

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

Project Information

Project Name: HSH-Apartments

HEROS Number: 900000010241608

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

RE Preparer: David Mecklenburg

State / Local Identifier:

Certifying Officer: Jaclyn Moynahan

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

Point of Contact:

**Consultant (if applicab
le):**

Point of Contact:

Project Location: 401 5th Ave, Seattle, WA 98104

Additional Location Information:

The address above, per the confidentiality plan, is not the address of the project. The project is located in a mostly residential area east of Lake Washington.

Direct Comments to:

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

The project consists of rehabilitation of an existing 25-unit apartment complex, converting it into 25 affordable housing units for domestic violence survivors and their children. The project will additionally add, through New Construction, a Resident Services Building and re-landscape significant portions of the area around the buildings.

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

The units in this project are planned for survivors of domestic violence who would otherwise have to choose between violence and homelessness. All will be low-barrier entry. Residents are primarily single women and women with children who do not have other options for housing. Priority will be given to survivors with the highest risks for lethality and homelessness and to those who have the greatest barriers to other housing. The ten transitional units will serve survivors who are also recovering from substance abuse and are parenting. The area median income (AMI) range for all residents is 0-50% AMI. The project design fits the needs of program participants by providing individual apartments (one-bedroom and two-bedroom), a tot lot, a community room, and meeting and office spaces for onsite advocates (case managers) and other visiting professionals, such as legal advocates and behavioral health counselors. Because 98% of all survivors experience financial abuse, most do not have the resources necessary to pay for shelter, rent, or move-in costs. As a result, many survivors must choose between remaining in a violent home or becoming homeless. The HSH Apartment Renovation and Addition will ensure that residents will not have to make that impossible choice.

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

The parcel contains an existing apartment complex in a developed residential area east of Lake Washington. The options and resources for survivors of domestic violence will be limited in absence of the project.

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

Determination:

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

Approval Documents:

7015.15 certified by Certifying Officer on:

7015.16 certified by Authorizing Officer on:

Funding Information

Grant / Project Identification Number	HUD Program	Program Name
B-21-UC-530001	Community Planning and Development (CPD)	Community Development Block Grants (CDBG) (Entitlement)
M-21-DC-53-0200	Community Planning and Development (CPD)	HOME American Rescue Plan (HOME-ARP)

Estimated Total HUD Funded, Assisted or Insured Amount: \$4,927,000.00

Estimated Total Project Cost [24 CFR 58.2 (a) (5)]: \$8,727,000.00

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

Compliance Factors: Statutes, Executive Orders, and Regulations listed at 24 CFR §50.4, §58.5, and §58.6	Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?	Compliance determination (See Appendix A for source determinations)
STATUTES, EXECUTIVE ORDERS, AND REGULATIONS LISTED AT 24 CFR §50.4 & § 58.6		
Airport Hazards Clear Zones and Accident Potential Zones; 24 CFR Part 51 Subpart D	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	The project site is not within 15,000 feet of a military airport. McChord AFB is over 40 miles away from the southern boundary of Bellevue or and Boeing Field, the closest civilian airport is over 7 miles away. Per the Confidentiality Plan, the specific Project Site is not listed on these maps. However, the actual distance is even further. 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	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	The structure or insurable property is not located in a FEMA-designated

<p>1973 and National Flood Insurance Reform Act of 1994 [42 USC 4001-4128 and 42 USC 5154a]</p>		<p>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 project is in compliance with flood insurance requirements. Please note that the location of the project site is not listed on this FIRM. For more information, inquiries can be made directly to King County Community.Development@kingcounty.gov stating the name of the project. Access will be at the discretion of the King County Department of Community and Human Services Public Records Officer and/or other County officials such as, but not limited to the Prosecuting Attorney and Risk Management Division.</p>
<p>STATUTES, EXECUTIVE ORDERS, AND REGULATIONS LISTED AT 24 CFR §50.4 & § 58.5</p>		
<p>Air Quality Clean Air Act, as amended, particularly section 176(c) & (d); 40 CFR Parts 6, 51, 93</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p>The NEPAAssist website show that the project is located within a maintenance area for carbon monoxide (CO) and ozone (O3). However, the Washington State Department of Ecology Maintenance State Implementation Plan website show that the Seattle-Tacoma maintenance areas for CO and O3, both of which encompass the project location, ended in 2016. References: NEPAAssist. https://nepassisttool.epa.gov/nepassist/nepamap.aspx. Accessed February 10, 2022. Ecology. https://ecology.wa.gov/Regulations-Permits/Plans-policies/State-implementation-plans/Maintenance-SIPs. Washington State Department of Ecology. Accessed February 10, 2022. Please note that the uploaded map shows the general area of the specific site. However, since the entirety of the project is in this maintenance area, the site can be considered acceptable from</p>

