Proposed Widening of SR 1131 (Cameron Road) From West of NC 59 (South Main Street) to East of SR 1132 (Legion Road) Hope Mills, Cumberland County Federal Aid Project No. STP-1131(11) WBS No. 39070.1.1 T.I.P. No. U-4706

CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION

U. S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION AND N. C. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

Submitted pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 4332(2) (c)



**APPROVED:** 

Date For Richard W. Hancock, PE, Manager Project Development and Environmental Analysis Unit, NCDOT

Date

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

# Proposed Widening of SR 1131 (Cameron Road) From West of NC 59 (South Main Street) to East of SR 1132 (Legion Road) Hope Mills, Cumberland County Federal Aid Project No. STP-1131(11) WBS No. 39070.1.1 T.I.P. No. U-4706

#### CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION

North Carolina Department of Transportation

November, 2013

Documentation Prepared in Project Development and Environmental Analysis Unit by:

<u>11/21/1</u>3 ames

Michele L. James **Project Planning Engineer** 

11/21/13 Date

Charles R. Cox, PE

**Project Engineer** 



### **PROJECT COMMITMENTS**

# Proposed Widening of SR 1131 (Cameron Road) From West of NC 59 (South Main Street) to East of SR 1132 (Legion Road) Hope Mills, Cumberland County Federal Aid Project No. STP-1131(11) WBS No. 39070.1.1 T.I.P. No. U-4706

### **Financial Management Division, Division 6 Construction**

A municipal agreement will be implemented prior to construction between NCDOT and the Town of Hope Mills for the inclusion of new sidewalks. Based on NCDOT's Pedestrian Policy, the Town of Hope Mills will fund 20% of the cost of these improvements.

#### **Roadway Design Unit**

Fourteen-foot outside lanes will be provided to accommodate bicycle traffic.

# **Table of Contents**

SU	MMARY	I
ſ	YPE OF ACTION	I
Ι	DESCRIPTION OF ACTION	I
S	UMMARY OF PURPOSE AND NEED	I
A	LTERNATIVES CONSIDERED	I
N	ICDOT RECOMMENDED ALTERNATIVE	.II
S	UMMARY OF ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS	.II
F	ermits Required	III
(	COORDINATION	IV
(	CONTACT INFORMATION	IV
I.	DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED ACTION	1
A	GENERAL DESCRIPTION	. 1
F	COST ESTIMATES	1
1		
II.	PURPOSE AND NEED FOR PROJECT	2
A	A. PURPOSE OF PROJECT	2
E	8. NEED FOR PROJECT	2
(	2. DESCRIPTION OF EXISTING CONDITIONS	2
	1. Functional Classification	. 2
	2. Physical Description of Existing Facility	. 2
	a. Roadway Cross Section	2
	b. Horizontal and Vertical Alignment	2
	c. Right of Way and Access Control	2
	d. Speed Limit	2
	e. Railroad Crossings	3
	f. Hydraulic Structures	3
	g. Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities/Greenways	3
	h. Utilities	3
	i. School Bus Usage	3
	3. Traffic Carrying Capacity	. 3
	a. Existing Traffic Volumes	3
	b. Existing Levels of Service	3
	c. Future Traffic Volumes	4
	d. Future Levels of Service	4
	e. Accident Data	5
	f. Airports	5
	g. Other Highway Projects in the Area	6
	4. Transportation and Land Use Plans	. 6
	a. NC Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)	6
	b. Local Thoroughfare Plans	6
	c. Land Use Plans	6
Ι	D. BENEFITS OF PROPOSED PROJECT	6

III.	ALTERNATIVES	.7
A.	PRELIMINARY STUDY ALTERNATIVES	.7
1	No-Build Alternative	7
2	Alternative Modes of Transportation	7
3	. Transportation Systems Management	7
4	. Widening Alternatives	7
В.	DETAILED STUDY ALTERNATIVE	8
C.	NCDOT RECOMMENDED ALTERNATIVE	9
IV.	PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS	10
A.	ROADWAY CROSS-SECTION AND ALIGNMENT	10
B.	RIGHT OF WAY AND ACCESS CONTROL	10
C.	Speed Limit & Design Speed	10
D.	ANTICIPATED DESIGN EXCEPTIONS	10
E.	INTERSECTIONS/INTERCHANGES	10
F.	RAILROAD CROSSINGS	11
G.	STRUCTURES	11
H.	BICYCLE AND PEDESTRIAN FACILITIES	11
I.	UTILITIES	11
J.	NOISE BARRIERS	11
Κ.	WORK ZONE, TRAFFIC CONTROL AND CONSTRUCTION PHASING	11
<b>V.</b> E	NVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS OF PROPOSED ACTION	12
A.	NATURAL RESOURCES	12
1	Biotic Resources	12
	a. Terrestrial Communities	12
	1. Mixed Pine/Hardwood Forest	12
	b. Terrestrial Wildlife	12
	c. Aquatic Communities	12
	d. Invasive Species	13
	e. Summary of Anticipated Effects	13
2	. Jurisdictional Issues	13
	a. Clean Water Act Waters of the United States	13
	b. Clean Water Act Permits	14
	c. Coastal Area Management Act Area of Environmental Concern	14
	d. Construction Moratoria	14
	e. N.C. River Basin Buffer Rules	14
	f. Rivers and Harbors Act Section 10 Navigable Waters	14
	g. Mitigation	14
3	Endangered Species Act	15
	a. Federally Protected Species	15
	b. Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act	19
_	c. Endangered Species Act Candidate Species	20
В.	CULTURAL RESOURCES	20
1	Historic Architectural Resources	20
2.	. Archaeological Resources	20

