# NOTICE OF FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT AND INTENT TO REQUEST RELEASE OF FUNDS (FONSI and NOI/RROF) 

## March 29, 2022

Multnomah County
Community. Development Block Grant (CDBG) Program
These notices shall satisfy two separate but related procedural requirements for activities to be undertaken by Multnomah County.

## REQUEST FOR RELEASE OF FUNDS

On or about April 15, 2022 Multnomah County-will submit a request to the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) for the release of CDBG funds under Community Development Block Grant, Title 1 of the Housing and Community Development (CDBG) Act of 1974, Public Law 93-383, as amended, to undertake the following project:

## THE PROJECT

The City of Fairview proposes to do a sidewalk infill on the east side of NE 3rd Street from its intersection with NE Main Street down to NE Harrison Street. Project is estimated to begin July/August 2022 and completed by Fall 2022. CDBG award amount for construction is $\$ 80,000$. City of Fairview will pay $\$ 15,000$ of their own funds for professional and personnel costs.

## FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

Multnomah County has determined that these projects will have no significant impact on the human environment. Therefore, an Environmental Impact Statement under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) is not required. Additional project information is contained in the Environmental Review Records (ERRs) on file at

Multnomah County website: https://www.multco.us/cdbg. Copies may be examined by contacting fanny.rodriguez@multco.us.

## PUBLIC COMMENTS

Any individual, group, or agency disagreeing with this determination or wishing to comment on the projects may submit written comments to Fanny Adams, at fanny.rodriguez@multco.us or by calling (503) 988-7440. All comments received by April 14, 2022 will be considered by Multnomah County prior to authorizing submission of a request for release of funds. Commentors should specify which Notice they are addressing.

## ENVIRONMENTAL CERTIFICATION

Multnomah County certifies to HUD that Peggy Samolinski in her capacity as Director of the Youth and Family Services Division consents to accept the jurisdiction of the Federal Courts if an action is brought to enforce responsibilities in relation to the environmental review process and that these responsibilities have been satisfied. HUD's approval of the certification satisfies its responsibilities under NEPA and related laws and authorities and allows Multnomah County to use Program funds.

## OBJECTIONS TO RELEASE OF FUNDS

The U.S. Department of Housing \& Urban Development will consider objections to its release of funds and Multnomah County's certification for a period of fifteen days following the anticipated submission date or its actual receipt of the request (whichever is later) only if they are on one of the following bases: (a) the certification was not executed by the Certifying Officer of Multnomah County; (b) Multnomah County has omitted a step or failed to make a decision or finding required by HUD regulations at 24 CFR Part 58; (c) the grant recipient or other
participants in the development process have committed funds, incurred costs or undertaken activities not authorized by 24 CFR Part 58 before approval of a release of funds by HUD; or (d) another Federal agency acting pursuant to 40 CFR Part 1504 has submitted a written finding that the project is unsatisfactory from the standpoint of environmental quality.

Objections must be prepared and submitted in accordance with the required procedures ( 24 CFR Part 58, Sec. 58.76) and shall be addressed to HUD Portland Office of Community Planning and Development at CPD_COVID-19OEE-POR@hud.gov. Potential objectors should contact HUD via email to verify the actual last day of the objection period.

Peggy Samolinski, Director of the Youth and Family Services Division


# Environmental Assessment <br> Determinations and Compliance Findings for HUD-assisted Projects 

## 24 CFR Part 58

## Project Information

Project Name: NE-3rd-St-(Main-Harrison)-Sidewalk-Infill-(City-of-Fairview)
HEROS Number: 900000010240096

Responsible Entity (RE): MULTNOMAH COUNTY, COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT PORTLAND OR, 97204

RE Preparer: Fanny Adams
State / Local Identifier: CITY OF FAIRVIEW
Certifying Officer: Peggy Samolinski

Grant Recipient (if different than Responsible Ent
ity):
Point of Contact:

Consultant (if applicabl
e):

Point of Contact:
Project Location: , Fairview, OR 97024
Additional Location Information:
Intersection locations approximately Longitude: -122.444400 Latitude: 45.525500

## Direct Comments to:

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

Sidewalk infill will take place on the east side of NE 3rd Street from its intersection with NE Main Street down to NE Harrison Street. The 700 square feet of five foot wide concrete sidewalk with ADA ramps connecting and completing missing link of pedestrian walkway in a residential neighborhood on NE 3rd Street project is adjacent to Fairview Elementary School and Fairview Community Center, the sidewalks will include pedestrian crossing with four (4) ADA curb ramps along the east side of 3rd Street. This project will directly benefit 595 low and moderate income persons/households. City of Fairview is $63 \%$ LMI. The total population of City of Fairview is 10,424 people according to the 2020 Census. There are sidewalks already in place on the west side of the streets. Storm drainage improvements will be made along with the sidewalk installations, it is estimated that approximately 2 new catch basins will be installed and 1 existing catch basin will be adjusted to accommodate the finished street grade. All sidewalks and curbs, driveways and curb ramps will be constructed to meet the current City of Fairview Standard Specifications for Public Construction. City of Fairview ( 1300 NE Village St, Fairview OR 97024) will be overseeing the project. Project is estimated to begin July/August 2022 and completed by Fall 2022. CDBG award amount for construction is $\$ 80,000$. City of Fairview will pay $\$ 15,000$ of their own funds for professional and personnel costs.

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

The 700 sq feet project will include a pedestrian crossing with curb ramps down 3rd Street. The current infrastructure does not provide a safe route for pedestrians and those with disabilities. The completed project will provide a safer pedestrian movement between Fairview Elementary School and Fairview Community Center and the adjacent residential neighborhoods. Sidewalks are present on the west side of street, sidewalks infill will be installed on the eastside, currently no sidewalks.

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

Local residents and students who have been utilizing NE 3rd Street, between Main and Harrison have been limited to using only the west side of 3rd Street as there is non-existent pathway on the eastside. This has caused some adults walking their children to school having to cross 3rd street twice in order to travel north and south. Therefore, in the absence of a Community Development Block Grant fund there will be a shortage of necessary supplement to the local funds. The lack of adequate pedestrian facilities in this area will result in compromised safety and continuation of inconvenience to the seniors, disabled citizens and children.
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Maps, photographs, and other documentation of project location and description:
Census Data Track for NE 3rd St (Main-Harrison).pdf
2020 Census Address Count Listing Files Viewer.pdf
NE 3rd St (Main-Harrison).pdf
City of Fairview Communication_Sidewalk Percentage.pdf
Signage.jpg
Adjacent to Fairview Elementary School.jpg
Relocating Drain to Street.jpg
Non Native Daisy Present.jpg
3rd St and Cedar St.jpg
3rd St and Main St.jpg
Harrison to Main.jpeg
Install Sidewalks and Ramps.jpeg
Sidewalk Infill 3rd Street Cedar.jpeg
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 |

## Approval Documents:

### 7015.15 certified by Certifying Officer

on:
7015.16 certified by Authorizing Officer
on:

## Funding Information

| Grant / Project <br> Identification <br> Number | HUD Program | Program Name |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| B-20-UC-41-0003 | Community Planning and <br> Development (CPD) | Community Development Block Grants <br> (CDBG) (Entitlement) |

Estimated Total HUD Funded,
Assisted or Insured Amount:
$\$ 80,000.00$

City of Fairview A Community of History and

# "Exhibit A" <br> NE 3rd (MAIN-HARRISON) STREET IMPROVEMENT PROJECT 

## NE 3rd (Main-Harrison) St. Project Site




## ＂Exhibit F＂ HUD Fairview Census Tract Data

葛
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## RE: <External Message> Multnomah County -ER Questions

Miguel Sanchez [sanchezm@ci.fairview.or.us](mailto:sanchezm@ci.fairview.or.us)
Wed, Dec 1, 2021 at 8:35 AM
To: Fanny Adams [fanny.rodriguez@multco.us](mailto:fanny.rodriguez@multco.us) Cc: Allan Berry [berrya@ci.fairview.or.us](mailto:berrya@ci.fairview.or.us)

External Sender - Be Suspicious of Attachments, Links, and Requests for Payment or Login Information.

Hi Fanny,

This email is in regards to the NE $3^{\text {rd }}$ Street between Main and Harrison.
Attached is an excel document to officially show how the project's proposed sidewalk area is below the $20 \%$ threshold of the City's total sidewalk area.

It also shows how it compares to the existing sidewalk length in the project's area.
Below is the link to photos taken on the project's area.

Photo Link: https://www.dropbox.com/sh/tzhd9ngck3fxbf1/AADDfjjPI3GFiUTqc1aieUaca?dl=0

Please let me know if there is any other information you need.

Sincerely,

## Miguel Sanchez, EI

Civil Engineering Technician

City of Fairview Public Works Department
1300 NE Village St.
Fairview, OR 97024
C. (971) $347-7067$
D. (503) 674-6234 | sanchezm@ci.fairview.or.us

## Estimated Total Project Cost [24 CFR 58.2 (a) $\$ 95,000.00$ <br> (5)]:

## Compliance with 24 CFR $\S 50.4, \S 58.5$ and $\S 58.6$ Laws and Authorities

| Compliance Factors: | Are formal <br> Statutes, Executive Orders, and <br> Regulations listed at 24 CFR $\S 50.4, ~$ <br> $\S 58.5$, and $\S 58.6$ | Compliance determination <br> compliance steps <br> or mitigation <br> required? |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |

STATUTES, EXECUTIVE ORDERS, AND REGULATIONS LISTED AT 24 CFR §50.4 \& § 58.6

| Airport Hazards <br> Clear Zones and Accident Potential <br> Zones; 24 CFR Part 51 Subpart D | $\square$ Yes $\square$ No | The project site is not within 15,000 feet of a military airport or 2,500 feet of a civilian airport. The project is in compliance with Airport Hazards requirements. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Coastal Barrier Resources Act Coastal Barrier Resources Act, as amended by the Coastal Barrier Improvement Act of 1990 [16 USC 3501] | $\square$ Yes $\square$ No | This project is located in a state that does not contain CBRS units. Therefore, this project is in compliance with the Coastal Barrier Resources Act. |
| Flood Insurance <br> Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 and National Flood Insurance Reform Act of 1994 [42 USC 40014128 and 42 USC 5154a] | $\square$ Yes $\square$ No | Based on the project description the project includes no activities that would require further evaluation under this section. The project does not require flood insurance or is excepted from flood insurance. While flood insurance may not be mandatory in this instance, HUD recommends that all insurable structures maintain flood insurance under the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP). The project is in compliance with Flood Insurance requirements. |
| STATUTES, EXECUTIVE ORDERS, AND REGULATIONS LISTED AT 24 CFR §50.4 \& § 58.5 |  |  |
| Air Quality <br> Clean Air Act, as amended, particularly section 176(c) \& (d); 40 CFR Parts 6, 51, 93 | $\square$ Yes $\square$ No | Based on the project description, this project includes no activities that would require further evaluation under the Clean Air Act. The project is in compliance with the Clean Air Act. |
| Coastal Zone Management Act Coastal Zone Management Act, sections 307 (c) \& (d) | $\square$ Yes $\square$ No | This project is not located in or does not affect a Coastal Zone as defined in the state Coastal Management Plan. The |


|  |  | project is in compliance with the Coastal Zone Management Act. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Contamination and Toxic Substances <br> 24 CFR $50.3(\mathrm{i}) \& 58.5(\mathrm{i})(2)]$ | $\square$ Yes $\square$ No | Site contamination was evaluated as follows: None in close prosimity of project location. On-site or nearby toxic, hazardous, or radioactive substances that could affect the health and safety of project occupants or conflict with the intended use of the property were not found. The project is in compliance with contamination and toxic substances requirements. |
| Endangered Species Act Endangered Species Act of 1973, particularly section 7; 50 CFR Part 402 | $\square$ Yes $\square$ No | This project will have No Effect on listed species due to the nature of the activities involved in the project. This project is in compliance with the Endangered Species Act. . A critical species list was obtained from IPAC indicating that the Willamette Daisy is an endangered species of that area, site visits were conducted during spring and summer and the willamette daisy was not present in project area. It is not likely that the project site, will affect any FWS species encountered in Multnomah County. The water runoff will be protected by inlet protection (sediment bags) that will be installed by City of Fairview through the length of the project. City of Fairview did not take any permits for this project as it was on City of Fairview owned road. |
| Explosive and Flammable Hazards Above-Ground Tanks)[24 CFR Part 51 Subpart C | $\square$ Yes $\square$ No | Based on the project description the project includes no activities that would require further evaluation under this section. The project is in compliance with explosive and flammable hazard requirements. |
| Farmlands Protection Farmland Protection Policy Act of 1981, particularly sections 1504(b) and 1541; 7 CFR Part 658 | $\square$ Yes $\nabla$ No | This project does not include any activities that could potentially convert agricultural land to a non-agricultural use. The project is in compliance with the Farmland Protection Policy Act. |


| Floodplain Management Executive Order 11988, particularly section 2(a); 24 CFR Part 55 | $\square$ Yes $\square$ No | This project does not occur in a floodplain. The project is in compliance with Executive Order 11988. See FEMA map. Based on the project description and the maps provided in previous sections, the project includes no activities that would require further evaluation under this section. The project does not require flood insurance or is excepted from flood insurance. While flood insurance may not be mandatory in this instance, HUD recommends that all insurable structures maintain flood insurance under the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP). The project is in compliance with Flood Insurance requirements. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Historic Preservation <br> National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, particularly sections 106 and 110; 36 CFR Part 800 | $\square$ Yes $\square^{\text {No }}$ | Based on Section 106 consultation there are No Historic Properties Affected because there are no historic properties present. The project is in compliance with Section 106. |
| Noise Abatement and Control Noise Control Act of 1972, as amended by the Quiet Communities Act of 1978; 24 CFR Part 51 Subpart B | $\square$ Yes $\square$ No | Based on the project description, this project includes no activities that would require further evaluation under HUD's noise regulation. The project is in compliance with HUD's Noise regulation. No new noise sensitive use. Continuation of previous sidewalk improvement projects along this neighborhood area with CDBG funds. |
| Sole Source Aquifers <br> Safe Drinking Water Act of 1974, as amended, particularly section 1424(e); 40 CFR Part 149 | $\square$ Yes $\square$ No | The project is not located on a sole source aquifer area. The project is in compliance with Sole Source Aquifer requirements. |
| Wetlands Protection Executive Order 11990, particularly sections 2 and 5 | $\square$ Yes $\square$ No | The project will not impact on- or offsite wetlands. Nearby wetlands are over $1 / 2$ mile away. The project is in compliance with Executive Order 11990. |
| Wild and Scenic Rivers Act Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 1968, particularly section 7(b) and (c) | $\square$ Yes $\square$ No | This project is not within proximity of a NWSRS river. The project is in compliance with the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act. |


| HUD HOUSING ENVIRONMENTAL STANDARDS |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE |  |  |
| Environmental Justice <br> Executive Order 12898 | $\square$ Yes $\boxtimes$ No | No adverse environmental impacts were <br> identified in the project's total <br> environmental review. The project is in <br> 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.

| Environmental Assessment Factor | Impact Code | Impact Evaluation | Mitigation |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LAND DEVELOPMENT |  |  |  |
| Conformance with Plans / Compatible Land Use and Zoning / Scale and Urban Design | 2 | The project is in existing neighborhood with sidewalks already in place. The project aligns with the City of Fairview's plan to continue to build sidewalks for neighborhood access and safety. |  |
| Soil Suitability / Slope/ Erosion / Drainage and Storm Water Runoff | 1 | Water runoff is infiltrated on site. Possible erosion and sediment control measures are addressed by sub recipient City of Fairview for the project site. There are no issues with waste/sanitary sewer capacity with the project. |  |
| Hazards and Nuisances including Site Safety and Site-Generated Noise | 2 | There are no known hazards or site nuisances present in the project area. |  |
| Energy Consumption/Energy Efficiency | 2 | The improvements will not impact energy consumption. |  |
| SOCIOECONOMIC |  |  |  |
| Employment and Income Patterns | 2 | Project by nature does not affect employment or income. |  |

Harrison)-Sidewalk-Infill-
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| Environmental Assessment Factor | Impact Code | Impact Evaluation | Mitigation |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LAND DEVELOPMENT |  |  |  |
| Demographic Character Changes / Displacement | 2 | Project by nature will not lead to demographic character changes or displacement |  |
| COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND SERVICES |  |  |  |
| Educational and Cultural Facilities (Access and Capacity) | 1 | Access and safety to elementary school and community center on this project site will increase after completion. |  |
| Commercial Facilities (Access and Proximity) | 2 | Does not apply to this project |  |
| Health Care / Social Services (Access and Capacity) | 2 | Does not apply to this project |  |
| Solid Waste Disposal and Recycling (Feasibility and Capacity) | 2 | Does not apply to this project |  |
| Waste Water and Sanitary Sewers (Feasibility and Capacity) | 2 | Does not apply to this project |  |
| Water Supply (Feasibility and Capacity) | 2 | Does not apply to this project |  |
| Public Safety - Police, Fire and Emergency Medical | 2 | Does not apply to this project |  |
| Parks, Open Space and Recreation (Access and Capacity) | 1 | Access by foot will be increased in this neighborhood by adding sidewalk adjacet to elementary school with public access to a park on weekends and access to community center adjacent to project site. |  |
| Transportation and Accessibility (Access and Capacity) | 1 | The project will improve the accessibility and pedestrian traffic to elementary school, community center and residential properties by adding a sidewalk and removing the need to walk in the street way. |  |
| NATURAL FEATURES |  |  |  |
| Unique Natural Features /Water Resources | 2 | This project is not expected to impact water resources or unique natural features. |  |


| Environmental <br> Assessment Factor | Impact <br> Code | Impact Evaluation | Mitigation |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| LAND DEVELOPMENT |  |  |  |
| Vegetation / Wildlife <br> (Introduction, Modification, <br> Removal, Disruption, etc.) | 3 | Another field inspection will be <br> completed in the month the project <br> begins to look for endengared <br> willamette daisy flower. |  |
| Other Factors | 2 | N/A |  |

## Supporting documentation

## Additional Studies Performed:

No additional studies performed.

Field Inspection [Optional]: Date and completed
by:
Fanny Rodriguez-Adams 11/23/2021 12:00:00 AM

## Signage.jpg

Adjacent to Fairview Elementary School.jpg
Relocating Drain to Street.jpg
Non Native Daisy Present.jpg
3rd St and Cedar St.jpg
3rd St and Main St.jpg
Harrison to Main.jpeg
Install Sidewalks and Ramps.jpeg
Sidewalk Infill 3rd Street Cedar.jpeg
List of Sources, Agencies and Persons Consulted [40 CFR 1508.9(b)]:
EPA ECHO Facility Report U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service with IPaC Report State
Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) THPO using TDAT report Technical Assistance,
Brian Sturdivant, Director Office of Community Planning and Development

## TDAT Contact Info.pdf <br> Tribal communication tracking sheet 21-22.docx

## List of Permits Obtained:

City of Fairview did not take any permits for this sidewalk installation project as it was on City-owned road. Please see attachment for City of Fairview Liability and Coverage Declarations.










