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

Project Name: CDBG-DR Resilient Communities Program (RCP): Manville RC 100027 Joint OEM/DPW Buildings Relocation

Responsible Entity: New Jersey Department of Community Affairs (DCA)

Grant Recipient (if different than Responsible Entity): Borough of Manville

State/Local Identifier: New Jersey

Preparer: Michael Baker International Inc.

Certifying Officer Name and Title: Samuel Viavattine, Deputy Commissioner

Consultant (if applicable): Michael Baker International Inc.

Direct Comments to: Samuel Viavattine, Deputy Commissioner
Department of Community Affairs
PO Box 823
Trenton, NJ 08625-0800

Project Location

The proposed project is located Block 310.01, Lot 2.02 in the Borough of Manville in Somerset County, New Jersey. See **Figures 1** and **2** in **Attachment A** for the Project Location and USGS 7.5-Minute Topography maps.

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

The Borough of Manville proposes a set of hazard mitigation and resilience improvements to address unmet disaster recovery needs and reduce future flood-related risks. The proposed actions include: (1) reconstruction and relocation of the Department of Public Works (DPW) and Office of Emergency Management (OEM) facilities to a site outside the mapped flood hazard area; (2) improvements to emergency evacuation notification through automation of the Borough's siren system; and (3) flood mitigation improvements along critical roadway evacuation routes.

The primary component of the project is the construction of a new joint DPW and OEM complex at a location outside of flood hazard areas. The new site will provide sufficient space to accommodate vehicles, equipment, materials, and operational needs for both departments, thereby improving emergency response capabilities and long-term operational resilience. In addition, an oversized stormwater detention basin with an associated pump station is proposed to mitigate recurrent flooding at the South Main Street (Somerset County Route 533) underpass during rainfall events.

The proposed DPW/OEM complex and stormwater management facilities would be constructed within a 2.86-acre portion of the former "Rustic Mall" property. This site is a remediated former Superfund location that was restored by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. Design plans are provided in **Attachment B**.

Joint DPW and OEM Complex

The proposed complex consists of four structures designed to meet the operational needs of the Borough's emergency management and public works functions: 1) OEM Office and Garage Building; 2) Joint OEM–DPW Service Garage; 3) DPW Office Building; and 4) DPW Covered Storage Structure.

Vehicular access to the site will be provided by expanding the existing roadway from Valerie Drive into the former Rustic Mall property, utilizing the location of a former bowling alley driveway. The access roadway will be constructed with curbing and sidewalks and will serve parking areas for all proposed structures. Access to the Norfolk Southern Railroad right-of-way will be maintained. Landscaping is proposed along the eastern perimeter of the property to buffer noise and visual impacts associated with DPW operations.

Building 1: The proposed OEM building is a one-story structure with a partial second floor, with an approximate height of 31.5 feet and a width of 70 feet. The building will be constructed with a metal frame, metal siding, and a metal roof equipped with aluminum gutters and roof leaders to manage stormwater runoff. The structure will be supported by 24-inch concrete footings installed a minimum of four feet below grade.

The western façade will include six overhead doors providing access to emergency vehicle parking areas, while a standard 3-foot by 7-foot entry door will be located on the southern façade. The ground floor will primarily consist of emergency vehicle storage, along with a gym, washroom, showers, and two bathrooms. Office space will be located on the second floor. Architectural plans and construction details are provided on Sheets A1 and A2.

Building 2: The joint OEM–DPW service garage will have an approximate height of 27.58 feet and a width of 100 feet. The structure will feature metal siding and a metal roof with aluminum gutters and roof leaders for stormwater management. The foundation will consist of 24-inch concrete footings installed at least four feet below ground level.

Five 12-foot by 12-foot overhead doors will be located along the eastern side of the building to provide access for vehicle maintenance operations. The entire interior floor area will be dedicated to vehicle and equipment maintenance, with no additional interior rooms proposed. Architectural plans and construction details are shown on Sheets A3 and A4.

Building 3: The DPW office building will have an approximate height of 25.13 feet and a width of 72 feet. Construction materials will include metal siding and a metal roof with aluminum gutters and roof leaders. The building will be supported by 24-inch concrete footings installed a minimum of four feet below grade.

A single 3-foot by 7-foot entry door will be located on the northern façade. Interior spaces will include a common office work area, one private office, two restroom areas, and a cafeteria/rec room. Architectural and construction details are provided on Sheets A5 and A6.

Building 4: The covered storage structure will be approximately 22.25 feet in height and 285 feet in length. The structure will be supported by 8-inch by 8-inch posts connected to the roof and foundation and will be used to store equipment and materials protected from weather exposure in accordance with DPW best practices. Architectural and construction details are provided on Sheets A7 and A8.

Stormwater Detention Basin and Pump Station

To address recurrent flooding along South Main Street (Somerset County Route 533), the project includes construction of an oversized stormwater detention basin and pump station. During rainfall events, when stormwater levels exceed elevation 37.50 at Manhole MH-C1, runoff will be conveyed through approximately 17.5 feet of 8-inch high-density polyethylene (HDPE) piping to the pump station.

Once activated, the pump station will convey stormwater through approximately 195 feet of force main to Manhole MH-D2, which has an invert elevation of 48.50. Stormwater will then discharge from MH-D2 at an elevation of 43.05 and flow through approximately 202.5 feet of reinforced concrete pipe (RCP) into the proposed aboveground detention basin.

The detention basin will have an approximate depth of 10 feet and an area of approximately 24,000 square feet. When the pump station is in operation, a sluice gate at Outlet Control Structure OCS-C4 will be activated to prevent discharge from the basin, allowing it to function as a temporary holding facility. Post-storm drainage procedures will be determined following storm

events. The sluice gate may be manual or automated; final design details will be provided in subsequent project phases.

Automated Emergency Siren System

The project also includes automation of the Borough's emergency siren system. The proposed improvements will integrate existing siren infrastructure with software capable of monitoring U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) data and real-time stream elevation information. This system will provide predictive capability and enable automatic activation of emergency alerts, improving the timeliness and effectiveness of public warnings during flood and other emergency events.

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

The purpose of the proposed action is to reduce the Borough of Manville's vulnerability to flooding and other climate-driven hazards while improving emergency response, evacuation capability, and protection of critical municipal infrastructure. The project is intended to address unmet disaster recovery needs resulting from Tropical Storm Ida (2021) and to mitigate projected future flood risks identified in the Somerset County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan (FEMA-approved June 2, 2020).

Manville has a long history of riverine flooding due to its location at the confluence of the Raritan River, Millstone River, and Royce Brook. Major storm events—including Hurricane Floyd (1999), Tropical Storm Irene (2011), and Tropical Storm Ida (2021)—have resulted in repeated flood inundation, causing damage to homes, infrastructure, public facilities, and evacuation routes. During Tropical Storm Ida, floodwaters rose approximately 24 feet in a 13-hour period, exceeding modeled worst-case inundation scenarios. Approximately 650 homes were damaged, and large portions of the Borough were rendered inaccessible.

