

Mississippi Development Authority Small Rental Assistance Program Site-Specific Checklist

This Checklist is for Categorically Excluded activities as described in the *Mississippi Development Authority Small Rental Assistance Program, Unspecified Site Strategy and Broad Review*. See 24 CFR Part 58.

Agency: Mississippi Development Authority / Project Application ID #:	
Owner's Name:	
Street Address:	City, County:
USGS Quad Name:	District, Grouping, or Ensemble?
Tax Lot #:	Name:
Latitude/Longitude:	

Project Description: Check one:

Proposed Action "1" No alteration of undisturbed land; repair/reconstruction of rental structure in-place and in same footprint.

Proposed Action "2" - Expansion or Relocation of a rental structure on a parcel with pre-existing development.

Expansion: the existing structural footprint will be increased by approximately _____ square feet.

Relocation: _____ square feet - Size of existing structural (horizontal) footprint

_____ square feet - Approximate size of proposed new structural (horizontal) footprint.

Proposed Action "3" New construction with existing access to water, sewer/septic, and electricity; and, meeting or exceeding current flood elevation requirements of local floodplain management ordinance.

For the purpose of this Site-Specific Checklist, the "Proposed Action Site" is defined as the area that would be disturbed by the Applicant's action.

Under "1" above, the Proposed Action Site is the existing structural footprint of the rental structure.

Under "2" above, the Proposed Action Site is the proposed new structural footprint of the rental structure, either expanded or relocated.

Under "3" above, the Proposed Action Site is the proposed new structural footprint of the new structure.

Action Description - as provided by Applicant:

Additional Action Description – as communicated to or observed/recorded by Environmental Specialist:

Copy of the Applicant-signed Project Status Affidavit for the Proposed Action and description is attached.

Reviewers and Approvals

CHECK ONE:

All required environmental reviews for this Proposed Action Site and specified Proposed Action have been satisfactorily completed, and the Proposed Action has cleared the site-specific environmental review process.

This Proposed Action Site and/or Proposed Action as specified above does NOT clear the site-specific environmental review process. Comments:

Signature _____ Date _____
Patricia W. Slade OR Lawrence Frank, Senior Environmental Reviewer, *URS Corporation*

Signature _____ Date _____
Mark Edwards, Senior Cultural Resources Specialist, *URS Corporation*

HUD-Delegated Approving Official

Name: Donna Sanford

Disaster Recovery Director, *Mississippi Development Authority*

Signature _____ . Date _____ .

Project site is located within an Accident Potential Zone, Runway Clear Zone, or Clear Zone, and requires approval by Certifying Official. I, Donna Sanford, Certifying Official, approve this action by my or my designee's signature below.

Signature _____ . Date _____ .

SECTION I. SITE-SPECIFIC ENVIRONMENTAL AND SECTION 106 REVIEW DOCUMENTATION

A. Historic Preservation - National Historic Preservation Act, Section 106, 36 CFR Part 800, and Executive Order 11593 - REVIEW CONCLUDED. (check this box only when completion of the subtasks listed below result in a "Review Concluded")

- No potential to affect historic properties.
REVIEW CONCLUDED.
- Project meets requirements and/or allowances stipulated in executed 2008 Programmatic Agreement.
 - Yes. (see Section II)
 - Are project conditions required? YES. (see Section II) NO.
REVIEW CONCLUDED.
 - No. Conduct standard Section 106 review. Follow steps (1) and (2) below.

(1) HISTORIC BUILDINGS AND STRUCTURES

- No historic properties that are 50 years or older, or meet Criterion Consideration G, or that retain historic physical integrity, in project area.
Determination of No Historic Properties (MDA finding/SHPO concurrence on file).
REVIEW CONCLUDED.
- Building or structure, listed in National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) or 50 years or older in project area and activity not exempt from review.
 - Determination of No Historic Properties Present or Affected (MDA finding/SHPO concurrence on file).
REVIEW CONCLUDED.
 - Determination of Historic Properties Affected (MDA finding/SHPO concurrence on file)
 - Property is a National Historic Landmark & National Park Service was provided early notification during the consultation process. **If not**, explain in comments.
 - No Adverse Effect Determination (MDA finding/SHPO concurrence on file).
Are project conditions required? YES. (see Section II) NO.
REVIEW CONCLUDED.
 - Adverse Effect Determination (MDA finding/SHPO concurrence on file)
 - Resolution of Adverse Effect completed. (Memo to the file regarding which stipulation in PA used to address Adverse Effect, or separate MOA developed, and on file).
Are project conditions required? YES. (see Section II) NO.
REVIEW CONCLUDED.