## Tribal Directory Assessment Information



## Contact Information for Tribes with Interests in Multnomah County, Oregon



| Contact Name Title | Mailing Address | Work Phone Fax Number C | Cell Phone Email Address | URL |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| William lyall | Tribal Chairman | PO Box 2547 Longview, WA 98632 | (360) 577-8140 | (360) 577-7432 |
| Seth Russell | THPO | P.O. Box 2547 Longview, WA 98632.0 | (360) 353-9924 | (360) 577-7432 |
| 4 |  |  |  | - |
| - Nez Perce Tribe | Multnomah |  |  |  |
| Contact Name Title | Mailing Address | Work Phone Fax Number C | Cell Phone Emall Address | URL |
| Shannon Wheeler | Chairman | PO Box 305 Lapwai, ID 83540-0305 | (208) 843-2253 | (208) 843-7354 |
| Keith Baird | THPO | PO Box 365 Lapwai, ID 83540-0365 | (208) 621-3851 | (208) 843-7419 |
| 4 |  | *. ${ }^{\text {. }}$. |  | - |
| 1-6 of 6 results |  |  | 《 | 1 >> 10 V |

Contact Information for Tribes with Interests in Multnomah County, Oregon
Tibal Directory Assessment T00l (TDAT) 2021-2022

| Tribe | Contact Name | Title | Initial Email | Response | Desire to Consult Further? ( $\mathrm{Y} / \mathrm{N}$ ) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Confederated <br> Tribes of <br> Siletz Indians | Delores Pigsley | Tribal Chairperson | dpigsley@msn.com | 30 days lapsed since consultation email on 12/22/2021, no response from Tribe. | N/A |
| Confederated <br> Tribes of Grand Ronde | Cheryle <br> Kennedy | Tribal Council Chairwoman | reyn.leno@grandronde.org info@grandronde.org | 30 days lapsed since consultation email on 12/22/2021, no response from Tribe. | N/A |
|  | David Harrelson | Program <br> Manager and THPO | david.harrelson@grandronde.org |  |  |
|  | Christopher Bailey | Cultural Protection Specialist | thpo@grandronde.org |  |  |
| Confederated <br> Tribes of the <br> Warm <br> Springs <br> Reservation <br> of Oregon | Raymond Tsumpti, Sr. | Tribal Chairman | info@warmsprings.com | 30 days lapsed since consultation email on 12/22/2021, no response from Tribe. | N/A |
|  | Robert <br> "Bobby" <br> Brunoe | Tribal Historic Preservation Officer, THPO | robert.brunoe@ctwsbnr.org |  |  |
| Confederated <br> Tribes of the <br> Umatilla <br> Indian <br> Reservation | M. Kathryn Brigham | Board of <br> Trustees Chair | bot@ctuir.org | 30 days lapsed since consultation email on 12/22/2021, no response from Tribe. | N/A |
|  | Carey Miller | THPO | careymiller@ctuir.org |  |  |
| Cowlitz Indian Tribe | William lyall | Tribal Chairman | wiyall@cowlitz.org | 30 days lapsed since consultation email on 12/22/2021, no response from Tribe. | N/A |
|  | Seth Russell | THPO | srussell@cowlitz.org |  |  |
| Nez Perce <br> Tribe | Shannon Wheeler | Tribal Executive Committee Chairman | nptec@nezperce.org | 30 days lapsed since consultation email on 12/22/2021, no response from Tribe. | N/A |

Contact Information for Tribes with Interests in Multnomah County, Oregon
Tribal Directory Assessment T00 (TDAT) 2021-2022

|  | Keith (Pat) <br> Baird | THPO | keithb@nezperce.org | 30 days <br> lapsed since <br> consultation <br> email on |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  |  | N/A <br> $12 / 22 / 2021$, |  |
| no response |  |  |  |  |  |
| from Tribe. |  |  |  |  |  |$\quad$|  |
| :--- |

Reference: https://egis.hud.gov/tdat/

## Public Outreach [24 CFR 58.43]:

This project and previous sidewalks installations with CDBG funds were mentioned at the CDBG community needs assessment in November 2021. Multnomah County, as responsible entity will publish the FONSI in the local newspaper that circulates in the general area; Gresham Outlook. In addition to FONSI will also be posted in the MultCo CDBG website and take comments for the required 15 days.

## NE 3rd St (Main-Harrison) Liability.pdf

## Cumulative Impact Analysis [24 CFR 58.32]:

While the project will entail dust, dirt and noise during project implementation, the activity will have no permanent or significant impact on the environment. The project will provide significant improvement to pedestrian traffic and pedestrian mobility and safety, thereby eliminating potential public safety hazards and protecting lives and property. Creating new sidewalks which connect to existing sidewalks does not cause any new adverse impacts. There are no other projects that are linked to this one creating a cumulative effect.

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

There are no other alternatives to the activity no other location would provide the needed sidewalk improvements in the project area in a less environmentally impactful way. The area around the elementary school is in crucial need for sidewalks and ADA ramps. There are no other funds available to pay for the improvements and the project deferment is not an option since this is a needed public service for the City of Fairview.

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

Local residents and students who have been utilizing NE 3rd Street, between Main and Harrison have been limited to using only the west side of NE 3rd Street as there is non-existent pathway on the eastside. This has caused some adults walking their children to school having to cross 3rd street twice in order to travel north and south. Therefore, in the absence of a Community Development Block Grant fund there will be a shortage of necessary supplement to the local funds. The lack of adequate pedestrian facilities in this area will result in compromised public safety and continuation of inconvenience to the seniors, disabled citizens and children traveling to school, community center and their residence.

## Summary of Findings and Conclusions:

The project for this environmental review is small compared to other projects, but after receiving technical assistance from Bryan Guiney, Director of Office of Community Planning and Development, serving Oregon and Idaho it was suggested this level of review would be best for the digging disturbance lenghth of this project.

## "Exhibit C" GENERAL LIABILITY COVERAGE DECLARATIONS



[^1]CANCELLATION: Should any of the coverage documents herein be cancelled before the expiration date thereof, CIS will provide 30 days written notice to the certificate holder named herein, but failure to mail such notice shall impose no obligation or liability of any kind upon CIS, its agents or representatives, or the issuer of this certificate.

By:
Date:

The project is essenittially infilling a sidewalk where there is none in a developed incorporated residential neighborhood. The area where the sidewalks are being proposed for installation is already used for street parking which creates muddy problems during winter/rainy months. After this environmental change, the safety would be increased for all residents and students.

## 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 nonconformance with the above-listed authorities and factors. These measures/conditions must be incorporated into project contracts, development agreements and other relevant documents. The staff responsible for implementing and monitoring mitigation measures should be clearly identified in the mitigation plan.

| Law, <br> Authority, <br> or Factor | Mitigation Measure or Condition | Comments <br> on <br> Completed <br> Measures | Mitigation <br> Plan | Complete |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |

## Project Mitigation Plan

## Supporting documentation on completed measures

## APPENDIX A: Related Federal Laws and Authorities

## Airport Hazards

| General policy | Legislation | Regulation |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| It is HUD's policy to apply standards to <br> prevent incompatible development <br> 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?

$$
\checkmark \text { No }
$$

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

Yes

## Screen Summary

## Compliance Determination

The project site is not within 15,000 feet of a military airport or 2,500 feet of a civilian airport. The project is in compliance with Airport Hazards requirements.

## Supporting documentation

Military Air National Guard Airport to 3rd and Main St Map.pdf
Airport Map Fairview to Portland.pdf
Airport Map Fairview to Troutdale.pdf

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?
Yes
$\checkmark$ No

Fairview Elementary School to Air National Guard 142 Drive 9.5 miles, 21 min Fighter


Imagery ©2021 TerraMetrics, Map data ©2021 Google
1 mi $\qquad$
E) via NE Airport Way

Best route now due to traffic conditions
E) via NE Marine Dr

21 min
9.5 miles

21 min
9.9 miles
(a) via Sandy Blvd

21 min
9.0 miles

## Explore Air National Guard 142 Fighter

Restaurants Hotels Gas stations Parking Lots More


ArcGIS $\sim$ My Map
Open in new Map Viewer


## Coastal Barrier Resources

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

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

## Compliance Determination

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

## Supporting documentation

## CBRS Mapper.pdf

Coastal Barrier Resources Map.pdf

## Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

Yes
$\checkmark$ No

CBRS Home
Legislation \& Testimony

Historical Changes
CBRA Prohibitions

Existing Units: CBRS Mapper


- Use this mapper to view the existing CBRS units.
- Use the "CBRS Validation Tool" in this mapper to produce documentation that indicates whether a location is within or outside of the CBRS.

Note: Data last modified March 13, 2019.

## CBRS Mappers

Open either Mapper by clicking on the map icons below (best viewed by maximizing your browser window)
Official Maps and Data +

Boundary Modifications
Mapping Projects +

CBRS Documentation
Project Consultations +

Frequently Asked Questions
Flood Insurance

Official Maps and Data +


Glossary


Documents Library


Contact Us

For CBRA news, sign up for our listserv electronic mailing list

Coastal Barrier Resources System


## Flood Insurance

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

1. Does this project involve financial assistance for construction, rehabilitation, or acquisition of a mobile home, building, or insurable personal property?
$\checkmark \quad$ No. This project does not require flood insurance or is excepted from flood insurance.

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

## Yes

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

|  | Yes |
| ---: | ---: |
| $\checkmark \quad$ No |  |

## Screen Summary

Compliance Determination
Based on the project description the project includes no activities that would require further evaluation under this section. The project does not require flood insurance or is excepted from flood insurance. While flood insurance may not be mandatory in this instance, HUD recommends that all insurable structures maintain flood insurance under the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP). The project is in compliance with Flood Insurance requirements.

## Supporting documentation

Flood Hazard EnviroMapper.pdf
Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

NE-3rd-St-(Main-
Harrison)-Sidewalk-Infill-
(City-of-Fairview)
Yes
$\checkmark$ No

## 



200 m

## Air Quality

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

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

$\checkmark$ No

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

## Screen Summary

## Compliance Determination

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

## Supporting documentation

Clear Air Act Map.pdf
Clean Air Ozone EnviroMapper.pdf

## Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

Yes
$\checkmark$ No

NEPAssist

## 3rd Street (Main to Harrison)

Map


## Geographic coordinates:

POINT (45.537607,-122.435977)
with buffer 0.5 miles

Note: The information in the following reports is based on publicly available databases and web services. The National Report uses nationally available datasets and the State Reports use datasets available through the EPA Regions. Click on the hyperlinked question to view the data source and associated metadata.

The underlying connection was closed: An unexpected error occurred on a receive.
Save to Excel Save as PDF

## 


0.3 km

## Coastal Zone Management Act

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

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

$$
\begin{array}{r}
\text { Yes } \\
\checkmark \quad \text { No }
\end{array}
$$

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

## Screen Summary

## Compliance Determination

This project is not located in or does not affect a Coastal Zone as defined in the state Coastal Management Plan. The project is in compliance with the Coastal Zone Management Act.

## Supporting documentation

## CoastalZoneManagement-OR.doc

Coastal Zone Locator.pdf
Coastal-Zone-Management-Worksheet.docx
Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?
Yes
$\checkmark$ No

## Coastal Zone Management--Oregon

Checklist for HUD or Responsible Entity

| General requirements | Legislation | Regulation |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Ensure that projects are consistent <br> with the Oregon Coastal Zone <br> Management Program | Coastal Zone Management Act 16 | 15 CFR Part 930 |

1. Is the project located in Oregon's Coastal Zone?

> To view a map of the Coastal Zone, https://www.oregon.gov/lcd/OCMP/Pages/CoastalZone.aspx

No: STOP here. The Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development has agreed with HUD that HUD projects outside of the coastal zone are not subject to federal consistency review as part of the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972.Record your determination on the EA, Statutory Worksheet or HUD Form 4128.
$\square$ Yes: PROCEED to \#2
2. Is your project within the Territorial Sea (3 nautical miles into the ocean from the coastline)?
$\square$ Yes. Any project in the Territorial Sea (3 nautical miles into the ocean from the coastline) will require an individual review-Do not initiate the Project until you have obtained a federal consistency decision from DLCD.
$\square$ No. PROCEED to \#3
3. Has the project or will the project obtain all necessary state permits and local authorizations?

To be consistent with the Oregon Coastal Management Program (OCMP), a proposed project must be consistent with: the statewide planning goals; the applicable acknowledged city or county comprehensive plans (those plans approved by the Land Conservation and Development Commission as being in compliance with the statewide planning goals); and selected state authorities (e.g., those governing removal-fill, water quality, and fish and wildlife protections). All local and state permits for a project help demonstrate consistency and must be obtained for a project to be consistent with the OCMP. A copy of the Certification statement must be maintained in the ERR.
$\square$ Yes: STOP here. Sign the certification statement and send to the State-Federal Relations Coordinator in Oregon; address below. Your project is consistent with the Coastal Zone Management Program. Record your determination on the EA, Statutory Worksheet or HEROS. You must have a mechanism in place (i.e. condition to the contract or FIRM Commitment) to assure the recipient has obtained all required permits.
$\square$ No: If the project will not comply with local or state water or land use requirements or does not obtain all necessary state and local authorizations, contact the Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development to resolve any issues. www.oregon.gov/LCD/OCMP/Pages/Federal Consistency Home.aspx

DISCLAIMER: This document is intended as a tool to help HUD Region X grantees and HUD staff complete environmental requirements. This document is subject to change. This is not a policy statement, and the Coastal Zone Management Legislation and Regulations take precedence over any information found in this document.


## Contamination and Toxic Substances

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

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

## American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) Phase I Environmental Site

 Assessment (ESA)ASTM Phase II ESA
Remediation or clean-up plan
ASTM Vapor Encroachment Screening
$\checkmark$ None of the Above
2. Were any on-site or nearby toxic, hazardous, or radioactive substances found that could affect the health and safety of project occupants or conflict with the intended use of the property? (Were any recognized environmental conditions or RECs identified in a Phase I ESA and confirmed in a Phase II ESA?)
$\checkmark$ No

## Explain:

None active found.

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

Yes

## Screen Summary

## Compliance Determination

Site contamination was evaluated as follows: None in close prosimity of project location. On-site or nearby toxic, hazardous, or radioactive substances that could affect

Harrison)-Sidewalk-Infill-
(City-of-Fairview)
the health and safety of project occupants or conflict with the intended use of the property were not found. The project is in compliance with contamination and toxic substances requirements.

## Supporting documentation

Underground Tank Fairview Facility List Page 2.pdf
Underground Tanks 1000 ft from project site Map.pdf
Underground Tank Fairview Facility List.pdf
Site Contamination Map.pdf
Site Contamination Facility Report.pdf
Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?
Yes
$\checkmark$ No
State of Oregon Department of Environmental Quality

| $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { Facility } \\ \text { ID } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | FACILITY NAME | ADDRESS | CITY | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{ZIP} \\ & \text { Code } \end{aligned}$ | PHONE | PERMITTEE | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { \# ALL } \\ \text { Tank } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c\|} \hline \text { \#ACTIVE } \\ \text { TANK } \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { \# DECOMMM } \\ \text { Tank } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { \# PERMIT } \\ \text { Tank } \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 6593 | VELTEX - NORM WILSON | 801 W 2ND ST | THE DALLES | 97058 | (208) 377-0024 | MARLA J. GARDNER, OPERATIONS MANAGER | 3 |  | 3 |  |
| 9860 | WASCO COUNTY COURTHOUSE | 5TH \& WASHINGTON ST | THE DALLES | 97058 | (503) 296-5454 | ARTHUR M. LABROUSSE, JR., SHERIFF | 1 |  | 1 |  |
| 5280 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { WASCO COUNTY ROAD } \\ & \text { DEPARTMENT } \end{aligned}$ | 1819 W 10TH | THE DALLES | 97058 | (503) 296-5491 | $\begin{aligned} & \text { GEORGE GEISER, SHOP } \\ & \text { FOREMAN } \end{aligned}$ | 8 |  | 8 |  |
| 9990 | WASCO COUNTY ROAD DEPT | 2705 E 2ND ST | THE DALLES | 97058 | (541) 506-2647 | Matt Morris | 5 | 2 | 3 | 2 |
| 3922 | WASCO COUNTY SCHOOL DIST \#9 (CHENOWITH) | 3632 W 10TH ST | THE DALLES | 97058 | (503) 296-4635 | BOB YOUNG, MAINTENANCE SUPERVISOR | 7 |  | 7 |  |
| 1497 | WEST 6TH STREET 76 | 3902 W 6TH | THE DALLES | 97058 | (541)296-3515 | ALEX HATTENHAUER | 8 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| 8414 | WEST SECOND STREET MARKET | 1433 W 2ND ST | THE DALLES | 97058 | (541) 296-3515 | Alex Hattenhauer | 8 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| 5658 | YOUR RENTAL CENTER | 285 WEBBER ST | THE DALLES | 97058 | (503)386-2062 | CHARLES H JOHNIECE, GENERAL MANAGER | 3 |  | 3 |  |
| 6147 | ANIMAL CONTROL | 24450 W COLUMBIA | TROUTDALE | 97060 | (503)248-5050 | TOM GUINEY, FLEET ADMINISTRATOR | 2 |  | 2 |  |
| 3980 | ARCO WOOD VILLAGE | 2550 NE 238TH DR | WOOD VILLAGE | 97060 | (503) 724-3618 | Yong Cho | 8 | 4 | 4 | 4 |
| 7130 | ARNDT, LES | 2176 NW MARINE DR | TROUTDALE | 97060 | (503)666-7803 | LES ARNDT, LANDOWNER | 2 |  | , |  |
| 6149 | BLUE LAKE PARK | 20500 NE MARINE DR | TROUTDALE | 97060 | (503)248-5050 | TOM GUINEY, FLEET ADMINISTRATOR | 1 |  | 1 |  |
| 803 | BP OIL SITE \#11031 | 2225 NE 238TH | WOOD VILLAGE | 97060 | (503)666-9020 | BARRY J DESBIENS, DEALER | 6 |  | 6 |  |
| 1903 | BRAMON, DEAN | 23505 NE HALSEY ST | WOOD VILLAGE | 97060 | (503)665-7616 | DEAN BRAMON, OWNER | 3 |  | 3 |  |
| 1743 | BURNS BROTHERS | 650 NW FRONTAGE RD | TROUTDALE | 97060 | (503) 850-1397 | BILL KIRKSEY, CAR TRUCKSTOP MANAGER | 10 |  | 10 |  |
| 5081 | BUS BARN | 20311 NE GLISAN | TROUTDALE | 97060 | $\begin{aligned} & (503) 492-4291 \\ & \times 3312 \end{aligned}$ | J.R. Rice - Head Mechanic | 6 | 2 | 4 | 2 |
| 790 | CHEVRON USA INC \#98295 | 2555 NE 238TH | TROUTDALE | 97060 | (503) 665-8404 | GERRY BRAWLEY | 10 |  | 10 |  |
| 12496 | CITY OF TROUTDALE UST | 123 SW 21ST ST | TROUTDALE | 97060 | (503) 674-7241 | AMY PEPPER | 1 |  | 1 |  |
| 1800 | DALE KRUEGER'S (KRUEGER'S TRUCK STOP) | 2600 NE 238TH DR | TROUTDALE | 97060 | (503) 667-7999 | CHRISTOPHER J. NELSON | 8 |  | 8 |  |
| 11 | EDWIN O EGE SANITARY SERVICE INC | 901 W COLUMBIA | TROUTDALE | 97060 | (503) 666-2896 | TERRY E EGE, PRESIDENT | 1 |  | 1 |  |
| 6780 | ENGINE 49 | 600 SW CHERRY PARK RD | TROUTDALE | 97060 | (503)666-1979 | STATION CAPTAIN | 2 |  | 2 |  |
| 10822 | FAIRVIEW FARMS (OLD SITE) | 242ND \& NE SANDY | WOOD VILLAGE | 97060 | (503)665-9171 | DON GAINES | 4 |  | 4 |  |
| 12362 | FEDEX GROUND | 2460 NW SUNDIAL RD | TROUTDALE | 97060 | (412) 262-7375 | GAYLYN FROSINI | 2 | 2 |  | 2 |
| 10392 | FIX AUTO BODY | 22024 NE SANDY BLVD | TROUTDALE | 97060 | (503)665-1079 | DAVID AQUINO, OWNER | 4 |  | 4 |  |
| 10033 | FRANK GALBERTH TRUCKING | 20231 NE GLISAN | FAIRVIEW | 97060 | (503)665-7749 | FRANK GALBERTH, OWNER |  |  |  |  |
| 12478 | FRED MEYER FUEL \#660 | 22855 NE PARK LANE | WOOD VILLAGE | 97060 | (503) 797-3512 | DANIEL HERMANN | 3 | 3 |  | 3 |
| 5609 | GRESHAM ROOFING COMPANY INC | 21414 NE SANDY BLVD | TROUTDALE | 97060 | (503) 666-1006 | LEE E TROUTNER, VP | 2 |  | 2 |  |
| 3913 | GSA - FEDERAL WAREHOUSE | ROUTE 2, BOX 13, GRAHM RD | TROUTDALE | 97060 | (503) 221-2107 | JACK B GIBSON, ASST FIELD OFFICE MANAGER | 1 |  | 1 |  |
| 2362 | HANDY BROTHERS SERVICE | 146 W COLUMBIA | TROUTDALE | 97060 | (503)665-4752 | OWNER | 6 |  | 6 |  |
| 1495 | HAWKINS, ROBERT G | 31620 SE VICTORY | TROUTDALE | 97060 | (503)663-5994 | ROBERT G HAWKINS | 1 |  | 1 |  |
| 404 | HILLSBORO AERO ACADEMY, LLC | 911 NW GRAHAM RD | TROUTDALE | 97060 | (503) 726-3000 | Jon Hay | 1 | 1 |  |  |
| 1328 | JACKSON FOOD STORES \#525 | 25737 SE STARK ST | TROUTDALE | 97060 | (208) 888-6061 | Richard Wright | 4 | 4 |  | 4 |
| 10668 | LOVE'S TRAVEL STOP \#449 | 400 NW FRONTAGE RD | TROUTDALE | 97060 | 406.687.1060 | Jessie Diaz | 6 | 6 |  | 6 |
| 6531 | LSP CONSTRUCTORS INC | 23012 NE SANDY BLVD. | FAIRVIEW | 97060 | (503)666-9330 | STEPHEN A SHAW, SECRETARY/TREASURER | 1 |  | 1 |  |
| 6926 | M \& D AUTOMOTIVE | 20102 NE SANDY BLVD | TROUTDALE | 97060 | (503)667-6465 |  | 5 |  | 5 |  |
| 10920 | MCCF | 1906 SW HALSEY ST | TROUTDALE | 97060 | (503) 223-0109 | Michael McMenamin | 2 |  | 2 |  |
| 5661 | MORROW'S FAIRVIEW SHELL | 22231 NE SANDY BLVD | TROUTDALE | 97060 | (503)666-2249 | MORROW'S FAIRVIEW SHELL | 5 |  | 5 |  |
| 3146 | MORSE BROS.. SUNDIAL | 5700 NE SUNDIAL RD | TROUTDALE | 97060 | (503) 666-5577 | JEFF STEYAERT |  |  | 3 |  |



