

ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

Determinations and Compliance Findings for HUD-Assisted Projects

24 CFR Part 58

Responsible Entity: New Jersey Department of Community Affairs, Richard Constable III, Commissioner

Applicant Name: _____ (First) _____ (Last)

-or- VG Properties One LLC (Business/Corporate Name)

Project Location: 145-147 Philadelphia Avenue (Street Address)

Egg Harbor City (Municipality) Atlantic (County) NJ (State) 08215

206 (Block) 19 (Lot)

Conditions for Approval [40 CFR 1505.2(c)]:

The proposed project is approved with the following conditions:

1. Use of sound insulation in construction for noise attenuation
2. Incorporation of EPA suggested conservation and sustainability measures as detailed in August 18, 2014 letter.

FINDING:

Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) [24 CFR 58.40(g)(1); 40 CFR 1508.27]
(The project will not result in a significant impact on the quality of the human environment.)

Finding of Significant Impact [24 CFR 58.40(g)(2); 40 CFR 1508.27]
(The project may significantly affect the quality of the human environment.)

CERTIFICATIONS:

Laura Sliker, LBG
Preparer Name and Agency


Preparer Signature

9/17/14
Preparer Completion Date

RE Certifying Officer Name

RE Certifying Officer Signature

RE CO Signature Date

Funding Information:

Grant Number	HUD Program	Funding Amount
B-13-DS-34-0001	NEP	\$570,000

Estimated Total HUD Funded Amount: \$ 570,000

Estimated Total Project Cost [24 CFR 58.32(d)]: (HUD and non-HUD funds) \$1,425,000

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

The purpose of this project is to provide affordable senior housing by constructing seven units. The site is located in a city designated redevelopment area.

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

The proposed building (Renaissance Plaza) is a three-story structure that accommodates 7 residential units designated as senior affordable units. The first floor will serve as a community area for residents of the building. There are six one-bedroom units and one two-bedroom unit each having their own washers and dryers with separate utility metering. The typical unit size ranges from 700 to 735 square feet.

The proposed building envelope is approximately 3,990 square feet. Five parking spaces are supplemented by an abundance of shared parking spaces conveniently located near the building. The site is also served by a public transit system, post office, public library, and a senior nutrition site.

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

The site is located in a city designated redevelopment area. Since that designation, the city has completed a new streetscape and multimodal transit facility and established a public library branch located in the restored Historic Register listed “Commercial Bank Building”. The redevelopment plan is founded upon smart growth policies and encourages pedestrian oriented activities. The use is permitted within the adopted Redevelopment Plan.

PART I: STATUTORY CHECKLIST [24 CFR 50.4, 24 CFR 58.5]

DIRECTIONS – For each authority, check either Box “A” or “B” under “Status.”

“A box” The project is in compliance, either because: (1) the nature of the project does not implicate the authority under consideration, or (2) supporting information documents that project compliance has been achieved. In either case, information must be provided as to WHY the authority is not implicated, or HOW compliance is met; OR

“B box” The project requires an additional compliance step or action, including, but not limited to, consultation with or approval from an oversight agency, performance of a study or analysis, completion of remediation or mitigation measure, or obtaining of license or permit.

IMPORTANT: Compliance documentation consists of verifiable source documents and/or relevant base data. Appropriate documentation must be provided for each law or authority. Documents may be incorporated by reference into the ERR provided that each source document is identified and available for inspection by interested parties. Proprietary material and studies that are not otherwise generally available for public review shall be included in the ERR. Refer to HUD guidance for more information.

