

**JOINT NOTICES OF FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT AND NOTICES
OF INTENT TO REQUEST RELEASE OF FUNDS**

3/19/2025

King County Dept. of Community and Human Services Housing, Homelessness
and Community Development Division 401 Fifth Avenue, Suite 500
Seattle, WA 98104
Telephone Number (206) 263-9105

3/19/2025

These notices shall satisfy two separate but related procedural requirements for activities to be undertaken by the King County Department of Community and Human Services (DCHS), Housing, Homelessness, and Community Development Division (HHCDD).

REQUEST FOR RELEASE OF FUNDS

On or about 4/7/2025, King County DCHS/ HHCDD, having completed an environmental review of the project described below, will submit a request to the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) for the release of HOME funds under Section 8 of the Housing Act of 1937, as amended Project Based Vouchers which will be provided by HUD to the King County Housing Authority (KCHA) to undertake a project known as Muckleshoot Indian Tribe Supportive Housing/ AKA Ramirez Apartment Project being proposed by the Muckleshoot Tribal Housing Authority for the purpose of providing housing to low-income households, the total of HUD funding is approximately \$1,213,200 in Section 8 Project Based Vouchers. The overall total cost of the project at 38415 Auburn Enumclaw Rd SE, Auburn, WA, 98092 is \$50,000,000. The Project is located along Washington State Route 164 and on Muckleshoot Reservation Land.

The Supportive Housing Development consists of a 3-story, 50-unit Apartment Development on an undeveloped 4.46 acre site. The building footprint is 16,910 SF. The Muckleshoot Tribal Housing Authority THT will develop the site with an access driveway, parking lot, stormwater drainage facilities, and other utilities. Prior to any construction or ground disturbing activities, the THT Planning Department will acquire all the proper approvals and permits required by the MIT Planning and Public Works Department, including utility and building permits. King County has already performed a CENST-level review of the proposed pre-development costs. Owing to development that is already in the area, this site qualifies as urbanized area. See Farmlands Protection component of Related Laws and Authorities. King County Housing Authority has awarded this project 50 Project Based Section 8 Vouchers, whose annualized value is \$24,264 per unit.

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

The Environmental Review Record (ERR) documents the environmental review determinations for the proposed project described above. King County has determined a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) on the human environment. Therefore, an Environmental Impact Statement under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) is not required. Additional project information is contained in the Environmental Review Record (ERR). The ERR will be made available to the public electronically. The King County ERR can be accessed online at the following website: <https://kingcounty.gov/en/dept/dchs/human-social-services/housing-homeless-services/funding-opportunities/environmental-review>. Scroll to the

bottom of page and open “2025 Environmental Assessments” menu to view ERR for this project.

PUBLIC COMMENTS

Any individual, group, or agency may submit written comments on the ERR to King County Community Development Project/Program Manager David Mecklenburg via email at Dave.Mecklenburg@kingcounty.gov. All comments received by 5:00 PM PDT 4/4/2025 will be considered by HCDD prior to authorizing submission of a request for release of funds. Comments should specify which Notice they are addressing.

ENVIRONMENTAL CERTIFICATION

HCDD certifies to HUD that Sunaree Marshall in her capacity as Director - Housing, and Community Development Division, consents to accept the jurisdiction of the Federal Courts if an action is brought to enforce responsibilities in relation to the environmental review process and that these responsibilities have been satisfied. HUD’s approval of the certification satisfies its responsibilities under NEPA and related laws and authorities and allows King County use Program funds.

OBJECTIONS TO RELEASE OF FUNDS

HUD will accept objections to its release of funds and the King County’s certification for a period of fifteen days following the anticipated submission date or its actual receipt of the request (whichever is later) only if they are on one of the following bases: (a) the certification was not executed by the Certifying Officer of King County; (b) King County has omitted a step or failed to make a decision or finding required by HUD regulations at 24 CFR part 58; (c) the grant recipient or other participants in the development process have committed funds, incurred costs or undertaken activities not authorized by 24 CFR Part 58 before approval of a release of funds by HUD; or (d) another Federal agency acting pursuant to 40 CFR Part 1504 has submitted a written finding that the project is unsatisfactory from the standpoint of environmental quality. Objections must be prepared and submitted in accordance with the required procedures (24 CFR Part 58, Sec. 58.76) and shall be addressed to: HUD Seattle Office of Public Housing at U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, 909 First Ave., Suite 320 Seattle, WA 98104-1000 Seattlepublichousing@hud.gov regarding Project Based Vouchers. Potential objectors should contact HUD via email to verify the actual last day of the objection period.

Sunaree Marshall – Director — King County Housing, Homelessness and Community Development Division



U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
 451 Seventh Street, SW
 Washington, DC 20410
www.hud.gov
espanol.hud.gov

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

Project Information

Project Name: Muckleshoot-Permanent-Supportive-Housing-Construction

HEROS Number: 900000010424442

Start Date: 09/11/2024

Project Location: 38415 Auburn Enumclaw Rd SE, Auburn, WA 98092

Additional Location Information:

The Project site is located in Township 20N, Range 5E, in the northeast quadrant of Section 2. The project will take place in the Puyallup/White River Water Resource Inventory (WRIA 10), in King County, Washington. The location is undeveloped, partial woodland with several single family residential structures occupying the area immediately adjacent to the south.

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

The Supportive Housing Development consists of a 3-story, 50-unit Apartment Development on an undeveloped 4.46 acre site. The building footprint is 16,910 SF. The Muckleshoot Tribal Housing Authority THT will develop the site with an access driveway, parking lot, stormwater drainage facilities, and other utilities. Prior to any construction or ground disturbing activities, the THT Planning Department will acquire all the proper approvals and permits required by the MIT Planning and Public Works Department, including utility and building permits. King County has already performed a CENST-level review of the proposed pre-development costs. Owing to development that is already in the area, this site qualifies as urbanized area. See Farmlands Protection component of Related Laws and Authorities. King County Housing Authority has awarded this project 50 Project Based Section 8 Vouchers, whose annualized value is \$24,264 per unit.

