

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

Project Information

Project Name: White-Center-HUB-Construction

HEROS Number: 900000010303136

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

RE Preparer: David Mecklenburg

State / Local Identifier:

Certifying Office Kristin Pula
r:

**Grant Recipient (if different than Responsible
Entity):**

Point of Contact:

Consultant (if applicable): PBS Engineering and Environmental

Point of Contact: Susan Garland

Project Location: 10821 8th Ave SW, Seattle, WA 98146

Additional Location Information:

The project location is a 2.81-acre parcel in the unincorporated community of White Center, King County, Washington. It is owned by King County and is currently operated as a food bank. Historical operations have included County public health services, and an overnight homeless shelter. There are two main buildings on the property. The north building was constructed in 1961 and is currently vacant. The

south building was constructed in 2006 and operates as a food bank. The remainder of the parcel is developed with paved parking and landscaping. The property is located in a primarily residential neighborhood. It is adjoined to the south and west by Dick Thurnau Memorial Park (formerly known as Lakewood Park). Single family homes are located to the southeast and west, and across adjoining roadways to the north and east.

Direct Comments to: Community Development, Attn: David Mecklenburg
401 5th Ave
Suite 510
Seattle, WA 98105

dave.mecklenburg@kingcounty.gov

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

The White Center Community Development Association and Community Roots Housing have partnered with King County to develop a community center that will include a learning center, non-profit offices, integrated behavioral and physical health services, onsite medical clinic, and 76 units of affordable housing for those earning at or below sixty percent of the County median income. Phase 1 of the project will include demolition of the existing structures on the property and construction of the Community Center and Health Clinic. Phase 2 will include the construction of multi-family residential buildings for affordable housing. Figures 1 and 2, included in this submittal, show the location of the project and the current layout of the property. Figure 3 shows the proposed plan of the site following completion of this project. Located on the site of a former public health center, the White Center Community HUB will create a place of "Hope, Unity and Belonging" where working families will find affordable housing along with essential services that nurture their stability and create greater opportunity. This application and review will focus on the residential side of the project, as the two will not share funding sources. The property is currently owned by King County and the existing building on-site will be demolished. One building will be essentially replaced by the HUB in terms of functionality and community service. The White Center Food Bank is relocating.

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

Affordable housing is in critically short supply in King County. Access to physical and behavioral health services are also in short supply for low- and moderate-income populations. This project will provide permanent housing to low-income families and individuals. In addition, the community center will provide child care, physical and behavioral health services, and community rooms that will assist those in need of services to find stability, employment, and improved quality of life.

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

The U.S. Federal Housing Finance Agency reports that home purchase prices in King County have doubled in the last 10 years. Median rents have risen by 50 percent. The King County Comprehensive Plan outlines the County's commitment to creating and preserving affordable housing for lower-income households. Lower-income housing will ideally be located by frequent transit, public services, and near places of employment. Far fewer new housing and community services projects have been constructed than needed to keep pace with the increase in population, with the result that lower-income residents are becoming displaced or unhoused as the cost of housing increases in King County.

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

[Fig3-siteplan-specs.pdf](#)

[Fig 1 and 2.pdf](#)

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:

[WCHUB-SigPage - 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
M-21-DC-53-0200	Community Planning and Development (CPD)	HOME Program	\$378,597.00
M22-DC-530200	Community Planning and Development (CPD)	HOME Program	\$378,597.00

Estimated Total HUD Funded, Assisted or Insured Amount: \$757,194.00

Estimated Total Project Cost [24 CFR 58.2 (a) (5)]: \$37,403,559.00

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	Figure 4 shows the nearest airports to the project site. The nearest civilian airport is more than 2,500 feet from the project. Joint Base Lewis McChord is over 37 miles from the project. Information was downloaded on July 22, 2022 and March 14, 2023 from https://www.epa.gov/nepa/nepassist . 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. While flood insurance may not be mandatory in this instance, HUD recommends that all insurable structures maintain flood insurance under the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP). The FIRM panel for the property and documentation of King County's participation in the National Flood Insurance Program are attached to this submittal in Appendix A FEMA Flood.pdf. 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 attainment status for all criteria pollutants. The

<p>particularly section 176(c) & (d); 40 CFR Parts 6, 51, 93</p>		<p>project is not located in an air quality maintenance or non-attainment area. Between 1996 and 2016 the project location was included within the Seattle-Tacoma Maintenance Area for carbon monoxide and ozone. Attainment was achieved and the 20-year maintenance period has expired¹⁶. This will be a primarily residential project, with no manufacturing, fueling, or other emissions-heavy processes occurring. The current NEPA Assist Map (accessed 3/15/2023) shows the project site is in no active non-attainment areas. 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>Washington's Coastal Zone includes all of King County, where the proposed project is located. Washington implements the Coastal Zone Management Act through its Shoreline Master Programs. These programs designate which locations within the County are subject to shoreline program review and restrictions. The NW King County Shoreline designation map is included as Figure 6. The project property is outside of all King County designated shoreline zones. No shoreline or coastal land use restrictions apply to the project property. The NW King County Shoreline Designations map was downloaded on August 1, 2022. The King County Shoreline Master Program technical material was reviewed on August 1, 2022. Furthermore: "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</p>

		<p>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." (From HUD Region X Website, accessed 3/15/2023) This project is located in a Coastal Zone, but it has been determined to be consistent with the State Coastal Management Program. The project is in compliance 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>The Phase I Environmental Site Assessment performed in 2018 for the property found no evidence of recognized environmental conditions (RECs), controlled RECs, or historical RECs. The property was forested and apparently undeveloped prior to the construction of the current north building by 1961. Neighboring properties are in residential or parks use and have no known environmental concerns. Current environmental conditions were checked using the Washington Department of Ecology spill and cleanup databases on August 5, 2022. The NEPA site visit was performed by a qualified Environmental Professional and included visual assessment for RECs. No onsite conditions or reported environmental issues near the property were identified. The 2018 Phase I report is included as an attachment to this submittal in Appendix B. During review of the project's Washington State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) submittal package. The Washington Department of Ecology (Ecology) determined that the project site is located within the historical Tacoma Smelter Plume, and recommended that soil be tested for lead and arsenic prior</p>

		<p>to site redevelopment. Soils were screened in October 2022 and no samples were above applicable screening levels for lead or arsenic. Correspondence on this topic from Ecology and the Phase 1 and soil testing reports are attached to this submittal. Site contamination was evaluated as follows: ASTM Phase I ESA, ASTM Phase II 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. 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 type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p>This project May Affect, but is Not Likely to Adversely Affect, listed species, and informal consultation was conducted. This project is in compliance with the Endangered Species Act without mitigation. The United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) issued an IPaC letter on July 14, 2022 (Updated March 7, 2023) which lists five special status species that may occur near the project area. The letter was updated again on December 27, 2023, and a sixth species was added. USFWS correspondence and species profiles are attached to this submission. The NOAA Fisheries portal shows critical habitat for three additional fish species in the project area. * North American Wolverine * Marbled Murrelet * Yellow-billed Cuckoo * Northwestern Pond Turtle * Bull Trout * Monarch Butterfly * Pink Salmon * Chinook Salmon * Coho Salmon The attached files summarize why adverse effects to these species are unlikely to result from this project.</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>Prior to the site visit, aerial photographs were reviewed from Google Earth to determine whether any ASTs were visible within one full mile of the project</p>

