tract level at the time this report was compiled. Therefore, income data for Census Tract 001400 from the 2000 Census was used for this evaluation. In the 2000 Census, Census Tract 001400 included the project area. In the 2010 Census, the Census Tract boundaries were changed and Census Tracts 001400 and 001300 from 2000 were combined to create Census Tract 015900 for the 2010 Census. According to the 2000 U.S. Census, 43 percent of the people living within Census Tract 001400 lived below the federal poverty measure, compared to 14 percent of the residents of Kansas City. A total of 56 percent of the households within this tract had an income less than \$10,000, compared to 12 percent of the households within Kansas City. The per capita income of residents within the study area was \$5,601 in 1999, compared to \$20,735 for the residents of Kansas City (Census, 2000).

## **Minority Populations**

A minority population is defined as any readily identifiable group of minority persons who live in geographic proximity, or are geographically dispersed or transient persons (such as migrant workers) who will be similarly affected by a proposed program, policy, or action (FHWA, 1998). Although minorities exist within the study area, no minority populations are present on the project site.

According to the 2010 Census, within the study area (Census Tract 015900), Non-Latino Whites represent 46.8 percent of the population, Blacks or African Americans represent 43.7 percent of the population, American Indians of Alaska Natives represent 0.1 percent of the population, Asians represent 4.8 percent of the population, and Some Other Race Alone or Two or More Races represent 4.7 percent of the population (Census, 2010).

The total minority population of the study area is just above 50 percent of the total population (i.e., 53 percent). This is higher than the minority population of the City of Kansas City (40.8 percent) and the State of Missouri (17.2 percent). The Hispanic or Latino population in the study area (5.2 percent) is smaller than the City of Kansas City, Missouri (9.9 percent), larger than the State of Missouri (3.5 percent). However, the race and ethnicity statistics include the institutionalized population (e.g. Kansas City and Jackson County Jails) which comprises 44 percent of the study area population in Census Tract 015900 (Census, 2010).

## **STANDARDS OF SIGNIFICANCE**

Executive Order 12898 is designed to prevent federal policies and actions from creating disproportionately high and adverse impacts on minority and low-income populations. The order was issued as a result of concerns that minority populations and/or low-income populations bear a disproportionate amount of adverse health and environmental effects. A proposed project would result in a significant environmental justice impact if it were judged to be in conflict with the fair treatment for people of all races, cultures, and incomes.

## **IMPACTS**

### **Alternative 1 (No Action Alternative)**

The No Action Alternative would have no impact on the low-income or minority populations in the study area.

### **Alternative 2 (Preferred Alternative)**

The construction impacts of building the proposed structure, such as noise or traffic impacts, would equally affect everyone living or working in the area, regardless of race or income. There would be no residential displacements or other direct impacts to low income or minority populations within the study area as a result of the proposed project. Therefore, the proposed action would not result in disproportionately high or adverse impacts to these populations.

### **Alternative 3 (Lease Existing Space Alternative)**

The Lease Existing Space Alternative would have no impact on low-income or minority populations at any existing facility chosen within the CBD study area. There would be no residential displacements or other direct impacts to low income or minority populations within the CBD as a result of this alternative.

## **MITIGATION MEASURES**

Because there would be no disproportionately high or adverse impacts regarding Environmental Justice, no mitigation measures are proposed.

## **CONCLUSION**

There would be no disproportionately high or adverse impacts to minority or low-income populations as a result of the proposed project.

## **TRAFFIC AND TRANSPORTATION**

### **AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT**

#### **Traffic Circulation**

The existing street system within the study area of the preferred alternative is made up primarily of local one-way streets in a traditional grid system that provides direct access to businesses. The site is bound by 11<sup>th</sup> Street on the north, 12<sup>th</sup> Street on the south, Charlotte Street on the east, and Cherry Street on the west. In the project area, 11<sup>th</sup> Street is three lanes, one-way west; 12<sup>th</sup> Street is three lanes, one-way east; Charlotte Street is three lanes, one-way south; and Cherry Street provides one lane north and one lane south. Holmes Street is three lanes, one-way north, and currently bisects the site, but it would be vacated between 11<sup>th</sup> Street and 12<sup>th</sup> Street as part of this project.

The site is located within the Kansas City Downtown “Loop”. This area is created by I-29, I-35, I-70, and I-670, which come together and circle downtown Kansas City. On and off-ramps to the east side of the interstate loop are located one block to the east of the proposed project site on 11<sup>th</sup> Street. On and off-ramps to I-70 are located to the south of the site at 13<sup>th</sup> Street.

Downtown Kansas City, Missouri is at the center of the Kansas City Area Transportation Authority’s (KCATA) Metro Bus system which provides service throughout the metropolitan area. Several routes run along the north and south edge of the proposed project site on 11<sup>th</sup> and 12<sup>th</sup> Streets. Five current bus stop locations are located around the perimeter of the proposed project site. Future planning includes a new transit hub in the East Village area to supplement or replace the existing hub located at 10th and Main Streets. In addition, the City’s Bus Rapid Transit system, the MAX, includes stops located two blocks west of the site at 11<sup>th</sup> and Oak and 12<sup>th</sup> and Oak.

Pedestrian circulation exists throughout the project area with sidewalks located on both sides of all streets of the roadway grid system creating a very “walkable” area.

Metered parking is allowed on most of the streets within the downtown area. Surface parking lots as well as parking garages are located throughout the downtown area.

#### **Parking**

The western half (Block 99) of the existing project site is currently used for surface parking. Approximately one fourth of Block 99 is utilized by the Kansas City, MO Police Department, and the remainder is paid parking operated by private companies. These parking areas, which comprise approximately 360 spaces, would be removed as part of the proposed project.

Metered parking is provided on along both sides of most streets in the downtown area. In 2009, there were approximately 40,000 parking places available within the downtown area. A 350-space parking structure is currently under construction in the East Village, two blocks north of the proposed facility, at the southeast corner of 9<sup>th</sup> Street and Cherry Street.

The proposed project would be required to comply with the zoning ordinances of the City of Kansas City, Missouri. Chapter 80-444 of the Code of Ordinances of Kansas City Missouri outlines the general requirements of off-street parking. For office developments such as the proposed project, one parking space per each 1,000 square feet of gross floor area would

generally be required. The needs assessment in the Feasibility Study estimated that the proposed project would require 50 on-site, restricted access, surface parking spaces; 272 on-site, secured and enclosed structured parking spaces; and 988 off-site parking spaces.

#### **STANDARDS OF SIGNIFICANCE**

The proposed project would result in a traffic and transportation impact if it contributed to an increase in vehicle traffic that could not be accommodated by the roadway network. It would also result in an adverse impact if circulation problems occurred or if there was inadequate parking provided for occupants at the new Federal Building.

#### **IMPACTS**

##### **Alternative 1 (No Action Alternative)**

No impacts to transportation or traffic flow would result from the No Action Alternative.

##### **Alternative 2 (Preferred Alternative)**

Traffic and transportation impacts from the proposed project would include an increase in daily weekday vehicle traffic equivalent to the number of employees driving to work along the streets surrounding the proposed new facility and within the East Village area (e.g., 11<sup>th</sup>, 12<sup>th</sup>, Charlotte, Cherry, and Holmes Streets). Parking for the new Federal building would be accommodated by construction of on-site parking facilities and nearby on street parking and parking facilities. Employees and visitors would also be able to utilize the extensive Metro bus system that is centered in the downtown area. There would be an adverse long-term impact to traffic due to the removal of the 1100 block of Holmes Street. Traffic that would normally travel north on this block of Holmes Street would be required to go one block west to Cherry Street in order to continue further to the north. There would be a potential for adverse long-term impact due to the removal of the surface parking at the existing site if additional parking sites or structures could not meet the demand for parking.

##### **Alternative 3 (Lease Existing Space Alternative)**

Under the Lease Existing Space Alternative, there would be no impacts to transportation or traffic flow at any existing facility chosen within the CBD study area. While traffic and parking levels would increase in the areas occupied by the relocated tenants compared to when the existing facilities were vacant, any existing facilities would meet all applicable planning and zoning requirements for traffic and transportation. Existing lease spaces in the CBD study area for this alternative are also well served by the Metro bus system centered in this area.

#### **MITIGATION MEASURES**

As a part of the permitting for this project, GSA would conduct traffic and parking studies as required with coordination with the City of Kansas City, Missouri. As a result of these studies, GSA would work with the City on a plan to mitigate any traffic or parking impacts.