Funding Information

Grant Number	HUD Program	Program Name	
14.871	Public Housing	Project-Based Voucher Program	\$1,213,200.00

Estimated Total HUD Funded Amount: \$1,213,200.00

Estimated Total Project Cost [24 CFR 58.2 (a) (5)]: \$50,000,000.00

Muckleshoot-Permanent-
Supportive-Housing-
Construction

Auburn, WA

90000010424442

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
Endangered Species Act	The project, as designed meets Table A parameters for both the Washington State USF&WS and NMFS guidance/programmatic agreements. There are no species present on the site and stormwater mitigation as designed will further meet requirements. Mitigation will simply be retrieving final as-built drawings and submitting to NMFS as part of our standard procedure via the WA State Programmatic. USF&WS Table A will also be part of Construction Documents.
Soil Suitability / Slope/ Erosion / Drainage and Storm Water Runoff	A Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and Temporary Erosion and Sedimentation Control (TESC) Plan are in production. These plans will be completed prior to construction and will be implemented throughout construction. The MIT has applied the 2016 King County SWDM standards, with the 2023 MIT Addendum, as a guide to develop appropriate mitigation. A Temporary Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan (TESC Plan) will be implemented to treat construction runoff. A Spill Prevention Plan will be developed to deal with spills or releases of oil or petroleum compounds from construction equipment.
Permits, reviews, and approvals	MIT Building Permit Major Clearing and Grading MIT Water/Sewer/Storm L&I for Electric

Project Mitigation Plan

Muckleshoot-Permanent-
Supportive-Housing-
Construction

Auburn, WA

900000010424442

The Project Owner Representative shall convey (through email) to the King County Project Manager and Environmental Specialist certified plan sets and documents showing these measures. The County will follow up with Project Owner at substantial completion and occupancy that measures were successfully undertaken as described and documented. Documentation will be uploaded into this Environmental Review Record. Whereas archaeological monitoring was already planned for by the Muckleshoot Tribal Historic Preservation Officer, any discoveries of cultural resources or human remains will serve as the basis for notification to the County. Regular reporting of excavation monitoring to the County is not required, but may be should unforeseen circumstances arise. The County's role is to disseminate information to other consulted Tribes and the King County Housing Authority so they may remain informed. Critical decision making on this and all mitigation efforts is the sovereign prerogative of the Muckleshoot Tribe.

Determination:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	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
<input type="checkbox"/>	Finding of Significant Impact

Preparer Signature: DocuSigned by: Dave Mecklenburg Date: 3/19/2025
4DDED7D0570E478...

Name / Title / Organization: David Mecklenburg / / KING COUNTY

Certifying Officer Signature: DocuSigned by: Kristin Pula Date: 3/19/2025
1DDCEA0A790B439...

Name/ Title: Kristin Pula / Capital Programs Manager

This original, signed document and related supporting material must be retained on file by the Responsible Entity in an Environment Review Record (ERR) for the activity / project (ref: 24 CFR Part 58.38) and in accordance with recordkeeping requirements for the HUD program(s).

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

Project Information

Project Name: Muckleshoot-Permanent-Supportive-Housing-Construction

HEROS Number: 900000010424442

Start Date: 09/11/2024

Responsible Entity (RE): KING COUNTY, 401 Fifth Avenue SEATTLE WA,
98104

RE Preparer: David Mecklenburg

State / Local Identifier:

Certifying Officer Kristin Pula
r:

Grant Recipient (if different than Responsible Entity): King County Housing Authority

PHA Code:

Point of Contact: Kathleen Arledge

Consultant (if applicable)
:

Point of Contact:

40 CFR 1506.5(b)(4): The lead agency or, where appropriate, a cooperating agency shall prepare a disclosure statement for the contractor's execution specifying that the contractor has no financial or other interest in the outcome of the action. Such statement need not include privileged or confidential trade secrets or other confidential business information.

- ✓ By checking this box, I attest that as a preparer, I have no financial or other interest in the outcome of the undertaking assessed in this environmental review.

Project Location: 38415 Auburn Enumclaw Rd SE, Auburn, WA 98092

Additional Location Information:

The Project site is located in Township 20N, Range 5E, in the northeast quadrant of Section 2. The project will take place in the Puyallup/White River Water Resource Inventory (WRIA 10), in King County, Washington. The location is undeveloped, partial woodland with several single family residential structures occupying the area immediately adjacent to the south.

Direct Comments to:

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

The Supportive Housing Development consists of a 3-story, 50-unit Apartment Development on an undeveloped 4.46 acre site. The building footprint is 16,910 SF. The Muckleshoot Tribal Housing Authority THT will develop the site with an access driveway, parking lot, stormwater drainage facilities, and other utilities. Prior to any construction or ground disturbing activities, the THT Planning Department will acquire all the proper approvals and permits required by the MIT Planning and Public Works Department, including utility and building permits. King County has already performed a CENST-level review of the proposed pre-development costs. Owing to development that is already in the area, this site qualifies as urbanized area. See Farmlands Protection component of Related Laws and Authorities. King County Housing Authority has awarded this project 50 Project Based Section 8 Vouchers, whose annualized value is \$24,264 per unit.

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

Like the surrounding communities, there is a crisis of homelessness and housing insecurity on the Reservation. Some tribal members are living in overcrowded or unsafe situations, and face barriers to improving their situation, such as mental health issues, disability, substance use disorder, past incarceration, and more. The Tribe proposes to house these members in living units with adequate infrastructure and access to services, to serve the safety and general welfare of the residents and community. The parcel provides a good setting for such development. Therefore, the MIT is proposing to provide housing for its members with housing barriers. Because the proposal is funded in part by HUD, the MIT must act in accordance with NEPA Regulations 24 CFR 50.4, 58.5, and 58.6.

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

The site is currently undeveloped. Single-family residential neighborhoods lie within a mile to the north and south. The site is less than a mile from the Tribal School (north) and Tribal Administration buildings (south), a major employment center for the reservation. The site is ideal for unhoused tribal members to access services and build a stable life from which to transition to permanent housing. Currently, the reservation is experiencing the same crisis of homelessness that affects the entire region. Encampments of unhoused people result in pollution and unsafe living conditions. Building stability in these conditions and moving on to permanent housing is nearly impossible. The Supportive Housing Development would provide a transitional base to permanent housing and eliminate the need for encampments.