State of Oregon Department of Environmental Quality
Sorted by Zip Code then by Facility Name as of October 1， 2021

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | $\bigcirc$ |  | $\ulcorner$ | m |  |  |  | － |  |  | $\sim$ |  | － | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ |  |  |  | N |  |  | $\cdots$ | $\sim$ |  | f | N |  |  | m |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $1$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  | $\infty$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\sim$ |  | ${ }^{10}$ | $\cdots$ | $\cdots$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | m | $\sim$ |  |  |  |  |  | m |
|  |  | Bn |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{r\|l}  \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 䢒 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { 씰 } \\ & \text { 몸 } \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  | an |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| $\frac{1}{2} 8$ |  | NoM |  | Sion | $\begin{array}{\|c} \text { N } \\ \underset{N}{0} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | N |  | 겅융 |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & \stackrel{y}{\circ} \\ & 0 \\ & \hline 0 \end{aligned}$ | 0 0 0 0 0 | $\begin{aligned} & 900 \\ & 000 \\ & 0.0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} \hline ⿳ 亠 口 冋 刂 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ \hline 0 \end{array}$ |  | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l} \hline \stackrel{y}{\mathrm{O}} \\ \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\mathrm{O}} \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & \hline 0 \\ & \hline 0 \\ & 0 \\ & \hline 0 \end{aligned}$ |  |  | a |  |  | $\begin{array}{\|l} \stackrel{N}{N} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|c} \hline \stackrel{N}{N} \\ \hline ⿳ 亠 口 冋 口 \\ \hline \end{array}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \hat{y} \\ & \stackrel{0}{0} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |
| $\frac{E}{0}$ |  |  |  | $\left\{\begin{array}{l} \{ \\ \{ \end{array}\right\}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{\infty}{x} \\ & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{x} \\ & \underset{\sim}{u} \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ |  |  | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l} \frac{0}{4} \\ \frac{1}{x} \\ \underset{\sim}{u} \\ 0 \end{array}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \frac{n}{\mathbb{N}} \\ & \stackrel{y}{x} \\ & \underset{u}{u} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l\|l\|l\|l\|l\|} \hline \frac{\infty}{x} \\ x_{1} \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|l} \frac{0}{x} \\ \underset{\sim}{x} \\ \underset{\sim}{x} \\ \hline 0 \end{array}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\qquad$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & \infty \\ & 1 \\ & 1 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & \sum \\ & 2 \\ & 0 \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 를 |  | ¢ | 实웅 | － |  | $\stackrel{\Gamma}{N}$ | － | $\stackrel{\circ}{\circ} \stackrel{0}{\circ}$ | p |  | Noî |  |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{N}{\infty} \\ & \mathbf{N}_{N} \end{aligned}$ | $$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{n}{\infty} \\ & \hline \infty \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |  | 傦 |  | oisis | Son | 瘄 | $\frac{N}{N}$ | O | $\frac{p}{N}$ | \|e্ষ | No | － | 某 |

# Facility Search Results 




Not Filtering on 2
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Facility Characteristics

Facility Type0 Major
2 Minor
Facility Permit/ID1 Has Water Permit (ICISNPDES)
$\bigcirc 0$ Has ICIS-
Air ID
$\square 1$ Has RCRA
ID
0 Has TRI
Releases

## Enforcement and <br> Compliance <br> Characteristics

0 Facilities with
Violations (1 or more within the past 3 year


123456789

Facilities with Forma Enforcement Actions
$\square 0$ Yes $\square 2$ No
0000
$1 \quad 2 \quad 3 \quad 4$

Facilities with Inform: Enforcement Actions

| $\bigcup \mathbf{0}$ Yes $\bigsqcup \mathbf{2}$ No |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | $\circ$ | 0 | 0 |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

Facilities Inspected w Date Range


> Community Characteristics

2 Facilities Located in Areas with EJ Indexes Above 80th Percentile (US)


Any of of do or Marembentore
$\nabla$ Layers

Each map
layer requires a specific map scale for display. Layers are only available for selection if the map is zoomed in to a sufficient scale. Zoom in further to enable selection of additional layers. Note that adding multiple overlapping map layers may cause performance issues in the browser and display.Do not show again

## Current Zoom:

83\%
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 Act Critical Habitat

DATA REFRESH INFORMATION

## Detailed Facility Report

## Facility Summary

FAIRVIEW CITY OF
48 FIRST ST, FAIRVIEW, OR 97024
FRS (Facility Registry Service) ID: 110012257128
EPA Region: 10
Latitude: 45.54
Longitude: -122.43442
Locational Data Source: FRS
Industries: Executive, Legislative, and Other General
Government Support
Indian Country: N

## Enforcement and Compliance Summary

| Statute | RCRA |
| :---: | :---: |
| Insp (5 Years) | -- |
| Date of Last Inspection | -- |
| Current Compliance Status | No Siol |
| Qtrs with NC (of 12) | 0 |
| Qtrs with Significant Violation | 0 |
| Informal Enforcement Actions (5 years) | -- |
| Formal Enforcement Actions (5 years) | -- |
| Penalties from Formal Enforcement Actions (5 years) | -- |
| EPA Cases (5 years) | -- |
| Penalties from EPA Cases (5 years) | -- |

## Regulatory Information

Clean Air Act (CAA): No Information
Clean Water Act (CWA): No Information
Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA): Active VSQG (ORQ000019141)
Safe Drinking Water Act (SDWA): No Information

Air Emissions Inventory (EIS): No Information
Greenhouse Gas Emissions (eGGRT): No Information
Toxic Releases (TRI): No Information
Compliance and Emissions Data Reporting Interface (CEDRI): No Information

Known Data Problems

## Facility/System Characteristics

## Facility/System Characteristics

| Systen | Statute | Identifier | Universe | Status | Areas | Permit Expiration Date | Indian Country | Latiude | Longitude |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FRS |  | 110012257128 |  |  |  |  | N | 45.54 | -122.43442 |
| RCRAInfo | RCRA | ORQOONOOI9141 | vseci | Active (H) |  |  | N |  |  |

## Facility Address

| System | Slatute | Facility Name | Facility Address | Facility County |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| FRS |  | 110012257128 | FAIRVIEW CITY OF | M8 FIRST ST, FAIRVIEW, OR 97024 | Multromah County |
| RCRAInfo | RCRA | ORQ000019141 | FAIRVIEW CITY OF | 48 FIRST ST, FAIRVIEW, OR 97024 | Multromah County |

Facility SIC (Standard Industrial Classification) Codes

| System $1 \quad$ Identifier | SIC Code | SIC Description |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | No data records returned |  |

Facility NAICS (North American Industry Classification System) Codes

| System | Identifier | NAICS Code | NAICS Description |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- |
| RCRAInfo | ORQ000019141 | 92119 | Other General Govermment Support |

Facility Tribe Information

| Reservation Name | Tribe Name | EPA Tribal ID | Distance to Tribe (miles) |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Cowlitz Reservation | Cowlitz Indian Tribe | 100000067 | 24.75 |

## Enforcement and Compliance

## Compliance Monitoring History (5 years)

| Statute | Source ID | System | Activity Type | Compliance Monitoring Type | Lead Agency | Date | Finding (if applicable) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No data records returned |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Entries in italics are not counted in EPA compliance monitoring strategies or annual results.
1

## Compliance Summary Data

| Statute | Source ID | Current SNC (Significant Noncompliance)/HPV (High Priority Violation) | Current As Of | Qtrs with NC (Noncompliance) (of 12) | Data Last Refreshed |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| RCRA | ORQ000019141 | No | 11/27/2021 | 0 | 11/26/2021 |


|  | QTR 1 | QTR 2 | QTR 3 | QTR 4 | QTR 5 | QTR 6 | QTR 7 | QTR 8 | QTR 9 | QTR 10 | QTR 11 | QTR 12+ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| RCRA (Source ID: ORQ000019141) | 01/01-03/31/19 | 04,01-06/30/19 | 07/01-09/30/19 | 10/01-12/31/19 | 01/01-03/31/20 | 04/01-06/30/20 | 07701-09130/20 | 10/01-12/31/20 | 01/01-03/31/21 | 0+/01-06/30/21 | 07/01-09/30/21 | 10.01-12/31/21 |
| Facility-Level Status | No Violation Identified | No Violation Identified | No Violation Identified | No Violation Identifled | No Violation Identified | No Violation Identified | No Violation Identified | No Violation Identified | No Violation Identified | No Vialation Identified | No Violation Identified | No Violation Identified |

Informal Enforcement Actions (5 Years)

| Statute | System | Source ID | Type of Action | Lead Agency | Date |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No data records returned |  |  |  |  |  |

Entries in italics are not counted as "informal enforcement actions" in EPA policies pertaining to enforcement response tools.
$\square$

## Formal Enforcement Actions (5 Years)

 No data records returned

## Environmental Conditions

## Watershed(s)

| 12-Digit WBD (Watershed Boundary Dataset) HUC (RAD (Reach Address Database)) | WBD (Watershed Boundary Dataset) Subwatershed Name (RAD (Reach Address Database)) | State Water Body Name (ICIS (Integrated Compliance Information System)) | Beach Closures Within Last Year | Beach Closures Within Last Two Years | Pollutants Potentially Related to Impairment | Watershed with ESA (Endangered Species Act)-listed Aquatic Species? |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No data records retumed |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Assessed Waters From Latest State Submission (ATTAINS)

| State | Report Cycle | Assessment Unit ID | Assessment Unit Name | Water Condition | Cause Groups Impaired | Driuking Water Use | Aquatic Life | Fish Consumption Use | Recreation Use | Other Use |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No data records returned |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

## Air Quality Nonattainment Areas

| Pollutant | Within Nonattainment Status Area? | Nonattainment Status Applicable Standard(s) | Within Maintenance Status Area? | Maintenance Status Applicable Standard(s) |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ozone | No |  | Yes | 1-Hour Ozone (1979) |
| Lead | No |  | No |  |
| Particulate Matter | No |  | No |  |
| Carbon Monoxide | No |  | Yes | Carbon Monoxide (1971) |
| Sulfur Dioxide | No | . | No |  |

## Pollutants

Toxics Release Inventory History of Reported Chemicals Released in Pounds per Year at Site
 No data records returned

Toxics Release Inventory Total Releases and Transfers in Pounds by Chemical and Year

## Community

## EJSCREEN EJ Indexes

Eleven primary environmental justice (EJ) indexes of EJSCREEN, EPA's screening tool for EJ concerns. EPA uses these indexes to identify geographic areas that may warrant further consideration or analysis for potential EJ concerns. The index values below are for the Census block group in which the facility is located. Note that use of these indexes does not designate an area as an "EJ community" or "EJ facility." EJSCREEN provides screening level indicators, not a determination of the existence or absence of EJ concerns. For more information, see the EJSCREEN home page.

Census Block Group EJ Indexes (percentile)
Particulate Matter (PM. 2.5)
Ozone
NATA Diesel PM
NAIA Air Toxics Canter Risk
NATA Respintory Hazird Index (HI)
Traffic Proximity
Leal Paint Indicator
National Priority List (NPL) Site Proximity
Risk Alanagement Plan (RMP) Site Proximity
Hazardous Waste Proximity
Wastewater Discharge Proximity

Number of EJ Inderes Above $80 t \mathrm{t}$ Percentite

## View EJSCREEN Report

## Demographic Profile of Surrounding Area (1 Mile)

This section provides demographic information regarding the community surrounding the facility. ECHO compliance data alone are not sufficient to determine whether violations at a particular facility had negative impacts on public health or the environment. Statistics are based upon the 2010 U.S. Census and 2014-2018 American Community Survey (ACS) 5-year Summary and are accurate to the extent that the facility latitude and longitude listed below are correct. EPA's spatial processing methodology considers the overlap between the selected radii and the census blocks (for U.S. Census demographics) and census block groups (for ACS demographics) in determining the demographics surrounding the facility. For more detail about this methodology, see the DFR Data Dictionary.


| Age Breakdown - Persons (\%) |  |
| :---: | :---: |
| Cliildren 5 years and younger | 914 (8\%) |
| Minors 17 years and younger | 3,074 (26\%) |
| Adults 18 years and older | 8.557 (74\%) |
| Seniors 65 years and older | 1,102 (9\%) |
| Race Breakdown - Persons (\%) |  |
| White | 8,055 (69\%) |
| African-American | 447 (4\%) |
| Hispanic-Origin | 2,743 (24\%) |
| Asian/Pacific Islander | 615 (5\%) |
| Anterican Indian | 179 (2\%) |
| Oher/multimacia! | 2,335 (20\%) |
| Fducation Level (Persons 25 \& older)-Persons (\%) |  |
| Less than 9th Graile | 450(8.39\%) |
| 9th through 12 Hh Grade | 573 (10.68\%) |
| High Sctiool Diplona | 1,448 (26.99\%) |
| Some College/2-year | 2.057 (38.34\%) |
| B.S./B.A. (Batheior of Science/Bachelor of Ants) or More | 837(15.6\%) |


| Income Breakdown - Houscholds (\%) |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| $\$ 15,000-\$ 25,000$ | $245(8.47 \%)$ |
| $\$ 25,000-\$ 50,000$ | $805(27.82 \%)$ |
| $\$ 50,000-\$ 75,000$ | $665(22.98 \%)$ |
| Greater than $\$ 75,000$ | $902(31.17 \%)$ |

## Endangered Species

| General requirements | ESA Legislation | Regulations |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act (ESA) | The Endangered | 50 CFR Part |
| mandates that federal agencies ensure that | Species Act of 1973 <br> (16 U.S.C. 1531 et <br> actions that they authorize, fund, or carry out <br> shall not jeopardize the continued existence of <br> federally listed plants and animals or result in <br> section 7 (16 USC | 402 |
| the adverse modification or destruction of |  |  |
| designated critical habitat. Where their actions | 1536). |  |
| 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"). |  |  |

1. Does the project involve any activities that have the potential to affect specifies or habitats?
$\checkmark$ No, the project will have No Effect due to the nature of the activities involved in the project.

This selection is only appropriate if none of the activities involved in the project have potential to affect species or habitats. Examples of actions without potential to affect listed species may include: purchasing existing buildings, completing interior renovations to existing buildings, and replacing exterior paint or siding on existing buildings.
Based on the response, the review is in compliance with this section.
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.

## Screen Summary

## Compliance Determination

This project will have No Effect on listed species due to the nature of the activities involved in the project. This project is in compliance with the Endangered Species Act. . A critical species list was obtained from iPAC indicating that the Willamette Daisy is
an endangered species of that area, site visits were conducted during spring and summer and the willamette daisy was not present in project area. It is not likely that the project site, will affect any FWS species encountered in Multnomah County. The water runoff will be protected by inlet protection (sediment bags) that will be installed by City of Fairview through the length of the project. City of Fairview did not take any permits for this project as it was on City of Fairview owned road.

## Supporting documentation

## Stormwater Management Report.docx

OregonEndangeredSpeciesActNoEffectChecklist.pdf
Species List_Oregon Fish And Wildlife Office.pdf
Endangered Species Willamette Daisy.docx
Endangered species Fairview 97024.pdf
Endangered Species _Center for Conservation Biology.pdf
Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?
Yes
$\checkmark$ No

March 11, 2022

## NE $3^{\text {rd }}$ (Between Main and Harrison) Street

## Environmental Review: Stormwater Runoff Plan

The finished NE $3^{\text {rd }}$ (Between Main and Harrison) Street project will have catch basins located before the new curb ramps on Cedar and Harrison intersection with $3^{\text {rd }}$ Street. The drawings are not complete, therefore as of today, it is estimated that approximately 2 new catch basins will be installed and 1 existing catch basin will be adjusted to accommodate the finished street grade.

During construction, after catch basins are installed, they will be covered with sediment bags. This will protect catch basins from having sediment laden stormwater entering the municipal stormwater conveyance system. The sediment bags are to not be removed until project is $100 \%$ complete.

Existing storm drains next to the $3^{\text {rd }}$ street intersection with Main, Cedar, and Harrison streets will be covered with sediment bags as well. These catch basins will have sediment bags installed before the start of the project.

Please feel free to give me a call if you have any questions.
Sincerely,

Miguel Sanchez, EI
Civil Engineering Technician
City of Fairvew

## Endangered Species Act Guidance for Oregon

## Prepared in collaboration with the US Fish and Wildlife Service and NOAA Fisheries Service Applies in Oregon only

| General requirements | ESA Legislation | HUD Regulations |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Section 7(a)(2) of the Endangered Species Act mandates that <br> actions that are authorized, funded, or carried out by Federal <br> agencies do not jeopardize the continued existence of plants <br> and animals that are listed, or result in the adverse <br> modification or destruction of designated critical habitat. | Species Act of 1973; <br> She Endangered | 24 U.S.C. 1531 et seq. |$\quad$.

## Purpose

The purpose of this guidance is to assist the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) and their designated responsible entities who have assumed responsibility for environmental compliance to meet their duty to consult with the US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) Fisheries Service (NOAA Fisheries) under Section 7(a)(2) of the Endangered Species Act (ESA). Users will be able to determine whether their development projects are likely to have "no effect" on ESA-listed species and critical habitats, and thus do not require any further coordination with, or approval from, the USFWS or NOAA Fisheries.

If you make a "no effect" decision for your project, please document the circumstances and reason for your decision in a memo to file for use if the decision is ever reviewed by another party. If you find that your action "may affect" an ESA-listed species or critical habitat, including a result of post-construction runoff, then you must contact USFWS, NOAA Fisheries, or both to determine whether the project can be modified to eliminate the possibility of an adverse effect. If the adverse effect cannot be eliminated, further consultation with USFWS and/or NOAA Fisheries will be required.

This guidance also includes links to additional resources that describe low-impact development (LID) practices, including many actions that HUD and responsible entities can use to avoid or minimize the adverse impacts of post-construction runoff. HUD or a responsible entity may still choose to complete an individual consultation when warranted by project-specific facts.