		<p>site. (See map) None were identified during the desktop review. The project site is surrounded by hilly terrain that would block the effects of any potentially explosive or flammable hazards located more than approximately 2,200 feet eastward, 2,300 feet northward, 3,300 feet westward, and 4,000 feet southward. During the site visit, a windshield survey of this, more limited area was undertaken to identify any above-ground tanks and confirm the desktop survey results. No tanks of potentially explosive or hazardous materials were identified. Land use in the project area is characterized by residential, park, and educational uses. Figure 9 is a topographical map showing the hills surrounding the project site, and the area within which the drive-by survey for tanks was undertaken. 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.</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>The project site has been developed with government buildings and paved parking since at least the early 1960s. Prior to that time, aerial photos show that the property was wooded rather than farmed. Figure 10 shows the project site with respect to the nearest land zoned for farmland protection in King County. The property is located more than 5 miles from any farmland. The project site is also in designated Urbanized Area per NEPA-assist. USDA/NRCS regulations contained at 7 CFR Part 658.2 define "committed to urban development" as land with a density of 30 structures per 40-acre area; lands identified as "urbanized area" (UA) on the Census Bureau Map</p>

		or as urban area mapped with a "tint overprint" on USGS topographical maps; or as "urban-built-up" on the USDA Important Farmland Maps. No impacts to agriculture will occur as a result of this project. This project does not include any activities that could potentially convert agricultural land to a non-agricultural use. 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 a floodplain. Figure 5 shows the FEMA flood risk map for the project area, and the FEMA FIRM panel is attached to this submittal as Appendix A. The project is in compliance with Executive Order 11988.
Historic Preservation National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, particularly sections 106 and 110; 36 CFR Part 800	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Based on Section 106 consultation the project will have an Adverse Effect on historic properties. With mitigation, as identified in the MOA or SMMA, the project will be in compliance with Section 106. Satisfactory implementation of the mitigation should be monitored.
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	The Port of Seattle has created a noise exposure modeling map for the Seattle-Tacoma International Airport, which is located approximately 4.25 miles southeast of the project site. The project site is located more than one mile west of, and outside of the airport's modeled 65 dBA contour line. See the noise contours for SEA-TAC provided in Appendix F. King County International Airport (formerly Boeing Field) is located approximately four miles east of the project site. A noise study completed for the airport master plan update in 2020 shows that the project site is located more than two miles west of and outside the current 55 DNL contour mapped for this airport. It is also well outside of the projected 2030 55 DNL noise contour level. This

		<p>study is included in Appendix F. King County classifies its roads by use. The project site vicinity is shown on Figure 13 with respect to these roadways. The nearest principal arterial streets are all located more than 2,400 feet from the project site. The nearest highway is located more than 5,000 feet east of the project site. Figure 12 shows the classification of roadways near the project area. The nearest railway is located approximately 4 miles east of the project site. Figure 14 shows the location of airports and railways with respect to the project site. No industrial or commercial properties likely to create noise issues are located near the project site, which is a neighborhood primarily developed with residential, school, and park uses. Figure 15 shows overall area noise levels as modeled by the U.S. Department of Transportation based on the presence of roadway, noise, and air facilities. This model shows outdoor noise levels on the property in the 45-49 decibel range. A Noise Assessment was conducted. The noise level was acceptable: 49.0 db. See noise analysis. The project is in compliance with HUD's Noise regulation.</p>
<p>Sole Source Aquifers Safe Drinking Water Act of 1974, as amended, particularly section 1424(e); 40 CFR Part 149</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p>The project is not located on a sole source aquifer area. Figure 16 shows the location of the nearest sole-source aquifer, as provided by EPA's NEPAassist web server. The project is in compliance with Sole Source Aquifer requirements.</p>
<p>Wetlands Protection Executive Order 11990, particularly sections 2 and 5</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p>A Critical Areas Report for the project property was completed in July 2018 and includes delineation and functional assessment of a wetland identified on the adjoining west property. Two additional wetlands located south of the project property in Dick Thurnau Memorial Park are mapped on the National Wetland Inventory (NWI).</p>

		<p>These are located more than 350 feet from the nearest property boundary. No wetlands are present on the project property itself. The nearest wetland is a Category III wetland under Washington's rating system and has a Cowardin classification of Palustrine Forested wetland. According to Ecology's rating system, Category III wetlands are: (1) wetlands with a moderate level of functions (scoring between 16 and 19 points); (2) can often be adequately replaced with a well-planned mitigation project; and (3) interdunal wetlands between 0.1 and one acre. In order to avoid any wetland impacts, project plans incorporate setbacks from the identified wetland feature to the west of the property. King County requires an 80-foot buffer with an additional 15-foot building setback for this type of wetland. The 15-foot building setback extends onto the project property to an area currently developed as asphalt parking. After identifying this potential impact, the project designs were revised to ensure setbacks maintain buffer standards and do not degrade wetland functions. The project will include removing part of the existing asphalt parking and replanting 5,675 feet of the buffer and setback area with appropriate vegetation. The redevelopment of the property will improve stormwater management compared to current conditions, ensuring that water quality impacts deriving from stormwater runoff will be reduced compared to current conditions. Currently, any runoff from the existing parking lot flows to the wetland buffer untreated. The project has been modified to include additional onsite infiltration and filtration of stormwater runoff from parking areas.</p>
--	--	--

		<p>Figure 17 shows the NWI map for the project area. Figure 18 shows the delineation of the adjoining west wetland and the building buffer setback that has been incorporated into the proposed project. The Critical Areas Report and follow-up memoranda are attached as part of this submittal. The project is in compliance with Executive Order 11990.</p>
<p>Wild and Scenic Rivers Act Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 1968, particularly section 7(b) and (c)</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p>Figure 19 shows the project site location with respect to the nearest Wild and Scenic River (WSR), as shown on EPA's NEPAAssist web server. The Middle Fork Snoqualmie WSR is located approximately 50 miles east of the project site. The project is in compliance with the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act.</p>
<p>HUD HOUSING ENVIRONMENTAL STANDARDS</p>		
<p>ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE</p>		
<p>Environmental Justice Executive Order 12898</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p>EPA's Environmental Justice screening tool shows that the neighborhood around the project site has a higher proportion of low-income households, minority residents, and isolated language speakers than Washington State as a whole. The demographic report for the area is attached. The only NEPA environmental impact identified by this assessment is the demolition of a building that DAHP has deemed eligible for the national historic register, on the grounds that it is representative of the architect Richard Burkhard, and is "historically significant for its direct connection to the growth and expansion of the King County Health Department in the post WWII era". DAHP correspondence is attached as part of the cultural resources submittal. The redevelopment of this parcel will include facilities for medical and behavioral health assistance, which will represent a continuity of use for the</p>

		<p>property. The redevelopment will incorporate more energy efficient design; modern earthquake safety, spaces built for the specific intended uses, and safer building materials than the existing vacant building. The impact of the building demolition to eligible historic resources will be mitigated as agreed between King County and DAHP in the attached Memorandum of Agreement. Adverse environmental impacts are not disproportionately high for low-income and/or minority communities. The project is in compliance with Executive Order 12898.</p>
--	--	--

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	1	King County adopted its current Comprehensive Plan in 2020. Chapter 4 of the Comprehensive Plan lays out the goals and policies of King County with regard to Housing and Human Services. Policy H-102 applies directly to the proposed project: H-102 King County shall work with jurisdictions, the private sector, state and federal governments, other public funders of housing, other public agencies such as the Housing Authorities, regional agencies such as the Puget Sound Regional Council, intermediary housing organizations, and the non-profit sector, to encourage a wide range of	Not required.

