

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

Project Information

Project Name: 601-Method-Road-Transitional-Housing

HEROS Number: 900000010343136

Responsible Entity (RE): WAKE COUNTY, PO Box 550 Raleigh NC, 27602

RE Preparer: John Scales

State / Local Identifier:

Certifying Officer: David Ellis

Grant Recipient (if different than Responsible Entity):

Point of Contact:

Consultant (if applicable):

Point of Contact:

Project Location: 601 Method Rd, Raleigh, NC 27607

Additional Location Information:

Located in west Raleigh near NC State University and NC State Fairgrounds.

Direct Comments to: 601 Method Road - Comment
Housing Affordability & Community Revitalization - WCOB 440

Wake County Government
PO Box 550
Raleigh, NC 27602-0550

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

CASA is a non-profit organization providing specialized and affordable housing to the homeless community. CASA's mission is "To provide access to stable, affordable housing for people who are homeless or at risk by developing and managing rental communities." CASA has requested \$760,000 in funding from Wake County's Housing Affordability & Community Revitalization Department to address homelessness amongst young adults transitioning out of foster care. This proposed development at 601 Method Road in Raleigh will include nine one-bedroom apartment units and an office/meeting space. This apartment community will also incorporate a laundry center and outdoor gathering area. Additionally, this development will have the following measures as part of its construction process: * Will meet or exceed SystemVision and Energy Star standards. * Utilize quality and durable building materials that last longer and require less maintenance. When possible, CASA utilizes metal roofing over shingles, brick siding over vinyl, etc. * CASA focuses on creating less waste by installing durable materials, such as plank flooring, versus carpeting that requires replacement every few years. * Install low-flow plumbing fixtures and only use EnergyStar appliances. * Plant low-maintenance, drought-resistant landscaping to minimize the need for watering. CASA will partner with The Hope Center at Pullen (HCP), a non-profit that works to empower emerging adults who are transitioning out of foster care in Wake County with the support and connections needed for a safe and stable adulthood. Eight of the nine apartments will be occupied by clients from HCP via their transition program, and the target income is 30% of the area median income or less. The ninth unit will be dedicated to a "Resident Advisor" to provide an additional layer of support, and this position will likely be filled by a graduate of HCP's Transition Program or a Master of Social Work student at NC State University. This proposed development at 601 Method Road, Raleigh, NC 27607, is north of Western Blvd., south of Hillsborough Street, east of I-440, and west of Gorman Street/NC State University.

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

CASA is partnering with The Hope Center at Pullen (HCP), a nonprofit that works to empower emerging adults who are transitioning out of foster care in Wake County with the support and connections needed for a safe and stable adulthood. As stated in a letter of support from Wake County Human Services' partnership with HCP, "Housing is an immediate and urgent need for most of the youth in our 18-21 program. Because of their proven record in securing long-term affordable housing, HCP is the partner we turn to for assistance when youth served in our 18-21 program need housing. We know that HCP will act quickly and effectively to help youth connect to a housing voucher and work tirelessly to find an affordable unit once youth are approved for the voucher. HCP's network of landlords increases HCP's network of landlords increases the housing options available to our youth once they've been

approved for the voucher, but youth are still left in unstable living situations while they work through the voucher application process. This project will provide stable housing to 8 young adults who have recently transitioned out of foster care to ensure that they aren't living out of motels, couch surfing, or staying in shelters until an apartment becomes available. We are eager for this project to come to life and for our youth to experience the stability needed to pursue their education and employment goals."

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

The property is zoned Residential - 4 (R-4) with a Frequent Transit Area and Special Residential Parking overlay districts allowing for greater density for this proposed multi-family dwelling. The proposed project will be consistent with existing land use. The Method Community has a long and important history, and this proposed development adds an important legacy for this community and Raleigh as a whole.

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

[02_CASA_Map View.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:

[EA Determinations and Compliance Findings SIGNED 20231201_Signature Doc.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
MC-21-DC-37-0213	Community Planning and Development (CPD)	HOME Program

MC-21-DP-37-0213	Community Planning and Development (CPD)	HOME American Rescue Plan (HOME-ARP)
MC-22-DC-37-0213	Community Planning and Development (CPD)	HOME Program
MC-23-DC-37-0213	Community Planning and Development (CPD)	HOME Program

Estimated Total HUD Funded, \$760,000.00
Assisted or Insured Amount:

