## Type I or II Categorical Exclusion Action Classification Form

| STIP No.: | B-5831 |
| :--- | :--- | :---: |
| WBS Element: | 45784.1.2 |
| Federal Aid No.: | NHP-0077(006) |

## A. Project Description:

Replace Bridge No. 6 on I-77 NBL over Yadkin River, Norfolk Southern Railroad, and NC 268 in Yadkin and Surry Counties.

The replacement structure will use concrete girders approximately 815 -feet long providing a clear roadway width of 48 -feet. The new structure will be replaced in-place. The bridge will include two 12foot lanes and 12 -foot offsets. The bridge length is based on preliminary design information and is set by minimum vertical roadway clearance requirements and hydraulic considerations.

Bridge and approach project construction on I-77 NBL will extend approximately 825 -feet from the southern end of the new bridge and 325 -feet from the northern end of the new bridge. The approaches will provide two 12 -foot travel lanes with 4 -foot paved shoulders inside and 12 -foot paved shoulders outside.

Traffic will be maintained on-site during construction. Traffic will be shifted to the existing south bound bridge (Bridge No. 13) during construction. Cross overs will be utilized. The crossover length will be approximately 2,295 -feet to the north and 1,831-feet to the south. The project is shown in Figure 1.

NC 268 will be widened to the west under I-77 for 550 -feet to include 6 -foot shoulders ( 9 -feet with guardrail).
B. Description of Need and Purpose:

The purpose of the proposed project is to replace a 55 -year old functionally obsolete bridge. NCDOT records indicates Bridge 850006 has a sufficiency rating of 66.03 out of a possible 100 for a new structure in 2017. The bridge is considered functionally obsolete due to a deck geometry of 3 out of 9 according to Federal Highway Administration standards.

Routine maintenance has been performed on Bridge No. 850006; however, the addition of welded plates and painting performed was temporary pending construction of a new bridge. The temporary repair work did not address delamination, exposed rebar, spalling, corrosion, erosion and cracks.

## C. Categorical Exclusion Action Classification:

## Type I(A) - Ground Disturbing Action

D. Proposed Improvements:

23 CFR 771.117 (c)
28. Bridge rehabilitation, reconstruction, or replacement or the construction of grade separation to replace existing at-grade railroad crossings, if the actions meet the constraints in 23 CFR 771.117 (e)(1$6)$.

## E. Special Project Information:

## Design:

- Functional classification: Interstate
- Statewide Tier Guidelines
- Design Speed: 75-mph
- Posted Speed: 70-mph
- 2042 Design Year ADT: 40,025 vpd
- Design Exception: not required


## Alternatives Considered:

The No-Build alternative would result in eventually closing the road which is unacceptable given the traffic service provided by l-77 NBL.

A three-lane option for I-77 NBL was considered but was determined not to be feasible and was removed from further study. The 2040 forecast of 48,100 average daily traffic did not justify a three lane typical.

Rehabilitation of the old bridge is not practical due to its age and being functionally obsolete. The extent of deterioration and the numerous locations of areas of disrepair on the bridge make rehabilitation inefficient, ineffective, and costly beyond reasonable limits.

Estimated Costs: The estimated construction costs are based on 2017 prices.

| ITEM | Recommended <br> Alternative | 3-lane <br> Alternative |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Construction Costs | $\$ 9,000,000$ | $\$ 10,700,000$ |
| Right-of-Way Costs | $\$ 600,000$ | $\$ 600,000$ |
| Total Estimated Cost | $\$ 9,600,000$ | $\$ 11,300,000$ |

*Cost from 2020-2029 Draft STIP

Pedestrian and Bicycle Accommodations: I-77 is not part of a designated bicycle route nor is it listed in the STIP as needing incidental bicycle accommodations. Neither permanent nor temporary bicycle or pedestrian accommodations are required for this project.

The Piedmont Triad Regional Council (PTRC) requested accommodations for a river crossing as part of a regional trails network underneath the bridge. The request comes from the plan to connect Stone Mountain to Pilot Mountain via the Mountains to Sea Trail.

The current design includes accommodations for a greenway path under Bridge No. 6. NCDOT will continue coordination with PTRC and Yadkin County to provide adequate clearance under the proposed bridge to accommodate a future greenway and continued coordination during the final design phase.