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		<p>housing and to reduce barriers to the development and preservation of a wide range of housing, at an appropriate size and scale, that: a. Provides housing choices for people of all income levels, particularly in areas with existing or planned high-capacity and frequent public transportation access where it is safe and convenient to walk, bicycle, and take public transportation to work and other key destinations such as educational facilities, shopping and health care; b. Meets the needs of a diverse population, especially families and individuals who have very-low to moderate incomes, older adults, people of color, children and vulnerable adults (including victims and survivors of domestic violence, human trafficking, and commercial sexual exploitation), people with developmental disabilities, people with behavioral, physical, cognitive and/or functional disabilities, and people who are experiencing homelessness; c. Supports economic growth; d. Supports King County's Equity and Social Justice Initiative and Health and Human Services Transformation Plan goals, for an equitable and rational distribution of low-income and high-quality affordable housing, including mixed-income housing, throughout the county The proposed project complies with the current King County Comprehensive Plan for low-income housing development as summarized above and in the subsequent specific goals and policies listed in the Comprehensive Plan. The project site is located within one half mile of elementary, middle, and high schools. Recreational facilities are available in</p>	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		<p>the adjacent park, and new physical and behavior health offices will be located on-site. The project plan calls for the provision of job training opportunities at the community HUB, along with other support services that will enable economic improvement opportunities to those utilizing the services. A public bus route serves 108th Avenue SW, and the White Center "economic activity center" (as designated by the Comprehensive Plan) is located nearby. Private housing development is ongoing in the area for both single-family and multifamily projects, but the majority of these focus on the upper price end of the housing market. The proposed project will meet the King County goal of facilitating a range of housing options to accommodate all income levels of its residents, and to ensure equity in provision of services. The parcel is zoned R18. King County defines this zone as high-density residential, with a target of 18 dwelling units per acre, and a current use as "medical and dental offices" is listed for the parcel. The parcel has previously been granted conditional use permits as a homeless shelter. The proposed project will continue and extend the previous uses of the property to provide health services and housing. The project sponsors are working with the King County building permit office to finalize project design that will meet neighborhood goals as well as County-wide goals. While the immediate vicinity of the proposed project features older and lower density housing, the proposed project will include design features to minimize</p>	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		the impacts of the increased local density.	
Soil Suitability / Slope/ Erosion / Drainage and Storm Water Runoff	1	<p>The project site is a flat, mostly paved parcel that occupies a local high point in comparison to surrounding properties. The 2018 Critical Areas Report posits that the south end of the property was likely filled to create the current flat surface. Currently, areas of the site that are not paved are very heavily vegetated, and erosion has not been a problem. The project parcel is mapped as Urban land-Alderwood complex, 0 - 5% slopes. Soils examined during the Critical Areas site visit fit the gravelly sandy loam description. The NRCS lists no building constraints for this type of soil⁹. Neighbors have reported drainage complaints and localized flooding during rain events. Correspondence between the building department and project sponsors mentioning this issue is attached. Currently, stormwater on the property is unmanaged, and flows off the property into neighboring roadways, parks, natural areas, and yards. The proposed project will improve stormwater drainage over current conditions by constructing on-site stormwater facilities to manage the collection and discharge of stormwater. The project sponsors are working with the County building department to finalize satisfactory designs for the new stormwater system.</p>	Not required.
Hazards and Nuisances including Site Safety and Site-Generated Noise	2	<p>Hazardous building materials including lead paint, asbestos, and fungal issues have been identified in the North Building on the property. Project plans include demolition of this building using proper hazardous materials handling and disposal procedures. The</p>	Not required.

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		<p>new health and community center will be constructed using non-hazardous materials. There are no other known hazards or nuisances present on site. Soils were tested for elevated levels of lead and arsenic due to potential historical impacts from the Tacoma Smelter. No samples exceeded applicable screening levels for lead or arsenic. No unusual noise or nuisance issues are associated with the project property currently, and none are anticipated after the development of community center and affordable housing units.</p>	
SOCIOECONOMIC			
Employment and Income Patterns	1	<p>Employment directly associated with the project site will increase as a result of the proposed project. Following construction, Phase 1 of the project (Community HUB Center) will employ medical professionals, social service providers, and maintenance staff. Office space for local non-profit organizations will be available. Phase 2 will provide onsite employment for residential property management and maintenance staff. Indirect employment and income patterns will also likely improve as a result of the project. Job training and support services will be provided in the HUB community center. This will allow area residents to improve their economic well being and stability.</p>	Not required.
Demographic Character Changes / Displacement	2	<p>The project is not anticipated to have an adverse impact on the demographic character of the neighborhood as the property lies within an existing residential neighborhood with a mix of multi-family as well as single-family residences. The proposed development will provide affordable housing to low-income people. No long-term housing</p>	Not required.

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		<p>occupants will be displaced as a result of the project. An emergency overnight shelter has operated from the North building on the property in the past. This shelter has already been relocated. A central goal of this project is to prevent the displacement of lower-income populations from urban King County as regional housing costs continue to rise.</p>	
<p>Environmental Justice EA Factor</p>	<p>2</p>	<p>This EA identified one adverse impact from the proposed project, which is the proposed demolition of the vacant north building on the site. DAHP has determined that this building is an eligible historic resource based on its designing architect and "direct connection to the growth and expansion of the King County Health Department in the post WWII era". This project will mitigate the impacts to this historical resource by performing an historical resource inventory of this building. The project will include continuity of use for the site by providing public health services in a new building designed to current building codes for safety and resilience, and without the fungal issues, asbestos, and lead containing building materials present in the existing building. A historical information installation regarding the former building will be prominently located within the public area near the new health clinic in order to demonstrate the continuity of services this site has provided. No disproportionate impacts to environmental justice populations are anticipated as a result of this project.</p>	<p>See "Historic Preservation" in Laws and Authorities.</p>
<p>COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND SERVICES</p>			

