



STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA
DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

BEVERLY EAVES PERDUE
GOVERNOR

EUGENE A. CONTI, JR.
SECRETARY

June 8, 2011

U S. Army Corps of Engineers
151 Patton Avenue, Room 208
Asheville, NC 28801-5006

ATTN: Ms. Sarah Hair
NCDOT Coordinator

Subject: **Application for Section 404 Nationwide Permits 13, 23, 33 and Section 401 Water Quality Certification** for the proposed replacement of Bridge No. 90 over Hagan Fork on SR 1727 (Boggs Road) in Catawba County, Federal Aid Project No. BRZ-1727(1); Division 12; TIP No. B-4061, \$240.00 debit WBS 33425 1.1

Dear Madam:

The North Carolina Department of Transportation (NCDOT) proposes to replace Bridge No. 90 over Hagan Fork on SR 1727 (Boggs Road) with a bridge. The current structure is a two-span bridge approximately 61 feet in length. The replacement structure will be a single-span, box beam bridge approximately 100 feet in length. An unnamed tributary (UT) to Hagan Fork will be relocated away from the roadway and the pipe conveying the stream under SR 1727 will be replaced. The UT is currently undermining the roadway which necessitates the move to prevent further degradation of the road. A 60-inch CMP carrying the UT under SR 1727 is undersized and deteriorated to the point of needing to be replaced with a 78-inch RCP. An offsite detour will be used to control traffic during construction. There will be 298 linear feet of permanent impact to the UT to Hagan Fork due to the relocation of the stream away from the roadway. Ten feet of temporary impact will occur on the UT due to routing of water during the relocation and replacement of the pipe. The replacement of Bridge No. 90 will result in 92 linear feet of permanent stream impact due to bank stabilization.

Please see enclosed copies of the Pre-Construction Notification (PCN), NCEEP acceptance letter, jurisdictional determination form, stormwater management plan, permit drawings and design plans for the above mentioned project. The Categorical Exclusion (CE) was

completed in February 2009. Copies were distributed shortly thereafter. Additional copies are available upon request.

This project calls for a letting date of February 21, 2012 and a review date of January 3, 2012; however, the let date may advance as additional funding becomes available.

A copy of this permit application and its distribution list will be posted on the NCDOT website at <http://www.ncdot.org/doh/preconstruct/pe/neu/permit.html>. If you have any questions or need additional information, please call Jason Dilday at (919) 707-6111.

Sincerely,

for Gregory J. Thorpe, Ph.D., Manager
Project Development and Environmental Analysis Branch

The "cc" List:

NCDOT Permit Application Standard Distribution List



Office Use Only:
 Corps action ID no. _____
 DWQ project no. _____
 Form Version 1.3 Dec 10 2008

Pre-Construction Notification (PCN) Form		
A. Applicant Information		
1. Processing		
1a. Type(s) of approval sought from the Corps:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Section 404 Permit <input type="checkbox"/> Section 10 Permit	
1b. Specify Nationwide Permit (NWP) number: 13, 23, 33 or General Permit (GP) number:		
1c. Has the NWP or GP number been verified by the Corps?		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
1d. Type(s) of approval sought from the DWQ (check all that apply):		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 401 Water Quality Certification – Regular <input type="checkbox"/> Non-404 Jurisdictional General Permit <input type="checkbox"/> 401 Water Quality Certification – Express <input type="checkbox"/> Riparian Buffer Authorization		
1e. Is this notification solely for the record because written approval is not required?	For the record only for DWQ 401 Certification: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No	For the record only for Corps Permit: <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
1f. Is payment into a mitigation bank or in-lieu fee program proposed for mitigation of impacts? If so, attach the acceptance letter from mitigation bank or in-lieu fee program.		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
1g. Is the project located in any of NC's twenty coastal counties. If yes, answer 1h below.		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
1h. Is the project located within a NC DCM Area of Environmental Concern (AEC)?		<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
2. Project Information		
2a. Name of project:	Replacement of Bridge 90 over Hagan Fork on SR 1727	
2b. County:	Catawba	
2c. Nearest municipality / town:	Newton	
2d. Subdivision name:	<i>not applicable</i>	
2e. NCDOT only, T.I.P. or state project no.:	B-4061	
3. Owner Information		
3a. Name(s) on Recorded Deed:	North Carolina Department of Transportation	
3b. Deed Book and Page No.	<i>not applicable</i>	
3c. Responsible Party (for LLC if applicable):	<i>not applicable</i>	
3d. Street address:	1598 Mail Service Center	
3e. City, state, zip:	Raleigh, NC 27699-1598	
3f. Telephone no.:	(919) 707-6100	
3g. Fax no.:	(919) 212-5785	
3h. Email address:	jldilday@ncdot.gov	

4. Applicant Information (if different from owner)	
4a. Applicant is:	<input type="checkbox"/> Agent <input type="checkbox"/> Other, specify
4b. Name:	<i>not applicable</i>
4c. Business name (if applicable):	
4d. Street address:	
4e. City, state, zip:	
4f. Telephone no.:	
4g. Fax no.:	
4h. Email address:	
5. Agent/Consultant Information (if applicable)	
5a. Name:	<i>not applicable</i>
5b. Business name (if applicable):	
5c. Street address:	
5d. City, state, zip:	
5e. Telephone no.:	
5f. Fax no.:	
5g. Email address:	

B. Project Information and Prior Project History	
1. Property Identification	
1a. Property identification no. (tax PIN or parcel ID):	<i>not applicable</i>
1b. Site coordinates (in decimal degrees):	Latitude: 35.68505 (DD.DDDDDD) Longitude: - 81 12837 (-DD.DDDDDD)
1c. Property size:	2.0 acres
2. Surface Waters	
2a. Name of nearest body of water (stream, river, etc.) to proposed project:	Hagan Fork
2b. Water Quality Classification of nearest receiving water:	WS-IV
2c. River basin:	Catawba
3. Project Description	
3a. Describe the existing conditions on the site and the general land use in the vicinity of the project at the time of this application: Agriculture and residential development.	
3b. List the total estimated acreage of all existing wetlands on the property: 0.0	
3c. List the total estimated linear feet of all existing streams (intermittent and perennial) on the property: 650 linear feet perennial: 250 feet (Hagan Fork), 400 feet (UT to Hagan Fork)	
3d. Explain the purpose of the proposed project: To replace a structurally deficient and functionally obsolete bridge (Sufficiency rating of 19.8 out of 100) and replace an undersized and structurally deficient pipe conveying an UT to Hagan Fork.	
3e. Describe the overall project in detail, including the type of equipment to be used: The project involves replacing a 61-foot, 2-span bridge with a 100-foot, single span bridge. Replacement of an undersized, deteriorated 60-inch pipe with a 78-inch pipe. Standard road building equipment, such as trucks, dozers, and cranes will be used.	
4. Jurisdictional Determinations	
4a. Have jurisdictional wetland or stream determinations by the Corps or State been requested or obtained for this property / project (including all prior phases) in the past? Comments: Requesting Final JD with the permit.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown
4b. If the Corps made the jurisdictional determination, what type of determination was made?	<input type="checkbox"/> Preliminary <input type="checkbox"/> Final
4c. If yes, who delineated the jurisdictional areas? Name (if known):	Agency/Consultant Company: Other:
4d. If yes, list the dates of the Corps jurisdictional determinations or State determinations and attach documentation.	
5. Project History	
5a. Have permits or certifications been requested or obtained for this project (including all prior phases) in the past?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown
5b. If yes, explain in detail according to "help file" instructions.	
6. Future Project Plans	
6a. Is this a phased project?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
6b. If yes, explain.	