A Complete Streets Project Sheet was approved by NCDOT in May 2020.
Public Involvement: A landowner notification letter was sent to all property owners affected by this project in February 2016. Property owners were invited to comment. No comments have been received to date.

Start of Study letters were sent to local officials, and environmental permit and resource agencies with jurisdiction in the proposed project area in December 2015. All comments have been addressed within this document.

In accordance with the NCDOT Tribal Protocol, the following Tribal Partners were notified on June 25, 2020 of the proposed project: Catawba Indian Nation. Comments received will be addressed during final design.

Bridge Demolition: Bridge No. 6 is constructed of concrete and steel and should be possible to remove with no resulting debris based on standard demolition practices.

## Project Impact Criteria Checklists:

F2. Ground Disturbing Actions - Type I (Appendix A) \& Type II (Appendix B)
Proposed improvement(s) that fit Type I Actions (NCDOT-FHWA CE Programmatic Agreement, Appendix A) including 2, 3, 6, 7, 9, 12, 18, 21, 22 (ground disturbing), 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, \&/or 30; \&/or Type II Actions (NCDOT-FHWA CE Programmatic Agreement, Appendix B) answer the project impact threshold questions (below) and questions $8-31$.

- If any question 1-7 is checked "Yes" then NCDOT certification for FHWA approval is required.
- If any question 8-31 is checked "Yes" then additional information will be required for those questions in Section G.

| PROJECT IMPACT THRESHOLDS <br> (FHWA signature required if any of the questions 1-7 are marked "Yes".) |  | Yes | No |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Does the project require formal consultation with U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) or National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS)? | $\square$ | $\square$ |
| 2 | Does the project result in impacts subject to the conditions of the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act (BGEPA)? | $\square$ | $\checkmark$ |
| 3 | Does the project generate substantial controversy or public opposition, for any reason, following appropriate public involvement? | $\square$ | $\square$ |
| 4 | Does the project cause disproportionately high and adverse impacts relative to lowincome and/or minority populations? | $\square$ | $\checkmark$ |
| 5 | Does the project involve a residential or commercial displacement, or a substantial amount of right of way acquisition? | $\square$ | $\checkmark$ |
| 6 | Does the project require an Individual Section 4(f) approval? | $\square$ | $\square$ |
| 7 | Does the project include adverse effects that cannot be resolved with a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) or have an adverse effect on a National Historic Landmark (NHL)? | $\square$ | $\checkmark$ |
| If any question $8-31$ is checked "Yes" then additional information will be required for those questions in Section G. |  |  |  |
| Other Considerations |  | Yes | No |
| 8 | Is an Endangered Species Act (ESA) determination unresolved or is the project covered by a Programmatic Agreement under Section 7? | $\square$ | $\checkmark$ |
| 9 | Is the project located in anadromous fish spawning waters? |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 10 | Does the project impact waters classified as Outstanding Resource Water (ORW), High Quality Water (HQW), Water Supply Watershed Critical Areas, 303(d) listed impaired water bodies, buffer rules, or Submerged Aquatic Vegetation (SAV)? | $\square$ | $\checkmark$ |
| 11 | Does the project impact Waters of the United States in any of the designated mountain trout streams? | $\square$ | $\checkmark$ |
| 12 | Does the project require a U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) Individual Section 404 Permit? |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 13 | Will the project require an easement from a Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) licensed facility? | $\square$ | $\checkmark$ |