Access to adjacent businesses would be maintained during construction. Public information and signage would be utilized to inform drivers of any lane closures and detours.

#### **CONCLUSION**

There would be short-term adverse impacts to traffic and transportation as a result of the proposed construction for the proposed new downtown federal building. There would be minor long-term adverse impacts to traffic and transportation.

## **PUBLIC SERVICES AND UTILITIES**

### **AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT**

#### **Water Supply and Distribution System**

The Kansas City, Missouri Water Services Department supplies water to Kansas City through a pressurized system of water mains. Public water distribution mains and fire hydrants are located throughout the project area, with main lines ranging from 4-inches to 12-inches in size. An existing 6-inch main is located below Holmes Street (SFS, 2010).

#### **Fire and Police Protection**

The Kansas City, Missouri Fire and Police Departments provide all aspects of fire, rescue and police services to the project area. The Kansas City, Missouri Fire Department, District 102, Station 8 serves the project area including the proposed project site. The Central Patrol Division of the Kansas City, Missouri Police Department serves the proposed project site. Police headquarters is located at 1125 Locust, which is the west adjacent block to the proposed project site.

#### **Wastewater and Stormwater Collection and Treatment**

The Kansas City, Missouri Water Services Department provides wastewater collection and treatment. The downtown area, including the proposed project site, utilizes a combined sewer system. A combined sewer system is designed to collect rainwater runoff, domestic sewage, and industrial wastewater in the same pipe. The combined sewer system transports all of the wastewater to a sewage treatment plant, where it is treated by the City of Kansas City, Missouri and then discharged to the Missouri River.

Several existing sanitary sewer lines are located in proximity of the Site, including a 24-inch line below Charlotte Street, an 18-inch line below Holmes Street, an 18-inch line below Cherry Street, a 24-inch to 30-inch line below 12<sup>th</sup> Street, and an 8-inch to 12-inch line below the existing surface parking lot on Block 99 (SFS, 2010).

There is no existing stormwater detention facility on site. All surface runoff enters the storm drain system via a network of curb and grate inlets.

#### **Solid Waste**

The Solid Waste Division of the Kansas City, Missouri Public Works Department provides solid waste collection at the proposed site.

#### **Gas and Electricity**

Missouri Gas Energy provides natural gas to the site. Electrical service is provided by Kansas City Power and Light. Natural gas and electrical service is currently provided to the proposed project site via underground electrical service lines, and underground natural gas lines.

#### **Telecommunications**

Local telephone service is provided by AT&T through underground lines. Multiple entities offer internet and digital phone service to the area.

### **STANDARDS OF SIGNIFICANCE**

The proposed project would result in an adverse utility or public service impact if the project required more services than the existing infrastructure could provide or required services in conflict with adopted plans and policies for the area. The proposed project would also result in an

adverse impact if it resulted in a need for funding that required a separate vote of the public or securing funds that are not currently programmed.

### **IMPACTS**

#### **Alternative 1 (No Action Alternative)**

Under the No Action Alternative, there would be no change to existing public services and utilities.

#### **Alternative 2 (Preferred Alternative)**

Water Supply and Distribution System. It is anticipated that water demands would remain similar to that of the previous developments at the site. No major improvements or new service mains are anticipated to fulfill the needs of the project. The Kansas City, Missouri Water Services Department would likely require the existing 6-inch main located below Holmes Street to be relocated in association with the closure and abandonment of the 1100 block of Holmes Street. The relocation of this line may result in a short-term adverse impact to users in the area if the line cannot be bypassed during the relocation, such as a decrease in water pressure and temporary loss of service.

Fire and Police Protection. Additional fire and police protection are not anticipated. The City of Kansas City, Missouri Police Department and Fire Department would continue to service the area.

Wastewater Collection and Treatment. The existing system would remain in place. The City of Kansas City, Missouri Water Services Department would collect and treat wastewater using the existing combined gravity sewer system. Upon development of the site plan, the tap location would have to be determined and a 24-hour flow test performed by the City to verify that capacity exists in the existing system to support the proposed building. The existing sanitary lines located below Holmes Street would need to be removed in conjunction with the removal of the street in this area. This line serves other facilities to the north which would require that the sewer be relocated west or east to maintain upstream services. The existing line under Block 99 is assumed to have an easement since this line is not currently located in the public right-of-way and services facilities upstream. This line may require relocation in order to maintain upstream services. The construction of a new Federal Building would provide the opportunity to separate from the existing combined sewer infrastructure. This separation would have positive environmental impacts by reducing the city's water treatment costs and reducing potential combined sewer overflows during periods of high rain fall.

Stormwater Collection. The existing storm sewer system would remain in place. Storm sewer and sanitary sewer systems include combined systems for many areas of Downtown Kansas City, Missouri. As described in the Wastewater Collection and Treatment section, the existing underground storm sewer within the right-of-way of Holmes Street and the lines under Block 99 would most likely be required to be removed and/or relocated. Improvements to the existing sanitary and storm sewer may be required if the future design analysis by the City or consultants determine that the existing system does not have the capacity to accommodate stormwater runoff from the proposed site development.

Solid Waste. Service would be provided by the Solid Waste Division of the Kansas City, Missouri Public Works Department and disposed of in appropriate facilities.

Gas and Electricity. Additional service lines may need to be installed, depending on the LOS required by the proposed building.

Telecommunications. Additional telephone lines may need to be installed, depending on the LOS required by the proposed building.

### **Alternative 3 (Lease Existing Space Alternative)**

Under the Lease Existing Space Alternative, there would be no change to existing public services and utilities at any existing facility chosen within the CBD study area.

### **MITIGATION MEASURES**

Because the site would not require major utility infrastructure improvements beyond what would normally be anticipated with an office building construction project, no mitigation measures are proposed.

### **CONCLUSION**

There would be no long-term adverse impacts to public services and utilities as a result of the proposed action. Some existing utilities would require relocation as part of the project which could create a short-term adverse impact. Several energy saving and sustainable features would be incorporated into the new facility that would further reduce usage load on utilities and reduce utility impacts. These features may include the use of photovoltaic arrays, optimization of building orientation and design, geo-exchange systems, grey water / stormwater re-use and recycling, on-site water management, solid waste diversion, native landscaping and increased effective R-values of wall and roof assemblies.

## **WATER RESOURCES**

### **AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT**

#### **Surface Water**

The proposed site of the preferred alternative lies within the Missouri River Basin, which covers approximately 8,200 square miles in Missouri. The site is located in a highly developed urban area approximately one mile southeast of the Missouri River (Appendix A, Figure 1). The site is also located over 150 feet above the river in elevation. There are no other surface water features in the vicinity of the proposed project.

No drainages, catch basins, or culverts exist on the property. Stormwater and storm sewers are discussed in Section 3.5, Public Services and Utilities. The property is not located within a 100-year or 500-year floodplain as shown in Appendix A, Figure 2.

#### **Groundwater**

The proposed project site of the preferred alternative is located in the Northwest Groundwater Province, which is characterized by poor quality and low yields of groundwater due to the geological characteristics of the area (MDNR, 2011). The Missouri River Alluvium Province is located approximately one mile northwest of the project site and wells in this area are the principal source of groundwater for the greater Kansas City area (MDNR, 1997).

### **STANDARDS OF SIGNIFICANCE**

The proposed project would result in an adverse water resources impact if the project were to impact surface water, groundwater, drainage and floodplain, or water quality. Adverse surface and groundwater impacts would result if existing water resources were directly or indirectly impacted from water resource extraction. Water resource requirements of the project must be balanced with available supplies, and appropriate water rights and extraction procedures must be

followed. The proposed project would result in an adverse drainage or floodplain impact if the project:

- Is located in a regulatory floodplain without appropriate flood study, FEMA map revisions, and mitigation measures;
- Fails to adequately address upstream drainage as it is conveyed through the study area; or
- Changes historic drainage flows and/or patterns, potentially impacting downstream areas.

The proposed project would result in water quality impacts if federal or state water quality regulations and standards were violated or if the project did not meet water design requirements. Such violations could involve either surface water or groundwater.

### **IMPACTS**

#### **Alternative 1 (No Action Alternative)**

The No Action Alternative would result in no changes to water resources and would perpetuate the existing conditions at the site.

