

Guidelines for the Preparation of
Facilities Plans and Environmental Reviews
for
Community Wastewater Projects

Financed by:

The State of Oregon:

Oregon Department of Environmental Quality's (ODEQ) Clean Water State Revolving Fund (CWSRF)

Oregon Economic and Community Development Department's (OECD) Financing Programs

The Federal Government:

USDA - Rural Development (RD), Water and Waste Loan and Grant Programs

Non-Profit:

Rural Community Assistance Corporation (RCAC)

This document was prepared as a cooperative effort between:



DLCD



OREGON
ECONOMIC & COMMUNITY
DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT

December, 2005

Authority

This guidance document was developed in a cooperative process and is adopted as an official guidance document of each of the following funding agencies:

- Oregon Department of Environmental Quality
- Oregon Economic and Community Development Department
- USDA - Rural Development, Oregon Staff
- Rural Community Assistance Corporation staff

	Oregon Department of Environmental Quality		Date
	Lauri Aunan, Water Quality Administrator		
	Oregon Economic and Community Development Department		Date
	John Rakowitz, Community Development Division Manager		
	US DA Rural Development		Date
	Wayne Dunlap, Program Director		
	Rural Community Assistance Corporation		Date
	Chris Marko, Rural Development Specialist		

Table of Contents

	<u>Page</u>
1. Introduction	1
2. Facilities Plan Review Responsibility Not Related to Funding	2
3. What is a Wastewater Facilities Plan? When is One Required?.....	2
4. How does a facilities plan relate to an ODEQ-issued waste discharge permit?.....	3
5. Benefits of the Facilities Planning Process.....	3
6. When is NEPA Environmental Review of a Proposed Project Required? Of What Does it Consist?.....	4
7. Consistency with Comprehensive Land Use Plans	5
8. The Facilities Plan and Environmental Review: A Nine-Point Scope of Work	5
9. Water Quality Regulations for Facilities Planning	7
10. Review Process for Wastewater Facilities Plans	8
11. Phased and Incremental Projects	8
Appendix A - Wastewater Facilities Plan Outline	9
Appendix B - Financial Information Guideline.....	12
Appendix C - Environmental Report Outline/Format.....	13
Appendix D - Contacting Agencies Staff.....	15

Guidelines for the Preparation of Facilities Plans and Environmental Reviews for Community Wastewater Projects

1. Introduction

Oregon's cities and public wastewater service districts often need financial help in the form of grants and loans to upgrade facilities. Publicly owned wastewater utilities in Oregon have four sources of public funds for grants and loans available to them for the planning, design and construction of wastewater systems. This guidance document is intended to assist prospective funding recipients in the preparation of facilities plans and environmental reviews that meet the requirements of these funding agencies.

The funding agencies are the ODEQ, OECDD, USDA-RD and the RCAC.

- The ODEQ administers the Clean Water State Revolving Fund (CWSRF) which provides low interest loans to public agencies for preparing planning and environmental review documents, and for design and construction of wastewater facilities.
- The OECDD administers both the Federal Housing and Urban Development (HUD) Community Development Block Grant (CDGB) state and small cities program (grant) and the Oregon Lottery funded Water/Wastewater Financing and Special Public Works Fund programs (grant/loan). These programs can finance preparation of planning and environmental review documents, and design and construction of public wastewater systems.
- The USDA RD Agency administers several loan and grant programs focused on constructing and upgrading needed public and private non-profit utility systems, including wastewater systems in small rural communities of less than 10,000 in population.
- The RCAC is a Community Development Financial Institution (CDFI) designated by the U.S. Department of Treasury to provide low interest loans for projects, and provides technical assistance with USDA Rural Development and US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).

Each of these funding agencies requires the submittal of an appropriate planning document as a condition of funding. Additionally, programs that use Federal funds require an environmental review to comply with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA).

These guidelines are intended to provide the funding applicant with a set of instructions that, when followed, will result in planning and associated environmental review documents that meet all funding agencies administrative requirements.