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

- [Google-Map-MSH-01-Imagery.jpg](#)
- [MPSH-KCIMAP-01.jpg](#)
- [MPSH-KCIMAP-Radius Reference.jpg](#)
- [IMAP-ContourMap.jpg](#)
- [9655-00 GeoTech-Report 2024 0627.pdf](#)
- [Dwgs 9-20-24.pdf](#)
- [022005-9021-KCAssessor-ParcelInfo.pdf](#)
- [CDC-RadonTesting-Map.jpg](#)
- [MPSH-ViewEast from SR-164.jpg](#)
- [MPSH-ViewEast2 from SR-164.jpg](#)

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:

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

14.871	Public Housing	Project-Based Voucher Program	\$1,213,200.00
--------	----------------	-------------------------------	----------------

Estimated Total HUD Funded, Assisted or Insured Amount: \$1,213,200.00

Estimated Total Project Cost [24 CFR 58.2 (a) (5)]: \$50,000,000.00

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	The closest airport is the Crest private small craft airport. It is over seven miles away from the project site. Auburn Muni Airport is over 9 miles from the project. SeaTac, the closest major airport is over 21 miles away. Joint Base Lewis McChord, the closest Military Base is over 26 miles away. The project is in compliance with Airport Hazards requirements.
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	This project is located in a state that does not contain CBRS units. Therefore, this project is in compliance with the Coastal Barrier Resources Act.
Flood Insurance Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 and National Flood Insurance Reform Act of 1994 [42 USC 4001-4128 and 42 USC 5154a]	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	The structure or insurable property is not located in a FEMA-designated Special Flood Hazard Area. It is clearly in Zone X on the uploaded FIRM/Combo w/ FIRMette map. The project is in compliance with flood insurance requirements.
STATUTES, EXECUTIVE ORDERS, AND REGULATIONS LISTED AT 24 CFR §50.4 & § 58.5		
Air Quality Clean Air Act, as amended,	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	The project's county or air quality management district is in maintenance status for the following: Carbon

<p>particularly section 176(c) & (d); 40 CFR Parts 6, 51, 93</p>		<p>monoxide. See discussion above regarding maintenance for this area (and all of King County) This project does not exceed de minimis emissions levels or the screening level established by the state or air quality management district for the pollutant(s) identified above. The project is in compliance 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>Per HUD Region X Environmental Review Website: As of July 22, 2020, Washington State Department of Ecology notified HUD of the following: "Ecology has concluded that it is unnecessary for U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) to continue to send project information in order to receive Ecology's concurrence that the funding phase of the project is consistent with Washington's CZMP. Therefore, we are writing to inform you that HUD no longer needs to require applicants to send Ecology letters seeking our concurrence on projects for which HUD plans to release federal funding." Inclusion of the following statement in the Environmental Review Record is strongly encouraged to ensure projects are aware that CZM may still apply at the time of local and/or national permitting. "Concurrence from Dept. of Ecology for Coastal Zone Management is no longer required under a Part 58 or Part 50 Environmental Review in Washington State. However, at the time of project development, the activity may trigger review if it falls under other parts of the CZMA regulations for federal agency activities (Title 15 CFR Part 930, subpart C), or consistency for activities requiring a federal license or permit (Title 15 CFR Part 930, Subpart D) and will be subject to all enforceable policies of the Coastal Zone</p>

		<p>Management Program. It is during the local permitting process that a project might be subject to CZM and further review by the Dept of Ecology."The project is in compliance with the Coastal Zone Management Act. (https://www.hud.gov/states/shared/working/r10/environment#CoastalZoneManagement)</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>Site contamination was evaluated as follows: ASTM Phase I ESA. On-site or nearby toxic, hazardous, or radioactive substances that could affect the health and safety of project occupants or conflict with the intended use of the property were not found. Radon testing indicated radon levels below 4.0 pCi/L. The project is in compliance with 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p>This project May Affect, but is Not Likely to Adversely Affect, listed species, and informal consultation was conducted. With mitigation, identified in the mitigation section of this review, the project will be in compliance with the Endangered Species Act.</p>
<p>Explosive and Flammable Hazards Above-Ground Tanks][24 CFR Part 51 Subpart C</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p>There are no current or planned stationary aboveground storage containers of concern within 1 mile of the project site. The project is in compliance with explosive and flammable hazard requirements. Please see attached image collection of review of AGSTs.</p>
<p>Farmlands Protection Farmland Protection Policy Act of 1981, particularly sections 1504(b) and 1541; 7 CFR Part 658</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p>This project includes activities that could potentially convert agricultural land to a non-agricultural use. While the Project falls just outside the NEPA Assist map for Urbanized Area, due to the housing development adjacent to the property. The project density of the 40 acre measurement is 40 units. To qualify for urban area, it needs to be 30 units or greater. but an exemption applies. The</p>

		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 Section 106 consultation there are No Historic Properties Affected because there are no historic properties present. 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 via the HUD DNL. The noise level was acceptable: 60.0 db. While the Auburn Municipal Airport is 9 miles away, it does not service jet engine aircraft, only helicopters and small private aircraft. See documentation. SR 164 does not have measurable heavy-truck traffic, and WSDOT does not have information for it. Tribal staff confirmed this. The project is in compliance with HUD's Noise regulation.
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	While there is a wetland across State Route 164, the drainage ditch, which is part of the project's storm water system, does not feed to it. See attachment (and full stormwater design drawings under Endangered Species Act).
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 over 40 miles (and in a different watershed) from the nearest NWSRS river (the Middle Fork of the Snoqualmie). 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 type="checkbox"/> No	
---	--	--

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.