#### **Alternative 2 (Preferred Alternative)**

Under Alternative 2, no adverse, long-term impacts to surface water or groundwater are expected. The potential for minor adverse short-term construction impacts, such as soil run off, to surface water related to demolition and construction activities would be mitigated through the use of BMPs. Impacts to groundwater are not expected from the project, as hazardous material usage would be minimal, and BMPs would help to minimize the potential of contaminants to migrate through the soil to groundwater aquifers. The potential to separate sanitary and storm sewer systems as well as retaining storm water for use in on site irrigation, would result in positive impact to water resources.

The proposed new building would obtain its water from the Kansas City, Missouri Water Services Department, which supplies water to the area.

#### **Alternative 3 (Lease Existing Space Alternative)**

The Lease Existing Space Alternative would result in no changes to water resources at any existing facility chosen within the CBD study area.

### **MITIGATION MEASURES**

BMPs would be implemented to control runoff, erosion, and sediment transport during and after construction. The proposed project would be constructed in compliance with stormwater National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit requirements and guidelines.

The development of the proposed project would comply with federal, state, and local regulations governing construction activities. A Stormwater Management Plan would be submitted to the Missouri Department of Natural Resources (MDNR) and certified prior to proposed construction activities. The construction contractor would comply with the terms of a general permit to discharge stormwater associated with construction activities in accordance with the NPDES Stormwater Permit. MDNR regulates the NPDES Program and requires that a NOI be submitted at least 15 days before starting construction. The permit specifies that BMPs be utilized during construction and operation of the proposed project. The project must also comply with Kansas City Stormwater Permit Requirements.

**CONCLUSION**

There would be no adverse impacts to water quality resources as a result of the proposed construction activities, due to use of BMPs as regulated by MDNR through a NPDES permit.

**AIR QUALITY**

**AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT**

The regulatory structure for air quality planning in Missouri includes federal, state, regional, and local agencies. These agencies either have actual regulatory authority or are responsible for the development and implementation of programs and plans designed to reduce air pollution levels.

National air quality policies are regulated through the federal Clean Air Act (CAA). Pursuant to the CAA, the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) has established National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) for the following air pollutants (termed “criteria” pollutants): carbon monoxide (CO), ozone (O<sub>3</sub>), nitrogen dioxide (NO<sub>2</sub>), sulfur dioxide (SO<sub>2</sub>), particulate matter less than 10 micrometers in diameter (PM<sub>10</sub>), particulate matter less than 2.5 microns in diameter (PM<sub>2.5</sub>), and lead (Pb). The NAAQS are summarized in Table 6 and represent safe levels that allow for avoidance of specific adverse health effects associated with each pollutant.

**TABLE 6. NATIONAL AMBIENT AIR QUALITY STANDARDS AS OF DECEMBER 2008**

Pollutant	Averaging Time	Primary Standard <sup>1</sup>	Secondary Standard <sup>2</sup>
Ozone (O <sub>3</sub> )	8-Hour <sup>3</sup> (1997 std) 8-Hour (2000 std)	0.08 ppm (157 ug/m <sup>3</sup> ) 0.075 ppm	Same as Primary
Carbon Monoxide (CO)	8-Hour 1-Hour	9 ppm (10 mg/m <sup>3</sup> )* 35 ppm (40 mg/m <sup>3</sup> )*	No Secondary Standard
Nitrogen Dioxide (NO <sub>2</sub> )	Annual Arithmetic Mean	0.053 ppm (100 ug/m <sup>3</sup> )	Same as Primary
Sulfur Dioxides (SO <sub>2</sub> )	Annual Arithmetic Mean 24-Hour 1-Hour	0.03 ppm (80 ug/m <sup>3</sup> ) 0.14 ppm (365 ug/m <sup>3</sup> ) 75 ppb	0.5 ppm (1300 ug/m <sup>3</sup> ) – 3 hour averaging time
Particulates (PM <sub>10</sub> )	24-Hour	150 µg/m <sup>3</sup> *	Same as Primary
Particulates (PM <sub>2.5</sub> )	Annual Arithmetic Mean 24-Hour	15 µg/m <sup>3</sup> 35 µg/m <sup>3</sup>	Same as Primary
Lead (Pb)	Calendar Quarter Arithmetic Mean	1.5 µg/m <sup>3</sup>	Same as Primary

<sup>1</sup>Primary Standard means the level of air quality, which provides protection for public health with an adequate margin of safety.

<sup>2</sup>Secondary Standard means the level of air quality, which may be necessary to protect welfare from unknown or anticipated adverse effects.

<sup>3</sup>The 8-hour primary and secondary are met when the 3-year average of the 4<sup>th</sup> highest average concentration is less than or equal to 0.08 ppm (1997 std).

\*Concentration not to be exceeded more than once per year.

Source: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. 2008.

The Kansas City area is designated as an Ozone Maintenance Area due to exceedances of the previous ozone standards. The area is currently classified as in attainment with the 2008 – eight hour standard, but this is under evaluation. The new standards are expected to be published by the EPA in 2013 and may result in the re-designation of the area as nonattainment.

The EPA has found that the “aggregate group of the well-mixed greenhouse gases (GHGs)” constitutes an air pollutant that contributes to climate change. Carbon dioxide is a GHG, and the proposed project would have an indirect impact on carbon dioxide emissions from fossil fuel sources.

Electricity for the existing Bannister Federal complex and the proposed Federal building are currently supplied by Kansas City Power and Light. Great Plains Energy, the parent company of Kansas City Power and Light, obtains its electricity through multiple sources including coal-fired power plants (80 percent), nuclear (17 percent), natural gas and oil (2 percent), wind (1 percent), (GPE, 2011). Nonrenewable fossil fuels are, therefore, the primary electricity source for the existing and proposed facilities.

#### **STANDARDS OF SIGNIFICANCE**

The proposed project would result in an adverse air quality impact if the activities associated with its construction or operation would result in a violation of the NAAQS or cause deterioration in air quality.

#### **IMPACTS**

##### **Alternative 1 (No Action Alternative)**

The No Action Alternative would result in no changes to air quality and would perpetuate the existing conditions at the site.

##### **Alternative 2 (Preferred Alternative)**

Short-term adverse impacts to air quality would result from emissions from equipment used during site preparation, demolition, and project construction. These activities would involve the use of heavy-duty off-road diesel- and gasoline-powered equipment that would generate emissions of air pollutants, namely nitrogen oxides (NO<sub>x</sub>), CO, PM<sub>10</sub>, PM<sub>2.5</sub>, sulfur oxides (SO<sub>x</sub>), and volatile organic compounds (VOCs). Additionally, fugitive dust (PM<sub>10</sub>) would be generated from the construction of the new building. These emissions would be short term in nature and would not affect regional air quality. Ozone emissions from this project should be negligible.

Day-to-day operations of the proposed building could potentially have minimal long-term adverse air quality impacts over the life of the project compared to existing undeveloped conditions at the site. However, the proposed project would reduce the GSA's carbon footprint and GHG emissions by reducing the amount of electricity needed to service the tenants by incorporating specifications of a "green building," and energy conservation strategies that may include photovoltaic arrays, optimization of building orientation and window placement, increased effective R-values, geo-exchange systems. The use of any, or all, of these energy conservation strategies would create a much more efficient building than the existing Bannister Federal complex.

##### **Alternative 3 (Lease Existing Space Alternative)**

The Lease Existing Space Alternative would result in minimal localized impacts to air quality as compared to any existing vacant facility chosen within the CBD study area. However, there would be no impacts compared to any existing facility within the CBD which is currently of was previously occupied.

#### **MITIGATION MEASURES**

The primary pollutants of concern for this proposed project are PM<sub>10</sub> and PM<sub>2.5</sub> resulting from construction activities. Atmospheric emissions, however, would be short term and should not affect regional air quality. These emissions would be controlled through BMPs including watering disturbed areas during the duration of construction activities.

**CONCLUSION**

There would be localized, adverse, short-term impacts to air quality as a result of the proposed construction which would be mitigated by the use of BMPs. There would be minimal adverse long-term impacts.

**NOISE**

**AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT**

Noise is defined as unwanted sound. Sounds are described as noise if they interfere with an activity or disturb the person hearing them. Sound pressure levels are commonly measured in a logarithmic unit called a decibel (dB). The human ear is not equally sensitive to all sound frequencies, being generally less sensitive to very low and very high frequency sounds. Therefore, sound levels in standard frequency bands are weighted differentially to correspond more closely to the frequency response of the human ear and the human perception of loudness. Such weighted sound levels are designated as A-weighted decibels (dBA).