Estimated Total Project Cost [24 CFR 58.2 (a) (5)]: \$2,523,020.00

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

Compliance Factors: 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)
STATUTES, EXECUTIVE ORDERS, AND REGULATIONS LISTED AT 24 CFR §50.4 & § 58.6		
Airport Hazards 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 within 15,000 feet of a military airport or 2,500 feet of a civilian airport. The project is in compliance with Airport Hazards requirements. The proposed development site is situated 9+ to the southeast of Raleigh-Durham International Airport (civilian), and 63+ miles northwest of Seymour Johnson Airforce Base (military).
Coastal Barrier Resources Act 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	This project is not located in a CBRS Unit. Therefore, this project has no potential to impact a CBRS Unit and is in compliance with the Coastal Barrier Resources Act. Wake County (county location of proposed development) is not a coastal barrier county in NC.
Flood Insurance 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 structure or insurable property is not located in a FEMA-designated Special Flood Hazard Area. While flood insurance may not be mandatory in this instance, HUD recommends that all insurable structures maintain flood

		insurance under the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP). The project is in compliance with flood insurance requirements.
STATUTES, EXECUTIVE ORDERS, AND REGULATIONS LISTED AT 24 CFR §50.4 & § 58.5		
Air Quality 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	The project's county or air quality management district is in attainment status for all criteria pollutants. The project is in compliance with the Clean Air Act. Wake County, NC has historically been for 1-Hour Ozone (1979) (revoked on June 17, 1984), 8-Hour Ozone (1997) (revoked on December 26, 2007), and Carbon Monoxide (1971) (transportation conformity expired on September 18, 2015). Wake County was entered into a Carbon Monoxide (CO) Limited Maintenance Plan, as indicated in the attached letter dated August 2, 2012. This letter indicates that Wake County is well below the CO National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS) and introduced a State Implementation Plan (SIP), which outlined current levels of emissions. Based on the information provided in this report, the proposed construction is not expected to near the de minimis emission level of 100 tons/year, as outlined in 40 CFR 93.153(b)(2).
Coastal Zone Management Act Coastal Zone Management Act, sections 307(c) & (d)	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	This project is not located in or does not affect a Coastal Zone as defined in the state Coastal Management Plan. The project is in compliance with the Coastal Zone Management Act. Wake County (county of proposed development site) is not one of the 20 Coastal Zone Management counties in NC.
Contamination and Toxic Substances 24 CFR 50.3(i) & 58.5(i)(2)]	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	Site contamination was evaluated as follows: ASTM Phase I ESA. 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

		<p>property were not found. The project is in compliance with contamination and toxic substances requirements. GeoTechnologies, Inc. conducted a site visit on November 8, 2023, by Jason B. Grizzard. Mr. Grizzard observed no evidence of aboveground or underground storage tanks, and no staining, distressed vegetation or debris disposal were visible at the site. On page 16 of the Phase I report, "To summarize, our visual reconnaissance of the site did not identify evidence of RECs in connection with the Subject Property. No activities likely to result in environmental impairment of the property were observed. However, prior [to] obtaining a demolition permit, a[n] inspection for asbestos-containing materials will be needed."</p>
<p>Endangered Species Act Endangered Species Act of 1973, particularly section 7; 50 CFR Part 402</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p>This project has been determined to have No Effect on listed species. This project is in compliance with the Endangered Species Act without mitigation. Axiom Environmental conducted a site survey on September 21, 2023, and they found no evidence of any of the listed species (Bald Eagle, Tricolored bat, Monarch butterfly, Red-cockaded woodpecker, Neuse River waterdog, Carolina madtom, Atlantic Pigtoe, Dwarf Wedgemussel, Green Floater, or Michaux's sumac).</p>
<p>Explosive and Flammable Hazards Above-Ground Tanks)[24 CFR Part 51 Subpart C</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p>	<p>There are no current or planned stationary aboveground storage containers of concern within 1 mile of the project site. The project is in compliance with explosive and flammable hazard requirements. GeoTechnologies stated in their Phase I ESA that three Leaking Aboveground Storage Tank (LAST) sites were identified within a half mile of the subject site, and none appear to have impacted the subject site. Based on a review of the USGS topographic map,</p>

		none of the sites are located in areas that drain towards the site and they are not considered to create REC for this site. There are no current or planned stationary aboveground storage containers of concern within one-mile of the subject site.
Farmlands Protection Farmland Protection Policy Act of 1981, particularly sections 1504(b) and 1541; 7 CFR Part 658	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	This project includes activities that could potentially convert agricultural land to a non-agricultural use, but an exemption applies. The project is in compliance with the Farmland Protection Policy Act. According to the Web Soil Survey website, the subject site soil makeup is 100% urban soil (UR).
Floodplain Management Executive Order 11988, particularly section 2(a); 24 CFR Part 55	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	This project does not occur in a floodplain. The project is in compliance with Executive Order 11988.
Historic Preservation 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 there are No Historic Properties Affected because there are no historic properties present. The project is in compliance with Section 106. Please note, a new Programmatic Agreement (PA) with NCSHPO is under contract between Wake County and NCSHPO. Catawba Nation and Capital Area Preservation were consulted, and both responded with no adverse impacts were anticipated with this project. Please see supporting documents.
Noise Abatement and Control 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	A Noise Assessment was conducted. The noise level was acceptable: 61.0 db. See noise analysis. The project is in compliance with HUD's Noise regulation.
Sole Source Aquifers 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 is not located on a sole source aquifer area. The project is in compliance with Sole Source Aquifer requirements. North Carolina has no sole source aquifers within the state boundaries.
Wetlands Protection Executive Order 11990, particularly sections 2 and 5	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	The project will not impact on- or off-site wetlands. The project is in compliance with Executive Order 11990.