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
LAND DEVELOPMENT			
Conformance with Plans / Compatible Land Use and Zoning / Scale and Urban Design	2	However, prior to any construction or ground disturbing activities, the MIT Planning Department will acquire all the proper approvals and permits required by the MIT Planning and Public Works Department, including utility and building permits. The site is in an area that is planned for residential development. It is close to the Tribal School, Tribal Administration Buildings, and Behavioral Health Center, for access to services. Proximity to SR 164 (Auburn-Enumclaw Road) provides access to public transit for residents who don't have their own vehicles.	
Soil Suitability / Slope/ Erosion / Drainage and Storm Water Runoff	2	The area is mostly flat, and not within the White or Green River floodplain. The site is on the flat area at the top of a bluff that slopes down to the White River. The majority of	A Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and Temporary Erosion and Sedimentation Control (TESC) Plan are in production. These plans

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		<p>the site consists of Alderwood gravelly sandy loam, typical of 8 to 15 percent slopes. The easternmost portion is Alderwood gravelly sandy loam, typical of 0 to 8 percent slopes. Both soils are moderately well-drained, with the water table depth from 18 to 37 inches. (NRCS 2024). This soil type is not associated with flooding or hydric soils. The Puget Sound region is historically glaciated, with soils of varying depth. Soils are formed from glacial deposits and are sandy and gravelly in nature; however, there is a shallow hardpan that precludes use of infiltration for stormwater. No mineral or paleontological resources are known to exist in the area. Planned stormwater retention and treatment should mitigate issues.</p>	<p>will be completed prior to construction and will be implemented throughout construction. The MIT has applied the 2016 King County SWDM standards, with the 2023 MIT Addendum, as a guide to develop appropriate mitigation. A Temporary Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan (TESC Plan) will be implemented to treat construction runoff. A Spill Prevention Plan will be developed to deal with spills or releases of oil or petroleum compounds from construction equipment.</p>
<p>Hazards and Nuisances including Site Safety and Site-Generated Noise</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>No known toxic/contaminants have been identified. While close to SR 164, traffic counts on this road are far below most urbanized areas seeing this type of construction and the construction standards will likely allow for greater compliance in the future. Site generated noise will be mitigated during construction through standard, permitted industry best practices.</p>	
<p>SOCIOECONOMIC</p>			

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
Employment and Income Patterns	1	Staffing of the facility will need to be local and should assist with more local jobs.	
Demographic Character Changes / Displacement	1	The project will be keeping Muckleshoot Tribal Members experiencing homelessness close to their original homes in the vicinity, instead of displacing them to Seattle or Tacoma.	
Environmental Justice EA Factor	1	Native Americans are a socially protected group under the Civil Rights Act and Presidential Executive Order 12898. In recent decades, the MIT has made many investments in infrastructure on the reservation to improve quality of life for tribal members. The Supportive Housing Complex is an effort to integrate people into the community as functioning members, who currently face barriers to participation. Native Americans are disproportionately affected by poverty and homelessness, and these difficulties are aggravated by behavioral disorders caused and/or exacerbated by generational trauma. Prospective residents of the Supportive Housing complex are high-need, vulnerable individuals and families who do not have a permanent, safe place to reside. Units will have 1, 2, and 3 bedrooms to serve individuals, couples and families in need. The complex	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		will be staffed at all times to ensure the building is safe and secure for all residents. The Behavioral Health Center is located less than 5 miles away for residents in crisis who may need intensive care. The complex will provide a safe, comfortable situation for individuals and families, that is conducive to stability.	
COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND SERVICES			
Educational and Cultural Facilities (Access and Capacity)	2	Since the site is primarily designed to assist those immediate residents in need, there is no expected increase in service units that will affect the nearby Tribal Schools (<1 Mile away), Tribal administration, or Community Center facilities. (<1 mile south on SR 164)	
Commercial Facilities (Access and Proximity)	2	In this rural part of King County and the Muckleshoot Reservation, commercial facilities are dispersed widely and none will be impacted negatively by this project.	
Health Care / Social Services (Access and Capacity)	1	The nearest hospital remains in Enumclaw at 9 miles away and this is no different from the current concentration of Tribal residential locations. Tribal Social services will be improved since some of these will be located on site in the finished project.	
Solid Waste Disposal and Recycling	2	Solid waste will be added to the Tribal Solid Waste route service route. Tribal Solid Waste will pick up regularly	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
(Feasibility and Capacity)		once a week and they have capacity for twice a week pick up for both solid waste and recycle.	
Waste Water and Sanitary Sewers (Feasibility and Capacity)	2	Waste water and sanitary sewer will be added to the MIT sewer system and eventually will flow to the King County sewer treatment facility. MIT has ample sewer capacity to accommodate these flows.	
Water Supply (Feasibility and Capacity)	2	Water will be supplied by the MIT water system that serves the Reservation. The water supply will be sufficient to provide water to the Supportive Housing project. The Supportive Housing needs will not reduce the water available to surrounding residences and businesses. Water is also available from the Auburn municipal water system if needed; this is not anticipated.	
Public Safety - Police, Fire and Emergency Medical	2	Tribal Police, Fire, and Emergency Medical are located less than 1 mile from project site. The project's location along State Route 164 enables rapid response.	
Parks, Open Space and Recreation (Access and Capacity)	2	Owing to the rural nature of the area, this development is not expected to negatively impact parks.	
Transportation and Accessibility (Access and Capacity)	2	Whereas the project is located on State Route 164, King County Metro DART service (Route 915) is available Monday through Saturday.	
NATURAL FEATURES			

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
Unique Natural Features /Water Resources	2	The White River is about 1.2 miles south-southwest, and the Green River is about 2 miles north of the site. The project will have treated stormwater and sewer discharge and should not affect water resources.	
Vegetation / Wildlife (Introduction, Modification, Removal, Disruption, etc.)		Will need to be modified with USF&W and NMFS data and recommendations.	
Other Factors 1	2	For Air Quality: the maintenance and attainment levels for this site are acceptable. Industry standard and permitted building practices regarding particulate matter control should allow for minimal impact on the immediate area.	
Other Factors 2			
CLIMATE AND ENERGY			
Climate Change	2	As a multi-family building in a location that primarily uses hydroelectric power, along with green building techniques and efficiencies would help offset the potential greenhouse gas generation by people commuting to and from the site. The Project will adhere to Washington State energy standards	
Energy Efficiency	2	The project will follow the 2021 WSEC.	

