



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): Bergen Street Flood Mitigation Project

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

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

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 at 40 Bergen Street (Block 7804, Lot 1) in the Borough of Carteret in Middlesex County, New Jersey. See **Figure 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 Carteret proposes to construct a bioretention basin and stormwater pump station facility along Bergen Street in the southeastern section of the Borough, near its southern connection to the Arthur Kill Tidal Strait. Stormwater runoff from this portion of Carteret currently drains directly into the Arthur Kill through an existing drainage ditch (identified as SOW A) which drains to Arthur Kill Unnamed Tributary. Due to the high concentration of impervious surfaces and the area's proximity to the coastline, Bergen Street experiences flooding during major storm events and periods of heavy precipitation. This flooding impacts both multi-family and single-family residences located on and near Bergen Street.

To address these conditions, the proposed project would be constructed on Borough-owned property identified as Block 7804, Lot 1, which is the former site of three apartment buildings previously owned by the Carteret Housing Authority. These structures sustained severe damage during Hurricane Sandy and were subsequently removed, as they would have required substantial upgrades, including elevation, to reduce vulnerability to routine and coastal flood events.

The project would include open-cut trench construction of gravity storm sewer piping composed of polyvinyl chloride or reinforced concrete pipe, along with the construction of a 172,048-cubic-foot bioretention basin designed to capture, treat, and temporarily store stormwater runoff from Bergen Street and the surrounding drainage area. A stormwater pump station measuring approximately 625 square feet would be constructed of concrete masonry unit construction and equipped with two 75-horsepower, 460-volt column pumps housed within a precast concrete wet well. The pump station would be supported by an estimated 250-kilowatt diesel generator with an associated 50- to 80-gallon fuel tank and would include an above-ground precast concrete valve chamber.

Stormwater collected within the bioretention basin would be attenuated through an outlet control structure and redirected to the pump station, where it would be pressurized and conveyed through a 24-inch-diameter Class 52 ductile iron force main to an outfall at the existing gabion basket area before discharging into the Arthur Kill. The existing drainage channel would be cleaned to remove accumulated sediment to facilitate positive drainage and would then be restored with native vegetation to maintain conveyance while enhancing ecological function.

Additional project elements would include resurfacing and restriping of Bergen Street to restore pavement affected by construction activities; construction of 24 standard parking stalls and one Americans with Disabilities Act-compliant parking stall with an access aisle; completion of all necessary landscaping; and planting of basin bottom and slope seed mixes and other vegetation selected to assist in stormwater retention and treatment. The project would also include dry floodproofing of the existing Bergen Street Sewage Pump Station, which is located adjacent to

the proposed stormwater pump station, thereby improving the resilience of essential public infrastructure.

Overall, the proposed improvements would collect, filter, and manage stormwater runoff prior to discharge to the Arthur Kill, reducing flood risk along Bergen Street, improving water quality, and resulting in beneficial floodplain impacts through the conversion of previously developed land to a vegetated bioretention system.

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

The purpose of the Bergen Street Flood Mitigation Project is to reduce recurring flooding along Bergen Street and within the surrounding drainage area of the Borough of Carteret. Bergen Street is located in a highly developed industrial and residential area characterized by extensive impervious surfaces, including warehouses, roadways, and other infrastructure that limit natural infiltration and increase stormwater runoff. As a result, the area experiences frequent flooding during heavy precipitation events, with floodwaters impacting nearby multi-family and single-family residences.

Flooding conditions are intensified during major storm events, including Hurricane Sandy and Hurricane Ida, which caused significant damage to residential properties and public infrastructure and revealed deficiencies in the existing stormwater management system. These conditions represent an unmet disaster mitigation need, as flooding continues to pose a risk to public safety, property, and community stability.

The proposed project would address these needs through the installation of a bioretention basin and associated stormwater infrastructure designed to capture, store, treat, and convey stormwater away from Bergen Street. In addition to reducing flood risk, the project would filter pollutants from stormwater runoff prior to discharge to the Arthur Kill Tidal Strait, improving water quality in an environmentally and economically important waterway. The project is consistent with the Middlesex County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan, which identifies the Bergen Street basin and pump station as a high-priority action to reduce flood hazards.

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

Bergen Street is located in the southeastern section of Carteret, an area largely characterized by warehouses, shipping operations, and industrial facilities, interspersed with residential uses. The area has a high percentage of impervious surfaces, including roadways, rooftops, and paved lots, which limits natural infiltration and increases stormwater runoff volumes.

Under existing conditions, stormwater accumulates on Bergen Street and surrounding properties during rainfall events due to limited drainage capacity and the absence of effective stormwater detention or treatment facilities. Flooding occurs during moderate storms and intensifies during major weather events such as hurricanes and tropical systems. Hurricane Ida was the most recent event to cause significant flooding and damage along Bergen Street, underscoring the increasing frequency and severity of extreme precipitation events.

Environmental Assessment
Carteret RC 100021 Bergen Street Flood Mitigation

The project site itself lies largely within the floodplain, and its conversion from previously developed housing to a vegetated bioretention basin represents a beneficial floodplain impact. The introduction of vegetation and soil storage capacity will enhance stormwater attenuation, improve drainage performance, and reduce pollutant loading to the Arthur Kill. These trends—aging infrastructure, increased storm intensity, dense development, and limited pervious surfaces—demonstrate a clear and ongoing need for the proposed stormwater management improvements.

Funding Information

Grant Number	HUD Program	Funding Amount
B-21-DF-34-0001	CDBG-DR	\$4,107,675.00

Estimated Total HUD Funded Amount:

\$4,107,675.00

Estimated Total Project Cost (HUD and non-HUD funds) [24 CFR 58.32(d)]:

\$4,723,826.00

Additional project costs would be funded by the Borough of Carteret.

