

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

Project Information

Project Name: Karuk-Tribe-Yreka-Head-Start

HEROS Number: 900000010496468

Start Date: 09/12/2025

Responsible Entity (RE): Karuk Tribe of California, PO Box 1016 Happy Camp CA,
96039

RE Preparer: Stuart Fricke

State / Local Identifier:

Certifying Officer: Emma Lee Perez

Grant Recipient (if different than Responsible Entity):

Point of Contact:

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 preparer, I have no financial or other interest in the outcome of the undertaking assessed in this environmental review.

Project Location: 1621 Apsuun Rd, Yreka, CA 96097

Additional Location Information:
N/A

Direct Comments to:

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

The Karuk Tribe plans to build the Karuk Tribe Yreka Head Start Center on 2 acres of trust land at the tribe service delivery area of Yreka, California. The new center will be located near 1621 Apsuun Road, Yreka, California, south of the Karuk Tribe Housing Authority office and Community Center building at 1836 Apsuun Road and within the Karuk Tribe Housing Authority's Yreka housing community. The proposed facility is a 6,643-square-foot Head Start Center with areas dedicated to education, nutrition, family services, special needs screening, and resource delivery. It will have parking for cars and buses, a drop-off lane, a playground area, and an equipment and bicycle garage. This facility will replace the existing Head Start Center, which is not a stand-alone facility but is co-housed as the lower level of tribal apartments.

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

The new Yreka Head Start Facility will ensure that Low- and Moderate- Income (LMI) families have access to Head Start services in a safe and healthy environment. It will not only allow for more efficient service delivery, but future expansion of the Head Start program and building to include Early Head Start services. A new Head Start facility will cost-effectively address numerous inadequacies and deficiencies in the existing location. The current Head Start is co-housed on the first floor of a congested tribal apartment complex. This location allows for student exposure to incidents of domestic violence or adult situations requiring Housing Security and/or police intervention. Additionally, water damage and mold have been documented in the building, posing health risks to Head Start employees and students. The antiquated and deteriorating facilities have proven unsafe for children, families, and employees. The new facility will improve the Tribe's capacity to help Karuk families achieve independence and self-sufficiency through the education and school-readiness of tribal youth. It would also ensure that families can receive the supportive services they need.

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

The proposed project site is a vacant lot, and the current Karuk Tribe Head Start facility is located within tribal apartments. Students at the Head Start facility have been exposed to instances of domestic violence and other adult situations involving Housing Security and/or police intervention. Because of inadequate maintenance and an aging building, water damage and mold have been documented at the Head Start facility. These conditions pose health risks to anyone who enters -- employees, students, and their families. Without the project, these incidents and conditions will continue. Native American students in the Karuk Tribe service area, especially those in grades 9 to 12, show poor school performance, truancy, low GPA, substance abuse, and low self-esteem. They are at a high risk of dropping out, attending an alternative high school, or getting involved in the juvenile delinquency system. About 90% of all native students attend regular public schools. In 2015, the Yreka High School reported 659 students, 100 of whom self-identified as American Indian. Of those 100, 69% had poor school attendance, 35% had been or are involved in the delinquency system, 69% had poor school performance and were at risk of failing, and 57% were identified as having substance abuse issues. In 2015 Happy Camp High School reported 100 students, 51 of whom self-identified as American Indian. Of those 51, 100% had poor school attendance, 35% had been or were involved in the delinquency system, 51% had poor school performance and were at risk of failing, and 100% self-reported that either they or their parent(s) had a problem with substance abuse. The most current available data from the California Department of Education, for 2016-2017, shows that native graduation rates for schools within the Karuk Tribe's service area fall well below 75%. The Siskiyou County class of 2017 graduation rate was 66.7%, the Happy Camp High School rate was 55%, and Yreka High School's rate was 40%. In Humboldt County the overall class of 2017 graduation rates were 75%, better than Siskiyou County. The lack of educational attainment for native youth is an indicator of the level of trauma they are attempting to overcome. By providing modern, healthy environments for early childhood education via Head Start, we make a tremendous commitment to future generations in addressing this systemic trauma. The new Yreka Head Start facility will increase the viability of the community by improving school readiness, health, disabilities screening, and service delivery for children ages 3 to 5. Providing these students a strong educational foundation will work to escalate their educational attainment, increasing their job readiness for short-term and long-term employment, and reducing poverty. Additionally, the creation of a healthy and safe gathering place for Head Start students and their families to receive services and participate in student events will improve family stability and healing. It will also foster emotional healing in a community that has been impacted by multigenerational trauma compounded by a recent past of poverty, substance abuse, and crime.

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

[Karuk Site Visit Tech Memo.pdf](#)

[Karuk Site Visit Photo Log 20250521.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:

**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
FR-6800-N-23	Indian Housing	Indian Community Development Block Grant (ICDBG) Program	\$2,000,000.00

**Estimated Total HUD Funded, \$2,000,000.00
Assisted or Insured Amount:**

**Estimated Total Project Cost [24 CFR 58.2 (a) \$2,769,409.00
(5)]:**

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	☐ Yes ☒ 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 closest airport to the project site is the Montague Airport, 5.6 miles northeast. This distance exceeds the thresholds for both military and civilian airports. No formal compliance steps or mitigation measures are required.
Coastal Barrier Resources Act Coastal Barrier Resources Act, as amended by the Coastal Barrier Improvement Act of 1990 [16 USC 3501]	☐ Yes ☒ No	The project site is in California, which is not within the Coastal Barrier Resources System units. This project is located in a state that does not contain CBRS units. Therefore, this project is in compliance with the Coastal Barrier Resources Act. No formal compliance steps or mitigation measures are required.
Flood Insurance Flood Disaster Protection Act of 1973 and National Flood Insurance Reform Act of 1994 [42 USC 4001-4128 and 42 USC 5154a]	☐ Yes ☒ No	According to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's NEPAAssist tool, the project site is not in a Federal Emergency Management Agency flood hazard area. Based on the project description the project includes no activities that would require further evaluation under this section. The project does not require flood insurance or is excepted from flood insurance. 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. No formal compliance steps or mitigation measures are required.
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	☐ Yes ☒ No	Siskiyou County is in attainment status for all criteria pollutants. The project is in compliance with the Clean Air Act. No formal compliance steps or mitigation is required.

