

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

Project Information

**Project Name:** 642-Selby-Ave-Mixed-Use-Development

**HEROS Number:** 900000010449169

**Start Date:** 01/22/2025

**Responsible Entity (RE):** City of Saint Paul, 25 W 4th St Saint Paul MN, 55101

**RE Preparer:** Stefan Hankerson

**State / Local Identifier:**

**Certifying Officer:** Yasmine Robinson

**Grant Recipient (if different than Responsible Entity):** Rondo Community Land Trust

**Point of Contact:**

**Consultant (if applicable):** Stantec Consulting Services, Inc.

**Point of Contact:**

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

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

**Project Location:** 642 Selby Ave, Saint Paul, MN 55104

**Additional Location Information:**

N/A

**Direct Comments to:**

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

The project site, 642 Selby Avenue, Saint Paul, MN 55104 is currently occupied by an existing brick building and a parking lot. It is located in Ward 1 and the Summit-University district of Saint Paul. The project is located on the Selby Ave commercial corridor, with residential zoning in the surrounding neighborhood. This 0.3-acre parcel is zoned B2 Community Business, based on the City of Saint Paul Zoning Map, but this project will look to change the zoning to T3 (Traditional Neighborhood). LSE Architects would design a residential project with an anticipated 20 units; This would be mostly 2-Bedroom units, as well as retail, amenity space and sheltered parking.

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

As the population of St. Paul grows, many residents are experiencing challenges related to affordable housing. With a growing economy over the last decades, wages have not kept pace with rising rents and there is a growing gap between what people can afford versus what people are earning. The proposed development will bring affordable housing to a neighborhood that is currently undergoing new development. The proposed development will provide affordable housing in the City of Saint Paul.

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

The property is currently vacant. The property is located in a rapidly developing area and this trend will continue with or without this project. However, this project will provide affordable housing and commercial retail space in the neighborhood.

**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	Funding Amount
B-23-CP-MN-0854	Community Planning and Development (CPD)	CPD	\$1,000,000.00

**Estimated Total HUD Funded, Assisted or Insured Amount:** \$1,000,000.00

**Estimated Total Project Cost [24 CFR 58.2 (a) (5)]:** \$16,749,639.20

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

<b>Compliance Factors:</b> 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)
<b>STATUTES, EXECUTIVE ORDERS, AND REGULATIONS LISTED AT 24 CFR §50.4 &amp; § 58.6</b>		
<b>Airport Hazards</b> Clear Zones and Accident Potential Zones; 24 CFR Part 51 Subpart D	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	The project is not located within 2,500 feet of a civilian airport or 15,000 feet of a military airport. The project is in compliance with Airport Hazards requirements. For supporting documentation see attached Airport Hazards Map.
<b>Coastal Barrier Resources Act</b> 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	The project is not located in a CBRS Unit. Therefore, this project has no potential to impact a CBRS Units and is in compliance with the Coastal Barrier Resources Act. For supporting documentation see the attached Coastal Boundary Map.
<b>Flood Insurance</b> 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 FEMA Flood Insurance Map Number 27123C0085G dated July 31, 2024, indicated that the project site is mapped in Zone X, an area of minimal flood hazard. The project site is not mapped 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 site is in compliance with the flood insurance requirements. For supporting documentation see attached FEMA Flood Map.
<b>STATUTES, EXECUTIVE ORDERS, AND REGULATIONS LISTED AT 24 CFR §50.4 &amp; § 58.5</b>		
<b>Air Quality</b> Clean Air Act, as amended, particularly section 176(c) & (d); 40 CFR Parts 6, 51, 93	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	The Selby Avenue project is located in Ramsey County, which is currently in maintenance for the following: Sulfur Dioxide (1971) and Particulate Matter-10 (1987). The proposed project will include the new construction of a 5-story apartment complex with 4 levels of residential units and 1 level of retail space. It will include 20 residential units and approximately 20 covered parking spaces. In the EPA's General Conformity Guidance: Questions and Answers; July 13, 1994, EPA states that "Historical analysis of similar actions could be used in cases where the proposed projects are similar in size and scope to previous projects." The EPA de minimis threshold for maintenance areas is 100 tons per year for both Sulfur Dioxide (SO <sub>2</sub> ) and Particulate Matter-10 (PM <sub>10</sub> ). To determine the estimated increases in demolition and construction emissions for the project, Stantec used a historical analysis of the Village at Calabasas project in Calabasas, California as a comparison project. The total project emissions from both construction and demolition for the Villages at Calabasas project for SO <sub>2</sub> and PM <sub>10</sub> emissions are 0.0367 tons/year and 50.76 tons/year respectively. Therefore, the annual emissions generated from the proposed demolition and new construction at 642 Selby Avenue are not estimated to exceed the de minimis thresholds established in EPA's General Conformity regulations. Therefore, detailed analysis

		is not required for this project. For supporting documentation see attached Air Quality Memo, Calculated Emission tables, and EPA De Minimis Table.
<b>Coastal Zone Management Act</b> Coastal Zone Management Act, sections 307(c) & (d)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	The project is not located in a Coastal Zone. Minnesota's Coastal Zone includes four counties, Cook County, Lake County, Saint Louis County, and Carlton County. The project site is located in Ramsey County; therefore, this project has no potential to impact a Coastal Zone. This project is in compliance with the Coastal Zone Management Act. For supporting Documentation see attached State Coastal Zone Boundaries list and Coastal Boundary Map.
<b>Contamination and Toxic Substances</b> 24 CFR 50.3(i) & 58.5(i)(2)]	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	In November/December 2022, Stantec conducted concurrent Phase I and Phase II ESAs on the project site. The Phase I ESA revealed RECs associated with the dry-cleaning operations that have been present on the site since the 1950s. An additional Phase I ESA conducted in October 2024 confirmed the presence of RECs related to the on-site dry-cleaning operations. The Phase II ESA consisted of two soil/groundwater borings, two exterior vapor probes, and four sub-slab soil vapor samples. Soil, groundwater, and soil vapor samples were analyzed for volatile organic compounds (VOCs). Additionally, the soil sample collected from the boring completed on the east side of the site building, near the presumed UST, was also analyzed for diesel range organics (DRO). In soil, PCE was detected at a concentration of 0.1 milligrams per kilogram (mg/kg) exceeding its respective soil leaching value (SLV) of 0.042 mg/kg in the soil sample collected from B-2. DRO was not detected above laboratory reporting limits in the soil sample collected from B-1, near the potential UST. In groundwater, PCE was detected at a concentration of 1.1