## Definitions

- Action Area is all areas to be affected directly or indirectly by the Federal action and not merely the immediate area involved in the action.
- Built environment means roofs and paved areas like parking, patios, trails, retaining walls, sidewalks, streets, and amenities that prevent infiltration of rainwater into the water table.
- Candidate Species are plant and animal taxa considered for possible addition to the List of Endangered and Threatened Species. These are taxa for which the USFWS and NOAA Fisheries have sufficient information on biological vulnerability and threat(s) to support issuance of a proposal to list, but issuance of a proposed rule is currently precluded by higher priority listing actions.
- Critical Habitat means those specific areas that have been designated by USFWS or NOAA Fisheries (in a rule-making in the Federal Register) as essential to the conservation of a listed species.
- Impervious area means artificial structures such as rooftops and pavements (e.g., driveways, parking lots, roads, sidewalks, trails) that are covered by impervious material like asphalt, brick, compacted soil, concrete, or stone.
- Listed Species means any species of fish, wildlife or plant that has been determined to be endangered or threatened under section 4 of the Endangered Species Act.
- Low impact development (LID) means management principles and practices that reduce postconstruction runoff by infiltrating rainfall into the water table, evaporating rainwater back into the atmosphere after a storm, or finding beneficial uses for rainwater instead of exporting it from the site as a waste product.
- Nexus means any action that is funded, authorized or carried out by a Federal agency that may affect ESA-listed species or habitats.
- Post-construction runoff means runoff from the built environment that extends off-site after a project's construction is complete.
- Proposed Species any species of fish, wildlife or plant that has been proposed by USFWS or NOAA Fisheries in the Federal Register to be listed under section 4 of the Endangered Species Act.
- Proximity means areas or effects that occur near ESA-listed species or habitats in space or time, including areas where species roost, feed, nest, rear, overwinter, or migrate. NOAA Fisheries considers projects that discharge post-construction stormwater to be in proximity with ESAlisted species or habitats that occur downstream of the discharge site.
- Responsible entity means the party authorized by HUD under 24 CFR Part 58 to complete any environmental review necessary for HUD to obligate funds.
- Riparian area means vegetation, habitats, or ecosystems that are associated with bodies of water, typically within 150 -feet of a stream bank or the shoreline of a standing body of water.
- Take under the ESA is defined as actions that may harass, harm, pursue, hunt, shoot, wound, kill trap, capture, or collect, or to attempt to engage in any such conduct. The ESA also protects against interfering in vital breeding and behavioral activities or degrading critical habitat.


## Endangered Species Act Effects Determinations

Section 7 of the ESA requires all Federal agencies to insure that any action authorized, funded or carried out by the agency is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of a listed species or destroy or adversely modify designated critical habitat. To this end, every project with a Federal nexus must be evaluated to determine its likely effect on listed and proposed species and designated critical habitat. HUD funding for a project serves as a Federal nexus triggering the requirement for environmental review under the ESA. HUD and Responsible Entities are also encouraged to consider candidate species in their evaluations.

- No effect means the proposed action will not have any direct or indirect effect on listed species or designated critical habitat.

No effect is the appropriate conclusion when the action agency determines its proposed action will not affect listed species or critical habitat. A determination of 'no effect' must be supported in the environmental review record but does not require consultation with NOAA Fisheries or USFWS.

- May affect means the proposed action may have a direct or indirect effect on an ESA-listed species or critical habitat, including any habitat modification that alters water quality, physical habitat features, or other conditions that contribute to habitat value.

May affect, not likely to adversely affect is the appropriate conclusion when effects on listed species are expected to be discountable, or insignificant, or completely beneficial.

- Beneficial effects are contemporaneous positive effects without any adverse effects to the species.
- Insignificant effects relate to the size of the impact and should never reach the scale where take occurs. Based on best judgment, a person would not be able to meaningfully measure, detect, or evaluate insignificant effects.
- Discountable effects are those extremely unlikely to occur. Based on best judgment, a person would not expect discountable effects to occur.

A determination of 'not likely to adversely affect' requires informal consultation with NOAA Fisheries or USFWS (or both); informal consultation results in a Letter of Concurrence from NOAA Fisheries or USFWS.

May affect, likely to adversely affect is the appropriate conclusion if any adverse effect to listed species may occur as a direct or indirect result of the proposed action or its interrelated or interdependent actions, and the effect is not discountable, insignificant, or beneficial. A determination of 'likely to adversely affect' requires formal consultation under section 7 of the ESA; formal consultation results in a Biological Opinion from NOAA Fisheries or USFWS.

## Background

An ESA effects analysis must consider both the direct and indirect effects of the action. Indirect effects are those that are caused by the proposed action and are later in time, but are still reasonably certain to occur. Few HUD actions occur within designated critical habitat, where direct injury or harm to ESAlisted species or critical habitat is easy to discern. But many HUD actions increase the area of the built environment, and thereby release post-construction runoff to the off-site environment. The indirect effects of post-construction runoff on the aquatic environment are the primary interaction between HUD actions and ESA-listed species and habitats.

One important indirect effect of post-construction runoff occurs when sediment and chemicals like oil, pesticides, and heavy metals accumulate on the built environment where they can be picked up by rainwater and transported into wetlands, lakes, and streams. Once there, those pollutants cause harm when they enter the food chain or otherwise degrade aquatic habitats. Other indirect effects occur when the built environment interrupts the natural cycle of rainwater infiltration into soil by diverting large volumes of post-construction runoff into drainage systems that quickly discharge into the nearest water body, where the effluent can cause erosion or downstream flooding that also harms ESA-listed species and habitats.

This guidance is based on the use of LID practices and principles that are simple, flexible, and economical to use, even in redevelopment situations. LID is highly effective for controlling stormwater impacts. Examples include use of permeable pavers, rain gardens, soil amendments, and tree retention to retain or recreate natural landscape features, reduce impervious cover, and increase on-site detention and infiltration.

## Working Towards Recovery

The ESA requires all federal agencies to use their authorities to help conserve listed species. Therefore, as HUD-designated responsible entities, you are encouraged to minimize the effects of your actions on listed species, designated critical habitat and habitat identified in endangered species recovery plans. For your activities, you are especially encouraged to minimize your action's contribution to water quality degradation from point and non-point discharges, and water quantity alteration due to increased impervious surfaces.

DISCLAIMER: This document is intended as a tool to help grantees and HUD staff complete NEPA requirements. This document is subject to change. This is not a policy statement, and the Endangered Species Act and associated regulations take precedence over any information found in this document.

Questions concerning environmental requirements related to HUD programs can be addressed to Deborah Peavler-Stewart (206) 220-5414 or Sara Jensen (206) 220-5226.

## Procedure for Section 7 Determination

You may use the guidance below to document compliance with the Endangered Species Act.

## Part A: Consultuation with NOAA Fisheries Service

## Step 1: Obtain Species List \& Determine Critical Habitat

For NOAA Fisheries species and designated or proposed critical habitat go to:
http://www.westcoast.fisheries.noaa.gov/maps data/endangered species act critical habitat.html
http://www.nwr.noaa.gov/maps data/species population boundaries.html
With a few exceptions on the Oregon Coast, most watersheds in the land area affected by ESA-listings of salmon and steelhead are within or upstream of a watershed occupied by an ESA-listed species or habitat. ${ }^{1}$ NOAA Fisheries considers projects that discharge post-construction stormwater to be in proximity with ESA-listed species or habitats that occur downstream of the discharge site.

However, detailed distribution maps are available from recovery planning and implementation documents and the Salmon Population Summary (SPS) Database. ${ }^{2}$ If you need to confirm whether your action is in proximity to ESA-listed salmon or steelhead, contact the appropriate office for NOAA Fisheries. ${ }^{3}$

## Step 2: Determine Effect

Question 1: Would the project effects overlap with federally listed or proposed species and designated or proposed critical habitat covered by NOAA Fisheries?

Note that project effects include those that extend beyond the project site itself, such as noise, water quality, stormwater discharge, visual disturbance; habitat assessment must include consideration for feeding, spawning, rearing, overwintering sites, and migratory corridors.

NO, the project and all effects are outside the range of listed species and critical habitat covered by NOAA Fisheries.
X Record your determination of No Effect on species or habitats covered by NOAA Fisheries.
$\square$ Maintain documentation in your Environmental Review Record. For example, a map showing that your project is not in or upstream of a watershed of a listed species.
$\square \quad$ Section 7 Consultation with USFWS may still be necessary. CONTINUE TO Part B.
YES, project effects may overlap with ESA-listed species or designated critical habitat covered by NOAA Fisheries.
$\square$ Continue to Question 2 .
${ }^{1}$ http://www.westcoast.fisheries.noaa.gov/publications/protected species/salmon steelhead/status of esa salmon listings and ch designations map.pdf
https://www.webapps.nwfsc.noaa.gov/apex/f?p=261:1:1530350968904\#
http://www.westcoast.fisheries.noaa.gov/about us/our locations.html

Question 2: Is the project activity listed in Table A (see next page) and does it meet all of the required parameters?
$\square$ YES, the activity is listed in Table A and meets all of the required parameters. Therefore, the project will have No Effect on ESA-listed species and/or designated critical habitat.
D Record your determination of No Effect and maintain this documentation, including a species list and map of your project location, in your Environmental Review Record.
D Attach a statement to your determination explaining how your project meets the required parameters in Table A.
D Section 7 Consultation with USFWS may still be necessary. CONTINUE TO Part B.
$\square$ NO, the project description does not match a project description in Table A and all of the specified parameters.

D Continue to Question 3.
Question 3: Do you have some other basis for a No Effect determination, for example a biological assessment or other documentation from a qualified professional?

II YES, the project has professional documentation for No Effect determination.
D Record your determination of No Effect and maintain this documentation, including a species list and map of your project location, in your Environmental Review Record. D Attach the biological assessment or other professional documentation.
D Section 7 Consultation with USFWS may still be necessary. CONTINUE TO Part B.
NO, the project does not have professional documentation supporting a No Effect determination.

D YOU MUST INITIATE SECTION 7 CONSULTATION WITH NOAA Fisheries. Contact information on Page 8.
D Consultation with USFWS may also be necessary. CONTINUE TO PART B.

TABLE A.

| roterulaa "No EjJect Acuvicy | кequrreu rararieters |
| :---: | :---: |
| Purchase building | - No change to existing structures |
| Landscape repair, including adding sprinkler systems | - Does not remove trees or streamside vegetation |
| Interior rehabilitation | - For existing structures <br> - Waste materials are recycled or otherwise disposed of in an EPA approved sanitary or hazardous waste disposal site |
| Any exterior repair or improvement that will not increase post-construction runoff, e.g. <br> - Replace exterior paint or siding <br> - Build a fence <br> - Replace/repair roof without using bituminous waterproofing <br> - Replace/repair a roof or siding without using galvanized metal <br> - Reconstruct/repair existing curbs, sidewalks or other concrete structures <br> - Repair existing parking lots (pot holes, repainting lines, etc.) | - Does not increase amount of impervious surface <br> - Waste materials are recycled or otherwise disposed of in an EPA approved sanitary or hazardous waste disposal site |
| Special projects directed to the removal of | Meets all of the |
| material or architectural barriers that restrict the mobility of and accessibility to elderly and persons with disabilities, e.g. <br> - Curb cuts <br> - Wheelchair ramps | - Will not impact an area of natural habitat, a wetland, or riparian area; and <br> - Complies with all state and local building codes and stormwater regulations |
| Install LID practices | - For existing structures |
| New construction or addition on previously developed site (for example a building over an existing parking lot) | Meets all of the following |
|  | - not increase amount of impervious surface <br> - Waste materials are recycled or otherwise disposed of in an EPA approved sanitary or hazardous waste disposal site <br> - Stormwater meets NOAA Fisheries standards. ${ }^{4}$ |
| Project that will add new impervious surface that will increase post-construction runoff, including new construction. | Meets all of the |
|  | - All post-construction runoff will be completely infiltrated or used on-site; and <br> - Will not impact an area of natural habitat, a wetland, or riparian area; and <br> - Complies with all state and local building codes and stormwater regulations |

[^2]
## Part B: Consultation with U.S. Fish and Willdlifie Service

## Step 1: Obtain Species List \& Determine Critical Habitat

You must obtain a species list for the entire action area of your project. The action area encompasses all of the effects of the project, not just those that occur within the construction footprint. Note that project effects include those that extend beyond the project site itself, such as noise, air pollution, water quality, stormwater discharge, visual disturbance; effects to habitat must be considered, including the project's effects on roosting, feeding, nesting, spawning and rearing habitat, overwintering sites, and migratory corridors.

Go to http://ecos.fws.gov/ipac/for a list of species by project area. Please note that this list includes listed, proposed and candidate species; consideration of project effects on candidate species is optional, unless effects are very large (contact the local USFWS field office in this case). However, candidate species may become listed as endangered or threatened species during the period of construction. If you have questions, contact the appropriate USFWS field office ${ }^{5}$ to discuss the species list for your area.

## Step 2: Determine Effect

Question 1: Would the project effects overlap with federally-listed or proposed species or designated or proposed critical habitat covered by USFWS?

Consider all effects of the project within the action area. The action area encompasses all the effects of the project, including those that occur beyond the boundaries of the property (such as noise, air pollution, water quality, stormwater discharge, visual disturbance)

NO, the project and all effects are outside the range of listed or proposed species and designated critical habitat covered by USFWS. Therefore, the project will have No
$\times$ Effect on ESA-listed or proposed species or designated critical habitat.Record your determination of No Effect on species or habitats covered by USFWS, and maintain this documentation in your Environmental Review Record.Attach a statement explaining how you determined that your project's effects do not overlap with species or habitat covered by USFWS.
YES, project effects may overlap with ESA-listed or proposed species or designated critical habitat covered by USFWS. Therefore, your project could affect species and habitat.Continue to Question 2.
Question 2: Will the project occur on a previously developed site?
YES, the project will have No Effect on ESA-listed species or designated critical habitat.
$\square$ Record your determination of No Effect on species or habitats covered by USFWS, and maintain this documentation in your Environmental Review Record.
${ }^{5}$ http://www.fws.gov/oregonfwo/Administration/ContactUs/

D Attach a statement explaining how you determined that your project's effects do not impact species or habitat covered by USFWS.

No.
D Continue to Question 3.

Question 3: Is the project activity listed in Table $A$ and does it meet all of the required parameters?
YES, the activity is listed in Table A and meets all of the required parameters. Therefore, the project will have No Effect on ESA-listed species and/or designated critical habitat.

D Record your determination of No Effect and maintain this documentation, including the official species list and map of your project location, in your Environmental Review Record.
D Attach a statement to your determination explaining how your project met the required parameters in Table A.

NO, the project description does not match a project description in Table A and all of the specified parameters.

D Continue to Question 4.

Question 4: Do you have some other basis for a No Effect determination, for example a biological assessment or other documentation from a qualified professional?
$\square$ YES, the project has professional documentation for No Effect determination.
D Record your determination of No Effect and maintain this documentation, including the official species list and map of your project location, in your Environmental Review Record. D Attach the biological assessment or other professional documentation.

NO, the project does not have professional documentation for a No Effect determination and may affect a listed species.

D The project may affect listed or proposed species, or designated or proposed critical habitat. Consultation with the USFWS may be required. CONTACT THE USFWS TO DETERMINE THE APPROPRIATE EFFECTS DETERMINATION AND LEVEL OF CONSULTATION REQUIRED. Contact information on Page 9.

## Initiating Section 7 Consultation

If the effects of the action are insignificant, discountable, or entirely beneficial, it is not likely to adversely affect listed or proposed species or designated critical habitats, and the section 7 consultation for the project may remain informal and relatively simple. A May Affect, Not Likely to Adversely Affect determination is the most common outcome of consultation for HUD-funded projects with USFWS.

However, if the effects of the action on listed or proposed species and/or critical habitat are not discountable, insignificant, or entirely beneficial, (i.e., likely to adversely affect), formal consultation must be initiated. In such cases, a formal consultation must be initiated prior to committing resources to the project, by which the USFWS and/or NOAA Fisheries assess the action's potential to jeopardize the listed species, to result in the destruction or adverse modification of critical habitat, or to result in incidental take of a listed species. Formal consultation will result in the USFWS and/or NOAA Fisheries issuing a Biological Opinion for the project, including an incidental take statement for project actions, if appropriate. The Biological Opinion will also include non-discretionary terms and conditions to further minimize and/or avoid project impacts to ESA-listed species. Because the constituents of stormwater runoff are particularly harmful to aquatic species, a May Affect, Likely to Adversely Affect determination is the most common outcome of consultation for HUD-funded projects with NOAA Fisheries.
At any stage in making your determination, you may wish to contact the appropriate USFWS and NOAA Fisheries field offices for technical assistance. Contact information is available at:

NOAA Fisheries Service
Portland Regional Office
1201 Northeast Lyon Blvd, Suite 1100
Portland, OR 97232
503-230-5400
http://www.westcoast.fisheries.noaa.gov/index
.html

For projects located in the Klamath River Basin, you must contact NOAA's Northern California Office at:

NOAA Fisheries Service
Arcata Office
1655 Heindon Road
Arcata, CA 95521
707-825-5171

For a map of the Klamath River Basin, please visit:
http://www.westcoast.fisheries.noaa.gov/publications/gis maps/maps/salmon steelhead/esa/chinook/w
eb pdfs uktr chinook.pdf

## Links to Section 7 Handbook and additional Section 7 resources:

- Section 7 Handbook: http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/pr/pdfs/laws/esa section7 handbook.pdf
- Overview of the Section 7 Process: http://www.fws.gov/Midwest/endangered/section7/index.html


## Additional Resources for LID

- American Rivers, 2012, Banking on Green Report: Economic Benefits of Green Infrastructure Practices
- Clean Water Services, 2009, Low Impact Development Approaches (LIDA) Handbook
- ECONorthwest, 2009, LID at the Local Level - Developers' Experiences and City and County Support
- EPA, 2005, Low Impact Development for Big Box Retailers
- Herrera, 2013, Guidance Document: Western Washington LID Operation and Maintenance
- NCHRP, 2006, Evaluation of BMPs for Highway Runoff Control - LID Design Manual
- Prince George County, Maryland, 1999, Low-Impact Development Design Strategies
- Puget Sound Partnership, 2012, Low Impact Development: Technical Guidance Manual for Puget Sound
- US EPA, 2013, Stormwater to Street Trees: Engineering Urban Forests for Stormwater Management



# United States Department of the Interior 

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

Oregon Fish And Wildlife Office
2600 Southeast 98th Avenue, Suite 100
Portland, OR 97266-1398
Phone: (503) 231-6179 Fax: (503) 231-6195
https://www.fws.gov/oregonfwo/articles.cfm?id=149489416

In Reply Refer To:
November 24, 2021
Consultation Code: 01EOFW00-2022-SLI-0116
Event Code: 01EOFW00-2022-E-00292
Project Name: NE 3rd (Main - Harrison) Street Improvement Project (City-of-Fairview)
Subject: List of threatened and endangered species that may occur in your proposed project location or may be affected by your proposed project

## To Whom It May Concern:

The enclosed species list identifies threatened, endangered, proposed and candidate species, as well as proposed and final designated critical habitat, that may occur within the boundary of your proposed project and/or may be affected by your proposed project. The species list fulfills the requirements of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) under section 7(c) of the Endangered Species Act (Act) of 1973, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.).

New information based on updated surveys, changes in the abundance and distribution of species, changed habitat conditions, or other factors could change this list. Please feel free to contact us if you need more current information or assistance regarding the potential impacts to federally proposed, listed, and candidate species and federally designated and proposed critical habitat. Please note that under 50 CFR 402.12(e) of the regulations implementing section 7 of the Act, the accuracy of this species list should be verified after 90 days. This verification can be completed formally or informally as desired. The Service recommends that verification be completed by visiting the ECOS-IPaC website at regular intervals during project planning and implementation for updates to species lists and information. An updated list may be requested through the ECOS-IPaC system by completing the same process used to receive the enclosed list.

The purpose of the Act is to provide a means whereby threatened and endangered species and the ecosystems upon which they depend may be conserved. Under sections 7(a)(1) and 7(a)(2) of the Act and its implementing regulations ( 50 CFR 402 et seq.), Federal agencies are required to utilize their authorities to carry out programs for the conservation of threatened and endangered species and to determine whether projects may affect threatened and endangered species and/or designated critical habitat.

A Biological Assessment is required for construction projects (or other undertakings having similar physical impacts) that are major Federal actions significantly affecting the quality of the human environment as defined in the National Environmental Policy Act (42 U.S.C. 4332(2) (c)). For projects other than major construction activities, the Service suggests that a biological evaluation similar to a Biological Assessment be prepared to determine whether the project may affect listed or proposed species and/or designated or proposed critical habitat. Recommended contents of a Biological Assessment are described at 50 CFR 402.12.

If a Federal agency determines, based on the Biological Assessment or biological evaluation, that listed species and/or designated critical habitat may be affected by the proposed project, the agency is required to consult with the Service pursuant to 50 CFR 402. In addition, the Service recommends that candidate species, proposed species and proposed critical habitat be addressed within the consultation. More information on the regulations and procedures for section 7 consultation, including the role of permit or license applicants, can be found in the "Endangered Species Consultation Handbook" at:
http://www.fws.gov/endangered/esa-library/pdf/TOC-GLOS.PDF
Please be aware that bald and golden eagles are protected under the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act (16 U.S.C. 668 et seq.), and projects affecting these species may require development of an eagle conservation plan (http://www.fws.gov/windenergy/eagle_guidance.html). Additionally, wind energy projects should follow the wind energy guidelines (http://www.fws.gov/windenergy/) for minimizing impacts to migratory birds and bats.

