



ODOT ENVIRONMENTAL PROSPECTUS

PROJECT NAME Cox Creek (Waverly Dr) Bridge (City of Millersburg)		REGION 2	KEY NUMBER 23143	FEDERAL AID NUMBER 4380(000)	
CITY Millersburg with Linn Co.	COUNTY Linn	FHWA NEXUS PE & CON funding		PROJECT SPONSOR LPA	
HIGHWAY NAME N/A				BEGIN MP N/A	END MP
LATITUDE 44.644038	LONGITUDE -123.074032	TOWNSHIP Albany Quad 11S	RANGE 3W	SECTION 5	
PROJECT DESCRIPTION (FIELD WILL EXPAND AS YOU TYPE. CLICK TAB TO SEE TEXT IN EXPANDED FIELD.) This project proposes to remove the existing structurally obsolete, weight-limited, deteriorated timber bridge #12752 and replace it with a single span pre-stressed concrete bridge that meets current standards. The existing bridge is 116 feet long on timber pile. The new bridge will be about 140 feet long. The new bridge will also support bicycle lanes and raised pedestrian sidewalks. The longer span bridge is expect to avoid bank erosion issues and address potential scour caused by a large flood event. This bridge provides the only access to city park areas, a bike trail system, a railroad maintenance center, and a portion of the city domestic sewage treatment system property. It is expected that the new bridge will need to be constructed one-half at a time for maintaining access. Beyond the bridge the roadway dead ends, so no detour route is available. The roadway approach to the bridge may need to be tapered to meet the new bridge width. Retaining walls may be needed to minimize impacts to adjacent properties. Cox Creek is the general dividing line for roadway right of way between City of Millersburg and City of Albany jurisdictions at the project area. Linn County is a Certified Agency and will provide engineering and construction support to the City of Millersburg for this project.					

Checklist questions marked with an asterisk (*) indicate that the question is related to the qualifying thresholds ("kickouts") identified in the 2015 PCE Agreement.

Estimated Right of Way Impacts

Right of Way

1. * Will the project involve temporary or permanent acquisition of right-of-way?.....	☒ Yes	☐ No	☐ Unknown
2. * Will the project result in the temporary or permanent displacement of persons or businesses?..	☐ Yes	☒ No	☐ Unknown

Railroads

3. Will the project involve work on or adjacent to railroad-owned property?	☐ Yes	☒ No	☐ Unknown
---	------------------------------	--	----------------------------------

Utilities

4. Will the project involve substantial impact to or relocation of existing reimbursable utilities that could create a disruption to service or additional environmental impacts??	☐ Yes	☐ No	☒ Unknown
--	------------------------------	-----------------------------	---

RIGHT OF WAY IMPACTS COMMENTS (FIELD WILL EXPAND AS YOU TYPE. CLICK TAB TO SEE TEXT IN EXPANDED FIELD.)

ROW funding is planned. The project area is not directly adjacent to the roadside area of 4(f) protected park property Simpson Park (OPRD) at the NW corner and Talking Water Gardens to the NE. Three quadrants are publicly owned properties, with a private property at the SE quadrant. City of Millersburg staff thinks that construction staging can occur within the closed sections of the roadway provided by staged construction. There is also some available space within the ROW off of the road southwest of the bridge. UPRR tracks are well beyond the project area at about 850 ft away, so railroad crossing coordination is not anticipated. Staging in parks is not anticipated.

Estimated Traffic/Transportation Impacts

5. What are the current and future ADT volumes for the project?.....	CURRENT ADT 150 (2010)	FUTURE ADT 500 (2030)	☐ Unknown ☐ N/A
--	---------------------------	--------------------------	---

TRAFFIC/TRANSPORTATION COMMENTS (FIELD WILL EXPAND AS YOU TYPE. CLICK TAB TO SEE TEXT IN EXPANDED FIELD.)

Waverly Dr. over Cox Creek is an urban local road and terminates in an industrial location to the north. It is currently restricted to 40 tons so does not serve the needs of the area. Staged construction should minimize inconvenience to roadway/bridge users during construction. No detour route is available for this dead end road.