		<p>micrograms per liter (µg/L) and 1.4 µg/L, below the respective drinking water standards for a PCE. In soil vapor, PCE was detected above laboratory reporting limits in all six soil vapor samples. PCE was reported above thirty-three times (33x) the Industrial Intrusion Screening Value (ISV) of 1,100 micrograms per cubic meter (µg/m³) in SS-2 at 2,960 µg/m³, in SS-3 at 1,340 µg/m³, in SS-4 at 2,580 µg/m³ and in VP-2 at 2,410 µg/m³. The project site was enrolled into the Voluntary Investigation and Cleanup (VIC) Program under BF0002427 and later referred to the Site Assessment (SA) Program under SA0010031. As a result, additional sampling and delineation of the PCE impacts to soil vapor and groundwater will be required by the MPCA. Soil remediation and soil vapor mitigation (installation of a vapor mitigation system paired with post construction verification testing) will be undertaken at the project site. Additionally, if confirmed during excavation activities and no longer in use the UST will be removed from the site. With mitigation the project will be in compliance with Contamination and Toxic Substances. For supporting documentation see attached MPCA No Association Determination Letter, Phase I ESAs, and Phase II ESA.</p>
<p><b>Endangered Species Act</b> 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>Stantec conducted a project review through the US Fish and Wildlife Services (USFWS) iPAC tool. According to the project review, the Northern Long-eared bat, Higgens Eye, and Rusty Patched Bumble Bee are listed as endangered species; the Tricolored Bat and Salamander Mussel are listed as a proposed endangered species; the Whooping Crane is listed as experimental population, non-essential species; and the Monarch Butterfly is</p>

		<p>listed as a candidate species located in the vicinity of the project area. A consistency letter was provided by the USFWS on December 27, 2024 that stated the proposed project will have no effect on the Higgens Eye, Monarch Butterfly, Rusty Patched Bumble Bee, Salamander Mussel, Tricolored Bat or Whooping Crane. Based on the "no effect" determination the project has met consultation requirements and no further consultation is required for the species. An additional consistency letter was provided by the USFWS on December 27, 2024 that stated the proposed project has reached the determination of "no effect" on the northern long-eared bat. The proposed project will have "no effect" on any endangered or threatened species. The project is in compliance with the Endangered Species Act. For supporting documentation see attached USFWS iPAC list and consistency letters.</p>
<p><b>Explosive and Flammable Hazards Above-Ground Tanks)[24 CFR Part 51 Subpart C</b></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p>Stantec used the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) What's In My Neighborhood (WIMN) website to ascertain whether any locations within a 1-mile radius of the project site housed above ground storage tanks (ASTs). Subsequently, Stantec identified the existence of two locations within the specified radius that indeed have ASTs. Among the two locations, one site features two tanks with 250 and 500-gallon capacities on-site. To determine which tanks, require evaluation for acceptable separation distance, we followed HUD's guidance. This involves assessing the largest tank capacity, the tank closest to the project site, dike structures around the tanks, and any pressurized tanks within a 1-mile radius of the project site. Additionally, we utilize the HUD Acceptable Separation Distance Assessment Tool. The following</p>

		<p>addresses have confirmed Aboveground Storage Tanks (ASTs): 619 St. Anthony Street and 520 University Avenue. For each location, we consider the largest tank capacity in our calculations:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>619 St. Anthony Street: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Largest tank capacity: 500 gallons</li> <li>o Acceptable distance for this tank capacity: 208 feet</li> <li>o Address location relative to the project site: Approximately 2,156 feet away</li> </ul> </li> <li>520 University Avenue: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o Largest tank capacity: 280 gallons</li> <li>o Acceptable distance for this tank capacity: 163 feet</li> <li>o Address location relative to the project site: Approximately 3,444 feet away</li> </ul> </li> </ol> <p>Given that the tank locations are significantly farther from the acceptable distances, we did not examine the closest tanks from these locations. We can reasonably assume that the given distances meet the acceptable criteria. The project is in compliance with Explosive and Flammable Hazards requirements. For supporting documentation, see attached Explosive and Flammable Hazards Map with Acceptable Separation Distances and Acceptable Distance Calculation.</p>
<p><b>Farmlands Protection</b> 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 is located in St. Paul, Ramsey County, Minnesota, which falls within an urbanized area as defined by the 2020 Census Urban Areas Wall Map. According to this map, the City of St. Paul and its surrounding regions have a population of 10,000 or more, qualifying them as Urban Areas. Additionally, a Soil Map from the Natural Resources Conservation Services identified the project site as urban land and the Waukegan complex. As the project site is on land already in, or committed to urban development, the project is in compliance with the Farmland Protection Policy Act. For supporting documentation see attached Soil Map</p>



		and 2020 Census Urban Areas Wall Map.
<b>Floodplain Management</b> Executive Order 11988, particularly section 2(a); 24 CFR Part 55	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	Stantec utilized the Federal Flood Standard Support Tool Beta and the FEMA Flood Map Service Center to determine if the project site is located in floodplain. According to the FEMA Flood Map the project site is located in Zone X and is not located in a floodplain or Special Flood Hazard Area. Additionally, the Freeboard Value Approach Report determined the project site is not located in the FFRMS floodplain. For supporting documentation see the attached FEMA Flood Map and Freeboard Value Approach Report. The project is in compliance with Executive Orders 11988 and 13690.
<b>Historic Preservation</b> National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, particularly sections 106 and 110; 36 CFR Part 800	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	Based on Section 106 consultation the project will have No Adverse Effect on historic properties. The project received a letter of concurrence from the SHPO on December 23, 2025. The letter states that "Based on the documentation provided and for the reasons noted below, we concur with the consultant's recommendations and the City of Saint Paul's presumed finding of No Adverse Effect to Historic Properties, made on behalf of the US Department of Housing and Urban Development." Conditions: None. Upon satisfactory implementation of the conditions, which should be monitored, the project is in compliance with Section 106.
<b>Noise Abatement and Control</b> 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	Noise generators were found to be within the threshold distances for the project site, therefore a Noise Assessment was completed for the project site. The noise assessment found that one major roadway (Dale Street) was located within 1,000 feet of the Subject Property site; and four airports (Saint Paul Downtown Airport, Minnesota St. Paul International Airport, Crystal Airport, and Lake Elmo Airport)

