

TIER 3 CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION

**ARDOT JOB NUMBER 040779
FAP NUMBER NHPP-0017(45)
ELMO CREEK STR. & APPRS. (S)
BRIDGE M2364
ROUTE 220, SECTION 2
CRAWFORD COUNTY**

Submitted Pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 4332(2)

By the

U.S. Department of Transportation
Federal Highway Administration

And the

Arkansas Department of Transportation

March 2020

3/11/2020

Date of Approval



Randal Looney
Environmental Coordinator
Federal Highway Administration

The Environmental Division reviewed the referenced project and has determined it falls within the definition of the Tier 3 Categorical Exclusion as defined by the ARDOT/FHWA Programmatic Agreement on the processing of Categorical Exclusions. The following information is included for your review and, if acceptable, approval as the environmental documentation for this project.

The purpose of this project is to replace a bridge (M2364) over Elmo Creek on Highway 220 in Crawford County. Total length of the project is 0.03 mile. A project location map is attached.

The existing roadway consists of two 10' wide paved travel lanes with 3' wide shoulders. The existing bridge is 57' x 24' and is weight posted. No existing right of way has been established for this project.

Proposed improvements include two 10' wide paved travel lanes with 4' (2' paved) wide shoulders. The new structure will be a quintuplet 12' x 12' x 70' steel reinforced concrete box culvert. The proposed right of way width will be variable between 25' - 155'. Approximately 2.3 acres of additional right of way and 1.0 acre of temporary construction easements will be required for this project. Of this additional acreage, 0.8 acre will be prime farmland. A NRCS-CPA-106 Form is attached.

Design data for this project is as follows:

Design Year	Average Daily Traffic	Percent Trucks	Design Speed
2021	440	3	30 mph
2041	550	3	30 mph

There are no relocations, environmental justice issues, or wetlands associated with this project. Field inspections found no evidence of existing underground storage tanks or hazardous waste deposits.

Noise predictions have been made for this project utilizing the Federal Highway Administration's TNM (Traffic Noise Model) 2.5 procedures. These predictions indicate that there will be no unacceptable increase in noise levels extending beyond the project right of way limits and that no noise sensitive receptors are affected. In compliance with federal guidelines, local authorities will not require notification.

The official species list obtained through US Fish and Wildlife Service's Information for Planning and Consultation website identified the following federally listed species as potentially occurring in the project area: the endangered gray bat (*Myotis grisescens*), the endangered Indiana bat (*Myotis sodalis*), the threatened northern long-eared bat (*Myotis septentrionalis*), the endangered Ozark big-eared bat (*Corynorhinus townsendii ingens*), the proposed threatened Eastern Black Rail (*Laterallus jamaicensis ssp. jamaicensis*), the threatened Piping Plover (*Charadrius melodus*), the threatened Red Knot (*Calidris canutus rufa*), the endangered Whooping Crane (*Grus americana*), the endangered American burying beetle (*Nicrophorus americanus*), and the threatened Missouri bladderpod (*Physaria filiformis*).

Utilizing the *Programmatic Biological Opinion for Transportation Projects within the Range of the Indiana Bat and Northern Long-eared Bat*, it has been determined that the project "may affect, and is likely to adversely affect" both the Indiana bat and the northern long-eared bat. Please see the attached Consistency Letter. Compensatory mitigation, in the form of a \$1,389 contribution to the Indiana bat migration study program, will be provided for adverse impacts to the Indiana bat associated with this project. The Final 4(d) Rule applies to the project's activities that have the potential to affect northern long-eared bats; however, any take that may occur as a result of this project is exempt and not prohibited under Endangered Species Act. The Service concurred on January 24, 2020.

A winter clearing only and a timing of day restriction will be placed in the job contract for this project, which prohibits tree clearing from April 1 to November 15 and requires construction activities not occur 30 minutes prior to sunset and sunrise, respectively. Due to the winter clearing only and timing of day restrictions, it has been determined that the project "may affect, but is not likely to adversely affect" the Ozark big-eared bat and gray bat.

Due to a lack of habitat in the project area and the distance to known occurrences, it has been determined that the project will have 'no effect' on the Eastern Black Rail, Piping Plover, Red Knot, Whooping Crane, American burying beetle, and the Missouri bladderpod. The Service concurred on January 24, 2020.




Permanent stream impacts total 108'. Temporary stream impacts total 45'. Construction of the proposed project should be allowed under the terms of a Section 404 Nationwide 14 Permit for Linear Transportation Projects as defined in the Federal Register 82(4):1860-2008.

The Elmo Creek Bridge was likely built in 1940 by either the Civilian Conservation Corps or the Works Progress Administration. The bridge was deemed eligible for the National Register of Historic Places in 2013. It is eligible for inclusion under Criterion C for the masonry abutment construction method common to the 1930's and 1940's. It is not considered a National Historic Landmark. Due to the construction type of the bridge, a marketing exemption was deemed appropriate. The attached Programmatic Section 4(f) Evaluation and Memorandum of Agreement call for documentation to mitigate demolition of the bridge. No other historic or cultural resources will be impacted as part of the proposed project. Arkansas State Historic Preservation Office concurrence is attached.

Crawford County participates in the in the National Flood Insurance Program. The project lies within the Zone A, Special Flood Hazard Area. The final project design will be reviewed to confirm that the design is adequate and that the potential risk to life and property are minimized. Adjacent properties should not be impacted nor have a greater flood risk than existed before construction of the project. None of the encroachments will constitute a substantial floodplain encroachment or risk to property or life.


This project has been determined to generate minimal air quality impacts for Clean Air Act criteria pollutants and has not been linked with any special mobile source air toxic (MSAT) concerns. As such, this project will not result in changes in traffic volumes, vehicle mix, basic project location, or any other factor that would cause a meaningful increase in MSAT impacts of the project from that of the no-build alternative.

No other adverse environmental impacts were identified. The checklist used to verify consideration of potential environmental impacts is attached.



ARDOT - Environmental GIS - Hopkins
December 13, 2019

Job 040779
Elmo Creek Str. & Apprs.
(Hwy. 220)
Crawford County





ARKANSAS HERITAGE



February 7, 2020

Mr. John Fleming
Division Head
Environmental Division
Arkansas State Highway and Transportation Department
P.O. Box 2261
Little Rock, AR 72203-2261

RE: Crawford County – General
Section 106 Review – FHWA
Elmo Creek Str. & Apprs. (S)
Route 220 Sec. 2
ARDOT Job Number: 040779
AHPP Tracking Number: 103893.04

Dear Mr. Fleming:

The staff of the Arkansas Historic Preservation Program (AHPP) reviewed the Cultural Resources Survey (CRS) for the above-referenced job in Crawford County. As described, the undertaking entails replacing Bridge M2364 on Highway 220 in Crawford County. Bridge M2364 is determined eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). On December 19, 2019, the Federal Highway Administration, Arkansas State Historic Preservation Officer, and the Arkansas Department of Transportation executed a memorandum of agreement governing the mitigation of Bridge M2364.

A portion of Site 3CW0150 lies within the area of potential effects. Based on the results of the field investigation and the information presented in the CRS, the AHPP will concur that Site 3CW0150 is undetermined for NRHP eligibility. However, the proposed undertaking within the portion of the ROW that overlaps the site will not cause effects as defined in 36 CFR § 800.16(i). Therefore, the AHPP concurs with the finding of **no historic properties affected pursuant to 36 CFR § 800.4(d)(1)**. In the event of a post-review discovery of historic properties within the area of potential effects, please contact the AHPP and other consulting parties in accordance with 36 CFR § 800.13(b)(3).

Tribes that have expressed an interest in the area include the Cherokee Nation (Ms. Elizabeth Toombs), the Choctaw Nation of Oklahoma (Ms. Madison Currie), the Muscogee (Creek) Nation (Ms. Corain Lowe-Zepeda), the Osage Nation (Dr. Andrea Hunter), the Quapaw Nation (Mr. Everett Bandy), the Shawnee Tribe (Ms. Tonya Tipton), and the United

Keetoowah Band of Cherokee Indians (Ms. Erin Thompson and Charlotte Wolfe). We recommend consultation in accordance with 36 CFR § 800.2(c)(2).

Thank you for the opportunity to review this CRS and undertaking. Please refer to the AHPP Tracking Number listed above in all correspondence. If you have any questions, please call Eric Mills of my staff at 501-324-9784 or email eric.mills@arkansas.gov.

Sincerely,


Scott Kaufman
Director, AHPP

cc: Mr. Randall Looney, Federal Highway Administration
Dr. Ann Early, Arkansas Archeological Survey

**FARMLAND CONVERSION IMPACT RATING
FOR CORRIDOR TYPE PROJECTS**

PART I (To be completed by Federal Agency) 040779	3. Date of Land Evaluation Request	4. Sheet 1 of _____
--	------------------------------------	---------------------

1. Name of Project	5. Federal Agency Involved
--------------------	----------------------------

2. Type of Project	6. County and State
--------------------	---------------------

PART II (To be completed by NRCS)	1. Date Request Received by NRCS	2. Person Completing Form
--	----------------------------------	---------------------------

3. Does the corridor contain prime, unique statewide or local important farmland? (If no, the FPPA does not apply - Do not complete additional parts of this form). YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>	4. Acres Irrigated Average Farm Size
---	--

5. Major Crop(s)	6. Farmable Land in Government Jurisdiction Acres: _____ %	7. Amount of Farmland As Defined in FPPA Acres: _____ %
------------------	---	--

8. Name Of Land Evaluation System Used	9. Name of Local Site Assessment System	10. Date Land Evaluation Returned by NRCS
--	---	---

PART III (To be completed by Federal Agency)	Alternative Corridor For Segment			
---	---	--	--	--

	Corridor A	Corridor B	Corridor C	Corridor D
A. Total Acres To Be Converted Directly				
B. Total Acres To Be Converted Indirectly, Or To Receive Services				
C. Total Acres In Corridor				

PART IV (To be completed by NRCS) Land Evaluation Information	
--	--

A. Total Acres Prime And Unique Farmland	
B. Total Acres Statewide And Local Important Farmland	
C. Percentage Of Farmland in County Or Local Govt. Unit To Be Converted	
D. Percentage Of Farmland in Govt. Jurisdiction With Same Or Higher Relative Value	

PART V (To be completed by NRCS) Land Evaluation Information Criterion Relative value of Farmland to Be Serviced or Converted (Scale of 0 - 100 Points)	
--	--

PART VI (To be completed by Federal Agency) Corridor Assessment Criteria (These criteria are explained in 7 CFR 658.5(c))	Maximum Points	Corridor A	Corridor B	Corridor C	Corridor D
1. Area in Nonurban Use	15				
2. Perimeter in Nonurban Use	10				
3. Percent Of Corridor Being Farmed	20				
4. Protection Provided By State And Local Government	20				
5. Size of Present Farm Unit Compared To Average	10				
6. Creation Of Nonfarmable Farmland	25				
7. Availability Of Farm Support Services	5				
8. On-Farm Investments	20				
9. Effects Of Conversion On Farm Support Services	25				
10. Compatibility With Existing Agricultural Use	10				
TOTAL CORRIDOR ASSESSMENT POINTS	160				

PART VII (To be completed by Federal Agency)	
---	--


Relative Value Of Farmland (From Part V)	100				
Total Corridor Assessment (From Part VI above or a local site assessment)	160				
TOTAL POINTS (Total of above 2 lines)	260				

1. Corridor Selected:	2. Total Acres of Farmlands to be Converted by Project:	3. Date Of Selection:	4. Was A Local Site Assessment Used? YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/>
-----------------------	---	-----------------------	--

5. Reason For Selection:

Signature of Person Completing this Part:	DATE
---	------

Joshua Graham
NOTE: Complete a form for each segment with more than one Alternate Corridor



IN REPLY REFER TO:

United States Department of the Interior

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

Arkansas Ecological Service Field Office
110 South Amity Road, Suite 300
Conway, Arkansas 72032



January 24, 2020

Mr. John Fleming
c/o Matthew Schrum
Arkansas Department of Transportation
10324 Interstate 30
Little Rock, AR 72209

Consultation Code: 04ER1000-2020-R-0255

RE: 040779 - Elmo Creek Str. & Apprs.

Dear Mr. Fleming,

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) is responding to your request dated January 21, 2020 to verify that the proposed Arkansas Department of Transportation (ArDOT) Job Number Job #ArDOT Job 040779 - Elmo Creek, Crawford County, AR (the Project) may rely on the February 5, 2018, Programmatic Biological Opinion (BO) for federally funded or approved transportation projects that may affect the federally listed endangered Indiana bat (*Myotis sodalis*) and/or federally listed threatened northern long-eared bat (NLEB) (*Myotis septentrionalis*). We received your request and the associated LAA Consistency Letter on January 21, 2020.

This is a bridge replacement project, on state Hwy 220, over Elmo Creek. Current plans are to replace the existing bridge with a quintuple 12' x 12' x 107' box culvert. This bridge crossing is in a hairpin turn in the creek valley. This action may rely on the revised February 5, 2018, Programmatic Biological Opinion (BO) for federally funded or approved transportation projects that may affect the Indiana Bat and/or Northern Long-eared Bat (NLEB). We received your request and the associated Project Submittal Form on October 10, 2019.

This letter provides the Service's response as to whether the Project may rely on the BO to comply with Section 7(a)(2) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (ESA) (87 Stat. 884, as amended; 16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.) for its effects to the Indiana Bat and/or NLEB. This letter also responds to your request for Service concurrence that the Project may affect, but is not likely to adversely affect (NLAA) ESA-listed species and/or designated critical habitats other than the Indiana bat and NLEB.

The official species list obtained through Service's Information for Planning and Consultation website identified the endangered gray bat (*Myotis grisescens*), the endangered Indiana Bat, the threatened Northern Long-eared Bat, the endangered Ozark Big-eared Bat (*Corynorhinus (=Plecotus) townsendii ingens*), the proposed threatened Eastern Black Rail (*Laterallus jamaicensis ssp. jamaicensis*), the threatened Piping Plover (*Charadrius melodus*), the threatened Red Knot (*Calidris canutus rufa*), the endangered Whooping Crane

Mr. John Fleming

2

(*Grus americana*), the endangered American Burying Beetle (*Nicrophorus americanus*), and the threatened Missouri Bladderpod (*Physaria filiformis*) as potentially occurring in the project area.

Utilizing the FHWA, FRA, FTA Programmatic Biological Opinion for Transportation Projects within the range of the Indiana Bat and northern long-eared bat, it has been determined that the project "may affect, and is likely to adversely affect" both the Indiana Bat and the northern long-eared bat. See the attached Consistency Letter generated by IPaC. Compensatory mitigation, in the form of a \$1,389 contribution to the Indiana Bat migration study program, will be provided for adverse impacts to the Indiana bat associated with this project.

The ArDOT has determined that the Project is likely to adversely affect (LAA) the Indiana Bat and/or the NLEB. The Service concurs with these determinations, because of the proximity of known species sites and foraging range to the project location and the occurrence of suitable foraging habitat for these species that exists on and adjacent to the site. A determination of LAA for Indiana Bat and/or the NLEB is appropriate based on the distance from the existing roadway and amount of suitable habitat being lost. The conservation measures being proposed, inactive season clearing (non-reproductive season) only provisions based on the site assessment and bridge survey results, and the proposed implementation of all required AMMs will help to mitigate the effects in accordance with the PBO.

ArDOT determined that the Project is not likely to adversely affect (NLAA) the Ozark Big-eared bat and Gray Bat. A Bridge and Structure Assessment was conducted and found no signs of any bat activity on the Elmo Creek Bridge. A winter clearing only and a timing of day restriction will be placed in the job contract for this project, which prohibits tree clearing from April 1 to November 15 and requires construction activities not occur 30 minutes prior to sunset and sunrise, respectively. A water pollution control special provision will be put in place to prevent material and debris from entering the waterway, minimizing the effects of the project on aquatic macroinvertebrates, the bats' forage base. A cave discovery special provision will be in place on this project, which will halt construction activity in the project area if a cave is discovered. Due to the negative bridge assessment and the preventive measures that will be in place during this project, the Service concurs that the project "may affect, but is not likely to adversely affect" the Ozark Big-eared bat and Gray Bat. This concurrence concludes your ESA Section 7 responsibilities relative to these species for this Project, subject to the Reinitiation Notice below.

Conclusion

The Service has reviewed the effects of the proposed Project, which includes the ArDOT's commitment to implement any applicable mitigation measures as indicated on the Project Submittal Form. We confirm that the proposed Project's effects are consistent with those analyzed in the BO. The Service determined that projects consistent with the conservation measures and scope of the program analyzed in the BO are not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of the Indiana Bat and/or the NLEB. In coordination with your agency and the other sponsoring Federal Transportation Agencies, the Service will reevaluate this conclusion annually in light of any new pertinent information under the adaptive management provisions of the BO.

Incidental Take: Indiana Bat

The Service anticipates that tree removal associated with the proposed Project will cause incidental take of Indiana Bats. As described in the Incidental Take Statement (ITS) of the BO, such taking will be difficult to detect. The Service determined that it is appropriate to measure the amount or extent of incidental taking resulting from BO projects using the proposed acreage of tree removal from Indiana Bat suitable habitat as a surrogate for the numbers of individuals taken.

The proposed Project will remove 0.16 acre of trees from habitat that is suitable for the Indiana Bat. All tree removal will occur in winter and comply with all other conservation measures in the BO. Based on the BO, 0.76 acre is anticipated to not result in adverse effects, and 0.16 acre is anticipated to result in adverse effects.

The ARDOT uses the mitigation ratio of 1.5 from Table 3 of the BO¹ to calculate the compensatory mitigation required to offset these adverse impacts for a total of 0.24² acre of trees that is suitable for the Indiana bat. Mitigation will be provided in the form of a \$1,389 contribution to the Indiana Bat migration study program for adverse impacts to the Indiana bat associated with this project.

The purchase of species conservation credits and/or in-lieu fee contributions shall occur prior to construction of a transportation project covered under this programmatic consultation. Exceptions to this program stipulation include emergency projects that do not require a letting prior to construction. In these cases, purchase of credits and/or in-lieu fee contributions shall occur within three months of completion of the project. This timeframe allows for measuring the acres of habitat affected by the emergency project and for financial processing.