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
Educational and Cultural Facilities (Access and Capacity)	2	The Community HUB will include classrooms, kitchens, and common areas for socialization. It is designed to foster belonging and community. The project site is located approximately two blocks from the Bethaday Community Learning Center. This facility is an event space operated by the Technology Access Foundation nonprofit, whose mission is to equip students of color for success through interdisciplinary STEM (Science, Technology, Engineering, Mathematics) education. The site is served by Mountain View Elementary School, Cascade Middle School, Evergreen Senior High School, and the White Center public library. All are located within one half-mile of the property, along safe routes for walking or biking.	Not required.
Commercial Facilities (Access and Proximity)	2	No commercial facilities are included in the proposed project. Supermarkets and restaurants are located within one half mile west of the site, on 16th Avenue SW. Various restaurants and commercial services are located a similar distance to the east, on 1st Avenue SW.	Not required.
Health Care / Social Services (Access and Capacity)	1	The project includes on-site providers for physical and behavioral health in the Community HUB building. This will improve access to health care and social services in the White Center neighborhood. The proposed project site is located 3.9 miles from St. Anne Hospital and 10.8 miles from Valley Medical Center.	Not required.
Solid Waste Disposal and Recycling (Feasibility and Capacity)	2	Garbage collection and recycling will be provided at the redeveloped site. Waste Management Northwest currently provides garbage collection and recycling and will provide these serves after redevelopment. No unusual types or volume of waste will	Not required.

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		be generated by construction or operations of the proposed project. All potentially hazardous building materials waste generated during demolition will be handled and disposed properly according to Washington Department of Ecology and OSHA regulations.	
Waste Water and Sanitary Sewers (Feasibility and Capacity)	2	The project site is on a previously developed parcel within an existing residential neighborhood. Wastewater is currently discharged into the Southwest Suburban Sewer District system. After redevelopment the property will continue to utilize the municipal sanitary sewer for domestic waste disposal.	Not required.
Water Supply (Feasibility and Capacity)	2	The site is served by municipal water provided by King County Water District. The capacity of the existing water supply is sufficient for the proposed use.	Not required.
Public Safety - Police, Fire and Emergency Medical	2	The project site is served by the St. Anne Hospital for emergency medical services, North Highline Fire District 18, and the Southwest Precinct of the Seattle Police Department. Emergency service providers are located nearby and response times to this area are good.	Not required.
Parks, Open Space and Recreation (Access and Capacity)	2	The proposed project site adjoins Dick Thurnau Memorial Park (formerly Lakewood Park) and is within walking distance of Evergreen Community Aquatic Center and Lakewood King Disc Golf Club. The open spaces in the adjoining park are well maintained and include trails, cycling areas, picnic tables, large trees and water features. Sports fields are located at the south end of the park. The White Center area also includes other nearby parks, trails and natural areas. The neighborhood is	Not required.

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		well served for open spaces and recreational opportunities.	
Transportation and Accessibility (Access and Capacity)	2	The project site is easily accessed through public transportation, as it is located near a King County Metro bus line with a stop within 0.1-mile of the property. The King County Roads Division reviewed the proposed use permit for the project and determined that the project will not result in any significant adverse traffic impacts. The existing north driveway of the property will be relocated approximately 65 feet to the south, which will improve line of site and safety of access for the intersection with SW 108th Street. Correspondence with the King County Building department regarding transportation issues is included in Appendix F. The HUB design is ADA accessible to ensure the availability of health services to those with mobility challenges.	Not required.
NATURAL FEATURES			
Unique Natural Features /Water Resources	2	There are no unique natural features or water resources to be impacted by the proposed redevelopment activity. There are no sole source aquifers located in this part of King County. The property is an already-developed site. Stormwater management on the property will improve as a result of the proposed project, which will provide a small benefit over existing conditions to the natural area and wetland to the west of the project site.	Not required.
Vegetation / Wildlife (Introduction, Modification, Removal, Disruption, etc.)	1	The proposed project includes several measures to reduce or eliminate existing impacts to area wildlife and vegetation, as follows: * Existing asphalt and weedy species near the adjoining west wetland will be removed and an area of 5,675 square feet (sf) will be replanted with	Not required.

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		<p>appropriate species. A landscaping plan will be submitted for King County approval prior to issuance of building permits. * Lighting will be concentrated toward the center portion of the site and screening vegetation will be retained or established along its outer perimeter. Lighting will be directed downward toward the ground surface and of low intensity. * The project has been designed to place parking at the northeast section of the site, away from the adjoining south park and the adjoining west natural area.</p>	
Other Factors 1			
Other Factors 2			
CLIMATE AND ENERGY			
Climate Change	2	<p>No climate impacts are likely to result from the proposed project. This location is served by existing urban infrastructure and public transportation.</p>	Not required.
Energy Efficiency	2	<p>The community center building design includes photovoltaic panels to offset the energy consumption of the building. All of the proposed buildings will be designed to meet the 2018 Washington State Energy code, which provides modern standards for insulation and efficient building operations. When fully constructed, the project will likely have a small increased energy use compared to the current operations on the property, as currently the larger of the two site buildings is vacant. This use is unlikely to have an impact on the local or regional energy supply.</p>	

Supporting documentation

[Appendix E Permitting Correspondence\(1\).pdf](#)

Additional Studies Performed:

Heffron Transportation, Inc., 2021. Trip Generation and Distribution Assessment Memorandum and Parking Assessment Memorandum. February 25. Krazan, 2018. Geotechnical Report, White Center Community HUB. August 6. PBS, 2022a. Revised Critical Areas Report and Buffer Mitigation Plan, White Center HUB. August. PBS, 2022b. White Center HUB Amphibian Survey Results. June 10. PBS, 2022c. Arsenic and Lead Soil Assessment, The Big Idea - White Center Community Resource Center. November 10. PBS, 2020.a Limited Hazardous Materials Good Faith Survey Report, White Center HUB. September 17. PBS, 2020b. Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, White Center Community Services. June 8. PBS, 2021. Critical Area Report and Buffer Averaging. April 14. PBS, 2018. White Center Critical Areas Report. July 25. HISTORICAL RESOURCES INVENTORY Sundberg, Kennedy, Ly-Au Young Architects, 2021. Revised Tree Retention Plan. April 23. Urban Forestry Services, Inc. 2018. Arborist Report. May 11.

Field Inspection [Optional]: Date and completed

by:

Susan Garland

8/11/2022 12:00:00 AM

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

See the attached list of sources. Agencies consulted: King County Building Permits National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration Fisheries Sound Transit U.S. Environmental Protection Agency U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Washington Department of Archeology and Historic Preservation Washington Department of Ecology Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife

[references.pdf](#)

List of Permits Obtained:

See the attached list of permits required for construction of this project, and their status as of the date of this submittal.