Critical municipal facilities—including the Department of Public Works (DPW) and the Office of Emergency Management (OEM)—are currently located within flood hazard areas and were directly impacted during Ida. The DPW facility sustained significant flood damage, resulting in loss of equipment, records, and operational capacity. While the OEM facility itself experienced limited structural flooding, it became isolated by surrounding floodwaters, rendering it inaccessible during the emergency. These conditions significantly delayed emergency response at a time when residents required immediate assistance, including during multiple gas explosions that occurred while emergency services were unable to access affected areas.

In addition, recurrent flooding at the Main Street (Somerset County Route 533) railroad underpass has repeatedly closed one of only two north–south evacuation routes through the Borough. During flood events, closure of this underpass isolates neighborhoods and delays emergency responders, fire, police, and emergency medical services. Maintaining reliable evacuation routes is critical for public safety during flood emergencies and other disaster scenarios.

The Borough's existing emergency warning system also proved inadequate during Tropical Storm Ida. Emergency sirens are manually activated and were not triggered early enough to allow residents to safely evacuate before floodwaters inundated roadways and vehicles. Residents

were forced to rely on informal rescues using private boats, underscoring the need for a more predictive and automated warning system integrated with real-time hydrologic data.

The proposed project directly addresses these needs by relocating DPW and OEM facilities to a site outside the 0.2 percent annual chance floodplain, constructing flood mitigation infrastructure to maintain a critical evacuation route, and automating emergency siren activation using U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) stream gauge data. Collectively, these actions will improve emergency response times, reduce risk to life and property, protect public investments, and enhance long-term municipal resilience to increasingly frequent and severe storm events driven by climate change.

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

The Borough of Manville is a fully built-out municipality located within a 7.77-square-mile watershed significantly influenced by regional development, altered hydrology, and climate change. The Borough's low-lying geography and proximity to multiple waterways make it highly susceptible to riverine flooding, flash flooding, and storm surge impacts. Flooding has historically affected both floodplain and non-floodplain areas, with recent events demonstrating that neighborhoods outside mapped flood zones are increasingly at risk.

Flood frequency and severity in Manville have increased over time. While major flood events were once associated primarily with large tropical systems, the Borough now experiences more frequent nuisance flooding and flash flooding during intense rainfall events. Tropical Storm Ida marked a significant escalation in flood intensity, with water levels exceeding anticipated modeling and inundating widespread areas of the community, including critical municipal and transportation infrastructure.

Existing DPW and OEM facilities are located in areas subject to flooding and access limitations during storm events. Flooding has damaged DPW buildings, destroyed equipment and records, and constrained the Borough's ability to mobilize resources effectively during emergencies. The OEM facility, although slightly elevated, becomes inaccessible during flooding due to surrounding inundation, isolating emergency management functions at critical times.

The existing emergency siren system relies on manual activation and lacks integration with real-time hydrologic monitoring. During recent flood events, warning activation lagged behind rapidly rising water levels, leaving residents with insufficient time to evacuate. Overnight flooding further compounded these risks, particularly for residents in first-floor apartments and vulnerable populations, including low- and moderate-income households, minority communities, and single-parent families.

Transportation infrastructure also presents significant constraints under existing conditions. The Main Street railroad underpass floods during heavy rain events, eliminating a primary north–south evacuation route and isolating portions of the Borough. When this route is closed, emergency responders must detour to limited alternative crossings, delaying response times during life-threatening emergencies.

Current land use trends indicate limited opportunities for relocation or expansion within the Borough, increasing the importance of redeveloping remediated sites such as the former Rustic

Mall property. This site has undergone environmental cleanup under NJDEP oversight and presents one of the few viable locations outside the flood hazard area capable of supporting resilient municipal infrastructure.

Climate change projections and recent legislative actions identifying expanded Special Flood Hazard Areas further suggest that flood risks in Manville will continue to worsen. Rising flood elevations, more frequent intense rainfall events, and compounded upstream development reinforce the need for proactive mitigation measures that account for future conditions rather than relying solely on historical flood data.

Absent implementation of the proposed project, DPW and OEM facilities will remain vulnerable to flood damage, emergency response capacity will continue to be constrained during storm events, evacuation routes will remain susceptible to closure, and residents will face ongoing risks associated with delayed warnings and limited evacuation options.

Funding Information

Grant Number	HUD Program	Funding Amount
B-21-DF-34-0001	CDBG-DR	$5,000,000

Estimated Total HUD Funded Amount:
$5,000,000

Estimated Total Project Cost (HUD and non-HUD funds) [24 CFR 58.32(d)]:
$9,200,308

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

Record below the compliance or conformance determinations for each statute, executive order, or regulation. Provide credible, traceable, and supportive source documentation for each authority. Where applicable, complete the necessary reviews or consultations and obtain or note applicable permits of approvals. Clearly note citations, dates/names/titles of contacts, and page references. Attach additional documentation as appropriate.

STATUTES, EXECUTIVE ORDERS, AND REGULATIONS LISTED AT 24 CFR 50.4 & 58.6		
Compliance Factors: Statutes, Executive Orders, and Regulations listed at 24 CFR §58.5 and §58.6	Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?	Compliance determinations
Airport Hazards 24 CFR Part 51 Subpart D	Yes No ☐ ☒	The proposed project is not located within HUD established buffers, therefore compliance with HUD airport policy is not required. HUD guidance establishes a buffer of 15,000 feet from a military airport and 2,500 feet from a civilian airport. Based on the New Jersey Airports Map (updated June 2024 by the NJ Department of Transportation, Division of Information Technology), the proposed project is not located within these distances. Accordingly, no additional review or compliance measures are required. See **Figure 3** in **Attachment A** for airport hazards map. See **Attachment C** for Airport Hazards Worksheet.
Coastal Barrier Resources Coastal Barrier Resources Act (CBRA), as amended by the Coastal Barrier Improvement Act of 1990 [16 USC 3501]	Yes No ☐ ☒	The proposed project is not located within a USFWS designated Coastal Barrier Resources System (CBRS), therefore compliance with CBRA is not required. The USFWS CBRS online mapping tool confirms that the project site is not located within a CBRS unit or buffer zone. Accordingly, no additional review or compliance measures are required. See **Figure 4** in **Attachment A** for coastal barrier resources map. See **Attachment C** for Coastal Barrier Resources Worksheet.
Flood Insurance Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 and National Flood Insurance Reform Act of 1994	Yes No ☐ ☒	Certain types of federal financial assistance may not be used in floodplains unless the community participates in the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP) and flood insurance is obtained and maintained. The proposed project is outside of the flood hazard area as shown on FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) No. 34035C0162E (Effective, dated September 28, 2007).