Estimated Land Use Impacts

6. Is the project outside of an Urban Growth Boundary?	☐ Yes	☒ No	☐ Partially
7. If the project is outside the UGB, is it expected to require new right-of-way?.....	☐ Yes	☐ No	☒ N/A
8. If the project is outside the UGB, is the project allowed, or conditionally allowed, by the rules for Transportation Planning on Rural Lands (OAR 660-012-0065)?	☐ Yes	☐ No	☒ N/A
9. Region Planner's opinion that the project conforms with:			

a. Transportation Planning Rule	☒ Yes ☐ No
b. * Statewide Planning Goals	☒ Yes ☐ No
c. Comprehensive Plan and/or Transportation System Improvement Plan (city, county or both)	☒ Yes ☐ No
10. Is the project located within the Oregon Coastal Zone?	☐ Yes ☒ No
11. Will areas of Forest or Exclusive Farm Use (EFU), or Open Space Reserve zoning be impacted by the project?	☐ Yes ☒ No
12. Will the project result in the conversion of prime farmland, unique farmland, or land of statewide or local importance by the Farmland Protection Policy Act?	☐ Yes ☒ No
13. What are the general uses of land adjacent to the project area?	☐ Residential ☒ Commercial ☐ Farm/Forest ☒ Public ☒ Other (explain below)
LAND USE IMPACTS COMMENTS (FIELD WILL EXPAND AS YOU TYPE. CLICK TAB TO SEE TEXT IN EXPANDED FIELD.) The project area is comprised of public parks, industrial uses, and public and private utilities.	
Andrew Potts, City Engineer, Millersburg indicates that the project will require a land use floodplain permit via Millersburg Planning Department, and two construction permits including a Erosion Prevention and Sediment Control permit (EPSC) and a Post Construction Stormwater Quality Permit (PCSQ).	

Estimated Socioeconomic Impacts

14. * Will the project involve displacements of key businesses, business districts, commercial/ industrial areas, or public facilities?	☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ Unknown
15. * Will the project involve temporary or permanent changes to travel patterns, access to goods/ services, or parking that appear important to business, business districts, commercial/ industrial areas, community events, or neighborhoods? (Explain below)	☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ Unknown
16. Will the project divide or disrupt an established community, or affect neighborhood character or stability?	☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ Unknown
17. Will the project temporarily or permanently affect emergency and/or public services?	☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ Unknown
18. Does visual inspection and/or information sources such as census data indicate the presence of low-income or minority populations within or near the project area?	☒ Yes ☐ No
19. Does visual inspection and/or other information sources indicate the presence of elderly, handicapped, or transit-dependent populations?	☐ Yes ☒ No
SOCIOECONOMIC IMPACTS COMMENTS (FIELD WILL EXPAND AS YOU TYPE. CLICK TAB TO SEE TEXT IN EXPANDED FIELD.) The main local issue would be maintaining the single lane of traffic to allow City of Albany maintenance staff to continue necessary work on infrastructure beyond the bridge, as well as the railroad staff access to their facility. The only minor local issue that may or may not be of importance will be the unhoused population that uses the Simpson Park and the outer ends of Talking Waters as a place to stay. The project should not require any relocation of the unhoused but there are a number of them who are regularly present just beyond the limits of this project.	
Access to parks and park paths will remain open to park users.	

Estimated Water Resources and Wetlands Impacts

Stormwater

20. Will the project trigger the need for stormwater treatment?	☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unknown
---	--

Waters of the U.S./State

21. Are there waters of the U.S. or State within the project area? (If no, skip to Question 30)	☒ Yes ☐ No
22. * Is the project within a FEMA 100-year flood plain?	☒ Yes ☐ No
23. * Is the project within a FEMA regulated floodway?	☒ Yes ☐ No
24. Will the project occur in or over publically owned submerged or submersible lands?	☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unknown
25. * Will the project require a new USCG Bridge Permit?	☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ Unknown
26. Will the project require modification to an existing USCG Bridge Permit or Temporary Rule Change?	☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ Unknown
27. Will there be any fill or removal from waters of the U.S. or state?	☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unknown

28. Will fill or removal take place in waters of the State listed by DSL as Essential Salmonid Habitat?	☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ N/A
29. Will fill or removal take place in waters of the State that are Aquatic Resources of Special Concern?	☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ N/A

Water Supply Wells

30. Will any active wells be impacted by the project?	☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ Unknown
---	--

Wetlands

31. Are wetlands potentially present in the project area?	☒ Yes ☐ No
32. Do soil surveys indicate hydric soils in the project area?	☒ Yes ☐ No
33. Is wetland vegetation evident from visual inspection?	☐ Yes ☒ No
34. Will the project fill or remove material from wetlands?	☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ Unknown
35. * Will the project require an Individual Permit, Nationwide Permit, General Authorization or General Permit?	☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unknown

WATER RESOURCES AND WETLANDS IMPACTS COMMENTS (FIELD WILL EXPAND AS YOU TYPE. CLICK TAB TO SEE TEXT IN EXPANDED FIELD.)

