

# NEW JERSEY DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

## CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION DOCUMENTATION

### I. GENERAL INFORMATION

DOT Job Code No.	1512515	Federal Project No.	MGS-19(106)
Project Management Team	Six	Data Base No.	94071A
Route and Section	Route 72 and East Road	Structure No.	N/A
Local Road Name	N/A	County	Ocean
Municipality	Stafford Township	Length	1.3 Miles
Type of Project	Congestion Mgmt - Hwy Operational Improvements		
From	M.P. 21.69	To	M.P. 22.99
Congressional District	3	Legislative District	9
ROW Cost	\$3,300,000	Construction Cost	\$9,800,000

EXISTING FACILITY	PROPOSED FACILITY
ROW Width <u>130' &amp; Varies</u>	ROW Width <u>130' &amp; Varies</u>
No. of Lanes & Width <u>WB: 3 @ 12' EB: 2 @ 12', 1 @ 15'</u>	No. of Lanes & Width <u>6 lanes @ 12'</u>
Shoulder Width <u>Inside: 3', Outside: 10' Median 13'</u>	Shoulder Width <u>Inside: 5' Outside: 10' Median 2' Median Barrier</u>
Overall Roadway Width <u>91'</u>	Overall Roadway Width <u>104'</u>

### II. PROJECT DESCRIPTION (Attach location map)

#### A. Project Need (briefly explain why the project is needed)

Stafford Township has recently experienced rapid growth and development, as evidenced by the addition of several schools, residential developments, and businesses in the project area. The following roadway improvements have been constructed to accommodate motorists within Stafford Township as part of the Access Management Plan (AMP):

- \* McKinley Avenue from Doc Cramer Blvd to US Route 9;
- \* Westerly and Easterly Master Plan roadways; and
- \* Completion of the "missing movements" at the Garden State Parkway (GSP) and Route 72 Interchange.

Despite these improvements, the Route 72 and East Road Intersection is subject to excessive queues during the weekday PM peak hour and summer season, and has been identified as the "bottleneck" of the Route 72 corridor. The following deficiencies have been identified for the section of Route 72 between the GSP and US Route 9:

- \* The forward jughandle at East Road has no deceleration lane and an inadequate stacking length;
- \* No deceleration lane exists along Route 72 WB for the exit ramp to GSP northbound;
- \* An accident history from 1997-1999 indicates several rear-end and sideswipe accidents at the Route 72 and East Road Intersection. Driver confusion and excessive queues were often cited as contributing factors to these accidents;
- \* The existing horizontal curve requires superelevation, but has a normal-crown section; and
- \* No outside shoulder exists in the eastbound direction.

This project is part of the approved AMP developed by NJDOT for Stafford Township.

**B. Proposed Improvements (provide a brief description of proposed improvements)**

The proposed improvements include intersection reconfiguration with the installation of a median barrier to replace existing grass median. The conversion to a median barrier will allow for the addition of a Route 72 westbound auxiliary lane and an eastbound outside shoulder while maintaining the existing curbline. See Figure 2.

**C. Right of Way Taking**

Total area needed: 3.75 ha (9.26 ac.+/-) est. number of parcels: in fee- 23 easements- 24  
Est. number of relocations: residences- 7 businesses- 1 parking spaces- 25  
Community facilities affected: 0  
Area (hectares) of public recreational land taken: 0.627 ha (1.55 ac.+/-) out of a total area of 174.08 ha (430 ac.+/-)

**III. ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS:**

**A. Noise**

- Sensitive receptors within 65 meters for two lanes or 130 meters for four lanes.
- Project substantially changes the vertical or horizontal alignment of the roadway.
- Traffic volumes or speeds substantially increase.

**Conclusion:**

- Noise study not required. No significant impact anticipated.
- Potential noise impacts were studied and are discussed in comments. Project still meets CE criteria.