Coastal Zone Management Act Coastal Zone Management Act, sections 307(c) & (d)	☐ Yes ☒ No	The California Coastal Zone includes coastline and inland areas in Del Norte, Humboldt, Mendocino, Sonoma, Marin, San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Cruz, Monterey, San Luis Obispo, Santa Barbara, Ventura, Los Angeles, Orange, and San Diego Counties. The project site is in Siskiyou County and does not fall under a coastal management plan. 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. No formal compliance or mitigation measures are required.
Contamination and Toxic Substances 24 CFR 50.3(i) & 58.5(i)(2)]	☐ Yes ☒ No	Site contamination was evaluated as follows: None of the above. 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. Radon analysis indicated elevated levels of radon or consideration of radon will occur following construction. 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.
Endangered Species Act Endangered Species Act of 1973, particularly section 7; 50 CFR Part 402	☐ Yes ☒ No	In August 2025, a biological assessment was conducted at the project site by SHN Engineers & Geologists Inc. to assess the biological resources at the site and confirm the conclusions of a 2015 biological assessment. SHN reviewed database queries and current literature on species status, habitat requirements, and range distribution, and determined that federally listed species are unlikely to occur at the project site. SHN therefore anticipates no impacts to federally listed species as a result of the project. SHN had the following findings and

		recommendations: --No federally protected habitats or aquatic resources are within the project site, and compliance with existing regulatory requirements would minimize potential impacts to the adjacent drainage. The project would be built approximately 200 feet upslope from the drainage; therefore, there would be no direct impact to aquatic species or their habitat. --Because the project involves more than 1 acre of ground disturbance, construction of would be subject to the U.S. EPA's federal construction general permit (CGP) under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System. The CGP requires the development of a stormwater pollution prevention plan (SWPPP) and incorporation of best management practices (BMPs) for construction, including site housekeeping practices, erosion control, inspections, maintenance, and worker training in pollution prevention. Adherence to the regulatory requirements of the CGP would ensure that construction of the proposed project would not result in substantial degradation of surface or groundwater quality and any potential aquatic habitat adjacent to the project site. --In compliance with the Federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act, vegetation removal and ground disturbance should occur outside the nesting bird season to avoid adverse impacts to nesting birds. The typical nesting season is March 1 to August 31. If vegetation removal and ground disturbance will commence during the nesting season, a qualified biologist shall conduct a nesting bird survey within seven calendar days prior to project construction-related activities. If active nests (containing eggs or nestlings) are found, the biologist shall determine and assist the
--	--	--

		contractor in implementing an appropriate no-disturbance buffer around the nest(s) until the biologist has determined that the nest is no longer active by monitoring the nest(s) on a weekly basis. If project activities cease for more than seven days during the breeding season and further vegetation removal is to be done, an additional nesting bird survey shall be conducted by the biologist prior to continuing project activities. --Should construction activities be delayed for longer than 12 months, a review of the then-current special-status species lists should be undertaken to determine whether the federal government has added new species for protection. If it has, applicable reviews and investigations should be developed to determine whether the additions are present at the site. There are no listed species or designated critical habitats in the action area. This project is in compliance with the Endangered Species Act.
Explosive and Flammable Hazards Above-Ground Tanks)[24 CFR Part 51 Subpart C	☐ Yes ☒ No	The following sites are within 1 mile of the project site: Siskiyou County Central Yard, 279 Sharps Road, stores propane, oxygen, gasoline, ethylene glycol, and diesel fuel in above-ground storage tanks (AST) in quantities up to 12,000 gallons. The lowest acceptable separation distance for an AST at the site is 778 feet. At 4,400 feet northwest of the project site, the facility is outside the acceptable separation distances for a container of that volume for people and buildings. Mountain Ready Mix, 321 Sharps Road, stores propane, motor oil, and #2 diesel in quantities up to 3,000 gallons. While the database does not show whether these chemicals are stored in above-ground storage tanks, at 4,300 feet northwest of the project site the facility is outside the acceptable

		separation distances for buildings and people for the listed container volumes. As the sites are outside the acceptable separation distances, no formal compliance steps or mitigation measures are required. There is a current or planned stationary aboveground storage container of concern within 1 mile of the project site. The Separation Distance from the project is acceptable. The project is in compliance with explosive and flammable hazard requirements.
Farmlands Protection Farmland Protection Policy Act of 1981, particularly sections 1504(b) and 1541; 7 CFR Part 658	☐ Yes ☒ No	According to the USDA Natural Resource Conservation Service Web Soil Survey, soils at the project site consist of Duzel-Jilson-Facey complex and Facey loam, both of which are classified as "not prime farmland." The project includes activities that could convert agricultural land to a non-agricultural use, but "prime farmland", "unique farmland", or "farmland of statewide or local importance" regulated under the Farmland Protection Policy Act does not occur on the project site. Because no prime farmland, unique farmland, or farmland of statewide or local importance is present at the project site, no formal compliance steps or mitigation measures are required. The project is in compliance with the Farmland Protection Policy Act.
Floodplain Management Executive Order 11988, particularly section 2(a); 24 CFR Part 55	☐ Yes ☒ No	This project does not occur in the FFRMS floodplain. According to the NEPAassist mapping tool, the project site is not within a floodplain. The project is in compliance with Executive Orders 11988 and 13690. No formal compliance steps or mitigation measures are required.
Historic Preservation National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, particularly sections 106 and 110; 36 CFR Part 800	☐ Yes ☒ No	Given the project's large-scale ground-disturbing activities, consultation with the Karuk tribal archaeologist was required. Tribal Historic Preservation