Stormwater treatment will be needed as triggered by bridge replacement. The Cox Creek drainage in the project area is deeply incised, and the new bridge will clear span. Cox Creek is a tributary to the Willamette River. Partially hydric soils (Woodburn silt loam 3-6 percent slopes) are indicated beyond the likely bridge project footprint. Essential Salmonid habitat is mapped for Cox Creek, particularly for Steelhead.

Estimated Biological Resources Impacts

Threatened, Endangered and/or Sensitive Species

36. Does the project have the potential to affect migratory birds and/or bats?	☒ Yes ☐ No
37. Are there USFWS T&E species, Proposed species, or critical habitat in the project's area of potential impact?	☒ Yes ☐ No
38. Are there NMFS T&E species, Proposed species, or critical habitat in the project's area of potential impact?	☒ Yes ☐ No
39. Are there State T&E or Proposed species present that are not federally listed?	☐ Yes ☒ No
40. Is the project located on or adjacent to BLM or USFS land?	☐ Yes ☒ No
41. * Will the project require an individual project-level formal consultation under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act?	☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ Unknown

In-Water Work

42. Are any streams or water bodies potentially impacted by the project?	☒ Yes ☐ No
43. Will the project require in-water work?	☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unknown

Fish Passage

44. Will the project trigger the Oregon State Fish Passage Statute (ORS 509.585)?	☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unknown
45. Are there any culverts within the project limits that are on the ODFW priority list for replacement/retrofit?	☐ Yes ☒ No

Wildlife Passage

46. Is the project within a wildlife collision hot spot, priority wildlife linkage area, or an area otherwise known to be a barrier to wildlife passage?	☐ Yes ☒ No
--	---

Noxious Weeds

47. Are there known noxious weed populations in the project area?	☒ Yes ☐ No
---	---

BIOLOGICAL RESOURCES IMPACTS COMMENTS (FIELD WILL EXPAND AS YOU TYPE. CLICK TAB TO SEE TEXT IN EXPANDED FIELD.)

ORBIC GIS indicates the presence in the general area of Oregon Spotted Frog (T/SC) last observed 1909, Steelhead (T/S) last observed 2009, and Oregon Chub (DL/S). Cox Creek is a fish bearing creek with Steelhead and Chinook Salmon. Western Pond Turtle (SOC/SC) is mapped in adjacent points and observed in 2019. Pacific Lamprey (SOC/S) is noted near the intersection of Cox Creek with the Willamette River and last observed in 2011.

Western Pond Turtle is under consideration for listing so a thorough evaluation of the project area should be made to determine presence and possible avoidance measures. FAHP ESA guidance will be updated in the future to account for Western Pond Turtle. Currently, an ESA Determination of No Effect (possibly with conditions) should be prepared for USFWS species.

FAHP ESA documentation should be prepared for NMFS species and for the effects of stormwater. Early coordination with the ODOT NMFS Liaison is needed to evaluate the project for use of FAHP. Coordination will also include discussion of stormwater treatment contributing area and proposed BMP type(s).

ODFW Fish Passage Approval is needed for the new structure.

The ODFW In-water Work Window is July 1 to October 31.

The project biologist should determine if there is bird or bat nesting use of the existing bridge. Also any tree or large brush cutting should occur during the non-nesting season of September 1 to March 1 in advance of construction. The services of USDA APHIS may be needed to prevent nesting.

