# NEPA/404 Merger Concurrence Point 4A 

TIP Project No. U-4700

Improvements to US 321 from Hickory to Lenoir in Catawba, Burke, and Caldwell Counties

## SUMMARYINFORMATION

## Meeting Purpose

The purpose of this meeting is to identify avoidance and minimization efforts for Project $\mathrm{U}-4700$.

## Project Description

The proposed improvements include the widening of US 321 from just north of the US 70 interchange in Hickory (Catawba County) to the Southwest Boulevard (SR 1933) interchange in Lenoir (Caldwell County). The proposed improvements involve approximately 13.5 miles of existing US 321 with a majority of the roadway located in Catawba and Caldwell Counties and 0.3 miles in Burke County. The purpose of the project is to reduce congestion on US 321 in order to achieve a level of service D or better in the design year (2040). The Environmental Assessment (EA) was approved in February 2016, and a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) will be prepared for the project. The project study area map (Figure 17) is attached.

## Project Activity since the Previous Merger Meeting (February 2018)

## Environmental Documentation

- The Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) was signed in April 2018.


## Roadway Design

- Final designs are underway for Sections A, CA, CB, and CC. Preliminary designs are available for Section B and the remainder of Section C.


## Merger History of Project

## Concurrence Point 1

The Project Team concurred with the following purpose and need and study area on February 16, 2018:

- Need: Some segments of US 321 between Hickory and Lenoir are currently experiencing congestion and operate at level of service (LOS) E and F. Also, a majority of intersections along the project area currently operate at LOS E and F. In 2035, 12 of 13 segments along the mainline and 16 of 18 intersections are projected to operate at LOS F.
- Purpose: The purpose of this project is to reduce congestion on US 321 in order to achieve a LOS of D or better in the Design Year (2040).
- Study Area: As presented in the attached Figure 1


## Concurrence Point 2

The Project Team concurred with the following alternatives to be carried forward, with a commitment to treat storm water in designated places throughout the project on October 14, 2015:

- Throughout the project, if intersection spacing permits, the Typical Superstreet Intersection (directional crossover with median U-turns) is utilized.
- One best fit alternative is being analyzed along US 321 with various typical sections throughout.

Typical Section 1: Six-lane divided with 22 -foot raised median with a concrete barrier with curb and gutter in outside lanes
Typical Section 2: Six-lane divided with 30-foot raised grassed median with curb and gutter in median and shoulder
Typical Section 3: Six-lane divided with 30-foot raised grassed median with curb and gutter in median and grassed shoulder

Table 1: Concurrence Point 2 - Proposed Typical Section

| U-4700 Segments* | Typical Section Alternatives for Detailed Study |
| :---: | :---: |
| Segment A: North of US 70 to 800 feet north of $2^{\text {nd }}$ Avenue NW in Hickory ( 0.95 miles) | Typical Section 1/2 (combination) |
| Segment B: 800 feet north of $2^{\text {nd }}$ Avenue NW to 1300 feet north of Clement Boulevard ( 0.95 miles) | Typical Section 3 |
| Segment C: 1300 feet north of Clement Boulevard to just south of Grace Chapel Road ( 1.12 miles) | Replace bridges over Catawba River and grade-separate RR crossing |
| Segment D: Just south of Grace Chapel Road to 400 feet south of Gunpowder Creek ( 8.10 miles) | Typical Section 3 |
| Segment E: 400 feet south of Gunpowder Creek to Southwest Boulevard ( 2.04 miles) | Typical Section 3 |
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## Concurrence Point 2A

The Project Team concurred with the following major drainage structures on February 16, 2018:
Table 2: Concurrence Point 2A - Proposed Hydraulic Structures

| Site No. | Proposed Hydraulic Structure |
| :---: | :---: |
| 1 | Extend $2-10^{\prime} \times 10^{\prime} \mathrm{RCBC}\left(26^{\prime} \mathrm{LT}\right.$ \& 15' RT) |
| 2 | 2 - New Bridges(1@ 825' \& 1 @ 944') |
| 3 | Extend $1-6^{\prime} \times 7^{\prime} \mathrm{RCBC}\left(73^{\prime} \mathrm{LT}\right.$ \& 89' RT) |
| 4 | Extend $2-6^{\prime} \times 7^{\prime} \mathrm{RCBC}\left(56^{\prime} \mathrm{LT}\right.$ \& 49' RT) |
| 5 | Extend $1-38^{\prime} \times 18^{\prime} \mathrm{RC}$ Arch ( $20^{\prime}$ LT \& 22.5' RT ) |
| 6 | 2 - Widen Bridges (1 @ 158' \& 1 @ 173') |
| 7 | Extend 3-9' x 9' RCBC (31' LT \& 15' RT) |
| 8 | Extend 1-7'x $7^{\prime}$ RCBC ( $41^{\prime}$ LT \& 23' RT ) |
| 17 | Extend 1-72" CMP (38' RT ) |
| 17A | New 135' bridge |
| 17B | New $8^{\prime} \times 8^{\prime}$ RCBC - 187 ${ }^{\prime}$ |