In addition, the Project may take up to 5 Indiana bats that were not detected during bridge bat assessments conducted prior to implementing the proposed work on the Elmo Creek Bridge. In these instances, potential incidental take of Indiana bats may be exempted provided that the take is reported to the Service (refer to User Guide Appendix E - Post Assessment Discovery of Bats at Bridge/Structure Form). Although such take is reasonably certain to occur at up to 10 bridge projects per year as included in the scope of the BO, it is a remote possibility for any individual project that is implemented consistent with the conservation measures of the BO.

The Service will add the acreage of Project-related tree removal to the annual total acreage attributed to the BO as a surrogate measure of Indiana Bat take and exempted from the prohibitions against incidental taking. Such exemption is effective as long as your agency implements the reasonable and prudent measure (RPM) and accompanying terms and conditions of the BO's ITS.

¹ https://www.fws.gov/midwest/endangered/section7/fhwa/pdf/IBAT_ILF_ratios_transportation_agencies.pdf

² XX acres * XX ratio

The sole RPM of the BO's ITS requires the Federal Transportation Agencies to ensure that State/Local transportation agencies, who choose to include eligible projects under the programmatic action, incorporate all applicable conservation measures in the project proposals submitted to the Service for ESA section 7 compliance using the BO. The implementing terms and conditions for this RPM require the Federal Transportation Agencies to offer training to appropriate personnel about using the BO, and about promptly reporting sick, injured, or dead bats (regardless of species) (or any other federally listed species) located in project action areas.

Northern Long-eared Bat

The Service anticipates that tree removal associated with the proposed Project will cause incidental take of NLEBs. However, the Project is consistent with the BO, and such projects will not cause take of NLEB that is prohibited under the ESA section 4(d) rule for this species (50 CFR §17.40(o)). Therefore, the take of NLEBs resulting from this project does not require exemption from the Service.

Reporting Dead or Injured Bats

The Arkansas Department of Transportation, its State/Local cooperators, and any contractors must take care when handling dead or injured Indiana Bats and/or NLEBs, or any other federally listed species that are found at the Project site to preserve biological material in the best possible condition and to protect the handler from exposure to diseases, such as rabies. Project personnel are responsible for ensuring that any evidence about determining the cause of death or injury is not unnecessarily disturbed. Reporting the discovery of dead or injured listed species is required in all cases to enable the Service to determine whether the level of incidental take exempted by this BO is exceeded, and to ensure that the terms and conditions are appropriate and effective. Parties finding a dead, injured, or sick specimen of any endangered or threatened species must promptly notify this Service Office.

Reinitiation Notice

This letter concludes consultation for the proposed Project, which qualifies for inclusion in the BO issued to the Federal Transportation Agencies. To maintain this inclusion, a reinitiation of this Project-level consultation is required where the Arkansas Department of Transportation's discretionary involvement or control over the Project has been retained (or is authorized by law) and if:

1. the amount or extent of incidental take of Indiana Bat is exceeded;
2. new information reveals that the Project may affect listed species or critical habitat in a manner or to an extent not considered in the BO;
3. the Project is subsequently modified in a manner that causes an effect to listed species or designated critical habitat not considered in the BO; or
4. a new species is listed or critical habitat designated that the Project may affect.

Per condition #1 above, the anticipated incidental take is exceeded when:

- the Project removes trees from more than 0.16 acres of habitat suitable for the Indiana Bat.
- the Project takes more than 5 Indiana bats resulting from work on the Elmo Creek Bridge.

In instances where the amount or extent of incidental take is exceeded, the Federal Highway Administration/Arkansas Department of Transportation is required to immediately request a reinitiation of formal consultation. Please note that the Service cannot exempt from the applicable ESA prohibitions any Action-caused take that exceeds the amount or extent specified in the ITS of this BO that may occur before the reinitiated consultation is concluded.

We appreciate your continued efforts to ensure that this Project is fully consistent with all applicable provisions of the BO. If you have any questions regarding our response or if you need additional information, please contact Lindsey Lewis at (501) 513-4489 or lindsey_lewis@fws.gov

Sincerely,



Melvin L. Tobin
Field Supervisor

cc: Project File
Read File

Filename: C:\Users\lilewis\Documents\PROJECTS\FY2020\ARDOT\ArDOT Job 040779 - Elmo Creek\AFO Letter -Job 040779 - Elmo Creek Str Apprs - Comments.docx



United States Department of the Interior



FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE
Arkansas Ecological Services Field Office
110 South Amity Suite 300
Conway, AR 72032-8975
Phone: (501) 513-4470 Fax: (501) 513-4480
<http://www.fws.gov/arkansas-es>

In Reply Refer To:

December 12, 2019

Consultation Code: 04ER1000-2020-SLI-0255

Event Code: 04ER1000-2020-E-00663

Project Name: 040779 - Elmo Creek Str. & Apprs. (S)

Subject: Updated list of threatened and endangered species that may occur in your proposed project location, and/or may be affected by your proposed project

To Whom It May Concern:

The enclosed species list identifies endangered, threatened, proposed, and candidate species, as well as proposed and final designated critical habitat, that may occur within the boundary of your proposed project and/or may be affected by your proposed project. The species list fulfills the requirements of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) under section 7(c) of the Endangered Species Act (Act) of 1973, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1531 *et seq.*). **This letter only provides an official species list and technical assistance; if you determine that listed species and/or designated critical habitat may be affected in any way by the proposed project, even if the effect is wholly beneficial, consultation with the Service will be necessary.**

If you determine that this project will have no effect on listed species and their habitat in any way, then you have completed Section 7 consultation with the Service and may use this letter in your project file or application.

The purpose of the Act is to provide a means whereby threatened and endangered species and the ecosystems upon which they depend may be conserved. Under sections 7(a)(1) and 7(a)(2) of the Act and its implementing regulations (50 CFR 402 *et seq.*), federal agencies are required to utilize their authorities to carry out programs for the conservation of threatened and endangered species and to determine whether projects may affect threatened and endangered species and/or designated critical habitat. More information on the regulations and procedures for section 7 consultation, including the role of permit or license applicants, can be found on our website.

Please visit our website at <http://www.fws.gov/arkansas-es/IPaC/home.html> for species-specific guidance to avoid and minimize adverse effects to federally endangered,

threatened, proposed, and candidate species. Our web site also contains additional information on species life history and habitat requirements that may be useful in project planning.

If your project involves in-stream construction activities, oil and natural gas infrastructure, road construction, transmission lines, or communication towers, please review our project specific guidance at <http://www.fws.gov/arkansas-es/IPaC/ProjSpec.html>.

The karst region of Arkansas is a unique region that covers the **northern third of Arkansas** and we have specific guidance to conserve sensitive cave-obligate and bat species. **Please visit <http://www.fws.gov/arkansas-es/IPaC/Karst.html> to determine if your project occurs in the karst region and to view karst specific-guidance.** Proper implementation and maintenance of best management practices specified in these guidance documents is necessary to avoid adverse effects to federally protected species and often avoids the more lengthy formal consultation process.

If your species list includes any mussels, Northern Long-eared Bat, Indiana Bat, Yellowcheek Darter, Red-cockaded Woodpecker, or American Burying Beetle, your project may require a presence/absence and/or habitat survey prior to commencing project activities. Please check the appropriate species-specific guidance on our website to determine if your project requires a survey. We strongly recommend that you contact the appropriate staff species lead biologist (see office directory or species page) prior to conducting presence/absence surveys to ensure the appropriate level of effort and methodology.

Under the ESA, it is the responsibility of the Federal action agency or its designated representative to determine if a proposed action "may affect" endangered, threatened, or proposed species, or designated critical habitat, and if so, to consult with the Service further. Similarly, it is the responsibility of the Federal action agency or project proponent, not the Service, to make "no effect" determinations. If you determine that your proposed action will have "no effect" on threatened or endangered species or their respective critical habitat, you do not need to seek concurrence with the Service. Nevertheless, it is a violation of Federal law to harm or harass any federally-listed threatened or endangered fish or wildlife species without the appropriate permit.

Through the consultation process, we will analyze information contained in a biological assessment that you provide. If your proposed action is associated with Federal funding or permitting, consultation will occur with the Federal agency under section 7(a)(2) of the ESA. Otherwise, an incidental take permit pursuant to section 10(a)(1)(B) of the ESA (also known as a habitat conservation plan) is necessary to harm or harass federally listed threatened or endangered fish or wildlife species. In either case, there is no mechanism for authorizing incidental take "after-the-fact." For more information regarding formal consultation and HCPs, please see the Service's Consultation Handbook and Habitat Conservation Plans at www.fws.gov/endangered/esa-library/index.html#consultations.

New information based on updated surveys, changes in the abundance and distribution of species, changed habitat conditions, or other factors could change this list. Please feel free to contact us if you need more current information or assistance regarding the potential impacts to

federally proposed, listed, and candidate species and federally designated and proposed critical habitat. Please note that under 50 CFR 402.12(e) of the regulations implementing section 7 of the Act, **the accuracy of this species list should be verified after 90 days**. This verification can be completed formally or informally as desired. The Service recommends that verification be completed by visiting the ECOS-IPaC website at regular intervals during project planning and implementation for updates to species lists and information. An updated list may be requested through the ECOS-IPaC system by completing the same process used to receive the enclosed list.

We appreciate your concern for threatened and endangered species. The Service encourages Federal agencies to include conservation of threatened and endangered species into their project planning to further the purposes of the Act. **Please include the Consultation Tracking Number in the header of this letter with any request for consultation or correspondence about your project that you submit to our office.**

Attachment(s):

- Official Species List
-

Official Species List

This list is provided pursuant to Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act, and fulfills the requirement for Federal agencies to "request of the Secretary of the Interior information whether any species which is listed or proposed to be listed may be present in the area of a proposed action".

This species list is provided by:

Arkansas Ecological Services Field Office

110 South Amity Suite 300

Conway, AR 72032-8975

(501) 513-4470

Project Summary

Consultation Code: 04ER1000-2020-SLI-0255

Event Code: 04ER1000-2020-E-00663

Project Name: 040779 - Elmo Creek Str. & Apprs. (S)

Project Type: BRIDGE CONSTRUCTION / MAINTENANCE

Project Description: This is a bridge replacement project in Crawford County AR, on state Hwy 220, over Elmo Creek. Current plans are to replace the existing bridge with a quintuple 12' x 12' x 107' box culvert. This bridge crossing in a hairpin turn in the creek valley.

Project Location:

Approximate location of the project can be viewed in Google Maps: <https://www.google.com/maps/place/35.65777646480729N94.3489390280929W>



Counties: Crawford, AR

Endangered Species Act Species

There is a total of 10 threatened, endangered, or candidate species on this species list.

Species on this list should be considered in an effects analysis for your project and could include species that exist in another geographic area. For example, certain fish may appear on the species list because a project could affect downstream species.

IPaC does not display listed species or critical habitats under the sole jurisdiction of NOAA Fisheries¹, as USFWS does not have the authority to speak on behalf of NOAA and the Department of Commerce.

See the "Critical habitats" section below for those critical habitats that lie wholly or partially within your project area under this office's jurisdiction. Please contact the designated FWS office if you have questions.

-
1. [NOAA Fisheries](#), also known as the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), is an office of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration within the Department of Commerce.

Mammals

NAME	STATUS
Gray Bat <i>Myotis grisescens</i> No critical habitat has been designated for this species. Species profile: https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/6329	Endangered
Indiana Bat <i>Myotis sodalis</i> There is final critical habitat for this species. Your location is outside the critical habitat. Species profile: https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/5949	Endangered
Northern Long-eared Bat <i>Myotis septentrionalis</i> No critical habitat has been designated for this species. Species profile: https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/9045	Threatened
Ozark Big-eared Bat <i>Corynorhinus (=Plecotus) townsendii ingens</i> No critical habitat has been designated for this species. Species profile: https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/7245	Endangered

Birds

NAME	STATUS
Eastern Black Rail <i>Laterallus jamaicensis ssp. jamaicensis</i> No critical habitat has been designated for this species. Species profile: https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/10477	Proposed Threatened
Piping Plover <i>Charadrius melodus</i> Population: [Atlantic Coast and Northern Great Plains populations] - Wherever found, except those areas where listed as endangered. There is final critical habitat for this species. Your location is outside the critical habitat. Species profile: https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/6039	Threatened
Red Knot <i>Calidris canutus rufa</i> No critical habitat has been designated for this species. Species profile: https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/1864	Threatened
Whooping Crane <i>Grus americana</i> Population: U.S.A. (AL, AR, CO, FL, GA, ID, IL, IN, IA, KY, LA, MI, MN, MS, MO, NC, NM, OH, SC, TN, UT, VA, WI, WV, western half of WY) No critical habitat has been designated for this species. Species profile: https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/758	Experimental Population, Non- Essential

Insects

NAME	STATUS
American Burying Beetle <i>Nicrophorus americanus</i> Population: Wherever found, except where listed as an experimental population No critical habitat has been designated for this species. Species profile: https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/66	Endangered

Flowering Plants

NAME	STATUS
Missouri Bladderpod <i>Physaria filiformis</i> No critical habitat has been designated for this species. Species profile: https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/5361	Threatened

Critical habitats

THERE ARE NO CRITICAL HABITATS WITHIN YOUR PROJECT AREA UNDER THIS OFFICE'S JURISDICTION.



United States Department of the Interior



FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE
Arkansas Ecological Services Field Office
110 South Amity Suite 300
Conway, AR 72032-8975
Phone: (501) 513-4470 Fax: (501) 513-4480
<http://www.fws.gov/arkansas-es>

IPaC Record Locator: 638-19675494

January 21, 2020

Subject: Consistency letter for the '040779 - Elmo Creek Str. & Apprs. (S)' project (TAILS 04ER1000-2020-R-0255) under the revised February 5, 2018, FHWA, FRA, FTA Programmatic Biological Opinion for Transportation Projects within the Range of the Indiana Bat and Northern Long-eared Bat.

To whom it may concern:

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) has received your request to verify that the **040779 - Elmo Creek Str. & Apprs. (S)** (Proposed Action) may rely on the revised February 5, 2018, FHWA, FRA, FTA Programmatic Biological Opinion for Transportation Projects within the Range of the Indiana Bat and Northern Long-eared Bat (PBO) to satisfy requirements under Section 7(a)(2) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (ESA) (87 Stat.884, as amended; 16 U.S.C. 1531 *et seq.*).

Based on the information you provided (Project Description shown below), you have determined that the Proposed Action is within the scope and adheres to the criteria of the PBO, including the adoption of applicable avoidance and minimization measures, and may affect, and is likely to adversely affect the endangered Indiana bat (*Myotis sodalis*) and/or the threatened Northern long-eared bat (*Myotis septentrionalis*). Consultation with the Service pursuant to Section 7(a)(2) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (ESA) (87 Stat. 884, as amended; 16 U.S.C. 1531 *et seq.*) is required.

This "may affect - likely to adversely affect" determination becomes effective when the lead Federal action agency or designated non-federal representative requests the Service rely on the PBO to satisfy the agency's consultation requirements for this project. Please provide this consistency letter to the lead Federal action agency or its designated non-federal representative for review, and as the agency deems appropriate, transmit to this Service Office for verification that the project is consistent with the PBO.

This Service Office will respond by letter to the requesting Federal action agency or designated non-federal representative within 30 calendar days to:

- verify that the Proposed Action is consistent with the scope of actions covered under the PBO;
- verify that all applicable avoidance, minimization, and compensation measures are included in the action proposal;
- identify any action-specific monitoring and reporting requirements, consistent with the monitoring and reporting requirements of the PBO, and
- identify anticipated incidental take.

ESA Section 7 compliance for this Proposed Action is not complete until the Federal action agency or its designated non-federal representative receives a verification letter from the Service.

For Proposed Actions that include bridge/structure removal, replacement, and/or maintenance activities: If your initial bridge/structure assessments failed to detect Indiana bats, but you later detect bats during construction, please submit the Post Assessment Discovery of Bats at Bridge/Structure Form (User Guide Appendix E) to this Service Office. In these instances, potential incidental take of Indiana bats may be exempted provided that the take is reported to the Service.

If the Proposed Action may affect any other federally-listed or proposed species and/or designated critical habitat, additional consultation between the lead Federal action agency and this Service Office is required. If the proposed action has the potential to take bald or golden eagles, additional coordination with the Service under the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act may also be required. In either of these circumstances, please advise the lead Federal action agency accordingly.

The following species may occur in your project area and **are not** covered by this determination:

- American Burying Beetle, *Nicrophorus americanus* (Endangered)
 - Eastern Black Rail, *Laterallus jamaicensis ssp. jamaicensis* (Proposed Threatened)
 - Gray Bat, *Myotis grisescens* (Endangered)
 - Missouri Bladderpod, *Physaria filiformis* (Threatened)
 - Ozark Big-eared Bat, *Corynorhinus (=Plecotus) townsendii ingens* (Endangered)
 - Piping Plover, *Charadrius melodus* (Threatened)
 - Red Knot, *Calidris canutus rufa* (Threatened)
 - Whooping Crane, *Grus americana* (Experimental Population, Non-Essential)
-

Project Description

The following project name and description was collected in IPaC as part of the endangered species review process.

Name

040779 - Elmo Creek Str. & Apprs. (S)

Description

This is a bridge replacement project in Crawford County AR, on state Hwy 220, over Elmo Creek. Current plans are to replace the existing bridge with a quintuple 12' x 12' x 107' box culvert. This bridge crossing is in a hairpin turn in the creek valley.

Determination Key Result

Based on your answers provided, this project is likely to adversely affect the endangered Indiana bat and/or the threatened Northern long-eared bat. Therefore, consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service pursuant to Section 7(a)(2) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (ESA) (87 Stat. 884, as amended 16 U.S.C. 1531 *et seq.*) is required. However, also based on your answers provided, this project may rely on the conclusion and Incidental Take Statement provided in the revised February 5, 2018, FHWA, FRA, FTA Programmatic Biological Opinion for Transportation Projects within the Range of the Indiana Bat and Northern Long-eared Bat.

Qualification Interview

1. Is the project within the range of the Indiana bat^[1]?

[1] See [Indiana bat species profile](#)

Automatically answered

Yes

2. Is the project within the range of the Northern long-eared bat^[1]?

[1] See [Northern long-eared bat species profile](#)

Automatically answered

Yes

3. Which Federal Agency is the lead for the action?

A) Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)

4. Are *all* project activities limited to non-construction^[1] activities only? (examples of non-construction activities include: bridge/abandoned structure assessments, surveys, planning and technical studies, property inspections, and property sales)

[1] Construction refers to activities involving ground disturbance, percussive noise, and/or lighting.