2. Facilities Plan Review Responsibility Not Related to Funding

It is important to note that in Oregon the authority to issue wastewater discharge permits to cities and sewer service districts resides only with ODEQ. As part of the wastewater discharge permit compliance process, ODEQ often requires the development of wastewater facilities plans prior to design and construction to assure that permittees identify wastewater facilities that will reliably meet discharge permit requirements. As per state statute, no wastewater collection, treatment or disposal facilities may be constructed unless ODEQ has approved engineering plans. These functions are carried out by ODEQ regardless of the source of funding for facilities.

<http://www.deq.state.or.us/wq/rules/div052guides.htm>

3. What is a Wastewater Facilities Plan? When is One Required?

A Wastewater Facilities Plan is a comprehensive document that examines the entire existing wastewater collection, treatment and disposal system and identifies all operational and performance problems. It projects future wastewater loads, and describes and evaluates viable alternatives for reliably meeting discharge permit requirements, usually for a twenty year time frame. It identifies a preferred alternative for implementation and includes a funding plan.

ODEQ usually requires a comprehensive facilities plan when a facility is at or near capacity and is not able to consistently meet its discharge permit requirements.

However, in some situations ODEQ may believe that the overall facilities are adequate and that only a specific piece of equipment or part of the wastewater treatment process needs upgrading, for example the addition of dechlorination or an upgraded pump station. In such cases, ODEQ may only require the permittee to prepare a predesign report or a narrowly focused feasibility study.

Wastewater discharge permittees are encouraged to talk early and often to the regional ODEQ engineering review and permit compliance staff to understand the level and extent of project planning that will be required by ODEQ for purposes of permitting and engineering design review.

The regulations governing the CWSRF program require that there be an approved facilities plan or other appropriate planning document as a condition of funding for loans for design and construction of facilities.

OECD may finance a FP, and if so, requires that the document follows these guidelines. At a minimum, most of the OECD funding programs require an engineering analysis or facilities plan equivalent for construction projects.

USDA RD requires that two separate documents, a Facilities Plan and an Environmental Report (ER), be completed simultaneously and submitted during the application process. The funds for a

project will not be obligated until both documents are approved by RD. The engineer responsible for the Facilities Plan will also be responsible to develop the Environmental Report, either with their own NEPA specialists or with a subconsultant who specializes in NEPA work. Applicants can get reimbursed with RD funding for planning costs including the FP and ER

Permittees are encouraged to establish contact with ODEQ-CWSRF, RD and OECD funding program staff to determine what planning documentation is required that is in addition to what is required by ODEQ for permitting and design approval.

4. How does a Facilities Plan relate to an ODEQ-issued wastewater discharge permit?

In all cases, a facilities plan should ensure that the new or upgraded facility will comply with all of Oregon's water quality requirements. This is sometimes complicated, particularly when it comes to setting effluent limits that ensure that the permitted source will not violate in-stream water quality standards. Ideally, a facilities plan should not be approved until ODEQ and the source are confident that the proposed facility will comply with all permit requirements.

5. Benefits of the Facilities Planning Process

A Facilities Plan:

- Serves as an educational tool for the public, community decision makers, state and federal funding and regulatory agencies.
- Demonstrates how the proposed project is a cost effective and environmentally sound alternative.
- Documents and addresses environmental and regulatory issues associated with the specific project.
- Serves as a guide for the design engineer by presenting engineering design criteria, process type and extent, alternate site locations, and budget.
- Provides the research, data collection, and analysis necessary for ODEQ to develop the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES)/ Water Pollution Control Facilities (WPCF) discharge permit.
- Shows how the cost of facility improvements, maintenance and operations will be paid, examines current user rates for adequacy, and projects when and where rate increases are necessary.
- Provides, when RD funding is involved, a recommended project that is modest in design, size and cost.

A Facilities Plan Is Not . . .