Guidance for minimizing impacts to migratory birds for projects including communications towers (e.g., cellular, digital television, radio, and emergency broadcast) can be found at: http://www.fws.gov/migratorybirds/CurrentBirdIssues/Hazards/towers/towers.htm; http://www.towerkill.com; and http:// www.fws.gov/migratorybirds/CurrentBirdIssues/Hazards/towers/comtow.html.

We appreciate your concern for threatened and endangered species. The Service encourages Federal agencies to investigate opportunities for incorporating conservation of threatened and endangered species into project planning processes as a means of complying with the Act. If you have questions regarding your responsibilities under the Act, please contact the Endangered Species Division at the Service's Oregon Fish and Wildlife Office at (503) 231-6179. For information regarding listed marine and anadromous species under the jurisdiction of NOAA Fisheries Service, please see their website (http://www.nwr.noaa.gov/habitat/ habitat conservation in the nw/habitat conservation in the nw.html).

Please include the Consultation Tracking Number in the header of this letter with any request for consultation or correspondence about your project that you submit to our office.

Attachment(s):

- Official Species List


## Official Species List

This list is provided pursuant to Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act, and fulfills the requirement for Federal agencies to "request of the Secretary of the Interior information whether any species which is listed or proposed to be listed may be present in the area of a proposed action".

This species list is provided by:
Oregon Fish And Wildlife Office
2600 Southeast 98th Avenue, Suite 100
Portland, OR 97266-1398
(503) 231-6179

## Project Summary

Consultation Code: 01EOFW00-2022-SLI-0116
Event Code: Some(01EOFW00-2022-E-00292)
Project Name: $\quad$ NE 3rd (Main - Harrison) Street Improvement Project (City-of-Fairview)
Project Type: LAND - EASEMENT / RIGHT-OF-WAY
Project Description: Sidewalk Installation to be started in Spring/Summer 2022
Project Location:
Approximate location of the project can be viewed in Google Maps: https://
www.google.com/maps/@45.53806855.-122.43630074999999,14z


Counties: Multnomah County, Oregon

## Endangered Species Act Species

There is a total of 7 threatened, endangered, or candidate species on this species list.
Species on this list should be considered in an effects analysis for your project and could include species that exist in another geographic area. For example, certain fish may appear on the species list because a project could affect downstream species.

IPaC does not display listed species or critical habitats under the sole jurisdiction of NOAA Fisheries ${ }^{\underline{1}}$, as USFWS does not have the authority to speak on behalf of NOAA and the Department of Commerce.

See the "Critical habitats" section below for those critical habitats that lie wholly or partially within your project area under this office's jurisdiction. Please contact the designated FWS office if you have questions.

1. NOAA Fisheries, also known as the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), is an office of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration within the Department of Commerce.

## Birds

NAME STATUS

Northern Spotted Owl Strix occidentalis caurina
Threatened
There is final critical habitat for this species. The location of the critical habitat is not available.
Species profile: https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/1123
Streaked Horned Lark Eremophila alpestris strigata
Threatened
There is final critical habitat for this species. The location of the critical habitat is not available.
Species profile: https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/7268
Yellow-billed Cuckoo Coccyzus americanus Threatened
Population: Western U.S. DPS
There is final critical habitat for this species. The location of the critical habitat is not available.
Species profile: https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/3911

## Insects

NAME
STATUS
Monarch Butterfly Danaus plexippus
Candidate
No critical habitat has been designated for this species.
Species profile: https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/9743

## Flowering Plants

NAME
Kincaid's Lupine Lupinus sulphureus ssp. kincaidii
There is final critical habitat for this species. The location of the critical habitat is not available. Species profile: https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/3747

Nelson's Checker-mallow Sidalcea nelsoniana
No critical habitat has been designated for this species.
Species profile: https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/7340
Willamette Daisy Erigeron decumbens
There is final critical habitat for this species. The location of the critical habitat is not available.
Species profile: https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/6270

## Critical habitats

THERE ARE NO CRITICAL HABITATS WITHIN YOUR PROJECT AREA UNDER THIS OFFICE'S JURISDICTION.

Project Zip Code: 97024 Endangered Species

## WILLAMETTE DAISY



## OVERVIEW

Species Common Name
Willamette Daisy
Federal Listing Status
Endangered

## Species Scientific Name

Erigeron decumbens

## State Listing Status

Endangered

Picture credit: https://www.oregonconservationstrategy.org/strategy-species/willamette-daisy/
Source: https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/CFR-2017-title50-vol2/pdf/CFR-2017-title50-vol2-sec17-12.pdf

## SPECIAL NEEDS

The Willamette daisy is found in seasonally-wet prairies and drier upland prairie sites, where woody cover is nearly absent and herbaceous vegetation tends to be low in stature.

Time of Blooming: Spring/Summer wherever found.

Outcome: The Willamette Daisy was not found on this project area in spring and June of 2021 during visits of planning and photographing for mapping.

Conducted by: Fanny Adams, Multnomah County CDBG Program Specialist Sr.

## IPaC resource list

This report is an automatically generated list of species and other resources such as critical habitat (collectively referred to as trust resources) under the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's (USFWS) jurisdiction that are known or expected to be on or near the project area referenced below. The list may also include trust resources that occur outside of the project area, but that could potentially be directly or indirectly affected by activities in the project area. However, determining the likelihood and extent of effects a project may have on trust resources typically requires gathering additional site-specific (e.g., vegetation/species surveys) and project-specific (e.g., magnitude and timing of proposed activities) information.

Below is a summary of the project information you provided and contact information for the USFWS office(s) with jurisdiction in the defined project area. Please read the introduction to each section that follows (Endangered Species, Migratory Birds, USFWS Facilities, and NWI Wetlands) for additional information applicable to the trust resources addressed in that section.

## Location

Multnomah County, Oregon


## Local office

Oregon Fish And Wildlife Office
C (503) 231-6179
掄 (503) 231-6195
2600 Southeast 98th Avenue, Suite 100
Portland, OR 97266-1398
https://www.fws.gov/oregonfwo/articles.cfm?id=149489416

## Endangered species

This resource list is for informational purposes only and does not constitute an analysis of project level impacts.

The primary information used to generate this list is the known or expected range of each species. Additional areas of influence (AOI) for species are also considered. An AOI includes areas outside of the species range if the species could be indirectly affected by activities in that area (e.g., placing a dam upstream of a fish population even if that fish does not occur at the dam site, may indirectly impact the species by reducing or eliminating water flow downstream). Because species can move, and site conditions can change, the species on this list are not guaranteed to be found on or near the project area. To fully determine any potential effects to species, additional site-specific and project-specific information is often required.

Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act requires Federal agencies to "request of the Secretary information whether any species which is listed or proposed to be listed may be present in the area of such proposed action" for any project that is conducted, permitted, funded, or licensed by any Federal agency. A letter from the local office and a species list which fulfills this requirement can only be obtained by requesting an official species list from either the Regulatory Review section in IPaC (see directions below) or from the local field office directly.

For project evaluations that require USFWS concurrence/review, please return to the IPaC website and request an official species list by doing the following:

1. Draw the project location and click CONTINUE.
2. Click DEFINE PROJECT.
3. $\log$ in (if directed to do so).
4. Provide a name and description for your project.
5. Click REQUEST SPECIES LIST.

Listed species ${ }^{1}$ and their critical habitats are managed by the Ecological Services Program of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and the fisheries division of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA Fisheries를).

Species and critical habitats under the sole responsibility of NOAA Fisheries are not shown on this list. Please contact NOAA Fisheries for species under their jurisdiction.

1. Species listed under the Endangered Species Act are threatened or endangered; IPaC also shows species that are candidates, or proposed, for listing. See the listing status page for more information. IPaC only shows species that are regulated by USFWS (see FAQ).
2. NOAA Fisheries, also known as the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), is an office of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration within the Department of Commerce.

The following species are potentially affected by activities in this location:

## Birds

Northern Spotted Owl Strix occidentalis caurina
Wherever found
There is final critical habitat for this species. The location of the critical habitat is not available.
https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/1123

## Streaked Horned Lark Eremophila alpestris strigata

Threatened
Wherever found
There is final critical habitat for this species. The location of the critical habitat is not available.
https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/7268

Yellow-billed Cuckoo Coccyzus americanus
There is final critical habitat for this species. The location of the critical habitat is not available.
https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/3911

## Insects

NAME
Monarch Butterfly Danaus plexippus
Wherever found
No critical habitat has been designated for this species.
https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/9743

## Flowering Plants

NAME

Kincaid's Lupine Lupinus sulphureus ssp. kincaidii
Wherever found
There is final critical habitat for this species. The location of the critical habitat is not available.
https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/3747

Nelson's Checker-mallow Sidalcea nelsoniana
Wherever found
No critical habitat has been designated for this species.
https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/7340

Willamette Daisy Erigeron decumbens
Wherever found
There is final critical habitat for this species. The location of the critical habitat is not available.
https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/6270

STATUS
Threatened

Threatened

Endangered

## Critical habitats

Potential effects to critical habitat(s) in this location must be analyzed along with the endangered species themselves.

THERE ARE NO CRITICAL HABITATS AT THIS LOCATION.

## Migratory birds

Certain birds are protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act ${ }^{1}$ and the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act².

Any person or organization who plans or conducts activities that may result in impacts to migratory birds, eagles, and their habitats should follow appropriate regulations and consider implementing appropriate conservation measures, as described below.

1. The Migratory Birds Treaty Act of 1918.
2. The Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act of 1940.

Additional information can be found using the following links:

- Birds of Conservation Concern http://www.fws.gov/birds/management/managed-species/ birds-of-conservation-concern.php
- Measures for avoiding and minimizing impacts to birds http://www.fws.gov/birds/management/project-assessment-tools-and-guidance/ conservation-measures.php
- Nationwide conservation measures for birds http://www.fws.gov/migratorybirds/pdf/management/nationwidestandardconservationmeasures.pdf

The birds listed below are birds of particular concern either because they occur on the USFWS Birds of Conservation Concern (BCC) list or warrant special attention in your project location. To learn more about the levels of concern for birds on your list and how this list is generated, see the FAQ below. This is not a list of every bird you may find in this location, nor a guarantee that every bird on this list will be found in your project area. To see exact locations of where birders and the general public have sighted birds in and around your project area, visit the E-bird data mapping tool (Tip: enter your location, desired date range and a species on your list). For projects that occur off the Atlantic Coast, additional maps and models detailing the relative occurrence and abundance of bird species on your list are available. Links to additional information about Atlantic Coast birds, and other important information about your migratory bird list, including how to properly interpret and use your migratory bird report, can be found below.

For guidance on when to schedule activities or implement avoidance and minimization measures to reduce impacts to migratory birds on your list, click on the PROBABILITY OF PRESENCE SUMMARY at the top of your list to see when these birds are most likely to be present and breeding in your project area.

## NAME

Bald Eagle Haliaeetus leucocephalus
This is not a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) in this area, but warrants attention because of the Eagle Act or for potential susceptibilities in offshore areas from certain types of development or activities.
https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/1626

## Clark's Grebe Aechmophorus clarkii

This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) throughout its range in the continental USA and Alaska.

## Evening Grosbeak Coccothraustes vespertinus

This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) throughout its range in the continental USA and Alaska.

Lesser Yellowlegs Tringa flavipes
This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) throughout its range in the continental USA and Alaska.
https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/9679

Olive-sided Flycatcher Contopus cooperi
This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) throughout its range in the continental USA and Alaska.
https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/3914

Rufous Hummingbird selasphorus rufus
This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) throughout its range in the continental USA and Alaska.
https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/8002

Wrentit Chamaea fasciata
This is a Bird of Conservation Concern (BCC) throughout its range in the continental USA and Alaska.

BREEDING SEASON (IF A
BREEDING SEASON IS INDICATED
FOR A BIRD ON YOUR LIST, THE
BIRD MAY BREED IN YOUR
PROJECT AREA SOMETIME WITHIN
THE TIMEFRAME SPECIFIED,
WHICH IS A VERY LIBERAL
ESTIMATE OF THE DATES INSIDE
WHICH THE BIRD BREEDS
ACROSS ITS ENTIRE RANGE.
"BREEDS ELSEWHERE" INDICATES
THAT THE BIRD DOES NOT LIKELY
BREED IN YOUR PROJECT AREA.)
Breeds Jan 1 to Sep 30

Breeds Jun 1 to Aug 31

Breeds May 15 to Aug 10

Breeds elsewhere

Breeds May 20 to Aug 31

Breeds Apr 15 to Jul 15

Breeds Mar 15 to Aug 10

## Probability of Presence Summary

The graphs below provide our best understanding of when birds of concern are most likely to be present in your project area. This information can be used to tailor and schedule your project activities to avoid or minimize impacts to birds. Please make sure you read and understand the FAQ "Proper Interpretation and Use of Your Migratory Bird Report" before using or attempting to interpret this report.

## Probability of Presence (

Each green bar represents the bird's relative probability of presence in the 10 km grid cell(s) your project overlaps during a particular week of the year. (A year is represented as 12 4-week months.) A taller bar indicates a higher probability of species presence. The survey effort (see below) can be used to establish a level of confidence in the presence score. One can have higher confidence in the presence score if the corresponding survey effort is also high.

How is the probability of presence score calculated? The calculation is done in three steps:

1. The probability of presence for each week is calculated as the number of survey events in the week where the species was detected divided by the total number of survey events for that week. For example, if in week 12 there were 20 survey events and the Spotted Towhee was found in 5 of them, the probability of presence of the Spotted Towhee in week 12 is 0.25 .
2. To properly present the pattern of presence across the year, the relative probability of presence is calculated. This is the probability of presence divided by the maximum probability of presence across all weeks. For example, imagine the probability of presence in week 20 for the Spotted Towhee is 0.05 , and that the probability of presence at week 12 ( 0.25 ) is the maximum of any week of the year. The relative probability of presence on week 12 is $0.25 / 0.25=1$; at week 20 it is $0.05 / 0.25=0.2$.
3. The relative probability of presence calculated in the previous step undergoes a statistical conversion so that all possible values fall between 0 and 10, inclusive. This is the probability of presence score.

To see a bar's probability of presence score, simply hover your mouse cursor over the bar.

## Breeding Season ()

Yellow bars denote a very liberal estimate of the time-frame inside which the bird breeds across its entire range. If there are no yellow bars shown for a bird, it does not breed in your project area.

## Survey Effort (I)

Vertical black lines superimposed on probability of presence bars indicate the number of surveys performed for that species in the 10 km grid cell(s) your project area overlaps. The number of surveys is expressed as a range, for example, 33 to 64 surveys.

To see a bar's survey effort range, simply hover your mouse cursor over the bar.

## No Data (-)

A week is marked as having no data if there were no survey events for that week.
Survey Timeframe

Surveys from only the last 10 years are used in order to ensure delivery of currently relevant information. The exception to this is areas off the Atlantic coast, where bird returns are based on all years of available data, since data in these areas is currently much more sparse.


Olive-sided

Flycatcher
BCC Rangewide
(CON) (This is a
Bird of
Conservation
Concern (BCC)
throughout its
range in the
continental USA
and Alaska.)
Rufous
Hummingbird
BCC Rangewide
(CON) (This is a
Bird of
Conservation
Concern (BCC)
throughout its
range in the continental USA and Alaska.)

Wrentit
BCC Rangewide (CON) (This is a
Bird of
Conservation
Concern (BCC) throughout its range in the continental USA and Alaska.)
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Tell me more about conservation measures I can implement to avoid or minimize impacts to migratory birds.
Nationwide Conservation Measures describes measures that can help avoid and minimize impacts to all birds at any location year round. Implementation of these measures is particularly important when birds are most likely to occur in the project area. When birds may be breeding in the area, identifying the locations of any active nests and avoiding their destruction is a very helpful impact minimization measure. To see when birds are most likely to occur and be breeding in your project area, view the Probability of Presence Summary. Additional measures or permits may be advisable depending on the type of activity you are conducting and the type of infrastructure or bird species present on your project site.

What does IPaC use to generate the migratory birds potentially occurring in my specified location?
The Migratory Bird Resource List is comprised of USFWS Birds of Conservation Concern (BCC) and other species that may warrant special attention in your project location.

The migratory bird list generated for your project is derived from data provided by the Avian Knowledge Network (AKN). The AKN data is based on a growing collection of survey, banding, and citizen science datasets and is queried and filtered to return a list of those birds reported as occurring in the 10 km grid cell(s) which your project intersects, and that have been identified as warranting special attention because they are a BCC species in that area, an eagle (Eagle Act requirements may apply), or a species that has a particular vulnerability to offshore activities or development.

Again, the Migratory Bird Resource list includes only a subset of birds that may occur in your project area. It is not representative of all birds that may occur in your project area. To get a list of all birds potentially present in your project area, please visit the AKN Phenology Tool.

What does IPaC use to generate the probability of presence graphs for the migratory birds potentially occurring in my specified location?

The probability of presence graphs associated with your migratory bird list are based on data provided by the Avian Knowledge Network (AKN). This data is derived from a growing collection of survey, banding, and citizen science datasets.

Probability of presence data is continuously being updated as new and better information becomes available. To learn more about how the probability of presence graphs are produced and how to interpret them, go the Probability of Presence Summary and then click on the "Tell me about these graphs" link.

## How do I know if a bird is breeding, wintering, migrating or present year-round in my project area?

To see what part of a particular bird's range your project area falls within (i.e. breeding, wintering, migrating or year-round), you may refer to the following resources: The Cornell Lab of Ornithology All About Birds Bird Guide, or (if you are unsuccessful in locating the bird of interest there), the Cornell Lab of Ornithology Neotropical Birds guide. If a bird on your migratory bird species list has a breeding season associated with it, if that bird does occur in your project area, there may be nests present at some point within the timeframe specified. If "Breeds elsewhere" is indicated, then the bird likely does not breed in your project area.

## What are the levels of concern for migratory birds?

Migratory birds delivered through IPaC fall into the following distinct categories of concern:

1. "BCC Rangewide" birds are Birds of Conservation Concern (BCC) that are of concern throughout their range anywhere within the USA (including Hawaii, the Pacific Islands, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands);
2. "BCC - BCR" birds are BCCs that are of concern only in particular Bird Conservation Regions (BCRs) in the continental USA; and
3. "Non-BCC - Vulnerable" birds are not BCC species in your project area, but appear on your list either because of the Eagle Act requirements (for eagles) or (for non-eagles) potential susceptibilities in offshore areas from certain types of development or activities (e.g. offshore energy development or longline fishing).

Although it is important to try to avoid and minimize impacts to all birds, efforts should be made, in particular, to avoid and minimize impacts to the birds on this list, especially eagles and BCC species of rangewide concern. For more information on conservation measures you can implement to help avoid and minimize migratory bird impacts and requirements for eagles, please see the FAQs for these topics.

## Details about birds that are potentially affected by offshore projects

For additional details about the relative occurrence and abundance of both individual bird species and groups of bird species within your project area off the Atlantic Coast, please visit the Northeast Ocean Data Portal. The Portal also offers data and information about other taxa besides birds that may be helpful to you in your project review. Alternately, you may download the bird model results files underlying the portal maps through the NOAA NCCOS Integrative Statistical Modeling and Predictive Mapping of Marine Bird Distributions and Abundance on the Atlantic Outer Continental Shelf project webpage.

Bird tracking data can also provide additional details about occurrence and habitat use throughout the year, including migration. Models relying on survey data may not include this information. For additional information on marine bird tracking data, see the Diving Bird Study and the nanotag studies or contact Caleb Spiegel or Pam Loring.

What if I have eagles on my list?
If your project has the potential to disturb or kill eagles, you may need to obtain a permit to avoid violating the Eagle Act should such impacts occur.

