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**Project Name:** Neighborhood Action and Fact Redevelopment Area

**Responsible Entity:** City of Omaha, Planning Department, Housing and Community Development Division

**Certifying Officer Name & Title** [24 CFR 58.2(a)(2)]: William Lukash, Provisional Assistant Director-City of Omaha Planning Department, Housing and Community Development

**Environmental Review Record (ERR) File #:** 2017-001

**Project Location:** Omaha, Nebraska

**Estimated Total Project Cost (all sources):** approximately $16,600,000

**Amount of HUD Assistance:** approximately $14,000,000

**HUD Grant Program:** HOME, CDBG

**Grant Recipient (if different from Responsible Entity) [24 CFR 58.2(a)(5)]:**

**Recipient Address & Phone:**

**RE Project Contact Name & Phone:**

**CONDITIONS FOR APPROVAL:**

The developer must follow the City of Omaha’s (“City”) building codes for housing construction projects\(^1\). The building codes are available to the public through the City’s website.

All new construction must be built with radon resistant construction. This means a passive radon system must be installed. When the home is finished, a subsequent test must be conducted to ensure that radon levels are low. If not, the passive system must be converted to an active system. Radon mitigation must occur if the radon levels are high. This likely means the passive radon system will be converted to an active system. Please see the **Contamination and Toxic Substances** section.

Developers must work with the City to ensure the soil on all properties is sampled for high lead concentrations and cleaned-up, if necessary. Please see the **Contamination and Toxic Substances** section.

Developers should consult with the City about any future building sites due to concerns over lead contamination, noise, and historic preservation.

\(^1\) City of Omaha Planning Department, Codes and Amendments [https://permits.cityofomaha.org/codes-amendments](https://permits.cityofomaha.org/codes-amendments)
FINDING: [58.40(g)]

☒ Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI)
(The project will not result in a significant impact on the quality of the human environment.)

☐ Finding of Significant Impact
(The project may significantly affect the quality of the human environment.)

Preparer Signature: ___________________________ Date: ________________
Preparer Name & Title: Nicole Engels, Environmental City Planner
Preparer’s Agency (If Different from RE): ___________________________
RE Approving Official Signature: ___________________________ Date: ________________
RE Approving Official Name & Title: William Lukash, Provisional Assistant Director-Housing and Community Development

PROJECT PURPOSE/DESCRIPTION:
The Neighborhood Action and Fact Redevelopment Area (NAFRA) is bounded on the north by Sprague Street, Wirt Street on the south, 24th Street on the east, and 27th Street/the North Freeway on the west. The neighborhood began developing in the 1890s and was fully developed by the 1940s. It is a largely residential neighborhood with some civic and commercial spaces. This neighborhood revitalization effort will prioritize properties within these boundaries but will not be strictly limited to them. Nearby properties may also be affected as part of the redevelopment effort.

The purpose of the redevelopment plan is to develop and implement a holistic neighborhood revitalization plan with input from the community. One aspect of this is to improve housing throughout the NAFRA through site clearance, demolition of degraded structures, construction of infill housing, and rehabilitation of existing structures. While the 2016 redevelopment plan calls for approximately 60 single-family homes to be built on currently vacant parcels, this plan may instead focus on rehabilitation of existing structures, ________________

2 Neighborhood Action and Fact Redevelopment Area Map, See Appendix 1
3 Neighborhood Action and Fact Redevelopment Plan, 2016, See Appendix 1
demolition of degraded structures, small public improvement projects, and streetscape projects. While some homes are likely to be built, that will be a smaller aspect of the City's activities in the area. The redevelopment plan calls for approximately 80 homes to be rehabilitated. While the City may purchase, rehabilitate, and resell these properties, owner-occupants and investor-owners will also receive grant assistance. Habitat for Humanity will also be focusing on the same area with rehabilitation, demolition, and new construction projects. Other developers, such as Gesu Housing or Holy Name Housing, may also develop properties in the neighborhood.

The NAF Redevelopment Plan allows for low-density multi-family housing and mixed-used development along the 24\textsuperscript{th} Street corridor. A mix of Community Development Block Grants, City Redevelopment Bonds, Tax Increment Financing, and private development funds may be used for this development.

At the time that this Environmental Assessment was prepared, the exact addresses where work will take place have not been identified. As individual properties are identified, a Tier II Environmental Assessment will be conducted prior to any funds being committed to the site. Sections of the assessment needing further investigation in the Tier II will be identified throughout this document.

**EXISTING CONDITIONS AND TRENDS**

Over the last sixty years, the population in the larger North Omaha area has declined to approximately a third the size that it was in 1960. Between 2000 and 2010, the NAFRA stayed relatively stable in the number of residents (1,072 in 2000, 1,062 in 2010) and the number of housing units (533 in 2000, 539 in 2010). While housing in the NAFRA was already predominantly renter-occupied in 2000, there was an almost 10\% increase in renter-occupied properties by 2010 (57.6\% to 67.4\%)\footnote{Neighborhood Action and Fact Redevelopment Plan, 2016, See Appendix 1}. The housing stock shows some signs of decay. A survey conducted during the establishment of the redevelopment plan found that only about 30\% of homes in the NAFRA were in good condition. 68 of the 323 surveyed (19.8\%) had major condition issues. There are also more than 100 vacant lots within the NAFRA.

There are positive activities in the NAFRA that the City and developers can build on. The Salvation Army is planning a $10 million project that will expand on the physical facility as well as the social services and recreational activities available to the community. There is a strong, core group of neighbors that are dedicated to the improvement of the community as well. The neighborhood association is active in planning events such as block parties and representing the area at the North Omaha Neighborhood Alliance. In the summer of 2017, they received a small grant from the City’s Mayor’s Office for beautification along North 24\textsuperscript{th} Street. Plants were purchased and the neighborhood association is working with the community to provide continued care for them.
The following sections provide information about each of the 24 CFR §58.5 categories. Each category is either in compliance or not. This is indicated in the “status” box.

An “A” indicates the project is in compliance because, either because (1) the nature of the project does not implicate the authority under consideration, or (2) supporting information documents that project compliance has been achieved.

A “B” indicates the project requires an additional compliance step or action, including but not limited to consultation with or approval from and oversight agency, performance of a study or analysis, completion of remediation or mitigation measures, or obtaining a license of permit.

Compliance documentation consists of verifiable source documents and/or relevant base data. Much of the information used to generate this EA was obtained from websites and therefore website links are provided as a resource. Resources that could be easily reproduced are attached. The remaining resources can be accessed by contacting the City staff presented in the Finding section presented previously.

1. AIR QUALITY
Statute, Authority, Executive Order Regulation, or Policy cited at 24 CFR §58.5:
Clean Air Act sections 176(c) & (d), and 40 CFR 6, 51, 93]

Compliance Status: A

Air Quality [Clean Air Act Section 176 (c) & (d), and 40 CFR 6, 51, 93]

According to the United States Environmental Protection Agency, (“EPA”), Douglas County, where Omaha is located, has not had a non-attainment problem since the year 2000. The development area is not located in a non-attainment area. Although air quality fluctuates in Omaha, the air quality is acceptable. The development area is, however, located next to the North Freeway/Highway 75. Environmental justice scores, discussed below, suggest that the area has high levels of pollutants such as PM2.5. If there are mitigation measures that can be taken within the NAFRA, their implementation should be considered.

---

5 Nebraska Nonattainment/Maintenance Status for Each County by Year for All Criteria Pollutants, United States Environmental Protection Agency, https://www3.epa.gov/airquality/greenbook/anayo_ne.html, accessed 6/7/2017, see Appendix 2

6 PM2.5 is fine, inhalable particles with diameters generally 2.5 micrometers and smaller, United States Environmental Protection Agency, https://www.epa.gov/pm-pollution/particulate-matter-pm-basics, accessed 1/16/2018
Air quality permits in Omaha are issued by the Omaha Air Quality Control ("OAQC"). There are three types of permits issued by OAQC; construction permits\(^7\), air operating permits\(^8\), and administrative permits\(^9\). Based on the definitions provided by OAQC, housing construction and rehabilitation do not require any of the three permits. There are no permitted facilities within the NAFRA. The closest facility with a permit issued by OAQC is West Plains, LLC., which is approximately 0.8 miles from the southeast corner of the NAFRA. Several other permitted sources are between one and two miles from the site. It is under the purview of OAQC to assure that all facilities are in compliance with the issued permits and applicable regulations.

OAQC also oversees EPA's hazardous air pollutant regulations (called "MACT" standards) within the jurisdiction of Omaha. These regulations cover a broad spectrum of pollutants and activities. Affected sources include those that may already be permitted as well as smaller “area” sources that do not require a construction or operating permit. They are required to submit annual compliance notifications to OAQC. There are no area sources identified within the boundaries of the NAFRA. In an email\(^10\), OAQC noted that there is one metal fabrication facility to the north of the site on 25\(^{th}\) Street approximately 150 feet north of Sprague Street. In a windshield survey, Planning staff identified a mechanic and auto body shop that OAQC was not aware of. They will contact the facility to assure compliance with all relevant regulations. OAQC has not identified any other affected sources within the redevelopment area.

**Asbestos**

Asbestos is a hazardous material that was used in a wide variety of products, including building materials, that is linked to a variety of lung diseases. Asbestos abatement activities in single-family dwellings and multi-family dwellings with four or fewer units are addressed in Nebraska’s Department of Health and Human Services in the Nebraska Administrative Code, Title 178, Chapter 22\(^{11}\). Housing within the NAFRA exists mostly of such structures and all projects must comply with these regulations.

The NAFRA does contain some commercial structures. While it is unlikely that these will be affected by HUD-funded activities, 40 CFR 61 Subpart M lays out USEPA’s regulations for abatement and demolition of these structures. These structures are also subject to the Nebraska Department of Health and Human Services regulations noted above.

---

\(^7\) Construction Permitting Program, Omaha Air Quality Control, https://publicworks.cityofomaha.org/air-quality-control/permitting-programs/construction-permit-program, accessed 6/7/2017, see Appendix 2

\(^8\) Operating Permit Program, Omaha Air Quality Control, https://publicworks.cityofomaha.org/air-quality-control/permitting-programs/operating-permit-program, accessed 6/7/2017, see Appendix 2

\(^9\) Administrative Permits, Omaha Air Quality Control, https://publicworks.cityofomaha.org/air-quality-control/permitting-programs/administrative-permits, accessed 6/7/2017, see Appendix 2

\(^10\) Email with Dan May, Omaha Air Quality Control, 6/7/2017, See Appendix 2

2. AIRPORT HAZARDS

Statute, Authority, Executive Order Regulation, or Policy cited at 24 CFR §58.5:

(Clear Zones and Accident Potential Zones) [24 CFR 51D]

**Compliance Status: A**

The development area is located approximately 2.75 miles from the end of the nearest runway (14L-32R) at Omaha’s Eppley Airfield. The project is not located within a Runway Protection Zone (“RPZ”) of Eppley Airfield. Please see **Appendix 3** for a map of the airport layout\(^\text{12}\).

The Millard Airport is located just over 10 miles from the project site. The project site is not located in the RPZ of the Millard Airport. Please see **Appendix 3** for a map of the airport layout\(^\text{13}\).

The nearest military airfield, Offutt Air Force Base in Bellevue, NE is greater than 12 miles away. The project site is not located in the Clear Zone or the Accident Potential Zone. Please see **Appendix 3** for a map of the airfield layout\(^\text{14}\).

3. COASTAL ZONE MANAGEMENT

Statute, Authority, Executive Order Regulation, or Policy cited at 24 CFR §58.5:

[Coastal Zone Management Act sections 307(c) & (d)]

**Compliance Status: A**

There are no coastal zones within Nebraska\(^\text{15}\).

---

\(^{12}\) Eppley Airfield Airport Layout Drawing, Coffman Associates, December 2, 1997, see **Appendix 3**

\(^{13}\) Millard Airport, Airport Layout Plan, Airport Layout Drawing, February 6, 2009, see **Appendix 3**

\(^{14}\) Department of the Air Force, Air Combat Command, Offutt AFB, AICUZ, Figure 3: Accident Potential Zones, June 2006, see **Appendix 3**

\(^{15}\) Ocean and Coastal Resources Management, https://coast.noaa.gov/czm/mystate/, accessed 5/15/2017, see **Appendix 4**
4. Contamination and Toxic Substances

Statute, Authority, Executive Order Regulation, or Policy cited at 24 CFR §58.5:

[24 CFR 58.5 (i)(2)]

Compliance Status: B

Lead
According to the Omaha Lead Registry, the redevelopment area is located within the focus area of the Omaha Lead Superfund Site (“OLS”)\(^\text{16}\). The OLS addresses lead contamination at residential and residential-type properties which became contaminated due to historic air emissions from two lead smelting operations located along the Missouri River in eastern Omaha. The status of properties in the development area vary. The City now manages the OLS through a cooperative agreement with the United States Environmental Protection Agency (“EPA”). The City will work with contractors, mostly Habitat for Humanity, to ensure properties needing sampling and properties awaiting soil clean-up are addressed following the OLS sampling and remediation protocols.

Radon
Omaha is in Radon Zone 1. Areas in Zone 1 have the highest potential for radon levels exceeding 4 picoCuries per Liter. Homes with radon levels exceeding 4 picoCuries per Liter should have radon mitigated. The City has developed radon policies for new construction\(^\text{17}\). All new construction projects must follow this policy. A copy of the radon policy is attached.

Hazardous Sites
City staff conducted a field survey, reviewed historical and current aerial photography and the Sandborn Fire Insurance Company maps, and utilized the EPA’s NEPAssist tool\(^\text{18}\) to assess what, if any, potentially hazardous sites are in the NAFRA. There are currently several commercial and light industrial sites along the perimeter of the NAFRA. As noted above, there is one metal fabrication shop and one mechanic shop directly to the north of the NAFRA boundaries. Within half a mile, there are several other industrial sites to the north and east of the NAFRA boundaries. It is unlikely that these sites will have an impact on the NAFRA.

Historically, the NAFRA has not had any development of significant concern. Sandborn Fire Insurance Company maps indicate that there have never been any underground storage tanks or industrial development within the boundaries of the NAFRA. There has been no evidence of potentially hazardous sites found through the review process.

The Tier II environmental review process will be required to address lead and radon hazards as specific addresses for rehabilitation and new construction are identified.

---

\(^{16}\) Omaha Lead Superfund Site, www.omahalead.org, accessed 6/7/2017

\(^{17}\) Radon Mitigation for Rehabilitation Projects Policy, City of Omaha, August 2015, see Appendix 5

5. ENDANGERED SPECIES
Statute, Authority, Executive Order Regulation, or Policy cited at 24 CFR §58.5:
[50 CFR 402]

Compliance Status: A

Since the development area is located in an urban area and isn’t located in near a waterway, it is highly unlikely that any threatened or endangered species, or critical habitat, are present in this area.

The City of Omaha had contacted both the Nebraska Game and Parks Commission ("NGPC") and the United States Fish and Wildlife Service ("USFWS") to determine if threatened or endangered species, or critical habitats, will be impacted by this project. Letters of inquiry were sent to both agencies in 2016.

On February 2, 2017, the USFWS provided a response indicating they had “no concerns.”

On February 17, 2017, the NGPC provided a response indicating that “the project as described will have no adverse effects on state-listed endangered or threatened species.”

6. ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE
Statute, Authority, Executive Order Regulation, or Policy cited at 24 CFR §58.5:
[Executive Order 12898]

Compliance Status: A

As noted previously in Section 4 Contamination and Toxic Substances, there are a number of near-by industrial sites or sites that may handle toxic waste, but they are all sufficiently distant from the boundaries of the site to not be of concern. The EJScreen web tool was used to determine if there were any environmental justice ("EJ") indexes that were high (indicating potential environmental justice issues.)

An EJSCREEN Report is attached. PM2.5, Traffic Proximity and Volume, Lead Paint Indicator, and Proximity to NPL sites all score highly in the State Percentile category. This is not surprising since the sites are located within an area with older housing, are near three major roads, and is located in the Final Focus area.

---

19 Letter from Eliza Hines, United States Fish and Wildlife Service, to William Lukash, City of Omaha, February 2, 2017, see Appendix 6

20 Letter from Carey Grell, Nebraska Game and Park Commission, to William Lukash, City of Omaha, February 17, 2017, see Appendix 6


22 EJSCREEN Report, Neighborhood Action and Fact Redevelopment Area, United States Environmental Protection Agency, accessed 6/7/2017, see Appendix 7
Area of the Omaha Lead Site. The NAFRA is also close to an industrial area, although the facilities discussed in the hazardous sites review all seem to be in compliance with relevant regulations or are no longer operating. All of the variables score highly on the EPA Region Percentile as well.

People living in new homes will not be affected by lead-based paint and rehabilitation projects are also likely to reduce lead-based paint hazards. The new homes will be built with sufficient noise mitigation, see Noise Control, below. PM2.5 is something the City has been dealing with for many years. There have not been any significant programs to address the issue. There have been efforts to curb ground level ozone, which is tied to many of the same sources (namely automobiles) as PM2.5. The same activities targeted for ground level ozone reductions would likely also result in lower PM2.5 levels. The high air pollution scores in this Census Block Group, which is high even relative to other high areas, could be related to the proximity of the North Freeway/Highway 75. Other potential sources of PM2.5 nearby include OPPD’s North Omaha power plant. Currently, the facility has two coal-fired energy generating units (EGUs) and one natural gas fired EGU. By 2023, all three EGUs are planned to be converted to burn natural gas, which will lead to a reduction in PM2.5. The City and partners will continue to consider options for air quality improvements as they are identified.

No further action is required to address EJ issues, however it may be worthwhile to consider how to reduce these issues as redevelopment plans further solidify. Lead hazards and healthy home concerns will be addressed as specific sites for rehabilitation and new construction are identified. Noise burdens will be lessened by new construction and rehabilitation efforts. Focusing on rehabilitation instead of new construction may create a smaller increase in the density of low-income residents in this area with high EJ scores.

7. EXPLOSIVES AND FLAMMABLE OPERATIONS

Statute, Authority, Executive Order Regulation, or Policy cited at 24 CFR §58.5:

[24 CFR 51C]

Compliance Status: A

A visual survey of aerial photographs and an on-the-ground survey of properties in the NAFRA did not identify any above ground storage tanks (“AST”) within a mile of the site’s borders. There does not appear to be a risk from explosives or flammable operations to this project.
8. FARMLAND PROTECTION  
Statute, Authority, Executive Order Regulation, or Policy cited at 24 CFR §58.5:

[7 CFR 658]

Compliance Status: A

There is no farmland at the project site. Farmland will not be impacted by this project.

9. FLOODPLAIN MANAGEMENT  
Statute, Authority, Executive Order Regulation, or Policy cited at 24 CFR §58.5:

[24 CFR 55, Executive Order 11988]

Compliance Status: A

The entire area of the NAFRA is located on Floodplain Panel 31055C0237H. Within the boundaries of the NAFRA is classified as Zone X. There are no special flood hazard areas within the redevelopment area.

10. HISTORIC PRESERVATION  
Statute, Authority, Executive Order Regulation, or Policy cited at 24 CFR §58.5:

[36 CFR 800]

Compliance Status: B

Development within the NAFRA goes back to the 1890s. Within the boundaries of the project are 13 structures (commercial and single-family homes) that are recommended to be placed on the National Register of Historic Places and more than sixty that will require further investigation.

As part of the Tier II Environmental Assessment for every structure, a Section 106 historic review must be conducted before any site is committed to. The City is able to make this determination through a Programmatic Agreement between the City and the State Historic Preservation Officer.

---

23 Neighborhood Action and Fact Redevelopment Area map, see Appendix 1


25 Neighborhood Action and Fact Redevelopment Plan, 2016
11. **NOISE CONTROL**

*Statute, Authority, Executive Order Regulation, or Policy cited at 24 CFR §58.5:*

[24 CFR 51B]

**Compliance Status:** B

There are several road noise sources near the redevelopment area, North 24th Street, Sprague Street, Bristol Street, and Spencer Street. There are other near-by roads, but the traffic count data for these roads is not available and so it is assumed they do not significantly contribute to the noise levels at the site. Road noise sources with traffic count data will not affect all.

The North Freeway/Highway 75 is located along the western border of the NAFRA. There is an earthen berm that runs the entire length of this boundary. It is generally about eight feet above the height of North 27th Street. Because of this berm, it is assumed that the North Freeway does not significantly contribute to the noise level at homes within the NAFRA.

No railroad main lines are located within 3,000 feet of the project site. It is assumed that this noise source does not significantly contribute to the noise levels of the neighborhood.

There are five airfields located within 15 miles of the project site. Those noise sources include Eppley Airfield, Council Bluffs Municipal Airport, Offutt Air Force Base, North Omaha Airport, and Millard Airport. The North Omaha Airport is not publicly owned and therefore is not required to have noise contour maps. It is approximately 4 miles from the project site so it is unlikely to contribute noise. The noise contour maps for Offutt Air Force Base\(^{27}\) and Eppley Airfield\(^{28}\) indicate that noise levels from the these airfields do not extend to the site. The Millard Airport is defined as a “reliever” airport and therefore is not required to have noise contour maps. The Council Bluffs Airport does not have noise contour maps, but the site is located over 10 miles from the Development Area and so is unlikely to be of concern.

Because there are several locations scattered across the Development Area, two properties which are likely to be subjected to the highest noise levels were evaluated. Those properties were 2423 N 25th Street and 3304 N 24th Street. No other properties are likely to have higher noise levels than these two.

HUD’s Day Night Noise Level Calculator was used to determine the noise level at the selected sites. Data used in the calculation is presented in the attached print outs. The calculated noise level at 2423 N 25th

---


\(^{27}\) Figure 4a: 1992 Noise Contour, Department of the Air Force, Air Combat Command, Offutt AFB, June 2006, see Appendix 10

\(^{28}\) Aircraft Noise Exposure Comparison – Past vs. Future, Airport Master Plan, Executive Summary Update, Omaha Airport Authority, page 6, 2001, see Appendix 10
Street is 60.4 decibels\(^{29}\), which is in HUD's Acceptable Noise Level range of under 65 decibels. The calculated noise level at 3304 N 24\(^{th}\) Street is 66.7 decibels\(^{30}\). This is in HUD's Normally Unacceptable Noise Level range of 65.1-75.0 decibels.

HUD further requires a 10-year noise projection when it is possible to create one. The Metropolitan Area Planning Agency predicts that the population will increase by 12.7\% between 2010 and 2020\(^{31}\). The City assumes that traffic counts will increase by about the same amount, and so the traffic counts were increased by 12.7\% and the model calculator was run again. The projected noise levels are 61.0\(^{32}\) and 67.2\(^{33}\) decibels, respectively.

Noise mitigation is potentially required for some projects. All potential projects should be evaluated for noise levels in the Tier II Environmental Assessments.

12. **WATER QUALITY (SOLE SOURCE AQUIFERS)**

**Statute, Authority, Executive Order Regulation, or Policy cited at 24 CFR §58.5:**

[40 CFR 149]

**Compliance Status:** A

There are no Sole Source Aquifers in EPA Region 7 which includes Iowa, Kansas, Missouri and Nebraska\(^{34}\).

---

\(^{29}\) Current Noise Calculation for 2423 N 25\(^{th}\) Street, Site DNL Calculator, United States Department of Housing and Urban Development, https://www.hudexchange.info/environmental-review/dnl-calculator/, accessed 8/18/2017, see Appendix 10

\(^{30}\) Current Noise Calculation for 3304 N 24\(^{th}\) Street, Site DNL Calculator, United States Department of Housing and Urban Development, https://www.hudexchange.info/environmental-review/dnl-calculator/, accessed 8/18/2017, see Appendix 10


\(^{33}\) Projected Noise Calculation for 3304 N 24\(^{th}\) Street, Site DNL Calculator, United States Department of Housing and Urban Development, https://www.hudexchange.info/environmental-review/dnl-calculator/, accessed 8/23/2017, see Appendix 10

13. WETLAND PROTECTION
Statute, Authority, Executive Order Regulation, or Policy cited at 24 CFR §58.5:

[24 CFR 55, Executive Order 11990]

Compliance Status: A

The United States Fish and Wildlife Service’s National Wetlands Inventory web tool\textsuperscript{35} was used to determine if there are any wetlands at the project site. The screen capture presented below shows that there are no wetlands at the project site.

---

14. **WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS**  
**Statute, Authority, Executive Order Regulation, or Policy cited at 24 CFR §58.5:**  
[36 CFR 297]  
**Compliance Status: A**  

According to the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System website\(^{36}\), there are two rivers in Nebraska in the wild and scenic rivers system. The designated sections of the Missouri\(^{37}\) and Niobrara\(^{38}\) Rivers are not located anywhere near the project site. Additionally, the proposed activities at this site will not impact wild and scenic rivers.


