

Package Document

Related Packages: [1655 \(Eval - Approved 11/01/06\)](#) | [11601 \(Reeval - Approved 11/27/13\)](#) | [23851 \(Reeval - Approved 08/14/17\)](#)

Funding

Federal Funding? Yes

Federal Oversight? Yes

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

Type

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

Phase: Reevaluation

Classification: Categorical Exclusion (Class II)

CE Level: 2

CE Action: 04 05 06 07 08 09
 10 11 12 13 14 Other [List](#)

Reevaluation Reason: Change in scope, impacts and/or mitigation.
 Three or more years since major authorization or phase change.
 Other:

Summary of Reevaluation Changes by Document

Part A: General Project Identification and Description

Changes since the approval of the CER in 2013 include the following: updated the project description to clarify that there are two sections of roadway discussed in the CER, RC1 and RC2 and to add an description of the work in Section RC1 on Street Road; access control is anticipated to change from limited access to free access. Changes are due to refinements from on-going engineering design studies and continued coordination with PennDOT and FHWA.

Part A: Engineering Information

Changes to the engineering information since the approved 2013 CER include the following: updated the Current ADT to 2017 ADT, bridge curb-to-curb widths (S.R. 0001, Section 03S, Station 10+00 to 51+00 lane widths plus shoulders on each side; S.R. 0001, Section 03S, Station 51+00 to 156+25 lane widths plus right shoulder plus 6'-0" left shoulder); Updated the reduced posted speeds along S.R. 0001 from their existing

posted speeds per the approved traffic technical memorandum (Sta. 3+00 to Sta. 77+00 from 50 MPH to 45 MPH and Sta. 77+00 to Sta. 155+00 from 55 MPH to 50 MPH). These changes from the approved 2013 CER are due to refinements from the on-going engineering design studies.

Part A: Roadway(s)

Since the approval of the evaluation in 2013, the project has undergone some design changes and new information is being requested by the latest version of the CE Expert System . As a result, the following item has been updated: Existing and Proposed Lane Width (12 feet for S.R. 0132, S.R. 2044, and S.R. 2025, and 11-12 feet for S.R. 0001-Sec 03S).

Part A: Structure(s)

Since the approval of the evaluation in 2013, proposed structure type has changed from a Single-Span P/S Conc. Spread Box Beam to a 2-Span P/S Conc. Spread Box Beam (for SR 0001 N.B. & S.B. over SR 0132 and SR 0001 N.B. and S.B. over PA Turnpike Ramp) and sufficiency ratings have been added. Changes to structure information are due to refinements from the on-going engineering design studies.

Part B: Section A-1

Since the approval of the evaluation in 2013, the project has undergone some design changes. As a result, the following items have been updated: Streams, Rivers & Watercourses Permanent Impacts and Description (2,366 linear feet reported in 2013, now 1,615 linear feet - 515 linear feet of which is from Section RC1 and RC2 will be refined as the design progresses toward final design); Streams, Rivers & Watercourses Temporary Impacts and Description (none reported in 2013, now 2,186 linear feet) and Project Specific Restoration/Enhancement measurement (none reported in 2013, now 2,342 linear feet); new PAGWIS results for potential wells in the project area have been added; an Erosion & Sediment Control Plan for S.R. 0001, Section RC1 has been approved by the Bucks County Conservation District; Wetlands Remarks (wetland delineation was performed for the Off-Site Stream and Wetland Mitigation Project at the Bensalem High School on February 11 and 12, 2016); Project Specific Replacement/Construction (none reported in 2013, now 2.16 acres)

Part B: Section A-2

Since the approval of the evaluation in 2013, a more detailed review of the project area was undertaken and agricultural resources in the form of prime or unique soils and soils of statewide importance were identified. The agricultural resources discussion has been updated to follow the March 2016 PennDOT Publication #324 and to include the off-site mitigation project. Also inclusion of the results of an ACM and heavy metals in paint Survey for all structures to be demolished in Section RC1 and an environmental covenant on the Comfort Inn property at 2779 Route 1 North, Treose, PA has been added to the CE document.

Part B: Section A-3

Since the approval of the evaluation in 2013, an updated evaluation of the project area using DCNR's PA Conservation Explorer Program's PNDI Environmental Review system was conducted; the current PNDI receipt dated October 1, 2015 has been added; a discussion of the Phase I Bog Turtle Habitat Survey that was performed for the project on September 9, 2015 has been included in this section and copies of the Phase 1 findings were sent to USFWS on April 12, 2016.

Part B: Section A-4

Since the approval of the evaluation in 2013, an offsite mitigation project has been included and a PHMC Negative Survey form has been completed and submitted to SHPO; the proposed project is to re-establish the unnamed tributary to Neshaminy Creek within the APE and details of the project have been included in this section; on 4/7/2016, an archeological survey was conducted which concluded that the bases and adjacent slopes of the entrenchment exhibited indications of grading and disturbance from previous construction of the school and dense brush and leaf litter was found; however, no indications of intact archaeological deposits were encountered in the APE; it has been determined that the proposed Bensalem High School Mitigation Site project will not affect historical properties eligible for listing in the NRHP, and no additional archaeological investigations are warranted for this project.

Part B: Section A-6

Since the approval of the evaluation in 2013, the Air Quality documentation has been revised to follow the new PennDOT Publication #321 (December 2015) to update the PM2.5 attainment status from non-attainment to maintenance and to update the project TIP information; the Final Design Noise Analysis Report was approved by FHWA on 03/16/2017 for Section RC1. One Noise Sensitive Area (NSA #2) was identified which meets the warranted, feasible and reasonable criteria for a noise wall. The property owner for this NSA #2 voted in favor of the construction of a noise wall.

Part B: Section A-7

Since the approval of the evaluation in 2013, the discussion on Environmental Justice Population impacts has been updated to follow the March 2016 PennDOT Publication #746; parcels requiring right-of-way acquisition, either partial or total, have been added (46 parcels on RC1 and 21 parcels on RC2) and the right-of-way information has been updated to reflect the current extent and locations of acquisitions; studies are still ongoing for pedestrian and bicycle facilities within the project study area from Section RC2 and they will be completed prior to the start of RC2 construction.

Part B: Section C

Ongoing coordination with public officials and the townships regarding Section RC1 has occurred since the approval of the Re-evaluation in 2013. A plans display and municipal officials meeting were held. No further meetings are anticipated for Section RC1. A plans display and municipal officials meeting will be scheduled for Section RC2 as the design progresses.

Part B: Section D

Since the approval of the evaluation in 2013, a Joint Permit Application for Sections RC1 and RC2 was submitted to PADEP and USACE (February 2017). Based upon discussions with USACE and PADEP the proposed project will be authorized by USACE under a Nationwide Permit #23 for Categorical Exclusions and by PADEP under a Standard Joint Permit. It is understood that a future modification of the permits will be required for Section RC2. A General NPDES permit has been authorized for Section RC1. A separate NPDES permit is anticipated for the Section RC2 work.

Part B: Section E

Specific Permanent Impacts: since the approval of the evaluation in 2013, stream and wetland impact numbers have been updated and a proposed on-site and off-site mitigation plan has been included; mitigation commitment for PFBC required redbelly turtle habitat assessment has been added; an Erosion & Sediment Control Plan for S.R. 0001, Section RC1 has been approved by the Bucks County Conservation District.

Confirmation of Reevaluation Classification and Level

Upon reevaluation, as supported by the attached documentation, this project qualifies as a CE Level 2.

Projects

PDOT Project Manager: Sibty Hasan

Federal Project Number: X061-151

MPMS Projects					
Lead?	Status/Title	District/County	SR/Sec	Description	
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 13549	Active / US1: Old Linc - PA413	06 / Bucks	0001 / 03S	US 1: Old Lincoln - PA 413; Bensalem & Middletown Twps; Bridge Deck Rehabs	
<input type="checkbox"/> 93444	Programmed / Route 1 Improvement-South	06 / Bucks	0001 / RC1	Route 1 Improvement - South; Route 1 - Old Lincoln Highway to Turnpike Exchange, Bucks County; Corridor Improvements	
<input type="checkbox"/> 93445	Programmed / Route 1 Improvement-North	06 / Bucks	0001 / RC2	Route 1 Improvement-North; Route 1 - Neshaminy and Penndel Interchanges, Bucks County; Corridor Improvement	

*The last time MPMS data was added or refreshed was on Friday, 04 August 2017 03:16 PM.

Project Funding & Fiscal Constraint						
MPMS	FD \$	ROW \$	UTL \$	CON \$	TIP	LRTP Date
13549	6,987,000		4,869,000		FFY 2017 DVRPC TIP	
93444				55,728,000	FFY 2017 DVRPC TIP	
93445						
Remarks:	.					
<p>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.</p> <p>"LRTP Date" is the date of the last adopted Long Range Transportation Plan.</p> <p>Refer to Supplement to January 28, 2008 "Transportation Planning Requirements and Their Relationship to NEPA Process Completion"</p>						

Editors

Names & Groups: Craig Patterson/PennDOT BP-000119

Grace Erisman/PennDOT BP-000119
 Ken Yerges/PennDOT BP-000119
 Kristen Aiosa/PennDOT BP-000119
 Michael Kenawell/PennDOT BP-000119
 Mike Miller/PennDOT BP-000119
 Pilar McClelland/PennDOT BP-000119
 All District 06 Users

Reviewers

Notify These Additional Emails Upon Approval:	System User Names	Non-System / Other Addresses
	Grace Erisman/PennDOT BP-000119 Ken Yerges/PennDOT BP-000119 Kristen Aiosa/PennDOT BP-000119 Michael Kenawell/PennDOT BP-000119 Mike Miller/PennDOT BP-000119 Pilar McClelland/PennDOT BP-000119 Sibty Hasan/PennDOT Timothy S Stevenson/PennDOT	

Package was submitted on Friday, 18 August 2017 03:56 PM by Timothy S Stevenson/PennDOT

Email Notify	Reviewed By	Date/Time
EM: Bob F Eppley/PennDOT	Bob F Eppley/PennDOT	Fri, 08/18/17 03:57 PM
ADE: Chuck Davies/PennDOT	Chuck Davies/PennDOT	Fri, 08/18/17 05:08 PM
HDTs: Eastern Region Allen S Melley/PennDOT Booker T Bates/PennDOT Brian E Shunk/PennDOT Divyang Pathak/PennDOT Harrison Knox/PennDOT Julius B Sanders/PennDOT Keith Highlands/PennDOT Nina Ertel/PennDOT Pat Willis/PennDOT Ryan R Shiffler/PennDOT Sarah A Cordek/PennDOT	Keith Highlands/PennDOT	Tue, 08/22/17 01:25 PM
FHWA: Barbara J Shaffer/PennDOT BP-001391 Camille A Otto/PennDOT BP-001391 Christopher Walston/PennDOT BP-001391 Clint H Beck/PennDOT BP-001391	Jennifer Elsken/PennDOT BP-001391	Thu, 08/24/17 10:43 AM

Cory Donahue/PennDOT BP-001391
Deborah Sucismith/PennDOT BP-001391
Ezequiel Lujan/PennDOT BP-001391
George Fleagle/PennDOT BP-001391
Jennifer Elsken/PennDOT BP-001391
John Bork/PennDOT BP-001391
Jonathan Buck/PennDOT BP-001391
Jonathan Crum/PennDOT BP-001391
Karyn Vandervoort/PennDOT BP-001391
Keith Lynch/PennDOT BP-001391
Matt Smoker/PennDOT BP-001391
Melissa Furlong/PennDOT BP-001391
Michael Sherman/PennDOT BP-001391
Phillip Bobitz/PennDOT BP-001391
Roger L Ryder/PennDOT BP-001391
Thomas G Cutrona/PennDOT BP-001391
Tony Mento/PennDOT BP-001391
Veronica L Feliciano/PennDOT BP-001391

CEES Package Number: 25870

Categorical Exclusion Reevaluation

MPMS: 13549

Project: US1: Old Linc - PA413



SR/Section: 0001 / 03S

County: Bucks

District: 06

CE Level: 2

CE Action: Other

Created: 08/18/17 by Kristen Aiosa

Submitted: 08/18/17 by Timothy S Stevenson

Approved: 08/24/17 by Jennifer Elsken

CE Reevaluation Part A
General Project Identification & Description

Project Identification

Part A Prepared By: Johnson
Mirmiran & Thompson
Inc.

Originating Office: District 06

Date: 09/05/03

Federal Project Number: X061-151

Township/Municipality: Middletown Township and Bensalem Township

Local Name: US1: Old Linc - PA413

Limits of Work (Segment/Offset)

Construction Stations

Start: 0010/1000 NB
0011/1000 SB
End: 0070/0249 NB
0071/0519 SB

Start: 10+00
End: 156+25

Total Length: 14,625 ft

Program: STP/STU/NHPP/581 **Funding:** **federal** 80% **state** 20% **local** **other**

Have context sensitive solutions and/or smart transportation strategies been integrated into the project? Yes No

Remarks

The project will be designed using PennDOT's Design Manual Part 2 design criteria, which incorporates context sensitive solutions, and by utilizing smart transportation tools and techniques. The following measures of success will be utilized during design: peak hour/non-peak hour level of service improvement, volume/capacity ratio reduction, improvement of corridor travel times, potential safety improvements at documented high-crash locations, median widths that meet design criteria, shoulder widths that meet design criteria, restoration of existing sidewalks, maintenance/improvement of safe pedestrian crossings, maintenance of existing bicycle access, maintenance of existing public transportation access, maintenance of community character thru minimization of residential, community facility and business displacements, mitigation of impacts to wetlands, streams, stream crossings and floodplains, and right-sizing to ensure correlation of the final design to project needs.

Date of First Federal Authorization for Preliminary Engineering:

n/a

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

Reevaluation Reason: Change in scope, impacts and/or mitigation.
Three or more years since major authorization or phase change.

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 Categorical Exclusion Reevaluation (CER) approved in 2013 removed two (2) bridge rehabilitations from the proposed project. Prior to the previous approval, the bridge carrying S.R. 0001 over S.R. 0213 (Maple Avenue) was split out as a separate standalone project (MPMS No. 84866) to replace the bridge instead of rehabilitation and to incorporate additional improvements to the S.R. 8061 (Maple Avenue) Interchange. Additionally, the rehabilitation of the bridge carrying S.R. 0001 over S.R. 2008 (Highland Avenue) was split out as part of a larger safety improvement project (MPMS No. 93446) to the frontage (service) road corridor of S.R. 0001 beginning at the northern terminus of the Section RC1/RC2 (formerly Section 03S) project.

The Section RC1/RC2 project description, below, is the same as the 2013 approved CER description. A CER was deemed to be necessary to prevent the CE document from expiring prior to project completion. The current expiration date is November 27, 2016. In addition, the project stream and wetland mitigation described in this latest CER has been better defined since the 2013 CER approval. This CER is for S.R. 0001, Section RC1, although there is discussion for Section RC2. An additional CER will be required for Section RC2.

The S.R. 0001 Section 03S project consists of two construction sections, Section RC1 and Section RC2 and this project is located in Bensalem and Middletown Townships in Bucks County, PA. It involves the reconstruction of approximately 2.75 miles of S.R. 0001 including four (4) interchanges (the Street Road, PA Turnpike, Neshaminy, and Pennel Interchanges) and eight (8) bridges. The proposed roadway and bridge improvements in the reconstruction corridor are listed below by Section:

Section RC1

- Widening of S.R. 0001 median width to meet current design criteria.
- Raising the S.R. 0001 profile from south of the S.R. 8017 (Street Road) Interchange to Station 77+00, which is the end of the Section RC1 project at a point midway between the S.R. 8019 PA Turnpike Interchange and the S.R. 8055 Neshaminy Interchange, to improve vertical clearances for the S.R. 0001 structures over S.R. 0132 (Street Road), I-276 (PA Turnpike), and the PA Turnpike Ramps (Ramps I & J).
- Adding a third travel lane along S.R. 0001 in each direction from the Street Road interchange north to Station 77+00, which is the end of the Section RC1 project at a point midway between the S.R. 8019 PA Turnpike Interchange and the S.R. 8055 Neshaminy Interchange.
- Adding a northbound right-turn lane along S.R. 0001 from the S.R. 2037 (Old Lincoln Highway) Intersection north to the Street Road Interchange.
- Reconfiguring the Street Road Interchange to remove the four (4) traffic movements (ramps) between westbound Street Road and S.R. 0001 northbound and southbound from the northern side of Street Road and adding the movements to the southern side. Removing these movements from the north side of the interchange eliminates access and egress points along S.R. 0001, allowing longer weave lengths between the Street Road Interchange and

the PA Turnpike Interchange. Reconfiguring the interchange includes improvements to the existing ramp geometry and the addition of a ramp in the southwestern quadrant. Traffic signals will be added on Street Road at each of the two (2) proposed ramp intersections.