- A guide for sizing the gross hydraulic capacity of sewers and pump stations in relation to zoning and ultimate land use density at build out, as would be found in the wastewater management master plan portion of the jurisdiction's comprehensive land use plan.
- A wastewater management master plan, defining organizational arrangements or the division of jurisdictions or responsibilities among various wastewater systems or agencies.
- An operations and maintenance (O&M) manual for the system.
- Part of a master plan, as may be prepared for identifying, prioritizing and scheduling the community's infrastructure needs.
- A term generally used for non-domestic wastewater facilities.

6. When is NEPA Environmental Review of a Proposed Project Required? Of What Does It Consist?

The requirement for preparation of a NEPA environmental review document for a proposed wastewater project pertains as a condition of funding *only* if the project will use funding of Federal origin:

- ODEQ CWSRF
- USDA RD
- OECD HUD CDBG

If a project will use only local funds or only OECD Water/Wastewater or Special Public Works Funds, a NEPA environmental review is not required.

The level or extent of environmental review will vary, generally in accordance with the complexity or scope of the project. The construction of new wastewater treatment plant at a new location will require a more comprehensive environmental review than the replacement of old pipes in an existing trench or the addition of a flow meter at the treatment plant.

Funding agency staff should be contacted early in the project planning process to identify the level of review appropriate to the project.

Generally, a project complex enough to require a comprehensive facilities plan will also require a comprehensive environmental review document. Appendix C provides an outline for the content of the environmental review document.

7. Consistency with Comprehensive Land Use Plans

Facilities plans and decisions to fund projects must be consistent with locally adopted comprehensive land use plans and development regulations in compliance with State wide planning goals acknowledged by the Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD).

For information about consistency with local comprehensive plans and compliance with the Statewide Planning Goals Regional Representatives link to:

<http://egov.oregon.gov/LCD/offices.shtml>

8. The Facilities Plan and Environmental Review: A Nine-Point Scope of Work

A basic nine-point scope of work for development of a comprehensive wastewater facilities plan is described in this section. If all nine points are adequately addressed, the funding agencies will be able to endorse the plan. A sample outline of a comprehensive wastewater facilities plan is provided in Appendix A. Within the facilities plan, a consistent format should be used in order to provide ease in locating the information and to assure that all of the minimum requirements are included.

1. A statement of purpose, background, and need for the wastewater facilities planning being undertaken. Also, demonstration of consistency with the applicable city and/or county comprehensive land use plan.
2. A definition of the planning study area. The study area should include the entire service area, such as an urban growth boundary or service district boundary.
3. A technical description and evaluation of all wastewater collection, treatment and disposal facilities in the study area, including common sewerage systems not owned or operated by the city or service district (That is, satellite collection systems. However, a separate plan may be submitted for the satellite collection system). This section should identify all known problems in the system along with the data, research and analysis techniques used to identify the extent, location and type of problem. This inventory of problems may include many items that are unrelated to the proposed project. Completing this inventory may require studies and tests and may take a considerable period of time to complete depending upon the type of problems identified, and the operation and maintenance records available.
 - With respect to pump stations and treatment works, descriptions and evaluations should be sufficiently detailed to meet current ODEQ guidelines for design reports. Contact the ODEQ Regional Staff for assistance or to obtain these guidelines.
 - With respect to effluent discharges to surface waters, a computer model is often necessary to document dilution and toxicity impacts downstream from the outfall. Supporting information and analysis on the receiving stream should be included to insure that the selected alternative can be permitted. A complete analysis with diagrams and selected photographs may be warranted.
 - Accurate flow data must be collected and included in sufficient detail to support an informed choice of alternatives, and to provide enough data for the development of a discharge permit. A discussion of overflows must be detailed. Flow meters should be

calibrated and all flows to and from the plant and from overflow points should be monitored for a minimum of one year.

