



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

Project ID P041148

Route S-11-56 (Montgomery Road)

County Cherokee

Part 1 - Project Description

Include the Project Name/Description

S-11-56 (Montgomery Road) over Horse Creek Bridge Replacement

SCDOT proposes to replace the S-11-56 (Montgomery Road) Bridge over Horse Creek in Cherokee County. The purpose of this project is to replace the bridge to correct the load restriction placed on it as well as restore all bridge components to good condition. The existing bridge is currently closed and has one or more components in poor condition. The proposed repair involves replacing the current bridge with a new bridge on existing alignment. The bridge will remain closed to traffic until construction is complete.

NEPA studies revealed no significant impacts or effects to resources within the project study area.

It is not anticipated that new right of way will be required for the replacement of this structure. Should additional right of way be needed, it will be minor, temporary or permanent strips. Existing right of way is approximately 66'. Given the rural location new acquisitions are not anticipated to have negative effects to resources or landowners and will be within the existing project study area.

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 771.117(c) Bridge rehabilitation, reconstruction, or replacement or railroad crossing improvements

23 CFR 771.117(d)

Part 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.**

1.	Involves any unusual circumstances as described in <u>*23 CFR Part 771.117(b)</u>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
2.	The acquisition of more than <u>*minor amounts</u> of temporary or permanent strips of right-of-way	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
3.	Involves acquisitions that result in residential or non-residential displacements	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
4.	Involves any adverse impacts to EJ populations	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

Part 3 - Thresholds Continued

5.	Results in capacity expansion of a roadway by adding through lanes	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
6.	Involves construction that would result in <u>*major traffic disruptions</u>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
7.	Involves <u>*changes in access control</u> requiring FHWA approval	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
8.	An adverse effect determination under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
9.	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	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
10.	Any use of a Section 6(f) property	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
11.	Requires an Individual USACE 404 Permit	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
12.	Requires an Individual U.S. Coast Guard Permit.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
13.	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	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
14.	Construction in, across, or adjacent to a river designated as a National Wild and Scenic River	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
15.	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	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
16.	May affect and is likely to adversely affect a Federally listed species or designated critical habitat or projects with impacts subject to the BGEPA	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
17.	Involves acquisition of land for hardship, protective purposes, or early acquisition	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
18.	Does not meet the latest Conformity Determination for air quality non-attainment areas (if applicable).	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
19.	Any known or potential <u>major</u> hazardous waste sites within the right-of-way.	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No
20.	Is not included in or is inconsistent with the STIP and/or TIP	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No

Part 3 Continued - Additional criteria to be completed for disposal of excess right-of-way PCE

1. Is the parcel part of a SCDOT environmental mitigation effort or could it be used for environmental mitigation?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
2. Is there a formal plan to use this parcel for a future transportation project (is it part of an approved LRTP)?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> 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 Reports or Interchange Justification Reports).

Environmental Commitments: (Check all that apply)

- | | | |
|---|--|--|
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> USTs/Hazardous Materials | <input type="checkbox"/> General Permit | <input type="checkbox"/> Right of Way |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Water Quality | <input type="checkbox"/> Individual Permit | <input type="checkbox"/> Floodplains |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Migratory Bird Treaty Act | <input type="checkbox"/> Essential Fish Habitat | <input type="checkbox"/> Lead Based Paint |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Stormwater | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cultural Resources | |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Coast Guard Permit Exclusion | <input type="checkbox"/> Noise | <input type="checkbox"/> Non-Standard Commitment (see below) |

Part of CLRB 2022-1 DB package 14

Relevant field studies and environmental reviews have been completed to determine that the project meets the criteria set forth in the Programmatic Categorical Exclusion Agreement signed by FHWA-SC and SCDOT. It is understood that any additions/deletions to the project may void environmentally processing the project as presently classified; consequently, any engineering changes must be brought to the attention of SCDOT Environmental Services Office immediately. A copy of this form is included in the project file and one (1) copy has been provided to FHWA.