PART II: ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT CHECKLIST

[Environmental Review Guide HUD CPD-782, 24 CFR 1508.8 & 1508.27]

LAND DEVELOPMENT

CONFORMANCE WITH COMPREHENSIVE AND NEIGHBORHOOD PLANS

Anticipated or Potential Impact

☐ Adverse
☒ Beneficial
☐ No Impact

Discussion

The City's Comprehensive Plan calls for the construction of new, affordable housing.39 Housing for extremely low, low, moderate, and middle income large families, families with children, the elderly, public housing residents, the elderly and frail elderly, persons with physical disabilities and persons with developmental disabilities are a high priority.

The City developed the NAFRA plan in 2016. The redevelopment plan calls for the construction of affordable housing as well as the rehabilitation of current homes. Other plans for this neighborhood could include making the community easier for the elderly and those with physical disabilities to traverse. These plans are in line with the goals set in the Comprehensive Plan.

The North Omaha Village Revitalization Plan40 states “build new affordable and market rate housing with a diversity of housing types.”

Habitat for Humanity also owns a significant number of lots in the NAFRA and plans to build affordable single family homes. This is compliant with the North Omaha Village Plan.


41 North Omaha Village Revitalization Plan, Executive Summary, April 5, 2011, p 9.
LAND USE COMPATIBILITY AND CONFORMANCE WITH ZONING

Anticipated or Potential Impact

☐ Adverse
☒ Beneficial
☐ No Impact

Discussion

The City’s Master Plan Future Land Use Map\(^\text{42}\) shows the proposed future land use for this site is mostly low-density residential. The City and Habitat for Humanity’s plan to build and rehabilitate mostly residences is consistent with the Future Land Use Map. The City will work to address any inconsistencies between the goals of the redevelopment plan, the current zoning, and the Future Land Use Map.

A majority of the area is zoned for residential use\(^\text{43}\), although there are areas reserved for commercial purposes. The sites with potential for housing construction appear to have the appropriate zoning classification and would lessen the number of vacant lots in the NAFRA.

URBAN DESIGN – VISUAL QUALITY AND SCALE

Anticipated or Potential Impact

☐ Adverse
☒ Beneficial
☐ No Impact

Discussion

All of the lots with the potential for housing construction are vacant or the structures at the sites are in poor condition. Development of this area will help bring the neighborhood together in a visual way. The proposed single-family homes are consistent with the types of homes already present in the area. The NAFRA has a large number of homes that have become somewhat run down or have not been well maintained on the exterior. By focusing on redevelopment of homes, the visual quality of the NAFRA will be raised throughout the neighborhood and maintain the potentially historic quality of many of the structures.


**SLOPE**

**Anticipated or Potential Impact**

- □ Adverse
- □ Beneficial
- ☒ No Impact

**Discussion**

The NAFRA is a flat neighborhood with only small elevation changes throughout. There is about 18 feet of elevation change across the development, with the highest point (1,042 feet above mean sea level) located in the northeastern corner and the lowest point (1,022 feet above mean sea level) located in the southeastern area.

All single-family lots have previously developed for single-family housing, so slope should not be significant problem at these sites, however this will need to be evaluated for each site individually.
EROSION

Anticipated or Potential Impact

☐ Adverse
☐ Beneficial
☒ No Impact

Discussion

Because all sites developed will be under an acre, neither the City nor any other contractor should need to develop and be permitted for a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (“SWPPP”). However, there is still a duty to prevent sediment from erosion reaching the streets and waterways established in City code44. Habitat for Humanity sometimes does projects that include larger areas of multiple homes that may exceed one acre. If a project of this scale is planned, Habitat, or any other developer, must apply for and be issued a SWPPP and comply with all terms of the SWPPP. Erosion should not be a problem as long as property grading and stormwater runoff design criteria are observed.

SOIL SUITABILITY

Anticipated or Potential Impact

☐ Adverse
☐ Beneficial
☒ No Impact

Discussion

The soil in this area is composed of three units, Urban land-Udorthents-Pohocco complex, Urban land-Udorthents-Marshall complex, and Urban land-Udorthents-Judson complex45. Urban lands are soils that have been highly modified due to anthropomorphic causes. They are not designated as prime farmland. In this case the soils have been modified due to site grading and home construction. It does not appear that the soil is unsuitable for housing construction or any other proposed undertaking under the NRI. Based on this information there is no evidence that the soil is unsuitable for development.


45 Custom Soil Resource Report for Douglas County, Nebraska, Neighborhood Action and Fact, Web Soil Survey, United States Department of Agriculture, 5/11/2017, see Appendix 13
HAZARDS AND NUISANCES, INCLUDING SITE SAFETY

Anticipated or Potential Impact

☐ Adverse
☒ Beneficial
☐ No Impact

Discussion

The NAFRA has seen a decline in the condition of housing over the last twenty years. Vacant lots, abandoned homes, and structures in poor condition can all provide hazards and nuisances. This project will provide the opportunity for site clearance, including demolition of degraded structures and cleanup of unmaintained vacant lots, construction of new infill housing, and rehabilitation of existing structures. By removing these hazards, the redevelopment activities will have a beneficial impact on the neighborhood.

Site preparation and construction activities may create site-safety hazards if the work area is not properly secured. Anticipated hazards are consistent with routine construction operations. Operations will be conducted in accordance with the requirements of OSHA Construction Standards and any that may be required by the City of Omaha. Once completed, there should be no other hazards or nuisances associated with the proposed action.

NOISE – EFFECTS OF AMBIENT NOISE ON PROJECT AND CONTRIBUTION TO COMMUNITY NOISE LEVELS

Anticipated or Potential Impact

☐ Adverse
☒ Beneficial
☐ No Impact

Discussion

As previously discussed in detail, the site is located in an area with high noise levels due to traffic along North 24th Street, Sprague Street, and Bristol Street. The North Freeway/Highway 75 also runs along the western border of the neighborhood. While there is an earthen berm that runs along the freeway, the City may consider options to further dampen noise resulting from this source. This would be beneficial to the neighborhood.

Elevated noise levels may occur during site preparation and construction activities at the project site. These sources will likely only occur during the daytime, and be of relatively short duration. Noise sources will be associated with construction equipment, tools and deliveries of construction materials.

Following completion, the project should have no significant impact on ambient noise in the site vicinity or on community noise levels. Noise levels at some project sites, particularly rehabilitation projects, may be
reduced due to improvements in building materials. New windows and doors are likely to be better at noise mitigation than old materials that may not be in good condition.

**AIR QUALITY – EFFECTS OF AMBIENT AIR QUALITY ON PROJECT AND CONTRIBUTION TO COMMUNITY POLLUTION LEVELS**

**Anticipated or Potential Impact**

- [ ] Adverse
- [ ] Beneficial
- [x] No Impact

**Discussion**

Site preparation and construction activities will not significantly impact ambient air quality standards. Any impacts are expected to be of comparatively short duration during the site preparation and construction phases of the project.

Based upon the project scope, the proposed action will not require an air emissions permit.

This neighborhood has elevated environmental justice scores\(^{46}\), many of which relate to the proximity of the North Freeway/Highway 75. The City will consider if there are any actions that may be taken to mitigate some of these air quality issues, such as planting trees as part of construction projects.

If suitable mitigation techniques can be implemented, the project will be beneficial to the air quality of the NAFRA. If not, the project is considered to have no significant impact on air quality, either positive or negative.

---

\(^{46}\) EJSCREEN Report, Neighborhood Action and Fact Redevelopment Area, United States Environmental Protection Agency, accessed 6/7/2017, see Appendix 7
ENERGY CONSERVATION

Anticipated or Potential Impact

☐ Adverse
☒ Beneficial
☐ No Impact

Discussion

It is not known at this time if energy conservation features will be built into the homes. It is possible that they may be. Modern construction standards certainly have energy conservation in mind, and modern structures are significantly more energy efficient than older buildings, specifically those built 100 years ago.

Rehabilitation of existing structures will be a significant aspect of revitalization efforts in the NAFRA. Rehabilitation efforts often include updating windows and doors. Sometimes more substantial equipment such as furnaces or water heaters are updated as well. These efforts will result in better energy efficiency for rehabilitated structures.

A significant amount of energy will be expended to construct these homes. Massive soil grading and filling activities are necessary, along with tree removal, the construction of retaining walls, and associated activities.

However, in the end, the homeowners will benefit the most from new, energy efficient construction.
SOCIOECONOMIC FACTORS

**Demographic Character Changes**

**Anticipated or Potential Impact**

- [ ] Adverse
- [ ] Beneficial
- [x] No Impact

**Discussion**

As discussed above, the population of the NAFRA has stayed relatively stable over the last ten years, but has declined over the last 25-30 years. Over the last ten years, there has been a relatively small, but noticeable, shift in the demographics in the NAFRA to include a greater proportion of Latino residents. This does not appear to have had a significant impact on the neighborhood.

By rehabilitating or building new homes, the NAFRA activities should bring some of the population back to the area. The impact that this would have on the demographics of the NAFRA is not clear at this time. However, focusing more on home rehabilitation than new construction would likely contribute to fewer demographic changes.

**Displacement**

**Anticipated or Potential Impact**

- [ ] Adverse
- [ ] Beneficial
- [x] No Impact

**Discussion**

The planned activities for the NAFRA will focus on vacant lots and homes as well as rehabilitation that will not require relocation of residents. Therefore, displacement should be avoided. If the situation arrives that displacement is required, HUD guidance will be followed to appropriately reimburse and relocate affected residents.
EMPLOYMENT AND INCOME PATTERNS

Anticipated or Potential Impact

☐ Adverse
☒ Beneficial
☐ No Impact

Discussion

The design and construction of the housing units will provide construction jobs. The homes themselves will not create permanent jobs.

Individuals residing in the homes may realize a savings over their hold homes if their old homes were energy inefficient.

Members of the neighborhood association have expressed that a primary goal is to work with the City to find developers and businesses that may be interested in helping to restore the 24th Street commercial corridor, using the redevelopment plans as a draw. This has the potential to provide jobs and increased income area residents.

COMMUNITY FACILITIES AND SERVICES

EDUCATIONAL FACILITIES

Anticipated or Potential Impact

☐ Adverse
☒ Beneficial
☐ No Impact

Discussion

Lothrop Magent Elementary and King Science Magnet Middle School are located in the Kountze Park Revitalization Area, which is contiguous with the NAFRA just on the east side of North 24th Street. These two neighborhoods will make up the focus area for the City’s revitalization efforts for 2018-2020. Both neighborhoods feed into these schools. Children from these neighborhoods will feed into North High School. These schools are both magnet schools that are well regarded. Lothrop Elementary is currently undergoing renovations and will reopen for the 2018-2020 school year with remodeled facilities. It may be beneficial to children moving into the neighborhood to have easy access to them.
There are several educational facilities located close to the Development Area, such as Druid Hill Elementary, Kennedy Elementary, Skinner Magnet Elementary, and ILP. Creighton University, the University of Nebraska at Omaha, and Metropolitan Community College are all located less than four miles from the Development Area. It is unlikely that the construction or rehabilitation of housing units will significantly impact the schools. Residents of the homes have access to educational facilities and improving the health of homes and neighborhoods is beneficial to students.

COMMERCIAL FACILITIES

Anticipated or Potential Impact

☐ Adverse
☒ Beneficial
☐ No Impact

Discussion

As presented at this time, the project will not directly impact commercial facilities. The project itself will not create commercial opportunities, but the site is located near a commercial area which is largely vacant and in need of rehabilitation. Members of the neighborhood association for the NAFRA have expressed a desire for the rehabilitation of these buildings and working towards new businesses to fill vacant buildings. While the City is unlikely to fund these projects, the revitalization efforts of the NAFRA plan may make the area more attractive to prospective businesses.

The City does own one commercial building in the NAFRA/Kountze Park area, the Native Omaha Building. This building is currently vacant and the City will be looking for an individual or organization with the ability to purchase and redevelop the building to a suitable use for the neighborhood.

The NAFRA is located approximately half a mile north from the development at 24th Street and Lake Street. This includes grocery stores, restaurants, cultural activities, and clothing stores. It is hard to predict how much access residents will have to, or need for, commercial facilities, but they are close at hand if there is a need.
**HEALTH CARE**

**Anticipated or Potential Impact**

- [ ] Adverse
- [x] Beneficial
- [ ] No Impact

**Discussion**

No health care facilities are located within the Development Area and the project will not directly affect health care facilities.

The Creighton University Medical Center\(^{47}\) is approximately a mile and a quarter south of the NAFRA, however most of the emergency services that this facility once housed have recently been moved to Bergan Mercy Hospital at 72\(^{nd}\) Street and Mercy Avenue, which is approximately five and a half miles from the NAFRA. The University of Nebraska\(^{48}\) Medical Center is located approximately three and a half to the south-west. This facility does have emergency services. The Charles Drew Health Center is located approximately a mile to the south-west at N 30\(^{th}\) Street and Burdette Street. There are other health care facilities within driving distance.

---

**SOCIAL SERVICES**

**Anticipated or Potential Impact**

- [ ] Adverse
- [x] Beneficial
- [ ] No Impact

**Discussion**

The Salvation Army has a large facility located within the Development Area at 24\(^{th}\) Street and Pratt Street\(^{49}\). This facility has plans to expand their facility and services within the next three to five years. Several of the surrounding vacant lots are owned by the Salvation Army and the organization is working to acquire

---

\(^{47}\) Creighton University Medical Center, http://www.chihealth.com/creighton-university-medical-center-university-campus, accessed 8/30/2017

\(^{48}\) University of Nebraska Medical Center, https://unmc.edu/patientcare/clinics-facilities/index.html, accessed 8/30/2017

several more to accommodate their expansion plans. The Salvation Army provides daily meals, a weight room and gym, after-school programs, and religious programming. The facility also serves as a meeting place for the neighborhood; Neighborhood Action and Fact holds their neighborhood association meetings here.

There are a number of social services located within a few miles of the Development Area, especially to the south where the Refugee Empowerment Center\textsuperscript{50} can be found, for example. The Siena/Francis House (Campus for Hope) is located approximately one and a half miles to the east. The Charles Drew Health Center\textsuperscript{51} provides social services, as well.

**SOLID WASTE**

**Anticipated or Potential Impact**

- [x] No Impact

**Discussion**

No solid waste facilities are located within the Development Area and the project will not directly affect solid waste facilities.

Construction of additional homes and bringing additional people into the area will likely create significant waste. The Douglas County landfill is not ‘at capacity,’ so it is unlikely the waste generated by project activities will create a problem for the landfill.

The project site is located in a part of town with regular trash service provided by the City.

\textsuperscript{50} Refugee Empowerment Center, http://refugeeempowerment.org/who-we-are-2/ accessed 5/17/2017

WASTE WATER
Anticipated or Potential Impact

☐ Adverse
☒ Beneficial
☐ No Impact

Discussion

No waste water facilities are located within the Development Area and the project will not directly affect waste water facilities.

The installation of septic system is not part of this project. The construction of sanitary sewer main lines is not part of the project. Main lines operated by the Metropolitan Utilities District are already in place. A service line to the housing units will need to be installed, but as this is, in a manner of speaking, an infill project and as such the result will be more efficient use of infrastructure.

The City of Omaha Public Work Department asked to be consulted when new housing was to be built in the eastern part of town. They said the reason was due to backflow problems in certain parts of town. Public Works was consulted on this development, and in an email the replied that this area was not of concern because the sewer lines in that area have been separated (storm water and sanitary sewer).

STORM WATER
Anticipated or Potential Impact

☐ Adverse
☒ Beneficial
☐ No Impact

Discussion

No storm water facilities are located within the Development Area and the project will not directly affect storm water facilities.

As previously stated, the storm water and sanitary sewer lines in this area have been separated (and by implication have been modernized.) Increased density in the area will make more efficient use of these city resources; however that could also add to increased runoff from more impermeable surfaces. The City’s stormwater division of Public Works has ordinances to manage the increased quantity and potentially

52 Email from Adam Wilmes, Public Works, to Nicole Engels, Planning Department, June 5, 2017, see Appendix 14
increased level of contamination. Developers and the City Planning Department will work with the stormwater team to implement all requirements for increasing density.

Contractors working on this project will also be required to follow storm water management regulations and prevent sediment and other contaminants from entering storm sewers, as discussed above.

**WATER SUPPLY**

**Anticipated or Potential Impact**

- [ ] Adverse
- [x] Beneficial
- [ ] No Impact

**Discussion**

No water supply facilities are located within the Development Area and the project will not directly affect water supply facilities. Wells will not be installed as part of this project.

The construction of water supply main lines is not part of the project. Main lines operated by the Metropolitan Utilities District are already in place. A service line from the main line to the various housing units will need to be installed. As mentioned above, this project will increase housing density, which makes more efficient use of the City’s utilities.

**PUBLIC SAFETY – POLICE**

**Anticipated or Potential Impact**

- [ ] Adverse
- [x] Beneficial
- [ ] No Impact

**Discussion**

The project does not include funding for police services or construction or modification of police stations.

Regular police coverage is offered to this area. The Omaha Police Department’s northeast precinct⁵³ is located just less than one mile to the northwest near North 30th Street and Ames Avenue.

---

⁵³ Northwest Precinct, City of Omaha Police Department, https://police.cityofomaha.org/about-us/precincts/northeast, accessed 8/30/2017
PUBLIC SAFETY – FIRE

Anticipated or Potential Impact

☐ Adverse
☒ Beneficial
☐ No Impact

Discussion
The project does not include the funding for fire department services or the construction or modification of fire stations.

Regular fire department coverage is offered to this area. Fire Station #5, located at 2209 Florence Boulevard, is approximately one mile southeast of the NAFRA. Fire hydrants are present in the neighborhood.

By rehabilitating or demolishing vacant homes, the City will be removing a fire hazard. From 2014-2016 almost 13% of all fires that the Omaha Fire Department in vacant homes. The Fire Department estimates that it costs approximately $2,000-$5,000 to put out a fire, depending on the time and equipment required.

PUBLIC SAFETY – EMERGENCY MEDICAL

Anticipated or Potential Impact

☐ Adverse
☒ Beneficial
☐ No Impact

Discussion
The project does not include the funding for the support of emergency medical services or the construction or modification of buildings for emergency medical services.

54 Fire Station #5, Omaha Fire Department, https://www.omaha-fire.org/index.php/fire-stations/station-5, accessed 8/30/2017

55 Email from Brent Van Scoy, BS, Omaha Fire Department, to Nicole Engels, Planning Department, December 1, 2016, Appendix 14

56 Email from Daryl Giles, Assistant Fire Marshal, Omaha Fire Department, to Nicole Engels, Planning Department, December 6, 2016, Appendix 14
As mentioned above, fire station #5 is close by. There are also ‘for hire’ ambulance services in Omaha. The Development Area is accessible to emergency vehicles and has easy access to major roads that lead directly to the University of Nebraska Medical Center.

Emergency medical service can be provided by the University of Nebraska Medical Center or, in a more limited capacity, Creighton University Medical Center.

**OPEN SPACE AND RECREATION – OPEN SPACE**

**Anticipated or Potential Impact**

- [ ] Adverse
- [x] Beneficial
- [ ] No Impact

**Discussion**

Currently there are a number of vacant lots creating too much open space in the Redevelopment Area. The project may develop housing on many of the vacant lots in this area, thus reducing open space, but for positive reasons.

While the primary goal of the project is not to address open space and recreation, there are opportunities for improving open space use. The City employs a planner who creates open space plans and city staff will continue to engage with residents of the NAFRA to determine where these plans would best serve the neighborhood.

**OPEN SPACE AND RECREATION – RECREATION**

**Anticipated or Potential Impact**

- [ ] Adverse
- [x] Beneficial
- [ ] No Impact

**Discussion**

There are no city parks within the boundaries of the NAFRA. The neighborhood association does own a property on the northeast corner of North 25th Ave and Manderson Ave that serves as a community garden and community gathering space. The addition of any city parks within the neighborhood is unlikely due to resource limitations.

Kountze Park is also less than a quarter mile from the Redevelopment Area and provides access to a walking trail, tennis courts, a playground, and a splash area. The King Science Magnet Middle in the
Kountze Park Revitalization Area is also within a quarter mile of the NAFRA and provide access to jogging tracks.

Other recreational activities are within driving distance.

**OPEN SPACE AND RECREATION – CULTURAL FACILITIES**

**Anticipated or Potential Impact**

- [ ] Adverse
- [x] Beneficial
- [ ] No Impact

**Discussion**

The project will not create or eliminate cultural facilities, nor provide funding for them.

There are a number of religious organizations in the area that can serve the needs of residents moving into the area, including the Salvation Army and a church that does revival services in good weather. There are, of course, more churches with a short driving distance.

Approximately a mile south of the NAFRA is a commercial district that houses Love’s Jazz Center and the Union for Contemporary Arts. This area also hosts the Native Omaha Days in August, which is a week-long festival that includes a parade, concerts, food, and other activities.

There do not appear to be any other cultural facilities within the immediate area.

**TRANSPORTATION**

**Anticipated or Potential Impact**

- [ ] Adverse
- [x] Beneficial
- [ ] No Impact

**Discussion**

The project does not call for the creation or maintenance of transportation services.
According the Metropolitan Area Planning Agency, the Redevelopment Area is located between two bus routes (#24 and 18, run along 24th Street and 18th street respectively)\(^5\) that service the neighborhood, running within a few blocks of the Development Area and connect easily with the North Omaha Transit Center at 30th Street and Sprague Street. The routes provide relatively easy access to amenities such as hospitals, grocery stores, and recreation opportunities.

Eppley Airfield is located approximately three and a half driving miles to the east of the project site.

**NATURAL FEATURES**

*WATER RESOURCES*

**Anticipated or Potential Impact**

- [ ] Adverse
- [ ] Beneficial
- [x] No Impact

**Discussion**

There are no water resources of note in this part of Omaha. Omaha’s drinking water is pulled from the Platte and Missouri Rivers. The nearest surface water body is Carter Lake, which is about two and a half miles to the east of the Redevelopment Area.

This project will not impact water resources.

---

SURFACE WATER

Anticipated or Potential Impact

☐ Adverse
☐ Beneficial
☒ No Impact

Discussion

Carter Lake is the nearest body of surface water, and that is located about a mile and a half to the east. The Missouri River is located about three miles to the east, as well.

This project will not impact surface water bodies.

UNIQUE NATURAL FEATURES AND AGRICULTURAL LANDS

Anticipated or Potential Impact

☐ Adverse
☐ Beneficial
☒ No Impact

Discussion

As previously mentioned in Farmland Protection, above, there is no farmland located within the Redevelopment Area. This project will not affect any agricultural lands.

The site topography offers some challenges during development, but certainly not insurmountable ones.

There are no unique natural features in the area.
VEGETATION AND WILDLIFE

Anticipated or Potential Impact

☐ Adverse
☐ Beneficial
☒ No Impact

Discussion

The project site is located in an urban setting. As previously stated in Endangered Species above, the project will not adversely impact threatened or endangered species, or critical habitats. There is no wildlife in the area other than squirrels, birds, raccoons and other animals found in an urban setting.

When a site is cleared, developers are asked to remove volunteer vegetation. However most vegetation removed is not significant. Because the area is already heavily developed, it is unlikely that vegetation will be impacted in an adverse way.

PART III: OTHER REQUIREMENTS

[24 CFR §58.6]

For the following sections, a response of “Yes” indicates the project is in compliance. A response of “No” indicates further action may be necessary.

FLOOD DISASTER PROTECTION ACT (FLOOD INSURANCE)

[§58.6(a)]

Status:

☒ Yes
☐ No

Discussion

The Development Area is not located within a Special Flood Hazard Area as defined by FEMA. Please see Floodplain Management, above.
COASTAL BARRIER RESOURCES ACT/COASTAL BARRIER IMPROVEMENT ACT
[§58.6(c)]

Status:
☑ Yes
☐ No

Discussion
There are no coastal zones in Nebraska. See Coastal Protection, above.

AIRPORT RUNWAY CLEAR ZONE DISCLOSURE & NOTIFICATION
[§58.6(d)]

Status:
☑ Yes
☐ No

Discussion
As discussed in Airport Hazards above, the project site is not located in CRZ or APZ. Runway clear zone disclosure and notification is not required.

PUBLIC OUTREACH

Public Notices were run in the Omaha Star and the Omaha World Herald on January 26, 2018.

On January 13, 2018, Nicole Engels from the City Planning Department attended the Neighborhood Action and Fact Neighborhood Association monthly meeting. Two paper copies of the draft assessment were left with the association members to review. One member requested that a copy be sent to her via email at that time.

