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

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

Project Information

Update Date	Updated By	Start Date	Deadline Date	End Date	Justification
07/29/2026	Fanny Rodriguez-Adams	07/29/2026	07/29/2027		Start Date Set
10/01/2026	Fanny Rodriguez-Adams	07/29/2026	06/30/2031		5 year review for CDBG projects taking place in PY26, PY28 and PY30
10/15/2026	Fanny Rodriguez-Adams	07/29/2026	06/30/2031	10/14/2026	Actual End Date set to Signed Date on Signature and Posting (6320) screen.

Project Name: 5-Year-(2026-2031)-Donald-L-Robertson-Park-Improvements

HEROS Number: 900000010547740

Start Date: 07/29/2026

Estimated End Date: 06/30/2031

Actual End Date: 10/14/2026

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

RE Preparer: Fanny Rodriguez-Adams

State / Local Identifier:

Certifying Officer: Lolita Broadous

Grant Recipient (if different than Responsible En tity):

Point of Contact:

Consultant (if applicable):

Point of Contact:

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

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

Project Location: 24300 NE Halsey St, Wood Village, OR 97060

Additional Location Information:
All improvements will take place at the Donald L. Robertson City Park. The three census blocks around the project site were selected. Block Group 1, Tract 103.04 contains the majority of people and land in the City. The remaining blocks contain the remainder of the Wood Village population in addition to areas of Fairview and Troutdale with the most direct access to Donald Robertson Park via Halsey St.

Direct Comments to: 209 SW 4th Ave, Suite 200, Portland OR 97204 or cdbg@multco.us

Description of the Proposed Project [24 CFR 50.12 & 58.32; 40 CFR 1508.25]:
The project at City of Wood Village's Donald L. Robertson Park includes accessibility development components during the span of a 5 year environmental review, spanning from July 1, 2026 through June 30, 2031. The components could vary from grant years and are as follows: 1) Playgrounds, multi-purpose sports court, or sports grounds improvements (baseball and basketball fields) that will incorporate the use of natural elements and will appeal to children of all ages and will reduce risk of injury, and increase community access to recreation. 2) nature habitat improvements that include new plantings, enhanced wildlife habitat, a fiber wood chips or infill soil trails for accessibility and a boardwalk. 3) improve or add new trailhead access. 4) Continued park improvements for ADA accessibility, including tables, benches, wider pathways and replacing barbeque pits. The four components together encompass under 3 acres of land. The project areas all involve some level of excavation and disturbance of soils. There are no existing building facilities that will be renovated, removed or demolished. Overview map identifying general construction areas, catch basins and information about runoff. Please see attached. Below is a description of construction and post construction storm water protection measures. It is not expected that any trees will be cut during these projects. Work will primarily occur only on Donald L. Robertson Park, spread out across an approximately two-acre area. Bidding will include ADA-compliant grading if expected to occur, ground disturbance will be mainly from removal of soil for new concrete surfaces. This should result in the disturbance of less than 50 cubic yards of soil. We will ensure that the contractor employs adequate erosion and sediment control, spoils storage and removal, and protection of the three inlets that might receive runoff. For program year 2026-27, an accessible crosswalk will be added to the parking area at Donald L Robertson Park to connect the new public restroom with picnic areas and the City Hall plaza. This builds on the work done for the City's previous CDBG projects, which installed picnic furnishings and an accessible path and walking trails around the park. Due to the existing conditions, modifications to the driveway around the crossing will be required to achieve ADA-compliant grading and allow for the passage of vehicles. Also, building off previous projects, the baseball infield soil, which has deteriorated over decades of use, will be rehabilitated with an industry standard mix designed to improve playability and significantly enhance safety for both casual users and organized recreational participants. Accessible Crosswalk; a straw wattle weighted with sand bags will be placed across the pavement past the limits of disturbance. Inlet protection will be placed at the nearest downstream catch basin on Halsey Street. The baseball field rehabilitation It is the opinion of the City that the field restoration will not pose a significant runoff risk during construction. Excavation will only disturb a few inches of the existing surface, and at that depth, the soil should be as compact as its current state. Removed soil will be disposed of offsite. Inlet protection will be placed at the nearest downstream catch basin as a precaution.