| Other Considerations for Type I and II Ground Disturbing Actions (continued) |  | Yes | No |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 14 | Does the project include a Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) effects determination other than a No Effect, including archaeological remains? | $\square$ | $\square$ |
| 15 | Does the project involve GeoEnvironmental Sites of Concerns such as gas stations, dry cleaners, landfills, etc.? | $\square$ | $\square$ |
| 16 | Does the project require work encroaching and adversely affecting a regulatory floodway or work affecting the base floodplain (100-year flood) elevations of a water course or lake, pursuant to Executive Order 11988 and 23 CFR 650 subpart A? | $\checkmark$ | $\square$ |
| 17 | Is the project in a Coastal Area Management Act (CAMA) county and substantially affects the coastal zone and/or any Area of Environmental Concern (AEC)? | $\square$ | $\square$ |
| 18 | Does the project require a U.S. Coast Guard (USCG) permit? |  | $\square$ |
| 19 | Does the project involve construction activities in, across, or adjacent to a designated Wild and Scenic River present within the project area? | $\square$ | $\checkmark$ |
| 20 | Does the project involve Coastal Barrier Resources Act (CBRA) resources? |  | $\square$ |
| 21 | Does the project impact federal lands (e.g. U.S. Forest Service (USFS), USFWS, etc.) or Tribal Lands? | $\square$ | $\checkmark$ |
| 22 | Does the project involve any changes in access control or the modification or construction of an interchange on an interstate? | $\square$ | $\checkmark$ |
| 23 | Does the project have a permanent adverse effect on local traffic patterns or community cohesiveness? | $\square$ | $\checkmark$ |
| 24 | Will maintenance of traffic cause substantial disruption? |  | $\checkmark$ |
| 25 | Is the project inconsistent with the STIP, and where applicable, the Metropolitan Planning Organization's (MPO's) Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)? | $\square$ | $\checkmark$ |
| 26 | Does the project require the acquisition of lands under the protection of Section 6(f) of the Land and Water Conservation Act, the Federal Aid in Fish Restoration Act, the Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act, Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA), Tribal Lands, or other unique areas or special lands that were acquired in fee or easement with public-use money and have deed restrictions or covenants on the property? | $\square$ | $\checkmark$ |
| 27 | Does the project involve Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) buyout properties under the Hazard Mitigation Grant Program (HMGP)? | $\square$ | $\square$ |
| 28 | Does the project include a de minimis or programmatic Section 4(f)? | $\square$ | $\square$ |
| 29 | Is the project considered a Type I under the NCDOT Noise Policy? |  | $\square$ |
| 30 | Is there prime or important farmland soil impacted by this project as defined by the Farmland Protection Policy Act (FPPA)? | $\square$ | $\square$ |
| 31 | Are there other issues that arose during the project development process that affected the project decision? | $\square$ | $\checkmark$ |

## F. Additional Documentation as Required from Section F:

## Question 8: Federally Protected Species

Northern long-eared bat (NLEB): A review of NCNHP records, updated April 2020, indicates no known occurrences of federally protected species within 1.0-mile of the project study area. The nearest known Northern long-eared bat hibernaculum is approximately 56-miles southwest of the project and no known NLEB roost trees occur within 150 -feet of the project area. NCDOT has determined that the proposed action does not require separate consultation on the grounds that the proposed action is consistent with the final Section 4(d) Rule, codified at 50 CFR $\S 17.40$ (o) and effective February 16, 2016. NCDOT may presume its determination is informed by best available information and consider Section 7 responsibilities fulfilled for NLEB.

Gray bat: A review of the April 2020 NCNHP dataset indicates no known occurrences of gray bat within 1.0-mile of the study area. The NCDOT Biological Surveys Group will provide additional information regarding the potential presence of this species prior to project construction.

## Question 16: Regulatory Floodway

Yadkin and Surry Counties are participants in the Federal Flood Insurance Program, administered by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). The project is within a Flood Hazard Zone, designated as Zone AE, for which the 100-year base flood elevations and corresponding regulatory floodway have been established. Yadkin River is a FEMA mapped stream studied by the North Carolina Floodplain Mapping Program by Limited Detail methods. The bridge is located on DFIRM Panel 4961.

No structures will be adversely affected by the surface water elevation from the proposed project.
The Hydraulics Unit will coordinate with the NC Floodplain Mapping Program (FMP), to determine the status of project with regard to applicability of NCDOT's Memorandum of Agreement, or approval of a Conditional Letter of Map Revision (CLOMR) and subsequent final Letter of Map Revision (LOMR). This project involves construction activities on or adjacent to FEMA-regulated streams(s). Therefore, the Division shall submit sealed as-built construction plans to the Hydraulics Unit upon completion of project construction, certifying that the drainage structure(s) and roadway embankment that are located within the 100-year floodplain were built as shown in the construction plans, both horizontally and vertically.

## G. Project Commitments (attach as Green Sheet to CE Form):

# NCDOT PROJECT COMMITMENTS 

Replace Bridge No. 6 on I-77 NBL over Yadkin River, Norfolk Southern Railroad and NC 268<br>Yadkin and Surry Counties<br>STIP No. B-5831

NCDOT Hydraulics Design Unit and Division 11- FEMA Coordination
The Hydraulics Unit will coordinate with the NC Floodplain Mapping Program (FMP), to determine status of project with regard to applicability of NCDOT's Memorandum of Agreement, or approval of a Conditional Letter of Map Revision (CLOMR) and subsequent final Letter of Map Revision (LOMR).