D.       FARMLAND/ VOLUNTARY AGRICULTURAL DISTRICTS       21         E.       COMMUNITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT       21         1.       American Indian Religious Freedom Act       21         2.       Title VI and Environmental Justice       21         3.       Limited English Proficiency       21         4.       Community Characteristics & Notable Features       21         a.       Notable Growth Rate       21         b.       Local Area Plans/Goals       21         c.       Known Plans for Development       22         5.       Bicycle/ Pedestrian Activity       22         6.       Community Cohesion       22         7.       FEMA Buyout Properties       23         9.       Cemetery       23         10.       Other Recreational Resources or Activities       23         11.       Relocations       23         12.       Potential Community Impacts       23         a.       Mobility and Access       23         b.       Business Resources       24         c.       Title VI and Environmental Justice       24         c.       Title VI and Environmental Justice       26         14.       Mitigation       25	C.	SECTION 4(F)/6(F) RESOURCES	20
E.       COMMUNITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT.       21         1.       American Indian Religious Freedom Act       21         2.       Title VI and Environmental Justice       21         3.       Limited English Proficiency       21         4.       Community Characteristics & Notable Features       21         a.       Notable Growth Rate       21         b.       Local Area Plans/Goals       21         c.       Known Plans for Development       22         c.       Known Plans for Development       22         c.       Community Cohesion       22         7.       FEMA Buyout Properties       22         8.       Access       23         10.       Other Recreational Resources or Activities       23         11.       Relocations       23         12.       Potential Community Impacts       23         a.       Mobility and Access       23         b.       Business Resources       24         c.       Title VI and Environmental Justice       24         13.       Indirect and Cumulative Effects       25         14.       Mitigation       25         75.       FLOOD HAZARD EVALUATION       25	D.	FARMLAND/ VOLUNTARY AGRICULTURAL DISTRICTS	21
1. American Indian Religious Freedom Act       21         2. Title VI and Environmental Justice       21         3. Limited English Proficiency       21         4. Community Characteristics & Notable Features       21         a. Notable Growth Rate       21         a. Notable Growth Rate       21         b. Local Area Plans/Goals       21         c. Known Plans for Development       22         S. Bicycle/ Pedestrian Activity       22         G. Community Choesion       22         7. FEMA Buyout Properties       22         8. Access       23         9. Cemetery       23         10. Other Recreational Resources or Activities       23         11. Relocations       23         a. Mobility and Access       23         a. Mobility and Access       23         b. Business Resources       24         c. Title VI and Environmental Justice       24         c. Title VI and Cumulative Effects       25         14. Mitigation       25         75. FLOOD HAZARD EVALUATION       25         76. TRAFIC NOISE ANALYSIS       26         71. Ambient Noise Levels       26         72. Traffic Noise Abatement Measures       28         a. Traffic System	E.	COMMUNITY IMPACT ASSESSMENT	21
2. Title VI and Environmental Justice       21         3. Limited English Proficiency       21         4. Community Characteristics & Notable Features       21         a. Notable Growth Rate       21         a. Notable Growth Rate       21         a. Notable Growth Rate       21         b. Local Area Plans/Goals.       21         c. Known Plans for Development       22         5. Bicycle/ Pedestrian Activity.       22         6. Community Cohesion       22         7. FEMA Buyout Properties       23         9. Cemetery.       23         10. Other Recreational Resources or Activities       23         11. Relocations.       23         12. Potential Community Impacts       23         a. Mobility and Access       23         b. Business Resources       24         c. Title VI and Environmental Justice       24         c. Title VI and Environmental Justice       25         I. Ambient Noise Levels       26         1. Ambient Noise Levels       26         1. Ambient Noise Levels       26         3. Traffic Noise Abatement Measures       28         a. Traffic Noise Abatement Measures       28         b. Buffer Zones       28	1	American Indian Religious Freedom Act	
3.       Limited English Proficiency       21         4.       Community Characteristics & Notable Features       21         a.       Notable Growth Rate       21         b.       Local Area Plans/Goals       21         c.       Known Plans for Development       22         5.       Bicycle/Pedestrian Activity       22         6.       Community Cohesion       22         7.       FEMA Buyout Properties       22         8.       Access       23         9.       Cemetery       23         10.       Other Recreational Resources or Activities       23         11.       Relocations       23         12.       Potential Community Impacts       23         13.       Indirect and Cumulative Effects       24         c.       Title VI and Environmental Justice       24         d.       Traffic Noise AnaLYSIS       25         14.       Mitigation       25         7.       FLOOD HAZARD EVALUATION       25         7.       FLOOD HAZARD EVALUATION       25         7.       FLOOD HAZARD EVALUATION       26         13.       Traffic Noise AnaLYSIS       26         14.       Ambient Noi	2	. Title VI and Environmental Justice	21
4. Community Characteristics & Notable Features.       21         a. Notable Growth Rate       21         b. Local Area Plans/Goals.       21         c. Known Plans for Development       22         5. Bicycle/ Pedestrian Activity.       22         6. Community Cohesion       22         7. FEMA Buyout Properties       23         9. Cemetery       23         9. Cemetery       23         10. Other Recreational Resources or Activities       23         11. Relocations       23         12. Potential Community Impacts       23         a. Mobility and Access       23         b. Business Resources       24         c. Title VI and Environmental Justice       24         13. Indirect and Cumulative Effects       25         F. FLOOD HAZARD EVALUATION       25         G. TRAFFIC NOISE ANALYSIS       26         14. Mitigation       25         7. Faffic System Management Measures       28         a. Traffic System Management Measures       28         a. Traffic System Management Measures       28         b. Buifer Zones       28         c. Noise Barriers       28         d. Construction Noise       29         J. Background CO Concentratio	3	Limited English Proficiency	21
a. Notable Growth Rate       21         b. Local Area Plans/Goals.       21         c. Known Plans for Development       22         5. Bicycle/ Pedestrian Activity       22         6. Community Cohesion       22         7. FEMA Buyout Properties       22         8. Access       23         9. Cemetery       23         10. Other Recreational Resources or Activities       23         11. Relocations       23         12. Potential Community Impacts       23         a. Mobility and Access       23         b. Business Resources.       24         c. Title VI and Environmental Justice       24         13. Indirect and Cumulative Effects       25         14. Mitigation       25         F. FLOOD HAZARD EVALUATION       25         G. TRAFFIC NOISE ANALYSIS       26         14. Ambient Noise Levels       26         25. Analysis Results       26         3. Traffic System Management Measures       28         a. Traffic System Management Measures       28         b. Buffer Zones       28         c. Noise Barriers       29         J. Analysis of MSAT in NEPA Documents       30         a. Analysis of MSAT in NEPA Documents       30	4	. Community Characteristics & Notable Features	
b. Local Area Plans/Goals.       21         c. Known Plans for Development       22         5. Bicycle/ Pedestrian Activity.       22         6. Community Cohesion       22         7. FEMA Buyout Properties       22         8. Access       23         9. Cemetery.       23         10. Other Recreational Resources or Activities       23         11. Relocations       23         12. Potential Community Impacts.       23         a. Mobility and Access       23         b. Business Resources.       24         c. Title VI and Environmental Justice       24         d. Traffic Noise AnALYSIS       26         f. Ambient Noise Levels       26         1. Ambient Noise Levels       26         2. Analysis Results       26         3. Traffic Noise Abatement Measures       28         a. Traffic Noise Abatement Measures       28         b. Buffer Zones       28         c. Noise Barriers       29         J. Summary       29         J. Background CO Concentrations       3		a. Notable Growth Rate	21
c. Known Plans for Development       22         5. Bicycle/ Pedestrian Activity       22         6. Community Cohesion       22         7. FEMA Buyout Properties       23         9. Cemetery       23         10. Other Recreational Resources or Activities       23         11. Relocations       23         12. Potential Community Impacts       23         13. Nobility and Access       23         14. Mobility and Access       23         15. Business Resources       24         16. Title VI and Environmental Justice       24         17. Indirect and Cumulative Effects       25         14. Mitigation       25         15. F. FLOOD HAZARD EVALUATION       25         16. TRAFFIC NOISE ANALYSIS       26         11. Ambient Noise Levels       26         22. Analysis Results       26         3. Traffic Noise Abatement Measures       28         a. Traffic Noise Abatement Measures       28         b. Buffer Zones       28         c. Noise Barriers       28         d. Construction Noise       29         17       AIR QUALITY ANALYSIS       29         18. Buffer Zones       30       30         a. Analysis of MSAT in NEPA Do		b. Local Area Plans/Goals	21
5. Bicycle/ Pedestrian Activity       22         6. Community Cohesion       22         7. FEMA Buyout Properties       22         8. Access       23         9. Cemetery       23         10. Other Recreational Resources or Activities       23         11. Relocations       23         12. Potential Community Impacts       23         a. Mobility and Access       23         b. Business Resources       24         c. Title VI and Environmental Justice       24         c. Title VI and Environmental Justice       25         14. Mitigation       25         15. F. FLOOD HAZARD EVALUATION       25         7. FAFFIC NOISE ANALYSIS       26         2. Analysis Results       26         3. Traffic Noise Abatement Measures       28         a. Traffic System Management Measures       28         b. Buffer Zones       28         c. Noise Barriers       28         d. Construction Noise       29         5. Summary       29         19. Background CO Concentrations       30         20. Mobile Source Air Toxics (MSATs)       30         a. Analysis of MSAT in NEPA Documents       30         b. Qualitative MSAT Analysis       30     <		c. Known Plans for Development	22
6. Community Cohesion       22         7. FEMA Buyout Properties       22         8. Access       23         9. Cemetery       23         10. Other Recreational Resources or Activities       23         11. Relocations       23         12. Potential Community Impacts       23         a. Mobility and Access       23         b. Business Resources       24         c. Title VI and Environmental Justice       24         c. Title VI and Environmental Justice       24         13. Indirect and Cumulative Effects       25         14. Mitigation       25         F. FLOOD HAZARD EVALUATION       25         G. TRAFFIC NOISE ANALYSIS       26         1. Ambient Noise Levels       26         2. Analysis Results       26         3. Traffic System Management Measures       28         a. Traffic System Management Measures       28         c. Noise Barriers       28         d. Construction Noise       29         J. Background CO Concentrations       30         a. Analysis of MSAT in NEPA Documents       30         a. Analysis of MSAT in NEPA Documents       30         a. Mobile Source Air Toxics (MSATs)       30         a. Malysis of MSAT in	5	Bicycle/ Pedestrian Activity	22
7. FEMA Buyout Properties       22         8. Access       23         9. Cemetery       23         10. Other Recreational Resources or Activities       23         11. Relocations       23         12. Potential Community Impacts       23         a. Mobility and Access       23         b. Business Resources       24         c. Title VI and Environmental Justice       24         13. Indirect and Cumulative Effects       25         14. Mitigation       25         15. F. FLOOD HAZARD EVALUATION       25         G. TRAFFIC NOISE ANALYSIS       26         1. Ambient Noise Levels       26         2. Analysis Results       26         3. Traffic Noise Abatement Measures       28         a. Traffic Noise Abatement Measures       28         b. Buffer Zones       28         c. Noise Barriers       28         d. Construction Noise       29         J. Background CO Concentrations       30         2. Mobile Source Air Toxics (MSATs)       30         a. Analysis of MSAT in NEPA Documents       30         a. Mailysis of MSAT in NEPA Documents       30         c. MSAT Conclusion       31         1. HAZARDOUS MATERIAL       31	6	Community Cohesion	22
8. Access       23         9. Cemetery       23         10. Other Recreational Resources or Activities       23         11. Relocations       23         12. Potential Community Impacts       23         a. Mobility and Access       23         b. Business Resources       24         c. Title VI and Environmental Justice       24         c. Title VI and Environmental Justice       24         13. Indirect and Cumulative Effects       25         14. Mitigation       25         F. FLOOD HAZARD EVALUATION       25         G. TRAFFIC NOISE ANALYSIS       26         1. Ambient Noise Levels       26         3. Traffic Noise Abatement Measures       28         a. Traffic System Management Measures       28         c. Noise Barriers       28         c. Noise Barriers       29         J. Background CO Concentrations       30         a. Analysis of MSAT in NEPA Documents       30         a. Mobile Source Air Toxics (MSATs)       30         a. Analysis of MSAT in NEPA Documents       30         b. Qualitative MSAT Analysis       30         c. MSAT Conclusion       31         I. HAZARDOUS MATERIAL       31         VI. COMMENTS AND COORDINA	7	FEMA Buyout Properties	22
9. Cemetery       23         10. Other Recreational Resources or Activities       23         11. Relocations       23         12. Potential Community Impacts       23         a. Mobility and Access       23         b. Business Resources       24         c. Title VI and Environmental Justice       24         13. Indirect and Cumulative Effects       25         14. Mitigation       25         F. FLOOD HAZARD EVALUATION       25         G. TRAFFIC NOISE ANALYSIS       26         1. Ambient Noise Levels       26         2. Analysis Results       26         3. Traffic Noise Abatement Measures       28         a. Traffic System Management Measures       28         b. Buffer Zones       28         c. Noise Barriers       28         d. Construction Noise       29         J. Background CO Concentrations       30         a. Analysis of MSAT in NEPA Documents       30         a. Mobile Source Air Toxics (MSATs)       30         a. Mobile Source Air Toxics (MSATs)       30         a. Malysis of MSAT in NEPA Documents       30         b. Qualitative MSAT Analysis       30         c. MSAT Conclusion       31         I. HAZARDOUS MATERIA	8	Access	23
10. Other Recreational Resources or Activities       23         11. Relocations       23         12. Potential Community Impacts       23         a. Mobility and Access       23         a. Mobility and Access       23         b. Business Resources.       24         c. Title VI and Environmental Justice       24         13. Indirect and Cumulative Effects       25         14. Mitigation       25         F. FLOOD HAZARD EVALUATION       25         G. TRAFFIC NOISE ANALYSIS       26         1. Ambient Noise Levels       26         2. Analysis Results       26         3. Traffic Noise Abatement Measures       28         a. Traffic System Management Measures       28         b. Buffer Zones       28         c. Noise Barriers       28         4. Construction Noise       29         5. Summary       29         1. Background CO Concentrations       30         2. Mobile Source Air Toxics (MSATs)       30         a. Analysis of MSAT in NEPA Documents       30         b. Qualitative MSAT Analysis       30         c. MSAT Conclusion       31         I. HAZARDOUS MATERIAL       31         VI. COMMENTS AND COORDINATION       33<	9	. Cemetery	23
11. Relocations       23         12. Potential Community Impacts       23         a. Mobility and Access       23         b. Business Resources       24         c. Title VI and Environmental Justice       24         13. Indirect and Cumulative Effects       25         14. Mitigation       25         F. FLOOD HAZARD EVALUATION       25         G. TRAFFIC NOISE ANALYSIS       26         1. Ambient Noise Levels       26         2. Analysis Results       26         3. Traffic Noise Abatement Measures       28         a. Traffic System Management Measures       28         b. Buffer Zones       28         c. Noise Barriers       28         4. Construction Noise       29         5. Summary       29         H. AIR QUALITY ANALYSIS       29         I. Background CO Concentrations       30         2. Mobile Source Air Toxics (MSATs)       30         a. Analysis of MSAT in NEPA Documents       30         c. MSAT Conclusion       31         I. HAZARDOUS MATERIAL       31         VI. COMMENTS AND COORDINATION       33         A. CITIZENS INFORMATIONAL WORKSHOP       33         B. PUBLIC HEARING       33	1	0. Other Recreational Resources or Activities	23
12. Potential Community Impacts       23         a. Mobility and Access       23         b. Business Resources       24         c. Title VI and Environmental Justice       24         r. Title VI and Cumulative Effects       25         14. Mitigation       25         F. FLOOD HAZARD EVALUATION       25         G. TRAFFIC NOISE ANALYSIS       26         1. Ambient Noise Levels       26         2. Analysis Results       26         3. Traffic Noise Abatement Measures       28         a. Traffic System Management Measures       28         b. Buffer Zones       28         c. Noise Barriers       28         4. Construction Noise       29         5. Summary       29         1. Background CO Concentrations       30         2. Mobile Source Air Toxics (MSATs)       30         a. Analysis of MSAT in NEPA Documents       30         b. Qualitative MSAT Analysis       30         c. MSAT Conclusion       31         I. HAZARDOUS MATERIAL       31         VI. COMMENTS AND COORDINATION       33         A. CITIZENS INFORMATIONAL WORKSHOP       33         B. PUBLIC HEARING       33         D. OTHER AGENCY COORDINATION       34	1	1. Relocations	23
a. Mobility and Access       23         b. Business Resources.       24         c. Title VI and Environmental Justice       24         13. Indirect and Cumulative Effects.       25         14. Mitigation.       25         F. FLOOD HAZARD EVALUATION       25         G. TRAFFIC NOISE ANALYSIS       26         1. Ambient Noise Levels       26         2. Analysis Results       26         3. Traffic Noise Abatement Measures       28         a. Traffic System Management Measures       28         b. Buffer Zones       28         c. Noise Barriers       28         d. Construction Noise       29         J. Background CO Concentrations       30         2. Mobile Source Air Toxics (MSATs)       30         a. Analysis of MSAT in NEPA Documents       30         b. Qualitative MSAT Analysis       30         c. MSAT Conclusion       31         I. HAZARDOUS MATERIAL       31         VI. COMMENTS AND COORDINATION       33         A. CITIZENS INFORMATIONAL WORKSHOP       33         B. PUBLIC HEARING       33         C. NIEPA/404 MERGER PROCESS       33         D. OTHER AGENCY COORDINATION       34	12	2. Potential Community Impacts	23
b. Business Resources.       24         c. Title VI and Environmental Justice       24         13. Indirect and Cumulative Effects.       25         14. Mitigation.       25         14. Mitigation.       25         15. F. FLOOD HAZARD EVALUATION       25         16. TRAFFIC NOISE ANALYSIS       26         17. Ambient Noise Levels       26         2. Analysis Results       26         3. Traffic Noise Abatement Measures       28         a. Traffic System Management Measures       28         a. Traffic System Management Measures       28         b. Buffer Zones.       28         c. Noise Barriers       28         4. Construction Noise       29         5. Summary       29         H. AIR QUALITY ANALYSIS       29         1. Background CO Concentrations.       30         2. Mobile Source Air Toxics (MSATs)       30         a. Analysis of MSAT in NEPA Documents       30         b. Qualitative MSAT Analysis       30         c. MSAT Conclusion       31         I. HAZARDOUS MATERIAL       31         VI. COMMENTS AND COORDINATION       33         A. CITIZENS INFORMATIONAL WORKSHOP       33         B. PUBLIC HEARING       33<		a. Mobility and Access	23
c. Title VI and Environmental Justice2413. Indirect and Cumulative Effects2514. Mitigation2515. F. FLOOD HAZARD EVALUATION25G. TRAFFIC NOISE ANALYSIS261. Ambient Noise Levels262. Analysis Results263. Traffic Noise Abatement Measures28a. Traffic System Management Measures28b. Buffer Zones28c. Noise Barriers284. Construction Noise295. Summary291. Analysis of MSAT in NEPA Documents30a. Analysis of MSAT in NEPA Documents30b. Qualitative MSAT Analysis30c. MSAT Conclusion31I. HAZARDOUS MATERIAL31VI. COMMENTS AND COORDINATION33A. CITIZENS INFORMATIONAL WORKSHOP33B. PUBLIC HEARING33C. NEPA/404 MERGER PROCESS33D. OTHER AGENCY COORDINATION34		b. Business Resources	24
13. Indirect and Cumulative Effects       25         14. Mitigation       25         14. Mitigation       25         F. FLOOD HAZARD EVALUATION       25         G. TRAFFIC NOISE ANALYSIS       26         1. Ambient Noise Levels       26         2. Analysis Results       26         3. Traffic Noise Abatement Measures       28         a. Traffic System Management Measures       28         a. Traffic System Management Measures       28         c. Noise Barriers       28         c. Noise Barriers       28         4. Construction Noise       29         5. Summary       29         H. AIR QUALITY ANALYSIS       29         1. Background CO Concentrations       30         2. Mobile Source Air Toxics (MSATs)       30         a. Analysis of MSAT in NEPA Documents       30         b. Qualitative MSAT Analysis       30         c. MSAT Conclusion       31         I. HAZARDOUS MATERIAL       31         VI. COMMENTS AND COORDINATION       33         A. CITIZENS INFORMATIONAL WORKSHOP       33         B. PUBLIC HEARING       33         C. NEPA/404 MERGER PROCESS       33         D. OTHER AGENCY COORDINATION       34		c. Title VI and Environmental Justice	24
14. Mitigation       25         F. FLOOD HAZARD EVALUATION       25         G. TRAFFIC NOISE ANALYSIS       26         1. Ambient Noise Levels       26         2. Analysis Results       26         3. Traffic Noise Abatement Measures       28         a. Traffic System Management Measures       28         b. Buffer Zones       28         c. Noise Barriers       28         4. Construction Noise       29         5. Summary       29         H. AIR QUALITY ANALYSIS       29         1. Background CO Concentrations       30         2. Mobile Source Air Toxics (MSATs)       30         a. Analysis of MSAT in NEPA Documents       30         b. Qualitative MSAT Analysis       30         c. MSAT Conclusion       31         I. HAZARDOUS MATERIAL       31         VI. COMMENTS AND COORDINATION       33         A. CITIZENS INFORMATIONAL WORKSHOP       33         B. PUBLIC HEARING       33         C. NEPA/404 MERGER PROCESS       33         D. OTHER AGENCY COORDINATION       34	1	3. Indirect and Cumulative Effects	25
F.FLOOD HAZARD EVALUATION25G.TRAFFIC NOISE ANALYSIS261.Ambient Noise Levels262.Analysis Results263.Traffic Noise Abatement Measures28a.Traffic System Management Measures28b.Buffer Zones28c.Noise Barriers284.Construction Noise295.Summary29H.AIR QUALITY ANALYSIS291.Background CO Concentrations302.Mobile Source Air Toxics (MSATs)30a.Analysis of MSAT in NEPA Documents30b.Qualitative MSAT Analysis30c.MSAT Conclusion31I.HAZARDOUS MATERIAL31VI.COMMENTS AND COORDINATION33A.CITIZENS INFORMATIONAL WORKSHOP33B.PUBLIC HEARING33C.NEPA/404 MERGER PROCESS33D.OTHER AGENCY COORDINATION34	14	4. Mitigation	25
G. TRAFFIC NOISE ANALYSIS       26         1. Ambient Noise Levels       26         2. Analysis Results       26         3. Traffic Noise Abatement Measures       28         a. Traffic System Management Measures       28         b. Buffer Zones       28         c. Noise Barriers       28         4. Construction Noise       29         5. Summary       29         H. AIR QUALITY ANALYSIS       29         1. Background CO Concentrations       30         2. Mobile Source Air Toxics (MSATs)       30         a. Analysis of MSAT in NEPA Documents       30         b. Qualitative MSAT Analysis       30         c. MSAT Conclusion       31         I. HAZARDOUS MATERIAL       31         VI. COMMENTS AND COORDINATION       33         A. CITIZENS INFORMATIONAL WORKSHOP       33         B. PUBLIC HEARING       33         C. NEPA/404 MERGER PROCESS       33         D. OTHER AGENCY COORDINATION       34	F.	FLOOD HAZARD EVALUATION	25
1. Ambient Noise Levels       26         2. Analysis Results       26         3. Traffic Noise Abatement Measures       28         a. Traffic System Management Measures       28         b. Buffer Zones       28         c. Noise Barriers       28         4. Construction Noise       29         5. Summary       29         6. Air QUALITY ANALYSIS       29         1. Background CO Concentrations       30         2. Mobile Source Air Toxics (MSATs)       30         a. Analysis of MSAT in NEPA Documents       30         b. Qualitative MSAT Analysis       30         c. MSAT Conclusion       31         I. HAZARDOUS MATERIAL       31         VI. COMMENTS AND COORDINATION       33         A. CITIZENS INFORMATIONAL WORKSHOP       33         B. PUBLIC HEARING       33         D. OTHER AGENCY COORDINATION       34	G.	TRAFFIC NOISE ANALYSIS	
2. Analysis Results       26         3. Traffic Noise Abatement Measures       28         a. Traffic System Management Measures       28         b. Buffer Zones       28         c. Noise Barriers       28         4. Construction Noise       29         5. Summary       29         6. Arr QUALITY ANALYSIS       29         1. Background CO Concentrations       30         2. Mobile Source Air Toxics (MSATs)       30         a. Analysis of MSAT in NEPA Documents       30         b. Qualitative MSAT Analysis       30         c. MSAT Conclusion       31         I. HAZARDOUS MATERIAL       31         VI. COMMENTS AND COORDINATION       33         A. CITIZENS INFORMATIONAL WORKSHOP       33         B. PUBLIC HEARING       33         D. OTHER AGENCY COORDINATION       34	1	Ambient Noise Levels	
3. Traffic Noise Abatement Measures       28         a. Traffic System Management Measures       28         b. Buffer Zones       28         c. Noise Barriers       28         4. Construction Noise       29         5. Summary       29         H. AIR QUALITY ANALYSIS       29         1. Background CO Concentrations       30         2. Mobile Source Air Toxics (MSATs)       30         a. Analysis of MSAT in NEPA Documents       30         b. Qualitative MSAT Analysis       30         c. MSAT Conclusion       31         I. HAZARDOUS MATERIAL       31         VI. COMMENTS AND COORDINATION       33         A. CITIZENS INFORMATIONAL WORKSHOP       33         B. PUBLIC HEARING       33         D. OTHER AGENCY COORDINATION       34	2	Analysis Results	
a. Traffic System Management Measures28b. Buffer Zones28c. Noise Barriers28c. Noise Barriers284. Construction Noise295. Summary29H. AIR QUALITY ANALYSIS291. Background CO Concentrations302. Mobile Source Air Toxics (MSATs)30a. Analysis of MSAT in NEPA Documents30b. Qualitative MSAT Analysis30c. MSAT Conclusion31I. HAZARDOUS MATERIAL31VI. COMMENTS AND COORDINATION33A. CITIZENS INFORMATIONAL WORKSHOP33B. PUBLIC HEARING33C. NEPA/404 MERGER PROCESS33D. OTHER AGENCY COORDINATION34	3	. Traffic Noise Abatement Measures	
b. Buffer Zones		a. Traffic System Management Measures	
c. Noise Barriers284. Construction Noise295. Summary296. Summary299. AIR QUALITY ANALYSIS291. Background CO Concentrations302. Mobile Source Air Toxics (MSATs)302. Mobile Source Air Toxics (MSATs)30a. Analysis of MSAT in NEPA Documents30b. Qualitative MSAT Analysis30c. MSAT Conclusion31I. HAZARDOUS MATERIAL31VI. COMMENTS AND COORDINATION33A. CITIZENS INFORMATIONAL WORKSHOP33B. PUBLIC HEARING33C. NEPA/404 MERGER PROCESS33D. OTHER AGENCY COORDINATION34		b. Buffer Zones	
4. Construction Noise       29         5. Summary       29         H. AIR QUALITY ANALYSIS       29         1. Background CO Concentrations       30         2. Mobile Source Air Toxics (MSATs)       30         a. Analysis of MSAT in NEPA Documents       30         b. Qualitative MSAT Analysis       30         c. MSAT Conclusion       31         I. HAZARDOUS MATERIAL       31         VI. COMMENTS AND COORDINATION       33         A. CITIZENS INFORMATIONAL WORKSHOP       33         B. PUBLIC HEARING       33         C. NEPA/404 MERGER PROCESS       33         D. OTHER AGENCY COORDINATION       34		c. Noise Barriers	
5. Summary       29         H. AIR QUALITY ANALYSIS       29         1. Background CO Concentrations       30         2. Mobile Source Air Toxics (MSATs)       30         a. Analysis of MSAT in NEPA Documents       30         b. Qualitative MSAT Analysis       30         c. MSAT Conclusion       31         I. HAZARDOUS MATERIAL       31         VI. COMMENTS AND COORDINATION       33         A. CITIZENS INFORMATIONAL WORKSHOP       33         B. PUBLIC HEARING       33         C. NEPA/404 MERGER PROCESS       33         D. OTHER AGENCY COORDINATION       34	4	Construction Noise	29
H. AIR QUALITY ANALYSIS       29         1. Background CO Concentrations.       30         2. Mobile Source Air Toxics (MSATs)       30         a. Analysis of MSAT in NEPA Documents       30         b. Qualitative MSAT Analysis       30         c. MSAT Conclusion       31         I. HAZARDOUS MATERIAL       31         VI. COMMENTS AND COORDINATION       33         A. CITIZENS INFORMATIONAL WORKSHOP       33         B. PUBLIC HEARING       33         C. NEPA/404 MERGER PROCESS       33         D. OTHER AGENCY COORDINATION       34	5	. Summary	29
1. Background CO Concentrations.       30         2. Mobile Source Air Toxics (MSATs)       30         a. Analysis of MSAT in NEPA Documents       30         b. Qualitative MSAT Analysis       30         c. MSAT Conclusion       31         I. HAZARDOUS MATERIAL       31         VI. COMMENTS AND COORDINATION       33         A. CITIZENS INFORMATIONAL WORKSHOP       33         B. PUBLIC HEARING       33         C. NEPA/404 MERGER PROCESS       33         D. OTHER AGENCY COORDINATION       34	H.	AIR QUALITY ANALYSIS	29
2. Mobile Source Air Toxics (MSATs)       30         a. Analysis of MSAT in NEPA Documents       30         b. Qualitative MSAT Analysis       30         c. MSAT Conclusion       31         I. HAZARDOUS MATERIAL       31         VI. COMMENTS AND COORDINATION       33         A. CITIZENS INFORMATIONAL WORKSHOP       33         B. PUBLIC HEARING       33         C. NEPA/404 MERGER PROCESS       33         D. OTHER AGENCY COORDINATION       34	1	Background CO Concentrations	30
a. Analysis of MSAT in NEPA Documents30b. Qualitative MSAT Analysis30c. MSAT Conclusion31I. HAZARDOUS MATERIAL31VI. COMMENTS AND COORDINATION33A. CITIZENS INFORMATIONAL WORKSHOP33B. PUBLIC HEARING33C. NEPA/404 MERGER PROCESS33D. OTHER AGENCY COORDINATION34	2	. Mobile Source Air Toxics (MSATs)	30
b. Qualitative MSAT Analysis		a. Analysis of MSAT in NEPA Documents	30
c. MSAT Conclusion31I. HAZARDOUS MATERIAL31VI. COMMENTS AND COORDINATION33A. CITIZENS INFORMATIONAL WORKSHOP33B. PUBLIC HEARING33C. NEPA/404 MERGER PROCESS33D. OTHER AGENCY COORDINATION34		b. Qualitative MSAT Analysis	30
I.HAZARDOUS MATERIAL31VI.COMMENTS AND COORDINATION33A.CITIZENS INFORMATIONAL WORKSHOP33B.PUBLIC HEARING33C.NEPA/404 MERGER PROCESS33D.OTHER AGENCY COORDINATION34		c. MSAT Conclusion	31
VI.COMMENTS AND COORDINATION33A.CITIZENS INFORMATIONAL WORKSHOP33B.PUBLIC HEARING33C.NEPA/404 MERGER PROCESS33D.OTHER AGENCY COORDINATION34	I.	HAZARDOUS MATERIAL	31
A.       CITIZENS INFORMATIONAL WORKSHOP	VI.	COMMENTS AND COORDINATION	33
B.  PUBLIC HEARING	A.	CITIZENS INFORMATIONAL WORKSHOP	33
C. NEPA/404 MERGER PROCESS	B.	PUBLIC HEARING	
D. OTHER AGENCY COORDINATION	C.	NEPA/404 Merger Process	
	D.	OTHER AGENCY COORDINATION	34

VII.	CONCLUSION	34
------	------------	----

# TABLES

TABLE S-1: SUMMARY OF RESOURCES AND IMPACTS	III
TABLE 1: INTERSECTION LEVEL OF SERVICE SR 1131 (CAMERON ROAD)	4
TABLE 2: CRASH RATE COMPARISONS	5
TABLE 3: SUMMARY OF RESOURCES AND IMPACTS	9
TABLE 4: INVASIVE SPECIES WITHIN PROJECT AREA	13
TABLE 5: COVERAGE OF TERRESTRIAL NATURAL COMMUNITIES	13
TABLE 6: JURISDICTIONAL CHARACTERISTICS OF WATER RESOURCES	14
TABLE 7: FEDERAL PROTECTED SPECIES LISTED FOR CUMBERLAND COUNTY	15
TABLE 8: TRAFFIC NOISE IMPACT SUMMARY	27
TABLE 9: KNOWN AND POTENTIAL GEOENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT SITES	32

# APPENDICES

Appendix A	Figures	
Figure 1	Project Vicinity Map	
Figure 2	Alternative Aerial Map	
Figure 3	Proposed Typical Section	
Figure 4	Traffic Forecast (2009/2035 Estimated AADT)	
Appendix B	Comments from Federal, State, and Local Agencies	
Appendix C	<b>Relocation/Displacement Policies &amp; Relocation Report</b>	

## Proposed Widening of SR 1131 (Cameron Road) From West of NC 59 (South Main Street) to East of SR 1132 (Legion Road) Hope Mills, Cumberland County Federal Aid Project No. STP-1131(11) WBS No. 39070.1.1 T.I.P. No. U-4706

#### SUMMARY

#### **Type of Action**

This Categorical Exclusion (CE) has been prepared to evaluate the potential impacts of this proposed transportation improvement project. From this evaluation, the North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT) and Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) anticipate significant impacts to the environment will not occur due to this proposed project; therefore, the project is classified as a Federal "Categorical Exclusion".