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

In addition to the other accessibility components, these projects will significantly enhance this public space, providing more attractions and activities to users of the park trails and visitors to the Donald L. Robertson Park. The three census blocks around the project site were selected. Block Group 1, Tract 103.04 contains the majority of people and land in the City. The remaining blocks contain the remainder of the Wood Village population in addition to areas of Fairview and Troutdale with the most direct access to Donald Robertson Park via Halsey St. with a total of 3,690 low to moderate individuals living in the areas. These critical access, safety, and serviceability improvements will be delayed until alternative grant funding can be secured. The City's limited general fund budget is primarily allocated toward public safety, with some remaining for routine park maintenance and emergency repairs, leaving little capacity for accessibility enhancements beyond basic upkeep. Providing useful, accessible amenities is essential to ensuring that all park visitors can fully participate in gatherings, sports, and community activities. The proposed crossing represents the final component needed to complete an accessible pathway between the park plaza and the restroom facilities. Without this connection, visitors with mobility challenges must rely on City Hall restrooms available only during regular business hours--or navigate indirect and potentially difficult routes to reach park facilities. These conditions create avoidable barriers and limit equitable access to public amenities. Previous grant funding was used to replace the backstop and bleachers for the baseball field. This project will rehabilitate the baseball field's infield using an industry-standard dirt mix designed for optimal playability, drainage, and long-term maintenance. The current surface has deteriorated, creating safety concerns and limiting field availability. By installing a stable, properly graded infield blend, the project will enhance player safety, reduce maintenance costs, and create an attractive and useful sports field for community members, recreation programs, youth leagues, and other organizations. Funding these projects will enhance ADA accessibility to essential park facilities, reduce risk of injury, and increase community access to recreation. Other accessibility upgrades will be carried out with future CDBG grants.

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

The City of Wood Village desires to continue to increase access to parks, natural space and recreational opportunities within the City. Currently, the Donald Robertson Park is the only park within the City's boundary. The park is a regional draw as it contains an active playground, sports field, as well as nature over its 21 acres. A lot of residents get to the park from the adjacent neighborhoods, and recent development has added over 230 new households near the park. Many of the immediately adjacent residents are lower-income, and new development will increase park usage and the need for expansion. Wood Village's 2016 Parks Master Plan identified a couple of underutilized acres of land within the Donald Robertson Park that would be suitable for a nature play and natural habitat project. Through a partnership with Oregon State Parks, they

were able to fund the design of this great park feature, but lacked the funds to fully complete the construction of the project. Being able to complete the project expands the recreational opportunities within the park and encourages kids to play outdoors and learn about the natural environment firsthand. Wood Village serves some of the lowest income residents in our Metro area. While Wood village has invested over $500,000 in recent years in its parks system, there continues to be more demand than available resource. This project allows wood Village to continue to provide high-quality services to those most in need and have been historically marginalized and underserved. If the City of Wood Village does not receive funding for this project, these critical access, safety, and serviceability improvements will be delayed until alternative grant funding can be secured. The City's limited general fund budget is primarily allocated toward public safety, with some remaining for routine park maintenance and emergency repairs, leaving little capacity for accessibility enhancements beyond basic upkeep. Providing useful, accessible amenities is essential to ensuring that all park visitors can fully participate in gatherings, sports, and community activities. The proposed crossing represents the final component needed to complete an accessible pathway between the park plaza and the restroom facilities. Without this connection, visitors with mobility challenges must rely on City Hall restrooms--available only during regular business hours--or navigate indirect and potentially difficult routes to reach park facilities. These conditions create avoidable barriers and limit equitable access to public amenities. Previous grant funding was used to replace the backstop and bleachers for the baseball field. This project will rehabilitate the baseball field's infield using an industry-standard dirt mix designed for optimal playability, drainage, and long-term maintenance. The current surface has deteriorated, creating safety concerns and limiting field availability. By installing a stable, properly graded infield blend, the project will enhance player safety, reduce maintenance costs, and create an attractive and useful sports field for community members, recreation programs, youth leagues, and other organizations. Funding these projects will enhance ADA accessibility to essential park facilities, reduce risk of injury, and increase community access to recreation.