This project involves construction activities on or adjacent to FEMA-related stream(s). Therefore, the Division shall submit sealed as-built construction plans to the Hydraulics Unit upon completion of project construction, certifying that the drainage structure(s) and roadway embankment that are located within the 100-year floodplain were built as shown in the construction plans, both horizontally and vertically.

## Structures Management Unit - Greenway Coordination

NCDOT will continue coordination with PTRC and Yadkin County to provide adequate clearance under the proposed bridge to accommodate a future greenway and continued coordination during the final design phase.

## Division 11 and Structures Management Unit - Paddler Safety Plan

NCDOT shall require the contractor to install and maintain a rigid, non-drooping catchment device on the overhead structure of the bridge to prevent material from falling on river users or in the water.

## Environmental Coordination \& Permitting (ECAP) - Gray bat

The NCDOT Biological Surveys Group will be responsible for habitat assessment, and if needed, surveys for the gray bat prior to construction.

## H. Categorical Exclusion Approval:

| STIP No: | B-5831 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| WBS No.: | 45784.1.2 |
| Federal Aid No.: | NHP-0077(006) |

## Prepared By:


Prepared For: $\quad$ North Carolina Department of Transportation

| Reviewed By |  |  | usigned by: |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 7/20/2020 \| | 6:04 | PM EDT | Philip S. Harris, III, PE |
| Date |  | Philip S NCDOT |  nvironmental Analysis Unit |


| $\checkmark$ | Approved | - If NO grey boxes are checked in Section F (pages 2 and 3), NCDOT approves the Type I or Type II Categorical Exclusion. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\square$ | Certified | - If ANY grey boxes are checked in Section F (pages 2 and 3), NCDOT certifies the Type I or Type II Categorical Exclusion for FHWA approval. <br> - If classified as Type III Categorical Exclusion. |
| 7/20/2020 | \| 2:00 PM EDT | DocuSigned by: <br> Kevin Fischer |
| Date | Kevin F <br> NCDO |  ructures Management Unit |

FHWA Approved: For Projects Certified by NCDOT (above), FHWA signature required.

Date $\quad$| for $/$ John F. Sullivan, III, PE, Division Administrator |
| :---: |
| Federal Highway Administration |

Note: Prior to ROW or Construction authorization, a consultation may be required (please see Section VII of the NCDOT-FHWA CE Programmatic Agreement for more details).


# State of North Carolina <br> DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION 

## Roy Cooper <br> Governor

J. Eric Boyette<br>Secretary

June 25, 2020

Dr. Wenonah Haire
Tribal Historic Preservation Officer
Catawba Indian Nation
1536 Tom Steven Road
Rock Hill SC, 29730
Dear Dr. Haire,
The North Carolina Department of Transportation has started the project development, environmental, and engineering work for the replacement of Bridge No. 6 over the Yadkin River, Yadkin Valley Railroad, and N.C. 268 on I-77 NBL on the Yadkin/Surry County border as project B-5831.

The US Army Corps of Engineers is the lead agency and a permit is anticipated under the Section 404 Process with the USACE.

The project vicinity map is attached. The coordinates of this project are approximately $36.250450,-80.820985$.
This project was reviewed/surveyed for cultural resources by NCDOT under the terms of the 2015 Amended Programmatic Agreement Among the Federal Highway Administration, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation and the North Carolina State Historic Preservation Office for Minor Transportation Projects in North Carolina (PA). The results of that review/survey are attached. The environmental document for this undertaking is currently under development.

Please respond by July 27 th so that your comments can be used to evaluate potential environmental impacts during the design phase of this project. If you have any questions concerning this project, or would like additional information, please contact me at (919) 707-6442 or email dstutts@ncdot.gov.