Public Outreach [24 CFR 58.43]:

The White Center HUB Affordable Housing Project has held in-person community meetings in the early years of the project through a series of different types of outreach methods. These include door-to-door outreach, advisory council, summits, and workshops. Information has also been spread through tabling at events, open houses, and a mobile tour with CAPACD. All these forms of outreach and communication ensure that the public has had an opportunity to participate in the decision-making process. Timeline + Methods: 2017: Door-to-doors Advisory Council open house Summit 2018: Summit Advisory councils SWYFS Board meetings Environmental Workshop 2019: Summit Community Learning Session 2020: Community

Design Workshops 2021: Community Open House Tabling at events 2022:
Tabling at events Mobile Tour w/CAPACD End of year campaign

[permit list.pdf](#)

Cumulative Impact Analysis [24 CFR 58.32]:

Affordable housing and services projects are being undertaken by various governmental and private parties throughout the region. Each project represents an incremental improvement in the availability of housing and services for vulnerable populations. However, as the need for such housing and services has also significantly increased throughout the region and country as a whole, the need for this project is still significant. One building deemed historically eligible by Washington DAHP will be removed and replaced with a new building as part of this project. Governmental and private parties continue to replace older buildings as needed to ensure that safe building materials are used, energy efficiency and earthquake hazards are addressed, and to meet the current community needs. Furthermore, the building itself is not directly operating in its original function as a health clinic, but as a temporary family shelter. As increased affordable housing and an active public health clinic, the project will serve to meet these needs. DAHP and WCCDA has signed a memorandum of agreement with King County that mitigates the impact for this project. See Historic Preservation in Laws and Authorities for details.

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

Design modifications have been incorporated into the project as a result of collaboration County Building Department requests; review of critical area buffers by the Washington Department of Ecology, feedback from local residents, and ongoing engagement with our community partners. Other locations for this project were not considered as developable parcels available for County/non-profit use in the area are in extremely short supply, and this parcel is ideally located near schools, parks, and transit lines.

No Action Alternative [24 CFR 58.40(e)]

In the event that this redevelopment project does not occur, current food bank services would likely continue to operate from the project site. The eligible historic resource of the vacant north building would likely not be demolished. The north building would remain vacant and its condition could deteriorate. No new community services offices, medical, or behavioral health services would become available in White Center. No additional low-income housing units would be constructed. Untreated site stormwater would continue to run off the site to infiltrate on adjacent properties or enter the County stormwater system.

Summary of Findings and Conclusions:

This project will provide affordable housing and community support services to vulnerable populations in an area where both are in very short supply. The location is ideally situated near parks, schools, transit, and employment options. The project has

incorporated community and reviewing agency input into its design to ensure it meets project goals without inadvertently causing adverse impacts. No adverse effects were identified to natural systems, economic or cultural considerations, public safety, infrastructure and transportation services, or contamination hazards. One building deemed historically eligible by Washington DAHP will be removed and replaced with a new building as part of this project. Governmental and private parties continue to replace older buildings as needed to ensure that safe building materials are used, energy efficiency and earthquake hazards are addressed, and to meet the current community needs. DAHP has signed a memorandum of agreement with King County that mitigates the impact for this project.

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
Historic Preservation	The WCCDA will create a preservation plaque near the entrance of a community health clinic in the public area of the building. This plaque will be authorized by DAHP. and the County prior to creation/installation. Additionally, the WCCDA will be responsible for completing a historic property survey and inventory of all clinic buildings associated with the Seattle-King County Health Department, located in King County, and built between 1951 and 1981. (For more information, please see "WCHUB Historic Preservation MOA.pdf"	N/A	Please see Historic Preservation under "Related Laws and Authorities"	
Conformance with Plans / Compatible	Not required.	N/A		

Land Use and Zoning / Scale and Urban Design				
Soil Suitability / Slope/ Erosion / Drainage and Storm Water Runoff	Not required.	N/A		
Hazards and Nuisances including Site Safety and Site-Generated Noise	Not required.	N/A		
Employment and Income Patterns	Not required.	N/A		
Demographic Character Changes / Displacement	Not required.	N/A		
Environmental Justice EA Factor	See "Historic Preservation" in Laws and Authorities.	N/A	ibid	
Educational and Cultural Facilities (Access and Capacity)	Not required.	N/A		
Commercial Facilities (Access and Proximity)	Not required.	N/A		
Health Care / Social Services (Access and Capacity)	Not required.	N/A		
Solid Waste Disposal and Recycling (Feasibility and Capacity)	Not required.	N/A		

Waste Water and Sanitary Sewers (Feasibility and Capacity)	Not required.	N/A		
Water Supply (Feasibility and Capacity)	Not required.	N/A		
Public Safety - Police, Fire and Emergency Medical	Not required.	N/A		
Parks, Open Space and Recreation (Access and Capacity)	Not required.	N/A		
Transportation and Accessibility (Access and Capacity)	Not required.	N/A		
Unique Natural Features /Water Resources	Not required.	N/A		
Vegetation / Wildlife (Introduction, Modification, Removal, Disruption, etc.)	Not required.	N/A		
Climate Change	Not required.	N/A		

Project Mitigation Plan

The Historic Preservation Memorandum of Agreement lays out the plan for mitigation of the eligible historic resource. See Historic Preservation in Laws and Authorities for details.

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

Figure 4 shows the nearest airports to the project site. The nearest civilian airport is more than 2,500 feet from the project. Joint Base Lewis McChord is over 37 miles from the project. Information was downloaded on July 22, 2022 and March 14, 2023 from <https://www.epa.gov/nepa/nepassist>. The project is in compliance with Airport Hazards requirements.

Supporting documentation

[McChord-HUB-distance.jpg](#)
[Figure 4 Airport Hazards.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)	

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:

[Appendix A FEMA Flood.pdf](#)
[Figure 5 Flood Map.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. While flood insurance may not be mandatory in this instance, HUD recommends that all insurable structures maintain flood insurance under the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP). The FIRM panel for the property and documentation of King County's participation in the National Flood Insurance Program are attached to this submittal in Appendix A FEMA Flood.pdf. 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):

Screen Summary

Compliance Determination

The project's county or air quality management district is in attainment status for all criteria pollutants. The project is not located in an air quality maintenance or non-attainment area. Between 1996 and 2016 the project location was included within the Seattle-Tacoma Maintenance Area for carbon monoxide and ozone. Attainment was achieved and the 20-year maintenance period has expired¹⁶. This will be a primarily

residential project, with no manufacturing, fueling, or other emissions-heavy processes occurring. The current NEPA Assist Map (accessed 3/15/2023) shows the project site is in no active non-attainment areas. The project is in compliance with the Clean Air Act.

Supporting documentation

[AirQuality-NEPA-Assist-3-15-2023.jpg](#)

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

3. Has this project been determined to be consistent with the State Coastal Management Program?

Yes, without mitigation

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

Yes, with mitigation

No, project must be canceled.

Screen Summary

Compliance Determination

Washington's Coastal Zone includes all of King County, where the proposed project is located. Washington implements the Coastal Zone Management Act through its Shoreline Master Programs. These programs designate which locations within the County are subject to shoreline program review and restrictions. The NW King County Shoreline designation map is included as Figure 6. The project property is outside of all King County designated shoreline zones. No shoreline or coastal land use restrictions apply to the project property. The NW King County Shoreline Designations map was downloaded on August 1, 2022. The King County Shoreline Master Program technical material was reviewed on August 1, 2022. Furthermore: "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." (From HUD Region X Website, accessed 3/15/2023) This project is located in a Coastal Zone, but it has been determined to be consistent with the State Coastal Management Program. The project is in compliance with the Coastal Zone Management Act.