(2) ARCHAEOLOGICAL RESOURCES

- No potential to affect archaeological resources.
Project limited to area within 3 feet of existing building footprint, involves construction of new foundation or pier structure where work would not penetrate below the depth of the historic foundation or pier structure, or affects only previously disturbed ground.
REVIEW CONCLUDED.
- Project affects undisturbed ground, and/or construction of new foundation or pier structure where work would penetrate below the depth of the historic foundation or pier structure.
 - Project area has no potential for presence of archaeological resources.
 - Determination of No Historic Properties Present or Affected.
MDA finding/SHPO/THPO concurrence or consultation on file.
REVIEW CONCLUDED.
 - Project area has potential for presence of archaeological resources.
 - Determination of No Historic Properties Affected
MDA finding/SHPO/THPO concurrence on file.
Are project conditions required? YES. (see Section II) NO.
REVIEW CONCLUDED.
 - Determination That Additional Work is Required to Make Effects Determination.
 - NR-listed or -eligible resources not present. MDA finding/SHPO/ THPO concurrence on file.
Are project conditions required? YES. (see Section II) NO.
REVIEW CONCLUDED.

- NR-listed or -eligible resource(s) present in project area. MDA finding/SHPO/THPO concurrence on file.
- No Adverse Effect Determination. MDA finding/ SHPO/THPO concurrence on file.
Are project conditions required? YES. (see Section II) NO.
REVIEW CONCLUDED.
- Adverse Effect Determination. MDA finding/ SHPO/THPO concurrence on file.
 - Resolution of Adverse Effect completed. Memo to the file regarding which stipulation in PA used to address Adverse Effect, or MOA on file.
Are project conditions required? YES. (see Section II) NO.
REVIEW CONCLUDED.

Comments:
Correspondence/Consultation/References:

B. Floodplain Protection/E.O. 11988 - REVIEW CONCLUDED. (check this box only when completion of the subtasks listed below result in a "Review Concluded")

- Proposed Action Site is not located in SFHA. REVIEW CONCLUDED.
- Proposed Action Site is located in a FEMA-designated floodway. Source Document:
STOP - SITE IS NOT ELIGIBLE FOR HUD ASSISTANCE.
- Proposed Action Site is located within the Special Flood Hazard Area (SFHA). Source Document:
 - The eight-step process as described at 24 CFR Part 55.20 has been completed through preparation of the document entitled, *Documentation of Areawide Compliance Process, Executive Order 11988, Pearl River, Hancock, Harrison, and Jackson Counties, Mississippi, Mississippi Development Authority ("Areawide Compliance")*. This document concludes that the program overall would not have a negative impact on floodplain density due to the number of Katrina destroyed rental properties being greater than the number of MDA-assisted Small Rental Applicants with sites proposed or existing in the SFHA.
 - The Applicant's Proposed Action description is addressed in the Areawide Compliance.
REVIEW CONCLUDED.
 - Flood Insurance and compliance with the latest (most recent) elevation requirement issued by FEMA, or its successors, pursuant to the NFIP, or a successor program, whether advisory, preliminary, or final is required. (see Section II)

Comments: See *Documentation of Areawide Compliance Process, Executive Order 11988, Pearl River, Hancock, Harrison, and Jackson Counties, Mississippi, Mississippi Development Authority.*
Correspondence/Consultation/References:

C1. Wetland Protection (EO 11990) - REVIEW CONCLUDED. (check this box only when completion of the subtasks listed below result in a "Review Concluded"). NOTE: Early public review occurred when the program announcement was made on April 23, 2007.