- Adding an auxiliary lane along S.R. 0001 in both the northbound and southbound directions between the Street Road Interchange and the PA Turnpike Interchange.
- At the PA Turnpike Interchange, increasing the existing loop ramp radius to improve design speed to 30 mph and incorporating a second lane on the S.R. 0001 northbound exit ramp to the PA Turnpike.
- Structure improvements including the replacement of four (4) existing bridges and the removal of one (1) existing bridge. The existing bridges to be replaced are those that carry S.R. 0001 over Street Road, the PA Turnpike, and the PA Turnpike Ramps (Ramps I & J). The S.R. 2025 (Bristol Road) bridge over S.R. 0001 will also be replaced. The existing bridge to be removed currently carries S.R. 0001 over a closed private access road located equidistant between the PA Turnpike and Neshaminy Interchanges.
- Street Road improvements include two (2) new traffic signals and one (1) modified traffic signal at the Street Road Interchange ramp termini and at the PA Turnpike EZ Pass ramp. Additionally, as with the rest of the project corridor, drainage and stormwater improvements will be completed on Street Road.

Section RC2

- Widening of S.R. 0001 median width to meet current design criteria.
- Raising the S.R. 0001 profile from Station 77+00, which is the beginning of the Section RC2 project at a point midway between the S.R. 8019 PA Turnpike Interchange and the S.R. 8055 Neshaminy Interchange, to north of the S.R. 8055 (Neshaminy) Interchange to improve vertical clearance for the S.R. 0001 structure over S.R. 2044 (Rockhill Drive).
- Adding a third travel lane along S.R. 0001 in each direction from Station 77+00, which is the beginning of the Section RC2 project at a point midway between the S.R. 8019 PA Turnpike Interchange and the S.R. 8055 Neshaminy Interchange, north to the S.R. 8067 (Penndel) interchange.
- Adding an auxiliary lane along S.R. 0001 in both the northbound and southbound directions between the PA Turnpike Interchange and Neshaminy Interchange.
- Reconfiguring the Neshaminy Interchange to relocate the ramp from Rockhill Drive to S.R. 0001 northbound from the northeastern quadrant of the interchange to the southeastern quadrant as a loop ramp, eliminating the signalized left turn movement immediately west of the existing Neshaminy Mall traffic signal. Improving the geometry of the interchange ramps, where feasible. Modification to both existing signalized intersections on Rockhill Drive to improve traffic flow into and out of the Neshaminy Mall and the Horizon Corporate Center (shopping center).
- North of the Neshaminy Interchange, adding/lengthening auxiliary (acceleration and deceleration) lanes along S.R. 0001 in both the northbound and southbound directions for ramps to and from Rockhill Drive.
- Structure improvements including the replacement of three (3) existing bridges. The existing bridges to be replaced are those that carry S.R. 0001 over Rockhill Drive, Neshaminy Creek, and Business Route 1 and the CSX and

SEPTA rail lines. S.R. 0001 southbound will be realigned across Neshaminy Creek to allow traffic to be maintained on the existing bridge during construction of the proposed structure on new alignment. Traffic will be switched to the new S.R. 0001 southbound structure during demolition of the existing bridge and construction of the proposed S.R. 0001 northbound structure. Similarly, S.R. 0001 northbound will be realigned across the CSX/SEPTA Railroad and Business Route 1 to allow traffic to be maintained on the existing bridge during construction of a new S.R. 0001 northbound structure. Traffic will be switched to the new S.R. 0001 northbound structure during demolition of the existing bridge and construction of the proposed S.R. 0001 southbound structure. Environmental and right-of-way constraints along the S.R. 0001 corridor restricted the potential to relocate the S.R. 0001 northbound bridge over Neshaminy Creek and the S.R. 0001 southbound bridge over Business Route 1/CSX. The S.R. 2025 (Bristol Road) bridge over S.R. 0001 will also be replaced.

Project Purpose and Need

Include narrative to describe the project need.

The Section RC1/RC2 project purpose and need discussion, below, is the same as the 2013 approved CER description. A CER was deemed to be necessary to prevent the CE document from expiring prior to project completion. The current expiration date is November 27, 2016. In addition, the project stream and wetland mitigation described in this latest CER has been better defined since the 2013 CER approval.

The overall purpose of the S.R. 0001 improvement project is to provide a long-term structurally sound stream and roadway crossings that are capable of safely handling the expected vehicular traffic while also incorporating highway and interchange safety enhancements to facilitate safe and efficient inter-modal travel along the S.R. 0001 corridor to meet both current and future transportation needs of the area.

More specifically, the S.R. 0001 improvement project will address the following needs:

- Deficient bridge structural integrity (inadequate load limits) and substandard lateral and vertical clearances.
- - The aging structures carrying S.R. 0001 over the underpassing roadways and Neshaminy Creek have deteriorated due to age, environmental factors, collision, scour, and flood damage and are structurally deficient. Three (3) underpasses within the corridor do not meet the current design criteria of 16'-6" for vertical clearance above an arterial and require reconstruction. A fourth underpass does not meet the current design criteria of 14'-6" for vertical clearance above a collector road. Additionally, seven (7) of the seven (7) structures lack the cross sectional width to accommodate the necessary travel lanes, shoulder widths, and median width associated with the corridor's service needs. An eighth structure carrying S.R. 2025 (Bristol Road) over S.R. 0001, has insufficient span length to accommodate the widening of S.R. 0001 and does not meet the current design criteria of 16'-6" for vertical clearance above an expressway.
- Poor traffic and pedestrian safety (high rates of incidences).
- - Throughout the corridor, including the intersecting roadways, there are traffic and pedestrian safety issues. The accident intensity rate (number of accidents per mile) is more than double the statewide average with several accident clusters (locations with higher volumes of accidents) occurring at the on and off ramps to S.R. 0001. This is due to deficient roadway geometries and high levels of traffic congestion. In addition,

multiple pedestrian accidents have been recorded within the corridor occurring predominantly at the at-grade intersections of Rockhill Drive and Old Lincoln Highway.

- Deficient roadway horizontal and vertical geometry.
- - Within the project corridor, all of the existing acceleration and deceleration lane lengths for each of the interchanges ramps do not meet current design criteria. Also, S.R. 0001 lacks the cross sectional roadway and bridge width to accommodate present and future traffic volumes, thus increasing traffic congestion, decreasing maneuverability, and increasing the potential for accidents.
- High levels of traffic congestion (poor levels of service).
- - Based on traffic analysis for current conditions, there are twelve (12) locations within the 2.5 mile corridor with high levels of traffic congestion. These areas currently operate at level of service E or F, which means that the facility is operating at or over capacity resulting in increased delays and reduced maneuverability. This subsequently affects the entire corridor and adjacent corridors. Traffic projections indicate, if no improvements are made to the project corridor, that the number of locations operating at level of service E or F will increase to thirty (30) areas within twenty (20) years. These areas are generally located in the weave areas between the four (4) interchanges, both on the thru and auxiliary lanes, and on the interchange ramps themselves. This will affect the entire corridor's level of service and impact adjacent roadways.
 -
- Poor accessibility to multi-modal connections.
- - The S.R. 0001 corridor is a limited access facility north of the PA Turnpike; Street Road is also limited access within the project limits. However, in the vicinity of the retail area near Rockhill Drive and near Old Lincoln Highway to the south of the project area where S.R. 0001 is non-access controlled, there are a limited number of transit stops and minimal pedestrian and bicycle facilities.

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.

S.R. 0001 (formerly L.R. 281 Par.) was originally paved/constructed from the Philadelphia County line in the south to the north of the Business Route 1 (Penndel) Interchange from 1933 to 1935 with at-grade intersections for all intersecting roads with the exception of the Penndel Interchange. The road was subsequently widened from the county line to S.R. 2037 (Old Lincoln Highway) in 1947 followed by widening of the rest of the corridor in 1954. The PA Turnpike Interchange was constructed during the PA Turnpike mainline construction in 1953. From 1965-1967, the roadway was widened and reconstructed to its current widths and configuration. During this period, the S.R. 0132 (Street Road) and S.R. 2044 (Neshaminy) Interchanges were constructed along with the construction of the S.R. 2025 (Bristol Road) Overpass. In 1994 and 1998, PennDOT completed a 3-R project from the county line to the bridge over the private road between the PA

Turnpike and Neshaminy Interchanges and from the bridge over the private road to the north, respectively, which rehabilitated the pavement surface. The Bristol Road overpass superstructure was rehabilitated in 2001.

The project is located in a suburban mixed residential and commercial community. This community is a fast growing community with competing interests with respect to transportation needs including local vehicular traffic, commuter vehicular traffic, pedestrian activities, commerce travel, tourism traffic and transit traffic. Proposed economic and community development plans focus on the additional development of commercial and residential uses. The area is serviced by SEPTA which provides passenger services and CSX which provides freight services. Other valued community resources include archaeological resources located to the northeast of Neshaminy Creek at S.R. 0001, the Water Company located to the northwest of Neshaminy Creek, and the Roosevelt Park Cemetery located to the southwest of the project area. The topography is rolling, typical of the Lowland and Intermediate Upland Section of the Atlantic Coastal Plain (ACP) Physiographic Province in which it is located. The fall line separating the ACP region from the Piedmont is visible in the area of the Neshaminy Mall east of the project corridor.

Describe the involvement with utilities with this project.

The project will involve overhead utility relocation work, especially south of the PA Turnpike Interchange and over the railroad overpass, which will be coordinated as part of the project. There is also the possible relocation of underground utilities.

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

The project will involve the replacement of the structure carrying S.R. 0001 over CSX and SEPTA rail lines with relocation of the adjacent railroad catenary towers as coordinated with CSX.

Describe changes to access control.

The only change anticipated to access control will be S.R. 0132 (Street Road) which will be changed from limited access to free access.

Additional Information

Remarks, Footnotes, Supplemental Data

Since the CER approved in 2013, the project description has been clarified to identify the two sections of the project, RC1 and RC2; access control is anticipated to change from limited access to free access. Changes are due to refinements from on-going engineering design studies and continued coordination with PennDOT and FHWA.

Attachments

1. [SR 0001-03S_ USGS Map.pdf](#) (1511KB / 1.5MB)
2. [SR0001SecRC1RC2Index Maps2016-10.pdf](#) (1624KB / 1.6MB)

CE Reevaluation Part A Engineering Information

Design Criteria

Roadway Description: S.R. 0001, Section 03S, Station 10+00 to 51+00

Functional Classification: Principal Arterial Urban Rural

Current ADT: 90,900 (2017)

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: 93,500 (2035)

Current LOS: B-E

Design Year Build ADT: 98,400 (2035)

Design Year Build LOS: B & C

DHV: 8,860

Truck %: 6

D (Directional Distribution) %: 55

Design Speed: 50 mi/h

Posted Speed: 45 mi/h

Required Minimum Widths

Lane Width: 11 ft

Shoulder Width: 8 ft

Bridge Curb-to-Curb: Minimum 130* ft

Design Exception Required? Yes No

If "Yes", explain.

Typology: Regional Arterial – Suburban Corridor

Topography: Level Rolling Mountainous

Proposed Design Criteria: New and Reconstruction

Roadway Description: S.R. 0001, Section 03S, Station 51+00 to Station 156+25

Functional Classification: Freeways/Interstates Urban Rural

Current ADT: 90,100 (2015)

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: 93,500 (2035)

Current LOS: B-E

Design Year Build ADT: 98,400 (2035)

Design Year Build LOS: B & C

DHV: 8,860

Truck %: 6

D (Directional Distribution) 55 %:

Design Speed: 60 mi/h

Posted Speed: 50 and 55 mi/h

Required Minimum Widths

Lane Width: 12 ft

Shoulder Width: 12 desirable, 10 min. ft

Bridge Curb-to-Curb: 46-146* ft

Design Exception Required? Yes No

If "Yes", explain.

A design exception will be required for the proposed vertical grade along S.R. 2025 (Bristol Road) to minimize impacts to Right-of-Way. This is a Limited Access Freeway; Urban Non-Interstate Typology.

Typology: Regional Arterial – Suburban Corridor

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: Temporary lane closures and flagging operations will be used as well.

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.

Detours should be clearly shown on the map and described, including provisions for pedestrians, bicycles, disabled and the elderly.

Approximate length of planned detour: 0.7 to 1.6 miles

Detour Map

Make the selection that best describes the planned detour:

- Detour will use local roads with no improvements.
- Detour will involve improvements to local roads with no resulting impacts on safety or the environment.
- Detour will involve improvements to local roads and will impact safety and/or the environment.
- Detour will use only state owned roads.

Describe impacts

The Bristol Road detour will use State and local roadways with a detour length of 1.6 miles. Neshaminy Blvd. (T-321) is a Township Route and is the only local road to be used in any of the detours. Signal timing may need to be adjusted at the intersections but no improvements to the local road should be needed. The Old Lincoln Highway detour will use only State-owned roadways with a detour length of 1.1 mile. All detours of interchange ramps will use only State-owned roadways. The detour lengths for each detour are on the attached plan sheets. None of the detours will have impacts on the safety or environment.

Estimated Costs

Engineering: \$ 15,000,000 **Right-of-Way:** \$ 20,100,000 **Construction:** \$ 180,000,000 **Utilities:** \$ 5,000,000

Additional Information

Remarks, Footnotes, Supplemental Data

*The bridge curb to curb widths provided above have been added since the CER approved in 2013 and are calculated as follows: S.R. 0001, Section 03S, Station 10+00 to 51+00 - lane widths plus shoulders on each side S.R. 0001, Section 03S, Station 51+00 to 156+25 - lane widths plus right shoulder plus 6'-0" left shoulder. The posted speeds along S.R. 0001 are proposed to be reduced from their existing posted speeds per the approved traffic technical memorandum as follows: Sta. 3+00 to Sta. 77+00 from 50 MPH to 45 MPH and Sta. 77+00 to Sta. 155+00 from 55 MPH to 50 MPH. These changes from the approved 2013 CER are due to refinements from the on-going engineering design studies.

Attachments

1. [SR-0001_TC-Detours.pdf](#) (3076KB / 3MB)

CE Reevaluation Part A Roadway

No roadways included with this project

Roadway Description

S.R. 0132 (Street Road) between Richlieu Road and Old Lincoln Highway.

	Existing	Proposed
Number of Lanes:	4	4-7
Lane Width:	12 ft	12 ft
Shoulder Width:	10 ft	5 - 14 ft
Median Width:	4 ft	4 - 16 ft
Sidewalk Width:	none ft	none ft
Bicycle Lane Width:	n/a ft	n/a ft
Clear Zone Width:	20 ft	20 ft

Additional Information

Remarks, Footnotes, Supplemental Data

The above information is repeated from the approved 2013 CE Re-evaluation.