## Concurrence Point 3

The Project Team concurred with the following Least Environmentally Damaging Practicable Alternative (LEDPA) on February 16, 2018, shown on Tables 3 and 4:

Typical Section 1: Six-lane divided with 22 -foot raised median with a concrete barrier with curb and gutter in outside lanes
Typical Section 2: Six-lane divided with 30-foot raised grassed median with curb and gutter in median and shoulder
Typical Section 3: Six-lane divided with 30-foot raised grassed median with curb and gutter in median and grassed shoulder

Table 3: Concurrence Point 3 - Least Environmentally Damaging Practicable Alternative (Typical Sections)

| U-4700 Segments* | NCDOT Recommended Design |
| :--- | :--- |
| Segment A: North of US 70 to 800 feet north of 2nd Avenue <br> NW in Hickory (0.95 miles) | Typical Section 1/2 (combination) |
| Segment B: 800 feet north of 2nd Avenue NW to 1300 feet <br> north of Clement Boulevard (0.95 miles) | Typical Section 3 |
| Segment C: 1300 feet north of Clement Boulevard to just <br> south of Grace Chapel Road (1.12 miles) | Replace bridges over Catawba River and <br> grade-separate at RR crossing |
| Segment D: Just south of Grace Chapel Road to 400 feet <br> south of Gunpowder Creek (8.10 miles) | Typical Section 3 |
| Segment E: 400 feet south of Gunpowder Creek to <br> Southwest Boulevard (2.04 miles) | Typical Section 3 |

[^1]Table 4: Concurrence Point 3 - Least Environmentally Damaging Practicable Alternative (Interchanges)

| U-4700 Interchange Locations | NCDOT Recommended Design |
| :--- | :--- |
| $2^{\text {nd }}$ Avenue SW | Interchange |
| Clement Boulevard | Superstreet intersection |
| Grace Chapel Road | Flyover |
| Alex Lee Boulevard | Tight diamond interchange |
| Falls Avenue | Tight diamond interchange |

## Project Status/Schedule

## Planning: In progress

- Section CA, CB, CC Final Design - Winter 2018/2019
- Section A Final Design - Spring 2020

Right-of-Way and Construction:
Section A: US 70 to US 321A
Right-of-way - April 2019
Construction - April 2021
Section B: US 321A to Mission Road
Unfunded
Section C: Mission Road to Southwest Boulevard
Unfunded
Section CA: US 321/Mount Herman Road intersection
Right-of-way - October 2018
Construction - April 2019
Section CB: US 321/Pine Mountain Road (SR 1809/1952) intersection
Right-of-way - October 2018
Construction - April 2019
Section CC: US 321/Mission Road (SR 1108) intersection
Right-of-way - October 2018
Construction - April 2019

## Concurrence Point 4A - Avoidance and Minimization Measures

## General Avoidance and Minimization Efforts

To minimize or avoid impacts, the following issues were evaluated:

- Horizontal and vertical alignment shifts
- Steeper slopes and narrower right-of-way
- Construction techniques
- Bridge design

The preferred alternative typical section varies along the corridor in median width and shoulder type to minimize impacts to natural resources and property. Multiple interchange and intersection types were also evaluated at main intersections along the corridor to minimize or avoid impacts. These varying typical sections and interchange and intersection designs were concurred upon by the Project Team during previous Merger meetings.

## Specific Avoidance and Minimization Efforts

In addition to the general minimization and avoidance practices undertaken described above, the following specific measures were included in the design. Table 5 summarizes impacts to streams and wetlands. Tables 6 and 7 summarize reduction in impacts since designs were presented at the C.P. 3 meeting.