Thank You,


David Stutts, PE
Structures Magaement Unit Project Engineer, NCDOT
cc: Matt Wilkerson, NCDOT Archaeology Team Lead
Lori Beckwith, USACE Division 11

## PROJECT INFORMATION

| Project No: | B-5831 | County: | Surry/Yadkin |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| WBS No: | 45784.1 .1 | Document: | Categorical Exclusion |
| Federal Aid No: | NHP- | Funding: | $\square$ State $\boxtimes$ Federal |
|  | $0077(006)$ |  |  |

Federal Permit Required? $\triangle$ Yes $\square$ No Permit Type: Nationwide
Project Description: Replace Bridge 6 on I-77 (Northbound) over NC 268, the Southern
Railroad, and the Yadkin River. Area of Potential Effects (A.P.E.) is approximately 763 meters (2,500 ft.) long and 92 meters ( 300 ft. .) wide. No design plans were provided.

## SUMMARY OF CULTURAL RESOURCES REVIEW

## Brief description of review activities, results of review, and conclusions:

The review included an examination of a topographic map, the Surry and Yadkin Counties soil surveys, an aerial photograph, and listings of previously recorded sites, previous archaeological surveys, and previous environmental reviews at the Office of State Archaeology (O.S.A.). Also, a visual reconnaissance of the project area was conducted on $2 / 24 / 2016$. The bridge is oriented approximately north-south. Surry County is on the north side of the Yadkin River and Yadkin County is on the south side.

The topographic maps (Elkin North, N.C. and Elkin South, N.C.) show the A.P.E. is located in a wide river valley. The A.P.E. includes floodplain and moderate to steep ridges on each side. Falls Creek joins the Yadkin River in the southwest quadrant. The floodplain on each side of the Yadkin River has the highest archaeological potential. The ridges have low potential.

The Surry and Yadkin County soil surveys show the soil on the north (Surry) side of the bridge is Colvard and Suches soils ( $0-3 \%$ slopes), occasionally flooded, in the floodplain. The soil in the floodplain along the east edge of the A.P.E. is Udorthents, a soil described as "mine spoil" or "earthy fill." Fairview sandy clay loam ( $8-15 \%$ and $15-45 \%$ slopes) is the soil type on the ridge in the northern part of the A.P.E. The soil on the south (Yadkin) side of the bridge is Ronda loamy sand ( $0-5 \%$ slopes), occasionally flooded, Dan River/ Comus soils ( $0-4 \%$ slopes), occasionally flooded, and Hatboro soils ( $0-2 \%$ slopes) frequently flooded, in the floodplain. The Hatboro soil appears to mark the bed of Fall Creek. Fall Creek joins the Yadkin River in the southwest quadrant, but was probably re-routed to that confluence when I-77 was constructed. Prior to the construction of I-77 it probably joined the river in what is now the southeast quadrant. The soil on the ridge is Fariview-Stott Knob complex ( $25-45 \%$ slopes).

The aerial photograph shows that most of the A.P.E. is wooded.
A review of information at the O.S.A. shows there are no previously recorded sites within or
adjacent to the A.P.E. The A.P.E. has not been previously surveyed for archaeological sites. There are several projects near the A.P.E. that have been reviewed by the State Historic Preservation Office (HPO). These include a wasterwater line along the north side of NC 268 (ER 14-1132), a walking trail along the north side of the Yadkin River (ER 15-2367), and a pedestrian bridge along the south side of the Yadkin River (ER 12-0889). No archaeological surveys were requested for any of the projects.

A visual reconnaissance of the project area was conducted by NCDOT archaeologists Scott Halvorsen and Caleb Smith on 2/24/2016. The reconnaissance was conducted on the north side of the river but not the south (we could not figure out how to access that part of the A.P.E.). The examination of the north side of the river focused on the northeast quadrant. The A.P.E. includes the area within 46 meters ( 150 ft .) of centerline on both sides of the I-77 Northbound bridge. The A.P.E. on the west side of that bridge is mostly occupied by the I-77 Southbound bridge. The A.P.E. in the northeast quadrant consists of floodplain from the river north for 90 meters ( 295 ft. ), then the Southern Railroad tracks, then NC 268, and then a slope up to a ridge. The floodplain along the north side of the river appears to be poorly-drained. The soil survey describes the soil next to the bridge as "occasionally flooded", and along the east edge of the A.P.E. as Udorthents, which is disturbed fill. Visual examination of the A.P.E. to the east of the bridge did not identify any visible evidence of fill, but it did appear to be a poorly-drained area.