Maps, photographs, and other documentation of project location and description:
Project Proposal Wood Village FY2026-27.pdf

Determination:

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

	environment
	Finding of Significant Impact

Approval Documents:
Signature Page Environmental Assessment Donald L Robertson Park.pdf

7015.15 certified by Certifying Officer on:

7015.16 certified by Authorizing Officer on:

Funding Information

Grant / Project Identification Number	HUD Program	Program Name	Funding Amount
B-26-UC-41-0003	Community Planning and Development (CPD)	Community Development Block Grants (CDBG) (Entitlement)	$80,000.00

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

Estimated Total Project Cost [24 CFR 58.2 (a)(5)]: $106,800.00

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

Compliance Factors: Statutes, Executive Orders, and Regulations listed at 24 CFR §50.4, §58.5, and §58.6	Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?	Compliance determination (See Appendix A for source determinations)
STATUTES, EXECUTIVE ORDERS, AND REGULATIONS LISTED AT 24 CFR §50.4 & § 58.6		
Airport Hazards Clear Zones and Accident Potential Zones; 24 CFR Part 51 Subpart D	☐ Yes ☑ 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]	☐ Yes ☑ No	This project is located in a state that does not contain CBRS units. Therefore, this project is in compliance with the Coastal Barrier Resources Act.
Flood Insurance Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 and National Flood Insurance Reform Act of 1994 [42 USC 4001-4128 and 42 USC 5154a]	☐ Yes ☑ 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 Clean Air Act, as amended, particularly section 176(c) & (d); 40 CFR Parts 6, 51, 93	☐ Yes ☑ 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)	☐ Yes ☑ 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. No additional development restrictions due to coastal considerations are in place for this project site.
Contamination and Toxic Substances 24 CFR 50.3(i) & 58.5(i)(2)]	☐ Yes ☑ No	Site contamination was evaluated as follows: None of the above. 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 exempt from radon consideration. 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	☐ Yes ☑ 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.
Explosive and Flammable Hazards Above-Ground Tanks)[24 CFR Part 51 Subpart C	☐ Yes ☑ 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. Gas stations are generally not covered under 24 CFR Part 51 Subpart C because their fuel storage tanks are usually underground or small.
Farmlands Protection Farmland Protection Policy Act of 1981, particularly sections 1504(b) and 1541; 7 CFR Part 658	☐ Yes ☑ 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	☐ Yes ☑ No	
Historic Preservation National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, particularly sections 106 and 110; 36 CFR Part 800	☐ Yes ☑ No	Based on Section 106 consultation there are No Historic Properties Affected because there are no historic properties present. Tribes contacted; Cowlitz, Grand Ronde, NezPerce, Siletz, Umatilla. Warm Springs. The Office for the Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde Community of Oregon requested that an Inadvertent Discovery Plan (IDP) be in place, and if archaeological and/or cultural resources are identified during project activities Multnomah County is to contact the tribe immediately by phone. After consultation with THPO and SHPO, 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	☐ Yes ☑ 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 path improvement projects from CDBG on park outdoor grounds only. The project is in compliance with HUD's Noise regulation. This park project will take place over 5 years which will add outdoor sport facility baseball field new ADA sidewalks, benches and additional accessibility park improvements.
Sole Source Aquifers Safe Drinking Water Act of 1974, as amended, particularly section 1424(e); 40 CFR Part 149	☐ Yes ☑ 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	☐ Yes ☑ No	The project will not impact wetlands. The project is in compliance with Executive Order 11990. Map attached of the National Wetlands Inventory shows Freshwater Emergent Wetland across the street from project site approximately 1,500 feet away and should not be impacted by minor park improvements.
Wild and Scenic Rivers Act Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 1968, particularly section 7(b) and (c)	☐ Yes ☑ 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 Assessment Factors [24 CFR 58.40; Ref. 40 CFR 1508.8 &1508.27]

Impact Codes: An impact code from the following list has been used to make the determination of impact for each factor.
(1) Minor beneficial impact
(2) No impact anticipated
(3) Minor Adverse Impact – May require mitigation
(4) Significant or potentially significant impact requiring avoidance or modification which may require an Environmental Impact Statement.