Approved By:

Date

Primavera:

☒

Yes

☐

No

NEPA Start Date:

3/15/22

Does the project contain additional commitments?: (if Yes attach to form) ☒ Yes

☐

No

Date: 07/19/2022


NEPA ENVIRONMENTAL COMMITMENTS FORM

Project ID : P041148 County : Cherokee District : District 4 Doc Type: PCE Total # of Commitments: 5

Project Name: S-11-56 (Montgomery Road) Bridge Replacement over Horse Creek

The Environmental Commitment **Contractor Responsible** measures listed below **are to be included in the contract and must be implemented**. It is the responsibility of the Program Manager to make sure the Environmental Commitment **SCDOT Responsible** measures are adhered to. If there are questions regarding the commitments listed please contact:

CONTACT NAME: Michael Pitts**PHONE #:** (803)737-2566**ENVIRONMENTAL COMMITMENTS FOR THE PROJECT****Water Quality**

NEPA Doc Ref:

Responsibility:

CONTRACTOR

The contractor will be required to minimize possible water quality impacts through implementation of BMPs, reflecting policies contained in 23 CFR 650B and the Department's Supplemental Specification on Erosion Control Measures (latest edition) and Supplemental Technical Specifications on Seeding (latest edition). Other measures including seeding, silt fences, sediment basins, etc. as appropriate will be implemented during construction to minimize impacts to water quality.

☐ Special Provision**Migratory Bird Treaty Act**

NEPA Doc Ref:

Responsibility:

CONTRACTOR

The federal Migratory Bird Treaty Act, 16 USC § 703-711, states that it is unlawful to pursue, hunt, take, capture or kill; attempt to take, capture or kill; possess, offer to or sell, barter, purchase, deliver or cause to be shipped, exported, imported, transported, carried or received any migratory bird, part, nest, egg or product, manufactured or not. The South Carolina Department of Transportation (SCDOT) will comply with the Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1918 in regard to the avoidance of taking of individual migratory birds and the destruction of their active nests.

The contractor shall notify the Resident Construction Engineer (RCE) at least four (4) weeks prior to construction/demolition/maintenance of bridges and box culverts. The RCE will coordinate with SCDOT Environmental Services Office (ESO), Compliance Division, to determine if there are any active birds using the structure. After this coordination, it will be determined when construction/demolition/maintenance can begin. If a nest is observed that was not discovered after construction/demolition/maintenance has begun, the contractor will cease work and immediately notify the RCE, who will notify the ESO Compliance Division. The ESO Compliance Division will determine the next course of action.

The use of any deterrents by the contractor designed to prevent birds from nesting, shall be approved by the RCE with coordination from the ESO Compliance Division. The cost for any contractor provided deterrents will be provided at no additional cost to SCDOT.

☐ Special Provision**Stormwater**


NEPA Doc Ref:


Responsibility:


CONTRACTOR

Stormwater control measures, both during construction and post-construction, are required for SCDOT projects with land disturbance and/or constructed in the vicinity of 303(d), TMDL, ORW, tidal, and other sensitive waters in accordance with the SCDOT's MS4 Permit. The selected contractor would be required to minimize potential stormwater impacts through implementation of construction best management practices, reflecting policies contained in 23 CFR 650 B and SCDOT's Supplemental Specifications on Seed and Erosion Control Measures (latest edition).

☐ Special Provision

Project ID : <input type="text" value="P041148"/>	SCDOT NEPA ENVIRONMENTAL COMMITMENTS FORM	
ENVIRONMENTAL COMMITMENTS FOR THE PROJECT		

Project ID : <input type="text" value="P041148"/>	SCDOT NEPA ENVIRONMENTAL COMMITMENTS FORM	
ENVIRONMENTAL COMMITMENTS FOR THE PROJECT		



Project ID : <input type="text" value="P041148"/>	SCDOT NEPA ENVIRONMENTAL COMMITMENTS FORM	
ENVIRONMENTAL COMMITMENTS FOR THE PROJECT		

Cultural Resources

NEPA Doc Ref:

Responsibility:	CONTRACTOR
-----------------	------------

CONTRACTOR

The contractor and subcontractors must notify their workers to watch for the presence of any prehistoric or historic remains, including but not limited to arrowheads, pottery, ceramics, flakes, bones, graves, gravestones, or brick concentrations during the construction phase of the project, if any such remains are encountered, the Resident Construction Engineer (RCE) will be immediately notified and all work in the vicinity of the discovered materials and site work shall cease until the SCDOT Archaeologist directs otherwise.