4. A projection of the future wastewater flows and waste loads is required. The planning period is normally twenty (20) years from completion of construction. While alternate flow projection methods may be proposed, the facilities plan must include a probability analysis of peak flows based on ODEQ flow-projection guidelines. Adequate justification must be provided if alternate flow projections are used as the basis of design. Population projections need to be consistent with applicable city and/or county comprehensive plans; if such plans are out of date they may need to be amended to incorporate the new information.
5. A discussion of the regulatory requirements that must be met by all viable alternatives is necessary. These include regulations pertaining to surface and storm water discharges, erosion control, effluent reuse, groundwater, sludge management, and wetland or waterway impacts. The facilities plan must include a discussion of the water quality status of the receiving stream (i.e. 303d list) and impact the discharge has on each parameter for which the stream is water quality limited. It must also include a discussion of the permit effluent limits and the Total Maximum Daily Load (TMDL), if one is completed or proposed. A summary of all effluent quality monitoring data should be included as an appendix. Specific regulations are cited below under "Water Quality Regulations for Facilities Planning." Also, this discussion needs to include a determination of whether each alternative is permitted by the local comprehensive plan and development regulations (zoning) and what, if any conditions or limitations are required.
6. A general description of all viable alternatives and a description of the alternative selection process are key to the planning process. The facilities plan must include a justification and methodology for selecting the recommended alternative. There should be enough detail and clearly stated conclusions in addressing each alternative to make it clear why each is or is not viable. A description of the recommended alternative in detail is necessary. Effectiveness and reliability in meeting the regulatory requirements discussed in step five above needs to be documented. A detailed technical description and cost estimate needs to be included. If the recommended alternative is a significant project which is not included in the list of public facility projects in the applicable city and/or county comprehensive plan, an amendment to the comprehensive plan may be necessary. This requirement applies to urban growth boundaries or unincorporated communities with a population greater than 2,500.

When RD and OECD-CDGB funding is involved, detailed cost estimates of the most viable alternatives must be provided. Also, the environmental impacts and any remediation required for these impacts for each viable alternative must be summarized in the Facilities Plan.

7. Technical descriptions in facilities plans should meet ODEQ guidelines for pre-design engineering reports. Adequate details about individual components and processes must be presented for all proposed facilities. The level of detail must be sufficient for an engineer who

was not involved in the report to produce plans and specifications for the construction of the same facility that was envisioned by the report writers, without changes to process sizing or arrangement. Any major decisions on equipment, layout, sizing, or process that are being deferred to a separate pre-design report or which are being postponed until the preliminary design phase should be identified.

8. Analysis of financing options for the preferred alternative and competitive alternatives, and a viable financing plan for construction, long-term operations and maintenance, and replacement is a necessity. Operational financing plans should include a projection of sewer use charges for residential, commercial and industrial users of the system. ODEQ relies on this information to verify adequacy of the financing plan. A guideline for the financing analysis is included in Appendix B. All projects with estimated costs in excess of ten (10) million dollars will be required to perform a value engineering (VE) study during or after engineering design but prior to construction.

9. Documentation of environmental concerns involves the identification of any factors of special significance at the construction site (particularly if it is undisturbed), including historic, cultural, archeological, socio-economic or biological factors. If the site is of special significance, the responsible agency should be identified, and any avoidance, mitigation or protection actions that have been planned or implemented should be discussed. This information is required to assure compliance with goals five, seven and eleven of Oregon's Statewide Planning Goals and Guidelines of the DLCD, and is required to assure compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). An in-depth outline of an environmental review that will meet the requirements of all financing agencies is presented in Appendix C.

9. Water Quality Regulations for Facilities Planning

Wastewater facilities planning needs to be performed with reference to the following water quality regulations:

Non-discharging alternatives (*alternatives that do not discharge to waters of the state*) have priority pursuant to *OAR 340-41-0007(4)*. If an existing surface water discharge is proposed to be expanded, or a new one is proposed, the facilities plan should demonstrate why non-discharging alternatives are unreasonable.

New sources of wastewater discharge must meet specific criteria outlined in *OAR 340-41-0004(9)*. These criteria should be addressed in the facilities plan.