**Comments:**

The project will not substantially alter the roadway's horizontal or vertical alignment and no new thru lanes are proposed, therefore, no quantitative noise impact study is required. (See Section 3.0)

**B. Air Quality: CONFORMITY WITH THE CLEAN AIR ACT AMENDMENTS (CAAA) OF 1990**

**Section 1: Regional Emissions Analysis (STIP or MPO's conforming transportation plan).**

- This project is included in the FY 2003 - 2005 approved State Transportation Improvement Plan (STIP).
- This project is not listed in the FY 200\_ - 200\_ approved STIP, but is included in the MPO's conforming transportation plan.
- This project is not included in either the approved STIP or the MPO's conforming transportation plan.

**Section 2: Based on its scope, the project is categorized by the Transportation Conformity Rule (TCR) as:**

A project type listed in Table 2 of the TCR, i.e. **Exempted** from the conformity requirements of the CAAA (i.e. exempted from regional emissions analysis and Carbon Monoxide (CO) analysis requirement) and may proceed toward implementation even in the absence of a conforming transportation plan and TIP.

- A project type listed in Table 3 of the TCR, i.e. **Exempted** from regional emissions analysis requirement, but local effects of this project with respect to CO concentrations must be considered to determine if a hot-spot analysis is required. Complete Section a below.
- A project type not listed in either Table 2 or Table 3 of the TCR, i.e. must be a part of a conforming STIP and/or a MPO's conforming transportation plan and requires a CO hot-spot analysis. Complete Section b below.

**Section a: Project type listed in Table 3 of the TCR**

- Project located in **CO Attainment area**. CO analysis not required – project may proceed to the project development process.
- The total eight-hour Carbon Monoxide levels are expected to be reasonably below the NAAQS of 9 ppm. This is based on LOS data for the intersection(s) and the total highest traffic volumes at this (those) intersection(s) and the distance of the sensitive receptors to the roadway. No quantitative analysis required – project may proceed to the project development process even in the absence of a conforming transportation plan and TIP.

Project located in a Carbon Monoxide Non-Attainment/Maintenance area and requires a Carbon Monoxide hot-spot analysis. A CO Analysis was completed at the following intersections:

and the results are:

**Section B: Project type listed in neither Table 2 nor Table 3 of the TCR**

Carbon Monoxide hot-spot (Quantitative/Qualitative) analysis was performed at the following locations:

and the results are:

**Comments:**

See Section 4.0.

**C. Ecology & Permits (briefly describe any potential impact(s) under comments)**

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Water Quality	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Sole Source Aquifer
<input type="checkbox"/> Floodplain	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Unique/Endangered Species Habitat
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Wetlands	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Wildlife
<input type="checkbox"/> Acid Soils	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Forested Areas

**Conclusion:**

No significant impact anticipated.

Further studies needed to obtain permits. Project still satisfies CE criteria. (see comments)

**Comments:**

The original Stafford Township scheme, known as Alternative #5, is approved by NJDEP under LUR Permits (CAFRA, FWW IP and TAW) with an expiration date of February 17, 2004. The revised project, Figures 2A & 2B, is known as Alternative #5C and is a reduced version of the Stafford Township alternative. It will be determined, in consultation with NJDEP, if the existing permits can be modified for the revised design. (See Section 5.0.)

**D. Environmental Permits/Coordination Needed:**

U.S. Coast Guard (Bridge)		NJDEP Waterfront Development	
USACOE Section 404 (Individual)		NJDEP Stream Encroachment - Major	X
USACOE Section 404 (Nationwide)		NJDEP Stream Encroachment - Minor	X
USACOE Sec. 10 (Navigable Waters)		NJDEP Riparian	
CAFRA	X	NJDEP Water Quality Certificate	X
NJDEP Remediation Approval		USEPA - Sole Source Aquifer	
NJDEP Coastal Wetlands		Delaware Basin Commission	
NJDEP Freshwater Wetlands - GP		D & R Canal Commission	
NJDEP Freshwater Wetlands - IP	X	Meadowlands Commission	
NJDEP Pollutant Discharge		Pinelands Commission	
EO 11990 Wetlands	X	EO 11988 Floodplain	
P. L. 2001 Chapter 10 Reforestation	X		

**Comments: (potential impacts, unique features, sensitive issues)**

Existing approvals will be modified as necessary.

