

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

**Project Information**

<b>Update Date</b>	<b>Updated By</b>	<b>Start Date</b>	<b>Deadline Date</b>	<b>End Date</b>	<b>Justification</b>
06/16/2026	Aaron Keniski			06/15/2026	Actual End Date set to Signed Date on Signature and Posting (6320) screen.

**Project Name:** Zaria

**HEROS Number:** 900000010519163

**Start Date:** 02/09/2026

**Responsible Entity (RE):** MINNESOTA HOUSING FINANCE AGENCY, 400 Sibley St  
Saint Paul MN, 55101

**RE Preparer:** Aaron Keniski

**State / Local Identifier:** D8599

**Certifying Officer:** James Lehnhoff

**Grant Recipient (if different than Responsible Entity):** Minneapolis Public Housing Authority

**Point of Contact:** Aleksandra Veriga

**Consultant (if applicable):**

**Point of Contact:**

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

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

**Project Location:** 3033 Blaisdell Ave, Minneapolis, MN 55408

**Additional Location Information:**

The proposed project will be located at the northeast corner of the intersection of Blaisdell Avenue and West 31st Street.

**Direct Comments to:** Minnesota Housing Finance Agency  
400 Wabasha Street North, Suite 400  
St. Paul, MN 55102  
Aaron Keniski, 651.539.9602, aaron.keniski@state.mn.us  
Cindy Diel, 651.539.9655, cindy.diel@state.mn.us

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

Zaria will involve the acquisition of vacant land and the new construction of a 6-story, 90-unit affordable family housing project located at 3033 Blaisdell Avenue in Minneapolis with both underground and surface parking. This project represents the second and final phase of a larger, multi-phase redevelopment of a former Wells Fargo Bank site in south Minneapolis. The first phase successfully closed and began construction in June 2024, featuring 110 units of affordable housing. Together, these two complementary projects will create a comprehensive mixed-use development that includes new commercial space in the first phase and additional uses determined through a community engagement process. This review is only for the proposed Zaria project. Zaria will be a large family-focused building with 78 of the 90 units featuring two-, three-, or four-bedrooms, representing 87% of the total units. The housing will offer rents affordable to households at 30% and 50% of Area Median Income (AMI), with 32% of units (29 units total) specifically reserved for families at 30% of AMI. 14 units will be supportive housing units and will utilize Housing Support rental assistance through Hennepin County. Of these 14 units, 9 units will serve High Priority Homeless households and five units will serve Persons with Disabilities households. An additional 20 units (three- and four-bedroom units) will utilize Project-based Section 8 vouchers from the Minneapolis Public Housing Authority (MPHA). The project will incorporate Universal Design principles to better accommodate tenants who may need accessible units, and will include comprehensive features designed to meet residents' needs: an on-site management office, substantial community activity space to accommodate winter

programming for large families, bike storage, mail room, and a large community room suitable for resident gatherings such as birthday parties, as well as community events and educational trainings. The project will also feature a park with a large playground, charcoal grills, patio tables, and grassy areas where children can play freely. This review covers the anticipated HOME funds from Minnesota Housing and project-based Section 8 vouchers from MPHA. Acquisition and construction is anticipated to take place and begin towards the end of 2026 or early 2027.

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

The Zaria project directly responds to the housing needs identified through comprehensive community engagement led by the Cultural Wellness Center. Through extensive outreach by phone and in-person to underrepresented groups, including large immigrant communities such as Somali and Latinx organizations as well as BIPOC small business owners, the development team has built meaningful relationships that encouraged broad community participation in planning meetings. This engagement strategy ensures that community members remain involved not only in this redevelopment but also in the future redevelopment of the former Kmart site to the north of the Zaria project site. During the first two community meetings, residents identified their top priorities for the site: affordable housing and entrepreneurship opportunities. Specifically regarding affordable housing, community discussions emphasized the critical need for more family units and additional Section 8 housing options. In direct response to these identified needs, the development team increased the number of large family units in the project design and successfully secured an allocation of project-based vouchers from the Minneapolis Public Housing Authority. The project also contributes significantly to implementing the City of Minneapolis's Community Development Initiative, specifically supporting objectives outlined in the FY 2020-24 Minneapolis Consolidated Plan. Zaria advances three key Consolidated Plan goals: 1) Providing decent affordable housing by maintaining and producing safe, affordable housing options for extremely low-, low- and moderate-income households. The City prioritizes creating units affordable to households with incomes less than 30% and 60% of Area Median Income through new construction, preservation, acquisition and substantial rehabilitation. This work specifically addresses racial disparities in housing and affirmatively furthers fair housing goals. 2) Providing special needs housing by supporting development of affordable housing options for households with special needs, including physical disabilities. Zaria's incorporation of Universal Design principles directly addresses this objective. 3) Improving neighborhood conditions by implementing housing, economic development and public service strategies that improve access to affordable housing, jobs, transit, amenities and services for Minneapolis residents. The project's location within an important cultural corridor and its comprehensive community amenities support this broader neighborhood improvement goal.

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

The project site is located in the Lyndale neighborhood in south Minneapolis. The surrounding neighborhood is mixed-use, consisting of single-family homes, multifamily developments, public uses, and commercial/retail uses, the majority of which are in fair to average condition. The site is currently vacant land that was formerly occupied by a U.S. Bank branch. Land use adjacent to the north of the site consists of two retail plazas in average condition. These plazas include retailers such as Banadir Pharmacy, Nurturing Hands Day Care, Dollar Tree, Walgreens, and Subway, among others. Land use to the east of the site consists of the phase I site (Opportunity Crossing) with 110 affordable units that was completed in 2025. Land use to the southeast of the site is a station for the Minneapolis Police Department. Land use to the south of the site is the Metro Transit Nicollet Garage. Land use to the southwest of the site consists of Horn Towers, a 1971-built highrise Public Housing development that targets a senior tenancy. Land use to the west of the site consists of Albright Townhomes, an 89-unit project-based Section 8 development. According to Zillow, the majority of single-family homes in the Subject's immediate neighborhood have recently sold for between \$220,000 and \$620,000. According to a market study completed for the project in the summer of 2023, the demographic data demonstrates that both the population and the number of households in the primary market area (PMA) have increased from 2000 to 2022 and are forecasted to continue to increase through the date of market entry and 2027. Similarly, the metro area has experienced growth in population and households, a trend that is projected to continue. Both areas appear to be growing at a consistent rate, which indicates a need for additional affordable housing options. The total number of renter-occupied housing units within the PMA during 2022 was 65.7 percent of the total population. Comparatively, the total percentage of renter-occupied households within the metro area during 2022 was just 29.0 percent. The number of renters in the PMA is anticipated to increase by 321 through 2027. The comparables reviewed by the 2023 market study were located between 0.3 and 1.7 miles of the project site, all of which are located in the PMA. As a newly constructed property, the project would exhibit similar to slightly superior condition relative to the majority of the comparables, which ranged from good to excellent condition. Further, it should be noted that existing improvements in the surrounding neighborhood generally ranged in condition and quality from fair to average; thus, construction of the project would be a significant improvement to the immediate area. The project's proposed unit sizes, unit and common area amenities would all be considered competitive. Overall, the project's development scheme would be appropriate and well received as an affordable and supportive housing development targeted to the general population, formerly homeless households, and people with disabilities. The comparables reported vacancy rates ranging from zero to 8.8 percent, with an overall weighted average of 3.5 percent. Managers at four of the seven LIHTC properties reported being fully occupied. The average vacancy rate reported by the affordable comparables was 1.2 percent, below the 5.6 percent average reported by the market

rate properties. All of the market rate properties reported vacancy rates of 8.2 percent or lower. The project's LIHTC rents would offer a significant advantage over estimated achievable market rents and there is ample demand evidenced by the extensive waiting lists and high occupancy at the affordable comparables. Overall, the project would offer substantial value to potential tenants and help fulfill a need for high quality housing for the general population, formerly homeless households, and people with disabilities.