For the average person, a 10-dBA increase in the measured sound level is subjectively perceived as being twice as loud, and a 10-dBA decrease is perceived as half as loud. The decibel change at which the average human would indicate that the sound is just perceptibly louder or perceptibly quieter is 3 dBA. There is generally a 10-dBA reduction in sound level for each doubling of distance from a noise source due to spherical spreading loss (e.g., if the sound level at 25 feet from a piece of construction equipment was 86 dB, the sound level at 50 feet would be expected to be 76 dB, at 100 feet 66 dB, etc.). Typical sound levels experienced by people range from about 40 dBA in a quiet living room, to about 85 dBA on a sidewalk adjacent to heavy traffic.

Table 7 provides a list of typical noise levels. The general principle on which most noise acceptability criteria are based is that a perceptible change in noise is likely to cause annoyance wherever it intrudes upon the existing ambient sound; that is, annoyance depends upon the sound that exists before the introduction of the new sound.

The preferred alternative of the proposed project is subject to the Kansas City Noise Ordinance (Code of Ordinances of Kansas City, Missouri, Chapter 46). The area surrounding the proposed project site is a developed urban area consisting of mixed office, commercial, and multifamily residential land use, and existing area streets. Two sensitive noise receptors are located in the vicinity of the proposed project: the Della Lamb School located one block to the north, and St. Mary's Episcopal Church located two blocks to the south.

**TABLE 7: TYPICAL NOISE LEVELS**

Noise Level (dBA)	Noise Source
140	Jet Engine
130	Threshold of Pain
115-120	Amplified Rock Band
105-115	Commercial Jet Takeoff at 200 feet
95-105	Community Warning Siren at 100 feet
85-95	Busy Urban Street
75-85	Construction Equipment at 50 feet
65-75	Freeway Traffic at 50 feet
55-65	Normal Conversation at 6 feet
45-55	Typical Office Interior
35-45	Soft Radio Music
25-35	Typical Residential Interior

Noise Level (dBA)	Noise Source
15-25	Typical Whisper at 6 feet
5-15	Human Breathing
0-5	Threshold of Hearing

**STANDARDS OF SIGNIFICANCE**

The proposed project would result in an adverse noise impact if it resulted in conditions that violated established noise guidelines.

**IMPACTS**

**Alternative 1 (No Action Alternative)**

Under the No Action Alternative, noise levels would not increase over current conditions.

**Alternative 2 (Preferred Alternative)**

There would be an increase in vehicle traffic equivalent to the number of employees driving to work along the streets surrounding the proposed new facility. However, the increase in noise levels would be negligible given the existing development and location in a dense urban center.

Construction activities associated with the proposed project would include site excavation and construction of the new federal building. Construction activities would be of a short-term nature, and depending on the nature of the construction operations, would last from seconds (e.g., a truck passing by) to months (e.g., constructing a building). Construction noise is also intermittent and depends on the type of operation, location, and function of the equipment, and the equipment usage cycle. While the proposed project is being built, adjoining properties in the study area would be exposed to noise from construction activities. These activities would result in adverse short-term noise impacts.

**Alternative 3 (Lease Existing Space Alternative)**

Under the Lease Existing Space Alternative, noise levels would not increase over current conditions at any existing facility chosen within the CBD study area.

**MITIGATION MEASURES**

Activities associated with the proposed project, such as excavation and pile driving, would not be noisy enough at nearby offices and residences to require mitigation. All construction noise generated would be within the parameters set forth in the Code of Ordinances of Kansas City, Missouri. To address the temporary elevated noise levels anticipated during construction, standard mitigation measures would be incorporated into construction contracts. Measures would include:

- Exhaust systems on equipment will be in good working order and equipment will be maintained on a regular basis;
- Properly designed engine enclosures and intake silencers will be used where appropriate;
- New equipment will be subject to new product noise emission standards; and
- Stationary equipment will be stationed as far from sensitive noise receptors as possible.

**CONCLUSION**

Under the proposed action, there would be minor adverse and short-term noise impacts to adjacent areas as a result of the proposed construction activities. There would be no adverse long-term impacts.

## **VISUAL RESOURCES**

### **AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT**

Visual resources within the study area of the preferred alternative are representative of urbanized mixed use areas. The proposed project site is located in the East Village Redevelopment Area of the CBD of downtown Kansas City. In general, the CBD of Kansas City is predominately comprised of mid- to high-rise commercial office buildings and civic structures. Several blocks of the East Village Redevelopment Area have been cleared and are currently being utilized as surface parking lots prior to their redevelopment. Views in the vicinity are partially screened due to adjacent development and nature of the urban area. Several NRHP listed and eligible buildings have views of the proposed project site with varying degrees of screening. The site is located on a south facing slope which provides some restricted views of midtown and more southern portions of Kansas City, Missouri. A photographic log of the site and surrounding areas is included in Appendix D.

Visual sensitivity of the site is considered low due to the developed nature of the urban core of downtown Kansas City, Missouri.

### **STANDARDS OF SIGNIFICANCE**

The proposed project would result in an adverse impact if the project were to substantially degrade the scenic quality of the site or the immediately surrounding area. The extent to which the proposed project may affect the visual resource depends on the amount of visual contrast created between the proposed new building and the visual characteristics of the surrounding area. Impacts would occur if the project resulted in visual contrasts that had a negative impact on the visual setting of the site or surrounding area.

### **IMPACTS**

#### **Alternative 1 (No Action Alternative)**

Under the No Action Alternative, there would be no impact upon visual resources.

#### **Alternative 2 (Preferred Alternative)**

Construction of the proposed building would create a visual feature in the project area consistent with the scenic character of the surrounding area. The building would consist of a multistory structure of office and related space. The building would project a professional and aesthetically pleasing appearance consistent with the urban nature of the CBD. The building will meet the requirements of GSA's Design Excellence program (GSA, 2011), in which buildings express the vision, leadership, and commitment of the government to serve the public and the values of the nation. The proposed project would have to be approved by the Kansas City Planning and Development Department and satisfy all requirements of the Code of Ordinances of Kansas City, Missouri.

Redevelopment of the site would have a visual impact on views from the east side of the downtown interstate loop, and from adjacent and nearby buildings.

The building would be designed as a Level 3 security risk, which requires a 50-foot setback distance from a secure perimeter on all sides. The area within the 50-foot setback distance surrounding the proposed building on three sides would include large sidewalks, professional landscaping, and would be pedestrian-friendly.

Construction activities associated with the proposed project include site excavation and construction of the new proposed building. Construction activities would result in short-term

impacts to the aesthetics of the area, due to noise, street closures, and other general construction disturbances. Construction activities are scheduled to last approximately 42 months.

### **Alternative 3 (Lease Existing Space Alternative)**

Under the Lease Existing Space Alternative, there would be no impact upon visual resources at any existing facility chosen within the CBD study area.

### **MITIGATION MEASURES**

Because the proposed project would have no adverse impacts regarding visual resources, no mitigation measures are proposed.

### **CONCLUSION**

The project would result in a beneficial long-term impact on visual resources in the project area by providing a new building in a redeveloping area consistent with the urban nature of the area.

## **CULTURAL RESOURCES**

### **AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT**

The National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA), as amended (16 USC 470 *et seq.*), NEPA, and GSA Order ADM 1022 require the consideration of impacts on historic properties. The term “historic property” is defined in the NHPA (16 USC §470(w)(5)) as “any prehistoric or historic district, site, building, structure, or object included in, or eligible for inclusion on the National Register [of Historic Places].” Section 101(b)(4) of NEPA stresses the importance of preserving “important historic, cultural, and natural aspects of our national heritage...” (emphasis added). Section 106 of the NHPA stipulates that:

*The head of any federal agency having direct or indirect jurisdiction over a proposed federal or federally assisted undertaking in any state and the head of any federal department or independent agency having authority to license any undertaking shall, prior to the approval of the expenditure of any federal funds on the undertaking or prior to the issuance of any licenses, as the case may be, take into account the effect of the undertaking on any district, site, building, structure, or object that is included in or eligible for inclusion in the National Register.*

The regulations implementing the NHPA (36 CFR 800) encourage federal agencies to consider their Section 106 responsibilities as early as possible in the NEPA process, and to plan their public participation, analysis, and review in such a way that they can meet the purposes and requirements of both statutes in a timely and efficient manner.