Supporting documentation

[Figure 6 Coastal.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)

1. How was site contamination evaluated? Select all that apply. Document and upload documentation and reports and evaluation explanation of site contamination below.

- American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA)
- ASTM Phase II ESA
 - Remediation or clean-up plan
 - ASTM Vapor Encroachment Screening
 - None of the Above

2. Were any on-site or nearby toxic, hazardous, or radioactive substances 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?)

- No

Explain:

The Phase I ESA identified a potential environmental concern because the property is within the mapped range of the Tacoma Smelter Plume. Follow up soil testing showed no elevated levels of contaminants of concern.

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

Yes

Screen Summary

Compliance Determination

The Phase I Environmental Site Assessment performed in 2018 for the property found no evidence of recognized environmental conditions (RECs), controlled RECs, or historical RECs. The property was forested and apparently undeveloped prior to the construction of the current north building by 1961. Neighboring properties are in residential or parks use and have no known environmental concerns. Current environmental conditions were checked using the Washington Department of Ecology spill and cleanup databases on August 5, 2022. The NEPA site visit was performed by a qualified Environmental Professional and included visual assessment for RECs. No onsite conditions or reported environmental issues near the property were identified. The 2018 Phase I report is included as an attachment to this submittal in Appendix B. During review of the project's Washington State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) submittal package. The Washington Department of Ecology (Ecology) determined that the project site is located within the historical Tacoma Smelter Plume, and recommended that soil be tested for lead and arsenic prior to site redevelopment. Soils were screened in October 2022 and no samples were above applicable screening levels for lead or arsenic. Correspondence on this topic from Ecology and the Phase 1 and soil testing reports are attached to this submittal. Site contamination was evaluated as follows: ASTM Phase I ESA, ASTM Phase II 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. The project is in compliance with contamination and toxic substances requirements.

Supporting documentation

[Appendix E Permitting Correspondence.pdf](#)
[WhiteCenterCRH_AsPbSoilReport_11-10-2022.pdf](#)
[PhaseI-ESA_8June2018.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

- ✓ 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:

- ✓ No mitigation is necessary.

Explain why mitigation will not be made here:

Based on the Programmatic Agreement between HUD and NMFS from 2016, and on the lack of habitat needed by special status species regulated by USFWS, a FONSI without additional mitigation is appropriate for this project.

Screen Summary

Compliance Determination

This project May Affect, but is Not Likely to Adversely Affect, listed species, and informal consultation was conducted. This project is in compliance with the Endangered Species Act without mitigation. The United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) issued an IPaC letter on July 14, 2022 (Updated March 7, 2023) which lists five special status species that may occur near the project area. The letter was updated again on December 27, 2023, and a sixth species was added. USFWS correspondence and species profiles are attached to this submission. The NOAA Fisheries portal shows critical habitat for three additional fish species in the project area. * North American Wolverine * Marbled Murrelet * Yellow-billed Cuckoo * Northwestern Pond Turtle * Bull Trout * Monarch Butterfly * Pink Salmon * Chinook Salmon * Coho Salmon The attached files summarize why adverse effects to these species are unlikely to result from this project.

Supporting documentation

[Species Summary.pdf](#)

[NW pond turtle _WDFW.pdf](#)

[Species Profile for Northwestern Pond Turtle.pdf](#)

[Species List _Washington Fish And Wildlife Office 12-27-23.pdf](#)

[WhiteCtrHub _WildlifeStudy_Memo_2022-11-15.pdf](#)

[Species List_Updated.pdf](#)

[Figure 8 NMFS EFH.pdf](#)
[Figure 7 USFWS Habitat.pdf](#)
[Appendix B profiles.pdf](#)
[Appendix B Species.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

Prior to the site visit, aerial photographs were reviewed from Google Earth to determine whether any ASTs were visible within one full mile of the project site. (See map) None were identified during the desktop review. The project site is surrounded by hilly terrain that would block the effects of any potentially explosive or flammable hazards located more than approximately 2,200 feet eastward, 2,300 feet northward, 3,300 feet westward, and 4,000 feet southward. During the site visit, a windshield survey of this, more limited area was undertaken to identify any above-ground tanks and confirm the desktop survey results. No tanks of potentially explosive or hazardous materials were identified. Land use in the project area is characterized by residential, park, and educational uses. Figure 9 is a topographical map showing the hills surrounding the project site, and the area within which the drive-by survey for tanks was undertaken. 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.

Supporting documentation

[Explosives-Radius-KCIMAP-3-15-2023.jpg](#)

[Figure 9 Explosives.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:

This project will redevelop a property that already has buildings and paved parking. No agricultural properties are nearby.

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

The project site has been developed with government buildings and paved parking since at least the early 1960s. Prior to that time, aerial photos show that the property was wooded rather than farmed. Figure 10 shows the project site with respect to the nearest land zoned for farmland protection in King County. The property is located more than 5 miles from any farmland. The project site is also in designated Urbanized Area per NEPA-assist. USDA/NRCS regulations contained at 7 CFR Part 658.2 define "committed to urban development" as land with a density of 30 structures per 40-acre area; lands identified as "urbanized area" (UA) on the Census Bureau Map or as urban area mapped with a "tint overprint" on USGS topographical maps; or as "urban-built-up" on the USDA Important Farmland Maps. No impacts to agriculture will occur as a result of this project. This project does not include any activities that could potentially convert agricultural land to a non-agricultural use. The project is in compliance with the Farmland Protection Policy Act.

Supporting documentation

[urbanized-area-NEPAassist-3-15-2023.jpg](#)
[Figure 10 Farmland.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	24 CFR 55

1. Do any of the following exemptions apply? Select the applicable citation? [only one selection possible]

55.12(c)(3)

55.12(c)(4)

55.12(c)(5)

55.12(c)(6)

55.12(c)(7)

55.12(c)(8)

55.12(c)(9)

55.12(c)(10)

55.12(c)(11)

None of the above

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

[Appendix A FEMA Flood.pdf](#)
[Figure 5 Flood Map.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.

Does your project occur in a floodplain?

No

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

Yes

Screen Summary

Compliance Determination

This project does not occur in a floodplain. Figure 5 shows the FEMA flood risk map for the project area, and the FEMA FIRM panel is attached to this submittal as Appendix A. The project is in compliance with Executive Order 11988.

Supporting documentation

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):

- ✓ State Historic Preservation Offer (SHPO) Completed
- ✓ Advisory Council on Historic Preservation Completed
- ✓ Indian Tribes, including Tribal Historic Preservation Officers (THPOs) or Native Hawaiian Organizations (NHOs)
 - ✓ Duwamish Tribe Completed
 - ✓ Muckleshoot Tribe Response Period Elapsed

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
10821 8th Ave SW, Seattle, WA 98146	Eligible	Yes	✓ Not Sensitive

Additional Notes:

The SHPO concurred that the building was eligible owing to the architect and use of the building when first constructed, however, the SHPO also acknowledged that the structure would need to be demolished. There were no archaeological/cultural resources found or evidence that a further survey would be required.