Attachments

CE Reevaluation Part A Roadway

No roadways included with this project

Roadway Description

SR 0001-Sec 03S Old Lincoln Highway to bridge over Business Rte. 1/CSX

	Existing	Proposed
Number of Lanes:	4 - 6	6 - 8
Lane Width:	11-12 ft	11-12 ft
Shoulder Width:	4 - 8 ft	2 - 12 ft
Median Width:	4 ft	4 - 89 ft
Sidewalk Width:	none ft	*See note ft
Bicycle Lane Width:	n/a ft	n/a ft
Clear Zone Width:	30 ft	30 ft

Additional Information

Remarks, Footnotes, Supplemental Data

The following information is repeated from the 2013 CE Re-evaluation (CER). Sidewalks are present south of the cemetery on the SB side of SR 0001 and south of the Sunrise Motel on the NB side of SR 0001. Impacted sidewalks are to be replaced in kind (5 ft. width). Changes to the above information since the approved 2013 CER are due to refinements from the on-going engineering design studies.

Attachments

CE Reevaluation Part A Roadway

No roadways included with this project

Roadway Description

S.R. 2044 (Rockhill Drive) between Neshaminy Boulevard and Old Lincoln Highway

	Existing	Proposed
Number of Lanes:	4	4 - 8
Lane Width:	12 ft	12 ft
Shoulder Width:	8 ft	2 - 10 ft
Median Width:	4 ft	6 - 14 ft
Sidewalk Width:	none ft	5* ft
Bicycle Lane Width:	n/a ft	n/a ft
Clear Zone Width:	14 ft	14 ft

Additional Information

Remarks, Footnotes, Supplemental Data

The following information is repeated from the 2013 CE Re-evaluation (CER). PennDOT will investigate provision of sidewalks contingent upon reaching agreement with the Township regarding maintenance of the facility.

Attachments

CE Reevaluation Part A Roadway

No roadways included with this project

Roadway Description

S.R. 2025 (Bristol Road) between Grandview Ave and Old Lincoln Highway

	Existing	Proposed
Number of Lanes:	2	2
Lane Width:	12 ft	12 ft
Shoulder Width:	9 ft	8 ft
Median Width:	n/a ft	n/a ft
Sidewalk Width:	none ft	none ft
Bicycle Lane Width:	n/a ft	n/a ft
Clear Zone Width:	14 ft	14 ft

Additional Information

Remarks, Footnotes, Supplemental Data

The above information is repeated from the approved 2013 CE Re-evaluation.

Attachments

CE Reevaluation Part A Structure

No structures included with this project

BMS Number: 09-0001-0024-0718

BRKEY: 6709

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

SR 0001 N.B. & S.B. over SR 0132 (Street Rd) (Str. 1B) - Section RC1

	Existing	Proposed
Structure Type:	Adj. Conc(Span2) & Spread Conc. (Spans1&3) Box Beam	2 Span P/S Conc. Spread Box Beam
Weight Restrictions:	none ton	none ton
Height Restrictions:	none ft	none ft
Curb to Curb Width:	46 SB, 24 NB ft	72.44minNB & 61.27minSB ft
Lane Width:	12 ft	11 min ft
Shoulder Width:	10 SB, 8 NB ft	4.3 (inside)/12 (outside) ft
Sidewalk Width:	n/a ft	n/a ft
Total Bridge Width*:	50 SB & 50 NB ft	140.54 min ft
	*Total Bridge Width is measured from outside of barrier to outside of barrier, which should include sidewalks, when present.	
Under Clearance:	14.82 ft	17.25 ft
Lateral Clearance:	3 ft	33.36 ft
Sufficiency Rating:	49.0	
Structure Length:	139.73 ft	87.75 + 87.75 = 175.5 ft

Additional Information

Remarks, Footnotes, Supplemental Data

Since the CER approved in 2013, proposed structure type has changed from a Single-Span P/S Conc. Spread Box Beam to a 2-Span P/S Conc. Spread Box Beam. Changes to the above information since the approved 2013 CER are due to refinements from the on-going engineering design studies and changes to ECMS. The BMS has been revised to match ECMS, 09-0001-0024-0718. The 2015 Inspection Report listed the BMS Number as 09-0001-0024-0767.

Attachments

CE Reevaluation Part A Structure

No structures included with this project

BMS Number: 09-0001-0060-1082

BRKEY: 6721

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

SR 0001 S.B. over SR 2037 Spur B (Business Rte. 1) and CSX & SEPTA (6BS)- Section RC2

	Existing	Proposed
Structure Type:	Steel I-beams w/ cover PLs & Plate Girders	Steel Plate Girder
Weight Restrictions:	none ton	none ton
Height Restrictions:	none ft	none ft
Curb to Curb Width:	29 SB, 29 NB ft	54 ft
Lane Width:	12 ft	12 ft
Shoulder Width:	4 ft	6 (inside)/12 (outside) ft
Sidewalk Width:	n/a ft	n/a ft
Total Bridge Width*:	67.5 ft	57.87 ft
	*Total Bridge Width is measured from outside of barrier to outside of barrier, which should include sidewalks, when present.	
Under Clearance:	See below ft	See below ft
Lateral Clearance:	10 ft	14 (See below) ft
Sufficiency Rating:	50.0	
Structure Length:	455.7 ft	106+140+184+125=555 ft

Additional Information

Remarks, Footnotes, Supplemental Data

The following information is repeated from the 2013 CER. Existing Under Clearance: 25 ft over Business Rte 1; Existing Under Clearance: 23.5 ft over RR; Height Restrictions: Electric lines overhead; Proposed Under Clearance over SR 2037 Ramp B (Business Rte 1): 17.02 ft; Proposed Lateral Clearance for SR 2037 to Pier Column: 14 ft; Proposed Under Clearance over CSX: 24.57 ft; Proposed Lateral Clearance to Pier Column: 26.85 ft; Proposed Under Clearance over SEPTA: 24.95 ft; Proposed Lateral Clearance for SEPTA: 18.14 ft; Since the CER approved in 2013, a sufficiency rating of 50.0 has been added.

Attachments

CE Reevaluation Part A Structure

No structures included with this project

BMS Number: 09-0001-0030-0641

BRKEY: 6714

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

SR 0001 N.B. and S.B. over PA Turnpike Ramp IJ (Str. 2B) - Section RC1

	Existing	Proposed
Structure Type:	Steel I-Beam	2 Span P/S Conc. Spread Box Beam
Weight Restrictions:	none ton	none ton
Height Restrictions:	none ft	none ft
Curb to Curb Width:	32 SB/44 NB ft	72.27 NB & 60.27 SB ft
Lane Width:	12 ft	12 ft
Shoulder Width:	8 ft	12.3(inside)/12(outside) ft
Sidewalk Width:	0 ft	0 ft
Total Bridge Width*:	85.79 NB & SB ft	139.37 ft
	*Total Bridge Width is measured from outside of barrier to outside of barrier, which should include sidewalks, when present.	
Under Clearance:	15.3 ft	16.79 ft
Lateral Clearance:	6 ft	44.14 ft
Sufficiency Rating:	67.0	
Structure Length:	43 ft	76+90=166 ft

Additional Information

Remarks, Footnotes, Supplemental Data

Since the CER approved in 2013, proposed structure type has changed from a Single-Span P/S Conc. Spread Box Beam to a 2-Span P/S Conc. Spread Box Beam and a sufficiency rating of 67.0 has been added. The proposed structure length was changed to reflect the adjusted substructure location, which was revised to accommodate the integral abutments.

Attachments

CE Reevaluation Part A Structure

No structures included with this project

BMS Number: 09-0001-0040-0000

BRKEY: 6715

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

SR 0001 over Private Road (3B) - Section RC1

	Existing	Proposed
Structure Type:	Concrete slab	roadway fill
Weight Restrictions:	none ton	none ton
Height Restrictions:	none ft	none ft
Curb to Curb Width:	36 SB ft	n/a ft
Lane Width:	12 ft	n/a ft
Shoulder Width:	4 SB ft	n/a ft
Sidewalk Width:	0 ft	0 ft
Total Bridge Width*:	78.5 NB & SB ft	n/a ft
	*Total Bridge Width is measured from outside of barrier to outside of barrier, which should include sidewalks, when present.	
Under Clearance:	12 ft	n/a ft
Lateral Clearance:	2 ft	n/a ft
Sufficiency Rating:	68.0	
Structure Length:	18 ft	n/a ft

Additional Information

Remarks, Footnotes, Supplemental Data

Private road is closed to traffic. Structure is to be removed and replaced with roadway fill. Existing Curb to Curb Width: 33ft. NB; Existing Shoulder Width: 8ft. NB. Added Sufficiency Rating. Otherwise, no changes to the above information since the approved 2013 CER.

Attachments

CE Reevaluation Part A Structure

No structures included with this project

BMS Number: 09-7276-9903-5161

BRKEY: 7668

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

SR 0001 N.B. & S.B. over SR 0276 (PA Turnpike mainline) (9B) Section RC1

	Existing	Proposed
Structure Type:	Steel Riveted PI Girder	P/S Conc. Spread Box Beam
Weight Restrictions:	none ton	none ton
Height Restrictions:	none ft	none ft
Curb to Curb Width:	44 SB/ 32 NB ft	72.39 min to 81.45 SB ft
Lane Width:	12 ft	12 ft
Shoulder Width:	8 ft	12.3(inside)/12(outside) ft
Sidewalk Width:	0 ft	0 ft
Total Bridge Width*:	85.79 NB & SB ft	151.62 min. to 160.68 ft
	*Total Bridge Width is measured from outside of barrier to outside of barrier, which should include sidewalks, when present.	
Under Clearance:	15.25 ft	20.4 ft
Lateral Clearance:	13 ft	58.58 (See below) ft
Sufficiency Rating:	74.3	
Structure Length:	94.67 ft	90.11 + 90.26 = 180.37 ft

Additional Information

Remarks, Footnotes, Supplemental Data

The following information is repeated from the 2013 CER. Under Clearance with Future Widening: 19.92 ft; Lateral Clearance with Future Turnpike Widening: 36.58 ft. Since the CER approved in 2013, a sufficiency rating of 74.3 has been added. Changes to the above information since the approved 2013 CER are due to refinements from the on-going engineering design studies. The proposed inside shoulder width was revised to correct a typo. The proposed under clearance was revised to reflect the latest Turnpike elevation provided by the Pennsylvania Turnpike Commission.

Attachments

CE Reevaluation Part A Structure

No structures included with this project

BMS Number: 09-0001-0040-1557

BRKEY: 6717

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

SR 0001 over SR 2044 (Rockhill Drive) (4B) - Section RC2

	Existing	Proposed
Structure Type:	Conc. PA I-Beam	P/S Conc. Spread Box Beam
Weight Restrictions:	none ton	none ton
Height Restrictions:	none ft	none ft
Curb to Curb Width:	46 SB / 33 NB ft	72.27 NB & 72.27 min SB ft
Lane Width:	12 ft	12 ft
Shoulder Width:	4 SB / 8 NB ft	12.3(inside)/12(outside) ft
Sidewalk Width:	0 ft	0 ft
Total Bridge Width*:	88.5 NB & SB ft	151.37 min ft
	*Total Bridge Width is measured from outside of barrier to outside of barrier, which should include sidewalks, when present.	
Under Clearance:	13.75 ft	16.71 ft
Lateral Clearance:	8 ft	30 ft
Sufficiency Rating:	55.0	
Structure Length:	142.25 ft	79.75 + 93.75 = 173.5 ft

Additional Information

Remarks, Footnotes, Supplemental Data

No changes to the above information since the approved 2013 CER. Added Sufficiency Rating.

Attachments

CE Reevaluation Part A Structure

No structures included with this project

BMS Number: 09-0001-0050-2106

BRKEY: 6719

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

SR 0001 S.B. over Neshaminy Creek (5BS) - Section RC2

	Existing	Proposed
Structure Type:	Conc. Deck Arch	P/S Conc. Bulb-Tee Beam
Weight Restrictions:	none ton	none ton
Height Restrictions:	none ft	none ft
Curb to Curb Width:	41 SB / 29.08 NB ft	60 min to 63.41 max ft
Lane Width:	12 ft	12 ft
Shoulder Width:	4 ft	12 (inside and outside) ft
Sidewalk Width:	0 ft	0 ft
Total Bridge Width*:	79.58 ft	63.37 min to 66.78 max ft
	*Total Bridge Width is measured from outside of barrier to outside of barrier, which should include sidewalks, when present.	
Under Clearance:	28 ft	24.21 ft
Lateral Clearance:	n/a ft	n/a ft
Sufficiency Rating:	66.0	
Structure Length:	408 ft	146.1+149.9+105.5=401.5* ft

Additional Information

Remarks, Footnotes, Supplemental Data

*As measured along BL Construction/PGL SR 0001 S.B. No changes to the above information since the approved 2013 CER. Added Sufficiency Rating.

Attachments

CE Reevaluation Part A Structure

No structures included with this project

BMS Number: 09-2025-0342-0000

BRKEY: 7201

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

SR 2025 (Bristol Road) over SR 0001 (10B) Section RC1

	Existing	Proposed
Structure Type:	Conc.Spr.Box Beam	P/S Conc Spread Box Beam
Weight Restrictions:	none ton	none ton
Height Restrictions:	none ft	none ft
Curb to Curb Width:	42 ft	40 ft
Lane Width:	12 ft	12 ft
Shoulder Width:	9 ft	8 ft
Sidewalk Width:	0 ft	0 ft
Total Bridge Width*:	45.5 ft	43.37 ft
	*Total Bridge Width is measured from outside of barrier to outside of barrier, which should include sidewalks, when present.	
Under Clearance:	14 ft	16.84 ft
Lateral Clearance:	7.92 ft	14 ft
Sufficiency Rating:	88.0	
Structure Length:	121.25 ft	$70 + 68.375 = 138.37$ ft

Additional Information

Remarks, Footnotes, Supplemental Data

No changes to the above information since the approved 2013 CER. Added Sufficiency Rating.

Attachments

CE Reevaluation Part A Structure

No structures included with this project

BMS Number: 09-0001-0060-1082

BRKEY: 6721

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

SR 0001 N.B. over SR 2037 Spur B (Business Rte. 1) and CSX & SEPTA (6BN) - Section RC2

	Existing	Proposed
Structure Type:	Steel I-beams w/ cover PLs & Plate Girders	Curved Steel Plate Girder
Weight Restrictions:	none ton	none ton
Height Restrictions:	none ft	none ft
Curb to Curb Width:	29 SB, 29 NB ft	46 ft
Lane Width:	12 ft	12 ft
Shoulder Width:	4 ft	10(inside)/12(outside) ft
Sidewalk Width:	0 ft	0 ft
Total Bridge Width*:	67.5 ft	49.37 ft
	*Total Bridge Width is measured from outside of barrier to outside of barrier, which should include sidewalks, when present.	
Under Clearance:	See below ft	See below ft
Lateral Clearance:	10 ft	See below ft
Sufficiency Rating:	50.0	
Structure Length:	455.7 ft	110+145+180+125=560 ft

Additional Information

Remarks, Footnotes, Supplemental Data

Existing Under Clearance: 25 ft over Business Rte 1; Existing Under Clearance: 23.5 ft over RR; Height restrictions: Electric lines overhead; Proposed Under Clearance: 20.72 ft over SR 2037 Ramp B (Business Rte 1); Proposed Lateral Clearance for SR 2037 to Pier Column: 14 ft; Proposed Under Clearance over CSX: 27.01 ft; Proposed Lateral Clearance to Pier Column: 15 ft; Proposed Under Clearance to SEPTA: 27.19 ft; Proposed Lateral Clearance to SEPTA: 20.08 ft. No changes to the above information since the approved 2013 CER. Added Sufficiency Rating.