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 <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>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.</p> <p>See Figure 3 in Attachment A for airport hazards map. See Attachment C for Airport Hazards Worksheet.</p>
Coastal Barrier Resources Coastal Barrier Resources Act (CBRA), as amended by the Coastal Barrier Improvement Act of 1990 [16 USC 3501]	Yes No <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<p>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.</p> <p>See Figure 4 in Attachment A for coastal barrier resources map. See Attachment C for Coastal Barrier Resources Worksheet.</p>
Flood Insurance Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 and National Flood Insurance	Yes No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	<p>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 meets this requirement because it involves an eligible activity located within the floodplain, as shown on FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM)</p>

*Environmental Assessment
Carteret RC 100021 Bergen Street Flood Mitigation*

<p>Reform Act of 1994 [42 USC 4001-4128 and 42 USC 5154a]</p>		<p>No. 34023C0078G (Preliminary, dated January 31, 2014), which indicates the project area lies entirely within the 1% annual chance floodplain. The Borough of Carteret participates in the NFIP. To ensure compliance with 24 CFR 58.6, conditions shall be included requiring that the grant recipient obtains and maintains flood insurance (see Mitigation Measures and Conditions section).</p> <p>See Figure 5 in Attachment A for FEMA FIRM map. See Attachment C for Flood Insurance Worksheet.</p>
<p>Clean Air</p> <p>Clean Air Act (CAA), as amended, particularly section 176(c) & (d); 40 CFR Parts 6, 51, 93</p>	<p>Yes No</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>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 Middlesex County is in maintenance of the 2006 24-hour PM2.5 NAAQS.</p> <p>Because of the project's scope and the air quality status of the county, compliance with the State Implementation Plan (SIP) is required. On August 6, 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. Standard construction Best Management Practices to minimize air quality impacts are included as project conditions (see Mitigation Measures and Conditions section).</p> <p>See Figure 6 in Attachment A for air quality map. See Attachment C Clean Air Worksheet and Attachment D for NJDEP correspondence.</p>
<p>Coastal Zone Management</p> <p>Coastal Zone Management Act (CZMA), sections 307(c) & (d)</p>	<p>Yes No</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>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-foot landward of the MHWL. Because the project is located outside of the State's coastal zone, the project does not trigger CZMA Federal Consistency review requirements</p>

Environmental Assessment
 Carteret RC 100021 Bergen Street Flood Mitigation

		<p>See Figure 7 in Attachment A for Coastal Zone Management map. See Attachment C for Coastal Zone Management Act Worksheet.</p>
<p>Contamination and Toxic Substances</p> <p>24 CFR Part 50.3(i) & 58.5(i)(2)</p>	<p>Yes No</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>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.</p> <p>A Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) was completed in September 2025. The two RECs – historic fill and historic railroad use – were identified at the site, leading to a recommendation of further investigation. Subsequently, a Phase II ESA was completed in January 2026. The analytical data was compared to the NJDEP Soil Remediation Standards (SRS). Evaluation of analytical results from the soil samples collected on December 2, 2025, indicate that metal constituents were detected above their respective NJ Migration to Groundwater Soil Remediation Standards (NJMGW-SRS), NJ Residential Ingestion Dermal Exposure Soil Remediation Standards (NJ-RID-SRS), and NJ Non-Residential Ingestion Dermal Exposure Soil Remediation Standards (NJ-NRID-SRS) across several borings. Further investigation is needed to define the extent of metal impacts and evaluate potential groundwater impacts. In accordance with NJDEP Historic Fill Material Technical Guidance, a Confirmed Discharge Notification must be submitted, and a Licensed Site Remediation Professional (LSRP) must be retained to advance the next phase of site investigation.</p> <p>The Borough of Carteret shall be responsible for complying with all applicable New Jersey site remediation regulations, including retention of an LSRP to further investigate on-site contamination and to ensure that contaminated materials do not conflict with the intended use of the site. This includes implementation of any necessary mitigation measures, such as remediation, engineering controls or design considerations. See Mitigation Measures and Conditions Section.</p> <p>See Attachment C for Site Contamination Worksheet and Attachment E for Phase I and II ESA reports.</p>
<p>Endangered Species, Migratory Birds, and Bald and Golden Eagles</p> <p>Endangered Species Act (ESA) of 1973,</p>	<p>Yes No</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>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.</p> <p>The USFWS Information for Planning and Consultation (IPaC) tool identifies federally threatened, endangered, proposed, and</p>

Environmental Assessment
 Carteret RC 100021 Bergen Street Flood Mitigation

<p>particularly section 7; 50 CFR Part 402; Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) of 1918 and Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act of 1940.</p>	<p>candidate species that may occur in the study area or be affected by the proposed project. According to IPaC data (last updated February 4, 2026), records indicate the presence of the monarch butterfly (<i>Danaus plexippus</i>, federally proposed threatened) and the tricolored bat (<i>Perimyotis subflavus</i>, proposed endangered). Informal consultation with the NJFO USFWS was completed on December 12, 2025. This project is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of these species; therefore, ESA Section 7(a)(4) conference is not required. Once a final rule to list the monarch butterfly or tricolored bat 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 or tricolored bats and reinitiate consultation with the Service if remaining project activities ‘may affect’ either species. The DCA has preliminarily determined that the project may affect the tricolored bat. The Service’s recommended conservation measures for the project include: 1) avoid drilling and/or blasting activities during May 15 through July 31 annually (i.e., the pup season for the tricolored bat in New Jersey), and 2) avoid tree cutting/trimming/removal from May 15 through July 31 annually. With these conservation measures incorporated into the project scope, adverse effects to the tricolored bat will be extremely unlikely to occur (see Mitigation Measures and Conditions section, below).</p> <p>The NMFS Section 7 Mapper was used to assess potential habitat for species under NOAA jurisdiction. The unnamed tributary to Arthur Kill provides habitat for Atlantic sturgeon (<i>Acipenser oxyrinchus oxyrinchus</i>) (adult and subadult life stages; migrating and foraging) and shortnose sturgeon (<i>Acipenser brevirostrum</i>) (adult life stage; migrating and foraging). Because no sturgeon habitat is present within the project’s area, there would be no effect on these species and consultation is not required.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>See Figure 8 in Attachment A for map of threatened and endangered species. See Attachment C for Endangered Species</p>
--	---