[42 USC 4001-4128 and 42 USC 5154a]		Therefore, no compliance is required and no further review is necessary. See **Figure 5** in **Attachment A** for FEMA FIRM map. See **Attachment C** for Flood Insurance Worksheet.
Clean Air Clean Air Act (CAA), as amended, particularly section 176(c) & (d); 40 CFR Parts 6, 51, 93	Yes No ☒ ☐	The proposed project constitutes new construction and is in a nonattainment area, therefore compliance with the CAA is required. According to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Green Book on Nonattainment Areas for Criteria Pollutants, the area is designated as nonattainment under the 8-hour ozone National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) and Somerset County is in maintenance of the 2006 24-hour PM2.5 NAAQS. Because of the project's scope and the air quality status of the county, compliance with the State Implementation Plan (SIP) is required. On December 11, 2025, the NJDEP Division of Air Quality and Radiation Protection determined that the project's anticipated emissions would fall below the General Conformity de minimis thresholds (40 CFR 93.153). Therefore, in accordance with EPA's General Conformity regulations, the project is considered to conform to the New Jersey SIP. As potential adverse impacts are negligible, no mitigation measures are required. See **Figure 6** in **Attachment A** for air quality map. See **Attachment C** Clean Air Worksheet and **Attachment D** for NJDEP correspondence.
Coastal Zone Management Coastal Zone Management Act (CZMA), sections 307(c) & (d)	Yes No ☐ ☒	The NJDEP regulates New Jersey's coastal zone through the Coastal Zone Management (CZM) Rules. The coastal zone includes Coastal Area Facility Review Act (CAFRA) boundary, coastal waters (extending seaward from the mean high water line (MHWL) three miles offshore), tidal wetlands, the New Jersey Sports and Exposition Authority (NJSEA) District (formerly the Hackensack Meadowlands District), and up to 500-feet landward of the MHWL. The proposed project is located outside of regulated coastal areas; therefore, compliance with the CZMA is not required. See **Figure 7** in **Attachment A** for Coastal Zone Management map. See **Attachment C** for Coastal Zone Management Act Worksheet.
Contamination and Toxic Substances	Yes No ☒ ☐	HUD policy requires that all proposed properties are 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 Part 50.3(i) & 58.5(i)(2)		A Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) was completed in January 2026. The evaluation identified that the Site is subject to a Deed Notice and Soil Management Plan (SMP) associated with historic impacts from the former Federal Creosote wood-treatment facility, a Federal Creosote Superfund Site which underwent remediation. Proposed excavation for the stormwater improvements is expected to remain within the clean fill layer and outside impacted soils; therefore, no additional investigation is required provided all work complies with the Deed Notice and SMP, including NJDEP notification requirements, soil handling controls, and maintenance/restoration of the engineering control. In addition to residual creosote impacts, some planned utilities will be installed within a mapped historic fill area. Per NJDEP Historic Fill Material Technical Guidance, intrusive work in mapped historic fill may encounter material requiring evaluation and proper management. It is recommended that test pits or trenching be performed within the historic fill footprint before earthwork to confirm subsurface conditions. If historic fill is encountered, additional characterization may be needed to support soil handling, reuse, or disposal during construction. Because this area lies within the Deed Notice boundary, all intrusive activities must follow the SMP and NJDEP requirements. Environmental oversight during test pits is recommended to document encountered soils and ensure compliance. Because the project site is a remediated Superfund site it is subject to ongoing EPA monitoring. EPA has identified groundwater contaminant concentrations above vapor intrusion screening levels and recommended incorporation of a vapor intrusion barrier to address a potential indoor air exposure pathway. The project will implement this recommendation by installing a vapor intrusion barrier during construction. With this mitigation measure in place, the project will not expose occupants to hazardous substances and will comply with the requirements of 24 CFR §58.5(i). The Borough of Manville is responsible for ensuring the use of a vapor intrusion barrier on all buildings and ensuring that a qualified environmental professional (as defined by EPA) is present during test pit installation to observe subsurface conditions and identify any signs of contamination so that appropriate measures can be implemented (see Mitigation Measures and Conditions section, below).

		See **Attachment C** for Site Contamination Worksheet and **Attachment E** for Phase I ESA reports.
Endangered Species, Migratory Birds, and Bald and Golden Eagles Endangered Species Act (ESA) of 1973, particularly section 7; 50 CFR Part 402; Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) of 1918 and Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act of 1940.	Yes ☒ No ☐	Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act (ESA) requires consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and/or National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) for projects that may affect listed species. The USFWS Information for Planning and Consultation (IPaC) tool identifies federally threatened, endangered, proposed, and candidate species that may occur in the study area or be affected by the proposed project. Because the project is outside the range of any marine species under the jurisdiction of marine listed-species, no consultation with NMFS was required. According to IPaC data (dated December 18, 2025), records indicate the presence of the monarch butterfly (*Danaus plexippus*, federally proposed threatened) and the Indiana bat (*Myotis sodalis*, endangered). On March 16, 2026, the USFWS New Jersey Field Office (NJFO) concurred with the determination that the proposed project would be not likely to affect the Indiana bat provided that all cutting, trimming, or other knocking or bringing down of live or dead trees greater than or equal to five (5) inches in diameter will occur only between October 1 and March 31 to avoid impacts to suitable roost trees during the species' summer occupancy period in New Jersey. To ensure impacts to Indiana Bat are avoided and minimized a seasonal restriction was included as a project condition (see Mitigation Measures and Conditions section, below). Because the monarch butterfly is a proposed species, consultation is not required. Proposed species may be addressed through Section 7(a)(4) conference where a project is anticipated to jeopardize the continued existence of a proposed species. It was determined that this project is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of the monarch butterfly; therefore, ESA Section 7(a)(4) conference is not required. Once a final rule to list the monarch butterfly is published and goes into effect (typically 30–60 days after publication), Section 7(a)(2) requirements for consultation and Section 9 prohibitions against unpermitted 'take' of the species will apply. If the proposed project is not completed prior to the effective date of a final rule to list the monarch butterfly or tricolored bat, the DCA must assess the project's potential impacts to monarch butterflies and reinitiate consultation with the Service if remaining project activities 'may affect' either species (see Mitigation Measures and Conditions section, below).

		Additionally, IPaC identified several migratory bird species in the vicinity of the project area protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1918 and the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act of 1940. Because avian species are highly mobile and ample foraging habitat remains available during construction, therefore, adverse impacts are not anticipated. See **Figure 9** in **Attachment A** for map of threatened and endangered species mapped habitat from NJDEP Landscape Project. See **Attachment C** for Endangered Species Worksheet and **Attachment D** for IPaC Report and NJFO USFWS Section 7 consultation correspondence.
Explosive and Flammable Hazards 24 CFR Part 51 Subpart C	Yes No ☐ ☒	HUD Explosive and Flammable Hazards policy require projects to meet Acceptable Separation Distance (ASD) to protect from explosive and flammable hazards. The scope and nature of the proposed project does not include activities that would require further evaluation under this section. The project itself is not one that involves the development of a hazardous facility nor does it include development, construction or rehabilitation that would increase residential densities. Therefore, the project complies with HUD explosive and flammable hazard policies and ASD is not required. See **Attachment C** for Explosive and Flammable Hazards Worksheet.
Farmlands Protection Farmland Protection Policy Act (FPPA) of 1981, particularly sections 1504(b) and 1541; 7 CFR Part 658	Yes No ☐ ☒	The FPPA discourages federal actions that would convert farmland to nonagricultural uses. The proposed project does not involve any activities—such as new construction, acquisition of undeveloped land, or land use conversion—that could result in such impacts. Based on land use mapping, no farmland is located within or near the project area. Therefore, there is no potential for agricultural land to be converted to nonagricultural use as a result of this project, and the project complies with the FPPA. See **Figure 10** in **Attachment A** for land use map. See **Attachment C** for Farmlands Protection Worksheet.
Floodplain Management Executive Order (EO) 11988, particularly section 2(a); 24 CFR Part 55	Yes No ☐ ☒	EO 11988, requires Federal activities to avoid adverse impacts to floodplains and to avoid direct and indirect support of floodplain development to the extent practicable. The proposed project is outside the designated flood hazard area, as shown on FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) No. 34035C0162E (effective, dated September 28, 2007). Therefore, EO 11988 compliance is not required, and no further floodplain review is necessary. See **Figure 5** in **Attachment A** for FEMA FIRM map. See **Attachment C** for Floodplain Management Worksheet.