- Proposed Action "1": project involves disturbance within existing structural footprint only. There is no potential to affect wetlands, based on the limited scope of the action.
REVIEW CONCLUDED.
- Proposed Action "2" or "3"
 - Wetlands-trained professional has reviewed the property conditions, and concluded that the Applicant's Proposed Action will not directly impact wetlands.
Comments: (based on review of site photos, review of aerials, site visit, etc.)
REVIEW CONCLUDED.
 - Wetlands-trained professional has reviewed the property conditions, and concluded that the Applicant's Proposed Action will directly impact wetlands.
Comments: (based on review of site photos, review of aerials, site visit, etc.)

- Applicant has been consulted regarding practicable alternatives to avoid and/or minimize the potential adverse impact on wetlands.
 - Applicant has redesigned project and/or chosen a new construction location that will avoid direct impact on wetlands.
REVIEW CONCLUDED.

- Applicant has not identified a practicable alternative to directly impacting wetlands.
 - 8-Step Process Initiated – Actions to avoid or minimize wetlands impacts have been considered. Describe the action taken:
 - Second public notice and explanation have occurred. Date published:
 - Identification and evaluation of alternatives to locating in wetlands have been considered. Describe these alternatives:
 - Actions to avoid or minimize wetlands impacts have been considered, and alternatives to locating in wetlands have been reevaluated. Describe these actions:
REVIEW CONCLUDED.

C2. Clean Water Act - REVIEW CONCLUDED. (check this box only when completion of the subtasks listed below result in a "Review Concluded").

- Proposed Action "1": project involves disturbance within existing structural footprint only. There is no potential to affect wetlands, based on the limited scope of the action.
REVIEW CONCLUDED.
- Proposed Action "2": project involves construction outside existing structural footprint. OR
- Proposed Action "3": project involves new construction on new structural footprint.
 - Wetlands-trained professional has reviewed the proposed construction area, and concluded that the Applicant's Proposed Action Site does not contain Waters of the U.S.
 - Coordination with U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) will not be conducted as part of this Site-Specific Checklist review.
REVIEW CONCLUDED.
 - Coordination with U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) is recommended.
 - Mobile District Vicksburg District
 - Coordination with USACE has been completed. Letter dated:
 - USACE response re: concurrence of no effect to Waters of the U.S. received.
Date: _____ (attach).
REVIEW CONCLUDED.
 - No USACE response received within 30 days.
REVIEW CONCLUDED.
 - Wetlands-trained professional has reviewed the proposed construction area, and concluded that Waters of the U.S. WOULD or COULD be affected by the Proposed Action.
Date of Field Observation(s): _____
Source Document(s): Comments: (based on review of site photos, review of aeriels, site visit, etc.)
 - Coordination with U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) is required.
 - Mobile District Vicksburg District
 - Coordination with USACE has been completed. Letter dated:
 - USACE response received. Letter dated: _____ (attach)
 - Permit from USACE is NOT required. No impact to Waters of the U.S.
REVIEW CONCLUDED.
 - USACE requires additional information. MDA will notify Applicant to submit the additional information to USACE.
 - Project requires Section 404/401 or Section 9/10 (Rivers and Harbors Act) permit, including qualification under Nationwide Permit, Regional General Permit, or Individual Permit.
 - MDA will notify Applicant. (note: if Applicant decides to relocate to avoid Waters of the U.S., return to the beginning of this section)
 - Applicant has obtained USACE permit or approval to use a Nationwide or Regional General Permit. Letter response and evidence of implementation of any required mitigation measures has been provided. *Include permit specifics below.*
 - MDA plans to approve project without the Applicant already having a permit. MDA will require Applicant to obtain the

appropriate Clean Water Act permit and/or provide documentation to and from USACE that permit is not required. (See Section II.)
REVIEW CONCLUDED.