		Officer/ Archaeologist Alex R. Watts-Tobin, Ph.D., and cultural resources technician Naomi Huddleston performed a reconnaissance survey to establish the sufficiency of a 1997 cultural resources survey by Dr. John Salter. As a result of the visit and reviewing the previous survey, the THPO/Archaeologist recommended a finding of No Adverse Effects to Historic Properties for the project and that cultural resources monitoring provide oversight given the scale of ground disturbance required. No other formal compliance steps or mitigation measures are required. As part of the Section 106 consultation process, a letter describing the proposed project and requesting concurrence with a 1997 cultural resources survey was sent to Karuk Tribe THPO/Archaeologist Alex R. Watts-Tobin, Ph.D. Watts-Tobin surveyed the project site with cultural resources technician Naomi Huddleston and sent a letter dated June 12, 2025, with the following recommendations: A finding of No Adverse Effects to Historic Properties from the project, and cultural monitoring in view of the scale of ground disturbance required by the project. No other formal compliance or mitigation measures are required.
Noise Abatement and Control Noise Control Act of 1972, as amended by the Quiet Communities Act of 1978; 24 CFR Part 51 Subpart B	☐ Yes ☒ No	The Preliminary Screening identified no noise generators in the vicinity of the project. 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	☐ Yes ☒ No	The project is not located on a sole source aquifer area. According to the NEPAassist mapping tool, the project site is not on a sole-source aquifer. The nearest sole-source aquifer is 150 miles northwest in Florence, Oregon. The project is in compliance with Sole Source Aquifer requirements. No formal

		compliance steps or mitigation measures are required.
Wetlands Protection Executive Order 11990, particularly sections 2 and 5	☐ Yes ☒ No	While the project does involve new construction, it is not within a wetland, according to the NEPAAssist mapping tool. The site is an area of high slopes on a small hill. The NEPAAssist tool lists an area approximately 50 feet east from the project site as riverine. The area may act as seasonal streams but were dry when site reconnaissance was conducted. The project will not impact on- or off-site wetlands. The project is in compliance with Executive Order 11990. No formal compliance steps or mitigation measures are required.
Wild and Scenic Rivers Act Wild and Scenic Rivers Act of 1968, particularly section 7(b) and (c)	☐ Yes ☒ No	According to the NEPAAssist mapping tool, the project site is not in proximity to a Wild and Scenic River. The nearest Wild and Scenic-designated river is the Klamath River, 12 miles north of the project site. As the project site is not in proximity to a Wild and Scenic-designated river, no formal compliance steps or mitigation measures are required. The project is in compliance with the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act.
HUD HOUSING ENVIRONMENTAL STANDARDS		
ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE		
Environmental Justice Executive Order 12898	☐ Yes ☒ No	No adverse environmental impacts were identified in the project's total environmental review. The project is in compliance with Executive Order 12898.