Statute, Authority, Executive Order, Regulation, or Policy cited at 24 CFR §50.4 & §58.5	STATUS A B		Compliance Documentation
<p>1. Air Quality [Clean Air Act, as amended, particularly sections 176(c) & (d), and 40 CFR 6, 51, 93]</p>	A		<p>The proposed project is located in Atlantic County, which has the following air quality status: Nonattainment area for the 8-hour ozone standard (1997 and 2008) and maintenance for the Carbon Monoxide standard.</p> <p>Source: http://www.epa.gov/airquality/greenbk/ See <i>NEP0234_AirQualityMap.pdf</i>.</p> <p>The NJDEP Division of Air Quality has issued a Memorandum stating that the activities under the CDBG-DR Program are below the Federal General Conformity regulation’s de minimis thresholds and are presumed to conform to the SIP. See <i>NEP0234_AirQualityGenConfMemo_NEP_TO2007.pdf</i>.</p>
<p>2. Airport Hazards (Clear Zones and Accident Potential Zones) [24 CFR 51D]</p>	A		<p>The proposed project is not located within 2,500 feet of the end of a civil airport runway or 15,000 feet of the end of a military airfield runway.</p> <p>See <i>NEP0234_AirportHazardsMap.pdf</i> Source: NJDEP HUD Environmental Review GIS Tool 2.1</p> <p>Atlantic City International Airport is located approximately 4.93 miles (26,030 feet) from the site. Lakehurst Naval Air Station is located approximately 35.27 miles from the site. Newark Liberty International Airport clear zone is located approximately 82.47 miles from the site.</p>

<p>3. Coastal Zone Management [Coastal Zone Management Act sections 307(c) & (d)]</p>	<p>A</p>	<p>The proposed project is not located within the boundaries of the NJ Coastal Area Facility Review Act (CAFRA) Zone, the Upland Waterfront Development Zone, or the Hackensack Meadowlands, as defined by the State's Coastal Zone Management Program.</p> <p>See <i>NEP0234_CoastalZoneManagementActMap.pdf</i> Source: NJDEP HUD Environmental Review GIS Tool 2.1</p>
---	-----------------	--

<p>4. Contamination and Toxic Substances [24 CFR 50.3(i) & 58.5(i)(2)]</p>	<p>A</p>	<p>During desktop review, the parcel was found to be within the 3,000 ft. radius of the following “threatening” sites on the map.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Egg Harbor City Irrigation Well Contamination (65930) - Egg Harbor Gas and Go Service Station (14546) - 327 Whitehorse Pike (64785) - Rays Sports Marine Center (56245) <p>The sites were cleared and are no longer considered a threat (see email correspondence with William Lindner, NJDEP from 02/03/2014 and associated spreadsheet <i>NEP0234_ToxicsSitesClearance_NEP_TO2007.pdf</i>.)</p> <p>See <i>NEP0234_ToxicHazardousandRadioactiveSubstancesMap.pdf</i> Source: NJDEP HUD Environmental Review GIS Tool 2.1</p> <p>The parcel may be within the 3,000 foot radius of additional Hazardous Waste cleanup sites, Landfills, solid waste cleanup sites or Hazardous Waste facilities that handle hazardous materials or toxic substances, however, all sites that were determined by NJDEP to be “non-threatening” to the potential HUD project are not depicted on the map. A later version of the map shows that three of the four sites are no longer shown on the map. See <i>NEP0234_ToxicHazardousandRadioactiveSubstancesMap2.pdf</i>.</p> <p>During site reconnaissance, Weisbecker Cleaners was observed adjacent to the project location. See photographs <i>NEP0234_EA_Photo7.pdf</i> through <i>NEP0234_EA_Photo10.pdf</i>. Several 55-gallon drums were observed at the rear of the property; however, the drums were in good condition and there was no staining or discharge visible. NJDEP confirmed via email (included as <i>NEP0234_WeisbeckerCorrespondence_NEP_TO2007.pdf</i>) that this site is currently in compliance and is not considered a recognized environmental condition (REC).</p> <p><u>Lead-Based Paint and Asbestos:</u> The project involves new construction on vacant lots; therefore, lead-based paint and Asbestos are not a concern.</p> <p><u>Radon:</u> The property is in a municipality designated as Tier 3 for radon potential. No further action required, provided the applicant complies with DCA construction codes. (See <i>NEP0234_RadonTier_NEP_TO2007.pdf</i>) Source: http://www.nj.gov/dep/rpp/radon/ctytiera.htm#01</p>
--	-----------------	---