#### **Description of Action**

The NCDOT, in consultation with the FHWA, proposes to widen SR 1131 (Cameron Road) from west of NC 59 (South Main Street) to east of SR 1132 (Legion Road) in Cumberland County (see Figure 1). The widening will convert SR 1131 (Cameron Road) from its current two-lane configuration to a four-lane, curb and gutter, median-divided facility (see Figure 3).

The total length of the project is 0.5 mile.

This project is included in the approved 2012-2018 North Carolina State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) and the 2013-2023 Draft STIP. The total cost in the STIP is \$8,000,000, which includes \$2,800,000 for right of way \$400,000 for utilities and \$4,800,000 for construction. The current estimated total cost is \$8,258,066. Right of way acquisition is scheduled to begin in Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2014 and construction in FFY 2016.

#### Summary of Purpose and Need

The purpose of the proposed project is to increase the traffic carrying capacity of SR 1131 (Cameron Road), between NC 59 (South Main Street) and SR 1132 (Legion Road), particularly in the vicinity of Hope Mills Middle School.

#### **Alternatives Considered**

The alternatives considered for the proposed project consists of the "no-build" alternative, TSM improvements, and 3-lane and 4-lane widening on existing roadway alternative. Both alternatives included signal improvements and roundabouts.

#### **NCDOT Recommended Alternative**

The 4-Lane Widening Alternative is the NCDOT recommended Alternative. The current design includes the construction of a roundabout at the intersection with SR 1132 (Legion Road) to aid the flow of traffic. This alternative was designed to minimize overall impacts to the human and natural environment by shifting the widening primarily to the south side. The widening will minimize residential impacts, yet does not impede the operations of the Hope Mills Middle School. This alternative also proposes minor improvements of Y-lines along SR 1131(Cameron Road) at their intersections.

This alternative also includes the redesign of the bus and faculty parking at Hope Mills Middle School to better aid the before-school and after-school traffic flow (see Figure 2).

#### **Summary of Environmental Effects**

Adverse impacts to the human and natural environment were minimized through the use of the "best fit" alignment. The proposed project will not impact any properties on or eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. The project will not encroach upon any known archaeological site eligible for listing in the National Register.

Four (4) potential Underground Storage Tanks (UST's) Facilities were identified within the project limits, but low monetary and scheduling impacts are anticipated to result from these sites.

One (1) business and eight (8) residential relocations are anticipated as a result of the proposed improvement. Approximately 31 noise receptors will be impacted. No adverse effect on the air quality of the surrounding area is anticipated as a result of the project.

There will be no impact to public recreational areas. The Hope Mills Middle School will lose some property and will require the shifting of parking areas to aid school traffic flow.

Seven (7) federally protected species are listed for Cumberland County; the biological conclusion for all seven species is "No Effect."

Table S-1 gives a summary of the resources and impacts due to the recommended alternative. Figure 2 shows the recommended alternative.

Resource	4-Lane Widening Alternative	
Length (miles)	0.5	
Schools	1	
Churches	0	
Cemeteries	1*	
Residential Relocations	8	
Business Relocations	1	
Traffic Noise Impacts		
Residential	29	
Churches	0	
Businesses	2	
Historic Properties (Listed on or Eligible	0	
for the National Register)	0	
Section 4(f) Properties	0	
Prime Farmland Impacts	0	
Wetland Impacts (acres)	0	
Stream Impacts (feet)	22	
Water Supply Watershed Protected Areas	None	
Federally Protected Species within	0	
Corridor		
Tanks	4	
Adverse/ Disproportionate Impacts to	Effects Identified**	
Minority/ Low Income Populations	Effects Identified***	
Right of Way Cost \$2,791,68		
Utility Relocation Cost	\$666,386	
Construction Cost \$4,800,		
Total Cost	\$8,258,066	

**Table S-1: Summary of Resources and Impacts** 

\* Cemetery is in study area, but only temporary impacts are anticipated.

\*\* Effects to Environmental Justice Population identified as discussed in Section V.12.c

#### **Permits Required**

The proposed project has been designated as a CE for the purposes of National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) documentation. As a result, a Nationwide Permit (NWP) 23 will likely be applicable. The USACE holds the final discretion regarding the permit required to authorize project construction. If a Section 404 permit is required, then a Section 401 Water Quality Certification (WQC) from the North Carolina Division of Water Quality (NCDWQ) will be needed.

### **Coordination**

Federal, state, and local agencies were consulted during the preparation of this Categorical Exclusion. Written comments were received and considered from agencies noted with an asterisk (\*) during the preparation of this assessment.

- \* U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
  - U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
  - U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
  - National Marine Fisheries Service
  - NC Wildlife Resources Commission
  - NC Division of Coastal Management
  - NC Division of Parks and Recreation
  - NC Division of Marine Fisheries
- \* N.C. Department of Administration
- \* N.C. Department of Cultural Resources
- \* N.C. Department of Environment and Natural Resources N.C. Department of Public Instruction
- \* N.C. Division of Water Quality
- \* N.C. Office of Conservation, Natural Heritage Program Mid Carolina Council of Governments
  - Cumberland County Board of Commissioners
- Town of Hope Mills
   Mayor of Hope Mills

### **Contact Information**

Additional information concerning the proposal and assessment can be obtained by contacting the following:

John F. Sullivan III, P. E., Division Administrator Federal Highway Administration 310 New Bern Avenue, Suite 410 Raleigh, NC 27601 Telephone: (919) 856-4346

Richard W. Hancock, P. E., Manager Project Development and Environmental Analysis Unit North Carolina Department of Transportation 1548 Mail Service Center Raleigh, NC 27699-1548 Telephone: (919) 707-6000

# Proposed Widening of SR 1131 (Cameron Road) From West of NC 59 (South Main Street) to East of SR 1132 (Legion Road) Hope Mills, Cumberland County Federal Aid Project No. STP-1131(11) WBS No. 39070.1.1 T.I.P. No. U-4706

### I. DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED ACTION

#### A. General Description

The NCDOT, in consultation with the FHWA, proposes to widen SR 1131 (Cameron Road) from NC 59 (South Main Street) to east of SR 1132 (Legion Road) in Cumberland County (see Figure 1). The widening will convert SR 1131 (Cameron Road) from its current two-lane configuration to a four-lane, curb and gutter, median-divided facility (see Figure 3).

The proposed facility will have two 12-foot inside travel lanes, two 14-foot outside travel lanes and a 23-foot raised median with curb and gutter (see Figure 3). The project will also include 5-foot sidewalks on both sides of SR 1131 (Cameron Road) for the length of the project. A roundabout is proposed at the intersection of SR 1131 (Cameron Road) and SR 1132 (Legion Road).

The project also proposes improvements at NC 59 (South Main Street), School Street and Stone Street, at their intersection with SR 1131 (Cameron Road). The total length of the project is approximately 0.5 miles.

#### B. Cost Estimates

This project is included in the approved 2012-2018 North Carolina State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) and the 2013-2023 Draft STIP. The total cost in the STIP is \$8,000,000, which includes \$2,800,000 for right of way \$400,000 for utilities and \$4,800,000 for construction. The current estimated total cost is \$8,258,066. Right of way acquisition is scheduled to begin in Federal Fiscal Year (FFY) 2014 and construction in FFY 2016.

## II. PURPOSE AND NEED FOR PROJECT

### A. <u>Purpose of Project</u>

The purpose of the proposed project is to increase the traffic carrying capacity of SR 1131 (Cameron Road) between NC 59 (Main Street) and SR 1132 (Legion Road), particularly in the vicinity of Hope Mills Middle School.

### B. <u>Need for Project</u>

The existing roadway will not provide adequate capacity to service the future traffic volumes (see Figure 4).

### C. Description of Existing Conditions

### 1. <u>Functional Classification</u>

SR 1131 (Cameron Road) is designated as a Minor Arterial on the North Carolina Statewide Functional Classification System.

### 2. <u>Physical Description of Existing Facility</u>

### a. <u>Roadway Cross Section</u>

SR 1131 (Cameron Road) currently varies from a two-lane to three-lane facility. From NC 59 (South Main Street) to SR 1132 (Legion Road), SR 1131 (Cameron Road) is a two-lane road. The three-lane portion is currently located east of SR 1132 (Legion Road).

# b. Horizontal and Vertical Alignment

The horizontal and vertical alignment along existing SR 1131 (Cameron Road) is suitable for the posted speed limit, 35 miles per hour (mph).

### c. Right of Way and Access Control

The existing right of way along SR 1131 (Cameron Road) is 60 feet. There is currently no control of access.

# d. Speed Limit

The posted speed limit along SR 1131 (Cameron Road) is 35 mph.

### e. Railroad Crossings

There are no railroad crossings within the project corridor.

#### f. <u>Hydraulic Structures</u>

There are no major hydraulic structures on this project.

#### g. Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities/Greenways

No bicycle and pedestrian facilities or greenways exist along the project corridor.

#### h. Utilities

The following utilities are located within the project corridor: overhead telephone, overhead electricity, underground cable TV, underground gas, underground water, and underground sewer. Also, a 69kv H-frame wood transmission tower is located inside the project limits.

### i. School Bus Usage

Currently, there are 11 buses that travel round trip along this section of SR 1131 (Cameron Road) on a daily basis to area schools, including the Hope Mills Middle School.

### 3. Traffic Carrying Capacity

### a. Existing Traffic Volumes

According to the 2011 traffic counts, the existing Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT) on SR 1131 (Cameron Road) was between 2,600 and 8,100 vehicles per day (vpd) (see Figure 4).

### b. Existing Levels of Service

The capacity analysis was performed to compute Level of Service (LOS) and other performance measures for the roadway segments along the study corridor.

Simulations were completed for the No-Build scenarios using the Base year (2011) traffic. A mainline analysis of SR 1131 (Cameron Road) projected that under the existing geometry and with No-Build conditions, the mainline operates at LOS D during the Base year (2011). Four (4) key intersections were also evaluated for proposed improvements. Under current traffic conditions, SR 1131 (Cameron Road) intersects with NC 59 (South Main Street), School Street, Stone Street and SR 1132 (Legion Road). The results are shown in Table 1.

#### c. Future Traffic Volumes

According to the Design year (2035) traffic forecasts, the estimated AADT for SR 1131 (Cameron Road) will range from 3,300 vpd to 14,800 vpd (see Figure 4).

#### d. Future Levels of Service

#### Corridor Analysis

Simulations were completed for both the Build and No-Build scenarios using the Design year (2035) traffic. Analysis shows that the three-lane facility is expected to operate at LOS D in 2035. The four-lane median divided facility is expected to operate at LOS B in 2035.

#### Intersection Analysis

Four (4) key intersections were also evaluated for proposed improvements. All four intersections were analyzed to determine the operations. The NC 59 (South Main Street) and SR 1132 (Legion Road) intersections were analyzed under traffic control signal control and as a roundabout in order to determine the future traffic control operations. Analysis shows all intersection movements were operating at LOS D or better in 2011. In 2035, all intersection movements are expected to continue to operate at LOS C or better, with the exception of the NC 59 (South Main Street) intersection. The intersection analysis results are shown in Table 1.

Y-line	2011 No Build	2035 Build 3-Lanes	2035 Build 4-Lanes
Main Street	D	F(F)	F(F)
School Street	B*	C*	B*
Stone Street	B*	C*	B*
Legion Road	В	C(B)	C (B)

 Table 1: Intersection Level of Service SR 1131 (Cameron Road)

\*Highway Capacity Software does not provide a LOS for unsignalized intersections; minor street movement reported

() Proposed roundabout LOS reported.

#### SR 1131 (Cameron Road) at NC 59 (South Main Street)

The traffic analysis showed that this signalized intersection will operate at an overall LOS F in 2035. The delays and queing from the signal at NC 59 (South Main Street) will adversely affect traffic operations on SR 1131 (Cameron Road). The operations will remain at LOS F with the construction of a single-lane roundabout. A dual-lane roundabout is only expected to operate at an acceptable LOS until 2026. Therefore, NCDOT did not recommend a roundabout at this intersection. The 2035 forecast traffic volumes on NC 59 (South Main Street) are expected to surpass 36,000

vpd, which well exceeds the 16,000 vpd carrying capacity for a three lane facility. Without widening NC 59 (South Main Street) to a multilane facility, there are no intersection improvements that can be made along SR 1131 (Cameron Road) that will considerably improve delay and queing in the design year.

#### SR 1131 (Cameron Road) at SR 1132 (Legion Road)

Analysis shows that with a traffic signal installed, the intersection will operate at an overall LOS C in 2035. The operations will improve to LOS B with the construction of a single-lane roundabout with an eastbound and southbound bypass lane. A singlelane roundabout is expected to operate at an acceptable LOS beyond 2040.

#### e. Accident Data

A crash analysis was performed on SR 1131 (Cameron Road) from SR 1132 (Legion Road) to NC 59 (South Main Street). There were 27 reported crashes along this segment from July 1, 2008 through June 30, 2013. For crash rate purposes, this location can be classified as an urban 2-lane, undivided Secondary Route (SR) with a continuous left turn. Table 2 shows the comparison of the crash rates for the analyzed section of SR 1131 (Cameron Road) versus the 2008-2013 statewide crash rates for a comparable road type and configuration.

Rate	Crashes	Crashes per 100 MVM <sup>1</sup>	Statewide Rate <sup>2</sup>	Critical Rate <sup>3</sup>
Total	27	799.27	252.71	409.74
Fatal	1	29.60	0.91	24.24
Non-Fatal Injury	6	177.61	77.71	171.38
Night	4	118.41	60.92	145.55
Wet	6	177.61	41.63	114.15

**Table 2: Crash Rate Comparisons** 

<sup>1</sup> MVM – Million Vehicle Miles

<sup>1</sup> 2008-2013 statewide crash rate for urban 2-lane undivided North Carolina route

<sup>3</sup> Based on the statewide crash rate (95% level of confidence).

Current crash rates exceed the statewide crash rates in all categories and exceed the critical crash rates in all categories except the night category. Thirty-three percent (9 accidents) were left turn accidents and 29% (8 accidents) were rear end/angle accidents.

### f. <u>Airports</u>

There are no public airports within 5 miles of the project corridor.

# g. Other Highway Projects in the Area

There is one TIP project near the proposed project area. TIP project U-2809 proposes to widen SR 1132 (Legion Road) to multi-lanes from SR 1131 (Cameron Road) to SR 1007 (Owen Drive) in Fayetteville. It is currently funded for right of way in FY 2014 and construction in FY 2016. Projects U-2809 and U-4706 are planned to be constructed at the same time.

### 4. Transportation and Land Use Plans

### a. <u>NC Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)</u>

This project is included in the approved 2012-2020 North Carolina State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) and the 2013-2023 Draft STIP. The total cost in the STIP is \$2,000,000, which includes \$750,000 for right of way and \$1,250,000 for construction.

### b. Local Thoroughfare Plans

The Fayetteville Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (FAMPO) adopted its Mobility 2035 Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) in April 2009. U-4706 is referenced in the LRTP.

### c. Land Use Plans

The Cumberland County Land Use Plan was updated in 2010. The project lies within the Town of Hope Mills Municipal influence area.

### D. Benefits of Proposed Project

The proposed widening of SR 1131 (Cameron Road) will improve the traffic carrying capacity of this roadway. The improvements will establish a more efficient travel route that will insure adequate access to the Hope Mills Middle School.

Additionally, the proposed raised median will prevent left turns, resulting in a reduced percentage of left turn and rear/angle accidents.

### III. ALTERNATIVES

### A. Preliminary Study Alternatives

#### 1. No-Build Alternative

The No-Build Alternative offers no improvements to the project area. This alternative assumes that all other projects currently planned or programmed in the TIP will be constructed in the area as proposed.

This alternative will not allow for the additional capacity needed to efficiently service the projected growth within the project corridor, nor will it provide improved safety conditions along SR 1131 (Cameron Road). Level of service along SR 1131 (Cameron Road) will continue to worsen unless improvements are made.

Since the No-Build Alternative does not address the purpose and need of the proposed action, it is not recommended. However, it is used as a basis for comparison to other alternatives.

### 2. <u>Alternative Modes of Transportation</u>

There are limited transit options currently available in this section of Cumberland County. While the inclusion of transit options, as well as bicycle and pedestrian accommodations, could aid in reducing congestion in the project area, these options alone do not meet the purpose and need of this project since they would not reduce demand enough to eliminate the need to improve the traffic carrying capacity of SR 1131 (Cameron Road).

#### 3. Transportation Systems Management

The Transportation Systems Management (TSM) alternative includes those types of limited construction activities designed to maximize the utilization and energy efficiency of an existing roadway. TSM improvement options considered under this alternative include traffic signal optimization at NC 59 (South Main Street) and SR 1132 (Legion Road) and the construction of roundabouts at these intersections. These improvements alone will not adequately address the traffic carrying capacity of SR 1131 (Cameron Road).