- Selected a 22 and 30 -foot median rather than 46 -foot median typical section
- Added expressway gutter on the northbound side of US 321 from Station $49+00$ to $63+00$ to minimize impacts to property
- Added expressway gutter on the southbound side of US 321 from Station $60+00$ to $63+00$ to minimize impacts to Duke Energy Substation
- Added a bridge and increased slopes on the Grace Chapel Flyover ramp at Station $14+98$ to minimize stream impacts
- Added a retaining wall on the northbound side of US 321 at Station $365+00$ (northbound offramp at Falls Avenue) to minimize impacts to streams and a dwarf-flowered heartleafboundary
- Added a retaining wall on the southbound side of US 321 at Station 370+00 (southbound onramp at Falls Avenue) to minimize stream impacts
- Added a retaining wall on the northbound side of US 321 at Station 397+00 (northbound onramp at Falls Avenue) to minimize stream impacts
- Re-aligned the connector road from the Alex Lee Boulevard interchange to Sage Meadow Circle to avoid stream impacts and minimize property impacts
- Steepened slopes and tightened buffer to avoid impacts to dwarf-flowered heartleaf conservation area
- Steepened slopes to minimize impacts to other dwarf-flowered heartleaf populations (see page 6)
- Steepened slopes at C.P. 2A Hydraulic sites 3, 5, 6 and 11
- Removed Dudley Shoals Road loop to avoid impacts to historical resources and minimize stream impacts


## Storm Water Treatment

Storm water treatment was discussed during previous Merger Team meetings. At the February 2014 meeting, the 46 -foot median typical section option was eliminated with a commitment to treat storm water in designated places through the project. At the October 2015 meeting, NCDOT committed to include storm water treatment facilities during the final design process. Final designs are underway for Sections A, CA, CB, and CC. No specific information on storm water treatment is available at this time.

## Threatened and Endangered Species

There are 14 federally protected species listed in the $\mathrm{U}-4700$ project study area. Details about the species are in the Natural Resource Technical Reports, EA, and FONSI documents. The biological conclusion for each is listed below:

- Dwarf-flowered heartleaf: "May Affect, Likely to Adversely Affect." The selected alternative is anticipated to impact approximately 1.4 acres of identified dwarf-flowered heartleaf population, estimated to represent 1,165 plants. Impacts to a dwarf-flowered heartleaf conservation easement (shown on Figure 2 J ) will be avoided based on minimization measures identified since the C.P. 3 meeting. The steepening of slopes near existing dwarf-flowered heartleaf populations was undertaken as a minimization measure to reduce impacts to this species. Slopes were steepened to 2:1 at the following locations:
- Between station 336+50 and 338+50 (Site 51)
- Between station 361+00 and 364+50 (Site 48)
- Between station 581+50 and 583+50 (Site 36)
- At station 596+00 (Site 32)
- At station 635+00 (Site 26)
- At station 638+00 (Site 24)

These impacts will continue to be minimized, where feasible, during final design. Construction authorization will not be requested until Endangered Species Act (ESA) compliance is satisfied for the dwarf-flowered heartleaf. Table 8 summarizes impacts to dwarf-flowered heartleaf populations.

- Carolina northern flying squirrel, Virginia big-eared bat, spruce-fir moss spider, rock gnome lichen, Schweinitz's sunflower, Heller's blazing star, mountain golden heather, small whorled pogonia, white irisette, Roan Mountain bluet and spreading avens: "No Effect."
- Bog turtle: "Not Required."
- Northern long-eared bat is consistent with the $4(\mathrm{~d})$ rule.


## Avoidance and Minimization Commitments

- This project will not encroach into the dwarf-flowered heartleaf conservation easement area.