<p>5. Endangered Species [Endangered Species Act of 1973, particularly section 7; 50 CFR 402]</p>	<p>A</p>	<p>No Effect determination: Based on a review of the desktop mapping tool and a search of the Natural Heritage Databases, there are no state or federally listed species identified at the site of the proposed project.</p> <p>See <i>NEP0234_EndangeredSpeciesMap.pdf</i> and <i>NEP0234_LandscapeProjectMap.pdf</i></p> <p>Source: Letter from NJDEP Natural Heritage Program dated January 23, 2014, entitled <i>NEP0234_NHResponse_NEP_TO2007.pdf</i>. NJDEP Landscape Project Database 2012, and NJDEP HUD Environmental Review GIS Tool 2.1</p>									
<p>6. Environmental Justice [Executive Order 12898]</p>	<p>A</p>	<p>The proposed project is located in an area with both a high minority population and a high population of those living below the poverty level when compared to Atlantic County. However, the project is residential in nature and is not expected to raise environmental justice concerns.</p> <table border="1" data-bbox="776 863 1544 1045"> <thead> <tr> <th data-bbox="776 863 1089 972">Geography</th> <th data-bbox="1089 863 1328 972">Percent Minority (by blockgroup)</th> <th data-bbox="1328 863 1544 972">Percent Below Poverty (by tract)</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td data-bbox="776 972 1089 1010">Egg Harbor City, NJ</td> <td data-bbox="1089 972 1328 1010">65.44%</td> <td data-bbox="1328 972 1544 1010">20.87%</td> </tr> <tr> <td data-bbox="776 1010 1089 1045">Atlantic County, NJ</td> <td data-bbox="1089 1010 1328 1045">40.54%</td> <td data-bbox="1328 1010 1544 1045">11.78%</td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>See <i>NEP0234_EJChecklist_NEP_TO2007.pdf</i>, <i>NEP0234_EJViewMapPoverty_NEP_TO2007.pdf</i> (2 pages), and <i>NEP0234_EJViewMapMinority_NEP_TO2007.pdf</i> (2 pages)</p> <p>Source: EPA EJView</p>	Geography	Percent Minority (by blockgroup)	Percent Below Poverty (by tract)	Egg Harbor City, NJ	65.44%	20.87%	Atlantic County, NJ	40.54%	11.78%
Geography	Percent Minority (by blockgroup)	Percent Below Poverty (by tract)									
Egg Harbor City, NJ	65.44%	20.87%									
Atlantic County, NJ	40.54%	11.78%									

<p>7. Explosive and Flammable Operations [24 CFR 51C]</p>	<p>A</p>	<p>Desk top aerial photo review revealed a facility with several ASTs within 1 mile of the potential HUD project. Aerial photography shows 4 large fuel oil tanks as well as numerous, smaller-sized fuel oil and propane tanks (see NEP0234_EA_AST2 and NEP0234_EA_AST3.pdf). Site reconnaissance confirmed that this is a home heating oil company. See <i>NEP0234_AST_BINGMaps_TO2007.pdf</i>:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • AST1: Tank contains fuel oil. Field reconnaissance estimated tank dimensions as 12 feet in diameter by 43 feet in length. Using these dimensions, a conservative estimate of the tank capacity is 36,474 gallons. The ASD for a tank of this size and nature is 1,237.43 feet (ASDPPD). The actual distance calculated by the desk top tool was 1,981 feet. Upon measurement, the distance exceeded the necessary Acceptable Separation Distance (ASD). No further action necessary. See photograph <i>NEP0234_EA_AST1.pdf</i> and location of the tank on <i>NEP0234_ASTMap.pdf</i>. <p>AST 2-4: The tanks contain fuel oil. Field reconnaissance estimated tank dimensions as 12 feet in diameter by 34 feet in length. Using these dimensions, a conservative estimate for the capacity of these tanks is 28,839 gallons. The ASD for a tank of this size and nature is 1,122.09 (ASDPPD). The actual distance calculated by the desk top tool was 1,981 feet. Upon measurement, the distance exceeded the necessary Acceptable Separation Distance (ASD). No further action necessary.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The remaining tanks present at this facility are smaller, such that the associated ASDs are completely within the ASDs of the other, larger tanks located on this facility. The closest of these tanks is the 1,000-gallon propane tank (see NEP0234_EA_AST2.pdf). The ASD for a tank of this size and nature is 276.57 feet (ASDPPU). The actual distance calculated by the desk top tool was 1,940 feet. Upon measurement, the distance exceeded the necessary Acceptable Separation Distance (ASD). No further action necessary. <p>Source: NJDEP HUD Environmental Review GIS Tool 2.1</p>
<p>8. Farmland Protection [Farmland Protection Policy Act of 1981, particularly section 1504(b) & 1541; 7 CFR 658]</p>	<p>A</p>	<p>The property is located on farmland of statewide importance. The land use of the project area is currently developed/urban; therefore the project is exempt from the Farmland Conversion Impact Rating (Form AD-1006) analysis.</p> <p>See <i>NEP0234_FarmlandProtectionMap.pdf</i> <i>NEP0234_NRCSFarmlandSoilsDetermination_NEP_TO2007.pdf</i> Source: NJDEP HUD Environmental Review GIS Tool 2.1</p>