Historic Preservation National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) of 1966, particularly sections 106 and 110; 36 CFR Part 800	Yes No ☒ ☐	Section 106 of the NHPA requires consultation with the SHPO for federal actions that have the potential to affect historic properties. It was determined that the proposed project had the potential to affect historic properties and the Section 106 process was initiated. An SOI-qualified architectural historian identified no historic properties in the APE and an SOI-qualified archaeologist determined that there is no potential for encountering archaeological sites or deposits within the APE. Therefore, per 36 CFR 800.4(d)(1), the DCA determined that there would be no historic properties affected because of the undertaking. On December 16, 2025, consultation with the SHPO was initiated and invitations to consult were sent to the identified consulting parties. On January 14, 2026, the SHPO concurred with the findings, and no mitigation was required. No objections were received from consulting parties. See **Figure 11** in **Attachment A** for historic resources map. See **Attachment C** for Historic Preservation Worksheet and **Attachment D** for SHPO consultation letter, consulting party letters and concurrence letter.
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 ☐ ☒	HUD policies require protection for residential properties from excessive noise exposure and encourage mitigation as appropriate. The proposed project does not include activities that require further evaluation under HUD's noise regulations and compliance or mitigation is not required. See **Attachment C** for Noise Worksheet.
Sole Source Aquifers Safe Drinking Water Act (SDWA) of 1974, as amended, particularly section 1424(e); 40 CFR Part 149	Yes No ☒ ☐	The SDWA 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. The proposed project is located within the Northwest New Jersey sole-source aquifer. Consultation with the EPA was initiated pursuant to the Region 2 MOU between HUD and EPA. On March 31, 2026, the Drinking Water and Ground Water Protection Section of EPA Region 2 determined that based on their review, proposed project activities do not pose a substantial threat to the Northwest New Jersey sole source aquifer system. As such, the project is in compliance with the sole-source aquifer requirements. To avoid impacts to the aquifer, the EPA made several recommendations and requirements (see Mitigation and Conditions section).

		See **Figure 12** in **Attachment A** for sole source aquifer map. See **Attachment C** for Sole Source Aquifer Worksheet. See **Attachment D** for the EPA consultation letter and MOU.
Wetlands Protection Executive Order 11990, particularly sections 2 and 5	Yes No ☐ ☒	EO 11990 discourages the direct or indirect support of new construction impacting wetlands wherever there is a practicable alternative. A desktop analysis of the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection (NJDEP) 2020 Land Use/Land Cover Freshwater Wetlands (FWW) and the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) National Wetlands Inventory (NWI) were reviewed to identify potential wetlands within the study area. The NJDEP 2020 FWW and USFWS NWI mapping did not identify any wetlands within or in the immediate vicinity of the project site. Therefore, EO 11990 compliance is not required and no further wetland review is necessary. See **Figure 13 and 14** in **Attachment A** for FWW and NWI map. See **Attachment C** for Wetlands Protection Worksheet.
Wild and Scenic Rivers Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (WSRA) of 1968, particularly section 7(b) and (c)	Yes No ☐ ☒	The WSRA 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). Based on a review of the National Park Service NWSRS mapping, the project area is not located within or in proximity of any Wild or Scenic Rivers or Study Rivers. Compliance with the WSRA is not required. See **Figure 15** in **Attachment A** for Wild and Scenic Rivers map. See **Attachment C** for Wild and Scenic Rivers Worksheet.

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

Recorded below is the qualitative and quantitative significance of the effects of the proposal on the character, features and resources of the project area. Each factor has been evaluated and documented, as appropriate and in proportion to its relevance to the proposed action. Verifiable source documentation has been provided and described in support of each determination, as appropriate. Credible, traceable and supportive source documentation for each authority has been provided. Where applicable, the necessary reviews or consultations have been completed and applicable permits of approvals have been obtained or noted. Citations, dates/names/titles of contacts, and page references are clear. Additional documentation is attached, as appropriate. **All conditions, attenuation or mitigation measures have been clearly identified.**

Impact Codes: Use an impact code from the following list 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

LAND DEVELOPMENT		
Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation
Conformance with Plans / Compatible Land Use and Zoning / Scale and Urban Design	1	The proposed relocation of the DPW and OEM facilities is consistent with the Somerset County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan and local planning objectives to reduce exposure of critical facilities to flood hazards. The project site is located within an area identified for redevelopment and municipal use, and the scale and design of the proposed facilities are compatible with surrounding industrial and transportation-related land uses. The project represents an improvement over existing conditions by relocating essential services out of flood-prone areas and consolidating municipal operations in a resilient location.
Soil Suitability/ Slope/ Erosion/ Drainage/ Storm Water Runoff	3	According to the USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) Web Soil Survey mapping for the project area, soils underlying the former Rustic Mall property consist primarily of urban and disturbed soil map units associated with previously developed land, exhibiting generally low to moderate slopes and variable infiltration characteristics typical of remediated brownfield sites. These soils are considered suitable for structural development when appropriate engineering controls and stormwater management practices are employed.

		The project site is a formerly developed and remediated Superfund property that underwent environmental cleanup under federal and state oversight. Existing engineering controls, including capped soils and site stabilization measures, are in place to prevent exposure to underlying impacted materials. All proposed site development will be designed to maintain the integrity of these controls, and construction activities will be conducted in accordance with applicable remedial requirements to prevent disturbance of capped areas. Short-term, minor adverse impacts related to soil disturbance, erosion, and sedimentation may occur during construction. These impacts will be mitigated through the implementation of certified Soil Erosion and Sediment Control Plans and compliance with local Soil Conservation District requirements. Stormwater management for the project will be designed and implemented in accordance with the New Jersey Stormwater Management Rules (N.J.A.C. 7:8), including applicable design and performance standards for stormwater runoff quantity, quality, groundwater recharge, and basin safety. The proposed detention basin and associated pumping infrastructure are intended to improve drainage conditions and reduce stormwater impacts both on-site and at the downstream Main Street railroad underpass, a known flooding location. With adherence to NJDEP stormwater regulations, erosion control measures, and maintenance of existing remedial engineering controls, no significant adverse long-term impacts to soils, drainage, or stormwater runoff are anticipated. The project is expected to result in improved overall stormwater management and reduced flood-related impacts compared to existing conditions.
Hazards and Nuisances including Site Safety and Noise	3	Temporary increases in noise, dust, and construction-related hazards are anticipated during site development and building construction. These impacts will be short-term and localized and will be mitigated through compliance with local noise ordinances, construction safety standards, and best management practices. Long-term impacts are beneficial, as the project reduces hazard exposure to municipal facilities and improves emergency response capability. During the most recent groundwater monitoring event, EPA identified contaminant concentrations that exceed EPA vapor intrusion screening levels. Although these concentrations do not preclude redevelopment, they indicate a potential vapor intrusion pathway in the absence of appropriate engineering controls. Based on these findings, EPA recommended

		incorporation of a vapor intrusion barrier to mitigate potential indoor air exposure associated with subsurface contamination. In response to EPA's recommendation, the proposed project will include installation of a vapor intrusion barrier as part of building construction. This engineering control is a standard and effective mitigation measure for managing vapor intrusion risks at remediated sites with residual subsurface contamination. With implementation of the vapor intrusion barrier, potential exposure pathways will be effectively controlled. Therefore, with the incorporation of the recommended mitigation measure, the proposed project is not anticipated to result in adverse impacts related to hazardous materials or site contamination.

