



PROJECT INITIATION FORM

SPOT ID: H090013A		STIP DESCRIPTION: LAUREL HILLS BYPASS (PART OF FS-1508A)			
DIVISION: 8	COUNTY: SCOTLAND	ROW DATE: TBD	LET DATE: TBD		
	EXISTING FACILITY CHARACTERISTICS:		PROPOSED FACILITY CHARACTERISTICS:		
	Functional Classification: Freeway Existing No. of Lanes: 4 Existing Median: Yes Existing control of access: Partial Control Posted Speed: 55/45 AADT: 22,150 Right-of-Way Width: 200' Structures: <input type="checkbox"/> Culvert(s) Number, Size(s) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Bridge(s) 2, Dual 45' x 182'		Proposed Functional Classification: Interstate Proposed Typical Section: 4A – 4 Lane Divided (46' Depressed Median) with Paved Shoulders, 45-70 mph Proposed No. of Lanes: 4 Addition of Median(s): No Proposed control of access: Full Control Design Speed: 75 AADT: >22,150 Right-of-Way Width: 300' Structures: <input type="checkbox"/> Culvert(s) Number, Size(s) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Bridge(s) 8, x 140'45.25' X 368', Dual 43.25' x 149.89', Dual 55.25 x 140', 55.25' x 182', 53.43' x 182'		
PROJECT DESCRIPTION: <i>Include project scope and location, including municipality and county.</i>					
US 74 SOUTHERLY BYPASS OF LAUREL HILL (SECTION D) FROM WEST OF FRED CARTER RD. TO DEVON DR., IN SCOTLAND COUNTY. THIS PROJECT IS A PART OF THE LARGER PROJECT FOR THE US 74 UPGRADE TO INTERSTATE STANDARDS FROM US 74 ROCKINGHAM-HAMLET BYPASS IN RICHMOND COUNTY TO EXISTING I-74 IN ROBESON COUNTY INTERCHANGE.					
COST ESTIMATES:					
Construction: TBD		Right-of-Way: TBD			
Utilities: TBD		ITS: TBD			
FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS:					
FS-1508A WAS COMPLETED IN 2017. IN 2022, DIVISION 8 REQUESTED A CONCEPTUAL DESIGN AND ESTIMATE ON THE LAUREL HILLS BYPASS (SECTION D) FROM THE ORIGINAL FS-1508A FEASIBILITY STUDY.					
CHANGES TO THE ORIGINAL FEASIBILITY STUDY INCLUDE THE BEGINNING OF THE FLYOVER NEEDING TO BE PUSHED TO THE EAST TO AVOID DISTURBING EXISTING TRANSMISSION TOWERS. TRANSMISSION TOWERS ALSO HAVE TO BE AVOIDED PRIOR TO THE BYPASS CROSSING SPRINGS MILL RD. AT THIS LOCATION THE ALIGNMENT WAS MADE TO CROSS THE TRANSMISSION LINES AS PERPENDICULAR AS POSSIBLE WITH AN EVEN SPLIT BETWEEN TOWERS.					
BYPASS DESIGNED TO LIMIT WETLAND IMPACTS AS MUCH AS POSSIBLE.					
LEVEL OF PSR:	DOCUMENT TYPE:	MERGER:	PROJECT TYPE:	FUNDING:	CONTRACT TYPE:



<input type="checkbox"/> STREAMLINED PSR	<input type="checkbox"/> CE/MCDC	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> MERGER	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> DIVISION	<input type="checkbox"/> FEDERAL	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Design Bid Build
<input type="checkbox"/> PSR	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> EA/FONSI	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NON-MERGER	<input type="checkbox"/> CENTRAL	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> STATE	<input type="checkbox"/> Design Build
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> ENHANCED PSR	<input type="checkbox"/> EIS	SCREENING DATE: TBD			<input type="checkbox"/> Construction Manager
					<input type="checkbox"/> Progressive Design Build

PROJECT HISTORY	Planning Studies: Click or tap here to enter text.
	SPOT Descriptions: <i>Provide the project description from the most recent SPOT analysis.</i> Click or tap here to enter text.
	Feasibility Studies: <i>Describe any feasibility studies that include the project corridor.</i> The original FS-1508A feasibility study, upgrading US 74 to interstate standards from East of Rockingham to east of Maxon, (Alternatives 1 & 2) included this project corridor as Section D.
	Problem Statement: <i>Provide any previous problem statements from the CTP/MTP or Feasibility Study.</i> Division 8 noted significant congestion through Laurel Hills area on US 74, particularly traffic heading to the beach.