		<p>this documentation. Site specific mapping is being withheld on King County servers per Confidentiality Plan The project is in compliance with the Clean Air Act.</p>
<p>Coastal Zone Management Act Coastal Zone Management Act, sections 307(c) & (d)</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p>Per HUD Region X Environmental Office Website: https://www.hud.gov/states/shared/working/r10/environment As of July 22, 2020, Washington State Department of Ecology notified HUD of the following: "Ecology has concluded that it is unnecessary for U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) to continue to send project information in order to receive Ecology's concurrence that the funding phase of the project is consistent with Washington's CZMP. Therefore, we are writing to inform you that HUD no longer needs to require applicants to send Ecology letters seeking our concurrence on projects for which HUD plans to release federal funding." Inclusion of the following statement in the Environmental Review Record is strongly encouraged to ensure projects are aware that CZM may still apply at the time of local and/or national permitting. "Concurrence from Dept. of Ecology for Coastal Zone Management is no longer required under a Part 58 or Part 50 Environmental Review in Washington State. However, at the time of project development, the activity may trigger review if it falls under other parts of the CZMA regulations for federal agency activities (Title 15 CFR Part 930, subpart C), or consistency for activities requiring a federal license or permit (Title 15 CFR Part 930, Subpart D) and will be subject to all enforceable policies of the Coastal Zone Management Program. It is during the local permitting process that a</p>

		project might be subject to CZM and further review by the Dept of Ecology."
Contamination and Toxic Substances 24 CFR 50.3(i) & 58.5(i)(2)]	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	Site contamination was evaluated as follows: ASTM Phase I ESA. On-site or nearby toxic, hazardous, or radioactive substances were found that could affect the health and safety of project occupants or conflict with the intended use of the property. The adverse environmental impacts can be mitigated. With mitigation, identified in the mitigation section of this review, the project will be in compliance with contamination and toxic substances requirements. For documentation, a redacted Phase 1 summary is attached. The full documentation is protected under the confidentiality plan for this project. Inquiries regarding documentation should be sent to community.development@kingcounty.gov . Determination of any information release is contingent upon formal review proceedings carried out at the request of the King County Department of Community and Human Services Public Records Officer.
Endangered Species Act Endangered Species Act of 1973, particularly section 7; 50 CFR Part 402	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	This project May Affect, but is Not Likely to Adversely Affect, listed species, and informal consultation was conducted. With mitigation, identified in the mitigation section of this review, the project will be in compliance with the Endangered Species Act. Please note that the associated documentation below has had location information redacted in concordance with the Confidentiality Plan for this project. The NMFS-Review Summary document is an overall summary of the NMFS Programmatic informal consultation process along with findings.
Explosive and Flammable Hazards Above-Ground Tanks [24 CFR Part 51 Subpart C	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	There are no current or planned stationary aboveground storage containers of concern within 1 mile of the project site. Google Earth was

		<p>used to search for tanks within a 1-mile radius of the project location. Review results: Based on HUD guidance and 24 CFR 51.201(5), containers used to hold liquefied petroleum gas with a capacity of 1,000 gallons or less capacity and in compliance with National Fire Protection Association 58 (e.g., propane tanks used at gasoline stations) are not considered hazards requiring acceptable separation distance (ASD) calculations. One such tank was identified. Screenshots of map and tank are included in attached supporting documentation. No tanks requiring ASD calculations were identified within a 1-mile radius of the project site. Additional backup mapping is confidential and is protected under the confidentiality plan for this project. Inquiries regarding documentation should be sent to community.development@kingcounty.gov. Determination of any information release is contingent upon formal review proceedings carried out at the request of the King County Department of Community and Human Services Public Records Officer. Reference: Google, Inc. Google Earth Pro. Accessed February 10, 2022. 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>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. Please note in documentation that Census Map does not show precise Project Site. However, the project site is inside the Urbanized boundary area as show on the map.</p>
<p>Floodplain Management Executive Order 11988, particularly section 2(a); 24 CFR Part 55</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p>This project does not occur in a floodplain. The project is in compliance with Executive Order 11988.</p>

