

Appendix G

Ohio Department of Transportation

County CLA Route 794 Section Sub Area Study PID _____ SJN _____

CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION DOCUMENT

Part I - General Project Identification, Description, and Design Information

Sponsor of the Project: Clark County / Springfield Transportation Coordinating Committee ODOT District: 7
Local Name of the Facility: West Blee Road and West Sparrow Road

Program: _____ Funding Source: Federal State Local Private

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

County and Township: Springfield County / Springfield and Green Township
Municipality: None

Limits of Proposed Work:
Start: _____ / _____ End: _____ / _____
Total Work Length: _____ km or (_____ mi).

Is an Interchange Modification Study / Interchange Justification Study (IMS/IJS) required? Yes* No
If yes, when did FHWA grant a conditional approval for this project? Date: _____

*If yes, for CE 2 or CE 3 projects a copy of the approved document must be submitted to FHWA with a request with for final approval of the IMS/IJS.

Located in rural Clark County, south of the City of Springfield, Ohio, this project involves SR 794 between US 68 and SR 72. SR 794 is immediately north of the Springfield-Beckley Municipal Airport and Ohio Air National Guard (OANG) Base. SR 794 provides access to the airport and guard base, and SR 794 is a primary connection between US 68 and SR 72.
To encompass a variety of transportation alternatives, the study area spanned east to west from US 68 to SR 72 and north to south from West Possum Road to Jackson Road. As a result of the study, the Springfield TCC narrowed alternatives to two, D1 and D4.
The proposed new alignments deviate from the existing alignment west of Mill Creek, following jus to north of the existing landfill, which is on the north side of Blee Road, to a location approximately 1000 feet east of Peacock Rd. D4 would extend directly west and intersect with US 68
D1 would veer to the southwest and connect with existing Blee Road at a point approximately 1200 feet west of Peacock Rd. the overall length of D1 is 6500 feet, D4 is 7500 feet
The 3200 feet section on the east end of the project is common to both alternatives

Ohio Department of Transportation

County CLA Route 794 Section Sub Area Study PID SJN

PURPOSE AND NEED FOR THE PROJECT:

SR 794 runs primarily east and west between US 68 and SR 72. SR 794 is adjacent to the Springfield-Beckley Municipal Airport and the Ohio Air National Guard (OANG) Base. The federal government recently adopted anti-terrorism regulations relating to the protection of US military installations. As a result, the existing SR 794 facility violates "Force Protection" standards for the minimum clearance from a public roadway to the OANG Base.

One solution for complying with the new regulations is to simply close SR 794 in the vicinity of the OANG Base; however, the impacts of the closure needed studied. The Clark County – Springfield Transportation Coordinating Committee (TCC) conducted a study (SR 794 Sub Area Study) to determine the best options for maintaining a functional transportation system in the area, while complying with Force Protection standards for the Base.

The Ohio Department of Transportation (ODOT) is proposing to relinquish this roadway to the Clark County Engineer for ownership, maintenance and access control, and therefore the roadway is now referred to as "CR X".

The purpose of the project is to find alternatives and provide the highest measure of security possible for the OANG Base and any future military installations near SR 794. In addition to meeting or exceeding all military security standards, the goals of the project are to develop a roadway system that 1) preserves the ease of mobility, 2) has minimal impact on the surrounding community, 3) provides adequate emergency and public services for the area, 4) meets existing and future transportation demands and 5) provides for safe and efficient local access.

ALTERNATIVES:

Since the existing roadway was being closed in the vicinity of the OANG Base, there were three basic alternatives;

- 1) Construct a new connection between US 68 and SR 72 north of the Springfield-Beckley Municipal Airport: The preferred design provides adequate clearance from the OANG Base, and it provides a link in the transportation system near the airport without any major negative impacts to the environment.
- 2) Construct a new connection between US 68 and SR 72 south of the Springfield-Beckley Municipal Airport: This alternative considered had fewer impacts to streams; however, the great number of residential properties in the area prevented the development of a feasible corridor for the proposed roadway.
- 3) The "Do Nothing" Alternative: This alternative actually involves a small amount of work to convert one or both ends of SR 794 to access roads for the airport. The majority of the traffic on SR 794 was heading to and from the airport, rather than traveling between US 68 and SR 72, therefore, eliminating the roadway was studied.