At a meeting with community members and potential partnering organizations on January 17, 2018, Ms. Engels again presented on the environmental review and asked that anyone wishing for a copy provide their email address. None of the attendees requested a digital copy.

This portion of the environmental assessment will be amended as further comments are received.
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND CONCLUSIONS

PROJECT ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED
[24 CFR 58.40(e), Ref. 40 CFR 1508.9]

The No Action Alternative would be to do no work in this Redevelopment Area. However, this is one of the lowest income areas of the city. It contains a high concentration of vacant lots and homes that are deteriorating. There is little interest from outside developers, aside from Habitat for Humanity, in building homes or moving businesses to the area. NAFRA has a relatively low rate of owner-occupied homes. If the City were to choose this alternative, it is likely that the neighborhood and properties in it would continue to erode.

No other alternatives were considered for this project.

MITIGATION AND PROJECT MODIFICATION MEASURES RECOMMENDED
[24 CFR 58.40(d), 40 CFR 1508.20]

Radon testing and mitigation must be conducted for all new construction projects and select housing rehabilitation projects (see Contamination and Toxic Substances).

The City must conduct a Tier II Environmental Assessment before acquiring any lots so that environmental conditions, such as lead hazards, can be addressed (see Contamination and Toxic Substances).

ADDITIONAL STUDIES PERFORMED

No additional studies have been performed. The need for additional studies will be done on a case by case basis.

LIST OF AGENCIES AND PERSONS CONSULTED
[40 CFR 1508.9(b)]

Paul Mohr, United States Department of Housing and Urban Development, Region VII
Carey Grell, Nebraska Game and Parks Commission
Eliza Hines, United States Fish and Wildlife Service
Don Seten, City of Omaha Section 106 Historic Preservation Officer
Adam Wilmes, City of Omaha Public Works Department
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INTRODUCTION

The Neighborhood Action and Fact Redevelopment Plan (NAFRP) includes a portion of northeast Omaha bounded by Sprague Street on the north, both sides of Wirt Street on the south, 24th Street on the east and 27th Street/North Freeway on the west (See attached Map 1). These 103 acres are within an older part of the city that was declared a Community Redevelopment Area (previously known as Blighted and Substandard) by the Omaha City Council on June 2, 1992.

The redevelopment plan area is west of the recently approved King Science Redevelopment Plan (KSRP) area and is comprised of the Neighborhood Action and Fact Association area, south of Sprague Street. In an effort to transform this part of northeast Omaha, Habitat for Humanity of Omaha has been leading a revitalization effort by improving the physical environment through acquisition of vacant lots and houses, demolition of deteriorated structures, construction of new homes, and rehabilitation of existing houses for sale to owner-occupants. The more dramatic of these efforts has taken the form of what Habitat calls “Blitz Builds,” the construction of multiple single-family homes on the same block within a several week period.

While Habitat for Humanity has focused much effort in the area east of 24th Street, it has been active on the west side as well with plenty of opportunity for continued infill housing development. The housing stock varies widely in its physical condition; some units for which condition is an issue could be rehabilitated, but in many cases demolition may be a better choice for revitalization. The NAFRP allows the City of Omaha to assemble vacant lots and acquire deteriorated structures for Habitat for Humanity and other housing developers to continue the physical transformation of the neighborhood. In all, approximately 60 single-family housing units will be constructed or improved for homeownership within the NAFRP area.

The Planning Department will assist existing residents with a program of homeowner rehabilitation, handyman services and energy conservation. A City rental rehabilitation program will renovate housing units for tenant occupancy. Approximately 80 housing units will be rehabilitated.

An important consideration to this revitalization effort is North 24th Street; as much for the development opportunity it presents as for the viability of the adjacent single-family neighborhood. Like the east side of North 24th Street, the west side of 24th Street within the redevelopment area has vacant land and buildings in poor condition. New development along North 24th Street, should it occur, should be compatible with the transportation arterial while providing some buffering for the primarily single-family residential neighborhood. Low-density multi-family housing will be encouraged to meet this challenge, which could include a variety of housing configurations like town homes or apartments and could be designed for specific populations like seniors. If market conditions are favorable, a mix of other compatible low
intensity uses such as limited office, retail or other appropriate commercial uses could also be incorporated into the multi-family developments. The City will seek developers for this housing. The expansion of a long standing institutional presence is well timed to contribute to the development energy and stability within the redevelopment area. The Salvation Army, at its North Corps Community Center at North 24th and Pratt Streets, will construct a new facility replacing the current community center structure. The $10 million project will substantially expand recreational and social services to meet a growing demand with a facility occupying approximately half a city block designed to contribute to the physical transformation and long-term viability of the neighborhood.

The Neighborhood Action and Fact Association and the City of Omaha will work with a partnership of public and private organizations to create and implement holistic neighborhood revitalization. Through this broad spectrum of community partners, many of the residents’ needs will be met through: new housing construction, existing home rehabilitation, healthy home and energy-efficiency upgrades; and will include projects and programs such as the establishment of community gardens, cultural fairs, neighborhood art projects, financial management training, parenting classes and gang prevention initiatives.

Existing Conditions

About Census Information

Information about population and housing is taken from the 2000 and 2010 Decennial Census, and the American Community Survey (ACS). Some Census data, primarily basic population and housing unit counts, is available at the block level, permitting high geographic specificity which closely matches the Redevelopment Plan area boundary. Unfortunately, not all information is available at the block level. More detailed socioeconomic data related to income, employment and housing in this plan relies on sample data from the 2000 Census and five-year sample data from the 2010 ACS which is only available at the larger Block Group and/or Tract levels of geography. The tables identify the year(s) from which the information comes, and the level of geography used along with the data source (Census or ACS).

Demographics and Housing

Table 1 provides basic information about the people living within the NAFRP area, using Decennial Census information from 2000 and 2010. For reference, the table compares the Plan area data to the same information for the city as a whole. The population in the Neighborhood Action and Fact Redevelopment Plan Area remained stable from 2000 to 2010, while the population of the city overall, including annexations, experienced a small increase.

Both areas become somewhat more racially and ethnically diverse during the 2000s (ethnicity, using Census data criteria, is determined by how a survey respondent identifies him/herself, as either Hispanic or non-Hispanic.) The largest racial group within the redevelopment area, African American, was 85.3 percent of the population in 2010, while the largest racial group in the city was the white population at 75.3 percent. The decline in the African American
population represents the only loss of population by a racial group from 2000 to 2010 within the redevelopment plan area. Other racial groups experienced small numerical and proportional increases during the decade.

The proportion of Hispanic population increased somewhat from 2000 to 2010 for both the City and for the redevelopment area. The NAFRP area had very few Hispanic residents in 2000, but increased to 6.0 percent of the population by the end of the decade.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1</th>
<th>Population; 2000 &amp; 2010</th>
<th>Decennial Censuses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Population</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAF Area</td>
<td>Omaha</td>
<td>NAF Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>1,072</td>
<td>1,062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain or loss in</td>
<td>-0.9%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race/ Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One Race</td>
<td>1,032</td>
<td>1,029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>percent</td>
<td>96.3%</td>
<td>96.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>percent</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>10.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>963</td>
<td>878</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>percent</td>
<td>89.8%</td>
<td>85.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native American</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>percent</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>percent</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some other Race</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>percent</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multi-Racial</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3
Expanding on a portion of the information provided in Table 1, helps underscore a significant issue which has and will influence development within and surrounding the NAFRP area, at least in the near-term. The population change between 2000 and 2010, as indicated in Table 1, is representative of the leveling off of population losses in North Omaha in the last half-century. Starting with the 1960 Census and using an area which centers on the original North Omaha commercial corridor, North 24th Street as the study area, Table 2 clearly indicates significant levels of population decline. (The study area for this analysis is west of 16th Street, north of Cuming Street, east of 30th Street, and south of Ames Avenue.) The loss of population, particularly during the 1960s and 1970s is dramatic; declining by 33% and 43% respectively. Much of the loss can be directly linked to the extension of Interstate-480 North of downtown to Ames Avenue which was completed in the 1980s, though some can also be linked to deteriorating economic and physical conditions and the social unrest of the 1960s. Largely due to City redevelopment efforts, some census tracts have had increases in population within the study area since 2000, primarily east of 24th Street. Within the context of the North Omaha commercial market area, in terms of population, it is approximately a third of its mid-century peak.

**Table 2**

North Omaha Study Area Population: 1960 to 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Change in #</th>
<th>Change in %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>26,240</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>17,509</td>
<td>-8,731</td>
<td>-33.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>10,026</td>
<td>-7,483</td>
<td>-42.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>9,190</td>
<td>-836</td>
<td>-8.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>8,957</td>
<td>-233</td>
<td>-2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010</td>
<td>8,709</td>
<td>-248</td>
<td>-2.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Data Sources: 1960 to 2010 U.S. Censuses using complete count census track data*

The ages of the populations within the City and the redevelopment area were nearly the same, and changed very little from 2000 to 2010.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>2000 NAF Area</th>
<th>2000 Omaha</th>
<th>2010 NAF Area</th>
<th>2010 Omaha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Under 5 percent</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>28,249</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>305,041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>under 5 percent</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 19 percent</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>83,500</td>
<td>265</td>
<td>84,476</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 to 19 percent</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
<td>21.4%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>20.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 34 percent</td>
<td>176</td>
<td>91,470</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>97,356</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 to 34 percent</td>
<td>16.4%</td>
<td>23.50%</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>23.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 59 percent</td>
<td>259</td>
<td>127,252</td>
<td>313</td>
<td>130,409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35 to 59 percent</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
<td>32.60%</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
<td>31.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 to 74 percent</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>37,346</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>43,326</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 to 74 percent</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 and older percent</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>22,190</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>22,887</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 and older percent</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Sources: 2000 and 2010 U.S. Censuses using complete count block data.

In the late 2000s, Omaha, along with the rest of the nation, experienced what has been referred to as the “Great Recession,” an event triggered by, or at least related to the housing mortgage crisis. One effect of the mortgage crisis was that homeowners lost their homes. This reduced the amount of owner-occupied housing and added pressure to the rental housing market. While having fared better than many other places during this period, Census data suggests Omaha was not immune. The housing vacancy rate in Omaha went from 5.4 percent in 2000 to 8.4 percent in 2010; an increase of almost 6,000 vacant units in the city. A shift in tenure in Omaha from owner- to renter-occupied housing continued from 2000 to 2010 with the proportion of owner-occupied units declining to 58.3 percent in 2010 from 59.6 percent in 2000.

An effect of the housing mortgage crisis subsequent to the increase in vacant housing is the eventual loss of some of those housing units altogether, a process which is probably not yet complete in Omaha. While several important economic indicators such as median housing value, per-capita income and median household income, appear stable or improving in Omaha, not all
indicators are encouraging. The unemployment rate increased to nearly 7 percent in 2010 from 4.3 percent in 2000. Of equal concern was the change in the percent of people in poverty increasing by four percentage points to 15.3 percent in 2010.

Using the same housing and economic indicators, conditions within the redevelopment area clearly worsened from 2000 to 2010. Table 4 compares the redevelopment area with the City as a whole on key economic indicators. Note that the data examines the entirety of Census Tract 7, of which the NAFRP area is a smaller part. It appropriately reflects the context and setting of the Plan Area conditions, however.

While the total number of housing units increased slightly within the redevelopment area, the number of owner-occupied units dropped by approximately 25 percent and a corresponding increase in renter households took place. These changes represent a shift in tenure from owner-occupied to renter-occupied housing which is far more dramatic than that experienced for the city, and is an example of how unevenly the housing mortgage crisis can impact communities.

Housing values increased in the city, no doubt bolstered by record increases through the mid-2000s. Appreciation in housing values in redevelopment area more than kept pace with those of the city, but remained well under half of the median value for the city overall. From 2000 to 2010, median contract rent decreased dramatically within the redevelopment area.

Measures of income and the economic well-being of residents also indicate substantial differences between the city and Neighborhood Action and Fact Redevelopment Plan area. The median household income and per-capita income are considerably greater in Omaha than those of the redevelopment plan area and increased from 2000 to 2010. The same income measures stayed the same or declined during the same time period within the redevelopment area.

The rate of unemployment, generally considered an economic strength in Omaha and Nebraska, increased from 2000 to 2010 for the city. At seventeen percent, the unemployment rate in the redevelopment area is more than double the city rate in 2000, but stays at about the same rate in 2010. Changes from 2000 to 2010 in another important economic indicator, the rate of poverty, are also apparent at the city-wide level, increasing from 11.3 percent to 15.3 percent. The poverty rates observed in the Neighborhood Action and Fact Redevelopment Plan area were more than triple the city rate both in 2000 and 2010 and increased by nine percentage points from 2000 to 2010.

---

**Table 4**  
**Housing and Economic Indicators**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2000 NAF Area</th>
<th>2000 Omaha</th>
<th>2010 NAF Area</th>
<th>2010 Omaha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Housing Units</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#</td>
<td>*533</td>
<td>165,731</td>
<td>*539</td>
<td>177,518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Occupied</td>
<td>86.7%</td>
<td>94.5%</td>
<td>86.5%</td>
<td>91.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Vacant</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2000 NAF Area</td>
<td>Omaha</td>
<td>2010 NAF Area</td>
<td>Omaha</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tenure</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number Owner-Occupied</td>
<td>*196</td>
<td>93,449</td>
<td>*152</td>
<td>94,815</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Owner Occupied</td>
<td>42.4%</td>
<td>59.6%</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
<td>58.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number Renter Occupied</td>
<td>*266</td>
<td>63,289</td>
<td>*314</td>
<td>67,812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Renter Occupied</td>
<td>57.6%</td>
<td>40.4%</td>
<td>67.4%</td>
<td>41.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Median Housing Value</strong></td>
<td>$24,868</td>
<td>$94,200</td>
<td>$55,000</td>
<td>$131,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Median Contract Rent</strong></td>
<td>$286</td>
<td>$471</td>
<td>$185</td>
<td>$593</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Median Household Income</strong></td>
<td>$17,123</td>
<td>$40,006</td>
<td>$16,530</td>
<td>$46,230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Per Capita Income</strong></td>
<td>$10,071</td>
<td>$21,756</td>
<td>$10,899</td>
<td>$26,123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percent in Poverty</strong></td>
<td><strong>45.5%</strong></td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td><strong>54.5%</strong></td>
<td>15.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unemployment Rate</strong></td>
<td><strong>17.1%</strong></td>
<td>4.3%</td>
<td><strong>17.7%</strong></td>
<td>6.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*2000 and 2010: Census Tract 7 and Block Group 1 of Tract 11 data*
*2000 and 2010 U.S. Censuses using complete count block data.
**Census Tracts 7 and 11

**Land Use**

Residential is the most prevalent land use in the 103 acres which comprise the NAFRP area consisting of 50 acres and 48 percent of the area as indicated on Table 4. The overwhelming majority of the residential use is single-family housing, 46 acres, located throughout the area. The 3.8 acres of Multi-family housing consists primarily of Omaha Housing Authority (OHA) properties like the Evans Tower located on 24th Street from Evans to Pratt Streets, and the Spencer Apartments west of 26th Avenue on Spencer Street. Other OHA duplexes, regarded as single-family residential, are located adjacent to or near the Spencer Apartments. Commercial uses, mostly located along 24th Streets and total 2.5 acres. Civic uses, totaling 1.8 acres, include the Tabernacle of Faith church at 25th Avenue and Evans, the Salvation Army Omaha North-Corps-Community Center at 24th and Pratt Street and the Neighborhood Action and Fact Market Place at 24th and Manderson Streets. With the exception of Evans Street, most streets in the NAFRP area have at least a few vacant lots, the total of which is nearly seventeen acres or 16.9 percent of the redevelopment area. The remaining 32 acres of the NAFRP area is made up of right-of-way. (See attached Map 1)
Table 4
Land Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Use</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SF-Residential</td>
<td>45.8</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MF-Residential</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right-of-Way</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>103.1</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Land uses surrounding the NAFRP area vary considerably. While what is on the west side of 24th Street, the eastern boundary of the redevelopment area, does not mirror the east side of the street, it has a similar mix of commercial, residential and civic uses. The redevelopment area’s other long boundary, I-480, is the redevelopment area’s western edge. Sprague Street, the redevelopment area’s northern boundary, is adjacent to a residential area which serves as a brief transition to the largely vacated commercial/industrial uses of what was the Omaha Beltline Railroad and the commercial node at the intersection of 24th Street and Ames Avenue. The southern boundary consists of the backyard property line shared by mostly single-family neighbors.

Housing Conditions

A windshield survey reveals that of the 338 residential structures in the NAFRP area, nearly 20 percent are in poor condition. Almost 50 percent are in fair condition and the remaining 31 percent of the residential structures are in good condition.

Table 5
Residential Structure Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Condition</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good (no, or almost no condition issues)</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>30.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair (minor condition issues)</td>
<td>166</td>
<td>49.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor (major condition issues)</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Utilities and Infrastructure

Sewers
The capacity and coverage of the sewer system in the NAFRP area were designed to accommodate the once fully developed neighborhood. A portion of the area is part of an active Clean Solutions for Omaha (CSO) project. The CSO Program is designed to improve the water quality in our local rivers and streams. This project contributes to water improvement by separating the neighborhoods combined sewers into storm and sanitary sewers which permits the treatment of more sewage before it gets released into the Missouri River. The portion of the redevelopment within the current CSO project is Wirt and Spencer Streets from 24th to approximately 25th Street, and 24th Street at Spencer Street extending south out of the redevelopment area. In addition to separating the sewer lines, this project will reduce basement backups in the neighborhood. Following implementation of the redevelopment plan and completion of the CSO project, the sewer system will better accommodate the redevelopment area. (See attached Map 2).

Water
A sufficient water supply system was provided for the NAFRP area when it was originally developed and will continue to be available throughout the area for infill development.

Gas
Like the other utilities in the NAFRP Area, sufficient natural gas capacity is available to accommodate the new proposed infill housing development. The gas lines are available and accessible for the provision of service required for additional residential units.

Transportation

Most of the streets within the NAFRP area are local streets intended primarily to serve the immediate residents. North 24th Street is a minor arterial and provides north-south access. Sprague and Bristol Streets are collectors for which bridges provide east-west access to and from the redevelopment area. Between Pratt and Manderson Streets, a pedestrian bridge also connects the redevelopment area to neighborhoods to the west. Uncharacteristically of a neighborhood of this era, several cul-de-sacs are located in its interior south of Bristol Street. Access to the north Freeway is within blocks of the north and south ends of the redevelopment area providing excellent vehicular access to the freeway system serving the entire metropolitan area.

Two Metro (formerly Metro Area Transit) bus lines serve the redevelopment area, route #16 along Sprague Street and, route #24 along 24th Street. The North Omaha Transit Center at 30th and Taylor is approximately a half mile from the northwest corner of the redevelopment area. The transit center permits improved access to destinations throughout the Metro bus network, including express bus routes and connections to Sarpy County and Council Bluffs.
Zoning

The NAFRP area is predominately zoned R5 single-family residential, which is intended for medium density residential and is well suited for the area. Twenty-Fourth Street varies in zoning with R7, medium density multi-family comprising more than half of the frontage, along with R8, high density multi-family (the Evans Tower Senior high-rise) and General Commercial (GC) located at the north and south ends of 24th Street. R7 is also found along the west end of Spencer Street—the location of the Spencer Apartments Public Housing Development and north of Spaulding Street on the east side of North 25th Street. (See attached Map 3).

The GC located on or near 24th Street at each end of the redevelopment area, is an outdated zoning category that allows some uses which can have negative external effects and is inappropriate for residential neighborhoods. As opportunities arise, parcels should be down-zoned to more appropriate zoning categories within the redevelopment area.

Natural Features

The most notable natural feature of the redevelopment area is its flatness. The difference in elevation from one location to any other location is not more than 22 feet within the redevelopment area.

Historic Preservation

Residential development in the NAFRP area began prior 1890, with some units located throughout the redevelopment area and others in a closer pattern of development along the only paved streets in the neighborhood—Bristol and Spaulding Streets. The depression of the 1890’s slowed housing construction within the neighborhood and throughout North Omaha, so most of the housing within the NAFRP area was constructed in the early part of the 20th Century. Commercial districts closely followed the timing and location of residential development, mostly along North 24th Street, which also served as a streetcar line. By 1925, the initial physical development NAFRP area, and that of North Omaha for that matter, was largely complete.

*The Reconnaissance Level Survey for: North Omaha--Omaha Historic Building Survey 2016* identifies thirteen individual properties within the NAFRP area recommended for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (NRPH). Most of the properties are single-family structures located in the interior of the area with the historical context of being significant for their contribution to residential settlement. Several other structure types include commercial and retail located along North 24th Street. One, the Lothrop Drug Store, is significant for its sign, and the Clair Memorial United Methodist Church at 2443 Evans is significant as a religious institution.

In addition to property the 2016 survey recommends for inclusion on the NRPH, it also identifies 62 which are on a list of active resources. These properties were identified as having qualities that may require further investigation to determine if they should be recommended for the
NRPH. One, for example, at 3116 North 24th Street, Goodwins Spencer Street Barber Shop, is a 60 year old institution in North Omaha known for being the place where people would gather to discuss events of the day and where, in the 1960s, Ernie Chambers—barber, State Legislator and social activist worked for the civil rights of African Americans and the improvement of North Omaha.

This portion of the redevelopment plan used The Reconnaissance Level Survey for: North Omaha—Omaha Historic Building Survey 2016, and the 1984 Patterns on the Landscape: Heritage Conservation in North Omaha. These documents were either written by, or with the assistance of City of Omaha Planning staff. It should also be noted that although the two classifications are included in the 2016 survey, additional work would be needed to get them actually placed on the NRPH.

Development Strategy

Overview

The amount of redevelopment work that has already taken place in the vicinity of the NAFRP area is significant. The role Habitat for Humanity of Omaha played was crucial to this effort and much of what they accomplished was completed without the use of all the redevelopment tools typical of a similar undertaking. Working with the neighborhood association, the City of Omaha, Habitat for Humanity, other housing developers and other partner organizations, implementation of the NAFRP will permit further redevelopment of the area.

The development strategy will focus on the acquisition of vacant lots and housing, the demolition or rehabilitation of deteriorated houses and the construction of single-family infill housing to create homeownership opportunities. The similar mix of low-density multi-family with other uses such as limited office, retail and personal services (a mixed-used development) that is being encouraged on the east side of 24th Street, will be encouraged on the west side. The exception to this pattern of similarity is the expansion of the Salvation Army’s facility at 24th and Pratt Streets. The privately funded effort will construct a new $10 million, two story facility that is anticipated to occupy a half city block, and will increase the Salvation Army’s stabilizing presence in the surrounding neighborhoods and the larger community.

In addition to these more traditional approaches to neighborhood revitalization and sustainability the city, with a host of partners, will facilitate a more comprehensive range of assistance to groups and individuals within the NAFRP area. This is an approach that the city is currently implementing in another neighborhood, which reaches more neighborhood residents directly and provides assistance for a larger variety of needs. Based on the experience gained from this current effort, the city and its partners will implement a similar effort tailored to the NAFRP area and the specific needs of its residents.
**Property Acquisition**

This Redevelopment Plan provides for the acquisition of property within the Neighborhood Action and Fact Redevelopment Plan area. The City plans to acquire vacant lots within the Plan Area. The City may also acquire deteriorated houses and remove them as blighting influences as well as for locations for new housing. Vacant housing that is acquired will be evaluated for its potential for rehabilitation and in instances when rehabilitation and resale are economically viable options, the houses will be sold to qualified homebuyers.

As part of the acquisition process the City of Omaha will have the property appraised and offer just compensation to the property owners. Every reasonable attempt will be made to acquire the property through negotiated agreement between the property owner and the City. In the event that the City is unable to negotiate the purchase, the Redevelopment Plan authorizes the use of the eminent domain process to assist in the acquisition of the property necessary to implement the plan. At times, property owners interested in selling to the City have liens, encumbrances and/or title issues that make the transaction difficult. Eminent domain is sometimes used even if a sale is mutually agreeable, as a means to help clear a property’s title and facilitate the transfer.

Occupants, if any, will receive moving costs and relocation payments in accordance with the federal Uniform Relocation Act and the Nebraska Relocation Assistance Act. A one-for-one replacement of any low/moderate-income dwelling unit demolished for the project will be provided as required by the Federal Housing and Community Development Act of 1974, as amended. An equivalent replacement housing unit will be provided within the city limits in accordance with Nebraska Community Development Statutes. The City of Omaha will utilize programs identified in the Annual Omaha-Council Bluffs Consortium Consolidated Submission for Community Development Programs Action Plan to provide the replacement dwelling units.