☐ Special Provision

USTs/Hazardous Materials

NEPA Doc Ref:

Responsibility:	CONTRACTOR
-----------------	------------

CONTRACTOR

If avoidance of hazardous materials is not a viable alternative and soils that appear to be contaminated are encountered during construction, the South Carolina Department of Health and Environmental Control (SCDHEC) will be informed. Hazardous materials will be tested and removed and/or treated in accordance with the United States Environmental Protection Agency and the SCDHEC requirements, if necessary.


☐ Special Provision

NEPA Doc Ref: Page: XX Paragraph: XX

Page: XX Paragraph: XX

Responsibility:

☐ Special Provision




LEGEND

 Study Area

 Bridge

DATA SOURCE: Bing Hybrid Aerial Imagery





Cultural Resources Project Screening Form

File Number: PIN: Route: County:

Project Name:

Type 1: Resurfacing, installation of fencing, signs, pavement markings, traffic signals, passenger shelters, railroad warning devices, installation of rumble strips, and landscaping

Project Type

Type 2: Bridge replacements on alignment, construction of bicycle/pedestrian facilities, and intersection improvements

Type 3: Projects that do not fall into Type 1 and Type 2 categories (e.g. road widening)

Comments

This project replaces the S-11-56 (Montgomery Road) bridge over Horse Creek. The archaeological area of potential effect (APE) extends approximately 600 feet from either end of the bridge and 75 feet from the road centerline. The architectural APE extends an additional 300 feet outside of the archaeological APE. HDR conducted a field survey on June 29, 2022 and created a short form report detailing the project. The survey consisted of a pedestrian reconnaissance of the entire archaeological APE augmented by the excavation of shovel test pits (STPs). A total of 24 STP locations were investigated. Three STPs were not excavated due to slope, wetlands, or ground disturbance. The remaining 21 STPs were excavated but produced no cultural resources. No archaeological sites were identified within the archaeological APE. A total of 11 (SHPO Site Nos 0303-0305) previously unrecorded historic resources and their associated sub-numbers were identified within either APE. SHPO Site No. 0303 is a residential structure and outbuilding constructed about 1910. SHPO Site No. 0304 is a residential structures constructed circa 1967 and containing three outbuildings. SHPO Site No. 0305 is a residential structure constructed in 1965 and features four outbuildings. All of the resources are recommended not eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. The current bridge to be replaced was built in 1950 and has no distinctive or noteworthy details and is neither historically or technologically significant. Although the bridge is over 50 years of age, it qualifies for streamlined review under the Federal Highway Administration's Post 1945 Bridges-Program Comment. This relieves SCDOT from considering the project's proposed effects on the bridge. No historic properties will be affected by this project. No additional cultural resources investigations are recommended.


Effect Determination:

*SHPO consultation is required for all Type 3 projects and any project with a No Adverse or Adverse Effect Determination.

This screening form was developed to satisfy documentation requirements for Type I and Type II projects under a Programmatic Agreement between the Federal Highway Administration, the South Carolina State Historic Preservation Office, the US Army Corps of Engineers, and the South Carolina Department of Transportation. For Type I and Type II projects that have no effect on historic properties, the completion of this screening form with supporting documentation (e.g. ArchSite Map) provides evidence of FHWA and SCDOT's compliance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Prepared by:

Review Date:




Date:
July, 2022



Cherokee County S-56 Bridge Replacement Over Horse Creek

Figure 2





Memo

Date: June 10, 2022

Project: S-56 Bridge Replacement over Horse Creek
SCDOT PIN #P040665

To: Will McGoldrick - SCDOT

From: Blake Hartshorn – HDR
Eric Mularski, PWS – HDR

Subject: **Natural Resources Technical Memorandum**

HDR conducted a natural resources survey for the South Carolina Department of Transportation (SCDOT) S-56 Bridge Replacement over Horse Creek Project (Project) on April 28, 2022. The Project will involve the replacement of the S-56 Bridge over Horse Creek to improve structural integrity, capacity, and/or safety concerns.