**E. Cultural Resources**

**Technical Findings:**

- No Effect per FHWA/SHPO Agreement of 07-06-00; subject to conditions identified in the Agreement
- No NR listed/eligible properties in APE (Section 106 Findings = No Historic Properties Affected)
- NR listed/eligible properties in APE (see summary table below)

Archaeology	Architecture				Sec. 106 Finding
	Bridge	Building	District	Other	
					NR listed/elig. property - No Historic Properties Affected
					NR listed/elig. property - No Adverse Effect (NAE)
					NR listed/elig. property - NAE with conditions
					NR listed/elig. property - Adverse Effect

**Conclusion: Consultation Summary ( indicate date of concurrence/approval)**

- FHWA concurred with Adverse Effect Finding on
- SHPO provided Section 106 consultation comments on
- FHWA concurred with No Adverse Effect/No Adverse Effect with Conditions on
- ACHP notified of Adverse Effects on
- ACHP responded to notification on
- ACHP will participate in consultation
- ACHP declined to participate in consultation
- MOA executed by FHWA on
- MOA filed with ACHP on (OR)
- ACHP accepted/signed MOA on

\_\_\_\_\_  
 August 29, 2003  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_  
 \_\_\_\_\_

**Comments:**

No properties in APE pursuant to investigation performed by URS (See Section 6.0).

**F. Sec. 4(f) Involvement - Historic Sites**

- Project results in a use of Historic site(s) on or eligible for the National Register of Historic Places.
- Project results in a "constructive use" of Section 4(f) property.

**Conclusion:**

- No Section 4(f) Involvement  
 Section 4(f) Involvement. Project falls under the **Programmatic Nationwide Section 4(f) Evaluation** and all applicability criteria have been met including agreement of the SHPO with the "No Effect" recommendation.
  - Section 4(f) Involvement. Project is a **Programmatic Nationwide Section 4(f) Evaluation** and all applicability standards have been met including agreement by the ACHP with the "No Adverse Effect".
  - Section 4(f) Involvement. Project is covered under the **Programmatic Nationwide Section 4(f) Evaluation for Historic Bridges**.
  - Section 4(f) Involvement. Project has an "Adverse Effect". Individual Section 4(f) prepared.
- Documentation:** If Section 4(f) impacts exist - refer to Appendix for FHWA approved documentation.

**Comments:**

No properties in APE pursuant to investigation performed by URS.

### G. Sec. 4(f) Involvement - Recreational Land

Project requires acquisition from Publicly-owned recreation land.

Project results in a "Constructive Use" of Section 4(f) property.

If either of the above are checked, fill out the following:

Site (use local name): Edwin B. Forsythe National Wildlife Refuge

Lot and Block #: Block 67, Lot 5

Total Hectares To Be Acquired (consider acquisition and easement)

Total Hectares of Park: 174.08 ha (430 ac. +/-) Amount of Parkland affected: 0.627 ha (1.55 ac. +/-)

Federal DOI Section 6(f) regulations or other Federal encumbrances involved.

#### Conclusion:

No Section 4(f) Involvement.

Section 4(f) Involvement. Project falls under **Temporary Occupancy**; all applicability criteria and conditions have been met (Explain below).

Section 4(f) Involvement. Project falls under the **Programmatic Nationwide Section 4(f) Evaluation**; all applicability criteria and conditions have been met.

Section 4(f) Involvement. **Individual Section 4(f) Evaluation** was completed, but **no significant impacts are anticipated.**

No Section 4(f) Involvement, but any changes made to the project which require use of Section 4(f) land would require compliance with Section 4(f).

Documentation: If Section 4(f) impacts exist - refer to Appendix C for compliance documentation.