C. Proposed Impacts Inventory

1. Impacts Summary

1a. Which sections were completed below for your project (check all that apply):

- Wetlands Streams - tributaries Buffers
 Open Waters Pond Construction

2. Wetland Impacts

If there are wetland impacts proposed on the site, then complete this question for each wetland area impacted.

2a. Wetland impact number – Permanent (P) or Temporary (T)	2b. Type of impact	2c. Type of wetland (if known)	2d. Forested	2e. Type of jurisdiction (Corps - 404, 10 DWQ – non-404, other)	2f. Area of impact (acres)
Site 1 <input type="checkbox"/> P <input type="checkbox"/> T			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Corps <input type="checkbox"/> DWQ	
Site 2 <input type="checkbox"/> P <input type="checkbox"/> T			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Corps <input type="checkbox"/> DWQ	
Site 3 <input type="checkbox"/> P <input type="checkbox"/> T			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Corps <input type="checkbox"/> DWQ	
Site 4 <input type="checkbox"/> P <input type="checkbox"/> T			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Corps <input type="checkbox"/> DWQ	
Site 5 <input type="checkbox"/> P <input type="checkbox"/> T			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Corps <input type="checkbox"/> DWQ	
Site 6 <input type="checkbox"/> P <input type="checkbox"/> T			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	<input type="checkbox"/> Corps <input type="checkbox"/> DWQ	
2g. Total wetland impacts					X Permanent X Temporary

2h. Comments:

3. Stream Impacts

If there are perennial or intermittent stream impacts (including temporary impacts) proposed on the site, then complete this question for all stream sites impacted.

3a. Stream impact number - Permanent (P) or Temporary (T)	3b. Type of impact	3c. Stream name	3d. Perennial (PER) or intermittent (INT)?	3e. Type of jurisdiction (Corps - 404, 10 DWQ – non-404, other)	3f. Average stream width (feet)	3g. Impact length (linear feet)
Site 1 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> P <input type="checkbox"/> T	Stream Relocation	UT to Hagan Fork	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PER <input type="checkbox"/> INT	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Corps <input type="checkbox"/> DWQ	4	298
Site 2 <input type="checkbox"/> P <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> T	Temporary Dewatering	UT to Hagan Fork	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PER <input type="checkbox"/> INT	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Corps <input type="checkbox"/> DWQ	4	10 (<0.01 ac.)
Site 3 <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> P <input type="checkbox"/> T	Bank Stabilization	Hagan Fork	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> PER <input type="checkbox"/> INT	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Corps <input type="checkbox"/> DWQ	25	92
Site 4 <input type="checkbox"/> P <input type="checkbox"/> T			<input type="checkbox"/> PER <input type="checkbox"/> INT	<input type="checkbox"/> Corps <input type="checkbox"/> DWQ		
Site 5 <input type="checkbox"/> P <input type="checkbox"/> T			<input type="checkbox"/> PER <input type="checkbox"/> INT	<input type="checkbox"/> Corps <input type="checkbox"/> DWQ		
Site 6 <input type="checkbox"/> P <input type="checkbox"/> T			<input type="checkbox"/> PER <input type="checkbox"/> INT	<input type="checkbox"/> Corps <input type="checkbox"/> DWQ		
3h. Total stream and tributary impacts						390 Perm 10 Temp

3i. Comments: Temporary impacts to Hagan Fork due to installation of new pipe equals <0.01 acres.

4. Open Water Impacts

If there are proposed impacts to lakes, ponds, estuaries, tributaries, sounds, the Atlantic Ocean, or any other open water of the U.S. then individually list all open water impacts below.

4a. Open water impact number – Permanent (P) or Temporary (T)	4b. Name of waterbody (if applicable)	4c. Type of impact	4d. Waterbody type	4e. Area of impact (acres)
O1 <input type="checkbox"/> P <input type="checkbox"/> T				
O2 <input type="checkbox"/> P <input type="checkbox"/> T				
O3 <input type="checkbox"/> P <input type="checkbox"/> T				
O4 <input type="checkbox"/> P <input type="checkbox"/> T				
4f. Total open water impacts				X Permanent X Temporary

4g. Comments:

5. Pond or Lake Construction

If pond or lake construction proposed, then complete the chart below.

5a. Pond ID number	5b. Proposed use or purpose of pond	5c. Wetland Impacts (acres)			5d. Stream Impacts (feet)			5e. Upland (acres)
		Flooded	Filled	Excavated	Flooded	Filled	Excavated	Flooded
P1								
P2								
5f. Total								

5g. Comments:

5h. Is a dam high hazard permit required?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No If yes, permit ID no:
5i. Expected pond surface area (acres):	
5j. Size of pond watershed (acres):	
5k. Method of construction:	

6. Buffer Impacts (for DWQ)

If project will impact a protected riparian buffer, then complete the chart below. If yes, then individually list all buffer impacts below. If any impacts require mitigation, then you **MUST** fill out Section D of this form.

6a. Project is in which protected basin?		<input type="checkbox"/> Neuse <input type="checkbox"/> Tar-Pamlico <input type="checkbox"/> Other <input type="checkbox"/> Catawba <input type="checkbox"/> Randleman			
6b. Buffer impact number – Permanent (P) or Temporary (T)	6c. Reason for impact	6d. Stream name	6e. Buffer mitigation required?	6f. Zone 1 impact (square feet)	6g. Zone 2 impact (square feet)
B1 <input type="checkbox"/> P <input type="checkbox"/> T			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No		
B2 <input type="checkbox"/> P <input type="checkbox"/> T			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No		
B3 <input type="checkbox"/> P <input type="checkbox"/> T			<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No		
6h. Total buffer impacts					
6i. Comments:					