*Environmental Assessment
Carteret RC 100021 Bergen Street Flood Mitigation*

		Worksheet and Attachment D for IPaC Report and NJFO USFWS Section 7 consultation email correspondence.
<p>Explosive and Flammable Hazards</p> <p>24 CFR Part 51 Subpart C</p>	<p>Yes No</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>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.</p> <p>See Attachment C for Explosive and Flammable Hazards Worksheet.</p>
<p>Farmlands Protection</p> <p>Farmland Protection Policy Act (FPPA) of 1981, particularly sections 1504(b) and 1541; 7 CFR Part 658</p>	<p>Yes No</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>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.</p> <p>See Figure 9 in Attachment A for land use map. See Attachment C for Farmlands Protection Worksheet.</p>
<p>Floodplain Management</p> <p>Executive Order (EO) 11988, particularly section 2(a); 24 CFR Part 55</p>	<p>Yes No</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>The project involves development within the floodplain; therefore, compliance with Executive Order 11988 (Floodplain Management) was evaluated using the required 8-Step decision-making process (24 CFR Part 55). Avoidance alternatives, including off-site locations outside the floodplain and reduced-scope or alternative stormwater approaches, were considered and determined to be impracticable due to limited land availability, hydrologic and tidal constraints, potential impacts to wetlands or riparian resources, and inability to meet the project purpose and need.</p> <p>The proposed project is located on Borough-owned, previously developed land currently maintained as managed open space and incorporates flood-resilient design, green infrastructure, and controlled stormwater storage and conveyance. Construction impacts within the floodplain would be temporary and minimized through best management practices, with all disturbed areas restored following construction. Long-term impacts are expected to be beneficial, including reduced flood risk, improved stormwater quality, and protection of critical</p>

*Environmental Assessment
Carteret RC 100021 Bergen Street Flood Mitigation*

		<p>infrastructure. In addition, the project would require a NJDEP Flood Hazard Area Control Act Individual Permit. It is the responsibility of the Borough of Carteret as the subrecipient to obtain all necessary local, state and federal permits (see Mitigation Measures and Conditions section, below).</p> <p>With implementation of identified minimization and mitigation measures, the proposed project represents the practicable alternative that best minimizes potential adverse impacts to the floodplain and is consistent with Executive Order 11988 and 24 CFR Part 55.</p> <p>See Figure 5 in Attachment A for FEMA FIRM map. See Attachment C for Floodplain Management Worksheet. See Attachment F for 8-step documentation.</p>
<p>Historic Preservation</p> <p>National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) of 1966, particularly sections 106 and 110; 36 CFR Part 800</p>	<p>Yes No</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>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 low 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 September 26, 2025, consultation with the SHPO was initiated and invitations to consult were sent to the identified consulting parties. On October 20, 2025, the SHPO concurred with the findings, and no mitigation was required. No responses were received from consulting parties.</p> <p>See Figure 10 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.</p>
<p>Noise Abatement and Control</p> <p>Noise Control Act of 1972, as amended by the Quiet Communities Act of 1978; 24 CFR Part 51 Subpart B</p>	<p>Yes No</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>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.</p> <p>See Attachment C for Noise Worksheet.</p>

Environmental Assessment
 Carteret RC 100021 Bergen Street Flood Mitigation

<p>Sole Source Aquifers</p> <p>Safe Drinking Water Act (SDWA) of 1974, as amended, particularly section 1424(e); 40 CFR Part 149</p>	<p>Yes No</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>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 Coastal Plain sole-source aquifer. Consultation with the EPA was initiated pursuant to the Region 2 MOU between HUD and EPA. On September 11, 2025, 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 New Jersey Coastal Plain 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).</p> <p>See Figure 11 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.</p>
<p>Wetlands Protection</p> <p>Executive Order 11990, particularly sections 2 and 5</p>	<p>Yes No</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>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 mapping did not identify any freshwater wetlands within or in the immediate vicinity of the project site. NWI mapping identified riverine habitat associated with Arthur Kill Unnamed Tributary located outside the proposed project area. On August 27, 2024, a site reconnaissance of the proposed project area was performed and confirmed the absence of wetlands. The NJDEP Freshwater Wetlands Protection Act (FWPA) Rules, N.J.A.C. 7:7a, regulated activities within wetlands, wetland transition areas, and State open waters (SOW). Therefore, although the project will not impact wetlands, authorization under the FWPA Rules is required due to the proposed activities impacts to SOW A.</p> <p>See Figure 12 in Attachment A for NWI map. See Attachment C for Wetlands Protection Worksheet. See Attachment G for wetland delineation forms and investigator certificate.</p>
<p>Wild and Scenic Rivers</p> <p>Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (WSRA)</p>	<p>Yes No</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/></p>	<p>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</p>

Environmental Assessment
Carteret RC 100021 Bergen Street Flood Mitigation

of 1968, particularly section 7(b) and (c)		proximity of any Wild or Scenic Rivers or Study Rivers. Compliance with the WSRA is not required. See Figure 13 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	<p>The proposed Bergen Street Flood Mitigation Project is consistent with federal, state, regional, and local planning objectives related to flood hazard mitigation and stormwater management. The project is identified as a high-priority action in the Middlesex County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan and supports the Borough of Carteret’s goals to reduce flooding and improve infrastructure in a flood-prone area.</p> <p>The project would be located on Borough-owned property previously developed and now vacant following storm-related damage. Surrounding land uses include industrial, warehouse, utility, and residential development. The proposed bioretention basin and stormwater pump station would be compatible with existing land use patterns and zoning and would be appropriately scaled for the surrounding urban environment. Conversion of the site to landscaped stormwater infrastructure would improve site function. Impacts would be minor and beneficial.</p>