<p>9. Floodplain Management [24 CFR 55; Executive Order 11988, particularly section 2(a)]</p>	<p>A</p>	<p>The property is not located within the Special Flood Hazard Area.</p> <p>See <i>NEP0234_FloodplainMgmtandFloodInsuranceMap.pdf</i> Source: NJDEP HUD Environmental Review GIS Tool 2.1</p>
<p>10. Historic Preservation [National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, particularly sections 106 & 110; 36 CFR 800]</p>	<p>A</p>	<p>No historic properties affected. The project is not located within the Historic Property Exemption Zone; further review determined that the proposed project is not located within or near a National Register of Historic Places and is located on previously disturbed soils less than ¼ acre. A Form 1 (No Historic Properties Affected) was prepared and the NJ State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) has concurred that there are no historic properties affected within the proposed project’s area of potential effects.</p> <p>See <i>NEP0234_HistoricPreservationExemptionZoneMap.pdf</i> and <i>NEP0234_SHPOForm1_NEP_TO2007.pdf</i>. Source: NJDEP HUD Environmental Review GIS Tool 2.1</p>
<p>11. Noise Abatement and Control [Noise Control Act of 1972, as amended by the Quiet Communities Act of 1978; 24 CFR 51B]</p>	<p>B</p>	<p>Taking into account the railroad and roadway noise assessments, the predicted combined noise level at the project site is 65.4 dBA DNL, which is just over the HUD threshold for “normally unacceptable” exterior noise. The most appropriate noise mitigation in this case is to incorporate building sound insulation measures into the design of the new building. See Required Mitigation and Project Modification Measures, below.</p> <p>See noise screening calculations and maps, <i>NEP0234_NoiseScreening_NEP_TO2007.pdf</i></p>
<p>12. Sole Source Aquifers [Safe Drinking Water Act of 1974, as amended, particularly section 1424(e); 40 CFR 149]</p>	<p>A</p>	<p>The grantee proposes new construction that is located on the Coastal Plain sole source aquifer designated by the EPA. The project entails connection to public water and sewer, which will be provided by the City of Egg Harbor Municipal Utilities Authority. Storm water will be handled by the municipal storm water system.</p> <p>The EPA has reviewed the proposed project and determined that it satisfies the requirements of 1424(e) of the SWDA. EPA suggests that in order to further minimize impact on the SSA, the applicant use local and recycled materials during construction, utilize clean diesel, green storm water and landscaping, and WaterSense conservation measures. See EPA response letter dated 8/18/14 titled <i>NEP0234_SSA_EPA_Approval.pdf</i> located in the Supporting Documentation, SSA folder and Required Mitigation and Project Modification Measures, below.</p> <p>See <i>NEP0234_SoleSourceAquiferMap.pdf</i> Source: NJDEP HUD Environmental Review GIS Tool 2.1</p>