D. Impact Justification and Mitigation		
1. Avoidance and Minimization		
1a. Specifically describe measures taken to avoid or minimize the proposed impacts in designing project. Replacing a structurally deficient bridge with a structure that is safer for commuters. Replacement of a two-span bridge with a single-span structure. Replacement of an undersized and deteriorated 60-inch pipe with a larger 78-inch pipe. An off-site detour will be used during construction. NCDOT's "Best Management Practices for Protection of Surface Waters" will be adhered to during all phases of construction.		
1b. Specifically describe measures taken to avoid or minimize the proposed impacts through construction techniques. Rip rap for bank stabilization will be kept at a minimum and will only be used to protect the bridge.		
2. Compensatory Mitigation for Impacts to Waters of the U.S. or Waters of the State		
2a. Does the project require Compensatory Mitigation for impacts to Waters of the U.S. or Waters of the State?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No If no, explain:	
2b. If yes, mitigation is required by (check all that apply):	<input type="checkbox"/> DWQ <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Corps	
2c. If yes, which mitigation option will be used for this project?	<input type="checkbox"/> Mitigation bank <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Payment to in-lieu fee program <input type="checkbox"/> Permittee Responsible Mitigation	
3. Complete if Using a Mitigation Bank		
3a. Name of Mitigation Bank: not applicable		
3b. Credits Purchased (attach receipt and letter)	Type	Quantity
3c. Comments:		
4. Complete if Making a Payment to In-lieu Fee Program		
4a. Approval letter from in-lieu fee program is attached.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	
4b. Stream mitigation requested:	298 linear feet (due to stream relocation)@2:1=596 feet	
4c. If using stream mitigation, stream temperature:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> warm <input type="checkbox"/> cool <input type="checkbox"/> cold	
4d. Buffer mitigation requested (DWQ only):	square feet	
4e. Riparian wetland mitigation requested:	acres	
4f. Non-riparian wetland mitigation requested:	acres	
4g. Coastal (tidal) wetland mitigation requested:	acres	
4h. Comments: Mitigation is for the placement of the box culvert replacing the current bridge.		
5. Complete if Using a Permittee Responsible Mitigation Plan		
5a. If using a permittee responsible mitigation plan, provide a description of the proposed mitigation plan.		

6. Buffer Mitigation (State Regulated Riparian Buffer Rules) – required by DWQ

6a. Will the project result in an impact within a protected riparian buffer that requires buffer mitigation?

Yes No

6b. If yes, then identify the square feet of impact to each zone of the riparian buffer that requires mitigation. Calculate the amount of mitigation required.

Zone	6c. Reason for impact	6d. Total impact (square feet)	Multiplier	6e. Required mitigation (square feet)
Zone 1			3 (2 for Catawba)	
Zone 2			1.5	
6f. Total buffer mitigation required:				

6g. If buffer mitigation is required, discuss what type of mitigation is proposed (e.g., payment to private mitigation bank, permittee responsible riparian buffer restoration, payment into an approved in-lieu fee fund).

6h. Comments:

E. Stormwater Management and Diffuse Flow Plan (required by DWQ)	
1. Diffuse Flow Plan	
1a. Does the project include or is it adjacent to protected riparian buffers identified within one of the NC Riparian Buffer Protection Rules?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
1b. If yes, then is a diffuse flow plan included? If no, explain why Comments:	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
2. Stormwater Management Plan	
2a. What is the overall percent imperviousness of this project?	N/A
2b. Does this project require a Stormwater Management Plan?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
2c. If this project DOES NOT require a Stormwater Management Plan, explain why:	
2d. If this project DOES require a Stormwater Management Plan, then provide a brief, narrative description of the plan: See attached permit drawings.	
2e. Who will be responsible for the review of the Stormwater Management Plan?	<input type="checkbox"/> Certified Local Government <input type="checkbox"/> DWQ Stormwater Program <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> DWQ 401 Unit
3. Certified Local Government Stormwater Review	
3a. In which local government's jurisdiction is this project?	not applicable
3b. Which of the following locally-implemented stormwater management programs apply (check all that apply):	<input type="checkbox"/> Phase II <input type="checkbox"/> NSW <input type="checkbox"/> USMP <input type="checkbox"/> Water Supply Watershed <input type="checkbox"/> Other
3c. Has the approved Stormwater Management Plan with proof of approval been attached?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
4. DWQ Stormwater Program Review	
4a. Which of the following state-implemented stormwater management programs apply (check all that apply):	<input type="checkbox"/> Coastal counties <input type="checkbox"/> HQW <input type="checkbox"/> ORW <input type="checkbox"/> Session Law 2006-246 <input type="checkbox"/> Other
4b. Has the approved Stormwater Management Plan with proof of approval been attached?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
5. DWQ 401 Unit Stormwater Review	
5a. Does the Stormwater Management Plan meet the appropriate requirements?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
5b. Have all of the 401 Unit submittal requirements been met?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No

F. Supplementary Information	
1. Environmental Documentation (DWQ Requirement)	
1a. Does the project involve an expenditure of public (federal/state/local) funds or the use of public (federal/state) land?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
1b. If you answered "yes" to the above, does the project require preparation of an environmental document pursuant to the requirements of the National or State (North Carolina) Environmental Policy Act (NEPA/SEPA)?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
1c. If you answered "yes" to the above, has the document review been finalized by the State Clearing House? (If so, attach a copy of the NEPA or SEPA final approval letter.) Comments:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
2. Violations (DWQ Requirement)	
2a. Is the site in violation of DWQ Wetland Rules (15A NCAC 2H .0500), Isolated Wetland Rules (15A NCAC 2H 1300), DWQ Surface Water or Wetland Standards, or Riparian Buffer Rules (15A NCAC 2B .0200)?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
2b. Is this an after-the-fact permit application?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
2c. If you answered "yes" to one or both of the above questions, provide an explanation of the violation(s):	
3. Cumulative Impacts (DWQ Requirement)	
3a. Will this project (based on past and reasonably anticipated future impacts) result in additional development, which could impact nearby downstream water quality?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
3b. If you answered "yes" to the above, submit a qualitative or quantitative cumulative impact analysis in accordance with the most recent DWQ policy. If you answered "no," provide a short narrative description. Due to the minimal transportation impact resulting from this bridge replacement, this project will neither influence nearby land uses nor stimulate growth. Therefore, a detailed indirect or cumulative effects study will not be necessary.	
4. Sewage Disposal (DWQ Requirement)	
4a. Clearly detail the ultimate treatment methods and disposition (non-discharge or discharge) of wastewater generated from the proposed project, or available capacity of the subject facility not applicable	