*Environmental Assessment
Carteret RC 100021 Bergen Street Flood Mitigation*

<p>Soil Suitability/ Slope/ Erosion/ Drainage/ Storm Water Runoff</p>	<p>1</p>	<p>According to the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) Natural Resources Conservation Service soil mapping, soils within the project area consist primarily of urban land and disturbed fill soils, which are common in developed coastal environments and generally exhibit low infiltration capacity and poor natural drainage. Combined with flat topography, proximity to the Arthur Kill, and extensive surrounding impervious surfaces, existing soil conditions contribute to stormwater ponding and recurring flooding during heavy precipitation events.</p> <p>The proposed bioretention basin and stormwater infrastructure would improve soil functionality and drainage by incorporating engineered soils and vegetation designed to capture, store, and treat stormwater runoff prior to controlled discharge. Construction would temporarily disturb soils through excavation and trenching; however, standard erosion and sediment control measures and post-construction stabilization would minimize short-term impacts. Upon completion, the transition from compacted urban soils to landscaped, vegetated areas would reduce erosion potential and improve long-term stormwater management. Overall impacts related to soils, slope, erosion, drainage, and stormwater runoff would be minor and beneficial.</p>
<p>Hazards and Nuisances including Site Safety and Noise</p>	<p>3</p>	<p>Construction activities would result in temporary increases in noise, equipment traffic, and minor safety risks typical of infrastructure projects. Standard construction controls and safety practices would minimize these effects. Upon completion, the project would reduce flood-related hazards along Bergen Street, resulting in improved long-term site safety. No significant or permanent hazards are anticipated.</p>

SOCIOECONOMIC		
Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation
Employment and Income Patterns	1	The project would generate short-term construction employment and support local contractors and suppliers. No long-term changes to employment or income patterns are expected. Flood risk reduction would help protect nearby residential and commercial properties, indirectly supporting economic stability in the area.
Demographic Character Changes, Displacement	2	The project would be constructed on vacant, Borough-owned land and would not require residential or business displacement. No changes to population characteristics, housing availability, or neighborhood composition are anticipated.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND SERVICES		
Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation
Educational and Cultural Facilities	2	No schools, cultural resources, or educational facilities are located within or adjacent to the project site. The project would not affect access to or operation of such facilities.
Commercial Facilities	3	Temporary construction activity may cause short-term access or traffic disruptions near nearby commercial and industrial properties. These impacts would be localized and temporary. Long-term flood mitigation would reduce storm-related disruptions to nearby commercial facilities.
Health Care and Social Services	1	The project would not directly affect health care facilities or social service providers. Reduced flooding would help maintain access to services during storm events, resulting in an indirect community benefit.
Solid Waste Disposal / Recycling	2	The project would not generate long-term solid waste. Construction debris would be managed and disposed of in accordance with applicable New Jersey regulations at N.J.A.C. 7:26 and 7:26A. No changes to local waste or recycling services are anticipated.

*Environmental Assessment
Carteret RC 100021 Bergen Street Flood Mitigation*

Waste Water / Sanitary Sewers	2	The project involves only stormwater management improvements and does not connect to or modify the sanitary sewer system. No changes to wastewater flows, loading, or sanitary sewer capacity would occur, and therefore no impact is anticipated on wastewater or sanitary sewer infrastructure.
Water Supply	2	The project would not affect public or private water supply systems. No new water demand would be created, and existing service capacity would remain unchanged.
Public Safety, Police, Fire and Emergency Medical	1	Temporary construction coordination with emergency services would be required but would not impair service delivery. Long-term flood mitigation would improve emergency response access and reduce storm-related risks, benefiting public safety services.
Parks, Open Space and Recreation	1	The project would convert a previously developed and flood-prone site into a landscaped bioretention basin, contributing to green space within the community. The site would not displace recreational facilities and would enhance environmental conditions.
Transportation and Accessibility	3	Temporary traffic disruptions may occur during construction due to lane closures and equipment access along Bergen Street. These impacts would be short-term and managed through traffic control measures. Long-term improvements would reduce flooding-related roadway closures and improve accessibility.

NATURAL FEATURES		
Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation
Unique Natural Features, Water Resources	3	<p>The proposed project includes construction of a new stormwater outfall discharging to surface waters designated as Surface Water of the State (SOW A), which could result in short-term impacts such as localized erosion or sedimentation during construction. These temporary effects would be minimized through implementation of best management practices (BMPs) and compliance with applicable permitting requirements.</p> <p>Following construction, the bioretention system would improve water quality by capturing and treating stormwater runoff prior to discharge to the Arthur Kill, reducing pollutant</p>

*Environmental Assessment
Carteret RC 100021 Bergen Street Flood Mitigation*

		loading. With regulatory oversight and BMP implementation, impacts to surface waters and other water resources would be minor and temporary, with long-term conditions expected to improve.
Vegetation, Wildlife	3	<p>A Natural Heritage Program (NHP) database and Landscape Project Version 3.4 search was conducted for the project site and surrounding area. Results indicate that no rare plant species, ecological communities, priority sites, or rare wildlife species or habitats are documented on the project site itself. In addition, no vernal pool habitat or regulated stream habitat is present on the site.</p> <p>Rare wildlife species and associated habitats, including federally and state-listed fish and bird species, are documented within the immediate vicinity and within one mile of the project site, primarily in association with the Arthur Kill and adjacent aquatic and riparian environments. These include migratory corridors for Atlantic and Shortnose sturgeon and foraging or nesting habitat for various wading birds and raptors. The project site does not contain designated habitat for these species, and construction activities would be confined to previously developed and disturbed areas.</p> <p>Temporary impacts to vegetation would occur during construction; however, long-term conditions would improve through the establishment of landscaped and native vegetated areas associated with the bioretention basin. With avoidance of on-site sensitive habitats and compliance with applicable permitting and standard construction practices, impacts to vegetation and wildlife would be minor, and no significant adverse effects are anticipated.</p> <p>See Attachment D for Natural Heritage Data search results.</p>

ENERGY		
Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation
Energy Efficiency	3	The project includes mechanical components, including pumps and backup power, that would require energy use. However, the green infrastructure components of the project would offset impacts by reducing stormwater treatment demands downstream. Energy use would be consistent with similar public infrastructure projects and would not be significant.