#### Comments:

There will be a land exchange for the proposed jughandle area between NJDOT the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. See Section 7.0 for further information.

### H. Hazardous Materials and Landfills

Involvement with known or suspected contaminated site. (If so, explain under comments)

Involvement with underground storage tanks. (If so, explain under comments)

#### Conclusion:

Low potential for involvement with contamination, no further investigation required.

Further investigation and/or sampling required to determine extent of involvement with contamination. Project still meets FHWA criteria for a CE.

#### Comments:

The Hazardous Materials Screening Report (May 2003) recommended soil and water sampling at five properties that may have land impacted by the project. These properties are:

1. Gulf Service Station on Route 72 Westbound
2. Exxon Service Station on Route 72 Eastbound
3. Goodyear Tire Center on Route 72 Eastbound
4. Midas Mufflers on Route 72 Eastbound
5. Sunoco Service Station on Route 72 Westbound

### I. Socioeconomic Areas

The project will not result in significant socioeconomic impacts.

Comments: (See Section 9.0)

### J. Environmental Justice

Project will have no disproportionately high or adverse effects on low income and or minority communities  
 Project will have disproportionately high and adverse effects on low income and or minority communities

### Conclusion:

Project is in compliance with the goals of Executive Order 12898 and the requirements of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.

Project is in compliance with the goals of Executive Order 12898 and the requirements of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, through the identification of measures to address disproportionate effects, including actions to avoid or mitigate them. Project satisfies CE criteria.

Comments: (See Section 10.0)

### K. Public Reaction (briefly describe input from the Office of Community Relations or current status of public reaction)

A meeting was held on February 20, 2003 with the Mayor of Stafford Township and NJDOT representatives. Mayor Carl Block indicated that the project has the full support of the Township and that there is still support from the property owners. An Information Center was held on October 9, 2003 to present the Preferred Alternative to the public; no objections to the project were voiced. The Township has provided a Resolution of Support (dated September 3, 2002) for the project. (See Appendix D)

### L. Environmental Commitments (list if any)

1. The maintenance of a standard construction noise attenuation program throughout the construction period.
2. The implementation of a soil erosion and sediment control program to minimize sediment run off.
3. Orange snow fence will be placed along the jughandle right-of-way/slope easement line to prohibit construction vehicle intrusion into the Forsythe Refuge.
4. In May 2002, NJDOT completed an interim widening project by adding a third westbound lane on Route 72 between MP 21.69 and 22.99. This "Interim Widening Project" added 1.71 acres of impervious area (pavement) to the project area. NJDOT applied for and received the NJDEP CAFRA permit in March 2002. The roadway improvements were constructed under conditional approval by NJDEP where NJDOT committed to constructing a detention basin(s) in order to conform to NJDEP CAFRA stormwater management regulations. NJDOT has requested and received approval from NJDEP to defer the implementation of the interim CAFRA permit conditions to this final intersection improvement project. NJDOT will commit to construct the detention basin(s) for both the interim project and the final project at the same time.
5. Section 4(f) mitigation commitments as listed in the Nationwide Section 4(f) document, Section VIII.

**DETERMINATION OF CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION**

**Project name and location:**

**CE #:** 771.117(d)(1) Modernization of a Highway and (2) Highway Safety or Traffic Operations Improvements.

The proposed project satisfies the Categorical Exclusion definition outlined in 23 CFR 771.117(a) and will not result in significant environmental impacts.

*James F. Conrey*  
James Conrey

11/21/03

Project Manager, Division of Project Management

Date

**Recommended:**

*Jerry Thomas*  
for Pamela Garrett

Environmental Team Leader

11/21/03

Date

**Certified**

**Approved**

Elkins Green

*Elkins Green*

Manager, Bureau of Environmental Services

11/21/03

Date

**Concurrence**

(only needed for  
CEs not certified  
by BES Manager)

*[Signature]*  
(FOR) Division Administrator  
Federal Highway Administration

12/19/03

Date