<p>13. Wetland Protection [24 CFR 55, Executive Order 11990, particularly sections 2 & 5]</p>	<p>A</p>	<p>Wetlands were not identified at the site or in the vicinity of the proposed project on the map during desktop review or during site reconnaissance.</p> <p>See <i>NEP0234_WetlandsProtectionMap.pdf</i> Source: NJDEP HUD Environmental Review GIS Tool 2.1</p>
<p>14. Wild and Scenic Rivers [Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 1968, particularly section 7(b) & (c); 36 CFR 297]</p>	<p>A</p>	<p>In compliance; the proposed project is located 1.84 miles from the nearest wild and scenic river buffer zone</p> <p>See <i>NEP0234_WildandScenicRiversMap.pdf</i> Source: NJDEP HUD Environmental Review GIS Tool 2.1</p>

PART II: ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT CHECKLIST

[24 CFR 58.40; 40 CFR 1508.8 & 1508.27]

For each impact category, evaluate the significance of the effects of the proposal on the character, features, and resources of the project area. Enter relevant base data and credible, verifiable source documentation to support the finding. Note names, dates of contact, telephone numbers, and page references. Attach additional material as appropriate. **All conditions, attenuation or mitigation measures have been clearly identified.**

Impact Codes:

- (1) no impact anticipated
- (2) potentially beneficial
- (3) potentially adverse- requires documentation
- (4) requires mitigation
- (5) significant/potentially significant adverse impact requiring avoidance or modification which may require an Environmental Impact Statement

Impact Categories	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation, Source Documentation and Mitigation or Modification Required
Land Development		
Conformance with Comprehensive and Neighborhood Plans	1	According to the project application, the City Planning board granted Final Site Plan Approval on October 18, 2011 and the project was found to be consistent with the Pinelands Comprehensive Management Plan. <i>Source: Project application</i>
Land Use Compatibility and Conformance with Zoning	1	Project applicant received final site plan approval and zoning waivers to construct proposed project on October 18, 2011, with conditions as listed in Resolution #12 of 2011; See Supporting Documentation folder file <i>NEP0234_Zoning Waivers_NEP_TO2007</i> . <i>Source: Gordon Dahl</i>
Urban Design- Visual Quality and Scale	1	According to the project application, the City Planning board granted Final Site Plan Approval on October 18, 2011 and the project was found to be consistent with the Pinelands Comprehensive Management Plan. <i>Source: Project application</i>
Slope	1	The site of the proposed project is urban, vacant, and level. See site photographs and <i>NEP0234_TopographicMap.pdf</i> .

Erosion	1	The site of the proposed project is urban, vacant, and has been previously disturbed and cleared. It is not located on or near any steep slopes or bodies of water, so will not pose an erosion threat.
Soil Suitability	1	<p>The site of the proposed project is urban, vacant, and has been previously disturbed. According to the NJDEP HUD Environmental GIS Tool, the property is located on farmland of statewide importance. However, the land use of the project area is currently developed/urban; therefore the project is exempt and will not adversely impacts soils of importance to farmland.</p> <p>The soil underlying the project site is Galloway loamy sand, clayey substratum with 0 to 5 percent slopes, which is suitable for the construction of dwellings and small commercial buildings, comparable to the proposed project structure.</p> <p>See <i>NEP0234_SoilSuitabilityReport_NEP_TO2007.pdf</i></p>
Hazards and Nuisances, Including Site Safety	1	<p>The proposed project is located in an urban environment. During construction of the second story, contractors should implement best management practices to protect the public from hazards while using the sidewalk.</p> <p>Source: <i>OneCPD Resource Exchange: Environmental Assessment Factors Guidance.</i> https://www.onecpd.info/resource/3306/environmental-assessment-factors-guidance/</p>
Drainage/Storm Water Runoff	1	<p>According to the project application, the proposed project site will be served by an area-wide storm water system.</p> <p>Source: <i>Project application</i></p>
Noise- Effects of Ambient Noise on Project & Contribution to Community Noise Levels	4	<p>Taking into account the railroad and roadway noise assessments (in file), the predicted combined noise level at the project site is 65.4 dBA DNL, which is just over the HUD threshold for “normally unacceptable” exterior noise. The most appropriate noise mitigation in this case is to incorporate building sound insulation measures into the design of the new building.</p> <p>Source: <i>Part I Statutory Checklist noise analysis and associated materials in file.</i></p>
Energy Consumption	1	<p>According to the project application, the proposed project will be served by electric and gas. The EPA suggests the use of energy efficient and water-conserving appliances and fixtures to minimize impacts to the sole source aquifer.</p> <p>Source: <i>Project application</i></p>