Thus, GSA is obliged to consider the effects of construction for the proposed new building on any historic properties. In doing so, GSA must first define the Area of Potential Effects (APE). According to 36 CFR 800.16(d), the APE is defined as:

*The geographic area or areas within which an undertaking may directly or indirectly cause alterations in the character or use of historic properties, if any such properties exist. The area of potential effects is influenced by the scale and nature of the undertaking and may be different for different kinds of effects caused by the undertaking.*

The preferred alternative is the development of the new Federal Building is located on a two-block site (Blocks 99 and 100) located in downtown Kansas City, Missouri, as shown in

Appendix A, Figure 3. The site is approximately 4.91 acres and bounded by 11<sup>th</sup> Street on the north, 12<sup>th</sup> Street on the south, Charlotte Street on the east, and Cherry Street on the west, in Kansas City, Jackson County, Missouri. The architectural APE is based on the potential for the project to directly or indirectly effect historic properties and potential historic districts. Indirect effects of historic properties would include altering viewsheds of existing properties and those from existing properties. The APE for this project includes the proposed project location and an area approximately two blocks wide in all directions, bounded by 9<sup>th</sup> Street on the north, Oak Street on the west, 14<sup>th</sup> Street on the south, and the I-70/I-35 Highway on the east (Appendix A, Figure 8). The archeological APE includes all areas with the potential for ground disturbance as a result of this project, which includes the entire site area bounded by 11<sup>th</sup> Street on the North, 12<sup>th</sup> Street on the South, Charlotte Street on the East, and Cherry Street on the West, including the area of the current Holmes Street that would be vacated as a part of this project.

The investigation of historic, archeological, and architectural properties present within the APE was completed by URS in 2010. The investigation followed GSA and Missouri State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) approved protocol for cultural resources surveys and documentation. The findings of the *Archeological Survey, Proposed Downtown Federal Building* (URS, 2010a) and the *Cultural Resources Assessment, Proposed Downtown Federal Building* (URS, 2010b) are summarized in this section. The reports included a records and literature review of previous surveys, aerial photographs, topographic maps, Sanborn maps, as well as a field survey of the APE. The aerial photographs, topographic maps, and Sanborn maps, were provided by Environmental Data Resources (EDR), and are included in Appendix E.

### **Archeological Resources**

The preferred alternative project site is located in an urban setting with a history of development, demolition and redevelopment extending over at least a 150 year period. These activities have removed or disturbed the soils of the project site to an extent that it is highly unlikely that any undisturbed evidence of prehistoric occupation still exists on the property.

The earliest identified records for Block 99, an 1896 Sanborn map (EDR, 2010b), indicate eleven residential dwellings facing Cherry Street, one facing 11th Street, and four facing 12th Street; five stores, an unidentified building, and a barn faced 12th Street; a blacksmiths shop, the Weis & Ridge Cornice Co., and five vacant parcels faced Holmes Street. Numerous changes and developments occurred to Block 99 over time, but by 1979 all structures had been removed from the site and the entire block was utilized as surface parking. Currently, all of block 99 is asphalt paved and utilized as surface parking. Records of demolition were not available for all buildings in the block, and those available did not fully indicate if all foundations and building materials had been removed from the site during the demolition process. Therefore, it is unknown if building materials or other historic archeological materials are present in Block 99. In an April 27, 2011 letter (Appendix C) the SHPO stated that Block 99 has the potential for historic archeological sites, and further investigation should be conducted when access to the site is obtained.

A Greyhound Bus Terminal was constructed on the entire area of Block 100 in 1967. The building was condemned in 2007 and demolished in the fall of 2009. The demolition included deep excavations to remove all building materials including the basement and foundations. Due to the deep excavations associated with both the construction and demolition of the former Greyhound Bus Terminal, it is unlikely that any intact prehistoric or historic archeological resources remain in Block 100. In an April 27, 2011 letter (Appendix C) the SHPO concurred that that there are unlikely to be any historic or prehistoric archeological sites with Block 100 and that no further archeological investigations are warranted for this block.

A review of cultural resource records show that there are no archaeological sites recorded in or near the project area. One previous archeological survey (BO-92) has been performed that included the project site in the survey area. Three previous archeological investigations (AU-29, AU-33, and JA-130) have been performed in the vicinity of the proposed project area. Appendix A, Figure 9 illustrates the boundaries of the previous surveys. These surveys did not identify any new or previously recorded sites in or near the proposed project area.

### **Native American Consultation**

GSA contacted nine Tribes which are known to have an association with Jackson County, Missouri. These tribes included: Sac and Fox of the Missouri in Kansas and Nebraska, Osage Nation, Absentee-Shawnee Tribe of Indians of Oklahoma, Otoe-Missouria Tribe of Oklahoma, Shawnee Tribe, Eastern Shawnee Tribe of Oklahoma, Iowa Tribe of Kansas and Nebraska, Kickapoo Tribe in Kansas, and Prairie Band of Potawatomi Indians. A letter was sent to each of the Tribes briefly describing the proposed project, requesting comments, and inviting representatives to the Public Meeting held on January 19, 2010. One response was received from the Osage Nation requesting a copy of the EA for the proposed project. Appendix C contains an example of the letters sent to the Tribes and the one response received.

### **Historic Resources**

Currently there are no structures located on the subject property of the preferred alternative, with block 99 being used as a surface parking lot and block 100 undeveloped and vegetated. The historical usage of the subject property was gathered from numerous sources as detailed in the *Cultural Resources Assessment, Proposed Downtown Federal Building* (URS, 2010b). The subject property has seen a number of different uses over the years. These uses included residential dwellings, a cornice works, blacksmith shop, hotels, a laundry, a service station, a drug store, a bus terminal, and parking lots. Over the years, numerous buildings on the site have been demolished, reconfigured, and/or redeveloped. The most recent redevelopment occurred in January of 2010 with the demolition of the Greyhound bus terminal that formerly occupied all of Block 100. Development prior to 1894 (date of the oldest Sanborn map) is not known.

There are 29 structures located within the APE for the project. There are two properties in the APE of the proposed project which are listed in the NRHP: the Inter-State Building, and St. Mary's Episcopal Church.

- **Inter-State Building** - The Inter-State Building is located at 417 E. 13<sup>th</sup> Street, two blocks west and two blocks south of the proposed project area, and in the southwest corner of the intersection of 13<sup>th</sup> Street and Locust Street. A map showing the location of the Inter-State Building is included in Appendix A, Figure 8.
- **St. Mary's Episcopal Church** - St. Mary's Episcopal Church is located at 1307 Holmes Street, two blocks south of the proposed project area, and in the southeast corner of the intersection of 13<sup>th</sup> Street and Holmes Street. A map showing the location of the St. Mary's Episcopal Church is included in Appendix A, Figure 8.

A field survey to document and assess the condition of the 29 structures located within the APE was conducted on May 27 and 28, 2010. This survey identified five additional properties as eligible for listing in the NRHP: The Wiltshire Apartment Hotel, City Hall, Police Headquarters, Jackson County Courthouse, and the Regional Correctional Center/ Community Justice Building. In an April 27, 2011 letter (Appendix C) the SHPO stated that they concur with the two NRHP listed and five NRHP eligible buildings.

### **STANDARDS OF SIGNIFICANCE**

Cultural resources are evaluated for nomination to the National Register according to the Criteria for Evaluation shown at 36 CFR 60.4, as summarized below:

*The quality of significance in American history, architecture, archaeology, engineering, and culture is present in districts, sites, buildings, structures, and objects that possess integrity of location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association and*

- a) that are associated with events that have made a significant contribution to the broad patterns of our history; or*
- b) that are associated with the lives of persons significant in our past; or*
- c) that embody the distinctive characteristics of a type, period, or method of construction, or that represent the work of a master, or that possess high artistic values, or that represent a significant and distinguishable entity whose components may lack individual distinction; or*
- d) that have yielded, or may be likely to yield, information important in prehistory or history.*

Integrity is the “ability of a property to convey its significance.” In order to retain historic integrity, a property will always possess several, and usually most, of the seven aspects (location, design, setting, materials, workmanship, feeling, and association). Eligible sites are those that satisfy one or more of the aforementioned criteria and retain integrity. Non-eligible sites are those that do not satisfy any of the evaluation criteria and/or lack integrity.

Each of the structures within the APE was evaluated individually according to the Criteria for Evaluation shown above.

### **IMPACTS**

#### **Alternative 1 (No Action Alternative)**

The No Action Alternative would have no impact on any cultural resources.