		Axiom Environmental conducted a site visit on September 21, 2023, for a protected species survey. Axiom did not find/notice any jurisdictional streams or wetlands.
Wild and Scenic Rivers Act 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. The project is in compliance with the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act. The 601 Method Road project is 10.5 miles west of the Neuse River. The Neuse River is a Nationwide Rivers Inventory (NRI) river. 601 Method Road is 10+ miles to the west of the Neuse River.
HUD HOUSING ENVIRONMENTAL STANDARDS		
ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE		
Environmental Justice Executive Order 12898	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	No adverse environmental impacts were identified in the project's total environmental review. The project is in compliance with Executive Order 12898. Based on the information collected and reviewed, this project will not create an adverse and disproportionate environmental impact or aggravate an existing impact. The overwhelming benefit is affordable housing needed for this community.

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
LAND DEVELOPMENT			
Conformance with Plans / Compatible	2	The site is zoned R-4. This property site is in a designated Frequent Transit Area (City of	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
Land Use and Zoning / Scale and Urban Design		Raleigh UDO, TC-20-21 created a new development option near high-frequency transit routes), allowing for greater density. In addition, this site has a special overlay district, allowing for special residential parking to accommodate the residents at this site. The project adheres to the City's 2030 Comprehensive Plan in that it intends to "Provide supportive services and facilities to Raleigh's families, elderly, special needs, and others in need of adaptive services that contribute to their quality of life."	
Soil Suitability / Slope/ Erosion / Drainage and Storm Water Runoff	2	The soil type on the site is 100% Urban land, so adverse impacts on farmland soils is not applicable. The topography has a slight slope of two feet from the highest point to the lowest point at the building footprint. For any land disturbing activity, the NC Sedimentation Control Law requires land developers to plan and implement effective temporary and permanent control measures to prevent accelerated erosion and off-site sedimentation. If one or more acres are to be disturbed, an erosion and sedimentation control plan will be implemented. Accounting for applicable design and installation of appropriate perimeter sediment trapping devices, no adverse environmental impacts are anticipated.	
Hazards and Nuisances including Site Safety and Site-Generated Noise	2	NEPAssist did not identify any known hazards or nuisance (hazardous waste, water dischargers, toxic releases, Superfund or Brownfield sites, and toxic substances) violations that would create an unsafe environment for the workers and residents of this development. The only project-related noise will be generated during construction by machinery and equipment. Activities will also generate minor amounts of dust and dirt; appropriate mitigation measures will be utilized to minimize dust and dirt. Garbage and construction debris	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		will be collected and disposed of according to appropriate local, state, and federal regulations. Demolition or renovations of structures containing asbestos material must be in compliance with 15 A NCAC 20.1110 (a) (1) which requires notification and removal prior to demolition.	
SOCIOECONOMIC			
Employment and Income Patterns	2	The project will increase temporary construction labor needs. Once built, additional employment may be needed to assist in the maintenance of common areas of the buildings. The project would be anticipated to draw a local labor force. In this manner, it would not greatly impact the local economy through the influx of workers or expenditures associated with the construction period. The project will create nine housing units in a central area that is serviced by public transportation, allowing potential residents access to jobs, retail, and community services.	
Demographic Character Changes / Displacement	2	The developer confirms a single-family building is located at 601 Method Road, and has been vacant for more than one-year. The current building will be demolished for the construction of a multi-family residential dwelling. The construction of a multi-family development will have little impact on the demographics for this area, and this development compliments another multi-family complex across the street. As the overall project will have a limited construction timeframe and anticipates the use of local labor, the project would not likely impact the local physical, and social dimensions of the community during construction.	
Environmental Justice EA Factor	2	The project will create nine affordable apartment units for young adults transitioning out of foster care in an area that is serviced by public transportation, allowing potential residents access to jobs,	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		retail, and community services. The established rent for these units is 30% or less of the tenants gross income. The project will not change existing land use.	
COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND SERVICES			
Educational and Cultural Facilities (Access and Capacity)	2	Wake County Public School System determined the "Total number of units and purpose of units should have a negligible impact on student enrollment/school crowding." The following public schools are located within three miles of the proposed development: Fred A. Olds Elementary School (1.6 miles), Combs Magnet Elementary School (1.8 miles), Centennial Campus Middle School (3.7 miles), and Athens Drive High School (2.6 miles). North Carolina State University and Meredith University are in the same neighborhood as this proposed development and within walking distance of the main campuses. The most prominent cultural facility near this site is the North Carolina Museum of Art (2.0 miles), and numerous cultural facilities at nearby NC State University and Meredith University.	
Commercial Facilities (Access and Proximity)	2	This proposed site will be conveniently located within walking distance (0.5 miles) to two grocery stores (Food Lion and Almadina Market). A third grocery store, Harris Teeter, is 2.1 miles away from proposed site. There are three CVS pharmacies within 2.0 miles, and the closest store is 0.9 miles from this proposed site. The Target Store is located on Hillsborough Street and is 1.7 miles away. The site is near numerous dining places, and coffee/tea shops. Downtown Raleigh is 4.4 miles to the east of this site, and will be conveniently assessable by GoRaleigh public transportation.	