#### 4. Widening Alternatives

Originally, two widening alternatives were considered: 3-lane widening (no median) and 4-lane with widening (with raised median). After evaluation of the capacity analysis showing the 4-lane widening option operated better (LOS A) than the 3-lane option (LOS D), the 3-lane option was removed from consideration.

For both NC 59 (South Main Street) and SR 1132 (Legion Road) intersections, both traffic signals and roundabouts were evaluated. For NC 59 (Main Street), a dual lane roundabout would fail by 2026, so this option was dropped. For SR 1132 (Legion Road), the roundabout operated at a better level of service (LOS B), than the traffic signal, so the signal was dropped from consideration.

The current improvements will include widening SR 1131(Cameron Road) from the existing two facility to a four-lane median-divided facility. The current design includes the construction of a roundabout at the intersection with SR 1132 (Legion Road) to aid the flow of traffic and maintaining the traffic signal at NC 59 (South Main Street). This alternative was designed to minimize overall impacts to the human and natural environment by shifting the widening primarily to the south side. The widening will minimize residential impacts, yet does not impede the operations of the Hope Mills Middle School. This alternative also proposes minor improvements of facilities intersecting with SR 1131 (Cameron Road).

This alternative also includes the redesign of the bus and faculty parking at Hope Mills Middle School to better aid the before-school and after-school traffic flow (see Figure 2). Several meetings were held with the Cumberland County School System to determine the best scenario; this current design reflects the outcome of this coordination.

#### B. Detailed Study Alternative

The 4-lane widening alternative was the only alternative carried forward for detailed environmental studies. The impacts associated with this alternative are noted in Table 3.

Resource	4-LaneWidening Alternative
Length (miles)	0.5
Schools	1
Churches	0
Cemeteries	1*
Residential Relocations	8
Business Relocations	1
Traffic Noise Impacts	
Residential	29
Churches	0
• Businesses	2
Historic Properties (Listed on or Eligible	0
for the National Register)	U
Section 4(f) Properties	0
Prime Farmland Impacts	0
Wetland Impacts (acres)	0
Stream Impacts (feet)	22
Water Supply Watershed Protected Areas	None
Federally Protected Species within Corridor	0
Underground/ Aboveground Storage Tanks	4
Adverse/ Disproportionate Impacts to Minority/ Low Income Populations	Effects Identified**
Right of Way Cost	\$ 2,791,680
Utility Relocation Cost	\$ 666,386
Construction Cost	\$ 4,800,000
Total Cost	\$ 8,258,066

**Table 3: Summary of Resources and Impacts** 

\* Cemetery is in study area, but only temporary impacts are anticipated.

\*\* Effects to Environmental Justice Population identified as discussed in Section V.12.c

#### C. NCDOT Recommended Alternative

The 4-Lane Widening Alternative is the NCDOT recommended Alternative. The current design includes the construction of a roundabout at the intersection with SR 1132 (Legion Road) to aid the flow of traffic and maintain the signal at NC 59 (South Main Street). This alternative was designed to minimize overall impacts to the human and natural environment by shifting the widening primarily to the south side.

This alternative also includes the redesign of the bus and faculty parking at Hope Mills Middle School to better aid the before-school and after-school traffic flow (see Figure 2). Several meetings were held with the Cumberland County School System to determine the best scenario; this current design reflects the outcome of this coordination.

### IV. PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS

#### A. Roadway Cross-Section and Alignment

The proposed typical section for SR 1131 (Cameron Road) is a 4-lane, raised median-divided facility with curb and gutter, consisting of a 23-foot raised median, 12-foot inside travel lanes and 14-foot outside travel lanes (see Figure 3).

#### B. Right of Way and Access Control

The proposed right of way width for this project is approximately110 feet. There is no proposed control of access along the project corridor.

#### C. Speed Limit & Design Speed

The design speed for the proposed widening of SR 1131 (Cameron Road) is 40 mph. The anticipated posted speed limit is 35 mph.

#### D. Anticipated Design Exceptions

No design exceptions are anticipated on this project.

#### E. Intersections/Interchanges

NC 59 (South Main Street)/ Edwin Deaver Road: Separate turn lanes will be added on all legs of this intersection. No additional through lanes are proposed on NC 59 (South Main Street) or Edwin Deaver Road.

Stone Road: Stone Road is proposed to have right in and right out only access.

School Road: Because bus traffic will be redirected to this road, School Street is proposed to have a dedicated westbound left turn into the school with right in and right out access only out of the school. This project is proposed to improve the bus parking area on the west side of the school and the staff parking area located on the east side of the school.

SR 1132 (Legion Road): A roundabout is proposed at this intersection. The roundabout includes channelization.

River Road: Access from River Road to SR 1131 (Cameron Road) is currently closed and will remain closed.

Professional Drive: This roadway is proposed to have a dedicated northbound left turn into the drive that should be accessed by traveling through the roundabout. There is right in and right out access only out of Professional Drive. Meadowood Court: SR 1131 (Cameron Road) between SR 1132 (Legion Road) and Meadowood Court is proposed to have two eastbound travel lanes, where one of the travel lanes after about 600 feet will transition to a dedicated right turn lane into Meadowood Court. The distance from SR 1132 (Legion Road) to Meadowood Court is about 850 feet.

Honeycutt Avenue: This roadway south of SR 1131 (Cameron Road) on south NC 59 (South Main Street), is proposed to have right in and right out only access.

No service roads are proposed for this project.

### F. <u>Railroad Crossings</u>

No railroad crossings will be impacted by this project.

#### G. Structures

No major drainage structures will be impacted by this project. The widening of the Rockfish Bridge on SR 1132 (Legion Road) will handled under another project.

#### H. Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities

At the request of the Town of Hope Mills, the NCDOT will enter into a municipal agreement to construct 5-foot sidewalks on each side of SR 1131 (Cameron Road) for the length of the project. The pedestrian crossings and median refuges will be ADA-compliant.

To accommodate bicyclists, the outside lanes along SR 1131 (Cameron Road) will be 14 feet, rather than 12 feet.

### I. <u>Utilities</u>

The project does not propose improvements to existing utilities along SR 1131 (Cameron Road); however, utilities will be relocated as needed for construction.

### J. <u>Noise Barriers</u>

No noise barriers are proposed as part of this project.

### K. Work Zone, Traffic Control and Construction Phasing

During construction of the project, it's anticipated that SR 1131 (Cameron Road) traffic will be maintained on site, as the widening will be primarily to the south side.

### V. ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS OF PROPOSED ACTION

#### A. <u>Natural Resources</u>

#### 1. Biotic Resources

#### a. <u>Terrestrial Communities</u>

Two terrestrial communities were identified within the project area: maintained/disturbed and mixed pine/hardwood forest. A brief description of each community type follows.

#### 1. <u>Mixed Pine/Hardwood Forest</u>

This community is found in the forested areas around Little Rockfish Creek and is generally comprised of longleaf pine mixed with mature hardwood trees. The hardwood tree species include post oak, water oak, turkey oak, willow oak, red maple, and sweetgum. Common shrub and herb species include high-bush blueberry, pepperbush, American beautyberry, and azalea with Japanese honeysuckle, poison ivy, and common greenbrier in the vine layer.

#### b. Terrestrial Wildlife

Terrestrial communities in the study area are comprised of both natural and disturbed habitats that may support a diversity of wildlife species. Mammal species that commonly exploit forested habitats and stream corridors found within the study area include species such as raccoon, Virginia opossum, gray squirrel, and white-tailed deer. Birds that commonly use forest and forest edge habitats include the red-bellied woodpecker, northern cardinal, yellowbelly sapsucker, hairy woodpecker, Carolina chickadee, and mourning doves. Birds that may use the open habitat within the study area include red-shouldered hawk, mockingbird and turkey vulture.

Reptile and amphibian species that may use terrestrial communities located in the study area include the rat snake, eastern box turtle, Atlantic coast slimy salamander, ground skink and spring peeper.

#### c. Aquatic Communities

Aquatic communities in the study area consist of Little Rockfish Creek, a large perennial coastal plain stream, and its associated unnamed tributaries. In the study area, Little Rockfish Creek could support chain pickerel, redbreast sunfish, bluegill, and largemouth bass.

Other aquatic species likely to be found in the study area include the banded water snake, southern chorus frog, and green frog.

#### d. Invasive Species

Two plant species listed on the Invasive Exotic Plant List for North Carolina were observed within the study area. The species identified were Chinese privet (Threat Level 1) and Japanese honeysuckle (Threat Level 2). NCDOT will manage invasive plant species as appropriate. Invasive species are categorized into one of three threat levels, Level 1 (Severe Threat), Level 2 (Threat), and Level 3 (Watch List). Threat levels for the observed invasive species are shown in Table 4.

Common Name	Scientific Name	Threat Level
Chinese privet	Ligustrum sinense	1
Japanese honeysuckle	Lonicera japonica	2

**Table 4: Invasive Species within Project Area** 

NCDOT will follow the Department's Best Management Practices (BMPs) for the management of invasive plant species.

#### e. Summary of Anticipated Effects

Table 5 describes the acreage of terrestrial communities within the project study area. Impacts to terrestrial communities associated with construction activities include the removal of vegetation, soil compaction, damaging and/or exposing root systems, as well as potential impacts associated with petroleum spills. The estimated impacts are based on the current design slope stake limits.

Table 5:	<b>Coverage of Terrestrial Natural Communities</b>
	(within the Project Study Area)

Community	Coverage (ac.)	
Maintained/Disturbed	24.3	
Mixed Pine/Hardwood Forest	2.0	
Total Area:	26.3	

### 2. Jurisdictional Issues

#### a. <u>Clean Water Act Waters of the United States</u>

No wetlands were identified in the study area. Three jurisdictional streams were identified in the study area (Table 6). The jurisdictional streams in the study area have been designated as a warm water streams for the purposes of stream mitigation. Based on the current design, only 22 feet of a tributary of Rockfish Creek will be impacted.

(within the Hoject Study Area)							
Map ID	Length (ft.)	Classification	Compensatory Mitigation Required	River Basin Buffer			
Little Rockfish Creek	244	Perennial	Yes	Not Subject			
SB	185	Perennial	Yes	Not Subject			
SB	257	Intermittent	Yes	Not Subject			
SC	45	Ephemeral	No	Not Subject			

Table 6: Jurisdictional Characteristics of Water Resources(within the Project Study Area)

### b. Clean Water Act Permits

The proposed project has been designated as a CE for the purposes of National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) documentation. As a result, a Nationwide Permit (NWP) 23 will likely be applicable. The USACE holds the final discretion as to what permit will be required to authorize project construction. If a Section 404 permit is required then a Section 401 Water Quality Certification (WQC) from the NCDWR will be needed.

#### c. Coastal Area Management Act Area of Environmental Concern

Cumberland County is not one of the 20 coastal counties regulated by the NC Division of Coastal Management.

### d. Construction Moratoria

There is no construction moratorium for this project.

### e. N.C. River Basin Buffer Rules

No buffer rules are in effect for this part of the Cape Fear River basin.

### f. <u>Rivers and Harbors Act Section 10 Navigable Waters</u>

Little Rockfish Creek has not been designated by the USACE as a Navigable Water under Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act.

#### g. Mitigation

The NCDOT will attempt to avoid and minimize impacts to streams to the greatest extent practicable during project design.

If mitigation is required, the NCDOT will investigate potential on-site stream mitigation opportunities. If on-site mitigation is not feasible, mitigation will be provided by the North Carolina Department of Environment and Natural Resources Ecosystem Enhancement Program (EEP).

# 3. Endangered Species Act

# a. Federally Protected Species

As of December 26, 2012, the United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) lists seven federally protected species for Cumberland County (Table 7). A brief description of each species' habitat requirements follows, along with the Biological Conclusion based on survey results in the study area.

Table 7. Tederal Trotected Species Listed for Cumberland County						
Common Name	Scientific Name	Federal Status	Habitat Present	Biological Conclusion		
American alligator	Alligator mississippiensis	T/(S/A)	No	N/A		
Red-cockaded woodpecker	Picoides borealis	E	No	No Effect		
Saint Francis' satyr	Neonympha mitchellii francisci	E	No	No Effect		
American chaffseed	Schwalbea americana	E	No	No Effect		
Michaux's sumac	Rhus michauxii	E	Yes	No Effect		
Pondberry	Lindera melissifolia	E	No	No Effect		
Rough-leaved loosestrife	Lysimachia asperulaefolia	E	No	No Effect		

### Table 7: Federal Protected Species Listed for Cumberland County

E-Endangered T-Threatened T(S/A) – Threatened due to Similarity of Appearance

### American alligator

USFWS Recommended Survey Window: year round (only warm days in winter)

Habitat Description: In North Carolina, alligators have been recorded in nearly every coastal county, and many inland counties to the fall line. The alligator is found in rivers, streams, canals, lakes, swamps, and coastal marshes. Adult animals are highly tolerant of salt water, but the young are apparently more sensitive, with salinities greater than 5 parts per thousand considered harmful. The American alligator remains on the protected species list due to its similarity in appearance to the Endangered American crocodile.

Biological Conclusion: Not Applicable

### **Red-cockaded woodpecker**

USFWS survey window: year round; November-early March (optimal)

Habitat Requirements: The red-cockaded woodpecker (RCW) occupies open, mature stands of southern pines, particularly longleaf pine, for foraging and nesting habitat. The RCW typically nests in pine trees that are >60 years old, and which are contiguous with pine stands at least 30 years of age to provide foraging habitat. The foraging range of the RCW is normally no more than 0.5 mile.

### **Biological Conclusion: No Effect**

In the areas surrounding the proposed project, a high degree of urbanization and development has greatly diminished the quality and quantity of red-cockaded woodpecker roosting and foraging habitat within remaining mesic pine flatwoods, pine/scrub oak sandhill, and xeric sandhill scrub communities. A lack of larger and older trees limit potential nesting and foraging opportunities. A review of NCNHP element occurrence (EO) database records (updated May 3, 2011) revealed one element occurrence (EO 1503) documented from June 11, 1990 for red-cockaded woodpecker within one mile of the project study area. Surveys for an adjacent project were completed on October 4, 2007 by NCDOT Biologists. Approximately 6 person-hours were spent in field surveys for red-cockaded woodpecker roosting and foraging habitat within the project corridor and the area surrounding EO 1503. Additional surveys were conducted on May 18, 2011 for the current project. No appropriate habitat was found within the project study area and no active nesting trees were found around the abandoned EO 1503; therefore there will be no effect on this species.

### Saint Francis' satyr

USFWS Recommended Survey Window: May 5-June 6 and July 26-August 21

Habitat Description: The Saint Francis' satyr butterfly is only known from the Sandhills of North Carolina, although it's historic range may have been much larger. This butterfly is known to inhabit wide, wet meadows dominated by sedges and other wetland graminoids. These wetlands are often relicts of beaver activity and are boggy areas that are acidic and ephemeral. These sites must be continually maintained to persist as open areas. The larval host of the Saint Francis' satyr is thought to be grasses, sedges and rushes.

**Biological Conclusion: No Effect** 

A review of the NCNHP database records (updated May 3, 2011) revealed no recorded occurrences of Saint Francis' satyr found within one mile of the project

study area. The probability of Saint Francis' satyr occurring within the project area is low due to the lack of wide, wet meadows preferred by the species; therefore the Biological Conclusion is No Effect.

### American chaffseed

### USFWS Optimal Survey Window: May-August (1-2 months after a fire)

Habitat Description: American chaffseed generally occurs in habitats described as open, moist to dryish Mesic Pine Flatwoods and longleaf pine flatlands, Pine Savannas, Pine/Scrub Oak Sandhills, Sandhill Seeps, and other open grass/sedge-dominated communities. This herb also occurs in the ecotonal areas between peaty wetlands and xeric sandy soils and on the upper ecotones of, or sites close, to Streamhead Pocosins. The species prefers sandy peat or sandy loam, acidic, seasonally moist to dry soils in sunny or partly sunny areas subject to frequent fires in the growing season. The plant is dependent on factors such as fire, mowing, or fluctuating water tables to maintain its required open to partly-open habitat. Most extant occurrences, and all of the most vigorous occurrences, are in areas subject to frequent fire. This species is also known to occur on road cuts and power line rights-of-way that experience frequent mowing or clearing. Soil series that it is found on include Blaney, Candor, Gelead, Fuquay, Lakeland, and Vaucluse.

### **Biological Conclusion: No Effect**

The NCNHP database records (updated May 3, 2011) revealed no recorded occurrences of American chaffseed found within one mile of the project study area. No suitable habitat for American chaffseed exists within the proposed project ROW in the form of fire-maintained savannas or open, moist pine flatwoods. Little to no evidence of fire was observed within the proposed project ROW. Therefore this project will have no effect on this species.

### Michaux's sumac

### USFWS Optimal Survey Window: May-October

Habitat Description: Michaux's sumac, endemic to the inner Coastal Plain and lower Piedmont, grows in sandy or rocky, open, upland woods on acidic or circumneutral, well-drained sands or sandy loam soils with low cation exchange capacities. The species is also found on sandy or submesic loamy swales and depressions in the fall line Sandhills region as well as in openings along the rim of Carolina bays; maintained railroad, roadside, power line, and utility rights-of way; areas where forest canopies have been opened up by blowdowns and/or storm damage; small wildlife food plots; abandoned building sites; under sparse to moderately dense pine or pine/hardwood canopies; and in and along edges of other artificially maintained clearings undergoing natural succession. In the central Piedmont, it occurs on clayey soils derived from mafic rocks. The plant is shade intolerant and, therefore, grows best where disturbance (*e.g.*, mowing, clearing, grazing, periodic fire) maintains its open habitat.

# **Biological Conclusion: No Effect**

The NCNHP database records (updated May 3, 2011) did not reveal recorded occurrences of Michaux's sumac within one mile of the project study area. Suitable habitat for Michaux's sumac exists within the project study area in the form of roadsides and maintained/disturbed areas as well as in open, sandy woods with a dominance of longleaf pine in the canopy (xeric sandhill scrub community).

A habitat assessment for Michaux's sumac within the project area was conducted on May 18, 2011. Areas containing open longleaf pine-dominated canopies with a moderate to sparse understory or areas that are kept in a low-growing successional state due to frequent mowing were surveyed for Michaux's sumac. Surveys were conducted for Michaux's sumac along ecotonal edges between regularly mowed roadsides and forested areas dominated by pine and scrub oaks. Small sections of low- to medium-quality habitat are interspersed throughout the length of the study area. Approximately 4 person-hours were spent conducting plant-by-plant foot surveys within the study area; however, the species was not found. Consequently, a Biological Conclusion of No Effect is valid for Michaux's sumac within the study area.

