## Type I and II Ground Disturbing Categorical Exclusion Action Classification Form

STIP Project No.	B-6008
WBS Element	48203.1.1
Federal Project No.	BRZ-1536(007)

A. <u>Project Description</u>: (Include project scope and location, including Municipality and County. Refer to the attached project location map and photos.)

This project will replace structure number 080198 on SR 1536 (James Porter Road) over Kelly Creek in Bladen County. The bridge will be replaced on existing alignment while and there will be no detour due to this being a dead-end road.

B. Description of Need and Purpose:

Bridge inspections have been performed on the bridge and it has been determined that it is structurally deficient and functionally obsolete. This bridge was built in 1966.

C. Categorical Exclusion Action Classification:



- D. Proposed Improvements
- 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. <u>Special Project Information</u>: (Provide a description of relevant project information, which may include: vicinity map, costs, alternative analysis (if any), traffic control and staging, and resource agency/public involvement).

This project is an Express Design Build Bridge Replacement that is included in a set of 4 bridges that will be let.

No detour will be provided for this road due to it being a dead-end road and this has been approved by Division.

Type I &	II - Ground Disturbing Actions				
FHWA A	PPROVAL ACTIVITIES THRESHOLD CRITERIA				
If any of	If any of questions 1-7 are marked "yes" then the CE will require FHWA approval. Yes No				
1	Does the project require formal consultation with U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) or National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS)?		X		
2	Does the project result in impacts subject to the conditions of the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act (BGPA)?		$\boxtimes$		
3	Does the project generate substantial controversy or public opposition, for any reason, following appropriate public involvement?		$\boxtimes$		
4	Does the project cause disproportionately high and adverse impacts relative to low-income and/or minority populations?		$\boxtimes$		
5	Does the project involve a residential or commercial displacement, or a substantial amount of right of way acquisition?		$\boxtimes$		
6	Does the project require an Individual Section 4(f) approval?		$\boxtimes$		
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)?		$\mathbb{X}$		
If any of questions 8 through 31 are marked "yes" then additional information will be required for those questions in Section G.					
Other Co	nsiderations	Yes	No		
8	Does the project result in a finding of "may affect not likely to adversely affect" for listed species, or designated critical habitat under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act (ESA)?	$\boxtimes$			
9	Is the project located in anadromous fish spawning waters?		X		
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)?		$\boxtimes$		
11	Does the project impact waters of the United States in any of the designated mountain trout streams?		$\boxtimes$		
12	Does the project require a U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) Individual Section 404 Permit?		$\boxtimes$		
13	Will the project require an easement from a Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) licensed facility?		$\boxtimes$		
14	Does the project include a Section 106 of the NHPA effects determination other than a no effect, including archaeological remains?		$\boxtimes$		

Other Co	onsiderations (continued)	Yes	No
15	Does the project involve hazardous materials and/or landfills?		X
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?		$\boxtimes$
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)?		$\boxtimes$
18	Does the project require a U.S. Coast Guard (USCG) permit?		$\boxtimes$
19	Does the project involve construction activities in, across, or adjacent to a designated Wild and Scenic River present within the project area?		$\mathbb{X}$
20	Does the project involve Coastal Barrier Resources Act (CBRA) resources?		$\boxtimes$
21	Does the project impact federal lands (e.g. U.S. Forest Service (USFS), USFWS, etc.) or Tribal Lands?		X
22	Does the project involve any changes in access control?		$\boxtimes$
23	Does the project have a permanent adverse effect on local traffic patterns or community cohesiveness?		$\mathbf{X}$
24	Will maintenance of traffic cause substantial disruption?		X
25	Is the project inconsistent with the STIP or the Metropolitan Planning Organization's (MPO's) Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) (where applicable)?		$\boxtimes$
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), 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?		$\boxtimes$
27	Does the project involve Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) buyout properties under the Hazard Mitigation Grant Program (HMGP)?		X
28	Does the project include a <i>de minimis</i> or programmatic Section 4(f)?		$\boxtimes$
29	Is the project considered a Type I under the NCDOT's Noise Policy?		X
30	Is there prime or important farmland soil impacted by this project as defined by the Farmland Protection Policy Act (FPPA)?		$\boxtimes$
31	Are there other issues that arose during the project development process that affected the project decision?		$\mathbf{X}$