Health Care / Social Services (Access and Capacity)	2	A major regional and emergency hospital, UNC Rex Hospital, is 3.2 miles from this site, and several specialty healthcare facilities	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		border the UNC Rex. WakeMed Urgent Care - Oberlin is 2.2 miles from the site. Additionally, several dentist and eyecare providers are close by. The developer will work with The Hope Center at Pullen (non-profit organization providing services to young adults transitioning out of foster care) for behavioral health care, and setting goals in education and employment to lay the foundation for long-term stability.	
Solid Waste Disposal and Recycling (Feasibility and Capacity)	2	Construction activities will be conducted so as to minimize run-off and safely dispose of waste products. Any waste generated during construction will be handled/disposed per all applicable governmental regulations. A Wake County Convenience Center - Site 4 is located 8.4 miles from this site.	
Waste Water and Sanitary Sewers (Feasibility and Capacity)	2	The City of Raleigh responded and indicated "no impact anticipated" as a result of this proposed development. The project will connect to existing wastewater and sanitary sewer systems in accordance with state and local building codes. Demand increase due to the project will be de minimis. Plans and specifications for the construction, expansion, or alteration of a public water system must be approved by the Division of Water Resources/Public Water Supply Section prior to the award of a contract or the initiation of construction as per 15A NCAC 18C .0300 et. seq., Plans and specifications should be submitted to 1634 Mail Service Center, Raleigh, North Carolina 27699-1634. All public water supply systems must comply with state and federal drinking water monitoring requirements. For more information, contact the Public Water Supply Section, (919) 707-9100. If existing water lines will be relocated during the construction, plans for the water line relocation must be submitted to the Division of Water Resources/Public Water	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		Supply Section at 1634 Mail Service Center, Raleigh, North Carolina 27699-1634. For more information, contact the Public Water Supply Section, (919) 707-9100.	
Water Supply (Feasibility and Capacity)	2	The City of Raleigh responded and indicated "no impact anticipated" because of this proposed development. The project will connect to existing water supply infrastructure in accordance with state and local building codes. Demand increase due to the project will be de minimis.	
Public Safety - Police, Fire and Emergency Medical	2	The small increase in population related to the proposed project will be de minimis to Public Safety programs. The following entities were consulted and provided a determination of no impact anticipated: City of Raleigh Police Department, City of Raleigh Fire Department and Wake County EMS.	
Parks, Open Space and Recreation (Access and Capacity)	2	The small increase in population related to the proposed project will be de minimis to Public Safety programs. The City of Raleigh Parks, Recreation, and Cultural Services Department did not respond to our request for comments about this development. The subject site is located less than 200 feet from Method Community Center and Park. JC Raulston Arboretum and Pollock Place Park are located less than one-mile from the development site. Additionally, nearby NC State University offers many options for open space activities.	
Transportation and Accessibility (Access and Capacity)	2	The City of Raleigh is in the process of developing and implementing a bus rapid transit (BRT) project along the Hillsborough Street (Western BRT) corridor to connect the Raleigh central business district with the NC State University campus and Cary, NC, a total span of approximately nine miles. BRT service is planned to improve access for low-income residents, senior citizens, and other underserved populations to major employers and medical facilities in the	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		corridor. Residents of this proposed housing development will benefit from this faster, more efficient transit option. The development is also located near Interstate 440, to provide easy access to other areas of the Triangle region.	
NATURAL FEATURES			
Unique Natural Features /Water Resources	2	According to the NC Natural Heritage Program (NCNHP) website, this site indicates that no Managed or Natural Areas are presently on the project site. A local government controlled managed area (City of Raleigh park) is located less than 200 feet from this proposed development site. The 2010 Forest Land Assessment (NCDA&CS) rates this parcel on the "High" scale for maintaining a viable urban forest. As for drinking water susceptibility, the ground and surface water susceptibility is not rated for this site. Since the water supply is from the City of Raleigh municipal water treatment facility, this will help mitigate any water supply concerns, if any. Additionally, there are no public or private scenic areas on or near the project site. There are no mapped streams or wetlands within the project area.	
Vegetation / Wildlife (Introduction, Modification, Removal, Disruption, etc.)	2	The subject site is a residential property located in an established urban neighborhood, and the vegetation is mainly hardwood and pine trees. According to the NC Natural Heritage Program (NCNHP) website, the Forest Lands Assessment and the biodiversity and wildlife habitat assessment NCNHP's assessment is to protect forests and communities from wildfire risk, and the biodiversity and wildlife habitat assessment is unrated.	
Other Factors 1	2	No other factors to address.	
Other Factors 2	2	No other factors to address.	
CLIMATE AND ENERGY			
Climate Change	2	No other factors know that would adversely impact this proposed development. As to	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		the impact of climate change, this development will adhere to current zoning and building code regulations to ensure safe and resilient structures.	
Energy Efficiency	2	This development will adhere to current zoning and building code regulations to ensure utilization of energy efficient building components. Building materials and practices will incorporate the latest adopted building codes and green energy appliances where applicable. The increase in energy consumption at the facility will be minimis.	