No

5. Does the project include *any* activities that are **greater than** 300 feet from existing road/rail surfaces^[1]?

[1] Road surface is defined as the actively used [e.g. motorized vehicles] driving surface and shoulders [may be pavement, gravel, etc.] and rail surface is defined as the edge of the actively used rail ballast.

No

6. Does the project include *any* activities **within** 0.5 miles of a known Indiana bat and/or NLEB hibernaculum^[1]?

[1] For the purpose of this consultation, a hibernaculum is a site, most often a cave or mine, where bats hibernate during the winter (see suitable habitat), but could also include bridges and structures if bats are found to be hibernating there during the winter.

No

7. Is the project located **within** a karst area?

Yes

8. Will the project include *any* type of activity that could impact a **known** hibernaculum^[1], or impact a karst feature (e.g., sinkhole, losing stream, or spring) that could result in effects to a **known** hibernaculum?

[1] For the purpose of this consultation, a hibernaculum is a site, most often a cave or mine, where bats hibernate during the winter (see suitable habitat), but could also include bridges and structures if bats are found to be hibernating there during the winter.

No

9. Is there *any* suitable^[1] summer habitat for Indiana Bat or NLEB **within** the project action area^[2]? (includes any trees suitable for maternity, roosting, foraging, or travelling habitat)

[1] See the Service's [summer survey guidance](#) for our current definitions of suitable habitat.

[2] The action area is defined as all areas to be affected directly or indirectly by the Federal action and not merely the immediate area involved in the action (50 CFR Section 402.02). Further clarification is provided by the [national consultation FAQs](#).

Yes

10. Will the project remove *any* suitable summer habitat^[1] and/or remove/trim any existing trees **within** suitable summer habitat?

[1] See the Service's [summer survey guidance](#) for our current definitions of suitable habitat.

Yes

11. Will the project clear more than 20 acres of suitable habitat per 5-mile section of road/rail?

No

12. Have presence/probable absence (P/A) summer surveys^{[1][2]} been conducted^{[3][4]} **within** the suitable habitat located within your project action area?

[1] See the Service's [summer survey guidance](#) for our current definitions of suitable habitat.

[2] Presence/probable absence summer surveys conducted within the fall swarming/spring emergence home range of a documented Indiana bat hibernaculum (contact local Service Field Office for appropriate distance from hibernacula) that result in a negative finding requires additional consultation with the local Service Field Office to determine if clearing of forested habitat is appropriate and/or if seasonal clearing restrictions are needed to avoid and minimize potential adverse effects on fall swarming and spring emerging Indiana bats.

[3] For projects within the range of either the Indiana bat or NLEB in which suitable habitat is present, and no bat surveys have been conducted, the transportation agency will assume presence of the appropriate species. This assumption of presence should be based upon the presence of suitable habitat and the capability of bats to occupy it because of their mobility.

[4] Negative presence/probable absence survey results obtained using the [summer survey guidance](#) are valid for a minimum of two years from the completion of the survey unless new information (e.g., other nearby surveys) suggest otherwise.

No

13. Does the project include activities **within documented Indiana bat habitat**^{[1][2]}?

[1] Documented roosting or foraging habitat – for the purposes of this consultation, we are considering documented habitat as that where Indiana bats and/or NLEB have actually been captured and tracked using (1) radio telemetry to roosts; (2) radio telemetry triangulation/triangulation to estimate foraging areas; or (3) foraging areas with repeated use documented using acoustics. Documented roosting habitat is also considered as suitable summer habitat within 0.25 miles of documented roosts.)

[2] For the purposes of this key, we are considering documented corridors as that where Indiana bats and/or NLEB have actually been captured and tracked to using (1) radio telemetry; or (2) treed corridors located directly between documented roosting and foraging habitat.

No

14. Will the removal or trimming of habitat or trees occur **within** suitable but **undocumented Indiana bat** roosting/foraging habitat or travel corridors?

Yes

15. What time of year will the removal or trimming of habitat or trees **within** suitable but **undocumented Indiana bat** roosting/foraging habitat or travel corridors occur^[1]?

[1] Coordinate with the local Service Field Office for appropriate dates.

B) During the inactive season

16. Does the project include activities **within documented NLEB habitat**^{[1][2]}?

[1] Documented roosting or foraging habitat – for the purposes of this consultation, we are considering documented habitat as that where Indiana bats and/or NLEB have actually been captured and tracked using (1) radio telemetry to roosts; (2) radio telemetry biangulation/triangulation to estimate foraging areas; or (3) foraging areas with repeated use documented using acoustics. Documented roosting habitat is also considered as suitable summer habitat within 0.25 miles of documented roosts.)

[2] For the purposes of this key, we are considering documented corridors as that where Indiana bats and/or NLEB have actually been captured and tracked to using (1) radio telemetry; or (2) treed corridors located directly between documented roosting and foraging habitat.

No

17. Will the removal or trimming of habitat or trees occur **within** suitable but **undocumented NLEB** roosting/foraging habitat or travel corridors?

Yes

18. What time of year will the removal or trimming of habitat or trees **within** suitable but **undocumented NLEB** roosting/foraging habitat or travel corridors occur?

B) During the inactive season

19. Will *any* tree trimming or removal occur **within** 100 feet of existing road/rail surfaces?

Yes

20. Will the tree removal alter *any* **documented** Indiana bat or NLEB roosts and/or alter any surrounding summer habitat **within** 0.25 mile of a documented roost?

No

21. Will *any* tree trimming or removal occur **between** 100-300 feet of existing road/rail surfaces?

Yes

22. Are *all* trees that are being removed clearly demarcated?

Yes

23. Will the removal of habitat or the removal/trimming of trees include installing new or replacing existing **permanent** lighting?

No

24. Does the project include wetland or stream protection activities associated with compensatory wetland mitigation?

No

25. Does the project include slash pile burning?

Yes

26. Does the project include *any* bridge removal, replacement, and/or maintenance activities (e.g., any bridge repair, retrofit, maintenance, and/or rehabilitation work)?

Yes

27. Is there *any* suitable habitat^[1] for Indiana bat or NLEB **within** 1,000 feet of the bridge? (includes any trees suitable for maternity, roosting, foraging, or travelling habitat)

[1] See the Service's current [summer survey guidance](#) for our current definitions of suitable habitat.

Yes

28. Has a bridge assessment^[1] been conducted **within** the last 24 months^[2] to determine if the bridge is being used by bats?

[1] See [User Guide Appendix D](#) for bridge/structure assessment guidance

[2] Assessments must be completed no more than 2 years prior to conducting any work below the deck surface on all bridges that meet the physical characteristics described in the Programmatic Consultation, regardless of whether assessments have been conducted in the past. Due to the transitory nature of bat use, a negative result in one year does not guarantee that bats will not use that bridge/structure in subsequent years.

Yes

SUBMITTED DOCUMENTS

- *040779_bat_bridge_assessment.pdf* <https://ecos.fws.gov/ipac/project/JSBM7H2RWNHKRD3NPPTLAKZHLY/projectDocuments/19865579>

29. Did the bridge assessment detect *any* signs of Indiana bats and/or NLEBs roosting in/under the bridge (bats, guano, etc.)^[1]?

[1] If bridge assessment detects signs of *any* species of bats, coordination with the local FWS office is needed to identify potential threatened or endangered bat species. Additional studies may be undertaken to try to identify which bat species may be utilizing the bridge prior to allowing *any* work to proceed.

Note: There is a small chance bridge assessments for bat occupancy do not detect bats. Should a small number of bats be observed roosting on a bridge just prior to or during construction, such that take is likely to occur or does occur in the form of harassment, injury or death, the PBO requires the action agency to report the take. Report all unanticipated take within 2 working days of the incident to the USFWS. Construction activities may continue without delay provided the take is reported to the USFWS and is limited to 5 bats per project.

No

30. Will the bridge removal, replacement, and/or maintenance activities include installing new or replacing existing **permanent** lighting?

No

31. Does the project include the removal, replacement, and/or maintenance of *any* structure other than a bridge? (e.g., rest areas, offices, sheds, outbuildings, barns, parking garages, etc.)

No

32. Will the project involve the use of **temporary** lighting *during* the active season?

No

33. Will the project install new or replace existing **permanent** lighting?

No

34. Does the project include percussives or other activities (**not including tree removal/trimming or bridge/structure work**) that will increase noise levels above existing traffic/background levels?

No

35. Are *all* project activities that are **not associated with** habitat removal, tree removal/trimming, bridge and/or structure activities, temporary or permanent lighting, or use of percussives, limited to actions that DO NOT cause any additional stressors to the bat species?

Examples: lining roadways, unlighted signage , rail road crossing signals, signal lighting, and minor road repair such as asphalt fill of potholes, etc.

Yes

36. Will the project raise the road profile **above the tree canopy**?

No

37. Is the slash pile burning portion of this project consistent with a Not Likely to Adversely Affect determination in this key?

Automatically answered

Yes, because it is near suitable habitat and >0.5 miles from any hibernaculum

38. Are the project activities that are not associated with habitat removal, tree removal/trimming, bridge and/or structure activities, temporary or permanent lighting, or use of percussives consistent with a No Effect determination in this key?

Automatically answered

Yes, other project activities are limited to actions that DO NOT cause any additional stressors to the bat species as described in the BA/BO

39. Is the habitat removal portion of this project consistent with a Not Likely to Adversely Affect determination in this key?

Automatically answered

Yes, because the tree removal/trimming that occurs outside of the Indiana bat's active season occurs greater than 0.5 miles from the nearest hibernaculum, is less than 100 feet from the existing road/rail surface, includes clear demarcation of the trees that are to be removed, and does not alter documented roosts and/or surrounding summer habitat within 0.25 miles of a documented roost.

40. Is the habitat removal portion of this project consistent with a Likely to Adversely Affect determination in this key?

Automatically answered

Yes, because the tree removal that occurs outside the Indiana bat's active season is 100-300 feet from the existing road/rail surface, and is not in documented roosting/foraging habitat or travel corridors.

41. Is the habitat removal portion of this project consistent with a Not Likely to Adversely Affect determination in this key?

Automatically answered

Yes, because the tree removal/trimming that occurs outside of the NLEB's active season occurs greater than 0.5 miles from the nearest hibernaculum, is less than 100 feet from the existing road/rail surface, includes clear demarcation of the trees that are to be removed, and does not alter documented roosts and/or surrounding summer habitat within 0.25 miles of a documented roost.

42. Is the habitat removal portion of this project consistent with a Likely to Adversely Affect determination in this key?

Automatically answered

Yes, because the tree removal that occurs outside the NLEB's active season is 100-300 feet from the existing road/rail surface, and is not in documented roosting/foraging habitat or travel corridors.

43. Is the bridge removal, replacement, or maintenance activities portion of this project consistent with a No Effect determination in this key?

Automatically answered

Yes, because the bridge has been assessed using the criteria documented in the BA and no signs of bats were detected

44. **General AMM 1**

Will the project ensure *all* operators, employees, and contractors working in areas of known or presumed bat habitat are aware of *all* FHWA/FRA/FTA (Transportation Agencies) environmental commitments, including all applicable Avoidance and Minimization Measures?

Yes

45. **Hibernacula AMM 1**

Will the project ensure that on-site personnel will use best management practices^[1], secondary containment measures, or other standard spill prevention and countermeasures to avoid impacts to possible hibernacula?

[1] Coordinate with the appropriate Service Field Office on recommended best management practices for karst in your state.

Yes

46. Hibernacula AMM 1

Will the project ensure that, where practicable, a 300 foot buffer will be employed to separate fueling areas and other major containment risk activities from caves, sinkholes, losing streams, and springs in karst topography?

Yes

47. Tree Removal AMM 1

Can *all* phases/aspects of the project (e.g., temporary work areas, alignments) be modified, to the extent practicable, to avoid tree removal^[1] in excess of what is required to implement the project safely?

Note: Tree Removal AMM 1 is a minimization measure, the full implementation of which may not always be practicable. Projects may still be NLAA as long as Tree Removal AMMs 2, 3, and 4 are implemented and LAA as long as Tree Removal AMMs 3, 5, 6, and 7 are implemented.

[1] The word “trees” as used in the AMMs refers to trees that are suitable habitat for each species within their range. See the USFWS’ current summer survey guidance for our latest definitions of suitable habitat.

Yes

48. Tree Removal AMM 3

Can tree removal be limited to that specified in project plans and ensure that contractors understand clearing limits and how they are marked in the field (e.g., install bright colored flagging/fencing prior to any tree clearing to ensure contractors stay within clearing limits)?

Yes

49. For Indiana bat, if applicable, compensatory mitigation measures are required to offset adverse effects on the species (see Section 2.10 of the BA). Please select the mechanism in which compensatory mitigation will be implemented:

6. *Not Applicable*

Project Questionnaire

1. Have you made a No Effect determination for *all* other species indicated on the FWS IPaC generated species list?

No

2. Have you made a May Affect determination for *any* other species on the FWS IPaC generated species list?

Yes

3. How many acres^[1] of trees are proposed for removal between 0-100 feet of the existing road/rail surface?

[1] If described as number of trees, multiply by 0.09 to convert to acreage and enter that number.

0.76

4. How many acres^[1] of trees are proposed for removal between 100-300 feet of the existing road/rail surface?

[1] If described as number of trees, multiply by 0.09 to convert to acreage and enter that number.

0.16

5. **Please verify:**

All tree removal will occur greater than 0.5 mile from any hibernaculum.

Yes, I verify that all tree removal will occur greater than 0.5 miles from any hibernaculum.

6. Is the project location 0-100 feet from the edge of existing road/rail surface?

Yes

7. Is the project location 100-300 feet from the edge of existing road/rail surface?

No

8. **Please verify:**

No documented Indiana bat roosts or surrounding summer habitat within 0.25 mile of documented roosts will be impacted between May 1 and July 31.

Yes, I verify that no documented Indiana bat roosts or surrounding summer habitat within 0.25 mile of documented roosts will be impacted during this period.

9. **Please verify:**

No documented NLEB roosts or surrounding summer habitat within 150 feet of documented roosts will be impacted between June 1 and July 31.

Yes, I verify that no documented NLEB roosts or surrounding summer habitat within 150 feet of documented roosts will be impacted during this period.

10. Please describe the proposed bridge work:

The existing Route 220 bridge over Elmo Creek in Crawford County is being replaced with a quintuple 12' x 12' x 107' box culvert. Approaches to the crossing will also be re-aligned.

11. Please state the timing of all proposed bridge work:
-

The letting for this project is scheduled for 2021 with no specific date.

12. Please enter the date of the bridge assessment:

1/15/2020

13. You have indicated that the following Avoidance and Minimization Measures (AMMs) will be implemented as part of the proposed project:

- *General AMM 1*
- *Hibernacula AMM 1*
- *Tree Removal AMM 1*
- *Tree Removal AMM 3*

Avoidance And Minimization Measures (AMMs)

This determination key result includes the commitment to implement the following Avoidance and Minimization Measures (AMMs):

GENERAL AMM 1

Ensure all operators, employees, and contractors working in areas of known or presumed bat habitat are aware of all FHWA/FRA/FTA (Transportation Agencies) environmental commitments, including all applicable AMMs.

HIBERNACULA AMM 1

For projects located within karst areas, on-site personnel will use best management practices, secondary containment measures, or other standard spill prevention and countermeasures to avoid impacts to possible hibernacula. Where practicable, a 300 foot buffer will be employed to separate fueling areas and other major containment risk activities from caves, sinkholes, losing streams, and springs in karst topography.

TREE REMOVAL AMM 1

Modify all phases/aspects of the project (e.g., temporary work areas, alignments) to avoid tree removal.

TREE REMOVAL AMM 3

Ensure tree removal is limited to that specified in project plans and ensure that contractors understand clearing limits and how they are marked in the field (e.g., install bright colored flagging/fencing prior to any tree clearing to ensure contractors stay within clearing limits).

Determination Key Description: FHWA, FRA, FTA Programmatic Consultation For Transportation Projects Affecting NLEB Or Indiana Bat

This key was last updated in IPaC on December 02, 2019. Keys are subject to periodic revision.

This decision key is intended for projects/activities funded or authorized by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), Federal Railroad Administration (FRA), and/or Federal Transit Administration (FTA), which may require consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act (ESA) for the endangered **Indiana bat** (*Myotis sodalis*) and the threatened **Northern long-eared bat** (NLEB) (*Myotis septentrionalis*).

This decision key should only be used to verify project applicability with the Service's [February 5, 2018, FHWA, FRA, FTA Programmatic Biological Opinion for Transportation Projects](#). The programmatic biological opinion covers limited transportation activities that may affect either bat species, and addresses situations that are both likely and not likely to adversely affect either bat species. This decision key will assist in identifying the effect of a specific project/activity and applicability of the programmatic consultation. The programmatic biological opinion is not intended to cover all types of transportation actions. Activities outside the scope of the programmatic biological opinion, or that may affect ESA-listed species other than the Indiana bat or NLEB, or any designated critical habitat, may require additional ESA Section 7 consultation.



PROGRAMMATIC SECTION 4(F) EVALUATION FOR
FEDERALLY-AIDED HIGHWAY PROJECTS THAT NECESSITATE
THE USE OF HISTORIC BRIDGES

ARDOT Job Number 040779

Elmo Creek Str. & Apprs. (S)

Crawford County

March 2020

Submitted Pursuant to 49 U.S.C. Section 303 and 23 U.S.C. Section 138 by the U.S. Department of Transportation Federal Highway Administration and the Arkansas Department of Transportation.

Programmatic Section 4(f) Evaluation – Historic Bridges

1 Why is this report being prepared?

Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act of 1966 declared a national policy to make a special effort to preserve the natural beauty of the countryside, public parks and recreation lands, wildlife and waterfowl refuges, and historic sites. The current Section 4(f) legislation permits the Secretary of Transportation to approve a project that requires the use of certain historic bridge structures scheduled to be replaced or rehabilitated with Federal funds, only if a determination has been made that there is no feasible and prudent alternative to the use of the property and all possible planning has been undertaken to minimize harm to the property resulting from such use. These determinations, submitted pursuant to 49 U.S.C. Section 303 and 23 U.S.C. Section 138, are set forth in this Programmatic Section 4(f) Evaluation.

2 What would the project accomplish?

The Arkansas Department of Transportation (ARDOT; formerly the Arkansas State Highway and Transportation Department [AHTD]), in conjunction with the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), is proposing to construct a new bridge across Elmo Creek along Highway 220 in Crawford County, Arkansas. The project will improve safety and the transportation needs in west central Arkansas. As part of the project, a historic bridge will be replaced.