5. Endangered Species and Designated Critical Habitat (Corps Requirement)		
5a. Will this project occur in or near an area with federally protected species or habitat?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
5b. Have you checked with the USFWS concerning Endangered Species Act impacts?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
5c. If yes, indicate the USFWS Field Office you have contacted.	<input type="checkbox"/> Raleigh <input type="checkbox"/> Asheville	
5d. What data sources did you use to determine whether your site would impact Endangered Species or Designated Critical Habitat? USFWS web page of T/E species for Catawba County and the NHP database of element occurrences. Visual surveys of the project area conducted 05/2007		
6. Essential Fish Habitat (Corps Requirement)		
6a. Will this project occur in or near an area designated as essential fish habitat?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
6b. What data sources did you use to determine whether your site would impact Essential Fish Habitat? NMFS County Index		
7. Historic or Prehistoric Cultural Resources (Corps Requirement)		
7a. Will this project occur in or near an area that the state, federal or tribal governments have designated as having historic or cultural preservation status (e.g., National Historic Trust designation or properties significant in North Carolina history and archaeology)?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
7b. What data sources did you use to determine whether your site would impact historic or archeological resources? NEPA Documentation		
8. Flood Zone Designation (Corps Requirement)		
8a. Will this project occur in a FEMA-designated 100-year floodplain?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
8b. If yes, explain how project meets FEMA requirements: NCDOT Hydraulics coordination with FEMA		
8c. What source(s) did you use to make the floodplain determination? FEMA Maps		
Dr. Gregory J. Thorpe, Ph D Applicant/Agent's Printed Name	 Applicant/Agent's Signature <small>(Agent's signature is valid only if an authorization letter from the applicant is provided.)</small>	6-6-11 Date



April 21, 2011

Mr. Gregory J. Thorpe, Ph.D.
Manager, Project Development and Environmental Analysis Branch
North Carolina Department of Transportation
1548 Mail Service Center
Raleigh, North Carolina 27699-1548

Dear Dr. Thorpe:

Subject: EEP Mitigation Acceptance Letter:

B-4061, Replace Bridge Number 90 over Hagan Creek on SR 1727 (Boggs Road),
Catawba County

The purpose of this letter is to notify you that the Ecosystem Enhancement Program (EEP) will provide the compensatory stream mitigation for the subject project. Based on the information supplied by you on April 20, 2011, the impacts are located in CU 03050101 of the Catawba River Basin in the Central Piedmont (CP) Eco-Region, and are as follows:

Catawba 03050101 CP	Stream			Wetlands			Buffer (Sq. Ft.)	
	Cold	Cool	Warm	Riparian	Non-Riparian	Coastal Marsh	Zone 1	Zone 2
Impacts (feet/acres)	0	0	298	0	0	0	0	0
Mitigation Units (Credits-up to 2:1)	0	0	596	0	0	0	0	0

EEP commits to implementing sufficient compensatory stream mitigation credits to offset the impacts associated with this project in accordance with the N.C. Department of Environment and Natural Resources' Ecosystem Enhancement Program In-Lieu Fee Instrument dated July 28, 2010. If the above referenced impact amounts are revised, then this mitigation acceptance letter will no longer be valid and a new mitigation acceptance letter will be required from EEP

If you have any questions or need additional information, please contact Ms. Beth Harmon at 919-715-1929

Sincerely,

William D. Gilmore, P.E.
EEP Director

cc: Ms. Liz Hair, USACE – Asheville Regulatory Field Office
Mr. Brian Wrenn, Division of Water Quality, Wetlands/401 Unit
File: B-4061

Restoring... Enhancing... Protecting Our State



STORMWATER MANAGEMENT PLAN

B-4061, State Project 33425.1.1

Date: 4/18/11

Catawba County

Hydraulics Project Engineer: R.C. Henegar, PE

ROADWAY DESCRIPTION

This project involves replacing Bridge No. 90 over Hagan Creek and a 60" CMP in which an Unnamed Tributary to Hagan Creek flows through on SR 1727 (Boggs Rd.) in Catawba County. The overall length of the project is 0.112 miles. The existing 18-foot paved road is a two-lane road with 3-foot grassed shoulders. Bridge No. 90 is a 61 ft. two span bridge (2@30.5') with a clear roadway width of 20 feet. The project will be a two-lane section with 11 foot lanes and 4 foot paved shoulders. The replacement structure for Bridge No. 90 will be a 1@ 100 foot long 39 inch Box Beam providing a 30 foot clear deck width. The replacement structure for the 60" CMP will be a 78" RCP buried a foot on each end.

ENVIRONMENTAL DESCRIPTION

This project is located in the Catawba River Basin. There are two crossings on this project, which has a WS-IV classification. Neither crossing is on the 303(d) list. Wetlands will not be impacted by the proposed project.

BEST MANAGEMENT PRACTICES AND MAJOR STRUCTURES

The proposed bridge is a one span structure eliminating the bent in the creek. Deck drains on the proposed structure will not discharge directly into the stream. Also the storm drainage is being discharged as far away as practicable.

APPROVED JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION FORM
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

Hagan Fork
and
UT

This form should be completed by following the instructions provided in Section IV of the JD Form Instructional Guidebook.

SECTION I: BACKGROUND INFORMATION

A. REPORT COMPLETION DATE FOR APPROVED JURISDICTIONAL DETERMINATION (JD):

B. DISTRICT OFFICE, FILE NAME, AND NUMBER: B-4061 (Replacement of Bridge 90 over Hagan Fork on SR 1727)

C. PROJECT LOCATION AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

State: NC County/parish/borough: Catawba City: Newton
Center coordinates of site (lat/long in degree decimal format): Lat. 35.68505° N Long. 81.12837° W
Universal Transverse Mercator:

Name of nearest waterbody: Hagan Fork

Name of nearest Traditional Navigable Water (TNW) into which the aquatic resource flows: Catawba River

Name of watershed or Hydrologic Unit Code (HUC): 03050101

Check if map/diagram of review area and/or potential jurisdictional areas is/are available upon request.

Check if other sites (e.g., offsite mitigation sites, disposal sites, etc...) are associated with this action and are recorded on a different JD form.

D. REVIEW PERFORMED FOR SITE EVALUATION (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY):

Office (Desk) Determination. Date:

Field Determination. Date(s):

SECTION II: SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

A. RHA SECTION 10 DETERMINATION OF JURISDICTION.

There **Are no** "navigable waters of the U.S." within Rivers and Harbors Act (RHA) jurisdiction (as defined by 33 CFR part 329) in the review area. [Required]

Waters subject to the ebb and flow of the tide.

Waters are presently used, or have been used in the past, or may be susceptible for use to transport interstate or foreign commerce.

Explain:

B. CWA SECTION 404 DETERMINATION OF JURISDICTION.

There **Are** "waters of the U.S." within Clean Water Act (CWA) jurisdiction (as defined by 33 CFR part 328) in the review area. [Required]

1. Waters of the U.S.

a. Indicate presence of waters of U.S. in review area (check all that apply):¹

- TNWs, including territorial seas
- Wetlands adjacent to TNWs
- Relatively permanent waters² (RPWs) that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs
- Non-RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs
- Wetlands directly abutting RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs
- Wetlands adjacent to but not directly abutting RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs
- Wetlands adjacent to non-RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs
- Impoundments of jurisdictional waters
- Isolated (interstate or intrastate) waters, including isolated wetlands

b. Identify (estimate) size of waters of the U.S. in the review area:

Non-wetland waters: 650 linear feet: 4-25 width (ft) and/or acres.

Wetlands: acres.

c. Limits (boundaries) of jurisdiction based on: Established by OHWM.