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 Land Use and Zoning / Scale and Urban Design	2	The project site occupies an area of Yreka zoned for single-family residential. However, the offices of the Karuk Tribe Housing Authority are directly north of the property, and it is unlikely the project would significantly impact the surrounding residential neighborhood. Additionally, the project will provide schooling for tribe members in the area. The project complies with Siskiyou County land use policies in that: According to the USGS U.S. Landslide Inventory and Susceptibility map, the site is in an area of high slopes with slight susceptibility to landslides. It is not, however, an area with historically documented landslides, according to the Reported California Landslides database. Construction activities will utilize erosion-control measures. The project site is not within a floodplain or a designated critical deer wintering area. Finally, the project will not impact timber productivity or woodland soils or convert prime agricultural farmland to other uses.	
Soil Suitability / Slope/ Erosion / Drainage and	2	The project site occupies an area of Yreka zoned for single-family residential.	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
Storm Water Runoff		However, the offices of the Karuk Tribe Housing Authority are directly north of the property, and it is unlikely the project would significantly impact the surrounding residential neighborhood. Additionally, the project will provide schooling for tribe members in the area. The project complies with Siskiyou County land use policies in that: According to the USGS U.S. Landslide Inventory and Susceptibility map, the site is in an area of high slopes with slight susceptibility to landslides. It is not, however, an area with historically documented landslides, according to the Reported California Landslides database. Construction activities will utilize erosion-control measures. The project site is not within a floodplain or a designated critical deer wintering area. Finally, the project will not impact timber productivity or woodland soils or convert prime agricultural farmland to other uses.	
Hazards and Nuisances including Site Safety and Site-Generated Noise	2	The project site is in a noise-sensitive area, a residential neighborhood, and construction activities may expose residents to loud noises. Once the project is complete, the school will generate low levels of noise.	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		FEMA seismic risk maps indicate Siskiyou County could experience strong to very strong shaking, with damage ranging from negligible in well-built structures to substantial in poorly built structures. The California Geological Survey has mapped minor earthquake fault zones in Siskiyou County; however, even with these faults, the chance of a damaging earthquake is extremely low. Mt. Shasta is a stratovolcano 30 miles from Yreka in the Interstate 5 corridor. Volcanic ash, the fine fragments of volcanic rock carried downwind from the volcano during an eruption, is the main volcanic hazard Mt. Shasta poses to the project site. Yreka is outside the hazard areas for near-volcano ejecta, lahars, and regional lava flows.	
SOCIOECONOMIC			
Employment and Income Patterns	1	The project will create temporary jobs during construction, and the expanded Head Start program would provide employment opportunities from the expansion into offering Early Head Start programs. Expansion of the Head Start program will bring an expansion of employment opportunities in the form of educators, Education	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		Coordinators, Head Start Family Advocates and Family Support Specialists, among other positions.	
Demographic Character Changes / Displacement	2	According to Data USA, 4% of Yreka's population identifies as Native American, and 22% of the city's population lives in poverty, higher than the national average. A higher-quality Head Start program in Yreka will help attract and retain Karuk tribe members in the city in addition to easing financial pressure on low-income families by providing disability and mental health resources and hearing, vision and dental screenings for students. Completion of the project will aid in maintaining the Karuk population in Yreka.	
Environmental Justice EA Factor	2	No adverse Impacts.	
COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND SERVICES			
Educational and Cultural Facilities (Access and Capacity)	2	Completion of the project will expand low-income tribal members' access to childhood educational facilities in a safe environment. The project site is in the Yreka Union School District, which provides transitional kindergarten through high school at four facilities. Siskiyou County Museum and the Franco-American Hotel are within 2 miles of the project site. The city of Yreka also maintains the Yreka Community Center	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		and the Yreka Community Theater. Because the project is replacing an existing facility, these facilities will not be impacted.	
Commercial Facilities (Access and Proximity)	2	The project site is 2 miles, a 6-minute drive, from Yreka's commercial core and Interstate 5, which provides access to the bulk of Yreka's commercial facilities along the interstate and State Route 3. Because the project is a school built on vacant land, the project will not adversely impact or displace existing retail or commercial services.	
Health Care / Social Services (Access and Capacity)	2	The project site is 2 miles from Fairchild Medical Center. Yreka has Yreka Pharmacy, a Walmart pharmacy, and a Raley's Pharmacy. There are a number of mental health providers in the Yreka area. Because the project seeks to replace an existing facility, it will not impact health care facilities or social services in the area.	
Solid Waste Disposal and Recycling (Feasibility and Capacity)	2	Disposal services in Yreka are offered by Yreka Transfer LLC, which also services Montague, Grenada, Big Springs, Gazelle, Lake Shastina, Copco Lake, Hilt, and Hornbrook. Service may increase during construction activities but will stabilize after the completion of the project. The Oberlin Road	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		transfer station serves the Yreka area. Because the project is replacing an existing facility, it is unlikely to adversely impact the service provider.	
Waste Water and Sanitary Sewers (Feasibility and Capacity)	2	Wastewater from the project will be discharged to the municipal sanitary sewer. The Yreka Wastewater Treatment Plant is at 701 Fourth Street, 3.6 miles to the north. Because the project is replacing an existing facility, it will not adversely impact the service provider.	
Water Supply (Feasibility and Capacity)	2	The project site will obtain water from the city of Yreka. Yreka obtains its water from a conduit from Fall Creek, 23 miles northeast of the city, and has access to an emergency well along Yreka Creek. The water is stored in a series of hillside tanks in the city. Because the project is the replacement of an existing facility, completion of the project will not adversely impact these resources.	
Public Safety - Police, Fire and Emergency Medical	2	The all-volunteer Yreka Fire Department serves the project site. The department is 3 miles from the project site, an 8-minute drive. The Yreka Police Department serves the project site. The Yreka police station is 2 miles from the project site, a 6-minute drive. Fairchild Medical Center is 2.2 miles	

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		from the project site, a 7-minute drive. The project site is easily accessible by police, fire, and emergency medical personnel. As it is a replacement of an existing facility, the project site will not adversely impact these services.	
Parks, Open Space and Recreation (Access and Capacity)	2	The city of Yreka maintains eight parks. The Greenhorn Park Reservoir Trail is 3 miles west of the project site. As it is a replacement of an existing facility, the project will not adversely impact these services.	
Transportation and Accessibility (Access and Capacity)	2	The project site is easily accessed from Interstate 5, the primary route for travelers into and out of Yreka. Yreka does not have its own public transportation system. Siskiyou County operates a bus line called STAGE with a \$1 fare. The bus travels between Yreka, Weed, Dunsmuir, McCloud, Scott, Valley, and Montague. The nearest STAGE bus stop to the project site is at the Siskiyou Transit Center, 2 miles west of the project site, a 6-minute drive and a 45-minute walk. Because the project is the replacement of an existing facility, completion of the project will not adversely impact these services.	
NATURAL FEATURES			

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
Unique Natural Features /Water Resources	2	The project site is near Klamath National Forest and Butte Valley National Grassland. These features do not extend into the city of Yreka, and the project will not adversely impact them.	
Vegetation / Wildlife (Introduction, Modification, Removal, Disruption, etc.)	3	In August 2025, a biological assessment was conducted at the project site by SHN Engineers & Geologists Inc. to assess the biological resources at the project site and confirm the conclusions of a 2015 biological assessment. SHN reviewed database queries and current literature on species status, habitat requirements, and range distribution, and determined that federally listed species are unlikely to occur at the project site. SHN therefore anticipates no impacts to federally listed species from the project. SHN recommended the construction work be conducted under a federal construction general permit and that vegetation removal and ground-disturbing activities occur outside the nesting season for seasonal migratory birds (March 1 to August 31. If these activities should occur during nesting season, SHN recommends that a qualified biologist conduct a nesting bird survey within seven calendar days	In compliance with the Federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act, vegetation removal and ground disturbance should occur outside the nesting bird season to avoid adverse impacts to nesting birds. The typical nesting season is March 1 to August 31. If vegetation removal and ground disturbance will commence during the nesting season, a qualified biologist shall conduct a nesting bird survey within seven calendar days prior to project construction-related activities. If active nests (containing eggs or nestlings) are found, the biologist shall determine and assist the contractor in implementing an appropriate no-disturbance buffer around the nest(s) until the biologist has determined that the nest is no longer active by monitoring the nest(s) on a weekly basis. If project activities cease for more than seven days during the breeding season and further vegetation removal is to be