# Pondberry

USFWS Optimal Survey Window: February-October

Habitat Description: Pondberry occurs in seasonally flooded wetlands, sandy sinks, and pond

margins, and swampy depressions. This deciduous, aromatic shrub occurs in bottomland hardwood forests with perched water tables along inland areas of the southeastern United States. In the Coastal Plain of the Carolinas, the species occurs at the margins of limestone sinks and ponds and in undrained, shallow depressions of longleaf pine and pond pine forests. Known occurrences in North Carolina occur in the Small Depression Pocosin natural community, grow in soils with sandy sediments and high water table, contain high peat content in the subsurface, and include a prevalence of shrubs due to historically frequent or intense fires. It generally grows in somewhat shaded areas, but can tolerate full sun.

# **Biological Conclusion: No Effect**

A review of the NCNHP database records (updated May 3, 2011) revealed no

recorded occurrences of pondberry within one mile of the project study area. No habitat exists within the study area. Consequently, a Biological Conclusion of No Effect is rendered for this species within the project study area.

### **Rough-leaved loosestrife**

USFWS Optimal Survey Window: mid May-June

Habitat Description: Rough-leaved loosestrife, endemic to the Coastal Plain and Sandhills of North and South Carolina, generally occurs in the ecotones or edges between longleaf pine uplands and pond pine pocosins in dense shrub and vine growth on moist to seasonally saturated sands and on shallow organic soils overlaying sand (spodosolic soils). Occurrences are found in such disturbed habitats as roadside depressions, maintained power and utility line rights-of-way, firebreaks, and trails. The species prefers full sunlight, is shade intolerant, and requires areas of disturbance (*e.g.*, clearing, mowing, periodic burning) where the overstory is minimal. It can, however, persist vegetatively for many years in overgrown, fire-suppressed areas. Blaney, Gilead, Johnston, Kalmia, Leon, Mandarin, Murville, Torhunta, and Vaucluse are some of the soil series that the plant occurs on.

**Biological Conclusion: No Effect** 

A review of the NCNHP database records (updated May 3, 2011) revealed no recorded occurrences of rough-leaved loosestrife within one mile of the project study area. No habitat exists within the study area. Consequently, a Biological Conclusion of No Effect is rendered for this species within the project study area.

# b. Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act

Habitat for the bald eagle primarily consists of mature forest in proximity to large bodies of open water for foraging. Large, dominant trees are utilized for nesting sites, typically within 1.0 mile of open water.

A desktop-GIS assessment of the study area, as well as the area within a 1.13-mile radius (1.0 mile plus 660 feet) of the project limits, was performed on July 1, 2011 using 2010 color aerials. One water body large enough and sufficiently open to be considered potential feeding sources was identified. A survey of the study area and the area within 660 feet of the project limits was conducted May 18, 2011 and observed no individual birds or nests. Additionally, a review of the NCNHP database (updated May 3, 2011) revealed no known occurrences of this species within 1.0 mile of the study area. Due to the lack of observed presence, known occurrences, and minimal impact anticipated for this project, it has been determined that this project will not affect this species.

### c. Endangered Species Act Candidate Species

As of December 26, 2012, the USFWS lists no Candidate species for Cumberland County.

### B. Cultural Resources

This project is subject to compliance with section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended, and implemented by the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation's Regulations for Compliance with Section 106, codified as 36 CFR Part 800. Section 106 requires Federal agencies to take into account the effect of their undertakings (federally-funded, licensed, or permitted) on properties included in or eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places and to afford the Advisory Council a reasonable opportunity to comment on such undertakings.

### 1. Historic Architectural Resources

In a memorandum dated January 21, 2011, the North Carolina Historic Preservation Office (NCHPO) determined that this project as it is proposed will not affect any historic structures. A copy of this memorandum is included in Appendix B.

### 2. Archaeological Resources

In a memorandum dated January 21, 2011, the North Carolina Historic Preservation Office (NCHPO) determined that this project as it is proposed will not affect any archaeological resource. A copy of this memorandum is included in Appendix B.

### C. Section 4(f)/6(f) Resources

Section 4(f) of the USDOT Act of 1966 protects the use of publicly owned parks, recreation areas, wildlife/waterfowl refuges, and historic properties. No Section 4(f) protected properties will be impacted by this project.

Section 6(f) of the Land and Water Conservation Act applies to the conversion of certain recreation lands to non-recreational purposes. The act applies to recreation lands that have received Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) money. Any land conversions on property that has received LWCF money must be approved by the National Park Service. Section 6(f) also requires that any applicable land converted to non-recreational uses must be replaced with land of equal or greater value, location, and usefulness. No Section 6(f) protected properties will be impacted by this project.

# D. Farmland/ Voluntary Agricultural Districts

Impacts to prime farmland were not assessed because the project limits are completely within an urbanized area inside a municipal boundary. There are no Voluntary Agricultural Districts within the project area.

### E. Community Impact Assessment

### 1. American Indian Religious Freedom Act

The project is not located in a county claimed as "territory" by the Eastern Band of Cherokee Indians

# 2. <u>Title VI and Environmental Justice</u>

While Census data does not indicate a notable presence of populations meeting the criteria for Environmental Justice (EJ) with the overall Demographic Study Area, minority and/or low income communities were observed within the Direct Community Impact Area during the site visit. The apartment complex on Professional Drive appears to have both minority and lower income households. Residents of the houses on the north side of Cameron Road between Stone Street and River Road appear to be elderly, with many being renters. Although well maintained, these small, older houses show no sign of modernization or remodeling. Indications are that all elderly residents are considered fixed income households, while elderly renters considered likely to be lower income.

# 3. Limited English Proficiency

There are no populations living in the Demographic Study Area that meet the criteria for Limited English Proficiency.

# 4. <u>Community Characteristics & Notable Features</u>

### a. Notable Growth Rate

The population in the Demographic Study Area grew by 159.8% between 2000 and 2010, with an annualized growth rate of 10.0%. This new growth occurred mainly in 4 large subdivisions built near the borders of the Demographic Study Area during the first half of the decade, 2002-2006.

# b. Local Area Plans/Goals

Cumberland County Planning Department does the long-range planning for Hope Mills. The Draft 2030 Growth Vision Plan is a new comprehensive planning initiative for Cumberland County and its municipalities and is currently under review for adoption.

One of the many policies contained in the Draft 2030 Plan is the focus on a balanced transportation system made up of a network of roads, mass transit services, sidewalks, trails, and bicycling facilities to help reduce automobile dependency and traffic congestion.

The Fayetteville Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (FAMPO) adopted its Mobility 2035 Long Range Transportation Plan in April 2009. The widening of SR 1131 (Cameron Road) from SR 1132 (Legion Road) east to I-95 Business is shown in the Fiscally Constrained Plan as a Priority Two improvement (roads that are currently close to capacity) and is tentatively scheduled between FY 2030 and FY 2035.

FAMPO is developing a Multi-Modal Congestion Management Plan. This plan will:

- Establish a regional vision for the study area;
- Address land use suitability needs;
- Identify existing travel patterns and transportation network deficiencies;
- Identify bicycling, pedestrian, and transit alternatives to prevent automobile travel and congestion; and

• Identify short-term and long-term improvements for roadways and intersection projects.

The Town of Hope Mills has submitted a letter to NCDOT requesting to participate in the installation of sidewalks on both sides of this project.

# c. <u>Known Plans for Development</u>

There are no known plans for development activity in the vicinity of the project.

# 5. Bicycle/ Pedestrian Activity

There are no sidewalks in the Direct Community Impact Area. Worn paths, indicative of pedestrian activity, were observed on some parts of the shoulder during the site visit. According to Hope Mills Middle School, students from the western South Main LLC Subdivision walk along SR 1131 (Cameron Road) to the middle school. There is a school crosswalk on SR 1131 (Cameron Road) near the middle school.

### 6. Community Cohesion

There is a high elderly population occupying homes along SR 1131 (Cameron Road). Some middle school students live in Creekside Apartments and walk to school.

# 7. FEMA Buyout Properties

There are no FEMA Buyout Properties in the vicinity of the project.

# 8. Access

Within the Direct Community Impact Area, SR 1131 (Cameron Road) intersects, from west to east: NC 59 (South Main Street), Stone Street, School Street, SR 1132 (Legion Road), and Meadowood Court. There are homes and businesses on SR 1131 (Cameron Road) with direct driveway access. Among these, the Exxon at the northeast quadrant of the NC 59 (South Main Street) and SR 1131 (Cameron Road) intersection has three driveways, with one connecting to SR 1131 (Cameron Road). The vacant lot across SR 1131 (Cameron Road) was in use as a seasonal produce stand during the site visit and has access to SR 1131 (Cameron Road). The car and bus parking lots at Hope Mills Middle School each have two driveways to SR 1131 (Cameron Road).

### 9. <u>Cemetery</u>

There is a small private cemetery located in the northwest quadrant of the intersection of SR 1132 (Legion Road) and SR 1131 (Cameron Road), across from Hope Mills Middle School. There is a cemetery on the west side of NC 59 (South Main Street), extending from about 200 feet south of Church Street to about 200 feet north of Church Street.

### 10. Other Recreational Resources or Activities

Two ball fields are present on the grounds of Hope Mills Middle School.

# 11. <u>Relocations</u>

Based on the current design, 8 residences and 1 business will be relocated as part of this project. The relocation report for the preferred alternative, as well as more information on NCDOT's Relocation and Displacement Policies can be found in Appendix C.

# 12. Potential Community Impacts

# a. Mobility and Access

This project will restrict left turns along the project corridor. Driveways will have right-in, right-out access only. Motorists on SR 1131 (Cameron Road) will have only right-turn access to side streets, with the exceptions of School Street and Professional Drive, where leftovers will allow for left turns from SR 1131 (Cameron Road). Motorists on side streets will have only right-turn access to SR 1131 (Cameron Road).

The proposed median will provide a refuge for pedestrians attempting to cross SR 1131 (Cameron Road). Bicyclists will be accommodated with wider outside travel lanes.

#### b. **Business Resources**

The addition of turn lanes to NC 59 (South Main Street) at its intersection with SR 1131 (Cameron Road) may require the relocation of the gas pumps at Kangaroo Express and may take a portion of the parking lot at CVS.

Due to the addition of concrete islands to NC 59 (South Main Street) at its intersection with SR 1131 (Cameron Road), drivers on NC 59 (South Main Street) will not be able to turn left into the gas stations or the CVS.

Driveway openings will be maintained for these businesses.

#### c. Title VI and Environmental Justice

Age is a protected class under FHWA's Title VI/Non-discrimination Program, based on the Age Discrimination Act of 1975. Executive Order 12898 requires all federal agencies to "make achieving environmental justice a part of its mission by identifying and addressing, as appropriate, disproportionately high adverse human health or environmental effects of its programs, policies, and activities on minority and lowincome populations."

A number of residents and a business are proposed to be relocated as part of this project, with relocation impacts mitigated by the right of way acquisition process. However, lower income elderly residents living along the north side of SR 1131 (Cameron Road) will remain in place after having a substantial portion of their front yards purchased for right of way. These residents, some of whom are fixed income renters, will be impacted by increased proximity to traffic, potentially having insufficient space to park in their driveways, in most cases having to back out onto a multi-lane road, and being limited to right-in/right-out access to their property after making U turns. Negative impacts are partially offset by installation of sidewalks and crosswalks.

During the June 28, 2011 public meeting elderly residents indicated the proposed widening would have a notable negative effect on their community. These residents opposed the project in its entirety and supported a "no build" approach, so no acceptable mitigation options were suggested by these residents. Mitigation through the ROW process by purchase of the entire parcel would not be of much help to renters, while the resulting undevelopable land fragments not used for ROW are likely to result in negative community impacts themselves.

Public involvement and outreach activities did ensure full and fair participation of all potentially affected communities in the transportation decision-making process. Adverse community impacts are anticipated with this project and these effects appear to affect elderly populations notably more than the general population. Impacts to lower income and minority populations appear to be higher than the general population in the project study area. Benefits and burdens resulting from the project are not anticipated to be equitably distributed throughout the community due to greater effects falling on elderly residents along the north side of SR 1131 (Cameron Road) between Stone Street and River Road; however, the project is not expected to result in a denial of benefit. The proposed project is in compliance with the Title VI and E.O. 12898 based on an active public involvement process, consideration of mitigation, and the participation of lowincome, elderly and minority residents in the project development process.

### 13. Indirect and Cumulative Effects

The project will not notably alter travel patterns, increase exposure of adjacent parcels or create new transportation or land use nodes. Changes in traffic capacity, travel time and access to adjacent parcels do not meet or exceed minimum thresholds required in order to be considered Transportation Impact Causing Activities. Due to its minimal impact causing activities this project will neither influence nearby land uses nor stimulate growth. Therefore, a detailed indirect and cumulative effects study is not necessary.

# 14. Mitigation

NCDOT has coordinated with Cumberland County Schools about potential impacts to school-related traffic at the intersection of SR 1131 (Cameron Road) and School Street and impacts to their bus and carpool traffic. NCDOT has redesigned the parking lots on the school property to better deal with school related traffic flow.

The project will include wider outside lanes to accommodate bicyclists. A sidewalk will be constructed as part of this project.

# F. Flood Hazard Evaluation

Cumberland County is currently participating in the National Flood Insurance Regular Program. Rockfish Creek is located nearby; however, as no major stream crossings are directly involved, this project will not affect any designated flood hazard zones, and the proposed improvements will not have any adverse effect on any existing floodplain areas. NCDOT's Hydraulics Unit will coordinate with the Federal Emergency Management agency and local authorities to ensure compliance with applicable floodplain ordinances.
### G. Traffic Noise Analysis

Traffic noise impacts and temporary construction noise impacts can be a consequence of transportation projects, especially for noise-sensitive land uses in close proximity to high-volume and/or high-speed existing steady-state traffic noise sources. A Traffic Noise Analysis was performed utilizing the FHWA Traffic Noise Model software (TNM 2.5) to predict future noise levels and impacted receptors along the proposed alignments. A copy of the unabridged version of the full technical report entitled Traffic Noise Analysis can be viewed at Century Center- Building A in the Project Development and Environmental Analysis Unit, Raleigh, NC.

### 1. Ambient Noise Levels

Existing traffic noise exposure is relatively unvarying in the vicinity of the proposed SR 1131 (Cameron Road) project. SR 1131(Cameron Road) is the dominant noise source for receptors adjacent and in close proximity to the existing highway facility.

Ambient noise monitoring data was collected at 4 locations in conjunction with this traffic noise analysis. For this traffic noise analysis, loudest-hour traffic estimates, or the ambient noise levels obtained at representative locations in the field.

### 2. Analysis Results

Traffic noise impacts occur when the predicted traffic noise levels either: [a] approach or exceed the FHWA noise abatement criteria (with "approach" meaning within 1 dB(A) of the NAC values or [b] substantially exceed the existing noise levels. FHWA and NCDOT require that feasible and reasonable measures be considered to abate traffic noise at all predicted traffic noise impacts. Measures considered include highway alignment selection, traffic systems management, vegetation, buffer zones, proper use of land controls, noise walls, and earth berms.

Traffic noise is predicted to create differing numbers of impacts in the vicinity of the SR 1131 (Cameron Road) widening project for the presently considered design alternative. All of the predicted impacts are a result of predicted design year 2035 build-condition noise levels that will approach or exceed FHWA noise abatement criteria. The number and types of predicted traffic noise impacts in each segment is shown in Table 8, with impacts delineated as either approaching or exceeding the FHWA NAC, by a substantial increase in Design Year 2035 build-condition traffic noise levels over existing ambient noise levels, or by meeting both criteria.

Alternative Description	Approximate # of Impacted Receptors Approaching or Exceeding FHWA NAC <sup>2</sup>						Substantial Noise Level	Impacts Due to Both	Total Impacts Per 23	
	A	В	С	$\mathbf{D}^{5}$	E	F	G	Increase <sup>3</sup> Criteri	Criteria <sup>4</sup>	772 <sup>5</sup>
Existing	0	21	1	0	0	0	0	N/A	N/A	22
No-Build <sup>1</sup>	0	21	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	22
Build	0	29	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	31

**Table 8: Traffic Noise Impact Summary** 

1. This table presents the number of build-condition traffic noise impacts as predicted for the buildcondition alternative and no-build alternative presently under consideration. Refer to Appendix B for a detailed analysis of traffic noise impacts at each noise sensitive receptor location.

2. Predicted traffic noise level impact due to approaching or exceeding NAC.

3. Predicted "substantial increase" traffic noise level impact.

4. Predicted traffic noise level impact due to exceeding NAC *and* "substantial increase" in build-condition noise levels.

5. The total number of predicted impacts is not duplicated if receptors are predicted to be impacted by more than one criterion.

Predicted build-condition traffic noise level contours can aid in future land use planning efforts in presently undeveloped areas.

TNM did not predict hourly-equivalent traffic noise levels equal to or greater than 71 dB(A) beyond the pavement limits of the build-condition SR 1131 (Cameron Road) roadway. The 66 dB(A) noise level contour is predicted to occur 79 feet from the center of the proposed SR 1131 widening alignment, and 153 feet from the center of the proposed NC 59 alignment.

Per 23 CFR 772.9(c) and NCDOT Policy, noise contour lines shall not be used for determining highway traffic noise impacts. However, the 71 dB(A) and 66 dB(A) noise level contour information should assist local authorities in exercising land use control over the remaining undeveloped lands, so as to avoid development of incompatible activities adjacent to the roadways within local jurisdiction.

### 3. Traffic Noise Abatement Measures

### a. Traffic System Management Measures

Traffic management measures such as prohibition of truck traffic, lowering speed limits, limiting of traffic volumes, and/or limiting time of operation were considered as possible traffic noise impact abatement measures. The purpose of the SR 1131 widening project (TIP U-4706) is to increase the functional capacity of the highway facility. Prohibition of truck traffic, reduction of the speed limit below the existing and proposed 35 miles per hour, or screening total traffic volumes would diminish the functional capacity of the highway facility and are not considered practicable.

### b. Buffer Zones

Buffer zones are typically not practical and/or cost effective for noise mitigation due to the substantial amount of right-of-way required, and would not be a feasible noise mitigation measure for this project. Furthermore, if the acquisition of a suitable buffer zone had been feasible, the associated costs would exceed the NCDOT Policy reasonable abatement cost threshold per benefited receptor.