<p>Historic Preservation National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, particularly sections 106 and 110; 36 CFR Part 800</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p>Based on Section 106 consultation there are No Historic Properties Affected because there are no historic properties present. The project is in compliance with Section 106.</p>
<p>Noise Abatement and Control Noise Control Act of 1972, as amended by the Quiet Communities Act of 1978; 24 CFR Part 51 Subpart B</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p>The project is within 15 miles of Seattle Seaplanes, Will Rogers Wiley Post Memorial, Renton Municipal, Seattle Tacoma International (SeaTac), Boeing Field/King County International (Boeing Field), and Kenmore Air Harbor. The following airports include operations that could contribute to noise levels at the site: Renton Municipal Boeing Field SeaTac, Kenmore Air Harbor. Noise contours for Boeing Field, SeaTac, and Renton Municipal are included in the protected documentation. Contours for Kenmore Air Harbor were not available so noise levels and contour size from SeaTac were conservatively used for this airport. Total estimated airport noise was 57 dB. No railroads are present within 3,000 feet of the project location. Daily traffic counts for each roadway were obtained from the jurisdictional city, including night and truck percentages. Distances were measured using NEPAassist and Google Earth. Elevations were estimated based on design documentation. Three outdoor use areas were identified as shown in the protected backup documentation. The northeast corner was identified as worst-case location for interior noise. A barrier analysis was completed for each location assuming the concrete wall surrounding the eastern side of the property to be 8 feet tall, increasing to 9 feet at the location shown. Ground elevations were included in this analysis. Outdoor use area receivers were assumed to be 5 feet from ground level to represent average human ear height. The location representing interior noise impacts was</p>

		<p>assumed to be 15 feet from ground level to approximate mid-height of the highest residential level. Based on the barrier analysis, noise levels at each outdoor location were as follows: Common Patio East: 64 dB Common Patio West: 64 dB Bioretention Area: 65 dB. After the barrier analysis, the highest noise level was 75 dB at the building corner location. A building material analysis was completed assuming materials with the lowest Sound Transmission Classification (STC) where specific materials were not known. Based on this analysis, the building materials meet the required STC rating, achieving a rating of 34.22 compared to a required rating of 33. Mapping documentation, which shows the site location is also protected under the Confidentiality Plan, but is available per the plan's parameters.</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>Please note that per Confidentiality Plan, the project site is not specified on the map. The location is not on a sole source aquifer. The project is not located on a sole source aquifer area. 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>The project is over 2000 feet from any wetland and will not impact on- or off-site wetlands. Please note that since this is a confidential project, the map uploaded is a general map of the area in which the project is located. King County Housing, Homelessness, and Community Development Division are maintaining the detailed Wetlands Map showing actual project location and distance on its secure server per the Confidentiality Plan. The project is in compliance with Executive Order 11990. Reference: https://www.fws.gov/wetlands/data/mapper.html</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>Per NEPA Assist, the location is over 32 miles away (and downstream) of the nearest Wild and Scenic River (Middle Fork of the Snoqualmie) The project site is not specified in this map per the confidentiality plan. This project is not within proximity of a NWSRS river. 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>	

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

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

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

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
LAND DEVELOPMENT			
Conformance with Plans / Compatible Land Use and Zoning / Scale and Urban Design	2	The project improves the existing housing on the site, consistent with the multi-family, medium density zoning designation (refer to Appendix Q). The Jurisdiction's Comprehensive Plan includes a Human Services policy to support an intentional local community response to homelessness, with housing and supportive services provided to families, youth, and single adults.	
Soil Suitability / Slope/ Erosion /	2	Geotechnical evaluation has been completed for the site. The investigation found the	Geotechnical engineering recommendations for

