



Project Information			
Project Name:	Abrams Creek Trail - Phase 1	Federal Project#:	HSIP-5138(210)
Project Number:	0657-034-908, C501, P101, R201	Project Type:	Construction
UPC:	113895	Charge Number:	0000113895-61401
Project Number(Assoc)(UPC):			
Route Number:	657	Route Type:	N/A
Project Limit--From:	Senseny Road	To:	Woodstock Lane
IPM Project Description:	Abrams Creek Trail - Frederick County		
Additional Project Description:	Phase 1 to construct an approximate 1 mile section of shared-use path in the Abrams Creek drainage in eastern Frederick County. Trail begins approximately 0.12 mile north of Senseny Road (Rt 657) on the west side of Meade Drive (Rt 807), and ends across from Hilltop Terrace (Rt 1234) on the north side of Woodstock Lane (Rt 744). Trail includes floodplain areas and a crossing of Abrams Creek, and is a Federally funded HSIP project. An entrance and parking area along Meade Drive will be constructed concurrently, paid for with local funds.		
Purpose And Need:	The purpose of this project is to construct a shared use path in Frederick County to provide an alternate route for bicyclists and pedestrians.		
District:	City/County:	Residency:	
Staunton	Frederick	Edinburg	

The subject project meets the criteria for a Programmatic Categorical Exclusion in accordance with:

23 CFR 771.117

Description of PCE Category:

Construction of bicycle and pedestrian lanes, paths, and facilities.

PCE c03

UNUSUAL CIRCUMSTANCES:

1. The proposed action will not result in significant environmental impacts.

Finding: *Other; brief narrative provided in notes.*

Notes: *As per Staunton District Environmental Staff, there are no significant environmental impacts as determined through project reviews and as described in the "Impacts" section of this document.*

2. The proposed action will not result in substantial controversy on environmental grounds.

Finding: *Other; brief narrative provided in notes.*

Notes: *As per Staunton District Environmental Staff and the Staunton District Project Manager (PM), there is no controversy on environmental grounds.*

3. The proposed action will not result in significant impact on properties protected by Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act or Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Finding: *Other; brief narrative provided in notes.*

Notes: *As per Staunton District Environmental Staff, there are no significant impacts to these protected resources as determined through project reviews/coordination and described in the "Impacts" section of this document.*

4. The project sponsor confirms that proposed action will not result in any inconsistencies with any Federal, State, or local law, requirement or administrative determination relating to the environmental aspects of the action.

IMPACTS:

5. The proposed action will not involve acquisition of more than minor amounts of temporary or permanent right of way.

Finding: *Review of project plans.*

Notes: *As per the project plans, only minor amounts of right-of-way would be acquired for this project.*

6. The proposed action will not involve residential or non-residential displacements.

Finding: *Review of project plans.*

Notes: *As per the scope of work and project plans, there would be no displacements associated with this project.*

7. The proposed action will not result in capacity expansion of a roadway by addition of through lanes.

Finding: *Review of project plans indicates there is no capacity expansion*

Notes: *Based upon the project scope and plans, this project would not include roadway expansion.*

8. The proposed action does not involve the construction of temporary access, or the closure of an existing road, bridge, or ramps that would result in major traffic disruptions based on the context and intensity of the impact.

Finding: *There will be no major traffic disruptions based on the project scope.*

Notes: *Based upon the project scope and plans, there would be no major disruptions to traffic.*

9. The proposed action does not result in a determination of adverse effect on historic properties pursuant to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (54 U.S.C. §306108).

Finding: *Coordination with DHR resulted in a No Effect Determination.*

Date of

Finding: *04/15/2022*

Notes: *On April 15, 2022, the Virginia Department of Historic Resources concurred that the project would have No Effect on Historic properties.*

10. The proposed action does not require the use of properties protected by Section 4(f) (49 U.S.C. § 303/23 U.S.C. § 138) that cannot be documented with an FHWA de minimis determination, or a programmatic Section 4(f) evaluation signed by FHWA.