## ImpactsSummary

Table 5: Summary of Impactsfor Selected Alternative

| Topic | Segment A <br> (US 70 to <br> US 321A) | Segment B (US 321A to Mission Rd) | Segment C (Mission Rdto Southwest Blvd) | Total |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Length (miles) | 3.5 | 7.2 | 3.3 | 14.0 |
| Railroad Crossings | 2 | 0 | 0 | 2 |
| 100-Year Floodplain Crossings | 4 | 0 | 2 | 6 |
| Stream Impacts (linear feet) ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 1,765 | 3,055 | 1,000 | 5,820 |
| Wetland Impacts (acres) ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 0.1 | 0.2 | 0.4 | 0.7 |
| Dwarf-flowered heartleaf Impacts (acres) | <0.1 | 0.5 | 0.8 | 1.3 |
| Dwarf-flowered heartleaf Impacts (plants) | 1 | 380 | 782 | 1,163 |
| Water Supply Watersheds | 1 | 2 | 0 | 3 |
| Federal Listed Species ${ }^{\text {b }}$ |  | 13 |  | 13 |
| Historic Properties Affected | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Archaeological Sites Affected | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Section 4(f) Resources | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Total Relocations* | 73 | 27 | 5 | 105 |
| Residential Relocations* | 18 | 12 | 2 | 32 |
| Business Relocations* | 55 | 14 | 3 | 72 |
| Non-Profit Relocations* | 0 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| Schools Affected | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Recreation Areas and Parks Affected | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Churches Affected | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Cemeteries Affected | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Environmental Justice Impacts | None | None | None | None |
| Wildlife Refuges or Gamelands | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Noise Impacts ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | 33 | 43 | 14 | 90 |
| Potential Hazardous Material Site Impacts* | 39 | 19 | 12 | 70 |
| Total Cost* | \$176,857,244 | \$82,774,280 | \$22,398,320 | \$282,029,844 |
| Construction Cost* | \$116,300,000 | \$61,200,000 | \$10,400,000 | \$187,900,000 |
| Utility Relocation Cost* | \$931,744 | \$2,781,780 | \$548,320 | \$4,261,844 |
| Right-of-Way Cost* | \$59,625,500 | \$18,792,500 | \$11,450,000 | \$89,868,000 |

Note: The total number of impacted dwarf-flowered heartleaf plants in segment C shown in red was reduced since the original C.P. 4A packet was distributed based on further minimization in the design near two dwarf-flowered heartleaf populations.
${ }^{\text {a }}$ Shown acreage includes 25 -foot clearing limits outside slope stake lines.
b Biological conclusions: "No Effect" for Carolina northern flying squirrel, Virginia big-eared bat, spruce-fir moss spider, rock gnome lichen, Schweinitz's sunflower, Heller's blazing star, mountain golden heather, small whorles pogonia, white irisette, a nd sp rea ding avens; "Not Required" for the bog turtle; "May Affect, Likely to Adversely Affect" for the dwarf-flowered heartleaf; Northern longeared bat is consistent with 4(d) rule.
c Based upon preliminary traffic noise analysis

* The total relocations, potential hazardous material site impacts, and total cost estimates reflect the most recently available information that was included in the U-4700 FONSI which was approved in April 2018.

Table 6: Comparison of Itemized Stream Impacts

| Section | Map ID | Stream Name | Impact Length (If) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | CP 3 | CP 4A | Difference |
| A | Frye Creek | Frye Creek | 125 | 125 | 0 |
|  | SB | UT to Catawba River | 735 | 735 | 0 |
|  | SC | UT to Catawba River | 300 | 300 | 0 |
|  | SQQ | UT to Catawba River | 40 | 40 | 0 |
|  | SRR | UT to Catawba River | 590 | 595 | 5 |
|  | SUU | UT to Catawba River | 330* | 0 | -330 |
|  | SVV | UT to Catawba River | 110* | 0 | -110 |
| B | Billy Branch | Billy Branch | 660 | 305 | -355 |
|  | Little Gunpowder Creek | Little Gunpowder Creek | 150 | 145 | -5 |
|  | SF | UT to Gunpowder Creek | 230 | 230 | 0 |
|  | SJ | UT to Gunpowder Creek | 40 | 40 | 0 |
|  | SK | UT to Gunpowder Creek | 120 | 120 | 0 |
|  | SM | UT to Gunpowder Creek | 100 | 100 | 0 |
|  | SN | UT to Gunpowder Creek | 280 | 280 | 0 |
|  | SO | UT to Gunpowder Creek | 365 | 365 | 0 |
|  | SP | UT to Billy Branch | 180 | 180 | 0 |
|  | SQ | UT to Little Gunpowder Creek | 130 | 130 | 0 |
|  | SR | UT to Little Gunpowder Creek | 170 | 170 | 0 |
|  | SS | UT to Little Gunpowder Creek | 65 | 65 | 0 |
|  | ST | UT to Little Gunpowder Creek | 30 | 30 | 0 |
|  | STA | UT to Little Gunpowder Creek | 85 | 85 | 0 |
|  | SU | UT to Little Gunpowder Creek | 65 | 65 | 0 |
|  | SV | UT to Little Gunpowder Creek | 110 | 110 | 0 |
|  | SW | UT to Little Gunpowder Creek | 540 | 540 | 0 |
|  | SX | UT to Little Gunpowder Creek | 50 | 50 | 0 |
|  | SY | UT to Little Gunpowder Creek | 45 | 45 | 0 |
| C | Angley Creek | Angley Creek | 200 | 200 | 0 |
|  | Brushy Fork | Brushy Fork | 120 | 120 | 0 |
|  | Gunpowder Creek | Gunpowder Creek | 55 | 55 | 0 |
|  | SAA | UT to Gunpowder Creek | 115 | 115 | 0 |
|  | SBB | UT to Gunpowder Creek | 70 | 70 | 0 |
|  | SDD | UT to Gunpowder Creek | 20 | 20 | 0 |
|  | SEE | UT to Gunpowder Creek | 150 | 150 | 0 |
|  | SLL | UT to Gunpowder Creek | 185 | 185 | 0 |
|  | SZ | UT to Gunpowder Creek | 85 | 85 | 0 |
| Total |  |  | 6,645 | 5,820 | -795 |