**Maps, photographs, and other documentation of project location and description:**

[Zaria Site Map and Site Plan.pdf](#)

[Construction Prelim Architectural Requirements.pdf](#)

[General Photographs at Application.pdf](#)

**Determination:**

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

**Approval Documents:**

[Part 58 EA Signature Page Fully Signed - Zaria.pdf](#)

**7015.15 certified by Certifying Officer**

on:

**7015.16 certified by Authorizing Officer**

on:

**Funding Information**

Grant / Project Identification Number	HUD Program	Program Name	Funding Amount
M-23-SG-27-0100	Community Planning and Development (CPD)	HOME Program	\$3,444,500.00
MN002	Public Housing	Project-Based Voucher Program	\$5,668,800.00

**Estimated Total HUD Funded, Assisted or Insured Amount:** \$9,113,300.00

**Estimated Total Project Cost [24 CFR 58.2 (a) (5)]:** \$39,669,977.00

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

<b>Compliance Factors:</b> Statutes, Executive Orders, and Regulations listed at 24 CFR §50.4, §58.5, and §58.6	Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?	Compliance determination (See Appendix A for source determinations)
<b>STATUTES, EXECUTIVE ORDERS, AND REGULATIONS LISTED AT 24 CFR §50.4 &amp; § 58.6</b>		
<b>Airport Hazards</b> Clear Zones and Accident Potential Zones; 24 CFR Part 51 Subpart D	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	The project site is not located within 15,000 feet of a military airport or 2,500 feet of a civilian airport as evidenced by the attached map. The closest airport is the Minneapolis-St. Paul International Airport, located approximately 4 miles to the southeast. Therefore, the project is in compliance with Airport Hazards requirements.
<b>Coastal Barrier Resources Act</b> Coastal Barrier Resources Act, as amended by the Coastal Barrier Improvement Act of 1990 [16 USC 3501]	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	The project site is not located in a CBRS Unit as evidenced by the attached map. Therefore, this project has no potential to impact a CBRS Unit and is in compliance with the Coastal Barrier Resources Act.
<b>Flood Insurance</b> Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 and National Flood Insurance Reform Act of 1994 [42 USC 4001-4128 and 42 USC 5154a]	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	The project site is not located in a FEMA-designated Special Flood Hazard Area according to the FEMA Firmette effective 11/4/2016 for the project area. Therefore, the project is in compliance with flood insurance requirements.
<b>STATUTES, EXECUTIVE ORDERS, AND REGULATIONS LISTED AT 24 CFR §50.4 &amp; § 58.5</b>		
<b>Air Quality</b> Clean Air Act, as amended, particularly section 176(c) & (d); 40 CFR Parts 6, 51, 93	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	Hennepin County is in attainment status for all criteria pollutants. While the attached EPA Green Book information indicates that Hennepin County is in maintenance status for Carbon Monoxide and Sulfur Dioxide, the area is now in attainment since the 20 year maintenance plan for each criteria pollutant has ended. Therefore, the project is in compliance with the Clean Air Act.

<p><b>Coastal Zone Management Act</b> Coastal Zone Management Act, sections 307(c) &amp; (d)</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<p>This project will be located in Minneapolis and will not be located in or will not affect a Coastal Zone as defined in the state Coastal Management Plan. The only coastal zone in Minnesota is located along the state's North Shore, beginning in the Duluth area and extending northeast (see attached map). Therefore, the project is in compliance with the Coastal Zone Management Act.</p>
<p><b>Contamination and Toxic Substances</b> 24 CFR 50.3(i) &amp; 58.5(i)(2)]</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<p>A Phase I ESA and soil vapor sampling were completed for the project. On-site or nearby toxic, hazardous, or radioactive substances that could affect the health and safety of project occupants or conflict with the intended use of the property were not found. Any adverse soil vapor impacts will be mitigated through the implementation of the ECCP created for the project. Consideration of radon will occur following construction, and any adverse radon impacts can be mitigated. With mitigation, identified in the mitigation section of this review, the project will be in compliance with contamination and toxic substances requirements.</p>
<p><b>Endangered Species Act</b> Endangered Species Act of 1973, particularly section 7; 50 CFR Part 402</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<p>This project has been determined to have No Effect on the federally listed species based on the IPaC determination keys completed and project location and site characteristics. Therefore, this project is in compliance with the Endangered Species Act without mitigation.</p>
<p><b>Explosive and Flammable Hazards</b> Above-Ground Tanks)[24 CFR Part 51 Subpart C</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	<p>There were aboveground storage tanks of concern identified within one mile of the project site, in particular those located at the Metro Transit Nicollet Garage to the southeast (Site TS0002032) and Vina Auto Body &amp; Repair to the northwest (Site TS0122647) on the uploaded AST Location Map. The analysis of the tanks at the Metro Transit Nicollet</p>

		<p>Garage was supplemented by the Part 58 environmental review completed in early 2024 for the phase one project, 3030 Nicollet (HEROS Number 900000010351176), which is located immediately east of the project site for Zaria. The Part 58 review for 3030 Nicollet included a separation distance study, completed in early 2024, that identified the exact location of the tanks at the Metro Transit Nicollet Garage (approximately 450 feet from the edge of the Zaria project site) and determined that the tanks are located in such a manner that no threat to the project is present and mitigation is met. It was confirmed with Metro Transit staff that no design or changes have been made to the aboveground storage tanks present at the Nicollet Garage since early 2024. Given that the Zaria project will be located immediately west of the 3030 Nicollet project, and therefore further away from the tanks, this report is being used to substantiate that the separation distance from the Zaria project is acceptable. Therefore, the project is in compliance with explosive and flammable hazard requirements.</p>
<p><b>Farmlands Protection</b> Farmland Protection Policy Act of 1981, particularly sections 1504(b) and 1541; 7 CFR Part 658</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p>This project will not include any activities that could potentially convert agricultural land to a non-agricultural use. The project site is also located within the Minneapolis/St. Paul Urbanized Area according to the U.S. Census Bureau (see attached map). Therefore, the project is in compliance with the Farmland Protection Policy Act.</p>
<p><b>Floodplain Management</b> Executive Order 11988, particularly section 2(a); 24 CFR Part 55</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p>This project will not occur in the FFRMS floodplain according to the FEMA Firmette effective 11/4/2016 for the project area. Therefore, the project is in compliance with Executive Orders 11988 and 13690.</p>

<b>Historic Preservation</b> National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, particularly sections 106 and 110; 36 CFR Part 800	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	Based on Section 106 consultation, which included the completion of a Phase I architecture-history survey, a determination of No Historic Properties Affected was made because the project will have no effect on the historic properties that are present in the defined APE. Therefore, the project is in compliance with Section 106.
<b>Noise Abatement and Control</b> Noise Control Act of 1972, as amended by the Quiet Communities Act of 1978; 24 CFR Part 51 Subpart B	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	The only noise generator found within the threshold distances that would have a noise impact on the project was West Lake Street to the north. A noise assessment was conducted and the noise level was found to be acceptable at 61.0 db. See the attached documents for the noise analysis. The project is in compliance with HUD's Noise regulation.
<b>Sole Source Aquifers</b> Safe Drinking Water Act of 1974, as amended, particularly section 1424(e); 40 CFR Part 149	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	The project will be located in Minneapolis and not be located on a sole source aquifer area as evidenced by the attached map. The only sole source aquifer area in Minnesota is surrounding Lake Mille Lacs. Therefore, the project is in compliance with Sole Source Aquifer requirements.
<b>Wetlands Protection</b> Executive Order 11990, particularly sections 2 and 5	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	The project will not impact wetlands as evidenced by the attached map. Therefore, the project is in compliance with Executive Order 11990.
<b>Wild and Scenic Rivers Act</b> Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 1968, particularly section 7(b) and (c)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	This project is not within proximity of a NWSRS river as evidenced by the attached maps. Therefore, the project is in compliance with the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act.
<b>HUD HOUSING ENVIRONMENTAL STANDARDS</b>		

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

**Impact Codes:** An impact code from the following list has been used to make the determination of impact for each factor.