Socioeconomic Factors		
Demographic Character Changes	2	The proposed project is located in a high-minority community. However, the introduction of 8 new residents (maximum) to the area is not expected to greatly impact the demographics of the area. The proposed project is part of a downtown redevelopment plan aimed at improving the area as a whole. <i>Source: Project application, EPA EJView</i>
Displacement	1	No displacement will occur as a result of the proposed project. <i>Source: Project application</i>
Employment and Income Patterns	1	The proposed project provides housing for senior citizens that will not likely be seeking employment in the area. The proposed project is not expected to be a source of employment in the area. <i>Source: Project applicant consultant (Gordon Dahl)</i>
Community Facilities and Services		
Educational Facilities	1	The proposed project provides senior living units and is not expected to impact schools in the area. <i>Source: OneCPD Resource Exchange: Environmental Assessment Factors Guidance</i> https://www.onecpd.info/resource/3306/environmental-assessment-factors-guidance/
Commercial Facilities	1	The proposed project constructing seven new senior living units accommodating up to 8 new residents. This increase in residency is not expected to negatively impact existing businesses. Various commercial facilities including grocery and banking are located along Agassiz Street and at Harbor Plaza, which is approximately .5 mile from the project site and may be beneficial to the residents. <i>Source: OneCPD Resource Exchange: Environmental Assessment Factors Guidance</i> https://www.onecpd.info/resource/3306/environmental-assessment-factors-guidance/
Health Care	1	The Atlantic City Medical Center –Mainland is located approximately 7.5 miles from the project site via White Horse Pike and W Jimmie Leeds Rd. There is a shuttle service to the medical center located within walking distance from the proposed project site. <i>Source: Gordon Dahl, Google Maps</i>
Social Services	1	There is a Senior Citizen Nutrition Site located approximately 2 blocks from the site of the proposed project. A Senior Care Centers of America Galloway location is located across from the Atlantic City Medical Center. <i>Source: Gordon Dahl, Google Maps</i>

Solid Waste Disposal/Recycling	1	Atlantic County Utilities Authority provides garbage and recycling pick up at a fee. <i>Source: Egg Harbor City Clerk</i>
Waste Water/Sanitary Sewers	1	According to the project application, the proposed project will be served by public sewer provided by the City of Egg Harbor Municipal Utilities Authority. <i>Source: Project application, NEP0234_SSA_EPA_Approval.pdf, and NEP0234_SSAQuestionnaire.pdf.</i>
Water Supply	1	According to the project application, the proposed project will be served by public water provided by the City of Egg Harbor Municipal Utilities Authority. <i>Source: Project application, NEP0234_SSA_EPA_Approval.pdf, and NEP0234_SSAQuestionnaire.pdf.</i>
Public Safety: • Police	1	Egg Harbor City Police Department is located at 500 London Ave, which is 0.6 miles from the project site. <i>Source: OneCPD Resource Exchange: Environmental Assessment Factors Guidance. Distances measured using Google Maps.</i>
• Fire	1	The Egg Harbor City Fire Department is located at 631 Philadelphia Ave, which is 0.6 miles from the project site. <i>Source: OneCPD Resource Exchange: Environmental Assessment Factors Guidance. Distances measured using Google Maps.</i>
• Emergency Medical	1	The Atlantic City Medical Center –Mainland is located approximately 7.5 miles from the project site via White Horse Pike and W Jimmie Leeds Rd. <i>Source: OneCPD Resource Exchange: Environmental Assessment Factors Guidance.</i> https://www.onecpd.info/resource/3306/environmental-assessment-factors-guidance/ <i>Distances measured using Google Maps.</i>
Parks, Open Space & Recreation: • Open Space	1	A park providing passive recreation opportunities is located approximately 2 blocks away from the proposed project site, along White Horse Pike near the Egg Harbor City Rail Station. <i>Source: OneCPD Resource Exchange: Environmental Assessment Factors Guidance.</i> https://www.onecpd.info/resource/3306/environmental-assessment-factors-guidance/ <i>Distances measured using Google Maps.</i>
• Recreation	1	The proposed project includes a first-floor community area for the residents of the building. A Senior Care Centers of America Galloway location is located across from the Atlantic City Medical Center, which provides recreation opportunities for seniors. <i>Source: Project application</i>