ARDOT Bridge Number M2364 (Elmo Creek Bridge) is a steel multi-beam bridge consisting of steel I-beams. The total length of the bridge is 57 feet. It has two 10-foot wide travel lanes, no shoulders, and a clear deck width of approximately 22 feet. According to the Bridge Inspection Report dated December 17, 2019, the condition of the deck and substructure are listed as fair (code 5), and the superstructure is listed as satisfactory (code 6).


The bridge will be replaced with a quintuple (five barrel) reinforced concrete box culvert with wing walls. It will measure approximately 70 feet long with a roadway width of 28 feet. To meet current standards, the new culvert roadway will have two 10-foot wide paved travel lanes, each with a four-foot shoulder.

What does Section 4(f) protect?

Section 4(f) properties include significant publicly owned parks, recreation areas, and wildlife or waterfowl refuges, or any publicly or privately owned historic site listed or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places with national, state, or local significance. The ARDOT considers historic bridges as historic sites.

What is a steel multi-beam bridge?

The primary structure of the bridge consists of three or more parallel rolled beams.



3 What Section 4(f) properties are being impacted?

ARDOT Bridge Number M2364 (Elmo Creek Bridge) contains one 57-foot simple span of reinforced concrete deck on timber floor beams and steel I-beams. The beams rest on masonry abutments (Figure 1). The roadway is flanked by metal guardrails. A Depression Era/New Deal program workforce, such as the Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC) or the Works Progress Administration (WPA), likely built the circa 1940 bridge. Masonry abutments and piers were a known building style often attributed to these two programs.

The Elmo Creek Bridge was determined eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) in 2013. It is eligible under Criterion A for its association with Depression Era/New Deal projects, which employed Arkansans and built infrastructure in the state. It is also eligible under Criterion C for the masonry abutment construction method common to the 1930s and 1940s. The Elmo Creek Bridge is not considered a National Historic Landmark.

What are the National Register Criteria for Evaluation?

Properties that possess significance in American history, architecture, archeology, engineering, and culture that retain aspects of integrity, and:

- A) associated with an event, broad patterns, or trends of history;
- B) associated with an important person(s);
- C) embody typical features of a type, period, or construction method, that represent the work of a master, or possess high artistic values; or
- D) that have yielded, or will likely yield, significant information for history or prehistory.

(National Register Bulletin 15: <https://www.nps.gov/NR/PUBLICATIONS/bulletins/nrb15/>)

What was the Civilian Conservation Corps?

The Civilian Conservation Corps (CCC) began in 1933 as part of President Franklin Delano Roosevelt’s New Deal. This program required enrollees to be between 18 and 25 years old (later 17 through 23) and serve for six-month terms. Types of work included planting trees, constructing parks and park buildings, creating hiking trails, applying erosion control, and building bridges and culverts. Congress dissolved this agency in 1942 due to World War II. Most Arkansas CCC projects occurred in national forests or on state-owned property, such as state parks.

Elmo Creek Bridge



Figure 1

4 Does this project qualify for the Section 4(f) programmatic for historic bridges?

The FHWA may apply the programmatic Section 4(f) evaluation to projects that meet the criteria shown in Table 1.

Table 1

Criteria To Use Programmatic Section 4(f) Evaluation For Federally-Aided Highway Projects That Necessitate The Use of Historic Bridges

The bridge is to be replaced or rehabilitated with Federal funds.	√
The project will require the use of a historic bridge that is eligible for inclusion or listed in the NHRP.	√
The bridge is not a National Historic Landmark.	√
The FHWA Division Administrator determines that the facts of the project match those set forth in the FHWA Section 4(f) Policy Paper issued March 1, 2005.	√
Agreement has been reached among the FHWA, State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation through procedures pursuant to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA).	√

What was the Works Progress Administration?

The Works Progress Administration (WPA), later renamed the Works Projects Administration in 1939, began as part of President Franklin Delano Roosevelt’s New Deal. WPA operations in Arkansas dated from 1935 through June 1943. This program employed Arkansans and contributed buildings, roads, bridges, and culverts to the state. WPA structures are generally known for craftsmanship in concrete and stone construction.

What are the qualifications for a National Historic Landmark?

A National Historic Landmark is a property selected by the Secretary of the Interior for its national historic significance. The property should “possess exceptional value in honoring or showing the history of the United States,” according to the National Park Service (<https://www.nps.gov/nhl/learn/intro.htm>).

5 Could the project avoid demolishing the historic bridge?

In order for a Programmatic Section 4(f) Evaluation and Approval for FHWA Projects That Necessitate the Use of Historic Bridges to be applied to a project, each of the three following alternatives must be supported by the circumstances, studies, and consultations on the project:

- 1) No Action,
- 2) Rehabilitation of the Existing Structure, and
- 3) Build on New Location and Retain the Existing Structure.

To this effect, ARDOT established a Historic Bridge Analysis Committee (HBAC) to evaluate viable alternatives for the preservation of historically significant bridges through retention, rehabilitation, or to justify their removal, if required. The required alternatives were evaluated by the HBAC to determine if a feasible and prudent alternative to the proposed impacts on the historic bridge existed. The results of the discussion are listed on the following pages.

No Action

This alternative involves no improvements to the existing facilities and would continue to provide only routine maintenance. This alternative does not improve the existing roadway width or conditions of the bridge and would not alleviate the safety issues. It is not prudent to leave the bridge as is, resulting in safety and/or operational issues.

Rehabilitation of the Existing Structure

Two rehabilitation alternatives were considered for this project.

Rehabilitation Alternative One rehabilitates the existing historic bridge for two-way traffic operations. The bridge is too narrow to meet minimum design standards. Widening the bridge would compromise its historic integrity. According to the HBAC discussion, the wide beam spacing is likely the reason for the weight limitation. Adding beams is not feasible due to the unknown design factors of the masonry abutments and base. Rehabilitating the bridge for less than design standards leaves a narrow, weight restricted bridge in service. *Rehabilitation Alternative One* is not feasible or prudent as it results in unacceptable safety and operational problems.

Rehabilitation Alternative Two rehabilitates the existing historic bridge for one-way traffic operations and constructs a new bridge for one-way traffic operations in the opposite direction. The bridge would remain weight restricted following a rehabilitation. Rehabilitation is not feasible due to the roadway curves. Splitting and rejoining the roadway for couplet bridges is not a prudent option at this location as it would increase unacceptable safety and operational problems. *Rehabilitation Alternative Two* is not feasible or prudent.

New Location

The *New Location Alternative* constructs a new bridge on a new location in accordance with the approved ARDOT project design criteria with another entity accepting ownership of the historic bridge for preservation either in place or relocation. ARDOT currently owns the historic bridge. The HBAC determined that a new location for the bridge with an alignment that straightens the roadway would introduce unacceptable safety and operational issues; the curve helps to limit speed in the area. A slightly new alignment is planned, but some of the current alignment will be required for this alternative, and the historic bridge cannot remain for preservation in place.

Generally, in this situation the bridge would be marketed for relocation; however, relocation was not a prudent option as it would destroy the historic integrity of the Elmo Creek Bridge due to its construction type.

What is meant by feasible?

Per 23 CFR 774.17, Feasible and prudent avoidance alternative definitions:

(2) An alternative is not feasible if it cannot be built as a matter of sound engineering judgment.

What is meant by prudent?

Per 23 CFR 774.17, Feasible and prudent avoidance alternative definitions:

(3) An alternative is not prudent if:

- (i) It compromises the project to a degree that it is unreasonable to proceed with the project in light of its stated purpose and need;
- (ii) It results in unacceptable safety or operational problems;
- (iii) After reasonable mitigation, it still causes:
 - (A) Severe social, economic, or environmental impacts
 - (B) Severe disruption to established communities;
 - (C) Severe disproportionate impacts to minority or low income populations; or
 - (D) Severe impacts to environmental resources protected under other Federal statutes;
- (iv) It results in additional construction, maintenance, or operational costs of an extraordinary magnitude;
- (v) It causes other unique problems or unusual factors; or
- (vi) It involves multiple factors in paragraphs (3)(i) through (3)(v) of this definition, that while individually minor, cumulatively cause unique problems or impacts of extraordinary magnitude.

A marketing exemption was deemed appropriate for this bridge (see Appendix A for marketing exemption correspondence). Therefore, the *New Location Alternative* is not prudent due to safety and operational issues and the impact to the bridge’s historic integrity.

6 How will the ARDOT mitigate for the harm being done to the historic property?

The FHWA and the SHPO reached an agreement through the Section 106 process (36 CFR 800) of NHPA (16 U.S.C. 470) on measures to minimize harm. These measures have been incorporated into this project. Through a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA), it was agreed that the historic Elmo Creek Bridge would be documented to the Arkansas Historic Preservation Program’s (AHPP) architectural documentation standards and then demolished. A copy of the MOA, which includes all agreed upon mitigation stipulations, can be found in Appendix B.

7 What are the findings of the alternatives analysis and this evaluation?

Table 2 contains a summary of the analysis and decision-making information included in this evaluation.

Table 2
Section 4(f) Analysis Summary

Alternative	Feasible	Prudent	Uses Section 4(f) Property	Harm to Section 4(f) Property
No Action	Yes	No	No	None
Rehabilitation One	No	No	Yes	Adverse Effect
Rehabilitation Two	No	No	Yes	Adverse Effect
New Location	Yes	No	Yes	Adverse Effect

Based on the above considerations, there is no feasible and prudent alternative to the use of the historic bridge. The proposed action includes all possible planning to minimize the harm to the historic bridge resulting from such use.

8 What are the recommendations on this project?

ARDOT recommends that the Elmo Creek Bridge be documented to AHPP architectural documentation standards and demolished as agreed to under the stipulations set forth in the MOA (Appendix B).

The above documentation illustrates that the proposed project complies with all requirements of the Programmatic Section 4(f) Evaluation for Federal-aid highway projects that require the use of a historic bridge.

Appendix A: Marketing Exemption Correspondence



ARKANSAS DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

ArDOT.gov | IDriveArkansas.com | Scott E. Bennett, P.E., Director

10324 Interstate 30 | P.O. Box 2261 | Little Rock, AR 72203-2261

Phone: 501.569.2000 | Voice/TTY 711 | Fax: 501.569.2400

September 24, 2019

Ms. Stacy Hurst
Arkansas Historic Preservation Program
1100 North Street
Little Rock, Arkansas 72201

RE: Historic Bridge M2364
Job Number 040779
Elmo Creek Str. & Apprs. (S)
Route 220, Section 2
Crawford County
Historic Bridge Marketing
Exemption Request

Dear Ms. Hurst:

The Arkansas Department of Transportation (ARDOT) is planning to replace Bridge Number M2364 (Elmo Creek Bridge) on Highway 220 in Crawford County. In 2013, the ARDOT (previously the Arkansas State Highway and Transportation Department) submitted Bridge Number M2364 on a list of exceptional post-war bridges as part of the implementation of the *Advisory Council on Historic Preservation's Program Comment for Common Post-1945 Concrete and Steel Bridges*; therefore, it is eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places. A location map for the bridge is enclosed.

The Fixing America's Surface Transportation (FAST) Act, 23 USC § 144 (g)(5) states: "Any State which proposes to demolish a historic bridge for a replacement project ... shall first make the bridge available for donation to a State, locality, or responsible private entity..." Through the Section 4(f) evaluation process, the ARDOT has determined that using the same alignment the historic bridge currently occupies is the prudent and feasible option (see enclosure). In accordance with the FAST Act, the ARDOT would generally offer the bridge for donation to a responsible entity willing to accept it at a new location.

The Elmo Creek Bridge was constructed as a steel stringer/multi-beam bridge on stone abutments. This construction method cannot be disassembled and relocated without destroying the historic integrity of the bridge. In the meeting on January 14, 2016, which

included representatives for the Arkansas Historic Preservation Program, the ARDOT, and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), it was agreed to discuss the marketing of immovable bridges for relocation on a case-by-case basis to determine if omitting the marketing process was suitable. Presenting an immovable bridge for donation to the public with relocation as the only option for preservation is disingenuous. The ARDOT requests your concurrence that an exemption from marketing this bridge is appropriate.

If you have questions about the bridge or marketing process, please contact Nikki Senn of my staff at (501) 569-2979.

Sincerely,





John Fleming
Division Head
Environmental Division

Enclosures

JF:NS:cb


c: Assistant Chief Engineer - Planning

Bridge Division
District 4 Engineer
FHWA



ARDOT - Environmental GIS - Hopkins
September 16, 2019

Historic Bridge Crawford County

 Project Location



THE DEPARTMENT OF ARKANSAS
HERITAGE

Asa Hutchinson
Governor

Stacy Hurst
Secretary
Parks, Heritage & Tourism

Arkansas Arts Council

Arkansas Historic
Preservation Program

Arkansas Natural
Heritage Commission

Arkansas State Archives

Delta Cultural Center

Historic Arkansas Museum

Mosaic Templars Cultural Center

Old State House Museum



1100 North Street
Little Rock, AR 72201

(501) 324-9880
fax: (501) 324-9184

info@arkansaspreservation.org
www.arkansaspreservation.com

An Equal Opportunity Employer

September 26, 2019

Mr. John Fleming
Division Head
Environmental Division
Arkansas Department of Transportation
PO Box 2261
Little Rock, AR 72203-2261

RE: Crawford County – General
Section 106 Review – FHWA
Request for Historic Bridge Marketing Exemption
ARDOT Job Number 040779
Elmo Creek Str. & Apprs.
Route 220, Section 2
AHPP Tracking Number 103893.01

Dear Mr. Fleming:

This letter is written in response to your letter of September 24, 2019. The staff of the Arkansas Historic Preservation Program (AHPP) agrees that moving ARDOT Bridge Number M2364 would destroy the historic integrity of the bridge. Therefore, we concur that an exemption from marketing this bridge is appropriate.

Tribes that have expressed an interest in the area include the Cherokee Nation (Ms. Elizabeth Toombs), the Chickasaw Nation (Ms. Karen Brunso), the Choctaw Nation of Oklahoma (Ms. Madison Currie), the Muscogee (Creek) Nation (Ms. Corain Lowe-Zepeda), the Osage Nation (Dr. Andrea Hunter), the Quapaw Nation (Mr. Everett Bandy), the Shawnee Tribe (Ms. Tonya Tipton), and the United Keetoowah Band of Cherokee Indians (Ms. Erin Thompson and Charlotte Wolfe). We recommend that they be consulted in accordance with 36 CFR § 800.2 (c) (2).

Thank you for the opportunity to review this undertaking. If you have any questions, please call Theresa Russell of my staff at (501)-324-9357. Please refer to the AHPP Tracking Number listed above in all correspondence.

Sincerely,

Scott Kaufman
Director, AHPP

cc: Mr. Randal Looney, Federal Highway Administration
Dr. Ann Early, Arkansas Archeological Survey

Appendix B: Memorandum of Agreement

MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT
AMONG THE
FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION,
THE ARKANSAS DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
AND THE ARKANSAS STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICER
REGARDING
ARDOT JOB NUMBER 040779
ELMO CREEK STR. & APPRS.
HIGHWAY 220, CRAWFORD COUNTY, ARKANSAS
ARDOT BRIDGE NUMBER M2364

WHEREAS, the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arkansas Department of Transportation (ARDOT) wish to construct a new bridge across Elmo Creek along Highway 220 in Crawford County; and the old Elmo Creek Bridge (Bridge), also known as Bridge Number M2364, will be demolished as part of completing ARDOT Job Number 040779; and

WHEREAS, the Bridge is an historic property determined eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) through consultation with the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO); and

WHEREAS, in consultation with the FHWA, the ARDOT requested an exemption from marketing the Bridge, as the bridge was designed in such a way that it cannot be relocated without destroying its historic integrity; therefore, it is immovable (Appendix A); and

WHEREAS, the SHPO concurred that a marketing exemption was appropriate and relocating the Bridge would destroy its historic integrity; and

WHEREAS, through the Programmatic Section 4(f) Evaluation process the FHWA has determined that no feasible and prudent alternative to the demolition of the historic bridge exists; and

WHEREAS, the FHWA has determined that this undertaking will have an adverse effect on a historic property and in accordance with the 36 Code of Federal Regulation (CFR) Part (§) 800, regulations implementing Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) of 1966, as amended [54 United States Code (USC) 306108], must address this effect; and

WHEREAS, the definitions set forth in 36 CFR § 800.16 are applicable throughout this Memorandum of Agreement (MOA); and

ARDOT Job Number 040779
Memorandum of Agreement
Page 2 of 8

WHEREAS, the FHWA has consulted with the Caddo Nation, the Cherokee Nation, the United Keetoowah Band of Cherokee Indians in Oklahoma, the Choctaw Nation of Oklahoma, the Osage Nation, and the Quapaw Nation for which the Bridge or sites and properties in the immediate area might have religious and cultural significance; and

WHEREAS, in accordance with 36 CFR § 800.6(a)(1), the FHWA has notified the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) of its adverse effect determination with specified documentation, and the ACHP has chosen not to participate in the consultation pursuant to 36 CFR § 800.6(a)(1)(iii); and

NOW THEREFORE, the FHWA, the ARDOT, and the SHPO agree that the undertaking shall be implemented in accordance with the following stipulations in order to take into account the adverse effect of this undertaking on the Bridge.

STIPULATIONS

The FHWA, through the ARDOT, shall ensure that the following stipulations are carried out.

- I. MITIGATION OF ADVERSE EFFECT TO THE HISTORIC PROPERTY
 - A. The ARDOT will produce architectural documentation for the Bridge that meets the Secretary of the Interior's *Standards and Guidelines for Archeology and Historic Preservation* set forth in 48 FR 44716 and the Arkansas Historic Preservation Program's (AHPP) 2016 *Survey Procedures Manual: Guidelines for Historic and Architectural Surveys in Arkansas*. Documentation for the Bridge will include the AHPP Arkansas Architectural Resources Form and color digital photographs.
 - B. The documentation will be provided for curation to the AHPP, the Arkansas State Library, the Arkansas Studies Institute, the Arkansas State Archives, and the Torreyson Library at the University of Central Arkansas.
 - C. The Bridge will be laser scanned and a three-dimensional digital model of the Bridge will be created and housed in the Historic Bridge Program Section of the ARDOT website.
 - D. No construction will be undertaken on the historic property until all fieldwork portions of the required mitigation have been completed.

ARDOT Job Number 040779
Memorandum of Agreement
Page 3 of 8

E. The FHWA shall ensure that adequate time and funding are provided in order to carry out all aspects of the required mitigation.