Attachments

CE Reevaluation Part A Structure

No structures included with this project

BMS Number: 09-0001-0050-2106

BRKEY: 6719

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

SR 0001 N.B. over Neshaminy Creek (5BN) - Section RC2

	Existing	Proposed
Structure Type:	Conc. Deck Arch	P/S Conc. Bulb-Tee Beam
Weight Restrictions:	none ton	none ton
Height Restrictions:	none ft	none ft
Curb to Curb Width:	41 SB / 29.08 NB ft	60 min. to 63.41 max. ft
Lane Width:	12 ft	12 ft
Shoulder Width:	4 ft	12 (inside and outside) ft
Sidewalk Width:	0 ft	0 ft
Total Bridge Width*:	79.58 ft	63.37 min. to 66.78 ft
	*Total Bridge Width is measured from outside of barrier to outside of barrier, which should include sidewalks, when present.	
Under Clearance:	28 ft	19.92 ft
Lateral Clearance:	n/a ft	n/a ft
Sufficiency Rating:	66.0	
Structure Length:	408 ft	150 + 150 + 103 = 403* ft

Additional Information

Remarks, Footnotes, Supplemental Data

*As measured along BL Construction & PGL SR 0001 N.B. No changes to the above information since the approved 2013 CER. Added Sufficiency Rating.

Attachments

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

Federal Project Number: X061-151

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 type="radio"/> Not Present <input checked="" type="radio"/> Present	<input type="radio"/> No <input checked="" 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 checked="" type="radio"/> Not Present <input type="radio"/> Present	<input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Yes

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

Since the CE Re-evaluation in 2013 the southernmost portion of the project area in Section RC1 occurs within the Poquessing Creek HUC-12 Watershed. There are two unnamed tributaries to Poquessing Creek within and immediately surrounding the project area. The Poquessing Creek and its tributaries are designated as Warm Water Fisheries (WWF) and Migratory Fisheries (MF) according to the PA Code Title 25, Chapter 93, Water Quality Standards. According to the Pennsylvania Fish and Boat Commission (PFBC), the Poquessing Creek and its tributaries within the vicinity of and downstream of the project area are not classified as Approved Trout Waters, Class A Wild Trout Streams, stocked trout waters, or as streams supporting natural trout reproduction.

Since the CE Re-evaluation approved in 2013, it has been determined that the northern part of the RC1 Section and Section RC2 of the S.R. 0001 Project occurs within the Core Creek-Neshaminy Creek HUC-12 Watershed. Streams located within this portion of the project area include the Neshaminy Creek and three unnamed tributaries to the Neshaminy Creek. The Neshaminy Creek and its tributaries are also designated as WWF and MF according to the PA Code Title 25, Chapter 93, Water Quality Standards. According to the PFBC, the Neshaminy Creek and its tributaries within the vicinity of and downstream of the project area are not classified as Approved Trout Waters, Class A Wild Trout Streams, stocked trout waters, or as streams supporting natural trout reproduction.

Linear feet of Streams permanently impacted: 1,615

Describe Any Permanent Impacts

Since the CER approved in 2013, it has been determined that a total of 1,615 linear feet of unavoidable permanent impacts to perennial, intermittent, and ephemeral streams is anticipated from the Section RC1 and RC2 construction. Permanent impacts associated with Section RC1 equal 515 linear feet and currently it is estimated that 1,100 linear feet of impacts will occur associated with Section RC2. Impact numbers for Section RC2 will be refined during final design and a CE Re-evaluation will be prepared to document any changes associated with Section RC2. Permanent impacts include partial and complete filling of the channels in Sections RC1 and RC2 to extend the slopes of the roadway as well as the extension of pipes and culverts throughout the project corridor. Channels that are completely filled will involve relocation. Neshaminy Creek will receive permanent impacts in Section RC2 from the placement of new piers within the active stream channel and shading impacts from the new structure.

Describe Any Temporary Impacts

Since the CER approved in 2013, it has been determined that a total of 2,186 linear feet of unavoidable temporary impact to perennial and intermittent streams is anticipated from the Section RC1 construction and the off-site stream and wetland mitigation construction. Temporary impacts from Section RC2 will be refined as the design progresses toward final design. Temporary impacts will occur to unnamed tributaries of the Poquessing Creek, and the Neshaminy Creek and its unnamed tributaries within the S.R. 0001, Section

RC1 and RC2 project area and the two mitigation sites. Temporary impacts are anticipated from general construction access, stream diversions, and the removal of the existing S.R. 0001 bridge piers and the placement of the new S.R. 0001 bridge piers. Cofferdams and causeways will be required to be placed in Neshaminy Creek during the new bridge construction. An off-site mitigation project is included in the proposed project to provide stream and wetland mitigation for unavoidable impacts to streams and wetlands resulting from the S.R. 0001, Section RC1 and RC2 roadway construction. This project will involve impacts to unnamed tributaries of the Neshaminy Creek as a result of the mitigation construction. The S.R. 0001 project also includes an on-site stream and wetland mitigation project along S.R. 0132 (Street Road). The on-site mitigation construction will result in impacts to an unnamed tributary of the Poquessing Creek.

Is mitigation incorporated? No Yes

Project Specific Restoration/Enhancement: 2,342 *linear feet*

Advanced Compensation/Banking: 0 *linear feet*

Other:

Mitigation Remarks

For Section RC1, PennDOT is proposing On-Site and Off-Site stream mitigation to satisfy compensatory mitigation requirements for the anticipated impacts associated with the overall S.R. 0001 project, Sections RC1 and RC2. Section RC1 has impacts to streams, but no wetland impacts. All compensatory mitigation for Section RC1 will be accomplished at the On-Site mitigation project. Section RC2 has both stream and wetland impacts that require compensatory mitigation. This mitigation will take place at the proposed Off-Site mitigation project.

The On-Site stream mitigation site consists of an unnamed tributary (UNT) to Poquessing Creek, located in the vicinity of the westbound Street Road ramp to northbound S.R. 0001 within PennDOT acquired right-of-way. The project limits begin approximately 200 feet upstream of the confluence of the UNT to Poquessing Creek (WUS-25) and an unnamed perennial tributary to Poquessing Creek (WUS-26), and extends downstream for a distance of approximately 700 feet to the twin box culverts located at the Pennsylvania Turnpike slip ramp. The proposed On-Site mitigation project includes relocation/restoration of 789 linear feet of the UNT to the Poquessing Creek (WUS-25) and 71 linear feet of an unnamed perennial tributary to Poquessing Creek (WUS-26) for a total of 860 linear feet of mitigated (restored) stream.

The proposed Off-Site stream mitigation site is located approximately 2 miles southeast of the S.R. 0001 project limits on Bensalem School District Property. The Off-Site mitigation proposes to reestablish an UNT to Neshaminy Creek. The proposed Off-Site mitigation project includes relocation/restoration of 1,482 linear feet of the UNT to the Neshaminy Creek (WUS-M1).

Both the On-Site and Off-Site stream mitigation sites will mitigate for all permanent stream impacts associated with the S.R. 0001, Group 03S, Sections RC1 and RC2 roadway improvement project and are located within the same Hydrologic Unit Code (02-04-02), the Delaware River Basin. Additionally, the Off-Site mitigation will satisfy mitigation requirements for anticipated Section RC2 aquatic resource impacts within the Neshaminy Creek watershed that are located within the Coastal Zone Management Area.

A Mitigation Plan has been developed for the S.R. 0001 Project in accordance with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' (USACE) 2008 Final Compensatory Mitigation Rule. The Mitigation Plan, which can be found in the project technical files, proposes On-Site and Off-Site stream mitigation to satisfy compensatory mitigation requirements for the anticipated impacts associated with the S.R. 0001, Sections RC1 and RC2 project.

Remarks

Overall the extent of permanent impact to jurisdictional waters of the U.S. is 1,615 linear feet, which has changed from 2,366 linear feet since the CER approved in 2013. Waters of the U.S. include drainage channels and streams. Breakdown of impacts to each channel will be calculated during the permit preparation phase of the project. Changes to the above information since the approved 2013 CER are due to refinements from the on-going engineering design studies and development of stream and wetland mitigation.

FEDERAL WILD & SCENIC RIVERS & STREAMS¹

Not Present Present

No Yes

Remarks

Based on a review of the Nationwide Rivers Inventory by the National Park Service there are no federal wild and scenic rivers or streams in the project area. ***No changes from the CE approved in 2013.

PRESENCE

IMPACTS²

STATE SCENIC RIVERS & STREAMS¹

Not Present Present

No Yes

Remarks

Based on a review of the Pennsylvania Rivers Inventory there are no state scenic rivers or streams in the project area. ***No changes from the CE approved in 2013.

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

Neshaminy Creek, in Section RC2, is the only stream within the entire S.R. 0001, Sections RC1 and RC2 project area large enough for recreational boating. Permanent impacts to Neshaminy Creek are anticipated with this project due to the placement of two structures, northbound and southbound S.R. 0001 bridges, rather than one structure in the creek. The number of piers to be placed in the Neshaminy Creek will be determined during final design of Section RC2. Temporary impacts to Neshaminy Creek will include the placement of cofferdams and causeways in order to remove and construct the piers for the S.R. 0001 bridges. There are no impacts to navigable waters, including the Neshaminy Creek, for Section RC1.

Is mitigation incorporated?

No Yes

Remarks

Neshaminy Creek is listed as navigable by the USACE from Newportville to the mouth of the creek, a distance of 4 miles. The proposed project is approximately 4.4 miles upstream of the navigable limit of Neshaminy Creek. This portion of the creek is not listed as a designated Water Trail by the PA Fish and Boat Commission. Additional coordination with the PA Fish and Boat Commission during final design will determine whether an Aids to Navigation Plan (ATON) will be required for this project during construction to allow for safe passage of recreational boaters. ***No changes from the CE approved in 2013.

	PRESENCE	IMPACTS ²
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 type="radio"/> Not Present <input checked="" 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 type="radio"/> No <input checked="" 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

Within the RC1 Section of the project two stormwater facilities will be impacted. The Red Roof Inn stormwater facility will be removed entirely to accommodate RC1 roadwork. A stormwater facility located by the Pennsylvania Turnpike slip ramp to Street Road will be modified due to RC1 impacts. There are multiple stormwater detention basins located adjacent to the Home Depot in the Section RC2 portion of the study area. No impacts are anticipated for these basins.

Is mitigation incorporated? No Yes

Describe Mitigation

The impacts to stormwater facilities from Section RC1 will be mitigated for by PennDOT as follows:

- Stormwater management for the Red Roof Inn in RC1 has been incorporated into the Postconstruction Stormwater Management Plan for Section RC1.
- The stormwater facility for the Pennsylvania Turnpike at Street Road will be modified and regraded to provide equal storage to its existing conditions.

Remarks

Detention basins located by Home Depot will not be impacted by the project. ***No changes from the CE approved in 2013.

	PRESENCE	IMPACTS ²
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 checked="" type="radio"/> Not Present <input 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 type="radio"/> Not Present <input checked="" 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 are no impacts to groundwater resources as a result of the S.R. 0001, Sections RC1 and RC2 project.

Is mitigation incorporated? No Yes

Remarks

Since the CER approved in 2013, new PAGWIS results for potential wells in the S.R. 0001, Sections RC1 and RC2 project area have been added. A PAGWIS search on 10/20/2016 identified 3-4 potential wells within the RC1 and RC2 Sections of the project area. Two of the wells are domestic wells owned by the American Standard Corporation and the Clover Motel (Section RC1); one well is a monitoring well owned by Lifestyle Real Estate, LLP (Section RC1); and one well is a commercial well owned by an Arco Station (Section RC1). The commercial well is closed or abandoned, as the Arco Station has been demolished. A field crew investigated the project site and searched within a 25-30 foot radius around the PAGWIS projected well locations in Section RC2 but were unable to locate any of the wells listed by PAGWIS. Most likely these wells have been abandoned or removed.

	PRESENCE	IMPACTS ²
WETLANDS¹	<input type="radio"/> Not Present <input checked="" type="radio"/> Present	
Open Water	<input type="radio"/> Not Present <input checked="" 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 checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Yes
Scrub Shrub	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Not Present <input type="radio"/> Present	<input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input 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

A wetland delineation was performed for the S.R. 0001, Section RC1 and RC2 Project on November 21, 2003; March 24, April 7, April 22, and May 13, 2004; and February 25, March 5, and March 13, 2013. The routine method prescribed by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 1987 Manual, was utilized in delineating wetlands. A wetland delineation was also performed for the Off-Site Stream and Wetland Mitigation Project at the Bensalem High School on February 11 and 12, 2016. The delineation was based on the methodologies outlined in the 1987 Corps of Engineers Wetland Delineation Manual and the 2012 Regional Supplement to the Corps of Engineers Wetland Delineation Manual Version 2.0: Eastern Mountains and Piedmont Region. The Wetland Identification and Delineation Reports can be found in the project technical files.

Number of Wetlands permanently impacted: 5

Acreeage of Wetlands permanently impacted: 0.521

Describe Any Permanent Impacts

Section RC1 construction will not impact wetlands. Section RC2 wetland impacts will continue to be evaluated during final design and a CE Re-evaluation will be prepared to document any changes associated with Section RC2. Current Section RC2 wetland permanent impacts include 9,257 square feet (0.213 acre) of permanent impact to Wetland 11A, 11B and 16 based on the placement of fill material for the slopes of Rockhill Drive (S.R. 2044) and Business Route 1 (S.R. 2037), which is included in Section RC2 of the SR 0001 Project. In addition, there will be 13,437 square feet (0.308 acre) of permanent impact to Wetland M1 and Wetland M3 located at the Off-Site Mitigation Project location due to placement of fill and grading, and relocation of WUS-M1 during construction of the mitigation project.

Describe Any Temporary Impacts

Section RC1 construction will not impact wetlands. Section RC2 wetland impacts will continue to be evaluated during final design and a CE Re-evaluation will be prepared to document any changes associated with Section RC2. No temporary impacts are proposed for wetlands within the Section RC2 project study area at this time.

Is mitigation incorporated? No Yes

Project Specific Replacement/Construction: 2.16 acres

Banking: acres

Bank to be Debited:

Restoration: acres

Preservation: acres

In-Lieu Fee: whole dollars

Other:

Mitigation Remarks

For Section RC1, PennDOT is proposing On-Site and Off-Site wetland mitigation to satisfy compensatory mitigation requirements for the anticipated impacts associated with the Section RC2 portion of the S.R. 0001 project. There are no wetland impacts due to Section RC1. A Mitigation Plan has been developed for the S.R. 0001 Project in accordance with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' (USACE) 2008 Final Compensatory Mitigation Rule. The Mitigation Plan, which can be found in the project technical files, proposes On-Site and Off-Site stream and wetland mitigation to satisfy compensatory mitigation requirements for the anticipated impacts associated with the overall S.R. 0001, Sections RC1 and RC2 Project.

The on-site wetland mitigation site consists of an unnamed tributary (UNT) to Poquessing Creek, located in the vicinity of the westbound Street Road ramp to northbound S.R. 0001 within PennDOT acquired right-of-way. The project limits begin approximately 200 feet upstream of the confluence of the UNT to Poquessing Creek (WUS-25) and an unnamed perennial tributary to Poquessing Creek (WUS-26), and extends downstream for a distance of approximately 700 feet to the twin box culverts located at the Pennsylvania Turnpike slip ramp. The proposed On-Site Mitigation Project includes creation/restoration of approximately 0.79 acres of floodplain wetlands along the above streams.

The proposed off-site wetland mitigation site is located approximately 2 miles southeast of the S.R. 0001 project limits on Bensalem School District Property, the Bensalem High School. The off-site mitigation proposes to reestablish an UNT to Neshaminy Creek. The proposed Off-Site Mitigation Project includes creation/restoration of approximately 1.37 acres of floodplain wetlands along the above streams, which will include mitigation for the 0.309 acres of existing wetlands that will be impacted by the proposed mitigation construction activities.

Both the on-site and off-site wetland mitigation sites will mitigate for all wetland impacts associated with the S.R. 0001, Group 03S, Section RC2 Roadway Improvement Project (Section RC1 does not require wetland impacts) and are located within the same Hydrologic Unit Code (02-04-02), the Delaware River Basin. Additionally, the off-site mitigation will satisfy mitigation requirements for anticipated Section RC2 aquatic resource impacts within the Neshaminy Creek watershed that are located within the Coastal Zone

Management Area.