The facilities plan advocating a new or expanded discharge must demonstrate that **in-stream water quality** standards will not be violated as a result of the proposed discharge. These standards have been established in *OAR 340-41*.

Effluent quality must be consistent with the minimum design criteria listed in *OAR 340-41* and the federal secondary treatment standards listed in *40 CFR, Part 133*.

Components of existing or proposed sewage works must be evaluated to determine their impacts on

groundwater quality. Examples include sludge storage ponds, wastewater treatment lagoons, constructed wetlands, irrigation disposal systems, and drainfields. If the evaluation indicates that there is potential for adverse impact, a groundwater protection program is required by *OAR 340-40*.

Re-use of treated effluents must conform with the reclaimed water standards presented in *OAR 340-55*. If re-use of treated effluent is anticipated for irrigation purposes an OWRD registration must be completed. For information and staff contact names and telephone numbers link to <http://www.oregon.gov/OWRD/offices.shtml>

Biosolids management must comply with the provisions of *OAR 340-50* and the current federal biosolids management regulations.

10. Review Process for Wastewater Facilities Plans

A draft facilities plan should be submitted for review and comment by ODEQ and participating funding agencies. Please check with agency staff for estimated turn around time. Ongoing agency involvement and review throughout the process greatly expedites subsequent approval of project plans and specifications, so this is not lost time. Past experience in the review of facilities plans and engineering reports in draft form indicates project completion is not usually delayed as a result of these reviews. Depending on the number of agencies involved and the complexity of the project 3 to 15 copies of the documentation may be needed for concurrent review. For ease in reviewing and amending the document and to conserve resources, use of a standard sized three ring binder system with spine label (including name of the community, the month and year), printing on both sides, and tabbed dividers for each appendix is advisable.

11. Phased and Incremental Projects

Projects that are to be completed as a series of incremental wastewater treatment system expansion phases shall be described in a wastewater facilities plan. A phased facilities plan will address the wastewater needs of the larger community area over a 20 or more year planning period, and describe an implementation program to meet those needs as they develop. ODEQ's review of phased or incremental projects attempts to verify consistency with the approved facilities plan; and adequacy, effectiveness, reliability, and operational aspects with reference to the overall plan and the existing facilities. Such reviews generally require no more than a copy of the relevant parts of the overall plan, an engineering report on the project, and an updated description of existing facilities, particularly with respect to design data. Proposed projects that are not within the scope of the original or amended phased facilities plan will require the development of an amendment to the plan and associated environmental documentation.

Appendix A

Wastewater Facilities Plan Outline

1.Executive Summary

2.Introduction, Purpose and Need

3.Study Area Characteristics

- 3.1 Study Area
- 3.2 Physical Environment
 - 0.1 Climate
 - 0.2 Soils
 - 0.3 Geologic Hazards
 - 0.4 Public Health Hazards
 - 0.5 Energy Production and Consumption
 - 0.6 Water Resources
 - 0.7 Flora and Fauna
 - 0.8 Air Quality and Noise
 - 0.9 Environmentally Sensitive Areas
 - 0.10 Land Use Issues
- 3.3 Socio-Economic Environment
 - 0.1 Economic Conditions and Trends
 - 0.2 Population
 - 0.3 Population growth projections
- 3.4 Land Use Regulations
 - 0.1 City or County Comprehensive Plan
 - 0.2 City or County Zoning Ordinance
 - 0.3 Intergovernmental Agreements

4.Existing Wastewater Facilities

- 4.1 Wastewater Conveyance System
 - 0.1 Pump Stations and Force Main
 - 0.2 Collection sewers
 - 0.3 Condition, Deficiencies, and Status of Conveyance System
- 4.2 Wastewater Treatment Plant
 - 0.1 Plant History
 - 0.2 Plant Design
 - 0.3 Plant Operations
 - 0.4 Unit Performance and Deficiencies