II. HUMAN REMAINS

Human remains are not expected to be discovered on this undertaking; however, if they are encountered during implementation of the project, all activity in the vicinity of the discovery shall cease. The treatment of human remains shall follow the guidelines developed for the *Arkansas Burial Law* (Act 753 of 1991, as amended) and the ACHP's *Policy Statement Regarding Treatment of Burial Sites, Human Remains, and Funerary Objects* published February 23, 2007. As such a permit will be obtained from the AHPP prior to exaction of any remains.

III. DURATION

This MOA will expire if its terms are not carried out within ten (10) years from the date of its execution. Prior to such time, the FHWA may consult with the other signatories to reconsider the terms of the MOA and amend it in accordance with Stipulation VIII below.

IV. PROFESSIONAL QUALIFICATIONS STANDARDS

The FHWA shall ensure that all archeological investigations and other historic preservation activities pursuant to this MOA are carried out by, or under the direct supervision of, a person or persons meeting the appropriate qualifications set forth in the Secretary of the Interior's professional qualification standards (36 CFR Part 61).

V. POST-REVIEW DISCOVERY SITUATIONS

Pursuant to 36 CFR § 800.13, if cultural material is discovered during implementation of the project, the FHWA shall ensure that all construction activities cease in the area of the discovery and the consulting parties are notified. The FHWA, in consultation with the SHPO, shall determine if the discovery is eligible for inclusion in the NRHP. If so, the FHWA and the ARDOT will develop a treatment plan for historic properties which shall be reviewed by the SHPO. Disputes arising from such review shall be resolved in accordance with Stipulation VI.

ARDOT Job Number 040779
Memorandum of Agreement
Page 4 of 8

VI. DISPUTE RESOLUTION

Should the SHPO or any consulting party to this MOA object within thirty (30) calendar days to any findings, proposed actions or determinations made pursuant to this MOA, the FHWA shall consult with the objecting party to resolve the objection. If the FHWA determines that the objection cannot be resolved, it shall request further comments from the ACHP pursuant to 36 CFR § 800.7. Any ACHP comment provided in response to such a request shall be taken into account by the FHWA in accordance with 36 CFR § 800.6(b)(2) with reference only to the subject of the dispute; the FHWA's responsibility to carry out all actions under this MOA that are not subject to dispute shall remain unchanged.

VII. MONITORING

The consulting parties or one or more parties in cooperation may monitor the undertaking and stipulations carried out pursuant to this MOA.

VIII. AMENDING THE MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT

Should any of the signatories to this MOA believe that the terms of this MOA are not being met or cannot be met, that party shall immediately notify the other signatories and request consultation to amend this MOA in accordance with 36 CFR § 800.6. The process to amend this MOA shall be conducted in a manner similar to that leading to the execution of this MOA.

IX. TERMINATING THE MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT

If any signatory to this MOA determines that its terms of this MOA will not or cannot be carried out, that party shall immediately consult with other signatories to attempt to develop an amendment per Stipulation VIII, above. If within thirty (30) days an amendment cannot be reached, any signatory may terminate the MOA upon written notification to the other signatories. In the event of termination, the FHWA shall comply with 36 CFR § 800.4 through 800.6 with regard to the undertaking covered by this MOA.

X. FAILURE TO CARRY OUT THE MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT

In the event that the FHWA does not carry out the terms of this MOA, the FHWA shall comply with 36 CFR § 800.4 through 800.6 with regard to the undertaking covered by this MOA.

**ARDOT Job Number 040779
Memorandum of Agreement
Page 5 of 8**

XI. FULFILLMENT OF SECTION 106 RESPONSIBILITIES

Execution of this MOA and implementation of its terms evidences that the FHWA has taken into account the effect of the undertaking on the historic property and has fulfilled its Section 106 responsibilities under the NHPA of 1966, as amended.

Signatory

FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Pete Jilek", is written over a horizontal line.

Pete Jilek
Acting Arkansas Division Administrator

Date

ARDOT Job Number 040779 _____
Memorandum of Agreement
Page 7 of 8

Signatory

ARKANSAS STATE HISTORIC PRESERVATION OFFICE



Stacy Hurst
Arkansas State Historic Preservation Officer

11-3-19

Date

ARDOT Job Number 040779
Memorandum of Agreement
Page 8 of 8

Signatory

ARKANSAS DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION



11-18-2019

Scott E. Bennett, P.E.
Director

Date

~~MEB~~
SMB

**ARDOT ENVIRONMENTAL VERIFICATION CHECKLIST
FOR CONSIDERATION OF POTENTIAL IMPACTS**


ARDOT Job Number 040779 FAP Number NHPP-0017(45)

Job Title Elmo Creek Str. & Apprs. (S)

Environmental Resource	None	Minimal	Major	Comments-required for each item
Air Quality	X			No MSAT impacts anticipated
Cultural Resources	X			SHPO clearance attached
Economic	X			Will not be impacted by project
Endangered Species		X		"No Effect" and "LAA" determinations
Environmental Justice/Title VI	X			No protected populations in project area
Fish and Wildlife		X		Minimal during construction
Floodplains		X		Floodplain SP will be required
Forest Service Property	X			None in the project area
Hazardous Materials/Landfills		X		Illegal Dump SP will be required
Land Use	X			Will not be impacted by project
Migratory Birds		X		Migratory Bird SP included
Navigation/Coast Guard	X			None in the project area
Noise Levels	X			No increases due to project
Prime Farmland		X		0.83 acres impacted
Protected Waters		X		WPC SP; NRI coordination; IWQC required
Public Recreation Lands	X			None in project area
Public Water Supply/WHPA	X			None in the project area
Relocates	X			No relocations
Section 4(f)/6(f)		X		Programmatic 4(f) Evaluation attached
Social	X			No impacts to the social environment
Underground Storage Tanks	X			No USTs in project area
Visual	X			No changes to visual environment
Streams		X		Nationwide Permit 14 required
Water Quality		X		Temporary decline during construction
Wetlands	X			None in the project area
Wildlife Refuges	X			None in the project area

Section 401 Water Quality Certification Required? Yes
 Short-term Activity Authorization Required? Yes
 Section 404 Permit Required? Yes Type Nationwide 14

Remarks: WPC SP: Elmo creek is a tributary to Lee Creek, ERW and NRI waterbody. NRI coordination letter was sent on 12/17/19

Signature of Evaluator  Date March 11, 2020

ROADWAY DESIGN REQUEST

Job Number 040779 FAP No. NHPP-0017(45) County Crawford

Job Name Elmo Creek Str. & Apprs. (S)

Design Engineer George W. Davison *GWD* Environmental Staff _____

Brief Project Description Bridge Replacement

A. Existing Conditions:

Roadway Width: 26' Shoulder Type/Width: Unpaved / 3'

Number of Lanes and Width: 2-10' Existing Right-of-Way: None

Sidewalks? No Location: N/A Width: N/A

Bike Lanes? No Location: N/A Width: N/A

B. Proposed Conditions:

Roadway Width: 28' Shoulder Type/Width: 4'(2' paved)

Number of Lanes and Width: 2-10' Proposed Right-of-Way: 25'-155'

Sidewalks? No Location: N/A Width: N/A

Bike Lanes? No Location: N/A Width: N/A

C. Construction Information:

If detour: Where: Lt. Side of Const. Length: 0.170

D. Design Traffic Data:

2021 ADT: 440 2041 ADT: 550 % Trucks: 3

Design Speed: 30 m.p.h.

E. Approximate total length of project: 0.029 mile(s)

F. Justification for proposed improvements: Bridge is posted.

G. Total Relocatees: 0 Residences: 0 Businesses: 0

H. Have you coordinated with any outside agencies (e.g., FHWA, City, County, etc.)? No

Agency/Official	Person Contacted	Date



DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
LITTLE ROCK DISTRICT, CORPS OF ENGINEERS
POST OFFICE BOX 867
LITTLE ROCK, ARKANSAS 72203-0867
www.swl.usace.army.mil

June 15, 2022

Regulatory Division

NATIONWIDE PERMIT NO. SWL 2021-00310

Mr. John Fleming
Division Head, Environmental Division
Arkansas Department of Transportation
PO Box 2261
Little Rock, Arkansas 72203-2261

Dear Mr. Fleming:

Please refer to your recent request concerning Department of the Army permit requirements pursuant to Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. You requested authorization for the placement of dredged and fill material in waters of the United States associated with replacing a bridge over Elmo Creek and upgrading the approaches. Total length of the project is 0.03 miles and approximately 2.3 acres of additional right-of-way will be required. The project will replace the functionally obsolete bridge with a steel reinforced box culvert on existing alignment. The existing roadway consists of two 10-foot-wide travel lanes with 3-foot-wide shoulders. The upgraded roadway will consist of two 10-foot-wide travel lanes with 4-foot-wide shoulders. A temporary detour will be constructed approximately 70 feet downstream from the bridge for the maintenance of traffic. Permanent impacts to Elmo Creek will be approximately 107 linear feet. The project may affect and is likely to adversely affect the Indiana Bat (*Myotis sodalis*) and the Northern Long-eared Bat (*Myotis septentrionalis*). The project may affect but is not likely to adversely affect the Ozark Big-eared Bat (*Corynorhinus townsendii ingens*) and Gray Bat (*Myotis grisescens*). The existing bridge is eligible for the National Register of Historic Places and a Section 4(f) Evaluation and Memorandum of Agreement were completed. On March 11, 2020, the Federal Highway Administration determined that the project falls within the definition of a Tier 3 Categorical Exclusion under 23 Code of Federal Regulations, Section 771.117, and the ARDOT/Federal Highway Administration Memorandum of Agreement on the processing of Categorical Exclusions. The project is located north of Cedarville on State Highway 220, in section 1, T. 11 N., R. 32 W., Crawford County, Arkansas. A vicinity map and project location maps are enclosed.

The proposed activities are authorized by Department of the Army Nationwide Permit (NWP) **No. 14** (copy enclosed), provided that the following **Special Conditions** and General Conditions therein are met. For your convenience, we have highlighted the General Conditions of the NWP that are the most pertinent to your project. Please pay particular attention to General Condition No. 12 which stipulates that appropriate erosion and siltation controls be used during

construction and all exposed soil be permanently stabilized. Erosion control measures must be implemented before, during and after construction. You should become familiar with the conditions and maintain a copy of the permit at the worksite for ready reference. If changes are proposed in the design or location of the project, you should submit revised plans to this office for approval before construction of the change begins.

Special Conditions:

- 1. ArDOT agrees to prohibit the on-site clearing of trees from April 1 through November 15 to avoid potential impacts to the Northern Long-eared Bat and Indiana Bat.**
- 2. ArDOT agrees to consult with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service for any off-site tree cutting which would occur during the Northern Long-eared Bat and Indiana Bat summer active period, March 15 through November 14.**

We have also enclosed a copy of the Section 401 water quality certification issued by the Arkansas Department of Energy and Environment (ADEE). In addition to the specific criteria and conditions of the NWP, you must comply with the conditions specified in the certification as special conditions to this permit. If you have any questions concerning compliance with the conditions, you should contact Mr. Jim Wise or Mr. Joshua Nilz at the ADEE, Water Division, 5301 Northshore Drive, North Little Rock, Arkansas 72118, telephone (501) 682-0040.

Also, in order to fully comply with the conditions of the NWP, you must submit the enclosed compliance certification within 30 days of completion of the project. This is required pursuant to General Condition No. 30 of the permit.

The NWP determination will be valid until March 14, 2026. If NWP **No. 14** is modified, suspended, or revoked during this period, your project may not be authorized unless you have begun or are under contract to begin the project. If work has started or the work is under contract, you would then have twelve (12) months to complete the work.

Your cooperation in the Regulatory Program is appreciated. If you have any additional questions about this permit or any of its provisions, please contact Mr. Johnny McLean at (501) 324-5295 and refer to Permit No. **SWL 2021-00310, Elmo Creek Structure and Approaches on State Highway 220 (ArDOT Project No. 040779)**.

Sincerely,

Chris Joyner
Deputy Chief, Regulatory Division

Enclosures

Copy Furnished:

Mr. Jim Wise, Arkansas Department of Environmental Quality

Mr. Lindsey Lewis, U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service

Chief, Regulatory Enforcement

PERMITTEE COMPLIANCE CERTIFICATION

PERMIT NO.: SWL 2021-00310, Elmo Creek Structure and Approaches on State Highway 220 (ArDOT Project No. 040779)

NWP/S NO.: 14

PERMITTEE NAME: ArDOT

DATE OF ISSUANCE: _____

PROJECT MANAGER: Johnny McLean

Upon completion of the activity authorized by this permit and any mitigation required by the permit, sign this certification and return it to the following address:

**US Army Corps of Engineers, Little Rock
ATTENTION: CESWL-RD
PO Box 867
Little Rock, Arkansas 72203-0867**


Please note that your permitted activity is subject to a compliance inspection by a US Army Corps of Engineers representative. If you fail to comply with this permit, you are subject to permit suspension, modification, or revocation.

I hereby certify that the work authorized by the above referenced permit has been completed in accordance with the terms and conditions of the said permit, and required mitigation was completed in accordance with the permit conditions.


DATE WORK COMPLETED: _____

SIGNATURE OF PERMITTEE


DATE





NWP No. SWL 2021-00310
Arkansas Dept. of Transportation
Elmo Creek Structure & Approaches
State Hwy. 220 – Crawford County
June 2022 Sheet 1 of 3




Job 040779
Elmo Creek Str. & Apprs.
(Hwy. 220)
Crawford County







Str. #M2364
 Latitude: 35.6575
 Longitude: -94.3482




Scale - 1:24,000

ARDOT - Environmental GIS - Hopkins
 February 25, 2019

Job 040779
 Elmo Creek Str. & Apprs.
 (Hwy. 220)
 Crawford County

Sheet 3 of 3



USGS Topographic Map:
 Rudy NE 1983

Nationwide Permit No. 14

Linear Transportation Projects. Activities required for crossings of waters of the United States associated with the construction, expansion, modification, or improvement of linear transportation projects (e.g., roads, highways, railways, trails, driveways, airport runways, and taxiways) in waters of the United States. For linear transportation projects in non-tidal waters, the discharge of dredged or fill material cannot cause the loss of greater than 1/2-acre of waters of the United States. For linear transportation projects in tidal waters, the discharge of dredged or fill material cannot cause the loss of greater than 1/3-acre of waters of the United States. Any stream channel modification, including bank stabilization, is limited to the minimum necessary to construct or protect the linear transportation project; such modifications must be in the immediate vicinity of the project.

This NWP also authorizes temporary structures, fills, and work, including the use of temporary mats, necessary to construct the linear transportation project. Appropriate measures must be taken to maintain normal downstream flows and minimize flooding to the maximum extent practicable, when temporary structures, work, and discharges of dredged or fill material, including cofferdams, are necessary for construction activities, access fills, or dewatering of construction sites. Temporary fills must consist of materials, and be placed in a manner, that will not be eroded by expected high flows. Temporary fills must be removed in their entirety and the affected areas returned to pre-construction elevations. The areas affected by temporary fills must be revegetated, as appropriate.

This NWP cannot be used to authorize non-linear features commonly associated with transportation projects, such as vehicle maintenance or storage buildings, parking lots, train stations, or aircraft hangars.

Notification: The permittee must submit a pre-construction notification to the district engineer prior to commencing the activity if: (1) the loss of waters of the United States exceeds 1/10-acre; or (2) there is a discharge of dredged or fill material in a special aquatic site, including wetlands. (See general condition 32.) (Authorities: Sections 10 and 404)

Note 1: For linear transportation projects crossing a single waterbody more than one time at separate and distant locations, or multiple waterbodies at separate and distant locations, each crossing is considered a single and complete project for purposes of NWP

authorization. Linear transportation projects must comply with 33 CFR 330.6(d).

Note 2: Some discharges of dredged or fill material for the construction of farm roads or forest roads, or temporary roads for moving mining equipment, may qualify for an exemption under Section 404(f) of the Clean Water Act (see 33 CFR 323.4).

Note 3: For NWP 14 activities that require pre-construction notification, the PCN must include any other NWP(s), regional general permit(s), or individual permit(s) used or intended to be used to authorize any part of the proposed project or any related activity, including other separate and distant crossings that require Department of the Army authorization but do not require pre-construction notification (see paragraph (b)(4) of general condition 32). The district engineer will evaluate the PCN in accordance with Section D, "District Engineer's Decision." The district engineer may require mitigation to ensure that the authorized activity results in no more than minimal individual and cumulative adverse environmental effects (see general condition 23)

2021 Nationwide Permit General Conditions

Note: To qualify for NWP authorization, the prospective permittee must comply with the following general conditions, as applicable, in addition to any regional or case-specific conditions imposed by the division engineer or district engineer. Prospective permittees should contact the appropriate Corps district office to determine if regional conditions have been imposed on an NWP. Prospective permittees should also contact the appropriate Corps district office to determine the status of Clean Water Act Section 401 water quality certification and/or Coastal Zone Management Act consistency for an NWP. Every person who may wish to obtain permit authorization under one or more NWPs, or who is currently relying on an existing or prior permit authorization under one or more NWPs, has been and is on notice that all of the provisions of 33 CFR 330.1 through 330.6 apply to every NWP authorization. Note especially 33 CFR 330.5 relating to the modification, suspension, or revocation of any NWP authorization.

1. **Navigation.** (a) No activity may cause more than a minimal adverse effect on navigation.

(b) Any safety lights and signals prescribed by the U.S. Coast Guard, through regulations or otherwise, must be installed and maintained at the permittee's

expense on authorized facilities in navigable waters of the United States.

(c) The permittee understands and agrees that, if future operations by the United States require the removal, relocation, or other alteration, of the structure or work herein authorized, or if, in the opinion of the Secretary of the Army or his or her authorized representative, said structure or work shall cause unreasonable obstruction to the free navigation of the navigable waters, the permittee will be required, upon due notice from the Corps of Engineers, to remove, relocate, or alter the structural work or obstructions caused thereby, without expense to the United States. No claim shall be made against the United States on account of any such removal or alteration.

2. Aquatic Life Movements. No activity may substantially disrupt the necessary life cycle movements of those species of aquatic life indigenous to the waterbody, including those species that normally migrate through the area, unless the activity's primary purpose is to impound water. All permanent and temporary crossings of waterbodies shall be suitably culverted, bridged, or otherwise designed and constructed to maintain low flows to sustain the movement of those aquatic species. If a bottomless culvert cannot be used, then the crossing should be designed and constructed to minimize adverse effects to aquatic life movements.