Supporting documentation

[Day_Night Noise Level \(DNL\) Calculator - HUD Exchange.pdf](#)

[Muckleshoot-PSH-NMFS-ActionForm.docx](#)
[MIT SH Hazmaps.pdf](#)

Additional Studies Performed:

Field Inspection [Optional]: Date and completed
by:

[MPSH-ViewEast from SR-164.jpg](#)
[MPSH-ViewEast2 from SR-164.jpg](#)

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

HUD Region X Environmental Website:
<https://www.hud.gov/states/shared/working/r10/environment> NEPA Assist:
<https://www.epa.gov/nepa/nepassist> FEMA Map Center:
<https://msc.fema.gov/portal/home> National Wetlands Mapper:
<https://www.fws.gov/program/national-wetlands-inventory/wetlands-mapper> King
County IMAP and Assessor's Office Parcel Viewer:
<https://kingcounty.gov/en/dept/kcit/data-information-services/gis-center/maps-apps>
Google Maps: <https://www.google.com/maps> Muckleshoot Tribal Historic
Preservation Office: Laura Murphy, THPO

List of Permits Obtained:

MIT Building Permit Major Clearing and Grading MIT Water/Sewer/Storm L&I for
Electric

Public Outreach [24 CFR 58.43]:

9/20/23 and 9/27/23-Phillip Starr building as part of the comp plan and housing needs-
47 total participated 5/23/2024-Community Center as part of the General Council
Meeting. Board Chair Warren King George presented on Housing and the Supportive
housing program.-Over 100 in attendance 2019-2023-Before COVID and after
COVID-19, Assessment for Housing needs involved interviews and group meetings(
Training building and Pentecostal Church) with over 500 members. The consensus was
the need for the PSH and its location to be further away from the clean and sober units
but on the bus line for easy access to community departments.

Cumulative Impact Analysis [24 CFR 58.32]:

The Supportive Housing Development contributes to buildout on the Muckleshoot Reservation. As a thriving community, the population on the reservation has risen in recent years. The reservation is an attractive option for tribal members who have left it in the past, and there are non-Indian residents as well. The cumulative socioeconomic impact is beneficial, as the crisis of homelessness affects the entire community. The location is near Tribal services (see below in Alternatives for discussion). Environmental impacts on water and air quality are adequately mitigated, and the Tribal Historic Preservation Office will be conducting monitoring during excavation activities.

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

While other sites were considered, the location of this available property near the nexus of SR 164 and Tribal Community Facilities (Tribal Seat, Community Center, Health and Wellness Center, and Muckleshoot Housing Authority Offices) was unmatched in terms of providing more density for residential housing along with access to aforementioned Tribal facilities and services. The location was already zoned by the Tribe for housing and owing to existing density does not affect farmland. Much of the Muckleshoot Reservation is outside the current Urbanized Area map (see Farmland Protection in Laws and Authorities), but this project will allow for residential density development owing to the density of units already nearby (see Farmlands Protection in Laws and Authorities for details).

No Action Alternative [24 CFR 58.40(e)]

If no construction occurs, water resources will not be affected at the site. Private development of the parcel will likely occur eventually, resulting in the same potential impacts to water resources, but without as much oversight and control as can be enforced by the MHA. Prospective residents of the Supportive Housing are either unhoused or living in unsafe situations. Encampments and overcrowded, substandard housing situations will contribute to pollution of surface waters and increase cost of overall services to unhoused individuals and families. These conditions will persist if the complex is not built.

Summary of Findings and Conclusions:

The Project makes efficient use of a site for which the Muckleshoot Housing Authority already owns. This will allow for greater cost savings in overall development. Aside from standard operating/mitigation practices (such as construction Temporary Erosion and Soil Control and archaeological monitoring) there are no adverse effects on species, extant communities, or other environmental concerns. The Project will add no adverse load on community resources and utilities. Lastly, and most importantly, the Project will result in a stable, supportive, culturally appropriate residential setting for residents to establish a dignified life course that can break cycles of homelessness and poverty. Not carrying out the Project would only exacerbate those conditions.

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
Endangered Species Act	The project, as designed meets Table A parameters for both the Washington State USF&WS and NMFS guidance/programmatic agreements. There are no species present on the site and stormwater mitigation as designed will further meet requirements. Mitigation will simply be retrieving final as-built drawings and submitting to NMFS as part of our standard procedure via the WA State Programmatic. USF&WS Table A will also be part of Construction Documents.	N/A	Mitigation will simply be retrieving final as-built drawings and submitting to NMFS as part of our standard procedure via the WA State Programmatic. USF&WS Table A will also be part of Construction Documents.	
Soil Suitability / Slope/ Erosion / Drainage and Storm Water Runoff	A Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and Temporary Erosion and Sedimentation Control (TESC) Plan are in production. These plans will be completed prior to construction and will be implemented throughout construction. The MIT has applied the 2016 King County SWDM standards, with the 2023 MIT Addendum, as a guide to develop appropriate mitigation. A Temporary Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan (TESC Plan) will be implemented to treat	N/A	The SWPPP, TESC, and Spill Prevention plans will be implemented through the construction documents.	

	construction runoff. A Spill Prevention Plan will be developed to deal with spills or releases of oil or petroleum compounds from construction equipment.			
--	---	--	--	--

Project Mitigation Plan

The Project Owner Representative shall convey (through email) to the King County Project Manager and Environmental Specialist certified plan sets and documents showing these measures. The County will follow up with Project Owner at substantial completion and occupancy that measures were successfully undertaken as described and documented. Documentation will be uploaded into this Environmental Review Record. Whereas archaeological monitoring was already planned for by the Muckleshoot Tribal Historic Preservation Officer, any discoveries of cultural resources or human remains will serve as the basis for notification to the County. Regular reporting of excavation monitoring to the County is not required, but may be should unforeseen circumstances arise. The County's role is to disseminate information to other consulted Tribes and the King County Housing Authority so they may remain informed. Critical decision making on this and all mitigation efforts is the sovereign prerogative of the Muckleshoot Tribe.

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

The closest airport is the Crest private small craft airport. It is over seven miles away from the project site. Auburn Muni Airport is over 9 miles from the project. SeaTac, the closest major airport is over 21 miles away. Joint Base Lewis McChord, the closest Military Base is over 26 miles away. The project is in compliance with Airport Hazards requirements.