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
LAND DEVELOPMENT			
Conformance with Plans / Compatible Land Use and Zoning / Scale and Urban Design	1	The project is in existing park and is part of park development plan of the City of Wood Village	
Soil Suitability / Slope/ Erosion / Drainage and Storm Water Runoff	2	Water runoff is infiltrated on site, no changes to the current drainage or storm water runoff are planned as part of this project. Stormwater on the project site and in the surrounding area is managed on-site via drywells. There are no significant development or drainage restrictions on this type of soil.	
Hazards and Nuisances including Site Safety and Site-Generated Noise	2	There will be no additional noise generated by completion of the project and it is public infrastructure and not residential housing project.	
SOCIOECONOMIC			
Employment and Income Patterns	2	Project by nature does not affect	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		employment or income	
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	Increases access and usability of park for people with disabilities, families with children by developing accessible trails, nature play areas	
Commercial Facilities (Access and Proximity)	2	There are no immediate commercial facilities that will benefit or be denigrated because of these park improvements.	
Health Care / Social Services (Access and Capacity)	2	There are no immediate health care or social service facilities that will benefit or be denigrated because of these park improvements.	
Solid Waste Disposal and Recycling (Feasibility and Capacity)	2	Not applicable for this project.	
Waste Water and Sanitary Sewers (Feasibility and Capacity)	2	Not applicable for this project.	
Water Supply (Feasibility and Capacity)	2	Not applicable for this project.	
Public Safety - Police, Fire and Emergency Medical	2	Not applicable for this project.	
Parks, Open Space and	1	Increases access and	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
Recreation (Access and Capacity)		usability of park for people with disabilities, families with children by developing accessible trails, nature play areas	
Transportation and Accessibility (Access and Capacity)	1	Increases accessibility to this natural and recreation area through accessible trails, sport areas and small amount of sidewalk.	
NATURAL FEATURES			
Unique Natural Features /Water Resources	1	Creates Nature Habitat area to further improve already existing park. No unique natural features or water resources are located in or near the project area. No impacts to natural features or water resources are anticipated from this project.	
Vegetation / Wildlife (Introduction, Modification, Removal, Disruption, etc.)	1	Increases vegetation and wildlife through additional plantings of trees and native plants. As the project site is already developed, it is not anticipated that this project will significantly impact any wildlife species.	
Other Factors 1	2	Not applicable for this project.	
Other Factors 2	2	Not applicable for this	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		project.	
ENERGY			
Energy Efficiency	1	No impacts to, or hazards from climate change are anticipated as a result of this project.	

Supporting documentation
Onsite Visit Donald L Robertson Park.pdf
Erosion Control Donald L Robertson Park Project.pdf

Additional Studies Performed:
Erosion control plan submitted by City of Wood Village Public Works.

Field Inspection [Optional]: Date and completed by:

List of Sources, Agencies and Persons Consulted [40 CFR 1508.9(b)]:
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service with IPaC Report NOAA State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) THPO using TDAT report Technical Assistance All documents uploaded in Related Laws and Authorities section.

List of Permits Obtained:
City of Wood Village will be responsible for all Public Works permits per program year a grant is awarded during the 5 year span from July 1, 2026 to June 30, 2031.

Public Outreach [24 CFR 58.43]:
A public hearing was held on May 6, 2026 and published in the Gresham Outlook newspaper. A presentation about the park improvements was made for CDBG Multnomah County Policy Advisory Board members and public. No objections were received and full allocation of $80,000 for PY2026-27 was approved. This project installation using CDBG funds and local City of Wood Village funds were discussed at the PY26 CDBG Annual Action Plan. Multnomah County, as the responsible entity, will

publish the FONSI and the NOI/RROF in the local Multnomah County government CDBG website for required 15 day public review and comment consultation. https://multco.us/cdbg

Cumulative Impact Analysis [24 CFR 58.32]:

Access to public spaces and ADA-accessible outdoor areas plays a critical role in building stable, inclusive communities, including in City of Wood Village. The connection between community public infrastructure and long-term housing stability is deeply linked. This park serves more than just community members of City of Wood Village, it also serves members of City of Fairview, City of Troutdale and unincorporated East Multnomah County. 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]

The proposed sidewalks and ADA ramps in the Donald L Robertson Park is a crucial need according to the advising committee group city of Wood Village consults with and the CDBG Multnomah County Policy Advisory Board. Though the City contributes local funds towards park improvements the CDBG funds elevate the most critical park improvements in need. Project deferment is not an option since this is a needed public service for the City of Wood Village.