Brief Explanation of why the available information provides a reliable basis for reasonably predicting that there are no unidentified historic properties in the APE:
The floodplain landforms on both sides of the river appear to have a moderate to high potential for archaeological sites, while the ridges have a low potential. The western half of the A.P.E. (the northwest and southwest quadrants) is occupied by existing I-77 Southbound, and has little potential for undisturbed archaeological sites. The soil survey indicates much of the floodplain soil in the northeast quadrant is disturbed fill. The floodplain in the southeast quadrant is a narrow stip between the river and the ridge. Visual examination of the northeast quadrant indicates the flooplain may be poorly-drained.

## SUPPORT DOCUMENTATION

See attached: $\boxtimes$ Map(s) $\square$ Previous Survey Info Photocopy of County Survey Notes
$\boxtimes$ Photos $\square$ Correspondence Other:

## FINDING BY NCDOT ARCHAEOLOGIST

NO ARCHAEOLOGY SURVEY REQUIRED
Caleb Smith 4/12/2016
NCDOT ARCHAEOLOGIST II Date

Dear Landowner:
The North Carolina Department of Transportation (Department) is constantly working to provide better and safer transportation facilities for public uses in North Carolina. The effects that these proposed facilities have on the human and natural environment are of great concern to the Department and must be adequately described in environmental documents, such as Environmental Assessments or Environmental Impact Statements. As part of this process, the Department is obligated to identify and document environmental resources so that they can be avoided or impacts reduced. Streams and wetlands are two of the resources that must be identified during the review process. The Department has begun planning studies for the proposed replacement of bridge No. 6 on I 77 NBL, over NC 268, South RR, \& Yadkin River, Curry County, TIP Project B-5831.

Over the next several weeks, representatives of the Department, as well as the US Army Corps of Engineers, Wilmington District, Regulatory Division, may be present on your property for the purposes of conducting or verifying the limits of waters and wetlands pursuant to Section 404 of the Clean Water Act and/or Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899. These representatives will be wearing orange safety vests, have picture ID badges, and will be hanging pink and black flagging, or ribbons, on trees and shrubs to identify the limits of streams and wetlands, if present, on the property. This flagging does not indicate the location of a proposed transportation project, but it is very important in our environmental review process. Please do not disturb this flagging.

Please note that if the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers has already issued a Jurisdictional Determination on your property confirming the presence of streams and/or wetlands, or if you have general questions or comments about the project, contact the NCDOT Planning Engineer Jonathan Carr, by phone (919) 707-6014, or via email at jecarr@ncdot.gov. If you call, please mention NCDOT project number B-5831.

Thank you for your cooperation.
Sincerely,


Richard W. Hancock, PE, Unit Head
Project Development and Environmental Analysis Unit

Febrero 16, 2016
Estimado propietario
El Departamento de Transporte de Carolina del Norte (Departamento) trabaja constantemente para ofrecer mejores y más seguras instalaciones de transporte para el uso público en Carolina del Norte. Los efectos que estas instalaciones propuestas tienen sobre el medio ambiente representan una gran preocupación para el Departamento y deben ser descritas adecuadamente en documentos ambientales, tales como Exclusiones Categóricas, Evaluaciones Ambientales o Declaraciones de Impacto Ambiental. Como parte de este proceso, el Departamento está obligado a identificar y documentar recursos ambientales con el fin de evitar o reducir los impactos. Los arroyos y los humedales son dos de los recursos que deben ser identificados durante el proceso de revisión. El Departamento ha iniciado los estudios de planeación relacionados con la propuesta reemplazo de la puente número 6 de I 77 NBL, encima de NC 268, South RR, \& Yadkin River, en el condado Surry, Proyecto TIP B-5831.

Durante los próximos meses, es posible que representantes del Departamento, así como del Cuerpo de Ingenieros del Ejército de los Estados Unidos del distrito de Wilmington, pertenecientes a la División Regulatoria, se presenten en su propiedad con el propósito de conducir o verificar los límites de aguas y humedales de conformidad con la Sección 404 del Acta de Agua Limpia y/o la Sección 10 del Acta de Ríos y Puertos de 1899. Estos representantes vestirán chalecos de seguridad de color naranja, llevarán credenciales de identificación con fotografía y estarán colgando banderines de color rosa y negro, o listones, en árboles y arbustos para identificar los límites de arroyos y humedales que existan en la propiedad. Este mapeo no significa que en la zona se contemple un proyecto de transportación propuesto, pero es muy importante en nuestro proceso de revisión ambiental. Por favor no retire tales banderines o listones.