Elevation of established OHWM (if known):

2. Non-regulated waters/wetlands (check if applicable):³

Potentially jurisdictional waters and/or wetlands were assessed within the review area and determined to be not jurisdictional.

Explain:

¹ Boxes checked below shall be supported by completing the appropriate sections in Section III below.

² For purposes of this form, an RPW is defined as a tributary that is not a TNW and that typically flows year-round or has continuous flow at least "seasonally" (e.g., typically 3 months).

³ Supporting documentation is presented in Section III.F

SECTION III: CWA ANALYSIS

A. TNWs AND WETLANDS ADJACENT TO TNWs

The agencies will assert jurisdiction over TNWs and wetlands adjacent to TNWs. If the aquatic resource is a TNW, complete Section III.A.1 and Section III.D.1. only; if the aquatic resource is a wetland adjacent to a TNW, complete Sections III.A.1 and 2 and Section III.D.1.; otherwise, see Section III.B below.

- 1. **TNW**
Identify TNW.

Summarize rationale supporting determination:

- 2. **Wetland adjacent to TNW**
Summarize rationale supporting conclusion that wetland is “adjacent”.

B. CHARACTERISTICS OF TRIBUTARY (THAT IS NOT A TNW) AND ITS ADJACENT WETLANDS (IF ANY):

This section summarizes information regarding characteristics of the tributary and its adjacent wetlands, if any, and it helps determine whether or not the standards for jurisdiction established under *Rapanos* have been met.

The agencies will assert jurisdiction over non-navigable tributaries of TNWs where the tributaries are “relatively permanent waters” (RPWs), i.e. tributaries that typically flow year-round or have continuous flow at least seasonally (e.g., typically 3 months). A wetland that directly abuts an RPW is also jurisdictional. If the aquatic resource is not a TNW, but has year-round (perennial) flow, skip to Section III.D.2. If the aquatic resource is a wetland directly abutting a tributary with perennial flow, skip to Section III.D.4.

A wetland that is adjacent to but that does not directly abut an RPW requires a significant nexus evaluation. Corps districts and EPA regions will include in the record any available information that documents the existence of a significant nexus between a relatively permanent tributary that is not perennial (and its adjacent wetlands if any) and a traditional navigable water, even though a significant nexus finding is not required as a matter of law.

If the waterbody⁴ is not an RPW, or a wetland directly abutting an RPW, a JD will require additional data to determine if the waterbody has a significant nexus with a TNW. If the tributary has adjacent wetlands, the significant nexus evaluation must consider the tributary in combination with all of its adjacent wetlands. This significant nexus evaluation that combines, for analytical purposes, the tributary and all of its adjacent wetlands is used whether the review area identified in the JD request is the tributary, or its adjacent wetlands, or both. If the JD covers a tributary with adjacent wetlands, complete Section III.B.1 for the tributary, Section III.B.2 for any onsite wetlands, and Section III.B.3 for all wetlands adjacent to that tributary, both onsite and offsite. The determination whether a significant nexus exists is determined in Section III.C below.

1. Characteristics of non-TNWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNW

(i) General Area Conditions:

Watershed size: **Pick List**
Drainage area: **Pick List**
Average annual rainfall: inches
Average annual snowfall: inches

(ii) Physical Characteristics:

(a) Relationship with TNW:

- Tributary flows directly into TNW
- Tributary flows through **Pick List** tributaries before entering TNW

Project waters are **Pick List** river miles from TNW
Project waters are **Pick List** river miles from RPW
Project waters are **Pick List** aerial (straight) miles from TNW
Project waters are **Pick List** aerial (straight) miles from RPW
Project waters cross or serve as state boundaries. Explain:

Identify flow route to TNW⁵.
Tributary stream order, if known:

⁴ Note that the Instructional Guidebook contains additional information regarding swales, ditches, washes, and erosional features generally and in the arid West.

⁵ Flow route can be described by identifying, e.g., tributary a, which flows through the review area, to flow into tributary b, which then flows into TNW

(b) **General Tributary Characteristics (check all that apply):**

- Tributary is: Natural
 Artificial (man-made). Explain:
 Manipulated (man-altered). Explain:

Tributary properties with respect to top of bank (estimate):

- Average width: feet
Average depth: feet
Average side slopes: **Pick List**.

Primary tributary substrate composition (check all that apply):

- | | | |
|--|--|-----------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Silts | <input type="checkbox"/> Sands | <input type="checkbox"/> Concrete |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Cobbles | <input type="checkbox"/> Gravel | <input type="checkbox"/> Muck |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Bedrock | <input type="checkbox"/> Vegetation. Type/% cover: | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other. Explain: | | |

Tributary condition/stability [e.g., highly eroding, sloughing banks]. Explain:

Presence of run/riffle/pool complexes. Explain:

Tributary geometry: **Pick List**

Tributary gradient (approximate average slope): %

(c) **Flow:**

Tributary provides for: **Pick List**

Estimate average number of flow events in review area/year: **Pick List**

Describe flow regime:

Other information on duration and volume:

Surface flow is: **Pick List**. Characteristics:

Subsurface flow: **Pick List**. Explain findings:

- Dye (or other) test performed:

Tributary has (check all that apply):

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Bed and banks | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> OHWM ⁶ (check all indicators that apply): | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> clear, natural line impressed on the bank | <input type="checkbox"/> the presence of litter and debris |
| <input type="checkbox"/> changes in the character of soil | <input type="checkbox"/> destruction of terrestrial vegetation |
| <input type="checkbox"/> shelving | <input type="checkbox"/> the presence of wrack line |
| <input type="checkbox"/> vegetation matted down, bent, or absent | <input type="checkbox"/> sediment sorting |
| <input type="checkbox"/> leaf litter disturbed or washed away | <input type="checkbox"/> scour |
| <input type="checkbox"/> sediment deposition | <input type="checkbox"/> multiple observed or predicted flow events |
| <input type="checkbox"/> water staining | <input type="checkbox"/> abrupt change in plant community |
| <input type="checkbox"/> other (list): | |

- Discontinuous OHWM.⁷ Explain:

If factors other than the OHWM were used to determine lateral extent of CWA jurisdiction (check all that apply):

- | | |
|--|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> High Tide Line indicated by: | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Mean High Water Mark indicated by: |
| <input type="checkbox"/> oil or scum line along shore objects | <input type="checkbox"/> survey to available datum; |
| <input type="checkbox"/> fine shell or debris deposits (foreshore) | <input type="checkbox"/> physical markings; |
| <input type="checkbox"/> physical markings/characteristics | <input type="checkbox"/> vegetation lines/changes in vegetation types. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> tidal gauges | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> other (list): | |

(iii) **Chemical Characteristics:**

Characterize tributary (e.g., water color is clear, discolored, oily film; water quality; general watershed characteristics, etc.).