5.Wastewater Flows

- 5.1 Wastewater Volume
 - 0.1 Dry Weather Flow
 - 0.2 Wet Weather Flow
 - 0.3 Infiltration and Inflow
 - 0.4 Summary of Existing Flows
 - 0.5 Projected Wastewater Flows
- 5.2 Wastewater Composition
 - 0.1 Analysis of Plant Records
 - 0.2 Wastewater Composition
- 5.3 Projected Wastewater Characteristics

6.Basis of Planning

- 6.1 Basis for Design
 - 0.1 Regulatory Requirements
 - 0.2 Effluent Quality
 - 0.3 Treatment Effectiveness
 - 0.4 Plant Reliability Criteria
 - 0.5 Design Concepts and Constraints
 - 0.6 Unit Design Considerations
- 6.2 Basis for Cost Estimate
 - 0.1 Construction Costs
 - 0.2 Contingencies
 - 0.3 Engineering
 - 0.4 Legal and Administrative
- 6.3 Water Quality Impact
 - 0.1 Background Data on the receiving stream
- 6.4 Water Balance Analysis of any Wastewater Treatment Impoundments
- 6.5 Design Capacity of Conveyance System and Wastewater Treatment Plant
 - 0.1 Conveyance System
 - 0.2 Wastewater Treatment Plant Facilities
 - 0.3 Seasonal Land Irrigation

7.Development and Evaluation of Alternatives

- 7.1 Conveyance System Alternatives
 - 0.1 Basic Alternatives
 - 0.2 Selection
- 7.2 Wastewater Treatment Plant Liquid Stream Treatment Alternatives
 - 0.1 Basic Alternatives
 - 0.2 Selection

Appendix A

Facilities Plan Outline

- 7.3 Disinfection Alternatives
 - 0.1 Basic Alternatives
 - 0.2 Selection
- 7.4 Effluent Disposal Alternatives
 - 0.1 Wet Season Alternatives
 - 0.2 Selection
 - 0.3 Dry Season Alternatives
 - 0.4 Selection
- 7.5 Biosolids Management
 - 0.1 Biosolids Stabilization Alternatives
 - 0.2 Selection
 - 0.3 Ultimate Use and Disposal Alternatives
 - 0.4 Selection
- 7.6 Development and Evaluation of Complete Alternatives
 - 0.1 Common Parameters
 - 0.2 Development of at least three complete alternatives
 - 0.3 Matrix Evaluation

8. Rate Study (Incorporation of Appendix D, entitled “Financial Information Guideline” will meet the requirements of the funding agencies)

- 8.1 Estimated annual Operation, Maintenance and Replacement Costs of the proposed system
- 8.2 Evaluation of Local Funding Resources (municipal bonds, tax base, user fees, etc.)
- 8.3 Evaluation of Federal and State Funding Resources (grants, loans, state bond pool, etc)
- 8.4 Recommended Rate Structure and Financing Strategy

9. Recommended Plan

- 9.1 Introduction
 - 0.1 Project Selection
 - 0.2 Projected Design Flows
 - 0.3 Project Cost Summary
 - 0.4 Detailed Project Descriptions and Design Data
 - 0.5 Detailed Cost Estimates
- 9.2 Financing Strategy
- 9.3 Implementation Schedule

10. Environmental Report - A stand-alone environmental report may be required. Refer to Appendix C for information concerning this report. Projects funded through the CWSRF Program alone only require an Environmental Review chapter incorporated with the Facilities Plan document. CDBG-funded projects should follow the format/outline in appendix C.