**Existing Housing Rehabilitation**

While much of the housing stock within the NAFRP area is in good condition, over 65 percent is in fair or worse condition based on a windshield survey conducted by Planning Department staff. The City of Omaha will assist eligible residential property owners with the rehabilitation of housing units when economically feasible to do so through the city Homeowner Rehabilitation and Rental Rehabilitation Programs.

During the three years following the completion of the concentrated redevelopment effort currently underway in South Omaha, the City will make a total of $800,000 in CDBG and $800,000 of Nebraska Affordable Housing Trust Funds (NAHTF) available for the rehabilitation of 40 owner-occupied housing units.

Much of the housing in the NAFRP area is renter occupied for which the City will also make available $200,000 of HOME funds and $600,000 of NAHTF funds. These funds, in
combination with matching private funds, will rehabilitate 40 rental units in the NAFRP area during the same period.

Not all housing units are occupied and some are abandoned. In instances where an abandoned house can continue to provide a safe, healthy and affordable place for a family to live, the city will acquire, rehabilitate and resell these units to owner-occupants. Funding in the amount of $200,000 from CDBG and NAHTF will leverage $200,000 in private funds to create five single-family owner-occupied units from previously abandoned units.

### 3-YEAR Existing Housing Rehabilitation Budget

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use of Funds</th>
<th>Source of Funds</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Homeowner Rehabilitation (40 Units)</td>
<td>CDBG</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NAHTF</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental Rehabilitation (40 Units)</td>
<td>HOME</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NAHTF</td>
<td>$600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquisition, Rehabilitation and Resale (5 Units)</td>
<td>CDBG</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NAHTF</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Private</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitation Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,800,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources and uses of funds are estimates and may be revised pending the final design and the cost of improvements.

### Comprehensive Community Development Activity

Currently, the City of Omaha is engaged in a revitalization effort in another Omaha neighborhood. In this neighborhood, the City is taking a comprehensive approach to revitalization. The approach involves infill housing and housing rehabilitation, as has been outlined thus far in this redevelopment plan, but also addresses a wider range of neighborhood needs: education/training, household financial management, energy efficiency, roofs and smaller housing repairs, gardening, maintenance of vacant lots, as well as a variety of health and social
service needs. Increasing the scope and depth of assistance and targeting this assistance to a specific neighborhood represents a new approach for the City. If the approach proves effective, and if the costs and time commitment required prove feasible, then the City will implement a similar effort in the neighborhood as a part of the NAFRP.

**Single-Family Infill Housing Development**

During the last several years Habitat for Humanity of Omaha has sold dozens of newly constructed and rehabilitated housing units in and around the redevelopment area. The condition of some of the housing stock and the presence of vacant lots supports a similar revitalization effort within the redevelopment area. To do this, the City of Omaha will coordinate with nonprofit housing developers to assemble land and acquire houses that are in poor condition. These developers will create approximately 60 homeownership opportunities, primarily through the construction of new infill housing on vacant sites and in locations where deteriorated housing will be demolished. A small number of these homeownership opportunities may come from the rehabilitation of acquired units in good enough condition to be rehabilitated and sold.

The budget for the development of up to 60 single-family houses is estimated at $12,800,000. Approximately $3.2 million will be used by the City of Omaha to acquire mostly vacant houses and lots, provide relocation for occupied property and prepare sites for construction of single-family housing. Unless private donations are available, the City will use Community Development Block Grant funds and sell the cleared lots or vacant houses at market value to Habitat for Humanity or other housing developers and then use the proceeds to continue to acquire additional property over an extended time period. The remaining $9.6 million will be used for the rehabilitation or construction of single-family housing by Habitat and other housing developers and sold to low-income homebuyers. Financing for the construction will be provided by the developers and/or by private donations or financing.

Tax Increment Financing (TIF) is an appropriate source of funding for the planned new single-family housing development. The City of Omaha may prepare a TIF project plan upon finalization of project funding.

**Single-Family Infill Development Budget**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use of Funds</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vacant lot acquisition and site preparation</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing acquisition, demolition, relocation and site preparation</td>
<td>$2,900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Construction/Rehabilitation (60 units)</td>
<td>$9,600,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$12,800,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Estimate may be revised pending the final design and the cost of improvements.
Low Density Multi-Family Housing/Mixed Use Development

While the fabric of the single-family neighborhood continues to be repaired, some conditions that have contributed to the physical distress of the area persist; they also present opportunities for additional development. North 24th Street, the redevelopment area’s eastern boundary, presents a variety of conditions and factors that include: vacant, sometimes overgrown, deteriorating residential and business structures as well as land uses that are incompatible with adjacent single-family housing. Left unaddressed, these conditions will continue to place the viability of the neighborhood at risk. Long-term progress requires development of uses compatible with the neighborhood to the west and with the greater intensity of activity associated with North 24th Street. Low-density multi-family development provides a buffer for the single-family neighborhood while increasing population density for the transportation corridor. Some flexibility regarding use types would permit a variety of configurations like town homes or apartments and could be designed for specific populations like seniors. If market conditions permit, a mix of other compatible uses such as office, retail or other commercial uses could also be included in the multi-family housing giving the development a mixed-use character. (See attached Map 4)

Two sections of North 24th Street frontage, separated by the OHA Evans Tower, the Salvation Army, and the Market Place building, are good opportunities for the low-density multi-family/mixed-use development. The first is an approximately 1,800 foot distance which begins at the southern end of the redevelopment area, mid-block between Wirt and Binney Streets, and ends at Evans Street. The shorter norther section, approximately 790 feet, begins mid-block between Manderson and Spaulding Streets and extends to Sprague Street. Each of these sections contain vacant land and have structures for which physical conditions vary. City of Omaha Redevelopment Bonds and/or Community Development Block Grant funds used for acquisition, relocation and site preparation expenses are anticipated to be approximately $500,000. The City proposes to acquire vacant properties and commercial properties with structures for rehabilitation or removal and new construction.

Tax Increment Financing (TIF) is an appropriate source of funding to assist multi-family housing development. The City of Omaha may prepare a TIF project plan upon finalization of individual project funding.

Future Land Use and Zoning

Most of the current zoning for the redevelopment area is appropriate for the future land use proposed by the plan. The R5 medium density single-family zoning found throughout much of the residential portion of the neighborhood, the area not directly on North 24th Street, is well suited to the infill housing proposed by the plan. The goal is not necessarily to construct a house on every vacant lot, but to have every lot contribute to the mostly single-family character of the interior of the neighborhood. Whether it is a well maintained side-yard, play area, garden or home, no property should look abandoned or detract from the residential context. The other
residential zoning district, R7 medium density multi-family, in this part of the neighborhood is also appropriate for locations where development is present. In instances where an R7 district is vacant, careful consideration of the neighborhood context should be given the design of a proposed development. Down-zoning vacant R7 property may also be considered to assure compatibility with immediately surrounding single-family context prior to development.

The zoning in the portion of the redevelopment area adjacent to North 24th Street should be evaluated as development occurs to assure compatibility with adjacent uses. Specifically, the permitted uses of General Commercial (GC) zoning, the current zoning along portions of North 24th Street, allows a wide variety of commercial uses and even limited industrial facilities. Some of these are not appropriate so close to the single-family housing located immediately to the west. It is important the land uses along 24th Street provide a buffer for the single-family housing and contribute to the well-being of the area while being able to withstand the intensity of activity associated with the street.

Helping to reduce the impact of North 24th Street on the surrounding area is the fact that it has been designated a “Green Street.” As a Green Street, new development along it is required to meet design and landscaping standards for the public right-of-way.

Consistency with the Master Plan

One basic goal of the Concept Element of the City Master Plan, and a guiding principle of the NAFRP, states: “The City will ensure that policies and programs are in place to create healthy and diverse neighborhoods and ensure that Omahans find affordable housing throughout the city”. The NAFRP pursues this goal by reducing or eliminating unhealthy elements within the area--vacant lots and deteriorated structures, and replaces them with the rehabilitation of existing housing, construction of single-family infill housing and the construction of low-density multi-family/mixed use developments.
Appendix 2: Air Quality

1. Nebraska Nonattainment Status, Douglas County
2. City of Omaha, Air Quality Control Construction Permit Program
3. City of Omaha, Air Quality Control Operating Permit Program
4. Email chain with Dan May of Air Quality Control
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State/County</th>
<th>NTM/Year</th>
<th>NAAQS</th>
<th>County</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NEBRASKA</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Important Notes:
- Information see 40 CFR 85.20, Effective October 24, 2016.
- The 1997 Primary Annual PM-2.5 NAAQS (level of 15 μg/m³) is revoked in attainment and maintenance areas for that NAAQS. For additional revoked areas, see the 8-hour ozone (1997) standard.

Pollutants for Each County by Year:

- You are here: EPA Home > National Air and Climate > NAAQS Nonattainment/Maintenance Status for Each County by Year.
Construction Permitting Program

Before a new facility is built or before an existing facility is expanded or modified, an air quality construction permit may be required. Under the construction permit program, facilities are required to obtain a construction permit before they purchase, construct, reconstruct or modify any air contaminant source or emission unit where there is a net increase in the potential to emit (PTE) pollutants above the following thresholds:

- 15 tons per year (tpy) of particulate matter 10 microns in diameter or smaller;
- 40 tpy of sulfur dioxide, sulfur trioxide, or any combination thereof;
- 40 tpy of nitrogen oxides;
- 40 tpy volatile organic compounds;
- 50 tpy carbon monoxide;
- 0.6 tpy lead; or
- 2.5 tpy of any single hazardous air pollutant (HAP) or 10 tpy of all HAPs combined. All incinerators, regardless of emissions, must have a construction permit.

Potential emissions are based on operating the unit/source 24 hours per day at maximum capacity for twelve months or 8,760 hours.

Federal Construction Permits

Under certain circumstances, facilities may need to obtain a Federal construction permit. In areas in attainment with the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS), sources that meet the criteria below will need to obtain a Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) permit. In areas in non-attainment with the NAAQS, applicable facilities will need to obtain a New Source Review (NSR) permit. Currently, the Omaha area is in attainment with all NAAQS.

In order for a facility qualify for a PSD or NSR permit, it must meet both of the following criteria:

1. The facility must have potential emissions of:
   - 100 tpy of any regulated PSD pollutant* if the source is one of 26 specific source categories listed in the PSD rules (40 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) §52.21(b)) OR
   - 250 tpy of any regulated PSD pollutant* for sources not specifically listed in the PSD rules, and

2. Have net emissions increases of:
   - 25 tons per year of Particulate Matter (PM) or total suspended particulate (TSP)
   - 15 tpy PM10
   - 40 tpy of SO2 or SO3 or any combination thereof,
   - 40 tpy of NOx (calculated as NO2),
   - 40 tpy VOC,
   - 100 tpy CO, or
   - 0.6 tpy Pb (lead)
• Other pollutants with significance thresholds include fluorides, sulfuric acid mist, hydrogen sulfide (H2S),
total reduced sulfur (TRS), and reduced sulfur compounds.

*PSD pollutants include PM, PM10, NOx, SOx, CO, VOC, lead, fluorides, sulfuric acid mist, H2S, TRS,
reduced sulfur compounds, municipal waste combustor organics, metals and acid gases, and municipal
waste landfill emissions.

Permitting Process

If your planned facility or emission unit exceeds the levels requiring a construction permit, you must obtain a
construction permit before you begin construction of the source or unit. The permit review period can take
several months, and is followed by a 30 day public comment period. Therefore, it is highly recommended that
you submit your completed application as early in the planning process as possible. Contact OARC at 402-444-6015
to schedule a pre-planning meeting with our staff.

Minor Construction Permit Application

Minor Construction Permit Application

VOC and HAP Emissions Spreadsheet for Surface Coating

Permitting FAQs

NDEQ Construction Permitting Page

NDEQ’s Rolling 12 Month Total Guidance Document

Paint Tracker - An online for tracking and recording paint and solvent usage. Developed by the Iowa Waste
Reduction Center at the University of Northern Iowa.

*If you have trouble reading or accessing the documents on this page, please contact OARC at 402-444-6015.*

*The City of Omaha cannot guarantee the accuracy or accessibility of any document published by outside
agencies.*
Operating Permit Program

Air quality operating permits contain all applicable requirements for all emission points at a facility, including construction permit terms and other federal regulatory requirements. There are two types of operating permits, based on a facility's emissions:

**Major Source Operating Permit**

Facilities requiring a Major Source Operating Permit (also known as a Class I or Title V permit) have a potential-to-emit above one or more of the following levels:

- 100 tons per year (tpy) of any criteria air pollutant* excluding lead;
- 10 tpy of any single hazardous air pollutant (HAP) or 25 tpy of a combination of HAPs; or
- 5 tpy of lead.

*Criteria pollutants are particulate matter less than 10 microns (PM10), nitrous oxides (NOx), sulfur oxides (SOx), carbon monoxide (CO), volatile organic compounds (VOCs), and lead.

Potential emissions are based on operating the unit/source 24 hours per day at maximum capacity for twelve months or 8,760 hours.

**Minor Source Operating Permit**

Under Nebraska Title 129 and Omaha Municipal Code Section 41-2 Chapter 5, certain facilities may qualify for a Minor Source (or Class II) Operating Permit. Class II facilities are divided into two categories:

- **Synthetic Minor:**
  - Potential-to-emit above Class I levels, and
  - Enforceable permit limits are taken to reduce potential-to-emit to below Class I levels

- **True Minor (or Natural Minor):**
  - Potential-to-emit below Class I levels
  - Actual emissions above the following levels:
    - 25 tpy of PM10
    - 25 tpy of NOx
    - 25 tpy of VOCs
    - 25 tpy of CO
    - 1.25 tpy of Lead
    - 2.5 tpy of any one Hazardous Air Pollutant (HAP) or 6.25 tpy total HAPs

**Permitting Process**

Facilities that meet the criteria for an Air Operating Permit are required to submit their application within 12 months of beginning operation or within 12 months of becoming subject to those requirements, whichever is earlier. Contact OAGC at 402-444-6015 to assist you as you begin your operating permit application process.

https://publicworks.cityofomaha.org/air-quality-control/permitting-programs/operating-permit-program
Air Operating Permit Application

View a list of facilities which have been issued an Operating Permit by OAQC: Title V Sources, Class II (Minor) Sources

Permitting FAQs
NDEQ Operating Permit Page
EPA Operating Permit Page

For facilities with painting operations:
Paint Tracker - An online for tracking and recording paint and solvent usage. Developed by the Iowa Waste Reduction Center at the University of Northern Iowa.

*If you have trouble reading or accessing the documents on this page, please contact OAQC at 402-444-6015.*
Administrative Permits

Omaha Air Quality Control’s Administrative Permit program is intended for facilities whose emissions do not meet the levels under the Class I or II operating permit programs, but for whom there may be an increased risk of dust or odor emissions, as defined in the Omaha Municipal Code Section 41-2 Chapter 32 and 41-58 respectively.

A facility can apply for, or be required to obtain, an Administrative permit to document any voluntary or mandatory air quality controls, procedures, or equipment used by the company in their operation.

These permits are not part of the Federal or State air quality permitting programs, but are enforceable at the local level. Contact OAOQ at 402-444-6015 if you believe your facility may need to obtain an Administrative Permit.

View a list of facilities which have been issued an

Administrative Permit by OAOQ
Administrative Permit Application
Administrative Permit Application

*If you have trouble reading or accessing the documents on this page, please contact OAOQ at 402-444-6015.*
Environmental Review Question

3 messages

Nicole D. Engels (Plng) <nicole.engels@cityofomaha.org>          Mon, Jun 5, 2017 at 3:40 PM
To: "Daniel May (PWks)" <Daniel.May@cityofomaha.org>

Good morning Dan,

I'm working on a new environmental review for an area called Neighborhood Action And Fact. The map is attached, but the boundaries are basically Wirt to Sprague and 24th to the freeway.

I think that the closest permitted facility to this location would be Westplains. Am I missing anything? Drake Williams and Magellan are both within a mile and a half of the southeast corner of the site. The airport is about 2.5 miles to the east. Can you think of anything I am missing or any concerns in the area?

Also, found this auto repair shop that says they paint just west of 24th and Sprague. Didn't know if you already knew about it or not.

Nicole Engels
Environmental Planner
Planning Department, HCD
1819 Farnam St, Omaha, NE 68183
402-444-5150 x2024
nicole.engels@cityofomaha.org

Daniel May (PWks) <daniel.may@cityofomaha.org>          Tue, Jun 6, 2017 at 10:34 AM
To: "Nicole D. Engels (Plng)" <nicole.engels@cityofomaha.org>

I'd probably also add Ardent Mills North. There is also Hart Machine & Metal Fabrication (6X source) at 25th & Sprague.

And thanks for the tip on the auto body. I do not have them on my list.

https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?ui=2&ik=29552d5c48&view=pt&search=inbox&type=15c654a76d566b3e&th=15c7e9faeba0114e&simil=15c79fbc415e6637&simil...
Ardent Mills is 1.13 miles away, I'll add Hart to my list!
Appendix 3: Airports

1. Eppley Airfield Layout Drawing
2. Millard Airport Layout Plan
3. Offutt Air Force Base AICUZ
Appendix 4: Coastal Management

1. Coastal management plans by state
Coastal Zone Management Programs

Alabama (*)[Alabama]
California (*)[California]
Florida (*)[Florida]
Hawaii (*)[Hawaii]
Louisiana (*)[Louisiana]
Massachusetts (*)[Massachusetts]
Mississippi (*)[Mississippi]
New York (*)[New York]
Ohio (*)[Ohio]
Puerto Rico (*)[Puerto Rico]
Texas (*)[Texas]
Washington (*)[Washington]

Alaska (*)[Alaska]
Connecticut (*)[Connecticut]
Georgia (*)[Georgia]
Illinois (*)[Illinois]
Maine (*)[Maine]
Michigan (*)[Michigan]
New Hampshire (*)[New Hampshire]
North Carolina (*)[North Carolina]
Oregon (*)[Oregon]
Rhode Island (*)[Rhode Island]
Virgin Islands (*)[Virgin Islands]
Wisconsin (*)[Wisconsin]

American Samoa (*)[American Samoa]
Delaware (*)[Delaware]
Guam (*)[Guam]
Indiana (*)[Indiana]
Maryland (*)[Maryland]
Minnesota (*)[Minnesota]
New Jersey (*)[New Jersey]
Northern Mariana Islands (*)[Northern Mariana Islands]
Pennsylvania (*)[Pennsylvania]
South Carolina (*)[South Carolina]
Virginia (*)[Virginia]

* All 35 coastal and Great Lakes states and territories (with the exception of Alaska) participate in the National Coastal Zone Management Program.

ALABAMA
The Alabama Coastal Management Program [http://www.aden.state.al.us/programs/coastal/default.cnt], approved by NOAA in 1979, is administered by two state agencies:
- The Alabama Department of Conservation and Natural Resources [http://www.outdooralabama.com/alabama-coastal-area-management-program] is responsible for planning, fiscal management, public education, and research management; and

The primary authority for the coastal management program is the Alabama Coastal Act of 1976 (Act 534). The Alabama coastal zone [czm/media/StateCZBoundaries.pdf] extends inland to the continuous 10-foot contour in Mobile and Baldwin Counties.

ALASKA
Alaska withdrew from the voluntary National Coastal Zone Management Program [czm/about/1] on July 1, 2011. Contact NOAA’s Office for Coastal Management for additional information.

AMERICAN SAMOA
The American Samoa Coastal Management Program [http://www.doc.as/resource-management/ascmcp/], approved by NOAA in 1980, is led by the American Samoa Department of Commerce. The coastal program has developed a unique approach that incorporates both western and traditional systems of management. The American Samoa Coastal Management Act provides the primary authority for the program. American Samoa’s coastal zone boundary [czm/media/StateCZBoundaries.pdf] consists of seven islands, totaling roughly 77 square miles, with a coastline of 126 miles.

CALIFORNIA
The California Coastal Management Program, approved by NOAA in 1978, is administered by three state agencies:
- The California Coastal Commission [www.coastal.ca.gov] manages development along the California coast except San Francisco Bay, where the
- The California Coastal Conservancy [www.scc.ca.gov] purchases, protects, restores, and enhances coastal resources, and provides access to the shore.

The primary authorities for the California Coastal Management Program are the California Coastal Act, McAtee-Petris Act, and Suisun Marsh Preservation Act. The California coastal zone [czm/media/StateCZBoundaries.pdf] generally extends 1,000 yards inland from the mean high tide line. The coastal zone for the San Francisco Bay Conservation and Development Commission includes the open water, marshes, and mudflats of greater San Francisco Bay, and areas 100 feet inland from the line of highest tidal action.

CONNECTICUT
The Connecticut Coastal Management Program [http://www.ct.gov/deep/cwp/view.asp?a=27058&q=323366&deepNav_GID=1622], approved in 1980, is administered by the Office of Long Island Sound Programs within the Department of Energy and Environmental Protection. The primary authority for the coastal management program is the Connecticut Coastal Management Act of 1980. Connecticut has a two-tiered coastal zone [czm/media/StateCZBoundaries.pdf]. The first tier, the “coastal boundary,” generally extends inland 1,000 feet from the shore. The second tier, the “coastal area,” includes all of the state’s 36 coastal municipalities.

DELWARE
The Delaware Coastal Management Program [http://www.dnrec.delaware.gov/coastal/Pages/CoastalMgt.aspx], approved by NOAA in 1979. The coastal management program’s lead agency is the Division of Soil and Water Conservation, Department of Natural Resources and Environmental Control. The program coordinates across nearly every state agency to ensure the effective implementation of policies, state laws, regulations, and executive orders that affect coastal resources. Because the goals of the coastal management program are to balance the use, preservation, and development of coastal resources, these policies cover a surprising range of coastal issues.

The whole state of Delaware is designated as a coastal zone [czm/media/StateCZBoundaries.pdf] due to its small size and is divided into two tiers: the “coastal strip” and the rest of the state. The coastal strip, averaging four miles in width, receives special zoning protection from industrial development, while the second tier only falls under general program provisions.

FLORIDA
The Florida Coastal Management Program [http://www.dep.state.fl.us/zone/default.htm] was approved by NOAA in 1981, with the Florida Department of Environmental Protection serving as the lead agency. A network of nine state agencies and five water management districts together enforce 23 separate statutes. The Florida coastal zone [czm/media/StateCZBoundaries.pdf] is the entire state but is divided into two tiers. Only coastal cities and counties that include or are contiguous to state water bodies are eligible to receive coastal management funds.

GEORGIA
The Georgia Coastal Management Program [http://coastalga.dnr.org/oa] was approved by NOAA in 1998, with Georgia’s Department of Natural Resources, Coastal Resources Division, serving as the lead agency. The Georgia Coastal Management Act authorized the creation of the Georgia Coastal Management Program. The Georgia coastal zone [czm/media/StateCZBoundaries.pdf] includes the state’s six coastal counties and five “inland tier” counties, which include Chatham, Effingham, Bryan, Liberty, McIntosh, Long, Glynn, Wayne, Brantley, Camden, and Charlton counties.
GUAM
The Guam Coastal Management Program [http://bsp.guam.gov/guam-coastal-management-program/] was approved in 1979, and is overseen by the Bureau of Statistics and Plans. The coastal management program guides the use, protection, and development of land and ocean resources within Guam's coastal zone. Guam's comprehensive planning enabling legislation, Seashore Protection Act, and several executive orders are among the key legislation for the coastal management program. Because Guam is a small island, the entire land area is included within its coastal zone [czm/media/StateCZBoundaries.pdf].

HAWAII
The Hawaii Coastal Management Program [http://planning.hawaii.gov/czm/], approved by NOAA in 1978, is led by the Hawaii Office of Planning. The coastal management program is a network of authorities and partnerships collectively implementing the objectives and policies of Hawaii's Coastal Zone Management Statutes (Chapter 205A, HRS). The entire state of Hawaii falls within Hawaii's coastal zone boundary [czm/media/StateCZBoundaries.pdf].

ILLINOIS
The Illinois Coastal Management Program [http://www.dnr.illinois.gov/cmp/Pages/default.aspx] is the newest state partner in the National Coastal Zone Management Program, gaining approval in 2012. Illinois' program, under the direction of the Illinois Department of Natural Resources, Office of Coastal Management, focuses on several priority issues in the Illinois coastal zone [czm/media/StateCZBoundaries.pdf], a 63-mile stretch along Lake Michigan. The program manages impacts to its Lake Michigan shoreline through the Rivers, Lakes, and Streams Act, Lake Michigan Shoreline Act, and a network of other authorities.