## Proper Interpretation and Use of Your Migratory Bird Report

The migratory bird list generated is not a list of all birds in your project area, only a subset of birds of priority concern. To learn more about how your list is generated, and see options for identifying what other birds may be in your project area, please see the FAQ "What does IPaC use to generate the migratory birds potentially occurring in my specified location". Please be aware this report provides the "probability of presence" of birds within the 10 km grid cell(s) that overlap your project; not your exact project footprint. On the graphs provided, please also look carefully at the survey effort (indicated by the black vertical bar) and for the existence of the "no data" indicator (a red horizontal bar). A high survey effort is the key component. If the survey effort is high, then the probability of presence score can be viewed as more dependable. In contrast, a low survey effort bar or no data bar means a lack of data and, therefore, a lack of certainty about presence of the species. This list is not perfect; it is simply a starting point for identifying what birds of concern have the potential to be in your project area, when they might be there, and if they might be breeding (which means nests might be present). The list helps you know what to look for to confirm presence, and helps guide you in knowing when to implement conservation measures to avoid or minimize potential impacts from your project activities, should presence be confirmed. To learn more about conservation measures, visit the FAQ "Tell me about conservation measures I can implement to avoid or minimize impacts to migratory birds" at the bottom of your migratory bird trust resources page.

## Facilities

## National Wildlife Refuge lands

Any activity proposed on lands managed by the National Wildlife Refuge system must undergo a 'Compatibility Determination' conducted by the Refuge. Please contact the individual Refuges to discuss any questions or concerns.

THERE ARE NO REFUGE LANDS AT THIS LOCATION.

## Fish hatcheries

THERE ARE NO FISH HATCHERIES AT THIS LOCATION.

## Wetlands in the National Wetlands Inventory

Impacts to NWI wetlands and other aquatic habitats may be subject to regulation under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act, or other State/Federal statutes.

For more information please contact the Regulatory Program of the local U.S. Army Corps of
Engineers District.

WETLAND INFORMATION IS NOT AVAILABLE AT THIS TIME
This can happen when the National Wetlands Inventory (NWI) map service is unavailable, or for very large projects that intersect many wetland areas. Try again, or visit the NWI map to view wetlands at this location.

## Data limitations

The Service's objective of mapping wetlands and deepwater habitats is to produce reconnaissance level information on the location, type and size of these resources. The maps are prepared from the analysis of high altitude imagery. Wetlands are identified based on vegetation, visible hydrology and geography. A margin of error is inherent in the use of imagery; thus, detailed on-the-ground inspection of any particular site may result in revision of the wetland boundaries or classification established through image analysis.

The accuracy of image interpretation depends on the quality of the imagery, the experience of the image analysts, the amount and quality of the collateral data and the amount of ground truth verification work conducted. Metadata should be consulted to determine the date of the source imagery used and any mapping problems.

Wetlands or other mapped features may have changed since the date of the imagery or field work. There may be occasional differences in polygon boundaries or classifications between the information depicted on the map and the actual conditions on site.

## Data exclusions

Certain wetland habitats are excluded from the National mapping program because of the limitations of aerial imagery as the primary data source used to detect wetlands. These habitats include seagrasses or submerged aquatic vegetation that are found in the intertidal and subtidal zones of estuaries and nearshore coastal waters. Some deepwater reef communities (coral or tuberficid worm reefs) have also been excluded from the inventory. These habitats, because of their depth, go undetected by aerial imagery.

## Data precautions

Federal, state, and local regulatory agencies with jurisdiction over wetlands may define and describe wetlands in a different manner than that used in this inventory. There is no attempt, in either the design or products of this inventory, to define the limits of proprietary jurisdiction of any Federal, state, or local government or to establish the geographical scope of the regulatory programs of government agencies. Persons intending to engage in activities involving modifications within or adjacent to wetland areas should seek the advice of appropriate federal, state, or local agencies concerning specified agency regulatory programs and proprietary jurisdictions that may affect such activities.


More info (http://www.ccbbirds.org/what-we-do/research/species-of-concern/species-of-concern-projects/national-eagle-roost-registry/)

## Waterbirds

Shorebird Roost Registry
Zoom to Extents
Communal shorebird roost locations in the Western Hemisphere from published literature, tracking data, and public observations.
More info (https://ccbbirds.org/what-we-do/research/species-of-concern/species-of-concern-projects/shorebird-roost-registry/)
Colonial Waterbirds 2018
Zoom to Extents
A systematic aerial and ground survey of colonial waterbirds in coastal Virginia during the 2018 breeding season.
Black Skimmer
Black-crowned Night-Heron
Brown Pelican
Caspian Tern
Cattle Egret
Common Tern
Double-crested Cormorant
Forster's Tern
Glossy Ibis
Great Black-backed Gull
Great Egret
Gull-billed Tern
Herring Gull
Laughing Gull
Least Tern
Little Blue Heron
Royal Tern
Sandwich Tern
Snowy Egret
Tricolored Heron
White Ibis
Yellow-crowned Night-Heron
Colonial Waterbirds 2013
Zoom to Extents
A systematic aerial and ground survey of colonial waterbirds in coastal Virginia during the 2013 breeding season. Nearly 800 surveys were conducted of 496 colonies and 24 species.
More info (http://www.ccbbirds.org/what-we-do/research/species-of-concern/species-of-concern-projects/va-colonial-waterbird-survey/2013-virginia-colonial-waterbird-survey/) Black Skimmer
Black-crowned Night-Heron
Brown Pelican
Caspian Tern
Cattle Egret
Common Tern
DGnble-crested Cormorant
(forfunviswerrodb.com)

Glossy Ibis
Great Black-backed Gull
Great Blue Heron
Great Egret
Gull-billed Tern
Herring Gull
Laughing Gull
Least Tern
Little Blue Heron
Royal Tern
Sandwich Tern
Snowy Egret
Tricolored Heron
White Ibis
Yellow-crowned Night-Heron
Chesapeake Bay Herons 2013
Zoom to Extents
Great Blue Heron and Great Egret nesting pairs surveyed by airplane May-June of 2013.
More info (http://www,ccbbirds,org/what-we-do/research/species-of-concern/species-of-concern-projects/chesapeake-bay-heron-survey-2013/)
Colonial Waterbirds 2008
Zoom to Extents
A systematic aerial and ground survey of colonial waterbirds in coastal Virginia during the 2008 breeding season. More than 800 surveys were conducted of 446 colonies and 24 species.
More info (http://www.ccbbirds.org/what-we-do/research/species-of-concern/species-of-concern-projects/va-colonial-waterbird-survey/)
Black Skimmer
Black-crowned Night-Heron
Brown Pelican
Caspian Tern
Cattle Egret
Common Tern
Double-crested Cormorant
Forster's Tern
Glossy Ibis
Great Black-backed Gull
Great Blue Heron
Great Egret
Green Heron
Gull-billed Tern
Herring Gull
Laughing Gull
Least Tern
Little Blue Heron
Mixed Herons
Royal Tern
Snowy Egret
Tricolored Heron
White Ibis
Yellow-crowned Night-Heron
Colonial Waterbirds 2003
Zoom to Extents
A systematic aerial and ground survey of colonial waterbirds in coastal Virginia during the 2003 breeding season. Nearly 550 surveys were conducted of 250 colonies and 24
species.
More info (http://www.ccbbirds.org/what-we-do/research/species-of-concern/species-of-concern-projects/va-colonial-waterbird-survey/)
Black Skimmer
Black-crowned Night-Heron
Brown Pelican
Caspian Tern
Cattle Egret
Common Tern
Double-crested Cormorant
Forster's Tern
Glossy Ibis
Great Black-backed Gull
Great Blue Heron
Great Egret
Gull-billed Tern
Herring Guil
Laughing Gull
Least Tern
Little Blue Heron
Mixed Herons
Royal Tern
Sandwich Tern

Snowy Egret
Tricolored Heron
White Ibis
Yellow-crowned Night-Heron
Osprey
OspreyWatch Nests
Zoom to Extents
OspreyWatch is a global community of observers focused on breeding osprey. Volunteers provide nest locations and activity reports during the breeding season.
More info (http://www.osprey-watch.org/)
Chesapeake Bay Osprey Nests 1995-1996
Zoom to Extents
Osprey nests were surveyed by boat in the tidal portions of the Chesapeake Bay during the 1995 and 1996 breeding seasons. The Chesapeake Bay supports one of the largest osprey breeding populations in the world.
More info (http://www.ccbbirds.org/what-we-do/research/species-of-concern/species-of-concern-projects/chesapeake-osprey-survey-1995/)
Nightjars
Nightjar Survey Network Routes
Zoom to Extents
The U.S. Nightjar Network is a nationwide program where volunteers monitor the abundance and distribution of declining Nightjar species. On scheduled bright moonlit nights, participants conduct 10 roadside counts along a 9 -mile route. At each point, the observer counts all Nightjars seen or heard during a 6 -minute period.
More info (http://www.nightjars.org/)
undefined
Toggle Draw Tools
Generate Link
Pint Report
Search
LAT 45.5390546 / LONG -122.4368424 (decimal degrees)
ADDRESS (street, county, park name, etc.) 99 3rd St Fairview, Oregon
Clear

## Explosive and Flammable Hazards

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

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)?
$\checkmark$ No
Yes
2. Does this project include any of the following activities: development, construction, rehabilitation that will increase residential densities, or conversion?
$\checkmark$ No

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

## Screen Summary

## Compliance Determination

Based on the project description the project includes no activities that would require further evaluation under this section. The project is in compliance with explosive and flammable hazard requirements.

## Supporting documentation

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?
Yes
$\checkmark$ No

NE-3rd-St-(Main-
Fairview, OR
900000010240096
Harrison)-Sidewalk-Infill-(City-of-Fairview)

NE-3rd-St-(Main-
(City-of-Fairview)

## Farmlands Protection

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

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

## Yes

$\checkmark$ No

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

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

## Screen Summary

## Compliance Determination

This project does not include any activities that could potentially convert agricultural land to a non-agricultural use. The project is in compliance with the Farmland Protection Policy Act.

## Supporting documentation

## EPA_Urbanized Area.pdf

Non Farmland area Google Maps.pdf
Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?
Yes
$\checkmark$ No
DA $\Delta \begin{aligned} & \text { United States } \\ & \text { Anvironmental Protection } \\ & \text { Agency }\end{aligned}$


' Federal Lands


I EPA Regions
:e of Oregon DOT, S.

## Google Maps 99 3rd St



Imagery ©2022 Google, Imagery ©2022 Maxar Technologies, Metro, Portland Oregon, State of Oregon, U.S. Geological Survey, USDA
200 ft Farm Service Agency, Map data ©2022


## 99 3rd St

## Floodplain Management

| General Requirements | Legislation | Regulation |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Executive Order 11988, <br> Floodplain Management, <br> requires federal activities to <br> avoid impacts to floodplains <br> and to avoid direct and <br> indirect support of floodplain <br> development to the extent <br> practicable. | Executive Order 11988 | 24 CFR 55 |

1. Do any of the following exemptions apply? Select the applicable citation? [only one selection possible]
55.12(c)(3)
55.12(c)(4)
55.12(c)(5)
55.12(c)(6)
55.12(c)(7)
55.12(c)(8)
55.12(c)(9)
55.12(c)(10)
55.12(c)(11)
$\checkmark \quad$ None of the above
2. Upload a FEMA/FIRM map showing the site here:

## FIRMETTE Flood Hazard.pdf

The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) designates floodplains. The FEMA Map Service Center provides this information in the form of FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRMs). For projects in areas not mapped by FEMA, use the best available information to determine floodplain information. Include documentation, including a discussion of why this is the best available information for the site.

Does your project occur in a floodplain?
$\checkmark$ No
Based on the response, the review is in compliance with this section.

Yes

## Screen Summary

## Compliance Determination

This project does not occur in a floodplain. The project is in compliance with Executive Order 11988. See FEMA map. Based on the project description and the maps provided in previous sections, the project includes no activities that would require further evaluation under this section. The project does not require flood insurance or is excepted from flood insurance. While flood insurance may not be mandatory in this instance, HUD recommends that all insurable structures maintain flood insurance under the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP). The project is in compliance with Flood Insurance requirements.

## Supporting documentation

## Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

Yes
$\checkmark$ No


## Historic Preservation

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

## Threshold

Is Section 106 review required for your project?

No, because the project consists solely of activities listed as exempt in a Programmatic Agreement (PA ). (See the PA Database to find applicable PAs.)

No, because the project consists solely of activities included in a No Potential to Cause Effects memo or other determination [36 CFR 800.3(a)(1)].
$\checkmark \quad$ 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):
$\checkmark$ State Historic Preservation Offer (SHPO) Response Period Elapsed
$\checkmark \quad$ Indian Tribes, including Tribal Historic Preservation Officers (THPOs) or Native Hawaiian Organizations (NHOs)

| $\checkmark$ Cowlitz Indian Tribe | Response Period Elapsed |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\checkmark$ Grand Ronde Community of |  |
| Oregon | Response Period Elapsed |
| $\checkmark$ Nez Perce Tribe | Response Period Elapsed |
| $\checkmark$ Siletz Indians of Oregon | Response Period Elapsed |
| $\checkmark$ Umatilla Indian Reservation | Response Period Elapsed |
| $\checkmark$ Warm Springs Reservation of |  |
| Oregon | Response Period Elapsed |

Other Consulting Parties

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

Tribal consultation for this project was selected using the Tribal Directory Assessment Tool (TDAT) report list from, https://egis.hud.gov/tdat/

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:
NE 3rd Street from its intersection with Main St down to Harrison St. The 700 foot project is adjacent to Fairview Elementary School and Fairview Community Center, the sidewalks will include curb rampsdriveways and curbs throughout NE 3rd St from Main St to Harrison St.

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 | National Register <br> Status | SHPO Concurrence | Sensitive <br> Information |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |

Additional Notes:
N/A
2. Was a survey of historic buildings and/or archeological sites done as part of the project?

Yes
$\checkmark$ 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.

## $\checkmark \quad$ No Historic Properties Affected

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

## Document reason for finding:

$\checkmark \quad$ No historic properties present.

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

No Adverse Effect

Adverse Effect

```
NE-3rd-St-(Main-

> Harrison)-Sidewalk-Infill-
```

Fairview, OR
900000010240096
(City-of-Fairview)

## Screen Summary

## Compliance Determination

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

## Supporting documentation

Oregon Checklist HistoricPreservation.doc
Siletz_Tribal Consultation Letter.pdf
Nez Perce Tribe Tribal Consultation Letter.pdf
Grand Ronde Tribal Consultation Letter.pdf
Cowlitz Indian Tribe Tribal Consultation Letter.pdf
Warm Springs_Tribal Consultation Letter.pdf
Umatilla Tribal Consultation Letter.pdf
SHPO Consultation Request Multnomah County.pdf
Umatilla Tribe- Notification and Consultation- Fairview OR Sidewalk Installation
Project.pdf
Warm Springs - Notification and Consultation- Fairview OR Sidewalk Installation
Project.pdf
Cowlitz Tribe- Notification and Consultation- Fairview OR Sidewalk Installation
Project.pdf
Grande Ronde- Notification and Consultation- Fairview OR Sidewalk Installation
Project.pdf
Nez Perce Tribe- Notification and Consultation- Fairview OR Sidewalk Installation
Project.pdf
Siletz Tribe - Notification and Consultation- Fairview OR Sidewalk Installation
Project.pdf
TDAT Report.xlsx
Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?
Yes
$\checkmark$ No

# Historic Preservation for Oregon 

24 CFR Part 58

| General requirements | Legislation | Regulation |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Protect sites, buildings, objects, structures, and | National Historic Preservation | 36 CFR Part 800 |
| districts with national, state or local historic, cultural | Act, 16 U.S.C. 470(f), section | 24 CFR Part 58.5(a) |
| and/or archeological significance. Identify effects of <br> project on historic properties | 106 |  |

1. Does the project include repair, rehabilitation or conversion of existing properties; new construction; the acquisition of undeveloped land; or any activity that requires ground disturbance (defined as one cubic foot of disturbed soil)?
$\square$ No: STOP here. The Section 106 Historic Preservation review is complete.
Record your determination on the Statutory Worksheet or Environmental Assessment.
$\triangle$ Yes: PROCEED to \#2
2. Does the project involve a structure that is less than 45 years old, is not in a historic district and has no ground disturbing activities?
$\square$ Yes: STOP here. The Section 106 Historic Preservation review is complete.
Record your determination that there is no potential to cause effect, including the age of the existing building and information from the National Register to show that the activity is not in a historic district, on the Statutory Worksheet or Environmental Assessment.
区 No: PROCEED to \#3
3. Consult with SHPO or THPO and any tribes or groups that may have an interest in the project to determine if the project is eligible for the National Register of Historic Places.

- You must define and consider the Area of Potential Effect (APE). The APE is the geographic area within which an undertaking may directly or indirectly cause changes in the character or use of historic properties. The APE is influenced by the scale and nature of an undertaking. (36 CFR Part 800.16).
- Determine if there are tribes or groups that have an interest in the historic aspects of the project and invite them to participate in the consultation. For ground disturbing activities, you must make a reasonable and good faith effort to identify Indian tribes that may have an interest. HUD's website lists interested tribes by county: https://egis.hud.gov/tdat/It is suggested that you go to the Legislative Commission on Indian Services, Tribal websites, or contact the SHPO to make sure contact information is current.
- Consult the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), or if the project is on certain tribal lands, the Tribal Historic Preservation Officer (THPO), with details of the project and project site and your determination if it is eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. Instructions on how to submit projects for review to the Oregon SHPO and submittal requirements are below. SHPO or THPO has 30 calendar days from receipt of adequate documentation to review and concur or comment on your determination of eligibility and finding of effect. If SHPO does not respond within the timeframe, or provide a description of additional information needed, you may proceed with the next step of the process based on your finding or consult with the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP).

State Historic Preservation Officer contacts: http://www.nps.gov/nr/shpolist.htm
Tribal Historic Preservation Officers contacts: http://www.nathpo.org/map.html

Proceed as appropriate based on the Finding:
No Historic Properties Affected: STOP here. The Section 106 Historic Preservation review is complete. Attach SHPO/THPO concurrence, copies of letters to and from other interested parties and the tribes, and your response to the ERR. If SHPO/THPO did not respond within 30 days, your dated letter documents
compliance. Record your determination of no historic properties affected on the Statutory Worksheet or Environmental Assessment.
$\square$ No Adverse Effect on Historic Property: STOP here. The Section 106 Historic Preservation review is complete. Categorically Excluded projects (24 CFR Part 58.35(a)) CANNOT convert to exempt with this determination.
Attach SHPO/THPO concurrence, copies of letters to and from other interested parties and the tribes, and your response to the ERR. Record your determination of no adverse affect on historic properties on the Statutory Worksheet or Environmental Assessment.
$\square$ Adverse Effect on Historic Property Resolve Adverse Effects per 800.6 in consultation with SHPO/THPO, the ACHP if participating, and any consulting parties. The loan or grant may not be approved until adverse effects are resolved according to 800.6 or you have complied with 36 CFR Part 800. Categorically Excluded projects ( 24 CFR Part 58.35(a)) CANNOT convert to exempt with this determination.
Make sure that the resolution is fully documented in your ERR with all SHPO/THPO correspondence, copies of letters to and from other interested parties and the tribes, surveys, MOAs etc.

## Submittal Processes for the Oregon SHPO:

The Oregon SHPO is able to electronically receive project documentation using Go Digital. Go Digital submittals are sent to ORSHPO.Clearance@oregon.gov with the appropriate attachments. This dedicated email account is monitored by support staff and ensures your project receives a SHPO case number and is assigned to the appropriate staff for review. Do not send digital submissions to individual staff members. Instructions on Go Digital are available for download from:
https://www.oregon.gov/oprd/HCD/SHPO/Pages/go-digital.aspx.

## Submittal Requirements for the Oregon SHPO

For all reviews, include a cover letter with the following:

- A statement that you are the "responsible entity" for Section 106 consultation.
- A detailed description of the proposed project actions.
- Determinations of eligibility for all cultural resources.
- Finding of effect for the undertaking.