SOCIOECONOMIC		
Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation
Employment and Income Patterns	1	The project is expected to generate short-term construction employment and associated economic activity. While no permanent employment increases are anticipated, the improved reliability of municipal services supports overall community stability and economic resilience during and after emergency events.
Demographic Character Changes, Displacement	2	The proposed action does not involve residential displacement or changes to population density or demographic patterns. The project site is vacant and does not contain occupied housing or businesses requiring relocation.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND SERVICES		
Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation
Educational and Cultural Facilities	2	No educational or cultural facilities are located on or adjacent to the project site, and the proposed action will not affect access to or operation of such facilities.
Commercial Facilities	2	The project will not displace or adversely affect commercial facilities. Improved emergency response and flood mitigation

		may indirectly benefit nearby commercial areas by reducing service disruptions during storm events.
Health Care and Social Services	1	The relocation of OEM and DPW facilities and improvements to evacuation routes and emergency warning systems will enhance coordination with health care providers and social service agencies during emergencies. The project improves access for emergency medical services during flood events.
Solid Waste Disposal / Recycling	2	The project will not generate solid waste beyond typical construction debris, which will be managed and disposed of in accordance with applicable regulations New Jersey regulations at N.J.A.C. 7:26 and 7:26A. Operational waste generation will be consistent with existing municipal service activities.
Waste Water / Sanitary Sewers	2	Sanitary sewer service for the proposed project will be provided through the existing municipal sewer system operated by New Jersey American Water. An existing sewer main is located within Valerie Drive and currently extends west into an existing macadam cross-drive fronting a portion of the project area. As part of the proposed improvements, this sewer main will be extended along the remaining project frontage prior to final paving. Following extension of the sewer main, two (2) sanitary sewer service connections will be installed to serve the proposed development, including one connection to the eastern façade of the OEM Building and one connection to the southern façade of the DPW Building. The proposed sewer extensions and connections are typical for municipal facility development and are not anticipated to increase wastewater flows beyond the capacity of the existing system. No adverse impacts to sanitary sewer infrastructure or wastewater treatment capacity are anticipated. Temporary, localized disturbances associated with installation of sewer improvements will be managed through standard construction practices and coordination with the utility provider.
Water Supply	2	Water service for the proposed project will be provided through the existing municipal water system operated by New Jersey American Water. An existing water main is located within Valerie Drive and currently extends west into an existing macadam cross-drive fronting a portion of the project area. As part of the proposed improvements, the water main will be extended along the full project frontage prior to final paving and subsequently capped. Following extension of the water main, two (2) water service connections will be installed to serve the proposed facilities,

		including one connection to the eastern façade of the OEM Building and one connection to the southern façade of the DPW Building. The proposed water main extension and service connections are typical for municipal facility development and are not anticipated to increase water demand beyond the capacity of the existing system. No adverse impacts to the public water supply system are anticipated. Temporary, localized disturbances associated with installation of water infrastructure will be managed through standard construction practices and coordination with the utility provider.
Public Safety, Police, Fire and Emergency Medical	1	The proposed action directly improves public safety by relocating critical emergency management and public works facilities out of flood hazard areas, improving access during emergencies, maintaining a critical evacuation route, and automating emergency warning systems. These measures significantly enhance emergency response effectiveness during flood and other disaster events.
Parks, Open Space and Recreation	2	The project does not involve designated parkland, recreational facilities, or protected open space. No adverse impacts to recreational resources are anticipated.
Transportation and Accessibility	1	Construction activities may temporarily affect traffic flow; however, long-term impacts are beneficial. The stormwater detention basin and pump station are designed to reduce flooding at the Main Street railroad underpass, maintaining one of the Borough's primary north–south evacuation and emergency access routes during storm events.

NATURAL FEATURES		
Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation
Unique Natural Features, Water Resources	3	Construction near existing drainage features may temporarily affect local water resources. These impacts will be mitigated through permitting, erosion control measures, and compliance with applicable state and federal regulations. Long-term impacts are beneficial due to improved stormwater management and flood risk reduction.

Vegetation, Wildlife	3	The project site is a previously developed and remediated property with limited existing vegetation, consisting primarily of maintained or disturbed areas typical of an urban redevelopment site. Vegetation present on site is minimal and does not include high-quality or undisturbed natural habitat. A search of the New Jersey Natural Heritage Program (NHP) Database and Landscape Project Version 3.4 was conducted for the project site and surrounding area (NHP File No. 25-4007455-35413; dated December 10, 2025). Results indicate that no rare plant species, ecological communities, Natural Heritage Priority Sites, rare wildlife species, or regulated wildlife habitat are documented on the project site itself. No vernal pool habitat or stream-based rare wildlife habitat is mapped on site. The NHP review identified rare wildlife species and associated habitat within the immediate vicinity and within one mile of the project site, including species designated as Special Concern under state rankings. These records are primarily associated with nearby riverine and riparian habitats and include, among others, Bald Eagle (foraging and nesting habitat), Great Blue Heron, Wood Thrush, several bat species, Woodland Box Turtle, and rare fish species such as the Comely Shiner and Shield Darter documented in regional waterways. A potential vernal pool habitat was also identified within one mile of the site. Because no mapped rare species or regulated habitat occur on the project site, direct impacts to listed species or critical habitat are not anticipated. Construction activities will be confined to previously disturbed areas and will not encroach upon adjacent riparian corridors or mapped habitat areas. Standard construction best management practices will be implemented to minimize noise, lighting, and disturbance during construction. Should any wildlife be encountered during construction, work will comply with applicable state and federal wildlife protection requirements. With adherence to NHP guidance and avoidance of off-site habitat disturbance, the proposed action is not expected to result in significant adverse impacts to vegetation or wildlife resources. See **Attachment D** for Natural Heritage Data search results

ENERGY		
Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation
Energy Efficiency	1	The proposed facilities will be constructed using modern building standards and energy-efficient systems. Consolidation of municipal operations and improved facility design will result in more efficient energy use compared to existing, flood-damaged facilities.

Additional Studies Performed:
N/A

Field Inspection (Date and completed by):
A site inspection was performed on May 6, 2025 at the project site. Members from the Michael Baker International (CMF), NJ Department of Community Affairs, Borough of Manville, and Van Cleef (Designer) were in attendance. Michael Baker prepared the field report with site photos. Please see **Attachment F** for field report and photos.

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

ArcGIS Pro. ESRI, Maxar, Earthstar Geographics, and the GIS User Community.