Comments:

Correspondence/Consultation/References:

D. Coastal Zone Management - REVIEW CONCLUDED. (check this box only when completion of the subtasks listed below result in a "Review Concluded")

- Proposed Action "1": project involves disturbance within existing structural footprint only. No impacts to coastal wetlands. REVIEW CONCLUDED.
- Proposed Action "2": project involves construction outside existing structural footprint. OR Proposed Action "3": project involves new construction on new structural footprint.
 - Coastal wetland impacts are NOT associated with the Proposed Action. REVIEW CONCLUDED.
 - Coastal wetland impacts ARE associated with the Proposed Action.
 - Authorization from MS Department of Marine Resources (MDMR) is required. MDA to notify Applicant that MDMR coordination is required.
 - MDA has notified the Applicant.
 - Applicant has returned response from MDMR.
 - Authorization from MDMR has been granted and relevant documentation received. (attach documentation). REVIEW CONCLUDED.
 - MDMR did not authorize project. Follow-up with Applicant is required.
 - MDA to notify Applicant requesting follow-up with MDMR. Loan cannot be approved until MDMR authorizes action, or the project location is changed so that coastal wetlands are not impacted.

Comments:

Correspondence/Consultation/References:

E. Endangered Species - REVIEW CONCLUDED. (check this box only when completion of the subtasks listed below result in a "Review Concluded")

- Proposed Action "1": project involves disturbance within existing structural footprint only. There is no potential to affect Federally listed species and/or designated critical habitat, based on the limited scope of the action. REVIEW CONCLUDED.
- Proposed Action "2": project involves construction outside existing structural footprint. OR Proposed Action "3": project involves new construction on new structural footprint.
 - Trained personnel have reviewed site conditions, and concluded that NO Federally listed or state-listed threatened and endangered species and/or designated critical habitat present in areas affected directly or indirectly by the Proposed Action. REVIEW CONCLUDED.
 - Trained personnel have reviewed site conditions, and concluded that Federally listed or state-listed species and/or designated critical habitat present in the areas affected directly or indirectly by the Proposed Action.
 - May affect, but not likely to adversely affect species or designated critical habitat.
 - USFWS correspondence sent (only for Federally listed species and/or designated critical habitat); Date Sent:
 - USFWS response received and they concur; Date: REVIEW CONCLUDED.
 - USFWS response received and they DO NOT concur; consider whether Formal Consultation is required. Date of USFWS response letter:
Note: MDA determination letter and USFWS concurrence must be attached to this Site-Specific Checklist)
Are project conditions required? YES. (See Section II) NO. REVIEW CONCLUDED.
 - MDWFP correspondence sent (only for state-listed species and/or designated critical habitat); Date Sent:

- MDWFP response received and they concur; Date:
REVIEW CONCLUDED.
- MDWFP response received and they DO NOT concur.
 - MDA and MDWFP have resolved the potential concern to state-listed species or designated critical habitat. (attach documentation)
Are project conditions required? YES. (See Section II) NO.
REVIEW CONCLUDED.
- Likely to adversely affect Federally listed species or designated critical habitat. MDA will consult with the Applicant regarding their choice of possible alternative locations and whether the new site will have an adverse effect on Federally listed species or designated critical habitat. If no suitable alternative location is available, MDA will initiate formal consultation with USFWS per 50 CFR Part 402.
 - Formal consultation initiated and correspondence sent; Date Sent:
 - Formal consultation concluded. (Biological Assessment and Biological Opinion on file)
Are project conditions required? YES. (see Section II) NO.
REVIEW CONCLUDED.
- Likely to adversely affect state-listed species or designated critical habitat. MDA will consult with the Applicant regarding their choice of possible alternative locations and whether the new site will have an adverse effect on State-listed species or designated critical habitat.
 - MDA to consult with MDWFP. Date Sent:
 - MDA and MDWFP have resolved the potential concern to state-listed species or designated critical habitat. (attach documentation)
Are project conditions required? YES. (see Section II) NO.
REVIEW CONCLUDED.

Comments:

Correspondence/Consultation/References:

F. Farmland Protection - REVIEW CONCLUDED. (check this box only when completion of the subtasks listed below result in a "Review Concluded")

- Proposed Action Site is located inside municipal limit. Not subject to Farmland Protection Policy Act (FPPA).
REVIEW CONCLUDED.
- Proposed Action Site is located outside municipal limit; subject to FPPA.
 - NRCS has stated that Proposed Action 1 Sites located outside municipal limits do not require NRCS coordination.
 - Coordination with Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) is required.
 - Farmland Conversion Impact Rating, Form AD-1006, or other NRCS-approved documentation has been completed and submitted on Date:
 - NRCS has replied on Date: _____ (attach documentation)
Are conditions required? NO. YES. (Describe in Section II)
REVIEW CONCLUDED.
 - NRCS has not replied within 30 days; MDA considers "no response" to be concurrence of no significant adverse effect.
REVIEW CONCLUDED.