3. Spawning Areas. Activities in spawning areas during spawning seasons must be avoided to the maximum extent practicable. Activities that result in the physical destruction (e.g., through excavation, fill, or downstream smothering by substantial turbidity) of an important spawning area are not authorized.

4. Migratory Bird Breeding Areas. Activities in waters of the United States that serve as breeding areas for migratory birds must be avoided to the maximum extent practicable.

5. Shellfish Beds. No activity may occur in areas of concentrated shellfish populations, unless the activity is directly related to a shellfish harvesting activity authorized by NWP 4 and 48 or is a shellfish seeding or habitat restoration activity authorized by NWP 27.

6. Suitable Material. No activity may use unsuitable material (e.g., trash, debris, car bodies, asphalt, etc.). Material used for construction or discharged must be

free from toxic pollutants in toxic amounts (see section 307 of the Clean Water Act).

7. Water Supply Intakes. No activity may occur in the proximity of a public water supply intake, except where the activity is for the repair or improvement of public water supply intake structures or adjacent bank stabilization.

8. Adverse Effects From Impoundments. If the activity creates an impoundment of water, adverse effects to the aquatic system due to accelerating the passage of water, and/or restricting its flow must be minimized to the maximum extent practicable.

9. Management of Water Flows. To the maximum extent practicable, the pre-construction course, condition, capacity, and location of open waters must be maintained for each activity, including stream channelization, storm water management activities, and temporary and permanent road crossings, except as provided below. The activity must be constructed to withstand expected high flows. The activity must not restrict or impede the passage of normal or high flows, unless the primary purpose of the activity is to impound water or manage high flows. The activity may alter the pre-construction course, condition, capacity, and location of open waters if it benefits the aquatic environment (e.g., stream restoration or relocation activities).

10. Fills Within 100-Year Floodplains. The activity must comply with applicable FEMA-approved state or local floodplain management requirements.

11. Equipment. Heavy equipment working in wetlands or mudflats must be placed on mats, or other measures must be taken to minimize soil disturbance.

12. Soil Erosion and Sediment Controls. Appropriate soil erosion and sediment controls must be used and maintained in effective operating condition during construction, and all exposed soil and other fills, as well as any work below the ordinary high water mark or high tide line, must be permanently stabilized at the earliest practicable date. Permittees are encouraged to perform work within waters of the United States during periods of low-flow or no-flow, or during low tides.

13. Removal of Temporary Structures and Fills. Temporary structures must be removed, to the maximum extent practicable, after their use has been discontinued. Temporary fills must be removed in their entirety and the affected areas returned to pre-

construction elevations. The affected areas must be revegetated, as appropriate.

14. Proper Maintenance. Any authorized structure or fill shall be properly maintained, including maintenance to ensure public safety and compliance with applicable NWP general conditions, as well as any activity-specific conditions added by the district engineer to an NWP authorization.

15. Single and Complete Project. The activity must be a single and complete project. The same NWP cannot be used more than once for the same single and complete project.

16. Wild and Scenic Rivers. (a) No NWP activity may occur in a component of the National Wild and Scenic River System, or in a river officially designated by Congress as a “study river” for possible inclusion in the system while the river is in an official study status, unless the appropriate Federal agency with direct management responsibility for such river, has determined in writing that the proposed activity will not adversely affect the Wild and Scenic River designation or study status.

(b) If a proposed NWP activity will occur in a component of the National Wild and Scenic River System, or in a river officially designated by Congress as a “study river” for possible inclusion in the system while the river is in an official study status, the permittee must submit a pre-construction notification (see general condition 32). The district engineer will coordinate the PCN with the Federal agency with direct management responsibility for that river. Permittees shall not begin the NWP activity until notified by the district engineer that the Federal agency with direct management responsibility for that river has determined in writing that the proposed NWP activity will not adversely affect the Wild and Scenic River designation or study status.

(c) Information on Wild and Scenic Rivers may be obtained from the appropriate Federal land management agency responsible for the designated Wild and Scenic River or study river (e.g., National Park Service, U.S. Forest Service, Bureau of Land Management, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service). Information on these rivers is also available at: <http://www.rivers.gov/>.

17. Tribal Rights. No activity or its operation may impair reserved tribal rights, including, but not limited to, reserved water rights and treaty fishing and hunting rights.

18. Endangered Species. (a) No activity is authorized under any NWP which is likely to directly or indirectly jeopardize the continued existence of a threatened or endangered species or a species proposed for such designation, as identified under the Federal Endangered Species Act (ESA), or which will directly or indirectly destroy or adversely modify designated critical habitat or critical habitat proposed for such designation. No activity is authorized under any NWP which “may affect” a listed species or critical habitat, unless ESA section 7 consultation addressing the consequences of the proposed activity on listed species or critical habitat has been completed. See 50 CFR 402.02 for the definition of “effects of the action” for the purposes of ESA section 7 consultation, as well as 50 CFR 402.17, which provides further explanation under ESA section 7 regarding “activities that are reasonably certain to occur” and “consequences caused by the proposed action.”

(b) Federal agencies should follow their own procedures for complying with the requirements of the ESA (see 33 CFR 330.4(f)(1)). If pre-construction notification is required for the proposed activity, the Federal permittee must provide the district engineer with the appropriate documentation to demonstrate compliance with those requirements. The district engineer will verify that the appropriate documentation has been submitted. If the appropriate documentation has not been submitted, additional ESA section 7 consultation may be necessary for the activity and the respective federal agency would be responsible for fulfilling its obligation under section 7 of the ESA.

(c) Non-federal permittees must submit a pre-construction notification to the district engineer if any listed species (or species proposed for listing) or designated critical habitat (or critical habitat proposed such designation) might be affected or is in the vicinity of the activity, or if the activity is located in designated critical habitat or critical habitat proposed for such designation, and shall not begin work on the activity until notified by the district engineer that the requirements of the ESA have been satisfied and that the activity is authorized. For activities that might affect Federally-listed endangered or threatened species (or species proposed for listing) or designated critical habitat (or critical habitat proposed for such designation), the pre-construction notification must include the name(s) of the endangered or threatened species (or species proposed for listing) that might be affected by the proposed activity or that utilize the designated critical habitat (or critical habitat proposed for such

designation) that might be affected by the proposed activity. The district engineer will determine whether the proposed activity “may affect” or will have “no effect” to listed species and designated critical habitat and will notify the non-Federal applicant of the Corps’ determination within 45 days of receipt of a complete pre-construction notification. For activities where the non-Federal applicant has identified listed species (or species proposed for listing) or designated critical habitat (or critical habitat proposed for such designation) that might be affected or is in the vicinity of the activity, and has so notified the Corps, the applicant shall not begin work until the Corps has provided notification that the proposed activity will have “no effect” on listed species (or species proposed for listing or designated critical habitat (or critical habitat proposed for such designation), or until ESA section 7 consultation or conference has been completed. If the non-Federal applicant has not heard back from the Corps within 45 days, the applicant must still wait for notification from the Corps.

(d) As a result of formal or informal consultation or conference with the FWS or NMFS the district engineer may add species-specific permit conditions to the NWP.

(e) Authorization of an activity by an NWP does not authorize the “take” of a threatened or endangered species as defined under the ESA. In the absence of separate authorization (e.g., an ESA Section 10 Permit, a Biological Opinion with “incidental take” provisions, etc.) from the FWS or the NMFS, the Endangered Species Act prohibits any person subject to the jurisdiction of the United States to take a listed species, where “take” means to harass, harm, pursue, hunt, shoot, wound, kill, trap, capture, or collect, or to attempt to engage in any such conduct. The word “harm” in the definition of “take” means an act which actually kills or injures wildlife. Such an act may include significant habitat modification or degradation where it actually kills or injures wildlife by significantly impairing essential behavioral patterns, including breeding, feeding or sheltering.

(f) If the non-federal permittee has a valid ESA section 10(a)(1)(B) incidental take permit with an approved Habitat Conservation Plan for a project or a group of projects that includes the proposed NWP activity, the non-federal applicant should provide a copy of that ESA section 10(a)(1)(B) permit with the PCN required by paragraph (c) of this general condition. The district engineer will coordinate with the agency that issued the ESA section 10(a)(1)(B) permit to determine whether the proposed NWP

activity and the associated incidental take were considered in the internal ESA section 7 consultation conducted for the ESA section 10(a)(1)(B) permit. If that coordination results in concurrence from the agency that the proposed NWP activity and the associated incidental take were considered in the internal ESA section 7 consultation for the ESA section 10(a)(1)(B) permit, the district engineer does not need to conduct a separate ESA section 7 consultation for the proposed NWP activity. The district engineer will notify the non-federal applicant within 45 days of receipt of a complete pre-construction notification whether the ESA section 10(a)(1)(B) permit covers the proposed NWP activity or whether additional ESA section 7 consultation is required.

(g) Information on the location of threatened and endangered species and their critical habitat can be obtained directly from the offices of the FWS and NMFS or their world wide web pages at <http://www.fws.gov/> or <http://www.fws.gov/ipac> and <http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/pr/species/esa/> respectively.

19. Migratory Birds and Bald and Golden Eagles. The permittee is responsible for ensuring that an action authorized by an NWP complies with the Migratory Bird Treaty Act and the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act. The permittee is responsible for contacting the appropriate local office of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service to determine what measures, if any, are necessary or appropriate to reduce adverse effects to migratory birds or eagles, including whether “incidental take” permits are necessary and available under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act or Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act for a particular activity.

20. Historic Properties. (a) No activity is authorized under any NWP which may have the potential to cause effects to properties listed, or eligible for listing, in the National Register of Historic Places until the requirements of Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) have been satisfied.

(b) Federal permittees should follow their own procedures for complying with the requirements of section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (see 33 CFR 330.4(g)(1)). If pre-construction notification is required for the proposed NWP activity, the Federal permittee must provide the district engineer with the appropriate documentation to demonstrate compliance with those requirements. The district engineer will verify that the appropriate

documentation has been submitted. If the appropriate documentation is not submitted, then additional consultation under section 106 may be necessary. The respective federal agency is responsible for fulfilling its obligation to comply with section 106.

(c) Non-federal permittees must submit a pre-construction notification to the district engineer if the NWP activity might have the potential to cause effects to any historic properties listed on, determined to be eligible for listing on, or potentially eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places, including previously unidentified properties. For such activities, the pre-construction notification must state which historic properties might have the potential to be affected by the proposed NWP activity or include a vicinity map indicating the location of the historic properties or the potential for the presence of historic properties. Assistance regarding information on the location of, or potential for, the presence of historic properties can be sought from the State Historic Preservation Officer, Tribal Historic Preservation Officer, or designated tribal representative, as appropriate, and the National Register of Historic Places (see 33 CFR 330.4(g)). When reviewing pre-construction notifications, district engineers will comply with the current procedures for addressing the requirements of section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. The district engineer shall make a reasonable and good faith effort to carry out appropriate identification efforts commensurate with potential impacts, which may include background research, consultation, oral history interviews, sample field investigation, and/or field survey. Based on the information submitted in the PCN and these identification efforts, the district engineer shall determine whether the proposed NWP activity has the potential to cause effects on the historic properties. Section 106 consultation is not required when the district engineer determines that the activity does not have the potential to cause effects on historic properties (see 36 CFR 800.3(a)). Section 106 consultation is required when the district engineer determines that the activity has the potential to cause effects on historic properties. The district engineer will conduct consultation with consulting parties identified under 36 CFR 800.2(c) when he or she makes any of the following effect determinations for the purposes of section 106 of the NHPA: no historic properties affected, no adverse effect, or adverse effect.

(d) Where the non-Federal applicant has identified historic properties on which the proposed NWP activity might have the potential to cause effects and has so notified the Corps, the non-Federal applicant

shall not begin the activity until notified by the district engineer either that the activity has no potential to cause effects to historic properties or that NHPA section 106 consultation has been completed. For non-federal permittees, the district engineer will notify the prospective permittee within 45 days of receipt of a complete pre-construction notification whether NHPA section 106 consultation is required. If NHPA section 106 consultation is required, the district engineer will notify the non-Federal applicant that he or she cannot begin the activity until section 106 consultation is completed. If the non-Federal applicant has not heard back from the Corps within 45 days, the applicant must still wait for notification from the Corps.

(e) Prospective permittees should be aware that section 110k of the NHPA (54 U.S.C. 306113) prevents the Corps from granting a permit or other assistance to an applicant who, with intent to avoid the requirements of section 106 of the NHPA, has intentionally significantly adversely affected a historic property to which the permit would relate, or having legal power to prevent it, allowed such significant adverse effect to occur, unless the Corps, after consultation with the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP), determines that circumstances justify granting such assistance despite the adverse effect created or permitted by the applicant. If circumstances justify granting the assistance, the Corps is required to notify the ACHP and provide documentation specifying the circumstances, the degree of damage to the integrity of any historic properties affected, and proposed mitigation. This documentation must include any views obtained from the applicant, SHPO/THPO, appropriate Indian tribes if the undertaking occurs on or affects historic properties on tribal lands or affects properties of interest to those tribes, and other parties known to have a legitimate interest in the impacts to the permitted activity on historic properties.

21. Discovery of Previously Unknown Remains and Artifacts. Permittees that discover any previously unknown historic, cultural, or archeological remains and artifacts while accomplishing the activity authorized by an NWP, they must immediately notify the district engineer of what they have found, and to the maximum extent practicable, avoid construction activities that may affect the remains and artifacts until the required coordination has been completed. The district engineer will initiate the Federal, Tribal, and state coordination required to determine if the items or remains warrant a recovery effort or if the site is eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places.

22. Designated Critical Resource Waters. Critical resource waters include, NOAA-managed marine sanctuaries and marine monuments, and National Estuarine Research Reserves. The district engineer may designate, after notice and opportunity for public comment, additional waters officially designated by a state as having particular environmental or ecological significance, such as outstanding national resource waters or state natural heritage sites. The district engineer may also designate additional critical resource waters after notice and opportunity for public comment.

(a) Discharges of dredged or fill material into waters of the United States are not authorized by NWP's 7, 12, 14, 16, 17, 21, 29, 31, 35, 39, 40, 42, 43, 44, 49, 50, 51, 52, 57 and 58 for any activity within, or directly affecting, critical resource waters, including wetlands adjacent to such waters.

(b) For NWP's 3, 8, 10, 13, 15, 18, 19, 22, 23, 25, 27, 28, 30, 33, 34, 36, 37, 38, and 54, notification is required in accordance with general condition 32, for any activity proposed by permittees in the designated critical resource waters including wetlands adjacent to those waters. The district engineer may authorize activities under these NWP's only after she or he determines that the impacts to the critical resource waters will be no more than minimal.

23. Mitigation. The district engineer will consider the following factors when determining appropriate and practicable mitigation necessary to ensure that the individual and cumulative adverse environmental effects are no more than minimal:

(a) The activity must be designed and constructed to avoid and minimize adverse effects, both temporary and permanent, to waters of the United States to the maximum extent practicable at the project site (i.e., on site).

(b) Mitigation in all its forms (avoiding, minimizing, rectifying, reducing, or compensating for resource losses) will be required to the extent necessary to ensure that the individual and cumulative adverse environmental effects are no more than minimal.

(c) Compensatory mitigation at a minimum one-for-one ratio will be required for all wetland losses that exceed 1/10-acre and require pre-construction notification, unless the district engineer determines in writing that either some other form of mitigation would be more environmentally appropriate, or the adverse environmental effects of the proposed activity are no more than minimal and provides an

activity-specific waiver of this requirement. For wetland losses of 1/10-acre or less that require pre-construction notification, the district engineer may determine on a case-by-case basis that compensatory mitigation is required to ensure that the activity results in only minimal adverse environmental effects.

(d) Compensatory mitigation at a minimum one-for-one ratio will be required for all losses of stream bed that exceed 3/100-acre and require pre-construction notification, unless the district engineer determines in writing that either some other form of mitigation would be more environmentally appropriate, or the adverse environmental effects of the proposed activity are no more than minimal and provides an activity-specific waiver of this requirement. This compensatory mitigation requirement may be satisfied through the restoration or enhancement of riparian areas next to streams in accordance with paragraph (e) of this general condition. For losses of stream bed of 3/100-acre or less that require pre-construction notification, the district engineer may determine on a case-by-case basis that compensatory mitigation is required to ensure that the activity results in only minimal adverse environmental effects. Compensatory mitigation for losses of streams should be provided, if practicable, through stream rehabilitation, enhancement, or preservation since streams are difficult-to-replace resources (see 33 CFR 332.3(e)(3)).

(e) Compensatory mitigation plans for NWP activities in or near streams or other open waters will normally include a requirement for the restoration or enhancement, maintenance, and legal protection (e.g., conservation easements) of riparian areas next to open waters. In some cases, the restoration or maintenance/protection of riparian areas may be the only compensatory mitigation required. If restoring riparian areas involves planting vegetation, only native species should be planted. The width of the required riparian area will address documented water quality or aquatic habitat loss concerns. Normally, the riparian area will be 25 to 50 feet wide on each side of the stream, but the district engineer may require slightly wider riparian areas to address documented water quality or habitat loss concerns. If it is not possible to restore or maintain/protect a riparian area on both sides of a stream, or if the waterbody is a lake or coastal waters, then restoring or maintaining/protecting a riparian area along a single bank or shoreline may be sufficient. Where both wetlands and open waters exist on the project site, the district engineer will determine the appropriate compensatory mitigation (e.g., riparian

areas and/or wetlands compensation) based on what is best for the aquatic environment on a watershed basis. In cases where riparian areas are determined to be the most appropriate form of minimization or compensatory mitigation, the district engineer may waive or reduce the requirement to provide wetland compensatory mitigation for wetland losses.

(f) Compensatory mitigation projects provided to offset losses of aquatic resources must comply with the applicable provisions of 33 CFR part 332.

(1) The prospective permittee is responsible for proposing an appropriate compensatory mitigation option if compensatory mitigation is necessary to ensure that the activity results in no more than minimal adverse environmental effects. For the NWP, the preferred mechanism for providing compensatory mitigation is mitigation bank credits or in-lieu fee program credits (see 33 CFR 332.3(b)(2) and (3)). However, if an appropriate number and type of mitigation bank or in-lieu credits are not available at the time the PCN is submitted to the district engineer, the district engineer may approve the use of permittee-responsible mitigation.

(2) The amount of compensatory mitigation required by the district engineer must be sufficient to ensure that the authorized activity results in no more than minimal individual and cumulative adverse environmental effects (see 33 CFR 330.1(e)(3)). (See also 33 CFR 332.3(f).)