Borough of Manville, Somerset County, New Jersey. Zoning and Land Use Maps. Borough of Manville Official Website. Available at: https://www.manvillenj.org/

Borough of Manville. Department of Public Works and Office of Emergency Management. Borough of Manville, Somerset County, New Jersey. Available at: https://www.manvillenj.org/

Federal Aviation Administration (FAA). *Federal Aviation Administration*. U.S. Department of Transportation. Accessed at: https://www.faa.gov/

Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM), Somerset County, New Jersey, including incorporated areas. Accessed via FEMA Map Service Center at: https://msc.fema.gov/portal/home

Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). *Somerset County, New Jersey Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan*, approved June 2, 2020.

Google™ Earth Pro.

National Wild and Scenic Rivers System. Explore Designated Rivers, New Jersey. Accessed at http://www.rivers.gov/new-jersey.php

New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection (NJDEP). Flood Hazard Area Control Act Rules (N.J.A.C. 7:13). Trenton, New Jersey.

New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection (NJDEP). Freshwater Wetlands Protection Act Rules (N.J.A.C. 7:7A). Trenton, New Jersey.

New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection (NJDEP). *Historic Preservation Office (HPO)*. State of New Jersey. Available at: https://dep.nj.gov/hpo/

New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection (NJDEP). Stormwater Management Rules (N.J.A.C. 7:8). Trenton, New Jersey.

New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection (NJDEP). New Jersey Natural Heritage Program (NHP) Database and Landscape Project Version 3.4 – Data Request File No. 25-4007455-35413, dated December 10, 2025.

New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection (NJDEP). Site Remediation Program. State of New Jersey. Available at: https://www.nj.gov/dep/srp/

New Jersey Department of Transportation (NJDOT). GIS Web Applications and Open Data Portal. State of New Jersey. Available at: https://open-data-portal-njdot.hub.arcgis.com/

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA). Vertical Datum Transformation (VDatum). Available at: https://vdatum.noaa.gov/

U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS). *Web Soil Survey*. United States Department of Agriculture. Available at: https://websoilsurvey.nrcs.usda.gov/app/WebSoilSurvey.aspx

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA). Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) / Superfund Program – Site Information. Available at: https://www.epa.gov/superfund

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA). *Nonattainment Areas for Criteria Pollutants (Green Book).* Accessed at https://www.epa.gov/green-book.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). *Coastal Barrier Resources System Mapper.* Accessed at http://www.fws.gov/CBRA/Maps/Mapper.html.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). *Endangered Species Act, Section 7 – Interagency Cooperation*. U.S. Department of the Interior. Available at: https://www.fws.gov/laws/endangered-species-act/section-7

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). National Wetlands Inventory (NWI) Wetlands Mapper. U.S. Department of the Interior. Available at: https://fwsprimary.wim.usgs.gov/wetlands/apps/wetlands-mapper

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). Information for Planning and Consultation (IPaC) System. Available at: https://ecos.fws.gov/ipac/

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). Endangered Species Act (ESA), Section 7 – Interagency Cooperation. Available at: https://www.fws.gov/laws/endangered-species-act/section-7

U.S. Geological Survey (USGS). National Water Information System (NWIS) – Stream Gage Data for Raritan River, Millstone River, and Royce Brook. Available at: https://waterdata.usgs.gov/

List of Permits Obtained

As of this date, no permits have been obtained for the proposed project. The grantee is responsible for obtaining all applicable local/county, state and federal permits prior to construction. Required environmental permits/approvals would likely include:

- Compliance with Stormwater Management Rules
- Soil Conservation District SESC plan certification
- NJDEP Site Remediation Program and LSRP Coordination

Public Outreach [24 CFR 50.23 & 58.43]

The Borough of Manville held a public hearing on November 30, 2023 at the public library, regarding the application to Resilient Communities Program for grant funds to address flooding needs in the Borough of Manville in which thirteen (13) Borough residents attended. Two public comments were received during the 14-day comment period following the meeting expressing concern over the issues of flooding in the Borough. Another meeting was held at the Mayor and Council Meeting on February 26, 2024, regarding the project. See **Attachment G** for public outreach documentation.

Furthermore, a final combined public notice for eight-step decision making process, finding of no significant impact (FONIS), and notice of intent to request release of funds with a 15-day comment period will be published prior to project authorization.

Cumulative Impact Analysis [24 CFR 58.32]

Cumulative effects consider the incremental impacts of the proposed DPW and OEM relocation, stormwater detention basin and pump station, and emergency siren automation when added to past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions within the Borough of Manville, particularly the South Main Street corridor, adjacent drainage areas, and receiving waters associated with the Raritan River, Millstone River, and Royce Brook.

The project area is located in a densely developed municipal setting characterized by transportation infrastructure, former industrial and commercial uses, and surrounding residential neighborhoods. The Borough has a documented history of severe flooding from major storm events, including Hurricanes Floyd (1999), Irene (2011), and Ida (2021), as well as

increasingly frequent minor and moderate flooding events. Past and ongoing actions in the area include roadway maintenance, redevelopment of previously industrial parcels, municipal drainage system maintenance, flood recovery activities, and implementation of hazard mitigation measures such as property buyouts and open space conversions. Collectively, these actions have altered hydrologic conditions, increased impervious coverage in portions of the watershed, and placed continued stress on drainage and emergency response infrastructure.

Construction of the proposed DPW/OEM facilities and stormwater detention basin would result in short-term, localized impacts typical of municipal infrastructure projects, including temporary soil disturbance, construction noise, traffic disruptions, and the potential for erosion or sedimentation during earth-moving activities. These construction-related impacts would be additive to other short-term disturbances occurring periodically within the Borough but would be limited in duration and extent. Implementation of soil erosion and sediment control measures, compliance with NJDEP stormwater management requirements, and adherence to site-specific remedial engineering controls associated with the previously remediated Rustic Mall property would minimize cumulative construction impacts to soils, drainage features, and nearby water resources.

In the long term, the proposed project would contribute beneficial cumulative effects by reducing flood risk and improving the resilience of critical municipal infrastructure. Relocation of DPW and OEM facilities out of the 0.2 percent annual chance floodplain, when considered alongside other hazard mitigation initiatives in Manville, reduces the likelihood of repeated damage to essential public services and enhances the Borough's ability to respond effectively during future emergencies. The stormwater detention basin and pump station would improve management of runoff at the South Main Street railroad underpass, incrementally reducing roadway flooding and improving reliability of a critical north–south evacuation and emergency access route when combined with existing and future drainage improvements.

Automation of the emergency siren system further contributes to positive cumulative impacts by improving public warning capabilities in advance of flood and other emergency events. When considered in combination with physical flood mitigation measures, improved evacuation routes, and regional hazard mitigation planning efforts, the siren automation enhances overall community preparedness and reduces risks to public safety.

Natural Heritage Program and Landscape Project database reviews indicate that no rare plant species, ecological communities, or rare wildlife species or habitats occur on the project site itself. Although rare wildlife species and sensitive habitats are documented within the surrounding watershed and within one mile of the site, project activities will remain confined to previously disturbed areas and will not encroach upon riparian corridors or mapped habitat areas. As a result, the proposed action would not contribute to cumulative adverse impacts on sensitive biological resources.