Additional avoidance and minimization measures for the S.R. 0001, Section RC2 project include:

- Temporary wetland impacts will be avoided by fencing the non-impacted wetland areas to preclude disturbance by heavy equipment during project construction.
- Permanent and temporary wetland impacts have been avoided through the use of steepened slopes and retaining walls in the project design.

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

Since the CER approved in 2013, acreage of permanent wetland impacts has increased due to addition of the Off-Site Mitigation Project.

	PRESENCE	IMPACTS ²
COASTAL ZONE ¹	<input type="radio"/> Not Present <input checked="" type="radio"/> Present	<input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Yes

Documentation³

DEP Coastal Zone Coordination Letter

Describe Any Permanent and Temporary Impacts

No permanent or temporary impacts will occur to coastal zones.

Is mitigation incorporated? No Yes

Remarks

A Joint Permit Application for Sections RC1 and RC2 was submitted to the PA Department of Environmental Protection (PADEP) and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) in February 2017. Based upon discussions with USACE and PADEP the proposed project will be authorized by USACE under a Nationwide Permit (NWP) #23 for Categorical Exclusions and by PADEP under a Standard Joint Permit. It is understood that a future modification of the permits will be required for Section RC2.

In accordance with the 2017 NWPs Coastal Zone Management (CZM) and Water Quality Certification (WQC) Status Table: Delaware,

New Jersey, Pennsylvania, posted on the Philadelphia USACE website

(http://www.nap.usace.army.mil/Portals/39/docs/regulatory/publicnotices/NWP_Status_Table_for_CZM_and_WQC.pdf), CZM Consistency is issued for Pennsylvania projects that are authorized under the NWP #23. Matthew Walderon, PADEP Coastal Resources Management Program, confirmed by phone on July 7, 2017, that the S.R. 0001, Sections RC1 and RC2 project is consistent with CZM if authorized under the NWP #23 and that no additional coordination with the PADEP Coastal Resources Management Program is required.

The following information is repeated from the 2013 CER. The Coastal Zone Management letter dated August 25, 2004 granted consistency conditional upon obtaining a Water Obstruction and Encroachment Permit for impacts to Waters of the U.S. and an NPDES Permit for discharges of stormwater from construction activities. This will occur during final design for this project.

	PRESENCE	IMPACTS ²
FLOODPLAINS¹	<input type="radio"/> Not Present <input checked="" type="radio"/> Present	<input type="radio"/> No <input checked="" type="radio"/> 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

No FEMA mapped 100-Year floodplains are found within Section RC1 or the proposed Off-Site and On-Site Mitigation Projects. The Poquessing Creek 100-year floodplain is not present within the S.R. 0001, Sections RC1 and RC2 project or the proposed Off-Site and On-Site Mitigation Projects. All 100-year floodplain impacts for the S.R. 0001 project result from Section RC2 and impacts to the Neshaminy Creek 100-year floodplain. Temporary impacts are anticipated to the floodplain of Neshaminy Creek during construction of the proposed structure. The use of cofferdams and a half width causeway may cause an increase in the 2 year storm but the increase will stay within the streambank. Additional studies will be needed in final design to determine the extent of temporary impacts to the floodplain. No permanent impacts to the 100-year water surface elevation are anticipated with the proposed structure over Neshaminy Creek. The floodplains of the various tributaries to Neshaminy Creek will not be permanently impacted even though some will be filled and the streams and associated floodplains relocated to accommodate the widened roadway. The Off-Site mitigation project will include grading/lowering of the floodplain surrounding an unnamed tributary to Neshaminy Creek. This will allow the stream to be better connected with its floodplain. The mitigation project will result in a decrease of the 100-year water surface elevation at the upstream limits and no changes in water surface elevation at the downstream limits.

Is mitigation incorporated? No Yes

Remarks

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

An Erosion & Sedimentation Control (E&SC) Plan has been prepared for Section RC1 and submitted to the Bucks County Conservation District for review as part of an NPDES Permit application. The E&SC plan was determined adequate in conjunction with the issuance of the General NPDES Permit (PAG02000916027) by Bucks County Conservation District on September 6, 2016. The E&SC Plan for Section RC1 will be implemented in strict accordance with the terms of the adequacy determination. An Conservation District. An E&SC Plan will be prepared for Section RC2 and submitted as part of the request for issuance of the NPDES Permit required for Section RC2. A CE Re-evaluation will be prepared to document any changes associated with Section RC2.

- 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. [CZM_8-25-04.PDF](#) (95KB / 0.1MB)
2. [SR1 over Nesh. Crk - FEMA Map.pdf](#) (814KB / 0.8MB)

CE Reevaluation 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 checked="" type="radio"/> Not Present <input type="radio"/> Present	<input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Yes
Agricultural Security Areas	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Not Present <input type="radio"/> Present	<input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Yes
Prime Agricultural Land	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Not Present <input type="radio"/> Present	<input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Yes
Agricultural Conservation Easements	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Not Present <input type="radio"/> Present	<input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Yes
Farmland Enrolled in Preferential Tax Assessments	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Not Present <input type="radio"/> Present	<input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input type="radio"/> Yes
Agricultural Zoning	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Not Present <input type="radio"/> Present	<input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input 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

Only Agricultural Resources protected under the Farmland Protection Policy Act (FPPA) will be impacted due to this project. Permanent and temporary impacts are anticipated to Prime Farmland Soils, Farmland of Statewide Importance Soils, and soils with Capability Classes of II, III, and IV due to right-of-way acquisitions and temporary construction easements in both Sections RC1 and RC2 of the S.R. 0001 project.

Since the 2013 approved CER document, a more detailed review of the S.R. 0001, Sections RC1 and RC2 project area was undertaken and agricultural resources in the form of prime or unique soils and soils of statewide importance were identified. Within the roadway project area, there are four types of prime farmland soils. These include: Alton gravelly loam (AlA), Chester silt loam (CdB and CdC), Glenville silt loam (GrA and GrB), and Lawrenceville silt loam (LkA) which are defined by the Federal Farmland Policy Act (FPPA). Within the Off-Site mitigation project area, there are 2 types of prime farmland soils. These include: Lawrenceville silt loam (LkA) and Matapeake silt loam (McB). However, the FPPA does not afford protection to these soils if they are in or committed to urban development or water storage. The entire project area meets the following exclusionary condition: the project affects areas mapped as prime farm land soils which are identified as "urbanized areas" on a Census Bureau Map. Therefore, the project is in compliance with the FPPA.

Is mitigation incorporated? No Yes

Remarks

	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 checked="" type="radio"/> Not Present <input type="radio"/> Present	<input checked="" type="radio"/> No <input 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

In addition to landscaped vegetation and forest, the project area for S.R. 0001, Sections RC1 and RC2, contains typical roadside vegetation. Selective removal of forested and roadside vegetation will occur during the construction of both Section RC1 and Section RC2. Only the area needed to effectively perform the construction will be disturbed. It is anticipated that some landscaped areas in front of businesses will be impacted with the roadway widening.

Invasive Non-Native Plants are Present

Mitigation:

Are measures being taken to minimize movement of invasive plant parts (roots, tubers, seeds)? Yes No

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.**

Describe Mitigation

All disturbed areas within Sections RC1 and RC2 will be restored and revegetated with native species as part of construction, as appropriate. All plantings in stormwater management facilities will include standard PennDOT seed mixes. It is anticipated that proposed plantings for Sections RC1 and RC2 will be similar in nature.

Remarks

***No changes from the CE approved in 2013.

Vegetation within the S.R. 0001 corridor varies by location. The area between Neshaminy Creek and the railroad is wooded. Dominant vegetation includes boxelder, black walnut, silver maple, sycamore and ash. Understory vegetation includes lesser celandine, multiflora rose, silky dogwood, field garlic, Japanese knotweed, VA bluebells, garlic mustard, and poison ivy. Some oriental bittersweet, forsythia, English ivy and mayapple were also noted. Small woodlots were also noted north of Street Road, east of S.R. 0001; along Bristol Road; and behind Ruby Tuesday Restaurant.

Dominant vegetation included boxelder, silky dogwood, multiflora rose, garlic mustard, Allegheny blackberry, and Japanese honeysuckle. A moderate sized patch of Siberian elm was identified along a drainage channel behind Home Depot and within the Right-of-Way fence of S.R. 0001. Vegetation-lined drainage areas contained similar species associations.

	PRESENCE	IMPACTS²
GEOLOGIC RESOURCES¹	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Not Present <input type="radio"/> Present	

Remarks

***No changes from the CE approved in 2013.

Review of the Outstanding Scenic Geological Features of Pennsylvania website was completed in addition to field verification and no unique geologic resources were noted within the study area.

PARKS & RECREATION FACILITIES¹ **PRESENCE** **IMPACTS²**
 Not Present Present

Remarks

***No changes from the CE approved in 2013.
Field verification revealed no parks or recreation facilities will be impacted by the project.

FOREST & GAMELANDS¹ **PRESENCE** **IMPACTS²**
 Not Present Present

Remarks

***No changes from the CE approved in 2013.
Based on a review of USGS topographic mapping and field verification it was determined that no forest or gamelands are present within the project area and therefore no impacts to these resources will occur as a result of this project.

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

Remarks

***No changes from the CE approved in 2013.
According to the DCNR Natural and Wild Areas listing, there are no Natural or Wild Areas in the project area.

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

Remarks

***No changes from the CE approved in 2013.
Based on the review of the National Natural Landmarks Program website it was determined that no National Natural Landmarks would be impacted by the project.

PRESENCE **IMPACTS²**

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

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

Describe Any Permanent and Temporary Impacts

There are five bridges in Section RC1 and three bridges in Section RC2 that will be demolished, either being replaced or removed entirely. The bridges in Section RC1 were surveyed for asbestos containing material (ACM) and heavy metals in paint on February 23 and March 23, 2017. The bridges in Section RC2 will be surveyed for ACM and LBP prior to construction of Section RC2. The ACM and heavy metals in paint survey for the five Section RC1 bridges concluded that three of the RC1 bridges (S.R. 0001 over Bristol Road, Pennsylvania Turnpike (PTC) Mainline, and PTC Ramps) contain asbestos material and/or heavy metals in paint, which will require permanent impacts during demolition.

- The S.R. 0001 bridge over Street Road was found to have ACM only, in pedestal base caulking, transite conduits and transite shims, and sign bracket caulking.
- The S.R. 0001 bridge over the mainline PTC was found to have ACM and heavy metals in paint. Asbestos in the guiderail pedestal base caulking was found and also grayish-green paint with orange primer on the structure was found to contain detectable concentrations of cadmium, chromium, and lead. In addition, this structure had two inaccessible transite conduits that are known to contain asbestos.
- The S.R. 0001 bridge over the PTC ramps was found to have ACM and heavy metals in paint. Asbestos was found in the guiderail pedestal base caulking and silver-gray paint with orange primer was found on the structure to contain detectable concentrations of arsenic, cadmium, chromium, and lead. In addition, this structure had two inaccessible transite conduits that are known to contain asbestos.

Following the study it was determined based upon Verizon plans that there are underground transite ducts along Street Road, which are known to contain asbestos. These ducts will be permanently impacted by the Section RC1 construction.

Since the 2013 CEE, documentation obtained through the right-of-way clearance process uncovered an environmental covenant on the Comfort Inn parcel located at 2779 Route 1 North, Trevoise, PA. This site previously held a gasoline filling station and the fuel tanks were removed in 1986. A leak of unleaded gasoline occurred prior to removing the tanks. Soil contamination exceeding the Residential Statewide Health Standard exists in the vicinity of the former tank excavation. Due to this fact, the covenant restricts activities and use of the property and does not allow for potable wells to be installed and any soils that are removed need to be tested and disposed of properly. This covenant will stay with the property until it can be verified that the soil and shallow groundwater meet the Statewide Health Standards.

A permanent impact will occur due to the acquisition of required right of way from a Comfort Inn property for the construction of a foundation for a sign structure. The permanent impact will occur to an area of the Comfort Inn property which is the site of a former gasoline filling station and which contains soil contamination and a plume of groundwater contamination due to the presence of a leak of unleaded gasoline from the station's underground tank. The tank has been removed, however soil contamination and groundwater contamination has been documented in an Environmental Covenant executed in 2010, in the area of the former filling station on this Comfort Inn property. Soil excavation will occur as part of the S.R. 0001, Section RC1 project, for the construction of the sign foundation. The excavation is required over an area of 220 square feet to a depth of 6 feet within the limits of the former filling station.

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

Describe Remediation/Mitigation

Recommendations from the ACM and heavy metals in paint survey include the following:

- All five bridge substructures and superstructures are proposed to be demolished and replaced. Since the bridges are considered "facilities" by the U.S. EPA and demolition of "facilities" is governed by the NESHAPs regulation, proper ten-day notification as required in the NESHAPs must occur prior to beginning asbestos abatement and demolition of the bridges.
- Since the bridge inspections identified ACMs that will be disturbed and become friable during demolition efforts, abatement action is

necessary prior to any such efforts. In addition, the ten-day notification should reflect the need for asbestos abatement.

- Work disturbing the paint coatings should be performed in compliance with OSHA construction standards 29 CFR 1926.1118 for inorganic arsenic, 29 CFR 1926.62 for lead, 29 CFR 1926.1126 for chromium, and 29 CFR 1926.1127 for cadmium.
- Prior to disturbing or removing bridge components with paint coatings, stabilize the existing coating by applying an encapsulant (paint, mastic, etc.) to the areas of flaking/loose paint coatings to bond it to their substrates. Best management practices to prevent the release of paint chips to the environment should be implemented during work disturbing the metal bridge components.

The ACM and heavy metals in paint inspection was limited to visible and accessible areas and components of the bridges' substructures and superstructures only and that ACM and paint coatings not identified through these inspections may exist within inaccessible (i.e., internal) and uninspected areas. Should suspect ACM or paints suspected of containing heavy metals beyond those identified during this inspection be encountered at any time during demolition, Skelly and Loy recommends that they be treated as ACM and coatings containing heavy metals until clarification by a qualified and PA DOLI asbestos or lead-based paint inspector and subsequent laboratory analysis occurs.

Skelly and Loy under a Remediation Contract with PennDOT will perform the abatement work; therefore, a special provision for abatement is not required in the general contract documents. However, a specification will be developed to indicate that whereas all known ACM will be abated from the bridge by others (Skelly and Loy), the General Contractor (GC) will need to coordinate and cooperate with the PennDOT's environmental remediation contractor (Skelly and Loy) regarding abatement of ACMs from the bridges. The specification will indicate that the GC shall "cooperate and coordinate" during the removal of the ACMs identified on the SR 0001 Section RC1 bridges and from the subsurface in between the bridges where stormwater features are being excavated for and installed, which will intercept existing buried transite conduits.

In compliance with the terms of the Environmental Covenant on the Comfort Inn property PennDOT will notify in writing both the PA Department of Environmental Protection and the current property owner of the change in land use and ownership prior to any construction activity on the acquired right-of-way. A Special Provision will be included that verifies the completion of this notification. In addition, prior to the start of construction PennDOT will complete required work to identify the specific area of soil contamination and/or groundwater contamination and will include a Special Provision for any required disposal of contaminated soil or treatment of contaminated groundwater. Also, in accordance with the terms of the Environmental Covenant a Special Provision will be included which requires the immediate restoration of the integrity of any disturbed area that is presently included in an asphalt parking lot within the limits of the Comfort Inn property.

Remarks

An EDD-IV form has been prepared for the S.R. 0001, Section RC1 and is available in the project technical files. A copy of the Environmental Covenant and plan showing the proposed PennDOT work within the boundaries of the contaminated area are found in the project technical files.