		are located within 15 miles of the project site. There were no railroads located within 3,000 feet of the project site. The noise assessment found that noise at the project site will not exceed 65 dB, therefore the project site is in compliance with Noise Abatement and Control requirements. For supporting documentation see attached Noise Assessment.
<b>Sole Source Aquifers</b> Safe Drinking Water Act of 1974, as amended, particularly section 1424(e); 40 CFR Part 149	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	The project is located in Minnesota. There is one sole source aquifer located in Minnesota located over 79 miles from the project site. The project is not located on a sole source aquifer. The project is in compliance with Sole Source Aquifer requirements. For supporting documentation see attached Sole Source Aquifer Map.
<b>Wetlands Protection</b> Executive Order 11990, particularly sections 2 and 5	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	The project is not located within wetlands identified in the National Wetlands Inventory (NWI) database. The project will not impact on-site or off-site wetlands. The project is in compliance with Executive Order 11990. For supporting documentation see attached Nearby Wetlands Map.
<b>Wild and Scenic Rivers Act</b> Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 1968, particularly section 7(b) and (c)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	This project is located over 1.3 miles from the Mississippi River, a NRI river. The project is not within the proximity of a NWSR river, study river or Nationwide Rivers Inventory River. The project is in compliance with the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act. For supporting documentation see attached Nationwide Rivers Inventory Map, Study Rivers list, and Wild and Scenic Rivers list.
<b>HUD HOUSING ENVIRONMENTAL STANDARDS</b>		
<b>ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE</b>		
<b>Environmental Justice</b> Executive Order 12898	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	The project's total environmental review found Contamination and Toxic Substances to require mitigation. With mitigation, this portion of the project will be in compliance with the project's

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

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

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

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

<b>Environmental Assessment Factor</b>	<b>Impact Code</b>	<b>Impact Evaluation</b>	<b>Mitigation</b>
<b>LAND DEVELOPMENT</b>			
Conformance with Plans / Compatible Land Use and Zoning / Scale and Urban Design	2	The new construction conforms with the City of Saint Paul's 2040 Comprehensive Plan. The new construction will be subject to state and local ordinances and will be in compliance with the City of Saint Paul's zoning delegations. The project site is located in a mixed-use area including commercial and residential development in the City of Saint Paul. The proposed project will add affordable commercial space and affordable condos that will include a modern style. References: City of Saint Paul's 2040 Comprehensive Plan	
Soil Suitability / Slope/ Erosion / Drainage and Storm Water Runoff	2	According to the Phase I ESA site reconnaissance observation, no slope erosion, drainage, or stormwater issues are present at the project site. The proposed project will not affect slope conditions or be affected by slope conditions. Stormwater runoff will be properly managed during redevelopment activities. References: Phase I ESA Stantec Consulting Services Inc.	
Hazards and Nuisances including Site Safety and Site-Generated Noise	2	Airport hazards, contamination and toxic substances, explosive and flammable hazards and noise have been evaluated. The nearest airport is located 2.5 miles from the project site and is not considered a hazard. The noise	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		assessment found that noise at the project site will not exceed 65 dB, therefore the project site is in compliance with Noise Abatement and Control requirements. In November/December of 2022 Stantec completed concurrent Phase I and Phase II ESAs for the project site. An additional Phase I ESA conducted in October 2024 confirmed the presence of RECs related to the on-site dry-cleaning operations. The site has been occupied by drycleaner operations since the 1950s and features of a potential UST were identified during the site reconnaissance at the site. Following the Phase II ESA, PCE was detected in groundwater below its respective drinking water standards. Based on the Phase II ESA analytical results, additional sampling and delineation of the PCE impacts to soil vapor and groundwater will be required by the MPCA. Soil remediation and soil vapor mitigation (installation of a vapor mitigation system paired with post construction verification testing) will be undertaken at the project site. Additionally, if confirmed during excavation activities and no longer in use, the UST will be removed from the site. The identified adverse environmental impacts will be mitigated. With mitigation, the project will be in compliance with contamination and toxic substances requirements. References: Airport Hazards map, Phase I and Phase II ESA completed by Stantec Consulting Services Inc., Noise Assessment completed by Stantec Consulting Services inc., and Explosive and Flammable Hazards Map	
<b>SOCIOECONOMIC</b>			
Employment and Income Patterns	1	This project may offer short-term employment opportunities during the new construction and offer long-term employment opportunities after completion. The project is not anticipated to eliminate existing jobs.	
Demographic Character Changes / Displacement	2	Demographics will not change due to the proposed new construction and the	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		neighborhood character will be positively impacted.	
Environmental Justice EA Factor	2	The project would not alter the Environmental Justice composition of the population in the project area and would not increase the population that could be exposed to environmental hazards.	
<b>COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND SERVICES</b>			
Educational and Cultural Facilities (Access and Capacity)	2	Several educational facilities are located near the project site and satisfactory per the St. Paul Public School system. Barack and Michelle Obama Elementary School is located 0.5 miles from the project and Capitol Hill Magnet School is located 0.6 from the project site. Maxfield Elementary School and J. J. Hill Montessori School are located 0.8 miles from the project site. Central Highschool is located 1.1 miles from the project site. Several Christian churches are located within a 5-minute drive from the project site. The City of St. Paul also has several churches, temples, and worship centers for other religions and faiths that can be accessed via Metro Transit or private vehicles at a farther distance. St. Paul Public Library - Rondo Community Library is located 0.9 miles from the project site. Several tourist attractions (Allianz Field, Xcel Energy Center, Landmark Center, Union Depot, and the St. Paul Farmers' Market) and museums (Minnesota History Museum, Science Museum of Minnesota, James J. Hill House, etc.) are located within a 10-minute drive from the project site. Reference: Google Maps	
Commercial Facilities (Access and Proximity)	2	The project site is located west of downtown St. Paul. It is located within walking distance to Mississippi Market Natural Foods Co-op, retail stores and several local restaurants. Is it located within a 5-minute drive to several restaurants and businesses, retail stores, and recreational facilities. Several metro transit buss stops are located within 400 feet of the project site. Reference: Google Maps	