Finding: *There will be no use of Section 4(f) properties.*

Date of

Finding: *12/08/2023*

Notes: *Although minor amounts of right-of-way will be required, there are no Section 4(f) properties present within the project limits and therefore no use of Section 4(f) properties.*

11. The proposed action does not require the acquisition of lands under the protection of Section 6(f) of the Land and Water Conservation Act of 1965 (54 U.S.C. § 200305) or other unique areas or special lands that were acquired in fee or easement with federal public-use-money and have deed restrictions or covenants on the property.

Finding: *Based on documented review of available mapping and databases, there will be no acquisition of lands protected by Section 6(f) or other unique areas or special lands.*

Notes: *As per Staunton District Environmental Staff, no Section 6(f) or other unique areas or special lands would be impacted by this project.*

12. The proposed action does not require a U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Section 404 (33 U.S.C. § 1344) permit other than a Nationwide or a General Permit.

Finding: *Other; brief narrative provided in notes.*

Date of

Finding: *04/10/2024*

Notes: *As per Frederick County Parks and Recreation Staff, no Individual Permits from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers would be required for this project. This coordination can be found in CEDAR and is dated April 10, 2024.*

13. The proposed action does not require a U.S. Coast Guard bridge permit (33 U.S.C. § 401).

Finding: *The project does not involve work on bridges over navigable waters necessitating a USCG permit.*

Notes: *Given the scope and location of this project, it would not require a U.S. Coast Guard bridge permit.*

14. The proposed action does not require work that will cause an increase of the flood level by more than one foot within a regulatory floodway of water courses or water bodies or work affecting the base floodplain (100-year flood) elevations of a water course or lake, pursuant to 23 CFR §650 subpart A.

Finding: *Other; brief narrative provided in notes.*

Notes: *Per the Preliminary Hydraulic Analysis Report by Civil & Environmental Consultants, Inc, the maximum increase of water surface elevation due to the proposed project is 0.20 feet for a 100-year storm event, which is less than one foot within a regulatory floodway of water courses or water bodies or work affecting the base floodplain (100-year flood) elevations of a water course or lake, pursuant to 23 CFR §650 subpart A.*

15. The proposed action is not defined as a "Type I project" per 23 CFR §772.5 and the VDOT noise manual for purposes of a noise analysis.

Finding: *(VDOT ONLY) VDOT noise manual.*

Notes: *As per VDOT Noise Guidance, this project does not require a noise study.*

16. The proposed action is not likely to adversely affect federally listed species or designated critical habitat, with the exception of a "may affect, likely to adversely affect" (MALAA) determination for a species with a Section 7 programmatic biological opinion.

Finding: *The project is Not Likely to Adversely Affect federally listed species or designated critical habitat.*

Date of

Finding: *02/01/2024*

Notes: *As per Staunton District Natural Resources Staff, the project would not adversely affect federally listed species or designated critical habitat. The T&E Clearance Report, dated February 1, 2024, is in CEDAR.*

17. The proposed action does not involve any known or potential hazardous materials issues that represent a substantial liability or require substantial regulatory negotiation to resolve.

Finding: *(VDOT ONLY) Hazardous Materials Summary Report.*

Notes: *As per Regional Hazardous Materials Manager, no hazardous materials issues are anticipated for this project. The Hazardous Materials Form, dated October 6, 2023, is in CEDAR.*

18. The proposed action is fiscally constrained and meets the provisions of the "Planning Documents and NEPA Approvals" document in accordance with 23 CFR §450.

Finding: *This project is included in a STIP Grouping.*

Notes: *This project is grouped as Construction : Transportation Alternatives/Byway/Non-Traditional.*

19. The proposed action will not cause disproportionately high and adverse effects on any minority or low-income populations.

Finding: *The project does not involve displacements, changes in access, major traffic disruptions, more than minor amounts of right of way acquisition, community disruptions, or disruption of emergency services.*

Notes: *Given its scope and location, this project would not cause disproportionately high or adverse effects on any minority or low-income populations.*

20. The project sponsor confirms the project does not involve consideration of multiple NEPA alternatives and is not listed in 23 CFR §771.115(a).

Jordan, Elizabeth G

04/30/2024

Environmental Manager, CE Determination

Date