

**Environmental Assessment
Determinations and Compliance Findings
for HUD-assisted Projects
24 CFR Part 58**

Project Information

Project Name: SPPHA-McDonough-182-Timberlake

HEROS Number: 900000010417289

Responsible Entity (RE): ST. PAUL, DEPARTMENT OF PED ST. PAUL MN, 55102

RE Preparer: Joshua Williams

State / Local Identifier:

Certifying Officer: Yasmine Robinson

Grant Recipient (if different than Responsible Entity): Saint Paul Public Housing Agency

Point of Contact: Jordan LaSota

Consultant (if applicable):

Point of Contact:

Project Location: 1582 Timberlake Rd, Saint Paul, MN 55117

Additional Location Information:

N/A

Direct Comments to: City of Saint Paul c/o Joshua Williams
25 W. 4th St., CHA Suite 1400

Saint Paul, MN 55102

josh.williams@ci.stpaul.mn.us

Description of the Proposed Project [24 CFR 50.12 & 58.32; 40 CFR 1508.25]:

McDonough Homes II (AMP 16) is a seven-unit townhome building on the site of RAD-PBRA Project 1, McDonough Homes. The townhome would be constructed as a mixed-finance development under HUD's Low Income Public Housing (LIPH) program, as Asset Management Project 16 (AMP 16). Upon completion of the project, it would be transitioned to HUD's Multifamily Project-Based Rental Assistance (PBRA) program and would become the PHA's ninth RAD-PBRA project. McDonough Homes (like the PHA's other family housing developments and hi-rises) has been operating as PBRA since the conversion from LIPH through RAD (HUD's Rental Assistance Demonstration program) effective January 1, 2020. With the new townhome building, the McDonough Homes site would have a total of 599 family housing units in two separate RAD-PBRA projects. The new townhome building will be located in the northeast quadrant of McDonough Homes, located at 1582 A-G Timberlake Road (shown on the attached map). The building will contain three unit configurations, including: - One single-level two-bedroom apartment that will be accessible for persons with disabilities (no basement or steps), - Five two-story, two-bedroom apartments, and - One two-story, five-bedroom apartment. The six two-story units will have full basements. In addition, the deteriorated parking lot adjacent to the new townhome building will be replaced and two new paths for improved pedestrian access to an adjacent PHA community garden at McDonough Homes will be constructed. The construction project includes the following features: - All units will be fully protected by fire suppression sprinklers. - Units will have security screens on the first-floor windows to reduce potential window damage and increase security. - Units will have cementitious siding (like Hardi-Plank) on the exteriors to provide extra durability and reduced maintenance costs. - As required by local storm water regulations, and site constraints, an at-grade storm water retention area will be constructed to control runoff rate and water quality. - The new parking lot will provide 37 standard parking spaces and two accessible parking spaces.

Statement of Purpose and Need for the Proposal [40 CFR 1508.9(b)]:

The proposed project consists of a new 7-unit multifamily building, to be constructed by the Saint Paul Public Housing Authority (SPPHA) as an addition to the existing McDonough Homes complex, and is being undertaken in response to an ongoing shortage of affordable housing in Saint Paul and the surrounding metropolitan area. The McDonough Homes complex sits on approximately 59 acres of SPPHA-owned land in northern Saint Paul, and is located just west of Interstate 35E. The proposed project location is already owned by the SPPHA and will replace a portion of an underutilized surface parking spot, saving acquisition costs and using land more efficiently for public purposes. In addition, future maintenance activities can be coordinated with those for the existing 592 units in the McDonough Homes complex.

Existing Conditions and Trends [24 CFR 58.40(a)]:

The proposed project will be located within the 59 acre McDonough Homes complex, which currently includes 592 units of affordable housing in low-rise building of similar scale to the proposed project, and includes green space between building. The complex is bounded by minor arterials on the north, south, and west, and a public school and Interstate 35E to the east. Residential development is to the west and north, with commercial development to the south. In the area where the proposed project is located, incomes and housing costs are generally below the median for the the broader Metropolitan Area, and long-term trends do not suggest that significant change in the incomes and housing costs in the area relative to the metropolitan area are likely to change in the foreseeable future. If this trend holds, the proposed project will not significantly impact the overall character of the area. If housing prices and area income trends upward, the proposed project will ensure more housing is available for both long-term and new lower-income residents in the area.

Maps, photographs, and other documentation of project location and description:

Determination:

✓	Finding of No Significant Impact [24 CFR 58.40(g)(1); 40 CFR 1508.13] The project will not result in a significant impact on the quality of human environment
	Finding of Significant Impact

Approval Documents:

[McDonough Homes II - Sig Page - SIGNED.pdf](#)

7015.15 certified by Certifying Officer on:

7015.16 certified by Authorizing Officer on:

Funding Information

Grant / Project Identification Number	HUD Program	Program Name	Funding Amount
MN46P00150123	Public Housing	Public Housing Capital Fund (including CFFP and other grants)	\$175,399.00

Estimated Total HUD Funded, Assisted or Insured Amount: \$175,319.00

This project anticipates the use of funds or assistance from another federal agency in addition to HUD in the form of:

Estimated Total Project Cost [24 CFR 58.2 (a) (5)]: \$2,775,399.00

Compliance with 24 CFR §50.4, §58.5 and §58.6 Laws and Authorities

Compliance Factors: Statutes, Executive Orders, and Regulations listed at 24 CFR §50.4, §58.5, and §58.6	Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?	Compliance determination (See Appendix A for source determinations)
STATUTES, EXECUTIVE ORDERS, AND REGULATIONS LISTED AT 24 CFR §50.4 & § 58.6		
Airport Hazards Clear Zones and Accident Potential Zones; 24 CFR Part 51 Subpart D	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	Using our GIS software, we were able to determine that the project site, 1582 Timberlake Rd, is not within 2,500 feet of either civilian airport in the Twin Cities. In addition, there are no military airports within 15,000 feet of the project site. The project is compliant with HUD's Airport Hazards policy.
Coastal Barrier Resources Act Coastal Barrier Resources Act, as amended by the Coastal Barrier Improvement Act of 1990 [16 USC 3501]	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	We utilized the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's "Coastal Barrier Resources System Mapper" GIS application to determine whether the project site falls into a CBRS. According to the USFWS, the only CBRS found in Minnesota is the "John H. Chafee CBRS" in Duluth, Minnesota. Since the proposed HUD project is in the city of Saint Paul, Minnesota, approximately 160 miles south of the "John H. Chafee CBRS", it can be determined that there will be no effect. Therefore, this project is compliant with the Coastal Barrier Resources Act.
Flood Insurance Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 and National Flood Insurance	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	According to the map generated by FEMA's National Flood Hazard Layer (NFHL) GIS application, it was determined that the project site is in

<p>Reform Act of 1994 [42 USC 4001-4128 and 42 USC 5154a]</p>		<p>FEMA FIRMette Map Panel Number: 27123C0102G. This panel has been in effect since 6/4/2010 and is labeled as "Zone X (Unshaded)". Since the proposed HUD-Assisted project occurs in an unshaded "Zone X" area, it can be determined that 1582 Timberlake Rd is neither in a Special Flood Hazard Area (SFHA) or an area of Moderate Risk. Flood insurance will not be necessary to serve as mitigation. Therefore, the project is compliant with Flood Insurance requirements.</p>
<p>STATUTES, EXECUTIVE ORDERS, AND REGULATIONS LISTED AT 24 CFR §50.4 & § 58.5</p>		
<p>Air Quality Clean Air Act, as amended, particularly section 176(c) & (d); 40 CFR Parts 6, 51, 93</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p>Based on the project description, this project includes no activities that would require further evaluation under the Clean Air Act. Therefore, the project is compliant with the Clean Air Act.</p>
<p>Coastal Zone Management Act Coastal Zone Management Act, sections 307(c) & (d)</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p>In the state of Minnesota, the only coastal zone that is protected by the Coastal Zone Management Act (CZMA) is along the coast of Lake Superior. The project occurs in the City of Saint Paul and the proposed project site, is approximately 130 miles away from coastal areas protected in the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources coastal management plan. Therefore, the project is compliant with the Coastal Zone Management Act.</p>
<p>Contamination and Toxic Substances 24 CFR 50.3(i) & 58.5(i)(2)]</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p>To ensure compliance with the Contamination and Toxic Substances Requirements, we visited the EPA's "NEPAssist" and Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) "What's in My Neighborhood" (WIMN) GIS web applications to identify sources of contamination within 1/2 mile of the proposed HUD-assisted project site. On NEPAssist, we found no Superfund site within 1/2 mile of 1582 Timberlake Rd. We found 6 Brownfield sites within 1/2 mile of the proposed project site. As evidence of due diligence, these sites</p>