<b>Environmental Assessment Factor</b>	<b>Impact Code</b>	<b>Impact Evaluation</b>	<b>Mitigation</b>
Health Care / Social Services (Access and Capacity)	2	The project site is located 1.4 miles from United Hospital and 3.1 miles from Regions Hospital. The City of St. Paul and private agencies offer a range of social services which are accessible by private vehicle. Reference: Google Maps	
Solid Waste Disposal and Recycling (Feasibility and Capacity)	2	Solid waste/recycling services in the City of St. Paul area are currently provided by private trash hauler companies. These private companies have the capacity to service the proposed development. References: The City of St. Paul Garbage and Recycling Services	
Waste Water and Sanitary Sewers (Feasibility and Capacity)	2	The City of St. Paul has the capacity to treat wastewater and has sufficient sewer infrastructure to service the proposed development. Reference: The City of St. Paul Department of Public Works	
Water Supply (Feasibility and Capacity)	2	The City of St. Paul has the capacity to supply water to the proposed development and has acceptable water quality. Reference: The City of St. Paul Regional Water Services Department	
Public Safety - Police, Fire and Emergency Medical	2	Based on data from the City of St. Paul the police, fire, and medical response is timely, and the area has adequate coverage. The nearest police station is located 2.0 miles from the project site. The nearest fire department is located 0.7 miles away from the project site. The nearest hospitals are United Hospital and Regions Hospital located 1.4 miles and 3.1 miles away respectively. Reference: Google Maps	
Parks, Open Space and Recreation (Access and Capacity)	2	Several parks and open spaces are located within a 5-minute drive from the project site. The proposed project will have no effect on these parks and open spaces. References: The City of St. Paul Department of Parks and Recreation and Google Maps	
Transportation and Accessibility (Access and Capacity)	2	The site is accessible by private vehicle, Metro Transit, and/or ride share services. Several Metro Transit bus stops are located within 400 feet of the project site. References: metrotransit.org and Google Maps	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
<b>NATURAL FEATURES</b>			
Unique Natural Features /Water Resources	2	The project site is currently developed with a mixed-use commercial/residential building. There are no unique natural features such as sand dunes, waterfalls, rock outcrops, caves, canyons, or fossil beds present at the project site. The proposed project will not destroy any unique natural features or water resources. Runoff from the project site will be properly managed in accordance with state and federal regulations. The proposed project will not introduce nuisance or non - indigenous species of vegetation. Reference: Phase I ESA conducted by Stantec Consulting Services Inc.	
Vegetation / Wildlife (Introduction, Modification, Removal, Disruption, etc.)	2	The project site is located in a developed residential/commercial area in the city of St. Paul, Minnesota. No project development activities will harm or destroy existing wildlife. No nuisance or non-indigenous species will be introduced at the project site. References: Phase I ESA conducted by Stantec Consulting Services Inc. and Endangered Species iPAC consistency letters.	
Other Factors 1			
Other Factors 2			
<b>CLIMATE AND ENERGY</b>			
Climate Change	2	Stantec explored <a href="https://crt-climate-explorer.nemac.org/">https://crt-climate-explorer.nemac.org/</a> to identify potential future climate risk changes. The foreseeable future hazard types are extreme temperatures and changes seasonal patterns. According to the Climate Explorer the hottest days of the year are projected to increase by 7-13 degrees F. Extreme temperatures in St. Paul have historically averaged 83 degrees F. In order to combat extreme heat, the residential and commercial units will be constructed with air conditioning. Having access to air conditioning will ensure that the residents can keep cool on extreme weather days.	
Energy Efficiency	2	The proposed project building has been thoughtfully designed to incorporate	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		sustainable and economical materials. Additionally, the project site is located within walking distance from a Metro Transit stop. The availability of nearby public transportation may encourage tenants to use it often, therefore reducing carbon emissions from gas-powered vehicles. Additionally, a solar panel system is planned to be installed on the building rooftop.	

### Supporting documentation

[Phase II November 2022\(1\).pdf](#)

[Phase I October 2024\(1\).pdf](#)

[Phase I December 2022\(1\).pdf](#)

### Additional Studies Performed:

Stantec performed these additional studies for the project site: a HUD Noise Assessment, Flood Hazard Assessment, Section 106 Compliance, EPA Enviromapper Assessment, Endangered Species Assessment, and checked for updated federal and state requirements.

**Field Inspection [Optional]:** Date and completed by:

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

The City of Saint Paul Planning and Economic Development Department Google Maps The City of St. Paul Garbage and Recycling Services The City of St. Paul Department of Public Works The City of St. Paul Regional Water Services Department The City of St. Paul Department of Parks and Recreation City of Saint Paul and Dakota County, Minnesota HUD Exchange, DNL Calculator, website National Wild and Scenic River System, website City of Saint Paul 2040 Comprehensive Plan Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, dated December 15, 2022 Phase II Environmental Site Assessment, dated November 21, 2022 Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, dated October 29, 2024 MetroTransit Map and Schedule Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Map Service Center (MSC) website (FIRM) U.S. Department of the Interior Fish & Wildlife Service's National Wetlands Inventory (NWI) Map EPA NEPAAssist Map Tool, website United States Geological Survey (U.S.G.S) HUD Exchange, Acceptable Separation Distance (ASD) Electronic Assessment Tool, website HUD Environmental Assessment Factors and Categories eGuide, website Natural Resources Conservation Service, USDA Web Soil Survey, website Minnesota SHPO Minnesota Department of Transportation (MNDOT), Road and Traffic Data, website U.S. Federal Railroad Administration, Crossing Inventory Data, website Apache Tribe of Oklahoma Cheyenne and Aprapaho Tribes Flandreau Santee Sioux Tribe of South Dakota Fort Belknap Indian Community Iowa Tribe of Kansas and Nebraska Lower Sioux Indian



Community Menominee Indian Tribe of Wisconsin Prairie Island Indian Community Santee  
Sioux Nation, Nebraska Upper Sioux Community

**List of Permits Obtained:**

The developer will be required to obtain all necessary construction permits prior to beginning construction.

**Public Outreach [24 CFR 58.43]:**

A combined Notice of Finding of No Significant Impact and Notice of Intent to Request Release of Funds will be published on the City of Saint Paul website.

**Cumulative Impact Analysis [24 CFR 58.32]:**

The proposed project includes demolition and new construction of a residential/commercial building that will provide retail space and for sale condos in the area of West St. Paul, Minnesota. The project's beneficial impacts include bringing affordable retail and living space within modern facilities to the City of Saint Paul. No adverse impacts are identified with respect to the implementation for the project. There are no unresolved conflicts concerning the implementation of the project. No properties within the vicinity of the project area will be impacted by the project. The project will assist in the revitalization of the City of Saint Paul.