PURPOSE AND NEED	Purpose: <i>Provide the purpose of the project, if one has been identified in prior planning studies.</i> US 74 Bypass could alleviate significant congestion for local traffic in Laurel Hills area.
	Need(s): <i>Include the identified need for the project as defined on the Identified Need form or other available information.</i> US 74 Bypass could alleviate significant congestion for local traffic in Laurel Hills area.
	Supporting Data: <i>Are there any studies or other documents that demonstrate the need for the project? For example, if the project is needed because of traffic congestion, has a forecast been prepared?</i> Click or tap here to enter text.

ALTERNATIVES BEING CONSIDERED	Alternative 1: In the Laurel Hill area, upgrade US 74 to interstate standards along the ex. corridor. Build bridges on two Old Wire Rd. and St. Johns Church Rd. to overpass US 74 and build dual bridges on US 74 to overpass Springs Mill Rd.
	Alternative 2: Build a bypass in the Laurel Hill area, providing a flyover for local traffic to access ex. US 74 within this area. Culdesac Old Wire Rd. where the bypass crosses, and build dual bridges to overpass St. Johns Church Rd. and Springs Mill Rd.
	Alternatives Previously Dismissed and Why: Alternative 1 is not being pursued due to division 8's interest in a bypass that will alleviate congestion in the Laurel Hills area.

PUBLIC/ AGENCY COORDINATION	Anticipated Permits: <i>Describe potential 404 permitting and any other anticipated permits (CAMA, FERC, TVA, US Coast Guard, etc.)</i> TBD
	Federal Agency Involvement: <i>Who is the lead federal agency? Which agencies will be involved?</i> TBD



PRELIMINARY RESOURCE INVENTORY TABLE	Public Involvement Strategy: <i>This is different and more inclusive than a Public Involvement Plan. A public involvement strategy is dynamic and subject to change.</i>		
	TBD		
	Potential Merger Issues: TBD		
<i>Check all resources that are likely to be impacted or involved in the project based on the Project Scoping Process. Refer to the Project Scoping Technical Report and Project Scoping Screening Checklist for additional information.</i>			
Natural Environment	Human Environment	Physical Environment	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Stream(s) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Wetland(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Water supply watersheds or critical area(s) <input type="checkbox"/> CAMA Area(s) of environmental concern <input type="checkbox"/> T/E species or potential habitat <input type="checkbox"/> Protected land(s) <input type="checkbox"/> FEMA resource(s) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Riparian buffer(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: Click or tap here to enter text.	<input type="checkbox"/> Historic site(s)/district(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Cemetery(ies)/archaeological resource(s) <input type="checkbox"/> EJ community(ies) <input type="checkbox"/> Section 4(f) resource(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Section 6(f) resource(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Unusually large number of relocations <input type="checkbox"/> Other: Click or tap here to enter text.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Utilities <input type="checkbox"/> Hazardous material(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Active agriculture <input type="checkbox"/> Prime or important farmland soil <input type="checkbox"/> Air quality non-attainment or maintenance area <input type="checkbox"/> Type I noise project <input type="checkbox"/> Other: Click or tap here to enter text.	
RISK IDENTIFICATION	<i>This section shall be completed if a PSR is required. Check all risks that have the potential to impact the project scope, schedule, budget, quality or commitments. For all risks identified, provide additional information in the Project Scoping Screening Checklist.</i>		
	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project may be subdivided into smaller projects or combined into a larger project. <input type="checkbox"/> Identified Purpose & Need may require updating <input type="checkbox"/> Complex design (i.e. first of a kind, prototypes, special & unproven technology) may impact schedule <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Adequate funding may not be available.	<input type="checkbox"/> Additional impacts (more than currently indicated) to historic/archeological preservation site (Section 106) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Additional impacts to wetland, floodplains and/or endangered/critically threatened species <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Significant stakeholder involvement may result in scope, schedule, budget or commitment modifications	<input type="checkbox"/> Site contamination/hazardous waste may be discovered. <input type="checkbox"/> Scope change/creep is likely <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Project limits / area may increase <input type="checkbox"/> Quantity and complexity of ROW impacts may increase costs and/or delay schedule <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Level of Utility coordination / relocations may increase cost and/or delay schedule.