(3) Since the likelihood of success is greater and the impacts to potentially valuable uplands are reduced, aquatic resource restoration should be the first compensatory mitigation option considered for permittee-responsible mitigation.

(4) If permittee-responsible mitigation is the proposed option, the prospective permittee is responsible for submitting a mitigation plan. A conceptual or detailed mitigation plan may be used by the district engineer to make the decision on the NWP verification request, but a final mitigation plan that addresses the applicable requirements of 33 CFR 332.4(c)(2) through (14) must be approved by the district engineer before the permittee begins work in waters of the United States, unless the district engineer determines that prior approval of the final mitigation plan is not practicable or not necessary to ensure timely completion of the required compensatory mitigation (see 33 CFR 332.3(k)(3)). If permittee-responsible mitigation is the proposed option, and the proposed compensatory mitigation site is located on land in which another federal

agency holds an easement, the district engineer will coordinate with that federal agency to determine if proposed compensatory mitigation project is compatible with the terms of the easement.

(5) If mitigation bank or in-lieu fee program credits are the proposed option, the mitigation plan needs to address only the baseline conditions at the impact site and the number of credits to be provided (see 33 CFR 332.4(c)(1)(ii)).

(6) Compensatory mitigation requirements (e.g., resource type and amount to be provided as compensatory mitigation, site protection, ecological performance standards, monitoring requirements) may be addressed through conditions added to the NWP authorization, instead of components of a compensatory mitigation plan (see 33 CFR 332.4(c)(1)(ii)).

(g) Compensatory mitigation will not be used to increase the acreage losses allowed by the acreage limits of the NWPs. For example, if an NWP has an acreage limit of 1/2-acre, it cannot be used to authorize any NWP activity resulting in the loss of greater than 1/2-acre of waters of the United States, even if compensatory mitigation is provided that replaces or restores some of the lost waters. However, compensatory mitigation can and should be used, as necessary, to ensure that an NWP activity already meeting the established acreage limits also satisfies the no more than minimal impact requirement for the NWPs.

(h) Permittees may propose the use of mitigation banks, in-lieu fee programs, or permittee-responsible mitigation. When developing a compensatory mitigation proposal, the permittee must consider appropriate and practicable options consistent with the framework at 33 CFR 332.3(b). For activities resulting in the loss of marine or estuarine resources, permittee-responsible mitigation may be environmentally preferable if there are no mitigation banks or in-lieu fee programs in the area that have marine or estuarine credits available for sale or transfer to the permittee. For permittee-responsible mitigation, the special conditions of the NWP verification must clearly indicate the party or parties responsible for the implementation and performance of the compensatory mitigation project, and, if required, its long-term management.

(i) Where certain functions and services of waters of the United States are permanently adversely affected by a regulated activity, such as discharges of dredged or fill material into waters of the United States that

will convert a forested or scrub-shrub wetland to a herbaceous wetland in a permanently maintained utility line right-of-way, mitigation may be required to reduce the adverse environmental effects of the activity to the no more than minimal level.

24. Safety of Impoundment Structures. To ensure that all impoundment structures are safely designed, the district engineer may require non-Federal applicants to demonstrate that the structures comply with established state or federal, dam safety criteria or have been designed by qualified persons. The district engineer may also require documentation that the design has been independently reviewed by similarly qualified persons, and appropriate modifications made to ensure safety.

25. Water Quality. (a) Where the certifying authority (state, authorized tribe, or EPA, as appropriate) has not previously certified compliance of an NWP with CWA section 401, a CWA section 401 water quality certification for the proposed discharge must be obtained or waived (see 33 CFR 330.4(c)). If the permittee cannot comply with all of the conditions of a water quality certification previously issued by certifying authority for the issuance of the NWP, then the permittee must obtain a water quality certification or waiver for the proposed discharge in order for the activity to be authorized by an NWP.

(b) If the NWP activity requires pre-construction notification and the certifying authority has not previously certified compliance of an NWP with CWA section 401, the proposed discharge is not authorized by an NWP until water quality certification is obtained or waived. If the certifying authority issues a water quality certification for the proposed discharge, the permittee must submit a copy of the certification to the district engineer. The discharge is not authorized by an NWP until the district engineer has notified the permittee that the water quality certification requirement has been satisfied by the issuance of a water quality certification or a waiver.

(c) The district engineer or certifying authority may require additional water quality management measures to ensure that the authorized activity does not result in more than minimal degradation of water quality.

26. Coastal Zone Management. In coastal states where an NWP has not previously received a state coastal zone management consistency concurrence, an individual state coastal zone management consistency concurrence must be obtained, or a

presumption of concurrence must occur (see 33 CFR 330.4(d)). If the permittee cannot comply with all of the conditions of a coastal zone management consistency concurrence previously issued by the state, then the permittee must obtain an individual coastal zone management consistency concurrence or presumption of concurrence in order for the activity to be authorized by an NWP. The district engineer or a state may require additional measures to ensure that the authorized activity is consistent with state coastal zone management requirements.

27. Regional and Case-By-Case Conditions. The activity must comply with any regional conditions that may have been added by the Division Engineer (see 33 CFR 330.4(e)) and with any case specific conditions added by the Corps or by the state, Indian Tribe, or U.S. EPA in its CWA section 401 Water Quality Certification, or by the state in its Coastal Zone Management Act consistency determination.

28. Use of Multiple Nationwide Permits. The use of more than one NWP for a single and complete project is authorized, subject to the following restrictions:

(a) If only one of the NWPs used to authorize the single and complete project has a specified acreage limit, the acreage loss of waters of the United States cannot exceed the acreage limit of the NWP with the highest specified acreage limit. For example, if a road crossing over tidal waters is constructed under NWP 14, with associated bank stabilization authorized by NWP 13, the maximum acreage loss of waters of the United States for the total project cannot exceed 1/3-acre.

(b) If one or more of the NWPs used to authorize the single and complete project has specified acreage limits, the acreage loss of waters of the United States authorized by those NWPs cannot exceed their respective specified acreage limits. For example, if a commercial development is constructed under NWP 39, and the single and complete project includes the filling of an upland ditch authorized by NWP 46, the maximum acreage loss of waters of the United States for the commercial development under NWP 39 cannot exceed 1/2-acre, and the total acreage loss of waters of United States due to the NWP 39 and 46 activities cannot exceed 1 acre.

29. Transfer of Nationwide Permit Verifications. If the permittee sells the property associated with a nationwide permit verification, the permittee may transfer the nationwide permit verification to the new owner by submitting a letter to the appropriate Corps district office to validate the transfer. A copy of the

nationwide permit verification must be attached to the letter, and the letter must contain the following statement and signature:

“When the structures or work authorized by this nationwide permit are still in existence at the time the property is transferred, the terms and conditions of this nationwide permit, including any special conditions, will continue to be binding on the new owner(s) of the property. To validate the transfer of this nationwide permit and the associated liabilities associated with compliance with its terms and conditions, have the transferee sign and date below.”

(Transferee)

(Date)

30. Compliance Certification. Each permittee who receives an NWP verification letter from the Corps must provide a signed certification documenting completion of the authorized activity and implementation of any required compensatory mitigation. The success of any required permittee-responsible mitigation, including the achievement of ecological performance standards, will be addressed separately by the district engineer. The Corps will provide the permittee the certification document with the NWP verification letter. The certification document will include:

- (a) A statement that the authorized activity was done in accordance with the NWP authorization, including any general, regional, or activity-specific conditions;
- (b) A statement that the implementation of any required compensatory mitigation was completed in accordance with the permit conditions. If credits from a mitigation bank or in-lieu fee program are used to satisfy the compensatory mitigation requirements, the certification must include the documentation required by 33 CFR 332.3(l)(3) to confirm that the permittee secured the appropriate number and resource type of credits; and
- (c) The signature of the permittee certifying the completion of the activity and mitigation.

The completed certification document must be submitted to the district engineer within 30 days of completion of the authorized activity or the

implementation of any required compensatory mitigation, whichever occurs later.

31. Activities Affecting Structures or Works Built by the United States. If an NWP activity also requires review by, or permission from, the Corps pursuant to 33 U.S.C. 408 because it will alter or temporarily or permanently occupy or use a U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) federally authorized Civil Works project (a “USACE project”), the prospective permittee must submit a pre-construction notification. See paragraph (b)(10) of general condition 32. An activity that requires section 408 permission and/or review is not authorized by an NWP until the appropriate Corps office issues the section 408 permission or completes its review to alter, occupy, or use the USACE project, and the district engineer issues a written NWP verification.

32. Pre-Construction Notification. (a) Timing. Where required by the terms of the NWP, the prospective permittee must notify the district engineer by submitting a pre-construction notification (PCN) as early as possible. The district engineer must determine if the PCN is complete within 30 calendar days of the date of receipt and, if the PCN is determined to be incomplete, notify the prospective permittee within that 30-day period to request the additional information necessary to make the PCN complete. The request must specify the information needed to make the PCN complete. As a general rule, district engineers will request additional information necessary to make the PCN complete only once. However, if the prospective permittee does not provide all of the requested information, then the district engineer will notify the prospective permittee that the PCN is still incomplete and the PCN review process will not commence until all of the requested information has been received by the district engineer. The prospective permittee shall not begin the activity until either:

- (1) He or she is notified in writing by the district engineer that the activity may proceed under the NWP with any special conditions imposed by the district or division engineer; or
- (2) 45 calendar days have passed from the district engineer’s receipt of the complete PCN, and the prospective permittee has not received written notice from the district or division engineer. However, if the permittee was required to notify the Corps pursuant to general condition 18 that listed species or critical habitat might be affected or are in the vicinity of the activity, or to notify the Corps pursuant to general condition 20 that the activity might have the

potential to cause effects to historic properties, the permittee cannot begin the activity until receiving written notification from the Corps that there is “no effect” on listed species or “no potential to cause effects” on historic properties, or that any consultation required under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act (see 33 CFR 330.4(f)) and/or section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (see 33 CFR 330.4(g)) has been completed. If the proposed activity requires a written waiver to exceed specified limits of an NWP, the permittee may not begin the activity until the district engineer issues the waiver. If the district or division engineer notifies the permittee in writing that an individual permit is required within 45 calendar days of receipt of a complete PCN, the permittee cannot begin the activity until an individual permit has been obtained. Subsequently, the permittee’s right to proceed under the NWP may be modified, suspended, or revoked only in accordance with the procedure set forth in 33 CFR 330.5(d)(2).

(b) Contents of Pre-Construction Notification: The PCN must be in writing and include the following information:

- (1) Name, address and telephone numbers of the prospective permittee;
- (2) Location of the proposed activity;
- (3) Identify the specific NWP or NWP(s) the prospective permittee wants to use to authorize the proposed activity;
- (4) (i) A description of the proposed activity; the activity’s purpose; direct and indirect adverse environmental effects the activity would cause, including the anticipated amount of loss of wetlands, other special aquatic sites, and other waters expected to result from the NWP activity, in acres, linear feet, or other appropriate unit of measure; a description of any proposed mitigation measures intended to reduce the adverse environmental effects caused by the proposed activity; and any other NWP(s), regional general permit(s), or individual permit(s) used or intended to be used to authorize any part of the proposed project or any related activity, including other separate and distant crossings for linear projects that require Department of the Army authorization but do not require pre-construction notification. The description of the proposed activity and any proposed mitigation measures should be sufficiently detailed to allow the district engineer to determine that the adverse environmental effects of the activity will be no more than minimal and to determine the need for

compensatory mitigation or other mitigation measures.

(ii) For linear projects where one or more single and complete crossings require pre-construction notification, the PCN must include the quantity of anticipated losses of wetlands, other special aquatic sites, and other waters for each single and complete crossing of those wetlands, other special aquatic sites, and other waters (including those single and complete crossings authorized by an NWP but do not require PCNs). This information will be used by the district engineer to evaluate the cumulative adverse environmental effects of the proposed linear project and does not change those non-PCN NWP activities into NWP PCNs.

(iii) Sketches should be provided when necessary to show that the activity complies with the terms of the NWP. (Sketches usually clarify the activity and when provided results in a quicker decision. Sketches should contain sufficient detail to provide an illustrative description of the proposed activity (e.g., a conceptual plan), but do not need to be detailed engineering plans);

(5) The PCN must include a delineation of wetlands, other special aquatic sites, and other waters, such as lakes and ponds, and perennial and intermittent streams, on the project site. Wetland delineations must be prepared in accordance with the current method required by the Corps. The permittee may ask the Corps to delineate the special aquatic sites and other waters on the project site, but there may be a delay if the Corps does the delineation, especially if the project site is large or contains many wetlands, other special aquatic sites, and other waters. Furthermore, the 45-day period will not start until the delineation has been submitted to or completed by the Corps, as appropriate;

(6) If the proposed activity will result in the loss of greater than 1/10-acre of wetlands or 3/100-acre of stream bed and a PCN is required, the prospective permittee must submit a statement describing how the mitigation requirement will be satisfied or explaining why the adverse environmental effects are no more than minimal and why compensatory mitigation should not be required. As an alternative, the prospective permittee may submit a conceptual or detailed mitigation plan.

(7) For non-federal permittees, if any listed species (or species proposed for listing) or designated critical habitat (or critical habitat proposed for such designation) might be affected or is in the vicinity of

the activity, or if the activity is located in designated critical habitat (or critical habitat proposed for such designation), the PCN must include the name(s) of those endangered or threatened species (or species proposed for listing) that might be affected by the proposed activity or utilize the designated critical habitat (or critical habitat proposed for such designation) that might be affected by the proposed activity. For NWP activities that require pre-construction notification, Federal permittees must provide documentation demonstrating compliance with the Endangered Species Act;

(8) For non-federal permittees, if the NWP activity might have the potential to cause effects to a historic property listed on, determined to be eligible for listing on, or potentially eligible for listing on, the National Register of Historic Places, the PCN must state which historic property might have the potential to be affected by the proposed activity or include a vicinity map indicating the location of the historic property. For NWP activities that require pre-construction notification, Federal permittees must provide documentation demonstrating compliance with section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act;

(9) For an activity that will occur in a component of the National Wild and Scenic River System, or in a river officially designated by Congress as a “study river” for possible inclusion in the system while the river is in an official study status, the PCN must identify the Wild and Scenic River or the “study river” (see general condition 16); and

(10) For an NWP activity that requires permission from, or review by, the Corps pursuant to 33 U.S.C. 408 because it will alter or temporarily or permanently occupy or use a U.S. Army Corps of Engineers federally authorized civil works project, the pre-construction notification must include a statement confirming that the project proponent has submitted a written request for section 408 permission from, or review by, the Corps office having jurisdiction over that USACE project.

(c) Form of Pre-Construction Notification: The nationwide permit pre-construction notification form (Form ENG 6082) should be used for NWP PCNs. A letter containing the required information may also be used. Applicants may provide electronic files of PCNs and supporting materials if the district engineer has established tools and procedures for electronic submittals.

(d) Agency Coordination: (1) The district engineer will consider any comments from Federal and state agencies concerning the proposed activity’s compliance with the terms and conditions of the NWPs and the need for mitigation to reduce the activity’s adverse environmental effects so that they are no more than minimal.

(2) Agency coordination is required for: (i) all NWP activities that require pre-construction notification and result in the loss of greater than 1/2-acre of waters of the United States; (ii) NWP 13 activities in excess of 500 linear feet, fills greater than one cubic yard per running foot, or involve discharges of dredged or fill material into special aquatic sites; and (iii) NWP 54 activities in excess of 500 linear feet, or that extend into the waterbody more than 30 feet from the mean low water line in tidal waters or the ordinary high water mark in the Great Lakes.

(3) When agency coordination is required, the district engineer will immediately provide (e.g., via e-mail, facsimile transmission, overnight mail, or other expeditious manner) a copy of the complete PCN to the appropriate Federal or state offices (FWS, state natural resource or water quality agency, EPA, and, if appropriate, the NMFS). With the exception of NWP 37, these agencies will have 10 calendar days from the date the material is transmitted to notify the district engineer via telephone, facsimile transmission, or e-mail that they intend to provide substantive, site-specific comments. The comments must explain why the agency believes the adverse environmental effects will be more than minimal. If so, contacted by an agency, the district engineer will wait an additional 15 calendar days before making a decision on the pre-construction notification. The district engineer will fully consider agency comments received within the specified time frame concerning the proposed activity’s compliance with the terms and conditions of the NWPs, including the need for mitigation to ensure that the net adverse environmental effects of the proposed activity are no more than minimal. The district engineer will provide no response to the resource agency, except as provided below. The district engineer will indicate in the administrative record associated with each pre-construction notification that the resource agencies’ concerns were considered. For NWP 37, the emergency watershed protection and rehabilitation activity may proceed immediately in cases where there is an unacceptable hazard to life, or a significant loss of property or economic hardship will occur. The district engineer will consider any comments received to decide whether the NWP 37 authorization should be modified, suspended, or

revoked in accordance with the procedures at 33 CFR 330.5.

(4) In cases of where the prospective permittee is not a Federal agency, the district engineer will provide a response to NMFS within 30 calendar days of receipt of any Essential Fish Habitat conservation recommendations, as required by section 305(b)(4)(B) of the Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act.

(5) Applicants are encouraged to provide the Corps with either electronic files or multiple copies of pre-construction notifications to expedite agency coordination.

District Engineer's Decision

1. In reviewing the PCN for the proposed activity, the district engineer will determine whether the activity authorized by the NWP will result in more than minimal individual or cumulative adverse environmental effects or may be contrary to the public interest. If a project proponent requests authorization by a specific NWP, the district engineer should issue the NWP verification for that activity if it meets the terms and conditions of that NWP, unless he or she determines, after considering mitigation, that the proposed activity will result in more than minimal individual and cumulative adverse effects on the aquatic environment and other aspects of the public interest and exercises discretionary authority to require an individual permit for the proposed activity. For a linear project, this determination will include an evaluation of the single and complete crossings of waters of the United States that require PCNs to determine whether they individually satisfy the terms and conditions of the NWP(s), as well as the cumulative effects caused by all of the crossings of waters of the United States authorized by an NWP. If an applicant requests a waiver of an applicable limit, as provided for in NWPs 13, 36, or 54, the district engineer will only grant the waiver upon a written determination that the NWP activity will result in only minimal individual and cumulative adverse environmental effects.