Environmental Assessment Factor	Impact Code	Impact Evaluation	Mitigation
		prior to construction-related activities.	done, an additional nesting bird survey shall be conducted by the biologist prior to continuing project activities.
Other Factors 1			
Other Factors 2			
CLIMATE AND ENERGY			
Climate Change	2	Yreka, and the project site, are exposed to increasingly intense weather events such as heatwaves and unpredictable winter storms in addition to larger wildfires as a result of climate change. The project will incorporate high efficiency heating and cooling systems to mitigate the impacts of severe weather events.	
Energy Efficiency	2	The project will be constructed to the most updated city, county, and state codes and standards, including the most recent versions of building energy-efficiency standards, and utilize high-efficiency lighting, heating, and cooling systems.	

Supporting documentation

[Water Supply - 2024 Water Quality Report \(PDF\).pdf](#)
[Transportation - Guide to Riding STAGE _ Siskiyou County California.pdf](#)
[Transportation - april 2 2024 bus schedule.pdf](#)
[Solid Waste Disposal - Yreka Transfer - HOME.pdf](#)
[Public Safety - safety element 2025 06 11 jp - Copy.pdf](#)
[Hazards and Nuisances - Seismic Risk Map.pdf](#)
[Hazards and Nuisances - fema hazard maps western-map_graphic.jpg](#)
[Hazards and Nuisances - safety element 2025 06 11 jp.pdf](#)
[Education-Cultural Facilities - Siskiyou County Museum _ Siskiyou County California.pdf](#)

[Education-Cultural Facilities - Schools - Yreka Union School District.pdf](#)
[Education-Cultural Facilities - Franco American Hotel - Discover Siskiyou.pdf](#)
[Demographic Character Changes - Annual Report for the 2024 Grant.pdf](#)
[Conformance with Plans - Mule Deer Range.pdf](#)
[Conformance with Plans - General Plan Siskiyou County California.pdf](#)
[Conformance with Plans - City of Yreka General Plan Update.pdf](#)

Additional Studies Performed:

SHN Engineers & Geologists Inc. Karuk Yreka Housing Project, Biological Review
Addendum. August 29, 2025.

[7 - 20250829-EnvReviewAddendum-KarukHomes\(1\).pdf](#)

Field Inspection [Optional]: Date and completed

by:

Will Mulligan

5/21/2025 12:00:00 AM

[Karuk Site Visit Tech Memo.pdf](#)

[Karuk Site Visit Photo Log 20250521.pdf](#)

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

California Department of Conservation. Reported California Landslides Database. July 26, 2025. Online address:
https://cadoc.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=bc48ad40e3504134a1fc8f3909659041&_gl=1*1umx23w*_ga*MTgwMTAyMzcyMS4xNzQ1NjE1Mjc3*_ga_N4MB98DBXY*cze3NTI3OTIyODEkbzlkZzAkDDE3NTI3OTIyODEkajYwJGwwJGgw
California Department of Fish and Wildlife. Mule Deer Range and Distribution. July 26, 2025. Online address: <https://gis.data.ca.gov/datasets/CDFW::mule-deer-range-region-1ds277/explore?location=2.850626%2C-1.424458%2C8.61>
City of Yreka. Community Center and Theater web page. July 23, 2025. Online address:
<https://yrekaca.gov/203/Community-Center-Theater>
City of Yreka, California. 2025. City of Yreka General Plan Update 2002-2022. July 28, 2025. Online address:
<https://ci.yreka.ca.us/DocumentCenter/View/119/General-Plan-PDF?bidId=>
City of Yreka, California. Parks and Resources web page. July 29, 2025. Online address:
<https://yrekaca.gov/204/Parks-and-Resources>
City of Yreka, California. 2024 Water Quality Report. July 29, 2025. Online address:
<https://yrekaca.gov/ArchiveCenter/ViewFile/Item/225>
City of Yreka, California. Water Webpage. July 29, 2025. Online address: <https://yrekaca.gov/191/Water>
Discover Siskiyou County. Franco-American Hotel. July 23, 2025. Online address:
<https://discoversiskiyou.com/activities/francoamericanhotel/>
Federal Emergency Management Agency. Earthquake Hazard Maps. July 24, 2025. Online address:
<https://www.fema.gov/emergency-managers/risk-management/earthquake/hazard-maps>
Karuk Tribe. Karuk Tribal Head Start Annual Report 2022-2023. July 28, 2025.

Online address:

https://www.karuk.us/images/docs/Head_Start/Annual_Report_for_the_2024_Grant.pdf Siskiyou County. Siskiyou County Museum. July 23, 2025. Online address:

<https://www.siskiyoucounty.gov/museum> Siskiyou County. General Plan 2025 Safety Element. July 24, 2025. Online address:

https://www.siskiyoucounty.gov/sites/default/files/fileattachments/planning/page/2601/_safety_element_2025_06_11_jp.pdf Siskiyou County. General Plan Housing Element 2023- 2031. July 26, 2025. Online address:

<https://www.siskiyoucounty.gov/planning/page/general-plan> Siskiyou County. Guide to Riding STAGE web page. July 29, 2025. Online address:

<https://www.siskiyoucounty.gov/stage/page/guide-riding-stage> Siskiyou County. STAGE Schedule. July 29, 2025. Online address:

https://www.siskiyoucounty.gov/sites/default/files/fileattachments/general_services/page/5581/april_2_2024_bus_schedule.pdf U.S. Department of Agriculture National Resources Conservation Service. Web Soil Survey. July 25, 2025. Online address: <https://websoilsurvey.nrcs.usda.gov/app/WebSoilSurvey.aspx> United States Geological Survey. United States Landslide Inventory Susceptibility Map. July 26, 2025. Online address:

<https://usgs.maps.arcgis.com/apps/webappviewer/index.html?id=ae120962f459434b8c904b456c82669d> Yreka Transfer LLC. Service Areas. July 29, 2025. Online address:

<https://www.yrekatransferllc.com/index.html> Yreka Union School District. Schools web page. July 28, 2025. Online address: <https://www.yrekausd.net/schools>

List of Permits Obtained:

Building permits will be obtained from Siskiyou County and the city of Yreka.