### c. Noise Barriers

Passive noise abatement measures are effective because they absorb sound energy, extend the source-to-receptor sound transmission path, or both. Sound absorption is a function of abatement medium (e.g. earth berms absorb more sound energy than noise walls of the same height because earth berms are significantly more massive). The source-to-receptor path is extended by placement of an obstacle, such as a wall, that sufficiently blocks the transmission of sound waves that travel from the source to the receptor. Highway sound barriers are primarily constructed as earth berms or solid-mass walls adjacent to limited-access freeways that are in close proximity to noise-sensitive land use(s). To be effective, a sound barrier must be long enough and tall enough to shield the impacted receptor(s). Generally, the noise wall length must be eight times the distance from the barrier to the receptor. For example, if a receptor is 200 feet from the roadway, an effective barrier would be approximately 1,600 feet long – with the receptor in the horizontal center. On roadway facilities with direct access for driveways, sound barriers are typically not feasible because the openings render the barrier ineffective in impeding the transmission of traffic noise. Due to the requisite lengths for effectiveness, sound barriers are typically not economical for isolated or most low-density areas. However, sound barriers may be economical for the benefit of as few as one predicted traffic noise impact if the barrier can benefit enough total receptors – impacted and nonimpacted combined – to meet applicable reasonableness criteria.

Access to SR 1131 will be uncontrolled to allow for driveway openings and atgrade intersections. The driveway openings and at-grade intersections would prevent any noise barriers from providing a 5-decibel noise level reduction at any impacted receptors in the vicinity of the SR 1131 widening project. Therefore, noise barriers will not meet the applicable feasibility or reasonableness criteria.

### 4. Construction Noise

The predominant construction activities associated with this project are expected to be earth removal, hauling, grading, and paving. Temporary and localized construction noise impacts may occur as a result of these activities. During daytime hours, the predicted effects of these impacts will be temporary speech interference for passers-by and individuals living, working, or attending school near the project. During evening and nighttime hours, steady-state construction noise emissions such as from paving operations will be audible, and may cause impacts to activities such as sleep. Sporadic evening and nighttime construction equipment noise emissions such as from backup alarms, lift gate closures ("slamming" of dump truck gates), etc., will be perceived as distinctly louder than the steady state acoustic environment, and will likely cause severe impacts to the general peace and usage of noise-sensitive areas – particularly residences, hospitals, and hotels.

### 5. <u>Summary</u>

Existing traffic noise impacts 22 receptors in the vicinity of the proposed SR 1131 (Cameron Road) widening . For design year 2035 traffic volumes, the no-build condition is predicted to impact 22 receptors; the build-condition is predicted to impact 31 receptors.

Consideration for noise abatement measures was given to all impacted receptors. This analysis completes the traffic noise requirements of the Title 23 CFR Part 772 and NCDOT Traffic Noise Abatement Policy. Unless modifications in the project alignment or traffic volumes occur, additional traffic noise analysis is not warranted for the project.

### H. Air Quality Analysis

Air pollution originates from various sources. Emissions from industry and internal combustion engines are the most prevalent sources. The impact resulting from highway construction ranges from intensifying existing air pollution problems to improving the ambient air quality. Changing traffic patterns are a primary concern when determining the impact of a new highway facility or the improvement of an existing highway facility. Motor vehicles emit carbon monoxide (CO), nitrogen oxide (NO), hydrocarbons (HC), particulate matter, sulfur dioxide (SO<sub>2</sub>), and lead (Pb) (listed in order of decreasing emission rate).

### 1. <u>Background CO Concentrations</u>

Automobiles are considered the major source of CO in the project area. In order to determine the ambient CO concentration at a receptor near a highway, two concentration components must be used: local and background. The local concentration is defined as the CO emissions from cars operating on highways in the near vicinity (i.e., distance within 400 feet) of the receptor location. The background concentration is defined by the North Carolina Department of Environment, Health and Natural Resources as "the concentration of a pollutant at a point that is the result of emissions outside the local vicinity; that is, the concentration at the upwind edge of the local sources." A microscale air quality analysis is performed to determine future CO concentrations resulting from the proposed highway improvements. "CAL3QHC – A Modeling Methodology for Predicting Pollutant Concentrations near Roadway Intersections" is used to predict the CO concentration near sensitive receptors. In accordance with 40 CFR 93.126, this project is an air quality neutral project. It is not required to be included in the regional emissions analysis (if applicable) and a project level CO analysis is not required.

The project is located in Cumberland County, which has been determined to comply with the National Ambient Air Quality Standards. The proposed project is located in an attainment area; therefore, 40 CFR Parts 51 and 93 are not applicable. This project is not anticipated to create any adverse effects on the air quality of this attainment area.

### 2. Mobile Source Air Toxics (MSATs)

### a. Analysis of MSAT in NEPA Documents

The FHWA developed a tiered approach for analyzing MSAT in NEPA documents, depending on specific project circumstances. The FHWA has identified three levels of analysis:

1. No analysis for projects with no potential for meaningful MSAT effects;

2. Qualitative analysis for projects with low potential MSAT effects; or

3. Quantitative analysis to differentiate alternatives for projects with higher potential MSAT effects.

For projects warranting MSAT analysis, the seven priority MSAT should be analyzed. This project is included in level 2 above.

### b. **Qualitative MSAT Analysis**

For both Build and No Build alternatives in this air quality analysis, the amount of MSAT emitted would be proportional to the vehicle miles traveled, or VMT, assuming that other variables such as fleet mix are the same for each alternative. Regardless of the alternative chosen, emissions will likely be lower than present levels in the design year as

a result of EPA's national control programs that are projected to reduce annual MSAT emissions by 72 percent from 1999 to 2050. Local conditions may differ from these national projections in terms of fleet mix and turnover, VMT growth rates, and local control measures. However, the magnitude of the EPA-projected reductions is so great (even after accounting for VMT growth) that MSAT emissions in the study area are likely to be lower in the future in virtually all locations. Consequently higher levels of MSAT are not expected from the Build Alternative compared to the No Build. The additional travel lanes contemplated as part the project Build alternative will have the effect of moving some traffic closer to nearby homes, schools and businesses; therefore, there may be localized areas where ambient concentrations of MSAT could be higher under the Build Alternative than the No Build Alternative. The localized increases in MSAT concentrations would likely be most pronounced where any additional lanes are built along the proposed widening of SR 1131 Cameron Road. However, the magnitude and the duration of these potential increases compared to the No-Build alternative cannot be reliably quantified due to incomplete or unavailable information in forecasting projectspecific MSAT health impacts. In sum, when a highway is widened, the localized level of MSAT emissions for the Build Alternative could be higher relative to the No Build Alternative, but this could be offset due to increases in speeds and reductions in congestion (which are associated with lower MSAT emissions). Also, MSAT will be lower in other locations when traffic shifts away from them. However, on a regional basis, EPA's vehicle and fuel regulations, coupled with fleet turnover, will over time cause substantial reductions that, in almost all cases, will cause region-wide MSAT levels to be significantly lower than today.

### c. MSAT Conclusion

What we know about mobile source air toxics is still evolving. As the science progresses FHWA will continue to revise and update this guidance. To that end we expect that a number of significant improvements in model forecasting and air pollution analysis guidance with the MOVES model and the issuance of the PM 2.5 Hot Spot Modeling Guidance released by EPA.

### I. Hazardous Material

Four possible Underground Storage Tanks (UST) facilities were identified within the proposed project corridor. The sites are described in Table 9. Low to non-existent monetary and scheduling impacts resulting from these sites is anticipated.

No Hazardous Waste Sites were identified within the project limits. No apparent landfills were identified within the project limits.

Property Location	Property Owner	UST Owner	Facility ID #	
4000 South Main Street Hope Mills, NC 28348	The Pantry Inc.	The Pantry Inc.	00-0- 0000012289	
This facility currently operates as a convenience store and gas station. It is located in the southeast quadrant of the intersection of S. Main and Cameron Road. According to the NCDENR's UST Section registry there are three tanks currently in use. Groundwater incident #'s 17525 and 29030 are associated with this facility. <b>This site will present low</b> geoenvironmental impact to the project.				
<b>Property Location</b>	<b>Property Owner</b>	UST Owner	Facility ID #	
3979 South Main Street Hope Mills, NC 28348	Gregory S. High	Li'L Thrift Food Marts, Inc.	00-0- 0000024573	
This facility currently operates as a convenience store and gas station. It is located in the northeast quadrant of the intersection of S. Main and Cameron Road. According to the NCDENR's UST Section registry four (4) tanks were removed in 2012 and there are three tanks currently in use. Groundwater incident # 29745 is associated with this facility. <b>This site will present low geoenvironmental impact to the project</b>				
Property Location	<b>Property Owner</b>	UST Owner	Facility ID #	
5091 Cameron Road Hope Mills, NC 28348	Lillie M. Pate	Unknown	Unknown	
This site is currently used as a residential property. It is located on the southeast quadrant of the intersection of Cameron Road and Stone Street. The site may have been an old gas station at one time. The facility dos not appear on the UST Section Registry and there are no groundwater incidents associated with this property. <b>This site will present low geoenvironmental impacts to the project.</b>				
<b>Property Location</b>	<b>Property Owner</b>	UST Owner	Facility ID #	
4975 Cameron RoadCumberland CountyCumberland00-0-Hope Mills, NC 28348Board of EducationCounty Schools0000027625This site is currently Hope Mills Middle School. The site is located in the southeast quadrant of Cameron Road. According to NCDENR's UST Section Registry there are three (3) tanks				
currently in use. There is no known Facility IDs or Groundwater Incidents associated with this property. <b>This site will present low geoenvironmental impacts to the project.</b>				

 Table 9: Known and Potential GeoEnvironmental Impact Sites

### VI. COMMENTS AND COORDINATION

### A. <u>Citizens Informational Workshop</u>

A Citizens Informational Workshop was held June 28, 2011 at the Hope Mills Community Center. Over 30 people attended the workshop, including NCDOT representatives and Hope Mills officials. Several verbal comments were received at this workshop, the majority of which were based on access to businesses or residences along SR 1131 (Cameron Road) and the need for the road to be widened. One petition opposing widening of this roadway was given to NCDOT. Four written comments were received after the workshop. One of this comments requested roundabouts at both NC 59 and SR 1132 (Legion Road).

### B. Public Hearing

On March 25, 2013, an Informal Design Public Meeting was held at the Hope Mills Community Center. At this meeting, NCDOT representatives presented the current proposed design. Approximately 35 people attended the meeting, including NCDOT staff.

Several verbal comments were received at this meeting, the majority of which were similar to the workshop comments.

Four written comments were received after this meeting. The comments expressed concerns in the following areas:

- Closing Honeycutt Street and extending Gales Street NCDOT felt this was outside the scoping of the current project.
- The current traffic on NC 59 is the problem, not SR 1131 (Cameron Road) NC 59 widening is not proposed as part of this project.
- Questioning how a "superhighway" would be safer for children NCDOT is coordinating with the school system to provide crosswalks where needed and provide a refuge for pedestrians on the raised median.
- Request to reduce impacts to residences NCDOT is adjusting the design where possible to reduce impacts to adjacent properties.

### C. <u>NEPA/404 Merger Process</u>

The Merger Process is a process to streamline the project development and permitting processes, agreed to by the USACE, NCDENR-DWQ, FHWA, and NCDOT and supported by other stakeholder agencies and local units of government. To this effect, the Merger Process provides a forum for appropriate agency representatives to discuss and reach consensus on ways to facilitate meeting the regulatory requirements of Section 404 of the Clean Water Act during the NEPA/SEPA decision-making phase of transportation projects. Due to its limited scope and lack of substantial environmental consequences this project does not meet the criteria for the NEPA/404 Merger Process.

### D. Other Agency Coordination

Federal, state, and local agencies were consulted during the preparation of this Categorical Exclusion. Written comments were received and considered from agencies noted with an asterisk (\*) during the preparation of this assessment.

*	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
	National Marine Fisheries Service
	NC Wildlife Resources Commission
	NC Division of Coastal Management
	NC Division of Parks and Recreation
	NC Division of Marine Fisheries
*	N.C. Department of Administration

- \* N.C. Department of Cultural Resources
- \* N.C. Department of Environment and Natural Resources N.C. Department of Public Instruction
- \* N.C. Division of Water Quality
- \* N.C. Office of Conservation, Natural Heritage Program Mid Carolina Council of Governments Cumberland County Board of Commissioners
  - Cumberland County Board of Commissioners
- \* Town of Hope Mills
  - Mayor of Hope Mills

These comments and related issues, included in Appendix B, have been addressed in this document.

### VII. CONCLUSION

On the basis of the above discussion, it is concluded that no substantial adverse environmental impacts will result from the implementation of the project. The project is therefore considered to be a Federal Categorical Exclusion due to its limited scope and lack of substantial environmental consequences.

# APPENDIX A FIGURES





G







10

-

# APPENDIX B LETTERS FROM FEDERAL, STATE AND LOCAL AGENCIES



DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY WILMINGTON DISTRICT, CORPS OF ENGINEERS 69 DARLINGTON AVENUE WILMINGTON, NORTH CAROLINA 28403-1343

13 January 2011

**Regulatory Division** 

Action ID. No. SAW-2011-00011; U-4706, Cumberland County

Dr. Gregory J. Thorpe, Ph.D. Environmental Management Director North Carolina Department of Transportation Project Development & Environmental Analysis 1598 Mail Service Center Raleigh, N.C. 27699-1598

Dear Dr. Thorpe:

Reference is made to your letter of December 20, 2010, regarding the proposed widening of SR 1131 (Cameron Road) from SR 1132 (Legion Road) to NC 59 (Hope Mills Road) in Hope Mills, Cumberland County, North Carolina. The letter requested an evaluation of potential environmental impacts including recommendations of alternatives to be studied.

We have reviewed the subject documents and determined that, based upon a review of the information provided and available maps, the construction of this project may impact streams and/or wetlands within the work corridor. Please be aware that impacts associated with the discharge of fill into jurisdictional waters of the United States are subject to our regulatory authority pursuant to Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. Any discharge of excavated or fill material into waters of the United States and/or any adjacent wetlands would require Department of the Army (DA) permit authorization. The type of DA authorization required (i.e., general or individual permit) will be determined by the location, type, and extent of jurisdictional area impacted by the project, and by the project design and construction limits.

Until additional data is furnished which details the extent of the construction limits of the proposed project, and an onsite inspection is completed with regard to determinations of the presence of jurisdictional waters in the project area, we are unable to verify that the project will not have jurisdictional impacts, or to provide specific comments concerning DA permit requirements or a recommendation of alternatives. To assist you with determining permitting requirements, we recommend that you perform a detailed delineation of the streams and/or wetlands present on the project site. When this information becomes available, it should be forwarded to our office for review and comment, as well as a determination of DA permit eligibility.

Should you have any further questions related to DA permits for this project, please contact me at (910) 251-4829.

Sincerely,

Ronnie Smith NCDOT, Project Manager Wilmington Regulatory Field Office

Copies Furnished:

Ms. Kristine A. O'Connor, PE North Carolina Department of Transportation Project Development & Environmental Analysis 1598 Mail Service Center Raleigh, N.C. 27699-1598

Mr. Mason Herndon NCDENR-DWQ 225 Green Street, Suite 214 Fayetteville, North Carolina 28301-5094

Mr. Jim Rerko Division Environmental Officer, Division 6 North Carolina Department of Transportation Post Office Box 1150 Fayetteville, North Carolina 28302

Mr. Chris Militcher United States Environmental Protection Agency c/o Federal Highway Administration 310 New Bern Avenue, Room 206 Raleigh, North Carolina 27601



### North Carolina Department of Administration

Beverly Eaves Perdue, Governor

Moses Carey, Jr., Secretary

February 7, 2011

Mr. Gregory J. Thorpe NC Department of Transportation Project Development and Environmental An 1548 Mail Service Center Raleigh, NC 27699-1548

Dear Mr. Thorpe:

### Re: SCH File # 11-E-4220-0162; SCOPING; Widening of SR 1131 (Cameron Road) from SR 1132 (Legion Road) to NC 59 (Main Street). TIP No. U-4706

The above referenced environmental impact information has been submitted to the State Clearinghouse under the provisions of the National Environmental Policy Act. According to G.S. 113A-10, when a state agency is required to prepare an environmental document under the provisions of federal law, the environmental document meets the provisions of the State Environmental Policy Act. Attached to this letter for your consideration are the comments made by agencies in the course of this review.

If any further environmental review documents are prepared for this project, they should be forwarded to this office for intergovernmental review.

Should you have any questions, please do not hesitate to call.

Sincerely,

Sheila Green State Environmental Review Clearinghouse

Attachments

cc: Region M

Mailing Address: 1301 Mail Service Center Raleigh, NC 27699-1301 Telephone: (919)807-2425 Fax (919)733-9571 State Courier #51-01-00 e-mail state.clearinghouse@doa.nc.gov Location Address: 116 West Jones Street Raleigh, North Carolina

An Equal Opportunity/Affirmative Action Employer



### North Carolina Department of Environment and Natural Resources

Beverly Eaves Perdue Governor Dee Freeman Secretary

MEMORANDUM

то:	Sheila Green State Clearinghouse
FROM:	Melba McGee // Environmental Review Coordinator
RE:	11-0162 Proposed Improvements to SR 1131 (Cameron Road) to NC 59 (Main Streat) in Hope Mills, Cumberland County
DATE:	February 2, 2011

The Department of Environment and Natural Resources has reviewed the proposed information. The attached comments are for the applicant's information.

Thank you for the opportunity to review.

Attachments

1601 Mail Service Center, Raleigh. North Carolina 27699-1601 Phone: 919-733-4984 \ FAX: 919-715-3060 Internet: www.enr.state.nc.us An Equal Opportunity \ Afirmative Action Employer - 50% Recycled \ 10% Post Consumer Paper



### North Carolina Department of Environment and Natural Resources Division of Water Quality Coleen H. Sutlins Director

Dee Freeman Secretary

Bavarly Eaves Perdue Governor

January 24, 2011

#### MEMORANDUM

To: Gregory J Thorpe, Ph.D., NCDOT

From: Belinda Henson, NC Division of Water Quality, Fayetteville Regional Office

Subject: Scoping comments on proposed improvements to SR 1131 (Cameron Rd) from SR 1132 (Legion Rd) to NC 59 (Main Street), Hope Mills in Cumberland County, Federal Aid Project No. STP-1131(11), WBS No.39070.1.1, TIP U-4706.