2. When making minimal adverse environmental effects determinations the district engineer will consider the direct and indirect effects caused by the NWP activity. He or she will also consider the cumulative adverse environmental effects caused by activities authorized by an NWP and whether those cumulative adverse environmental effects are no more than minimal. The district engineer will also consider site specific factors, such as the

environmental setting in the vicinity of the NWP activity, the type of resource that will be affected by the NWP activity, the functions provided by the aquatic resources that will be affected by the NWP activity, the degree or magnitude to which the aquatic resources perform those functions, the extent that aquatic resource functions will be lost as a result of the NWP activity (e.g., partial or complete loss), the duration of the adverse effects (temporary or permanent), the importance of the aquatic resource functions to the region (e.g., watershed or ecoregion), and mitigation required by the district engineer. If an appropriate functional or condition assessment method is available and practicable to use, that assessment method may be used by the district engineer to assist in the minimal adverse environmental effects determination. The district engineer may add case-specific special conditions to the NWP authorization to address site-specific environmental concerns.

3. If the proposed activity requires a PCN and will result in a loss of greater than 1/10-acre of wetlands or 3/100-acre of stream bed, the prospective permittee should submit a mitigation proposal with the PCN. Applicants may also propose compensatory mitigation for NWP activities with smaller impacts, or for impacts to other types of waters. The district engineer will consider any proposed compensatory mitigation or other mitigation measures the applicant has included in the proposal in determining whether the net adverse environmental effects of the proposed activity are no more than minimal. The compensatory mitigation proposal may be either conceptual or detailed. If the district engineer determines that the activity complies with the terms and conditions of the NWP and that the adverse environmental effects are no more than minimal, after considering mitigation, the district engineer will notify the permittee and include any activity-specific conditions in the NWP verification the district engineer deems necessary. Conditions for compensatory mitigation requirements must comply with the appropriate provisions at 33 CFR 332.3(k). The district engineer must approve the final mitigation plan before the permittee commences work in waters of the United States, unless the district engineer determines that prior approval of the final mitigation plan is not practicable or not necessary to ensure timely completion of the required compensatory mitigation. If the prospective permittee elects to submit a compensatory mitigation plan with the PCN, the district engineer will expeditiously review the proposed compensatory mitigation plan. The district engineer must review the proposed compensatory mitigation plan within 45

calendar days of receiving a complete PCN and determine whether the proposed mitigation would ensure that the NWP activity results in no more than minimal adverse environmental effects. If the net adverse environmental effects of the NWP activity (after consideration of the mitigation proposal) are determined by the district engineer to be no more than minimal, the district engineer will provide a timely written response to the applicant. The response will state that the NWP activity can proceed under the terms and conditions of the NWP, including any activity-specific conditions added to the NWP authorization by the district engineer.

4. If the district engineer determines that the adverse environmental effects of the proposed activity are more than minimal, then the district engineer will notify the applicant either: (a) that the activity does not qualify for authorization under the NWP and instruct the applicant on the procedures to seek authorization under an individual permit; (b) that the activity is authorized under the NWP subject to the applicant's submission of a mitigation plan that would reduce the adverse environmental effects so that they are no more than minimal; or (c) that the activity is authorized under the NWP with specific modifications or conditions. Where the district engineer determines that mitigation is required to ensure no more than minimal adverse environmental effects, the activity will be authorized within the 45-day PCN period (unless additional time is required to comply with general conditions 18, 20, and/or 31), with activity-specific conditions that state the mitigation requirements. The authorization will include the necessary conceptual or detailed mitigation plan or a requirement that the applicant submit a mitigation plan that would reduce the adverse environmental effects so that they are no more than minimal. When compensatory mitigation is required, no work in waters of the United States may occur until the district engineer has approved a specific mitigation plan or has determined that prior approval of a final mitigation plan is not practicable or not necessary to ensure timely completion of the required compensatory mitigation.

Further Information

1. District engineers have authority to determine if an activity complies with the terms and conditions of an NWP.
2. NWPs do not obviate the need to obtain other federal, state, or local permits, approvals, or authorizations required by law.

3. NWPs do not grant any property rights or exclusive privileges.

4. NWPs do not authorize any injury to the property or rights of others.

5. NWPs do not authorize interference with any existing or proposed Federal project (see general condition 31).

Nationwide Permit Definitions

Best management practices (BMPs): Policies, practices, procedures, or structures implemented to mitigate the adverse environmental effects on surface water quality resulting from development. BMPs are categorized as structural or non-structural.

Compensatory mitigation: The restoration (re-establishment or rehabilitation), establishment (creation), enhancement, and/or in certain circumstances preservation of aquatic resources for the purposes of offsetting unavoidable adverse impacts which remain after all appropriate and practicable avoidance and minimization has been achieved.

Currently serviceable: Useable as is or with some maintenance, but not so degraded as to essentially require reconstruction.

Direct effects: Effects that are caused by the activity and occur at the same time and place.

Discharge: The term "discharge" means any discharge of dredged or fill material into waters of the United States.

Ecological reference: A model used to plan and design an aquatic habitat and riparian area restoration, enhancement, or establishment activity under NWP 27. An ecological reference may be based on the structure, functions, and dynamics of an aquatic habitat type or a riparian area type that currently exists in the region where the proposed NWP 27 activity is located. Alternatively, an ecological reference may be based on a conceptual model for the aquatic habitat type or riparian area type to be restored, enhanced, or established as a result of the proposed NWP 27 activity. An ecological reference takes into account the range of variation of the aquatic habitat type or riparian area type in the region.

Enhancement: The manipulation of the physical, chemical, or biological characteristics of an aquatic

resource to heighten, intensify, or improve a specific aquatic resource function(s). Enhancement results in the gain of selected aquatic resource function(s) but may also lead to a decline in other aquatic resource function(s). Enhancement does not result in a gain in aquatic resource area.

Establishment (creation): The manipulation of the physical, chemical, or biological characteristics present to develop an aquatic resource that did not previously exist at an upland site. Establishment results in a gain in aquatic resource area.

High Tide Line: The line of intersection of the land with the water's surface at the maximum height reached by a rising tide. The high tide line may be determined, in the absence of actual data, by a line of oil or scum along shore objects, a more or less continuous deposit of fine shell or debris on the foreshore or berm, other physical markings or characteristics, vegetation lines, tidal gages, or other suitable means that delineate the general height reached by a rising tide. The line encompasses spring high tides and other high tides that occur with periodic frequency but does not include storm surges in which there is a departure from the normal or predicted reach of the tide due to the piling up of water against a coast by strong winds such as those accompanying a hurricane or other intense storm.

Historic Property: Any prehistoric or historic district, site (including archaeological site), building, structure, or other object included in, or eligible for inclusion in, the National Register of Historic Places maintained by the Secretary of the Interior. This term includes artifacts, records, and remains that are related to and located within such properties. The term includes properties of traditional religious and cultural importance to an Indian tribe or Native Hawaiian organization and that meet the National Register criteria (36 CFR part 60).

Independent utility: A test to determine what constitutes a single and complete non-linear project in the Corps Regulatory Program. A project is considered to have independent utility if it would be constructed absent the construction of other projects in the project area. Portions of a multi-phase project that depend upon other phases of the project do not have independent utility. Phases of a project that would be constructed even if the other phases were not built can be considered as separate single and complete projects with independent utility.

Indirect effects: Effects that are caused by the activity and are later in time or farther removed in distance but are still reasonably foreseeable.

Loss of waters of the United States: Waters of the United States that are permanently adversely affected by filling, flooding, excavation, or drainage because of the regulated activity. The loss of stream bed includes the acres of stream bed that are permanently adversely affected by filling or excavation because of the regulated activity. Permanent adverse effects include permanent discharges of dredged or fill material that change an aquatic area to dry land, increase the bottom elevation of a waterbody, or change the use of a waterbody. The acreage of loss of waters of the United States is a threshold measurement of the impact to jurisdictional waters or wetlands for determining whether a project may qualify for an NWP; it is not a net threshold that is calculated after considering compensatory mitigation that may be used to offset losses of aquatic functions and services. Waters of the United States temporarily filled, flooded, excavated, or drained, but restored to pre-construction contours and elevations after construction, are not included in the measurement of loss of waters of the United States. Impacts resulting from activities that do not require Department of the Army authorization, such as activities eligible for exemptions under section 404(f) of the Clean Water Act, are not considered when calculating the loss of waters of the United States.

Navigable waters: Waters subject to section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899. These waters are defined at 33 CFR part 329.

Non-tidal wetland: A non-tidal wetland is a wetland that is not subject to the ebb and flow of tidal waters. Non-tidal wetlands contiguous to tidal waters are located landward of the high tide line (i.e., spring high tide line).

Open water: For purposes of the NWPs, an open water is any area that in a year with normal patterns of precipitation has water flowing or standing above ground to the extent that an ordinary high water mark can be determined. Aquatic vegetation within the area of flowing or standing water is either non-emergent, sparse, or absent. Vegetated shallows are considered to be open waters. Examples of "open waters" include rivers, streams, lakes, and ponds.

Ordinary High Water Mark: The term ordinary high water mark means that line on the shore established by the fluctuations of water and indicated by physical characteristics such as a clear, natural line impressed

on the bank, shelving, changes in the character of soil, destruction of terrestrial vegetation, the presence of litter and debris, or other appropriate means that consider the characteristics of the surrounding areas.

Perennial stream: A perennial stream has surface water flowing continuously year-round during a typical year.

Practicable: Available and capable of being done after taking into consideration cost, existing technology, and logistics in light of overall project purposes.

Pre-construction notification: A request submitted by the project proponent to the Corps for confirmation that a particular activity is authorized by nationwide permit. The request may be a permit application, letter, or similar document that includes information about the proposed work and its anticipated environmental effects. Pre-construction notification may be required by the terms and conditions of a nationwide permit, or by regional conditions. A pre-construction notification may be voluntarily submitted in cases where pre-construction notification is not required, and the project proponent wants confirmation that the activity is authorized by nationwide permit.

Preservation: The removal of a threat to, or preventing the decline of, aquatic resources by an action in or near those aquatic resources. This term includes activities commonly associated with the protection and maintenance of aquatic resources through the implementation of appropriate legal and physical mechanisms. Preservation does not result in a gain of aquatic resource area or functions.

Re-establishment: The manipulation of the physical, chemical, or biological characteristics of a site with the goal of returning natural/historic functions to a former aquatic resource. Re-establishment results in rebuilding a former aquatic resource and results in a gain in aquatic resource area and functions.

Rehabilitation: The manipulation of the physical, chemical, or biological characteristics of a site with the goal of repairing natural/historic functions to a degraded aquatic resource. Rehabilitation results in a gain in aquatic resource function but does not result in a gain in aquatic resource area.

Restoration: The manipulation of the physical, chemical, or biological characteristics of a site with the goal of returning natural/historic functions to a former or degraded aquatic resource. For the purpose

of tracking net gains in aquatic resource area, restoration is divided into two categories: re-establishment and rehabilitation.

Riffle and pool complex: Riffle and pool complexes are special aquatic sites under the 404(b)(1) Guidelines. Riffle and pool complexes sometimes characterize steep gradient sections of streams. Such stream sections are recognizable by their hydraulic characteristics. The rapid movement of water over a coarse substrate in riffles results in a rough flow, a turbulent surface, and high dissolved oxygen levels in the water. Pools are deeper areas associated with riffles. A slower stream velocity, a streaming flow, a smooth surface, and a finer substrate characterize pools.

Riparian areas: Riparian areas are lands next to streams, lakes, and estuarine-marine shorelines. Riparian areas are transitional between terrestrial and aquatic ecosystems, through which surface and subsurface hydrology connects riverine, lacustrine, estuarine, and marine waters with their adjacent wetlands, non-wetland waters, or uplands. Riparian areas provide a variety of ecological functions and services and help improve or maintain local water quality. (See general condition 23.)

Shellfish seeding: The placement of shellfish seed and/or suitable substrate to increase shellfish production. Shellfish seed consists of immature individual shellfish or individual shellfish attached to shells or shell fragments (i.e., spat on shell). Suitable substrate may consist of shellfish shells, shell fragments, or other appropriate materials placed into waters for shellfish habitat.

Single and complete linear project: A linear project is a project constructed for the purpose of getting people, goods, or services from a point of origin to a terminal point, which often involves multiple crossings of one or more waterbodies at separate and distant locations. The term "single and complete project" is defined as that portion of the total linear project proposed or accomplished by one owner/developer or partnership or other association of owners/developers that includes all crossings of a single water of the United States (i.e., a single waterbody) at a specific location. For linear projects crossing a single or multiple waterbodies several times at separate and distant locations, each crossing is considered a single and complete project for purposes of NWP authorization. However, individual channels in a braided stream or river, or individual arms of a large, irregularly shaped wetland or lake, etc., are not separate waterbodies, and

crossings of such features cannot be considered separately.

Single and complete non-linear project: For non-linear projects, the term “single and complete project” is defined at 33 CFR 330.2(i) as the total project proposed or accomplished by one owner/developer or partnership or other association of owners/developers. A single and complete non-linear project must have independent utility (see definition of “independent utility”). Single and complete non-linear projects may not be “piecemealed” to avoid the limits in an NWP authorization.

Stormwater management: Stormwater management is the mechanism for controlling stormwater runoff for the purposes of reducing downstream erosion, water quality degradation, and flooding and mitigating the adverse effects of changes in land use on the aquatic environment.

Stormwater management facilities: Stormwater management facilities are those facilities, including but not limited to, stormwater retention and detention ponds and best management practices, which retain water for a period of time to control runoff and/or improve the quality (i.e., by reducing the concentration of nutrients, sediments, hazardous substances and other pollutants) of stormwater runoff.

Stream bed: The substrate of the stream channel between the ordinary high water marks. The substrate may be bedrock or inorganic particles that range in size from clay to boulders. Wetlands contiguous to the stream bed, but outside of the ordinary high water marks, are not considered part of the stream bed.

Stream channelization: The manipulation of a stream’s course, condition, capacity, or location that causes more than minimal interruption of normal stream processes. A channelized jurisdictional stream remains a water of the United States.

Structure: An object that is arranged in a definite pattern of organization. Examples of structures include, without limitation, any pier, boat dock, boat ramp, wharf, dolphin, weir, boom, breakwater, bulkhead, revetment, riprap, jetty, artificial island, artificial reef, permanent mooring structure, power transmission line, permanently moored floating vessel, piling, aid to navigation, or any other manmade obstacle or obstruction.

Tidal wetland: A tidal wetland is a jurisdictional wetland that is inundated by tidal waters. Tidal waters rise and fall in a predictable and measurable rhythm or cycle due to the gravitational pulls of the moon and sun. Tidal waters end where the rise and fall of the water surface can no longer be practically measured in a predictable rhythm due to masking by other waters, wind, or other effects. Tidal wetlands are located channelward of the high tide line.

Tribal lands: Any lands title to which is either: 1) held in trust by the United States for the benefit of any Indian tribe or individual; or 2) held by any Indian tribe or individual subject to restrictions by the United States against alienation.

Tribal rights: Those rights legally accruing to a tribe or tribes by virtue of inherent sovereign authority, unextinguished aboriginal title, treaty, statute, judicial decisions, executive order or agreement, and that give rise to legally enforceable remedies.

Vegetated shallows: Vegetated shallows are special aquatic sites under the 404(b)(1) Guidelines. They are areas that are permanently inundated and under normal circumstances have rooted aquatic vegetation, such as seagrasses in marine and estuarine systems and a variety of vascular rooted plants in freshwater systems.

Waterbody: For purposes of the NWPs, a waterbody is a “water of the United States.” If a wetland is adjacent to a waterbody determined to be a water of the United States, that waterbody and any adjacent wetlands are considered together as a single aquatic unit (see 33 CFR 328.4(c)(2)).



ARKANSAS

ENERGY & ENVIRONMENT

November 18th, 2020

Colonel Eric M. Noe, District Commander
Little Rock District Corps of Engineers
P.O. Box 867
Little Rock, Arkansas 72203-0867

RE: Public Notice: Re-issuance of Nationwide Permits 2020

Dear Colonel Noe,

The Arkansas Department of Energy and Environment (E&E), Division of Environmental Quality (DEQ) has completed its review of the above referenced public notice for re-issuance of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Nationwide Permits (NWP) for the State of Arkansas.

DEQ has determined discharges from projects covered under these NWP will comply with water quality requirements according to Arkansas Pollution Control and Ecology Commission's (APC&EC) Rule 2.

Therefore, pursuant to §401(a)(1) of the Clean Water Act, the DEQ hereby issues water quality certification for all NWP, contingent upon the following conditions:

- 1) An individual water quality certification request must be submitted to DEQ for activities which may impact Extraordinary Resource Waters, Ecologically Sensitive Waterbodies, and Natural Scenic Waterways as identified in APC&EC Rule 2, Water Quality Standards for Surface Waters of the State of Arkansas. In order to determine compliance with the standards set forth in APC&EC Rule 2.203 for these Outstanding Resource Waters, projects covered under NWP on these waters shall be reviewed by DEQ.
- 2) In accordance with APC&EC Rule 2.305, the applicant shall obtain a Short Term Activity Authorization (STAA) when performing work in the wetted area of waters of the state as defined by Arkansas Code Annotated (A.C.A.) §8-4-102. Activities approved under a STAA, are subject to the provisions that no permanent or long-term impairment of beneficial uses is likely to result from such activity. More information can be obtained by visiting <https://www.adeq.state.ar.us/water/planning/instream/> or <https://portal.adeq.state.ar.us/>.
- 3) The applicant shall implement all practicable best management practices (BMP) to avoid excessive impacts of turbidity to waters of the state, 40 CFR §122.26(c).
- 4) The applicant will take all reasonable measures to prevent the spillage or leakage of any chemicals, oil, grease, gasoline, diesel, or other fuel in accordance with A.C.A. §8-4-217. In the unlikely event such spillage or leakage occurs, the applicant must contact E&E Emergency Response at 501-682-0716 immediately.

- 5) If a construction site will disturb equal to or greater than one (1) acre and less than five (5) acres, the applicant shall comply with the requirements in APC&EC Rule 6.203 for Stormwater discharge associated with a small construction site, as defined in APC&EC Rule No. 6. If the construction site will disturb five (5) acres or more, the applicant shall comply with the terms of the Stormwater Construction General Permit Number ARR150000 prior to the start of construction. BMPs must be implemented regardless of the size. More information can be obtained by contacting the NPDES Stormwater Section of DEQ at (501) 682-0623.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Blanz', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

Robert E. Blanz, Ph.D., P.E.
Associate Director, Office of Water Quality

Cc: Sarah Chitwood, Regulatory Division Chief USACE
Lisa Boyle, Project Manager USACE
Wanda Boyd, U.S. EPA