		<p>will be listed below and the NEPA Assist Report will be uploaded to HEROS. All sites - AJ West Parcels 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 10 - are brownfields marked as necessitating cleanup and having had none occur. All parcels acted as storage or maintenance facilities for salvaged auto parts. Due to the nature of the previous activities and the distance from the proposed project site, these sites pose no risk to end users/project occupants. While there are points of contamination on the WIMN Report, we found no evidence of on-site or notable nearby sites of contamination. The most pertinent sites are "McDonough Homes Clinic," "Saint Paul Public Housing - Saint Paul," and "ISD 625 Mississippi." All these sites are specifically for hazardous waste generators of a small capacity, and the existence of permits precludes them to being disposed responsibly. Further analysis is not required. As evidence of due diligence, the WIMN Report will be uploaded to HEROS. To determine compliance with HUD's Radon policy, we used the alternative strategy of reviewing science-based data. The data we reviewed was provided by the Center for Disease Control and Prevention's (CDC) National Environmental Public Health Tracking Network site. According to the site, the Annual Mean Pre-Mitigation Radon Measurement in Tested Buildings from 2010-2020 in Ramsey County was 2.9 pCi/L. This number is below the 4.0 pCi/L that would require mitigation. Therefore, the project is compliant with HUD's Radon policy and Contamination and Toxic Substances requirements.</p>
<p>Endangered Species Act Endangered Species Act of 1973, particularly section 7; 50 CFR Part 402</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p>The following species were identified in the IPaC species list generated on August 2, 2024: Northern Long-eared Bat, Tricolored Bat, Whopping Crane,</p>

		<p>Higgins Eye (pearlymussel), Salamander Mussel, Rusty Patched Bumble Bee, and Monarch Butterfly. Project activities will have no effect on the Northern Long-eared Bat. This determination can be made because project activities do not involve clearing or disturbing suitable habitat, no activity in or near the entrance to cave or mine, nor mining, deep excavation, or underground work within 0.25 miles of a cave or mine, nor construction of wind turbines or demolition or reconstruction of human made structures known to be used by bats. Project activities will have no effect on the Tricolored Bat. This determination can be made because project activities do not involve clearing or disturbing suitable habitat, no activity in or near the entrance to cave or mine, nor mining, deep excavation, or underground work within 0.25 miles of a cave or mine, nor construction of wind turbines or demolition or reconstruction of human made structures known to be used by bats. Project activities will have no effect on the Whooping Crane. This determination can be made because the Whooping Crane is designated as a "non-essential" experimental population in Minnesota. Consultation under Section 7(a)(2) of the Endangered Species Act is only required if project activities will occur within a National Wildlife Refuge or National Park. Since proposed project activity will occur on land outside of a National Wildlife Refuge or National Park, we are not required to consult for this species. Project activities will have no effect on the Higgins Eye (pearlymussel). This determination can be made because project activities do not involve habitat loss, degradation, or introduction of exotic species including Zebra mussels,</p>
--	--	--

		<p>which are the major threats to the survival of the Higgins eye mussel. Project activities will have no effect on the Salamander Mussel. This determination can be made because the species, as of September 1st, 2023, has been proposed for listing as an endangered species under the Endangered Species Act of 1973. As a result, this species is not yet protected by the Act. Proposed Critical Habitat for the Salamander Mussel exists in Chisago and Washington County, Minnesota, specifically in the St. Croix River. The proposed project activity will not impact known habitat. Project activities will have no effect on the Rusty Patched Bumble Bee. This determination can be made because project activities do not involve habitat loss, degradation, or introduction of pathogens or exposure to insecticides or fungicides, which are suspected to be the major threats to the species along with non-native and managed bees, the effects of climate change, and small population biology. The Monarch Butterfly is a candidate species and not yet listed or proposed for listing. There are currently no section 7 requirements for candidate species. Project activities will not impact known habitat. Project activities do not involve construction of Communication Towers (radio, television, cellular, and microwave towers), Transmission Lines (power lines or poles, particularly those with uninsulated or unguarded electrical currents), or Wind Turbines. Therefore, there will be no effect on migratory birds. In addition, there are no critical habitats for the listed species within the project area under the USFWS jurisdiction. The project site is in a fully urbanized area and there is no habitat present in the project site for the</p>
--	--	--

		species on the IPaC list. The proposed project activities will not jeopardize the continued existence of any listed species. Therefore, the project is compliant with Section 7 requirements.
Explosive and Flammable Hazards Above-Ground Tanks [24 CFR Part 51 Subpart C	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	There are no current or planned stationary aboveground storage containers of concern within 1 mile of the project site. This was determined by consultation with Minnesota Pollution Control Agency above ground tank records, NEPAAssist records, and visual survey. The project is in compliance with explosive and flammable hazard requirements.
Farmlands Protection Farmland Protection Policy Act of 1981, particularly sections 1504(b) and 1541; 7 CFR Part 658	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	This project is located in an urbanized area.. The project is in compliance with the Farmland Protection Policy Act.
Floodplain Management Executive Order 11988, particularly section 2(a); 24 CFR Part 55	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	This project does not occur in the FFRMS floodplain. The project is in compliance with Executive Orders 11988 and 13690.
Historic Preservation National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, particularly sections 106 and 110; 36 CFR Part 800	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	Based on the evaluation contained in the attached memo, the project is in compliance with Section 106.
Noise Abatement and Control Noise Control Act of 1972, as amended by the Quiet Communities Act of 1978; 24 CFR Part 51 Subpart B	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	A Noise Assessment was conducted. The total DNL was found to be normally unacceptable at 68.0 db. See noise analysis. A STraCAT analysis as conducted using HUD guidance, This analysis found that planned construction will result in sufficient reduction of interior noise, and the project does not include and outdoor components. The project is in compliance with HUD's Noise regulation without mitigation.
Sole Source Aquifers Safe Drinking Water Act of 1974, as amended, particularly section 1424(e); 40 CFR Part 149	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	The project is not located on a sole source aquifer area. The project is in compliance with Sole Source Aquifer requirements.

Wetlands Protection Executive Order 11990, particularly sections 2 and 5	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	The project will not impact on- or off-site wetlands. The project is in compliance with Executive Order 11990.
Wild and Scenic Rivers Act Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 1968, particularly section 7(b) and (c)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	This project is not within proximity of a NWSRS river, per data provided by the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources. The project is in compliance with the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act.
HUD HOUSING ENVIRONMENTAL STANDARDS		
ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE		
Environmental Justice Executive Order 12898	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	No adverse environmental impacts were identified in the project's total environmental review. The project is in compliance with Executive Order 12898.

Environmental Assessment Factors [24 CFR 58.40; Ref. 40 CFR 1508.8 &1508.27]

Impact Codes: An impact code from the following list has been used to make the determination of impact for each factor.

- (1) Minor beneficial impact
- (2) No impact anticipated
- (3) Minor Adverse Impact – May require mitigation
- (4) Significant or potentially significant impact requiring avoidance or modification which may require an Environmental Impact Statement.