Comments:

Correspondence/Consultation/References:

G. HUD Environmental Standards - Hazardous, Toxic or Radioactive

Materials & Substances (24 CFR Part 58.5 [i][2][i] and [iii]) – REVIEW CONCLUDED. (check this box only when completion of the subtasks listed below result in a "Review Concluded")

Note: This review is not intended to satisfy the requirements of a Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) or other Environmental Due Diligence Process as defined by the American Society of Testing and Materials (ASTM), or any of the requirements necessary to qualify for the innocent landowner, contiguous property owner, or bona fide prospective purchaser limitations on CERCLA liability.

FINDINGS FROM LIMITED SITE OBSERVATION FROM PUBLIC RIGHT-OF-WAY (ROW):

Obvious signs of hazardous, toxic, or radioactive materials or substances were observed on the Proposed Action Site from the public right-of-way during the site visit on (date):

NO. YES. If "yes," describe:

FINDINGS FROM REVIEW OF REGULATORY DATABASES AND OTHER INFORMATION SOURCES:

The Proposed Action Site has been evaluated through review of the following regulatory databases and other information sources.

Is the property encumbered with any environmental liens, based on the Applicant-signed Loan Agreement?

NO. YES. If "yes," describe:

Is the Proposed Action Site, by its address or name:	Yes / No	Is "yes," describe/list name, distance, etc.	Source Review Document(s)/Person(s)
Listed on US EPA Superfund National Priorities List (NPL)?			US EPA EnviroFacts online database (http://www.epa.gov/enviro/geo_data.html); 2007
Listed on Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act (CERCLA) List?			US EPA EnviroFacts online database, 2007
Listed in Equivalent State list (Mississippi Department of Environmental Quality [MDEQ] CERCLA/Uncontrolled Sites File List)			MDEQ Groundwater Assessment and Remediation Division (GARD) online database, (http://www.deq.state.ms.us/), 2007
Located within 3,000 feet of a toxic site (e.g., NPL, CERCLA, MDEQ State Hazardous Waste Site, or MDEQ underground storage tank [UST]/leaking UST [LUST])?			US EPA EnviroFacts online database, 2007 MDEQ GARD online database, 2007 MDEQ UST and LUST databases, 2007
Located within 3,000 feet of a solid waste landfill site?			MDEQ Solid Waste Management online databases (http://www.deq.state.ms.us/), 2007 Local regulatory/government agency (insert applicable name)
Listed as having a registered UST?			MDEQ UST and LUST databases, 2007
Known or suspected to be contaminated by toxic chemicals or radioactive materials?*			US EPA EnviroFacts online database, 2007 MDEQ GARD online database, 2007 MDEQ UST and LUST databases, 2007 Local regulatory/government agency (insert applicable name)

** Note: this review is not intended to identify the potential presence of toxics in building materials or equipment, such as asbestos-containing materials, lead-based paint, polychlorinated biphenyls, mercury, urea formaldehyde, formaldehyde, or from drinking water or septic system contamination.

"No" answers were given above. Based on the limited site observations made in support of this environmental review, and review of the listed databases and information sources, the Proposed Action Site does NOT appear to be impacted by hazardous, toxic, or radioactive materials or substances where the specified hazard could affect the health and safety of occupants or conflict with the intended utilization of the site, as specified by the HUD guidance received and as described in the MDA Small Rental Assistance Program Unspecified Site Strategy and Broad Review.

REVIEW CONCLUDED.

One or more "yes's" were answered above.

As described above, the Proposed Action Site IS listed as a known or suspected contaminated (hazardous, toxic, or radioactive materials) site.

More information is required, such as documentation of cleanup/remediation and/or "No Further Action" letter from the USEPA or MDEQ.