Supporting documentation

[Phase I ESA_601 Method Rd\(1\).pdf](#)

[HUD ER Response_CAP_CASA Method Rd\(1\).pdf](#)

[HUD ER Request Ltr_Catawba RESPONSE_CASA Method Rd\(1\).docx](#)

[HUD ER Response_Solid Waste_CASA Method Rd.pdf](#)

[HUD ER Response_Parks and Rec_CASA Method Rd.pdf](#)

[HUD ER Response_Raleigh Water_CASA Method Rd.pdf](#)

[HUD ER Response_Public Transportation_CASA Method Rd.pdf](#)

[HUD ER Response_Public Ed_CASA Method Rd.pdf](#)

[HUD ER Response_Planning_CASA Method Rd.pdf](#)

[HUD ER Response_Police_CASA Method Rd.pdf](#)

[HUD ER Response_Health and Human_CASA Method Rd.pdf](#)

[HUD ER Response_Fire_CASA Method Rd.pdf](#)

[HUD ER Response_EMS_CASA Method Rd.pdf](#)

[Wetlands Protection_iMaps No Stream or Watershed Map_601 Method Rd\(1\).pdf](#)

[Farmland Protection_2020 Census Urban Area Layer_601 Method Rd\(1\).pdf](#)

[Axiom 601 Method Road Site TE Survey Results 230929\(1\).pdf](#)

[Web Soil Survey Report_601 Method Rd.pdf](#)

Additional Studies Performed:

Federally Protected Species survey.

Field Inspection [Optional]: Date and completed by:

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

Wake County EMS, Raleigh Fire Department, Wake County Health and Human Services, NC Natural Heritage Program, Raleigh Police Department, Raleigh Planning Department, Wake County Public School System, GoTriangle Public Transportation, Raleigh Water Department, Raleigh Parks and Recreation, Wake County Soil and Water Conservation District, Raleigh Public Works Department, NC Department of Transportation, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, U.S. Fish and Wildlife, Catawba Indian Nation, Capital Area Preservation, Wake County Fires Services, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Axiom Environmental Services

List of Permits Obtained:

All building and demolition permits required by North Carolina and local government will be obtained by the developer and contractors for this construction project. Permits have not been obtained at the time of this review.

Public Outreach [24 CFR 58.43]:

Wake County will post a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) and a Request for Release of Funds (RROF) for the required period before forwarding to HUD in Greensboro, NC. Wake County will post the FONSI and RROF on the County's website (<http://www.wakegov.com/housing/Pages/plansdocs.aspx>).

Cumulative Impact Analysis [24 CFR 58.32]:

The construction of this affordable multi-family apartment complex is a short-term, single-phase construction activity. This project is not associated with other neighborhood/community construction or infrastructure projects. The likelihood of a cumulative impact that negatively impacts this development is not anticipated.

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

No alternatives or project modifications are not an option at this time. The goal is to provide affordable housing for young adults transitioning out of foster care.

No Action Alternative [24 CFR 58.40(e)]

A no-action alternative means fewer affordable and stable housing options for young adults transitioning out of foster care. Environmental conditions would remain unchanged.

Summary of Findings and Conclusions:

The location of this proposed development is a significant southwest Raleigh neighborhood that evolved from a freedman's village establish in the 1870s. This area

is now called Method, and is adjacent to the Berry O'Kelly Historic District. The goal of preserving this site for affordable housing is vital to this community. The project will entail temporary noise, dirt, and dust, but it will benefit the community by providing transitional housing in proximity to transit. The project will comply with all environmental regulations outlined in this review. Therefore, Wake County concludes that the implementation of this project will have no significant impact upon the environment.

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
---------------------------------	---------------------------------	---	--------------------	----------

Project Mitigation Plan

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 within 15,000 feet of a military airport or 2,500 feet of a civilian airport. The project is in compliance with Airport Hazards requirements. The proposed development site is situated 9+ to the southeast of Raleigh-Durham International Airport (civilian), and 63+ miles northwest of Seymour Johnson Airforce Base (military).

Supporting documentation

[Airport Hazards Seymour Johnson AFB Distance 601 Method Rd.pdf](#)
[Airport Hazards RDU Distance 601 Method Rd.pdf](#)
[RDU Noise Contour Map.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

This project is not located in a CBRS Unit. Therefore, this project has no potential to impact a CBRS Unit and is in compliance with the Coastal Barrier Resources Act. Wake County (county location of proposed development) is not a coastal barrier county in NC.

Supporting documentation

[Coastal Barriers Map.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:

[Flood Insurance_Screenshop Firmett Map with parcel boundary_601 Method Rd.pdf](#)
[Flood Insurance_FEMA Firmette Map_601 Method Rd.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 structure or insurable property is not located in a FEMA-designated Special Flood Hazard Area. While flood insurance may not be mandatory in this instance, HUD recommends that all insurable structures maintain flood insurance under the National Flood Insurance Program (NFIP). The project is in compliance with flood insurance requirements.