Environ- mental Assessm- ent Factor	Imp- act Cod- e	Impact Evaluation	Mitig- ation
LAND DEVELOPMENT			
Conform- ance with Plans / Compati- ble Land Use and Zoning / Scale and Urban Design	1	The McDonough Homes complex, approximately 70 acres, is bounded by Arlington Street to the south, Johnson Street to the west and Wheelock Parkway to the north, all of which function as arterial connectors although truck traffic is restricted on Wheelock Parkway. To the east is interstate 35 E, separated from the complex by a school site on the northern end of the complex, where the proposed project is located. The project is consistent with the City of Saint Paul 2040 Comprehensive Plan as well as the Northend neighborhood plan; both broadly support additional housing, particularly affordable housing. The project will provide 7 additional affordable units in the neighborhood. The proposed building massing is consistent with what is allowed	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		under applicable zoning. Applicable plans can be found via the link below. https://www.stpaul.gov/departments/planning-and-economic-development/planning	
Soil Suitability / Slope/ Erosion / Drainage and Storm Water Runoff	2	<p>The project site is in the core of a long-developed major metropolitan area. The existing McDonough Homes complex, including the surface parking lot where the project is proposed to be located, was constructed in 1952, on a previously undeveloped site. While it is possible that fill was brought to the project site, the complex has been in place for over 70-years, demonstrating that soils are suitable to support the proposed project. There is little slope within the existing complex, although there is some mild drop in elevation going east from the project site to the adjacent freeway (I35E). The project will need to meet applicable municipal requirements for erosion control, storm water runoff rate control, and proper storm water discharge. This includes erosion control measures both during and post-construction, storm water detention measures as needed to control rate of discharge from the site, and conveyance to municipal storm water conveyance (ie. storm sewers) through direct connection and/or overland flow on durable surfaces. Compliance will be verified through the City of Saint Paul's site plan review process, which is a requirement for project permitting. Municipal storm water requirements can be found in Ch. 52 of the Saint Paul legislative code and are accessible via the following link: https://library.municode.com/mn/st._paul/codes/code_of_ordinances?nodeId=PTIILECO_TITVIBUHO_CH52STRU</p>	
Hazards and Nuisances including Site Safety and Site-Generated Noise	2	<p>The project site is located in the core of a major metropolitan area, and the immediate area (the McDonough Homes complex) was developed on a greenfield in 1952 and has remain largely unchanged since that time in terms of land use and structure location. Given the size of the complex overall, the project site is relatively shielded from glare and odors. Noise from the adjacent freeway (I35E) exceeded normally allowed levels, but, as noted elsewhere in this report, will be mitigated through construction techniques. The site is not exposed to unacceptable risk from aboveground tanks or hazardous substances. See maps and findings under the Related Laws and Authorities section of this review for more information. The project itself will not result in significant increased noise generation. The project is not</p>	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		<p>susceptible to most major natural hazards as analyzed per HUD guidance. Minnesota is not located in a zone of either volcanic or notable seismic activity. Similarly, its mid-continent location means tsunamis and hurricanes are not a risk factor, even with consideration of climate change. The project site is in the middle of a large urban area not located near forested or range areas, essentially eliminating the risk from wildfire. The project site is approximately three miles from the river and more than 180 feet above the ordinary high water level of the river, well outside FEMA floodplain hazard zones. The site and surrounding area are generally flat, although a constructed, vegetated slope exists to the east of the project site. The project site is not subject to hazards such as mudslides or sand movement and free of hazardous terrain features. Streets and sidewalks serving the project site are maintained by the City of Saint Paul and the SPPHA and these paved surfaces are in good condition and designed and built consistent with current standards, including ADA accessibility features. Minnesota is subject to extreme weather events including blizzards, strong thunderstorms and occasional tornados. The likelihood of these events and associated risk potential is similar across the entire Minneapolis-Saint Paul .metropolitan area. The project site is well served by municipal snow removal and easily accessible to emergency services. The project site is surrounded by residential uses on three sides, and a school, including play fields to the east. There are no notable sources of hazards or excessive noise in the vicinity of the project area.</p>	
SOCIOECONOMIC			
Employment and Income Patterns	2	<p>The project will be built on a portion of a surface parking lot which is part of the existing McDonough Homes complex. The project will not result in the dislocation of any employers, and will generate temporary construction jobs. In 2022, per the Metropolitan Council, the poverty rate in the census tract where the project site is located (Ramsey County, MN - Tract 305) exceeded 40% for all residents and 50% for individuals of color. The project will result in 7 additional units of affordable housing.</p>	
Demographic Character	2	<p>Based on 2022 data from the American Community Survey (ACS) via the Metropolitan Council, for the census tract in which the proposed project is located (Ramsey County, MN, Tract 305), the poverty rate exceeds 40% for all residents and 50% for individuals</p>	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
Changes / Displacement		of color. Per the 2022 ACS, a total of 6,160 individuals reside in the census tract, of which approximately 50% are of Asian descent, 20% Black, and 20% White. 2022 ACS data shows 1,098 total rental units and 674 owner-occupied. The proposed project will not result in displacement of any housing units, and will provide 7 additional housing units affordable to the majority of current area residents.	
Environmental Justice EA Factor	2	The project will add 7 new affordable housing units in an area of high racial diversity (approximately 50% Asian, 20% Black, and 20% White) and a poverty rate of more than 50% among persons of color. The 7 new units will be part of an existing affordable housing complex of almost 600 units. The project will provide additional units in an area of need; there are no negative environmental justice impacts.	
COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND SERVICES			
Educational and Cultural Facilities (Access and Capacity)	2	The project will add 7 new affordable housing units. As of September of 2023, Saint Paul Public Schools (the public school district serving the project are) had a projected enrollment of 32,789 students. In addition, Saint Paul and the greater metro area are served by a large number of charter public schools, which are not part of the Saint Paul school district and offer free enrollment. Both public schools and charter schools offer some level of bus transportation. The housing complex where the project is located is bounded on three sides by arterial streets and is served by public transit. There will be no impacts to elementary or secondary schools in the area. Also, In addition to the main University of Minnesota campus, at least three community colleges located in Saint Paul and Minneapolis are also accessible from the project site via regular, scheduled transit service. Per the SPPHA, A full range of services for residents of all ages is available at the McDonough Community Center. Programs include a recreation program utilizing a full gymnasium and a children's gym operated by St. Paul Parks and Recreation; a health clinic operated by West Side Community Health Services; a full service computer lab with open lab hours that includes online classes, and basic computer training; Resident Council and council-planned events and activities; Head Start; Bookmobile; after school homework help, support for groups and mentoring programs for youth. Other notable cultural facilities in Saint Paul include the Science Museum of Minnesota, the Minnesota	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		<p>Museum of American Art, the Ordway (home of the Minnesota Opera, the Saint Paul Chamber Orchestra, and the Schubert Club), the home ballpark of the Saint Paul Saint (AAA affiliate of the MLB Minnesota Twins), and the Xcel Energy Center (home of the NHL Minnesota Wild). In addition, cultural centers serving Muslim, Oromo, Hmong and other cultural/religious communities are located in Saint Paul. All are accessible from the project site by private vehicle and public transit.</p>	
<p>Commercial Facilities (Access and Proximity)</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>A variety of affordable options for groceries, pharmacy, clothing, and everyday needs are accessible on foot, by private vehicle or taxi/rideshare, or via transit. These include a regional chain discount grocery, which also has a pharmacy, and a national general discount retailer which sells clothing, household goods, and everyday needs in addition to groceries and a pharmacy. There are also nearby local retail districts accessible via transit.</p>	
<p>Health Care / Social Services (Access and Capacity)</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>The project site is located in the center of a major metropolitan area of more than 3 million people. There are two clinics located within less than a mile of t/4 mile of the project site, and four large urban hospitals (in downtown Minneapolis, downtown Saint Paul, and at the main University of Minnesota campus), all of which all accessible via transit, private vehicle, and taxi/rideshare/app-based transportation, as well as private and public ambulance service. The project site is also served by the City of Saint Paul police and fire departments. The addition of seven new units in a city of more than 300,000 residents will not meaningfully impact emergency response service levels.</p>	
<p>Solid Waste Disposal and Recycling (Feasibility and Capacity)</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>The proposed project will not create hazardous waste during operations. Any hazardous materials associated with construction would be typical of residential construction, and handled according to applicable guidelines and regulations. Any contaminated soil encountered during construction will be disposed of according to Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA) requirements. The City of Saint Paul provides solid waste and recycling collection to all residential properties. These services, while billed by the City to residents, are provided by a combination of municipal workers and contracted service providers.</p>	
<p>Waste Water and</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>The vast majority of the City of Saint Paul, including the site of the proposed project, is served by a municipal sanitary sewer system. The municipal system in turn connects to large mains owned and</p>	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
Sanitary Sewers (Feasibility and Capacity)		operated by Metropolitan Council Environmental Services (MCES) and conveyed for treatment at the Pigs Eye Waste Water Treatment Plant. The plant is also owned and operated by MCES, which is a division of the Metropolitan Council, subdivision of Minnesota state government which coordinates infrastructure and development planning across the 7-county Minneapolis-Saint Paul metropolitan area. In general, the Saint Paul municipal sewer system has excess capacity, resulting from separation of storm water conveyance from what was previously a combined system, a process largely carried out during the 1990s. The exception is a few areas where waste water must pass through a pump station, which may need to be upgraded to accommodate additional flow. However, the project site is not in an area served by a pump station (all flow is gravity-driven). The adequacy of connection to the sanitary sewer system from the existing and new portions of the building will be evaluated during the City of Saint Paul's site plan review process (a zoning entitlement process) and upgrades or new connections as needed required as part of that approval.	
Water Supply (Feasibility and Capacity)	2	The vast majority of the City of Saint Paul, including the site of the proposed project, is served by Saint Paul Regional Water Services (SPRWS). This municipal utility also serves several surrounding communities with water, which is sourced from a combination of the Mississippi River and deep bedrock wells. Water is purified to drinking water standards at a plant just north of the City of Saint Paul, and then distributed through an existing system of pipes using gravity, pumps, and elevated reservoirs to maintain sufficient head pressure. The treatment and distribution network has ample excess capacity due to previous population decline, loss of heavy industry, and conservation measures such as lower-flow toilets and showers. The adequacy of domestic and fire service from the main to the existing and new portions of the building will be evaluated during the City of Saint Paul's site plan review process (a zoning entitlement process) and upgrades or new connections as needed required as part of that approval. The water supply is supported by the largest river in North America, and not likely to be substantially compromised by climate change in the foreseeable future. As documented elsewhere in this report, the project will not impact a sole source aquifer.	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
Public Safety - Police, Fire and Emergency Medical	2	The project site is surrounded by three urban arterial streets and an interstate highway. Police, fire, and EMS service will be provided by the Saint Paul Police and Fire Departments. Per the SPPHA, A Community Outreach Program (ACOP) of the Saint Paul Police Department is officed in the McDonough Homes Community Center. This is a community policing program jointly funded by the St. Paul Police Department and St. Paul Public Housing. Nine officers, a Sergeant, and two Community Liaison Officers police family developments and work with youth and adults to foster positive relationships with police and successful tenancies. Additional ambulance service associated with major hospitals and health care providers in the area is also available. The building will be built consistent with the International Building Code and will be sprinklered. The addition of seven new units in a city of more than 300,000 residents will not meaningfully impact emergency response service levels.	
Parks, Open Space and Recreation (Access and Capacity)	2	The project site is adjacent to both a charter (public) school and a City of Saint Paul recreation center. Facilities include a baseball field and general use open space, as well as a gymnasium and indoor community space. City of Saint Paul parks regularly rate among the top 3 cities nationally in the Trust for Public Lands annual rankings of municipal park systems. These ratings are based on total acreage, investment, amenities, access, and equity, among other factors. A number of these parks are accessible from the project site via transit. This includes extensive parkland along the Mississippi River in both Saint Paul and neighboring Minneapolis. The addition of seven new units in a city of more than 300,000 residents will not meaningfully impact park or recreation facility availability.	
Transportation and Accessibility (Access and Capacity)	2	The site of the proposed project is served by regular route transit service, generally with 15 to 30 minutes frequency depending on time and day of the week. This route serving the site connects to an extensive transit network in the greater metropolitan area, which includes, regular routes buses, arterial bus rapid transit and light rail. This provides transit access to major service, employment, and retail hubs, including downtown Saint Paul, downtown Minneapolis, the University of Minnesota, and the Minnesota Capitol Complex. The McDonough Homes complex is bounded on three sides by arterials streets, one of which has an interchange with Interstate 35E. See attachments.	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
NATURAL FEATURES			
Unique Natural Features /Water Resources	2	The area where the project site is located, the McDonough Homes complex, was developed for it's current use in 1952. The complex has both open grassy areas and tree plantings, but no vegetation on site or other natural features are unique. To the west of the complex and accessible by a trail is a remnant wetland system that is part of a natural drainageway which feeds into the Trout Brook system. The project will not impact this wetland system. Storm water will be treated as is typical for a lower-density urban site, with water directed away from buildings for natural infiltration, with excess run-off eventually reaching the City of Saint Paul's existing stormwater conveyance system via overland flow and catch basins. The area of disturbance will trigger City of Saint Paul rate control requirements for stormwater and may require a permit from the Ramsey Washington Metro Watershed District, which requires use of best management practices such as vegetated swales or underground pipe galleries to increase infiltration of stormwater into the soil. These requirements will need to be met as part of the City of Saint Paul's site plan review requirement.	
Vegetation / Wildlife (Introduction, Modification, Removal, Disruption, etc.)	2	The area where the project site is located, the McDonough Homes complex, was developed for it's current use in 1952. The complex has both open grassy areas and tree plantings. The project itself will replace a portion of an existing paved surface parking lot, and will include new tree plantings of species common to the urban canopy in Saint Paul. No significant wildlife impacts are anticipated, including any to listed species in the area (see the Related Laws and Authorities portion of this report). New plantings may provide a small amount of additional habitat, particularly over time, for birds and small mammal species (squirrels, chipmunks, etc.) already common to the area.	
Other Factors 1			
Other Factors 2			
CLIMATE AND ENERGY			
Climate Change	2	The project will meet applicable HUD and Saint Paul Public Housing Authority standards for construction and energy efficiency. The type of construction proposed is outlined in the STraCAT analysis included in this report to verify acceptable	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		internal noise levels. The project will replace a portion of an existing paved parking lot with the new building. This may potentially have a positive impact in reducing heat island impacts in the immediate vicinity. Heat island impacts in aggregate can affect local climate, and may contribute to climate change.	
Energy Efficiency	2	The project will meet applicable HUD and Saint Paul Public Housing Authority standards for construction and energy efficiency. The type of construction proposed is outlined in the STraCAT analysis included in this report to verify acceptable internal noise levels.	