Specify additional information obtained from regulatory agency:

- Based on the review conducted, it does NOT currently appear that the identified hazard affects the health and safety of occupants or conflicts with the intended utilization of the property. Note that this review does not constitute a risk assessment or definitive determination of the hazard and its potential effect on health and safety of occupants or the environmental condition of the property.
REVIEW CONCLUDED.
- Based on the review conducted, it DOES currently appear that the identified hazard affects the health and safety of occupants or conflicts with the intended utilization of the property. The Proposed Action Site and/or Proposed Action does NOT clear the site-specific review process.
STOP - SITE NOT ELIGIBLE FOR SMALL RENTAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.
- As described above, based on review of the MDEQ Registered UST Database, the Proposed Action Site contains a registered UST. Describe the Registered UST (size, contents, installation date, testing results, etc.):
 - The registered UST on the Proposed Action Site is NOT identified as a leaking UST (LUST), based on a review of MDEQ databases.
REVIEW CONCLUDED.
 - The registered UST on the Proposed Action Site IS identified as a LUST, based on a review of MDEQ databases.
STOP - SITE NOT ELIGIBLE FOR SMALL RENTAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM, unless the site has obtained a No Further Action status from MDEQ and the documented levels of contamination are below Federal clean-up and/or action standards, and where a hazard would not affect the health and safety of occupants or conflict with the intended utilization of the property..
- As described above, based on review of regulatory databases and other information sources, the Proposed Action Site DOES appear to be located proximate to a site of environmental concern (toxic site or solid waste landfill site) that could have adversely impacted the site, and/or IS known or suspected to be contaminated by toxic chemicals or radioactive materials.
Describe findings from review of local topography, inferred direction of groundwater flow, review of state regulatory files, agency inquiries, etc.:

Based on topography and/or distance of the Proposed Action Site relative to the site of environmental concern:

- It does NOT appear that the Proposed Action Site is likely to have been impacted by the site of environmental concern to a degree where the hazard could affect the health and safety of occupants or conflict with the intended utilization of the property.
REVIEW CONCLUDED.
- It DOES appear that the Proposed Action Site is likely to have been impacted by the site of environmental concern to a degree where the hazard could affect the health and safety of occupants or conflict with the intended utilization of the property. Additional regulatory file review to be performed.
 - Regulatory agency file review performed for site of environmental concern. The review indicates that the Proposed Action Site is NOT suspected or known to be contaminated by the site (attach regulatory file review documentation).
REVIEW CONCLUDED.
 - Regulatory agency file review performed for site of environmental concern. Results of regulatory agency file review indicate that the Proposed Action Site is KNOWN to be contaminated by the site of environmental concern. The Proposed Action Site and/or Proposed Action does NOT clear the site-specific review process.
STOP - SITE NOT ELIGIBLE FOR SMALL RENTAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.
 - Regulatory agency file review performed for site of environmental concern. Results of regulatory agency file review indicate that the Proposed Action Site is SUSPECTED to be contaminated by the site of environmental concern. MDA to request additional information from the Applicant.
- Information provided by Applicant documents that the Proposed Action Site is not contaminated. (attach documentation)
REVIEW CONCLUDED.

- Applicant does not have documentation related to potential for contamination of the Proposed Action Site. Applicant must request a letter or finding from the State, stating that the Proposed Action Site is not contaminated or has been remediated. If Applicant provides documentation, return to the step above.
If Applicant does not provide adequate documentation, STOP - SITE NOT ELIGIBLE FOR SMALL RENTAL ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.

Comments:

Correspondence/Consultation/References:

H. Siting of HUD-Assisted Projects Near Hazardous Operations Handling Conventional Fuels or Chemicals of an Explosive or Flammable Nature

(24 CFR Part 51, Subpart C – REVIEW CONCLUDED. (check this box only when completion of the subtasks listed below result in a "Review Concluded")

Note: The review addresses aboveground containers readily observed on the exterior of buildings on a Proposed Action Site or from a public right-of-way on an adjoining site unless otherwise identified by an Applicant or a regulatory agency; containers identified on a Proposed Action Site or adjoining site by a regulatory agency; and projected hazardous operations development that is identified by regulatory agencies.