#### **Alternative 2 (Preferred Alternative)**

This alternative would require excavation and ground disturbance activities associated with the construction of a multistory Federal building. While it is unlikely that any prehistoric resources remain within Block 99 or Block 100 of the site, Block 99 of the site may have the potential to contain historic archeological sites, and the proposed construction would have an adverse effect on those resources. In an April 27, 2011 letter (Appendix C) the SHPO concurred that there are unlikely to be any historic or prehistoric archeological sites within Block 100 and that no further archeological investigations are warranted for this block. The SHPO also determined that the construction of the proposed project may have an adverse effect on historic archeological resources in Block 99, and that additional archeological investigations of Block 99 are required to identify the presence, or lack of historic archeological resources within Block 99.

Due to the topography of the area and existing structures, the Interstate Building and the Regional Correctional Center/ Community Justice Building are blocked from view of the proposed project site. City Hall, Police Headquarters, and the Jackson County Courthouse have limited views of and from the proposed project site. St. Mary's Episcopal Church is located two blocks south of the proposed project site and currently has direct views of the project area. The Wiltshire Apartment Hotel is located one block north of the proposed project site and currently has direct

views of the project area from the rear façade of the building. Given the setting of the project area in the urban core of downtown Kansas City, as well as the construction and demolition of multiple structures in the immediate area over time, any relationship of the original setting and viewshed of St. Mary's Episcopal Church and the Wiltshire Apartment Hotel are no longer present. The SHPO stated in an April 27, 2011 letter (Appendix C) that St. Mary's Episcopal Church is listed in the NRHP and within the viewshed of the proposed project, and "while this could be construed as an adverse effect, there have already been dramatic changes to the context of the area with other new construction and with surface parking lots."

### **Alternative 3 (Lease Existing Space Alternative)**

The Lease Existing Space Alternative would have no impact on any cultural resources at any existing facility chosen within the CBD study area.

### **MITIGATION MEASURES**

A Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) that outlines the steps needed to mitigate the potential adverse effects from this preferred alternative will be prepared in consultation with the SHPO, the City of Kansas City, Missouri, and any other interested parties, prior to any construction related activities.

### **CONCLUSION**

The preferred alternative has the potential to have an adverse impact to cultural resources as a result of the proposed construction activities. A MOA would stipulate appropriate measures to mitigate any adverse impacts from the proposed project. If any additional archeological sites were encountered during the construction process, GSA would stop work on the site to avoid further impacts and would have a qualified archeologist assess the site in coordination with the SHPO.

### **HAZARDOUS MATERIALS AND WASTE**

Hazardous materials and waste information presented in this section is provided to identify current conditions and potential concerns. Phase I and Phase II Environmental Site Assessments (ESAs) were completed for the project site (URS, 2010c and URS, 2011). The Phase I and Phase II ESA reports describe in further detail the current environmental conditions at the site.

### **AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT**

An environmental contamination assessment was conducted to evaluate potential environmental contamination impacts within one mile of the proposed project site of the preferred alternative (subject property). The assessment was completed by identifying, compiling, and reviewing available information on past and present activities of hazardous material significance within the study area. This included obtaining information about present and former land use of the site and surrounding properties, and information about any prior environmental contamination investigations that may have been conducted.

#### **Phase I Environmental Site Assessment**

The scope of work for the Phase I ESA included a visual inspection and photographic documentation of the Site, interviews with the Site contact, review of pertinent background and historical information, review of on-site activities, observation of property and surrounding land use, and review of a regulatory database report.

The subject property consists of two square blocks (Block 99 and 100) that are 4.91 acres in size. Currently the western block (Block 99) consists of an asphalt surfaced parking lot, while the

eastern block (Block 100) consists of a recently redeveloped property that at the time of the visual inspection was a vacant vegetated lot.

The Phase I ESA revealed no evidence of Recognized Environmental Conditions (RECs) or environmental concerns, as defined by the American Society for Testing and Materials, in connection with the subject property except for the following:

- According to historic Sanborn Fire Insurance maps and city directories, the site and the surrounding properties appear to have a long history of retail, commercial, and to some extent manufacturing uses that primarily included businesses that may have stored, handled, or dispensed petroleum products; businesses focused on clothes cleaning that may or may not have involved the use of dry cleaning solvents; and a variety of other operations that may have involved the use of hazardous chemicals. These former uses represent historical RECs to the subject property due to the potential for releases of petroleum products, chlorinated solvents and metals (URS, 2010c).
- Previous Phase I and Phase II ESAs were conducted for the City of Kansas City, Missouri on the eastern half (Block 100) of the property (Family, 2008a and Family, 2008b). The site was previously occupied by the Greyhound Bus Terminal and historically had two underground storage tanks (diesel and gasoline). Prior to the Greyhound Bus Terminal, the site was occupied by a former filling station on the northwest corner, auto repair operations, and welding operations. As a result of the findings of the Phase I ESA, a Phase II ESA was conducted that investigated soils and groundwater at the site for the presence of petroleum, solvent, and metals contamination. The analytical results were compared with the Missouri Risk Based Corrective Action (MRBCA) Lowest Default Target Levels (LDTLs) and Residential Default Target Levels (RDTLs) that are typically the most conservative/protective contaminant levels established.

The consultant for the city concluded that while several compounds primarily exceeded their respective MRBCA LDTLs, which are the most conservative risk based standards, they would likely not be applicable to the current and future use of the property since there is unlikely to be groundwater wells on-site for domestic use (Family, 2008).

- Review of an environmental database revealed six nearby facilities that either had prior releases or formerly had drycleaning operations at the facility. Based on the upgradient proximity, groundwater flow, and known releases and/or drycleaning operations, the six facilities pose environmental concerns to the subject property that would require remediation if the property were to be further developed beyond current surface parking.

Since the time of the previous Phase I ESA for Block 100 was completed, the City of Kansas City, Missouri entered the Block 100 site into the MDNR Brownfields Voluntarily Cleanup Program (BVCP) and reportedly abated all asbestos and lead based paint from the Greyhound building prior to demolition. The city's consultant prepared and submitted another report to the BVCP. Based upon review of the report, the BVCP did not require further monitoring, investigation at the site, or institutional controls at the site, and considered the investigation closed. A Certificate of Completion for the site was issued on November 5, 2010, indicating that no further action is required at the site. Therefore, the block 100 portion of the site no longer represents a REC to the subject property.

Based on the information obtained and scope of services performed for the Phase I ESA, it was recommended that further assessment (a Phase II ESA) be conducted on the western half

(Block 99) portion of the property in the vicinity of former filling stations, a former dry cleaning facility and a former gasoline storage tank located on what is now a portion of the Kansas City, Missouri Police Department's parking lot.

### **Phase II Environmental Site Assessment**

The objective of the Phase II ESA was to assess the nature of the RECs that were identified in the URS Phase I ESA (URS, 2010c). The scope of work for the Phase II ESA included a geophysical investigation, a utility clearance, and a subsurface investigation of the Block 99 portion of the site. Site access for the Phase II investigation was only granted for the western half of Block 99. Therefore, the geophysical survey was limited to the western half of Block 99, and the subsurface investigation was limited to the western half of Block 99 and areas directly adjacent to the eastern half of Block 99.

A geophysical survey consisting of an electromagnetic (EM) and ground penetrating radar survey was conducted to identify the presence of underground storage tanks (USTs) or other buried materials of significance.

The geophysical survey identified six anomalies. Three of the anomalies appeared to be associated with an underground utility, a small guard building, and a parking lot sign. The remaining three anomalies appeared to be large masses of buried metal that could be indicative of underground storage tanks (USTs). These anomalies appear to be anywhere from 2 to three 3 feet below ground surface (bgs) and are located on the southwest quarter of Block 99 that is currently utilized by the Kansas City, Missouri Police Department for vehicle parking.

The subsurface investigation included six borings that were advanced to 25 feet bgs in each of the areas of concern identified, with the exception of soil boring 1 (SB-1) which was terminated at 11.5 feet bgs after encountering what is believed to have been the concrete basement floor of a former building.

Visual and/or olfactory signs of impact were observed in two of the soil borings at depths ranging from 10 to 20 feet bgs. Impacted soils were observed to consist of greenish gray silty clays with slight petroleum or chemical odors.

Analytical results of the soils samples indicated that arsenic and lead were generally detected slightly above the MDNR MRBCA DTLs in all of the soil samples and are consistent with background concentrations typically encountered in Jackson County. Acetone was detected slightly above the DTL in one of the soil samples. No analytes were detected above the non-residential or construction worker levels. The DTLs are typically the most conservative / protective contaminant levels established. Since the property under the proposed action will be developed by the GSA for office use the analytical results were not compared to MDNR MRBCA residential levels, but more appropriately the non-residential and construction worker levels.