• Cultural Facilities	1	The Egg Harbor Historical Society is located 0.6 miles away from the proposed project site. The property includes a museum and recreation fields/outdoor space. <i>Source: NJ Tourism Website, Wikimapia</i>
Transportation & Accessibility	1	Egg Harbor City New Jersey Transit Station is located approximately 2 blocks from the proposed project site and provides service to Atlantic City and Philadelphia. Atlantic County Human Services runs a shuttle service for seniors which helps with medical appointments and errands. <i>Source: Google Maps, Gordon Dahl</i>
Natural Features		
Water Resources	1	The proposed project involves the development of a vacant, urban lot in the downtown area. The site is not located in a coastal zone or a flood hazard area. <i>NJDEP HUD Environmental Review GIS Tool 2.1</i>
Surface Water	1	The proposed project involves the development of a vacant, urban lot in the downtown area. The development will increase impervious surface by adding a building where none currently exists. The project application mentions the potential integration of a “green roof” into project design. Incorporating Green construction measures such as this would reduce the negative impacts of adding impervious surface to the area. <i>Source: Project application</i>
Unique Natural Features & Agricultural Lands	1	The proposed project involves the development of a vacant, urban lot in the downtown area. No natural features remain on the site due to previous development. <i>Source: Site reconnaissance and project application</i>
Vegetation and Wildlife	1	The proposed project involves the development of a vacant, urban lot in the downtown area. Desktop review and consultation with NJDEP revealed no threatened or endangered species at the project site. <i>Source: NJDEP HUD Environmental Review GIS Tool 2.1 Part I Statutory Checklist and associated documentation in file.</i>

PART III: 58.6 CHECKLIST [24 CFR 50.4, 24 CFR 58.6]

1. AIRPORT RUNWAY CLEAR ZONES AND CLEAR ZONES NOTIFICATION [24 CFR Part 51.303(a)(3)]

Does the project involve the sale or acquisition of property located within a Civil Airport Runway Clear Zone or a Military Airfield Clear Zone?

No. Cite or attach Source Documentation: NJDEP HUD Environmental Review Tool 2.1
See NEP0234 AirportHazardsMap.pdf

[Project complies with 24 CFR 51.303(a)(3).]

Yes. Notice must be provided to the buyer. The notice must advise the buyer that the property is in a Runway Clear Zone or Clear Zone, what the implications of such a location are, and that there is a possibility that the property may, at a later date, be acquired by the airport operator. The buyer must sign a statement acknowledging receipt of this information, and a copy of the signed notice must be maintained in the ERR.

2. COASTAL BARRIERS RESOURCES ACT [Coastal Barrier Resources Act, as amended by the Coastal Barrier Improvement Act of 1990 (16 USC 3501)] Is the project located in a coastal barrier resource area?

No. Cite or attach Source Documentation: Coastal Barrier Resources System (CBRS), USFWS, 2010.
See NEP0234 CoastalBarrierResourcesActMap.pdf

[Proceed with project.]

Yes. Federal assistance may not be used in such an area.

3. FLOOD DISASTER PROTECTION ACT [Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 and National Flood Insurance Reform Act of 1994 (42 USC 4001-4128 and 42 USC 5154a)]

Does the project involve acquisition, construction, or rehabilitation of structures located in a FEMA-identified Special Flood Hazard Area (SFHA)?