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:

See "PrintReport_710784_1643784.pdf" and "KC Public Health SW Health Center_Historic Report 12-13-2022.pdf"

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

No Adverse Effect

✓ Adverse Effect

**Document reason for finding; upload the criteria with summary and justification.
Criteria of Adverse Effect 36 CFR 800.5.**

36 CFR 800.5(a)(2)(i)

Step 4 – Resolve Adverse Effects

Work with consulting parties to try to avoid, minimize or mitigate adverse effects. Refer to HUD Exchange guidance and 36 CFR 800.6 and 800.7.

Were the Adverse Effects resolved?

✓ Yes

Describe the resolution of Adverse Effects, including consultation efforts and participation by the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation:

The County, Washington State DAHP, and White Center Community Development Association entered into a Memorandum of Understanding regarding the building. Whereas Tribal comments were mostly (if any) concerned with precautions for archaeology (see below), and did not address the structure, they were not included in the MOA **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.

The WCCDA will create a preservation plaque near the entrance of a community health clinic in the public area of the building. This plaque will be authorized by DAHP. and the County prior to creation/installation. Additionally, the WCCDA will be responsible for completing a historic property survey and inventory of all clinic buildings associated with the Seattle-King County Health Department, located in King County, and built between 1951 and 1981. (For more information, please see "WCHUB

Historic Preservation MOA.pdf"

Based on the response, the review is in compliance with this section. Document and upload the signed Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) or Standard Mitigation Measures Agreement (SMMA) below.

No

Screen Summary

Compliance Determination

Based on Section 106 consultation the project will have an Adverse Effect on historic properties. With mitigation, as identified in the MOA or SMMA, the project will be in compliance with Section 106. Satisfactory implementation of the mitigation should be monitored.

Supporting documentation

[ACHP submission White Center HUB Section 106 Review.msg](#)
[view of south facing wall on main building of existing property .jpg](#)
[Vicinity Map White Center HUB.jpg](#)
[North Entrance to Existing property.jpg](#)
[HP process V2.jpg](#)
[front of existing north building - SW Youth and Family Services.jpg](#)
[former food bank building on S of property.jpg](#)
[Area of Potential Impact.jpg](#)
[WCHUB-Duwamish.pdf](#)
[WCHUB Historic Preservation MOA.pdf](#)
[wa-cdbg-king county-wch-resdvpmnt20230530odnp.pdf](#)
[Tribal-CorrespondenceFiles.pdf](#)
[Section 106 Attachments.pdf](#)
[PrintReport_710784_1643784.pdf](#)
[KC Public Health SW Health Center Historic Report 12-13-2022.pdf](#)
[EZ1 FORM - 106 WC HUB.pdf](#)
[demolition and erosion control plan.pdf](#)
[2023-03-01441_030623.pdf](#)
[23-0131 WCHUB SITE PLAN.pdf](#)
[Tribal-Correspondence\(1\).pdf](#)
[WCCDA-TribalCorrespondence.zip](#)
[Tribal-Correspondence-Summary.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: 49

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: 49

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

Screen Summary

Compliance Determination

The Port of Seattle has created a noise exposure modeling map for the Seattle-Tacoma International Airport, which is located approximately 4.25 miles southeast of the project site. The project site is located more than one mile west of, and outside of the airport's modeled 65 dBA contour line. See the noise contours for SEA-TAC provided in Appendix F. King County International Airport (formerly Boeing Field) is located approximately four miles east of the project site. A noise study completed for the airport master plan update in 2020 shows that the project site is located more

than two miles west of and outside the current 55 DNL contour mapped for this airport. It is also well outside of the projected 2030 55 DNL noise contour level. This study is included in Appendix F. King County classifies its roads by use. The project site vicinity is shown on Figure 13 with respect to these roadways. The nearest principal arterial streets are all located more than 2,400 feet from the project site. The nearest highway is located more than 5,000 feet east of the project site. Figure 12 shows the classification of roadways near the project area. The nearest railway is located approximately 4 miles east of the project site. Figure 14 shows the location of airports and railways with respect to the project site. No industrial or commercial properties likely to create noise issues are located near the project site, which is a neighborhood primarily developed with residential, school, and park uses. Figure 15 shows overall area noise levels as modeled by the U.S. Department of Transportation based on the presence of roadway, noise, and air facilities. This model shows outdoor noise levels on the property in the 45-49 decibel range. A Noise Assessment was conducted. The noise level was acceptable: 49.0 db. See noise analysis. The project is in compliance with HUD's Noise regulation.

Supporting documentation

[Appendix F SEATAC noise.pdf](#)

[Appendix F Boeing Noise.pdf](#)

[Figure 15 Noise.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. Figure 16 shows the location of the nearest sole-source aquifer, as provided by EPA's NEPAAssist web server. The project is in compliance with Sole Source Aquifer requirements.

Supporting documentation

[Figure 16 Aquifer.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

A Critical Areas Report for the project property was completed in July 2018 and includes delineation and functional assessment of a wetland identified on the adjoining west property. Two additional wetlands located south of the project property in Dick Thurnau Memorial Park are mapped on the National Wetland Inventory (NWI). These are located more than 350 feet from the nearest property boundary. No wetlands are present on the project property itself. The nearest wetland is a Category III wetland under Washington's rating system and has a Cowardin classification of Palustrine Forested wetland. According to Ecology's rating system, Category III wetlands are: (1) wetlands with a moderate level of functions (scoring between 16 and 19 points); (2) can often be adequately replaced with a well-planned mitigation project; and (3) interdunal wetlands between 0.1 and one acre. In order to avoid any wetland impacts, project plans incorporate setbacks from the identified wetland feature to the west of the property. King County requires an 80-foot buffer with an additional 15-foot building setback for this type of wetland. The 15-foot building setback extends onto the project property to an area currently developed as asphalt parking. After identifying this potential impact, the project designs were revised to ensure setbacks maintain buffer standards and do not degrade wetland functions. The project will include removing part of the existing asphalt parking and replanting 5,675 feet of the buffer and setback area with appropriate vegetation. The redevelopment of the property will improve stormwater management compared to current conditions, ensuring that water quality impacts deriving from stormwater runoff will be reduced compared to current conditions. Currently, any runoff from the existing parking lot flows to the wetland buffer untreated. The project has been modified to include additional onsite infiltration and filtration of stormwater runoff from parking areas. Figure 17 shows the NWI map for the project area. Figure 18 shows the delineation of the adjoining west wetland and the building buffer setback that has been incorporated into the proposed project. The Critical Areas Report and follow-up memoranda are attached as part of this submittal. The project is in compliance with Executive Order 11990.

Supporting documentation

[White Center HUB Wetland Spring Egg Survey.pdf](#)
[White Center CAR and Buffer Mitigation Plan 03-02-2022.pdf](#)
[Appendix D Critical Areas Rpt.pdf](#)
[Figure 18 Delineated Wetlands.pdf](#)
[Figure 17 NWI Wetlands.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

Figure 19 shows the project site location with respect to the nearest Wild and Scenic River (WSR), as shown on EPA's NEPAAssist web server. The Middle Fork Snoqualmie WSR is located approximately 50 miles east of the project site. The project is in compliance with the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act.