Analytical results of the groundwater samples identified one analyte (Benzo(b)fluoranthene) detected above any MRBCA screening levels. The SVOC was detected at levels above the DTL for the non-residential dermal contact and construction worker dermal contact levels.

### **STANDARDS OF SIGNIFICANCE**

The proposed project would cause adverse hazardous substance impacts if it were not compatible with current site hazardous materials conditions or solutions, or violated federal, state, or local regulations with respect to hazardous materials or waste. In addition, the impact would be considered adverse if development of the proposed project posed an unacceptable threat to human health or private property.

## **IMPACTS**

### **Alternative 1 (No Action Alternative)**

The No Action Alternative would not impact any potential hazardous materials sites.

### **Alternative 2 (Preferred Alternative)**

Based on the Phase I and Phase II ESAs, hazardous materials may likely to be present in Block 99 of the project site. If hazardous materials are not remediated by the property owners prior to GSA's purchase and development of the site, the proposed project could have impacts to hazardous materials. These impacts would be mitigated through remediation, in conformance with all applicable EPA and MDNR requirements.

### **Alternative 3 (Lease Existing Space Alternative)**

The Lease Existing Space Alternative would not impact any potential hazardous materials sites at any existing facility chosen within the CBD study area.

## **MITIGATION MEASURES**

In the event that hazardous materials are identified on the site, GSA would negotiate cleanup responsibility with the current owners. Negotiation with the current owners and any investigative or remedial activities would be coordinated with the MDNR's Hazardous Waste Management Program and would comply with all applicable regulations. If any additional hazardous waste or materials were to be encountered during the construction process, they would be dealt with in accordance with appropriate state and federal regulations.

It is recommended that groundwater disturbed by the proposed construction activities be assumed to be potentially contaminated and that proper safety precautions be taken to minimize exposure. Potential constituents of concern in groundwater are Benzo(b)fluoranthene. Any groundwater impacted by construction activities will be containerized and analyzed for the constituents of concern. Based on the analytical results, containerized groundwater will be disposed of in accordance with applicable regulations.

## **CONCLUSION**

GSA would ensure that any hazardous materials identified at the site are remediated to acceptable levels for the proposed use of the site. Therefore, there would be no adverse impacts regarding hazardous materials.

## **CUMULATIVE IMPACTS**

The CEQ regulations require assessment of cumulative impacts in the decision-making process for federal projects. Cumulative impacts are defined as "the impact on the environment which results from the incremental impact of the action when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions regardless of what agency (federal or non-federal) or person undertakes such actions" (40 CFR 1508.7).

The No Action Alternative would have no cumulative impacts. The Lease Existing Space Alternative would have minimal cumulative impacts to the infrastructure and environment of the CBD, due to its relatively short duration and its utilization of currently existing and underutilized office space, parking areas, public services, utilities, and transportation infrastructure.

Cumulative impacts discussed below were determined by combining the incremental impacts of the preferred alternative with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions.

### **OTHER PLANNING AND CONSTRUCTION PROJECTS**

Other planning and/or construction efforts that are currently being undertaken near the proposed project site or are proposed for the reasonably foreseeable future, and are relevant to the study area, are listed below.

#### **Under Construction:**

- A residential apartment building is under construction near the northwest corner of the intersection of 10th Street and Holmes Street, two blocks north of the proposed project. The \$11.9 million project is a four-story, 50 unit building, with 30 two-bedroom and 20 one-bedroom apartments.
- A parking garage is under construction on the east side of Cherry Street between 9<sup>th</sup> Street and 10<sup>th</sup> Street. The 350 space parking structure is located in the same block, and adjacent to the apartment building listed above.

#### **Proposed:**

- The East Village redevelopment area is generally defined as an area bounded by 8<sup>th</sup> Street on the north, Cherry Street on the west, 12<sup>th</sup> Street on the south, and Charlotte Street on the east, with one additional block to the west between 10<sup>th</sup> and 11<sup>th</sup> Streets. The proposed redevelopment of this area includes over 1,000 affordable and market rate housing units, over 150,000 square feet of office space, 80,000 square feet of retail space, and over 3,000 parking spaces. The apartment building and parking garage currently under construction are part of the proposed East Village redevelopment plan.

Potential Cumulative Impacts for the resources analyzed in this EA are briefly described below.

### **LAND USE**

The proposed action would occur in a previously developed urban core area. The major foreseeable construction in the immediate study area within the 10-year (or more) horizon is the redevelopment of the East Village into a mixed-use office/commercial/residential district. This major redevelopment project, future employment center and residential area will have a substantial positive impact upon the surrounding area and all of Kansas City. The East Village area is expected to become an urban development, bringing new residents to the area and customers for local businesses. The proposed action, by comparison, contributes in a small, yet beneficial way for the East Village redevelopment to gain momentum. Therefore, no adverse cumulative impacts on land use are anticipated.

### **SOCIOECONOMICS AND ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE**

Cumulative impacts that could be expected as a result of the new Federal building regarding socioeconomics could include a rise in surrounding property values, and further commercial and residential redevelopment.

There are currently 35 residential units available in the East Village area. According to the 2000 census, 32 of the 35 units were renter occupied, and 55.5 percent of those households had an income of less than \$10,000. The study area also has a 53 percent minority population. While the eventual redevelopment of the East Village area could displace these 35 households which are predominantly minorities and low-income populations, the proposed East Village redevelopment would provide substantially more low-income housing units to be available to these populations. The 50 unit apartment building currently under construction in the East Village is being partially financed with Missouri and Federal low-income housing tax credits, and will provide affordable housing for low-income populations.

Positive cumulative impacts to low-income and minority populations may occur as a result of the overall East Village Redevelopment Plan. The East Village redevelopment will provide a number of employment and business opportunities within walking distance for low-income and minority populations within the study area.

#### **TRANSPORTATION AND PARKING**

The redevelopment of the East Village area could directly impact the new Federal building site, and the downtown area as a whole. As a result of the East Village Redevelopment, traffic in all forms could be increased. In terms of negative impacts, more traffic from the East Village Redevelopment would potentially be traveling within the blocks surrounding the proposed new Federal building.

Existing surface parking in the East Village area would be removed as part of the redevelopment. However, multiple parking structures with over 3,000 parking spaces are proposed as part of the proposed East Village redevelopment, and would offset the loss of undeveloped surface parking lots. The City of Kansas City, Missouri is also investigating a potential public-private partnership to develop a mixed-use project that would include parking for the proposed Federal building as well as the existing Richard Bolling Federal building and the Federal Aviation Administration building.

As long as planning efforts such as those identified in the East Village Development Plan are continued in an effort to plan for and address changes in traffic numbers and circulation, long-term cumulative impacts are anticipated to be negligible.

#### **PUBLIC SERVICES AND UTILITIES**

Proposed development in the study area would not overburden the current supply capabilities; therefore, no cumulative impacts to public services and utilities are anticipated.

#### **WATER RESOURCES**

The surrounding area is predominately developed, and as a result, cumulative impacts from recent and planned projects to water resources are not expected because stormwater runoff increases are not anticipated. Additional redevelopment in the East Village area would be subject to current water resource guidelines that could improve the overall water quality in the area by implementing newer designs and technologies. Cumulative impacts to groundwater are also not anticipated as the proposed project and other associated planned activities are primarily commercial in nature and use, and appreciable storage of materials that could degrade groundwater quality is not anticipated.

#### **AIR QUALITY AND NOISE**

Demolition and construction activities associated with the proposed action would result in minimal adverse cumulative impacts related to air quality and noise over the short term. Increased traffic capacity would be minor and would have a negligible contribution to air quality and noise in the area; therefore, no long-term cumulative impacts are anticipated.

This page intentionally left blank.

## **CONSULTATION AND COORDINATION**

### **AGENCIES AND ORGANIZATIONS**

Agencies and organizations contacted for information, or that assisted in identifying important issues, developing alternatives, or analyzing impacts, or that will review and comment upon the EA include:

#### **FEDERAL AGENCIES**

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers  
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency  
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service  
U.S. General Services Administration

#### **STATE AGENCIES**

Missouri Department of Natural Resources  
Missouri Department of Conservation

#### **CITY AGENCIES**

City of Kansas City, Missouri

### **PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT**

The GSA has provided specific and ongoing opportunities for public input during the study for a new downtown Federal building in Kansas City. Through the study's public involvement program, interested agencies, local units of government and the general public have provided comments and input into the development and evaluations of alternatives.