Supporting documentation

- [Access to Community Facilities and Services.pdf](#)
- [Median Household Income by Census Tract.pdf](#)
- [Predominant Racial/Ethnic Identity by Census Tract.pdf](#)
- [Unemployment by Census Tract.pdf](#)

Additional Studies Performed:

Field Inspection [Optional]: Date and completed by:

List of Sources, Agencies and Persons Consulted [40 CFR 1508.9(b)]:

NEPAssist, Minnesota Pollution Control Agency, American Community Survey, SPPHA staff, City of Saint Paul Research, ESRI.

List of Permits Obtained:

Site plan approval, building permits, potentially Ramsey Washington Metro Watershed District.

Public Outreach [24 CFR 58.43]:

The City of Saint Paul as the RE on behalf of the Saint Paul Public Housing Agency did not conduct public outreach other than publication of notices for the require HUD environmental review pursuant to NEPA.

Cumulative Impact Analysis [24 CFR 58.32]:

Among the goals of applicable municipal and regional is to allow for more housing in already developed areas. In addition to addressing ongoing housing shortages, particularly affordable housing, the plans also support increased land use efficiency and utilization of existing infrastructure. The project magnitude (7 new units) is limited in comparison to existing development in the area. And while additional development in the surrounding area can be anticipated within long-range planning timelines (~30 years), no specific projects have been proposed in the area at this time. Any future development in the area will be redevelopment of existing sites, and will undergo standard development reviews at the municipal and regional level and may be subject to additional environmental review depending on factors including project size, type, and funding sources. The analysis in this report also found the proposed project not to result in any notable negative environmental impacts.

Alternatives [24 CFR 58.40(e); 40 CFR 1508.9]

Due to the nature of the project, alternatives were not seriously considered. The project proposer provides public housing for low income individuals and families. There is an ongoing need for this housing as evidenced by waiting lists for SPPHA housing, and the project location will result in more efficient use of land already owned by SPPHA and does not require additional expenditures for land acquisition. It allows SPPHA tp accommodate more residents, and potentially allow existing residents to remain in their neighborhood, and may allow more efficient provision of services and maintenance.

No Action Alternative [24 CFR 58.40(e)]

A no action alternative would result in less available affordable housing units in an area of need.

Summary of Findings and Conclusions:

The analysis contained within this document did not identify any negative potential environmental impacts. The project meets all HUD requirements pursuant to NEPA.

Mitigation Measures and Conditions [CFR 1505.2(c)]:

Summarized below are all mitigation measures adopted by the Responsible Entity to reduce, avoid or eliminate adverse environmental impacts and to avoid non-compliance or non-conformance with the above-listed authorities and factors. These measures/conditions must be incorporated into project contracts, development agreements and other relevant documents.

The staff responsible for implementing and monitoring mitigation measures should be clearly identified in the mitigation plan.

Law, Authority, or Factor	Mitigation Measure or Condition	Comments on Completed Measures	Mitigation Plan	Complete
--	--	---	----------------------------	-----------------

Project Mitigation Plan

Supporting documentation on completed measures

APPENDIX A: Related Federal Laws and Authorities

Airport Hazards

General policy	Legislation	Regulation
It is HUD's policy to apply standards to prevent incompatible development around civil airports and military airfields.		24 CFR Part 51 Subpart D

1. To ensure compatible land use development, you must determine your site's proximity to civil and military airports. Is your project within 15,000 feet of a military airport or 2,500 feet of a civilian airport?

No

Based on the response, the review is in compliance with this section. Document and upload the map showing that the site is not within the applicable distances to a military or civilian airport below

Yes

Screen Summary

Compliance Determination

Using our GIS software, we were able to determine that the project site, 1582 Timberlake Rd, is not within 2,500 feet of either civilian airport in the Twin Cities. In addition, there are no military airports within 15,000 feet of the project site. The project is compliant with HUD's Airport Hazards policy.