Overall, when considered in combination with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions in the Borough, the proposed project would not result in significant adverse cumulative impacts. Instead, it would provide a net cumulative benefit by reducing flood risk, improving emergency response capability, enhancing stormwater management, and increasing the

long-term resilience of municipal infrastructure. The cumulative effects of the project do not rise to a level of significance and do not warrant preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement.

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

The purpose of the proposed action is to reduce flood risk and improve emergency preparedness in the Borough of Manville by relocating critical municipal facilities out of flood hazard areas, maintaining a reliable evacuation route through targeted stormwater mitigation, and enhancing emergency warning capabilities. In accordance with HUD regulations at 24 CFR Part 58 and the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), this Alternatives Analysis evaluates reasonable alternatives capable of meeting the project's purpose and need, including the No Action Alternative and other practicable site and design alternatives. Each alternative is assessed based on feasibility, effectiveness in addressing flood risk and emergency response needs, and potential environmental impacts in order to identify the preferred alternative.

Alternative 1: Reconstruct or Retrofit DPW and OEM Facilities at Existing Locations

This alternative would involve reconstructing, elevating, or floodproofing the existing DPW and OEM facilities at their current sites, while maintaining emergency response operations in place. Limited mitigation measures could include structural floodproofing, site grading, or equipment relocation.

This alternative is not practicable because the existing facilities are located within flood hazard areas and are subject to access constraints during flood events. Even if floodproofed or elevated, the facilities would remain vulnerable to isolation when surrounding roadways flood. Space limitations further restrict the ability to elevate structures or reconfigure operations to meet modern operational and resilience standards. As a result, this alternative would not sufficiently reduce risk to critical infrastructure or ensure reliable emergency operations during severe storm events.

Alternative 2: Relocation of DPW and OEM Facilities to an Alternate Site within the Borough

Under this alternative, the Borough would relocate the DPW and OEM facilities to a site other than the proposed Rustic Mall property. Potential sites could include underutilized municipal parcels, commercial or industrial properties, or undeveloped land elsewhere within Manville.

This alternative was evaluated but determined to be not practicable due to site availability, flood risk, and operational constraints. Manville is a fully built-out municipality with limited vacant land outside mapped flood hazard areas. Many potential sites are located within floodplains, lack sufficient acreage for vehicle storage and operations, or are inaccessible during flood events. Additionally, assembling alternate parcels would likely require multiple acquisitions, zoning variances, or relocation of existing uses, resulting in increased costs, delays, and uncertainty.

The former Rustic Mall site is one of the few parcels within the Borough that is of sufficient size, located outside the 0.2 percent annual chance floodplain, previously remediated, and capable of accommodating the operational, access, and resilience requirements of both DPW and OEM. Therefore, relocation to an alternate site would not meet the project's purpose and need as effectively or reliably as the Proposed Action.

Alternative 3: Limited Stormwater Improvements Without Detention Basin

Under this alternative, the Borough would implement minor stormwater improvements at the Main Street railroad underpass, such as drainage inlet modifications, minor pipe upgrades, or increased maintenance, without constructing the proposed detention basin or pump station.

This alternative is not practicable because flooding at the underpass results from downstream hydraulic constraints and elevated river stages during storm events, not solely from insufficient inlet capacity. During major rainfall events, gravity drainage is ineffective regardless of minor system upgrades. This alternative would not reliably prevent roadway flooding or maintain this critical north–south evacuation route during emergencies and therefore would not meet the project's purpose and need.

Alternative 4: Distributed or Non-Structural Flood Mitigation Measures

Under this alternative, the Borough would rely on non-structural measures such as emergency road closures, traffic detours, temporary barriers, warning signage, and emergency response protocols in lieu of constructing the stormwater detention basin and pump station.

This alternative is not practicable because it does not reduce flood risk or improve evacuation reliability. Temporary and reactive measures require advance warning and active staffing during rapidly evolving storm events and have proven insufficient during past flooding, including Tropical Storm Ida. Continued reliance on such measures would leave residents and emergency responders vulnerable to roadway closures and delayed access during critical emergencies.

Alternative 5: Relocation of DPW and OEM Facilities with Flood Mitigation and Siren Automation (Proposed Action)

Under the Proposed Action, the Borough would acquire and redevelop a remediated portion of the former Rustic Mall property located outside the 0.2 percent annual chance floodplain. DPW and OEM facilities would be relocated to a centralized, resilient site and supported by construction of stormwater detention and pumping infrastructure to maintain the Main Street evacuation route, along with automation of the emergency siren system using real-time hydrologic data.

This alternative is practicable and preferred because it fully addresses the project's purpose and need. Relocation outside flood hazard areas eliminates recurring damage to critical facilities, ensures consistent access during flood events, improves emergency response and evacuation reliability, and protects public investment. The Rustic Mall site is one of the few available parcels suitable for municipal use, has undergone environmental remediation, and supports implementation of modern design and resilience standards. This alternative aligns with the Borough's Hazard Mitigation Plan, climate adaptation objectives, and long-term resilience planning.

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

Under the No Action Alternative, the Borough of Manville would not undertake the proposed relocation of the Department of Public Works (DPW) and Office of Emergency Management (OEM) facilities, would not construct stormwater mitigation infrastructure at the Main Street railroad underpass, and would not automate the emergency siren system. Existing facilities

would remain in their current locations within flood-prone areas, and emergency notification and evacuation routes would continue under existing conditions.

This alternative is not practicable because it would not address documented unmet disaster recovery needs or projected flood risks. During Tropical Storm Ida, flooding severely impaired DPW and OEM operations, delayed emergency response, and isolated critical facilities during life-threatening conditions. Continued inaction would leave municipal assets vulnerable to future flood events and place residents at ongoing risk. The No Action Alternative fails to meet the project's purpose and need and is inconsistent with the Borough's Hazard Mitigation Plan goals.

Summary of Findings and Conclusions

The Environmental Assessment (EA) for the Borough of Manville DPW and OEM Relocation, Stormwater Mitigation, and Emergency Siren Automation Project evaluated the potential environmental impacts associated with relocation and construction of new municipal facilities, installation of stormwater detention and pumping infrastructure at the Main Street railroad underpass, and automation of the Borough's emergency warning system. Environmental review factors analyzed in accordance with HUD regulations at 24 CFR Part 58 indicate that project-related impacts would be minor, temporary, or beneficial in nature.

The proposed project is consistent with applicable federal, state, county, and local planning documents and directly implements high-priority mitigation actions identified in Manville's section of the Somerset County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan, including relocation of flood-vulnerable public facilities and installation of a pump station to address recurrent roadway flooding. The proposed land uses are compatible with surrounding development patterns, zoning, and infrastructure, and the project improves overall site function by relocating critical municipal operations to a previously remediated site outside the 0.2 percent annual chance floodplain.

Temporary construction-related impacts, including soil disturbance, noise, traffic disruptions, and potential erosion or sedimentation, would be short-term and localized. These impacts would be minimized through implementation of soil erosion and sediment control measures, compliance with New Jersey Stormwater Management Rules, adherence to applicable permitting requirements, and maintenance of existing remedial engineering controls at the project site. Long-term environmental conditions are expected to improve due to enhanced stormwater management, reduced roadway flooding, and improved emergency access and evacuation reliability.