Por favor tome en cuenta que si el Cuerpo de Ingenieros del Ejército de los EE.UU. ha emitido una Determinación Jurisdiccional en su propiedad confirmando la presencia de arroyos y/o humedales, o si tiene preguntas o comentarios relacionados con el proyecto, por favor contacte la Línea Directa en Español del NCDOT llamando al 1-800-481-6494 o envíe su correspondencia a Jonathan Carr jecarr@ncdot.gov. Cuando llame, por favor mencione el Proyecto TIP B-5831 del NCDOT.

Gracias por su cooperación.
Atentamente,


Richard W. Hancock, PE, Unit Head
Unidad de Desarrollo de Proyectos y Análisis Ambientales


## HISTORIC ARCHICTECTURE AND LANDSCAPES NO SURVEY REQUIRED FORM

This form only pertains to Historic Architecture and Landscapes for this project. It is not valid for Archaeological Resources. You must consult separately with the Archaeology Group.

## PROJECT INFORMATION

| Project No: | B-5831 | County: | Surry |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| WBS No.: | 45784.1 .1 | Document <br> Type: | CE |
| Fed. Aid No: | NHP-0077(006) | Funding: | $\square$ State 区 Federal |
| Federal <br> Permit(s): | Q Yes $\square$ No | Permit <br> Type(s): | NWP |
| Project Description: <br> Replace Bridge No. 6 on I-77 (northbound lane) over Yadkin River. |  |  |  |

## SUMMARY OF HISTORIC ARCHICTECTURE AND LANDSCAPES REVIEW

## Description of review activities, results, and conclusions:

Review of HPO quad maps, relevant background reports, historic designations roster, and indexes was undertaken on February 8, 2016. Based on this review there are no NR, DE, LL, SL, or SS in the Area of Potential Effects (APE). Both the Yadkin and Surry County tax data was utilized to check for structures greater than 50 years of age. There are no standing structures in the APE greater than fifty years of age. The bridge itself, Surry County Bridge No. 6, was built in 1965. The structure does not exemplify any distinctive engineering or aesthetic type and is not eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. No survey is required. On June 12, 2020 the APE of this project extended beyond the area examined in the original screening. However, in the extended APE there are no properties over 50 years of age. No survey is required.
Why the available information provides a reliable basis for reasonably predicting that there are no unidentified significant historic architectural or landscape resources in the project area:
Using HPO GIS website and county tax data provides reliable information regarding the structures in the APE. These combined utilities are considered valid for the purposes of determining the likelihood of historic resources being present.

## SUPPORT DOCUMENTATION

$\boxtimes$ Map(s) $\quad \square$ Previous Survey Info. $\quad \square$ Photos $\quad \square$ Correspondence $\quad \square$ Design Plans

## FINDING BY NCDOT ARCHITECTURAL HISTORIAN

Historic Architecture and Landscapes -- NO SURVEY REQUIRED

## PROJECT INFORMATION

| Project No: | B-5831 | County: | Surry/Yadkin |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| WBS No: | 45784.1 .1 | Document: | Categorical Exclusion |
| Federal Aid No: | NHP- | Funding: | $\square$ State $\boxtimes$ Federal |
|  | $0077(006)$ |  |  |

Federal Permit Required? $\triangle$ Yes $\square$ No Permit Type: Nationwide
Project Description: Replace Bridge 6 on I-77 (Northbound) over NC 268, the Southern
Railroad, and the Yadkin River. Area of Potential Effects (A.P.E.) is approximately 763 meters (2,500 ft.) long and 92 meters ( 300 ft. .) wide. No design plans were provided.

## SUMMARY OF CULTURAL RESOURCES REVIEW

## Brief description of review activities, results of review, and conclusions:

The review included an examination of a topographic map, the Surry and Yadkin Counties soil surveys, an aerial photograph, and listings of previously recorded sites, previous archaeological surveys, and previous environmental reviews at the Office of State Archaeology (O.S.A.). Also, a visual reconnaissance of the project area was conducted on $2 / 24 / 2016$. The bridge is oriented approximately north-south. Surry County is on the north side of the Yadkin River and Yadkin County is on the south side.