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

Alternatives include choosing another site for this project or do nothing and let the site remain as is. Challenges associated with choosing another site include the availability of viable land for redevelopment. The site remaining vacant would result in underutilized land and the contamination cleanup associated with the proposed project would not occur.

**No Action Alternative [24 CFR 58.40(e)]**

The no action alternative is one that would lend the property to remaining as is which could have a negative impact to the redevelopment in the area. The project not being constructed would impact the potential brownfield reclamation project cleanup and fail to utilize the land for potential increase job opportunities (short-term associated with construction and long-term associated with commercial space), affordable housing, and business growth in the City of Saint Paul.

**Summary of Findings and Conclusions:**

This assessment identified Contamination and Toxic Substations to require mitigation and/or further investigation. A Response Action Plan and Construction Contingency Plan have been prepared for the project site and submitted to the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA). While a response from the MPCA is still pending, the project will comply with any approvals granted and address any comments or requests for additional information as needed.

**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.

<b>Law, Authority, or Factor</b>	<b>Mitigation Measure or Condition</b>	<b>Comments on Completed Measures</b>	<b>Mitigation Plan</b>	<b>Complete</b>
Contamination and Toxic Substances	In November/December of 2022 a Phase I ESA and Phase II ESA were concurrently completed for the project site. An additional Phase I ESA conducted in October 2024 confirmed the presence of RECs related to the on-site dry-cleaning operations. The site has been occupied by drycleaner operations from the 1950s to the present and features of a potential UST were identified during the site reconnaissance at the site. The Phase II ESA identified PCE in soil above its respective Soil Leaching Value (SLV) and in soil vapor above its thirty-three times (33x) Industrial Intrusion Screening Value (ISV). PCE was detected in groundwater below its respective drinking water	N/A	Site contamination has been evaluated through Phase I and Phase II ESAs completed for the project site by Stantec in November/December of 2022 and October 2024. In August of 2024 Stantec completed a Response Action Plan and Construction Contingency Plan (RAP/CCP) for the project site and submitted it to the MPCA August 30, 2024. While a response from the MPCA is still pending, the project will comply with any approvals granted and address any comments or requests for additional information as needed.	

	<p>standards. DRO was not detected above laboratory reporting limits in the soil sample collected near the potential UST. The project site was enrolled into the Voluntary Investigation and Cleanup (VIC) Program under BF0002427 and later referred to the Site Assessment (SA) Program under SA0010031. Based on the Phase II ESA analytical results, additional sampling and delineation of the PCE impacts to soil vapor and groundwater will be required by the MPCA. Soil remediation and soil vapor mitigation (installation of a vapor mitigation system paired with post construction verification testing) will be undertaken at the project site. Additionally, if confirmed during excavation activities and no longer in use, the UST will be removed from the site.</p>			
--	--	--	--	--

### **Project Mitigation Plan**

The project site was enrolled into the Voluntary Investigation and Cleanup (VIC) Program under BF0002427 and later referred to the Site Assessment (SA) Program under SA0010031. Based on the Phase II ESA analytical results, additional sampling and delineation of the PCE impacts to soil vapor and groundwater will be required by the MPCA. Soil remediation and soil vapor mitigation (installation of a vapor mitigation system paired with post construction verification testing) will be undertaken at the project site. Additionally, if confirmed during excavation activities and no longer in use, the UST will be removed from the site. Project managers from the City of Saint Paul will follow up with the project team as they reach construction milestones.

### **Supporting documentation on completed measures**

DRAFT

**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 is not located within 2,500 feet of a civilian airport or 15,000 feet of a military airport. The project is in compliance with Airport Hazards requirements. For supporting documentation see attached Airport Hazards Map.

**Supporting documentation**

[1\\_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)	

### 1. Is the project located in a CBRS Unit?

☒ No

Document and upload map and documentation below.

Yes

### Compliance Determination

The project is not located in a CRBS Unit. Therefore, this project has no potential to impact a CBRS Units and is in compliance with the Coastal Barrier Resources Act. For supporting documentation see the attached Coastal Boundary Map.

### Supporting documentation

[2\\_CBRS Units Map.pdf](#)

### Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

Yes

☒ No

## Flood Insurance

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

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

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

✓ Yes

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

[3\\_10\\_FEMA 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 FEMA Flood Insurance Map Number 27123C0085G dated July 31, 2024, indicated that the project site is mapped in Zone X, an area of minimal flood hazard. The project site is not mapped 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 site is in compliance with the flood insurance requirements. For supporting documentation see attached FEMA Flood Map.

**Supporting documentation**

[3\\_10\\_FEMA\\_Flood\\_Map\(1\).pdf](#)

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

Yes

✓ No



**Air Quality**

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

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

☒ Yes

☐ No

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

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

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

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

☐ Carbon Monoxide

☐ Lead

☐ Nitrogen dioxide

☒ Sulfur dioxide

Ozone

Particulate Matter, &lt;2.5 microns

✓ Particulate Matter, &lt;10 microns

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

Sulfur dioxide	0.04	ppb (parts per billion)
Particulate Matter, <10 microns	50.76	µg/m <sup>3</sup> (micrograms per cubic meter of air)

**Provide your source used to determine levels here:**

Historical analysis of the Village of Calabasas project in Calabasas, California.

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

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

**Enter the estimate emission levels:**

Sulfur dioxide	ppb (parts per billion)
Particulate Matter, <10 microns	µg/m <sup>3</sup> (micrograms per cubic meter of air)

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

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

**Screen Summary**

**Compliance Determination**

The Selby Avenue project is located in Ramsey County, which is currently in maintenance for the following: Sulfur Dioxide (1971) and Particulate Matter-10 (1987). The proposed project will include the new construction of a 5-story apartment complex with 4 levels of residential units and 1 level of retail space. It will include 20 residential units and approximately 20 covered parking spaces. In the EPA's General Conformity Guidance: Questions and Answers;

July 13, 1994, EPA states that "Historical analysis of similar actions could be used in cases where the proposed projects are similar in size and scope to previous projects." The EPA de minimis threshold for maintenance areas is 100 tons per year for both Sulfur Dioxide (SO<sub>2</sub>) and Particulate Matter-10 (PM<sub>10</sub>). To determine the estimated increases in demolition and construction emissions for the project, Stantec used a historical analysis of the Village at Calabasas project in Calabasas, California as a comparison project. The total project emissions from both construction and demolition for the Villages at Calabasas project for SO<sub>2</sub> and PM<sub>10</sub> emissions are 0.0367 tons/year and 50.76 tons/year respectively. Therefore, the annual emissions generated from the proposed demolition and new construction at 642 Selby Avenue are not estimated to exceed the de minimis thresholds established in EPA's General Conformity regulations. Therefore, detailed analysis is not required for this project. For supporting documentation see attached Air Quality Memo, Calculated Emission tables, and EPA De Minimis Table.