Natural Heritage Program and Landscape Project database searches confirmed that no rare plant species, ecological communities, or rare wildlife species or habitats are present on the project site. While sensitive wildlife species and habitats are documented within the surrounding watershed and within one mile of the site, project activities would be confined to previously disturbed areas and would not encroach upon regulated habitats. The cumulative impacts analysis determined that, when considered with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions, the project would contribute net beneficial effects by reducing flood risk, enhancing emergency preparedness, and improving the resilience of critical municipal infrastructure.

The Alternatives Analysis evaluated the No Action Alternative, reconstruction or retrofit of existing facilities, relocation to alternate sites within the Borough, limited stormwater improvements, non-structural flood mitigation measures, and the Proposed Action. The No Action and other alternatives were determined to be impracticable because they would not adequately address documented flood risks, emergency response limitations, or long-term resilience needs. The Proposed Action was identified as the only practicable alternative that effectively meets the project's purpose and need while minimizing environmental impacts.

Based on the findings of the Environmental Assessment, Alternatives Analysis, and Cumulative Impact Analysis, the proposed project would not result in significant adverse environmental impacts. Accordingly, preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement is not required, and the project is appropriately supported by a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI).

Mitigation Measures and Conditions [40 CFR 1505.2(c)]

Summarize below 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. Please see the table below for a summary of anticipated mitigation measures.

General Project Conditions

1. The grantee shall obtain all required federal, state, and local permits prior to construction and comply with all permit conditions.
2. If the scope of work of the proposed project changes, the application for funding must be revised and resubmitted for reevaluation under NEPA.

Historic Preservation

3. If project activities uncover archaeological deposits, including any Native American pottery, stone tools, bones, or human remains, the project shall be halted, and the applicant shall immediately stop work in the vicinity of the discovery and take reasonable measures to avoid or minimize harm to the finds. All archeological findings will be secured and access to the sensitive area restricted. The applicant will inform DCA and DCA will consult with the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) or Tribal Historic Preservation Office (THPO) and Tribes. Work in sensitive areas cannot resume until consultation is completed and appropriate measures have been taken to ensure that the project is in compliance with the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA).

Endangered Species

4. To avoid impacts to the Indiana bat summer roosting and maternity season in New Jersey, all cutting, trimming, or other knocking or bringing down of live or dead trees greater than or equal to five (5) inches in diameter is prohibited between April 1 and September 30.
5. The monarch butterfly (*Danaus plexippus*, proposed threatened) may occur within the project area. If the project is not completed prior to the effective date of a final rule listing for this species, the grantee shall contact the DCA to reassess potential impacts to the monarch butterfly. DCA shall reinitiate consultation with USFWS if any remaining project activities may affect the monarch butterfly.

Site Contamination and Hazardous Materials

6. Prior to initiating earthwork within areas identified as containing mapped historic fill, the project sponsor shall complete test pits or trenching to confirm the presence or absence of historic fill. If historic fill is encountered, additional investigation or characterization shall be conducted, as necessary, to support appropriate soil handling, reuse, or disposal during construction. Because this portion of the site lies within the boundary of a recorded Deed Notice, all earth-disturbing activities shall be performed in compliance with the Deed Notice requirements and the associated Soil Management Plan, including NJDEP notification, soil handling protocols, and maintenance of the existing engineering control. Environmental oversight by a qualified environmental professional shall be provided during test pit

installation and related earthwork to document subsurface conditions and ensure that construction activities remain consistent with the Deed Notice and applicable NJDEP site remediation requirements.

7. The project site is located on a remediated property subject to a recorded Deed Notice. Prior to and during construction, the project sponsor shall coordinate the New Jersey Licensed Site Remediation Professional (LSRP) of record and the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection (NJDEP) Site Remediation Program to ensure compliance with the applicable Remedial Action Permit (RAP), Deed Notice requirements, and the Technical Requirements for Site Remediation. Any disturbance of contaminated soils, engineering controls, or caps shall be conducted in accordance with an NJDEP-approved Soil Management Plan and, if applicable, a RAP modification. Construction activities shall not compromise existing institutional or engineering controls, and all required post-construction certifications and ongoing monitoring obligations shall be maintained.
8. The project shall incorporate a vapor intrusion barrier consistent with EPA recommendations to mitigate potential vapor intrusion associated with residual subsurface contamination. The barrier shall be installed prior to occupancy and maintained as part of the permanent building design.

Sole Source Aquifers

9. During construction and operation, the grantee shall ensure that all contractors and subcontractors are informed that the project site is located within a designated Sole Source Aquifer and wellhead protection area. Construction activities shall be planned and implemented in a manner that avoids endangerment of groundwater resources, including adherence to approved site remediation requirements and applicable best management practices already required elsewhere in these conditions. Any construction-related wastewater (including equipment wash water) shall be managed in accordance with applicable environmental requirements.
10. Because construction activities will occur within designated wellhead protection areas, the grantee shall prepare and implement a Spill Prevention, Mitigation, and Response Plan prior to the start of construction. The plan shall be submitted to the appropriate local water authority and shall include measures for spill containment associated with construction equipment, refueling activities, and onsite storage or use of potential fuel sources (including, but not limited to, gasoline, diesel, kerosene, and motor oils for generators and pumps). The plan shall also identify response and mitigation procedures to be implemented in the event of a fuel spill, leak, or equipment fire during construction.

Construction Best Management Practices

11. During construction, standard noise and air quality best management practices shall be implemented, including the use of functional mufflers on all equipment, compliance with applicable local noise ordinances, and minimization of noise impacts to nearby receptors. The project shall control dust through water or approved suppressants, cover trucks hauling loose materials, and prevent off-site dust or emissions in accordance with N.J.A.C. 7:27-5. The grantee and their construction crew shall comply with New Jersey idling limits at N.J.A.C. 7:27-14 and 7:27-15, use ultra-low sulfur diesel fuel, and obtain any required NJDEP air permits for applicable stationary equipment under N.J.A.C. 7:27-8. All reasonable measures

shall be taken to minimize construction-related air emissions and noise throughout the duration of work.

Solid Waste Management

12. All solid waste, construction debris, and recyclable materials generated by the project shall be managed in accordance with the New Jersey Solid Waste Management Rules (N.J.A.C. 7:26) and the Recycling Rules (N.J.A.C. 7:26A). The contractor shall ensure proper handling, storage, transport, recycling, and disposal of all materials at facilities authorized to accept such waste. Hazardous or contaminated materials, if encountered, shall be managed in compliance with all applicable federal and state requirements. The applicant shall implement waste reduction and recycling practices to the maximum extent practicable and maintain documentation of proper waste disposal for the duration of construction. All solid-waste-related requirements shall be incorporated into project construction documents and enforced throughout the project.

Determination:

☒ **Finding of No Significant Impact** [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.

Preparer Signature: Kendall Papineau Date: 05/01/2026

Name/Title/Organization: Kendall Papineau, Environmental Specialist, Michael Baker International

Certifying Officer Signature: Date: 05/20/2026

Name/Title: Samuel Viavattine, Deputy Commissioner

This original, signed document and related supporting material must be retained on file by the Responsible Entity in an Environmental Review Record (ERR) for the activity/project (ref: 24 CFR Part 58.38) and in accordance with recordkeeping requirements for the HUD program(s).