No Action Alternative [24 CFR 58.40(e)]

If this project did not go forward, it would have a negative impact to the upkeeping up Wood Village park. The City of Wood Village serves one of the lowest-income populations in the Metro region and is the most diverse community in the area on a percentage basis. The City has allocated $106,800 in its proposed FY 2026-27 budget toward these improvements, inclusive of its CDBG request. Grant funding to support completion of the ADA crossing and ballfield soil replacement will allow the City to continue providing high-quality, equitable recreational opportunities to community members, particularly those who are historically marginalized and underserved. No action would leave an unsafe park with no sidewalk for pedestrian use. Local residents and students who have been utilizing the Donald L Robertson Park have access to the public facility as of 2019 since being acquired from the Confederate Tribes of Grand Ronde. If there were no alternatives to the park improvements the park would have

to go without maintenance to some of their amenities such as the multipurpose field, walking trail system, ball fields, picnic shelter house, Arata Creek boardwalk, basketball court and gazebo amphitheater. The lack of adequate ADA pedestrian public facilities in this area will result in compromised public safety and continuation of inconvenience to the seniors, disabled citizens and children traveling to the park from school, community center and their residence.

Summary of Findings and Conclusions:

This 5 year project for this environmental assessment Part 58 is small compared to other projects, but after receiving technical assistance from Brian Sturdivant, Regional Environmental Officer (REO), it was suggested this level of EA Part 58 review would be best for the digging disturbance length of this project. This project is most likely going to take place during CDBG PY2026, 2028, 2030. The project is essentially making repairs and improvements to an existing park; Donald L. Robertson in the City of Wood Village. This project will not have a significant impact on the environment and the improvement of pedestrian facilities will improve the LMI-eligible census tract it is located in. After these environmental accessibility improvements, the safety would be increased for all residents and students. Should any changes need to be undertaken that would adversely change this determination, the County, as Responsible Entity, will reopen the Review and carry out necessary procedures as required by Local, State, and Federal permitting authorities.

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

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

Law, Authority, or Factor	Mitigation Measure or Condition	Comments on Completed Measures	Mitigation Plan	Complete

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 prevent incompatible development around civil airports and military airfields.		24 CFR Part 51 Subpart D

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

✓ **No**

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

Yes

Screen Summary

Compliance Determination

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

Supporting documentation

PDX Airport distance to Donald L Robertson Park.pdf
Troutdale Airport KTTD to Donald L Robertson City Park.pdf

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

Yes

✓ No

Coastal Barrier Resources

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

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

Compliance Determination

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

Supporting documentation

CBRS Mapper Tool.pdf

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

	Yes
✓	No

Flood Insurance

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

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

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

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

Yes

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

Yes

✓ No

Screen Summary

Compliance Determination

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.

5-Year-(2026-2031)-Donald-L-Robertson-Park-Improvements	Wood Village, OR	900000010547740

Supporting documentation
FIRMETTE_Wood Village Map.pdf

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

	Yes
✓	No

Air Quality

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

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

Yes

✓ No

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

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

Yes

✓ No

Coastal Zone Management Act

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

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

Yes

✓ No

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

Screen Summary

Compliance Determination

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. No additional development restrictions due to coastal considerations are in place for this project site.

Supporting documentation

GEOHub Coastal Zone Boundary Map.pdf
Oregon Coastal Zone Boundary Map.pdf

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

Yes

✓ No

Contamination and Toxic Substances

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

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

	ASTM Phase I ESA
	ASTM Phase II ESA
	Remediation or clean-up plan
	ASTM Vapor Encroachment Screening.
✓	None of the above

* HUD regulations at 24 CFR § 58.5(i)(2)(ii) require that the environmental review for multifamily housing with five or more dwelling units or non-residential property include the evaluation of previous uses of the site or other evidence of contamination on or near the site.
For acquisition and new construction of multifamily and nonresidential properties HUD strongly advises the review include an ASTM Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) to meet real estate transaction standards of due diligence and to help ensure compliance with HUD's toxic

policy at 24 CFR §58.5(i) and 24 CFR §50.3(i). Also note that some HUD programs require an ASTM Phase I ESA.

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

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

✓ No

Explain:

The project site is located Block Group 1, Tract 103.04 in a residential neighborhood alongside existing homes, schools, commercial buildings, schools and paved streets. The project is adding ADA, safety and accessibility accommodations to an already exciting park in the residential neighborhood, which would not change or increase residents exposure to hazardous substances. No known hazardous substances are present in the project area.