Supporting documentation

[Airports-SeaTac-21.jpg](#)

[Airports-JBLM-26.jpg](#)

[Airports-Crest-8miles.jpg](#)

[Airports-AuburnMuni-9miles.jpg](#)

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

Yes

Muckleshoot-Permanent-
Supportive-Housing-
Construction

Auburn, WA

900000010424442

✓ 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)	

This project is located in a state that does not contain CBRA units. Therefore, this project is in compliance with the Coastal Barrier Resources Act.

Compliance Determination

This project is located in a state that does not contain CBRS units. Therefore, this project is in compliance with the Coastal Barrier Resources Act.

Supporting documentation

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.

✓ Yes

2. Upload a FEMA/FIRM map showing the site here:

[FIRM53033C1269G.pdf](#)

The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) designates floodplains. The [FEMA Map Service Center](#) provides this information in the form of FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRMs). For projects in areas not mapped by FEMA, use the best available information to determine floodplain information. Include documentation, including a discussion of why this is the best available information for the site. Provide FEMA/FIRM floodplain zone designation, panel number, and date within your documentation.

Is the structure, part of the structure, or insurable property located in a FEMA-designated Special Flood Hazard Area?

✓ No

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

The structure or insurable property is not located in a FEMA-designated Special Flood Hazard Area. It is clearly in Zone X on the uploaded FIRM/Combo w/ FIRMette map. The project is in compliance with flood insurance requirements.

Supporting documentation

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

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):

Carbon Monoxide

Lead

Nitrogen dioxide

Sulfur dioxide

Ozone

Particulate Matter, <2.5 microns

Particulate Matter, <10 microns

3. What are the *de minimis* emissions levels (40 CFR 93.153) or screening levels for the non-attainment or maintenance level pollutants indicated above

Carbon monoxide 0.00 ppm (parts per million)

Provide your source used to determine levels here:

Per the EPA Greenbook, all areas are in maintenance for Carbon Monoxide. The area is not any non-attainment areas. Other air quality measures are not in effect for the project site. See NEPA Assist Maps.

4. Determine the estimated emissions levels of your project. Will your project exceed any of the *de minimis* or threshold emissions levels of non-attainment and maintenance level pollutants or exceed the screening levels established by the state or air quality management district?

- ✓ No, the project will not exceed *de minimis* or threshold emissions levels or screening levels.

Enter the estimate emission levels:

Carbon monoxide 0.00 ppm (parts per million)

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

Yes, the project exceeds *de minimis* emissions levels or screening levels.

Screen Summary

Compliance Determination

The project's county or air quality management district is in maintenance status for the following: Carbon monoxide. See discussion above regarding maintenance for this

area (and all of King County) This project does not exceed de minimis emissions levels or the screening level established by the state or air quality management district for the pollutant(s) identified above. The project is in compliance with the Clean Air Act.

Supporting documentation

[AttainmentAreas-1-NepaAssist.jpg](#)

[AttainmentAreas-1-Detail-NepaAssist.jpg](#)

[Green Book CO-1971-Area InformationUSEPA.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

2. Does this project include new construction, conversion, major rehabilitation, or substantial improvement activities?

Yes

No

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

Screen Summary

Compliance Determination

Per HUD Region X Environmental Review Website: As of July 22, 2020, Washington State Department of Ecology notified HUD of the following: "Ecology has concluded that it is unnecessary for U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) to continue to send project information in order to receive Ecology's concurrence that the funding phase of the project is consistent with Washington's CZMP. Therefore, we are writing to inform you that HUD no longer needs to require applicants to send

Ecology letters seeking our concurrence on projects for which HUD plans to release federal funding." Inclusion of the following statement in the Environmental Review Record is strongly encouraged to ensure projects are aware that CZM may still apply at the time of local and/or national permitting. "Concurrence from Dept. of Ecology for Coastal Zone Management is no longer required under a Part 58 or Part 50 Environmental Review in Washington State. However, at the time of project development, the activity may trigger review if it falls under other parts of the CZMA regulations for federal agency activities (Title 15 CFR Part 930, subpart C), or consistency for activities requiring a federal license or permit (Title 15 CFR Part 930, Subpart D) and will be subject to all enforceable policies of the Coastal Zone Management Program. It is during the local permitting process that a project might be subject to CZM and further review by the Dept of Ecology."

The project is in compliance with the Coastal Zone Management Act.
(<https://www.hud.gov/states/shared/working/r10/environment#CoastalZoneManagement>)

Supporting documentation

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:

The Attached Phase 1 shows no Recognized Environmental Concerns (RECs) or Controlled RECS found. NEPA Assist for Facilities show no facilities either on or near the project site.

Yes

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

** Utilize EPA's EnviroMapper, NEPA Assist, 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:

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.

4. Is the proposed project new construction or substantial rehabilitation where testing will be conducted but cannot yet occur because building construction has not been completed?

Yes

Compliance with this section is conditioned on post-construction testing being conducted, followed by mitigation, if needed. Radon test results, along with any needed mitigation plan, must be uploaded to the mitigation section within this screen.

No

5. Was radon testing or a scientific data review conducted that provided a radon concentration level in pCi/L?

Yes

No

If no testing was conducted and a review of science-based data offered a lack of science-based data for the project site, then document and upload the steps taken to look for documented test results and science-based data as well as the basis for the conclusion that testing would be infeasible or impracticable.

Explain:

File Upload:

Based on the response, the review is in compliance with this section.
Continue to the Screen Summary at the bottom of this screen.

Non-radon contamination was found in a previous question.

6. How was radon data collected?

All buildings involved were tested for radon

- ✓ A review of science-based data was conducted

Enter the Radon concentration value, in pCi/L, derived from the review of science-based data:

0.9

Provide the documentation* used to derive this value:

CDC State Radon Testing Map Uploaded

File Upload:

[CDC-RadonTesting-Map\(1\).jpg](#)

Based on the response, the review is in compliance with this section.
Continue to the Screen Summary at the bottom of this screen.

Radon concentration value is greater than or equal to 4.0 pCi/L and/or non-radon contamination was found in a previous question. Continue to Mitigation.