Supporting documentation

[Figure 19 WSR.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

2. Were these adverse environmental impacts disproportionately high for low-income and/or minority communities?

Yes

No

Explain:

See Summary below. The only identified impact is the planned demolition of a vacant building that DAHP has determined is eligible for the national register. The County will undertake mitigation to record and inventory this resource and the site redevelopment will include continuity of use, to provide medical services to the community.

Based on the response, the review is in compliance with this section. Document and upload any supporting documentation below.

Screen Summary
Compliance Determination

EPA's Environmental Justice screening tool shows that the neighborhood around the project site has a higher proportion of low-income households, minority residents, and isolated language speakers than Washington State as a whole. The demographic report for the area is attached. The only NEPA environmental impact identified by this assessment is the demolition of a building that DAHP has deemed eligible for the national historic register, on the grounds that it is representative of the architect Richard Burkhard, and is "historically significant for its direct connection to the growth and expansion of the King County Health Department in the post WWII era". DAHP correspondence is attached as part of the cultural resources submittal. The redevelopment of this parcel will include facilities for medical and behavioral health assistance, which will represent a continuity of use for the property. The redevelopment will incorporate more energy efficient design; modern earthquake safety, spaces built for the specific intended uses, and safer building materials than the existing vacant building. The impact of the building demolition to eligible historic resources will be mitigated as agreed between King County and DAHP in the attached Memorandum of Agreement. Adverse environmental impacts are not disproportionately high for low-income and/or minority communities. The project is in compliance with Executive Order 12898.

Supporting documentation

[Appendix E ejscreen_report.pdf](#)

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

Yes

✓ No



**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: White-Center-HUB-Construction

HEROS Number: 900000010303136

Project Location: 10821 8th Ave SW, Seattle, WA 98146

Additional Location Information:

The project location is a 2.81-acre parcel in the unincorporated community of White Center, King County, Washington. It is owned by King County and is currently operated as a food bank. Historical operations have included County public health services, and an overnight homeless shelter. There are two main buildings on the property. The north building was constructed in 1961 and is currently vacant. The south building was constructed in 2006 and operates as a food bank. The remainder of the parcel is developed with paved parking and landscaping. The property is located in a primarily residential neighborhood. It is adjoined to the south and west by Dick Thurnau Memorial Park (formerly known as Lakewood Park). Single family homes are located to the southeast and west, and across adjoining roadways to the north and east.

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

The White Center Community Development Association and Community Roots Housing have partnered with King County to develop a community center that will include a learning center, non-profit offices, integrated behavioral and physical health services, onsite medical clinic, and 76 units of affordable housing for those earning at or below sixty percent of the County median income. Phase 1 of the project will include demolition of the existing structures on the property and construction of the Community Center and Health Clinic. Phase 2 will include the construction of multi-family residential buildings for affordable housing. Figures 1 and 2, included in this submittal, show the location of the project and the current layout of the property. Figure 3 shows the proposed plan of the site following completion of this project. Located on the site of a former public health center, the White Center Community HUB will create a place of "Hope, Unity and Belonging" where working families will find affordable housing along with essential services that nurture their stability and create greater opportunity. The property is currently owned by King County and the existing building on-site will be demolished. One building will be essentially replaced by the HUB in terms of functionality and community service. The Project Owner is working with a consultant in compliance with Uniform Relocation Act to provide assistance to the Food Bank. The Food Bank has secured a location nearby for continued operation and service to the community..

Funding Information

Grant Number	HUD Program	Program Name	
M-21-DC-53-0200	Community Planning and Development (CPD)	HOME Program	\$378,597
M22-DC-530200	Community Planning and Development (CPD)	HOME Program	\$378,597

Estimated Total HUD Funded Amount: \$757,194.00

Estimated Total Project Cost [24 CFR 58.2 (a) (5)]: \$37,403,559.00

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
Historic Preservation	The WCCDA will create a preservation plaque near the entrance of a community health clinic in the public area of the building. This plaque will be authorized by DAHP. and the County prior to creation/installation. Additionally, the WCCDA will be responsible for completing a historic property survey and inventory of all clinic buildings associated with the Seattle-King County Health Department, located in King County, and built between 1951 and 1981. (For more information, please see "WCHUB Historic Preservation MOA.pdf"
Conformance with Plans / Compatible Land Use and Zoning / Scale and Urban Design	Not required.
Soil Suitability / Slope/ Erosion / Drainage and Storm Water Runoff	Not required.
Hazards and Nuisances including Site Safety and Site-Generated Noise	Not required.
Employment and Income Patterns	Not required.
Demographic Character Changes / Displacement	Not required.
Educational and Cultural Facilities (Access and Capacity)	Not required.
Commercial Facilities (Access and Proximity)	Not required.
Health Care / Social Services (Access and Capacity)	Not required.
Solid Waste Disposal and Recycling (Feasibility and Capacity)	Not required.

Waste Water and Sanitary Sewers (Feasibility and Capacity)	Not required.
Water Supply (Feasibility and Capacity)	Not required.
Public Safety - Police, Fire and Emergency Medical	Not required.
Parks, Open Space and Recreation (Access and Capacity)	Not required.
Transportation and Accessibility (Access and Capacity)	Not required.
Unique Natural Features /Water Resources	Not required.
Vegetation / Wildlife (Introduction, Modification, Removal, Disruption, etc.)	Not required.
Climate Change	Not required.
Environmental Justice EA Factor	See "Historic Preservation" in Laws and Authorities.
Permits, reviews, and approvals	See the attached list of permits required for construction of this project, and their status as of the date of this submittal.

Project Mitigation Plan

The Historic Preservation Memorandum of Agreement lays out the plan for mitigation of the eligible historic resource. See Historic Preservation in Laws and Authorities for details.

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: David Mecklenburg Date: 1/2/2024

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

Certifying Officer Signature: Kristin Pula Date: Jan 3, 2024
Kristin Pula (Jan 3, 2024 14:05 PST)

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).






WCHUB-SigPage

Final Audit Report

2024-01-03

Created:	2024-01-02
By:	Dave Mecklenburg (dave.mecklenburg@kingcounty.gov)
Status:	Signed
Transaction ID:	CBJCHBCAABAAZTI5vqfF5osxwNchDAESwa-UDoJWpU9M

"WCHUB-SigPage" History

-  Document created by Dave Mecklenburg (dave.mecklenburg@kingcounty.gov)
2024-01-02 - 10:57:24 PM GMT- IP address: 198.49.222.20
-  Document emailed to Kristin Pula (kpula@kingcounty.gov) for signature
2024-01-02 - 10:57:39 PM GMT
-  Email viewed by Kristin Pula (kpula@kingcounty.gov)
2024-01-03 - 10:04:57 PM GMT- IP address: 104.47.64.254
-  Document e-signed by Kristin Pula (kpula@kingcounty.gov)
Signature Date: 2024-01-03 - 10:05:09 PM GMT - Time Source: server- IP address: 67.183.49.42
-  Agreement completed.
2024-01-03 - 10:05:09 PM GMT