Yes

* This question covers the presence of radioactive substances excluding radon. Radon is addressed in the Radon Exempt Question.
** Utilize EPA's Enviromapper, NEPAssist, or state/tribal databases to identify nearby dumps, junk yards, landfills, hazardous waste sites, and industrial sites, including EPA National Priorities List Sites (Superfund sites), CERCLA or state-equivalent sites, RCRA Corrective Action sites with release(s) or suspected release(s) requiring clean-up action and/or further investigation. Additional supporting documentation may include other inspections and reports.

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

✓ Yes

Explain:

Buildings will not be constructed or rehabbed during this Part 58, 5 year environmental assessment. The project is adding sport field improvements outdoors on the park in an existing residential neighborhood and will not result in the creation of new indoor spaces where radon gas may collect.

No

* Notes:

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

Screen Summary

Compliance Determination

Site contamination was evaluated as follows: None of the above. 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 exempt from radon consideration. The project is in compliance with contamination and toxic substances requirements.

Supporting documentation

Radon-zones-map.pdf
State of Oregon_ Department of Environmental Quality_Wood Village.pdf

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

Yes

✓ No

Endangered Species

General requirements	ESA Legislation	Regulations
Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act (ESA) mandates that federal agencies ensure that actions that they authorize, fund, or carry out shall not jeopardize the continued existence of federally listed plants and animals or result in the adverse modification or destruction of designated critical habitat. Where their actions may affect resources protected by the ESA, agencies must consult with the Fish and Wildlife Service and/or the National Marine Fisheries Service ("FWS" and "NMFS" or "the Services").	The Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 *et seq*.); particularly section 7 (16 USC 1536).	50 CFR Part 402

1. Does the project involve any activities that have the potential to affect specifies or habitats?

✓ 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.

Supporting documentation

Endangered Species Act Magnuson Stevens Act Checklist.pdf
FWS ESA Section 7 Consultation Packet_Wood Village Donald L Robertson Park_FY27.pdf
Wood Village No Effect Response Letter 2026.pdf
Habitat NOAA Mapper_Wood Village.pdf
CONSERVATION OPPORTUNITY AREAS Map_Wood Village.pdf
Threatened_and_Endangered_Species_Oregon.pdf
IPaC_ Explore Location resources_Donald L Robertson Park.pdf
Endangered species IPaC_Wood Village.pdf

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

	Yes
✓	No

Explosive and Flammable Hazards

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

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

✓ No

Yes

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

✓ No

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. Gas stations are generally not covered under 24 CFR Part 51 Subpart C because their fuel storage tanks are usually underground or small.

Supporting documentation

Explosive and Flammable Hazards_UST Finder Map Tool.pdf

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

	Yes
✓	No

Farmlands Protection

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

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

Yes

✓ No

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

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 NEPAssist Urban Areas Map.pdf
Web Soil Survey_Donald L Robertson Park.pdf

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

Yes

✓ No

Floodplain Management

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

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

✓ Yes

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

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

(c) The approval of financial assistance for restoring and

preserving the natural and beneficial functions and values of floodplains and wetlands, including through acquisition of such floodplain and wetland property, where a permanent covenant or comparable restriction is place on the property's continued use for flood control, wetland projection, open space, or park land, but only if:
(1) The property is cleared of all existing buildings and walled structures; and
(2) The property is cleared of related

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

(d) An action involving a repossession, receivership,

foreclosure, or similar acquisition of property to protect or enforce HUD's financial interests under previously approved loans, grants, mortgage insurance, or other HUD assistance.

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

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

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

any new construction in or modifications of a wetland .

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

(i) Special projects directed to the removal of material and architectural barriers that restrict the

mobility of and accessibility to elderly and persons with disabilities.

Describe:

Park is not near floodplain. These improvements to the park are "de minimis" as it is a recreation area.

No

Screen Summary
Compliance Determination

Supporting documentation

Oregon HazVu_ Statewide Geohazards Viewer_Donald L Robertson Park.pdf
FIRMETTE_Flood Hazard_Donald L Robertson Park.pdf
NEPAssist_ Analysis_Floodplain.pdf
Flood Hazard Zones_Donald L Robertson Park.pdf

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

Yes

✓ No

Historic Preservation

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

Threshold

Is Section 106 review required for your project?