- (1) Minor beneficial impact
- (2) No impact anticipated
- (3) Minor Adverse Impact – May require mitigation

**(4)** Significant or potentially significant impact requiring avoidance or modification which may require an Environmental Impact Statement.

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
<b>LAND DEVELOPMENT</b>			
Conformance with Plans / Compatible Land Use and Zoning / Scale and Urban Design	2	The development site is zoned "Community Mixed Use District" by the City of Minneapolis, and the project is consistent with the current zoning, which will remain in place following redevelopment. The project will redevelop a currently vacant site with a 90-unit affordable multifamily housing development and will provide a mix of 1- to 4-bedroom units. The project is consistent with the City of Minneapolis comprehensive plan, including Minneapolis 2040, which supports increased housing supply and affordability in transit-accessible urban areas. The scale and design of the development are anticipated to be compatible with surrounding land uses. With a waitlist exceeding five years for three- and four- bedroom units in this neighborhood, and a Minneapolis Public Housing Authority identified need for more family-sized units, Zaria will provide much-needed housing options for large families in this community. No adverse impacts related to zoning, land use compatibility, or urban design are anticipated.	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
Soil Suitability / Slope/ Erosion / Drainage and Storm Water Runoff	2	The development site is underlain by fill material extending approximately 9 to 13 feet below grade with variable consistency and no documentation of placement or compaction. The project will involve typical grading and excavation activities, which may temporarily increase erosion potential and alter localized drainage patterns, and will result in increased stormwater runoff due to added impervious surfaces. No significant slope or stability concerns were identified. To mitigate these conditions, fill within building areas will be removed and replaced with properly compacted structural fill in accordance with the geotechnical report (Geotechnical Engineering Report, Zaria, Terracon Consultants, March 6, 2026). The project will be designed and constructed in compliance with all applicable local, state, and federal stormwater management regulations. No adverse impact was identified.	
Hazards and Nuisances including Site Safety and Site-Generated Noise	2	The project is not expected to result in any significant hazards or long-term nuisances. Environmental investigation has identified soil and soil vapor detections below Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA) regulatory criteria. The project is proceeding with MPCA oversight, although no cleanup response actions are required during earthwork because contaminated soil was not identified. Soil removed during construction will be managed and handled in accordance with applicable regulatory requirements. Short-term construction-related impacts (e.g. noise, dust, vibration, increased truck traffic) may occur during development. These impacts will be managed in accordance with applicable local regulations and standard construction practices, including construction hour limitations and dust control measures. Once completed, the project is expected to	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		generate typical residential activity levels and is not anticipated to create significant noise or other nuisances for surrounding uses. The redevelopment will improve overall site conditions by converting a vacant parcel to active use. The project is not located in proximity to any major noise-generating sources such as airports, rail lines, or major highways that would be expected to result in significant long-term exposure to noise impacts. No significant adverse impacts are anticipated, and no mitigation measures beyond standard construction compliance are required.	
<b>SOCIOECONOMIC</b>			
Employment and Income Patterns	2	The proposed project will have a modest positive effect on employment and income patterns. Approximately three permanent full-time-equivalent (FTE) positions (site manager, maintenance technician, and service provider) will be created. A higher number of temporary construction jobs will be needed during project construction. To meet Section 3 requirements, the project team will need to target employment and contracting opportunities to low-income workers and businesses that employ them, to the greatest extent feasible. The development will add 90 units of affordable housing, supporting low- and moderate-income households and potentially improving economic stability by reducing housing cost burden. The site is currently vacant; therefore, no existing jobs will be displaced. No adverse impacts are anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.	
Demographic Character Changes / Displacement	2	Because the site is currently vacant, no residential or economic displacement will occur. The project will introduce new residents to the area, increasing the number of households in the neighborhood. The project will support continued access to housing for low- and moderate- income	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		households in Minneapolis. Given the existing mix of housing in the surrounding area, no substantial change to the overall demographic character of the neighborhood is anticipated.	
<b>COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND SERVICES</b>			
Educational and Cultural Facilities (Access and Capacity)	2	The proposed project will have no adverse effect on educational or cultural facilities in the project area. The development of 90 affordable housing units may result in a minor increase in demand for nearby schools and community facilities; however, this increase is not expected to exceed existing capacity. The project is supported by community engagement led by the Cultural Wellness Center, including outreach to diverse and underrepresented populations. This engagement helps ensure the development is responsive to local cultural needs and supports continued access to community and cultural resources. Because the site is currently vacant, no educational or cultural facilities will be displaced or adversely affected. No mitigation measures are required.	
Commercial Facilities (Access and Proximity)	2	The project will be located within a wide range of commercial facilities along Lake Street and Nicollet Avenue in South Minneapolis, including various food stores, various restaurants, medical clinics, gyms, places of worship, and childcare. These facilities will be within walking distance or accessible via public transit. Additionally, the attractions and amenities of both downtown Minneapolis and St. Paul will be accessible from the site as well via public transit or personal vehicle.	
Health Care / Social Services (Access and Capacity)	2	The project is informed by community engagement led by the Cultural Wellness Center, including outreach to underrepresented populations, helping align the development with local economic needs. The development team has secured Project-based Section 8 vouchers from the	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		Minneapolis Public Housing Authority and received a Housing Support commitment from Hennepin County. No adverse impacts are anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.	
Solid Waste Disposal and Recycling (Feasibility and Capacity)	2	The proposed project will have a minimal impact on solid waste disposal and recycling services. The development of 90 residential units will generate typical household waste. The existing municipal waste management and recycling services are expected to adequately accommodate the incremental increase in demand. The project will comply with all applicable local and state regulations related to solid waste handling and recycling, and appropriate facilities for waste collection and recycling will be incorporated into the site design. The site is currently vacant, and no existing waste management infrastructure will be displaced. No adverse impacts are anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.	
Waste Water and Sanitary Sewers (Feasibility and Capacity)	2	The proposed building will likely have minimal impacts on the sewer system as it is well established and is designed to support such projects (City of Minneapolis website). No adverse impacts are anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.	
Water Supply (Feasibility and Capacity)	2	The water supply for the site will come from the Mississippi River and be treated at a Minneapolis Water Treatment facility (City of Minneapolis website). The proposed project will result in a minor increase in demand on the municipal water supply. This increase is not expected to exceed the capacity of the existing public water system. The development will connect to existing municipal water infrastructure and will be designed in compliance with all applicable local, state, and federal requirements governing water supply and service connections. The site is currently vacant,	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		and no existing water users will be displaced. No adverse impacts are anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.	
Public Safety - Police, Fire and Emergency Medical	2	The site will be served by the City of Minneapolis Police and Fire Departments. The proposed development is not expected to significantly impact public safety services, as existing facilities are adequate to serve the area. Emergency medical services are also expected to remain sufficient. Abbott Northwestern Hospital is the nearest hospital and is capable of accommodating residents of the new development. While the project may result in a minor increase in demand for police, fire, and emergency medical services due to the addition of residents, no significant adverse impacts are anticipated.	
Parks, Open Space and Recreation (Access and Capacity)	2	The nearest park to the development site is Painter Park, located less than one mile to the southwest. The proposed development is not expected to have any adverse impacts on parks, open space, or recreational facilities in the area. While the addition of new residents may result in a minor increase in use of nearby recreational resources, no significant impacts are anticipated, and existing parks and facilities are expected to adequately serve the project area.	
Transportation and Accessibility (Access and Capacity)	2	The project is located in a walkable urban area, supporting multimodal accessibility and the project incorporates Universal Design principles to better accommodate tenants who may need accessible units. The site is well served by existing transportation infrastructure, including Metro Transit Route 18 along Nicollet Avenue and Route 21 along Lake Street. Additional regional transit access is available via the nearby Metro Blue Line light rail stations at Lake Street/Midtown and 38th Street, providing connections throughout the Twin Cities. The	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		proposed development is not expected to adversely affect local transportation or accessibility. While the project may result in a minor increase in local traffic and transit use, the Minneapolis transit system is equipped to handle the growing community. No adverse impacts are anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.	
<b>NATURAL FEATURES</b>			
Unique Natural Features /Water Resources	2	Because the development site is on previously developed land, unique natural features and water resources will not be impacted.	
Vegetation / Wildlife (Introduction, Modification, Removal, Disruption, etc.)	2	Because the development site is on previously developed land, wildlife and vegetation will not be impacted.	
Other Factors 1	2	Climate Change Impacts: 1. Is this project designed in a way that will withstand, within the useful life of the project, the expected climate-related changes projected for the area? The City of Minneapolis and the watershed district provide extensive landscaping and stormwater management requirements, which will be followed in the project design. 2. How will increasingly frequent or severe natural disasters affect the proposed project? The project will be designed with native plantings, canopy trees that will not require extensive water use for establishment and maintenance. The watershed district requires a robust rainwater management system. The project will also have an emergency generator to power most critical loads in case of power failure. Exterior wall systems designed using durable, fire-resistant exterior materials will protect the project from fires. 3. What specific climate change impacts have been identified for the project area? What measures will help mitigate those impacts? Will they shorten the project's	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		<p>lifespan? The project will be located in a dense urban area and is at risk of fires and flooding associated with spring thaw and rainfall. The robust native landscaping and stormwater management system will mitigate risks from rain fall. Fire risks will be managed with fire-resistant exterior wall construction and durable exterior materials. The building foundation will be designed with robust waterproofing systems and foundation water management to account for any change in the water table in the future. Water conservation efforts will be integral to the project in the plumbing fixtures, water-sense labeled irrigation system and native landscaping. 4. What future climate projections were considered when planning mitigation measures? If more extreme climate scenarios occur, how much of a margin of error will the project have? It is our understanding that the building, as designed, will be resilient against current and future climate scenarios projected in this climate, namely flooding and fires.</p>	
Other Factors 2			
<b>ENERGY</b>			
Energy Efficiency	2	<p>Building Location and Orientation: The building will be located in a dense urban neighborhood and will have convenient access to multiple pre-existing transit and bike lines along with other existing infrastructure. Pedestrian pathways will be designed to accommodate and encourage different modes of transportation. The project will have its primary elevations facing east and west. All exterior glazing systems will be specified and designed to meet Multifamily Energy Star and SB2030 considerations. Energy Code Compliance: The proposed project will be designed to comply with the 2024 Minnesota Commercial Energy Code (based on ASHRAE 90.1-2019). All envelope assemblies,</p>	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		<p>mechanical systems, lighting, and service water heating meet or exceed the applicable code minimums. An Energy Model will verify the projected energy use and sustainable features of the building.</p> <p>Mechanical, Electrical, and Plumbing Systems: The project will incorporate the following energy-efficient systems and equipment: 1. HVAC: High-efficiency heating and cooling equipment that will be Energy Star Certified 2. Domestic Hot Water: Domestic water heating equipment will be high-efficiency, Energy Star Certified. The building will be able to accommodate a conversion from gas water heaters to all electric water heaters. 3. Lighting: LED lighting throughout, with occupancy sensors in common areas, corridors, and utility spaces. All exterior light fixtures will be dark-sky certified. 4. Appliances: ENERGY STAR-rated appliances provided in all residential units 5. Water Efficiency: Water Sense-labeled fixtures and fittings throughout to reduce hot water demand</p> <p>Green Building Standard Compliance: The project will be designed to comply with the Minnesota Housing MN Overlay to the 2020 Enterprise Green Communities Criteria (EGCC); all mandatory criteria indicated in the Intended Methods worksheet will be met; optional points selected will be documented in the drawings and specifications. The project will be designed as solar-ready and electric-ready. Electric service and conduit will be sized to accommodate future solar installation. The project is additionally pursuing the following green building standards to comply with the requirements of the Intended Methods Worksheet: 1. ENERGY STAR Multifamily New Construction 2. SB 2030 Energy Standard Utility Benchmarking and Ongoing Monitoring: Energy and water data will be monitored</p>	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		through the EPA's ENERGY STAR Portfolio Manager after occupancy. The project will qualify for energy rebates for efficiency through the Xcel Energy Design Assistance program. Energy consumption will be limited where possible. The project will be designed and constructed in compliance with applicable energy efficiency standards and building codes, which will help reduce overall energy demand. Energy efficient appliances will be implemented where applicable and possible. No adverse impacts to regional energy supply are anticipated, and no mitigation measures are required.	