The Study Area encompasses approximately 10.5 acres. The site primarily consists of undeveloped forested lands, agricultural fields, and existing road right-of-way along S-56 (Montgomery Road) in Cherokee County, South Carolina. This technical memorandum provides a summary of HDR's methods and findings from a desktop analysis and an on-site natural resources survey. Attached to this report are, supporting figures, a permit determination form, and a biological assessment.

Desktop Analysis Methods

A desktop analysis was completed as part of an initial Study Area evaluation to identify key environmental resources to be considered for permitting and/or design. The potential resources identified in the desktop evaluation were field-verified by HDR to ensure that critical regulatory items will not adversely impact the Project. The following resources were consulted during the desktop analysis:

- Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Map Service Center (<https://msc.fema.gov/portal>)
- South Carolina Department of Natural Resources (SCDNR) and South Carolina Natural Heritage Program (SCNHP) (<https://sclportal.dnr.sc.gov/portal/apps/sites/#/natural-heritage-program>)
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Services (USFWS) Information for Planning and Consultation (IPaC) (<https://ecos.fws.gov/ipac/>)
- USFWS National Wetland Inventory (NWI) (<http://www.fws.gov/wetlands>)
- U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) National Hydrography Dataset (NHD) (<http://nhd.usgs.gov/>)
- USGS Topographic Quadrangle Maps (1:24,000-scale) Chesnee Quadrangle

Wetlands and Jurisdictional Waters of U.S.

On-site reconnaissance activities identified three streams and two wetlands within the Study Area (Attachment 1, Figure 4). A summary of jurisdictional waters of the U.S. is provided in Table 1.

Table 1. Summary of Delineated Waters of the U.S. within the Study Area

Feature Name	Coordinates (Decimal Degrees)	Type of Aquatic Resource	Cowardin et al. (1979) Classification ¹	Estimated Amount of Aquatic Resource in Study Area (ft)
Streams				
Stream 1 Tributary to Horse Creek	35.176883 -81.865996	non-section 10 - non-wetland	R4SB5	Length:160 Average Width:3
Stream 2 Tributary to Horse Creek	35.176468 -81.865803	non-section 10 - non-wetland	R5UB2	Length:485 Average Width:4
Stream 3 Horse Creek	35.175941 -81.865401	non-section 10 - non-wetland	R3UB2	Length:490 Average Width:15
Total Streams:				Length: 1,135 lf
Wetlands				
Wetland 1	35.1770232 -81.86621691	non-section 10 - wetland	PFO	Area: 0.01 ac.
Wetland 2	35.176355 -81.864986	non-section 10 - wetland	PFO	Area: 0.23 ac.
Wetland 2	35.176309 -81.86515	non-section 10 - wetland	PEM	Area: 0.11 ac.
Total Wetlands:				Area: 0.35 ac.

¹ R3UB2: Riverine, upper perennial, unconsolidated bottom, with a sand bottom.
R4SB5: Riverine, intermittent, streambed, with mud bottom.
R5UB2: Riverine, unknown perennial, unconsolidated bottom, with a sand bottom.

No surface water impacts are anticipated. The SCDOT Permit Determination Form has been completed and is attached to this report (Attachment 2).


Pursuant to Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act a field survey was conducted within the project corridor. Results are in the biological assessment attached to this report (Attachment 3). USFWS IPaC was used to determine what potential federally protected species could be on site.


Attachments:

- Attachment 1 - Figures
- Attachment 2 - Permit Determination Form and SCDHEC Water Quality Report
- Attachment 3 – Biological Assessment

References

- Cowardin, L.M., Carter, V., Golet, F.C., and LaRoe, E.T. 1979. Classification of Wetlands and Deepwater Habitats of the United States. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Washington, D.C.
- Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). 2021. Special Flood Hazard Area Definition/Description. (<http://www.fema.gov/special-flood-hazard-area>) (Accessed May 2022).
- South Carolina Natural Heritage Program (SCNHP). 2022. Data Explorer database. <https://sclportal.dnr.sc.gov/portal/apps/sites/#/natural-heritage-program> (Accessed April 2022).





Date: 5/23/2022

PERMIT DETERMINATION

FROM Blake Hartshorn COMPANY HDR Engineering Inc.