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

Question 8 - Endangered Species: On May 4, 2015, the USFWS adopted a Programmatic Opinion for the Northern Long-eared bat for all projects and activities in the NCDOT Division 1-8 and the Biological Conclusion for the NCDOT program is "May Affect, Likely to Adversely Affect." The Biological Opinion provides an incidental take statement for all NCDOT projects in eastern North Carolina for the next five years. An incidental take is when a non-federal activity will result in the loss or "take" of a threatened or endangered animal. As a condition of the incidental take statement, NCDOT has agreed to conservation measures to minimize adverse effect, and benefit or promote the recovery of the species.

## H. <u>Project Commitments</u>

Bladen County Division 6 Set B Federal Project No. BRZ-1536(007) WBS No. 48203.1.1 TIP No. B-6008

## I. <u>Categorical Exclusion Approval</u>

STIP Project No.	B-6008
WBS Element	48203.1.1
Federal Project No	BRZ-1536(007)
	es J Rerko, PWS h Carolina Department of Transportation
Prepared For:	North Carolina Department of Transportation
Reviewed By: <u>Jo/3//8</u> Date Nort	n Gauthier, DDC Engineer h Carolina Department of Transportation
Approved	If all of the threshold questions (1 through 7) of Section F are answered "no," NCDOT approves this Categorical Exclusion.
Certified	If any of the threshold questions (1 through 7) of Section F are answered "yes," NCDOT certifies this Categorical Exclusion.
On l	which sty Huff, PE Division 6 Bridge Maintenance Supervisor behalf of Greg Burns, PE Division 6 Engineer h Carolina Department of Transportation
	Projects Certified by NCDOT (above), FHWA signature ired.

Date

John F. Sullivan, III, PE, Division Administrator Federal Highway Administration





## Vicinity Map B-6008 Structure No. 080198 on SR 1536 (James Porter Road) over Kelly Creek





NO ARCHAEOLOGICAL SURVEY REQUIRED FORM

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



#### **PROJECT INFORMATION**

Project No:	<b>B-6008</b>		County	y:	Blad	en	
WBS No:	48203.1.1		Docun	nent:	C E		
F.A. No:	BRZ-1536(007)		Fundir	ıg:		tate	⊠ Federal
Federal Permit Requ	uired?	Xes	🗌 No	Permit T	ype:	usace	

**Project Description:** NCDOT proposes to replace Bridge No. 198 on SR 1536 (James Porter Road) over Kelly Creek / Lyon Swamp Canal in southern Bladen County near the Kelly community. The current bridge is small and the proposed length of the new project is only 316 feet, though the resulting structure is likely to be somewhat larger than the existing crossing. No alternative designs were available for use during the archaeological review. It is not understood and this moment if any reasonable offsite detours are available or if an onsite detour may be utilized. For purposes of this review, the Area of Potential Effects (APE) is a more generous 0.10 mi (526 ft) with consideration of 75 ft to either side of the existing SR 1536, or 150 ft total width. This APE allows for and considers multiple possible alignments, temporary bridging and detour configurations and would include any needed new ROW, fill and cut lines, or construction easements. This is a federally funded undertaking with USACE permitting, therefore Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

#### SUMMARY OF CULTURAL RESOURCES REVIEW

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

The bridge to be replaced is located over the edge of swampy and wooded terrain on SR 1536 in a rural Bladen County. USGS mapping (Kelly) and aerial photography was studied (see Figures 1 and 2). Neither Bing nor Google streetview tools were available at this more isolated location, but GoogleEarth was viewed to show two or three decades of modern era aerials. That resource shows that the north end of the APE has been used repeatedly as a staging area for logging, that last which occurred around 2016 when managed rows of timber was clear cut.

According to USGS mapping and GIS resources (data layer created by NCDOT archaeologist Paul J. Mohler), no cemetery is present at the APE or immediately nearby though two are located about 2300 feet away to the north and northeast of the bridge and set back off the road. They will not be affected by the project.