Estimated Cultural Resources Impacts

Archaeological Resources

48. Are there known archaeological sites in the project area?	☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ Unknown
49. Will the project entail disturbance of previously undisturbed ground?	☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ Unknown
50. Will archaeologically sensitive areas (confluence of rivers, headlands, coves, overlooks, etc.) be affected?	☒ Yes ☐ No
51. If the project is on or adjacent to BLM or USFS land, does contact with BLM or USFS archaeologist indicate any issues?.....	☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ N/A

Historic resources (Built)

52. Does the SHPO historic database list any resources in the project area?	☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ Unknown
53. Will there be any impacts to known historic resources (either listed or determined eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places)?	☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ Unknown
54. Does any city/county comprehensive plan list any buildings/items in the project area as Goal 5 resources?	☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ Unknown
55. Are any buildings in the project area thought to be 50 years old or older?.....	☐ Yes ☒ No
56. Are there any apparent/unique structures of potential historical interest?.....	☒ Yes ☐ No

Section 4(f)

57. * Could the project impact any archaeological or historic resources eligible for protection under Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act?	☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ Unknown
---	--

CULTURAL RESOURCES IMPACTS COMMENTS (FIELD WILL EXPAND AS YOU TYPE. CLICK TAB TO SEE TEXT IN EXPANDED FIELD.)

The project location is close to the confluence of Cox Creek with the Willamette River. The project consulting archaeologist should prepare an archaeological resources Baseline Report. Further assessment could be required upon review of the report by the ODOT archaeologist.

The SHPO historic sites database does not indicate any historic resources on Waverly Dr. No historic resources were observed. The subject bridge has been modified so would not be considered an eligible resources. The project consulting historian should survey the project area and prepare a historic resources Baseline Report.

Estimated Parks / Recreation and Visual Impacts

Parks/Recreation Areas

58. * Could the project impact any parks, recreation areas, or wildlife/waterfowl refuges eligible for protection under Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act?	☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ Unknown
59. Could the project cause a Section 6(f) conversion or temporary occupancy of park or recreation area property encumbered by Land and Water Conservation funds?	☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ Unknown

Wild and Scenic Rivers

60. Is the project area within ¼ mile of the bank of an Oregon Scenic Waterway?	☐ Yes ☒ No
61. * Will the project affect waterways designated as National Wild and Scenic Rivers?.....	☐ Yes ☒ No

Visual

62. Will the project involve any potential triggers for visual impact analysis?	☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ Unknown
---	--

PARKS / RECREATION AND VISUAL IMPACTS COMMENTS (FIELD WILL EXPAND AS YOU TYPE. CLICK TAB TO SEE TEXT IN EXPANDED FIELD.)

There are two parks on the north side of the Cox Creek Bridge. In the NE quadrant is Talking Water Gardens (Albany and

Millersburg shared ownership) and in the NW quadrant is Simpson Park (OPRD) aka Simpson Lakes Access. Both parks would be subject to protections of Section 4(f) if there were impacts to those parcels. There is no 6(f) boundary mapped for either park close to or adjacent to the proposed work area (OPRD LWCF Viewer). There is 6(f) protection for Simpson Park but that area is mapped directly abutting the Willamette River. 6(f) does not apply to this project, however 4(f) protections will apply. Parks should be avoided in general, and permanent impacts to these parks should be avoided. 4(f) temporary occupancy may be needed.

Estimated Air Quality and Noise Impacts

Air Quality

63. Is the project in an air quality nonattainment or maintenance area?	☐ Yes ☒ No
64. Is the project type exempt from conformity or Mobile Source Air Toxic analysis (MSAT)? (If yes, skip to Question 69).....	☒ Yes ☐ No
69. Is the project located in Lane County?	☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A

Noise

70. Are noise-sensitive land-uses present within 500 feet of the project roadway?	☒ Yes ☐ No
71. Does the project require a noise analysis?	☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ Unknown
72. Does the project qualify for a screening analysis?	☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ Unknown ☐ N/A

AIR QUALITY AND NOISE IMPACTS COMMENTS (FIELD WILL EXPAND AS YOU TYPE. CLICK TAB TO SEE TEXT IN EXPANDED FIELD.)

The project is not located within an air quality management area. The project is the same one named in the 2024-2027 Active STIP, pg. 373, Work Type: Bridge, and named Cox Creek (Waverly Dr) Bridge (City of Millersburg). No air quality analysis is needed for this Type 2 project.

There will be temporary noise associated with construction that may affect the enjoyment of adjacent parks by park users.