Reference your correspondence dated December 20, 2010 in which you requested comments for the referenced project. Preliminary analysis of the project reveals the potential impacts to streams and jurisdictional wetlands in the project area. More specifically, impacts to:

Stream Name	River Basin	Stream Classification(s)	Stream Index Number	303(d) Listing
Little Rockfish Ck	Cape Fear	С	18-31-24-(7)	N/A

Further investigations at a higher resolution should be undertaken to verify the presence of other streams and/or jurisdictional wetlands in the area. In the event that any jurisdictional areas are identified, the Division of Water Quality requests that NCDOT consider the following environmental issues for the proposed project:

#### **General Project Comments:**

- The environmental document shall provide a detailed and itemized presentation of the proposed impacts to wetlands and streams with corresponding mapping. If mitigation is necessary as required by 15A NCAC 2H.0506(h), it is preferable to present a conceptual (if not finalized) mitigation plan with the environmental documentation. Appropriate mitigation plans will be required prior to issuance of a 401 Water Quality Certification.
- 2. Environmental assessment alternatives shall consider design criteria that reduce the impacts to streams and wetlands from storm water runoff. These alternatives shall include road designs that allow for treatment of the storm water runoff through best management practices as detailed in the most recent version of NCDWQ Stormwater Best Management Practices, such as grassed swales, buffer areas, preformed scour holes, retention basins, etc.
- After the selection of the preferred alternative and prior to an issuance of the 401 Water Quality Certification, NCDOT is respectfully reminded that they will need to demonstrate the avoidance and minimization of impacts to wetlands (and streams) to the maximum extent practical. In accordance

225 Green St., Suite 714, Parenawire, NC 28301-5043 Phone 910-433-3310 ( FAX: 910-468-0707 Internet www.ncwaterguality.org

NorthCarolina Naturally

An Equal Opportunity's Allknullive Action Employer – 60% Recyclice 110% Post Consumer Paper

with the Environmental Management Commission's Rules {15A NCAC 2H.0506(h)}, mitigation will be required for impacts of greater than 1 acre to wetlands. In the event that mitigation is required, the mitigation plan shall be designed to replace appropriate lost functions and values. The NC Ecosystem Enhancement Program may be available for use as wetland mitigation.

- 4. In accordance with the Environmental Management Commission's Rules {15A NCAC 2H.0506(h)}, mitigation will be required for impacts of greater than 150 linear feet to any single stream. In the event that mitigation is required, the mitigation plan shall be designed to replace appropriate lost functions and values. The NC Ecosystem Enhancement Program may be available for use as stream mitigation.
- 5. NCDWQ is very concerned with sediment and erosion impacts that could result from this project. NCDOT shall address these concerns by describing the potential impacts that may occur to the aquatic environments and any mitigating factors that would reduce the impacts.
- 6. If a bridge is being replaced with a hydraulic conveyance other than another bridge, NCDWQ believes the use of a Nationwide Permit may be required. Please contact the US Army Corp of Engineers to determine the required permit(s).
- If the old bridge is removed, no discharge of bridge material into surface waters is allowed unless
  otherwise authorized by the US ACOE. Strict adherence to the Corps of Engineers guidelines for
  bridge demolition will be a condition of the 401 Water Quality Certification.
- 8. Whenever possible, NCDWQ prefers spanning structures. Spanning structures usually do not require work within the stream or grubbing of the streambanks and do not require stream channel realignment. The horizontal and vertical clearances provided by bridges shall allow for human and wildlife passage beneath the structure. Fish passage and navigation by canoeists and boaters shall not be blocked. Bridge supports (bents) shall not be placed in the stream when possible.
- Bridge deck drains shall not discharge directly into the stream. Stormwater shall be directed across
  the bridge and pre-treated through site-appropriate means (grassed swales, pre-formed scour holes,
  vegetated buffers, etc.) before entering the stream. Please refer to the most current version of
  NCDWQ's Stormwater Best Management Practices.
- 10. If concrete is used during construction, a dry work area shall be maintained to prevent direct contact between curing concrete and stream water. Water that inadvertently contacts uncured concrete shall not be discharged to surface waters due to the potential for elevated pH and possible aquatic life and fish kills.
- 11. If temporary access roads or detours are constructed, the site shall be graded to its preconstruction contours and elevations. Disturbed areas shall be seeded or mulched to stabilize the soil and appropriate native woody species should be planted. When using temporary structures the area shall be cleared but not grubbed. Clearing the area with chain saws, mowers, bush-hogs, or other mechanized equipment and leaving the stumps and root mat intact allows the area to re-vegetate naturally and minimizes soil disturbance.
- 12. Placement of culverts and other structures in waters, streams, and wetlands shall be below the elevation of the streambed by one foot for all culverts with a diameter greater than 48 inches, and 20 percent of the culvert diameter for culverts having a diameter less than 48 inches, to allow low flow passage of water and aquatic life. Design and placement of culverts and other structures including temporary erosion control measures shall not be conducted in a manner that may result in dis-

equilibrium of wetlands or streambeds or banks, adjacent to or upstream and down stream of the above structures. The applicant is required to provide evidence that the equilibrium is being maintained if requested in writing by NCDWQ. If this condition is unable to be met due to bedrock or other limiting features encountered during construction, please contact NCDWQ for guidance on how to proceed and to determine whether or not a permit modification will be required.

- 13. If multiple pipes or barrels are required, they shall be designed to mimic natural stream cross section as closely as possible including pipes or barrels at flood plain elevation, floodplain benches, and/or sills may be required where appropriate. Widening the stream channel shall be avoided. Stream channel widening at the inlet or outlet end of structures typically decreases water velocity causing sediment deposition that requires increased maintenance and disrupts aquatic life passage.
- 14. If foundation test borings are necessary; it should be noted in the document. Geotechnical work is approved under General 401 Certification Number 3624/Nationwide Permit No. 6 for Survey Activities.
- 15. Sediment and erosion control measures sufficient to protect water resources must be implemented and maintained in accordance with the most recent version of North Carolina Sediment and Erosion Control Planning and Design Manual and the most recent version of NCS000250.
- 16. All work in or adjacent to stream waters shall be conducted in a dry work area unless otherwise approved by NCDWQ. Approved BMP measures from the most current version of NCDOT Construction and Maintenance Activities manual such as sandbags, rock berms, cofferdams and other diversion structures should be used to prevent excavation in flowing water.

17. Sediment and erosion control measures shall not be placed in wetlands and streams.

- 18. Borrow/waste areas shall avoid wetlands to the maximum extent practical. Impacts to wetlands in borrow/waste areas could precipitate compensatory mitigation.
- 19. While the use of National Wetland Inventory (NWI) maps, NC Coastal Region Evaluation of Wetland Significance (NC-CREWS) maps and soil survey maps are useful tools, their inherent inaccuracies require that qualified personnel perform onsite wetland delineations prior to permit approval.
- 20. Heavy equipment shall be operated from the bank rather than in stream channels in order to minimize sedimentation and reduce the likelihood of introducing other pollutants into streams. This equipment shall be inspected daily and maintained to prevent contamination of surface waters from leaking fuels. lubricants, hydraulic fluids, or other toxic materials.
- 21. In most cases, NCDWQ prefers the replacement of the existing structure at the same location with road closure. If road closure is not feasible, a temporary detour should be designed and located to avoid wetland impacts, minimize the need for clearing and to avoid destabilizing stream banks. If the structure will be on a new alignment, the old structure shall be removed and the approach fills removed from the 100-year floodplain. Approach fills should be removed and restored to the natural ground elevation. The area shall be stabilized with grass and planted with native tree species. Tall fescue shall not be used in riparian areas.
- 22. Riprap shall not be placed in the active thalweg channel or placed in the streambed in a manner that precludes aquatic life passage. Bioengineering boulders or structures should be properly designed, sized and installed.

Thank you for requesting our input at this time. NCDOT is reminded that issuance of a 401 Water Quality Certification requires that appropriate measures be instituted to ensure that water quality standards are met and designated uses are not degraded or lost. If you have any questions or require additional information, please contact Mason Herndon at (910) 308-4021.

 cc: Ronnie Smith, US Army Corps of Engineers, Wilmington Field Office Clarence Coleman, Federal Highway Administration Greg Burns, PE. Division 6 Engineer Jim Rerko, Division 6 Environmental Officer Chris Millischer, Environmental Protection Agency (electronic copy only) Travis Wilson, NC Wildlife Resources Commission William D Gilmore, PE. Ecosystem Enhancement Program Sonia Carrillo, NCDWQ Central Regional Office File Copy



### North Carolina Department of Environment and Natural Resources Office of Conservation, Planning, & Community Affairs

**Beverly Eaves Perdue, Governor** 

Linda Pearsall, Director

Dee Freeman, Secretary

January 5, 2011

#### MEMORANDUM

TO:	Gregory Thorpe, NC DOT Project Development and Environmental Analysis Branch
FROM:	Harry LeGrand, Natural Heritage Program
SUBJECT:	Proposed Widening of SR 1131 (Cameron Road) from SR 1132 (Legion Road) to NC 59 (Main Street); Hope Mills, Cumberland County

REFERENCE: WBS #39070.1.1, TIP Project # U-4706

The Natural Heritage Program has several records of rare species, significant natural communities, significant natural heritage areas, and conservation/managed areas within a mile of the project area; however, none are located within 0.3-mile of the project area. Because the project lies in an already heavily developed area, we anticipate no impacts to significant natural resources.

Please do not hesitate to contact me at 919-715-8697 if you have questions or need further information.

1601 Mail Service Center, Raleigh, North Carolina 27699-1601 Phone: 919-715-4195 \ FAX: 919-715-3060 Internet: www.oneNCNaturally.org



An Equal Opportunity \ Affirmative Action Employer - 50% Recycled \ 10% Post Consumer Paper

#### State of North Carolina

Department of Environment and Natural Resources • 1

Reviewing Office: Fagetle Allo Legional Office

INTERGOVERNMENTAL REVIEW - PROJECT COMMENTS Project Number: 11-0162 Due Date: 1-28-11 After review of this project it has been determined that the ENR permit(s) and/or approvals indicated may need to be obtained in order for this project to comply with North Carolina Law, Questions regarding these permits should be addressed to the Reviewal Office Indicated and the endance of the determined to comply with North Carolina Law. Questions regarding these parmits should be addressed to the Regional Office Indicated on the reverse of the form. All applications, information and guidelines selative to these plans and permits are available from the same Regional Office.

and a second sec	PERMITS	SPECIAL APPLICATION PROCEDURES or REQUIREMENTS	Normal Process Tin (statutory time limi
	Permit to construct & operate wastevator treatment facilities, sower system extensions & sower systems not discharging into state surface waters.	Application 90 days before begin construction or award of construction contracts. On-site inspection, Post-application technical conference usual.	30 days (90 days)
$\Box$	NPD ES - permit to discharge into surface water and/or permit to operate and construct wastewater facilities discharging into state surface waters.	Application 180 days before begin activity. On-site inspection. Pie-epplication conference usual. Additionally, obtain germit to construct watewater treatment facility-graded after NPDES. Reply time, 30 days after receipt of plans or issue of NPDES permit-whichever is later.	90-120 days (H/A)
0	Water Use Pamil	Pre-application (echnical conference usually necessary	30 dəsə (N/A)
	Well Construction Permit	Complete application must be received and permit issued prior to the instellation of a welt.	? days (15 days)
1	Diedgeand Fill Permit	Application copy must be served on each adjacent riparian property owner. On-site inspection: Pre-application conference usual. Filling may require Resement to Fill from N.C. Department of Administration and Federal Dredge and Fill Permit	55 days (90 days)
5	Permit in construct & operate Air Pollution Abstement facilities nador Emission Sources as per 13 A NCAC (20,0100 thre 20,0300)	Application must be submitted and permit received prior to construction and operation of the source. If a permit is required in an area without local zoning, then there are additional requirements and timelines (20.0113).	90 days
	Permit to construct & operate Transportation Facility as yes 154 NCAC (20.0800, 2() 0601)	Application must be submitted on least 90 days prior to construction or modification of the source.	90 days
	Any open burning associated with subject proposal nust be in compliance with 15 A NCAC 2D, 1900		
1 & A & A	Demolition or renovations of structures containing stock to material must be in compliance with 15 A (CA C 20, 110 (a) (1) which requires notification and ento val prior to descolition. Contact Asbestos Control roup 919-707-5950.	N/A	60 days (90 days)
C	iomyster Source Permit required under 15 A NCAC D 0800		w <del>Kanada ang kanada ang kanada</del>
TT Se Se	he Sedimentation Pollution Control Act of 1973 must be p dimentation control plac will be required if one or more w rotion) At least 30 days before beginning activity. A fee of withble with additional fees.	roperly addressed for any land disturbing activity. An erosion & cres to be disturbed. Plan filed with proper Regional Office (Land Quality \$65 for the first some or any part of an acre. An express review option is	20 days (30 days)
Ke	dimentation and crosion control must be addressed in according to a second in the seco	ordance with NCDOT's approved program. Particular attention should be given to pping devices as well as stable storenwater conveyances and outlets.	(30 days)
Mi	On-site inspection usual, Sweety bond filed with BNR Bond amount varies with type mine and number of dores of affected land. Any are oblied greater than one acce must be permitted. The appropriate bond must be received before the permit can be insued.		30 days (60 days)
Na	rth Carolina Burning parmit	On-site inspection by N.C. Division Forest Resources if permit exceeds 4 days.	l day (N/A)
Spe	icialGround Clearance Berning Permit - 22 atics in cosstal N.C. with organic soils	On site inspection by N.C. Division Forest Resources required "If more than five acres of ground clearing activities are involved. Inspections should be requested at least ten days before actual burn is planned."	1 day (N/A)
)i] J	Refining Facilities	· N/A	90-120 days (N/A)
) and	n Saisty Pernuit	If permit required, application 60 days before begin construction. Applicant must hire N.C. qualified engineer to: prepare plans, inspect construction, certify construction is according to ENR approved plans. Nay alte require permit under mosquito control program. And a 604 permit from Corps of Engineers. An inspection of site is necessary to veilty Hazard Classification. A minimum fee of \$200.00 must accompany the application. An additional minimum fee of \$200.00 must accompany the application. An additional	30 days (60 days)

	PENAUTS	SUBCIAL AUDI ICLATION BROCEDURE - BEDI BESLESITE	(elotutory time limi
<u> </u>	Permit to drill exploratory all or gas well	File surely bond of \$5,000 with ENR maning to State of NC conditional dat any well opened by drill operator shall, upon shandonment, be plogged according to liNR rules and regulations.	10 days NA
D	Geophysical Exploration Permit	Application filed with ENR at least 10 days prior to issue of permit. Application by letter. No standard application form.	10 days N/A
	State Lakes Construction Permit	Application fees based on structure size is charged. Must include descriptions & drawings of structure & proof of ownership of riparian property.	15-20 days NA
V	401 Water Quality Cartification	N/A	60 days (130 days)
2	CAMA Permit for MAJOR development	\$250.00 fee must accompany application	55 days (150 days)
5	CAMA Permit for MINOR development	\$50.00 fee must accompany application	22 days (25 days)
	Several geodetic monuments we located in or new the	e project area. If any monument needs to be moved or destroyed, please notify. N.C. Geodetic Survey, Box 27687 Raleigh, NC 27611	Anna an
31	thundonment of any wells, if required must be in acco	ordunce with Tille ISA. Subchapter 20.0100.	-
3 1	latification of the proper regional office is requested i	if "urphan" underground storage tanks (USTS) are discovered during any exervation operation.	
Compliance with ISA NCAC 211 2000 (Coastal Stormwater Rules) is required.			43 diye (54/A)
1 7	r Parelico or Neuse Riparian Buffer Rules required.		
Q1	late comments (ettack authinink) pages as notoskiry,	octag eermin to mit commen annonky)	

### REGIONAL OFFICES

Questions regarding these permits should be addressed to the Regional Office marked below.

- Asheville Regional Office 2090 US Highway 70 Swannanoa, NC 28778 (828) 296-4500
- Fayetteville Regional Office
   225 North Green Street, Suite 714
   Fayetteville, NC 28301-5043
   (910) 433-3300
- Mooresville Regional Office
   610 Bast Center Avenue, Suite 301
   Mooresville, NC 28115
   (704) 663-1699
- Raleigh Regional Office
   3800 Barrett Drive, Suite 101
   Raleigh, NC 27609
   (919) 791-4200
- Washington Regional Office 943 Washington Square Mall Washington, NC 27889 (252) 946-6481
- Wilmington Regional Office 127 Cardinal Drive Extension Wilmington, NC 28405 (910) 796-7215
- Winston-Salem Regional Office 585 Waughtown Street Winston-Salem, NC 27107 (336) 771-5000

RECHIVED			
NATURAL RESOUR	NMENT ANI	0	Project Number 11-0162
DIVISION OF ENVIRONMEN	TAL HEALT	H	County Cumberland
Inter-Agency Project Re	eview Response	e	
FATET Project Name (ONAL OFFICE (FAMPO)	Type of Project	Scoping - (Cameron (Legion R	Widening of SR 1131 Rd) from SR 1132 d) to NC 59 (Main St):
Comments provided by:		widen to r	nulti-lanes
Regional Program Person			
Regional Supervisor for Public Water Supply	Section		
Central Office program person Alinston Cole- Name Debra Benoy-Fayetteville RO	[] Date	118/20	11
Telephone number: 910 433 426	8		
Program within Division of Environmental Health:			
Public Water Supply			
Other, Name of Program:			
Response (check all applicable):			
No objection to project as proposed			
No comment			
Insufficient information to complete review			
Comments attached			
See comments below		na manga ng kanangang ng kang n	
All construction projects must-submit plans and public Water supply second and obtain approval before begin. Once the project is con water system can be pl applicant again must-obtain	with W Speci- tion (Pb re Const npleted laced in in a fine	ater s lication (15) for ruition be for to se la ypo	ystems 3 to r review n work Can re the rvice, the vuice, the
Return to: Public Water Supply Section Environment	tal Review Coordin	ator for the	

ply Section Environmental Review Division of Environmental Health

105 0 2 MAL

### DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENT AND NATURAL RESOURCES DIVISION OF ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH

Project Number	
11-0162	
County	
Cumberland	

Inter-Agency Project Review Response

Project Name

<u>Fayetteville Area MPO</u> (FAMPO)

Project	(Cameron Rd) from SR 1132 (Legion
	Rd) to NC 59 (Main St); widen to

The applicant should be advised that plans and specifications for all water system improvements must be approved by the Division of Environmental Health prior to the award of a contract or the initiation of construction (as required by 15A NCAC 18C .0300et seq.). For information, contact the Public Water Supply Section, (919) 733-2321.

This project will be classified as a non-community public water supply and must comply with state and federal drinking water monitoring requirements. For more information the applicant should contact the Public Water Supply Section, (919) 733-2321.

If this project is constructed as proposed, we will recommend closure of \_\_\_\_\_\_\_feet of adjacent waters to the harvest of shellfish. For information regarding the shellfish sanitation program, the applicant should contact the Shellfish Sanitation Section at (252) 726-6827.

The soil disposal area(s) proposed for this project may produce a mosquito breeding problem. For information concerning appropriate mosquito control measures, the applicant should contact the Public Health Pest Management Section at (919) 733-6407.