INDIANA
The Indiana Coastal Management Program [http://www.in.gov/dnr/lakemich/], approved by NOAA in 2002, is led by the Indiana Department of Natural Resources. The coastal management program is a networked program built upon a framework of state laws and authorities addressing key coastal priorities. The Coastal Advisory Board, which represents various stakeholder groups, determines the priorities for each grant funding cycle and provides a forum for public input on regional issues affecting Lake Michigan coastal resources. The Indiana coastal zone [czm/media/StateCZBoundaries.pdf] is based on watershed boundaries and varies from a little less than two miles to 17 miles from the shore.

LOUISIANA
The Louisiana Coastal Management Program [http://dnr.louisiana.gov/index.cfm?mid=pagebuilder&tmpl=home&p=85&ngj=5], approved by NOAA in 1980, is administered by the Department of Natural Resources through the Office of Coastal Management. The primary authority for the coastal management program is the State and Local Coastal Resources Management Act of 1978. The Louisiana coastal zone [czm/media/StateCZBoundaries.pdf], which varies from 16 to 32 miles inland from the Gulf coast, is a 10 million-acre area that includes 40 percent of the nation's coastal wetlands.

MAINE
The Maine Coastal Management Program [http://www.maine.gov/dacf/mcp/index.html], approved in 1978, is led by the Maine Department of Agriculture, Conservation, and Forestry. The coastal management program consists of a network of 19 state laws with four state agencies working in cooperation with local governments, nonprofit organizations, private businesses, and the public to improve management of coastal resources. Maine's coastal zone [czm/media/StateCZBoundaries.pdf] extends to the inland boundary of all towns bordering tidal waters and includes all coastal islands.

MARYLAND
The Maryland Coastal Management Program [http://dnr.maryland.gov/ccs/Pages/funding/czma.aspx] was approved by NOAA in 1978, with the Department of Natural Resources acting as the lead agency. The coastal management program is a networked program composed of several state planning and regulatory programs implementing a suite of enforceable policies to protect coastal resources and manage coastal uses, including the Chesapeake Bays Critical Areas Protection Program. Maryland's coastal zone [czm/media/StateCZBoundaries.pdf] follows the inland boundary of the counties (and Baltimore City) bordering the Atlantic Ocean, Chesapeake Bay, and the Patuxent River (as far as the municipal limits of Washington, D.C.).

MASSACHUSETTS
The Massachusetts Coastal Management Program [http://www.mass.gov/czm/czm.htm], approved by NOAA in 1978, is administered by the Office of Coastal Zone Management within the Executive Office of Environmental Affairs and serves as the lead for coastal policy and technical assistance in the state.

The Executive Office of Environmental Affairs enforces 20 program policies and nine management principles governing activities within the coastal zone. The Massachusetts coastal zone [czm/media/StateCZBoundaries.pdf] roughly includes all land within a half-mile of coastal waters and salt marshes, as well as all islands.

MICHIGAN
The Michigan Coastal Management Program [http://www.michigan.gov/deg/0,4651,7-135-3313_3677_3696-11188--00,html] was approved by NOAA in 1978, and is administered by the Department of Environmental Quality. Key management authorities include several parts of the Natural Resources and Environmental Protection Act pertaining to Shorelands Protection and Management (Part 323), Great Lakes Submerged Lands (Part 325), and Sand Dunes Protection and Management (Part 353).

Boasting the world's largest freshwater coastline, Michigan's coastal zone [czm/media/StateCZBoundaries.pdf] generally extends a minimum of 1,000 feet inland from the ordinary high water mark, with the boundary extending further inland in some locations to encompass important coastal features.

MINNESOTA
The Minnesota Coastal Management Program [http://www.dnr.state.mn.us/waters/lakesuperior/index.html] was approved by NOAA in 1999 and consists of a network of agencies and programs led by the Department of Natural Resources.

Key legislation includes the Shoreland Management Act and the North Shore Management Plan. Minnesota's coastal zone [czm/media/StateCZBoundaries.pdf] includes the area approximately six miles inland from Lake Superior, following the nearest township boundaries along the shore.

MISSISSIPPI
The Mississippi Coastal Management Program [http://www.dmr.ms.gov/index.php/coastal-resources-management], approved by NOAA in 1980, consists of a network of agencies with authority in the coastal zone. The Department of Marine Resources, through the Office of Coastal Ecology, serves as the lead agency.

The primary authority guiding the coastal management program is the Coastal Wetlands Protection Act. The Mississippi coastal zone [czm/media/StateCZBoundaries.pdf] includes the three coastal counties, as well as all adjacent coastal waters and the barrier islands of the coast.

NEW HAMPSHIRE
The New Hampshire Department of Environmental Services leads the implementation of the state's coastal program. The New Hampshire Coastal Management Program [http://des.nh.gov/organization/divisions/water/wmb/coastal/index.htm], approved by NOAA in 1982, is a networked program where several state agencies help enforce the coastal management program's 16 coastal policies. The New Hampshire coastal zone [czm/media/StateCZBoundaries.pdf] covers areas next to the Atlantic Ocean and the lower Piscataqua River, along with areas bordering the Great Bay and tidal rivers, and all 17 municipalities along tidal waters.

NEW JERSEY
The New Jersey Coastal Management Program [http://www.state.nj.us/dep/cmp/] was approved by NOAA in 1978 and is directly administered by its lead agency, the New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection, in partnership with the New Jersey Meadowlands Commission, as the lead planning agency for the Hackensack Meadowlands District.

The coastal management program is based on three major laws: the Coastal Area Facility Review Act, the Wetlands Act of 1970, and the Waterfront Development Law. New Jersey's coastal zone [czm/media/StateCZBoundaries.pdf] encompasses approximately 1,800 miles of tidal coastline and ranges in width from 100 feet to 24 miles inland.
NEW YORK
The New York Coastal Management Program [https://www.dos.ny.gov/opd/] was approved by NOAA in 1982, with the New York Department of State serving as the lead agency. The Executive Law Article 42, Waterfront Revitalization of Coastal Areas and Inland Waterways, provides the state with the authority to establish a coastal program, develop coastal policies, define the coastal boundaries, and establish state consistency requirements.

The inland New York coastal zone boundary [rczm/media/StateCZBoundaries.pdf] is variable but generally is 1,000 feet from the shoreline in non-urbanized areas. In urbanized areas and other developed locations along the coastline, the inland boundary is usually 500 feet or less from the shoreline, with the boundary possibly extending inland up to 10,000 feet to encompass significant coastal resources.

NORTH CAROLINA
The North Carolina Coastal Management Program [https://deq.nc.gov/about/divisions/coastal-management], approved by NOAA in 1978, is administered by the Division of Coastal Management within the Department of Environment and Natural Resources. The primary authority for the coastal management program is the Coastal Area Management Act. North Carolina’s coastal zone [rczm/media/StateCZBoundaries.pdf] includes 20 coastal counties that in whole or in part are adjacent to, adjoining, intersected, or bounded by the Atlantic Ocean or any coastal sound.

NORTHERN MARIANA ISLANDS
The Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands is made up of 14 islands that span 440 miles of the western Pacific Ocean, with the Division of Coastal Resources Management [http://www.crm.gov.mp/sec.asp?secID=1] serving as the lead agency for the Northern Mariana Islands Coastal Management Program. NOAA approved the Commonwealth's coastal management program in 1980. Since the islands are small, the entire land and water area of the commonwealth is included within the coastal zone [rczm/media/StateCZBoundaries.pdf].

OHIO
The Ohio Coastal Management Program [http://coastal.ohiodnr.gov/] was approved by NOAA in 1997, with the Ohio Department of Natural Resources serving as the lead agency for the networked program. The coastal management program incorporates state laws, regulations, and programs within 41 management policies that are organized around nine issue areas [http://coastal.ohiodnr.gov/ocmp]. Ohio’s coastal zone [rczm/media/StateCZBoundaries.pdf] is quite varied and runs through the nine counties bordering Lake Erie and its tributaries. The boundary width ranges from about one-eighth of a mile to 15 miles depending on features, such as coastal wetlands and bluffs.

OREGON
The Oregon Coastal Management Program [https://www.oregon.gov/LCD/OCMP/pages/cstzone_intro.aspx], approved by NOAA in 1977, consists of a network of agencies with authority in the coastal zone. The Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development serves as the lead agency. The primary authority for the coastal management program is the Oregon Land Use Planning Act and the 19 statewide planning goals. The Oregon coastal zone [rczm/media/StateCZBoundaries.pdf] includes the state’s coastal watersheds and extends inland to the crest of the coast range, with a few minor exceptions.

Pennsylvania
The Pennsylvania Coastal Management Program [http://www.dep.state.pa.us/river/czmp.htm], approved in 1980, is administered by the Department of Environmental Protection. The coastal management program comprises two widely separated coastal areas: the 63-mile Lake Erie shoreline and the 57-mile stretch of coastline along the Delaware Estuary. The program relies on a network of state authorities. The Pennsylvania coastal zone [rczm/media/StateCZBoundaries.pdf], along Lake Erie varies from 900 feet in urban areas to over three miles in rural areas, and the Delaware River Estuary boundary extends inland from 660 feet in urbanized areas to 3.5 miles in rural areas.

Puerto Rico
Puerto Rico’s Coastal Management Program [http://irma.pr.gov/tag/zona-costanera/] was approved by NOAA in 1978 and comprises a network of state agencies led by the Department of Natural and Environmental Resources. The program comprises 40 statutes.

Puerto Rico’s coastal zone [rczm/media/StateCZBoundaries.pdf] generally extends 1,000 meters (one kilometer) inland, but extends further inland in places to include important coastal resources.

Rhode Island
The Rhode Island Coastal Management Program [http://www.crmc.ri.gov/], approved by NOAA in 1978, is administered by the Rhode Island Coastal Resources Management Council. The primary authority for the coastal management program is the Coastal Resources Management Act of 1971. Rhode Island’s coastal zone [rczm/media/StateCZBoundaries.pdf] encompasses the entire state, although the inland extent of the coastal management program’s regulatory authority is generally 200 feet inland from any coastal feature.

South Carolina
The South Carolina Coastal Management Program [http://www.scdhec.gov/HomeAndEnvironment/Water/CoastalManagement/] was approved by NOAA in 1979, and the lead agency is the Department of Health and Environmental Control. The primary authority for the coastal management program is the 1977 Coastal Tidelands and Wetlands Act. The South Carolina coastal zone [rczm/media/StateCZBoundaries.pdf] includes all lands and waters in the counties of the state that contain any one or more “critical areas,” which are defined as coastal waters, tidelands, beaches, and primary oceanfront sand dunes.

Texas
The Texas Coastal Management Program [http://www.glo.texas.gov/coast/grant-projects/cmp/index.html], approved by NOAA in 1996, is administered by the Texas General Land Office in conjunction with the Coastal Coordination Advisory Committee. The Coastal Coordination Act is the primary authority for the Texas Coastal Management Program. The Texas coastal zone [rczm/media/StateCZBoundaries.pdf] is generally the area seaward of the Texas coastal facility designation line, up to three marine leagues into the Gulf of Mexico.

Virgin Islands
The U.S. Virgin Islands Coastal Management Program was approved by NOAA in 1979. The lead agency is the Department of Planning and Natural Resources. The primary authority for the coastal management program is the U.S. Virgin Islands Coastal Zone Management Act; and the coastal zone [rczm/media/StateCZBoundaries.pdf] includes the entire territory.

Virginia
The Virginia Coastal Management Program [http://www.deq.state.va.us/Programs/CoastalZoneManagement.aspx] was approved by NOAA in 1986, and the Department of Environmental Quality serves as the lead agency. Authorized by a commonwealth executive order, the coastal management program is structured as a network of agencies that have authority for implementing nine core policies and a set of advisory policies covering wetlands, fisheries, water quality, dunes and beaches, subaqueous lands, and other coastal resources in the Virginia coastal zone [rczm/media/StateCZBoundaries.pdf]. The coastal zone includes the state’s 29 coastal counties, 17 cities, and 42 incorporated towns.

Washington
The Washington Coastal Management Program [http://www.ecy.wa.gov/programs/saa/czm/index.html], approved by NOAA in 1976, was the first approved program in the nation. The Department of Ecology serves as the lead coastal management agency. The primary authority for the coastal management program is the Shoreline Management Act of 1971. The Washington coastal zone [rczm/media/StateCZBoundaries.pdf] includes the state’s 15 coastal counties that front saltwater.
The Wisconsin Coastal Management Program [http://www.doa.state.wi.us/section.asp?linkid=65&locid=9], approved by NOAA in 1978, is administered by the Department of Administration, Bureau of Intergovernmental Relations. The coastal management program is a networked program implemented in partnership with the Wisconsin Coastal Management Council, with representatives from local governments, state agencies, Native American tribes, and interest groups. The council sets the policy direction for the program. The Wisconsin coastal zone [/cmz/media/StateCZBoundaries.pdf] comprises the 15 counties fronting Lake Superior, Lake Michigan, and Green Bay.

For more information, contact us [https://coast.noaa.gov/contactform/].

| About the National Program [/cmz/about/] |
| States and Territories [/cmz/mystate/] |
| Coastal Zone Management Act [/cmz/act] |
| Regulations [http://www.ecfr.gov/cgi-bin/text/text-idx?SID=73fa77136a5eeceb25a52b3ef02368ecb&tpl=/ecfrbrowse/Title15/15cfr923_main_02.tpl] |
| National Program Funding Summary [/cmz/media/funding-summary.pdf] |
| Program Guidance [/cmz/guidance/] |
| National Program Publications [/cmz/publications/] |
| Evaluations [/cmz/evaluations/] |
| Performance Measures [/cmz/performance/] |
Appendix 5: Contamination and Toxic Substances

1. City of Omaha Radon Mitigation Policy
Radon Mitigation for Rehabilitation Projects Policy (December 2010)

According to the United States Environmental Protection Agency radon is an invisible radioactive gas that has no taste, smell, or color. Because radon is a gas it enters buildings through openings or cracks in the foundation. High levels of radon gas can be toxic and increase the risk of lung cancer.

Douglas County is in the Highest Potential category for radon incidence in homes, meaning it has a predicted average indoor radon screening level greater than 4.0 picocuries per liter ("pCi/L"), a level at which the Nebraska Department of Health ("NDOH") recommends radon mitigation due to the health risk it presents.

The United States Department of Housing and Urban Development ("HUD") policy (24 CRF 58.5(i)(2)(i)) on radon states "all properties that are being proposed for use in HUD programs be free of hazardous materials, contaminants, toxic chemicals and gases, and radioactive substances, where a hazard could affect the health and safety of occupants."

To comply with the HUD’s policy, the City will test for radon in residential use structures where the total cost of rehabilitation is equal to or exceeds 50% of the structure’s pre-rehabilitation assessed value. The assessed value will be determined by referring to the Douglas County Assessor. The exception is the Lead-based Paint Hazard Control Program which will test every residential use structure for radon regardless of cost.

If the radon level is equal to or exceeds 4.0 picocuries per liter ("pCi/L") then an active radon mitigation system will be installed.

Radon mitigation is not required if the radon level is below 4.0 pCi/L or if the cost of rehabilitation is less than 50% of the assessed value.

Radon testing and mitigation will be conducted in accordance with Nebraska Department of Health regulations and guidelines (http://www.hhs.state.ne.us/ranon/index.htm.)

Revised and approved 12/20/2010
Appendix 6: Endangered Species

1. Letter from Eliza Hines, US Fish and Wildlife
2. Letter from Carey Grell, Nebraska Game and Parks
John Cochnar  
Deputy Field Supervisor / Fish and Wildlife Biologist  
US Fish and Wildlife Service  
Nebraska Field Office  
9325 South Alda Road  
Wood River, NE  68883

RE: Neighborhood Action and Fact Redevelopment Area

Dear Mr. Cochnar,

The Neighborhood Action and Fact Redevelopment Plan calls for the construction or rehabilitation of approximately 60 housing units within the Neighborhood Action and Fact Redevelopment Area located in Omaha, Nebraska. The redevelopment area is located between North 24th and North 27th Streets, from just north of Binney Street to Sprague Street. Please see that attached map.

We seek confirmation that these activities will not adversely affect threatened or endangered species or critical habitat. Please contact me if you have any comments or questions. I can be reached by telephone at 402-444-5150 x 2026, or by email at william.lukash@cityofomaha.org. Please respond as soon as you can.

Thank you,

[Signature]

William Lukash, AICP, PG  
City Planner
February 17, 2017

William Lukash  
City of Omaha, Planning Department  
1819 Farnam Street, Suite 1100  
Omaha, NE 68183  

RE: Neighborhood Action and Fact Redevelopment Area, City of Omaha, Douglas County

Dear Mr. Lukash:

Nebraska Game and Parks Commission (NGPC) staff members have reviewed the information for the proposal identified above. The plan calls for construction or rehabilitation of approximately 60 housing units within the redevelopment area that is located in Omaha between North 24th and North 27th Streets, from just north of Binney Street to Sprague Street.

Based on our review, we have determined that the project as described will have no adverse impacts on state-listed threatened and endangered species or critical habitat, or any other resources within our agency’s areas of concern.

Thank you for opportunity to review this proposal. Please contact me if you have any questions regarding these comments at 402-471-5423 or carey.grell@nebraska.gov.

Sincerely,

Carey Grell  
Environmental Analyst Supervisor  
Planning and Programming Division
Appendix 7: Environmental Justice

1. Environmental Justice Tool Report
The EJSCREEN Report (Version 2016) for the User-Specified Area in NEBRASKA, EPA Region 7 presents an analysis of various environmental justice indexes. The approximate population for this area is 1,164, and the input area is 0.17 square miles.

The report includes selected variables such as:
- EJ Index for Particulate Matter (PM 2.5)
- EJ Index for Ozone
- EJ Index for NATA* Diesel PM
- EJ Index for NATA* Air Toxics Cancer Risk
- EJ Index for NATA* Respiratory Hazard Index
- EJ Index for Traffic Proximity and Volume
- EJ Index for Lead Paint Indicator
- EJ Index for Superfund Proximity
- EJ Index for RMP Proximity
- EJ Index for Hazardous Waste Proximity
- EJ Index for Water Discharger Proximity

The percentiles in the State, EPA Region, and USA for these indexes are provided in a table, indicating how these areas compare to others across the nation.

The bar graph illustrates the EJ Index for the selected area compared to all people's blockgroups in the state/region/US, with percentiles ranging from 0 to 100. The report explains that these percentiles provide perspective on how the selected block group or buffer area compares to the entire state, EPA region, or nation. For example, if a given location is at the 95th percentile nationwide, this means that only 5 percent of the US population has a higher block group value than the average person in the location being analyzed. The years for which the data are available, and the methods used, vary across these indicators. Important caveats and uncertainties apply to this screening-level information, so it is essential to understand the limitations on appropriate interpretations and applications of these indicators. Please see EJSCREEN documentation for discussion of these issues before using reports.
## Sites reporting to EPA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Superfund NPL</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazardous Waste Treatment, Storage, and Disposal Facilities (TSDF)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES)</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Selected Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>State Average</th>
<th>Percentile in State</th>
<th>Percentile in EPA Region</th>
<th>Percentile in USA Average</th>
<th>Percentile in USA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Particulate Matter (PM 2.5 in μg/m³)</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>9.27</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>9.75</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>9.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ozone (ppb)</td>
<td>48.9</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>47.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATA Diesel PM (μg/m³)</td>
<td>0.931</td>
<td>0.759</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>0.779</td>
<td>60-70th</td>
<td>0.937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATA Air Toxics Cancer Risk (risk per MM)</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>60-70th</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NATA Respiratory Hazard Index</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>60-70th</td>
<td>1.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Proximity and Volume (daily traffic count/distance to road)</td>
<td>540</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lead Paint Indicator (% pre-1960s housing)</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superfund Proximity (site count/km distance)</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>0.097</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMP Proximity (facility count/km distance)</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazardous Waste Proximity (facility count/km distance)</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>0.099</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Discharger Proximity (facility count/km)</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>0.21</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>0.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Demographic Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Value</th>
<th>State Average</th>
<th>Percentile in State</th>
<th>Percentile in EPA Region</th>
<th>Percentile in USA Average</th>
<th>Percentile in USA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demographic Index</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minority Population</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Income Population</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Linguistically Isolated Population</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population with Less Than High School Education</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population under Age 5</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population over Age 64</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The National-Scale Air Toxics Assessment (NATA) is EPA's ongoing, comprehensive evaluation of air toxics in the United States. EPA developed the NATA to prioritize air toxics, emission sources, and locations of interest for further study. It is important to remember that NATA provides broad estimates of health risks over geographic areas of the country, not definitive risks to specific individuals or locations. More information on the NATA analysis can be found at: [https://www.epa.gov/national-air-toxics-assessment](https://www.epa.gov/national-air-toxics-assessment).

*The hazardous waste environmental indicator and the corresponding EJ index will appear as NIA if there are no hazardous waste facilities within 50 km of a selected location.

For additional information, see: [www.epa.gov/environmentaljustice](http://www.epa.gov/environmentaljustice)
data, particularly when looking at small geographic areas. Important caveats and uncertainties apply to this screening-level information, so it is essential to understand the limitations on appropriate interpretations and applications of these indicators. Please see EJSCREEN documentation for discussion of these issues before using reports. This screening tool does not provide data on every environmental impact and demographic factor that may be relevant to a particular location. EJSCREEN outputs should be supplemented with additional information and local knowledge before taking any action to address potential EJ concerns.
Appendix 8: Floodplain Management

1. FEMA Flood Map
Appendix 9: Historic Preservation

1. Programmatic Agreement between the State Historic Preservation Office and the City of Omaha
PROGRAMMATIC AGREEMENT
BETWEEN THE CITY OF OMAHA, NEBRASKA
AND THE NEBRASKA STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICER,
FOR U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HOUSING AND URBAN DEVELOPMENT
PROGRAMS ADMINISTERED BY
THE CITY OF OMAHA, NEBRASKA

WHEREAS, the City of Omaha, State of Nebraska ("City"), administers grant programs from
the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development ("HUD"), which include, but
are not limited to the Community Development Block Grant ("CDBG") program, HOME
program, Neighborhood Stabilization Program, and other HUD programs (collectively, "HUD
Programs") for which the City assumes HUD's environmental review responsibility pursuant to
24 C.F.R. Part 58; and

WHEREAS, in the administration of HUD Programs and pursuant to 24 C.F.R. Part 58, the City
assumes responsibility for compliance with the requirements of Section 106 of the National
Historic Preservation Act, as amended [16 USC Sec. 470f ] as implemented at 36 C.F.R. Part
800 ("Section 106"); and

WHEREAS, the City or other participant in the development process, including public or
private nonprofit or for-profit entities, or any of their contractors, may undertake activities that
include, but are not limited to, acquisition, land-banking, leasing, repair, rehabilitation,
renovation, improvement, demolition, conversion, and new construction of residential and non-
residential properties, structures or facilities, each of which is an undertaking ("Undertaking") as
defined pursuant to 36 C.F.R. Part 800.16; and

WHEREAS, the City has determined that Undertakings may have an effect on properties
included in or eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places and has consulted
with the Nebraska State Historic Preservation Officer ("SHPO") and the Advisory Council on
Historic Preservation (hereinafter "ACHP") pursuant to 36 C.F.R. Part 800.14; and

WHEREAS, the principles set forth in the ACHP's Policy Statement on Affordable Housing and
Historic Preservation, which is attached as Appendix A and incorporated herein, shall be taken
into consideration by all parties when carrying out the stipulations of this Programmatic
Agreement; and

WHEREAS, citations made to Section 106 within this agreement relate to the version of 36

NOW, THEREFORE, the City and SHPO agree that the City's HUD-funded programs shall be
administered in accordance with the stipulations provided below to satisfy the City's Section 106
responsibilities for all individual Undertakings.
STIPULATIONS

The City shall ensure that the following measures are carried out:

I. Qualifications of Personnel

A. The City shall ensure that all activities and reviews carried out pursuant to this agreement are implemented by or under the supervision of a person(s) qualified in accordance with The Secretary of the Interior’s Professional Qualifications Standards (hereinafter “Professional Qualifications”) (48 FR 44716), attached as Appendix C. The City shall assign a staff person (hereinafter “Head Preservation Administrator” or “HPA”), or retain a consultant, that possesses the Professional Qualifications necessary to monitor the administration of this agreement. When archaeological review and monitoring is necessary, the services of a person(s) meeting the Professional Qualifications for the discipline of archaeology shall be retained.

B. The City shall notify the SHPO of the personnel responsible for complying with this agreement and shall notify the SHPO when there is a change in personnel. The City shall submit a report to the SHPO verifying the qualifications of the HPA when the PA is renewed, and when a new HPA, either assigned staff person or consultant, is assigned.

C. If the City does not employ or contract with a qualified HPA, the City shall consult with the SHPO to develop alternate administrative procedures.

II. Section 106 Review Process. The City shall follow the process outlined in Appendix B: Section 106 Review Process for projects covered by this PA unless circumstances dictate an alternate review process is necessary.