CONTACT INFO (phone and/or email) blake.hartshorn@hdrinc.com

SCDOT PROJECT ENGINEER Michael Pitts

TO Will McGoldrick - Design Build Coordinator

Project Description Replacing bridge over Horse Creek along Montgomery Drive in
in Cherokee County, SC

Route or Road No. S-56 County Cherokee

CONST. PIN P040665 OTHER PINS or STRUCTURE #

RESPONSE:

☒ It has been determined that no permits are required because:

Impacts should be avoidable

☐ The following permit(s) is/are necessary:
(Please check which type(s) of permit the project will need)

USACE Permit ☐ GP ☐ IP ☐ 401 ☐ JD

OCRM Permit ☐ CAP ☐ CZC

Navigable ☐ SCDHEC NAVGP — if checked a USCG and/or USACE navigable permit may also be required, but will be determined during the NEPA and Permitting stages.

Other

Water Classification: FW *Print and attach the SCDHEC water quality report*

303(d) listed ☒ no ☐ yes, for *

TMDL developed ☐ no ☒ yes, for * Fecal

*List all that apply using the SCDHEC abbreviations

Comments: S-56 Bridge is an existing bridge replacement project that should avoid
impacts.

The determination above was based on the most recently available information at the time. This is a preliminary determination and is subject to change if the design of the project is modified.

Hartshorn, Blake L. Digitally signed by Hartshorn, Blake L.
Date: 2022.07.19 13:32:33 -04'00'

Biologist, SCDOT/Consultant

7/19/2022

Date



Watershed and Water Quality Information

General Information

Applicant Name: SCDOT

Permit Type: Construction

Address: 1187 MONTGOMERY DR,
CHESNEE, SC, 29323

Latitude/Longitude: 35.175809 / -81.865395

MS4 Designation: Not in designated area

Monitoring Station:

Within Coastal Critical Area: No

Water Classification (Provisional): FW

Waterbody Name: Unnamed Trib

Entered Waterbody Name: Horse Creek

Parameter Description

NH3N	Ammonia	CD	Cadmium	CR	Chromium
CU	Copper	HG	Mercury	NI	Nickel
PB	Lead	ZN	Zinc	DO	Dissolved Oxygen
PH	pH	TURBIDITY	Turbidity	ECOLI	Escherichia coli (Freshwaters)
FC	Fecal Coliform (Shellfish)	BIO	Macroinvertebrates (Bio)	TP	(Lakes) Phosphorus
TN	(Lakes) Nitrogen	CHLA	(Lakes) Chlorophyll a	ENTERO	Enterococcus (Coastal Waters)
HGF	Mercury (Fish Tissue)	PCB	PCB (Fish)		

Impaired Status (downstream sites)

F = Standards full supported
N = Standards not supported

A = Assessed at upstream station
X = Parameter not assessed at station

WnTN = Within TMDL, parameter not supported
InTN = In TMDL, parameter not supported

WnTF = Within TMDL, parameter full supported
InTF = In TMDL, parameter full supported

Parameters to be addressed (those not supporting standards)

Fish Consumption Advisory

Waters of Concern (WOC)

TMDL Information - TMDL Parameters to be addressed

In TMDL Watershed: Yes

TMDL Site: RS-07038

TMDL Report No: 022-04

TMDL Parameter: Fecal

TMDL Document Link: https://www.scdhec.gov/sites/default/files/docs/HomeAndEnvironment/Docs/tmdl_ubroad_fc.pdf

Report Date: June 9, 2022

Biological Assessment of the
S-56 Bridge Replacement over Horse Creek
Cherokee County, SC
SCDOT PIN #P041148
June 3, 2022

Pursuant to Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act a field survey was conducted within the project corridor. The following list of threatened (T) and endangered (E) species was obtained from the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service:

Mammals

Northern long-eared bat (*Myotis septentrionalis*) - T

Plants

Dwarf-flowered Heartleaf (*Hexastylis nainflora*) - T

Methods

The project area was examined by GIS and field reconnaissance methods on April 28, 2022. Habitats surveyed were determined by each species' ecological requirements.