Supporting documentation

[\(1\) Airport Hazards Compliance.pdf](#)

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

Yes

No

Coastal Barrier Resources

General requirements	Legislation	Regulation
HUD financial assistance may not be used for most activities in units of the Coastal Barrier Resources System (CBRS). See 16 USC 3504 for limitations on federal expenditures affecting the CBRS.	Coastal Barrier Resources Act (CBRA) of 1982, as amended by the Coastal Barrier Improvement Act of 1990 (16 USC 3501)	

1. Is the project located in a CBRS Unit?

No

Document and upload map and documentation below.

Yes

Compliance Determination

We utilized the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's "Coastal Barrier Resources System Mapper" GIS application to determine whether the project site falls into a CBRS. According to the USFWS, the only CBRS found in Minnesota is the "John H. Chafee CBRS" in Duluth, Minnesota. Since the proposed HUD project is in the city of Saint Paul, Minnesota, approximately 160 miles south of the "John H. Chafee CBRS", it can be determined that there will be no effect. Therefore, this project is compliant with the Coastal Barrier Resources Act.

Supporting documentation

[\(2\) Coastal Barriers Resources System \(CBRS\) Compliance.pdf](#)

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

Yes

No

Flood Insurance

General requirements	Legislation	Regulation
Certain types of federal financial assistance may not be used in floodplains unless the community participates in National Flood Insurance Program and flood insurance is both obtained and maintained.	Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 as amended (42 USC 4001-4128)	24 CFR 50.4(b)(1) and 24 CFR 58.6(a) and (b); 24 CFR 55.1(b).

1. Does this project involve financial assistance for construction, rehabilitation, or acquisition of a mobile home, building, or insurable personal property?

- ✓ No. This project does not require flood insurance or is excepted from flood insurance.

Based on the response, the review is in compliance with this section.

Yes

4. While flood insurance is not mandatory for this project, HUD strongly recommends that all insurable structures maintain flood insurance under the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP). Will flood insurance be required as a mitigation measure or condition?

Yes

- ✓ No

Screen Summary

Compliance Determination

According to the map generated by FEMA's National Flood Hazard Layer (NFHL) GIS application, it was determined that the project site is in FEMA FIRMette Map Panel Number: 27123C0102G. This panel has been in effect since 6/4/2010 and is labeled as "Zone X (Unshaded)". Since the proposed HUD-Assisted project occurs in an unshaded "Zone X" area, it can be determined that 1582 Timberlake Rd is neither in a Special Flood Hazard Area (SFHA) or an area of Moderate Risk. Flood insurance will not be necessary to serve as mitigation. Therefore, the project is compliant with Flood Insurance requirements.

Supporting documentation

[\(3\) Flood Insurance Compliance.pdf](#)

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

SPPHA-McDonough-182-
Timberlake

Saint Paul, MN

900000010417289

Yes

✓ No

Air Quality

General requirements	Legislation	Regulation
The Clean Air Act is administered by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), which sets national standards on ambient pollutants. In addition, the Clean Air Act is administered by States, which must develop State Implementation Plans (SIPs) to regulate their state air quality. Projects funded by HUD must demonstrate that they conform to the appropriate SIP.	Clean Air Act (42 USC 7401 et seq.) as amended particularly Section 176(c) and (d) (42 USC 7506(c) and (d))	40 CFR Parts 6, 51 and 93

1. Does your project include new construction or conversion of land use facilitating the development of public, commercial, or industrial facilities OR five or more dwelling units?

Yes

No

Air Quality Attainment Status of Project's County or Air Quality Management District

2. Is your project's air quality management district or county in non-attainment or maintenance status for any criteria pollutants?

No, project's county or air quality management district is in attainment status for all criteria pollutants.

Yes, project's management district or county is in non-attainment or maintenance status for the following criteria pollutants (check all that apply):

Screen Summary

Compliance Determination

Based on the project description, this project includes no activities that would require further evaluation under the Clean Air Act. Therefore, the project is compliant with the Clean Air Act.

Supporting documentation

[\(4\) Air Quality Compliance.pdf](#)

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

Yes

✓ No

Coastal Zone Management Act

General requirements	Legislation	Regulation
Federal assistance to applicant agencies for activities affecting any coastal use or resource is granted only when such activities are consistent with federally approved State Coastal Zone Management Act Plans.	Coastal Zone Management Act (16 USC 1451-1464), particularly section 307(c) and (d) (16 USC 1456(c) and (d))	15 CFR Part 930

1. Is the project located in, or does it affect, a Coastal Zone as defined in your state Coastal Management Plan?

Yes

No

Based on the response, the review is in compliance with this section. Document and upload all documents used to make your determination below.

Screen Summary

Compliance Determination

In the state of Minnesota, the only coastal zone that is protected by the Coastal Zone Management Act (CZMA) is along the coast of Lake Superior. The project occurs in the City of Saint Paul and the proposed project site, is approximately 130 miles away from coastal areas protected in the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources coastal management plan. Therefore, the project is compliant with the Coastal Zone Management Act.

Supporting documentation

[\(5\) Coastal Zone Management Act Compliance.pdf](#)

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

Yes

No

Contamination and Toxic Substances

General Requirements	Legislation	Regulations
It is HUD policy that all properties that are being proposed for use in HUD programs be free of hazardous materials, contamination, toxic chemicals and gases, and radioactive substances, where a hazard could affect the health and safety of the occupants or conflict with the intended utilization of the property.		24 CFR 58.5(i)(2) 24 CFR 50.3(i)
Reference		
https://www.onecpd.info/environmental-review/site-contamination		

1. How was site contamination evaluated?* Select all that apply.

ASTM Phase I ESA

ASTM Phase II ESA

Remediation or clean-up plan

ASTM Vapor Encroachment Screening.

None of the above

* HUD regulations at 24 CFR § 58.5(i)(2)(ii) require that the environmental review for multifamily housing with five or more dwelling units or non-residential property include the evaluation of previous uses of the site or other evidence of contamination on or near the site.

For acquisition and new construction of multifamily and nonresidential properties HUD strongly advises the review include an ASTM Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) to meet real estate transaction standards of due diligence and to help ensure compliance with HUD’s toxic policy at 24 CFR §58.5(i) and 24 CFR §50.3(i). Also note that some HUD programs require an ASTM Phase I ESA.

2. Were any on-site or nearby toxic, hazardous, or radioactive substances* (excluding radon) found that could affect the health and safety of project occupants or conflict with the intended use of the property? (Were any recognized environmental conditions or RECs identified in a Phase I ESA and confirmed in a Phase II ESA?)

Provide a map or other documentation of absence or presence of contamination** and explain evaluation of site contamination in the Screen Summary at the bottom of this screen.

✓ No

Explain:

To ensure compliance with the Contamination and Toxic Substances Requirements, we visited the EPA's "NEPAssist" and Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) "What's in My Neighborhood" (WIMN) GIS web applications to identify sources of contamination within 1/2 mile of the proposed HUD-assisted project site. On NEPAssist, we found no Superfund site within 1/2 mile of 1582 Timberlake Rd. We found 6 Brownfield sites within 1/2 mile of the proposed project site. As evidence of due diligence, these sites will be listed below and the NEPAssist Report will be uploaded to HEROS. All sites - AJ West Parcels 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 10 - are brownfields marked as necessitating cleanup and having had none occur. All parcels acted as storage or maintenance facilities for salvaged auto parts. Due to the nature of the previous activities and the distance from the proposed project site, these sites pose no risk to end users/project occupants. While there are points of contamination on the WIMN Report, we found no evidence of on-site or notable nearby sites of contamination. The most pertinent sites are "McDonough Homes Clinic," "Saint Paul Public Housing - Saint Paul," and "ISD 625 Mississippi." All these sites are specifically for hazardous waste generators of a small capacity, and the existence of permits precludes them to being disposed responsibly. Further analysis is not required. As evidence of due diligence, the WIMN Report will be uploaded to HEROS.

Yes

* This question covers the presence of radioactive substances excluding radon. Radon is addressed in the Radon Exempt Question.

** Utilize EPA's Enviromapper, NEPAssist, or state/tribal databases to identify nearby dumps, junk yards, landfills, hazardous waste sites, and industrial sites, including EPA National Priorities List Sites (Superfund sites), CERCLA or state-equivalent sites, RCRA Corrective Action sites with release(s) or suspected release(s) requiring clean-up action and/or further investigation. Additional supporting documentation may include other inspections and reports.

3. Evaluate the building(s) for radon. Do all buildings meet any of the exemptions* from having to consider radon in the contamination analysis listed in CPD Notice [CPD-23-103](#)?