The 2013 CER indicated that a final determination regarding the Sunrise Inn Motel, the Red Roof Inn, the Oakford Inn and the Active Chemical Corporation will occur prior to construction. The Sunrise Inn Motel was located within Section RC1 and has been demolished under a separate PennDOT contract. The Red Roof Inn is also within Section RC1. The Phase I ESA noted the potential for the Red Roof Inn building materials to contain asbestos and/or lead based paint. There will be no disturbance to the buildings. This location also had an unknown action under CERCLIS which was reported by First Search. The site received an assessment of NFRAP (No Further Remedial Action Planned) on 08-13-1996 from EPA. Therefore, no further action is anticipated for the Red Roof Inn property. The Oakford Inn and the Active Chemical Corporation are located within the Section RC2 portion of the project and a final determination for these properties will be made prior to construction of Section RC2.

The following information is repeated from the 2013 CER. Thirty-three potential hazardous waste sites were identified in the Phase I Environmental Site Assessment. Based on the proposed roadway improvements No Further Action (NFA) is recommended for twenty-nine of the sites. No Further Action at this Time (NFT) was recommended for the Sunrise Inn Motel, Red Roof Inn, Oakford Inn and Active Chemical Corporation. A final determination regarding the Sunrise Inn Motel, the Red Roof Inn, the Oakford Inn and the Active Chemical Corporation will occur prior to construction. Between the 2006 CER approval and the 2013 CER approval, all the bridges were determined to have the potential for asbestos containing material and lead based paint. A formal asbestos containing material (ACM) and lead based paint (LBP) survey will be conducted by PennDOT.

-
- 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

Since the CER approved in 2013, a more detailed review of the project area was undertaken and agricultural resources in the form of prime or unique soils and soils of statewide importance were identified. The agricultural resources discussion has been updated to follow the March 2016 PennDOT Publication #324 and to include the off-site mitigation project.

Attachments

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

3. WILDLIFE

	PRESENCE	IMPACTS²
WILDLIFE & HABITAT¹	<input checked="" type="radio"/> Not Present <input type="radio"/> Present	
Remarks		
<p>***No changes from the CE approved in 2013.</p> <p>A review of the Nature Conservancy list, coordination with DCNR and map analysis confirmed there are no Sanctuaries or Refuges in the project area.</p>		

	PRESENCE	IMPACTS²
THREATENED & ENDANGERED PLANTS & ANIMALS¹	<input type="radio"/> Not Present <input checked="" type="radio"/> Present <input type="radio"/> No Coordination Needed	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Potential Impacts <input type="checkbox"/> Potential Impacts with Avoidance Measures <input type="checkbox"/> Potential Impacts with Conservation Measures <input type="checkbox"/> 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

Describe Planned Conservation Measures to be Implemented

Describe Other Mitigation

Remarks

A PNDI search was completed for S.R. 0001, Sections RC1 and RC2 on 2/18/13 and a second search was completed on 10/1/15, The search on 2/18/13 indicated a potential impact to a species under the jurisdiction of the PA Fish and Boat

Commission (PFBC). Correspondence received from the PFBC on 5/02/13 requested the completion of a habitat assessment for the redbelly turtle for this project. The habitat assessment for the redbelly turtle was completed on 10/25/13 and submitted to the PFBC for review. The PFBC issued a letter dated 12/12/13 which stated that this project is unlikely to result in an adverse impact to the eastern redbelly turtle or any other species of special concern under the jurisdiction of the PFBC. Following the 10/01/15 PNDI search the required coordination with the PFBC was completed and on 2/26/16 PFBC provided a letter stating that there have been no changes in the project or on-site biological information; therefore impacts to rare, candidate, threatened or endangered species under their jurisdiction, remains unchanged. See the attached letters from the PFBC.

Bucks County is a known county of bog turtle occurrence; therefore, a Phase 1 Bog Turtle Habitat Assessment was conducted for the entire S.R. 0001, Sections RC1 and RC2 project area, as well as the Off-Site mitigation site at the Bensalem High School. A habitat assessment was conducted by a PA Qualified Bog Turtle Surveyor on 9/9/2015, in accordance with the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service (USFWS) guidelines. Because the bog turtle habitat assessment was completed by a Qualified Bog Turtle Surveyor and no potential bog turtle habitat was found, the Phase 1 reports serve as the official clearance documents for the bog turtle. As a courtesy, copies of the Phase 1 findings were sent to USFWS on April 12, 2016. A copy of the Phase 1 Bog Turtle Habitat Assessment is also in the project technical files.

The following information is repeated from the 2013 CER. As a result of coordination with FHWA on October 11, 2013 approval was received for the steps which are listed below to be completed after environmental approval and prior to project advertisement for construction, thereby enabling authorization of funds for advance right of way acquisition. It is noted that this right of way acquisition involves acquiring properties that are not associated with potential habitat for the redbelly turtle.

1. The required Habitat Assessment for the Pennsylvania threatened Redbelly turtle will be completed in accordance with the 5/2/13 letter which was sent by the PA Fish and Boat Commission for the S.R. 0001 Section 03S project.
2. The results of the Habitat Assessment will be placed in the S.R. 0001 Section 03S project technical files.
3. All of the commitments which result from the completion of the Redbelly turtle coordination with the PA Fish and Boat Commission will be implemented for this project in accordance with this completed coordination.
4. If coordination with the PA Fish and Boat Commission results in a determination that the species may be impacted, the Level 1b CEE may be re-evaluated as appropriate.

-
- 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

Since the CER approved in 2013, an updated evaluation of the project area using DCNR's PA Conservation Explorer Program's PNDI Environmental Review system was conducted. The current PNDI receipt dated October 1, 2015 has been added. A discussion of the Phase I Bog Turtle Habitat Survey that was performed for the project on September 9, 2015 has been included in this section and copies of the Phase 1 findings were sent to USFWS on April 12, 2016.

Attachments

1. [SR 1-03S_PNDI Receipt_signed_2-18-13.pdf](#) (2554KB / 2.5MB)
2. [SR 1-03S_PFBC Response Letter_5-2-13.pdf](#) (1510KB / 1.5MB)
3. [SR 0001-03S_PFBC Response Letter \(02-26-16\).pdf](#) (234KB / 0.2MB)
4. [SR 1_PFBC Clearance Letter_12-11-2013.pdf](#) (249KB / 0.2MB)
5. [SR 1-03S_PNDI Receipt_10-01-15_signed.pdf](#) (727KB / 0.7MB)

CE Reevaluation 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: 12/21/00

CRP Architectural Historian in Attendance: Monica Harrower

CRP Archaeologist in Attendance: Catherine Spohn

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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<u>Archaeology</u>							
Pre-Contact:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Contact Native American:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Historic:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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:

- Executed Memorandum of Agreement (MOA)

Executed Letter of Agreement (LOA)

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

The S.R. 0001, Section RC2 portion of the project will permanently impact approximately 0.049 acre of land through the placement of four piers for the overhead S.R. 0001 bridge within the National Register boundary of the Reading Railroad - N.Y. Line. These piers will replace two existing piers within the National Register boundary that occupy 0.068 acre of land. This land will be vacated. Temporary impacts will require approximately 2.71 acres of temporary construction easements (TCE) to access the railroad, remove the existing piers, and construct the new piers. It is anticipated that the TCE will be required for approximately 12 months to complete demolition and construction of the new bridge. Upon completion of bridge replacement activities, all temporarily impacted areas will be returned to their original condition.

The S.R. 0001, Sections RC1 and RC2 project will have no impact on the Roosevelt Memorial Park/Roosevelt Cemetery Company, the Philadelphia Suburban Water Company, the Shultz Site, nor the Vansant Mill Complex Site.

Are mitigation and/or standard treatments required? No Yes

Describe Mitigation / Standard Treatments

The Shultz Site and Vansant Mill Complex site will need to be protected during construction of S.R. 0001, Section RC2 through the placement of standard orange safety fencing around the perimeter of each of the sites. The contractor will be responsible for notifying the District at least one week prior to the start of construction so that the District's archaeologist (or designated consultant) can be scheduled to be on-site during the fence installation process. Written and verbal notification concerning presence of these two sites and the preservation procedures must be given to all project contractors prior to the project's commencement. Details of the preservation plan need to be presented in the contract for the contractor's use and review. During the construction process, archaeologists from PennDOT District 6-0 and/or a designated consultant may periodically visit the site areas to insure that the

integrity of the site boundaries and fencing have been maintained. Copies of the construction schedule should be made available to the District archaeologist.

Remarks

Since the 2013 CER application, an offsite mitigation project has been included. The proposed project is to re-establish the unnamed tributary to Neshaminy Creek within the APE. The project will include removal of the abandoned dam, stream mitigation along the channel, and wetland creation within the adjacent floodplain. The impact will be confined to the entrenched portion of the stream valley. PHMC provided a finding of No Effect on above ground historic properties within the APE in a letter, dated February 12, 2016. PHMC also requested a Phase I Archaeological survey. A PHMC Negative Survey form was completed and submitted to SHPO. On April 7, 2016, an archeological survey was conducted which concluded that the bases and adjacent slopes of the entrenchment exhibited indications of grading and disturbance from previous construction of the school and dense brush and leaf litter was found; however, no indications of intact archaeological deposits were encountered in the APE. The proposed Bensalem High School Mitigation Site project will not affect historical properties eligible for listing in the NRHP, and no additional archaeological investigations are warranted for this project.

The following information is repeated from the 2013 CER. A Phase I Archaeological Survey was conducted for the project. As per the PennDOT Qualified Professional, archaeological testing for this project was limited to the northwestern and northeastern bridge quadrants of the S.R. 0001 Bridge over Neshaminy Creek. In total, the archaeological area of potential effect (APE) encompassed 4.1 acre.

The Phase I Survey included a geomorphological assessment of the APE. The geomorphological investigation confirmed the PennDOT Qualified Professional's assessment that the southern bridge quadrants were comprehensively disturbed and required no testing. The project geomorphologist also observed several large basin features in the northwestern quadrant, and chronicled the comprehensive soil disturbance in this area.

Soil test pits (STPs) were excavated in the northeastern quadrant of the APE. This testing identified two previously undocumented archaeological resources. The Shultz Site (36Bu365), a precontact period site of indeterminate age, was identified in the western margin of the terrace, adjacent to Neshaminy Creek. The Shultz Site measures approximately 0.07 acre. Phase I testing in the low upland slope and the eastern margin of the northeastern quadrant revealed the remains of the Vansant Mill Complex Site (36Bu366). A pedestrian reconnaissance of the area east and south of this sheet midden and outside of the APE revealed the remains of numerous mill-related structures, including a dwelling, two subterranean storage structures, the millrace, and the mill itself. The portion of the Vansant Mill Complex Site within the APE was approximately 0.12 acre.

The Phase I Survey determined that both the Shultz and the Vansant Mill Complex sites are potentially significant archaeological resources. These findings were presented to PennDOT and the decision was made to redesign the project in order to completely avoid these two sites and preserve them in place. A plan has been designed to facilitate this avoidance. Adherence to the directives of this preservation plan during all phases of construction will constitute compliance with Section 106.

This Determination of Effect Report evaluates the potential effect of the project to three resources eligible for the National Register of Historic Places. A.D. Marble & Company prepared PHRS forms for two properties within the APE for this project in 2004 (A.D. Marble & Company, June 2004). As a result, two properties were determined eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places: both Roosevelt Memorial Park/Roosevelt Cemetery Company and the Philadelphia Suburban Water Company were determined eligible for listing. In addition to these properties, the Reading Railroad – New York Line was previously determined eligible for listing in the National Register.

The Definition of Effect and Criteria of Adverse Effect were applied to this undertaking. This analysis resulted in finding that the proposed project will have No Effect on either the Roosevelt Memorial Park/Roosevelt Cemetery Company or the Philadelphia Suburban Water Company. The proposed project will have No Adverse Effect on the Reading Railroad – N.Y. Line. PHMC concurred with this finding in a letter dated November 15, 2005.

In 2009, additional archaeological surveys were completed near the S.R. 0001/S.R. 0213 interchange as part of the work to replace the S.R. 0001 over S.R. 0213 bridge and upgrade the off ramps to S.R. 0213. The Stipulation E document that was completed for this project has been attached to the CE along with communication from Cathy Spohn, District QP for Archaeology that the PHMC had no comment regarding the Stipulation E document.

Additional Information

Remarks, Footnotes, Supplemental Data

There is a Lincoln Highway marker located within the existing Right-of-Way. Preliminary investigation indicates there may be a need to move the marker. Coordination with the District qualified professional for Historic Structures may need to occur should this marker need to be relocated due to impacts from the design of the roadway.

Attachments

1. [PHMC concurrence 111505.pdf](#) (29KB / 0MB)
2. [SR0001Sec03S StipD.pdf](#) (349KB / 0.3MB)
3. [PHMC_11_10_05_arch_concur.pdf](#) (27KB / 0MB)
4. [SR 1-03S_Stip E.pdf](#) (59KB / 0.1MB)
5. [SR 1-03S_Email from Cathy Spohn_10-2-09.pdf](#) (9KB / 0MB)
6. [PHMC Negative Survey Form_5-01-2016.pdf](#) (1561KB / 1.5MB)

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

5. SECTION 4(f) RESOURCES

SECTION 4(f) RESOURCES **PRESENCE** **USE¹**
 Not Present Present No Yes

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

Approximately 0.049 acre of land will be permanently impacted through the placement of four piers for the overhead S.R. 0001 bridge within the National Register boundary of the Reading Railroad - N.Y. Line. These piers will replace two existing piers within the National Register boundary that occupy 0.068 acre of land. This land will be vacated. Temporary impacts will require approximately 2.71 acres of temporary construction easements (TCE) to access the railroad, remove the existing piers, and construct the new piers. It is anticipated that the TCE will be required for approximately 12 months to complete demolition and construction of the new bridge. Upon completion of bridge replacement activities, all temporarily impacted areas will be returned to their original condition.

Is mitigation incorporated? No Yes

Remarks

***No changes from the CE approved in 2013.

The project proposes avoidance of the Philadelphia Suburban Water Company, Roosevelt Memorial Park Cemetery, and archaeological resources. Activities in the vicinity of the Reading Railroad – N.Y. Line do not adversely effect the integrity for which the resource was listed. A Section 4(f) de minimis form was prepared and is attached to the CEE. Within the existing legal Railroad Right-of-Way (i.e. National Register boundary), two piers exist (Pier 3 and 4) and will be removed. These existing piers occupy 0.068 acre within the National Register boundary; this land will be vacated. Portions of four of the proposed six piers will be within the National Register boundary. The total required Right-of-Way for the proposed piers within the National Register boundary equals 0.049 acre.

-
- 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

1. [SR0001Sec03Sdeminimisform.pdf](#) (462KB / 0.5MB)
2. [SR0001Sec03STempUseForm.pdf](#) (84KB / 0.1MB)

CE Reevaluation Part B, Section A-6
Environmental Evaluation Subject Areas (Air Quality and Noise)

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 go to Project Level Impacts for CO.

If Yes, for what pollutant?

Ozone CO PM10 PM2.5

Refer to DEP's Bureau of Air Quality Attainment Status maps

Regional Conformity

Is the project exempt from a regional conformity air quality analysis? Yes No

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

If Yes, go to Project Level Impacts for CO and PM2.5/PM10 sections.

If No, was it included in the most recent regional conformity air quality analysis? Yes No

If Yes, go to Project Level Impacts for CO and PM2.5/PM10 sections.

If No, consult with District Air Quality Coordinator.

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.

Based on similar projects in similar settings, will there be any negative air quality impacts? Yes No

If Yes, complete a Quantitative or Qualitative Analysis of air quality impacts. Use currently approved Air Quality model.

Quantitative Analysis
 Qualitative Analysis

Conclusion of the analysis should be provided in Air Quality Remarks below, and the full analysis should be maintained in the project technical file.

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.

Check all applicable statements:

- The project is an activity that will not result in any meaningful changes in traffic volumes, vehicle mix, location of the existing facility, or any other factor that would cause an increase in emissions impacts relative over existing conditions.
- Because of the uncertainties due to unavailable or incomplete information, a quantitative assessment of the effects of air toxic emissions impacts on human health cannot be made at the project level.