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
LAND DEVELOPMENT			
Drainage and Storm Water Runoff		site to be suitable for the proposed project and provides recommendations for erosion control and drainage/waterproofing. Refer to Appendix R.	drainage/waterproofing and temporary erosion controls
Hazards and Nuisances including Site Safety and Site-Generated Noise	2	The proposed project poses no hazards or nuisances. No site safety concerns were identified.	
Energy Consumption/Energy Efficiency	2	The proposed project will not significantly increase energy consumption from current levels used by existing structures. The addition of a resident-services building may increase energy use slightly, but it is expected that the increase will be mitigated by energy efficiency in renovation designs, such as weatherizing/insulating the building and including energy-efficient lighting and appliances.	
SOCIOECONOMIC			
Employment and Income Patterns	2	The project is not anticipated to significantly impact the existing employment and income patterns of the surrounding area.	
Demographic Character Changes / Displacement	2	The project is located in a developed urban residential area. The project would not displace any current residents and conforms to applicable zoning.	
COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND SERVICES			
Educational and Cultural Facilities (Access and Capacity)	2	The proposed project renovates existing residential housing, therefore a demand for educational and cultural	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
LAND DEVELOPMENT			
		services and facilities is not anticipated.	
Commercial Facilities (Access and Proximity)	2	The site is located close to a food establishment, grocery stores, gas stations, and a farm. New residents may have a small, but positive, impact on local businesses.	
Health Care / Social Services (Access and Capacity)	1	Because the proposed project is a renovation of existing residential housing with the addition of an associated facility to provide social services, an increased demand for health care and social services and facilities outside of the project is not anticipated.	
Solid Waste Disposal and Recycling (Feasibility and Capacity)	2	The site has onsite garbage pickup and is in conformance with applicable zoning. Solid waste services will not be adversely affected. Waste created by construction and by the completed project will be hauled off site and disposed of at permitted facilities. The proposed project does not increase the residential population, so the demand for waste and recycling services and facilities is not expected to increase.	
Waste Water and Sanitary Sewers (Feasibility and Capacity)	2	Access to municipal wastewater/sanitary sewer service will be provided to the proposed project. Plans for the new resident-services building include new water and sanitary sewer lines, which will tap into existing building lines. Wastewater/sanitary sewer	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
LAND DEVELOPMENT			
		services will not be adversely affected, because the project is in conformance with existing zoning, and it is expected that the incremental increase in demand from the additional building will be met by the existing system capacity.	
Water Supply (Feasibility and Capacity)	2	Plans for the new resident-services building include a new fire service and water meter that will connect to the existing main. Water supply will not be adversely affected because the project is in conformance with existing zoning, and it is expected that water needs at the site will be met by the existing water-supply capacity.	
Public Safety - Police, Fire and Emergency Medical	1	Plans for the new resident-services building include a new fire service and water meter that will connect to the existing main. Water supply will not be adversely affected because the project is in conformance with existing zoning, and it is expected that water needs at the site will be met by the existing water-supply capacity.	
Parks, Open Space and Recreation (Access and Capacity)	1	This project provides safe transitional housing for residents leaving unsafe living situations. Public safety services such as police, fire, and emergency medical services can be met by the existing capacity.	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
LAND DEVELOPMENT			
Transportation and Accessibility (Access and Capacity)	2	<p>The project area is served by several King County Metro bus routes within walking distance.</p> <p>Residents/employees utilizing the project may use public transit, and it is expected that any incremental increase in demand can be met by the existing capacity. No adverse impact to transit or other transportation networks is anticipated. The project is on land that was already accessed from its cross-streets (exact cross-streets are not listed here per confidentiality plan), and it will not affect public access by neighboring residents.</p> <p>Therefore, the project will have no adverse effects to accessibility.</p>	
NATURAL FEATURES			
Unique Natural Features /Water Resources	2	<p>The project is located in an urban setting, and there are no unique natural features or agricultural lands in the project vicinity. The proposed project will not discharge or draw from any groundwater. No surface waters occur in the project area, and stormwater runoff will be managed as necessary to avoid adverse impact to surface waters.</p> <p>Therefore, no adverse effects on these natural features are anticipated.</p>	
Vegetation / Wildlife (Introduction, Modification,	2	<p>The proposed project will renovate existing buildings and add a green space and landscaped areas. The project</p>	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
LAND DEVELOPMENT			
Removal, Disruption, etc.)		landscaping plan currently includes designs to save and protect some existing trees and to add a bioretention area and landscaping, including trees, shrubs, and groundcover, in the common areas between buildings. Replacement of removed trees will include native species. The site does not contain habitat associated with species of local importance, and no adverse impacts to significant vegetation or wildlife is anticipated.	
Other Factors	2	None identified.	

Supporting documentation

Additional Studies Performed:

ATC. 2020. ATC Group Services LLC. Phase I Environmental Site Assessment September 17, 2020. Coterra. 2022. Utility & Drainage Plan & Profile. Coterra Engineering PLLC / Environmental Works Community Design Center. January 24, 2022. Environmental Works. 2021. Land Use Exemption Permit Set. Environmental Works Community Design Center. November 29, 2021. Geotech. 2021. Geotechnical Engineering Study, Proposed Services Building. Geotech Consultants, Inc. November 19, 2021. Note: City of Record not listed here owing to Confidentiality Plan. The documents listed above are also available per approved request as delineated in Confidentiality Plan.

Field Inspection [Optional]: Date and completed by:

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

King County. 2022. Boeing Field/King County International Noise Contour Map: <https://kingcounty.gov/~media/services/airport/documents/part-150/bfi-part-150-complete-04.ashx?la=en>. King County. Accessed February 18, 2022. City of Renton.

2022. Municipal Airport Noise Contour Map:

https://rentonwa.gov/city_hall/public_works/renton_municipal_airport/master_plan. City of Renton. Accessed February 18, 2022. GCR Companies. 2022. AirportIQ 5010 (Airport Master Records): <https://www.airportiq5010.com/5010Web/>. GCR Companies. Accessed February 18, 2022. FAA. 2022. SeaTac Noise Contour Map: https://www.faa.gov/airports/environmental/airport_noise/noise_exposure_maps/. Federal Aviation Administration. Accessed February 18, 2022. RE: Traffic Data Inquiry: email from Senior Transportation Engineer of jurisdictional city. February 18, 2022. Zoning courtesy of jurisdictional City Ecology. 2022. Maintenance SIPs Website: <https://ecology.wa.gov/Regulations-Permits/Plans-policies/State-implementation-plans/Maintenance-SIPs>. Washington State Dept. of Ecology. Accessed February 10, 2022. EPA. 2022. NEPAassist Website: <https://nepassisttool.epa.gov/nepassist/nepamap.aspx>. Environmental Protection Agency. Accessed February 11, 2022. EPA 2022. Sole Source Aquifer Map: <https://www.epa.gov/dwssa>. Environmental Protection Agency. Accessed February 10, 2022. FEMA. 2022. FEMA Flood Map Service Center. <https://msc.fema.gov/portal/home>. Federal Emergency Management Agency. Accessed February 10, 2022. Google. 2022. Google Earth Pro. Google, Inc. Accessed February 10, 2022. HUD. 2022. Environmental Guidance website: <https://www.hud.gov/states/shared/working/r10/environment>. US Department of Housing and Urban Development, Accessed February 10, 2022. HUD. 2022. HUD DNL Calculator: <https://www.hudexchange.info/environmental-review/dnl-calculator/>. Dept of Housing and Urban Development. Accessed February 18, 2022. NWSR. 2022. National Wild and Scenic Rivers map: <https://www.rivers.gov/map.php>. National Wild and Scenic Rivers System. Accessed February 10, 2022.

List of Permits Obtained:

Land Use Exemption Permit Building Permit approved for Building 13.

Public Outreach [24 CFR 58.43]:

The project FONSI/RROF will be published in the Seattle Times. During a copy of this Environmental Assessment will be concurrently available at: <https://kingcounty.gov/depts/community-human-services/housing/services/community-development/cd-environmental-review.aspx>. Owing to the confidential nature of the project open community meetings have been avoided in order to protect the vulnerable population present.

Cumulative Impact Analysis [24 CFR 58.32]:

The proposed project does not cause any adverse environmental impacts and will not result in a significant impact on the quality of the environment.

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

An initial plan was conceptualized to determine the feasibility of the project for the funding application. Subsequent site plans were developed as a result of an iterative design process between the project's experts and project partners to accurately assess and determine the needs of the project-specific demographic eligible to reside at the project. The project sought design input from the City. The site plan has been refined based on the community-partner feedback, and modifications may occur until the final site plan is complete and approved for permitting. Insofar as other uses, the site is already a residential multifamily complex so other uses could adversely impact the environment into development such as commercial or other uses.

No Action Alternative [24 CFR 58.40(e)]

If no action is taken at the site, the buildings would likely continue as residential apartment buildings without the added benefits described in the Impact Assessment section above.

Summary of Findings and Conclusions:

The proposed project does not cause any adverse environmental impacts and will not result in a significant impact on the quality of the environment.

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

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

Law, Authority, or Factor	Mitigation Measure or Condition	Comments on Completed Measures	Mitigation Plan	Complete
Endangered Species Act	Trees removed during construction will be replaced with native species. Runoff from the 1,452 square foot roof of the new building will be conveyed to a non-infiltrating bioretention planter, which is an area of replaced impervious surface.	N/A	Specifications will be included in Construction Documents. Documentation of implementation will be carried out by agency developer staff and returned to King County to note in this Environmental	

			<p>Review Record. Final as-builts and HUD-NMFS Programmatic closeout form will then be submitted within 60 days of construction completion (final permit sign off).</p>	
<p>Contamination and Toxic Substances</p>	<p>Use of engineering controls (specifically discussed in the Mitigation Screen for this project) will be incorporated into the Construction Documents and general plan for the project.</p>	<p>N/A</p>	<p>An inventory of PCB-containing ballasts and mercury-containing ampules should be performed prior to demolition or renovation work. Any identified hazardous building materials should be removed, as per applicable regulations, prior to any demolition or renovation work. Asbestos: State and federal regulations WAC 296-62, 296-65, local clean Air Pollution Agency rules, AHERA 40 CFR 763, OSHA 29 CFR and US EPA</p>	

			<p>NESHAP 40-CFR Part 61. Mercury: Washington Department of Safety and Health requires specific training, RCRA metals training for worker protection, handling, engineering controls, and disposal practices. Lead: Washington Labor and Industries regulations for Lead in Construction (WAC-62-155) PCBs: WAC 173-303 Dangerous Waste Regulations and 40 CFR Part 761 Subpart D. All waste shall be handled in accordance with WAC 173-303.</p>	
<p>Soil Suitability / Slope/ Erosion / Drainage and Storm Water Runoff</p>	<p>Geotechnical engineering recommendations for drainage/waterproofing and temporary erosion controls</p>	<p>N/A</p>		

Project Mitigation Plan

King County HHCDD shall make inclusion of the above referenced mitigation plans in both written agreement with the subgrantee and its Construction Documents with General Contractor and any 3rd Party testing/engineering entities. King County will confirm this prior to issuing Notice to Proceed on Construction. Specific monitoring check points will be coordinated through the King County contract monitor and Agency/Project Team liaison. Reimbursement of costs will be contingent upon successful implementation of mitigation plan at relevant points throughout construction period. Summary of mitigation efforts shall then be entered into this HEROS-Environmental Review Record.