✓ Yes

Explain:

To determine compliance with HUD's Radon policy, we used the alternative strategy of reviewing science-based data. The data we reviewed was provided

by the Center for Disease Control and Prevention's (CDC) National Environmental Public Health Tracking Network site. According to the site, the Annual Mean Pre-Mitigation Radon Measurement in Tested Buildings from 2010-2020 in Ramsey County was 2.9 pCi/L. This number is below the 4.0 pCi/L that would require mitigation. Therefore, the project is compliant with HUD's Radon policy and Contamination and Toxic Substances requirements.

No

* Notes:

- Buildings with no enclosed areas having ground contact.
- Buildings containing crawlspaces, utility tunnels, or parking garages would not be exempt, however buildings built on piers would be exempt, provided that there is open air between the lowest floor of the building and the ground.
- Buildings that are not residential and will not be occupied for more than 4 hours per day.
- Buildings with existing radon mitigation systems - document radon levels are below 4 pCi/L with test results dated within two years of submitting the application for HUD assistance and document the system includes an ongoing maintenance plan that includes periodic testing to ensure the system continues to meet the current EPA recommended levels. If the project does not require an application, document test results dated within two years of the date the environmental review is certified. Refer to program office guidance to ensure compliance with program requirements.
- Buildings tested within five years of the submission of application for HUD assistance: test results document indoor radon levels are below current the EPA's recommended action levels of 4.0 pCi/L. For buildings with test data older than five years, any new environmental review must include a consideration of radon using one of the methods in Section A below.

Screen Summary

Compliance Determination

To ensure compliance with the Contamination and Toxic Substances Requirements, we visited the EPA's "NEPAssist" and Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) "What's in My Neighborhood" (WIMN) GIS web applications to identify sources of contamination within 1/2 mile of the proposed HUD-assisted project site. On NEPAssist, we found no Superfund site within 1/2 mile of 1582 Timberlake Rd. We found 6 Brownfield sites within 1/2 mile of the proposed project site. As evidence of due diligence, these sites will be listed below and the NEPAssist Report will be uploaded to HEROS. All sites - AJ West Parcels 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, and 10 - are brownfields marked as necessitating cleanup and having had none occur. All parcels acted as storage or maintenance facilities for salvaged auto parts. Due to the nature of the previous activities and the distance from the proposed project site, these sites pose no risk to end users/project occupants. While there are points of contamination on the WIMN Report, we found no evidence of on-site or notable nearby sites of

contamination. The most pertinent sites are "McDonough Homes Clinic," "Saint Paul Public Housing - Saint Paul," and "ISD 625 Mississippi." All these sites are specifically for hazardous waste generators of a small capacity, and the existence of permits precludes them to being disposed responsibly. Further analysis is not required. As evidence of due diligence, the WIMN Report will be uploaded to HEROS. To determine compliance with HUD's Radon policy, we used the alternative strategy of reviewing science-based data. The data we reviewed was provided by the Center for Disease Control and Prevention's (CDC) National Environmental Public Health Tracking Network site. According to the site, the Annual Mean Pre-Mitigation Radon Measurement in Tested Buildings from 2010-2020 in Ramsey County was 2.9 pCi/L. This number is below the 4.0 pCi/L that would require mitigation. Therefore, the project is compliant with HUD's Radon policy and Contamination and Toxic Substances requirements.

Supporting documentation

[Saint Paul Public Housing Saint Paul WIMN.pdf](#)
[McDonough Homes Clinic WIMN.pdf](#)
[ISD 625 Mississippi WIMN.pdf](#)
[AJ West Parcel 10 Facility Report.pdf](#)
[AJ West Parcel 5 Facility Report.pdf](#)
[AJ West Parcel 4 Facility Report.pdf](#)
[AJ West Parcel 3 Facility Report.pdf](#)
[AJ West Parcel 2 Facility Report.pdf](#)
[AJ West Parcel 1 Facility Report.pdf](#)
[\(6\) WIMN Contamination and Toxic Substances Compliance.pdf](#)
[\(6\) NEPA Assist Contamination and Toxic Substances Compliance.pdf](#)

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

Yes

✓ No

Endangered Species

General requirements	ESA Legislation	Regulations
Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act (ESA) mandates that federal agencies ensure that actions that they authorize, fund, or carry out shall not jeopardize the continued existence of federally listed plants and animals or result in the adverse modification or destruction of designated critical habitat. Where their actions may affect resources protected by the ESA, agencies must consult with the Fish and Wildlife Service and/or the National Marine Fisheries Service (“FWS” and “NMFS” or “the Services”).	The Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 <i>et seq.</i>); particularly section 7 (16 USC 1536).	50 CFR Part 402

1. Does the project involve any activities that have the potential to affect species or habitats?

No, the project will have No Effect due to the nature of the activities involved in the project.

- ✓ No, the project will have No Effect based on a letter of understanding, memorandum of agreement, programmatic agreement, or checklist provided by local HUD office

Explain your determination:

Compliance determined based on consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. See attached documentation.

Based on the response, the review is in compliance with this section. Document and upload all documents used to make your determination below.

Yes, the activities involved in the project have the potential to affect species and/or habitats.

Screen Summary

Compliance Determination

The following species were identified in the IPaC species list generated on August 2, 2024: Northern Long-eared Bat, Tricolored Bat, Whopping Crane, Higgins Eye (pearlymussel), Salamander Mussel, Rusty Patched Bumble Bee, and Monarch Butterfly. Project activities will have no effect on the Northern Long-eared Bat. This

determination can be made because project activities do not involve clearing or disturbing suitable habitat, no activity in or near the entrance to cave or mine, nor mining, deep excavation, or underground work within 0.25 miles of a cave or mine, nor construction of wind turbines or demolition or reconstruction of human made structures known to be used by bats. Project activities will have no effect on the Tricolored Bat. This determination can be made because project activities do not involve clearing or disturbing suitable habitat, no activity in or near the entrance to cave or mine, nor mining, deep excavation, or underground work within 0.25 miles of a cave or mine, nor construction of wind turbines or demolition or reconstruction of human made structures known to be used by bats. Project activities will have no effect on the Whooping Crane. This determination can be made because the Whooping Crane is designated as a "non-essential" experimental population in Minnesota. Consultation under Section 7(a)(2) of the Endangered Species Act is only required if project activities will occur within a National Wildlife Refuge or National Park. Since proposed project activity will occur on land outside of a National Wildlife Refuge or National Park, we are not required to consult for this species. Project activities will have no effect on the Higgins Eye (pearly mussel). This determination can be made because project activities do not involve habitat loss, degradation, or introduction of exotic species including Zebra mussels, which are the major threats to the survival of the Higgins eye mussel. Project activities will have no effect on the Salamander Mussel. This determination can be made because the species, as of September 1st, 2023, has been proposed for listing as an endangered species under the Endangered Species Act of 1973. As a result, this species is not yet protected by the Act. Proposed Critical Habitat for the Salamander Mussel exists in Chisago and Washington County, Minnesota, specifically in the St. Croix River. The proposed project activity will not impact known habitat. Project activities will have no effect on the Rusty Patched Bumble Bee. This determination can be made because project activities do not involve habitat loss, degradation, or introduction of pathogens or exposure to insecticides or fungicides, which are suspected to be the major threats to the species along with non-native and managed bees, the effects of climate change, and small population biology. The Monarch Butterfly is a candidate species and not yet listed or proposed for listing. There are currently no section 7 requirements for candidate species. Project activities will not impact known habitat. Project activities do not involve construction of Communication Towers (radio, television, cellular, and microwave towers), Transmission Lines (power lines or poles, particularly those with uninsulated or unguarded electrical currents), or Wind Turbines. Therefore, there will be no effect on migratory birds. In addition, there are no critical habitats for the listed species within the project area under the USFWS jurisdiction. The project site is in a fully urbanized area and there is no habitat present in the project site for the species on the IPaC list. The proposed project activities will not jeopardize the continued existence of any listed species. Therefore, the project is compliant with Section 7 requirements.

Supporting documentation

[\(7\) Endangered Species Act \(ESA\) Compliance.pdf](#)

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

Yes

No

Explosive and Flammable Hazards

General requirements	Legislation	Regulation
HUD-assisted projects must meet Acceptable Separation Distance (ASD) requirements to protect them from explosive and flammable hazards.	N/A	24 CFR Part 51 Subpart C

1. Is the proposed HUD-assisted project itself the development of a hazardous facility (a facility that mainly stores, handles or processes flammable or combustible chemicals such as bulk fuel storage facilities and refineries)?

No

Yes

2. Does this project include any of the following activities: development, construction, rehabilitation that will increase residential densities, or conversion?