Explain:

Identify specific pollutants, if known:

⁶A natural or man-made discontinuity in the OHWM does not necessarily sever jurisdiction (e.g., where the stream temporarily flows underground, or where the OHWM has been removed by development or agricultural practices). Where there is a break in the OHWM that is unrelated to the waterbody's flow regime (e.g., flow over a rock outcrop or through a culvert), the agencies will look for indicators of flow above and below the break.

⁷Ibid.

(iv) **Biological Characteristics. Channel supports (check all that apply):**

- Riparian corridor. Characteristics (type, average width):
- Wetland fringe. Characteristics:
- Habitat for:
 - Federally Listed species. Explain findings:
 - Fish/spawn areas. Explain findings:
 - Other environmentally-sensitive species. Explain findings:
 - Aquatic/wildlife diversity Explain findings:

2. Characteristics of wetlands adjacent to non-TNW that flow directly or indirectly into TNW

(i) **Physical Characteristics:**

(a) General Wetland Characteristics:

Properties:

Wetland size: acres

Wetland type. Explain:

Wetland quality Explain:

Project wetlands cross or serve as state boundaries. Explain:

(b) General Flow Relationship with Non-TNW:

Flow is: **Pick List**. Explain:

Surface flow is: **Pick List**

Characteristics:

Subsurface flow: **Pick List**. Explain findings:

- Dye (or other) test performed:

(c) Wetland Adjacency Determination with Non-TNW:

- Directly abutting
- Not directly abutting
 - Discrete wetland hydrologic connection. Explain:
 - Ecological connection. Explain:
 - Separated by berm/barrier. Explain:

(d) Proximity (Relationship) to TNW

Project wetlands are **Pick List** river miles from TNW

Project waters are **Pick List** aerial (straight) miles from TNW

Flow is from: **Pick List**.

Estimate approximate location of wetland as within the **Pick List** floodplain.

(ii) **Chemical Characteristics:**

Characterize wetland system (e.g., water color is clear, brown, oil film on surface; water quality; general watershed characteristics; etc.). Explain:

Identify specific pollutants, if known:

(iii) **Biological Characteristics. Wetland supports (check all that apply):**

- Riparian buffer. Characteristics (type, average width):
- Vegetation type/percent cover. Explain:
- Habitat for:
 - Federally Listed species. Explain findings:
 - Fish/spawn areas. Explain findings:
 - Other environmentally-sensitive species. Explain findings:
 - Aquatic/wildlife diversity Explain findings:

3. Characteristics of all wetlands adjacent to the tributary (if any)

All wetland(s) being considered in the cumulative analysis: **Pick List**

Approximately () acres in total are being considered in the cumulative analysis.

For each wetland, specify the following:

Directly abuts? (Y/N)

Size (in acres)

Directly abuts? (Y/N)

Size (in acres)

Summarize overall biological, chemical and physical functions being performed:

C. SIGNIFICANT NEXUS DETERMINATION

A significant nexus analysis will assess the flow characteristics and functions of the tributary itself and the functions performed by any wetlands adjacent to the tributary to determine if they significantly affect the chemical, physical, and biological integrity of a TNW. For each of the following situations, a significant nexus exists if the tributary, in combination with all of its adjacent wetlands, has more than a speculative or insubstantial effect on the chemical, physical and/or biological integrity of a TNW. Considerations when evaluating significant nexus include, but are not limited to the volume, duration, and frequency of the flow of water in the tributary and its proximity to a TNW, and the functions performed by the tributary and all its adjacent wetlands. It is not appropriate to determine significant nexus based solely on any specific threshold of distance (e.g. between a tributary and its adjacent wetland or between a tributary and the TNW). Similarly, the fact an adjacent wetland lies within or outside of a floodplain is not solely determinative of significant nexus.

Draw connections between the features documented and the effects on the TNW, as identified in the *Rapanos* Guidance and discussed in the Instructional Guidebook. Factors to consider include, for example:

- Does the tributary, in combination with its adjacent wetlands (if any), have the capacity to carry pollutants or flood waters to TNWs, or to reduce the amount of pollutants or flood waters reaching a TNW?
- Does the tributary, in combination with its adjacent wetlands (if any), provide habitat and lifecycle support functions for fish and other species, such as feeding, nesting, spawning, or rearing young for species that are present in the TNW?
- Does the tributary, in combination with its adjacent wetlands (if any), have the capacity to transfer nutrients and organic carbon that support downstream foodwebs?
- Does the tributary, in combination with its adjacent wetlands (if any), have other relationships to the physical, chemical, or biological integrity of the TNW?

Note: the above list of considerations is not inclusive and other functions observed or known to occur should be documented below:

1. **Significant nexus findings for non-RPW that has no adjacent wetlands and flows directly or indirectly into TNWs.** Explain findings of presence or absence of significant nexus below, based on the tributary itself, then go to Section III.D:
2. **Significant nexus findings for non-RPW and its adjacent wetlands, where the non-RPW flows directly or indirectly into TNWs.** Explain findings of presence or absence of significant nexus below, based on the tributary in combination with all of its adjacent wetlands, then go to Section III.D:
3. **Significant nexus findings for wetlands adjacent to an RPW but that do not directly abut the RPW.** Explain findings of presence or absence of significant nexus below, based on the tributary in combination with all of its adjacent wetlands, then go to Section III.D:

D. DETERMINATIONS OF JURISDICTIONAL FINDINGS. THE SUBJECT WATERS/WETLANDS ARE (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY):

1. **TNWs and Adjacent Wetlands.** Check all that apply and provide size estimates in review area:

TNWs: li near feet width (ft), Or, acres.

Wetlands adjacent to TNWs: acres.

2. **RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs.**

Tributaries of TNWs where tributaries typically flow year-round are jurisdictional. Provide data and rationale indicating that tributary is perennial: Hagan Fork and its associated UT are perennial streams and have NCDWQ stream rating scores greater than 30.

Tributaries of TNW where tributaries have continuous flow "seasonally" (e.g., typically three months each year) are jurisdictional. Data supporting this conclusion is provided at Section III.B. Provide rationale indicating that tributary flows seasonally.

Provide estimates for jurisdictional waters in the review area (check all that apply):

- Tributary waters: **650** linear feet **4-25** width (ft).
 Other non-wetland waters: acres.

Identify type(s) of waters:

3. Non-RPWs⁸ that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs.

- Waterbody that is not a TNW or an RPW, but flows directly or indirectly into a TNW, and it has a significant nexus with a TNW is jurisdictional. Data supporting this conclusion is provided at Section III.C.

Provide estimates for jurisdictional waters within the review area (check all that apply):

- Tributary waters: linear feet width (ft).
 Other non-wetland waters: acres.

Identify type(s) of waters: .

4. Wetlands directly abutting an RPW that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs.

- Wetlands directly abut RPW and thus are jurisdictional as adjacent wetlands.
 Wetlands directly abutting an RPW where tributaries typically flow year-round. Provide data and rationale indicating that tributary is perennial in Section III.D.2, above. Provide rationale indicating that wetland is directly abutting an RPW: .
 Wetlands directly abutting an RPW where tributaries typically flow "seasonally" Provide data indicating that tributary is seasonal in Section III.B and rationale in Section III.D.2, above. Provide rationale indicating that wetland is directly abutting an RPW: .