III. Activities Exempt from Further Review. All Undertakings not identified under Stipulation II, “Activities Exempt from Further Review,” must be reviewed in accordance with 36 C.F.R. Part §§ 800.3 through 800.7.

A. General Exemptions. The following undertakings have no potential or limited potential to affect historic properties and do not require further review or consultation with the SHPO or ACHP. Further compliance with the ACHP’s regulation (36 C.F.R. Part 800) is not required.

1. Repair or rehabilitation, but not demolition or new construction, that involves buildings, structures, or facilities less than fifty (50) years old at the time of the proposed undertaking, provided that:
   a) The property has not been listed in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) at the time of the proposed undertaking, and
   b) The property has not been determined to be eligible for listing in the NRHP as identified in the records of the SHPO at the time of the proposed undertaking.

2. Refinancing, without demolition, repair, rehabilitation or construction.

3. Leasing, without demolition, repair, rehabilitation or construction.

4. Acquisition or land-banking of vacant real property (i.e., property without buildings or structures) for which there is no reasonably foreseeable plan for redevelopment, reuse, or new construction and without any reasonably foreseeable plan for ground disturbing activity. Properties acquired under this exemption require review pursuant
to 36 CFR Parts 800.3 through 800.6, as appropriate, upon identification of a plan for redevelopment, reuse, new construction, or ground disturbance.

IV. Exempt Activities. The following undertakings have no potential or limited potential to affect historic properties and do not require further review or consultation with the SHPO or ACHP, provided the undertakings comply with The Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for the Treatment of Historic Properties. For purposes of this agreement, the terms “in-kind repair” and “in-kind replacement” are defined as installation of a new element that matches the original material in terms of composition, appearance, dimension, detailing, and durability. In addition, and to the extent practicable, original materials will be preserved and reused for in-kind replacement/repair.

Exempt activities apply to projects not otherwise made exempt under Section II A, “General Exemptions.”

A. Acquisition and Design
1. Purchase and acquisition of real property.
2. Architectural and engineering fees.

B. Site Work
1. Removal and installation of non-historic retaining walls, driveways, curbs and gutters, and parking areas; and for in-kind repair using like materials, techniques, and design of historic retaining walls, driveways, curbs and gutters, and parking areas.
2. Installation or repair of concrete or asphalt sidewalks and alleys.
3. Installation or repair of brick or stone sidewalks and alleys with like materials.
4. Maintenance, repair or in-kind replacement of masonry steps not attached to any building.
5. Installation of landscaping when no grading is required and when excavation of holes for individual plantings is no more than thirty (30) inches deep.
6. Installation or repair of utilities such as water, gas, sewer, and electrical lines.
7. Installation of temporary, reversible barriers such as fencing and construction of pedestrian tunnels.

C. Exterior Rehabilitation
1. Securing and “mothballing” of structures, using methods defined in the National Park Service’s Preservation Brief 31, Mothballing Historic Structures.
2. Installation of scaffolding.
3. Temporary stabilization that causes no permanent damage to the building or site, including installation of temporary bracing, shoring, and tarps.
4. Exterior maintenance and repair made with in-kind materials that do not affect the external appearance and building fabric, including, but not limited to the following:
   a) Repointing of mortar joints with mortar similar in composition, joint profile, color, and texture. The mortar used in the tuckpointing shall be no harder than the existing mortar and bricks.
b) Repair and in-kind replacement of foundations, floor joists, and ceiling joists.
c) Removal of exterior paint by non-destructive means, limited to hand scraping, low-pressure water wash of less than 400 psi, heat plates or hot air guns, chemical paint removal.
d) Application of exterior paint, other than on previously unpainted masonry.
e) All lead paint abatement that does not involve removal or alteration of exterior features and/or windows.
f) Repair or partial in-kind replacement of wood siding and trim.
g) Repair or in-kind replacement of existing porch elements such as columns, flooring, floor joists, ceilings, railing, balusters and balustrades, and lattice.
h) Maintenance, repair, and in-kind replacement of roof cladding and sheeting, gutters, soffits, and downspouts with no change in roof pitch or configuration.
i) Window repair, including caulkling and weather stripping of existing window frames, installation of new clear glass in existing sashes, and replacement of glazing.
j) Maintenance, repair, or in-kind replacement of handicapped accessible improvements such as wheelchair ramps, but not including exterior elevators.

5. Installation of storm windows and doors provided the windows and doors are anodized or painted to match the trim and have horizontal and vertical divisions that align with the existing window divisions.

6. Placement and installation of exterior heating, ventilating or air conditioning (HVAC) mechanical units and vents, provided any exterior HVAC mechanical units at the front of the building are screened from public view.

7. Installation, replacement, or repair of basement bulkhead doors.

**D. Interior rehabilitation**

1. All plumbing work, including installation of water heaters. In no case shall ceilings be dropped to accommodate such work.
2. All electrical work not involving demolition of walls, ceilings, and/or floors.
3. All HVAC systems and their components. In no case shall ceilings be dropped to accommodate such work.
4. Installation of insulation in attics and crawl spaces. In no case shall ceilings be dropped to accommodate such work.
5. Repair and in-kind replacement of plaster walls and ceilings.
6. Installation of drywall where original plaster wall surfaces are missing and where the installation of drywall will not appreciably change the trim profile.
7. Repair and refinishing of interior floors.
8. All painting and carpeting, provided that carpet installation damages no underlying wood or masonry floor surfaces.
9. All kitchen and bathroom remodeling provided the location of walls, windows, or doors are not altered.

10. All lead paint abatement that does not involve removal or alteration of interior features.

11. All asbestos abatement that does not involve removal or alteration of interior features.

E. Demolition


2. Installation of temporary fencing and barriers for the purpose of site control or security.

3. Demolition of structures or building additions less than fifty years old, following review of City records, other than those eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places as defined by National Register Bulletin 22, *Guidelines for Evaluating and Nominating Properties that Have Achieved Significance Within the Past Fifty Years*.

4. Demolition of buildings, structures or facilities where a designated City official has determined that the structural integrity has been lost and there is an imminent threat to public health and safety; provided:
   a) That the property has been evaluated for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places at the time of the proposed undertaking, and
   b) That the historical significance of the site has been evaluated for archaeological or other capacity to yield information that may contribute to the understanding of Omaha history, and
   c) In all such circumstances, photo-documentation shall take place prior to demolition and photography shall follow guidelines established in *The Secretary of the Interior’s Documentation Standards*, when and where safely feasible.

5. Demolition of structures determined by the Nebraska SHPO within the past four years to be ineligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places, either individually or as part of a district, unless changes in condition or status of the property necessitate review. The four-year time period shall be applied from the date of request for demolition.

6. Demolition of noncontributing accessory structures and those ineligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places with a building footprint of less than 300 square feet, including, but not limited to, garages, sheds, and carports.

7. Removal and disposal of collapsed building debris and rubble not attached to any structure, except where the building debris is determined to be a contributing element of a site, or district, or archaeological site.

8. Removal of metal awnings, except where the awnings have been deemed to be a contributing element of the structure.


11. Grading and seeding sites where demolition has already taken place.

V. Technical Assistance. Nothing in this agreement shall be construed as meaning that the City cannot request advice, counsel, or assistance of the SHPO at any time.

VI. Monitoring. The SHPO may monitor activities carried out pursuant to this PA. The City shall cooperate with the SHPO in carrying out their monitoring and review responsibilities.

A. The City shall retain and make available to the SHPO public records documenting the date of construction of buildings, structures and facilities less than fifty years old that were demolished under programs covered by this PA.

B. The City shall submit a copy of the yearly Omaha-Council Bluffs Consortium Consolidated Submission for Community Development Programs: Action Plan within 15 days after release.

C. The City shall provide an annual report to the SHPO which lists properties that were reviewed for programs covered by this PA.

VII. Public Participation. Public participation shall occur in accordance with Implementation Principle II of Appendix A: ACHP's Policy Statement on Affordable Housing and according to the process outlined in Appendix B: Section 106 Review Process.

A. Consultation with Interested Parties.

1. The City shall identify and invite interested parties (IP) to comment in accordance with the process outlined Appendix B. IP are defined in Part II of Appendix B.

VIII. Dispute Resolution.

A. At any time during implementation of the measures stipulated in this agreement, should an objection to any measure or manner of implementation be raised by a member of the public, the City shall take the objection into account and consult with the objecting party and the SHPO to resolve the objection.

B. If the City determines that such objection cannot be resolved, the City shall:

1. Forward all documentation relevant to the dispute, including the City’s proposed resolution and SHPO comments, to the ACHP. The ACHP shall provide the City comment on resolving the objection within fifteen (15) days of receiving adequate documentation. If the ACHP does not provide comment within this period, the City may make a final decision on the dispute and proceed accordingly.

2. Prior to making a final decision on the dispute, the City shall prepare a written response to the ACHP and SHPO that takes into account any timely advice or comments regarding the dispute from the ACHP and SHPO and/or other known interested parties, and provide them with a copy of this written response. The City will then proceed according to its final decision.

C. The responsibilities of the signatories to carry out all other actions subject to the terms of this Agreement that are not the subject of the dispute remain unchanged.

IX. Effective Dates. This PA will continue in full force and effect until April 1, 2018. At any time during the six-months prior to this date, the City may request in writing that the ACHP and SHPO review the City’s program and consider an extension or modification of this PA.
No extension or modification will be effective unless all parties to the PA have agreed to such extension in writing.

X. Amendments. Any party to this PA may request that it be amended, whereupon the parties will consult in accordance with 36 CFR § 800.14 to consider such amendment. Twelve months after the execution of this agreement, the consulting parties shall review the process and procedures of this agreement; and if agreed to, make recommendations for amendments to this agreement in writing.

XI. Termination. Any party to this Programmatic Agreement may terminate it by providing thirty (30) days notice to the other party, provided that the parties will consult during the period prior to termination to seek agreement on amendments or other actions that would avoid termination. In the event of termination, the City will comply with 36 CFR §§ 800.3 through 800.6 with regard to individual undertakings covered by this PA.

Execution and implementation of this PA provides evidence that the City has afforded ACHP a reasonable opportunity to comment on the program and that the City has taken into account the effects of the program on historic properties.

SIGNED:

City of Omaha, State of Nebraska
By: James R. Thele, Assistant Director – Planning Department
Date: 1/13/13

Nebraska State Historic Preservation Officer
By: Michael J. Smith, State Historic Preservation Officer
Date: 01-23-2013
APPENDIX A

ACHP’S POLICY STATEMENT ON AFFORDABLE HOUSING AND HISTORIC PRESERVATION
(Adopted June 26, 1995)

The National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (NHPA) mandates preservation of the historical and cultural foundations of the Nation as a living part of community life and development in order to provide the American people with a sense of orientation.

It further states that increased knowledge about historic resources, establishment of a better means to identify and administer them, and encouragement of their preservation will not only improve planning and execution of Federal and federally assisted projects but also assist economic growth and development.

Toward that end, NHPA directs the Federal Government to foster conditions under which modern society and prehistoric and historic resources can exist in productive harmony and "fulfill the social, economic, and other requirements of present and future generations."

Federal agencies that assist in the construction and rehabilitation of housing, most notably the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) and the Department of Agriculture, are tasked with meeting Americans basic needs for safe, decent and affordable housing. Historic properties have played a vital role in fulfilling this objective; this must continue.

It is, however, important that Federal and State agencies, local governments, housing providers, and the preservation community in general actively seek ways to reconcile national historic preservation goals with the special economic and social needs associated with affordable housing, given that this is now one of the Nation's most pressing challenges.

In issuing this policy statement, ACHP seeks to promote a new, flexible approach toward affordable housing and historic preservation, which is embodied in the following Implementation Principles. State Historic Preservation Officers (SHPOs), Federal and State agencies, and local governments involved in the administration of the Section 106 review process for affordable housing projects funded or assisted by Federal agencies are encouraged to use these principles as a framework for Section 106 consultation and local historic preservation planning.

ACHP also encourages HUD, in consultation with the national preservation community, including the National Conference of State Historic Preservation Officers, the National Park Service, and the National Trust for Historic Preservation, to develop comprehensive historic preservation training programs for HUD staff, State, county, and local officials, and housing providers who implement affordable housing projects.

Such training should advance the Implementation Principles and the initiatives outlined in the Secretary of HUD's May 5, 1995, Historic Preservation Directive, focusing on:
1) improving coordination of Section 106 reviews;

2) evaluating the National Register eligibility of historic properties;

3) applying the Secretary's Standards;

4) providing technical assistance for routine maintenance and repairs to historic buildings;

5) developing financial packages for affordable housing projects; and

6) integrating historic preservation into Consolidated Plan Documents and local comprehensive plans.

Implementation Principles

I. Section 106 reviews for affordable housing projects should place principal emphasis on broad-based consensus reflecting the interests, desires, and values of affected communities, neighborhoods, and residents. Consensus-building should be facilitated through training, education, and consultation focused on historic preservation values, collaborative planning, and dispute resolution.

II. Identification of historic properties and evaluation of their eligibility for the National Register for Historic Places should include discussions with the local community and neighborhood residents to ensure that their views concerning architectural and historic significance and traditional and cultural values receive full consideration by the Federal agency, State, county, or local government, and the SHPO.

III. When assessing the effects of affordable housing projects on historic properties, consultation should focus not just on individual buildings which may contribute to a historic district but on the overall historic preservation potentials of the broader community, neighborhood, or "target area." This practice will ensure proper consideration is given to the cumulative impacts of projects within a designated area. Historic preservation issues should be related to social and economic development, housing, safety, and programmatic issues integral to community viability.

IV. Plans and specifications for rehabilitation, new construction, and abatement of hazardous conditions associated with affordable housing projects should adhere to the recommended approaches in The Secretary of the Interior's Standards for Rehabilitation and Guidelines for Rehabilitating Historic Buildings, when feasible. When economic or design constraints preclude application of the Standards, consulting parties may develop alternative design guidelines tailored to the district or neighborhood to preserve historic materials and spaces to the maximum extent feasible. Alternative guidelines shall be incorporated into executed Memoranda of Agreement or Programmatic Agreements.

V. Proposals for non-emergency demolitions of historic properties should include adequate background documentation to demonstrate to the SHPO and/or ACHP that rehabilitation is not economically or structurally feasible, or that retention of such properties would jeopardize the implementation of an affordable housing project.

VI. The Section 106 review process for affordable housing rehabilitation projects and abatement of hazardous conditions should emphasize treatment of exteriors and be
limited to significant interior features and spaces that contribute to the property's eligibility for the National Register, unless otherwise agreed to by all consulting parties.

VII. Where appropriate, Section 106 reviews for affordable housing projects should be conducted in conjunction with the Historic Rehabilitation Tax Credits and other State and local administrative reviews to ensure consistency of reviews and to minimize delays. When Section 106 reviews for affordable housing projects precede other related reviews, applicants who are seeking Historic Tax Credits are encouraged to seek the advice of the SHPO and to obtain early review by the National Park Service to assure final eligibility for the Historic Rehabilitation Tax Credit.

VIII. Archeological investigations should not be required for affordable housing projects which are limited to rehabilitation and require minimal ground disturbance activities.

IX. State, county, and local governments are encouraged to develop Programmatic Agreements that promote creative solutions to implement affordable housing projects and to streamline Section 106 reviews through the exemption of categories of routine activities; the adoption of "treatment and design protocols" for rehabilitation and infill new construction; and the delegation of Section 106 reviews to qualified preservation professionals employed by the local community.

X. Certified local governments and/or communities that employ qualified preservation professionals, as set forth in The Secretary of the Interior's Professional Qualification Standards should be allowed to conduct Section 106 reviews on behalf of ACHP and/or the SHPO for affordable housing projects when the local government and/or community has executed a Programmatic Agreement with ACHP and the SHPO.
APPENDIX B

SECTION 106 REVIEW PROCESS

The following is an outline of the Section 106 Review process for projects covered under this Programmatic Agreement (PA). This document also presents the public participation process to be used for all programs covered under the PA unless a party to this agreement determines that a specific project requires an alternative public participation process.

Part I - Section 106 Review Process

1) A request for environmental review is submitted to the responsible Manager, City Planner, or designee (hereafter referred to as the Requester)

   a) Designees may be appointed for projects requiring a Tier II (or project specific) environmental review. Typically the designee will be a Construction Specialist with the City of Omaha (City), but it is not limited to Construction Specialists.

2) A Section 106 Review Request form must be filled out for each property within the project area. One form may be filled out for several adjacent properties. If the Section 106 Review has previously been conducted, a subsequent review is not required unless a new scope of work at the project site has been developed. This does not apply to new scopes of work developed in conjunction with the City of Omaha Historical Preservation Administrator (HPA) and/or the SHPO. A blank copy of the Section 106 Review Request form is attached.

3) The Section 106 Review Request form includes the following information:
   i. Property Owner
   ii. Property Address
   iii. Date Built
   iv. Program
   v. Estimated Rehabilitation Cost (if applicable)
   vi. Level of Assistance (if applicable)
   vii. Assessed Value
   viii. Description of Proposed Undertaking
   ix. Submitted by
   x. Turn Around Date

4) The Requester forwards the filled out Section 106 Review Request form to the City of Omaha’s HPA.

5) The HPA reviews the project and makes one of the following determinations:
   a) Not a Historic Structure.
      i) If the HPA determines the property is not historic then no further consultation with the HPA, the Nebraska State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), or Interested Parties (IP), as defined in Part II, below, is required.
   b) Historic Structure
i) If the HPA determines the property is historic, then the HPA must evaluate if the project activities meet the requirements for exemptions listed under Section III of the PA.

(1) If all project activities meet the definition of an exempt activity listed under Section III of the PA, then modification to the project’s scope of work is not required.

(2) If any of the project activities do not meet the definition of an exempt activity listed under Section III of the PA, then modification to the project’s scope of work is required.

ii) Modification to the project’s scope of work will be conducted by the project manager and/or program manager after consultation with the HPA. Consultation shall provide direction to the project manager and/or program manager regarding steps which must be taken to preserve the historical significance of the property.

(1) The HPA, project manager, or program manager must document the results of the consultation by preparing a modified scope of work.

iii) The Section 106 Review form and the modified scope of work will be submitted to the SHPO and IP.

(1) The SHPO will provide comment to the City within 30 days of the receipt of the documents. Work at the project site will not proceed until the SHPO has provided comment, or until the 30-day response period has expired. It will be assumed that the SHPO concurs with modified scope of work if they do not respond by the end of the 30-day response period.

(a) If the SHPO concurs with the determination of the HPA, then no further modifications to the scope of work are required. The SHPO will provide a letter stating their concurrence to the City.

(b) If the SHPO does not concur with the determination of the HPA, then the SHPO, HPA, and project manager and/or program manager must resolve the dispute. Once the dispute has been resolved, another modified scope of work must be prepared by the City and a letter of concurrence must be provided from the SHPO.

(c) If the dispute cannot be resolved, the City will consult with the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP). This process is described in Section VI of the PA.

(2) IP are not required to provide comment to the City and the City will not wait for comment from IP before beginning work on the project if the SHPO has already concurred with the scope of work. Comments by IP about the scope of work for a project should be directed to the City of Omaha’s HPA.

c) Exempt Activity

i) The description indicates an exempt activity, or activities, as defined by the PA, will occur.
6) A copy of the signed Section 106 Review Request form, and modified scope of work, if required, will be returned to the Requester, and included as supporting documentation for the environmental review.

**Part II - Interested Parties**

IP are agencies and/or organizations which have an interest in the preservation of historic sites and/or potentially historic sites within Douglas County, Nebraska. IP will be notified of the City’s scope of work for historic or potentially historic properties during the public participation process described in Part I.

IP will be sent electronic copies of the Section 106 Review Request form and modified scope of work, if required, sent from the City to the SHPO. The electronic documents will be in .pdf format. The SHPO will also send an electronic copy of their response to IP.

The following organizations have been identified as IP, and have indicated the following email addresses as their preferred means of contact:

- 2020 Omaha, email: (2020omaha@cox.net)
- Landmarks, Inc., email: (board@omahalandmarks.org)

This list can be amended by the agreement of the SHPO and the City. IP are responsible for notifying both the City and the SHPO of any changes to their preferred means of contact. Additional IP may be added to this list by the agreement of the SHPO and the City.
SECTION 106 REVIEW REQUEST FORM

Please answer the questions to the best of your ability and submit the form to Don Seten with the City of Omaha Planning Department

PROPERTY OWNER:

PROPERTY ADDRESS:

DATE BUILT:

PROGRAM:

EST. REHAB COST (if applicable):

LEVEL OF ASSISTANCE (if applicable):

ASSESSED VALUE:

DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED UNDERTAKING:

SUBMITTED BY:

TURN-AROUND DATE:

☐ Not a Historic Structure

☐ Historic Structure

☐ Exempt Activity

Don Seten
HCD Historic Preservation Administrator

Date
Appendix C

Professional Qualification Standards

In the September 29, 1983, issue of the Federal Register (48 FR 44716), the National Park Service published the following Professional Qualification Standards as part of the larger Secretary of the Interior’s Standards and Guidelines for Archeology and Historic Preservation. These Professional Qualification Standards are in effect currently. Since 1983, the National Park Service has not issued any revisions for effect, although the National Park Service is in the process of drafting such revisions.

The following requirements are those used by the National Park Service, and have been previously published in the Code of Federal Regulations, 36 CFR Part 61. The qualifications define minimum education and experience required to perform identification, evaluation, registration, and treatment activities. In some cases, additional areas or levels of expertise may be needed, depending on the complexity of the task and the nature of the historic properties involved. In the following definitions, a year of full-time professional experience need not consist of a continuous year of full-time work but may be made up of discontinuous periods of full-time or part-time work adding up to the equivalent of a year of full-time experience.

History

The minimum professional qualifications in history are a graduate degree in history or closely related field; or a bachelor's degree in history or closely related field plus one of the following:

1. At least two years of full-time experience in research, writing, teaching, interpretation, or other demonstrable professional activity with an academic institution, historical organization or agency, museum, or other professional institution; or

2. Substantial contribution through research and publication to the body of scholarly knowledge in the field of history.

Archeology

The minimum professional qualifications in archeology are a graduate degree in archeology, anthropology, or closely related field plus:

1. At least one year of full-time professional experience or equivalent specialized training in archeological research, administration or management;

2. At least four months of supervised field and analytic experience in general North American archeology; and

3. Demonstrated ability to carry research to completion.
In addition to these minimum qualifications, a professional in prehistoric archeology shall have at least one year of full-time professional experience at a supervisory level in the study of archeological resources of the prehistoric period.

A professional in historic archeology shall have at least one year of full-time professional experience at a supervisory level in the study of archeological resources of the historic period.

**Architectural History**

The minimum professional qualifications in architectural history are a graduate degree in architectural history, art history, historic preservation, or closely related field, with coursework in American architectural history; or a bachelor's degree in architectural history, art history, historic preservation or closely related field plus one of the following:

1. At least two years of full-time experience in research, writing, or teaching in American architectural history or restoration architecture with an academic institution, historical organization or agency, museum, or other professional institution; or

2. Substantial contribution through research and publication to the body of scholarly knowledge in the field of American architectural history.

**Architecture**

The minimum professional qualifications in architecture are a professional degree in architecture plus at least two years of full-time experience in architecture; or a State license to practice architecture.

**Historic Architecture**

The minimum professional qualifications in historic architecture are a professional degree in architecture or a State license to practice architecture, plus one of the following:

1. At least one year of graduate study in architectural preservation, American architectural history, preservation planning, or closely related field; or

2. At least one year of full-time professional experience on historic preservation projects.

Such graduate study or experience shall include detailed investigations of historic structures, preparation of historic structures research reports, and preparation of plans and specifications for preservation projects.
Appendix 10: Noise Control

1. Offut Air Force Base Noise Contour Map
2. Epply Airfield Noise Exposure Comparison – Past and Future
3. Current noise calculation for 2423 N 25th Street
4. Current noise calculation for 3304 N 24th Street
5. Projected noise calculation for 2423 N 25th Street
6. Projected noise calculation for 3304 N 24th Street
The Airport Noise and Capacity Act of 1990 established a schedule for the phase-out of the noisier Stage 2 jet aircraft used by the airlines. This law required Stage 2 aircraft to be phased-out or modified to meet Stage 3 noise levels. The airline fleet met these noise levels by the year 2000.

Today, noise exposure levels in the residential areas around Eppley Airfield are lower than they were just a few years ago due to commercial and cargo aircraft meeting Stage 3 noise levels.
DNL Calculator

The Day/Night Noise Level Calculator is an electronic assessment tool that calculates the Day/Night Noise Level (DNL) from roadway and railway traffic. For more information on using the DNL calculator, view the Day/Night Noise Level Calculator Electronic Assessment Tool Overview (/programs/environmental-review/daynight-noise-level-electronic-assessment-tool/).