No

Yes

3. Within 1 mile of the project site, are there any current or planned stationary aboveground storage containers that are covered by 24 CFR 51C? Containers that are NOT covered under the regulation include:

- Containers 100 gallons or less in capacity, containing common liquid industrial fuels OR

- Containers of liquified petroleum gas (LPG) or propane with a water volume capacity of 1,000 gallons or less that meet the requirements of the 2017 or later version of National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) Code 58.

If all containers within the search area fit the above criteria, answer "No." For any other type of aboveground storage container within the search area that holds one of the flammable or explosive materials listed in Appendix I of 24 CFR part 51 subpart C, answer "Yes."

No

Based on the response, the review is in compliance with this section. Document and upload all documents used to make your determination below.

Yes

Screen Summary

Compliance Determination

There are no current or planned stationary aboveground storage containers of concern within 1 mile of the project site. This was determined by consultation with Minnesota Pollution Control Agency above ground tank records, NEPAassist records, and visual survey. The project is in compliance with explosive and flammable hazard requirements.

Supporting documentation

[Wasteco Inc MNPCA.pdf](#)
[Wasteco Inc ASD.pdf](#)
[TTC Materials MNPCA.pdf](#)
[TTC Materials ASD.pdf](#)
[Tecom Inc MNPCA.pdf](#)
[Tecom Inc ASD.pdf](#)
[Splash Products MNPCA.pdf](#)
[Splash Products ASD.pdf](#)
[Mccarrons St Paul Water Trmt Plant MNPCA.pdf](#)
[Mccarrons St Paul Water Trmt Plant ASD.pdf](#)
[Maplewood Truck Station MNDOT MNPCA.pdf](#)
[Maplewood Truck Station MNDOT ASD.pdf](#)
[Jack Carricks Minnesota Repair Inc MNPCA.pdf](#)
[Jack Carricks Minnesota Repair Inc ASD.pdf](#)
[Advance Shoring Co MNPCA.pdf](#)
[Advance Shoring Co ASD.pdf](#)
[\(8\) Explosive and Flammable Hazards Compliance.pdf](#)

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

Yes

✓ No

Farmlands Protection

General requirements	Legislation	Regulation
The Farmland Protection Policy Act (FPPA) discourages federal activities that would convert farmland to nonagricultural purposes.	Farmland Protection Policy Act of 1981 (7 U.S.C. 4201 et seq.)	7 CFR Part 658

1. Does your project include any activities, including new construction, acquisition of undeveloped land or conversion, that could convert agricultural land to a non-agricultural use?

Yes

✓ No

If your project includes new construction, acquisition of undeveloped land or conversion, explain how you determined that agricultural land would not be converted:

The project site is identified as part of an urbanized area.

Based on the response, the review is in compliance with this section. Document and upload all documents used to make your determination below.

Screen Summary

Compliance Determination

This project is located in an urbanized area.. The project is in compliance with the Farmland Protection Policy Act.

Supporting documentation

[\(9\) Farmland Protection Policy Act Compliance.pdf](#)

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

Yes

✓ No

Floodplain Management

General Requirements	Legislation	Regulation
Executive Order 11988, Floodplain Management, requires Federal activities to avoid impacts to floodplains and to avoid direct and indirect support of floodplain development to the extent practicable.	Executive Order 11988 * Executive Order 13690 * 42 USC 4001-4128 * 42 USC 5154a * only applies to screen 2047 and not 2046	24 CFR 55

1. Does this project meet an exemption at 24 CFR 55.12 from compliance with HUD's floodplain management regulations in Part 55?

Yes

(a) HUD-assisted activities described in 24 CFR 58.34 and 58.35(b).

(b) HUD-assisted activities described in 24 CFR 50.19, except as otherwise indicated in § 50.19.

(c) The approval of financial assistance for restoring and preserving the natural and beneficial functions and values of floodplains and wetlands, including through acquisition of such floodplain and wetland property, where a permanent covenant or comparable restriction is placed on the property's continued use for flood control, wetland protection, open space, or park land, but only if:

(1) The property is cleared of all existing buildings and walled structures; and

(2) The property is cleared of related improvements except those which:

(i) Are directly related to flood control, wetland protection, open space, or park land (including playgrounds and recreation areas);

(ii) Do not modify existing wetland areas or involve fill, paving, or other ground disturbance beyond minimal trails or paths; and

(iii) Are designed to be compatible with the beneficial floodplain or wetland function of the property.

(d) An action involving a repossession, receivership, foreclosure, or similar acquisition of property to protect or enforce HUD's financial interests under previously approved loans, grants, mortgage insurance,

or other HUD assistance.

(e) Policy-level actions described at 24 CFR 50.16 that do not involve site-based decisions.

(f) A minor amendment to a previously approved action with no additional adverse impact on or from a floodplain or wetland.

(g) HUD's or the responsible entity's approval of a project site, an incidental portion of which is situated in the FFRMS floodplain (not including the floodway, LiMWA, or coastal high hazard area) but only if: (1) The proposed project site does not include any existing or proposed buildings or improvements that modify or occupy the FFRMS floodplain except de minimis improvements such as recreation areas and trails; and (2) the proposed project will not result in any new construction in or modifications of a wetland .

(h) Issuance or use of Housing Vouchers, or other forms of rental subsidy where HUD, the awarding community, or the public housing agency that administers the contract awards rental subsidies that are not project-based (i.e., do not involve site-specific subsidies).

(i) Special projects directed to the removal of material and architectural barriers that restrict the mobility of and accessibility to elderly and persons with disabilities.

Describe:

No

2. Does the project include a Critical Action? Examples of Critical Actions include projects involving hospitals, fire and police stations, nursing homes, hazardous chemical storage, storage of valuable records, and utility plants.

Yes

Describe:

No

3. Determine the extent of the FFRMS floodplain and provide mapping documentation in support of that determination

The extent of the FFRMS floodplain can be determined using a Climate Informed Science Approach (CISA), 0.2 percent flood approach (0.2 PFA), or freeboard value approach (FVA). For projects in areas without available CISA data or without FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRMs), Flood Insurance Studies (FISs) or Advisory Base Flood Elevations (ABFEs), use the best available information¹ to determine flood elevation. Include documentation and an explanation of why this is the best available information² for the site. Note that newly constructed and substantially improved³ structures must be elevated to the FFRMS floodplain regardless of the approach chosen to determine the floodplain.

Select one of the following three options:

CISA for non-critical actions. If using a local tool, data, or resources, ensure that the FFRMS elevation is higher than would have been determined using the 0.2 PFA or the FVA.

- ✓ 0.2-PFA. Where FEMA has defined the 0.2-percent-annual-chance floodplain, the FFRMS floodplain is the area that FEMA has designated as within the 0.2-percent-annual-chance floodplain.

FVA. If neither CISA nor 0.2-PFA is available, for non-critical actions, the FFRMS floodplain is the area that results from adding two feet to the base flood elevation as established by the effective FIRM or FIS or — if available — a FEMA-provided preliminary or pending FIRM or FIS or advisory base flood elevations, whether regulatory or informational in nature. However, an interim or preliminary FEMA map cannot be used if it is lower than the current FIRM or FIS.

¹ Sources which merit investigation include the files and studies of other federal agencies, such as the U. S. Army Corps of Engineers, the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Soil Conservation Service and the U. S. Geological Survey. These agencies have prepared flood hazard studies for several thousand localities and, through their technical assistance programs, hydrologic studies, soil surveys, and other investigations have collected or developed other floodplain information for numerous sites and areas. States and communities are also sources of information on past flood 'experiences within their boundaries and are particularly knowledgeable about areas subject to high-risk flood hazards such as alluvial fans, high velocity flows, mudflows and mudslides, ice jams, subsidence and liquefaction.

² If you are using best available information, select the FVA option below and provide supporting documentation in the screen summary. Contact your [local environmental officer](#) with additional compliance questions.

³ Substantial improvement means any repair or improvement of a structure which costs at least 50 percent of the market value of the structure before repair or improvement or results in an increase of more than 20 percent of the number of dwelling units. The full definition can be found at [24 CFR 55.2\(b\)\(12\)](#).

5. Does your project occur in the FFRMS floodplain?

Yes

✓ No

Screen Summary

Compliance Determination

This project does not occur in the FFRMS floodplain. The project is in compliance with Executive Orders 11988 and 13690.

