

South Carolina Department of Transportation

South Carolina
Department of Transportation

On Behalf of the Federal Highway Administration - South Carolina Division Office

PROCESSING FORM FOR PROGRAMMATIC CATEGORICAL EXCLUSIONS NON MAJOR FEDERAL ACTIONS

| State ID | | Fed Project # | Route | | County | | | | |
|---|--------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------|-------|--------|------|--|--|--|
| Part 1 - Project Description | | | | | | | | | |
| nclude the Project Name/Description | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| Part 2 - PCE Type | | | | | | | | | |
| Select the appropriate Categorical Exclusion from 23 CFR Part 771.117 that best fits the entire project from the drop-down menu. Reference Appendix A of the PCE Agreement for a more detailed description of each CE contained in 23 CFR 771.117. | | | | | | | | | |
| 23 CFR 77 | 1.117(c) | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| 23 CFR 77 | 1.117(d) | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| | | Part 3 | 3 - Thresholds | | | | | | |
| To be processed as a Programmatic Categorical Exclusion (PCE) the following conditions must be met in addition to the General Criteria (as outlined in the PCE Agreement between FHWA-SC and SCDOT). Place a "X" in the appropriate box below. If the answer is "Yes" to any of the below criteria, SCDOT will consult with FHWA-SC to determine the appropriate level of NEPA documentation required and forward | | | | | | | | | |
| to FHWA-SC for approval. *Reference Part 4 of the Processing form or Section IV of the PCE Agreement for more details and definitions regarding each threshold. | | | | | | | | | |
| I. lı | ivolves any unusua | l circumstances as described in *23 | CFR Part 771.117(b | 1 | ☐ Yes | □ No | | | |
| 2. The acquisition of more than * <u>minor amounts</u> of temporary or p of right-of-way | | orary or permanent s | trips | ☐ Yes | □ No | | | | |

| Part 3 - Thresholds Continued | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|--|-------|------|--|--|--|
| 3. | Involves acquisitions that result in residential or non-residential displacements | ☐ Yes | ☐ No | | | |
| 4. | Results in capacity expansion of a roadway by adding through lanes | ☐ Yes | □ No | | | |
| 5. | Involves construction that would result in *major traffic disruptions | ☐ Yes | □No | | | |
| 6. | Involves *changes in access control requiring FHWA approval | ☐ Yes | ☐ No | | | |
| 7. | An adverse effect determination under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. | ☐ Yes | □ No | | | |
| 8. | Use of Section 4(f) property that cannot be documented with a FHWA <i>de minimis</i> determination or a programmatic Section 4(f) other than the programmatic evaluation for the use of historic bridges | ☐ Yes | □ No | | | |
| 9. | Any use of a Section 6(f) property | ☐ Yes | ☐ No | | | |
| 10. | Requires an Individual USACE 404 Permit | ☐ Yes | □ No | | | |
| 11. | Requires an Individual U.S. Coast Guard Permit. | ☐ Yes | ☐ No | | | |
| 12. | Work encroaching in a regulatory floodway, adversely affecting the base floodplain (100 yr.) pursuant to E.O. 11988 and 23 CFR Part 650 Subpart A | ☐ Yes | ☐ No | | | |
| 13. | Construction in, across, or adjacent to a river designated as a National Wild and Scenic River | ☐ Yes | ☐ No | | | |
| 14. | Involves an increase of 15 dBA or greater on any noise receptor or abatement measures are found to be feasible and reasonable due to noise impacts | ☐ Yes | ☐ No | | | |
| 15. | May affect and is likely to adversely affect a Federally listed species or designated critical habitat or projects with impacts subject to the BGEPA | ☐ Yes | ☐ No | | | |
| 16. | Involves acquisition of land for hardship, protective purposes, or early acquisition | ☐ Yes | □ No | | | |
| 17. | Does not meet the latest Conformity Determination for air quality non-attainment areas (if applicable). | ☐ Yes | ☐ No | | | |
| 18. | Any known or potential <u>major</u> hazardous waste sites within the right-of-way. | ☐ Yes | ☐ No | | | |
| 19. | Is not included in or is inconsistent with the STIP and/or TIP | ☐ Yes | ☐ No | | | |

| Part 3 Continued - Additional criteria to be completed for disposal of excess righ | t-of-way F | PCE | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------------------------|--------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 1. Is the parcel part of a SCDOT environmental mitigation effort or could it be used for environmental mitigation? | ☐ Yes | ☐ No | | | | | | | |
| 2. Is there a formal plan to use this parcel for a future transportation project (is it part of an approved LRTP)? | ☐ Yes | ☐ No | | | | | | | |
| Part 4 - Threshold Definitions | | | | | | | | | |
| Unusual Circumstances (23 CFR Part 771.117) - Unusual circumstances are defined as: | | | | | | | | | |
| a. Significant environmental impacts; b. Substantial controversy on environmental grounds; c. Significant impact on properties protected by Section 4(f) of the DOT ACT or Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act; or d. Inconsistencies with any Federal, State, or local law, requirement, or administrative determination relating to the environmental aspects of the action. | | | | | | | | | |
| Minor Amount of Right-of-Way (ROW): | | | | | | | | | |
| A minor amount of ROW is defined as less than 3 acres per linear mile for linear projects or less than 10 acres of impacts for non-linear projects (eg: intersections, bridges), and no removal of major property improvements. Examples of major improvements include residential and business structures, or the removal of other features which would change the functional utility of the property. Removal of minor improvements, such as fencing, landscaping, sprinkler systems, and mailboxes would be allowed. | | | | | | | | | |
| Major Traffic Disruptions: | | | | | | | | | |
| A major traffic disruption is defined as an action that would result in: a) adverse effects to through-traffic businesses or schools, b) substantial change in environmental impacts, or c) public controversy associated with the use of the temporary road, detour, or ramp closure. Changes in Access Control: | | | | | | | | | |
| Requires approval from FHWA for changes in access control on the Interstate system (eg: Interchange Modification | on Reports or | Interchange | | | | | | | |
| Justification Reports). | | | | | | | | | |
| Additional Comments if Needed: | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | | |
| Relevant field studies and environmental reviews have been completed to determine that the project forth in the Programmatic Categorical Exclusion Agreement signed by FHWA-SC and SCDOT. It is undeadditions/deletions to the project may void environmentally processing the project as presently classification engineering changes must be bought to the attention of SCDOT Environmental Services Office immediates form is included in the project file and one (1) copy has been provided to FHWA. | erstood that fied; consequ | any uently, any | | | | | | | |
| Prepared By: | | | | | | | | | |
| Primavera: Yes No P2S Date: Does the project contain commitments?: (if Yes attach to form | n) 🗌 Yes | ☐ No | | | | | | | |

Form Updated: 7-28-2016 Page 3 of 3