FINDINGS FOR PROPOSED ACTION SITE:

Obvious signs of an aboveground storage tank (AST)/container or a stationary emergency generator were observed on the Proposed Action Site from the public right-of-way during the site visit on (date) or reported by the Applicant.

NO. YES. If "yes,"

Is the capacity of the AST 100 gallons or greater? NO. YES. If "yes," state the size:

If yes," does the AST contain a Specific Hazardous Substance? NO. YES. If "yes,"

State the substance and purpose (e.g. heating oil as source sole of heating fuel, etc.):

Is the tank: diked or undiked

If the tank is diked, the size of the diked area [in square feet] is:

The tank contents are in a gas state liquid state

The contents are stored in pressurized container or unpressurized containers

The Acceptable Separation Distance (ASD) for the AST is:

Are the proposed building location and unprotected outdoor space, including yard(s) within the ASD of the container?

NO; at a distance greater than the ASD.

REVIEW CONCLUDED.

YES; at a distance less than the ASD.

NO. PROPOSED BUILDING SITE/OUTDOOR AREAS MUST BE RELOCATED, AST MUST BE RELOCATED, OR APPROPRIATE MITIGATING MEASURE MUST BE INSTALLED AND APPLICANT MUST PROVIDE APPROPRIATE DOCUMENTATION TO MEET HUD REQUIREMENTS FOR AN APPROPRIATE MITIGATION MEASURE FOR SITE TO PASS THIS REVIEW.

YES. If "yes," describe, and state the source:

FINDINGS FOR ADJOINING PROPERTIES:

Obvious signs of an aboveground storage tank (AST)/container or a stationary emergency generator were observed on properties adjoining the Proposed Action Site from the public right-of-way during the site visit on (date), or were reported by a regulatory agency:

NO. YES. Is "yes,"

Is the capacity of the AST 100 gallons or greater? NO. YES. If "yes," state the size:

If yes," does the AST contain a Specific Hazardous Substance? NO. YES.

If "yes,"

State the substance and purpose (e.g. heating oil as source sole of heating fuel, etc.):

Is the tank: diked or undiked

If the tank is diked, the size of the diked area [in square feet] is:

The tank contents are in a gas state liquid state

The contents are stored in pressurized container or unpressurized containers

The Acceptable Separation Distance (ASD) for the AST is:

Are the proposed building location and unprotected outdoor space, including yard(s) within the ASD of the container? NO; at a distance greater than the ASD. YES; at a distance less than the ASD.

If "yes," are appropriate mitigating measures in place, as verified by an appropriate agency (fire chief, etc.)? Describe the mitigating measure:

NO. PROPOSED BUILDING SITE/OUTDOOR AREAS MUST BE RELOCATED, AST MUST BE RELOCATED, OR APPROPRIATE MITIGATING MEASURE MUST BE INSTALLED AND APPLICANT MUST PROVIDE APPROPRIATE DOCUMENTATION TO MEET HUD REQUIREMENTS FOR AN APPROPRIATE MITIGATION MEASURE FOR SITE TO PASS THIS REVIEW.

YES. If "yes," describe, and state the source:

Based on the above reviews regarding the findings for the Proposed Action Site and the Adjoining Sites, the Proposed Action Site is located at a distance greater than the ASD for the identified ASTs or appropriate mitigating measures are in place. REVIEW CONCLUDED.

Based on the above reviews regarding the findings for the Proposed Action Site and the Adjoining Sites, the Proposed Action Site IS located at a distance that is less than the ASD for the identified ASTs and appropriate mitigating measures are not in place. STOP - SITE DOES NOT PASS THE ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW.

FINDINGS FROM REVIEW OF REGULATORY DATABASES AND OTHER INFORMATION SOURCES:

ASTs containing Specific Hazardous Substances are located on the Proposed Action Site and/or adjoining sites, as identified on the following regulatory databases and information sources.

Facility Name / Address for AST Facility	Distance from Proposed Action Site (feet)	size, diked/undiked, size of diked area, state of contents, pressurized/unpressurized container	Source Review Document(s) / Person(s)	Largest Acceptable Separation Distance for All Onsite ASTs
<input type="checkbox"/> None. REGULATORY DATABASE REVIEW CONCLUDED.				