Results

The project consists of replacing a bridge and associated road work on S-56 over Horse Creek in Cherokee County, South Carolina. Land use in the vicinity of the project includes agriculture and forested upland areas with a large relatively undisturbed bottomland hardwood swamp forest. Habitat types within the project corridor consist of bottomland forested wetlands dominated by canopy tree species such as southern red oak (*Quercus falcata*), red maple (*Acer rubrum*), loblolly pine (*Pinus taeda*), and sweet gum (*Liquidambar styraciflua*) with an understory dominated by common greenbrier (*Smilax rotundifolia*), Japanese honeysuckle (*Lonicera japonica*), Virginia creeper (*Parthenocissus quinquefolia*) and ebony spleenwort (*Asplenium platyneuron*).

Bottomland hardwoods are typically found on floodplains of rivers and streams and can occur in the Piedmont as well as the Coastal Plain. Typical trees species found in bottomland hardwood communities include sweetgum (*Liquidambar styraciflua*), loblolly pine (*Pinus taeda*), hackberry (*Celtis laevigata*), overcup oak (*Quercus lyrata*), water oak (*Q. nigra*), willow oak (*Q. phellos*), laurel oak (*Q. laurifolia*), swamp chestnut oak (*Q. michauxii*), cherrybark oak (*Q. falcata* var. *pagodafolia*), white ash (*Fraxinus americana*), sycamore (*Platanus occidentalis*), American holly (*Ilex opaca*), and American elm (*Ulmus americana*). Typically, there is a subcanopy of young canopy species, plus many tall shrubs including pawpaw (*Asimina triloba*), southern arrowwood (*Viburnum dentatum*) and blackhaw (*V. prunifolium*). Vine species are typically common and can include trumpet creeper (*Campsis radicans*), supplejack (*Berchemia scandens*), poison ivy (*Toxicodendron radicans*), summer grape (*Vitis aestivalis*), and crossvine (*Bignonia capreolata*). The herb layer is richest on driest spots and can include catchfly grass (*Leersia lenticularis*), Virginia dayflower (*Commelina virginica*), nodding lady's tresses (*Spiranthes cernua*), sand violet (*Viola affinis*), white violet (*V. lanceolate*), false nettle (*Boehmeria cylindrica*), cardinal flower

(*Lobelia cardinalis*), longleaf lobelia (*L. elongata*), blue skullcap (*Scutellaria lateriflora*), calico aster (*Aster lateriflorus*), jumpseed (*Tovara virginiana*), Nepalese browntop (*Microstegium vimineum*), sensitive fern (*Onoclea sensibilis*), netted chainfern (*Woodwardia areolata*), royal fern (*Osmunda regalis*), cinnamon fern (*O. cinnamomea*), river oats (*Chasmanthium latifolium*), butterweed (*Pakera glabellus*), eastern marsh fern (*Thelypteris palustris*) and ebony spleenwort (*Asplenium platyneuron*).

The forested upland areas consist primarily of a dense mixed pine forest dominated by loblolly pine (*Pinus taeda*), sweetgum (*Liquidambar styraciflua*), and red maple (*Acer rubrum*). In addition to the roadway embankment, there are two agricultural fields adjacent to the bridge and roadway.

HDR's on-site field reconnaissance revealed potential summer habitat for the northern long-eared bat under the bridge; however, no individuals were identified. Dwarf-flowered heartleaf habitat was also revealed along a forested north facing slope in the southwest portion of the Study Area. The South Carolina Natural Heritage database revealed records for dwarf-flowered heartleaf within a 2-mile radius of the Study Area. On-site field reconnaissance took place during the optimal survey window for this species (March-May) on April 28, 2022; however, no individuals of dwarf-flowered heartleaf were identified.

The project was found to be consistent with the Federal Highway Association biological opinion for northern long-eared bat. SCDOT is providing a concurrence letter to USFWS.

Horse Creek is classified as a perennial, unconsolidated bottom, riverine system. The creek is somewhat incised with areas of minor bank erosion, and it appears that it occasionally leaves its banks during heavy rain events. Woody debris was observed in the stream however no vegetation was growing in the channel.

The project was found to be consistent with the Federal Highway Association biological opinion for northern long-eared bat. SCDOT is providing a concurrence letter to USFWS.

Based on lack of suitable habitat and/or no observations of the listed species in the vicinity of the project, results of the threatened and endangered species study indicate that the proposed action will not have an effect upon any threatened or endangered species or critical habitats currently listed by the USFWS.