Historic maps were examined. The 1914 Soils Map of Bladen County (MC.011.1914) shows the road split north of the bridge and some other development in the vincinity within a mile or two, but little near the crossing which was present. The specific drainage patterns appear to change over the decades according to historic USGS mapping from the 1950s and 1980s (Bolton). Chanelized canals are present to drain the local soils and manage swamps.

The Office of State Archaeology was visited to review archaeological mapping and to reference any known archaeological surveys and sites. This helps establish an archaeological context for comparison. There are no recorded archaeological sites in the nearby vicinity nor have their been any environmental reviews for archaeology closeby.

# 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 bridge replacement may be replaced in place or realigned, or may an onsite detour. The APE allows for several possible design options. There are no recorded archaeological sites with the APE. Soils within the APE are normally not prime location for habitation, however, as the Kelly community and Frenches Creek area are rare elevated land, there was some historic and probably prehistoric activites at certain locations. The project is described as having relatively constrained impacts, mostly within existing disturbances of the road, bridge and staging area.

The context doesn't indicate a high probability for archaeological sites within the APE. It is unlikely that significant, intact archaeological remains would be present and impacted by the bridge replacement project. For archaeological review, this federally funded and permitted undertaking should be considered compliant with Section 106.

#### SUPPORT DOCUMENTATION

See attached:		Previous Survey Info of County Survey Notes	Photos Other:	Correspondence
FINDING BY	NCDOT ARC	HAEOLOGIST		
<u>NO ARCHAEC</u>	DLOGY SURVE	<u>Y REQUIRED</u>		
Burnt.	Out			10/04/2018
NCDOT ARCI	HAEOLOGIST			Date



Figure 1. Vicinity of TIP B-6008, PA 18-08-0023, the replacement of Br. No. 198 on SR 1536 (James Porter Road) over Kelly Creek/Lyon Swamp Canal in Bladen County, shown on USGS mapping (Kelly). The APE is shown in yellow.





Figure 2. Aerial map of TIP B-6008, PA 18-08-0023, the proposed replacement of Br. No. 198 on SR 1536 (James Porter Road) over Kelly Creek / Lyon Swamp Canal. The approximate APE is shown in yellow. Note the recent clear cutting activity and also a staging area within the APE.



#### HISTORIC ARCHITECTURE 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-6008	County:	Bladen		
WBS No.:	48203.1.1	Document Type:	Federal CE		
Fed. Aid No:	BRZ-1536(007)	Funding:	State Kederal		
Federal Permit(s):	Yes No	Permit Type(s):	USACE		
<b>Project Description</b> : Replace Bridge No. 198 over Kelly Creek on SR 1536 (James Porter Road).					

#### SUMMARY OF HISTORIC ARCHICTECTURE AND LANDSCAPES REVIEW <u>Description of review activities, results, and conclusions</u>:

Review of HPO quad maps, HPO GIS information, historic designations roster, and indexes was undertaken on September 5, 2018. Based on this review, there are no existing NR, SL, LD, DE, or SS properties in the Area of Potential Effects. There are no other structures within the APE. Bridge No. 198, built 1966, is not eligible for National Register listing. There are no National Register listed or eligible properties and no survey is required. If design plans change, additional review will be 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:

HPO quad maps and GIS information recording NR, SL, LD, DE, and SS properties for the Bladen County survey, Bladen County GIS/Tax information, and Google Maps are considered valid for the purposes of determining the likelihood of historic resources being present. There are no National Register listed or eligible properties within the APE and no survey is required.

( )	SUPPOR	T DOCUMEN	TATION				
Map(s)	Previous Survey Info.	Photos	Correspondence	Design Plans			
$\mathbf{x}'$	_		-				
(	FINDING BY NCDO	Г ARCHITEC	TURAL HISTORIAN	J			
Historic Arcl	hitecture and Landscapes N	O S <b>J</b> IRVEY RI	EQUIRED				
(1			. 1 .				
Dat	0 HUAL		91512	Pald			
- <i>[</i> /M	L I (ma Oan	/		0.8			
NCDOT Arc	hitectural Historian		Date				



State Historic Preservation Office GIS.