Provide acreage estimates for jurisdictional wetlands in the review area: acres.

5. Wetlands adjacent to but not directly abutting an RPW that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs.

- Wetlands that do not directly abut an RPW, but when considered in combination with the tributary to which they are adjacent and with similarly situated adjacent wetlands, have a significant nexus with a TNW are jurisdictional. Data supporting this conclusion is provided at Section III.C.

Provide acreage estimates for jurisdictional wetlands in the review area: acres.

6. Wetlands adjacent to non-RPWs that flow directly or indirectly into TNWs.

- Wetlands adjacent to such waters, and have when considered in combination with the tributary to which they are adjacent and with similarly situated adjacent wetlands, have a significant nexus with a TNW are jurisdictional. Data supporting this conclusion is provided at Section III.C.

Provide estimates for jurisdictional wetlands in the review area: acres.

7. Impoundments of jurisdictional waters.⁹

As a general rule, the impoundment of a jurisdictional tributary remains jurisdictional.

- Demonstrate that impoundment was created from "waters of the U.S.," or
 Demonstrate that water meets the criteria for one of the categories presented above (1-6), or
 Demonstrate that water is isolated with a nexus to commerce (see E below).

E. ISOLATED [INTERSTATE OR INTRA-STATE] WATERS, INCLUDING ISOLATED WETLANDS, THE USE, DEGRADATION OR DESTRUCTION OF WHICH COULD AFFECT INTERSTATE COMMERCE, INCLUDING ANY SUCH WATERS (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY):¹⁰

- which are or could be used by interstate or foreign travelers for recreational or other purposes.
 from which fish or shellfish are or could be taken and sold in interstate or foreign commerce.
 which are or could be used for industrial purposes by industries in interstate commerce.
 Interstate isolated waters. Explain:
 Other factors. Explain:

⁸See Footnote # 3.

⁹To complete the analysis refer to the key in Section III.D.6 of the Instructional Guidebook.

¹⁰Prior to asserting or declining CWA jurisdiction based solely on this category, Corps Districts will elevate the action to Corps and EPA HQ for review consistent with the process described in the Corps/EPA Memorandum Regarding CWA Act Jurisdiction Following Rapanos.

Identify water body and summarize rationale supporting determination:

Provide estimates for jurisdictional waters in the review area (check all that apply):

- Tributary waters: linear feet width (ft).
- Other non-wetland waters: acres.
Identify type(s) of waters: .
- Wetlands: acres.

F. NON-JURISDICTIONAL WATERS, INCLUDING WETLANDS (CHECK ALL THAT APPLY):

- If potential wetlands were assessed within the review area, these areas did not meet the criteria in the 1987 Corps of Engineers Wetland Delineation Manual and/or appropriate Regional Supplements.
- Review area included isolated waters with no substantial nexus to interstate (or foreign) commerce.
 - Prior to the Jan 2001 Supreme Court decision in "SWANCC," the review area would have been regulated based solely on the "Migratory Bird Rule" (MBR).
- Waters do not meet the "Significant Nexus" standard, where such a finding is required for jurisdiction. Explain: .
- Other: (explain, if not covered above): .

Provide acreage estimates for non-jurisdictional waters in the review area, where the sole potential basis of jurisdiction is the MBR factors (i.e., presence of migratory birds, presence of endangered species, use of water for irrigated agriculture), using best professional judgment (check all that apply):

- Non-wetland waters (i.e., rivers, streams): linear feet width (ft).
- Lakes/ponds: acres.
- Other non-wetland waters: acres. List type of aquatic resource:
- Wetlands: acres.

Provide acreage estimates for non-jurisdictional waters in the review area that do not meet the "Significant Nexus" standard, where such a finding is required for jurisdiction (check all that apply):



- Non-wetland waters (i.e., rivers, streams): linear feet, width (ft).
- Lakes/ponds: acres.
- Other non-wetland waters: acres. List type of aquatic resource:
- Wetlands: acres.

SECTION IV: DATA SOURCES.

A. SUPPORTING DATA. Data reviewed for JD (check all that apply - checked items shall be included in case file and, where checked and requested, appropriately reference sources below):

- Maps, plans, plots or plat submitted by or on behalf of the applicant/consultant:
- Data sheets prepared/submitted by or on behalf of the applicant/consultant.
 - Office concurs with data sheets/delineation report.
 - Office does not concur with data sheets/delineation report.
- Data sheets prepared by the Corps:
- Corps navigable waters' study
- U.S. Geological Survey Hydrologic Atlas:
 - USGS NHD data.
 - USGS 8 and 12 digit HUC maps.
- U.S. Geological Survey map(s). Cite scale & quad name:
- USDA Natural Resources Conservation Service Soil Survey Citation:
- National wetlands inventory map(s). Cite name:
- State/Local wetland inventory map(s):
- FEMA/FIRM maps:
- 100-year Floodplain Elevation is: (National Geodetic Vertical Datum of 1929)
- Photographs: Aerial (Name & Date):
or Other (Name & Date):
- Previous determination(s). File no. and date of response letter:
- Applicable/supporting case law
- Applicable/supporting scientific literature:
- Other information (please specify):

B. ADDITIONAL COMMENTS TO SUPPORT JD:



	<p>NORTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION DIVISION OF HIGHWAYS PROJECT DEVELOPMENT & ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS BRANCH</p>
<p align="center">CATAWBA COUNTY REPLACE BRIDGE NO. 90 ON SR 1727 OVER HAGAN CREEK B-4061</p>	
<p align="right">Figure 1</p>	

PROPERTY OWNERS
NAMES AND ADDRESSES

PARCEL NO.	NAMES	ADDRESSES
10	MICHAEL D. & RICHARD H. FRAZIER	P.O. BOX 1238 CONOVER, N.C. 28613
8	TERRY N. SHERRILL	3821 BOGGS RD. CLAREMONT, N.C. 28610
11	BEN A. & SHIRLEY F. FOX, Sr.	1314 OLD BRISTOL RD. BOONE, N.C. 28607

Permit Drawing
2 of 9

NCDOT
DIVISION OF HIGHWAYS
CATAWBA COUNTY
PROJECT: 33425.1.1 (B-4061)
REPLACE BRG#90 OVER HAGAN
CREEK ON SR 1727 (BOGGS RD.)
SHEET OF 04/18/11