Air Quality Remarks

Since the 2013 CER a change has occurred to the nonattainment/maintenance status for PM2.5 in Bucks County. Bucks County has been removed from nonattainment for PM2.5. The following information for PM2.5 is repeated from the 2013 CER for information only. The information on CO conformity and MSAT, which follows below, still applies to the entire S.R. 0001, Sections RC1 and RC2 project area. The project retains the designation of no significant adverse impact on air quality.

PM2.5 Documentation:

The proposed project is located in Bucks County; a county that as of the 2013 CER approval was designated as being in nonattainment for PM2.5. Since 2013, Bucks County has been reclassified to be in maintenance for PM2.5. The project is not exempt, however, it is not considered to be of air quality concern according to 40 CFR 93.123 (b)(1)(i-v) and as further described in the March 29, 2006 EPA/FHWA guidance, "Transportation Conformity Guidance for Qualitative Hot-Spot Analysis in PM2.5 and PM10 Nonattainment and Maintenance Areas". The EPA has determined that such projects meet the Clean Air Act's requirements without any further hot-spot analysis.

In evaluating the project for air quality concerns, the Level 2 Process Screening criteria defined in PennDOT Publication #321 was used. As per this criteria, if the projected ADT volumes for the Build conditions are less than 125,000 total vehicles and less than 10,000 heavy trucks, then the project is not of air quality concern. If either of these thresholds is exceeded, then comparisons of future Build vs. No-Build volume projections must be examined; if the Build volumes result in increases of greater than 6,250 total vehicles and less than 500 total truck volume, then a Level 3 ICG screening is required.

DVRPC provided ADT's for the project, including existing and future No-Build and Build conditions for two horizon years, 2015 and 2035. The 2035 design year volumes are used in the air quality evaluation. Review of the design year ADT projections shows that the S.R. 0001 mainline between the Street Road and Business Route 1 Interchanges will not exceed the 125,000 vehicle threshold. Truck ADT is estimated at 5% between the Street Road and Pennsylvania Turnpike Interchanges (approximately 4,400 trucks) and 6% between the Pennsylvania Turnpike and Business Route 1 interchanges (approximately 5,800 to 5,900 heavy vehicles). Since the design year ADT does not exceed the 125,000 vehicle threshold and the estimated truck ADT does not exceed the 10,000 vehicle threshold, the S.R. 0001, Section 03S project is not of air quality concern. The S.R. 0001, Section 03S project is not of air quality concern because there are not a significant number of diesel vehicles along the corridor (6,820 vehicles predicted for the year 2035 <10,000 vehicles maximum allowable) and the Level-of-Service for all intersections is LOS C or better or has not been made worse than for the No-build condition.

CO Documentation: Project Screened through LOS criteria.

The subject project does not include or directly affect any roadways for which the 20-year forecasted daily volume will exceed the established threshold level of 125,000 vehicles per day. It can therefore be concluded that the project will have no significant adverse impact on air quality as a result of CO emissions.

Conformity Documentation:

The project was listed on the 2009 TIP and the 2013 TIP, and is now listed on the 2017 TIP with expenditures estimated for Final Design, Utility, and Construction cost.

The Air Quality Code for the project is 2025M (Section RC 1) and 2035M (Section RC2), which means that the project is a regionally significant, nonexempt project, the emission estimates which are included in the 2025 analysis and all subsequent future analysis years. This project was included as part of a group of projects in the regional transportation demand network simulation.

The project is included in the most current conformity determination as a long-range plan project with a Long Range Plan ID of #37. It will be carried over into the new plan that is currently being revised and included in the 2040 modeled network.

MSAT Documentation:

See attached pdf for MSAT Documentation for this project.

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

Indicate the applicable construction type:

Highway on new alignment

Through lanes that increase capacity

Significant change in the horizontal or vertical alignment

Other

Other Description:

B. Type II Project?

Yes No

C. Type III Project? If Yes, the system skips questions 2 and 3.

Yes No

2. A. Are sensitive receptors present?

Yes No

If No, the system skips questions 2B and 3. Provide any additional comments in the Remarks section.

If Yes, how many noise sensitive receptors are within the project area? ~230

If Yes, what type(s) of sensitive receptors are present?

Commercial (hotel & daycare facility), Cemetery, and Residential (single-family & apartments)

B. What Land Use Activity Category is present in the project area as defined by PennDOT Pub #24? (Due to potential

mixed land uses, there could be several categories.)

A B C D E F G

3. A. Do the predicted noise levels approach or exceed FHWA/PennDOT Noise Abatement Criteria for the Land Use Activity Category(s) identified in 2B? Yes No

B. Will there be a substantial increase of 10 dB(A) over existing level? Yes No

If both 3A and 3B are No, provide a qualitative (narrative) analysis in Noise Remarks below. Qualitative Analysis Quantitative Analysis

If 3A or 3B is Yes, provide the conclusion of the quantitative analysis in Noise Remarks below. The full quantitative analysis should be maintained in the project technical file. Attach the FHWA Approval Letter for the Noise Report.

Noise Remarks

Since the CE Reevaluation approved in 2013, The Final Technical Noise Report was approved by FHWA on March 16, 2017 for Section RC1. See the attached approval letter. This report summarized the results of the detailed noise monitoring and analysis performed as part of the S.R. 0001 Section RC1 final design and provided information on three Noise Sensitive Areas (NSAs) which were identified in Section RC1. Only the analysis of NSA #2 resulted in the identification of a noise barrier which met all three criteria of being warranted, feasible and reasonable. The Roosevelt Memorial Park Cemetery is considered a special activity area as NSA #2 and the guidance from PennDOT Publication No. 24 dated May 2007 was included in the approved Final Technical Noise Report in order to complete the noise mitigation analysis. Noise specific community meetings were held with the owner of the Cemetery and the cemetery property owner voted in favor of the noise barrier. Therefore, final design noise assessments were conducted and this information is reported in the approved report. A copy of this report is in the project technical file.

The following information is repeated from the 2013 CER. Both recommended and non-recommended noise barriers may change between the environmental document and final design as a result of changes in the transportation improvement project design. Final determinations on any absorptive barrier surface treatments will be made during the Final Design Phase and through the public involvement process. The Draft Technical Noise Report was submitted to the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and they concurred with the results of the noise analysis and abatement determinations as detailed in the report. A copy of the Noise Report is in the project technical files and a copy of the May 29, 2013 concurrence letter from FHWA is attached to this Section of the CE Reevaluation.

Additional Information

Remarks, Footnotes, Supplemental Data

Attachments

1. [S R 0001 Section RC1 FHWA approval letter of Final Design Noise Analysis Report.pdf](#) (45KB / 0MB)
2. [SR 0001-03S_MSAT Documentation.pdf](#) (103KB / 0.1MB)

CE Reevaluation 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

If Yes, explain.

The proposed project is an upgrade of an existing facility and will maintain the transportation network for the safe and efficient movement of people and goods in the Philadelphia region.

Is the project consistent with planned growth? Yes No

Basis of this determination:

The proposed project is an upgrade of an existing facility and will maintain the transportation network for the safe and efficient movement of people and goods in the Philadelphia region.

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.)

Within S.R. 0001, Section RC1 corridor, all sidewalks will be replaced in kind and new sidewalks will be added in areas deemed necessary to provide continuity for pedestrians where there are gaps in the existing sidewalks. These areas where new sidewalk is proposed are within the southern portion of the project area, which is commercial in nature, including convenience stores and hotels. ADA ramps will be provided as necessary throughout the Section RC1 corridor. Pedestrian and bicycle facility studies are on-going for the S.R. 0001, Section RC2 project study area and they will be completed prior to the start of construction. Within Section RC2, there are transit stops along Rockhill Drive. The stops will be replaced in kind and discussions will be held with SEPTA regarding the need for additional stops/facilities. Section RC2 will include the addition of sidewalks along Rockhill Drive and the small, existing section of sidewalks near the Horizon Corporate Center will be replaced.

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

If Yes, explain.

The proposed bridge replacements for Sections RC1 and RC2 will prevent the bridges from experiencing further deterioration and eliminate the possibility of closing the roadway. This will ensure full access to all modes of transportation.

COMMUNITY COHESION

Will the project induce impacts to community cohesion? Yes No

If Yes, explain.

The project will induce positive impacts throughout the S.R. 0001 , Sections RC1 and RC2 project corridor by incorporating pedestrian access and movement to commercial and business facilities and modal transfer stations where feasible. Within S.R. 0001, Section RC1 corridor, all sidewalks will be replaced in kind and new sidewalks will be added in areas deemed necessary to provide continuity for pedestrians where there are gaps in the existing sidewalks. These areas where new sidewalk is proposed are within the southern portion of the project area, which is commercial in nature, including convenience stores and hotels. ADA ramps will be provided as necessary throughout the Section RC1 corridor to improve accessibility for the surrounding community. Pedestrian and bicycle facility studies are on-going for the S.R. 0001, Section RC2 project study area and they will be completed prior to the start of construction. Within Section RC2, there are transit stops along Rockhill Drive. The stops will be replaced in kind and discussions will be held with SEPTA regarding the need for additional stops/facilities.

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

If Yes, briefly summarize the methods used to determine the presence of an Environmental Justice Population.

Following guidance in Pub 746, a search was performed on EPA's EJSCREEN mapper to identify whether there is an Environmental Justice Population within or adjacent to the S.R. 0001, Sections RC1 and RC2 project area. Results concluded that there is a 16% minority population and a 24% low-income population within a 0.1 mile buffer of the project area.

Will the project induce disproportionately high and adverse impacts to minority or low income populations? 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?

46 parcels on RC1 and 21 parcels on RC2

Describe the extent and locations of acquisitions.

Acquisitions are generally limited to permanent right-of-way strip takes distributed throughout the corridor. Where feasible, permanent easements were acquired to lessen impacts. RC1 has 3 total takes - The Sunrise Inn, and two billboard sites. The total area for the Sunrise Inn take is 3.480 acres and the total area for the billboard takes is 0.097 acres. Required right-of-way is 13.971 acres and temporary construction easement is 25.684 acres. Other easements including drainage, slope, conservation, sound barrier, and aerial total 5.523 acres. All quantities for RC1 are final. RC2 has 1 total take - Scruples at the Oakford Inn; the total area for this take is .742 acres. Required right-of-way is 5.470 acres and temporary construction easement is 2.171 acres. Other easements including drainage, slope, and aerial total 3.452 acres. All quantities for RC2 are preliminary and once final design begins, these values are subject to change.

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

Yes No

If Yes, indicate number: 0 Residential 2 Commercial 0 Farms

If there are displacements, a conceptual stage survey report is required that analyzes the availability of replacement facilities.

Conceptual Stage Survey Report

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

Yes No

If Yes, explain.

Since the 2013 approved CER document, the Sunrise Inn Motel in Section RC1 has been acquired by the District and demolished. PennDOT paid relocation costs to the Sunrise Inn Motel but is unaware if the owners are continuing in the motel business. Scruples at the Oakford Inn, which is located in Section RC2, will be acquired prior to construction of Section RC2. The relocation of Scruples at the Oakford Inn will likely affect less than 50 employees at this establishment. Potential conflicts with relocation may be encountered for Section RC2 due to municipal zoning and associated permitted uses by right, special exception or conditional uses affecting possible relocation sites due to the Scruples at Oakford Inn being an adult entertainment establishment.

The S.R.0001 Section RC1 project may result in minor impacts to economic activity in the project area due to the total takes of these two businesses. Section RC2 will be evaluated in a future CE Re-evaluation.

MAINTENANCE AND OPERATING COSTS OF THE PROJECT AND RELATED FACILITIES

Will the project induce increases of operating or maintenance costs?

Yes No

If Yes, is the cost justified? Please explain:

There will likely be a need for increased budget to offset operating and maintenance costs of the widened roadway; however, initial maintenance costs will be reduced due to the replacement of the existing deteriorating structures and reconstruction of roadways throughout the corridor.

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

If Yes, explain.

Multiple use opportunities are present within the S.R. 0001, Sections RC1 and RC2 corridor, including sidewalks, the addition of a transit stop and bicycle facilities. Within S.R. 0001, Section RC1 corridor, all sidewalks will be replaced in kind and new sidewalks will be added in areas deemed necessary to provide continuity for pedestrians where there are gaps in the existing sidewalks. These areas where new sidewalk is proposed are within the southern portion of the project area, which is commercial in nature, including convenience stores and hotels. ADA ramps will be provided as necessary throughout the Section RC1 corridor. Pedestrian and bicycle facility studies are on-going for the S.R. 0001, Section RC2 project study area and they will be completed prior to the start of construction. Within Section RC2, there are transit stops along Rockhill Drive. The stops will be replaced in kind and discussions will be held with SEPTA regarding the need for additional stops/facilities. Section RC2 will include the addition of sidewalks along Rockhill Drive and the small, existing section of sidewalks near the Horizon Corporate Center will be replaced.

Will the project involve "joint development" activities? ³ Yes No

If Yes, explain.

Bridge widening, turning lanes, ramp accommodations and multimodal access within S.R. 0001, Section RC1 have been designed in conjunction with the PA Turnpike and existing and proposed commercial developments. These same considerations will be taken into account on the Section RC2 portion of the project as the final design is developed.

-
- 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

Since the CER approved in 2013, the discussion on Environmental Justice Population impacts has been updated to follow the March 2016 PennDOT Publication #746. Parcels requiring right-of-way acquisition, either partial or total, have been added (46 parcels on RC1 and 21 parcels on RC2) and the right-of-way information has been updated to reflect the current extent and locations of acquisitions. Studies are still on-going for pedestrian and bicycle facilities within the Section RC2 project study area and will be completed prior to the start of construction of Section RC2.

Attachments

1. [survey_report_SR0001.pdf](#) (87KB / 0.1MB)
2. [SR1 Sec03S BPFACILITIESCHECKLIST_5-29-12_Segment 0024.pdf](#) (281KB / 0.3MB)
3. [SR0001SecRC1RC2ConceptualStageSurveyReportAdd-1 2013-10.pdf](#) (190KB / 0.2MB)
4. [SR1 Sec03S BPFACILITIESCHECKLIST_10-25-13_Segment 0011.pdf](#) (245KB / 0.2MB)

CE Reevaluation 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

**No changes from the CER approval in 2013.
No impacts are proposed to the Coastal Zone.

Additional Information

Remarks, Footnotes, Supplemental Data

Attachments

CE Reevaluation 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	2	Plans displays are used to inform the public of proposed improvements and new traffic patterns. An open house plans display for S.R. 0001, Section RC1 was held on November 1, 2016. The schedule for the plans display for S.R. 0001, Section RC2 is to be determined as the design progresses.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Public Officials Meetings	5	Bensalem Twp meeting held 10-30-2003. Middletown Twp meeting held 11-25-2003. An update meeting was held for Bensalem Twp on 5-5-2014. A public officials meeting for S.R. 0001, Section RC1 was held on 10-24-2016. A schedule for the public officials meeting for Section RC2 will be determined as the design progresses.
<input type="checkbox"/> Public Meetings		
<input type="checkbox"/> Public Hearing		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Special Purpose Meetings (specify)	11	2003: 10-29 Senator Tomlinson, 1-27 Wawa 11-3 Horizon Corp Center 11-25 Neshaminy Mall 11-25 Red Roof Inn 11-25 Roosevelt Cemetery 12-1, 12-3 PA Turnpike 2-23 Bucks Co EMA 2005: 10-17 Economic Development, Mayor, school district, emergency services, Sen. Tomlinson 2013: 11-26 meeting with Roosevelt Memorial Park Cemetery to discuss noise walls
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Section 106 Public Involvement / Consulting Parties (specify)		See attached list.
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Section 106 Tribal Consultation		Delaware Nation, Delaware Tribe

(specify Tribe(s) contacted and Tribal response)

and Eastern Shawnee Tribe will be included. See attached table for responses.