Supporting documentation

[Flood Insurance_iMaps Map_601 Method Rd.pdf](#)

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):

Screen Summary

Compliance Determination

The project's county or air quality management district is in attainment status for all criteria pollutants. The project is in compliance with the Clean Air Act. Wake County, NC has historically been for 1-Hour Ozone (1979) (revoked on June 17, 1984), 8-Hour Ozone (1997) (revoked on December 26, 2007), and Carbon Monoxide (1971) (transportation conformity expired on September 18, 2015). Wake County was

entered into a Carbon Monoxide (CO) Limited Maintenance Plan, as indicated in the attached letter dated August 2, 2012. This letter indicates that Wake County is well below the CO National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS) and introduced a State Implementation Plan (SIP), which outlined current levels of emissions. Based on the information provided in this report, the proposed construction is not expected to near the de minimis emission level of 100 tons/year, as outlined in 40 CFR 93.153(b)(2).

Supporting documentation

[Air Quality_8 hour Ozone_2015.pdf](#)

[Air Quality_PM2 5_2012.pdf](#)

[Air Quality_Sulfur Dioxide_2010.pdf](#)

[Air Quality_Lead_2008.pdf](#)

[Air Quality_Carbon Monoxide_1971.pdf](#)

[Air Quality_Nitrogen Dioxide_1971.pdf](#)

[Air Quality_Wake Co by Each Year.pdf](#)

[Air Quality_CO Limited Maintenance Plan_2012_08_02.pdf](#)

[Air Quality_United States Map Designations.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 is not located in or does not affect a Coastal Zone as defined in the state Coastal Management Plan. The project is in compliance with the Coastal Zone Management Act. Wake County (county of proposed development site) is not one of the 20 Coastal Zone Management counties in NC.

Supporting documentation

[Coastal Zone Management.pdf](#)

[CAMA Counties 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)

1. How was site contamination evaluated? Select all that apply. Document and upload documentation and reports and evaluation explanation of site contamination below.

- ☒ American Society for Testing and Materials (ASTM) Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA)
- ☐ ASTM Phase II ESA
- ☐ Remediation or clean-up plan
- ☐ ASTM Vapor Encroachment Screening
- ☐ None of the Above

2. Were any on-site or nearby toxic, hazardous, or radioactive substances 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?)

- ☒ No

Explain:

GeoTechnologies, Inc. conducted a site visit on November 8, 2023, by Jason B. Grizzard. Mr. Grizzard observed no evidence of aboveground or underground storage tanks, and no staining, distressed vegetation or debris disposal were visible at the site. On page 16 of the Phase I report, "To summarize, our visual reconnaissance of the site did not identify evidence of RECs in connection with the Subject Property. No activities likely to result in environmental impairment of the property were observed. However, prior [to] obtaining a demolition permit, a[n] inspection for asbestos-containing materials will be needed."

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

Yes

Screen Summary

Compliance Determination

Site contamination was evaluated as follows: ASTM Phase I ESA. 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. The project is in compliance with contamination and toxic substances requirements. GeoTechnologies, Inc. conducted a site visit on November 8, 2023, by Jason B. Grizzard. Mr. Grizzard observed no evidence of aboveground or underground storage tanks, and no staining, distressed vegetation or debris disposal were visible at the site. On page 16 of the Phase I report, "To summarize, our visual reconnaissance of the site did not identify evidence of RECs in connection with the Subject Property. No activities likely to result in environmental impairment of the property were observed. However, prior [to] obtaining a demolition permit, a[n] inspection for asbestos-containing materials will be needed."

Supporting documentation

[Phase I ESA_601 Method Rd.pdf](#)

[Contamination and Toxic Substances_NEPAssist Report_601 Method Rd.pdf](#)

[Contamination and Toxic Substances_NEPAssist ECHO Toxic Release Report_601 Method Rd.pdf](#)

[Contamination and Toxic Substances_NEPAssist ECHO Hazardous Waste Report_601 Method Rd.pdf](#)

[Contamination and Toxic Substances_NEPAssist ECHO Hazardous Waste Report 22_601 Method Rd.pdf](#)

[Contamination and Toxic Substances_NEPAssist ECHO Hazardous Waste Report 21_601 Method Rd.pdf](#)

[Contamination and Toxic Substances_NEPAssist ECHO Hazardous Waste Report 20_601 Method Rd.pdf](#)

[Contamination and Toxic Substances_NEPAssist ECHO Hazardous Waste Report 19_601 Method Rd.pdf](#)

[Contamination and Toxic Substances_NEPAssist ECHO Hazardous Waste Report 18_601 Method Rd.pdf](#)

[Contamination and Toxic Substances_NEPAssist ECHO Hazardous Waste Report 17_601 Method Rd.pdf](#)

[Contamination and Toxic Substances_NEPAssist ECHO Hazardous Waste Report 16_601 Method Rd.pdf](#)

[Contamination and Toxic Substances_NEPAssist ECHO Hazardous Waste Report 15_601 Method Rd.pdf](#)

[Contamination and Toxic Substances_NEPAssist ECHO Hazardous Waste Report 14_601 Method Rd.pdf](#)