**Supporting documentation**

[Selby Avenue Air Quality Memo.docx](#)  
[De Minimis Table.pdf](#)

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

Yes

✓ No

## Coastal Zone Management Act

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

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

Yes

✓ No

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

### Screen Summary

#### **Compliance Determination**

The project is not located in a Coastal Zone. Minnesota's Coastal Zone includes four counties, Cook County, Lake County, Saint Louis County, and Carlton County. The project site is located in Ramsey County; therefore, this project has no potential to impact a Coastal Zone. This project is in compliance with the Coastal Zone Management Act. For supporting Documentation see attached State Coastal Zone Boundaries list and Coastal Boundary Map.

#### **Supporting documentation**

[5\\_State Coastal Zone Boundaries List.pdf](#)

### **Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?**

Yes

✓ No

## Contamination and Toxic Substances

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

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

- ☒ ASTM Phase I ESA
- ☒ ASTM Phase II ESA
- ☒ Remediation or clean-up plan

ASTM Vapor Encroachment Screening.

None of the above

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

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

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

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

No

Explain:

✓ Yes

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

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

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

Yes

Explain:

✓ No

\* Notes:

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

**4. Is the proposed project new construction or substantial rehabilitation where**

**testing will be conducted but cannot yet occur because building construction has not been completed?**

✓ Yes

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

No

## 8. Mitigation

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

For instances where radon mitigation is required (i.e. where test results demonstrated radon levels at 4.0 pCi/L and above), then you must include a radon mitigation plan\*.

### Can all adverse environmental impacts be mitigated?

No, all adverse environmental impacts cannot feasibly be mitigated. Project cannot proceed at this location.

✓ Yes, all adverse environmental impacts can be eliminated through mitigation, and/or consideration of radon and radon mitigation, if needed, will occur following construction.

Provide all mitigation requirements\*\* and documents in the Screen Summary at the bottom of this screen.

\* Refer to CPD Notice [CPD-23-103](#) for additional information on radon mitigation plans.

\*\* Mitigation requirements include all clean-up requirements required by applicable federal, state, tribal, or local law. Additionally, please upload, as applicable, the long-term operations and maintenance plan, Remedial Action Work Plan, and other equivalent documents.

**9. Describe how compliance was achieved. 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\*\*.**

In November/December of 2022 a Phase I ESA and Phase II ESA were concurrently completed for the project site. An additional Phase I ESA conducted in October 2024 confirmed the presence of RECs related to the on-site dry-cleaning operations. The site has been occupied by drycleaner operations from the 1950s to the present and features of a potential UST were identified during the site reconnaissance at the site. The Phase II ESA identified PCE in soil above its respective Soil Leaching Value (SLV) and in soil vapor above its thirty-three times (33x) Industrial Intrusion Screening Value (ISV). PCE was detected in groundwater below its respective drinking water standards. DRO was not detected above laboratory reporting limits in the soil sample collected near the potential UST. The project site was enrolled into the Voluntary Investigation and Cleanup (VIC) Program under BF0002427 and later referred to the Site Assessment (SA) Program under SA0010031. Based on the Phase II ESA analytical results, additional sampling and delineation of the PCE impacts to soil vapor and groundwater will be required by the MPCA. Soil remediation and soil vapor mitigation (installation of a vapor mitigation system paired with post construction verification testing) will be undertaken at the project site. Additionally, if confirmed during excavation activities and no longer in use, the UST will be removed from the site.

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

Complete removal

✓ Risk-based corrective action (RBCA)

Other

\* Engineering controls are any physical mechanism used to contain or stabilize contamination or ensure the effectiveness of a remedial action. Engineering controls may include, caps, covers, dikes, trenches, leachate collection systems, radon mitigation systems, signs, fences, physical access controls, ground water monitoring systems and ground water containment systems including, slurry walls and ground water pumping systems.

\*\* Institutional controls are mechanisms used to limit human activities at or near a contaminated site, or to ensure the effectiveness of the remedial action over time, when contaminants remain at a site at levels above the applicable remediation standard which would allow for unrestricted use of the property. Institutional controls may include structure, land, and natural resource use restrictions, well restriction areas, classification exception areas, deed notices, and declarations of environmental restrictions.



## **Screen Summary**

### **Compliance Determination**

In November/December 2022, Stantec conducted concurrent Phase I and Phase II ESAs on the project site. The Phase I ESA revealed RECs associated with the dry-cleaning operations that have been present on the site since the 1950s. An additional Phase I ESA conducted in October 2024 confirmed the presence of RECs related to the on-site dry-cleaning operations. The Phase II ESA consisted of two soil/groundwater borings, two exterior vapor probes, and four sub-slab soil vapor samples. Soil, groundwater, and soil vapor samples were analyzed for volatile organic compounds (VOCs). Additionally, the soil sample collected from the boring completed on the east side of the site building, near the presumed UST, was also analyzed for diesel range organics (DRO). In soil, PCE was detected at a concentration of 0.1 milligrams per kilogram (mg/kg) exceeding its respective soil leaching value (SLV) of 0.042 mg/kg in the soil sample collected from B-2. DRO was not detected above laboratory reporting limits in the soil sample collected from B-1, near the potential UST. In groundwater, PCE was detected at a concentration of 1.1 micrograms per liter (µg/L) and 1.4 µg/L, below the respective drinking water standards for a PCE. In soil vapor, PCE was detected above laboratory reporting limits in all six soil vapor samples. PCE was reported above thirty-three times (33x) the Industrial Intrusion Screening Value (ISV) of 1,100 micrograms per cubic meter (µg/m³) in SS-2 at 2,960 µg/m³, in SS-3 at 1,340 µg/m³, in SS-4 at 2,580 µg/m³ and in VP-2 at 2,410 µg/m³. The project site was enrolled into the Voluntary Investigation and Cleanup (VIC) Program under BF0002427 and later referred to the Site Assessment (SA) Program under SA0010031. As a result, additional sampling and delineation of the PCE impacts to soil vapor and groundwater will be required by the MPCA. Soil remediation and soil vapor mitigation (installation of a vapor mitigation system paired with post construction verification testing) will be undertaken at the project site. Additionally, if confirmed during excavation activities and no longer in use the UST will be removed from the site. With mitigation the project will be in compliance with Contamination and Toxic Substances. For supporting documentation see attached MPCA No Association Determination Letter, Phase I ESAs, and Phase II ESA.