Estimated Hazardous Materials / Waste Impacts

73. Does the project involve right-of-way acquisition or subsurface disturbance (e.g., excavation or drilling)? (If no, skip to Question 76).....	☒ Yes ☐ No
74. Does a search of DEQ databases (LUST, UST or ECSI) indicate the presence of any potentially contaminated sites within or adjacent to the project area?	☒ Yes ☐ No
75. Does a search of the Oregon Fire Marshal's Hazardous Materials Incident database indicate any hazardous materials releases within the project area?	☐ Yes ☒ No
76. Are there known current or historical land uses within or adjacent to the project area that could possibly have involved the use or storage of hazardous materials?	☒ Yes ☐ No
77. Will the project include any structure (including buildings or bridges) demolition, repair, or removal of potentially hazardous materials (e.g., lighting or electrical equipment, hydraulic equipment, bridge mechanics, striping paint, bridge/barrier paint, treated timbers, etc.)?	☒ Yes ☐ No

HAZARDOUS MATERIALS / WASTE IMPACTS COMMENTS (FIELD WILL EXPAND AS YOU TYPE. CLICK TAB TO SEE TEXT IN EXPANDED FIELD.)

Fire Marshal's database was inaccessible; checked several times. DEQ indicates a permitted City of Albany facility just south of the project area. As an industrial area it is assumed to have historic use of hazardous materials. The ODOT Hazmat Coordinator indicates that a building materials survey, a should soil investigation for determining clean fill, and a corridor assessment are needed. The City public works facility to the south is a LUST (closed in 1999) site and the Stimson Lumber (suspected contamination at the log pond, no investigation or cleanup completed) site to the north is a cleanup site. It's possible a Level 2 investigation may be needed but that cannot be confirmed yet.

Estimated Geological / Geotechnical Impacts

Geological Resources/Geotechnical

78. Will an ODOT owned/permitted material source be offered for this project?	☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ Unknown
79. Will ODOT owned/permitted disposal sites be offered for this project?	☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ Unknown
80. If an ODOT owned/permitted disposal or material source site is being offered, has it been previously cleared to federal environmental standards?	☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ N/A

GEOLOGICAL / GEOTECHNICAL IMPACTS COMMENTS (FIELD WILL EXPAND AS YOU TYPE. CLICK TAB TO SEE TEXT IN EXPANDED FIELD.)
ODOT materials sources and sites are not applicable to this project. Geotechnical notes are below.

Preliminary Investigations

81. Will the project include preliminary investigations (as described in ODOT NEPA Manual Section 418) as part of Preliminary Design Activities (defined in FHWA Order 6640.1A)?	☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unknown
--	--

82. Will preliminary investigations involve ground disturbing activities?	☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unknown
NOTE for consultants and local agencies: Contact the ODOT REC or EPM prior to scheduling any ground disturbing preliminary investigation activities.	
83. Will preliminary investigations require environmental clearances, approvals, permits and/or regulatory coordination prior to ground disturbing activities?	☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unknown
NOTE for consultants and local agencies: Contact the ODOT REC or EPM prior to scheduling any ground disturbing preliminary investigation activities.	
PRELIMINARY INVESTIGATIONS IMPACTS COMMENTS (FIELD WILL EXPAND AS YOU TYPE. CLICK TAB TO SEE TEXT IN EXPANDED FIELD.) It is assumed that preliminary investigation may be needed for support of bridge footing design. This should be a clear span bridge so investigation is not anticipated in the regulated area. When more information is available this topic will be revisited by the project team. Coordination with the ODOT REC is needed for preliminary clearance for rare plants, wetlands, and archaeology in advance of any geotechnical investigation.	

Stakeholder Concerns / Public Involvement

STAKEHOLDER CONCERNS / PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT COMMENTS (FIELD WILL EXPAND AS YOU TYPE. CLICK TAB TO SEE TEXT IN EXPANDED FIELD.) Notice to roadway and park users of temporary inconvenience and construction noise during the bridge replacement project.
--

Key Environmental Issues and Requirements

KEY ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES AND REQUIREMENTS COMMENTS (FIELD WILL EXPAND AS YOU TYPE. CLICK TAB TO SEE TEXT IN EXPANDED FIELD.) - Early coordination with the ODOT NMFS Liaison for application of FAHP ESA and determining the contributing impervious surface to be treated. - Project biologist to determine if there is bird or bat use of the existing bridge. The services of USDA APHIS may be needed to exclude nesting. - Maintain access to parks and park paths adjacent to the work area. - Avoid right of way that could affect park property.