[Contamination and Toxic Substances_NEPAssist ECHO Hazardous Waste Report 13_601 Method Rd.pdf](#)
[Contamination and Toxic Substances_NEPAssist ECHO Hazardous Waste Report 12_601 Method Rd.pdf](#)
[Contamination and Toxic Substances_NEPAssist ECHO Hazardous Waste Report 11_601 Method Rd.pdf](#)
[Contamination and Toxic Substances_NEPAssist ECHO Hazardous Waste Report 10_601 Method Rd.pdf](#)
[Contamination and Toxic Substances_NEPAssist ECHO Hazardous Waste Report 9_601 Method Rd.pdf](#)
[Contamination and Toxic Substances_NEPAssist ECHO Hazardous Waste Report 8_601 Method Rd.pdf](#)
[Contamination and Toxic Substances_NEPAssist ECHO Hazardous Waste Report 7_601 Method Rd.pdf](#)
[Contamination and Toxic Substances_NEPAssist ECHO Hazardous Waste Report 6_601 Method Rd.pdf](#)
[Contamination and Toxic Substances_NEPAssist ECHO Hazardous Waste Report 5_601 Method Rd.pdf](#)
[Contamination and Toxic Substances_NEPAssist ECHO Hazardous Waste Report 4_601 Method Rd.pdf](#)
[Contamination and Toxic Substances_NEPAssist ECHO Hazardous Waste Report 3_601 Method Rd.pdf](#)
[Contamination and Toxic Substances_NEPAssist ECHO Hazardous Waste Report 2_601 Method Rd.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:

Axiom Environmental conducted a site survey on September 21, 2023, and they found no evidence of any of the listed species (Bald Eagle, Tricolored bat, Monarch butterfly, Red-cockaded woodpecker, Neuse River waterdog, Carolina madtom, Atlantic Pigtoe, Dwarf Wedgemussel, Green Floater, or Michaux's sumac).

Screen

Summary

Compliance Determination

This project has been determined to have No Effect on listed species. This project is in compliance with the Endangered Species Act without mitigation. Axiom Environmental conducted a site survey on September 21, 2023, and they found no evidence of any of the listed species (Bald Eagle, Tricolored bat, Monarch butterfly, Red-cockaded woodpecker, Neuse River waterdog, Carolina madtom, Atlantic Pigtoe, Dwarf Wedgemussel, Green Floater, or Michaux's sumac).

Supporting documentation

[Axiom 601 Method Road Site TE Survey Results 230929.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

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

Yes

Screen Summary

Compliance Determination

There are no current or planned stationary aboveground storage containers of concern within 1 mile of the project site. The project is in compliance with explosive and flammable hazard requirements. GeoTechnologies stated in their Phase I ESA that three Leaking Aboveground Storage Tank (LAST) sites were identified within a half mile of the subject site, and none appear to have impacted the subject site. Based on a review of the USGS topographic map, none of the sites are located in areas that drain towards the site and they are not considered to create REC for this site. There are no current or planned stationary aboveground storage containers of concern within one-mile of the subject site.

Supporting documentation

[Explosive and Flammable Substances AGST 1-mail Radius Map 601 Method Rd.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.)	7 CFR Part 658

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

2. Does your project meet one of the following exemptions?

- Construction limited to on-farm structures needed for farm operations.
- Construction limited to new minor secondary (accessory) structures such as a garage or storage shed
- Project on land already in or committed to urban development or used for water storage. (7 CFR 658.2(a))

✓ Yes

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

No

Screen Summary

Compliance Determination

This project includes activities that could potentially convert agricultural land to a non-agricultural use, but an exemption applies. The project is in compliance with the Farmland Protection Policy Act. According to the Web Soil Survey website, the subject site soil makeup is 100% urban soil (UR).

Supporting documentation

[Web Soil Survey Report_601 Method Rd\(1\).pdf](#)

[Farmland Protection_2020 Census Urban Area Layer_601 Method Rd.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	24 CFR 55

1. Do any of the following exemptions apply? Select the applicable citation? [only one selection possible]

- 55.12(c)(3)
- 55.12(c)(4)
- 55.12(c)(5)
- 55.12(c)(6)
- 55.12(c)(7)
- 55.12(c)(8)
- 55.12(c)(9)
- 55.12(c)(10)
- 55.12(c)(11)
- ☒ None of the above

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

[Flood Insurance_Screenshop Firmett Map with parcel boundary_601 Method Rd.pdf](#)
[Flood Insurance FEMA Firmette Map 601 Method Rd.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.

Does your project occur in a floodplain?

- ☒ No

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

Yes

Screen Summary

Compliance Determination

This project does not occur in a floodplain. The project is in compliance with Executive Order 11988.

Supporting documentation

[Floodplain Management iMaps Flood Map_601 Method Rd.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" https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/CFR-2012-title36-vol3/pdf/CFR-2012-title36-vol3-part800.pdf

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) Not Required

- ✓ Advisory Council on Historic Preservation Not Required

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

- ✓ Catawba Indian Nation Completed

✓ Other Consulting Parties

✓ Capital Area Preservation

Completed

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

The Catawba Indian Nation is the tribal group most interested in Wake County, NC, based on the Tribal Directory Assessment Tool. Capital Area Preservation (CAP) is Wake County's consulting organization for historical reviews, and CAP and Wake County have a programmatic agreement for these consultation services.