Appendix B

Financial Information Guideline

1. Calculate the total number of Equivalent Dwelling Units (EDUs) in the system and identify the number of which are residential, commercial and industrial. Most financial programs use 7,500 gallons per month as an average residential flow, based on normal water use.
2. Identify the number of residential, commercial and industrial connections in the system.
3. Prepare an annual budget for the Operation, Maintenance (OM) costs and the capital long term system Replacement (R) funds for all the preferred alternatives (OMR). Also calculate what the user rate needs to be per EDU to adequately cover the proposed annual OMR.
4. Prepare a table that compares the monthly OMR costs per EDU for each alternative.
5. Show the current monthly residential user rate structure.
6. Identify any existing debt service that is being paid for the system whether through property taxes or user rates and when it will be paid off.
7. Calculate the monthly rate per EDU for the chosen alternative using the estimated OMR budget, and assuming the project is funded entirely with a loan.
8. Propose a rate structure for the community.
9. Propose a rate implementation schedule and identify what steps the community needs to undertake to adopt and implement a new rate structure.
10. When RD monies are involved, the FP must include a list of short lived assets that will be furnished with the recommended plan. The list must be broken into three groups – those with an expected life of 1 to 5 years, 6 to 10 years and 11 to 15 years. The estimated cost at the time of construction must be furnished for each asset or group of assets.
11. Rural Development requires other specific financial information be submitted with the application. Assistance can be obtained from the RD Community Programs Specialist assigned to a particular community. A list of Specialists can be found at:
www.rurdev.usda.gov/or/util1.htm .

Appendix C

Environmental Report Outline/Format

The USDA Rural Development, Rural Utilities Service (RUS), has developed a comprehensive environmental report guidance document (RUS Bulletin 1974A-02, Guide for Preparing the Environmental Report for Water and Waste Projects). This guidance document (called the “Green Guide”) should be used in preparing the Environmental Report required for a proposed project. The Green Guide can be obtained by calling your agency contact, or by downloading a copy from the Rural Development web site at <http://www.usda.gov/rus/water/ees/pdf/1794-602A2.PDF>.

The Environmental Report document should also include: 1) a Table of Contents; 2) an Executive Summary; 3) a description of the existing system and/or conditions; 4) an analysis of a “no action” alternative, in addition to other feasible alternatives considered; 5) a description of any additional studies that were performed, and 6) any mitigation measures needed to minimize the impact of the proposed project on the natural and human environments.

Each section and exhibit of the Environmental Report should be tabbed to correspond with the Table of Contents. The tabs should identify the section/exhibit (e.g. “3.3 Wetlands” or “6.0 Maps”).

Outline/Format for the Environmental Report

(For “level of detail” information required for each topic/section, see the Green Guide.)

1.0 Purpose and Need for the Project

- 1.1 Project Description (Proposed Action or Proposed Project)
- 1.2 Purpose and Need for the Project

2.0 Alternatives to the Proposed Action

(Alternatives considered OTHER THAN the Proposed Action.)

3.0 Affected Environment/Environmental Consequences

- 3.1 Land Use/Important Farmland/Formally Classified Lands
 - 3.1.1 Affected Environment *
 - 3.1.2 Environmental Consequences *
 - 3.1.3 Mitigation *
- 3.2 Floodplains
- 3.3 Wetlands
- 3.4 Cultural Resources

Appendix C

Environmental Reporting

- 3.5 Biological Resources
 - 3.6 Water Quality Issues
 - 3.7 Coastal Resources
 - 3.8 Socio-Economic/Environmental Justice Issues
 - 3.9 Miscellaneous Issues
- (* Repeat through all Section 3.0 subsections.)

4.0 Summary of Mitigation

5.0 Correspondence

6.0 Exhibits/Maps

Additional USDA Rural Development Environmental Program information documents particular to Oregon may be accessed and downloaded from the Oregon Rural Development Web Site at <http://www.rurdev.usda.gov/or/pss.htm>

Potential CDBG projects must ensure that the environmental report covers all aspects contained in the current grant management handbook. The handbook contains special forms that will need to be completed and submitted to OECDD.

Appendix D

Contacting Agency Staff

Oregon Department of Environmental Quality:
<http://www.deq.state.or.us/wq/loans/contacts.htm>

Oregon Community and Economic Development Department:
<http://econ.oregon.gov/>

USDA Rural Development:
<http://www.rurdev.usda.gov/or/RUSContadd.htm>