To encompass a variety of transportation alternatives, the study area spanned east to west from US 68 to SR 72 and north to south from West Possum Road to Jackson Road. As a result of the study, the Springfield TCC narrowed alternatives to two, D1 and D4. The proposed new alignments deviate from the existing alignment west of Mill Creek, following jus to north of the existing landfill, which is on the north side of Blee Road, to a location approximately 1000 feet east of Peacock Rd. D4 would extend directly west and intersect with US 68. D1 would veer to the southwest and connect with existing Blee Road at a point approximately 1200 feet west of Peacock Rd. the overall length of D1 is 6500 feet, D4 is 7500 feet. The 3200 feet section on the east end of the project is common to both alternatives.

The 2 feasible alternatives to be presented to the TCC board are alternatives D1 & D4. These alternatives were selected after careful consideration of the public comments received, cost, environmental impacts, community impact, number of relocations, function of properties and how well each met the purpose and need of the project. These chosen alignments clearly rose to the top when weighed against the previously stated measurables. Alternatives D1 & D4 represent the 2 least expensive alternatives, have the fewest property and environmental impacts, provide the best route(s) for provision of emergency services as well as the least impact to emergency response times and provide the best solution for force protection for the OANG base and future Marine guard unit base.

Yes No

This is page 2 of 15, which is part of: Categorical Exclusion, Level 2 Date: December 2005

Ohio Department of Transportation

County CLA Route 794 Section Sub Area Study PID _____ SJN _____

The Do Nothing Alternative is not feasible, prudent or practicable (Mark all that apply):

It would not correct existing capacity deficiencies;	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
It would not correct existing safety hazards;	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
It would not correct the existing roadway geometric deficiencies;	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
It would not correct existing deteriorated conditions and maintenance problems, or	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
It would result in serious impacts to the motoring public and general welfare of the economy.		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

ROADWAY CHARACTER:

Functional Classification: Minor Collector
 Current ADT: 2400 vpd 20(0 / 5) Design Year ADT: 4000 vpd (20 / 30)
 DHV: 240 Trucks, 5 %
 Designed Speed: 60 mph Legal Speed: 55 mph

	Existing	Proposed
Number of Lanes:	<u>2</u>	<u>2</u>
Type of Lanes:	<u>Through</u>	<u>Through</u>
Pavement Width:	<u>22</u> ft.	<u>24</u> ft.
Shoulder Width:	<u>2</u> ft.	<u>4</u> ft.
Median Width:	<u>na</u> ft.	<u>na</u> ft.
Sidewalk Width:	<u>na</u> ft.	<u>na</u> ft.
Setting:	<input type="checkbox"/> Urban	<input type="checkbox"/> Suburban <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Rural
Topography:	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Level <input type="checkbox"/> Rolling	<input type="checkbox"/> Hilly

DESIGN CRITERIA FOR BRIDGES:

Structure File Number(s): No bridges to be replaced Sufficiency Rating: _____

	Existing	Proposed
Bridge Type:	_____	_____
Number of Spans:	_____	_____
Weight Restrictions:	_____ ton	_____ ton
Height Restrictions:	_____ ft.	_____ ft.
Curb to Curb Width:	_____ ft.	_____ ft.
Shoulder Width:	_____ ft.	_____ ft.
Under Clearance:	_____ ft.	_____ ft.

	Y	N
Will the structure be rehabilitated or replaced as part of the project?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
If Yes, has an asbestos inspection been completed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

MAINTENANCE OF TRAFFIC DURING CONSTRUCTION:

	Y	N
Is a temporary bridge proposed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Is a temporary roadway proposed?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Will the project involve the use of a detour or require a ramp closure?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Provisions will be made for access by local traffic and so posted.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Provisions will be made for through-traffic dependent businesses.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Provisions will be made to accommodate any local special events or festivals.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Will the proposed MOT substantially change the environmental consequences of the action?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

This is page 3 of 15, which is part of: Categorical Exclusion, Level 2 Date: December 2005

Ohio Department of Transportation

County CLA Route 794 Section Sub Area Study PID _____ SJN _____

Is there substantial controversy associated with the proposed method for MOT?

Remarks: Since this is a roadway relocation project, traffic will be maintained on the existing facility while the proposed roadway is constructed. Portions of the existing roadway will be closed to the public when the new roadway is completed.

ESTIMATED PROJECT COST AND SCHEDULE:

Engineering: \$ \$500,000 Right-of-Way: \$ \$2,000,000 Construction: \$ \$3,000,000
 Anticipated Start Date of Construction: _____

RIGHT OF WAY AND UTILITY INVOLVEMENT:

Number of parcels to be affected for temporary ROW: 30
 Number of parcels to be affected for permanent ROW: 20
 Approximate area of temporary right-of-way needed: _____ acre
 Approximate area of permanent right-of-way needed: _____ acre

Has Utility Coordination been completed?	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
Are large scale transmission facilities located within the project area?	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Are there any private utility easements within the project area?	Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	No	<input type="checkbox"/>
If YES, will it be impacted by the project?	Yes	<input type="checkbox"/>	No	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Remarks:

Part II – Identification and Evaluation of Impacts of the Proposed Action

SECTION A – ECOLOGICAL RESOURCES

	<u>Presence</u>		<u>Impacts</u>	
	Y	N*	Y***	N**
Streams, Rivers & Watercourses	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
National Scenic River	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
State Wild, Scenic or Recreational River	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Commercial	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Non-Commercial	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
OEPA Aquatic Life Use Designation(eg. WWH)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
			Mill Creek - Warmwater habitat	

Ohio Department of Transportation

County CLA Route 794 Section Sub Area Study PID SJN

Remarks: The study area is within the Mad River watershed and is part of the Great Miami River drainage basin. There is approximately 81 waterways in the study area; and according to the *Soil Survey of Clark County, Ohio*, most streams in the study area are either intermittent, ephemeral, or ditches. There are no navigable waterways in the study area. Mill Creek, which runs from the northwest corner to the southeast corner of the study area, is the one perennial stream in the study area. Mill Creek is a Warmwater Habitat (WWH). Source: ACS Group, Inc. *Ecological Resources Red Flag Summary S.R. 794 Sub-Area Study Clark County, Ohio*. July 2005.

The eastern termini of alternatives D1 and D4 are immediately west of Mill Creek. Both alternatives D1 and D4 would use the existing structure along SR 794 over Mill Creek; however, an ecological survey is recommended to assess any potential impacts construction may have on Mill Creek.

In addition, there is an unnamed tributary located near the western terminus of Alternative D1. An ecological survey is recommended to assess any potential impacts construction may have on this stream.

Other Surface Waters

- Reservoirs
- Lakes
- Farm Ponds
- Detention Basins
- Storm Water Management Facilities
- Other: _____

Presence		Impacts	
Y	N*	Y***	N**
X			X
	X		X
	X		X
X			X
	X		X
X			X

Remarks: Based on USGS mapping, there are other surface waters in the study area. Mapping indicates a pond north of SR 794 (W. Blee Road) between SR 68 and Peacock Road; however, existence of this suspected farm pond was not confirmed during a site visit on August 25, 2005 because the surrounding area was planted with corn which obscured the view.

According to Greg Chambers, Environmental/Risk Administrator for The City of Springfield, the City has storm water management facilities servicing the Springfield-Beckley Municipal Airport and Ohio Air National Guard base on the south side of SR 794. Mr. Chambers confirmed that the City does not have any detention basins in the study area.

Neither Alternative D1 nor D4 impact other surface waters.

**If the resource is not present, the remainder of this subject section will not be completed*
***If the resource is present but no impacts are anticipated, the reason why is described under Remarks.*
****Any impacts, mitigation, and agency coordination are described under Remarks and coordination letters are attached.*

Wetlands

Presence		Impacts	
Y	N****	Y***	N**

Total wetland area impacted: _____ acre(s)

(If a determination has not been made for non-isolated/isolated wetlands, fill in the total wetland area impacted above.)

<p>Non-isolated Wetland</p> <p>OEPA Wetland Category: _____</p> <p>Size of Area Impacted: _____ acre(s)</p>	<p>Isolated Wetland</p> <p>OEPA Wetland Category: _____</p> <p>Size of Area Impacted: _____ acre(s)</p>
--	--

Wetlands

- Wetland Determination
- Wetland Delineation Report
- Individual Wetland Finding

Documentation	
Y	N

This is page 5 of 15, which is part of: Categorical Exclusion, Level 2 Date: December 2005

Ohio Department of Transportation

County CLA Route 794 Section Sub Area Study PID SJN

Improvements that will not result in any wetland impacts are not practicable because such avoidance would result in (Mark all that apply and explain):

- Substantial adverse impacts to adjacent homes, business or other improved properties;
- Substantially increased project costs;
- Unique engineering, traffic, maintenance, or safety problems;
- Substantial adverse social, economic, or environmental impacts, or
- The project not meeting the identified needs.

USACOE Isolated Waters Determination
Mitigation Plan

Measures to avoid, minimize and mitigate wetland impacts need to be discussed in the remarks section

Remarks: A literature review conducted in July 2005 reviewed the National Wetland Inventory (NWI) maps, Ohio Wetland Inventory maps, and *Soil Survey of Clark County, Ohio*. The 1991 Ohio Wetland Inventory Maps identify approximately 83 wetland/wetland complexes within the study area. Most of the wetland complexes are a mixture of shrub/scrub, shallow marsh, woods on hydric soils, and open water areas. The NWI maps identify 19 wetlands in the study area. The NWI maps describe 11 of the 19 as emergent wetlands, 4 of the 19 as forested wetlands, and 4 of the 19 as excavated open areas. Source: ACS Group, Inc. *Ecological Resources Red Flag Summary S.R. 794 Sub-Area Study Clark County, Ohio*. July 2005.

While developing alternatives, all efforts were made to avoid and minimize impacts to those wetlands identified in the literature review. An ecological survey is recommended for Alternatives D1 and D4 to determine the presence or absence of wetlands. As necessary, wetland delineations, individual wetland findings, and mitigation plans will be conducted within the preferred alternative.

	<u>Presence</u>		<u>Impacts</u>	
	Y	N****	Y***	N**
Terrestrial Habitat				
Unique or High Quality		x		x

Remarks: The majority of the study area is comprised of either crop land or residential land. In addition, the Springfield-Beckley Municipal Airport and the OANG base comprise a majority of the southern study area. Residential development is concentrated around the Ra-Mar Estates subdivision in the northeast portion of the study area and the Peacock Acres subdivision in the central portion of the study area. The crop land consists of corn and soybean fields. There are narrow tracts of woodland lining Mill Creek which runs diagonally northwest to southeast through the study area. There are also small woodland tracts scattered throughout the southwest and northeast corners of the study area. Source: Land coverage mapping from the City of Springfield and a site visit on August 25, 2005.

An ecological survey is recommended to identify potential habitat for threatened and endangered species within Alternatives D1 and D4.

*** If the resource is present but no impacts are anticipated, describe the reason why in the Remarks section.*
****Any impacts, mitigation and agency coordination are described under Remarks and coordination letters are attached.*
*****If "no", discuss in the Remarks details how this determination was made.*

	<u>Presence</u>		<u>Impacts</u>	
	Y	N****	Y***	N
Threatened or Endangered Species	x			
Within the known range of and federal species?	x			
Federal species found in project area?				
State species found in project area?				
Is the project in accordance with the Letter of Agreement on Endangered Species Coordination?				

Ohio Department of Transportation

County CLA Route 794 Section Sub Area Study PID SJN

Remarks: The study area is within the known range of the federally and state-endangered Indiana bat (*Myotis sodalists*). There are no known capture sites or hibernacula within a 2.5 mile radius of the study area. The nearest recorded location of the Indiana bat is 12.3 miles west of the study area.

Habitat for the Indiana bat consists of living or standing dead trees or snags with exfoliating, peeling or loose bark, split trunks and/or branches, or cavities. Most of the study area is agricultural fields or residential lots. Few wooded areas exist in the study area and additional field surveys are necessary to determine if these wooded areas contain suitable Indiana bat habitat.

Clark County is within the range of the federally endangered eastern prairie fringed orchid (*Platanthera leucophaea*) and a candidate species for federal listing, the eastern massasauga (*Sistrurus catenatus catenatus*). Neither of these species has been documented in the study area. Additional field surveys are necessary to determine presence or absence of these species and their habitats.

The eastern massasauga habitat consists of wet areas including wet prairies, marshes and low areas along rivers and lakes. The eastern massasauga also uses adjacent uplands part of the year.

The eastern prairie fringed orchid habitat consists of wet tallgrass prairie. The plant requires full sun. In 1999, the USFWS developed a recovery plan for the Eastern Prairie Fringed Orchid to protect and manage habitat in order to increase the size and number of existing populations.

The state-threatened upland sandpiper (*Bartramia longicauda*) has been located within the study area at the Springfield-Beckley Municipal Airport. The known location of the upland sandpiper is bordered on the north by S.R. 794, on the east by Petre Road, on the south by Jackson Road, and on the west by Mosier Road and S.R. 68. Upland sandpipers are migratory birds that return to Ohio during April to lay eggs and leave Ohio by mid-August. Upland sandpiper habitat consists of grasslands, prairies and pastures where the vegetation reaches a maximum height of 30-60 cm. The birds prefer to nest in the glassland bordering the airport.

Source: ASC Group, Inc. *Ecological Resources Red Flag Summary, S.R. 794 Sub-Area Study, Clark County, Ohio*. July 2005.

Agency Coordination ***

Ohio Department of Natural Resources (ODNR)
 United States Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS)
 Ohio Environmental Protection Agency (OEPA)
 United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE)
 ODNR State Scenic River
 National Park Service (NPS) National Scenic River

<u>Coordination</u>		<u>Approval</u>	
Y	N	Y	N
x			
x			
	x		
	x		

Remarks: ODNR Division of Natural Areas and Preserves reviewed the Natural Heritage maps and files and provided results in a letter dated May 31, 2005. The letter is included in ACS Group, Inc. *Ecological Resources Red Flag Summary S.R. 794 Sub-Area Study Clark County, Ohio*. July 2005.

After additional ecological surveys to identify potential habitat and the presence or absence of federal threatened and endangered species, an effects determination will be coordinated with the USFWS.

The OEPA was initially contacted in September 2005 regarding the City of Springfield landfill parcel in the vicinity of Alternatives D1 and D4. Additional coordination with the OEPA is necessary to obtain a "Rule 13" Authorization Permit to construct a new roadway facility adjacent to the landfill parcel. Depending on the results of the ecological survey for wetlands, additional coordination with OEPA and USACE may be necessary.

*If the resource is not present, the remainder of this section will not be completed.

**If the resource is present but no impacts are anticipated, the reason why is described under Remarks.

***Any impacts, mitigation, and agency coordination are described under Remarks and coordination letters are attached.

****If "no", discuss in the Remarks details how this determination was made.

SECTION B – OTHER RESOURCES

This is page 7 of 15, which is part of: Categorical Exclusion, Level 2 Date: December 2005

Ohio Department of Transportation

County CLA Route 794 Section Sub Area Study PID SJN

	<u>Presence</u>		<u>Impacts</u>	
	Y	N*	Y	N
Drinking Water Resources	X			X
Sole Source Aquifer		X		X
Source Water Protection Area(s)		X		X
Public Water System(s)	X			X
Groundwater Source		X		X
Surface Water Source		X		X
Residential Well(s)	X			X

Remarks: The City of Springfield supplies water to the Springfield-Beckley Municipal Airport and Ohio Air National Guard base within the study area; however, the City's well field is outside the study area. The source of the City's well field is the Mad River Buried Valley Aquifer. As of 9/5/05, there exists no Total Maximum Daily Load report for the Mad River watershed. The City does have a Drinking Water Source Protection Plan which is endorsed by the Ohio EPA, but the Ohio EPA does not designate any source water protection areas within the study area.

There are approximately 180 recorded water wells in the study area; however, the minimal cuts associated with this project will not affect any of the wells which vary from 30 to 70 feet in depth in the area.

	Y	N*	Y	N
Flood Plains		X		
Longitudinal Encroachment		X		
Transverse Encroachment		X		
Is the project located in a regulated floodplain?		X		
Will the proposed project result in an encroachment in the designated floodway?		X		
Will the proposed project result in an increase in the 100-year base flood elevation discharge?		X		
Does the project conform to the local flood plain standard?		X		

Remarks: According to Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) 2005 mapping, no 100-year floodplain exists in the study area. Source: ACS Group, Inc. *Ecological Resources Red Flag Summary S.R. 794 Sub-Area Study Clark County, Ohio*. July 2005.

	Y	N*	Y	N
Farmland	X		X	
Active Agricultural Lands	X		X	
Agricultural District	X			
Project in compliance with ORC 929.05(a)	X			
FPPA Project Screening Sheet				
Farmland Conversion Impact Rating Sheet				

Remarks: According to the Clark County Natural Resources Conservancy District's definitions of "Prime Farmland", most of the land within the study area is deemed prime farmland. However, the majority of the prime farmland is occupied by the Springfield-Beckley Municipal Airport and OANG Base. A FPPA Project Screening Sheet needs completed for the ODOT, and a Farmland Conversion Impact Rating (FCIR) sheet needs coordinated with the US Department of Agriculture for the preferred alternative.

* If the resource is not present, the remaining boxes for this subject section will not be completed. State how and who made this determination.

SECTION C – CULTURAL RESOURCES

This is page 8 of 15, which is part of: Categorical Exclusion, Level 2 Date: December 2005

Ohio Department of Transportation

County CLA Route 794 Section Sub Area Study PID SJN

	<u>Results of Research</u> Eligible and/or Listed Resource Present		<u>Project Effect</u>		
	Y	N	No Historic Properties Affected	No Adverse Effect	Adverse Effect
Prehistoric Archaeology	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Historic Archaeology	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
History/Architecture	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
NRHP Buildings/Sites	x	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
NRHP Districts	<input type="checkbox"/>	x	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
NRHP Bridges	<input type="checkbox"/>	x	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

<u>Documentation</u>	Y	N	<u>SHPO / OES / FHWA Approval Dates</u>
Phase I Short Report	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Phase I Cultural Resources Survey Report	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Phase I History/Architecture Survey Report	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Phase I Archaeology Survey Report	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Phase II Cultural Resources Survey Report	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Phase II History/Architecture Survey Report	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Phase II Archaeology Survey Report	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Phase III Archaeology Data Recovery	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Documentation for Consultation / MOA	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
HABS / HAER Documentation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Remarks: The Marquart-Mercer Farm (CLA-1-9) is the only property in the study area currently listed on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). There are numerous pre-1955 buildings in the study area. A windshield survey conducted June 27, 2005 identified the following pre-1955 properties as potentially eligible for the NRHP: 6736 Tanyard Road, 292 W. Jackson Road, 625 Blee Road, 5017 Peacock Road, and 4863 Peacock Road. A Phase I history/architecture survey is necessary to determine NRHP-eligible properties within the preferred alternative. Source: ASC Group, Inc. *Cultural Resource Red Flag Summary for the S.R. 794 Sub-Area Study in Springfield and Green Townships, Clark County, Ohio.* July 2005.

At this time, no reports have been coordinated with the Ohio Historic Preservation Office (OHPO). Phase I history/architecture and archaeological field investigations are necessary within Alternatives D1 and D4. A Phase I Cultural Resources Report will need coordinated with the OHPO.

SECTION D – SECTION 4(F) RESOURCES

	<u>Presence</u>		<u>Impacts</u>		<u>FHWA / OES approval dates</u>
	Y	N****	Y***	N**	
Parks & Other Recreational Land	<input type="checkbox"/>	x	<input type="checkbox"/>	x	<input type="checkbox"/>
Publicly owned park	<input type="checkbox"/>	x	<input type="checkbox"/>	x	<input type="checkbox"/>
Publicly owned recreation area	<input type="checkbox"/>	x	<input type="checkbox"/>	x	<input type="checkbox"/>
National Wild & Scenic River	<input type="checkbox"/>	x	<input type="checkbox"/>	x	<input type="checkbox"/>
Section 4(f) Determination of No-Use	<input type="checkbox"/>	x	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Programmatic Section 4(f) Evaluation	<input type="checkbox"/>	x	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Individual Section 4(f)	<input type="checkbox"/>	x	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Section 6(f) involvement	<input type="checkbox"/>	x	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other (school, state/national forest, bikeway, etc.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	x	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

This is page 9 of 15, which is part of: Categorical Exclusion, Level 2 Date: December 2005

Ohio Department of Transportation

County CLA Route 794 Section Sub Area Study PID _____ SJN _____

	<u>Presence</u>		<u>Impacts</u>		<u>FHWA / OES approval dates</u>
	Y	N****	Y***	N**	
Natural & Wildlife & Waterfowl Refuges					
Federal		X		X	
National Wildlife Refuge		X		X	
National Natural Landmark		X		X	
State		X		X	
State Wildlife Area		X		X	
State Natural Preserve		X		X	
Section 4(f) Determination of No-Use		X			
Programmatic Section 4(f)		X			
Individual Section 4(f) Evaluation		X			
Section 6(f) involvement		X			

	Y	N**	Y***	N**	<u>FHWA / OES approval dates</u>
Cultural Resources Areas					
Sites eligible and/or listed for the NRHP	X			X	
Section 4(f) Determination of No-Use					
Programmatic Section 4(f)					
Individual Section 4(f) Evaluation					

Remarks: The Marquart-Mercer Farm (CLA-1-9) is the only property in the study area currently listed on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). Source: ASC Group, Inc. *Cultural Resource Red Flag Summary for the S.R. 794 Sub-Area Study in Springfield and Green Townships, Clark County, Ohio*. July 2005.

Alternatives D1 and D4 avoid any impacts to CLA-1-9.

** If the resource is present but no impacts are anticipated, the reason why is described under Remarks.
 *** Any impacts, mitigation and agency coordination are described under Remarks and coordination letters are attached.
 ****If "No", discuss in the remarks section details about how this determination was made.

SECTION E – AIR QUALITY & NOISE

Will the project move the travel lanes closer to the receptors?

Y	N
x	

Air Quality

Conformity Status of the Project

Is the project in an air quality non-attainment or maintenance area?	Y	N
Is this project in the STIP?	x	
In this project in the most current MPO air quality conforming TIP?	x	
If NO, is this project exempt from conformity analysis?	x	

Ohio Department of Transportation

County CLA Route 794 Section Sub Area Study PID _____ SJN _____

Project-Level Analysis and Impacts

Has the project scope changed substantially since the conformity analysis?
 If YES, will this change require a reevaluation of the MPO TIP conformity?

Y	N
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Remarks:
 Since the facility is a roadway relocation not involving a substantial increase in traffic, the impacts to air quality and noise are not consider significant compared to the environmental issues surrounding the airport traffic.

Noise

Is a noise analysis required in accordance with FHWA regulations and ODOT's statewide noise abatement policy?
 If YES, is a design year noise impact predicted?
 If YES, have all noise attenuation measures been considered, consistent with the policy?
 If NO, explain why not: See explanation in remarks above for Air Quality
 Is noise attenuation found to be reasonable and feasible?

Y	N
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Remarks:

SECTION F – COMMUNITY IMPACTS

Regional, Community & Neighborhood Factors

Will the proposed action comply with the local/regional development patterns for the area?
 Will the proposed action result in substantial impacts to community cohesion?
 Will the proposed action result in substantial impacts to local tax base or property values?

Y	N
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>

Ohio Department of Transportation

County CLA Route 794 Section Sub Area Study PID SJN

Remarks: This project has been coordinated with the regional plan for rezoning of the areas surrounding the airport (Springfield-Beckley Airport Base Plan). These plans allow for growth and security of the base and the airport.

Will the proposed action result in reasonably foreseeable secondary or cumulative impacts? **Y** **N**

Remarks: Impacts beyond the project boundaries are anticipated to be minimal or nonexistent.

Public Facilities & Services **Y** **N**
 Will the proposed action result in substantial impacts on health and educational facilities, public utilities, fire, police, emergency services, religious institutions, public transportation or pedestrian and bicycle facilities?

Remarks: There are no schools in the area, and the proposed facility provides essentially the same route as the existing road, so bus route and EMS services are not adversely impacted. There are several churches in the area, but these will not be impacted by the new facility.

Environmental Justice (Presidential Executive Order 12898) **Y** **N**
 During public involvement activities, were Environmental Justice issues raised?
 Are any Environmental Justice populations located within the project area?
 Will the project result in adversely high or disproportionate impacts to the population?

Remarks: The project is in a rural area outside of the Springfield city limits, and is not within any other municipality. The project will not permanently alter existing transportation, utility or public housing, and does not impact any low income or minority population areas.

In 1999, the median household income in Clark County was \$40,340. In Springfield it was \$32,193 and in Census Tract 32 (i.e. the study area) it was \$52,882. In 1999, the number of households below poverty level in Clark County was 10.7%, in Springfield it was 16.9% and in the study area it was .06%. In 1999, Clark County's population was about 9% black and 88% white. Springfield was 18% black and 78% white. The study area was .05% black and 94% white. Source: 2000 U.S. Census Bureau

Displacement of People, Businesses or Farms: **Y** **N**
 Will the proposed action displace people, businesses or farms?
 Number of displacements: Residences: 0 Businesses: 0 Farms: 0 Institutions: 0

Ohio Department of Transportation

County CLA Route 794 Section Sub Area Study PID _____ SJN _____

Remarks: 1 or 2 depending on final alignment.

SECTION G – PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

Per ORC 5511.01 and 23 CFR 771.111 (h)(2)(i) and (ii), every Federal action requires some level of public involvement, providing for early and continuous opportunities throughout the project development process. The level of public involvement should be commensurate with the proposed action.

Discuss what public involvement activities (letters to affected property owners and residents, meetings, special purpose meetings, newspaper articles, etc.) have occurred for this project.

Were you inclusive of minority and low income people in your public involvement activities? Yes* [x] No [] * If YES, explain below.

All residents within the study area were included in public involvement activities. In the July of 2005 a project newsletter was send via US mail to all residents within the study area. The newsletter described the project's purpose and need and invited residents to a public meeting on July 20, 2005 from 5:00 P.M. to 7:00 P.M. at the Husted Elementary School. The Clark County – Springfield TCC provided a written summary of comments received from the July 20, 2005 public meeting. A second newsletter was mailed to study area residents in October of 2005. This second newsletter provided project updates and invited residents to a public meeting on October 12, 200 at the Husted Fire Station. At the meeting, attendees reviewed numerous alternatives including the no build, SR 794 vicinity, Jackson Road vicinity, West Possum Road vicinity, and a few combination alternatives. Meeting attendees also received a handout explaining the project's environmental requirements. The Clark County – Springfield TCC provided a written summary of comments received from the public meeting.