Public Outreach [24 CFR 58.43]:

Notices will be posted in the Siskiyou Daily News and on the Karuk Tribe Website.

Cumulative Impact Analysis [24 CFR 58.32]:

The project will have no adverse impacts on human health or the environment.

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

Other sites were considered, but none offered the benefits of the proposed parcel. The proposed facility is approximately 1 mile from the current facility. Its central location, relative to tribal housing developments, maintains the facility's accessibility while separating it from potential incidents with community members, ensuring the students will have a safe and healthy environment to attend school.

No Action Alternative [24 CFR 58.40(e)]

The No Action Alternative was considered, but it would not address the inadequate facilities available at the current Karuk Tribal Head Start in Yreka. Without the construction of a new facility, Head Start staff and students will continue to work and learn in unsafe and unhealthy conditions.

Summary of Findings and Conclusions:

The project has potential to impact nesting birds. In compliance with the Federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act, vegetation removal and ground disturbance should occur outside the nesting bird season to avoid adverse impacts to nesting birds. The typical nesting season is March 1 to August 31. If vegetation removal and ground disturbance will commence during the nesting season, a qualified biologist shall conduct a nesting bird survey within seven calendar days prior to project construction-related activities. If active nests (containing eggs or nestlings) are found, the biologist shall determine and assist the contractor in implementing an appropriate no-disturbance buffer around the nest(s) until the biologist has determined that the nest is no longer active by monitoring the nest(s) on a weekly basis. If project activities cease for more than seven days during the breeding season and further vegetation removal is to be done, an additional nesting bird survey shall be conducted by the biologist prior to continuing project activities.

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
Historic Preservation	Cultural resource monitoring is required during all ground disturbing activities.	N/A	Cultural resources monitoring personnel will be onsite for the duration of ground disturbing activities.	

Contamination and Toxic Substances	As there are no buildings at the site, compliance is dependent on the assessment of the building following construction.	N/A	Radon testing will be carried out after the construction of the facility.	
Vegetation / Wildlife (Introduction, Modification, Removal, Disruption, etc.)	In compliance with the Federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act, vegetation removal and ground disturbance should occur outside the nesting bird season to avoid adverse impacts to nesting birds. The typical nesting season is March 1 to August 31. If vegetation removal and ground disturbance will commence during the nesting season, a qualified biologist shall conduct a nesting bird survey within seven calendar days prior to project construction-related activities. If active nests (containing eggs or nestlings) are found, the biologist shall determine and assist the contractor in implementing an appropriate no-disturbance buffer around the nest(s) until the biologist has determined that the nest is no longer active by monitoring the nest(s) on a weekly basis. If project activities cease for more than seven days during the breeding season and further vegetation removal is to be done, an additional nesting bird survey shall be conducted by the biologist prior to continuing project activities.	N/A	A biological monitor will conduct a nesting bird survey if construction occurs between March 1 to August 31.	

Project Mitigation Plan

Radon testing will be carried out after the construction of the facility. Cultural resources monitoring personnel will be onsite for the duration of ground disturbing activities.

[11 - 25-06-12 Akana-YHS\(1\).pdf](#)

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 closest airport to the project site is the Montague Airport, 5.6 miles northeast. This distance exceeds the thresholds for both military and civilian airports. No formal compliance steps or mitigation measures are required.

Supporting documentation

[1 - Airport 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)	

This project is located in a state that does not contain CBRA units. Therefore, this project is in compliance with the Coastal Barrier Resources Act.

Compliance Determination

The project site is in California, which is not within the Coastal Barrier Resources System units. This project is located in a state that does not contain CBRS units. Therefore, this project is in compliance with the Coastal Barrier Resources Act. No formal compliance steps or mitigation measures are required.

Supporting documentation

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.

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

According to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's NEPAAssist tool, the project site is not in a Federal Emergency Management Agency flood hazard area. Based on the project description the project includes no activities that would require further evaluation under this section. The project does not require flood insurance or is excepted from flood insurance. 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. No formal compliance steps or mitigation measures are required.

Supporting documentation

[3 - Flood Hazard Map.pdf](#)

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

Karuk-Tribe-Yreka-Head-
Start

Yreka, CA

900000010496468

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

Siskiyou County is in attainment status for all criteria pollutants. The project is in compliance with the Clean Air Act. No formal compliance steps or mitigation is required.

Supporting documentation

[4 - Air-Quality Map.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

The California Coastal Zone includes coastline and inland areas in Del Norte, Humboldt, Mendocino, Sonoma, Marin, San Francisco, San Mateo, Santa Cruz, Monterey, San Luis Obispo, Santa Barbara, Ventura, Los Angeles, Orange, and San Diego Counties. The project site is in Siskiyou County and does not fall under a coastal management plan. 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. No formal compliance or mitigation measures are required.