	No, because the project consists solely of activities listed as exempt in a Programmatic Agreement (PA). (See the PA Database to find applicable PAs.)
	No, because the project consists solely of activities included in a No Potential to Cause Effects memo or other determination [36 CFR 800.3(a)(1)].
	No, because the project consists solely of activities covered by the ACHP's PROGRAM COMMENT ON CERTAIN HOUSING, BUILDING AND TRANSPORTATION UNDERTAKINGS, as demonstrated in the ACHP PC Checklist.
✓	Yes, because the project includes activities with potential to cause effects (direct or indirect).

5-Year-(2026-2031)-Donald-L-Robertson-Park-Improvements	Wood Village, OR	900000010547740

Step 1 – Initiate Consultation

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

✓ State Historic Preservation Offer (SHPO) Completed

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

✓ Confederate Tribes of the Grand Ronde	Completed
✓ Confederated Tribes of the Siletz	Response Period Elapsed
✓ Confederated Tribes of the Umatilla	Response Period Elapsed
✓ Confederated Tribes of Warm Springs	Response Period Elapsed
✓ Cowlitz Indian Tribe	Response Period Elapsed
✓ Nez Perce Tribe	Response Period Elapsed

Other Consulting Parties

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

All THPOs listed in HUD's tribal directory assistance tool were notified as was the Oregon SHPO on September 10th, 2026 both agencies were sent the SHPO Clearance form, IDP, Cultural surveys from 2019, 2021 and 2024 from the park site along with a Section 106 consultation letter inviting them to consult by October 12th 2026. SHPO response; This email acknowledges that the Oregon State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) received a submission on 09/11/26 regarding SHPO Case Number 20-1039. If SHPO does not respond within 30 calendar days from receipt of this submittal, the project may proceed as described in the submitted documentation. Other requirements under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, Oregon Revised Statute 358.653, and local permitting processes still apply.

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?

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:**
   24300 NE Halsey St, Wood Village, OR 97060

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

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

Address / Location / District	National Register Status	SHPO Concurrence	Sensitive Information
24300 NE Halsey St, Wood Village, OR 97060	Not Eligible	No	✓ Not Sensitive

Additional Notes:

No historic properties are likely to be affected by the project. SHPO has sent a concurrence letter which is included as an attachment to this submittal. Maps are included in copies of the consultation materials. No buildings are being altered as part of this project.

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

✓ Yes

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

Additional Notes:

Archeological surveys from 2019, 2021 and 2024 were carried out for the Donald L Robertson park improvements project. From these 3 surveys the scope of work for 2026-2031 should be covered by these 3 surveys that will be attached to this environmental review.

No

Step 3 –Assess Effects of the Project on Historic Properties

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

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

✓ No Historic Properties Affected

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

Document reason for finding:

✓ No historic properties present.
Historic properties present, but project will have no effect upon them.
No Adverse Effect

Adverse Effect

Screen Summary

Compliance Determination

Based on Section 106 consultation there are No Historic Properties Affected because there are no historic properties present. Tribes contacted; Cowlitz, Grand Ronde, NezPerce, Siletz, Umatilla. Warm Springs. The Office for the Confederated Tribes of Grand Ronde Community of Oregon requested that an Inadvertent Discovery Plan (IDP) be in place, and if archaeological and/or cultural resources are identified during project activities Multnomah County is to contact the tribe immediately by phone. After consultation with THPO and SHPO, the project is in compliance with Section 106.

Supporting documentation

Tribes Contacted and Comments_Donald L Robertson Park ADA Improvements.pdf
Grand Ronde Consultation Comment Donald L Robertson Park Improvements.pdf
Oregon Historic Sites Map_None Present on Donald L Robertson Park.pdf
Warm Springs Section 106 Consultation Letter.pdf
Umatilla Section 106 Consultation Letter.pdf
Siletz Section 106 Consultation Letter.pdf
NezPerce Section 106 Consultation Letter.pdf
Grand Ronde Section 106 Consultation Letter.pdf

Cowlitz Section 106 Consultation Letter.pdf
Cvr Let SHPO Case No_20 1039 Donald L Robertson Park.pdf
Arch Rpt 2024 Donald L Robertson Park Improvements.pdf
Arch Rpt 2021 Robertson Park Improvements.pdf
Arch Rpt 2019 Donald L Robertson Park Improvements.pdf
Sub Frm_Donald L Robertson Park Improvements.pdf
Clr_Frm_Donald L Robertson Park Improvements Project 2026-31.pdf