For Built Environment reviews, include:

- Completed Oregon SHPO Clearance Form, available for download from https://www.oregon.gov/oprd/HCD/SHPO/Pages/preservation_106.aspx. If multiple properties are being recorded, each property needs a separate form.
For Archaeological review, include:
- A map with the APE clearly delineated.
- A history of the APE (e.g. past development, land use, existing utilities)
- An archaeological report with the SHPO report cover sheet, available for download from https://www.oregon.gov/oprd/HCD/ARCH/Pages/index.aspx.
- Shapefiles of APE, survey area, and any resources discovered


## SHPO Consultation Request_Multnomah County

Hello SHPO,
Please find the OR SHPO submittal form, cover letter and maps attached for a sidewalk infill project in Fairview, Or.
Thank you for your assistance with this matter and please let me know if you have any questions or concerns.
Thank you,

## Fanny Rodriguez-Adams

Program Specialist Senior| Pronouns: She/Ella/Hers
Community Development Block Grant
Youth \& Family Services Division I Housing Stability Team
Multnomah County I Dept. of County Human Services
209 SW 4th Ave, Suite 200 | Portland, OR 97204
Office: (503)988-7440
Events Coordinator for Multnomah County Employees of Color (ERG)
Please note I am off work every Friday


## 4 attachments

Sub Frm City of Fairview 3rd St (Main to Harrison) Sidewalk Project.pdf 677K

Cvr Let_City of Fairview Sidewalk Project.docx
28KGoogleMaps Sidewalk Infill Project.pdf 372KUSGS map_City of Fairview Sidewalk Project.pdf 507K

CLEARANCE ORSHPO * OPRD [ORSHPO.Clearance@oprd.oregon.gov](mailto:ORSHPO.Clearance@oprd.oregon.gov)
Sun, Jan 9, 2022 at 6:29 PM
To: Fanny Adams [fanny.rodriguez@multco.us](mailto:fanny.rodriguez@multco.us)

External Sender - Be Suspicious of Attachments, Links, and Requests for Payment or Login Information.

# THIS E-MAIL CONFIRMS RECEIPT OF AN ELECTRONIC SUBMISSION FOR AN HISTORIC RESOURCE/106 REVIEW 

## THIS E-MAIL DOES NOT REPRESENT CONCLUSION OF THE REVIEW/106 CONSULTATION.....

We received a clearance submission on your above referenced project. Thank you.


#### Abstract

The assigned SHPO Case Number is 21-1625. Refer to this case number on all future correspondence or submitting any change to the scope of work for review using the provided SHPO case number. Please retain this email for your records.


#### Abstract

If the SHPO chooses to not respond within 30 calendar days from receipt of this submittal your responsibilities under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 as amended, Oregon Revised Statute 358.653, local permitting process, and/or other similar request are complete and the project may proceed as described in the submitted scope of work. The 30-day SHPO response period for this project ends after $1 / 21 / 2022$. Federal and state laws protecting cultural resources, local permitting requirements; and necessary consultation with Native American Indian Tribes for federal, state and local government projects still apply. See https://www.oregon.gov/oprd/ OH/Pages/lawsrules.aspx .


## Do not respond to this email.

From: Fanny Adams [fanny.rodriguez@multco.us](mailto:fanny.rodriguez@multco.us)
Sent: Tuesday, December 21, 2021 4:07 PM
To: CLEARANCE ORSHPO * OPRD [ORSHPO.Clearance@oprd.oregon.gov](mailto:ORSHPO.Clearance@oprd.oregon.gov)
Subject: SHPO Consultation Request_Multnomah County

Hello SHPO,

Please find the OR SHPO submittal form, cover letter and maps attached for a sidewalk infill project in Fairview, Or.

Thank you for your assistance with this matter and please let me know if you have any questions or concerns.

Thank you,

## Fanny Rodriguez-Adams

Program Specialist Senior| Pronouns: She/Ella/Hers
Community Development Block Grant
Youth \& Family Services Division I Housing Stability Team
Multnomah County I Dept. of County Human Services
209 SW 4th Ave, Suite 200 | Portland, OR 97204
Office: (503)988-7440

## Events Coordinator for Multnomah County Employees of Color (ERG)

Please note I am off work every Friday

$\qquad$ This email was encrypted for your privacy and security

# Notification and Consultation- Fairview OR Sidewalk Installation Project <br> 1 message 

Fanny Adams [fanny.rodriguez@multco.us](mailto:fanny.rodriguez@multco.us)
Wed, Dec 22, 2021 at 11:02 AM
To: careymiller@ctuir.org, bot@ctuir.org
Dear Carey Miller, M.Kathryn Brigham and Tribal Council members:
Attached is a letter to inform you of a review for compliance with the Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act that Multnomah County is conducting for a sidewalk installation project in Fairview, Or. We invite you to be a consulting party in the review.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

## --

## Fanny Rodriguez-Adams

Program Specialist Senior| Pronouns: She/Ella/Hers Community Development Block Grant Youth \& Family Services Division I Housing Stability Team Multnomah County I Dept. of County Human Services 209 SW 4th Ave, Suite 200 | Portland, OR 97204
Office: (503)988-7440
Events Coordinator for Multnomah County Employees of Color (ERG)
Please note I am off work every Friday


## 2 attachments

Tribal Consultation Letter- Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation.docx 1401K

Tribal Consultation Letter- Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation.pdf 750K

Youth \& Family Services Division

December 22 ${ }^{\text {nd }}, 2021$
Carey Miller, THPO
M. Kathryn Brigham, Board of Trustees Chair

Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla Indian Reservation
46411 Timine Way Pendleton, OR 97801

RE: Fairview, Oregon - NE 3rd (Main - Harrison) Sidewalk infill Improvement Project Multnomah County Community Development Block Grant Program

Dear Carey Miller, M.Kathryn Brigham and Tribal Council members:
Multnomah County, Oregon is considering funding the project listed above with federal funds from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). Under HUD regulation 24 CFR 58.4, Multnomah County, Oregon has assumed HUD's environmental review responsibilities for the project, including tribal consultation related to historic properties. Historic properties include archeological sites, burial grounds, sacred landscapes or features, ceremonial areas, traditional cultural places and landscapes, plant and animal communities, and buildings and structures with significant tribal association. The project is called City of Fairview-NE 3rd (Main to Harrison) Sidewalk infill Improvement Project. Approximate Address of proposed project is 99 3rd St Fairview, Oregon 97024 to 299 3rd St Fairview, Oregon 97024. The City of Fairview is the Project Owner.

Multnomah County, Oregon is conducting a review of this project to comply with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act and its implementing regulations 36 CFR Part 800. We would like to invite you to be a consulting party in this review to help identify historic properties in the project area that may have religious and cultural significance to your tribe, and if such properties exist, to help assess how the project might affect them. If the project might have an adverse effect, we would like to discuss possible ways to avoid, minimize or mitigate potential adverse effects.

Enclosed is a map that shows the project area where the sidewalks will be built. Storm drainage improvements will be made along with the sidewalk installations. The USGS map containing the purple linear area is the sidewalk length, also included is a google maps for exact location. The project encompasses 517 square feet of land. The project area involves some level of excavation and disturbance of soils. There are no existing facilities that will be renovated, removed or demolished. Sidewalk will only be installed on the east side of road.

The focus of this project is on the areas adjacent to Fairview Elementary and Fairview Community Center, where the sidewalks are inadequate creating a safety risk to the residents. This project does not involve any change in land use. Ground disturbance will occur in a residential neighborhood where there are some sidewalks. This project will directly benefit 595 low and moderate income persons/households.

More information on the Section 106 review process is available at http://www.onecpd.info/environmental-review/historic-preservation/.

HUD's process for tribal consultation under Section 106 is described in a Notice available at https://www.onecpd.info/resource/2448/notice-cpd-12-006-tribal-consultation-under-24-cfr-part-58.

To meet project timeframes, can you please let us know of your interest to consult on this project within 30 days? We would also greatly appreciate it if you would include in your response:

- A note of any initial concerns with impacts of the project on religious or cultural properties
- If you do want to consult on the project, the name and contact information for the tribe's principal representative in the consultation

Thank you very much for your consideration of this letter. If something develops during the NEPA review that we feel might be of interest or concern to your tribe, we will contact you at that time to provide information and additional opportunity for comment. We greatly value your assistance and look forward to consulting further if there are historic properties of religious and cultural significance to your tribe that may be affected by this project.

Sincerely,
Fanny Adams
CDBG Program Specialist Senior
Multnomah County DCHS/Youth \& Family Services Division
503-988-7440; fanny.rodriguez@multco.us

## Attachment 1 - Map of sidewalk installation in Fairview, OR



## Notification and Consultation- Fairview OR Sidewalk Installation Project

1 message

To: robert.brunoe@ctwsbnr.org
Cc: info@warmsprings.com
Dear Raymond Tsumpti, Robert Brunoe and Tribal council,
Attached is a letter to inform you of a review for compliance with the Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act that Multnomah County is conducting for a sidewalk installation project in Fairview, Or. We invite you to be a consulting party in the review.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

## Fanny Rodriguez-Adams

Program Specialist Senior| Pronouns: She/Ella/Hers Community Development Block Grant
Youth \& Family Services Division I Housing Stability Team
Multnomah County I Dept. of County Human Services
209 SW 4th Ave, Suite 200 | Portland, OR 97204
Office: (503)988-7440
Events Coordinator for Multnomah County Employees of Color (ERG)
Please note I am off work every Friday


## 2 attachments

Tribal Consultation Letter- Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation of Oregon.docx 30K

Tribal Consultation Letter- Confederated Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation of Oregon.pdf 580K

Youth \& Family Services Division

December $22^{\text {nd }}, 2021$

Raymond Tsumpti, Chairman
Robert Brunoe, Tribal Historic Preservation Officer
Confederate Tribes of the Warm Springs Reservation of Oregon
PO Box C
Warm Springs, OR 97761-3001

RE: Fairview, Oregon - NE 3rd (Main - Harrison) Sidewalk infill Improvement Project Multnomah County Community Development Block Grant Program

Dear Raymond Tsumpti, Robert Brunoea and Tribal Council:
Multnomah County, Oregon is considering funding the project listed above with federal funds from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). Under HUD regulation 24 CFR 58.4, Multnomah County, Oregon has assumed HUD's environmental review responsibilities for the project, including tribal consultation related to historic properties. Historic properties include archeological sites, burial grounds, sacred landscapes or features, ceremonial areas, traditional cultural places and landscapes, plant and animal communities, and buildings and structures with significant tribal association. The project is called City of Fairview-NE 3rd (Main to Harrison) Sidewalk infill Improvement Project. Approximate Address of proposed project is 99 3rd St Fairview, Oregon 97024 to 299 3rd St Fairview, Oregon 97024. The City of Fairview is the Project Owner.

Multnomah County, Oregon is conducting a review of this project to comply with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act and its implementing regulations 36 CFR Part 800 . We would like to invite you to be a consulting party in this review to help identify historic properties in the project area that may have religious and cultural significance to your tribe, and if such properties exist, to help assess how the project might affect them. If the project might have an adverse effect, we would like to discuss possible ways to avoid, minimize or mitigate potential adverse effects.

Enclosed is a map that shows the project area where the sidewalks will be built. Storm drainage improvements will be made along with the sidewalk installations. The USGS map containing the purple linear area is the sidewalk length, also included is a google maps for exact location. The project encompasses 517 square feet of land. The project area involves some level of excavation and disturbance of soils. There are no existing facilities that will be renovated, removed or demolished. Sidewalk will only be installed on the east side of road.

The focus of this project is on the areas adjacent to Fairview Elementary and Fairview Community Center, where the sidewalks are inadequate creating a safety risk to the residents. This project does not involve any change in land use. Ground disturbance will occur in a residential neighborhood where there are some sidewalks. This project will directly benefit 595 low and moderate income persons/households.

More information on the Section 106 review process is available at http://www.onecpd.info/environmental-review/historic-preservation/.

HUD's process for tribal consultation under Section 106 is described in a Notice available at https://www.onecpd.info/resource/2448/notice-cpd-12-006-tribal-consultation-under-24-cfr-part-58.

To meet project timeframes, can you please let us know of your interest to consult on this project within 30 days? We would also greatly appreciate it if you would include in your response:

- A note of any initial concerns with impacts of the project on religious or cultural properties
- If you do want to consult on the project, the name and contact information for the tribe's principal representative in the consultation

Thank you very much for your consideration of this letter. If something develops during the NEPA review that we feel might be of interest or concern to your tribe, we will contact you at that time to provide information and additional opportunity for comment. We greatly value your assistance and look forward to consulting further if there are historic properties of religious and cultural significance to your tribe that may be affected by this project.

Sincerely,
Fanny Adams
CDBG Program Specialist Senior
Multnomah County DCHS/Youth \& Family Services Division
503-988-7440; fanny.rodriguez@multco.us

Fanny Adams [fanny.rodriguez@multco.us](mailto:fanny.rodriguez@multco.us)

## Notification and Consultation- Fairview OR Sidewalk Installation Project 1 message

Fanny Adams [fanny.rodriguez@multco.us](mailto:fanny.rodriguez@multco.us)
Wed, Dec 22, 2021 at 11:26 AM
To: wiyall@cowlitz.org, srussell@cowlitz.org
Dear William Iyall, Seth Russell and Tribal Council members:
Attached is a letter to inform you of a review for compliance with the Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act that Multnomah County is conducting for a sidewalk installation project in Fairview, Or. We invite you to be a consulting party in the review.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

## --

## Fanny Rodriguez-Adams

Program Specialist Senior| Pronouns: She/Ella/Hers
Community Development Block Grant
Youth \& Family Services Division I Housing Stability Team
Multnomah County I Dept. of County Human Services
209 SW 4th Ave, Suite 200 | Portland, OR 97204
Office: (503)988-7440
Events Coordinator for Multnomah County Employees of Color (ERG)
Please note I am off work every Friday


## 2 attachments

Tribal Consultation Letter-Cowlitz Indian Tribe.docx 30K

Tribal Consultation Letter-Cowlitz Indian Tribe.pdf 566K

Youth \& Family Services Division

December 22 ${ }^{\text {nd }}, 2021$
William Iyall, Tribal Chairman
Seth Russell, THPO
Cowlitz Indian Tribe
PO Box 2547
Longview, WA 98632

## RE: Fairview, Oregon - NE 3rd (Main - Harrison) Sidewalk infill Improvement Project Multnomah County Community Development Block Grant Program

Dear William Iyall, Seth Russell and Tribal Council members:

Multnomah County, Oregon is considering funding the project listed above with federal funds from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). Under HUD regulation 24 CFR 58.4, Multnomah County, Oregon has assumed HUD's environmental review responsibilities for the project, including tribal consultation related to historic properties. Historic properties include archeological sites, burial grounds, sacred landscapes or features, ceremonial areas, traditional cultural places and landscapes, plant and animal communities, and buildings and structures with significant tribal association. The project is called City of Fairview-NE 3rd (Main to Harrison) Sidewalk infill Improvement Project. Approximate Address of proposed project is 99 3rd St Fairview, Oregon 97024 to 299 3rd St Fairview, Oregon 97024. The City of Fairview is the Project Owner.

Multnomah County, Oregon is conducting a review of this project to comply with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act and its implementing regulations 36 CFR Part 800. We would like to invite you to be a consulting party in this review to help identify historic properties in the project area that may have religious and cultural significance to your tribe, and if such properties exist, to help assess how the project might affect them. If the project might have an adverse effect, we would like to discuss possible ways to avoid, minimize or mitigate potential adverse effects.

Enclosed is a map that shows the project area where the sidewalks will be built. Storm drainage improvements will be made along with the sidewalk installations. The USGS map containing the purple linear area is the sidewalk length, also included is a google maps for exact location. The project encompasses 517 square feet of land. The project area involves some level of excavation and disturbance of soils. There are no existing facilities that will be renovated, removed or demolished. Sidewalk will only be installed on the east side of road.

The focus of this project is on the areas adjacent to Fairview Elementary and Fairview Community Center, where the sidewalks are inadequate creating a safety risk to the residents. This project does not involve any change in land use. Ground disturbance will occur in a residential neighborhood where there are some sidewalks. This project will directly benefit 595 low and moderate income persons/households.

More information on the Section 106 review process is available at http://www.onecpd.info/environmental-review/historic-preservation/.

HUD's process for tribal consultation under Section 106 is described in a Notice available at https://www.onecpd.info/resource/2448/notice-cpd-12-006-tribal-consultation-under-24-cfr-part-58.

To meet project timeframes, can you please let us know of your interest to consult on this project within 30 days? We would also greatly appreciate it if you would include in your response:

- A note of any initial concerns with impacts of the project on religious or cultural properties
- If you do want to consult on the project, the name and contact information for the tribe's principal representative in the consultation

Thank you very much for your consideration of this letter. If something develops during the NEPA review that we feel might be of interest or concern to your tribe, we will contact you at that time to provide information and additional opportunity for comment. We greatly value your assistance and look forward to consulting further if there are historic properties of religious and cultural significance to your tribe that may be affected by this project.

Sincerely,
Fanny Adams
CDBG Program Specialist Senior
Multnomah County DCHS/Youth \& Family Services Division
503-988-7440; fanny.rodriguez@multco.us

## Notification and Consultation- Fairview OR Sidewalk Installation Project 1 message

Fanny Adams [fanny.rodriguez@multco.us](mailto:fanny.rodriguez@multco.us)
Wed, Dec 22, 2021 at 10:07 AM
To: reyn.leno@grandronde.org, david.harrelson@grandronde.org, thpo@grandronde.org
Dear Chairwoman, Cheryle Kennedy, and Tribal Council,
Attached is a letter to inform you of a review for compliance with the Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act that Multnomah County is conducting for a sidewalk installation project in Fairview, Or. We invite you to be a consulting party in the review.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

## Fanny Rodriguez-Adams

Program Specialist Senior| Pronouns: She/Ella/Hers Community Development Block Grant
Youth \& Family Services Division I Housing Stability Team Multnomah County I Dept. of County Human Services 209 SW 4th Ave, Suite 200 | Portland, OR 97204 Office: (503)988-7440
Events Coordinator for Multnomah County Employees of Color (ERG)
Please note I am off work every Friday


## 2 attachments

Tribal Consultation Letter-Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde Community of Oregon.docx 1400K

Tribal Consultation Letter-Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde Community of Oregon.pdf 736K

Youth \& Family Services Division

December 22 ${ }^{\text {nd }}, 2021$
Cheryle Kennedy
Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde Community of Oregon
9615 Grand Ronde Road Grand Ronde, OR 97347

RE: Fairview, Oregon - NE 3rd (Main - Harrison) Sidewalk infill Improvement Project Multnomah County Community Development Block Grant Program

Dear Chairwoman, Cheryle Kennedy, and Tribal Council:
Multnomah County, Oregon is considering funding the project listed above with federal funds from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). Under HUD regulation 24 CFR 58.4, Multnomah County, Oregon has assumed HUD's environmental review responsibilities for the project, including tribal consultation related to historic properties. Historic properties include archeological sites, burial grounds, sacred landscapes or features, ceremonial areas, traditional cultural places and landscapes, plant and animal communities, and buildings and structures with significant tribal association. The project is called City of Fairview-NE 3rd (Main to Harrison) Sidewalk infill Improvement Project. Approximate Address of proposed project is 99 3rd St Fairview, Oregon 97024 to 299 3rd St Fairview, Oregon 97024. The City of Fairview is the Project Owner.

Multnomah County, Oregon is conducting a review of this project to comply with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act and its implementing regulations 36 CFR Part 800. We would like to invite you to be a consulting party in this review to help identify historic properties in the project area that may have religious and cultural significance to your tribe, and if such properties exist, to help assess how the project might affect them. If the project might have an adverse effect, we would like to discuss possible ways to avoid, minimize or mitigate potential adverse effects.

Enclosed is a map that shows the project area where the sidewalks will be built. Storm drainage improvements will be made along with the sidewalk installations. The USGS map containing the purple linear area is the sidewalk length, also included is a google maps for exact location. The project encompasses 517 square feet of land. The project area involves some level of excavation and disturbance of soils. There are no existing facilities that will be renovated, removed or demolished. Sidewalk will only be installed on the east side of road.

The focus of this project is on the areas adjacent to Fairview Elementary and Fairview Community Center, where the sidewalks are inadequate creating a safety risk to the residents. This project does not involve any change in land use. Ground disturbance will occur in a residential neighborhood where there are some sidewalks. This project will directly benefit 595 low and moderate income persons/households.

More information on the Section 106 review process is available at http://www.onecpd.info/environmental-review/historic-preservation/.

HUD's process for tribal consultation under Section 106 is described in a Notice available at https://www.onecpd.info/resource/2448/notice-cpd-12-006-tribal-consultation-under-24-cfr-part-58.

To meet project timeframes, can you please let us know of your interest to consult on this project within $\mathbf{3 0}$ days? We would also greatly appreciate it if you would include in your response:

- A note of any initial concerns with impacts of the project on religious or cultural properties
- If you do want to consult on the project, the name and contact information for the tribe's principal representative in the consultation

Thank you very much for your consideration of this letter. If something develops during the NEPA review that we feel might be of interest or concern to your tribe, we will contact you at that time to provide information and additional opportunity for comment. We greatly value your assistance and look forward to consulting further if there are historic properties of religious and cultural significance to your tribe that may be affected by this project.