Supporting documentation

[5 - Coastal Zone Management 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)
Reference		
https://www.onecpd.info/environmental-review/site-contamination		

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:

Akana viewed the California Environmental Protection Agency (CalEPA) Regulated Site Portal on May 15, 2025. The project site was not listed. There are three sites listed in the CalEPA Regulated Site Portal. Due to their distance from the project site, none have potential to impact the project site. - Mountain Ready Mix at 321 Sharps Road, Yreka, CA is a concrete distributor which store chemicals and generates federally listed hazardous wastes. The site is 0.79 mile northwest of the project site. Records indicate the site has two violations from June 2020 concerning Hazardous Materials Release Response Plans. -Siskiyou County Central Yard at 279 Sharps Road, Yreka, CA is a county maintenance and storage yard with aboveground petroleum storage tanks, which store chemicals and generates federally listed hazardous wastes. The site is 0.96 mile northwest of the project site. Records indicate the site has seven violations, dating back to 2016 concerning hazardous waste generation, aboveground petroleum storage, and Hazardous Materials Release Response Plans in the forms of failing to provide and document training and failure to submit hazardous materials inventories. -Yreka Biosolids Disposal Facility at 1614 Oberlin, Yreka, CA is a wastewater treatment facility owned by the city of Yreka. The site is 0.95 mile from the project site. It has no recorded history of violations. No formal compliance steps or mitigation measures are required.

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.**

As there are no buildings at the site, compliance is dependent on the assessment of the building following construction.

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

Site contamination was evaluated as follows: None of the above. 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. Radon analysis indicated elevated levels of radon or consideration of radon will occur following construction. 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

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

Based on the response, the review is in compliance with this section. Document and upload all documents used to make your determination below. Documentation may include letters from the Services, species lists from the Services' websites, surveys or other documents and analysis showing that there are no species in the action area.

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

Screen Summary

Compliance Determination

In August 2025, a biological assessment was conducted at the project site by SHN Engineers & Geologists Inc. to assess the biological resources at the site and confirm the conclusions of a 2015 biological assessment. SHN reviewed database queries and current literature on species status, habitat requirements, and range distribution, and determined that federally listed species are unlikely to occur at the project site. SHN therefore anticipates no impacts to federally listed species as a result of the project. SHN had the following findings and recommendations: --No federally protected habitats or aquatic resources are within the project site, and compliance with existing regulatory requirements would minimize potential impacts to the adjacent drainage. The project would be built approximately 200 feet upslope from the drainage; therefore, there would be no direct impact to aquatic species or their habitat. -- Because the project involves more than 1 acre of ground disturbance, construction of would be subject to the U.S. EPA's federal construction general permit (CGP) under the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System. The CGP requires the development of a stormwater pollution prevention plan (SWPPP) and incorporation of best management practices (BMPs) for construction, including site housekeeping practices, erosion control, inspections, maintenance, and worker training in pollution prevention. Adherence to the regulatory requirements of the CGP would ensure that construction of the proposed project would not result in substantial degradation of surface or groundwater quality and any potential aquatic habitat adjacent to the project site. --In compliance with the Federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act, vegetation removal and ground disturbance should occur outside the nesting bird season to avoid adverse impacts to nesting birds. The typical nesting season is March 1 to August 31. If vegetation removal and ground disturbance will commence during the nesting season, a qualified biologist shall conduct a nesting bird survey within seven calendar days prior to project construction-related activities. If active nests (containing eggs or nestlings) are found, the biologist shall determine and assist the contractor in implementing an appropriate no-disturbance buffer around the nest(s) until the biologist has determined that the nest is no longer active by monitoring the nest(s) on a weekly basis. If project activities cease for more than seven days during the breeding season and further vegetation removal is to be done, an additional nesting bird survey shall be conducted by the biologist prior to continuing project activities. --Should construction activities be delayed for longer than 12 months, a review of the then-current special-status species lists should be undertaken to determine whether the federal government has added new species for protection. If it has, applicable reviews and investigations should be developed to determine whether the additions are present at the site. There are no listed species or

designated critical habitats in the action area. This project is in compliance with the Endangered Species Act.

Supporting documentation

[7 - 20250829-EnvReviewAddendum-KarukHomes.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

The following sites are within 1 mile of the project site: Siskiyou County Central Yard, 279 Sharps Road, stores propane, oxygen, gasoline, ethylene glycol, and diesel fuel in above-ground storage tanks (AST) in quantities up to 12,000 gallons. The lowest acceptable separation distance for an AST at the site is 778 feet. At 4,400 feet northwest of the project site, the facility is outside the acceptable separation distances for a container of that volume for people and buildings. Mountain Ready Mix, 321 Sharps Road, stores propane, motor oil, and #2 diesel in quantities up to 3,000 gallons. While the database does not show whether these chemicals are stored in above-ground storage tanks, at 4,300 feet northwest of the project site the facility is outside the acceptable separation distances for buildings and people for the listed container volumes. As the sites are outside the acceptable separation distances, no formal compliance steps or mitigation measures are required. There is a current or planned stationary aboveground storage container of concern within 1 mile of the project site. The Separation Distance from the project is acceptable. The project is in compliance with explosive and flammable hazard requirements.

Supporting documentation

[8 - Acceptable Separation Distance \(ASD\) Electronic Assessment Tool - HUD Exchange 2.pdf](#)

[8 - Acceptable Separation Distance \(ASD\) Electronic Assessment Tool - HUD Exchange 1.pdf](#)

[8 - Explosive and Flammable Facilities Map.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

☒ No

3. Does “important farmland,” including prime farmland, unique farmland, or farmland of statewide or local importance regulated under the Farmland Protection Policy Act, occur on the project site?