#### **PUBLIC SCOPING**

In accordance with applicable regulations and policies GSA published a NOI to prepare an EA, request for comments on environmental issues, and notice of public scoping meeting in the Federal Register on Friday, December 17, 2010 (Vol. 75, No. 242, Pages 78994-78995). GSA also sent scoping notices to stakeholders, which included local, State, Tribal, and Federal agencies and officials; adjacent property owners, organizations; and other interested parties, to solicit comment on the scope of this EA. The NOI provided a summary of the proposed project, instructions on submitting comments, dates of the comment period, an invitation to the public scoping meeting, and contacts for additional information needs. A copy of the NOI and the scoping notice letter are included in Appendix C. A public scoping meeting was held on January 19, 2011 at St. Mary's Episcopal Church, 1307 Holmes, Kansas City, Missouri. A presentation summarizing the proposed project and the studies completed to date was made and public comments were requested. Approximately 15 people attended the public scoping meeting. The Public Scoping comment period opened on December 17, 2010 and closed on January 31, 2011.

In response to the scoping notice, GSA received one comment from the Osage Nation requesting to review a copy of the EA. A copy of the letter from the Osage Nation is included in Appendix C. Representatives of St Mary's Episcopal Church commented on potential loss of parking customers and new development may have on the church. The church relies on parking revenues to pay for annual renovation and upkeep.

**DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT**

The public and agencies are encouraged to comment on the contents of this draft EA. A Notice of Availability (NOA) that includes comment procedures for the draft EA has been issued and references the public's ability to comment on the proposed project's potential effects on the social, environmental, and economic factors. The NOA was sent to organizations, agencies, and interested parties. In order to solicit comment on the draft EA from the general public, the NOA has also been published in the Kansas City Star newspaper and posted on the GSA website (<http://www.GSA.com>). Stakeholders and the general public will be afforded the opportunity to comment on-line via email or via written correspondence to the postal address provided therein. The NOA for the draft EA clearly identifies that the stakeholders and the general public will have an opportunity to comment on the project's potential effects per the NEPA process. The draft EA is posted on the GSA NEPA Library website, (<http://www.gsa.gov/portal/content/103827>) and copies of the draft EA are available for review at: the Kansas City Public Library – Central Branch, 14 West 10th Street, Kansas City, Missouri 64105.

Comments on the draft EA must be submitted during the 30-day comment period, which concludes on February 24, 2012. Comments should be mailed, emailed, or faxed to:

Mr. Jeremiah Nelson  
U.S. General Services Administration  
1500 East Bannister Road, Room 2135  
Kansas City, Missouri 64131-3088

Email: [jeremiah.nelson@gsa.gov](mailto:jeremiah.nelson@gsa.gov)

Fax: 816-823-5803

At the conclusion of the comment period, GSA will analyze and consider all submitted comments and questions and will ensure that the final EA adequately addresses the comments received.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Environmental Data Resources (EDR). 2010a. Aerial Photo Decade Package. Inquiry Number: 2754380.4. April 26.
- Environmental Data Resources (EDR). 2010b. Certified Sanborn Map Report. Inquiry Number: 2754380.7. April 26.
- Environmental Data Resources (EDR). 2010c. Historical Topographic Map Report. Inquiry Number: 2754380.8. April 26.
- Environmental Data Resources (EDR). 2010d. NEPA Check Report. Inquiry Number: 2754380.9s. April 23.
- Environmental Data Resources (EDR). 2010e. Radius Map Report with GeoCheck. Inquiry Number: 2754380.6s. April 23.
- Family Environmental (Family). 2008a. *Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, East Village Project – Block 100: Former Greyhound Bus Terminal, Kansas City, Missouri 64106*. October 22.
- Family Environmental (Family). 2008b. *Phase II Environmental Site Assessment, East Village Project – Block 100: Former Greyhound Bus Terminal, Kansas City, Missouri 64106*. December 18.
- Federal Register. 1994. Executive Order No.12898, *Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations*. Volume 59, No. 32. February 16.
- Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). 1998. *FHWA Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations*. December 2.
- General Services Administration (GSA). 1999a. Administrative Order (ADM) 1095.1F, *Environmental Considerations in Decision Making*. October 19.
- General Services Administration (GSA) Public Buildings Service (PBS). 1999b. *National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) Desk Guide*. October.
- General Services Administration (GSA). 2003. *Security Standards for Leased Space ISC Subcommittee Final Report*. May 16.
- General Services Administration (GSA), 2011. Design Excellence: Policies and Procedures. Available at: <http://www.gsa.gov/portal/content/103738>. May 3.
- Great Plains Energy (GPE). 2011. The Power of Progress, 2010 Annual Report.
- Kansas City. 2011. City Ordinances, Chapter 80, Zoning Code.
- Kansas City. 2011. City Ordinances, Chapter 46, Noise Control.
- Missouri Department of Natural Resources (MDNR). 1997. Groundwater Resources of Missouri.
- Missouri Department of Natural Resources (MDNR). 2004. The Missouri River, Water Protection Program Fact Sheet.
- Missouri Department of Natural Resources (MDNR). 2011. Missouri Groundwater Provinces and Aquifer Characteristics. Available at: <http://www.dnr.mo.gov/env/wrc/groundwater/education/provinces/gwprovince.htm>

- SCS Engineers (SCS). 2010. *Phase I Environmental Site Assessment. Old JE Dunn Properties*. April 20.
- SFS Architecture (SFS). 2010. *Feasibility Study, New Downtown Federal Building, Kansas City, Missouri*. June.
- URS Corporation (URS). 2010a. *Archeology Survey, Proposed Downtown Federal Building, Kansas City, Missouri*. June.
- URS Corporation (URS). 2010b. *Cultural Resources Assessment, Proposed Downtown Federal Building, Kansas City, Missouri*. June.
- URS Corporation (URS). 2010c. *Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, Proposed Downtown Federal Building, Kansas City, Missouri*. June.
- URS Corporation (URS). 2011. *Limited Phase II Environmental Site Assessment, Proposed Downtown Federal Building, Kansas City, Missouri*. November.
- U.S. Census Bureau (Census). 2000. Household Income data. 2000 Summary File 3, Table P52.
- U.S. Census Bureau (Census). 2010. Profile of General Population and Housing Characteristics. 2010 Demographic Profile Data. Table DP-1.
- U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), Soil Conservation Service, 1984. Soil Survey of Jackson County, Missouri. September.
- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). 1981. *Noise Effects Handbook*. Office of the Noise Abatement and Control. Published by the National Association of Noise Control Officials, Fort Walton Beach, FL. July.
- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). 2008. National Ambient Air Quality Standards. Available at: [www.epa.gov/air/criteria.html](http://www.epa.gov/air/criteria.html)
- U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service (USFWS). 2011. National Wetlands Inventory (NWI) Maps. Geographic Information System Data. Available at: <http://www.fws.gov/wetlands/Data/DataDownload.html>. September 26.
- U.S. Geological Survey (USGS). 2008. National Geochemical Survey. Average Concentrations of Elements in Jackson County, Missouri. September. Available at: <http://tin.er.usgs.gov/geochem/doc/averages/as/central.html>

## **LIST OF PREPARERS**

Jason Klumb, U.S. General Services Administration, Regional Administrator.

John Topi, P.E., U.S. General Services Administration, Public Buildings Service, Heartland Region, Deputy Director – Design & Construction Division, Project Manager.

Christopher Powers, U.S. General Services Administration, Public Buildings Service, Heartland Region, Asset Management Specialist (6PTA), Portfolio Management Division.

Jeremiah Nelson, U.S. General Services Administration, Public Buildings Service, Heartland Region, Asset Management Specialist (6PTA), Portfolio Management Division.

David Kocour, CEP, URS Corporation, NEPA Manager and Contributing Author.

Charles Arthur, URS Corporation, Primary Author.

Quentin Bliss, URS Corporation, Technical Review.

Dave Bronson, URS Corporation, Contributing Author.

Kevin Slates, URS Corporation, Contributing Author.

Isabella Partin, URS Corporation, GIS and Graphics.

This page intentionally left blank.

## **APPENDIX A: FIGURES**

This page intentionally left blank.

## **APPENDIX B: FEASIBILITY STUDY**

This page intentionally left blank.

## **APPENDIX C: CONSULTATION**

This page intentionally left blank.

## **APPENDIX D: PHOTOGRAPHIC LOG**

This page intentionally left blank.

# **APPENDIX E: ENVIRONMENTAL DATABASE REPORT**

This page intentionally left blank.