Additional Studies Performed:

The drainage ditch onsite was delineated as State open water (SOW) A during a site delineation on August 27, 2024. See data forms in **Attachment G**.

Field Inspection (Date and completed by):

A site inspection was performed on April 14, 2025 at the project site. Members from the Michael Baker International (CMF), NJ Department of Community Affairs, Borough of Carteret, and French and Parrello (Designer) were in attendance. Michael Baker prepared the field report with site photos (see attached). Please see **Attachment G** 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 Carteret. *Zoning Map (Color)*. Borough of Carteret, Middlesex County, New Jersey, August 2018. Available at: <https://www.carteret.net/wp-content/uploads/2018/08/Zoning-Map-in-color.pdf>

Borough of Carteret. *Department of Public Works*. Borough of Carteret, Middlesex County, New Jersey. Available at: <https://www.carteret.net/publicworks/>

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)*, Panel No. 34023C0078G, Preliminary effective date January 31, 2014. Accessed at: <https://msc.fema.gov/portal/home>

Google™ Earth Pro.

Middlesex County, New Jersey. *Middlesex County Multi-Jurisdictional All-Hazards Mitigation Plan*. Middlesex County Office of Emergency Management and Preparedness, approved 2022.

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

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

NJDEP. *Stormwater Management Rules (N.J.A.C. 7:8)*. Trenton, New Jersey.

NJDEP. *New Jersey Natural Heritage Program – Data Request*. State of New Jersey. Available at: <https://nj.gov/dep/parksandforests/natural/heritage/request.html>

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/pages/gis-web-applications>

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

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

Environmental Assessment
Carteret RC 100021 Bergen Street Flood Mitigation

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). *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>.

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>

USFWS. *Information, Planning, and Conservation (IPaC) System*. Accessed at <http://ecos.fws.gov/ipac/>

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

List of Permits Obtained

As of this date, no permits have been obtained for the proposed project. The subrecipient, the Borough of Carteret, is required to secure all applicable local, state and federal permits prior to construction.

Based on the NJDEP Pre-Application Meeting held on June 16, 2025, the proposed Bergen Street Flood Mitigation Project, including the bioretention basin and associated stormwater infrastructure improvements will require several regulatory approvals. A Flood Hazard Area (FHA) Individual Permit will be required pursuant to N.J.A.C. 7:13, as the existing drainage ditch within the project area is considered a regulated waterway; compliance with N.J.A.C. 7:13-12.3, 12.4, and 12.5 will be required, and any disturbance within the associated 150-foot riparian zone, attributable to the presence of downstream threatened and endangered species, must meet the requirements of N.J.A.C. 7:13-11.2, including mitigation requirements. No wetlands were identified during the field investigation; however, SOW A was delineated and is a regulated feature under the FWPA Rules (N.J.A.C. 7:7a). A Freshwater Wetland (FWW) General Permit 11 would be required for impacts associated with the proposed force main discharge point. The project is also classified as a Major Development under the Stormwater Management Rules (N.J.A.C. 7:8) due to prior development on the site and a disturbance area exceeding one acre; therefore, stormwater management compliance is required, with groundwater recharge requirements potentially waived where inconsistent with the site remedial action plan, and hydrologic and hydraulic analyses demonstrating that post-development runoff does not exceed existing conditions. Compliance with the Stormwater Management Rules would be documented and included with the NJDEP FHA permit and FWW permit application. In addition, a Soil Erosion and Sediment Control Plan will be required in accordance with the New Jersey Soil Erosion and Sediment Control Act (N.J.S.A. 4:24-39 et seq.) and N.J.A.C. 2:90, with plan certification by the

Middlesex County Soil Conservation District prior to construction and implementation of measures consistent with the New Jersey Standards for Soil Erosion and Sediment Control to minimize off-site sedimentation. A Waterfront Development Permit is not required, as the proposed force main discharge is located more than 500 feet from the Mean High Water Line and is not regulated under N.J.A.C. 7:7.

See NJDEP pre-application meeting minutes in **Attachment H**.

Public Outreach [24 CFR 50.23 & 58.43]

The Borough of Carteret held a public hearing on November 27, 2023 at Carteret Borough Hall, where residents had the opportunity to voice their thoughts and views on the proposed project. A public notice was published in the Home News Tribune on November 21, 2023 that invited the public to attend. Per the guidelines of the program, the Borough published the notice in both English and Spanish. While no comments were made at the public hearing, the experience of residents have been essential in shaping the Borough's response to the recurring flooding that takes place along Bergen Street. The Borough plans to alleviate this flooding through the construction of a bioretention system located on Bergen Street and plans to incorporate public feedback in this process wherever possible.

The project area falls within the FEMA 100-year floodplain. As such as part of the Eight Step Analysis process, early notification and final notification was published in both English and Spanish and sent to interested parties. The early notification was published on August 25, 2025, through The New Jersey DCA Disaster Recovery and Mitigation, and was followed by a 15-day comment period. No comments regarding the proposed project were received during this time. See **Attachment E** for the 8-step 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 Bergen Street Flood Mitigation Project when added to past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions within the Bergen Street drainage area and the receiving waters of the Arthur Kill. The project area is located in a highly developed, industrial and residential portion of the Borough with extensive impervious cover and a documented history of flooding from major storm events such as Hurricanes Sandy and Ida. Past and ongoing actions in the area include industrial development, roadway maintenance, routine drainage system maintenance, and storm recovery activities, all of which have contributed to altered hydrology, increased runoff volumes, and degraded water quality. Construction of the proposed bioretention basin, pump station, force main, and outfall would result in short-term, localized impacts, including temporary soil disturbance, noise, traffic disruptions, and potential erosion or sedimentation near surface waters during outfall installation. These construction-related impacts would be additive to other short-term disturbances typical of urban infrastructure projects but would be limited in duration and extent.