* For example, if you conducted radon testing then provide a testing report (such as an ANSI/AARST report or DIY test) if applicable (note: DIY tests are not eligible for use in multifamily buildings), or documentation of the test results. If you conducted a scientific data review, then describe and cite the maps and data used and include copies of all supporting documentation. Ensure that the best available data is utilized, if conducting a scientific data review.

Screen Summary

Compliance Determination

Site contamination was evaluated as follows: ASTM Phase I ESA. On-site or nearby toxic, hazardous, or radioactive substances that could affect the health and safety of

project occupants or conflict with the intended use of the property were not found. Radon testing indicated radon levels below 4.0 pCi/L. The project is in compliance with contamination and toxic substances requirements.

Supporting documentation

[503835-ESA MIT-Housing-KCNEPA-Version.pdf](#)
[Muckleshoot-Toxics-NEPAAssist.jpg](#)

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

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

2. Are federally listed species or designated critical habitats present in the action area?

No, the project will have No Effect due to the absence of federally listed species and designated critical habitat

- ✓ Yes, there are federally listed species or designated critical habitats present in the action area.

3. What effects, if any, will your project have on federally listed species or designated critical habitat?

No Effect: Based on the specifics of both the project and any federally listed species in the action area, you have determined that the project will have absolutely no effect on listed species or critical habitat. in the action area.

- ✓ May Affect, Not Likely to Adversely Affect: Any effects that the project may have on federally listed species or critical habitats would be beneficial, discountable, or insignificant.

Likely to Adversely Affect: The project may have negative effects on one or more listed species or critical habitat.

4. Informal Consultation is required

Section 7 of ESA (16 USC. 1536) mandates consultation to resolve potential impacts to endangered and threatened species and critical habitats. If a HUD-assisted project may affect any federally listed endangered or threatened species or critical habitat, then compliance is required with Section 7. See 50 CFR Part 402 Subpart B Consultation Procedures.

Did the Service(s) concur with the finding that the project is Not Likely to Adversely Affect?

- ✓ Yes, the Service(s) concurred with the finding.

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

Document and upload the following below:

- (1) A biological evaluation or equivalent document
- (2) Concurrence(s) from FWS and/or NMFS
- (3) Any other documentation of informal consultation

Exception: If finding was made based on procedures provided by a letter of understanding, memorandum of agreement, programmatic agreement, or checklist provided by local HUD office, provide whatever documentation is mandated by that agreement.

No, the Service(s) did not concur with the finding.

6. For the project to be brought into compliance with this section, all adverse impacts must be mitigated. 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. If negative effects cannot be mitigated, cancel the project using the button at the bottom of this screen.

✓ Mitigation as follows will be implemented:

The project, as designed meets Table A parameters for both the Washington State USF&WS and NMFS guidance/programmatic agreements. There are no species present on the site and stormwater mitigation as designed will further meet requirements. Mitigation will simply be retrieving final as-built drawings and submitting to NMFS as part of our standard procedure via the WA State Programmatic. USF&WS Table A will also be part of Construction Documents.

No mitigation is necessary.

Screen Summary

Compliance Determination

This project May Affect, but is Not Likely to Adversely Affect, listed species, and informal consultation was conducted. With mitigation, identified in the mitigation section of this review, the project will be in compliance with the Endangered Species Act.

Supporting documentation

[Species List Washington Fish And Wildlife Office.pdf](#)

[FWS Endangered Species Act TableA.docx](#)

[FWS Endangered Species Act 2020.docx](#)

[NMFS-Verification-Muckleshoot-OK.pdf](#)

[Muckleshoot-PSH-NMFS-ActionForm\(1\).docx](#)

[Muckleshoot-DrainageTIR-MIT Supportive Housing.pdf](#)

[Civil-GradingDrainage-plans-MPSH.pdf](#)

[9655-00 GeoTech-Report 2024 0627\(1\).pdf](#)

Muckleshoot-Permanent-
Supportive-Housing-
Construction

Auburn, WA

900000010424442

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. The project is in compliance with explosive and flammable hazard requirements. Please see attached image collection of review of AGSTs.

Supporting documentation

[Explosives-ImgSchDoc.pdf](#)

[MPSH-KCIMAP-Radius Reference\(1\).jpg](#)

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

2. Does your project meet one of the following exemptions?

- Construction limited to on-farm structures needed for farm operations.
- Construction limited to new minor secondary (accessory) structures such as a garage or storage shed
- Project on land already in or committed to urban development or used for water storage. (7 CFR 658.2(a))

Yes

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

No

Screen Summary

Compliance Determination

This project includes activities that could potentially convert agricultural land to a non-agricultural use. While the Project falls just outside the NEPA Assist map for Urbanized Area, due to the housing development adjacent to the property. The project density of the 40 acre measurement is 40 units. To qualify for urban area, it

needs to be 30 units or greater. but an exemption applies. The project is in compliance with the Farmland Protection Policy Act.

Supporting documentation

[Farmland-Unit-Acreage-Calculation.jpg](#)

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 place 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

[FIRM53033C1269G\(1\).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).

Step 1 – Initiate Consultation

Select all consulting parties below (check all that apply):

- ✓ Indian Tribes, including Tribal Historic Preservation Officers (THPOs) or Native Hawaiian Organizations (NHOs)

- ✓ Duwamish Tribe Completed

✓ Muckleshoot Tribe	Completed
✓ Puyallup Tribe	Response Period Elapsed
✓ Snoqualmie Tribe	Completed
✓ Stillaguamish	Response Period Elapsed
✓ Suquamish Tribe	Completed
✓ Tulalip Tribe	Response Period Elapsed
✓ Warm Springs Tribes	Response Period Elapsed
✓ Yakama Nation	Response Period Elapsed

Other Consulting Parties

Describe the process of selecting consulting parties and initiating consultation here:

Whereas this project occurs on Muckleshoot Sovereign Land, King County, as the Responsible Entity for KCHA Project Based Vouchers concurs with the Tribe's historic/cultural resources survey and its conclusions. Per HUD guidance, the other eight Tribes indexed above were consulted per standard letters asking for consultation. Additional Note: the Muckleshoot Tribal Historic Preservation Officer had already consulted with the Washington State Historic Preservation Officer as detailed in Cultural Resources Report (included below as attachment) and the WISAARD APE map "WISAARD-Scrn-2024-07-04715". And again, since this project is on Tribal Land, HUD Environmental Guidance indicated that King County contact of the State Historic Preservation Officer was not necessary. The ACHP was not contacted since there were no apparent historic properties affected by the Project.