Submitted by:



Blake Hartshorn
HDR Environmental Scientist
6/3/2022

BRIDGE REPLACEMENT SCOPING TRIP RISK ASSESSMENT FORM

COUNTY: _____

DATE: _____

ROAD #: _____

STREAM CROSSING: _____

Purpose & Need for the Project:

I. FEMA Acknowledgement

Is this project located in a regulated FEMA Floodway? ☐ Yes ☐ No

Panel Number: _____ Effective Date: _____ (See Attached)

II. FEMA Floodmap Investigation

FEMA Flood Profile Sheet Number _____ illustrates the existing 100 year flood:

- ☐ Passes under the existing low chord elevation.
- ☐ Is in contact with the existing low chord elevation.
- ☐ Overtops the existing bridge finished grade elevation.

III. No Rise/CLOMR Preliminary Determination

- ☐ Preliminary assessment indicates this project may be constructed to meet the "No-Rise" requirements. A detailed hydraulic analysis will be performed to verify this assessment.

Justification:

- ☐ Preliminary assessment indicates this project may require a CLOMR/LOMR. Impacts will be determined by a detailed hydraulic analysis.

Justification:

BRIDGE REPLACEMENT SCOPING TRIP RISK ASSESSMENT FORM

IV. Preliminary Bridge Assessment

A. Locate Existing Plans

a. Bridge Plans ☐ Yes File No. _____ Sheet No. _____ (See Attached)
☐ No

b. Road Plans ☐ Yes File No. _____ Sheet No. _____ (See Attached)
☐ No

B. Historical Highwater Data

a. USGS Gage ☐ Yes Gage No. _____ Results: _____
☐ No

b. SCDOT/USGS Documented Highwater Elevations
☐ Yes Results: _____
☐ No

c. Existing Plans ☐ Yes See Above
☐ No

V. Field Review

A. Existing Bridge

Length: _____ ft. Width: _____ ft. Max. span Length: _____ ft.

Alignment: ☐ Tangent ☐ Curved

Bridge Skewed: ☐ Yes ☐ No Angle: _____

End Abutment Type: _____

Riprap on End Fills: ☐ Yes ☐ No Condition: _____

Superstructure Type: _____

Substructure Type: _____

Utilities Present: ☐ Yes ☐ No

Describe:

Debris Accumulation on Bridge: Percent Blocked Horizontally: _____ %
Percent Blocked Vertically: _____ %

Hydraulic Problems: ☐ Yes ☐ No

Describe:

BRIDGE REPLACEMENT SCOPING TRIP RISK ASSESSMENT FORM

V. Field Review (cont.)

B. Hydraulic Features

a. Scour Present: ☐ Yes ☐ No Location: _____

b. Distance from F.G. to Normal Water Elevation: _____ ft.

c. Distance from Low Steel to Normal Water Elev.: _____ ft.

d. Distance from F.G. to High Water Elevation: _____ ft.

e. Distance from Low Steel to High Water Elev.: _____ ft.

f. Channel Banks Stable: ☐ Yes ☐ No

Describe:

g. Soil Type: _____

h. Exposed Rock: ☐ Yes ☐ No Location: _____

i. Give Description and Location of any structures or other property that could be damaged due to additional backwater.

C. Existing Roadway Geometry

a. Can the existing roadway be closed for an On-Alignment Bridge Replacement

☐ Yes ☐ No

Describe:

If "yes", does the existing vertical and horizontal curves meet the proposed design speed criteria?

If "No", will the proposed bridge be:

☐ Staged Constructed

☐ Replaced on New Alignment

BRIDGE REPLACEMENT SCOPING TRIP RISK ASSESSMENT FORM

VI. Field Review (cont.)


A. Proposed Bridge Recommendation:

Length: _____ ft. Width: _____ ft. Elevation: _____ ft.