Implementation of best management practices (BMPs) and compliance with applicable permitting requirements would minimize potential cumulative construction impacts to soils, drainage features, and surface waters.

In the long term, the proposed project would contribute beneficial cumulative effects by improving stormwater management and reducing flood risk in an area that has experienced repeated flood damage. The bioretention system would capture, treat, and attenuate stormwater runoff prior to discharge, reducing runoff volumes, peak flows, and pollutant loading to the Arthur Kill when considered alongside existing and future municipal drainage improvements. Conversion of a previously developed and flood-prone site to vegetated green infrastructure would improve soil stability, reduce erosion potential, and incrementally enhance urban vegetation and habitat value relative to existing conditions.

Natural Heritage Program and Landscape Project database searches indicate no rare plants, ecological communities, or rare wildlife species or habitats occur on the project site. Although rare aquatic and avian species are documented in nearby waterways and riparian areas, project activities would remain confined to previously disturbed areas and regulated through applicable permits, avoiding cumulative adverse effects to sensitive biological resources. Dry floodproofing of the adjacent sanitary pump station would further enhance the resilience of critical infrastructure when considered cumulatively with other hazard mitigation measures in the Borough.

Overall, when combined with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable actions, the proposed project would not contribute to significant adverse cumulative impacts. Instead, it would provide a net cumulative benefit by reducing flood risk, improving stormwater quality, enhancing infrastructure resilience, and supporting long-term environmental and community sustainability. 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 Bergen Street Flood Mitigation Project is to reduce recurring flooding along Bergen Street and within the surrounding drainage area, improve stormwater management and water quality, and enhance the resilience of critical public infrastructure in a flood-prone portion of the Borough of Carteret. In accordance with HUD 24 CFR Part 58 and NEPA requirements, this Alternatives Analysis evaluates reasonable alternatives capable of meeting the project purpose, including the No Action Alternative and practicable design variations, and identifies the preferred alternative based on feasibility, effectiveness, and environmental considerations. Additionally, the proposed project is located in a floodplain, and in accordance with EO 11988, Floodplain Management, and HUD regulations at 24 CFR 55.20 Subpart C, alternatives to construction outside of the floodplain were evaluated at a part of the 8-step process. See the complete 8-step decision making process in **Attachment F**.

Alternative 1: Avoidance of the Floodplain (Off-Site Location)

Avoidance alternatives involving relocation of the project outside the floodplain were evaluated. Vacant land of sufficient size within the affected drainage area is extremely limited, and potential

upland sites would require acquisition of privately owned properties, resulting in displacement, increased cost, and extended project timelines. Additionally, relocating stormwater infrastructure outside the floodplain would necessitate extensive storm sewer extensions and pumping systems to convey runoff from low-lying areas, increasing environmental disturbance and operational complexity.

Off-site locations would also introduce new impacts to wetlands, riparian areas, or previously undisturbed land, while reducing the effectiveness of stormwater control at the point of collection. Because these alternatives do not adequately manage stormwater where flooding occurs and would result in greater environmental and socioeconomic impacts, avoidance of the floodplain is not practicable.

Alternative 2: Distributed or Smaller-Scale Green Infrastructure

An alternative involving multiple smaller, distributed green infrastructure practices—such as rain gardens, infiltration basins, or permeable pavement—was considered. Due to high groundwater levels, unsuitable native soils, and tidal influence, infiltration-based practices are not feasible at this location and would not comply with NJDEP Stormwater Best Management Practices. Smaller distributed systems would also lack sufficient storage and conveyance capacity to manage major storm events and would provide limited flood risk reduction. This alternative would not reliably meet the project purpose and therefore is not practicable.

Alternative 3: Gravity-Only Stormwater Conveyance

This alternative would involve construction of a bioretention basin to capture and treat stormwater runoff from Bergen Street, with stormwater discharged by gravity to the existing drainage channel and outfall, without the use of a pump station or force main.

This alternative was evaluated but determined to be infeasible due to site constraints and hydraulic limitations. The bottom elevation of the proposed bioretention basin would be lower than the elevation of the existing drainage ditch and outfall, preventing positive gravity drainage to the Arthur Kill. As a result, stormwater would not fully drain from the basin during storm events, reducing available storage volume and limiting the basin's effectiveness in managing larger runoff volumes.

In addition, the existing outfall lacks sufficient capacity to convey all stormwater generated by the Bergen Street drainage area during heavy rain events. Relying solely on gravity discharge would therefore fail to adequately reduce flooding along Bergen Street and could worsen ponding conditions within the basin. Because this alternative would not reliably manage stormwater volumes or meet the project purpose, it was not selected.

Alternative 4: Reduced-Scope Project

A reduced-scope alternative involving partial infrastructure improvements—such as storm sewer upgrades without a bioretention basin or pump station or floodproofing without stormwater system upgrades—was also considered. These options would not meaningfully reduce flood risk or manage stormwater volumes during major storm events. Failure to include floodproofing measures for adjacent sewer infrastructure would leave critical public infrastructure vulnerable to flood damage. As a result, reduced-scope alternatives do not meet the project purpose and are not practicable.