### **Supporting documentation**

[Phase II November 2022.pdf](#)

[Phase I October 2024.pdf](#)

[Phase I December 2022.pdf](#)

[MPCA NAD letter.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.

Document and upload all documents used to make your determination below.

Documentation should include a species list and explanation of your conclusion, and may require maps, photographs, and surveys as appropriate

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.

**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:

A no effect determination was made based on a letter from the US Fish and Wildlife Services.

### **Screen Summary**

### **Compliance Determination**

Stantec conducted a project review through the US Fish and Wildlife Services (USFWS) iPAC tool. According to the project review, the Northern Long-eared bat, Higgens Eye, and Rusty Patched Bumble Bee are listed as endangered species; the Tricolored Bat and Salamander Mussel are listed as a proposed endangered species; the Whooping Crane is listed as experimental population, non-essential species; and the Monarch Butterfly is listed as a candidate species located in the vicinity of the project area. A consistency letter was provided by the USFWS on December 27, 2024 that stated the proposed project will have no effect on the Higgens Eye, Monarch Butterfly, Rusty Patched Bumble Bee, Salamander Mussel, Tricolored Bat or Whooping Crane. Based on the "no effect" determination the project has met consultation requirements and no further consultation is required for the species. An additional consistency letter was provided by the USFWS on December 27, 2024 that stated the proposed project has reached the determination of "no effect" on the northern long-eared bat. The proposed project will have "no effect" on any endangered or threatened species. The project is in compliance with the Endangered Species Act. For supporting documentation see attached USFWS iPAC list and consistency letters.

### **Supporting documentation**

[7 Consistency Letter for Northern Long-Eared Bat.pdf](#)

[7 Consistency Letter for Multiple Species.pdf](#)

[7 USFWS Species List.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

☒ Yes

**4. Based on the analysis, is the proposed HUD-assisted project located at or beyond the required separation distance from all covered tanks?**

✓ Yes

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

No

**Screen Summary**

**Compliance Determination**

Stantec used the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency's (MPCA) What's In My Neighborhood (WIMN) website to ascertain whether any locations within a 1-mile radius of the project site housed above ground storage tanks (ASTs). Subsequently, Stantec identified the existence of two locations within the specified radius that indeed have ASTs. Among the two locations, one site features two tanks with 250 and 500-gallon capacities on-site. To determine which tanks, require evaluation for acceptable separation distance, we followed HUD's guidance. This involves assessing the largest tank capacity, the tank closest to the project site, dike structures around the tanks, and any pressurized tanks within a 1-mile radius of the project site. Additionally, we utilize the HUD Acceptable Separation Distance Assessment Tool. The following addresses have confirmed Aboveground Storage Tanks (ASTs): 619 St. Anthony Street and 520 University Avenue. For each location, we consider the largest tank capacity in our calculations:

- 1. 619 St. Anthony Street:
  - o Largest tank capacity: 500 gallons
  - o Acceptable distance for this tank capacity: 208 feet
  - o Address location relative to the project site: Approximately 2,156 feet away
- 2. 520 University Avenue:
  - o Largest tank capacity: 280 gallons
  - o Acceptable distance for this tank capacity: 163 feet
  - o Address location relative to the project site: Approximately 3,444 feet away

Given that the tank locations are significantly farther from the acceptable distances, we did not examine the closest tanks from these locations. We can reasonably assume that the given distances meet the acceptable criteria. The project is in compliance with Explosive and Flammable Hazards requirements. For supporting documentation, see attached Explosive and Flammable Hazards Map with Acceptable Separation Distances and Acceptable Distance Calculation.

**Supporting documentation**

[8 2\\_Acceptable Separation Distance \(ASD\) Electronic Assessment Tool - HUD Exchange.pdf](#)

[8 1\\_Acceptable Separation Distance \(ASD\) Electronic Assessment Tool - HUD Exchange.pdf](#)

[Explosive and Flammable Hazards Map.pdf](#)

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

Yes

✓ No

DRAFT

## 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.)	<a href="#">7 CFR Part 658</a>

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

Yes

✓ No

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

The proposed project is located in an urban area in the City of St. Paul, with no potential to convert agricultural land to non-agricultural use. Additionally, a Soil Map from the Natural Resources Conservation Services was reviewed, and it identified the project site as urban land and the Waukegan complex described to be comprised of silt loam and coarse sand.

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 is located in St. Paul, Ramsey County, Minnesota, which falls within an urbanized area as defined by the 2020 Census Urban Areas Wall Map. According to this map, the City of St. Paul and its surrounding regions have a population of 10,000 or more, qualifying them as Urban Areas. Additionally, a Soil Map from the Natural Resources Conservation Services identified the project site as urban land and the Waukegan complex. As the project site is on land already in, or committed to urban development, the project is in compliance with the Farmland Protection Policy Act. For supporting documentation see attached Soil Map and 2020 Census Urban Areas Wall Map.

#### Supporting documentation

[9\\_Farmlands\\_Soil Map.pdf](#)



[9 Farmlands\\_2020 Census Map.pdf](#)

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

Yes

✓ No

DRAFT

DRAFT

## Floodplain Management

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

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

Yes

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

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

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

- (1) The property is cleared of all existing buildings and walled structures; and
- (2) The property is cleared of related improvements except those which:
  - (i) Are directly related to flood control, wetland protection, open space, or park land (including playgrounds and recreation areas);
  - (ii) Do not modify existing wetland areas or involve fill, paving, or other ground disturbance beyond minimal trails or paths; and
  - (iii) Are designed to be compatible with the beneficial floodplain or wetland function of the property.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Describe:

☒ No

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

Yes

Describe:

☒ No

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

The extent of the FFRMS floodplain can be determined using a Climate Informed Science Approach (CISA), 0.2 percent flood approach (0.2 PFA), or freeboard value approach (FVA). For projects in areas without available CISA data or without FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRMs), Flood Insurance Studies (FISs) or Advisory Base Flood Elevations (ABFEs), use the best available information<sup>1</sup> to determine flood elevation. Include documentation and an explanation of why this is the best available information<sup>2</sup> for the site. Note that newly constructed and substantially improved<sup>3</sup> structures must be elevated to the FFRMS floodplain regardless of the approach chosen to determine the floodplain.