- Utilize USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service’s (NRCS) Web Soil Survey <http://websoilsurvey.nrcs.usda.gov/app/HomePage.htm>
- Check with your city or county’s planning department and ask them to document if the project is on land regulated by the FPPA (zoning important farmland as non-agricultural does not exempt it from FPPA requirements)
- Contact NRCS at the local USDA service center <http://offices.sc.egov.usda.gov/locator/app?agency=nrcs> or your NRCS state soil scientist <https://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/nrcs/main/national/contact/states/> for assistance

✓ 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

According to the USDA Natural Resource Conservation Service Web Soil Survey, soils at the project site consist of Duzel-Jilson-Facey complex and Facey loam, both of which are classified as "not prime farmland." The project includes activities that could convert agricultural land to a non-agricultural use, but "prime farmland", "unique farmland", or "farmland of statewide or local importance" regulated under the Farmland Protection Policy Act does not occur on the project site. Because no prime farmland, unique farmland, or farmland of statewide or local importance is present at the project site, no formal compliance steps or mitigation measures are required. The project is in compliance with the Farmland Protection Policy Act.

Supporting documentation

[9 - NRCS Soil Report.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 information¹ to determine flood elevation. Include documentation and an explanation of why this is the best available information² for the site. Note that newly constructed and substantially improved³ 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.

¹ 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.

² 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.

³ 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 does not occur in the FFRMS floodplain. According to the NEPAassist mapping tool, the project site is not within a floodplain. The project is in compliance with Executive Orders 11988 and 13690. No formal compliance steps or mitigation measures are required.

Supporting documentation

[10 - Flood Insurance Map.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):

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

✓ Karuk Tribe

Completed

Other Consulting Parties

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

Given the project's large-scale ground-disturbing activities, consultation with the Karuk tribal archaeologist was required. Tribal Historic Preservation Officer/ Archaeologist Alex R. Watts-Tobin, Ph.D., and cultural resources technician Naomi Huddleston performed a reconnaissance survey to establish the sufficiency of a 1997 cultural resources survey by Dr. John Salter.

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:**

1621 Apsuun Road, Yreka, California

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

✓ No Adverse Effect

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

Document reason for finding:

Given the project's large-scale ground-disturbing activities, consultation with the Karuk tribal archaeologist was required. Tribal Historic Preservation Officer/ Archaeologist Alex R. Watts-Tobin, Ph.D., and cultural resources technician Naomi Huddleston performed a reconnaissance survey to establish the sufficiency of a 1997 cultural resources survey by Dr. John Salter. As a result of the visit and reviewing the previous survey, the THPO/Archaeologist recommended a finding of No Adverse Effects to Historic Properties for the project and that cultural resources monitoring provide oversight given the scale of ground disturbance required.

Does the No Adverse Effect finding contain conditions?

✓ Yes (check all that apply)

Avoidance

Modification of project

Other

Describe conditions here:

Cultural resource monitoring is required during all ground disturbing activities.

No

Adverse Effect

Screen Summary

Compliance Determination

Given the project's large-scale ground-disturbing activities, consultation with the Karuk tribal archaeologist was required. Tribal Historic Preservation Officer/ Archaeologist Alex R. Watts-Tobin, Ph.D., and cultural resources technician Naomi Huddleston performed a reconnaissance survey to establish the sufficiency of a 1997 cultural resources survey by Dr. John Salter. As a result of the visit and reviewing the previous survey, the THPO/Archaeologist recommended a finding of No Adverse Effects to Historic Properties for the project and that cultural resources monitoring provide oversight given the scale of ground disturbance required. No other formal compliance steps or mitigation measures are required. As part of the Section 106 consultation process, a letter describing the proposed project and requesting concurrence with a 1997 cultural resources survey was sent to Karuk Tribe THPO/Archaeologist Alex R. Watts-Tobin, Ph.D. Watts-Tobin surveyed the project site with cultural resources technician Naomi Huddleston and sent a letter dated June 12, 2025, with the following recommendations: A finding of No Adverse Effects to Historic Properties from the project, and cultural monitoring in view of the scale of ground disturbance required by the project. No other formal compliance or mitigation measures are required.

Supporting documentation

[11 - 25-06-12 Akana-YHS.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.

Based on the response, the review is in compliance with this section. Document and upload a map showing the location of the project relative to any noise generators below.

Noise generators were found within the threshold distances.

Screen Summary

Compliance Determination

The Preliminary Screening identified no noise generators in the vicinity of the project. The project is in compliance with HUD's Noise regulation.

Supporting documentation

[12 - Noise Generators Map.pdf](#)

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. According to the NEPAassist mapping tool, the project site is not on a sole-source aquifer. The nearest sole-source aquifer is 150 miles northwest in Florence, Oregon. The project is in compliance with

Sole Source Aquifer requirements. No formal compliance steps or mitigation measures are required.

Supporting documentation

[13 - Sole-Source Aquifers Map 2.pdf](#)

[13 - Sole-Source Aquifers Map 1.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

While the project does involve new construction, it is not within a wetland, according to the NEPAassist mapping tool. The site is an area of high slopes on a small hill. The NEPAassist tool lists an area approximately 50 feet east from the project site as riverine. The area may act as seasonal streams but were dry when site reconnaissance was conducted. The project will not impact on- or off-site wetlands. The project is in compliance with Executive Order 11990. No formal compliance steps or mitigation measures are required.

Supporting documentation

[14 - Wetlands Map.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

According to the NEPAssist mapping tool, the project site is not in proximity to a Wild and Scenic River. The nearest Wild and Scenic-designated river is the Klamath River, 12 miles north of the project site. As the project site is not in proximity to a Wild and Scenic-designated river, no formal compliance steps or mitigation measures are required. The project is in compliance with the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act.

Supporting documentation

[15 - Wild-and-Scenic Rivers Map.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.

Supporting documentation

Are formal compliance steps or mitigation required?

Yes

No