Alternative 5: Proposed Action (Preferred Alternative)

The Proposed Action includes construction of a bioretention basin combined with a new stormwater pump station that will be elevated to comply with NJ FHACA flood-resistant construction standards, a force main, an improved outfall, storm sewer improvements, and dry floodproofing of the existing sanitary sewer pump station located adjacent to the new facility. Stormwater would be captured, treated, and temporarily stored in the bioretention basin and then conveyed under controlled conditions to the Arthur Kill via a pump-assisted discharge.

This alternative was selected as the preferred option because it effectively addresses site-specific flooding constraints, provides reliable stormwater storage and conveyance capacity during major storm events, and complies with NJDEP Stormwater Best Management Practices for green infrastructure that manage runoff quantity and quality without reliance on infiltration into native soils. The selected site is particularly suitable because it is Borough-owned vacant land located within the affected drainage area, allowing for long-term public maintenance and avoiding displacement. Vacant land of sufficient size is extremely limited in this portion of Carteret, and no practicable alternative sites exist outside the floodplain that would avoid impacts to wetlands or riparian areas while still meeting the project purpose.

While flood mitigation projects often involve work within floodplains and wetlands, the project site was previously developed with residential buildings and currently consists of managed open space rather than undisturbed natural floodplain. The proposed improvements would enhance the site's flood management function and long-term resilience. Temporary watercourse disturbance associated with outfall construction would be minimized and restored following installation, as the outfall would be located underground.

The Proposed Action best meets the project purpose by reducing flood risk, improving stormwater quality, protecting critical infrastructure, and providing long-term community benefits. For these reasons, it was selected as the environmentally preferable practicable alternative that meets the project purpose and need.

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

Under the No Action Alternative, the Borough would not construct the proposed bioretention basin, new elevated stormwater pump station, force main, or outfall improvements, and no dry floodproofing improvements would be made to the existing sanitary sewer pump station. Stormwater would continue to be conveyed through existing infrastructure to the current drainage channel and outfall.

This alternative would result in the continuation of existing conditions, including inadequate drainage capacity, accumulation of stormwater on Bergen Street, and recurring flooding during heavy rainfall and major storm events. The adjacent sanitary sewer pump station would remain vulnerable to flood damage without dry floodproofing.

Because the No Action Alternative would not address documented flooding problems, unmet disaster mitigation needs, or risks to public infrastructure and safety, it does not meet the project purpose and was therefore not selected.

Summary of Findings and Conclusions

The Environmental Assessment (EA) for the Bergen Street Flood Mitigation Project evaluated potential impacts associated with construction of a bioretention basin, stormwater pump station, force main, improved outfall, and related infrastructure improvements. Environmental review factors analyzed in accordance with HUD 24 CFR Part 58 indicate that project-related impacts would be minor, temporary, or beneficial in nature.

The project is consistent with applicable federal, state, regional, and local plans and is identified as a high-priority mitigation action in the Middlesex County Multi-Jurisdictional Hazard Mitigation Plan. The proposed use is compatible with surrounding land uses and zoning and would improve site function by converting a previously developed, flood-prone property into permanent stormwater management infrastructure. Temporary construction impacts to soils, drainage features, vegetation, noise levels, traffic, and surface waters would be minimized through standard best management practices and compliance with applicable permitting requirements.

Long-term benefits of the project include reduced flood risk along Bergen Street, improved stormwater management and water quality prior to discharge to the Arthur Kill, enhanced resilience of critical infrastructure, and incremental improvements to urban vegetation. Natural Heritage Program and Landscape Project searches confirmed that no rare species or sensitive habitats are present on the project site, and cumulative effects analysis determined that the project would contribute net beneficial effects when considered with past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions.

The alternatives analysis evaluated the No Action Alternative, off-site locations, distributed/smaller-scale green infrastructure projects, a gravity-only drainage option, a reduced-scope project and the Proposed Action (Preferred Alternative). The No Action Alternative does not meet the project purpose, and the gravity-only alternative was determined to be infeasible due to site elevation and drainage limitations. The Proposed Action was selected as the only practicable alternative that effectively meets flood mitigation and stormwater management objectives.

Based on the findings of the environmental assessment, alternatives analysis, and cumulative effects 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).

Flood Insurance

4. Properties in, or partially in, the 100-year floodplain shown on the effective FEMA FIRM, must be covered by flood insurance and the flood insurance must be maintained when ownership transfers [24 CFR 58.6(a)(1)]. No funding will be provided to any person who previously received federal flood disaster assistance conditioned on obtaining and maintaining flood insurance but failed to obtain and maintain insurance [24 CFR 58.6(b)].

Endangered Species

5. The monarch butterfly (*Danaus plexippus*, proposed threatened) and the tricolored bat (*Perimyotis subflavus*, proposed endangered) may occur within the project area. If the project is not completed prior to the effective date of a final rule listing either species, the grantee shall contact the DCA to reassess potential impacts to the monarch butterfly and/or tricolored bat. DCA shall reinstate consultation with USFWS if any remaining project activities may affect either species.
6. To avoid and minimize potential impacts to proposed endangered tricolored bat, the grantee shall: 1) avoid drilling and/or blasting activities during May 15 through July 31 annually (i.e., the pup season for the tricolored bat in New Jersey), and 2) avoid tree cutting/trimming/removal from May 15 through July 31 annually.

Wetlands and Waters Protection

7. The proposed action shall comply with all applicable federal and state regulations governing wetlands and regulated waters, including Section 404 of the Clean Water Act and USACE regulations (33 CFR Parts 320–332), as well as the New Jersey Freshwater Wetlands Protection Act Rules (N.J.A.C. 7:7A). All required federal and state permits for activities affecting wetlands, transition areas, or regulated waters shall be obtained prior to construction. The project shall avoid and minimize impacts to wetlands and regulated waters to the maximum extent practicable, with mitigation provided as required by the permitting agencies.