*Streamdelineation information forstreams SUU and SVV was received following theC.P. 3 meeting and was not reflected in the C.P. 3 packet. The design at these locations has been revised to avoid impacts to these streams.

Table 7: Comparison of Itemized Wetland Impacts

| Section | Map ID | Impact Area (acres) |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | CP 3 | CP 4A | Difference |
| A | WA | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0 |
| B | WF | $<0.1$ | $<0.1$ | 0 |
|  | WG | $<0.1$ | $<0.1$ | 0 |
|  | WFA | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0 |
| C | WI | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0 |
|  | WKA | $<0.1$ | $<0.1$ | 0 |
|  | WK | 0.1 | 0.1 | 0 |
|  | WP | 0.2 | 0.1 | $<0.1$ |
| Total |  |  | 0.7 | 0.7 |
|  |  |  |  |  |

Table 8: Comparison of Itemized Dwarf-flowered HeartleafImpacts

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ence |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Section | Site | Station | (plants/acre) | Area (acres) | Estimated Plants | Area (acres) | Estimated Plants | Area (acres) | Estimated Plants |
| A | F | $143+50$ | 818 | 0.026 | 22 | 0.00004 | 1 | -0.026 | -21 |
| B | 52a | 320+00 | 4,762 | 0.020 | 96 | 0.008 | 41 | -0.012 | -55 |
|  | 51 | 340+00 | 982 | 0.402 | 395 | 0.250 | 246 | -0.152 | -149 |
|  | 48 | 365+00 | 305 | 0.485 | 148 | 0.240 | 74 | -0.245 | -74 |
|  | 46 | 400+00 | 454 | 0.022 | 10 | 0.012 | 6 | -0.010 | -4 |
|  | 46a | 400+00 | 399 | 0.001 | 1 | 0.000 | 0 | -0.001 | -1 |
|  | 43 | 465+00 | 1,000 | 0.023 | 23 | 0.012 | 13 | -0.011 | -10 |
|  | 44 | 465+00 | 1,671 | 0.009 | 16 | 0.000 | 0 | -0.009 | -16 |
| C | 35 | 585+00 | 246 | 0.179 | 45 | 0.179 | 45 | 0.000 | 0 |
|  | 36 | 585+00 | 1,599 | 0.438 | 701 | 0.093 | 149 | -0.345 | -552 |
|  | 34 | 585+00 | 1,109 | 0.803 | 891 | 0.501 | 556 | -0.302 | -335 |
|  | 32 | 595+00 | 1,265 | 0.009 | 12 | 0.001 | 2 | -0.008 | -10 |
|  | 30 | 600+00 | 250 | 0.024 | 6 | 0.024 | 6 | 0.000 | 0 |
|  | 26 | $635+30$ | 889 | 0.027 | 24 | 0.025 | 23 | -0.002 | -1 |
|  | 24 | 637+50 | 164 | 0.010 | 2 | <0.001 | 1 | -0.010 | -1 |
| Total |  |  |  | 2.478 | 2,392 | 1.344 | 1,163 | -1.134 | -1,229 |

Note: Portions of the design near sites listed in red were further minimized since the original C.P. 4A packet was distributed. Additionally, estimated plant impact totals for Sites F, 52a, 48, 44, 35 and 36 were slightly modified by using an alternate rounding methodology following coordination with NCDOT Biological Surveys Group.
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Figure 2C: C.P. 4A Impacts Map
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Figure 2D: C.P. 4A Impacts Map
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Figure 2E: C.P. 4A Impacts Map
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Figure 2F: C.P. 4A Impacts Map
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Figure 20: C.P. 4A Impacts Map
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