### Supporting documentation

[Intended Methods Worksheet at Application June 2025 - Zaria.pdf](#)

[Market Study July 2023 - Zaria.pdf](#)

[Geotechnical Report 3-6-26 - Zaria.pdf](#)

[Part 58 EA Factors and Analysis Worksheet - Zaria.docx](#)

[Envrn - Climate Change - Energy Efficiency Narrative - Zaria.pdf](#)

### Additional Studies Performed:

Landmark Environmental. June 9, 2026. Non-Heating Season Soil Vapor Sampling Investigation Report, 3033 Blaisdell Avenue, Minneapolis, Minnesota. Landmark Environmental. April 2026. Phase I Environmental Site Assessment, 3033 Blaisdell Avenue, Minneapolis, Minnesota. Landmark Environmental. April 6, 2026. Soil Vapor Sampling Investigation Report, 3033 Blaisdell Avenue, Minneapolis, Minnesota. Terracon Consultants. March 6, 2026. Geotechnical Engineering Report, Minneapolis, Minnesota. Hess, Roise and Company. February 13, 2026. Phase I Architecture-History Survey, 3033 Blaisdell Avenue, Minneapolis, Minnesota.

**Field Inspection [Optional]:** Date and completed by:

[General Photographs at Application.pdf](#)

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

ArcGIS; Landmark Environmental; Design by Melo Architects; Terracon; City of Minneapolis; U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD); Federal

Emergency Management Agency (FEMA); Minnesota Climate Mapping & Analysis Tool and Minnesota Climate Adaptation Partnership; Minnesota Department of Natural Resources (MN DNR); U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA); U.S. Geological Survey; USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service; U.S. National Park Service; U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service; Minnesota State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO); Minnesota Office of the State Archaeologist (OSA); HUD Tribal Directory Assessment Tool (TDAT) for Hennepin County; Minnesota Department of Transportation (MNDOT); Minnesota Pollution Control Agency (MPCA); U.S. Census Bureau.

**List of Permits Obtained:****Public Outreach [24 CFR 58.43]:**

A Notice of Section 106 review was published in the Star Tribune on 3/11/2026. The combined NOI-RROF/FONSI notice was posted on Minnesota Housing's website on 6/17/2026 and was emailed to the following organizations: Minnesota Environmental Partnership, Environment Minnesota, Conservation Minnesota, Environmental Initiative, Minnesota Center for Environmental Advocacy, EPA Region 5, local city councilmember Soren Stevenson, Lyndale Neighborhood Association, and Minneapolis city staff contact Matt Bower.

**Cumulative Impact Analysis [24 CFR 58.32]:**

The proposed Zaria project will consist of a 6-story, 90-unit apartment building with amenities including an on-site management office, community activity space, bike storage, mail room, large community room, and a park with a large playground, charcoal grills, and patio tables. The project will be located at 3033 Blaisdell Ave, Minneapolis, MN 55408. The site is currently a surface parking lot. Upon project completion, vehicle traffic, waste generation, and activity would increase on the site, but are not expected to create significant impacts to the surrounding area. The incremental environmental impacts of the proposed Zaria project, when combined with other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions, are not significant. Existing infrastructure and public services are adequate to accommodate the project, and adherence to current regulatory standards ensures that environmental effects will be minimized. Cumulatively, the project will contribute meaningful positive outcomes to the community, particularly in housing stability and equity, that outweigh any minor adverse impacts.

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

The developer considered different variations of an affordable multifamily housing project, including different project sizes, unit mixes, parking configurations, indoor and outdoor amenity spaces and more. The reasons for rejecting those variations were all economic and none were found to have different benefits or adverse impacts to the environment.