Guidelines
- To display the Road and/or Rail DNL calculator(s), click on the "Add Road Source" and/or "Add Rail Source" button(s) below.
- All Road and Rail input values must be positive non-decimal numbers.
- All Road and/or Rail DNL value(s) must be calculated separately before calculating the Site DNL.
- All checkboxes that apply must be checked for vehicles and trains in the tables' headers.
- Note #1: Tooltips, containing field specific information, have been added in this tool and may be accessed by hovering over all the respective data fields (site identification, roadway and railway assessment, DNL calculation results, roadway and railway input variable(s) with the mouse.
- Note #2: DNL Calculator assumes roadway data is always entered.

### DNL Calculator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site ID</th>
<th>2423 N 25th Street - NAFRA Node 1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Record Date</strong></td>
<td>08/18/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>User's Name</strong></td>
<td>Nicole Engels</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Road #1 Name: Sprague Street

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Road #1</strong></th>
<th><strong>Vehicle Type</strong></th>
<th><strong>Cars</strong></th>
<th><strong>Medium Trucks</strong></th>
<th><strong>Heavy Trucks</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effective Distance</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Distance to Stop Sign</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average Speed</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average Daily Trips (ADT)</td>
<td>3146</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Night Fraction of ADT</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Road Gradient (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle DNL</td>
<td></td>
<td>56.3</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>56.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Calculate Road #1 DNL] Reset

#### Road #2 Name: N 24th St

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Road #2</strong></th>
<th><strong>Vehicle Type</strong></th>
<th><strong>Cars</strong></th>
<th><strong>Medium Trucks</strong></th>
<th><strong>Heavy Trucks</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Effective Distance</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Distance to Stop Sign</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Average Speed</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Daily Trips (ADT)</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

https://www.hudexchange.info/environmental-review/dnl-calculator/
### Mitigation Options

If your site DNL is in Excess of 65 decibels, your options are:

- **No Action Alternative:** Cancel the project at this location
- **Other Reasonable Alternatives:** Choose an alternate site
- **Mitigation**
  - Contact your Field or Regional Environmental Officer ([programs/environmental-review/hud-environmental-staff-contacts/](https://programs/environmental-review/hud-environmental-staff-contacts/))
  - Increase mitigation in the building walls (only effective if no outdoor, noise sensitive areas)
  - Reconfigure the site plan to increase the distance between the noise source and noise-sensitive uses
  - Incorporate natural or man-made barriers. See [The Noise Guidebook](https://resource/313/hud-noise-guidebook/)
  - Construct noise barrier. See the [Barrier Performance Module](https://programs/environmental-review/bpm-calculator/)

### Tools and Guidance

- Day/Night Noise Level Assessment Tool Flowcharts ([resource/3823/day-night-noise-level-assessment-tool-flowcharts/](https://resource/3823/day-night-noise-level-assessment-tool-flowcharts/))
DNL Calculator

The Day/Night Noise Level Calculator is an electronic assessment tool that calculates the Day/Night Noise Level (DNL) from roadway and railway traffic. For more information on using the DNL calculator, view the Day/Night Noise Level Calculator Electronic Assessment Tool Overview (/programs/environmental-review/day-night-noise-level-electronic-assessment-tool/).

Guidelines
- To display the Road and/or Rail DNL calculator(s), click on the "Add Road Source" and/or "Add Rail Source" button(s) below.
- All Road and Rail input values must be positive non-decimal numbers.
- All Road and/or Rail DNL value(s) must be calculated separately before calculating the Site DNL.
- All checkboxes that apply must be checked for vehicles and trains in the tables' headers.
- Note #1: Tooltips, containing field specific information, have been added in this tool and may be accessed by hovering over all the respective data fields (site identification, roadway and railway assessment, DNL calculation results, roadmap and railway input variables) with the mouse.
- Note #2: DNL Calculator assumes roadway data is always entered.

### Road #1 Name: Spencer Street

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vehicle Type</th>
<th>Cars</th>
<th>Medium Trucks</th>
<th>Heavy Trucks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effective Distance</td>
<td>561</td>
<td>561</td>
<td>561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance to Stop Sign</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Speed</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Daily Trips (ADT)</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Night Fraction of ADT</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Gradient (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle DNL</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>31.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Calculate Road #1 DNL**: 33.4

**Reset**

### Road #2 Name: N 24th St

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vehicle Type</th>
<th>Cars</th>
<th>Medium Trucks</th>
<th>Heavy Trucks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effective Distance</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance to Stop Sign</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Speed</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average Daily Trips (ADT): 636

https://www.hudexchange.info/environmental-review/dnl-calculator/
Mitigation Options
If your site DNL is in Excess of 65 decibels, your options are:

- **No Action Alternative**: Cancel the project at this location
- **Other Reasonable Alternatives**: Choose an alternate site
- **Mitigation**
  - Contact your Field or Regional Environmental Officer (/programs/environmental-review/hud-environmental-staff-contacts/)
  - Increase mitigation in the building walls (only effective if no outdoor, noise sensitive areas)
  - Reconfigure the site plan to increase the distance between the noise source and noise-sensitive uses
  - Incorporate natural or man-made barriers. See The Noise Guidebook (/resource/313/hud-noise-guidebook/)
  - Construct noise barrier. See the Barrier Performance Module (/programs/environmental-review/bpm-calculator/)
Tools and Guidance

Day/Night Noise Level Assessment Tool User Guide (/resource/3822/day-night-noise-level-assessment-tool-user-guide/)
Day/Night Noise Level Assessment Tool Flowcharts (/resource/3823/day-night-noise-level-assessment-tool-flowcharts/)
DNL Calculator

The Day/Night Noise Level Calculator is an electronic assessment tool that calculates the Day/Night Noise Level (DNL) from roadway and railway traffic. For more information on using the DNL calculator, view the Day/Night Noise Level Calculator Electronic Assessment Tool Overview (/programs/environmental-review/daynight-noise-level-electronic-assessment-tool/).

Guidelines

- To display the Road and/or Rail DNL calculator(s), click on the "Add Road Source" and/or "Add Rail Source" button(s) below.
- All Road and Rail input values must be positive non-decimal numbers.
- All Road and/or Rail DNL value(s) must be calculated separately before calculating the Site DNL.
- All checkboxes that apply must be checked for vehicles and trains in the tables' headers.
- Note #1: Tooltips, containing field specific information, have been added in this tool and may be accessed by hovering over all the respective data fields (site identification, roadway and railway assessment, DNL calculation results, roadway and railway input variables) with the mouse.
- Note #2: DNL Calculator assumes roadway data is always entered.

---

DNL Calculator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site ID</th>
<th>2423 N 25th Street - NAFRA Node 1 - 10 Year Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Record Date</td>
<td>08/18/2017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User's Name</td>
<td>Nicole Engels</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Road #1 Name: Sprague Street

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vehicle Type</th>
<th>Cars</th>
<th>Medium Trucks</th>
<th>Heavy Trucks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effective Distance</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance to Stop Sign</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Speed</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Daily Trips (ADT)</td>
<td>3546</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Night Fraction of ADT</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Gradient (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle DNL</td>
<td>56.9</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>56.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Calculate Road #1 DNL] 59.9

### Road #2 Name: N 24th Street

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vehicle Type</th>
<th>Cars</th>
<th>Medium Trucks</th>
<th>Heavy Trucks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effective Distance</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance to Stop Sign</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Speed</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Daily Trips (ADT)</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>07</td>
<td>07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Mitigation Options
If your site DNL is in Excess of 65 decibels, your options are:

- **No Action Alternative**: Cancel the project at this location
- **Other Reasonable Alternatives**: Choose an alternate site
- **Mitigation**
  - Contact your Field or Regional Environmental Officer (/programs/environmental-review/hud-environmental-staff-contacts/)
  - Increase mitigation in the building walls (only effective if no outdoor, noise sensitive areas)
  - Reconfigure the site plan to increase the distance between the noise source and noise-sensitive uses
  - Incorporate natural or man-made barriers. See The Noise Guidebook (/resource/313/hud-noise-guidebook/)
  - Construct noise barrier. See the Barrier Performance Module (/programs/environmental-review/bpm-calculator/)

Tools and Guidance
Day/Night Noise Level Assessment Tool User Guide (/resource/3822/day-night-noise-level-assessment-tool-user-guide/)
Day/Night Noise Level Assessment Tool Flowcharts (/resource/3823/day-night-noise-level-assessment-tool-flowcharts/)
DNL Calculator

The Day/Night Noise Level Calculator is an electronic assessment tool that calculates the Day/Night Noise Level (DNL) from roadway and railway traffic. For more information on using the DNL calculator, view the Day/Night Noise Level Calculator Electronic Assessment Tool Overview (/programs/environmental-review/daynight-noise-level-electronic-assessment-tool/).

Guidelines
- To display the Road and/or Rail DNL calculator(s), click on the "Add Road Source" and/or "Add Rail Source" button(s) below.
- All Road and Rail input values must be positive non-decimal numbers.
- All Road and/or Rail DNL value(s) must be calculated separately before calculating the Site DNL.
- All checkboxes that apply must be checked for vehicles and trains in the tables’ headers.
- Note #1: Tooltips, containing field specific information, have been added in this tool and may be accessed by hovering over all the respective data fields (site identification, roadway and railway assessment, DNL calculation results, roadway and railway input variables) with the mouse.
- Note #2: DNL Calculator assumes roadway data is always entered.

### DNL Calculator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site ID</th>
<th>3304 N 24th Street - NAFRA Node 2 - 10 Year Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Record Date</td>
<td>6/24/17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>User's Name</td>
<td>Nicole Engels</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Road #1 Name: Spencer Street

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vehicle Type</th>
<th>Cars</th>
<th>Medium Trucks</th>
<th>Heavy Trucks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effective Distance</td>
<td>561</td>
<td>561</td>
<td>561</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance to Stop Sign</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Speed</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Daily Trips (ADT)</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Night Fraction of ADT</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Gradient (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle DNL</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>31.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- [Calculate Road #1 DNL](#)
- [Reset](#)

#### Road #2 Name: N 24th Street

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vehicle Type</th>
<th>Cars</th>
<th>Medium Trucks</th>
<th>Heavy Trucks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effective Distance</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance to Stop Sign</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Speed</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Daily Trips (ADT)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

https://www.hudexchange.info/environmental-review/dnl-calculator/
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Cars</th>
<th>Medium Trucks</th>
<th>Heavy Trucks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Effective Distance</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distance to Stop Sign</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Speed</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Daily Trips (ADT)</td>
<td>3434</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Night Fraction of ADT</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Gradient (%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Combined DNL for all Road and Rail sources**: 67.2

**Combined DNL including Airport**: N/A

**Site DNL with Loud Impulse Sound**

---

### Mitigation Options

If your site DNL is in Excess of 65 decibels, your options are:

- **No Action Alternative**: Cancel the project at this location
- **Other Reasonable Alternatives**: Choose an alternate site
- **Mitigation**
  - Contact your Field or Regional Environmental Officer (/programs/environmental-review/hud-environmental-staff-contacts/)
  - Increase mitigation in the building walls (only effective if no outdoor, noise sensitive areas)
  - Reconfigure the site plan to increase the distance between the noise source and noise-sensitive uses
  - Incorporate natural or man-made barriers. See The Noise Guidebook (/resource/313/hud-noise-guidebook/)
  - Construct noise barrier. See the Barrier Performance Module (/programs/environmental-review/bpm-calculator/)
Tools and Guidance

Day/Night Noise Level Assessment Tool User Guide (/resource/3822/day-night-noise-level-assessment-tool-user-guide/)
Day/Night Noise Level Assessment Tool Flowcharts (/resource/3823/day-night-noise-level-assessment-tool-flowcharts/)
Appendix 11: Water Quality

1. Designated Sole Source Aquifers
Designated Sole Source Aquifers in EPA Region VII

Iowa, Kansas, Missouri, Nebraska

REGION VII (IA, KS, MO, NE)

Stephanie Lindberg
Drinking Water/Ground Water Branch
EPA Region 7
901 N. 5th Street
Kansas City, KS 66101
phone: (800) 223-0425
e-mail: lindberg.stephanie@epa.gov

There are no designated Sole Source Aquifers in Region VII. Contact the coordinator above for more information about designating SSAs in Region VII.

Return to: Sole Source Aquifer program home page
Appendix 12: Wild and Scenic Rivers

1. National Wild and Scenic Rivers, Nebraska
2. National Wild and Scenic Rivers, the Missouri River
3. National Wild and Scenic Rivers, the Niobrara
NEBRASKA

Nebraska has approximately 79,066 miles of river, of which 197 miles are designated as wild & scenic—approximately 2/10ths of 1% of the state's river miles.

Nourished by the fertile soils of the region, rivers of the Midwest explode with life, from great avian migrations to ancient fishes.

Missouri River
Niobrara River
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Designated Rivers</th>
<th>National System</th>
<th>River Management</th>
<th>Resources</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>About WSR Act</td>
<td>WSR Table</td>
<td>Council</td>
<td>Q &amp; A Search</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Listings</td>
<td>Study Rivers</td>
<td>Agencis</td>
<td>Bibliography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Profile Pages</td>
<td>Stewardship</td>
<td>Management Plans</td>
<td>Publications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>WSR Act Legislation</td>
<td>GIS Mapping</td>
<td>GIS Mapping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Logo &amp; Sign Standards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Display</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
MISSOURI RIVER, NEBRASKA, SOUTH DAKOTA

Managing Agency:
National Park Service, Missouri National Recreational River

Designated Reach:

Classification/Mileage:
November 10, 1978: Recreational — 59.0 miles; Total — 59.0 miles. May 24, 1991: Recreational — 39.0 miles; Total — 39.0 miles. Aggregate Totals: Recreational — 98.0 miles; Total — 98.0 miles.

Nourished by the fertile soils of the region, rivers of the Midwest explode with life, from great avian migrations to ancient fishes.
Missouri River (Nebraska and South Dakota)

This designation consists of two separate segments—from the Fort Randall Dam downstream to the backwaters of Lewis and Clark Lake and from Gavins Point Dam downstream to Ponca State Park. These are among the last free-flowing segments of the once "Mighty Mo" and still exhibit the river's dynamic character in its islands, bars, chutes and snags.
**Managing Agency:**
National Park Service, Niobrara National Scenic River
Fort Niobrara National Wildlife Refuge

**Designated Reach:**
May 24, 1981. From Borman Bridge to State Highway 137,
From the western boundary of Knox County to its confluence
with the Missouri River. Verdigre Creek from its confluence
with the Niobrara to the north boundary of the town of
Verdigre.

**Classification/Mileage:**
Scenic — 76.0 miles; Recreational — 28.0 miles; Total —
104.0 miles.
Niobrara River, Nebraska

RELATED LINKS

Niobrara National Scenic River
(National Park Service)
Niobrara River Management Plan

Photo Credit: Stuart Schneider

Niobrara River

Perhaps the epitome of a prairie river, the Niobrara is known as a biological crossroads. Although passing primarily through private land, it also flows through the Fort Niobrara National Wildlife Refuge and the largest single holding of The Nature Conservancy where bison have been reintroduced. The upper portion provides excellent canoeing.
Appendix 13: Land Development Considerations

1. City of Omaha Stormwater Program, Construction Requirements
2. NAFRA Soil Survey
MORE IN CONSTRUCTION

Erosion Control

Regulations

CONSTRUCTION DOWNLOADS

Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan Narrative Template (SWPPP-N)
PCWP Grading Permit Change of Responsibility Form
PCWP Grading Permit Terms
NDEQ CSW Instructions for Registration
2016 NDEQ CSW General Permit NER160000
City of Omaha Grading Permit and Payment form
2014 CSO Field Guide

View additional downloads »

Construction

Activities in this element work to minimize erosion, collect sediment from construction site runoff, and reduce other pollutants such as litter and concrete wastes through good housekeeping procedures and proper waste management. City staff provides guidance to the development community and other City staff on the State National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Permit for Construction Stormwater (CSW) discharges. City staff also permits, inspects, and enforces those sites that require a Grading Permit, those sites that are one acre or larger or a smaller site that is part of a larger, overall project. The goal of the grading permit is to limit erosion, sediment, and pollution during the construction process. These requirements are part of the City Code, Chapter 32 - Article IV.
FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS

Do I need to worry about stormwater runoff in the winter?

Yes. When you obtain a grading permit, the requirements do not change during the year. You may not have to worry about as many rain events as you would in the Spring, but snow-melt, track-out from muddy sites, good housekeeping practices, etc... are always needed.

My construction site isn't over one acre, do I need to do anything?

No and yes. If your site isn't part of a larger common plan of development greater than one acre you do not need to obtain a grading permit. You do however need to manage your site as needed to minimize construction stormwater discharges and other forms of pollution from the site. This can include the use of silt fence, wattles, stabilized entrances, diversion berms, temporary stabilization, etc...

There is a Construction Site creating a problem or mess, who do I contact to resolve this problem?

The active Construction Sites within the Papillion Creek Watershed are required to have a sign posted at the entrance to their project with contact information. The City of Omaha will also investigate complaints. You can file a complaint online or call the Environmental Quality Control Office at 402-444-3908.

Are construction projects required to sweep the streets regularly?

Construction sites are required to keep the entrances to their project maintained. If track out occurs they are required to clean the streets. Most sites scrape the streets clean at the end of the day or throughout the day in some conditions. Sweeping, however, is not required. The standard that all sites are held to is to scrape the streets at least once a day.

What can be done about the dust coming from a construction site?
Omaha Stormwater | Construction

Dust is an occurrence that will happen on most sites. During heavy grading, the contractors are required to maintain their entrances and haul roads. A reasonable effort must be made to control the dust from leaving the construction site. Areas that have been inactive or will be inactive in excess of 14 days need to have soil stabilization measures initiated.

LOCAL RESOURCES

Douglas County
City of Omaha
Omaha-Douglas Home

QUESTIONS? CONCERNS?

Hotline: (402) 444-3908

Report A Problem:
voice your concerns »

Use our contact form:
submit general questions »

https://omahastormwater.org/development/construction/
A product of the National Cooperative Soil Survey, a joint effort of the United States Department of Agriculture and other Federal agencies, State agencies including the Agricultural Experiment Stations, and local participants
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Preface

Soil surveys contain information that affects land use planning in survey areas. They highlight soil limitations that affect various land uses and provide information about the properties of the soils in the survey areas. Soil surveys are designed for many different users, including farmers, ranchers, foresters, agronomists, urban planners, community officials, engineers, developers, builders, and home buyers. Also, conservationists, teachers, students, and specialists in recreation, waste disposal, and pollution control can use the surveys to help them understand, protect, or enhance the environment.

Various land use regulations of Federal, State, and local governments may impose special restrictions on land use or land treatment. Soil surveys identify soil properties that are used in making various land use or land treatment decisions. The information is intended to help the land users identify and reduce the effects of soil limitations on various land uses. The landowner or user is responsible for identifying and complying with existing laws and regulations.

Although soil survey information can be used for general farm, local, and wider area planning, onsite investigation is needed to supplement this information in some cases. Examples include soil quality assessments (http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/nrcs/main/soils/health/) and certain conservation and engineering applications. For more detailed information, contact your local USDA Service Center (https://offices.sc.egov.usda.gov/locator/app?agency=nrcs) or your NRCS State Soil Scientist (http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/wps/portal/nrcs/detail/soils/contactus/?cid=nrcs142p2_053951).

Great differences in soil properties can occur within short distances. Some soils are seasonally wet or subject to flooding. Some are too unstable to be used as a foundation for buildings or roads. Clayey or wet soils are poorly suited to use as septic tank absorption fields. A high water table makes a soil poorly suited to basements or underground installations.

The National Cooperative Soil Survey is a joint effort of the United States Department of Agriculture and other Federal agencies, State agencies including the Agricultural Experiment Stations, and local agencies. The Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS) has leadership for the Federal part of the National Cooperative Soil Survey.

Information about soils is updated periodically. Updated information is available through the NRCS Web Soil Survey, the site for official soil survey information.

The U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) prohibits discrimination in all its programs and activities on the basis of race, color, national origin, age, disability, and where applicable, sex, marital status, familial status, parental status, religion, sexual orientation, genetic information, political beliefs, reprisal, or because all or a part of an individual’s income is derived from any public assistance program. (Not all prohibited bases apply to all programs.) Persons with disabilities who require
alternative means for communication of program information (Braille, large print, audiotape, etc.) should contact USDA's TARGET Center at (202) 720-2600 (voice and TDD). To file a complaint of discrimination, write to USDA, Director, Office of Civil Rights, 1400 Independence Avenue, S.W., Washington, D.C. 20250-9410 or call (800) 795-3272 (voice) or (202) 720-6382 (TDD). USDA is an equal opportunity provider and employer.
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How Soil Surveys Are Made

Soil surveys are made to provide information about the soils and miscellaneous areas in a specific area. They include a description of the soils and miscellaneous areas and their location on the landscape and tables that show soil properties and limitations affecting various uses. Soil scientists observed the steepness, length, and shape of the slopes; the general pattern of drainage; the kinds of crops and native plants; and the kinds of bedrock. They observed and described many soil profiles. A soil profile is the sequence of natural layers, or horizons, in a soil. The profile extends from the surface down into the unconsolidated material in which the soil formed or from the surface down to bedrock. The unconsolidated material is devoid of roots and other living organisms and has not been changed by other biological activity.

Currently, soils are mapped according to the boundaries of major land resource areas (MLRAs). MLRAs are geographically associated land resource units that share common characteristics related to physiography, geology, climate, water resources, soils, biological resources, and land uses (USDA, 2006). Soil survey areas typically consist of parts of one or more MLRA.

The soils and miscellaneous areas in a survey area occur in an orderly pattern that is related to the geology, landforms, relief, climate, and natural vegetation of the area. Each kind of soil and miscellaneous area is associated with a particular kind of landform or with a segment of the landform. By observing the soils and miscellaneous areas in the survey area and relating their position to specific segments of the landform, a soil scientist develops a concept, or model, of how they were formed. Thus, during mapping, this model enables the soil scientist to predict with a considerable degree of accuracy the kind of soil or miscellaneous area at a specific location on the landscape.

Commonly, individual soils on the landscape merge into one another as their characteristics gradually change. To construct an accurate soil map, however, soil scientists must determine the boundaries between the soils. They can observe only a limited number of soil profiles. Nevertheless, these observations, supplemented by an understanding of the soil-vegetation-landscape relationship, are sufficient to verify predictions of the kinds of soil in an area and to determine the boundaries.

Soil scientists recorded the characteristics of the soil profiles that they studied. They noted soil color, texture, size and shape of soil aggregates, kind and amount of rock fragments, distribution of plant roots, reaction, and other features that enable them to identify soils. After describing the soils in the survey area and determining their properties, the soil scientists assigned the soils to taxonomic classes (units). Taxonomic classes are concepts. Each taxonomic class has a set of soil characteristics with precisely defined limits. The classes are used as a basis for comparison to classify soils systematically. Soil taxonomy, the system of taxonomic classification used in the United States, is based mainly on the kind and character of soil properties and the arrangement of horizons within the profile. After the soil
scientists classified and named the soils in the survey area, they compared the individual soils with similar soils in the same taxonomic class in other areas so that they could confirm data and assemble additional data based on experience and research.

The objective of soil mapping is not to delineate pure map unit components; the objective is to separate the landscape into landforms or landform segments that have similar use and management requirements. Each map unit is defined by a unique combination of soil components and/or miscellaneous areas in predictable proportions. Some components may be highly contrasting to the other components of the map unit. The presence of minor components in a map unit in no way diminishes the usefulness or accuracy of the data. The delineation of such landforms and landform segments on the map provides sufficient information for the development of resource plans. If intensive use of small areas is planned, onsite investigation is needed to define and locate the soils and miscellaneous areas.

Soil scientists make many field observations in the process of producing a soil map. The frequency of observation is dependent upon several factors, including scale of mapping, intensity of mapping, design of map units, complexity of the landscape, and experience of the soil scientist. Observations are made to test and refine the soil-landscape model and predictions and to verify the classification of the soils at specific locations. Once the soil-landscape model is refined, a significantly smaller number of measurements of individual soil properties are made and recorded. These measurements may include field measurements, such as those for color, depth to bedrock, and texture, and laboratory measurements, such as those for content of sand, silt, clay, salt, and other components. Properties of each soil typically vary from one point to another across the landscape.

Observations for map unit components are aggregated to develop ranges of characteristics for the components. The aggregated values are presented. Direct measurements do not exist for every property presented for every map unit component. Values for some properties are estimated from combinations of other properties.