The applicant should be advised that prior to the removal or demolition of dilapidated structures, an extensive rodent control program may be necessary in order to prevent the migration of the rodents to adjacent areas. For information concerning rodent control, contact the local health department or the Public Health Pest Management Section at (919) 733-6407.

- The applicant should be advised to contact the local health department regarding their requirements for septic tank installations (as required under 15A NCAC 18A, 1900 et. sep.). For information concerning septic tank and other on-site waste disposal methods, contact the On-Site Wastewater Section at (919) 733-2895.
- The applicant should be advised to contact the local health department regarding the sanitary facilities required for this project.
- If existing water lines will be relocated during the construction, plans for the water line relocation must be submitted to the Division of Environmental Health, Public Water Supply Section, Technical Services Branch, 1634 Mail Service Center, Raleigh, North Carolina 27699-1634, (919) 733-2321.
- For Regional and Central Office comments, see the reverse side of this form.

Jim McRight	PWSS	11/12/2011
Reviewer	Section/Branch	Date

Dominique L. Boyd

### NORTH CAROLINA STATE CLEARINGHOUSE DEPARTMENT OF ADMINISTRATION INTERGOVERNMENTAL REVIEW

COUNTY: CUMBERLAND

F02: HIGHWAYS AND ROADS

 STATE NUMBER:
 11-E-4220-0162

 DATE RECEIVED:
 01/06/2011

 AGENCY RESPONSE:
 02/02/2011

 REVIEW CLOSED:
 02/07/2011

MS SHIRLEY FOYE CLEARINGHOUSE COORDINATOR DEPT OF TRANSPORTATION STATEWIDE PLANNING - MSC #1554 RALEIGH NC

REVIEW DISTRIBUTION

CC&PS - DIV OF EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT DENR LEGISLATIVE AFFAIRS DEPT OF AGRICULTURE DEPT OF CULTURAL RESOURCES DEPT OF TRANSPORTATION MID CAROLINA COG

PROJECT INFORMATION

APPLICANT: NC Department of Transportation TYPE: National Environmental Policy Act Scoping

DESC: Widening of SR 1131 (Cameron Road) from SR 1132 (Legion Road) to NC 59 (Main Street), TIP No. U-4706

The attached project has been submitted to the N. C. State Clearinghouse for intergovernmental review. Please review and submit your response by the above indicated date to 1301 Mail Service Center, Raleigh NC 27699-1301.

If additional review time is needed, please contact this office at (919)807-2425.







North Carolina Department of Cultural Resources

State Historic Preservation Office Peter B. Sandbeck, Administrator

Beverly Eaves Perdue, Governor Linda A. Carlisle, Secretary Jeffrey J. Crow, Deputy Secretary

Office of Archives and History Division of Historical Resources David Brook, Director

January 21, 2011

### MEMORANDUM

TO: Greg Thorpe, Ph.D., Director Project Development and Environmental Analysis Branch NCDOT Division of Highways

FROM:

SUBJECT: Widening of SR 1131 (Cameron Road) from SR 1132 (Legion Road) to NC 59 (Main Street), Hope Mills, U-4706, Cumberland County, ER 11-0002

Thank you for your letter of December 20, 2010, concerning the above project.

Claudia Brown PSE for Claudia Brown

We have conducted a review of the proposed undertaking and are aware of no historic resources which would be affected by the project. Therefore, we have no comment on the undertaking as proposed.

The above comments are made pursuant to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation's Regulations for Compliance with Section 106 codified at 36 CFR Part 800.

Thank you for your cooperation and consideration. If you have questions concerning the above comment, contact Renee Gledhill-Earley, environmental review coordinator, at 919-807-6579. In all future communication concerning this project, please cite the above referenced tracking number.

cc:

Mary Pope Furr, NCDOT Matt Wilkerson, NCDOT



JAN 07 2011

### North Carolina Department of Environment and Natural Resources Office of Conservation, Planning, & Community Affairs

Beverly Eaves Perdue, Governor

Linda Pearsall, Director

Dee Freeman, Secretary

January 5, 2011

### **MEMORANDUM**

TO:	Gregory Thorpe, NC DOT Project Development and Environmental Analysis Branch
FROM:	Harry LeGrand, Natural Heritage Program
SUBJECT:	Proposed Widening of SR 1131 (Cameron Road) from SR 1132 (Legion Road) to NC 59 (Main Street); Hope Mills, Cumberland County

REFERENCE: WBS #39070.1.1, TIP Project # U-4706

The Natural Heritage Program has several records of rare species, significant natural communities, significant natural heritage areas, and conservation/managed areas within a mile of the project area; however, none are located within 0.3-mile of the project area. Because the project lies in an already heavily developed area, we anticipate no impacts to significant natural resources.

Please do not hesitate to contact me at 919-715-8697 if you have questions or need further information.

1601 Mail Service Center, Raleigh, North Carolina 27699-1601 Phone: 919-715-4195 \ FAX: 919-715-3060 Internet: www.oneNCNaturally.org



An Equal Opportunity \ Affirmative Action Employer - 50% Recycled \ 10% Post Consumer Paper



## **TOWN OF HOPE MILLS**

5770 ROCKFISH ROAD • HOPE MILLS, NORTH CAROLINA 28348-1848 TELEPHONE (910) 424-4555 • FAX (910) 424-4902

October 20, 2010

Ms. Kristine A. O'Connor, P.E. Project Planning Engineer NCDOT Project Development & Environmental Analysis Branch 1548 Mail Service Center Raleigh, NC 27699

Re: U-4706 Cameron Road from Main Street to Legion Road

Dear Ms. O'Connor:

The Town of Hope Mills request participation in the TIP Project U-4706 for sidewalks for Cameron Road from Main Street to Legion Road. This is the area within the Hope Mills town limits only. If possible, we request sidewalks on both sides of the road.

If additional information is needed, please let me know.

Sincerely,

Care had a part of

Connie F. Spell, MMC Assistant Town Manager/Clerk

cc: Michael Rutan, Transportation Planner, FAMPO (email) Will Linville, FAMPO (email) Randy Beeman, Town Manager (email) Ira Peterson, Street Supervisor (email) File

### **NCDOT's Relocation/Displacement Policies**

NCDOT's policy regarding relocations involves providing assistance to those affected by transportation improvements per the Federal Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Properties Acquisition Policies Act. All alternatives under evaluation will result in the displacement of homes and/or businesses. Some residents in the DCI Study Area appear to be low-income. If so, and if they are displaced, the Last Resort Housing Program established by the Federal Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act (PL 91-646) may be used.

The Division of Highways offers a Relocation Assistance Program to help minimize the effects of displacement on families and businesses. The occupants of the affected residences or businesses may qualify for aid under one or more of the NCDOT relocation programs.

It is the policy of the NCDOT to ensure that comparable replacement housing will be available prior to construction of state and federally assisted projects. Furthermore, the North Carolina Board of Transportation has the following three programs to minimize the inconvenience of relocation:

Relocation Assistance Relocation Moving Payments Relocation Replacement Housing Payments or Rent Supplement

The Relocation Assistance Program provides experienced NCDOT staff to assist displacees with information such as availability and prices of homes, apartments, or businesses for sale or rent and financing or other housing programs. The Relocation Moving Payments Program provides for payment of actual moving expenses encountered in relocation. Where displacement will force an owner or tenant to purchase or rent property of higher cost or to lose a favorable financing arrangement (in cases of ownership), the Relocation Replacement Housing Payments or Rent Supplement Program will compensate up to \$22,500 to owners who are eligible and qualify and up to \$5,250 to tenants who are eligible and qualify.

The relocation program for the proposed action will be conducted in accordance with the Federal Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 (Public Law 91-646), and the North Carolina Relocation Assistance Act (GS-133-5 through 133-18). The program is designed to provide assistance to displaced persons in relocating to a replacement site in which to live or do business. At least one relocation officer is assigned to each highway project for this purpose.

The relocation officer will determine the needs of displaced families, individuals, businesses, non-profit organizations, and farm operations for relocation advisory services without regard to race, color, religion, sex, or national origin. The NCDOT will schedule its work to allow ample time prior to displacement for negotiations and possession of replacement housing that meets decent, safe, and sanitary standards. The displacees are given at least a 90-day written notice after NCDOT purchases the property. Relocation of displaced persons will be offered in areas not generally less desirable in regard to public utilities and commercial facilities. Rent and sale prices of replacement property will be within financial means of the families and individuals displaced, and will be reasonably accessible to their places of employment. The relocation officer will also assist owners of displaced businesses, non-profit organizations, and farm operations in searching for and moving to replacement property.

All tenant and owner residential occupants who may be displaced will receive an explanation regarding all available options, such as (1) purchase of replacement housing, (2) rental of replacement housing, either private or public, or (3) moving existing Owneroccupant housing to another site (if possible). The relocation officer will also supply information concerning other state or federal programs offering assistance to displaced persons and will provide other advisory services as needed in order to minimize hardships to displaced persons in adjusting to a new location.

The Moving Expense Payments Program is designed to compensate the displacee for the costs of moving personal property from homes, businesses, non-profit organizations, and farm operations acquired for a highway project. Under the Replacement Program for Owners, NCDOT will participate in reasonable incidental purchase payments for replacement dwellings such as attorney's fees, surveys, appraisals, and other closing costs and, if applicable, make a payment for any increased interest expenses for replacement dwellings. Reimbursement to owner-occupants for replacement housing payments, increased interest payments, and incidental purchase expenses may not exceed \$22,500 (combined total), except under the Last Resort Housing provision.

A displaced tenant may be eligible to receive a payment, not to exceed \$5,250, to rent a replacement dwelling or to make a down payment, including incidental expenses, on the purchase of a replacement dwelling. The down payment is based upon what the state determines is required when the rent supplement exceeds \$5,250.

It is the policy of the state that no person will be displaced by the NCDOT's state or federally assisted construction projects unless and until comparable replacement housing has been offered or provided for each displace within a reasonable period of time before displacement. No relocation payment received will be considered as income for the purposes of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 or for the purposes of determining eligibility or the extent of eligibility of any person for assistance under the Social Security Act or any other federal law.

Last Resort Housing is a program used when comparable replacement housing is not available, or when it is unavailable within the displacee's financial means, and the replacement payment exceeds the federal/state legal limitation. The purpose of the program is to allow broad latitudes in methods of implementation by the state so that decent, safe, and sanitary replacement housing can be provided. Last Resort Housing may be used if necessary.

# APPENDIX C RELOCATION/DISPLACMENT POLICIES & RELOCATION REPORTS
## **NCDOT's Relocation/Displacement Policies**

NCDOT's policy regarding relocations involves providing assistance to those affected by transportation improvements per the Federal Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Properties Acquisition Policies Act. All alternatives under evaluation will result in the displacement of homes and/or businesses. Some residents in the DCI Study Area appear to be low-income. If so, and if they are displaced, the Last Resort Housing Program established by the Federal Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act (PL 91-646) may be used.

The Division of Highways offers a Relocation Assistance Program to help minimize the effects of displacement on families and businesses. The occupants of the affected residences or businesses may qualify for aid under one or more of the NCDOT relocation programs.

It is the policy of the NCDOT to ensure that comparable replacement housing will be available prior to construction of state and federally assisted projects. Furthermore, the North Carolina Board of Transportation has the following three programs to minimize the inconvenience of relocation:

Relocation Assistance Relocation Moving Payments Relocation Replacement Housing Payments or Rent Supplement

The Relocation Assistance Program provides experienced NCDOT staff to assist displacees with information such as availability and prices of homes, apartments, or businesses for sale or rent and financing or other housing programs. The Relocation Moving Payments Program provides for payment of actual moving expenses encountered in relocation. Where displacement will force an owner or tenant to purchase or rent property of higher cost or to lose a favorable financing arrangement (in cases of ownership), the Relocation Replacement Housing Payments or Rent Supplement Program will compensate up to \$22,500 to owners who are eligible and qualify and up to \$5,250 to tenants who are eligible and qualify.

The relocation program for the proposed action will be conducted in accordance with the Federal Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 (Public Law 91-646), and the North Carolina Relocation Assistance Act (GS-133-5 through 133-18). The program is designed to provide assistance to displaced persons in relocating to a replacement site in which to live or do business. At least one relocation officer is assigned to each highway project for this purpose.

The relocation officer will determine the needs of displaced families, individuals, businesses, non-profit organizations, and farm operations for relocation advisory services without regard to race, color, religion, sex, or national origin. The NCDOT will schedule its work to allow ample time prior to displacement for negotiations and possession of replacement housing that meets decent, safe, and sanitary standards. The displacees are given at least a 90-day written notice after NCDOT purchases the property. Relocation of displaced persons will be offered in areas not generally less desirable in regard to public utilities and commercial facilities. Rent and sale prices of replacement property will be within financial means of the families and individuals displaced, and will be reasonably accessible to their places of employment. The relocation officer will also assist owners of displaced businesses, non-profit organizations, and farm operations in searching for and moving to replacement property.

All tenant and owner residential occupants who may be displaced will receive an explanation regarding all available options, such as (1) purchase of replacement housing, (2) rental of replacement housing, either private or public, or (3) moving existing Owneroccupant housing to another site (if possible). The relocation officer will also supply information concerning other state or federal programs offering assistance to displaced persons and will provide other advisory services as needed in order to minimize hardships to displaced persons in adjusting to a new location.

The Moving Expense Payments Program is designed to compensate the displacee for the costs of moving personal property from homes, businesses, non-profit organizations, and farm operations acquired for a highway project. Under the Replacement Program for Owners, NCDOT will participate in reasonable incidental purchase payments for replacement dwellings such as attorney's fees, surveys, appraisals, and other closing costs and, if applicable, make a payment for any increased interest expenses for replacement dwellings. Reimbursement to owner-occupants for replacement housing payments, increased interest payments, and incidental purchase expenses may not exceed \$22,500 (combined total), except under the Last Resort Housing provision.

A displaced tenant may be eligible to receive a payment, not to exceed \$5,250, to rent a replacement dwelling or to make a down payment, including incidental expenses, on the purchase of a replacement dwelling. The down payment is based upon what the state determines is required when the rent supplement exceeds \$5,250.

It is the policy of the state that no person will be displaced by the NCDOT's state or federally assisted construction projects unless and until comparable replacement housing has been offered or provided for each displace within a reasonable period of time before displacement. No relocation payment received will be considered as income for the purposes of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 or for the purposes of determining eligibility or the extent of eligibility of any person for assistance under the Social Security Act or any other federal law.

Last Resort Housing is a program used when comparable replacement housing is not available, or when it is unavailable within the displacee's financial means, and the replacement payment exceeds the federal/state legal limitation. The purpose of the program is to allow broad latitudes in methods of implementation by the state so that decent, safe, and sanitary replacement housing can be provided. Last Resort Housing may be used if necessary.

## EIS RELOCATION REPORT

## North Carolina Department of Transportation RELOCATION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM

	E.I.S.			RRIDOR		ESIGN							JANGE I	
WB	S Ele	MEN	NT: 39	070.1.1	COUNTY	Cumbe	rland		Alternat	e	1 (	of	1 A	ternate
T.I.F	<u> </u>	:	<u>U-4706</u>					_						
DES	CRIPT	ION	OF PROJ	IECT: Pro	oposed wi ad) to NC	idening of 59 (Main	SR 113 Street)	1 (Ca	meron R	load)	from SF	R 1132	(Legior	า
ESTIMATED DISPLACEES							INCON	IE LEVEI	_					
Туре	of													
Disp	lacees		Owners	Tenants	Total	Minorities	0-15N	1	15-25M	25	5-35M	35-50	м	50 UP
Resid	dential		2	4	6	0		0	1		2 3		0	
Busir	nesses		1	1	2	0	VAL	UE OF	DWELLING		DSS	DWELLIN	IG AVAIL	ABLE
Farm	IS		0	0	0	0	Owners		Tenai	nts	For	Sale	For	Rent
Non-	Profit		0	0	0	0	0-20м	0	\$ 0-150	0	0-20м	0	\$ 0-150	) 0
			ANSWE	R ALL QUEST	IONS		20-40M	0	150-250	0	20-40M	0	150-250	) 0
Yes	No	Ex	plain all '	'YES" answe	ers.		40-70м	0	250-400	0	40-70м	5	250-400	
Х		1.	Will spe	ecial relocation	n services be	necessary?	70-100м	1	400-600	3	70-100м	8	400-600	2
	X	2.	Will scl	hools or chur	ches be affe	cted by	100 UP	1	600 UP	1	100 UP	3	600 UF	· <u> </u>
		1	displac	ement?		,	ΤΟΤΑΙ	2		4		16		6
X		<b>1</b> <sub>3.</sub>	3 Will business services still be available REMARKS (Respond by Number)											
	<u> </u>	after project?				1 Convienence store if have to be relocated								
X		1 ₄	Will an	v husiness he	displaced?	lfso	1. 0011	ienene				aleu.		
	indicate size, type, estimated number of			3 2 convenience stores are presently in operation. If one is										
			employ	ees, minoritie	es, efc		displace	the i	nther will c	ontinu	e to provi	ido sorvi	00. 11.00 008	615
	X	5	Will rel	ocation cause	a housing s	hortage?	alopiaco	a, 010 (		onunu				
		6	Source	for available	housina (list	)	4 2 500	sa ft	convenien	re sto	ra nassih	la displa	coo with	
	Y	7 Will additional housing programs be					Employees 2 minorities Both the owner and tenant displaces							
	Χ		needed	1?	ng programo	50	mentione	ed abo	ve are ass	ociate	viated with this store.		ant uspi	acees
							NOTE	Misc I	Business r	nove f	or Pate's	old store	<b>`</b>	
							Full Bus	siness	move for a	conver	ience sto	re (close	e to UST	s)
												(		-/
X		8. Should Last Resort Housing be considered?			6. MLS Listing Service.									
X	X		Are the	re large, disal	bled, elderly,	8. Due to probability of elderly or lower income displacees.								
			families	?						-			-	
	Х	10.	Will publ	lic housing be	e needed for	project?	9. Elderl	у.						
X		11. Is public housing available?			11. Local public housing (Section 8) is available.									
X		12. Is it felt there will be adequate DSS housing		12. MLS listings and local newspapers.										
<u> </u>			housing	available du	ring relocatio	on period?		0						
X		13. Will there be a problem of housing within					13. Probability of low and/or fixed income displacees.							
V		1.4												
<u>^</u>		14.	Are suita	une pusitiess	SILES AVAIIAL	ne (iisi	14. IVILS	nsung	s service,	iocal la	ana speci	liators.		
		15	Number	monthe petim	nated to com	nlete								
		10.	RELOCATE	ON? 15-1	R months									
·	I													
														I .

:

0	11-1-12		11/14/12
Oscar L. Taylor Senior Right of Way Agent	Date	Relocation Coordinator	Date

FRM15-E