Floodplain Management

8. The proposed action shall comply with Executive Order 11988 (Floodplain Management), HUD regulations at 24 CFR Part 55, and the New Jersey Flood Hazard Area Control Act Rules (N.J.A.C. 7:13). All required NJDEP Flood Hazard Area permits, including any applicable Individual Permits or authorizations for activities within flood hazard areas or riparian zones, shall be obtained prior to construction. Project activities within the floodplain shall avoid and minimize impacts to flood storage, conveyance, and ecological function to the maximum extent practicable, in accordance with EO 11988, 24 CFR 55.20, and N.J.A.C. 7:13. To ensure compliance, the grantee and their construction contractors shall implement the following measures throughout design and construction:
 - a. Elevate or flood-proof project components, as required by N.J.A.C. 7:13, to ensure compliance with flood-resistant construction standards.
 - b. Limit temporary disturbance within the floodplain and restore all disturbed areas to pre-construction conditions or better using native vegetation and appropriate stabilization measures.
 - c. Maintain floodplain conveyance by prohibiting the placement of stockpiled materials, equipment, or fill within areas subject to flooding, unless otherwise approved under NJDEP permitting.
 - d. Implement best management practices (BMPs)—such as erosion and sediment controls, turbidity controls during in-channel work, and measures preventing downstream sedimentation—during any activity near regulated waters or outfalls.
 - e. Protect adjacent properties and infrastructure by ensuring no net increase in flood elevations or obstruction of flood flows.
 - f. Comply with all conditions established in the NJDEP Flood Hazard Area permit(s) and any local floodplain ordinances applicable to the project area.
 - g. All floodplain-related requirements and permit conditions shall be incorporated into construction documents and enforced throughout the duration of work.

Stormwater Management and Soil Erosion and Sediment Control Compliance

9. The Project will comply with the New Jersey Soil Erosion and Sediment Control Act (N.J.S.A. 4:24-39 et seq.) and all implementing regulations at N.J.A.C. 2:90. Prior to construction, the Applicant will obtain Soil Erosion and Sediment Control Plan certification from the local Soil Conservation District, as required. All temporary and permanent best management practices (BMPs) will be installed, maintained, and monitored in accordance with the approved plan

and the New Jersey Standards for Soil Erosion and Sediment Control. Any required stormwater management measures will be designed and implemented consistent with applicable NJDEP Stormwater Management Rules (N.J.A.C. 7:8) to ensure protection of water quality and minimize erosion, sedimentation, and off-site discharge.

Construction Best Management Practices

10. 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.

Site Contamination

11. Phase I and Phase II Environmental Site Assessments (ESAs) identified historic fill material and onsite contamination at the project site. The proposed action shall be implemented in accordance with the New Jersey Site Remediation Reform Act (SRRRA) and all applicable implementing regulations (N.J.A.C. 7:26C and N.J.A.C. 7:26E). The subrecipient shall retain a Licensed Site Remediation Professional (LSRP) to oversee further investigation, delineation, and management of historic fill and associated contaminants in compliance with NJDEP requirements. A Confirmed Discharge Notification shall be submitted to NJDEP consistent with SRRRA and applicable NJDEP technical guidance. The grantee shall ensure that all required remedial investigations, engineering or institutional controls, and construction-phase health and safety measures are implemented so that site conditions are protective of construction workers and prevent the mobilization or release of contamination during and after construction.

Sole Source Aquifer

12. The proposed action shall be implemented consistent with the Safe Drinking Water Act (SDWA) §1424(e) Sole Source Aquifer (SSA) protection requirements and any stipulations issued through EPA SSA consultation for the project. The project shall incorporate the following project-specific conditions into construction documents and operations and shall maintain compliance through completion of construction and for the life of the stormwater facilities.
 - a. Stormwater safeguards and BMPs: During construction and operation, implement safeguards and best management practices to ensure groundwater is not endangered. Measures shall include (a) contractor notification that the site is groundwater-sensitive, (b) use of green infrastructure/low-impact development practices wherever feasible, (c) contingency plans for any hazardous materials release, and (d) a designated decontamination area that captures and properly manages wastewater from equipment and concrete washout activities.

- b. Excavation below the water table – Construction Management Plan (CMP): Because excavation may extend below the water table, prepare and implement a CMP with robust groundwater protection controls, including spill containment/response for construction equipment; procedures for refueling; secure storage and secondary containment for fuels (e.g., gasoline, diesel, kerosene) and oils used for generators/pumps; and mitigation practices to address any fuel leak or equipment fire.
- c. Erosion and sediment controls protecting the aquifer: Install and maintain appropriate erosion and sediment control measures to prevent aquifer contamination by surface runoff or contaminant infiltration, with heightened protections for any phases involving excavation below the water table.
- d. Adjacent contaminated site coordination: Given the presence of a historically contaminated site adjacent to the project area, ensure contractors follow proper health and safety procedures and notification protocols if indicators of historic fill contamination are encountered (e.g., petroleum/chemical odors, stained soils, or free product). Prior to intrusive work that could re-mobilize contaminants, confirm that near-surface soils and groundwater within the work area are free of contamination or otherwise managed in accordance with applicable regulations and approvals.
- e. Dewatering and historic fill assumptions: Where historic fill is mapped/present, assume shallow groundwater is contaminated unless analytical data demonstrate compliance with applicable groundwater standards. Manage any water generated during construction dewatering as potentially contaminated, under appropriate discharge and/or waste regulations (e.g., permitted discharge, off-site treatment/disposal), including sampling/characterization, containment, and documentation.
- f. Aboveground storage tank (AST) closures: Complete any required AST closures in accordance with applicable federal, state, and local requirements before or during construction, as appropriate.
- g. New AST design and controls: Any proposed ASTs shall be double-walled with interstitial leak detection, equipped with overfill alarms, and located within secondary containment sized and designed per applicable standards to prevent releases to soil or groundwater.

Solid Waste Management

- 13. 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: 04/01/2026

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

Certifying Officer Signature: [Signature] Date: 04/06/2026

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).