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

A no action alternative would avoid short-term construction-related impacts created by the project such as noise, air emissions, and traffic. However, it would fail to address the critical need for affordable and supportive housing in Minneapolis, prolong site inactivity, and delay neighborhood reinvestment following damage associated with the 2020 protests.

**Summary of Findings and Conclusions:**

Overall, the Zaria project will benefit the surrounding neighborhood and the City of Minneapolis by providing new units of affordable general occupancy and supportive housing in close proximity to area services and amenities. During the completion of this Part 58 review, no adverse impacts requiring mitigation were identified for the project. The only potential mitigation measures needed for the project relate to site contamination. Any adverse soil vapor impacts based on the results of an additional round of soil vapor sampling during the non-heating season will be mitigated as necessary. Consideration of radon will also occur following construction, and any adverse impacts from radon can be mitigated. As a result, no changes to the project are necessary to avoid significant impacts. Taking this information into account, along with all other information reviewed for this Part 58 environmental review, the development of this project will not have an adverse impact on the surrounding environment or resources, nor will it be adversely impacted by existing environmental conditions.

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

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

Law, Authority, or Factor	Mitigation Measure or Condition	Comments on Completed Measures	Mitigation Plan	Complete
Contamination and Toxic Substances	Landmark Environmental will create an Environmental Construction Contingency	N/A	The external project team will ensure that	

	<p>Plan (ECCP) that will detail procedures to be followed during redevelopment, should unexpected environmental issues arise. Documentation confirming implementation of the ECCP will be provided after project construction. Radon testing will be completed post-construction and any mitigation measures will be implemented as necessary.</p>		<p>the ECCP developed for the project is implemented during construction and that post-construction radon testing is completed. The external project team will also ensure that any final documentation, reports, and approvals associated with any necessary mitigation required are provided.</p>	
--	--	--	---	--

**Project Mitigation Plan**

Landmark Environmental and the general contractor for the project will be responsible for ensuring that the ECCP for the project is implemented. This will include documenting that these measures are implemented and providing any necessary final approvals. Project construction is anticipated to begin in the spring/summer of 2027 and end in the summer/fall of 2028. The developer for the project will be responsible for ensuring that post-construction radon testing is completed and that the accompanying tests and reports are submitted to Minnesota Housing staff. It is anticipated that this will occur after construction completion in the summer/fall of 2028. Minnesota Housing staff will be responsible for confirming with the developer and Landmark Environmental that the ECCP is implemented during construction, and for reviewing and approving the post-construction radon testing once submitted after construction completion. Finally, Minnesota Housing staff will ensure that all required documentation, reports, and approvals are submitted into HEROS.

**Supporting documentation on completed measures**

## APPENDIX A: Related Federal Laws and Authorities

### Airport Hazards

General policy	Legislation	Regulation
It is HUD's policy to apply standards to prevent incompatible development around civil airports and military airfields.		24 CFR Part 51 Subpart D

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

✓ No

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

Yes

### Screen Summary

#### Compliance Determination

The project site is not located within 15,000 feet of a military airport or 2,500 feet of a civilian airport as evidenced by the attached map. The closest airport is the Minneapolis-St. Paul International Airport, located approximately 4 miles to the southeast. Therefore, the project is in compliance with Airport Hazards requirements.

#### Supporting documentation

[Airport Buffer Map - Zaria.pdf](#)

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

Yes

✓ No

## Coastal Barrier Resources

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

**1. Is the project located in a CBRS Unit?**

No

Document and upload map and documentation below.

Yes

### Compliance Determination

The project site is not located in a CBRS Unit as evidenced by the attached map. Therefore, this project has no potential to impact a CBRS Unit and is in compliance with the Coastal Barrier Resources Act.

### Supporting documentation

[CBRS Map - Zaria.pdf](#)

### Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

Yes

No

## Flood Insurance

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

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

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

Yes

**2. Upload a FEMA/FIRM map showing the site here:**

[FEMA FIRMETTE Eff 11-4-16 - Zaria.pdf](#)

The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) designates floodplains. The [FEMA Map Service Center](#) provides this information in the form of FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRMs). For projects in areas not mapped by FEMA, use the best available information to determine floodplain information. Include documentation, including a discussion of why this is the best available information for the site. Provide FEMA/FIRM floodplain zone designation, panel number, and date within your documentation.

**Is the structure, part of the structure, or insurable property located in a FEMA-designated Special Flood Hazard Area?**

No

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

Yes

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

Yes

✓ No

**Screen Summary**

**Compliance Determination**

The project site is not located in a FEMA-designated Special Flood Hazard Area according to the FEMA Firmette effective 11/4/2016 for the project area. Therefore, the project is in compliance with flood insurance requirements.

**Supporting documentation**

**Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?**

Yes

✓ No

## Air Quality

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

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

Yes

No

### Air Quality Attainment Status of Project's County or Air Quality Management District

**2. Is your project's air quality management district or county in non-attainment or maintenance status for any criteria pollutants?**

No, project's county or air quality management district is in attainment status for all criteria pollutants.

Yes, project's management district or county is in non-attainment or maintenance status for the following criteria pollutants (check all that apply):

**4. Determine the estimated emissions levels of your project. Will your project exceed any of the de minimis or threshold emissions levels of non-attainment and maintenance level pollutants or exceed the screening levels established by the state or air quality management district?**

No, the project will not exceed *de minimis* or threshold emissions levels or screening levels.

Yes, the project exceeds *de minimis* emissions levels or screening levels.

**Screen Summary****Compliance Determination**

Hennepin County is in attainment status for all criteria pollutants. While the attached EPA Green Book information indicates that Hennepin County is in maintenance status for Carbon Monoxide and Sulfur Dioxide, the area is now in attainment since the 20 year maintenance plan for each criteria pollutant has ended. Therefore, the project is in compliance with the Clean Air Act.

**Supporting documentation**

[EPA Green Book MN County Nonattainment Maintenance Status 12-31-25.pdf](#)

**Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?**

Yes

✓ No

## Coastal Zone Management Act

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

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

Yes

No

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

### Screen Summary

#### **Compliance Determination**

This project will be located in Minneapolis and will not be located in or will not affect a Coastal Zone as defined in the state Coastal Management Plan. The only coastal zone in Minnesota is located along the state's North Shore, beginning in the Duluth area and extending northeast (see attached map). Therefore, the project is in compliance with the Coastal Zone Management Act.

#### **Supporting documentation**

[Lake Superior Coastal Zone Map.pdf](#)

**Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?**

Yes

No

## Contamination and Toxic Substances

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

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

ASTM Phase I ESA

ASTM Phase II ESA

Remediation or clean-up plan

ASTM Vapor Encroachment Screening.

None of the above

\* HUD regulations at 24 CFR § 58.5(i)(2)(ii) require that the environmental review for multifamily housing with five or more dwelling units or non-residential property include the evaluation of previous uses of the site or other evidence of contamination on or near the site.

For acquisition and new construction of multifamily and nonresidential properties HUD strongly advises the review include an ASTM Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) to meet real estate transaction standards of due diligence and to help ensure compliance with HUD's toxic policy at 24 CFR §58.5(i) and 24 CFR §50.3(i). Also note that some HUD programs require an ASTM Phase I ESA.

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

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

✓ No

Explain:

The Phase I ESA completed for the project revealed no evidence of REC, CREC, HRECs or significant data gaps in connection with the subject property. Soil vapor sampling was also completed in March and May of 2026. Based on the two rounds of soil vapor sampling conducted by Landmark Environmental within the future building footprint, as well as previous soil vapor sampling results conducted by WSB and Bay West, no additional soil vapor investigation is necessary or warranted. Based on the redevelopment plan for the property, no response actions for soil vapor are warranted for the future building. As requested by the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency, Landmark Environmental will submit an Environmental Construction Contingency Plan (ECCP) for MPCA review. The ECCP will detail procedures to be followed during redevelopment, should unexpected environmental issues arise.

Yes

\* This question covers the presence of radioactive substances excluding radon. Radon is addressed in the Radon Exempt Question.