Supporting documentation on completed measures

APPENDIX A: Related Federal Laws and Authorities

Airport Hazards

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

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

✓ No

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

Yes

Screen Summary

Compliance Determination

The project site is not within 15,000 feet of a military airport. McChord AFB is over 40 miles away from the southern boundary of Bellevue or and Boeing Field, the closest civilian airport is over 7 miles away. Per the Confidentiality Plan, the specific Project Site is not listed on these maps. However, the actual distance is even further. The project is in compliance with Airport Hazards requirements.

Supporting documentation

[Airports-BV-Distance2-BoeingField.jpg](#)
[Airports-Bellevue-Distance2McChord.jpg](#)

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:

[FIRM-53033C0657G.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 project is in compliance with flood insurance requirements. Please note that the location of the project site is not listed on this FIRM. For more information, inquiries can be made directly to King County Community.Development@kingcounty.gov stating the name of the project. Access will be at the discretion of the King County Department of Community and Human Services Public Records Officer and/or other County officials such as, but not limited to the Prosecuting Attorney and Risk Management Division.

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 NEPAAssist website show that the project is located within a maintenance area for carbon monoxide (CO) and ozone (O3). However, the Washington State Department of Ecology Maintenance State Implementation Plan website show that the Seattle-Tacoma maintenance areas for CO and O3, both of which encompass the project location, ended in 2016. References: NEPAAssist. <https://nepassisttool.epa.gov/nepassist/nepamap.aspx>. Accessed February 10, 2022.

Ecology. <https://ecology.wa.gov/Regulations-Permits/Plans-policies/State-implementation-plans/Maintenance-SIPs>. Washington State Department of Ecology. Accessed February 10, 2022. Please note that the uploaded map shows the general area of the specific site. However, since the entirety of the project is in this maintenance area, the site can be considered acceptable from this documentation. Site specific mapping is being withheld on King County servers per Confidentiality Plan. The project is in compliance with the Clean Air Act.

Supporting documentation

[NEPA-Assist-AttainmentMaintenance.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

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

Screen Summary

Compliance Determination

Per HUD Region X Environmental Office Website:
<https://www.hud.gov/states/shared/working/r10/environment> As of July 22, 2020, Washington State Department of Ecology notified HUD of the following: "Ecology has concluded that it is unnecessary for U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) to continue to send project information in order to receive Ecology's concurrence that the funding phase of the project is consistent with Washington's CZMP. Therefore, we are writing to inform you that HUD no longer needs to require applicants to send Ecology letters seeking our concurrence on projects for which HUD plans to release federal funding." Inclusion of the following

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

Supporting documentation**Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?**

Yes

 No

Contamination and Toxic Substances

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

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

- Yes

3. Mitigation

Document and upload the mitigation needed according to the requirements of the appropriate federal, state, tribal, or local oversight agency. If the adverse environmental effects cannot be mitigated, then HUD assistance may not be used for the project at this site.

Can adverse environmental impacts be mitigated?

Adverse environmental impacts cannot feasibly be mitigated.

- ✓ Yes, adverse environmental impacts can be eliminated through mitigation. Document and upload all mitigation requirements below.

4. Describe how compliance was achieved in the text box below. Include any of the following that apply: State Voluntary Clean-up Program, a No Further Action letter, use of engineering controls, or use of institutional controls.

Use of engineering controls (specifically discussed in the Mitigation Screen for this project) will be incorporated into the Construction Documents and general plan for the project.

If a remediation plan or clean-up program was necessary, which standard does it follow?

Complete removal

- ✓ Risk-based corrective action (RBCA)

Screen Summary

Compliance Determination

Site contamination was evaluated as follows: ASTM Phase I ESA. On-site or nearby toxic, hazardous, or radioactive substances were found that could affect the health and safety of project occupants or conflict with the intended use of the property. The adverse environmental impacts can be mitigated. With mitigation, identified in the mitigation section of this review, the project will be in compliance with contamination and toxic substances requirements. For documentation, a redacted Phase 1 summary is attached. The full documentation is protected under the confidentiality plan for this project. Inquiries regarding documentation should be sent to community.development@kingcounty.gov. Determination of any information release is contingent upon formal review proceedings carried out at the request of the King County Department of Community and Human Services Public Records Officer.

Supporting documentation

[Phase1-RedactedSummary.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:

Trees removed during construction will be replaced with native species. Runoff from the 1,452 square foot roof of the new building will be conveyed to a non-infiltrating bioretention planter, which is an area of replaced impervious surface.

No mitigation is necessary.