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:**

601 Method Road, Raleigh, NC 27603, Wake County PIN # 0794039148.

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
----------------------------------	-----------------------------	------------------	--------------------------

Additional Notes:

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

Yes

✓ 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 there are No Historic Properties Affected because there are no historic properties present. The project is in compliance with Section 106. Please note, a new Programmatic Agreement (PA) with NCSHPO is under contract between Wake County and NCSHPO. Catawba Nation and Capital Area

Preservation were consulted, and both responded with no adverse impacts were anticipated with this project. Please see supporting documents.

Supporting documentation

[SHPO and Wake County Signed Agreement.pdf](#)

[HUD ER Response_CAP_CASA Method Rd.pdf](#)

[HUD ER Request Ltr_CAP_CASA Method Rd.docx](#)

[HUD ER Request Ltr_Catawba_CASA Method Rd.docx](#)

[HUD ER Request Ltr_Catawba RESPONSE_CASA Method Rd.docx](#)

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

A Noise Assessment was conducted. The noise level was acceptable: 61.0 db. See noise analysis. The project is in compliance with HUD's Noise regulation.

Supporting documentation

[Noise Abatement and Control_DNL Calculator_601 Method Rd.pdf](#)
[Noise Abatement and Control_RDU Noise Contour Map_601 Method Rd.pdf](#)
[Noise Abatement and Control_Railroad Distance in Feet_601 Method Rd.pdf](#)
[Noise Abatement and Control_I-440 Distance in Feet_601 Method Rd.pdf](#)
[Noise Abatement and Control_Hillsborough St Distance in Feet_601 Method Rd.pdf](#)
[NCDOT_AADT_I-440_2033 Projections.xlsx](#)
[NCDOT_AADT_Hillsborough St_2033 Projections.xlsx](#)

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

Yes

✓ No

Sole Source Aquifers

General requirements	Legislation	Regulation
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.	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 is not located on a sole source aquifer area. The project is in compliance with Sole Source Aquifer requirements. North Carolina has no sole source aquifers within the state boundaries.

Supporting documentation

[Sole Source Aquifer Program _ Ground Water Protection - Region 4 Southeast _ US EPA.pdf](#)

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

Yes

✓ No

Wetlands Protection

General requirements	Legislation	Regulation
Executive Order 11990 discourages direct or indirect support of new construction impacting wetlands wherever there is a practicable alternative. The Fish and Wildlife Service's National Wetlands Inventory can be used as a primary screening tool, but observed or known wetlands not indicated on NWI maps must also be processed Off-site impacts that result in draining, impounding, or destroying wetlands must also be processed.	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 Executive Order 11990, expansion of a building's footprint, or ground disturbance? The term "new construction" shall include draining, dredging, channelizing, filling, diking, impounding, and related activities and any structures or facilities begun or authorized after the effective date of the Order

No

✓ Yes

2. Will the new construction or other ground disturbance impact an on- or off-site 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, potholes, wet meadows, river overflows, mud flats, and natural ponds.

"Wetlands under E.O. 11990 include isolated and non-jurisdictional wetlands."

✓ No, a wetland will not be impacted in terms of E.O. 11990's definition of new construction.

Based on the response, the review is in compliance with this section. Document and upload a map or any other relevant documentation below which explains your determination

Yes, there is a wetland that be impacted in terms of E.O. 11990's definition of new construction.

Screen Summary

Compliance Determination

The project will not impact on- or off-site wetlands. The project is in compliance with Executive Order 11990. Axiom Environmental conducted a site visit on September 21, 2023, for a protected species survey. Axiom did not find/notice any jurisdictional streams or wetlands.

Supporting documentation

[Wetlands Protection_Wetland Mapper Map_601 Method Rd.pdf](#)

[Wetlands Protection_iMaps No Stream or Watershed Map_601 Method Rd.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. The project is in compliance with the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act. The 601 Method Road project is 10.5 miles west of the Neuse River. The Neuse River is a Nationwide Rivers Inventory (NRI) river. 601 Method Road is 10+ miles to the west of the Neuse River.

Supporting documentation

[Wild and Scenic Rivers Distance to Neuse River NRI 601 Method Rd.pdf](#)

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

Yes

✓ No

Environmental Justice

General requirements	Legislation	Regulation
Determine if the project creates adverse environmental impacts upon a low-income or minority community. If it does, engage the community in meaningful participation about mitigating the impacts or move the project.	Executive Order 12898	

HUD strongly encourages starting the Environmental Justice analysis only after all other laws and authorities, including Environmental Assessment factors if necessary, have been completed.

1. Were any adverse environmental impacts identified in any other compliance review portion of this project's total environmental review?

Yes

✓ No

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

Screen Summary

Compliance Determination

No adverse environmental impacts were identified in the project's total environmental review. The project is in compliance with Executive Order 12898. Based on the information collected and reviewed, this project will not create an adverse and disproportionate environmental impact or aggravate an existing impact. The overwhelming benefit is affordable housing needed for this community.

Supporting documentation

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

Yes

✓ No