Environmental Justice Community Involvement (if applicable)

Other information dissemination activities (specify)

A variety of media outlets will be used to announce project activities during construction including newspaper and District website. A project website has been established at <http://www.improveus1-bucksco.com/> and website promotional handouts (letter openers & magnetic clips) have been made to give out to local stakeholders and community members.

Remarks

Public involvement activities will take place in conjunction with design and construction activities.

Additional Information

Remarks, Footnotes, Supplemental Data

The following information is repeated from the 2013 CE Reevaluation - Future involvement with the public is anticipated to include Plans Display, Public Meetings and continual updating of the Project Website as needed.

Attachments

1. [SR 1 Interested Parties List.pdf](#) (98KB / 0.1MB)
2. [SR 0001 Tribal Response Table.pdf](#) (59KB / 0.1MB)

CE Reevaluation Part B, Section D
Permits Checklist

Check all permits required for permanent and temporary actions.

No Permits Required

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

A Joint Permit Application for Sections RC1 and RC2 was submitted to PADEP and USACE in February 2017. Based upon discussions with USACE and PADEP the proposed project will be authorized by USACE under a Nationwide Permit #23 for Categorical Exclusions and by PADEP under a Standard Joint Permit. It is understood that a future modification of the permits will be required for Section RC2. A General NPDES permit has been authorized for Section RC1. A separate NPDES permit is anticipated for the Section RC2 work.

Additional Information

Remarks, Footnotes, Supplemental Data

Attachments

CE Reevaluation 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): 1,615 *linear feet*

Wetlands (B:A-1): 0.521 *acres*

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

2. Specific Mitigation Commitments

STREAMS (B:A-1)

Project Specific Restoration/Enhancement: 2,342 *linear feet*

Advanced Compensation/Banking: 0 *linear feet*

Other:

Mitigation Remarks: For Section RC1, PennDOT is proposing On-Site and Off-Site stream mitigation to satisfy compensatory mitigation requirements for the anticipated impacts associated with the overall S.R. 0001 project, Sections RC1 and RC2. Section RC1 has impacts to streams, but no wetland impacts. All compensatory mitigation for Section RC1 will be accomplished at the On-Site mitigation project. Section RC2 has both stream and wetland impacts that require compensatory mitigation. This mitigation will take place at the proposed Off-Site mitigation project.

The On-Site stream mitigation site consists of an unnamed tributary (UNT) to Poquessing Creek, located in the vicinity of the westbound Street Road ramp to northbound S.R. 0001 within PennDOT acquired right-of-way. The project limits begin approximately 200 feet upstream of the confluence of the UNT to Poquessing Creek (WUS-25) and an unnamed perennial tributary to Poquessing Creek (WUS-26), and extends downstream for a distance of approximately 700 feet to the twin box culverts located at the Pennsylvania Turnpike slip ramp. The proposed On-Site mitigation project includes relocation/restoration of 789 linear feet of the UNT to the Poquessing Creek (WUS-25) and 71 linear feet of an unnamed perennial tributary to Poquessing Creek (WUS-26) for a total of 860 linear feet of mitigated (restored) stream.

The proposed Off-Site stream mitigation site is located approximately 2 miles

southeast of the S.R. 0001 project limits on Bensalem School District Property. The Off-Site mitigation proposes to reestablish an UNT to Neshaminy Creek. The proposed Off-Site mitigation project includes relocation/restoration of 1,482 linear feet of the UNT to the Neshaminy Creek (WUS-M1).

Both the On-Site and Off-Site stream mitigation sites will mitigate for all permanent stream impacts associated with the S.R. 0001, Group 03S, Sections RC1 and RC2 roadway improvement project and are located within the same Hydrologic Unit Code (02-04-02), the Delaware River Basin. Additionally, the Off-Site mitigation will satisfy mitigation requirements for anticipated Section RC2 aquatic resource impacts within the Neshaminy Creek watershed that are located within the Coastal Zone Management Area.

A Mitigation Plan has been developed for the S.R. 0001 Project in accordance with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' (USACE) 2008 Final Compensatory Mitigation Rule. The Mitigation Plan, which can be found in the project technical files, proposes On-Site and Off-Site stream mitigation to satisfy compensatory mitigation requirements for the anticipated impacts associated with the S.R. 0001, Sections RC1 and RC2 project.

WETLANDS (B:A-1)

Project Specific Replacement/Construction: 2.16 acres

Banking: acres

Bank to be Debited:

Restoration: acres

Preservation: acres

In-Lieu Fee: whole dollars

Other:

Mitigation Remarks: For Section RC1, PennDOT is proposing On-Site and Off-Site wetland mitigation to satisfy compensatory mitigation requirements for the anticipated impacts associated with the Section RC2 portion of the S.R. 0001 project. There are no wetland impacts due to Section RC1. A Mitigation Plan has been developed for the S.R. 0001 Project in accordance with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers' (USACE) 2008 Final Compensatory Mitigation Rule. The Mitigation Plan, which can be found in the project technical files, proposes On-Site and Off-Site stream and wetland mitigation to satisfy compensatory mitigation requirements for the anticipated impacts associated with the overall S.R. 0001, Sections RC1 and RC2 Project.

The on-site wetland mitigation site consists of an unnamed tributary (UNT) to Poquessing Creek, located in the vicinity of the westbound Street Road ramp to northbound S.R. 0001 within PennDOT acquired right-of-way. The project limits begin approximately 200 feet upstream of the confluence of the UNT to Poquessing Creek (WUS-25) and an unnamed perennial tributary to Poquessing Creek (WUS-26), and extends downstream for a distance of approximately 700 feet to the twin box culverts located at the Pennsylvania Turnpike slip ramp. The proposed On-Site Mitigation Project includes creation/restoration of approximately 0.79 acres of floodplain wetlands along the above streams.

The proposed off-site wetland mitigation site is located approximately 2 miles southeast of the S.R. 0001 project limits on Bensalem School District Property, the Bensalem High School. The off-site mitigation proposes to reestablish an UNT to Neshaminy Creek. The proposed Off-Site Mitigation Project includes creation/restoration of approximately 1.37 acres of floodplain wetlands along the above streams, which will include mitigation for the 0.309 acres of existing wetlands that will be impacted by the proposed mitigation construction activities. Both the on-site and off-site wetland mitigation sites will mitigate for all wetland impacts associated with the S.R. 0001, Group 03S, Section RC2 Roadway

Improvement Project (Section RC1 does not require wetland impacts) and are located within the same Hydrologic Unit Code (02-04-02), the Delaware River Basin. Additionally, the off-site mitigation will satisfy mitigation requirements for anticipated Section RC2 aquatic resource impacts within the Neshaminy Creek watershed that are located within the Coastal Zone Management Area. Additional avoidance and minimization measures for the S.R. 0001, Section RC2 project include:

- Temporary wetland impacts will be avoided by fencing the non-impacted wetland areas to preclude disturbance by heavy equipment during project construction.
- Permanent and temporary wetland impacts have been avoided through the use of steepened slopes and retaining walls in the project design.

STATE GAMELANDS (B:A-2)

Project Specific Replacement: *acres*

Banking: *acres*

Bank to be Debited:

Other:

Mitigation Remarks:

3. Other Mitigation Commitments

RESOURCE SPECIFIC

Other Surface Waters (B:A-1)

The impacts to stormwater facilities from Section RC1 will be mitigated for by PennDOT as follows:

- Stormwater management for the Red Roof Inn in RC1 has been incorporated into the Postconstruction Stormwater Management Plan for Section RC1.
- The stormwater facility for the Pennsylvania Turnpike at Street Road will be modified and regraded to provide equal storage to its existing conditions.

Vegetation (B:A-2)

All disturbed areas within Sections RC1 and RC2 will be restored and revegetated with native species as part of construction, as appropriate. All plantings in stormwater management facilities will include standard PennDOT seed mixes. It is anticipated that proposed plantings for Sections RC1 and RC2 will be similar in nature.

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

Recommendations from the ACM and heavy metals in paint survey include the following:

- All five bridge substructures and superstructures are proposed to be demolished and replaced. Since the bridges are considered "facilities" by the U.S. EPA and demolition of "facilities" is governed by the NESHAPs regulation, proper ten-day notification as required in the NESHAPs must occur prior to beginning asbestos abatement and demolition of the bridges.
- Since the bridge inspections identified ACMs that will be disturbed and become friable during demolition efforts, abatement action is necessary prior to any such efforts. In addition, the ten-day notification should reflect the need for asbestos abatement.
- Work disturbing the paint coatings should be performed in compliance with OSHA construction standards 29 CFR 1926.1118 for inorganic arsenic, 29 CFR 1926.62 for lead, 29 CFR 1926.1126 for chromium, and 29 CFR 1926.1127 for cadmium.

- Prior to disturbing or removing bridge components with paint coatings, stabilize the existing coating by applying an encapsulant (paint, mastic, etc.) to the areas of flaking/loose paint coatings to bond it to their substrates. Best management practices to prevent the release of paint chips to the environment should be implemented during work disturbing the metal bridge components.

The ACM and heavy metals in paint inspection was limited to visible and accessible areas and components of the bridges' substructures and superstructures only and that ACM and paint coatings not identified through these inspections may exist within inaccessible (i.e., internal) and uninspected areas. Should suspect ACM or paints suspected of containing heavy metals beyond those identified during this inspection be encountered at any time during demolition, Skelly and Loy recommends that they be treated as ACM and coatings containing heavy metals until clarification by a qualified and PA DOLI asbestos or lead-based paint inspector and subsequent laboratory analysis occurs.

Skelly and Loy under a Remediation Contract with PennDOT will perform the abatement work; therefore, a special provision for abatement is not required in the general contract documents. However, a specification will be developed to indicate that whereas all known ACM will be abated from the bridge by others (Skelly and Loy), the General Contractor (GC) will need to coordinate and cooperate with the PennDOT's environmental remediation contractor (Skelly and Loy) regarding abatement of ACMs from the bridges. The specification will indicate that the GC shall "cooperate and coordinate" during the removal of the ACMs identified on the SR 0001 Section RC1 bridges and from the subsurface in between the bridges where stormwater features are being excavated for and installed, which will intercept existing buried transite conduits.

In compliance with the terms of the Environmental Covenant on the Comfort Inn property PennDOT will notify in writing both the PA Department of Environmental Protection and the current property owner of the change in land use and ownership prior to any construction activity on the acquired right-of-way. A Special Provision will be included that verifies the completion of this notification. In addition, prior to the start of construction PennDOT will complete required work to identify the specific area of soil contamination and/or groundwater contamination and will include a Special Provision for any required disposal of contaminated soil or treatment of contaminated groundwater. Also, in accordance with the terms of the Environmental Covenant a Special Provision will be included which requires the immediate restoration of the integrity of any disturbed area that is presently included in an asphalt parking lot within the limits of the Comfort Inn property.

Cultural Resources (B:A-4)

The Shultz Site and Vansant Mill Complex site will need to be protected during construction of S.R. 0001, Section RC2 through the placement of standard orange safety fencing around the perimeter of each of the sites. The contractor will be responsible for notifying the District at least one week prior to the start of construction so that the District's archaeologist (or designated consultant) can be scheduled to be on-site during the fence installation process. Written and verbal notification concerning presence of these two sites and the preservation procedures must be given to all project contractors prior to the project's commencement. Details of the preservation plan need to be presented in the contract for the contractor's use and review. During the construction process, archaeologists from PennDOT District 6-0 and/or a designated consultant may periodically visit the site areas to insure that the integrity of the site boundaries and fencing have been maintained. Copies of the construction schedule should be made available to the District archaeologist.

NON-RESOURCE SPECIFIC

Other 1

Coordination with PA Fish and Boat Commission will be required in Final Design to determine whether an Aids to Navigation (ATON) plan is needed during construction of the proposed S.R. 0001 bridge.

Other 2

A Soil Erosion and Sedimentation Control Plan will be prepared for the project. This plan will be submitted for approval to the Bucks County Conservation District office. Upon approval, the plan will be implemented during construction of the project in order to minimize soil erosion. Only the area necessary to complete the construction will be disturbed. Any adjacent sensitive resources will be protected with fencing. Note that an E&SC Plan for S.R. 0001, Section RC1 has been approved by the Conservation District.

Other 3

Any required staging and waste disposal areas will be located in upland (non-wetland) areas and away from sensitive resources.

Other 4

Coordination will be undertaken with public health and educational facilities, fire, police, and other emergency services prior to the start of construction.

Other 5

Correspondence received from the PFBC on 5/2/13 stated that the completion of a habitat assessment for the redbelly turtle be completed for this project. On 2/26/16 PA Fish and Boat Commission provided a letter stating that there have been no changes in the project or on-site biological information; therefore impacts to rare, candidate, threatened or endangered species under their jurisdiction, remains unchanged.

As a result of coordination with FHWA on October 11, 2013 approval was received for the steps which are listed below to be completed after environmental approval and prior to project advertisement for construction, thereby enabling authorization of funds for advance right of way acquisition. It is noted that this right of way acquisition involves acquiring properties that are not associated with potential habitat for the redbelly turtle.

1. The required Habitat Assessment for the Pennsylvania threatened Redbelly turtle will be completed in accordance with the 5/2/13 letter which was sent by the PA Fish and Boat Commission for the S.R. 0001 Section 03S project.
2. The results of the Habitat Assessment will be placed in the S.R. 0001 Section 03S project technical files.
3. All of the commitments which result from the completion of the Redbelly turtle coordination with the PA Fish and Boat Commission will be implemented for this project in accordance with this completed coordination.
4. If coordination with the PA Fish and Boat Commission results in a determination that the species may be impacted, the level 1b CEE may be re-evaluated as appropriate.

Additional Information**Remarks, Footnotes, Supplemental Data**

The ECMTS matrix will be completed prior to the start of construction and included in the contract documents.

Attachments

CE Reevaluation Part B, Section F
Scoping Field View

Date of Scoping Field View: 03/18/03

Attendee List (Name, Organization)

see attached

Anticipated NEPA Documentation

As supported by the information available at the time of scoping, this project appears to qualify for a Level 2 Categorical Exclusion in accordance with 23 CFR Part 771.117(d), Item Number Other.

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

no additional documentation required

Scoping Field View Documentation Concurrences

Print this page, gather signatures, scan and attach to this document.

County: Bucks **SR/Sec:** 0001/03S **MPMS:** 13549 **Project:** US1: Old Linc - PA413

District Environmental Manager	Date	District Project Manager	Date
--------------------------------	------	--------------------------	------

Asst. District Executive - Design	Date	BOD Project Dev. Engineer	Date
-----------------------------------	------	---------------------------	------

Authorized FHWA Representative	Date	Authorized FHWA Representative	Date
--------------------------------	------	--------------------------------	------

Additional Information

Remarks, Footnotes, Supplemental Data

An initial internal Scoping Field View was held on July 21, 1999. A Scoping Field View with FHWA & PENNDOT Bureau of Design HQAD

representatives was held at the project site on March 18, 2003 to discuss project issues.

Attachments

1. [scoping_form.pdf](#) (243KB / 0.2MB)
2. [03-18-03 Field Mtg Minutes.pdf](#) (58KB / 0.1MB)

CE Reevaluation Part C
CEE Approval Processing

Section B - Level 2 CEE Approval

As supported by the attached Categorical Exclusion Evaluation, this project qualifies for a Level 2 Categorical Exclusion in accordance with 23 CFR 771.117(d), Item Number Other. Furthermore, the project will not result in any of the four circumstances cited in 23 CFR 771.117(b).

County: Bucks **SR/Sec:** 0001/03S **MPMS:** 13549 **Project:** US1: Old Linc - PA413

Prepared By: Kristin J Aiosa
Title: Sr. Environmental Scientist **Date:** 08/18/17

Approved By: Jennifer Elsken **Date:** 08/24/17
Title: Federal Highway Administration

The following individuals concurred with the statement above.

District Environmental Manager: Bob F Eppley **Date:** 08/18/17

Assistant District Executive for Design: Chuck Davies **Date:** 08/18/17

Additional Information

Remarks, Footnotes, Supplemental Data

Attachments