The topographic maps (Elkin North, N.C. and Elkin South, N.C.) show the A.P.E. is located in a wide river valley. The A.P.E. includes floodplain and moderate to steep ridges on each side. Falls Creek joins the Yadkin River in the southwest quadrant. The floodplain on each side of the Yadkin River has the highest archaeological potential. The ridges have low potential.

The Surry and Yadkin County soil surveys show the soil on the north (Surry) side of the bridge is Colvard and Suches soils ( $0-3 \%$ slopes), occasionally flooded, in the floodplain. The soil in the floodplain along the east edge of the A.P.E. is Udorthents, a soil described as "mine spoil" or "earthy fill." Fairview sandy clay loam ( $8-15 \%$ and $15-45 \%$ slopes) is the soil type on the ridge in the northern part of the A.P.E. The soil on the south (Yadkin) side of the bridge is Ronda loamy sand ( $0-5 \%$ slopes), occasionally flooded, Dan River/ Comus soils ( $0-4 \%$ slopes), occasionally flooded, and Hatboro soils ( $0-2 \%$ slopes) frequently flooded, in the floodplain. The Hatboro soil appears to mark the bed of Fall Creek. Fall Creek joins the Yadkin River in the southwest quadrant, but was probably re-routed to that confluence when I-77 was constructed. Prior to the construction of I-77 it probably joined the river in what is now the southeast quadrant. The soil on the ridge is Fariview-Stott Knob complex ( $25-45 \%$ slopes).

The aerial photograph shows that most of the A.P.E. is wooded.
A review of information at the O.S.A. shows there are no previously recorded sites within or
adjacent to the A.P.E. The A.P.E. has not been previously surveyed for archaeological sites. There are several projects near the A.P.E. that have been reviewed by the State Historic Preservation Office (HPO). These include a wasterwater line along the north side of NC 268 (ER 14-1132), a walking trail along the north side of the Yadkin River (ER 15-2367), and a pedestrian bridge along the south side of the Yadkin River (ER 12-0889). No archaeological surveys were requested for any of the projects.

A visual reconnaissance of the project area was conducted by NCDOT archaeologists Scott Halvorsen and Caleb Smith on 2/24/2016. The reconnaissance was conducted on the north side of the river but not the south (we could not figure out how to access that part of the A.P.E.). The examination of the north side of the river focused on the northeast quadrant. The A.P.E. includes the area within 46 meters ( 150 ft .) of centerline on both sides of the I-77 Northbound bridge. The A.P.E. on the west side of that bridge is mostly occupied by the I-77 Southbound bridge. The A.P.E. in the northeast quadrant consists of floodplain from the river north for 90 meters ( 295 ft. ), then the Southern Railroad tracks, then NC 268, and then a slope up to a ridge. The floodplain along the north side of the river appears to be poorly-drained. The soil survey describes the soil next to the bridge as "occasionally flooded", and along the east edge of the A.P.E. as Udorthents, which is disturbed fill. Visual examination of the A.P.E. to the east of the bridge did not identify any visible evidence of fill, but it did appear to be a poorly-drained area.

Brief Explanation of why the available information provides a reliable basis for reasonably predicting that there are no unidentified historic properties in the APE:
The floodplain landforms on both sides of the river appear to have a moderate to high potential for archaeological sites, while the ridges have a low potential. The western half of the A.P.E. (the northwest and southwest quadrants) is occupied by existing I-77 Southbound, and has little potential for undisturbed archaeological sites. The soil survey indicates much of the floodplain soil in the northeast quadrant is disturbed fill. The floodplain in the southeast quadrant is a narrow stip between the river and the ridge. Visual examination of the northeast quadrant indicates the flooplain may be poorly-drained.

## SUPPORT DOCUMENTATION

See attached: $\boxtimes$ Map(s) $\square$ Previous Survey Info Photocopy of County Survey Notes
$\boxtimes$ Photos $\square$ Correspondence Other:

## FINDING BY NCDOT ARCHAEOLOGIST

NO ARCHAEOLOGY SURVEY REQUIRED
Caleb Smith 4/12/2016
NCDOT ARCHAEOLOGIST II Date






$$
-L=P T S t a .11+55.44
$$