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

	Yes
✓	No

Noise Abatement and Control

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

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

New construction for residential use

Rehabilitation of an existing residential property

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

An interstate land sales registration

Any timely emergency assistance under disaster assistance provision or appropriations which are provided to save lives, protect property, protect public health and safety, remove debris and wreckage, or assistance that has the effect of restoring

	facilities substantially as they existed prior to the disaster
✓	None of the above

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 path improvement projects from CDBG on park outdoor grounds only. The project is in compliance with HUD's Noise regulation. This park project will take place over 5 years which will add outdoor sport facility baseball field new ADA sidewalks, benches and additional accessibility park improvements.

Supporting documentation

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

	Yes
✓	No

Sole Source Aquifers

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

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

Yes

✓ No

2. Is the project located on a sole source aquifer (SSA)?

A sole source aquifer is defined as an aquifer that supplies at least 50 percent of the drinking water consumed in the area overlying the aquifer. This includes streamflow source areas, which are upstream areas of losing streams that flow into the recharge area.

✓ No

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

Yes

Screen Summary

Compliance Determination

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

5-Year-(2026-2031)-Donald-L-Robertson-Park-Improvements	Wood Village, OR	900000010547740

Supporting documentation

Sole_source_aquifers_west_map.pdf
EPA NEPAssist Sole Source Aquifers Mao from Trotdale Aquifer.pdf
ArcGIS Sole Source Aquifers_City of Wood Village.pdf

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

	Yes
✓	No

Wetlands Protection

General requirements	Legislation	Regulation
Executive Order 11990 requires avoiding to the extent possible the long and short term adverse impacts associated with the destruction or modification of wetlands, and avoiding actions that directly or indirectly support new construction in wetlands wherever there is a practicable alternative. The Fish and Wildlife Service's National Wetlands Inventory must be used as a primary screening tool, but observed or known wetlands not delineated on NWI maps must also be evaluated.	Executive Order 11990	24 CFR 55.20 can be used for general guidance regarding the 8 Step Process.

1. Does this project involve new construction as defined in 24 CFR 55.10 and referenced in Executive Order 11990? The term "new construction" shall include grading, clearing, draining, dredging, channelizing, filling, diking, impounding, and related activities for any structure or facilities, including the siting of new manufactured housing units.

No

✓ Yes

2. Will the new construction activities directly impact an onsite 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, prairie potholes, wet meadows, river overflows, mud flats, and natural ponds. This definition includes those wetland areas separated from their natural supply of water as a result of activities such as the construction of structural flood protection methods or solid fill roadbeds and activities such as mineral extraction and navigation improvements. This definition includes both wetlands subject to and those not subject to Section 404 of the Clean Water Act as well as constructed wetlands.

✓ No, an onsite wetland will not be directly impacted by new construction

activities, as defined in 24 CFR 55.10.

Yes, there is an onsite wetland that will be directly impacted by new construction activities, as defined 24 CFR 55.10.

3. Will the proposed project indirectly affect wetlands by modifying the flow of stormwater, releasing pollutants, or otherwise changing conditions that contribute to wetlands viability?

Yes, wetlands may be indirectly affected by changing conditions that contribute to wetlands viability.

✓ No, wetlands will not be indirectly affected by changing conditions that contribute to wetlands viability.

4. Will the proposed project indirectly affect off-site wetlands?

Yes, off-site wetlands may be indirectly affected.

✓ No, off-site wetlands will not be indirectly affected by changing conditions that contribute to wetlands viability.

Screen Summary

Compliance Determination

The project will not impact wetlands. The project is in compliance with Executive Order 11990. Map attached of the National Wetlands Inventory shows Freshwater Emergent Wetland across the street from project site approximately 1,500 feet away and should not be impacted by minor park improvements.

Supporting documentation

FWS National Wetlands Inventory.pdf

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

	Yes
✓	No

Wild and Scenic Rivers Act

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

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

✓ No

Yes, the project is in proximity of a Designated Wild and Scenic River or Study Wild and Scenic River.
Yes, the project is in proximity of a Nationwide Rivers Inventory (NRI) River.

Screen Summary

Compliance Determination

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

Supporting documentation

Oregon Rivers List July 2026.pdf

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

Yes

✓ No