Span Arrangement: _____


Notes: _____

BRIDGE SITE DIAGRAM: (Show North Arrow and Direction of Flow)




Performed By: _____

Title: _____



MAP SCALE 1" = 2000'



NFIP

PANEL 0025D

FIRM

**FLOOD INSURANCE RATE MAP
CHEROKEE COUNTY,
SOUTH CAROLINA
AND INCORPORATED AREAS**

PANEL 25 OF 400

(SEE MAP INDEX FOR FIRM PANEL LAYOUT)

CONTAINS:

COMMUNITY	NUMBER	PANEL	SUFFIX
CHEROKEE COUNTY	450045	0025	D
UNINCORPORATED AREAS			

Notice to User: The Map Number shown below should be used when placing map orders; the Community Number shown above should be used on insurance applications for the subject community.



**MAP NUMBER
45021C0025D**

**EFFECTIVE DATE
SEPTEMBER 16, 2011**

Federal Emergency Management Agency

This is an official FIRMette showing a portion of the above-referenced flood map created from the MSC FIRMette Web tool. This map does not reflect changes or amendments which may have been made subsequent to the date on the title block. For additional information about how to make sure the map is current, please see the Flood Hazard Mapping Updates Overview Fact Sheet available on the FEMA Flood Map Service Center home page at <https://msc.fema.gov>.

**South Carolina Department of Transportation
Location and Hydraulic Design of Encroachments on Floodplains Checklist**

23 CFR 650, this regulation shall apply to all encroachments and to all actions which affect base floodplains, except for repairs made with emergency funds. Note: These studies shall be summarized in the environmental review documents prepared pursuant to 23 CFR 771.

I. PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The South Carolina Department of Transportation (SCDOT) proposes to replace the closed/load restricted bridge crossing of Horse Creek along Road S-11-56 (Montgomery Drive) in Cherokee County.

A. Narrative Describing Purpose and Need for Project

- a. Relevant Project History:
- b. General Project Description and Nature of Work (attach Location and Project Map):
- c. Major Issues and Concerns:

The primary purpose of the project is to replace the existing bridge. Roadway improvements are limited to those associated with accommodating the new structure.

The project crosses Horse Creek which is shown on the Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) Panel 45091C0025D. Horse Creek is not designated as a Special Flood Hazard Area in the vicinity of the project. The project is not expected to be a significant or longitudinal encroachment as defined under 23 CFR 650A, nor is it expected to have an appreciable environmental impact on the base flood elevation. In addition, the project would be developed to comply with all appropriate floodplain regulations and guidelines.

B. Are there any floodplain(s) regulated by FEMA located in the project area?

Yes ☐ No ☒

C. Will the placing of fill occur within a 100-year floodplain?

Yes ☒ No ☐

D. Will the existing profile grade be raised within the floodplain?

The roadway grade will be raised to accommodate the larger bridge structure.

E. If applicable, please discuss the practicability of alternatives to any longitudinal encroachments.

Minor longitudinal encroachments are expected based on the revised roadway profile. The bridge will be constructed on existing alignment to reduce longitudinal impacts.

F. Please include a discussion of the following: commensurate with the significance of the risk or environmental impact for all alternatives containing encroachments and those actions which would support base floodplain development:

a. What are the risks associated with implementation of the action?

Risks are minimal; the project will replace the existing single span bridge with a larger single span bridge. The increased opening will have a negligible impact on the BFE's along the floodplain.

b. What are the impacts on the natural and beneficial floodplain values?

The project is not expected to impact the floodplain values, as the hydraulics will be retained/improved.

c. What measures were used to minimize floodplain impacts associated with the action?

A similar bridge size will be used and constructed on the existing alignment.

d. Were any measures used to restore and preserve the natural and beneficial floodplain values impacted by the action?

Not applicable.

- G. Please discuss the practicability of alternatives to any significant encroachments or any support of incompatible floodplain development.

The impacts are not considered significant encroachments and would not support incompatible floodplain development. The proposed project will have no significant impact to base flood elevations along the stream and will not impact the potential for development within the floodplain.

- H. Were local, state, and federal water resources and floodplain management agencies consulted to determine if the proposed highway action is consistent with existing watershed and floodplain management programs and to obtain current information on development and proposed actions in the affected? Please include agency documentation.

All analysis for the project was performed in accordance with SCDOT, FEMA, and local regulations.

As the project progresses to final construction plans, the hydraulic modeling will be updated based on the final bridge layout

____Thomas Miller____

SCDOT Hydraulic Engineer

____6-9-2022____

Date