No. Cite or attach Source Documentation: NJDEP HUD Environmental Review Tool 2.1
See NEP0234 FloodplainMgmtFloodInsuranceMap.pdf

[Proceed with project.]

Yes. Cite or attach Source Documentation: _____
Is the community participating in the National Insurance Program (or has less than one year passed since FEMA notification of Special Flood Hazards)?

Yes. Flood Insurance under the National Flood Insurance Program must be obtained. If HUD assistance is provided as a grant, insurance must be maintained for the economic life of the project and in the amount of the total project cost (or up to the maximum allowable coverage, whichever is less). If HUD assistance is provided as a loan, insurance must be maintained for the term of the loan and in the amount of the loan (or up to the maximum allowable coverage, whichever is less). A copy of the flood insurance policy declaration must be kept on file in the ERR.

No. Federal assistance may not be used in the Special Flood Hazard Area.

Summary of Findings and Conclusions

Additional Studies Performed:

Field Inspection: William J. Oakes III and Mark Freed on January 9, 2014.

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

Gordon Dahl, Dahlsen Group (developer's consultant), 609-703-3503.
Egg Harbor City Clerk's office: 609-965-0081
William Lindner, NJDEP
NJ State Historic Preservation Office
Robert J. Cartica, NJDEP, Office of Natural Lands Management, Natural Heritage Program
Carrie Mosley, State Conservationist, NRCS, New Jersey State Office
USEPA Region II, Environmental Impact Branch

Lists of Permits Required:

N/A

Public Outreach [24 CFR 50.23 & 58.43]:

A combined Public Notice of Finding of No Significant Impact and Notice of Intent to Request Release of Funds will be published with local newspapers in both English and Spanish, and will be available online.

Cumulative Impact Analysis [24 CFR 58.32]:

The project would result in the redevelopment of a currently vacant lot, and provide 7 new affordable senior housing units. As an infill project in a developed area, the proposed project is not expected to have a significant cumulative impact on the community or the environment.

Project Alternatives Considered [24 CFR 58.40(e), 40 CFR 1508.9]:

Other than the no-action alternative, no other project alternatives were considered.

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

Under the no action alternative the lot would remain vacant and the downtown redevelopment plan incomplete.

Summary Statement of Findings and Conclusions:

The project site is currently a vacant lot in a downtown area. Environmental review has revealed no major environmental constraints to redeveloping the lot upon the provision of additional noise mitigation for the new residents and the incorporation of conservation and sustainability measured as suggested by the EPA to minimize impacts to the sole source aquifer. Therefore, the finding of this environmental assessment is that the federal action of releasing funding to aid this project will not have a significant impact on the quality of the human environment.

Required Mitigation and Project Modification Measures: [24 CFR 58.40(d), 40 CFR 1505.2(c), 40 CFR 1508.20]

The results of the noise screening analysis showed the 65 DNL criterion for acceptable noise would be exceeded at the project site, primarily due to traffic noise on Philadelphia Ave. The most appropriate noise mitigation in this case is to incorporate building sound insulation measures into the design of the new building. The maximum interior noise level per HUD regulation is 45 DNL. However, HUD regulations also require at least 5 dB of additional attenuation over that provided by typical construction practices if the predicted exterior sound level is above 65 dB, but not exceeding 70 dB (24 CFR 51.104). Based on these requirements, the required Sound Transmission Class (STC) for this project is 25. During the design of the project, the project architect should use HUD's "Sound Transmission Classification Assessment Tool" to ensure the selected building wall, window, and door materials meet the required 25 dB attenuation. Incorporation of this mitigation measure in project specifications will ensure no significant noise impact occurs.

The EPA has suggested the following conservation and sustainability measures be incorporated into the project to minimize impacts to the sole source aquifer:

- use of local and recycled materials in construction
- use of clean diesel vehicles during construction
- green stormwater techniques and pervious surfaces
- eco-friendly landscaping
- energy efficient technologies and water conserving products should be incorporated into the new building