\*\* Utilize EPA's Enviromapper, NEPAAssist, or state/tribal databases to identify nearby dumps, junk yards, landfills, hazardous waste sites, and industrial sites, including EPA National Priorities List Sites (Superfund sites), CERCLA or state-equivalent sites, RCRA Corrective Action sites with release(s) or suspected release(s) requiring clean-up action and/or further investigation. Additional supporting documentation may include other inspections and reports.

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

Yes

Explain:

✓ No

\* Notes:

- Buildings with no enclosed areas having ground contact.
- Buildings containing crawlspaces, utility tunnels, or parking garages would not be exempt, however buildings built on piers would be exempt, provided that there is open air between the lowest floor of the building and the ground.
- Buildings that are not residential and will not be occupied for more than 4 hours per day.
- Buildings with existing radon mitigation systems - document radon levels are below 4

pCi/L with test results dated within two years of submitting the application for HUD assistance and document the system includes an ongoing maintenance plan that includes periodic testing to ensure the system continues to meet the current EPA recommended levels. If the project does not require an application, document test results dated within two years of the date the environmental review is certified. Refer to program office guidance to ensure compliance with program requirements.

- Buildings tested within five years of the submission of application for HUD assistance: test results document indoor radon levels are below current the EPA's recommended action levels of 4.0 pCi/L. For buildings with test data older than five years, any new environmental review must include a consideration of radon using one of the methods in Section A below.

**4. Is the proposed project new construction or substantial rehabilitation where testing will be conducted but cannot yet occur because building construction has not been completed?**

✓ Yes

Compliance with this section is conditioned on post-construction testing being conducted, followed by mitigation, if needed. Radon test results, along with any needed mitigation plan, must be uploaded to the mitigation section within this screen.

No

**8. Mitigation**

Document the mitigation needed according to the requirements of the appropriate federal, state, tribal, or local oversight agency. If the adverse environmental impacts cannot be mitigated, then HUD assistance may not be used for the project at this site.

For instances where radon mitigation is required (i.e. where test results demonstrated radon levels at 4.0 pCi/L and above), then you must include a radon mitigation plan\*.

**Can all adverse environmental impacts be mitigated?**

No, all adverse environmental impacts cannot feasibly be mitigated.  
Project cannot proceed at this location.

- ✓ Yes, all adverse environmental impacts can be eliminated through mitigation, and/or consideration of radon and radon mitigation, if needed, will occur following construction.  
Provide all mitigation requirements\*\* and documents in the Screen Summary at the bottom of this screen.

\* Refer to CPD Notice [CPD-23-103](#) for additional information on radon mitigation plans.

\*\* Mitigation requirements include all clean-up requirements required by applicable federal, state, tribal, or local law. Additionally, please upload, as applicable, the long-term operations and maintenance plan, Remedial Action Work Plan, and other equivalent documents.

**9. Describe how compliance was achieved. Include any of the following that apply: State Voluntary Clean-up Program, a No Further Action letter, use of engineering controls\*, or use of institutional controls\*\*.**

Landmark Environmental will create an Environmental Construction Contingency Plan (ECCP) that will detail procedures to be followed during redevelopment, should unexpected environmental issues arise. Documentation confirming implementation of the ECCP will be provided after project construction. Radon testing will be completed post-construction and any mitigation measures will be implemented as necessary.

If a remediation plan or clean-up program was necessary, which standard does it follow?

Complete removal

Risk-based corrective action (RBCA)

Other

\* Engineering controls are any physical mechanism used to contain or stabilize contamination or ensure the effectiveness of a remedial action. Engineering controls may include, caps, covers, dikes, trenches, leachate collection systems, radon mitigation systems, signs, fences, physical access controls, ground water monitoring systems and ground water containment systems including, slurry walls and ground water pumping systems.

\*\* Institutional controls are mechanisms used to limit human activities at or near a contaminated site, or to ensure the effectiveness of the remedial action over time, when contaminants remain at a site at levels above the applicable remediation standard which would allow for unrestricted use of the property. Institutional controls may include structure, land, and natural resource use restrictions, well restriction areas, classification exception areas, deed notices, and declarations of environmental restrictions.

### **Screen Summary**

### **Compliance Determination**

A Phase I ESA and soil vapor sampling were completed for the project. On-site or nearby toxic, hazardous, or radioactive substances that could affect the health and safety of project occupants or conflict with the intended use of the property were not found. Any adverse soil vapor impacts will be mitigated through the implementation of the ECCP created for the project. Consideration of radon will occur following construction, and any adverse radon impacts can be mitigated. With mitigation, identified in the mitigation section of this review, the project will be in compliance with contamination and toxic substances requirements.

**Supporting documentation**

[Non-Heating Season Soil Vapor Testing June 2026 - Zaria.pdf](#)

[PART D\\_Final Phase I ESA April 2026 - Zaria.pdf](#)

[PART C\\_Final Phase I ESA April 2026 - Zaria.pdf](#)

[PART B\\_Final Phase I ESA April 2026 - Zaria.pdf](#)

[PART A\\_Final Phase I ESA April 2026 - Zaria.pdf](#)

[Soil Vapor Testing April 2026 - Zaria.pdf](#)

**Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?**

Yes

No

## Endangered Species

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

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

No, the project will have No Effect due to the nature of the activities involved in the project.

No, the project will have No Effect based on a letter of understanding, memorandum of agreement, programmatic agreement, or checklist provided by local HUD office

- ✓ Yes, the activities involved in the project have the potential to affect species and/or habitats.

**2. Are federally listed species or designated critical habitats present in the action area?**

No, the project will have No Effect due to the absence of federally listed species and designated critical habitat

- ✓ Yes, there are federally listed species or designated critical habitats present in the action area.

**3. What effects, if any, will your project have on federally listed species or designated critical habitat?**

- ✓ No Effect: Based on the specifics of both the project and any federally listed species in the action area, you have determined that the project will have absolutely no effect on listed species or critical habitat. in the action area.

Document and upload all documents used to make your determination below. Documentation should include a species list and explanation of your conclusion, and may require maps, photographs, and surveys as appropriate

May Affect, Not Likely to Adversely Affect: Any effects that the project may have on federally listed species or critical habitats would be beneficial, discountable, or insignificant.

Likely to Adversely Affect: The project may have negative effects on one or more listed species or critical habitat.

**6. For the project to be brought into compliance with this section, all adverse impacts must be mitigated. Explain in detail the exact measures that must be implemented to mitigate for the impact or effect, including the timeline for implementation. This information will be automatically included in the Mitigation summary for the environmental review. If negative effects cannot be mitigated, cancel the project using the button at the bottom of this screen.**

Mitigation as follows will be implemented:

- ✓ No mitigation is necessary.

Explain why mitigation will not be made here:

Based on the determination keys completed for the project in IPaC, the project as proposed will have no effect on the identified federally listed species. Also, due to the project location and site characteristics, the project will have no effect on bald eagles or migratory birds.

**Screen  
Compliance Determination**

**Summary**

This project has been determined to have No Effect on the federally listed species based on the IPaC determination keys completed and project location and site characteristics. Therefore, this project is in compliance with the Endangered Species Act without mitigation.

**Supporting documentation**

[Section 7 Endangered Species Act Determination - Zaria.pdf](#)

[IPaC Tricolored Bat Determination Key 3-13-26 - Zaria.pdf](#)

[IPaC Species List 3-13-26 - Zaria.pdf](#)

[IPaC Endangered Species Determination Key 3-13-26 - Zaria.pdf](#)

**Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?**

Yes

✓ No

## Explosive and Flammable Hazards

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

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

No

Yes

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

No

Yes

**3. Within 1 mile of the project site, are there any current or planned stationary aboveground storage containers that are covered by 24 CFR 51C? Containers that are NOT covered under the regulation include:**

- Containers 100 gallons or less in capacity, containing common liquid industrial fuels OR

- Containers of liquified petroleum gas (LPG) or propane with a water volume capacity of 1,000 gallons or less that meet the requirements of the 2017 or later version of National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) Code 58.