Supporting documentation

[\(10\) Floodplain Management Compliance.pdf](#)

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

Yes

✓ No

Historic Preservation

General requirements	Legislation	Regulation
Regulations under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) require a consultative process to identify historic properties, assess project impacts on them, and avoid, minimize, or mitigate adverse effects	Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (16 U.S.C. 470f)	36 CFR 800 "Protection of Historic Properties" https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/CFR-2012-title36-vol3/pdf/CFR-2012-title36-vol3-part800.pdf

Threshold

Is Section 106 review required for your project?

- No, because the project consists solely of activities listed as exempt in a Programmatic Agreement (PA). (See the PA Database to find applicable PAs.)
- ✓ No, because the project consists solely of activities included in a No Potential to Cause Effects memo or other determination [36 CFR 800.3(a)(1)].
- Yes, because the project includes activities with potential to cause effects (direct or indirect).

Threshold (b). Document and upload the memo or explanation/justification of the other determination below:

See attached memo.

Based on the response, the review is in compliance with this section.

Screen Summary

Compliance Determination

Based on the evaluation contained in the attached memo, the project is in compliance with Section 106.

Supporting documentation

[\(11\) Historic Preservation Compliance.pdf](#)

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

Yes

✓ No

Noise Abatement and Control

General requirements	Legislation	Regulation
HUD's noise regulations protect residential properties from excessive noise exposure. HUD encourages mitigation as appropriate.	Noise Control Act of 1972 General Services Administration Federal Management Circular 75-2: "Compatible Land Uses at Federal Airfields"	Title 24 CFR 51 Subpart B

1. What activities does your project involve? Check all that apply:

- New construction for residential use

NOTE: HUD assistance to new construction projects is generally prohibited if they are located in an Unacceptable zone, and HUD discourages assistance for new construction projects in Normally Unacceptable zones. See 24 CFR 51.101(a)(3) for further details.

Rehabilitation of an existing residential property

A research demonstration project which does not result in new construction or reconstruction

An interstate land sales registration

Any timely emergency assistance under disaster assistance provision or appropriations which are provided to save lives, protect property, protect public health and safety, remove debris and wreckage, or assistance that has the effect of restoring facilities substantially as they existed prior to the disaster

None of the above

4. Complete the Preliminary Screening to identify potential noise generators in the vicinity (1000' from a major road, 3000' from a railroad, or 15 miles from an airport).

Indicate the findings of the Preliminary Screening below:

There are no noise generators found within the threshold distances above.

- ✓ Noise generators were found within the threshold distances.

5. **Complete the Preliminary Screening to identify potential noise generators in the**

Acceptable: (65 decibels or less; the ceiling may be shifted to 70 decibels in circumstances described in §24 CFR 51.105(a))

- ✓ Normally Unacceptable: (Above 65 decibels but not exceeding 75 decibels; the floor may be shifted to 70 decibels in circumstances described in §24 CFR 51.105(a))

Is your project in a largely undeveloped area?

- ✓ No

Document and upload noise analysis, including noise level and data used to complete the analysis below.

Yes

Unacceptable: (Above 75 decibels)

HUD strongly encourages conversion of noise-exposed sites to land uses compatible with high noise levels.

Check here to affirm that you have considered converting this property to a non-residential use compatible with high noise levels.

Document and upload noise analysis, including noise level and data used to complete the analysis below.

6. **HUD strongly encourages mitigation be used to eliminate adverse noise impacts. Explain in detail the exact measures that must be implemented to mitigate for the impact or effect, including the timeline for implementation. This information will be automatically included in the Mitigation summary for the environmental review.**

Mitigation as follows will be implemented:

- ✓ No mitigation is necessary.

Explain why mitigation will not be made here:

A STraCAT analysis was completed by the project architect. The analysis found that the proposed building materials sufficient mitigate internal noise consistent with HUD requirements.

Based on the response, the review is in compliance with this section.

Screen Summary

Compliance Determination

A Noise Assessment was conducted. The total DNL was found to be normally unacceptable at 68.0 db. See noise analysis. A STraCAT analysis as conducted using HUD guidance, This analysis found that planned construction will result in sufficient reduction of interior noise, and the project does not include and outdoor components. The project is in compliance with HUD's Noise regulation without mitigation.

Supporting documentation

[STraCAT - HUD Exchange.pdf](#)

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

Yes

- ✓ No

Sole Source Aquifers

General requirements	Legislation	Regulation
The Safe Drinking Water Act of 1974 protects drinking water systems which are the sole or principal drinking water source for an area and which, if contaminated, would create a significant hazard to public health.	Safe Drinking Water Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 201, 300f et seq., and 21 U.S.C. 349)	40 CFR Part 149

1. Does the project consist solely of acquisition, leasing, or rehabilitation of an existing building(s)?

Yes

✓ No

2. Is the project located on a sole source aquifer (SSA)?

A sole source aquifer is defined as an aquifer that supplies at least 50 percent of the drinking water consumed in the area overlying the aquifer. This includes streamflow source areas, which are upstream areas of losing streams that flow into the recharge area.

✓ No

Based on the response, the review is in compliance with this section. Document and upload documentation used to make your determination, such as a map of your project (or jurisdiction, if appropriate) in relation to the nearest SSA and its source area, below.

Yes

Screen Summary

Compliance Determination

The project is not located on a sole source aquifer area. The project is in compliance with Sole Source Aquifer requirements.

Supporting documentation

[\(13\) Sole Source Aquifer Compliance.pdf](#)

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

Yes

No

Wetlands Protection

General requirements	Legislation	Regulation
Executive Order 11990 discourages direct or indirect support of new construction impacting wetlands wherever there is a practicable alternative. The Fish and Wildlife Service's National Wetlands Inventory can be used as a primary screening tool, but observed or known wetlands not indicated on NWI maps must also be processed. Off-site impacts that result in draining, impounding, or destroying wetlands must also be processed.	Executive Order 11990	24 CFR 55.20 can be used for general guidance regarding the 8 Step Process.

1. Does this project involve new construction as defined in Executive Order 11990, expansion of a building's footprint, or ground disturbance? The term "new construction" shall include draining, dredging, channelizing, filling, diking, impounding, and related activities and any structures or facilities begun or authorized after the effective date of the Order

No

✓ Yes

2. Will the new construction or other ground disturbance impact an on- or off-site wetland? The term "wetlands" means those areas that are inundated by surface or ground water with a frequency sufficient to support, and under normal circumstances does or would support, a prevalence of vegetative or aquatic life that requires saturated or seasonally saturated soil conditions for growth and reproduction. Wetlands generally include swamps, marshes, bogs, and similar areas such as sloughs, potholes, wet meadows, river overflows, mud flats, and natural ponds.

"Wetlands under E.O. 11990 include isolated and non-jurisdictional wetlands."

✓ No, a wetland will not be impacted in terms of E.O. 11990's definition of new construction.

Based on the response, the review is in compliance with this section. Document and upload a map or any other relevant documentation below which explains your determination

Yes, there is a wetland that be impacted in terms of E.O. 11990's definition of new construction.

Screen Summary

Compliance Determination

The project will not impact on- or off-site wetlands. The project is in compliance with Executive Order 11990.

Supporting documentation

[\(14\) Wetlands Protection Compliance.pdf](#)

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

Yes

✓ No

Wild and Scenic Rivers Act

General requirements	Legislation	Regulation
The Wild and Scenic Rivers Act provides federal protection for certain free-flowing, wild, scenic and recreational rivers designated as components or potential components of the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System (NWSRS) from the effects of construction or development.	The Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 U.S.C. 1271-1287), particularly section 7(b) and (c) (16 U.S.C. 1278(b) and (c))	36 CFR Part 297

1. Is your project within proximity of a NWSRS river?

No

Yes, the project is in proximity of a Designated Wild and Scenic River or Study Wild and Scenic River.

Yes, the project is in proximity of a Nationwide Rivers Inventory (NRI) River.

Screen Summary

Compliance Determination

This project is not within proximity of a NWSRS river, per data provided by the Minnesota Department of Natural Resources. The project is in compliance with the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act.

Supporting documentation

[\(15\) Wild and Scenic Rivers Compliance.pdf](#)

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

Yes

No

Environmental Justice

General requirements	Legislation	Regulation
Determine if the project creates adverse environmental impacts upon a low-income or minority community. If it does, engage the community in meaningful participation about mitigating the impacts or move the project.	Executive Order 12898	

HUD strongly encourages starting the Environmental Justice analysis only after all other laws and authorities, including Environmental Assessment factors if necessary, have been completed.

1. Were any adverse environmental impacts identified in any other compliance review portion of this project's total environmental review?

Yes

No

Based on the response, the review is in compliance with this section.

Screen Summary

Compliance Determination

No adverse environmental impacts were identified in the project's total environmental review. The project is in compliance with Executive Order 12898.

Supporting documentation

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

Yes

No