WETLAND PERMIT IMPACT SUMMARY

Site No	Station (From/To)	Structure Size / Type	WETLAND IMPACTS					SURFACE WATER IMPACTS						
			Permanent Fill In Wetlands (ac)	Temp Fill In Wetlands (ac)	Excavation in Wetlands (ac)	Mechanized Clearing in Wetlands (ac)	Hand Clearing in Wetlands (ac)	Permanent SW impacts (ac)	Temp SW impacts (ac)	Existing Channel Impacts Permanent (ft)	Existing Channel Impacts Temp (ft)	Natural Stream Design (ft)		
	13+60-16+16 LT.	78" RCP								0.04	<0.01	298	10	
	13+65 -L-	100'.39" Box Beam Bank Stabilization								0.02		92		
TOTALS.										0.06	<0.01	390	10	

Structures noted that there are no permanent impacts from bridge

Permit Drawing
Sheet 3 of 9

NC DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
DIVISION OF HIGHWAYS
CATAWBA COUNTY
WBS - 33425 1 1 (B-4061)
SHEET 4/19/2011

See Sheet 1-A For Index of Sheets

STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA
DIVISION OF HIGHWAYS

CATAWBA COUNTY


LOCATION: BRIDGE NO. 90 OVER HAGAN CREEK
ON SR 1727 (BOGGS RD)

TYPE OF WORK: GRADING, PAVING, DRAINAGE
AND STRUCTURE

STATE	STATE PROJECT REFERENCE NO.	SHEET NO.	TOTAL SHEETS
N.C.	B-4061	1	
STATE PROJ. NO.	F.A. PROJ. NO.	DESCRIPTION	
33425.1.1	BRZ-1727(1)	P.E.	
33425.2.1	BRZ-1727(1)	RW, UTIL	




Permit Drawing
Sheet 4 of 9



VICINITY MAP
DETOUR ROUTE —●—●—●—


WETLAND AND STREAM IMPACTS



CLEARING ON THIS PROJECT SHALL BE PERFORMED TO THE LIMITS ESTABLISHED BY METHOD III
THIS PROJECT IS NOT WITHIN ANY MUNICIPAL BOUNDARIES

TIP PROJECT: B-4061

CONTRACT:



DESIGN DATA

ADT 2009 =	3570
ADT 2035 =	6060
DHV =	12 %
D =	70 %
T =	4 % *
V =	50 MPH
* TTST 1%	DUAL 3%
SUB-REGIONAL TIER	

PROJECT LENGTH

LENGTH ROADWAY TIP PROJECT B-4061 =	0.093 MILES
LENGTH STRUCTURE TIP PROJECT B-4061 =	0.019 MILES
TOTAL LENGTH TIP PROJECT B-4061 =	0.112 MILES

Prepared in the Office of:
DIVISION OF HIGHWAYS
1000 Birch Ridge Dr, Raleigh NC, 27610

2006 STANDARD SPECIFICATIONS

RIGHT OF WAY DATE: FEBRUARY 22, 2011	TED S. WALLS PROJECT ENGINEER
LETTING DATE: FEBRUARY 21, 2012	ALLISON K. WHITE PROJECT DESIGN ENGINEER

HYDRAULICS ENGINEER

SIGNATURE: _____ P.E.


ROADWAY DESIGN ENGINEER

SIGNATURE: _____ P.E.

**DIVISION OF HIGHWAYS
STATE OF NORTH CAROLINA**

STATE HIGHWAY DESIGN ENGINEER P.E.

\$\$\$\$\$SYTIME\$\$\$\$\$DCN\$\$\$\$\$USRNAME\$\$\$\$\$




NCDOT
 DIVISION OF HIGHWAYS
 CATAWBA COUNTY
 PROJECT: 33-425.1.1 (B-4061)


REPLACE BRG#90 OVER HAGAN
 CREEK ON SR 1727 (BOGGS RD.)

SHEET OF 4 / 18 / 11

PROFILE




HORIZONTAL SCALE



VERTICAL SCALE


Permit Drawing
 5 of 8



NC DOT
 DIVISION OF HIGHWAYS
 CATAWBA COUNTY
 PROJECT: 33-425.1.1 (B-4061)
 REPLACE BRG# 90 OVER HAGAN
 CREEK ON SR 1727 (BOGGS RD)

SHEET OF 04/18/11



PROFILE



Permit Drawing
 Sheet 4 of 4

PROJECT REFERENCE NO. B-4061	SHEET NO. 4
RAW SHEET NO.	
ROADWAY DESIGN ENGINEER	HYDRAULICS ENGINEER
PRELIMINARY PLANS DO NOT USE FOR CONSTRUCTION	

Permit Drawing
Sheet 7 of 9




NAD '83


REVISIONS

B/17/95

 1. 11/15/83
 2. 11/15/83
 3. 11/15/83
 4. 11/15/83
 5. 11/15/83
 6. 11/15/83
 7. 11/15/83
 8. 11/15/83
 9. 11/15/83
 10. 11/15/83
 11. 11/15/83
 12. 11/15/83
 13. 11/15/83
 14. 11/15/83
 15. 11/15/83
 16. 11/15/83
 17. 11/15/83
 18. 11/15/83
 19. 11/15/83
 20. 11/15/83
 21. 11/15/83
 22. 11/15/83
 23. 11/15/83
 24. 11/15/83
 25. 11/15/83
 26. 11/15/83
 27. 11/15/83
 28. 11/15/83
 29. 11/15/83
 30. 11/15/83
 31. 11/15/83
 32. 11/15/83
 33. 11/15/83
 34. 11/15/83
 35. 11/15/83
 36. 11/15/83
 37. 11/15/83
 38. 11/15/83
 39. 11/15/83
 40. 11/15/83
 41. 11/15/83
 42. 11/15/83
 43. 11/15/83
 44. 11/15/83
 45. 11/15/83
 46. 11/15/83
 47. 11/15/83
 48. 11/15/83
 49. 11/15/83
 50. 11/15/83






DENOTES IMPACTS IN SURFACE WATER
 DENOTES TEMPORARY IMPACTS IN SURFACE WATER




8/17/99

ROW REVISION 3/9/11 lsb
Deleted Proposed RW and RW monuments +00.77/Est. Pl., +84.00/132.00' LT, +65.90/Est. RW and deleted Temp. Connt. Easement +65.90/65.00' LT, +97.42/Est. RW.
*Added Proposed RW and RW monuments +68.92/Est. Pl., +50.14/98.31' LT, +97.42/Est. RW to Parcel 10.

*****SYSTEMS*****
*****DONSON*****
*****FEIN*****




-L-
PI Sta 14+91.09
 $\Delta = 7' 07'' 10.7'' (RT)$
 $D = 5' 24'' 18.9''$
 $L = 131.7'$
 $T = 65.94'$
 $R = 1060.00'$
 $SE = 02$
RUNOFF = SEE PLANS



PROJECT REFERENCE NO.	SHEET NO.
B-4061	4
R/W SHEET NO.	
ROADWAY DESIGN ENGINEER	HYDRAULICS ENGINEER
PRELIMINARY PLANS	
DO NOT USE FOR CONSTRUCTION	

NAD 83



SEE SHEET 5 FOR PROFILE