Screen Summary

Compliance Determination

This project May Affect, but is Not Likely to Adversely Affect, listed species, and informal consultation was conducted. With mitigation, identified in the mitigation section of this review, the project will be in compliance with the Endangered Species Act. Please note that the associated documentation below has had location information redacted in concordance with the Confidentiality Plan for this project. The NMFS-Review Summary document is an overall summary of the NMFS Programmatic informal consultation process along with findings.

Supporting documentation

[NMFS-Stormwater-Form_Redacted.pdf](#)

[NMFS-Review Summary.pdf](#)

[FW-NEPA NMFS Requirements-Redacted.pdf](#)

[Final-NMFS-Determination_Redacted.pdf](#)

[Email-NOAA-Recepit_Redacted.pdf](#)

[Email-NMFS-03-Redacted.pdf](#)

[Email-NMFS-02-Redacted.pdf](#)

[Email-NMFS-01-Redacted.pdf](#)

[IPaC_Explore Location resources_Redacted.pdf](#)

[FWS-Worksheet_Redacted.pdf](#)

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

Yes

No

Explosive and Flammable Hazards

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

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

No

Yes

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

No

Yes

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

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

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

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

No

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

Yes

Screen Summary

Compliance Determination

There are no current or planned stationary aboveground storage containers of concern within 1 mile of the project site. Google Earth was used to search for tanks within a 1-mile radius of the project location. Review results: Based on HUD guidance and 24 CFR 51.201(5), containers used to hold liquefied petroleum gas with a capacity of 1,000 gallons or less capacity and in compliance with National Fire Protection Association 58 (e.g., propane tanks used at gasoline stations) are not considered hazards requiring acceptable separation distance (ASD) calculations. One such tank was identified. Screenshots of map and tank are included in attached supporting documentation. No tanks requiring ASD calculations were identified within a 1-mile radius of the project site. Additional backup mapping is confidential and is protected under the confidentiality plan for this project. Inquiries regarding documentation should be sent to community.development@kingcounty.gov. Determination of any information release is contingent upon formal review proceedings carried out at the request of the King County Department of Community and Human Services Public Records Officer. Reference: Google, Inc. Google Earth Pro. Accessed February 10, 2022. The project is in compliance with explosive and flammable hazard requirements.

Supporting documentation

[Explosives-Partner-Worksheet.docx](#)

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:

Review of NEPAassist and Census Map shows that the Project Site is in an urbanized area. 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.

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

Screen Summary

Compliance Determination

This project 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. Please note in documentation that Census Map does not show precise Project Site. However, the project site is inside the Urbanized boundary area as show on the map.

Supporting documentation

[Pages from 2010-Census-UrbanAreaMap.pdf](#)

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

HSH-Apartments

Seattle, WA

900000010241608

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:

[FIRM-53033C0657G.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. 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

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

- ✓ Duwamish Response Period Elapsed
- ✓ Muckle Response Period Elapsed
- ✓ Puyallup Tribe Response Period Elapsed
- ✓ Snoqualmie Tribe Response Period Elapsed

- ✓ Stillaguamish Response Period Elapsed
- ✓ Suquamish Response Period Elapsed
- ✓ Tulalip Tribe Response Period Elapsed
- ✓ Warm Springs Tribe Response Period Elapsed
- ✓ Yakama Nations Response Period Elapsed

Other Consulting Parties

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

Consulting parties were selected via the HUD Tribal Directory Assessment Tool along with updated information we keep. The transmittal typically goes to both the Tribal Chair and Historic/Archaeology Officer of a particular tribe. State SHPO Consultation consisted of sending a standard Washington State DAHP EZ-1 Form

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

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

- Yes
- No

Step 2 – Identify and Evaluate Historic Properties

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

Per the Confidential nature of this Project, the Area of Potential Effect shall not be listed here, nor an address. However, the State DAHP has determined that no historic buildings or districts will be involved or in danger from project activities.

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

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

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

Additional Notes:

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

Yes

No

Step 3 –Assess Effects of the Project on Historic Properties

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

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

No Historic Properties Affected

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

Document reason for finding:

No historic properties present.

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

No Adverse Effect

Adverse Effect

Screen Summary

Compliance Determination

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

Supporting documentation

- [Yakama-Tribe-HSHProject-Letter_Redacted.pdf](#)
- [WarmSpringsTribe-HSHProject-Letter_Redacted.pdf](#)
- [Tulalip-HSHProject-letter_Redacted.pdf](#)
- [Suquamish-HSHProject-Letter_Redacted.pdf](#)
- [Stillaguamish_HSH-Project_Redacted.pdf](#)
- [Snoqualmie-HSHProject-Letter_Redacted.pdf](#)
- [PuyallupLetter_Redacted.pdf](#)
- [Muckleshoot-HSH-ProjectLetter_Redacted.pdf](#)
- [LifeWire-DAHP-Decision2022-03-01338_030722_Redacted.pdf](#)
- [Duwamish-HSHProject-Letter_Redacted.pdf](#)
- [Section 106 Review HSH Apartment Project_Redacted.pdf](#)
- [RE_Section 106 Review HSH Apartment Project-DAHP-OK.pdf](#)
- [EZ-1-Coverletter-HSHLifewire-Sec106_Redacted.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

Rehabilitation of an existing residential property

NOTE: For major or substantial rehabilitation in Normally Unacceptable zones, HUD encourages mitigation to reduce levels to acceptable compliance standards. For major rehabilitation in Unacceptable zones, HUD strongly encourages mitigation to reduce levels to acceptable compliance standards. See 24 CFR 51 Subpart B for further details.