Potentially Required Permits / Approvals / Clearances

84. Local Land Use	☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unknown
85. Local Agency Floodplain Permit.....	☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unknown
86. U.S. Corps of Engineers Section 404 and DEQ Section 401 Cert	☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unknown
87. U.S. Corps of Engineers Section 10.....	☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ Unknown
88. DSL Removal/Fill.....	☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unknown
89. U.S. Corps of Engineers Section 408 (federal facilities).....	☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ Unknown
90. NPDES 1200-CA permit (or 1200-C permit for local agencies).....	☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ Unknown
91. U.S. Coast Guard New Bridge Permit	☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ Unknown
92. U.S. Coast Guard Permit Modification	☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ Unknown
93. U.S. Coast Guard Construction Plan Approval	☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ Unknown
94. FAHP Programmatic BO	☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unknown
95. SLOPES Programmatic BO.....	☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ Unknown
96. Individual Biological Opinion	☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ Unknown
97. Marine Mammal Protection Act IHA	☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ Unknown
98. ODFW Fish Passage Plan Approval	☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unknown
99. State Endangered Species Act	☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ Unknown
100. No Effect Memo	☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unknown
101. Archaeological Excavation Permit	☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ Unknown
102. Section 106 – State Historic Preservation Officer (Historic–Built)	☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unknown
103. Section 106 – State Historic Preservation Officer (Archaeological)	☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unknown
104. Section 4(f) temporary occupancy	☐ Yes ☐ No ☒ Unknown
105. Section 4(f) <i>de minimis</i>	☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ Unknown
106. Section 4(f) Programmatic	☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ Unknown
107. Section 4(f) Evaluation – Individual	☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ Unknown

108. Section 6(f) Temporary Occupancy or Conversion ☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ Unknown
109. Wild and Scenic River Section 7 Determination..... ☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ Unknown
110. Oregon Scenic Waterways ☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ Unknown
111. FHWA Noise ☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ Unknown
112. * Air Conformity ☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ Unknown
113. Hazardous Materials Study..... ☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unknown
114. DOGAMI Permit..... ☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ Unknown

115. Other (specify):	Building materials survey
116. Other (specify):	Roadside soil investigation for purposes of determining clean fill
117. Other (specify):	Possible Level 2 hazmat assessment
118. Other (specify):	
119. Other (specify):	
120. Other (specify):	

Preliminary NEPA Classification

Based upon the answers and content above, please answer the following questions:

23 CFR 771.117(a) – Would the project involve any of the following effects:

121. Induce significant impacts to planned growth or land use for an area? ☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ Unknown
122. Require relocation of significant numbers of people? ☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ Unknown
123. Have a significant impact on any natural, cultural, recreational, historic or other resources? ☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ Unknown
124. Involve significant air, noise, or water quality impacts? ☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ Unknown
125. Have significant impacts on travel patterns? ☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ Unknown

23 CFR 771.117(b) – Would the project involve unusual circumstances such as:

126. Significant environmental impacts? ☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ Unknown
127. Substantial controversy on environmental grounds? ☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ Unknown
128. Significant impacts to properties protected by Section 4(f) of the DOT Act or Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act? ☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ Unknown
129. Inconsistencies with any federal, state, or local law, requirements or administrative determination relating to the environmental aspects of the project? ☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ Unknown

Based upon questions 121-129 and the Environmental Prospectus responses, identify the project's preliminary NEPA class of action:

- ☒ Programmatic Categorical Exclusion (PCE)
- ☐ Documented Categorical Exclusion (CE)
- ☐ Environmental Assessment (EA)
- ☐ Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)

For preliminary PCEs and CEs, identify the up to three category(ies) of project work from the activities listed in CFR 771.117(c) and CFR771.117(d):

APPLICABLE CATEGORY (c)(28)	APPLICABLE CATEGORY (d)(13)	APPLICABLE CATEGORY
--------------------------------	--------------------------------	---------------------

Signatures

Digital signature/date are required from the preparer and/or ODOT REC.

PREPARER NAME AND TITLE	ODOT REC NAME AND TITLE Donna Hinze, REC R2
PREPARER DIGITAL SIGNATURE AND DATE	ODOT REC DIGITAL SIGNATURE AND DATE