Select one of the following three options:

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

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

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

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

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

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

5. Does your project occur in the FFRMS floodplain?

Yes

✓ No

### **Screen Summary**

### **Compliance Determination**

Stantec utilized the Federal Flood Standard Support Tool Beta and the FEMA Flood Map Service Center to determine if the project site is located in floodplain. According to the FEMA Flood Map the project site is located in Zone X and is not located in a floodplain or Special Flood Hazard Area. Additionally, the Freeboard Value Approach Report determined the project site is not located in the FFRMS floodplain. For supporting documentation see the attached FEMA Flood Map and Freeboard Value Approach Report. The project is in compliance with Executive Orders 11988 and 13690.

**Supporting documentation**

[10 FFRMS-Freeboard-Value-Approach-Report.pdf](#)

[3\\_10\\_FEMA Flood Map\(2\).pdf](#)

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

Yes

✓ No

## Historic Preservation

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

### 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 Officer (SHPO) Completed

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

Other Consulting Parties

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

Staff went through the "When to consult with Tribes" checklist in Appendix A of CPD Notice 12-006, and none of the criteria for consultation was met.

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:

642 Selby Ave

**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
565 Selby Avenue W.	Listed	Yes	✓ Not Sensitive
569-571 Selby Avenue	Listed	Yes	✓ Not Sensitive
570 Selby Avenue W.	Eligible	Yes	✓ Not Sensitive
574 Selby Avenue W	Eligible	Yes	✓ Not Sensitive
579-581 Selby Avenue	Listed	Yes	✓ Not Sensitive
580 Selby Avenue W.	Eligible	Yes	✓ Not Sensitive
584 Selby Avenue W.	Eligible	Yes	✓ Not Sensitive
595 Selby Avenue W.	Not Eligible	Yes	✓ Not Sensitive
Marshall Ave	Eligible	Yes	✓ Not Sensitive
Marshall Ave	Listed	Yes	✓ Not Sensitive

**Additional Notes:**



See attached report for full list of surveyed resources.

**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:

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

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

**Document reason for finding:**

limited visibility to the new four-story mixed use (commercial/residential) building.

**Does the No Adverse Effect finding contain conditions?**

Yes (check all that apply)

✓ No

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

Adverse Effect

**Screen Summary**

**Compliance Determination**

Based on Section 106 consultation the project will have No Adverse Effect on historic properties. The project received a letter of concurrence from the SHPO on December 23, 2025. The letter states that "Based on the documentation provided and for the reasons noted below, we concur with the consultant's recommendations and the City of Saint Paul's presumed finding of No Adverse Effect to Historic Properties, made on behalf of the US Department of Housing and Urban Development." Conditions: None. Upon satisfactory implementation of the conditions, which should be monitored, the project is in compliance with Section 106.

**Supporting documentation**

[FINAL SelbyAvenue\\_ArchHist\\_Dec 2025.pdf](#)  
[2024-2213c\\_PerpetualAffordability-642Selby\\_20251223.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: 65

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: 65

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

**Screen Summary**

**Compliance Determination**

Noise generators were found to be within the threshold distances for the project site, therefore a Noise Assessment was completed for the project site. The noise assessment found that one major roadway (Dale Street) was located within 1,000 feet of the Subject Property site; and four airports (Saint Paul Downtown Airport, Minnesota St. Paul International Airport, Crystal Airport, and Lake Elmo Airport) are located within 15 miles of the project site. There were no railroads located within 3,000 feet of the project site. The noise assessment found that noise at the project site will not exceed 65 dB, therefore the project site is in compliance with Noise Abatement and Control requirements. For supporting documentation see attached Noise Assessment.

**Supporting documentation**

[12\\_Noise Assessment.pdf](#)

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

Yes

✓ No

DRAFT

## Sole Source Aquifers

General requirements	Legislation	Regulation
<b>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.</b>	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 located in Minnesota. There is one sole source aquifer located in Minnesota located over 79 miles from the project site. The project is not located on a sole source

aquifer. The project is in compliance with Sole Source Aquifer requirements. For supporting documentation see attached Sole Source Aquifer Map.

**Supporting documentation**

[Sole Source Aquifer Map.pdf](#)

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

Yes

✓ No

DRAFT

## 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 not located within wetlands identified in the National Wetlands Inventory (NWI) database. The project will not impact on-site or off-site wetlands. The project is in compliance with Executive Order 11990. For supporting documentation see attached Nearby Wetlands Map.

**Supporting documentation**

[14 Wetlands\\_Nearby Wetlands Map.pdf](#)

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

Yes

✓ No

DRAFT

## Wild and Scenic Rivers Act

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

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

✓ No

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

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

### Screen Summary

#### Compliance Determination

This project is located over 1.3 miles from the Mississippi River, a NRI river. The project is not within the proximity of a NWSR river, study river or Nationwide Rivers Inventory River. The project is in compliance with the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act. For supporting documentation see attached Nationwide Rivers Inventory Map, Study Rivers list, and Wild and Scenic Rivers list.

#### Supporting documentation

[15\\_Wild and Scenic Rivers Map.pdf](#)

[15\\_Study Rivers List.pdf](#)

[15\\_NRI Map.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:**

The project's total environmental review found Contamination and Toxic Substances to require mitigation. With mitigation, this portion of the project will be in compliance with the project's total environmental review. No other adverse environmental impacts were identified in the project's total environmental review. The project is in compliance with Executive Order 12898.

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

### Screen Summary

### Compliance Determination

The project's total environmental review found Contamination and Toxic Substances to require mitigation. With mitigation, this portion of the project will be in compliance with the project's total environmental review. No other adverse environmental impacts were identified in the project's total environmental review. The project is in compliance with Executive Order 12898.

**Supporting documentation**

[16\\_EJScreen.pdf](#)

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

Yes

✓ No

DRAFT