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

An interstate land sales registration

Any timely emergency assistance under disaster assistance provision or appropriations which are provided to save lives, protect property, protect public health and safety, remove debris and wreckage, or assistance that has the effect of restoring facilities substantially as they existed prior to the disaster
 None of the above

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

Indicate the findings of the Preliminary Screening below:

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

- ✓ Noise generators were found within the threshold distances.

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

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

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

Indicate noise level here: 75

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

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: 75

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

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

Mitigation as follows will be implemented:

- ✓ No mitigation is necessary.

Explain why mitigation will not be made here:

Existing barrier and building materials meet the requirements for mitigation.

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

Screen Summary

Compliance Determination

The project is within 15 miles of Seattle Seaplanes, Will Rogers Wiley Post Memorial, Renton Municipal, Seattle Tacoma International (SeaTac), Boeing Field/King County International (Boeing Field), and Kenmore Air Harbor. The following airports include operations that could contribute to noise levels at the site: Renton Municipal Boeing Field SeaTac, Kenmore Air Harbor. Noise contours for Boeing Field, SeaTac, and Renton Municipal are included in the protected documentation. Contours for Kenmore Air Harbor were not available so noise levels and contour size from SeaTac were conservatively used for this airport. Total estimated airport noise was 57 dB. No railroads are present within 3,000 feet of the project location. Daily traffic counts for each roadway were obtained from the jurisdictional city, including night and truck percentages. Distances were measured using NEPAssist and Google Earth. Elevations were estimated based on design documentation. Three outdoor use areas were identified as shown in the protected backup documentation. The northeast corner was identified as worst-case location for interior noise. A barrier analysis was completed for each location assuming the concrete wall surrounding the eastern side of the property to be 8 feet tall, increasing to 9 feet at the location shown. Ground elevations were included in this analysis. Outdoor use area receivers were assumed to be 5 feet from ground level to represent average human ear height. The location representing interior noise impacts was assumed to be 15 feet from ground level to approximate mid-height of the highest residential level. Based on the barrier analysis, noise levels at each outdoor location were as follows: Common Patio East: 64 dB Common Patio West: 64 dB Bioretention Area: 65 dB. After the barrier analysis, the highest noise level was 75 dB at the building corner location. A building material analysis was completed assuming materials with the lowest Sound Transmission Classification (STC) where specific materials were not known. Based on this analysis, the building materials meet the required STC rating, achieving a rating of 34.22 compared to a required rating of 33. Mapping documentation, which shows the site location is also protected under the Confidentiality Plan, but is available per the plan's parameters.

Supporting documentation

[Redacted-Noise-EA-Partner-Worksheet.docx](#)

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

Please note that per Confidentiality Plan, the project site is not specified on the map. The location is not on a sole source aquifer. The project is not located on a sole source aquifer area. The project is in compliance with Sole Source Aquifer requirements.

Supporting documentation

[sole-source-aquifer-map.jpg](#)

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

Yes

No

Wetlands Protection

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

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

No

Yes

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

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

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

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

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

Screen Summary

Compliance Determination

The project is over 2000 feet from any wetland and will not impact on- or off-site wetlands. Please note that since this is a confidential project, the map uploaded is a general map of the area in which the project is located. King County Housing, Homelessness, and Community Development Division are maintaining the detailed Wetlands Map showing actual project location and distance on its secure server per the Confidentiality Plan. The project is in compliance with Executive Order 11990. Reference: <https://www.fws.gov/wetlands/data/mapper.html>

Supporting documentation

[HEROS-upload-Wetlands-GeneralLocation.jpg](#)

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

Yes

No

Wild and Scenic Rivers Act

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

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

No

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

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

Screen Summary

Compliance Determination

Per NEPA Assist, the location is over 32 miles away (and downstream) of the nearest Wild and Scenic River (Middle Fork of the Snoqualmie) The project site is not specified in this map per the confidentiality plan. This project is not within proximity of a NWSRS river. The project is in compliance with the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act.

Supporting documentation

[Wild-ScenicRivers-Distance.jpg](#)

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

Yes

No

Environmental Justice

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

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

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

Yes

No

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

Screen Summary

Compliance Determination

Supporting documentation

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

Yes

No