While a soil survey is in progress, samples of some of the soils in the area generally are collected for laboratory analyses and for engineering tests. Soil scientists interpret the data from these analyses and tests as well as the field-observed characteristics and the soil properties to determine the expected behavior of the soils under different uses. Interpretations for all of the soils are field tested through observation of the soils in different uses and under different levels of management. Some interpretations are modified to fit local conditions, and some new interpretations are developed to meet local needs. Data are assembled from other sources, such as research information, production records, and field experience of specialists. For example, data on crop yields under defined levels of management are assembled from farm records and from field or plot experiments on the same kinds of soil.

Predictions about soil behavior are based not only on soil properties but also on such variables as climate and biological activity. Soil conditions are predictable over long periods of time, but they are not predictable from year to year. For example, soil scientists can predict with a fairly high degree of accuracy that a given soil will have a high water table within certain depths in most years, but they cannot predict that a high water table will always be at a specific level in the soil on a specific date.

After soil scientists located and identified the significant natural bodies of soil in the survey area, they drew the boundaries of these bodies on aerial photographs and
identified each as a specific map unit. Aerial photographs show trees, buildings, fields, roads, and rivers, all of which help in locating boundaries accurately.
Soil Map

The soil map section includes the soil map for the defined area of interest, a list of soil map units on the map and extent of each map unit, and cartographic symbols displayed on the map. Also presented are various metadata about data used to produce the map, and a description of each soil map unit.
# Custom Soil Resource Report

## Map Legend

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area of Interest (AOI)</th>
<th>Special Point Features</th>
<th>Water Features</th>
<th>Transportation</th>
<th>Background</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area of Interest (AOI)</td>
<td>Blowout</td>
<td>Streams and Canals</td>
<td>Interstate Highways</td>
<td>Aerial Photography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil Map Unit Polygons</td>
<td>Borrow Pit</td>
<td></td>
<td>US Routes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil Map Unit Lines</td>
<td>Clay Spot</td>
<td></td>
<td>Major Roads</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soil Map Unit Points</td>
<td>Closed Depression</td>
<td></td>
<td>Local Roads</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gravel Pit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gravelly Spot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Landfill</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lava Flow</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marsh or swamp</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Mine or Quarry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Miscellaneous Water</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perennial Water</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rock Outcrop</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Saline Spot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sandy Spot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Severely Eroded Spot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sinkhole</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Slide or Slip</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sodic Spot</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Spoil Area
- Stony Spot
- Very Stony Spot
- Wet Spot
- Other
- Special Line Features
- Rails
- Interstate Highways
- US Routes
- Major Roads
- Local Roads
- Aerial Photography

## Map Information

The soil surveys that comprise your A 1:12,000.

Please rely on the bar scale on each measurements.

Source of Map: Natural Resources
Web Soil Survey URL: Coordinate System: Web Mercator

Maps from the Web Soil Survey are b projection, which preserves direction i distance and area. A projection that p Albers equal-area conic projection, sh accurate calculations of distance or ar

This product is generated from the US of the version date(s) listed below.

- Soil Survey Area: Douglas County, 1 Survey Area Data: Version 11, Sep
- Soil map units are labeled (as space 1:50,000 or larger.
- Date(s) aerial images were photograp 11, 2014
- The orthophoto or other base map on compiled and digitized probably differ imagery displayed on these maps. As shifting of map unit boundaries may b
Map Unit Legend

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Map Unit Symbol</th>
<th>Map Unit Name</th>
<th>Acres in AOI</th>
<th>Percent of AOI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9712</td>
<td>Urban land-Udahents-Udorthents complex, 0 to 23 percent slopes</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9719</td>
<td>Urban land-Udorthents-Marshall complex, 0 to 9 percent slopes</td>
<td>104.9</td>
<td>95.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Totals for Area of Interest</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>110.3</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Map Unit Descriptions

The map units delineated on the detailed soil maps in a soil survey represent the soils or miscellaneous areas in the survey area. The map unit descriptions, along with the maps, can be used to determine the composition and properties of a unit.

A map unit delineation on a soil map represents an area dominated by one or more major kinds of soil or miscellaneous areas. A map unit is identified and named according to the taxonomic classification of the dominant soils. Within a taxonomic class there are precisely defined limits for the properties of the soils. On the landscape, however, the soils are natural phenomena, and they have the characteristic variability of all natural phenomena. Thus, the range of some observed properties may extend beyond the limits defined for a taxonomic class. Areas of soils of a single taxonomic class rarely, if ever, can be mapped without including areas of other taxonomic classes. Consequently, every map unit is made up of the soils or miscellaneous areas for which it is named and some minor components that belong to taxonomic classes other than those of the major soils.

Most minor soils have properties similar to those of the dominant soil or soils in the map unit, and thus they do not affect use and management. These are called noncontrasting, or similar, components. They may or may not be mentioned in a particular map unit description. Other minor components, however, have properties and behavioral characteristics divergent enough to affect use or to require different management. These are called contrasting, or dissimilar, components. They generally are in small areas and could not be mapped separately because of the scale used. Some small areas of strongly contrasting soils or miscellaneous areas are identified by a special symbol on the maps. If included in the database for a given area, the contrasting minor components are identified in the map unit descriptions along with some characteristics of each. A few areas of minor components may not have been observed, and consequently they are not mentioned in the descriptions, especially where the pattern was so complex that it was impractical to make enough observations to identify all the soils and miscellaneous areas on the landscape.

The presence of minor components in a map unit in no way diminishes the usefulness or accuracy of the data. The objective of mapping is not to delineate pure taxonomic classes but rather to separate the landscape into landforms or
landform segments that have similar use and management requirements. The
delineation of such segments on the map provides sufficient information for the
development of resource plans. If intensive use of small areas is planned, however,
onsite investigation is needed to define and locate the soils and miscellaneous
areas.

An identifying symbol precedes the map unit name in the map unit descriptions.
Each description includes general facts about the unit and gives important soil
properties and qualities.

Soils that have profiles that are almost alike make up a soil series. Except for
differences in texture of the surface layer, all the soils of a series have major
horizons that are similar in composition, thickness, and arrangement.

Soils of one series can differ in texture of the surface layer, slope, stoniness,
salinity, degree of erosion, and other characteristics that affect their use. On the
basis of such differences, a soil series is divided into soil phases. Most of the areas
shown on the detailed soil maps are phases of soil series. The name of a soil phase
commonly indicates a feature that affects use or management. For example, Alpha
silt loam, 0 to 2 percent slopes, is a phase of the Alpha series.

Some map units are made up of two or more major soils or miscellaneous areas.
These map units are complexes, associations, or undifferentiated groups.

A complex consists of two or more soils or miscellaneous areas in such an intricate
pattern or in such small areas that they cannot be shown separately on the maps.
The pattern and proportion of the soils or miscellaneous areas are somewhat similar
in all areas. Alpha-Beta complex, 0 to 6 percent slopes, is an example.

An association is made up of two or more geographically associated soils or
miscellaneous areas that are shown as one unit on the maps. Because of present
or anticipated uses of the map units in the survey area, it was not considered
practical or necessary to map the soils or miscellaneous areas separately. The
pattern and relative proportion of the soils or miscellaneous areas are somewhat
similar. Alpha-Beta association, 0 to 2 percent slopes, is an example.

An undifferentiated group is made up of two or more soils or miscellaneous areas
that could be mapped individually but are mapped as one unit because similar
interpretations can be made for use and management. The pattern and proportion
of the soils or miscellaneous areas in a mapped area are not uniform. An area can
be made up of only one of the major soils or miscellaneous areas, or it can be made
up of all of them. Alpha and Beta soils, 0 to 2 percent slopes, is an example.

Some surveys include miscellaneous areas. Such areas have little or no soil
material and support little or no vegetation. Rock outcrop is an example.
Douglas County, Nebraska

9712—Urban land-Udarents-Udorthents complex, 0 to 23 percent slopes

Map Unit Setting
National map unit symbol: 1vff4
Elevation: 800 to 1,300 feet
Mean annual precipitation: 24 to 36 inches
Mean annual air temperature: 39 to 61 degrees F
Frost-free period: 155 to 175 days
Farmland classification: Not prime farmland

Map Unit Composition
Urban land: 42 percent
Udarents and similar soils: 34 percent
Udorthents and similar soils: 24 percent
Estimates are based on observations, descriptions, and transects of the map unit.

Description of Urban Land
Setting
Landform: Hillslopes
Landform position (two-dimensional): Backslope
Landform position (three-dimensional): Head slope, interfluve, side slope, nose slope
Down-slope shape: Convex, concave
Across-slope shape: Linear

Description of Udarents
Setting
Landform: Hillslopes
Landform position (two-dimensional): Backslope
Landform position (three-dimensional): Head slope, interfluve, side slope, nose slope
Down-slope shape: Convex, concave
Across-slope shape: Linear
Parent material: Disturbed fine-silty loess

Typical profile
H1 - 0 to 80 inches: silt loam

Properties and qualities
Slope: 6 to 36 percent
Depth to restrictive feature: More than 80 inches
Depth to water table: More than 80 inches
Frequency of flooding: None
Frequency of ponding: None
Calcium carbonate, maximum in profile: 8 percent

Description of Udorthents
Setting
Landform: Hillslopes
Landform position (two-dimensional): Backslope
9719—Urban land-Udorthents-Marshall complex, 0 to 9 percent slopes

Map Unit Setting
National map unit symbol: 1vfdy
Elevation: 800 to 1,300 feet
Mean annual precipitation: 24 to 36 inches
Mean annual air temperature: 39 to 61 degrees F
Frost-free period: 155 to 175 days
Farmland classification: Not prime farmland

Map Unit Composition
Urban land: 57 percent
Udorthents and similar soils: 23 percent
Marshall and similar soils: 20 percent
Estimates are based on observations, descriptions, and transects of the map unit.

Description of Urban Land
Setting
Landform: Hillslopes
Landform position (two-dimensional): Backslope
Landform position (three-dimensional): Head slope, interfluve, side slope, nose slope
Down-slope shape: Convex, concave
Across-slope shape: Linear

Description of Udorthents
Setting
Landform: Hillslopes
Landform position (two-dimensional): Backslope
Landform position (three-dimensional): Head slope, interfluve, side slope, nose slope
Down-slope shape: Convex, concave
Across-slope shape: Linear
Parent material: Disturbed fine-silty loess

Typical profile
H1 - 0 to 12 inches: silty clay loam
H2 - 12 to 80 inches: silt loam

Properties and qualities
Slope: 0 to 9 percent
Depth to restrictive feature: More than 80 inches
Depth to water table: More than 80 inches
Frequency of flooding: None
Frequency of ponding: None
Calcium carbonate, maximum in profile: 8 percent

Description of Marshall
Setting
Landform: Loess hills
Landform position (two-dimensional): Summit
Down-slope shape: Convex
Across-slope shape: Convex
Parent material: Fine-silty noncalcareous loess

Typical profile
Ap - 0 to 7 inches: silty clay loam
A - 7 to 18 inches: silty clay loam
Bw - 18 to 47 inches: silty clay loam
C - 47 to 68 inches: silty clay loam

Properties and qualities
Slope: 0 to 9 percent
Depth to restrictive feature: More than 80 inches
Natural drainage class: Well drained
Runoff class: Medium
Capacity of the most limiting layer to transmit water (Ksat): Moderately high (0.20 to 0.60 in/hr)
Depth to water table: More than 80 inches
Frequency of flooding: None
Frequency of ponding: None
Available water storage in profile: High (about 11.9 inches)

Interpretive groups
Land capability classification (irrigated): None specified
Land capability classification (nonirrigated): 3e
Hydrologic Soil Group: C
Hydric soil rating: No
References


Appendix 14: Community Facilities and Services

1. Email with Public Works regarding storm and wastewater concerns
2. Email with Omaha Fire’s Brent Vanscoy
3. Email with Omaha Fire’s Daryl Giles
New Redevelopment Area Question
2 messages

Nicole D. Engels (Plng) <nicole.engels@cityofomaha.org> Fri, Jun 2, 2017 at 10:17 AM
To: "Adam Wilmes (PWks)" <Adam.Wilmes@cityofomaha.org>

Good morning Adam,

I'm starting a new review for our next redevelopment area (unlike the last one I sent you when I was at the end of it, I'm learning!) and would like to know if you have any concerns.

This next redevelopment area is the Neighborhood Action and Fact. I've attached a map of the area but it is essentially bound by Sprague on the North, Wirt on the south, 24th on the east, and the freeway on the west. The plan is to build approximately 60 new single family homes and to rehabilitate, to varying degrees, approximately 80 homes.

Please let me know if you have any concerns, thank you,

Nicole Engels
Environmental Planner
Planning Department, HCD
1819 Farnam St, Omaha, NE 68183
402-444-5150 x2024
nicole.engels@cityofomaha.org

Adam Wilmes (PWks) <adam.wilmes@cityofomaha.org> Mon, Jun 5, 2017 at 3:52 PM
To: "Nicole D. Engels (Plng)" <nicole.engels@cityofomaha.org>

Hi Nicole,

I have no concerns.

Thanks for sending!
Adam

Adam Wilmes, PE
Omaha/Douglas Civic Center
Public Works, Design Division, Suite 604
1819 Farnam Street
Omaha, NE 68183-0604
Adam.Wilmes@CityofOmaha.org
(402) 444-3819

[Quoted text hidden]
Capt Steven S. Thornburg (OmaF) <steven.thornburg@cityofomaha.org>  
To: "Nicole D. Engels (Ping)" <nicole.engels@cityofomaha.org>  
Cc: "FAE W. Brent Vanscoy (OmaF)" <william.vanscoy@cityofomaha.org>  

Thu, Dec 1, 2016 at 1:23 PM

Nicole,

You can contact Brent Vanscoy he is our data person and should be able to give you the best information from the fire department. Just let him know what kind of information and time frame you are looking for data from. I would still recommend checking with Tracy Murray in code enforcement as well.

Steven Thornburg  
Captain  
Omaha Fire Prevention  
402-490-5262

Nicole D. Engels (Ping) <nicole.engels@cityofomaha.org>  
To: "FAE W. Brent Vanscoy (OmaF)" <william.vanscoy@cityofomaha.org>  

Thu, Dec 1, 2016 at 1:28 PM

Good afternoon Brent,  

I was told by Capt Thornburg that you were the person to talk to in order to get some data. We are looking to gather information on how many of the fires that OFD responds to are at vacant houses. Any chance that you would be able to pull that information for me today or tomorrow?  

Thank you!

Nicole Engels  
Environmental Planner  
Planning Department, HCD  
1819 Farnam St. Omaha, NE 68183  
402-444-5150 x2024  
nicole.engels@cityofomaha.org

[Quoted text hidden]

FAE W. Brent Vanscoy (OmaF) <william.vanscoy@cityofomaha.org>  
To: "Nicole D. Engels (Ping)" <nicole.engels@cityofomaha.org>  

Thu, Dec 1, 2016 at 2:03 PM

Yes. I can pull back to 2014  
[Quoted text hidden]

Nicole D. Engels (Ping) <nicole.engels@cityofomaha.org>  
To: "FAE W. Brent Vanscoy (OmaF)" <william.vanscoy@cityofomaha.org>  

Thu, Dec 1, 2016 at 2:05 PM

That's wonderful. If we can get it that far back by year, that would be great.

Also, do happen to know how much, on average, or a range, it costs per unit to put out a fire? My supervisor is preparing a report on vacant lots/homes.

Thank you so much for your help!

Nicole Engels  
Environmental Planner
Planning Department, HCD  
1819 Farnam St, Omaha, NE 68183  
402-444-5150 x2024  
nicole.engels@cityofomaha.org

FAE W. Brent Vanscoy (OmaF) <william.vanscoy@cityofomaha.org>  
Thu, Dec 1, 2016 at 2:07 PM
To: "Nicole D. Engels (Ping)" <nicole.engels@cityofomaha.org>

Steve might be able to figure that out. I have no idea. I'll be back to the office shortly.

Nicole D. Engels (Ping) <nicole.engels@cityofomaha.org>  
Thu, Dec 1, 2016 at 2:07 PM
To: "FAE W. Brent Vanscoy (OmaF)" <william.vanscoy@cityofomaha.org>

Thank you, I will ask him!

Nicole Engels  
Environmental Planner  
Planning Department, HCD  
1819 Farnam St, Omaha, NE 68183  
402-444-5150 x2024  
nicole.engels@cityofomaha.org

Nicole D. Engels (Ping) <nicole.engels@cityofomaha.org>  
Thu, Dec 1, 2016 at 2:09 PM
To: "Capt Steven S. Thornburg (OmaF)" <steven.thornburg@cityofomaha.org>

Steve,

I am getting the information from Brent, thank you.

I had another question that Brent said that he does not know the answer to, but you might. Do you happen to know how much it costs, on average or a range, to put out a fire at a unit?

Thank you!

-Nicole

Nicole Engels  
Environmental Planner  
Planning Department, HCD  
1819 Farnam St, Omaha, NE 68183  
402-444-5150 x2024  
nicole.engels@cityofomaha.org

On Thu, Dec 1, 2016 at 1:23 PM, Capt Steven S. Thornburg (OmaF) <steven.thornburg@cityofomaha.org> wrote:

FAE W. Brent Vanscoy (OmaF) <william.vanscoy@cityofomaha.org>  
Thu, Dec 1, 2016 at 2:23 PM
To: "Nicole D. Engels (Ping)" <nicole.engels@cityofomaha.org>

Hey,

Below is a screen shot. Whenever we have a house fire the fire officer is required to document the "status" of the house.

https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0?ui=2&ik=29552d6c48&jsver=NQ90xUauj60.en.&view=pt&q=vacant%20home%20fire&rs=true&search=query&th=15...
[Quoted text hidden]

--

Thanks,

Brent Van Scoy, BS | FireRMS Administrator | IT Coordinator
City of Omaha | Omaha Fire Department | IT Division
Graduate Student | M.S. in Management Information Systems | UNO
1516 Jackson Street | Omaha, Ne 68102
Cell 402-850-9799 | william.vanscoy@cityofomaha.org

Fire department data is important; if we don’t tell our story, someone else will.

Nicole D. Engels (Ping) <nicole.engels@cityofomaha.org>  Thu, Dec 1, 2016 at 2:25 PM

To: "William H. Lukash (Ping)" <william.lukash@cityofomaha.org>

Nicole Engels
Environmental Planner
Planning Department, HCD
1819 Farnam St, Omaha, NE 68183
402-444-5150 x2024
nicole.engels@cityofomaha.org

[Quoted text hidden]

Nicole D. Engels (Ping) <nicole.engels@cityofomaha.org>  Thu, Dec 1, 2016 at 2:28 PM

To: "William H. Lukash (Ping)" <william.lukash@cityofomaha.org>

Thank you so much!

One last question, I promise (I think...)

Can you tell me how many total house fires there have been over that same period?

Thank you!

Nicole Engels
Environmental Planner
Planning Department, HCD
1819 Farnam St, Omaha, NE 68183
402-444-5150 x2024
nicole.engels@cityofomaha.org

[Quoted text hidden]
Nicole D. Engels (Plng) <nicole.engels@cityofomaha.org>
To: "FAE W. Brent Vanscoy (OmaF)" <william.vanscoy@cityofomaha.org>

Thu, Dec 1, 2016 at 2:29 PM

Thank you so much!

One last question, I promise (I think...)

Can you tell me how many total house fires there have been over that same period?

Thank you!

Nicole Engels
Environmental Planner
Planning Department, HCD
1819 Farnam St, Omaha, NE 68183
402-444-5150 x2024
nicole.engels@cityofomaha.org

---[Quoted text hidden]---

FAE W. Brent Vanscoy (OmaF) <william.vanscoy@cityofomaha.org>
To: "Nicole D. Engels (Plng)" <nicole.engels@cityofomaha.org>

Thu, Dec 1, 2016 at 2:38 PM

Sure. I removed the "vacant" filter and it shows:

---[Quoted text hidden]---

Nicole D. Engels (Plng) <nicole.engels@cityofomaha.org>
To: "William H. Lukash (Plng)" <william.lukash@cityofomaha.org>

Thu, Dec 1, 2016 at 2:40 PM

Nicole Engels
Environmental Planner
Planning Department, HCD
1819 Farnam St, Omaha, NE 68183
402-444-5150 x2024
nicole.engels@cityofomaha.org

---------- Forwarded message ----------
From: FAE W. Brent Vanscoy (OmaF) <william.vanscoy@cityofomaha.org>
Date: Thu, Dec 1, 2016 at 2:38 PM
Subject: Re: Vacant Houses

[Quoted text hidden]
Nicole D. Engels (Plng) <nicole.engels@cityofomaha.org>
To: “FAE W. Brent Vanscoy (OmaF)” <william.vanscoy@cityofomaha.org>

Thank you so much for all of your help Brent. I think that's will be all that we need!

Nicole Engels
Environmental Planner
Planning Department, HCD
1819 Farnam St, Omaha, NE 68183
402-444-5150 x2024
nicole.engels@cityofomaha.org

[Quoted text hidden]
Another Question from Planning

Nicole D. Engels (Plng) <nicole.engels@cityofomaha.org>  
To: "AFM Daryl M. Giles (OmaF)" <daryl.giles@ci.omaha.ne.us>  
Tue, Dec 6, 2016 at 10:48 AM

Good morning Daryl,

We had another question that the tech guys at OFD weren't able to answer for us.

Do you happen to know the average cost of putting out a house fire? Preferably on a vacant structure, if that's possible, but I'm not sure if there would even be a difference. My boss, Bill Lukash, is putting together a report on vacant homes and lots.

Thank you!

Nicole Engels  
Environmental Planner  
Planning Department, HCD  
1819 Farnam St, Omaha, NE 68183  
402-444-5150 x2024  
nicole.engels@cityofomaha.org

AFM Daryl M. Giles (OmaF) <daryl.giles@cityofomaha.org>  
To: "Nicole D. Engels (Plng)" <nicole.engels@cityofomaha.org>  
Tue, Dec 6, 2016 at 11:19 AM

Nicole,

It would be difficult to determine but I think we could come up with an estimate cost.

There are many variables and associated cost especially when we try figuring time, equipment, and personnel wages.

I'll get back to you on this one.

Respectfully,

Daryl Giles  
Assistant Fire Marshal  
Omaha Fire Prevention Division  
402-444-5799

[Quoted text hidden]

Nicole D. Engels (Plng) <nicole.engels@cityofomaha.org>  
To: "AFM Daryl M. Giles (OmaF)" <daryl.giles@cityofomaha.org>  
Tue, Dec 6, 2016 at 11:23 AM

Thank you Daryl,

Either an average, estimate, or range are all useful.

-Nicole

Nicole Engels  
Environmental Planner
AFM Daryl M. Giles (OmaF) <daryl.giles@cityofomaha.org>  
To: "Nicole D. Engels (Plng)" <nicole.engels@cityofomaha.org>  

Tue, Dec 6, 2016 at 11:38 AM

Nicoles,

$2,000-$5,000.00 is a ball park estimated cost considering personnel cost, equipment, and time.

The figure could be less or more depending on time.

Hopefully this helps.

Respectfully,

Daryl Giles
Assistant Fire Marshal
Omaha Fire Prevention Division
402-444-5799

Nicole D. Engels (Plng) <nicole.engels@cityofomaha.org>  
To: "AFM Daryl M. Giles (OmaF)" <daryl.giles@cityofomaha.org>  

Tue, Dec 6, 2016 at 11:39 AM

Great, thank you so much Daryl!

Nicole Engels
Environmental Planner
Planning Department, HCD
1819 Farnam St, Omaha, NE 68183
402-444-5150 x2024
nicole.engels@cityofomaha.org

Nicole D. Engels (Plng) <nicole.engels@cityofomaha.org>  
To: "William H. Lukash (Plng)" <william.lukash@cityofomaha.org>  

Tue, Dec 6, 2016 at 11:40 AM

Please see Daryl's response below regarding the cost for OFD to put out a fire.

Nicole Engels
Environmental Planner
Planning Department, HCD
1819 Farnam St, Omaha, NE 68183
402-444-5150 x2024
nicole.engels@cityofomaha.org

William H. Lukash (Plng) <william.lukash@cityofomaha.org>  
To: "Nicole D. Engels (Plng)" <nicole.engels@cityofomaha.org>  

Tue, Dec 6, 2016 at 1:14 PM

https://mail.google.com/mail/u/0/?ui=2&ik=29552d6c48&jsver=NQ00xUaui60.en.&view=pt&q=vacant%20home%20fire&qs=true&search=query&th=15... 2/3
Thanks!

William H Lukash, AICP PG
City Planner
402-444-5150 x 2026
william.lukash@cityofomaha.org
Let's Build!

[Quoted text hidden]