As described above, a container with a Specific Hazardous Substance, greater than 100 gallons in capacity, is located at a distance less than the ASD to the Proposed Action Site.

An appropriate mitigating measure is situated between the Proposed Action Site and the AST, as verified by an appropriate agency (fire chief, etc.). Describe the mitigating measure:

YES; REVIEW CONCLUDED.

NO;. PROPOSED BUILDING SITE/OUTDOOR AREAS MUST BE RELOCATED, AST MUST BE RELOCATED, OR APPROPRIATE MITIGATING MEASURE MUST BE INSTALLED AND APPLICANT MUST PROVIDE APPROPRIATE DOCUMENTATION TO MEET HUD REQUIREMENTS FOR AN APPROPRIATE MITIGATION MEASURE FOR SITE TO PASS THIS REVIEW.

Comments:
 Correspondence/Consultation/References:

I. HUD Environmental Standards - Siting of HUD-Assisted Projects in Runway Clear Zones at Civil Airports and Clear Zones and Accident Potential Zones at Military Airfields (24 CFR Part 51, Subpart D) – REVIEW CONCLUDED. (check this box only when completion of the subtasks listed below result in a "Review Concluded")

Proposed Action Site is NOT located within an Accident Potential Zone, Runway Clear Zone, or Clear Zone. REVIEW CONCLUDED.

This conclusion is based on review of the URS GIS database of Civil and Military airport locations.

Proposed Action Site is located within an Accident Potential Zone, Runway Clear Zone, or Clear Zone.

Name of Airport:

Type: Municipal Military

- Type of Zone: Runway Clear Zone (Municipal); Clear Zone (Military)
- The airport operator must provide written assurance that there are no plans to purchase the land involved as part of a Runway Clear Zone or Clear Zone acquisition program.
Airport Operator Contacted on Date:
Airport Operator Response Date:
 - The Airport Operator has no plans to purchase the land.
 - The Airport Operator does have plans to purchase the land.
STOP – THE PROJECT MAY NOT BE APPROVED.
 - Accident Potential Zone (Military)
 - Project must be generally consistent with recommendations in Department of Defense (DoD) instructions.
 - DoD recommendations support the action.
 - DoD recommendations do not support the action.
STOP – THE PROJECT MAY NOT BE APPROVED.

The subject action in an Accident Potential Zone, Runway Clear Zone, or Clear Zone must be approved by the Certifying Officer having approval authority for the project. REVIEW CONCLUDED once the Certifying Official approves the project.

Comments:

Correspondence/Consultation/References:

ATTACHMENTS – check all documents that are to be attached to this SSC:

- Copy of the Applicant-signed Affidavit of the Proposed Action description
- Section A: Historic Preservation**
- Attachment A
 - Additional SHPO Correspondence
 - Letter to SHPO (archaeology)
 - Letter Response from SHPO (archaeology)
 - MOA
 - Other (define)
- Section C: Wetland Protection**
- Letter to USACE
 - Letter Response from USACE
 - Public Notice
 - Copy of Permit/Letter Approval of Nationwide Permit coverage, or Letter from USACE that a permit is not required
 - Other (define)
- Section D: Coastal Zone Management**
- Letter/Correspondence to MDMR
 - Letter/Correspondence Response from MDMR
- Section E: Endangered Species**
- Letter to USFWS
 - Letter Response from USFWS
 - Letter to MDWFP
 - Letter Response from MDWFP
- Section F: Farmland Protection**
- Letter and Form AD-1006 to NRCS
 - Letter Response and Completed Form AD-1006 from NRCS
- Section G: HUD Environmental Standards – Hazardous, Toxic or Radioactive Materials & Substances**
- Agency file documentation. Specify:
- Section H: HUD Environmental Standards – Explosive and Flammable Hazards**
- Agency-provided documentation. Specify:
- Section I: HUD Environmental Standards - Airport Hazards**
- Correspondence to Airport Operator
 - Correspondence from Airport Operator
 - Correspondence to DoD
 - Correspondence from DoD
- Other**
- Other (describe):

Section II. Environmental Review Project/Funding Conditions

General comments:

Project Conditions:

Monitoring Requirements: