

Package Document

Related Packages: [16818 \(Scoping - Approved 07/18/13\)](#)

Funding

Federal Funding? Yes

Federal Oversight? No

[Federal Oversight Agreement \(June 2015\)](#)

Type

Is this project being documented as an emergency project? Yes No

Phase: Evaluation

Classification: Categorical Exclusion (Class II)

CE Level: 1b

CE Action: 04 05 06 07 08 09
 10 11 12 13 14 Other

[List](#)

Projects

PDOT Project Manager: Mahendra M Patel

Federal Project Number: N/A

MPMS Projects

| Lead? | Status/Title | District/County | SR/Sec | Description |
|---|----------------------------------|-----------------|------------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 97274 | Active / Lenhartsville Bridge | 05 / Berks | 0078 / LBR | Widening and rehabilitation of structure carrying Interstate 78 over PA 143 and Maiden Creek in Lenhartsville, Greenwich Township, Berks County. |

*The last time MPMS data was added or refreshed was on Tuesday, 26 November 2019 11:13 AM.

Project Funding & Fiscal Constraint

| MPMS | FD \$ | ROW \$ | UTL \$ | CON \$ | TIP | L RTP Date |
|-------|-----------|---------|---------|-----------|-------------------------|------------|
| 97274 | 2,333,980 | 901,500 | 480,800 | 9,961,194 | FFY 2019 Interstate TIP | |

For federally funded projects where the construction phase (and if needed, ROW and/or utilities phases) is not programmed on the current TIP, remarks provide a detailed reference to the current LRTP identifying full funding for the project.

"LRTP Date" is the date of the last adopted Long Range Transportation Plan.

Refer to Supplement to January 28, 2008 "Transportation Planning Requirements and Their Relationship to NEPA Process Completion"

Editors

Names & Groups: Alyssa R Lynd/PennDOT BP-000092
 Brian Brawand/PennDOT BP-000010
 Craig Suhoskey/PennDOT
 Elizabeth B Grietzer/PennDOT BP-000092
 Eric R Bruggeman/PennDOT BP-000092
 John Thomas Graupensperger/PennDOT
 BP-000101
 Merle Mailloux/PennDOT BP-000101
 Michelle L Rehbogen/PennDOT BP-000101
 Stephen R Sartori/PennDOT
 Susan E Peters/PennDOT BP-000101
 All District 05 Users

Reviewers

| | System User Names | Non-System / Other Addresses |
|--|---|------------------------------|
| Notify These Additional Emails Upon Approval: | Amanda Leindecker/PennDOT Jennifer A Ruth/PennDOT Jim C Ruth/PennDOT Kerry Cox/PennDOT Vanessa Koenigkramer/PennDOT | |

Package was submitted on Tuesday, 26 November 2019 11:14 AM by Jim C Ruth/PennDOT

| Email Notify | Reviewed By | Date/Time |
|---|-----------------------------|------------------------|
| EM: Jerry E Neal/PennDOT | Jerry E Neal/PennDOT | Wed, 11/27/19 01:40 PM |
| ADE: Christopher J Kufro/PennDOT | Christopher J Kufro/PennDOT | Tue, 12/03/19 07:57 AM |
| DE: Christopher J Kufro/PennDOT | Christopher J Kufro/PennDOT | Tue, 12/03/19 07:57 AM |

CEES Package Number: 26583

Categorical Exclusion Evaluation

MPMS: 97274

Project: Lenhartsville Bridge



SR/Section: 0078 / LBR

County: Berks

District: 05

CE Level: 1b

CE Action: 13

Created: 12/27/17 by Eric R Bruggeman

Submitted: 11/26/19 by Jim C Ruth

Approved: 12/03/19 by Christopher J Kufro

CE Evaluation Part A
General Project Identification & Description

Project Identification

Part A Prepared By: Skelly and Loy
Alfred Benesch

Originating Office: 5-0 **Date:** 08/27/19

Federal Project Number: N/A

Township/Municipality: Greenwich Township

Local Name: Lenhartsville Bridge

Limits of Work (Segment/Offset)

Construction Stations

| Start: | End: | Start: | End: |
|---------------|-------------|---------------|-------------|
| 0344/2498 | 0354/2496 | 259+00.00 | 311+50.00 |
| 0345/2547 | 0355/2489 | | |

Total Length: 5250 ft

Program: 581 **Funding:** **federal** 80 **state** 20 **local** 0 **other** 0

Date of First Federal Authorization for Preliminary Engineering: 6/27/16

Date of Federal Authorization Time Extension(s) for Preliminary Engineering (if applicable): N/A

Project Description

Include narrative to describe the general project scope of work.

Attach Location Map(s) and Design Plan (only overview and sheets showing limits of work).

The purpose of this project is to replace the structure carrying SR 0078 over SR 0143 and Maiden Creek. Additionally, the roadway approaches to the structure will be widened to provide a consistent typical section along the SR 0078 corridor. The proposed structure will be widened to accommodate acceleration and deceleration lanes for the interchange loop ramps (Ramps B & C) and to provide full inside and outside shoulders. The proposed road profile will match existing at the ends of the project and across the structure. An existing vertical sag curve located just west of the bridge will be lengthened to meet headlight sight distance requirements. Reconstruction of 1800-feet of the western approach roadway and approximately, 1000-feet of the eastern approach roadway is required to accommodate widening of the roadway and the addition of acceleration and deceleration lanes. Additionally, reconstruction of approximately 200' of each of the interchange ramps is

required to accommodate the widening and addition of acceleration and deceleration lanes. Staged construction will be utilized to reconstruct the structure.

Project Purpose and Need

Include narrative to describe the project need.

Purpose: The purpose of the project is to replace the existing bridge, widening the bridge to accommodate the addition of auxiliary lanes in each direction and full inside and outside shoulders. The addition of the auxiliary lanes will lengthen the existing substandard SR 0078 westbound deceleration and SR 0078 eastbound acceleration lane lengths to and from the interchange. The auxiliary lanes are to be incorporated while avoiding interchange reconstruction and minimizing interchange impacts. These modifications will also provide a consistent typical section along the SR 0078 corridor.

Need: The project is needed to accommodate the addition of auxiliary lanes in each direction and full inside and outside shoulders. The addition of the auxiliary lanes will lengthen the existing substandard SR 0078 westbound deceleration and SR 0078 eastbound acceleration lane lengths to and from the interchange.

Project Setting and Distinct Project Features

Provide narrative to adequately describe the project setting (terrain, locale, land use, presence of bicycle/pedestrian or other unique facilities, etc.) and support the evaluation. Any additional information not otherwise covered by this form that is necessary to clearly understand project circumstances should also be included in this section. Narrative should be appropriate for the complexity of the CEE and project circumstances with the length and content varying accordingly.

The structure carrying SR 0078 over SR 143 and Maiden Creek in Greenwich Township, Berks County, is located in a rural setting. Although the Lenhartsville interchange ramps may not experience heavy traffic, the substandard interchange ramps with extremely tight curvature and the substandard acceleration/deceleration lanes pose potential safety hazards along SR 0078 considering the heavy average daily traffic of which a significant portion are trucks operating at high speeds.

Lane restrictions have the potential to create extremely long traffic delays.

The project area to the east of the bridge is forested. To the west is the Lenhartsville interchange and beyond is agricultural land (National Register Listed Property). To the south is Lenhartsville.

Describe the involvement with utilities with this project.

There are overhead utilities in the project area along SR 0143 that span under and over SR 0078 that may be impacted by the project. There are overhead utilities in the project area at the western approach to the structure that cross over SR 0078.

Coordination with utilities is ongoing and will continue through Final Design.

Describe the involvement with any railroad (active or inactive) including all rail lines, crossings, bridges, or signals.

SR 0078 crosses over an apparent abandoned rail line property on the east bank of Maiden Creek.

Describe changes to access control.

There are no changes to access control.

Additional Information

Remarks, Footnotes, Supplemental Data

Attachments

1. [Location Map_SR0078_LBR.pdf](#) (662KB / 0.6MB)
2. [SR 0078-LBR Engineering Plans.pdf](#) (1213KB / 1.2MB)

CE Evaluation Part A

Engineering Information

Design Criteria

Roadway Description: SR 0078

Functional Classification: Freeways/Interstates

Urban Rural

Current ADT: 51,080

Design Year No-Build / Build ADT, as well as Current / Design Year Build LOS, is only necessary when PM2.5 hot spot analysis is required.

If PM2.5 hot spot analysis is not needed (see exempt project list in Air Quality Handbook, Pub #321), "N/A" can be entered for these values.

Design Year No-Build ADT: N/A

Current LOS: N/A

Design Year Build ADT: N/A

Design Year Build LOS: N/A

DHV: 5,791

Truck %: 30

D (Directional Distribution) %: 52

Design Speed: 70 mi/h

Posted Speed: 55 mi/h

Required Minimum Widths

Lane Width: 12 ft

Shoulder Width: 12 ft, 4 ft

Bridge Curb-to-Curb: 52 ft

Design Exception Required? Yes No

If "Yes", explain.

The interchange will not be impacted by this project. The scope of the project is a bridge widening to obtain the standard length required on the accel/decel lanes.

a) Ramp B & C radii – The minimum 25 MPH loop ramp design speed requires ramp radii of 134'-0". This would require extensive reconstruction of the interchange, affecting the historic farmstead to the south of the Ramp A off-ramp from SR 0078 to SR 0143. Acceleration and deceleration lane lengths will be set to meet the requirements established in PennDOT Publication 13M. Mitigation for the design exception will include a 20 MPH ramp advisory speed sign. This design deficiency can be eliminated via interchange realignment in a future project.

b) SR 0078 superelevation – A portion of the existing horizontal curve at the beginning of the project along SR 0078 is to be reconstructed matching the existing 5700' radius. The proposed superelevation of 3.0% matches existing; however, this is below the required 3.6%. Eliminating this design exception for the existing curve would require extending the project limits to the west, resulting in additional full depth pavement reconstruction.

Typology: Limited Access Freeway – Rural Interstate

Topography: Level Rolling Mountainous

Proposed Design Criteria: New and Reconstruction

Traffic Control Measures

The following traffic control measures will be implemented:

- Temporary Bridge(s)
- Temporary Roadway
- Detour

- Ramp Closure
- Other (specify)
- None

Other Description: Staged construction

If any of the above traffic control measures will be implemented, indicate the following conditions.

Provisions for access by local traffic will be made and so posted. True False

Through-traffic dependent business will not be adversely affected. True False

There will be no interference with any local special event or festival. True False

There will be no substantial environmental consequences associated with the traffic control measure(s). True False

There is no substantial controversy associated with the traffic control measure(s). True False

There are no substantial impacts to bicycle or pedestrian routes. True False

If the answer to any of the above questions was "False", please explain.

Estimated Costs

Engineering: \$ 3,500,000

Right-of-Way: \$ 1,000,000

Construction: \$ 37,000,000

Utilities: \$ 500,000

Additional Information

Remarks, Footnotes, Supplemental Data

The estimated costs differ from the programmed TIP 2019 costs due to the required complete structure replacement as compared to the original estimates for rehabilitation only. In addition, the western limits of the project were extended during preliminary engineering.

Attachments

CE Evaluation Part A

Roadway

No roadways included with this project

Roadway Description

SR 0078

| | Existing | Proposed |
|----------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Number of Lanes: | 4 | 4 & 2 auxiliary |
| Lane Width: | 12 ft | 12 ft |
| Shoulder Width: | 1 & 10 in, 6 & 10 out ft | 10 inside, 12 outside ft |
| Median Width: | 4 ft | 22 ft |
| Sidewalk Width: | N/A ft | N/A ft |
| Bicycle Lane Width: | N/A ft | N/A ft |
| Clear Zone Width: | 6.5 ft | 12 ft |

Additional Information

Remarks, Footnotes, Supplemental Data

Attachments

CE Evaluation Part A

Structure

No structures included with this project

BMS Number: 06-0078-0354-0688

BRKEY: 4677

Description: (provide name of waterway or facility structure crosses)

SR 0078 over SR 0143 and Maiden Creek

| | Existing | Proposed |
|-----------------------------|---|---------------------------|
| Structure Type: | Steel Girder/Beam | Prestressed Concrete Beam |
| Weight Restrictions: | none ton | none ton |
| Height Restrictions: | none ft | none ft |
| Curb to Curb Width: | 64.9 ft | 118 ft |
| Lane Width: | 12 ft | 12 ft |
| Shoulder Width: | 1 inside, 6.5 outside ft | 9.3 inside, 12 outside ft |
| Sidewalk Width: | none ft | none ft |
| Total Bridge Width*: | 69.5 ft | 121.4 ft |
| | *Total Bridge Width is measured from outside of barrier to outside of barrier, which should include sidewalks, when present. | |
| Under Clearance: | 17.0 ft | 17.1 ft |
| Lateral Clearance: | 9' to SR 143 ft | 9' to SR 143 ft |
| Sufficiency Rating: | 77.0 | |
| Structure Length: | 667 ft | 615 ft |

Additional Information

Remarks, Footnotes, Supplemental Data

Attachments

CE Evaluation Part B, Section A-1
Environmental Evaluation Subject Areas (Aquatic Resources)

Federal Project Number: N/A

1. AQUATIC RESOURCES

| | PRESENCE | IMPACTS² |
|---|--|---|
| STREAMS, RIVERS & WATERCOURSES¹ | <input type="radio"/> Not Present <input checked="" type="radio"/> Present | |
| Intermittent (streams only) | <input type="radio"/> Not Present <input checked="" type="radio"/> Present | <input type="radio"/> No <input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes |
| Perennial | <input checked="" type="radio"/> Not Present <input type="radio"/> Present | <input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Yes |
| Wild trout streams | <input checked="" type="radio"/> Not Present <input type="radio"/> Present | <input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Yes |
| Stocked trout streams | <input type="radio"/> Not Present <input checked="" type="radio"/> Present | <input type="radio"/> No <input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes |

Identify all streams and their classifications per Chapter 93 of 25 PA Code (e.g. CWF, WWF, HQ, EV)

Maiden Creek (Channel 1), its unnamed tributaries (Channels 2-4), unnamed tributary to Furnace Creek (Channel 6), and Channels 5 and 7 (only retain channel characteristics in portions of the project area), which were identified within the immediate project area are designated, under PA DEP's Chapter 93 Water Quality Standards, as having water uses protected for Trout Stocked Fishes and Migratory Fishes (TSF, MF).

Linear feet of Streams permanently impacted: 377

Describe Any Permanent Impacts

There will be approximately 377 linear feet of permanent stream impacts due to the widened bridge (Channels 1 and 2) and culvert extensions (Channels 4 and 6).

Describe Any Temporary Impacts

There will be approximately 679 linear feet of temporary stream impacts due to the widened bridge (Channels 1 and 2) and culvert extensions (Channels 4 and 6).

Is mitigation incorporated? No Yes

Project Specific Restoration/Enhancement: *linear feet*

Advanced Compensation/Banking: *linear feet*

Other:

Mitigation Remarks

Maiden Creek is designated as a stocked trout stream, therefore, an in-stream construction timing restriction from March 1 to June 15 will apply.

Remarks

Seven channels and one stormwater management facility were identified within the immediate project area (Channels 1-7 and SWM 1). Channel 1 (main channel), Maiden Creek, is characterized as a perennial stream. Channels 2-4 are unnamed tributaries to Maiden Creek and are characterized as perennial streams. Channel 5 is an ephemeral drainage corridor culverted under I-78 which maintains channel characteristics only upstream of the culvert crossing. Channel 6 is an unnamed tributary to Furnace Creek and is an intermittent stream. Channel 7 is an intermittent drainage corridor culverted under the existing railroad grade and only maintains channel characteristics upstream of the culvert crossing. Stormwater Management Feature 1 is an active stormwater management corridor for I-78. According to the PFBC, Maiden Creek is designated as a stocked trout stream, therefore, an in-stream construction timing restriction from March 1 to June 15 will apply. Additionally, the unnamed tributaries to Maiden Creek are located within 0.5 mile of the trout stocked section of Maiden Creek, therefore, they are also subject to the time of year restriction.

PRESENCE

IMPACTS²

FEDERAL WILD & SCENIC RIVERS & STREAMS¹

Not Present Present

No Yes

Remarks

There are no federal Wild and Scenic Rivers in the project area according to the National Wild and Scenic River System.

PRESENCE

IMPACTS²

STATE SCENIC RIVERS & STREAMS¹

Not Present Present

No Yes

Remarks

There are no state Wild and Scenic Rivers in the project area according to the DCNR's Scenic Rivers Program.

PRESENCE

IMPACTS²

NAVIGABLE WATERWAYS¹

Not Present Present

Coast Guard Navigable

Not Present Present

No Yes

PFBC Water Trail

Not Present Present

No Yes

Recreational Boating Waterway

Not Present Present

No Yes

Documentation³

- PFBC Aids to Navigation Plan
- Coast Guard Coordination

Describe Any Permanent and Temporary Impacts

There will be permanent impacts to Channel 1 (Maiden Creek) due to the widening of the existing bridge and placement/removal of piers. There will be additional temporary impacts due to contractor access. Impacts will not affect the resulting navigability of the stream.

Is mitigation incorporated? No Yes

Describe Mitigation

The contractor will post warning signs at the construction site (one facing upstream and one facing downstream). Both signs will be placed within 200 feet of the bridge. These signs will warn boaters of the construction site and will be clearly visible. There will be approximately five two- to three-day periods in which it will be unsafe for boaters to pass through the project area and travel will be restricted – during the 1st and 2nd superstructure demolition stage, the demolition of the existing piers stage, and during the 1st and 2nd beam erection stage. The contractor will be required to warn boaters that travel is not permitted under the bridge through the additional “Warning Boaters Keep Out” signage. These signs will be in place during specific bridge demolition and construction activities in which boaters are required to portage.

Remarks

According to the PFBC, Maiden Creek, its unnamed tributaries and the unnamed tributary to Furnace Creek are not designated water trails, nor are they USACE navigable watercourses. However, Maiden Creek is designated as a recreationally navigable stream according to the Keystone Canoeing Guidebook (Gertler, 2004), an ATON plan has been completed and approved by the PFBC.

| | PRESENCE | IMPACTS² |
|---|--|---|
| OTHER SURFACE WATERS¹ | <input type="radio"/> Not Present <input checked="" type="radio"/> Present | |
| Reservoirs | <input checked="" type="radio"/> Not Present <input type="radio"/> Present | <input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Yes |
| Lakes | <input checked="" type="radio"/> Not Present <input type="radio"/> Present | <input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Yes |
| Farm ponds | <input checked="" type="radio"/> Not Present <input type="radio"/> Present | <input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Yes |
| Detention basins | <input checked="" type="radio"/> Not Present <input type="radio"/> Present | <input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Yes |
| Stormwater Management Facilities | <input type="radio"/> Not Present <input checked="" type="radio"/> Present | <input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Yes |
| Others (describe in remarks) | <input checked="" type="radio"/> Not Present <input type="radio"/> Present | <input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Yes |

Describe Any Permanent and Temporary Impacts

Permanent impact will occur to 234 linear feet of SWM 1 due to expanded fill limits. Temporary impacts will total 577 linear feet.

Is mitigation incorporated? No Yes

Remarks

A stormwater management facility, non-jurisdictional, was identified on the south side of I-78 and discharges into Channel 4.

| | PRESENCE | IMPACTS² |
|---|--|---|
| GROUNDWATER RESOURCES¹ | <input type="radio"/> Not Present <input checked="" type="radio"/> Present | |
| State, County, Municipal or Local Public Supply Wells | <input checked="" type="radio"/> Not Present <input type="radio"/> Present | <input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Yes |
| Residential Well | <input type="radio"/> Not Present <input checked="" type="radio"/> Present | <input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Yes |
| Well Head Protection Area | <input checked="" type="radio"/> Not Present <input type="radio"/> Present | <input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Yes |
| Springs, Seeps | <input checked="" type="radio"/> Not Present <input type="radio"/> Present | <input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Yes |
| Potable Water Source | <input checked="" type="radio"/> Not Present <input type="radio"/> Present | <input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Yes |
| Sole Source and/or Exceptional Value Aquifers | <input checked="" type="radio"/> Not Present <input type="radio"/> Present | <input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Yes |

Describe Any Permanent and Temporary Impacts

There will be no impacts to any groundwater resources as a result of the bridge widening.

Is mitigation incorporated? No Yes

Remarks

There are no anticipated impacts to groundwater resources as part of project implementation.

| | PRESENCE | IMPACTS ² |
|-----------------------------|--|---|
| WETLANDS¹ | <input type="radio"/> Not Present <input checked="" type="radio"/> Present | |
| Open Water | <input checked="" type="radio"/> Not Present <input type="radio"/> Present | <input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Yes |
| Vegetated | | |
| Emergent | <input type="radio"/> Not Present <input checked="" type="radio"/> Present | <input type="radio"/> No <input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes |
| Scrub Shrub | <input type="radio"/> Not Present <input checked="" type="radio"/> Present | <input type="radio"/> No <input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes |
| Forested | <input type="radio"/> Not Present <input checked="" type="radio"/> Present | <input type="radio"/> No <input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes |
| Exceptional Value | <input checked="" type="radio"/> Not Present <input type="radio"/> Present | <input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Yes |

Documentation³

- Data Forms
- Wetland Identification and Delineation Report
- Conceptual Mitigation Plan
- 404 (b)(1) Alternative Analysis
- Jurisdictional Determination
- Functional Assessment Analysis

Methodology

An on-site wetland and watercourse investigation was conducted using the Routine On-Site Wetland Delineation Method for Small Areas described in the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' (USACE) Wetland Delineation Manual, Technical Report Y-87-1 (1987) and the Regional Supplement to the USACE's Wetland Delineation Manual: Eastern Mountains and Piedmont (2012). If present, wetlands identified were classified in accordance with the USFWS' Classification of Wetlands and Deepwater Habitats of the United States (Cowardin, et al., 1979). The Munsell Soil Color chart was used to determine matrix and mottle colors for each soil sample.

Number of Wetlands permanently impacted: 2

Acreage of Wetlands permanently impacted: 0.02

Describe Any Permanent Impacts

There will be permanent impacts to Wetland A and E as a result of the placement of fill and pier locations.

Describe Any Temporary Impacts

There will be temporary impacts to Wetlands A-F, totaling 0.65 acres, as a result of contractor access and construction of the new bridge. There are no temporary impacts anticipated to Wetland G.

Is mitigation incorporated? No Yes

Project Specific Replacement/Construction: 0 acres

Banking: 0 acres

Bank to be Debited: 0

Restoration: 0 acres

Preservation: 0 acres

In-Lieu Fee: 0 whole dollars

Other: N/A

Mitigation Remarks

Orange protective fencing should be placed at the limits of work for Wetlands B, C, D, E and F. Wetland A, B and E will require temporary wooden matting during construction activities to avoid permanent impacts to these wetlands.

Executive Order 11990 Compliance

Compliance requires the determination that there is no practicable alternative to the proposed construction in wetlands and the proposed action includes all practicable measures to minimize harm to wetlands which may result from such use.

Options/design modifications were investigated to avoid impacts to wetlands: Yes No N/A

There are no practicable alternatives to construction within the wetlands: Yes No N/A

Alternative chosen (proposed project) includes all practicable measures to minimize harm to wetlands: Yes No N/A

If the answer to any of the above three questions is No, provide an explanation in the Remarks Section below.

Remarks

Seven wetlands were identified within the immediate project area; Wetlands A-G. Wetland A is a Palustrine Emergent (PEM) and Palustrine Forested (PFO) system located in the northwest quadrant. Wetland B is a PEM and Palustrine Scrub-shrub (PSS) system located in the southwest quadrant. Wetland C is a PSS system located within Maiden Creek. Wetland D is a PEM and PSS system located in the southeast quadrant. Wetland E is a PEM, PSS and PFO system located in the southeast quadrant. Wetland F is a PEM system located near the western edge of the project boundary. Wetland G is a PEM system located along the railroad grade.

Permanent impacts to Wetland A and E, measuring 0.02 acres is anticipated as part of project implementation. No wetland replacement mitigation is anticipated for this project.

COASTAL ZONE¹ Not Present Present No Yes**Remarks**

There are no coastal zones in Berks County.

PRESENCE**IMPACTS²****FLOODPLAINS¹** Not Present Present No Yes No significant floodplain encroachment would occur.

If, after consultation with FHWA, it is concluded that there will be significant floodplain encroachment, a floodplain finding is required, and an EIS or EA will need to be prepared because a CEE is not an appropriate level of NEPA documentation. Significant floodplain encroachment is defined in DM-1B.

Describe Any Permanent and Temporary Impacts

There will be no impacts to the floodplains.

Is mitigation incorporated? No Yes**Remarks**

The 100-year floodplain of Maiden Creek is present within the project area. There are no anticipated impacts to the 100-year floodplain as part of project implementation.

SOIL EROSION & SEDIMENTATION¹**Are there activities that could cause erosion or sedimentation and would require E&S Controls?** Yes No N/A**Documentation³** Coordination w/County Conservation District E&S Control Plan NPDES Stormwater Construction Permit**Is mitigation incorporated?** No Yes**Remarks**

Efforts to minimize potential erosion and sedimentation impacts will include following proper construction sequencing and implementing an Erosion and Sedimentation Pollution Control Plan approved by the PA DEP and in accordance with PennDOT criteria.

1 If the resource is not present, do not complete the remainder of this subject area.

2 If the resource is present but no impacts are anticipated, describe in Remarks why there will be no impact. If there will be no impact because avoidance/mitigation measures will be included, describe those in the mitigation text box provided.

3 Unless required as an attachment, documentation for subject areas should be maintained in the project's Technical Support Data and does not need to be submitted with the CEE.

Additional Information

Remarks, Footnotes, Supplemental Data

Attachments

1. [SR 0078-LBR ATON Approval Letter.pdf](#) (36KB / 0MB)

CE Evaluation Part B, Section A-2
Environmental Evaluation Subject Areas (Land)

2. LAND

| | PRESENCE | IMPACTS² |
|---|--|---|
| AGRICULTURAL RESOURCES¹ | <input type="radio"/> Not Present <input checked="" type="radio"/> Present | |
| Productive Agricultural Land | <input type="radio"/> Not Present <input checked="" type="radio"/> Present | <input type="radio"/> No <input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes |
| Agricultural Security Areas | <input type="radio"/> Not Present <input checked="" type="radio"/> Present | <input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Yes |
| Prime Agricultural Land | <input type="radio"/> Not Present <input checked="" type="radio"/> Present | <input type="radio"/> No <input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes |
| Agricultural Conservation Easements | <input type="radio"/> Not Present <input checked="" type="radio"/> Present | <input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Yes |
| Farmland Enrolled in Preferential Tax Assessments | <input type="radio"/> Not Present <input checked="" type="radio"/> Present | <input type="radio"/> No <input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes |
| Agricultural Zoning | <input type="radio"/> Not Present <input checked="" type="radio"/> Present | <input type="radio"/> No <input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes |
| Soil Capability Classes I, II, III, IV | <input type="radio"/> Not Present <input checked="" type="radio"/> Present | <input type="radio"/> No <input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes |
| Prime or Unique Soil | <input type="radio"/> Not Present <input checked="" type="radio"/> Present | <input type="radio"/> No <input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes |
| Statewide or Locally Important Soils | <input type="radio"/> Not Present <input checked="" type="radio"/> Present | <input type="radio"/> No <input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes |

Documentation³

- Farmland Assessment Report
- ALCAB Approval
- Agricultural Land Preservation Policy Conformance Statement
- Form AD-1006 - Farmland Conversion Impact Rating or Form NRCS-CPA-106 for Corridor Type Projects
- Coordination with County Tax Assessor

Describe Any Permanent and Temporary Impacts

There will be approximately 0.41 acre of permanent impacts to productive agricultural land associated with sliver takes on the northwest and southwest quadrants. Temporary impacts will total 0.18 acre to the productive agricultural land on the southwest quadrant.

Is mitigation incorporated? No Yes

Remarks

Productive agricultural land exists on the southwest, northwest and northeast quadrants. All three quadrants contain Act 319 (Clean and Green) properties and contain soils with capability classes I-IV. The northeast quadrant contains an agricultural conservation easement and an agricultural security area, which has been avoided entirely by the proposed project. As such, ALPP Prime Farmland is present within the project area.

According to Web Soil Surveyor, the project area contains soils classified as FPPA Prime Farmland Soils and Soils of Statewide Importance. A Farmland Conversion Impact Rating form (FCIR) was completed for the direct conversion of 2.87 acres and indirect conversion of 0.27 acres of FPPA soils to transportation use. The NRCS office concurred with the FCIR on August 28, 2019, see attached.

Impacts to Prime Farmland are unavoidable to meet the project needs. Therefore, there is no feasible alternative to the conversion of Prime Farmland under 4 PA Code Chapter 7, & 7.301 et seq. Agricultural Land Preservation Policy.

| | PRESENCE | IMPACTS² |
|-------------------------------|--|----------------------------|
| VEGETATION¹ | <input type="radio"/> Not Present <input checked="" type="radio"/> Present | |

- | | | |
|-----------------------------|--|---|
| Landscaped | <input type="radio"/> Not Present <input checked="" type="radio"/> Present | <input type="radio"/> No <input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes |
| Agricultural | <input type="radio"/> Not Present <input checked="" type="radio"/> Present | <input type="radio"/> No <input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes |
| Forest Land | <input type="radio"/> Not Present <input checked="" type="radio"/> Present | <input type="radio"/> No <input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes |
| Rangeland | <input checked="" type="radio"/> Not Present <input type="radio"/> Present | <input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Yes |
| Other (describe in remarks) | <input type="radio"/> Not Present <input checked="" type="radio"/> Present | <input type="radio"/> No <input checked="" type="radio"/> Yes |

Describe Any Permanent and Temporary Impacts

There will be permanent impacts to vegetation as a result of the right-of-way takes for the bridge widening.

Invasive Non-Native Plants are Present

Mitigation:

Will native plants be used in project landscaping or mitigation? Yes No **If Yes, explain in Describe Mitigation.**

Other? Yes No **If Yes, explain in Describe Mitigation.**

Remarks

Project area vegetation consists of forest land, maintained lawn, and wetland vegetation.

PRESENCE

IMPACTS²

GEOLOGIC RESOURCES¹

Not Present Present

Remarks

A review of the Pennsylvania Geological Survey's Outstanding Scenic Geological Features of Pennsylvania - Parts 1 and 2 and DCNR's Heritage Geology Site indicate that there are no unique geologic resources with in the project study area.

PRESENCE

IMPACTS²

PARKS & RECREATION FACILITIES¹

Not Present Present

Remarks

Map analysis and field reconnaissance did not identify any public parks or recreation areas in the project area.

PRESENCE

IMPACTS²

FOREST & GAMELANDS¹

Not Present Present

Remarks

Map analysis and field reconnaissance did not identify any state forest or gamelands in the project area.

PRESENCE**IMPACTS²****WILDERNESS, NATURAL & WILD
AREAS¹** Not Present Present**Remarks**

Map analysis and field reconnaissance did not identify any wilderness, natural or wild areas within the project area.

PRESENCE**IMPACTS²****NATIONAL NATURAL LANDMARKS¹** Not Present Present No Yes**Remarks**

A review of the National Park Service's National Registry of Natural Landmarks indicated that there are no National Natural Landmarks in the project area.

PRESENCE**IMPACTS²****HAZARDOUS OR RESIDUAL WASTE
SITES¹** Not Present Present No Yes**Documentation³**

- Phase I
- Phase II
- Phase III
- Other
- No Documentation Required

Describe Any Permanent and Temporary Impacts

There will be impacts to portions of the bridge found to contain lead-based paint due to the construction/removal of piers and expansion of the bridge.

Is remediation/mitigation incorporated? No Yes Unknown at this time

Describe Remediation/Mitigation

Special provisions will be included in the construction contract for heavy metals-in-paint to ensure worker protection and that best management practices be implemented to provide protection to the environment.

Remarks

BMS2 indicates that the bridge is listed as an "A" type bridge for asbestos indicating that no ACM contained or ACM found is below threshold values. A heavy metals-in-paint inspection was conducted for the bridge. One paint coating suspected of containing heavy metals was identified on the steel stringer and girders on the underside of the bridge. Laboratory analysis confirmed this suspicion. Special

provisions will be included in the construction contract to ensure worker protection and that best management practices be implemented to provide protection to the environment.

- 1 If the resource is not present, do not complete the remainder of this subject area.**
 - 2 If the resource is present but no impacts are anticipated, describe in Remarks why there will be no impact. If there will be no impact because avoidance/mitigation measures will be included, describe those in the mitigation text box provided.**
 - 3 Unless required as an attachment, documentation for subject areas should be maintained in the project's Technical Support Data and does not need to be submitted with the CEE.**
-

Additional Information

Remarks, Footnotes, Supplemental Data

Attachments

- 1. [SR 0078-LBR Approved FCIR.pdf](#) (1489KB / 1.5MB)**

CE Evaluation Part B, Section A-3
Environmental Evaluation Subject Areas (Wildlife)

3. WILDLIFE

PRESENCE

IMPACTS²

WILDLIFE & HABITAT¹

Not Present Present

Remarks

Map analysis and field reconnaissance did not reveal any wildlife sanctuaries/refuges or critical/unique habitat within the project area.

PRESENCE

IMPACTS²

THREATENED & ENDANGERED

PLANTS & ANIMALS¹

Not Present
 Present
 No Coordination Needed

No Potential Impacts
 Potential Impacts with Avoidance Measures
 Potential Impacts with Conservation Measures
 Potential Impacts

Reviews, concurrences and approvals for Threatened and Endangered Species searches/coordination are time sensitive. If the coordination is greater than two years old, a new coordination effort will be required with the commenting/review agency(s).

Documentation

PNDI ER Receipt

Agency Documentation

PFBC Correspondence
 PGC Correspondence
 DCNR Correspondence
 USFWS Correspondence

Describe Avoidance Measures to be Implemented

PFBC avoidance measures for Eastern red belly turtle:

1. Any dewatering or disturbance to Maiden Creek during the brumation period could cause harm or even death to turtles that are in a dormant state and unable to move away. Therefore, no construction activities should be conducted in the water during the overwintering period. All in-stream construction activities should take place between May 1 and October 31 to allow turtles to avoid the project area while they are active. If causeways or coffer dams are required for construction, they can be removed during this period if the project schedule requires.
2. A Super Silt Fence barrier should be placed around the perimeter of the proposed area of disturbance to prevent turtles from accessing active work zones. This fence should be installed during the inactive period of the red belly turtle (November 1 to April 30) so that turtles do not get trapped in the work zone.
3. Prior to the start of construction, potential basking habitat features (e.g. downed trees, rock piles, debris piles) should be removed from the construction area during the turtle's active period (May 1 to October 31). Removal of the basking sites prior to construction should serve to discourage turtles from using the project area for foraging or hibernating and allow them time to find alternative habitats. Basking features should be replaced where feasible once the project has been completed.
4. If any turtles are found within the work area, please photo document the animals and move them to a safe location outside the work area and notify PFBC immediately.

Describe Planned Conservation Measures to be Implemented

Describe Other Mitigation

Remarks

A PNDI review conducted February 2019 indicated a potential impact to a PFBC Threatened Species (see attached PNDI). Coordination with the PFBC, in a letter dated January 2019 indicated potential impacts to the Eastern Redbelly Turtle (*Pseudemys rubriventris*) (see attached PFBC Coordination Letter). It was concluded that no species surveys for the Redbelly Turtle were required, however, implementation of avoidance measures would be necessary (see avoidance measures).

Furthermore, Berks County is located within the known range of the Bog Turtle (*Clemmys muhlenbergii*). A Phase I Bog Turtle Survey was completed on July 11, 2017 by a USFWS/PFBC-recognized Qualified Bog Turtle Surveyor (QBTS) and determined that suitable habitat was present in two of the five wetlands. Phase II and Phase III surveys were conducted during the 2018 survey season by a USFWS/PFBC QBTS. The surveys determined that although the habitat is suitable, no bog turtles were located within the project area. In a letter dated April 2019, the USFWS concurred with the findings of all Phase I, II, and III Bog Turtle surveys (see attached USFWS Clearance).

-
- 1 If the resource is not present, do not complete the remainder of this subject area.**
 - 2 If the resource is present but no impacts are anticipated, describe in Remarks why there will be no impact. If there will be no impact because avoidance/mitigation measures will be included, describe those in the mitigation text box provided.**
 - 3 Unless required as an attachment, documentation for subject areas should be maintained in the project's Technical Support Data and does not need to be submitted with the CEE.**
-

Additional Information

Remarks, Footnotes, Supplemental Data

Attachments

- [SR 0078-LBR PFBC Clearance Letter.pdf](#) (296KB / 0.3MB)
- [SR 0078-LBR USFWS Clearance.pdf](#) (150KB / 0.1MB)
- [SR 0078-LBR PNDI February 2019 Signed.pdf](#) (1644KB / 1.6MB)

CE Evaluation Part B, Section A-4
Environmental Evaluation Subject Areas (Cultural Resources)

4. CULTURAL RESOURCES

Were Cultural Resource Professionals (CRPs) needed for project scoping? Yes No

CRP Scoping Field View Date: 06/12/13

CRP Architectural Historian in Attendance: Kris Thompson

CRP Archaeologist in Attendance: Kevin Mock

Was a Project Early Notification / Scoping Results Form completed? Yes No

For projects exempted from further Section 106 review under Appendix C of the Statewide Section 106 Programmatic Agreement, determine whether eligible resources are present for application of Section 4(f).

Is the project exempted from review by the District Designee or CRP as per Appendix C of the Statewide Section 106 Programmatic Agreement? Yes No

Is the project exempted from review by the District Designee or CRP as per Stipulation III of the Emergency Relief Projects Programmatic Agreement (2005)? Yes No

| | <u>PRESENCE</u> | | | | <u>LEVEL OF EFFECTS</u> | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| | Not Present | Potentially Eligible Resource Present | Eligible Resource Present | Listed Resource Present | No Historic Properties Affected | No Adverse Effect | Adverse Effect |
| CULTURAL RESOURCES | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <u>Archaeology</u> | | | | | | | |
| Pre-Contact: | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Contact Native American: | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Historic: | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| <u>Above-Ground Historic Properties</u> | | | | | | | |
| Structure/Building: | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| District: | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

Documentation

Conclusion of Section 106 consultation must be documented in the following ways:

For projects having an adverse effect, one of the following:

- Memorandum of Agreement (MOA)
- Letter of Agreement (LOA)
- Memorandum of Understanding (MOU)

- Letter of Understanding (LOU)
- Specific Programmatic Agreement (PA)
- Standard Treatment
- Deferral of Archaeological Testing

For projects ***not having a known adverse effect***, one from ***each*** column:

Above-Ground Historic Properties

- Above-Ground Historic Properties Field Assessment and Finding
- Above-Ground Historic Properties Finding Letter
- Section 106 (Above-Ground Historic Properties) Effect Concurrence Letter
- TE Project Field Assessment and Finding Checklist

Archaeology

- Archaeology Field Assessment and Finding
- Archaeology Finding Letter
- Section 106 (Archaeology) Effect Concurrence Letter
- TE Project Field Assessment and Finding Checklist
- Deferred Archaeological Testing Form
- Project Specific Programmatic Agreement

Supplemental documentation should be completed as warranted:

- Historic Structures Survey / Determination of Eligibility Report
- Phase Ia Archaeological Sensitivity Report
- Geomorphological Survey Report
- Archaeological Disturbance Report
- Archaeology Identification (Phase I) Report
- Archaeology Negative Survey Form
- Archaeology Evaluation (Phase II) Report
- Combined Archaeology Identification/Evaluation Report
- Determination of Effects Report
- (Bridge) Feasibility Report
- Other **(describe in remarks)**

Include Section 106 Public Involvement in Part B, Section C, Public Involvement.

Describe Any Permanent and Temporary Impacts

There are no current impacts to any cultural resources as a result of project implementation. Archaeology is still required on the Grims Mill Farmstead property, and will be completed once right-of-way is acquired.

Are mitigation and/or standard treatments required? No Yes

Describe Mitigation / Standard Treatments

Archaeology to be completed on the Grims Mill Farmstead, once right-of-way is acquired.

Remarks

The Lenhart Farm, a national register-listed resource, exists adjacent to I-78 in the southwest quadrant and is adjacent to the interchange. Project implementation will completely avoid the Lenhart Farm. The Grims Mill Farmstead was reevaluated and was determined not eligible.

A Phase I Archaeological survey was completed for the project area as documented in the Negative Survey Report, March 2019. Deferred archaeology on the Grims Mill Farmstead will be completed once right-of-way is acquired. See the link below for a summary of cultural clearance on project path that documents No Effect to Historic Resources as noted in the Dual Findings Form.

<https://search.paprojectpath.org/Reports/ReportViewer.aspx?Report=13&ProjectID=47917>

Additional Information

Remarks, Footnotes, Supplemental Data

Attachments

CE Evaluation Part B, Section A-5
Environmental Evaluation Subject Areas (Section 4(f) Resources)

5. SECTION 4(f) RESOURCES

PRESENCE

Not Present Present

USE¹

No Yes

SECTION 4(f) RESOURCES

Documentation²

- Individual Section 4(f) Evaluation
- Programmatic Section 4(f) Evaluation
- Section 2002 Evaluation
- De Minimis Use/No Adverse Use Checklist
- Non-Applicability/No Use Checklist
- Temporary Use Checklist
- FHWA Coordination Documents

Will temporary easements during construction be necessary from Section 4(f) resources?

No Yes

Describe Any Permanent and Temporary Impacts

There will be no permanent or temporary impacts to the Lenhart Farm as a result of this project, therefore, there is no use of the Section 4(f) resource.

Is mitigation incorporated?

No Yes

Describe Mitigation

If project design plans change during final design and result in a permanent or temporary use to the Lenhart Farm, further Section 4(f) coordination will be required.

Remarks

The National Register listed Lenhart Farm is present in the southwest quadrant of the project area adjacent to the interchange ramp and S.R. 0143. The property will not be impacted as part of project implementation. As such, there is no permanent or temporary use of the Lenhart Farm.

-
- 1 If the resource is present but no use is anticipated, describe in Remarks why there will be no use. If there will be no use because avoidance/mitigation measures will be included, describe those in the mitigation text box provided.**
 - 2 Unless required as an attachment, documentation for subject areas should be maintained in the project's Technical Support Data and does not need to be submitted with the CEE.**
-

Additional Information

Remarks, Footnotes, Supplemental Data

Attachments

6. AIR QUALITY AND NOISE

AIR QUALITY

Is the project exempt from regional ozone conformity analysis and a CO, PM10 & PM2.5 Hot-Spot analysis? Yes No

See exempt project list in Air Quality Handbook, Pub #321.

If Yes, the system skips the next few questions.

Is the project in an air quality nonattainment or maintenance area? Yes No

If No, the system skips the Regional Conformity section and goes to Project Level Impacts for CO.

Project Level Impacts for Carbon Monoxide (CO)

Are there any sensitive receptors located within the project area? Yes No

Sensitive Receptors = Schools, Churches, Residences, Apartments, Hospitals, etc.

If No, the system skips the remainder of this section.

Project Level Impacts for Particulate Matter (PM2.5 or PM10)

Is the project of air quality concern? No - Based on PennDOT Screening Document
 No - Based on Interagency Consultation
 Yes - Based on Interagency Consultation

Mobile Source Air Toxics (MSATs)

Is the project exempt from an analysis for MSATs based on Pub #321? Yes No

See Air Quality Handbook, Pub #321, for exemptions.

If Yes, the system skips the remainder of this section.

Air Quality Remarks

A review of PennDOT Publication 321, Project-Level Air Quality Handbook (October 2017), indicates that the proposed project is exempt from Project-level and Regional Conformity Analysis.

NOISE

1. Is the project a:

Reference PennDOT Pub #24 for additional information on Type I, II and III Projects.

A. Type I Project? Yes No

B. Type II Project? Yes No

C. Type III Project? Yes No

If Yes, the system skips questions 2 and 3.

- The project meets the criteria for a Type III project established in 23 CFR 772. Therefore, the project requires no analysis for highway traffic noise impacts. Type III projects do not involve added capacity, construction of new through lanes or auxiliary lanes, changes in the horizontal or vertical alignment of the roadway or exposure of noise sensitive land uses to a new or existing highway noise source. PennDOT acknowledges that a noise analysis is required if changes to the proposed project result in reclassification to a Type I project.

Noise Remarks

The project was determined to be a Type III given the auxiliary lanes being added are less than 2,500 feet, therefore, per FHWA policy, the project does not qualify as a Type I and is exempt from quantitative noise analysis.

Additional Information

Remarks, Footnotes, Supplemental Data

Attachments

CE Evaluation Part B, Section A-7
Environmental Evaluation Subject Areas (Socioeconomic Areas)

Where mitigation is incorporated for socioeconomic impacts, add the mitigation commitments to form B: E.

REGIONAL & COMMUNITY GROWTH

Will the project induce impacts (positive and negative) on planned growth, land use, or development patterns for the area? Yes No

Is the project consistent with planned growth? Yes No

Basis of this determination:

This project will make access to I-78 at this interchange safer.

Will the project induce secondary growth? Yes No

PUBLIC FACILITIES & SERVICES

Will the project induce negative impacts on health and educational facilities; public utilities; fire, police and emergency services; civil defense; religious institutions; or public transportation? Yes No

Does the project incorporate bicycle or pedestrian facilities into the overall design or operations (including construction)? Yes No

Explain. (Complete a bicycle/pedestrian checklist if applicable for this project.)

This project involves improvements to a limited access highway.

Will the project have a positive impact to the public facilities and services listed above? Yes No

If Yes, explain.

The project will improve access to I-78 for emergency services.

COMMUNITY COHESION

Will the project induce impacts to community cohesion? Yes No

Will the project induce impacts to the local tax base or property values?

Yes No

ENVIRONMENTAL JUSTICE

Is the project exempt from Detailed Project Level Environmental Justice Analysis per Section 2.1 of Publication 746, Project Level Environmental Justice Guidance?

Yes No

Is an Environmental Justice population, as identified in Executive Order 12898, present? ¹

Yes No

No known minority or low-income populations have been identified that would be disproportionately highly and adversely affected by this project as determined above. Therefore, this project has met the provisions of Executive Order 12898.

RIGHT-OF-WAY ACQUISITIONS OR DISPLACEMENTS OF PEOPLE, BUSINESSES OR FARMS

How many parcels require right-of-way acquisition, either partial or total?

Seven

Describe the extent and locations of acquisitions. Indicate for each acquisition whether it is temporary or permanent.

ROW will be required, in the form of strip takes, and totals 1.69 acres. An additional 0.20 acres will be required for TCEs.

Will the project require the relocation of people, businesses or farms?

Yes No

Will the project induce impacts to economic activity, including employment gains and losses?

Yes No

MAINTENANCE AND OPERATING COSTS OF THE PROJECT AND RELATED FACILITIES

Will the project induce increases of operating or maintenance costs?

Yes No

PUBLIC CONTROVERSY ON ENVIRONMENTAL GROUNDS

Will the project involve substantial controversy concerning social, cultural, or natural resource impacts?

Yes No

AESTHETIC AND OTHER VALUES

Will the project be visually intrusive to the surrounding environment?

Yes No

Will the project include "multiple use" opportunities? ²

Yes No

Will the project involve "joint development" activities? ³

Yes No

-
- 1 Copies of pertinent EJ information, data, analyses, and outreach activities should be placed in the project's Technical Support Data files.
 - 2 Examples of "multiple use" may include historical monuments, parking areas, bikeways, pedestrian paths, and other shared-use facilities on highway right-of-way.
 - 3 "Joint development" involves compatible development in conjunction with the highway. Examples could include construction of highway facilities such as highways, turning lanes, interchanges, or lane widening in conjunction with planned residential, shopping, commercial, or industrial facilities.
-

Additional Information

Remarks, Footnotes, Supplemental Data

Attachments

CE Evaluation Part B, Section B
Consistency Determinations

If the project is not consistent with established guidelines or will be made consistent through agreed upon mitigation, describe mitigation measures.

- DEP Coastal Zone Management Plan:** Not Applicable Consistent Not Consistent
- DCNR/NPS Wild and Scenic River Management Plan:** Not Applicable Consistent Not Consistent
- FEMA Flood Map:** Not Applicable Consistent Not Consistent
- Other (describe in Remarks):** Not Applicable Consistent Not Consistent

Describe Mitigation

Remarks

Additional Information

Remarks, Footnotes, Supplemental Data

Attachments

CE Evaluation Part B, Section C
Public Involvement

Document all public involvement efforts, including but not limited to, meetings, intent to enter letters, and displays. Indicate number of events when applicable. Include in the project technical file: notification of public involvement activities, and the resolution to relevant issues or concerns raised during public involvement.

| | # | Comments |
|---|----------|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Plans Display | 1 | One plans display was completed October 28, 2019 at the Greenwich Township building. |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Public Officials Meetings | 1 | One public officials meeting was completed October 28, 2019 at the Greenwich Township building. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Public Meetings | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Public Hearing | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Special Purpose Meetings (specify) | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Section 106 Public Involvement / Consulting Parties (specify) | | |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Section 106 Tribal Consultation (specify Tribe(s) contacted and Tribal response) | | The following tribes were notified: Absentee-Shawnee Tribe of Oklahoma, Delaware Nation - Oklahoma, Delaware, Eastern Shawnee Tribe of Oklahoma, Onondaga Nation, Shawnee Tribe and St. Regis Mohawk Tribe. |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Environmental Justice Community Involvement (if applicable) | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other information dissemination activities (specify) | | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Commitment for Further Public Involvement | | |

Remarks

A plans display and public officials meeting was completed October 28, 2019 at the Greenwich Township Building. There was no public controversy identified as part of the public outreach process.

Additional Information

Remarks, Footnotes, Supplemental Data

Attachments

CE Evaluation Part B, Section D
Permits Checklist

Check all permits required for permanent and temporary actions.

No Permits Required

United States Army Corps of Engineers Section 404 and/or Section 10 Permit

Individual Nationwide PASPGP

DEP Waterway Encroachment (105) Permit

Standard Small Project General Other

DEP 401 Water Quality Certification

Coast Guard Permit

NPDES Permit

General Individual Exempt

Other Permits

Other Permits Information

Additional Information

Remarks, Footnotes, Supplemental Data

Attachments

CE Evaluation Part B, Section E
Resources To Be Avoided and Mitigation Measures

The mitigation measures summarized in this section should be incorporated into the project's design documents. In order to track and transfer mitigation commitments through the project development process, **Environmental Commitments & Mitigation Tracking System (ECMTS)** documentation should be prepared and submitted to the appropriate channels, including the Contract Management Unit, as the project moves through Final Design and Construction. Mitigation is automatically completed for the resource specific areas in this document. Non-resourced specific mitigation should be added to this page for documentation purposes.

Mitigation measures are **COMMITMENTS** of both the Department and FHWA and are agreed to and approved by the District Executive for Level 1 CEEs and by the Division Administrator of FHWA for Level 2 CEEs.

Impacts and mitigation commitments are based on Preliminary Design and may change as the project moves through Final Design and Construction. Final design information and final mitigation commitments are included in the ECMTS documentation.

1. Specific Permanent Impacts

Streams (B:A-1): 377 *linear feet*

Wetlands (B:A-1): 0.02 *acres*

State Gamelands (B:A-2): *acres*

2. Specific Mitigation Commitments

STREAMS (B:A-1)

Project Specific Restoration/Enhancement: *linear feet*

Advanced Compensation/Banking: *linear feet*

Other:

Mitigation Remarks: Maiden Creek is designated as a stocked trout stream, therefore, an in-stream construction timing restriction from March 1 to June 15 will apply.

WETLANDS (B:A-1)

Project Specific Replacement/Construction: 0 *acres*

Banking: 0 *acres*

Bank to be Debited: 0

Restoration: 0 *acres*

Preservation: 0 *acres*

In-Lieu Fee: 0 *whole dollars*

Other: N/A

Mitigation Remarks: Orange protective fencing should be placed at the limits of work for Wetlands B, C, D, E and F. Wetland A, B and E will require temporary wooden matting during construction activities to avoid permanent impacts to these wetlands.

STATE GAMELANDS (B:A-2)

Project Specific Replacement: *acres*

Banking: *acres*

Bank to be Debited:

Other:

Mitigation Remarks:

COMMITMENTS FOR FURTHER PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT (B:C)

3. Other Mitigation Commitments

RESOURCE SPECIFIC

Navigable Waterways (B:A-1)

The contractor will post warning signs at the construction site (one facing upstream and one facing downstream). Both signs will be placed within 200 feet of the bridge. These signs will warn boaters of the construction site and will be clearly visible. There will be approximately five two- to three-day periods in which it will be unsafe for boaters to pass through the project area and travel will be restricted – during the 1st and 2nd superstructure demolition stage, the demolition of the existing piers stage, and during the 1st and 2nd beam erection stage. The contractor will be required to warn boaters that travel is not permitted under the bridge through the additional “Warning Boaters Keep Out” signage. These signs will be in place during specific bridge demolition and construction activities in which boaters are required to portage.

Hazardous or Residual Waste Sites (B:A-2)

Special provisions will be included in the construction contract for heavy metals-in-paint to ensure worker protection and that best management practices be implemented to provide protection to the environment.

Threatened & Endangered Plants & Animals - Avoidance Measures (B:A-3)

PFBC avoidance measures for Eastern red belly turtle:

1. Any dewatering or disturbance to Maiden Creek during the brumation period could cause harm or even death to turtles that are in a dormant state and unable to move away. Therefore, no construction activities should be conducted in the water during the overwintering period. All in-stream construction activities should take place between May 1 and October 31 to allow turtles to avoid the project area while they are active. If causeways or coffer dams are required for construction, they can be removed during this period if the project schedule requires.
2. A Super Silt Fence barrier should be placed around the perimeter of the proposed area of disturbance to prevent turtles from accessing active work zones. This fence should be installed during the inactive period of the red belly turtle (November 1 to April 30) so that turtles do not get trapped in the work zone.
3. Prior to the start of construction, potential basking habitat features (e.g. downed trees, rock piles, debris piles) should be removed from the construction area during the turtle’s active period (May 1 to October 31). Removal of the basking sites prior to construction should serve to discourage turtles from using the project area for foraging or hibernating and allow them time to find alternative habitats. Basking features should be replaced where feasible once the project has been completed.
4. If any turtles are found within the work area, please photo document the animals and move them to a safe location outside the work area and notify PFBC immediately.

Cultural Resources (B:A-4)

Archaeology to be completed on the Grims Mill Farmstead, once right-of-way is acquired.

Section 4(f) Resources (B:A-5)

If project design plans change during final design and result in a permanent or temporary use to the Lenhart Farm, further Section 4(f) coordination will be required.

NON-RESOURCE SPECIFIC

Other 1

The plans display is proposed for October 28, 2019. If this date is revised, a plans display should be completed before advancing in final design.

Additional Information

Remarks, Footnotes, Supplemental Data

Attachments

CE Evaluation Part B, Section F

Scoping Field View

Date of Scoping Field View: 06/12/13

Attendee List (Name, Organization)

Heather Heeter, PennDOT 5-0

Jay McGee, PennDOT 5-0 ADE

Kevin Mock, PennDOT 5-0 CRP

David Rostron, PennDOT 5-0

John Bohman, PennDOT 5-0

Kevin Milnes, PennDOT 5-0

Scott Vottero, PennDOT - BOPD

Cory Donahue, FHWA

Todd Rousenberger, RKK

Steve Sartori, Consultant PM, Pennoni Associates

JT Graupensperger, ASC Group, Inc.

Michelle Rehbogen, ASC Group, Inc.

***Jerry Neal, Kris Thompson, and Camille Otto viewed the project on 6/11/13

Anticipated NEPA Documentation

As supported by the information available at the time of scoping, this project appears to qualify for a Level 1b Categorical Exclusion in accordance with 23 CFR Part 771.117(d), Item Number 13.

Remarks Provide a brief description of NEPA documentation requirements agreed to at the field view.

1. Project Description

The proposed project consists of the SR 0078 (Lenhartsville Bridge) over Maiden Creek and SR 0143 bridge widening/superstructure replacement in Greenwich Township, Berks County, PA. The bridge will be widened to the outside on both sides to accommodate lengthened acceleration/deceleration lanes for the SR 0143 interchange.

2. Engineering Information

- SR 0078 is classified as a Rural Interstate with a posted speed of 55 MPH and current ADT of 39,421.
- The existing structure consists of 12 foot lanes, 7 foot shoulders and 4 foot median.
- The proposed bridge should follow the requirements of Design Manual 2 for Interstates and the Design Criteria for the I-78/12M Project. The typical section should consist of 12 foot lanes, 10 foot shoulders, 22 foot median and 12 foot acceleration/deceleration lanes.
- The acceleration and deceleration lanes should be lengthened to obtain the required length per Design Manual 2.
- The superstructure of the existing bridge will be replaced and the bridge will be widened to the outside.
- Traffic is anticipated to be maintained by half-width construction with widening to both sides of the bridge.

- Improvements to the sight distance at the intersection of the east bound ramps and SR 0143 should be investigated during preliminary engineering without impacting the historic farmstead.
- A design exception is anticipated for the sub-standard radii on the loop ramps.

3. Utilities Coordination

- Overhead utilities are present. Utility coordination will be required to determine relocation and/or service requirements during construction of the new superstructure and the bridge widening.

4. Right-of-Way

Existing structure plans for the bridge indicate an abandoned railroad is present within the eastern portion of the project area. Further investigation will be required to determine if the railroad still owns the land. Minor Right-of-Way acquisitions and temporary construction easements are anticipated at all three quadrants of the bridge with no impact to the historic farmstead. A temporary construction easement will be required for construction and for Erosion and Sedimentation control measures.

5. Environmental

- Maiden Creek is present within the project area, which is designated as CWF and MF waters and is listed as Approved Trout Waters. In-stream work restrictions will be required from March 1 through June 15; further coordination will be required with PFBC if a waiver is requested.
- Maiden Creek is listed as a Navigable Waterway, therefore an Aids to Navigation Plan will be required.
- An Unnamed Tributary to Maiden Creek was observed within the project area to the south of the S.R. 0078 bridge, flowing from beneath S.R. 0143.
- Extensive wetlands were observed within the project area during the Scoping Field View. A wetland identification and delineation is required. Impacts to wetlands will likely require mitigation, which could be completed onsite by improving the value and function of the current wetlands or creation of new wetlands adjacent to the existing wetlands.
- A preliminary PNDI search indicated one potential impact under the jurisdiction of the PFBC within the project area, which is likely related to the Red-Bellied Turtle. Further coordination will be required with PFBC. A Phase I Bog Turtle Habitat Assessment will be required for wetlands present within the project area and adjacent. Review of studies for the 12 M project to determine if study areas overlap.
- BMS2 indicates that the bridge is listed as an "A" type bridge for asbestos - No ACM contained or ACM found is below threshold values. The structure is painted and may contain lead and other heavy metals – further investigation will be required.
- Section 4(f) will not be required unless the adjacent NR Listed Lenhart Farm is impacted.
- Further investigation will be required to determine if a noise analysis will be required – input from FHWA on if noise analysis is required.

6. Cultural Resources

- **Archaeology Guidance:** A geomorphological investigation and Phase I Archaeological Survey will be required for the areas along Maiden Creek on both sides of the structure and on both the east and west sides of the creek.
- **Above Ground Historic Property Guidance:** The National Register listed Lenhart Farm is located immediately to the southwest of the project. No impacts to the farm property will occur. No work required.

7. Public Involvement

Coordination with the local municipalities will be necessary during Preliminary Engineering. A Public Officials Meeting and Public Plans Display is expected for this project.

8. Permits

A Joint Permit will likely be required due to the anticipated widening of the structure by 22' per side and impacts to wetlands.

9. Additional Discussion Points

During the SFV, discussions were held that included the removal of the soil embankment located in front of the western abutment along S.R. 0143, as well as lowering the height of the interchange infield areas for better site clearance/visibility.

The CE Scoping Document will be revised to reflect items discussed at the SFV. A Level 1B CE will likely be applicable.

Additional Information

Remarks, Footnotes, Supplemental Data

Attachments

CE Evaluation Part C
CEE Approval Processing

Section B - Level 1b CEE Approval

As supported by the attached Categorical Exclusion Evaluation, this project qualifies for a Level 1b Categorical Exclusion in accordance with 23 CFR 771.117(d), Item Number 13.

County: Berks **SR/Sec:** 0078/LBR **MPMS:** 97274 **Project:** Lenhartsville Bridge

Prepared By: Eric Bruggeman
Title: Environmental Scientist **Date:** 08/28/19

Approved By: Christopher J Kufro **Date:** 12/03/19
Title: District Executive

The following individuals concurred with the statement above.

District Environmental Manager: Jerry E Neal **Date:** 11/27/19

Assistant District Executive for Design: Christopher J Kufro **Date:** 12/03/19

Additional Information

Remarks, Footnotes, Supplemental Data

Attachments