If all containers within the search area fit the above criteria, answer "No." For any other type of aboveground storage container within the search area that holds one of the flammable or explosive materials listed in Appendix I of 24 CFR part 51 subpart C, answer "Yes."

No

Yes

**4. Based on the analysis, is the proposed HUD-assisted project located at or beyond the required separation distance from all covered tanks?**

✓ Yes

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

No

**Screen Summary**

**Compliance Determination**

There were aboveground storage tanks of concern identified within one mile of the project site, in particular those located at the Metro Transit Nicollet Garage to the southeast (Site TS0002032) and Vina Auto Body & Repair to the northwest (Site TS0122647) on the uploaded AST Location Map. The analysis of the tanks at the Metro Transit Nicollet Garage was supplemented by the Part 58 environmental review completed in early 2024 for the phase one project, 3030 Nicollet (HEROS Number 900000010351176), which is located immediately east of the project site for Zaria. The Part 58 review for 3030 Nicollet included a separation distance study, completed in early 2024, that identified the exact location of the tanks at the Metro Transit Nicollet Garage (approximately 450 feet from the edge of the Zaria project site) and determined that the tanks are located in such a manner that no threat to the project is present and mitigation is met. It was confirmed with Metro Transit staff that no design or changes have been made to the aboveground storage tanks present at the Nicollet Garage since early 2024. Given that the Zaria project will be located immediately west of the 3030 Nicollet project, and therefore further away from the tanks, this report is being used to substantiate that the separation distance from the Zaria project is acceptable. Therefore, the project is in compliance with explosive and flammable hazard requirements.

**Supporting documentation**

[Lake-Nicollet Redevelopment Separation Distance Study - 3030 Nicollet.pdf](#)

[ASD Calculations - 3030 Nicollet.pdf](#)

[RE Aboveground Storage Tanks at Nicollet Garage.pdf](#)

[MPCA Tank Info - Metro Transit Nicollet Garage.pdf](#)

[MPCA Tank Info - Horn Towers 3121 Pillsbury.pdf](#)

[MPCA Tank Info - Horn Towers 3110 Blaisdell.pdf](#)

[AST Location Map - Zaria.pdf](#)

[ASD Calculations 4-22-26 - Zaria.pdf](#)

**Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?**

Yes

No

## Farmlands Protection

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

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

Yes

✓ No

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

The site is currently a surface parking lot in an established urban neighborhood.

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

### Screen Summary

#### **Compliance Determination**

This project will not include any activities that could potentially convert agricultural land to a non-agricultural use. The project site is also located within the Minneapolis/St. Paul Urbanized Area according to the U.S. Census Bureau (see attached map). Therefore, the project is in compliance with the Farmland Protection Policy Act.

#### **Supporting documentation**

[Census Bureau TIGER Map - Zaria.pdf](#)

**Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?**

Yes

✓ No



## Floodplain Management

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

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

Yes

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

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

(c) The approval of financial assistance for restoring and preserving the natural and beneficial functions and values of floodplains and wetlands, including through acquisition of such floodplain and wetland property, where a permanent covenant or comparable restriction is place on the property's continued use for flood control, wetland projection, open space, or park land, but only if:

(1) The property is cleared of all existing buildings and walled structures; and

(2) The property is cleared of related improvements except those which:

(i) Are directly related to flood control, wetland protection, open space, or park land (including playgrounds and recreation areas);

(ii) Do not modify existing wetland areas or involve fill, paving, or other ground disturbance beyond minimal trails or paths; and

(iii) Are designed to be compatible with the beneficial floodplain or wetland function of the property.

(d) An action involving a repossession, receivership, foreclosure, or similar acquisition of property to protect or enforce HUD's financial interests under previously approved loans, grants, mortgage insurance,

or other HUD assistance.

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

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

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

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

(i) Special projects directed to the removal of material and architectural barriers that restrict the mobility of and accessibility to elderly and persons with disabilities.

Describe:

No

**2. Does the project include a Critical Action? Examples of Critical Actions include projects involving hospitals, fire and police stations, nursing homes, hazardous chemical storage, storage of valuable records, and utility plants.**

Yes

Describe:

No

**3. Determine the extent of the FFRMS floodplain and provide mapping documentation in support of that determination**

The extent of the FFRMS floodplain can be determined using a Climate Informed Science Approach (CISA), 0.2 percent flood approach (0.2 PFA), or freeboard value approach (FVA). For projects in areas without available CISA data or without FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRMs), Flood Insurance Studies (FISs) or Advisory Base Flood Elevations (ABFEs), use the best available information<sup>1</sup> to determine flood elevation. Include documentation and an explanation of why this is the best available information<sup>2</sup> for the site. Note that newly constructed and substantially improved<sup>3</sup> structures must be elevated to the FFRMS floodplain regardless of the approach chosen to determine the floodplain.

Select one of the following three options:

CISA for non-critical actions. If using a local tool, data, or resources, ensure that the FFRMS elevation is higher than would have been determined using the 0.2 PFA or the FVA.

- ✓ 0.2-PFA. Where FEMA has defined the 0.2-percent-annual-chance floodplain, the FFRMS floodplain is the area that FEMA has designated as within the 0.2-percent-annual-chance floodplain.

FVA. If neither CISA nor 0.2-PFA is available, for non-critical actions, the FFRMS floodplain is the area that results from adding two feet to the base flood elevation as established by the effective FIRM or FIS or — if available — a FEMA-provided preliminary or pending FIRM or FIS or advisory base flood elevations, whether regulatory or informational in nature. However, an interim or preliminary FEMA map cannot be used if it is lower than the current FIRM or FIS.

<sup>1</sup> Sources which merit investigation include the files and studies of other federal agencies, such as the U. S. Army Corps of Engineers, the Tennessee Valley Authority, the Soil Conservation Service and the U. S. Geological Survey. These agencies have prepared flood hazard studies for several thousand localities and, through their technical assistance programs, hydrologic studies, soil surveys, and other investigations have collected or developed other floodplain information for numerous sites and areas. States and communities are also sources of information on past flood 'experiences within their boundaries and are particularly knowledgeable about areas subject to high-risk flood hazards such as alluvial fans, high velocity flows, mudflows and mudslides, ice jams, subsidence and liquefaction.

<sup>2</sup> If you are using best available information, select the FVA option below and provide supporting documentation in the screen summary. Contact your [local environmental officer](#) with additional compliance questions.

<sup>3</sup> Substantial improvement means any repair or improvement of a structure which costs at least 50 percent of the market value of the structure before repair or improvement or results in an increase of more than 20 percent of the number of dwelling units. The full definition can be found at [24 CFR 55.2\(b\)\(12\)](#).

5. Does your project occur in the FFRMS floodplain?

Yes

No

**Screen Summary**

**Compliance Determination**

This project will not occur in the FFRMS floodplain according to the FEMA Firmette effective 11/4/2016 for the project area. Therefore, the project is in compliance with Executive Orders 11988 and 13690.

**Supporting documentation**

[FEMA FIRMETTE Eff 11-4-16 - Zaria\(1\).pdf](#)

**Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?**

Yes

No

## Historic Preservation

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

### Threshold

#### Is Section 106 review required for your project?

No, because the project consists solely of activities listed as exempt in a Programmatic Agreement (PA ). (See the PA Database to find applicable PAs.)

No, because the project consists solely of activities included in a No Potential to Cause Effects memo or other determination [36 CFR 800.3(a)(1)].

- ✓ Yes, because the project includes activities with potential to cause effects (direct or indirect).