Sincerely,
Fanny Adams
CDBG Program Specialist Senior
Multnomah County DCHS/Youth \& Family Services Division
503-988-7440; fanny.rodriguez@multco.us

Attachment 1 - Map of sidewalk installation in Fairview, OR


## Notification and Consultation- Fairview OR Sidewalk Installation Project <br> 1 message

Dear Shannon Wheeler, Keith Baird and Tribal Council members:
Attached is a letter to inform you of a review for compliance with the Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act that Multnomah County is conducting for a sidewalk installation project in Fairview, Or. We invite you to be a consulting party in the review.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

## --

## Fanny Rodriguez-Adams

Program Specialist Senior| Pronouns: She/Ella/Hers
Community Development Block Grant
Youth \& Family Services Division I Housing Stability Team
Multnomah County I Dept. of County Human Services
209 SW 4th Ave, Suite 200 | Portland, OR 97204
Office: (503)988-7440
Events Coordinator for Multnomah County Employees of Color (ERG)
Please note I am off work every Friday


## 2 attachments

Tribal Consultation Letter-Nez Perce Tribe.docx
30K
Tribal Consultation Letter-Nez Perce Tribe.pdf 581K

Youth \& Family Services Division

December 22 ${ }^{\text {nd }}, 2021$
Shannon Wheeler, Chairperson
Keith Baird, THPO
Nez Perce Tribe
PO Box 305
Lapwai, ID 83540-0365

## RE: Fairview, Oregon - NE 3rd (Main - Harrison) Sidewalk infill Improvement Project Multnomah County Community Development Block Grant Program

Dear Shannon Wheeler, Keith Baird and Tribal Council members:

Multnomah County, Oregon is considering funding the project listed above with federal funds from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). Under HUD regulation 24 CFR 58.4, Multnomah County, Oregon has assumed HUD's environmental review responsibilities for the project, including tribal consultation related to historic properties. Historic properties include archeological sites, burial grounds, sacred landscapes or features, ceremonial areas, traditional cultural places and landscapes, plant and animal communities, and buildings and structures with significant tribal association. The project is called City of Fairview-NE 3rd (Main to Harrison) Sidewalk infill Improvement Project. Approximate Address of proposed project is 99 3rd St Fairview, Oregon 97024 to 299 3rd St Fairview, Oregon 97024. The City of Fairview is the Project Owner.

Multnomah County, Oregon is conducting a review of this project to comply with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act and its implementing regulations 36 CFR Part 800 . We would like to invite you to be a consulting party in this review to help identify historic properties in the project area that may have religious and cultural significance to your tribe, and if such properties exist, to help assess how the project might affect them. If the project might have an adverse effect, we would like to discuss possible ways to avoid, minimize or mitigate potential adverse effects.

Enclosed is a map that shows the project area where the sidewalks will be built. Storm drainage improvements will be made along with the sidewalk installations. The USGS map containing the purple linear area is the sidewalk length, also included is a google maps for exact location. The project encompasses 517 square feet of land. The project area involves some level of excavation and disturbance of soils. There are no existing facilities that will be renovated, removed or demolished. Sidewalk will only be installed on the east side of road.

The focus of this project is on the areas adjacent to Fairview Elementary and Fairview Community Center, where the sidewalks are inadequate creating a safety risk to the residents. This project does not involve any change in land use. Ground disturbance will occur in a residential neighborhood where there are some sidewalks. This project will directly benefit 595 low and moderate income persons/households.

More information on the Section 106 review process is available at http://www.onecpd.info/environmental-review/historic-preservation/.

HUD's process for tribal consultation under Section 106 is described in a Notice available at https://www.onecpd.info/resource/2448/notice-cpd-12-006-tribal-consultation-under-24-cfr-part-58.

To meet project timeframes, can you please let us know of your interest to consult on this project within 30 days? We would also greatly appreciate it if you would include in your response:

- A note of any initial concerns with impacts of the project on religious or cultural properties
- If you do want to consult on the project, the name and contact information for the tribe's principal representative in the consultation

Thank you very much for your consideration of this letter. If something develops during the NEPA review that we feel might be of interest or concern to your tribe, we will contact you at that time to provide information and additional opportunity for comment. We greatly value your assistance and look forward to consulting further if there are historic properties of religious and cultural significance to your tribe that may be affected by this project.

Sincerely,
Fanny Adams
CDBG Program Specialist Senior
Multnomah County DCHS/Youth \& Family Services Division
503-988-7440; fanny.rodriguez@multco.us

## Notification and Consultation- Fairview OR Sidewalk Installation Project 1 message

Fanny Adams [fanny.rodriguez@multco.us](mailto:fanny.rodriguez@multco.us)
Wed, Dec 22, 2021 at 9:54 AM
To: dpigsley@msn.com
Dear Chairperson Delores Pigsley and Tribal council,
Attached is a letter to inform you of a review for compliance with the Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act that Multnomah County is conducting for a sidewalk installation project in Fairview, Or. We invite you to be a consulting party in the review.

Thank you for your time and consideration,

## Fanny Rodriguez-Adams

Program Specialist Senior| Pronouns: She/Ella/Hers
Community Development Block Grant
Youth \& Family Services Division I Housing Stability Team
Multnomah County I Dept. of County Human Services
209 SW 4th Ave, Suite 200 | Portland, OR 97204
Office: (503)988-7440
Events Coordinator for Multnomah County Employees of Color (ERG)
Please note I am off work every Friday


2 attachments
Tribal Consultation Letter-Siletz.docx 1400K

Q
Tribal Consultation Letter-Siletz.pdf 749K

Youth \& Family Services Division

December 22 ${ }^{\text {nd }}, 2021$
Delores Pigsley, Tribal Chairperson, and Tribal Council
Confederated Tribes of Siletz Indians
PO Box 549
Siletz, OR 97380-0549

## RE: Fairview, Oregon - NE 3rd (Main - Harrison) Sidewalk infill Improvement Project

 Multnomah County Community Development Block Grant ProgramDear Delores Pigsley and Tribal Council members:
Multnomah County, Oregon is considering funding the project listed above with federal funds from the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). Under HUD regulation 24 CFR 58.4, Multnomah County, Oregon has assumed HUD's environmental review responsibilities for the project, including tribal consultation related to historic properties. Historic properties include archeological sites, burial grounds, sacred landscapes or features, ceremonial areas, traditional cultural places and landscapes, plant and animal communities, and buildings and structures with significant tribal association. The project is called City of Fairview-NE 3rd (Main to Harrison) Sidewalk infill Improvement Project. Approximate Address of proposed project is 99 3rd St Fairview, Oregon 97024 to 299 3rd St Fairview, Oregon 97024. The City of Fairview is the Project Owner.

Multnomah County, Oregon is conducting a review of this project to comply with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act and its implementing regulations 36 CFR Part 800 . We would like to invite you to be a consulting party in this review to help identify historic properties in the project area that may have religious and cultural significance to your tribe, and if such properties exist, to help assess how the project might affect them. If the project might have an adverse effect, we would like to discuss possible ways to avoid, minimize or mitigate potential adverse effects.

Enclosed is a map that shows the project area where the sidewalks will be built. Storm drainage improvements will be made along with the sidewalk installations. The USGS map containing the purple linear area is the sidewalk length, also included is a google maps for exact location. The project encompasses 517 square feet of land. The project area involves some level of excavation and disturbance of soils. There are no existing facilities that will be renovated, removed or demolished. Sidewalk will only be installed on the east side of road.

The focus of this project is on the areas adjacent to Fairview Elementary and Fairview Community Center, where the sidewalks are inadequate creating a safety risk to the residents. This project does not involve any change in land use. Ground disturbance will occur in a residential neighborhood where there are some sidewalks. This project will directly benefit 595 low and moderate income persons/households.

More information on the Section 106 review process is available at http://www.onecpd.info/environmental-review/historic-preservation/.

HUD's process for tribal consultation under Section 106 is described in a Notice available at https://www.onecpd.info/resource/2448/notice-cpd-12-006-tribal-consultation-under-24-cfr-part-58.

To meet project timeframes, can you please let us know of your interest to consult on this project within 30 days? We would also greatly appreciate it if you would include in your response:

- A note of any initial concerns with impacts of the project on religious or cultural properties
- If you do want to consult on the project, the name and contact information for the tribe's principal representative in the consultation

Thank you very much for your consideration of this letter. If something develops during the NEPA review that we feel might be of interest or concern to your tribe, we will contact you at that time to provide information and additional opportunity for comment. We greatly value your assistance and look forward to consulting further if there are historic properties of religious and cultural significance to your tribe that may be affected by this project.

Sincerely, Fanny Adams
CDBG Program Specialist Senior
Multnomah County DCHS/Youth \& Family Services Division
503-988-7440; fanny.rodriguez@multco.us

## Attachment 1 - Map of sidewalk installation in Fairview, OR




| Resutts from query |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| rital Name | First Name | Last Name | Tite | Street Address | city | State | Zip-Code | Work Pho | mber | Celliphone | Emall | thpo | UFL | County <br> Name | State Name |
|  |  | Tiseri | Oxmen | mobac | wemsinic | $0{ }^{4}$ | 2751 | [541] $33+161$ | [541) $53 \times 3612$ |  | Pesatercrincem |  | *wiximitenicen | N.tuest | $\frac{\text { State Name }}{\text { Oicor }}$ |
|  | Fter | Rever | Theinmechere |  | ${ }_{\text {wermen }}$ | - | , |  |  |  | Tembrucesimitare | " | \%xammericen | $\cdots$ |  |
|  | ceters | Futer | Timatowersion | P0 Eac5 5 | seer | -88 | 9720 |  |  |  | tenemicer | N | mnxtiferet | Mensta | bitem |
| costernedtuendteluxtaldin | crer | May | mato | est11-mewns | Pextan | $\cdots$ | 9 ys | (441142\%:724 | 154127-1939 |  | owerstictut | $\stackrel{\sim}{*}$ | \%iwetiratis |  | Oicen |
| Butferertate | ${ }^{\text {rest }}$ | eirs | TH0 | foestss | L15*1 | 0 | [35603155 | 1229861-351 | 2061485749 | neamusta | 12tseremericert | $r$ | wiosentereers | Wement | O:4en |
| Kithere the | s.men | Wreter | Citas | pozatios | LTExat | $\cdots$ | assezous | [2:1243-2233 | 12011835354 |  | reterpmatrectr | \% | wwwterecteret | rom |  |
|  | Orater | Butu | cinminictest | smoantaparas | Gurdicose | -8 | 97379712 | (533187-1625 | (5013 38, 228 |  | uxemuthecer | * | wnwutserteern | cra | Orum |
|  |  | \%men | Tuntorsez |  | Cindeme | -8 |  | (tane |  |  |  | r | undoseere |  | Oficen |
| costeremite | W*am | 104 | Tisucxima | Poexa 384 | lextita | w/ | 9163 |  |  |  | minmsertater | \% | Wecriucre | 54 | crean |
| cownteantice | sent | Rissel | тНЕ |  | torseu | v/A | 453320 | (120) $333-7324$ | (18) |  | insergeentrent | n | wrxathetarte | What* | Oicers |

## Noise Abatement and Control

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

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

New construction for residential use

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
$\checkmark \quad$ None of the above

## Screen Summary

## Compliance Determination

Based on the project description, this project includes no activities that would require further evaluation under HUD's noise regulation. The project is in compliance with HUD's Noise regulation. No new noise sensitive use. Continuation of previous sidewalk improvement projects along this neighborhood area with CDBG funds.

## Supporting documentation

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

Harrison)-Sidewalk-Infill-(City-of-Fairview)

```
    Yes
\checkmark ~ N o
```


## Sole Source Aquifers

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

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

## Yes

$\checkmark$ 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.
$\checkmark$ No

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

Yes

## Screen Summary

## Compliance Determination

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

NE-3rd-St-(Main-
Fairview, OR
Harrison)-Sidewalk-Infill-
(City-of-Fairview)

Supporting documentation

Sole Source NEPAssist Map.pdf
Sole Source Aquifiers Map.pdf
Sole Source Aquifers ESRI Map.pdf

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?
Yes
$\checkmark$ No

## 
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## Sole Source Aquifers



## Wetlands Protection

| General requirements | Legislation | Regulation |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Executive Order 11990 discourages direct or | Executive Order | $\begin{array}{l}\text { 24 CFR 55.20 can be } \\ \text { used for general } \\ \text { indirect support of new construction impacting } \\ \text { wetlands wherever there is a practicable }\end{array}$ |
| alternative. The Fish and Wildlife Service's |  |  |$)$

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 <br> ```\checkmark 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."
$\checkmark$ No, a wetland will not be impacted in terms of E.O. 11990's definition of new construction.

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

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

## Screen Summary

Compliance Determination
The project will not impact on- or off-site wetlands. Nearby wetlands are over $1 / 2$ mile away. The project is in compliance with Executive Order 11990.

## Supporting documentation

Wetlands Fairview Map.pdf
Wetlands Map.pdf

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?
Yes
$\checkmark$ No



This map is for general reference only. The US Fish and Wildlife Service is not responsible for the accuracy or currentness of the
base data shown on this map. All wetlands related data should be used in accordance with the layer metadata found on the

## Wetlands Fairview Map



## Wild and Scenic Rivers Act

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

1. Is your project within proximity of a NWSRS river?
$\checkmark$ No
Yes, the project is in proximity of a Designated Wild and Scenic River or Study Wild and Scenic River.
Yes, the project is in proximity of a Nationwide Rivers Inventory (NRI) River.

## Screen Summary

## Compliance Determination

This project is not within proximity of a NWSRS river. The project is in compliance with the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act.

## Supporting documentation

National Wild and Scenic Rivers LIST System.pdf
Nationwide Rivers Inventory.pdf
WILD AND SCENIC RIVER MAP.pdf

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?
Yes
$\checkmark$ No
NATIONAL SYSTEM $\mid$ MANAGEMENT $\mid$ RESOURCES $\mid$ PUBLICATIONS $\mid$ CONTACT US $\mid 50$ YEARS $\mid$ SITE INDEX

## OREGON

Oregon has approximately 110,994 miles of river, of which $1,916.7$ miles are designated as wild \& scenic-almost $2 \%$ of the state's river miles.


+ View larger map

Big Marsh Creek
Chetco River
Clackamas River
Clackamas River (South Fork)
Collawash River
Crescent Creek
Crooked River
Crooked River (North Fork)
Deschutes River
Donner und Blitzen River
Eagle Creek (Mt. Hood National Forest)
Eagle Creek (Wallowa-Whitman National Forest)
Elk Creek
Elk River
Elkhorn Creek
Fifteenmile Creek
Fish Creek

Franklin Creek
Grande Ronde River
Hood River (East Fork)
Hood River (Middle Fork)
Illinois River
Imnaha River
Jenny Creek
John Day River
John Day River (North Fork)
John Day River (South Fork)
Joseph Creek
Klamath River
Little Deschutes River
Lobster Creek
Lostine River
Malheur River
Malheur River (North Fork)
McKenzie River
Metolius River
Minam River
Molalla River
Nestucca River
North Powder River
North Umpqua River
Owyhee River
Owyhee River (North Fork)
Powder River
Quartzville Creek
River Styx
Roaring River
Roaring River (South Fork)
Rogue River
Rogue River (Upper)
Salmon River
Sandy River
Silver Creek (North Fork)
Smith River (North Fork)
Snake River
Sprague River
Spring Creek
Sycan River
Walker Creek
Wallowa River
Wasson Creek
Wenaha River
West Little Owyhee River
Whychus Creek
White River
Wildhorse \& Kiger Creeks
Willamette River (North Fork Middle Fork)
Zigzag River

NATIONWIDE RIVERS INVENTORY | CONTACTUS \| PRIVACY NOTICE \| Q\&ASEARCHENGINE | SITEmAP

## flickr

| Designated Rivers | National System | River Management | Resources |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  |  |
| About WSR Act | WSR Table | Council | Q \& A Search |
| State Listings | Study Rivers | Agencies | Bibliography |
| Profile Pages | Stewardship | Management Plans | Publications |
|  | WSR Legislation | River Mgt. Society | GIS Mapping |
|  |  | GIS Mapping | Logo \& Sign Standards |

## Nationwide Rivers Inventory

## National Park Service

U.S. Department of the Interior

This is a listing of more than 3,200 free-flowing river segments in the U.S....




## Environmental Justice

| General requirements | Legislation | Regulation |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Determine if the project | Executive Order 12898 |  |
| 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. |  |  |

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
> $\checkmark \quad$ No

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

## Screen Summary

## Compliance Determination

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

## Supporting documentation

NEPAssist Analysis Map Report_Legend.pdf
Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?
Yes
$\checkmark$ No

## NEPAssist

## 7th Street Sidewalk Infill from Lincoln St to Cedar St Map



| Hazardous Waste |
| :--- |
| (RCRAInfo) |
| Air Pollution (ICIS-AIR) |
| Water Dischargers |
| (NPDES) |
| Toxic Releases (TRI) |
| Superfund (NPL) |
| Brownfields (ACRES) |
| RADInfo |
| Toxic Substances Control |
| Act (TSCA) |
| Wetlands |
| Wetlands |
| $\square$ Estuarine and |
| Marine Deepwater |
| Estuarine and |
| Marine Wetland |

## Geographic coordinates:

LINE (45.536653,-122.441181,45.534752,-122.440011)
with buffer 0.5 miles

Note: The information in the following reports is based on publicly available databases and web services. The National Report uses nationally available datasets and the State Reports use datasets available through the EPA Regions. Click on the hyperlinked question to view the data source and associated metadata.

## National Report (i)

| Length of digitized line | 0.14 mi |
| :--- | :---: |
| Within 0.5 miles of an Ozone 8 -hr (1997 standard) Non-Attainment/Maintenance Area? | no |
| Within 0.5 miles of an Ozone 8 -hr (2008 standard) Non-Attainment/Maintenance Area? | no |
| Within 0.5 miles of a Lead (2008 standard) Non-Attainment/Maintenance Area? | no |
| Within 0.5 miles of a SO2 1-hr (2010 standard) Non-Attainment/Maintenance Area? | no |
| Within 0.5 miles of a PM2.5 $24 \mathrm{hr}(2006$ standard) Non-Attainment/Maintenance Area? | no |
| Within 0.5 miles of a PM2.5 Annual (1997 standard) Non-Attainment/Maintenance Area? | no |
| Within 0.5 miles of a PM2.5 Annual (2012 standard) Non-Attainment/Maintenance Area? | no |
| Within 0.5 miles of a PM10 (1987 standard) Non-Attainment/Maintenance Area? | no |
| Within 0.5 miles of a Federal Land? | no |
| Within 0.5 miles of an impaired stream? | no |
| Within 0.5 miles of an impaired waterbody? | no |
| Within 0.5 miles of a waterbody? | no |
| Within 0.5 miles of a stream? | yes |
| Within 0.5 miles of an NWI wetland? | click here |

Within 0.5 miles of a Brownfields site? ..... no
Within 0.5 miles of a Superfund site? ..... no
Within 0.5 miles of a Toxic Release Inventory (TRI) site? ..... no
Within 0.5 miles of a water discharger (NPDES)? ..... yes
Within 0.5 miles of a hazardous waste (RCRA) facility? ..... yes
Within 0.5 miles of an air emission facility? ..... no
Within 0.5 miles of a school? ..... yes
Within 0.5 miles of an airport? ..... no
Within 0.5 miles of a hospital? ..... no
Within 0.5 miles of a designated sole source aquifer? ..... no
Within 0.5 miles of a historic property on the National Register of Historic Places? ..... no
Within 0.5 miles of a Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA) site? ..... no
Within 0.5 miles of a RADInfo site? ..... no
Within 0.5 miles of a Tribal Land? ..... no
Within 0.5 miles of a Land Cession Boundary? ..... yes
Save to Excel ${ }^{\text {Save as PDF }}$
Oregon Report ${ }^{(i)}$
Demographic Reports ${ }^{(i)}$
USFWS IPaC Report ${ }^{\text {i) }}$


[^0]:    -122.42945.538 Degrees

[^1]:    Description:
    Certificate Holder:

[^2]:    - Refer to HUD Programmatic Opinion or contact NOAA Fisheries.