Public Controversy on Environmental Grounds Will the project involve substantial controversy concerning community and/or natural resource impacts? Y [] N [x]

Remarks:

SECTION H – HAZARDOUS MATERIALS & REGULATED SUBSTANCES

Documentation

Environmental Site Assessment Screening / Checklist Phase I Environmental Site Assessment

Table with 2 columns (Y, N) and 2 rows (x,)

This is page 13 of 15, which is part of: Categorical Exclusion, Level 2 Date: December 2005

Ohio Department of Transportation

County CLA Route 794 Section Sub Area Study PID SJN

Phase II Environmental Site Assessment
Design for Remediation

Remarks: A Regulatory Database Review (dated 6/10/05) was completed by Environmental Data Resources Inc. (EDR) to determine areas of risk. No National Priority List (NPL), Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Information (CERCLIS), or Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) sites are within the study area. There are several USTs in the study area, including (but not limited to) three USTs at the Springfield-Beckley Municipal Airport and four USTs at the Ohio Air National Guard base. LUST reports a leaking incident at the Springfield-Beckley Municipal Airport.

A Phase I Environmental Site Assessment was completed in 1994 for the City of Springfield landfill parcels within the study area. See Lockwood Laboratories, Springfield Environmental. *Phase I Environmental Site Assessment Report for Tracts I, II, and III on Airpark, Ohio*. September 1994.

Alternatives D1 and D4 are adjacent to a City of Springfield Landfill facility. The Ohio EPA has recommended obtaining a Rule 13 Authorization before construction incase any hazardous materials are uncovered.

SECTION I – PERMITS CHECKLIST

	<u>Required</u>	<u>Not Required</u>		<u>Complete</u>
			Y	N
OES Permit Determination (PD)			<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Army Corps of Engineers (404/Section10 Permit				
Individual (IP)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Nationwide (NWP)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Pre-Construction Notification (PCN)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
OEPA				
Level 1 Review – General Isolated Wetland Permit	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Level 2 Review – Individual Isolated Wetland Permit	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Level 3 Review – Individual Isolated Wetland Permit	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
401 Water Quality Certification (WQC)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
NPDES Construction Storm Water Permit	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
US Coast Guard Section 9 Bridge Permit	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Wetland and/or Stream Mitigation	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		
Flood Plain Permit	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>		

Remarks: The level of necessary permitting will not be identified until after ecological investigations are completed to identify wetlands and any potential impacts to Mill Creek.

SECTION J – ENVIRONMENTAL COMMITMENTS MADE & RESOURCES TO BE AVOIDED

Form version: 11/16/044

Ohio Department of Transportation

County CLA Route 794 Section Sub Area Study PID SJN

Any unavoidable cutting of trees with suitable roosting and broad-rearing habitat for the Indiana bat (living or standing dead trees or snags with exfoliating, peeling or loose bark, split trunks and/or branches, or cavities) will be performed only before April 15 or after September 15 when the species would not be using such habitats.

The City of Springfield landfill parcel will be avoided as will the NRHP property CLA-1-9.

Additional commitments will likely result from the additional environmental surveys, particularly the ecological survey.

SECTION K – CONCURRENCE

It is hereby determined that the subject project meets the criteria for CE in accordance with the *Programmatic Categorical Exclusion Agreement* between ODOT and FHWA. This action does not: induce significant impacts to planned growth or land use for the area; require relocation of significant numbers of people; have significant impact on any natural, cultural, recreational, historic, or other resource; involve significant air, noise, or water quality impacts; have significant impacts on travel patterns; or otherwise, either individually or cumulatively, have any significant impacts and do not require the preparation of an Environmental Assessment or an Environmental Impact Statement.

As supported by information contained in this Categorical Exclusion Document, this project qualifies for a CE Level _____, Item Number _____, in accordance with the *Programmatic Categorical Exclusion Agreement* between ODOT and FHWA dated _____

Amy Botos, Tetra Tech

Name of Preparer and Organization		Date	
District Environmental Coordinator	Date	District Planning & Programs Administrator	Date
Office of Env. Services Administrator	Date	If CE-4: Date Submitted to FHWA	