### Step 1 – Initiate Consultation

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

- ✓ State Historic Preservation Offer (SHPO) Completed

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

- ✓ Apache Tribe of Oklahoma Response Period Elapsed
- ✓ Cheyenne and Arapaho Tribes, Oklahoma Response Period Elapsed

- |  |                         |
|--|-------------------------|
| ✓ Flandreau Santee Sioux Tribe of South Dakota | Response Period Elapsed |
| ✓ Fort Belknap Indian Community, Montana       | Response Period Elapsed |
| ✓ Iowa Tribe of Kansas and Nebraska            | Response Period Elapsed |
| ✓ Lower Sioux Indian Community, Minnesota      | Response Period Elapsed |
| ✓ Menominee Indian Tribe of Wisconsin          | Response Period Elapsed |
| ✓ Prairie Island Indian Community, Minnesota   | Response Period Elapsed |
| ✓ Santee Sioux Nation, Nebraska                | Response Period Elapsed |
| ✓ Shakopee Mdewakanton Sioux Community, MN     | Response Period Elapsed |
| ✓ Sisseton-Wahpeton Oyate, South Dakota        | Response Period Elapsed |
| ✓ Spirit Lake Tribe, North Dakota              | Response Period Elapsed |
| ✓ Upper Sioux Community, Minnesota             | Response Period Elapsed |
- ✓ Other Consulting Parties

- |                   |           |
|-------------------|-----------|
| ✓ Minneapolis HPC | Completed |
|-------------------|-----------|

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

The consulting parties were identified based on the project's location and scope.

Document and upload all correspondence, notices and notes (including comments and objections received below).

**Was the Section 106 Lender Delegation Memo used for Section 106 consultation?**

- Yes  
No

***Step 2 – Identify and Evaluate Historic Properties***

- 1. Define the Area of Potential Effect (APE), either by entering the address(es) or**

**uploading a map depicting the APE below:**

See pages 2 and 12 of the attached Phase I architecture-history survey for the defined APE for the project.

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

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

Address / Location / District	National Register Status	SHPO Concurrence	Sensitive Information
Lakesbury Apartments, 117 West Lake Street	Eligible	Yes	✓ Not Sensitive

**Additional Notes:**

No buildings were identified as eligible for historic listing upon completion of the Phase I architecture-history survey. However, SHPO disagreed with the consultant's recommendation that the Lakesbury Apartments are not eligible for inclusion in the National Register.

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

✓ Yes

Document and upload surveys and report(s) below.

For Archeological surveys, refer to HP Fact Sheet #6, Guidance on Archeological Investigations in HUD Projects.

Additional Notes:

No

***Step 3 –Assess Effects of the Project on Historic Properties***

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

per guidance on direct and indirect effects.

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

No Historic Properties Affected

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

**Document reason for finding:**

No historic properties present.

Historic properties present, but project will have no effect upon them.

No Adverse Effect

Adverse Effect

**Screen Summary**

**Compliance Determination**

Based on Section 106 consultation, which included the completion of a Phase I architecture-history survey, a determination of No Historic Properties Affected was made because the project will have no effect on the historic properties that are present in the defined APE. Therefore, the project is in compliance with Section 106.

**Supporting documentation**

[Star Tribune Notice of Section 106 Review 3-11-26 - Zaria.pdf](#)

[Star Tribune Affidavit Notice of Section 106 Review - Zaria.pdf](#)

[SHPO Response 4-6-26 - Zaria.pdf](#)

[City of Minneapolis HPC Response Email 4-2-26 - Zaria.pdf](#)

[SHPO Consultation Packet - Zaria.pdf](#)

[Section 106 Architectural Survey Report 2-13-26 - Zaria.pdf](#)

**Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?**

Yes

No



## Noise Abatement and Control

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

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

- New construction for residential use

NOTE: HUD assistance to new construction projects is generally prohibited if they are located in an Unacceptable zone, and HUD discourages assistance for new construction projects in Normally Unacceptable zones. See 24 CFR 51.101(a)(3) for further details.

Rehabilitation of an existing residential property

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

An interstate land sales registration

Any timely emergency assistance under disaster assistance provision or appropriations which are provided to save lives, protect property, protect public health and safety, remove debris and wreckage, or assistance that has the effect of restoring facilities substantially as they existed prior to the disaster  
None of the above

**4. Complete the Preliminary Screening to identify potential noise generators in the vicinity (1000' from a major road, 3000' from a railroad, or 15 miles from an airport).**

**Indicate the findings of the Preliminary Screening below:**

There are no noise generators found within the threshold distances above.

- ✓ Noise generators were found within the threshold distances.

5. **Complete the Preliminary Screening to identify potential noise generators in the**

- ✓ Acceptable: (65 decibels or less; the ceiling may be shifted to 70 decibels in circumstances described in §24 CFR 51.105(a))

Indicate noise level here: 61

Based on the response, the review is in compliance with this section. Document and upload noise analysis, including noise level and data used to complete the analysis below.

Normally Unacceptable: (Above 65 decibels but not exceeding 75 decibels; the floor may be shifted to 70 decibels in circumstances described in §24 CFR 51.105(a))

Unacceptable: (Above 75 decibels)

HUD strongly encourages conversion of noise-exposed sites to land uses compatible with high noise levels.

Check here to affirm that you have considered converting this property to a non-residential use compatible with high noise levels.

Indicate noise level here: 61

Document and upload noise analysis, including noise level and data used to complete the analysis below.

### **Screen Summary**

#### **Compliance Determination**

The only noise generator found within the threshold distances that would have a noise impact on the project was West Lake Street to the north. A noise assessment was conducted and the noise level was found to be acceptable at 61.0 db. See the attached documents for the noise analysis. The project is in compliance with HUD's Noise regulation.

#### **Supporting documentation**

- [Zaria Site Map and Site Plan\(1\).pdf](#)
- [Vehicle Count Exponential Growth Model - Zaria.xls](#)
- [MNDOT AADT Map - Zaria.PNG](#)
- [HUD DNL Calculator - Zaria.pdf](#)
- [Distance from West Lake Street - Zaria.PNG](#)
- [Distance from I-35 W - Zaria.PNG](#)

**Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?**

Yes

✓ No

## Sole Source Aquifers

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

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

Yes

✓ No

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

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

✓ No

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

Yes

### Screen Summary

#### **Compliance Determination**

The project will be located in Minneapolis and not be located on a sole source aquifer area as evidenced by the attached map. The only sole source aquifer area in Minnesota is surrounding Lake Mille Lacs. Therefore, the project is in compliance with Sole Source Aquifer requirements.

**Supporting documentation**

[Sole Source Aquifers Map - Zaria.pdf](#)

**Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?**

Yes

No

## Wetlands Protection

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

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

No

Yes

**2. Will the new construction activities directly impact an onsite wetland?**

The term "wetlands" means those areas that are inundated by surface or ground water with a frequency sufficient to support, and under normal circumstances does or would support, a prevalence of vegetative or aquatic life that requires saturated or seasonally saturated soil conditions for growth and reproduction. Wetlands generally include swamps, marshes, bogs, and similar areas such as sloughs, prairie potholes, wet meadows, river overflows, mud flats, and natural ponds. This definition includes those wetland areas separated from their natural supply of water as a result of activities such as the construction of structural flood protection methods or solid fill roadbeds and activities such as mineral extraction and navigation improvements. This definition includes both wetlands subject to and those not subject to Section 404 of the Clean Water Act as well as constructed wetlands.

No, an onsite wetland will not be directly impacted by new construction activities, as defined in 24 CFR 55.10.

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

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

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

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

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

Yes, off-site wetlands may be indirectly affected.

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

**Screen Summary**

**Compliance Determination**

The project will not impact wetlands as evidenced by the attached map. Therefore, the project is in compliance with Executive Order 11990.

**Supporting documentation**

[Wetlands Map - Zaria.pdf](#)

**Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?**

Yes

- ✓ No

## Wild and Scenic Rivers Act

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

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

No

Yes, the project is in proximity of a Designated Wild and Scenic River or Study Wild and Scenic River.

Yes, the project is in proximity of a Nationwide Rivers Inventory (NRI) River.

### Screen Summary

#### **Compliance Determination**

This project is not within proximity of a NWSRS river as evidenced by the attached maps. Therefore, the project is in compliance with the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act.

#### **Supporting documentation**

[Wild and Scenic Rivers Map - Zaria.PNG](#)

[Nationwide Rivers Inventory Map - Zaria.PNG](#)

#### **Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?**

Yes

No