Document and upload all correspondence, notices and notes (including comments and objections received below).

Was the Section 106 Lender Delegation Memo used for Section 106 consultation?

- Yes
- No

Step 2 – Identify and Evaluate Historic Properties

1. **Define the Area of Potential Effect (APE), either by entering the address(es) or uploading a map depicting the APE below:**

The Address is in the Project Summary Screen. Map of APE below
"WISAARD-Scrn-2024-07-04715.pdf"

In the chart below, list historic properties identified and evaluated in the APE. Every historic property that may be affected by the project should be included

in the chart.

Upload the documentation (survey forms, Register nominations, concurrence(s) and/or objection(s), notes, and photos) that justify your National Register Status determination below.

Address / Location / District	National Register Status	SHPO Concurrence	Sensitive Information
-------------------------------	--------------------------	------------------	-----------------------

Additional Notes:

2. Was a survey of historic buildings and/or archeological sites done as part of the project?

Yes

Document and upload surveys and report(s) below.
For Archeological surveys, refer to HP Fact Sheet #6, Guidance on Archeological Investigations in HUD Projects.

Additional Notes:

The Muckleshoot Tribe retained the services of Willamette Cultural Resources Associates to carry out a Cultural Resources Study. See attachments "WCRA MIT Ramirez Final reduced.pdf", page 30 (36 in PDF pagination) for conclusions.

No

Step 3 –Assess Effects of the Project on Historic Properties

Only properties that are listed on or eligible for the National Register of Historic Places receive further consideration under Section 106. Assess the effect(s) of the project by applying the Criteria of Adverse Effect. (36 CFR 800.5)] Consider direct and indirect effects as applicable as per guidance on direct and indirect effects.

Choose one of the findings below - No Historic Properties Affected, No Adverse Effect, or Adverse Effect; and seek concurrence from consulting parties.

No Historic Properties Affected

Based on the response, the review is in compliance with this section. Document and upload concurrence(s) or objection(s) below.

Document reason for finding:

- ✓ No historic properties present.

Historic properties present, but project will have no effect upon them.

No Adverse Effect

Adverse Effect

Screen Summary

Compliance Determination

Based on Section 106 consultation there are No Historic Properties Affected because there are no historic properties present. The project is in compliance with Section 106.

Supporting documentation

[WISAARD-Scrn-2024-07-04715.jpg](#)
[Yakama-MIT-Letter.pdf](#)
[WCRA MIT Ramirez Final reduced.pdf](#)
[WarmSprings-MIT-Letter.pdf](#)
[Tulalip-MIT-Letter.pdf](#)
[Suquamish-MIT-Letter-Response.pdf](#)
[Suquamish-MIT-Letter.pdf](#)
[Stillaguamish-MIT-Letter.pdf](#)
[Snoqualmie-MIT-Letter-Response.pdf](#)
[Snoqualmie-MIT-Letter.pdf](#)
[Ramirez-Apartment Project Cultural.pdf](#)
[Puyallup-MIT-Letter.pdf](#)
[PSH Willamette-Report from Laura.pdf](#)
[Muckleshoot-PSH- Tribal Letter - Warm Springs.pdf](#)
[Muckleshoot-PSH- Tribal Letter - Suquamish.pdf](#)
[Muckleshoot-PSH- Tribal Letter - Snoqualmie.pdf](#)
[Muckleshoot-PSH - Tribal Letter - Yakama.pdf](#)
[Muckleshoot-PSH - Tribal Letter - Tulalip .pdf](#)
[Muckleshoot-PSH - Tribal Letter - Stillaguamish.pdf](#)
[Muckleshoot-PSH - Tribal Letter - Puyallup.pdf](#)

Muckleshoot-Permanent-
Supportive-Housing-
Construction

Auburn, WA

900000010424442

[Muckleshoot-PSH - Tribal Letter - Duwamish.pdf](#)
[Duwamish-MIT-Letter-Response.pdf](#)
[Duwamish-MIT-Letter.pdf](#)
[Auburn Duwamish Tribe Comments.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))

Indicate noise level here: 60

Based on the response, the review is in compliance with this section.
Document and upload noise analysis, including noise level and data used to complete the analysis below.

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))

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.

Indicate noise level here: 60

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

Screen Summary

Compliance Determination

A Noise Assessment was conducted via the HUD DNL. The noise level was acceptable: 60.0 db. While the Auburn Municipal Airport is 9 miles away, it does not service jet engine aircraft, only helicopters and small private aircraft. See documentation. SR 164

does not have measurable heavy-truck traffic, and WSDOT does not have information for it. Tribal staff confirmed this. The project is in compliance with HUD's Noise regulation.

Supporting documentation

[MIT Supportive Housing Day_Night Noise.pdf](#)
[WSDOT-Traffic.jpg](#)
[DNLevel Calculator -MPSH.pdf](#)

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

Yes

✓ No

Sole Source Aquifers

General requirements	Legislation	Regulation
<p>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.</p>	<p>Safe Drinking Water Act of 1974 (42 U.S.C. 201, 300f et seq., and 21 U.S.C. 349)</p>	<p>40 CFR Part 149</p>

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

[MPSH-SSAs-NepaAssist.jpg](#)

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

While there is a wetland across State Route 164, the drainage ditch, which is part of the project's storm water system, does not feed to it. See attachment (and full stormwater design drawings under Endangered Species Act).

Supporting documentation

[Wetland-Request for Info - King County.pdf](#)

[Wetlands-MPSH-NWI.jpg](#)

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 over 40 miles (and in a different watershed) from the nearest NWSRS river (the Middle Fork of the Snoqualmie). The project is in compliance with the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act.

Supporting documentation

[WSR-MiddleForkSnoq-44Miles.jpg](#)

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

Screen Summary

Compliance Determination

Supporting documentation

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

Yes

No