

NORTH CAROLINA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

FIELD SCOPING MEETING WORKSHEET

Return with Comments to Division by 3/25/2015 (Two weeks prior to FSM)

TIP No.: **B-5507**

FIELD SCOPING MEETING DATE: 4/7/2015

DIVISION: **1**

LOCATION: Div 1 Office, 113 Airport Dr, Ste 100, Edenton

COUNTY: **Chowan**

ROUTE (US / NC / SR): **NC 32**

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: **Replace Br No 21 on NC 32 over Sand Run**

FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION: **Minor Arterial**

TIER: **Regional**

MPO / RPO AREA: **Albemarle**

MUNICIPALITY: **NA**

ATTENDEES	NAME (PRINT)	PHONE No	E-MAIL
DIVISION CONSTRUCTION ENGINEER	Shawn Mebane	252 482-1850	cmebane@ncdot.gov
DIVISION BRIDGE PROGRAM MANAGER	John Abel	252 482-1851	jabel@ncdot.gov
AREA BRIDGE CONSTRUCTION ENGINEER	Johnny Metcalf	252 675-3208	jmetcalfe@ncdot.gov
DIVISION BRIDGE MAINTENANCE ENGINEER	Gene Gurganus	252 789-6152	ggurganus@ncdot.gov
DIVISION UTILITY COORDINATOR	Tracey Brown	252 482-1854	ttbrown@ncdot.gov
DIVISION ENVIRONMENTAL OFFICER	Clay Willis	252 482-1876	tcwillis@ncdot.gov
DIVISION RIGHT OF WAY REPRESENTATIVE	Mike Kinlaw	252 332-8182	jkinlaw@ncdot.gov
HYDRAULICS REPRESENTATIVE	Paul Atkinson	919 707-6707	patkinson@ncdot.gov
PDEA REPRESENTATIVE	Kim Gillespie	919 707-6023	klgillespie@ncdot.gov
NEU REPRESENTATIVE	Chris Rivenbark	919 707-6152	crivenbark@ncdot.gov
GEOTECHNICAL REPRESENTATIVE	Jamey Batts	919 662-4710	jbatts@ncdot.gov
STRUCTURE DESIGN REPRESENTATIVE	Emily Murray	919 707-6498	emurray@ncdot.gov
ROADWAY DESIGN REPRESENTATIVE	Ron Mccollum	919 707-6205	remccollum@ncdot.gov
LOCATION AND SURVEYS REPRESENTATIVE	Keith Honeycutt	919 266-4078	khoneycutt@ncdot.gov
WORK ZONE TRAFFIC CONTROL REPRESENTATIVE	Steve Kite	919 662-4339	skite@ncdot.gov
UTILITY AGENT	Barry Whitaker	919 707-7173	bwwhitaker@ncdot.gov

DIVISION (COMPLETED BY DIVISION STAFF AND SENT WITH THE FSM LETTER)**EXISTING FEATURES**FEATURE BRIDGED: **Sand Run**(BRIDGE / CULVERT) LENGTH **30 (FT.)**DECK WIDTH (OUT TO OUT) **27.883 (FT.)**WATER DEPTH: **3 (FT.)**HEIGHT BED-TO-CROWN: **11 (FT.)**PRIOR SURVEY DATE: **11/19/2012**POSTED: SV **NA** TTST: **NA**STRUCTURE TYPE: **CONT. MONOLITHIC SLAB**SPAN TYPE: **4@7.5' CONTINUOUS**SUFFICIENCY RATING: **45.94**

POSTED SPEED LIMIT IN PROJECT VICINITY: (MPH / STATUTORY 55MPH)

DETOUR: OFF-SITE **NO** ON-SITE **YES** STAGE CONSTRUCTION -----

IF DETOUR IS OFF-SITE, PROVIDE DESCRIPTION OF DETOUR ROUTE

APPROXIMATE LENGTH OF DETOUR? **15+ (MILES)**IMPROVEMENTS NEEDED TO ROAD ON DETOUR? **N/A**IMPROVEMENTS NEEDED TO BRIDGES ON DETOUR? **N/A**ARE BRIDGES ON DETOUR CURRENTLY PROGRAMMED ON TIP? **N/A** COMMENTS:

ARE THERE EMS, SCHOOL , OR BUSINESS ACCESS ISSUES? ----- COMMENTS:

ARE THERE ANY RAILROAD CROSSINGS ON DETOUR? **N/A** COMMENTS:SHOULD WORK ZONE PEDESTRIAN ACCESS BE MAINTAINED DURING CONSTRUCTION? -----
REASONS:IMPACT RATING TO UTILITIES **Medium**OVERHEAD UTILITY LINES **Yes** IN CONFLICT **Yes**POWER TRANSMISSION LINES **No** IN CONFLICT **No**TELEPHONE / CABLE LINES **Yes** IN CONFLICT **Yes**FIBER OPTIC **No** IN CONFLICT **No**WATER **No** IN CONFLICT **No**SEWER **No** IN CONFLICT **No**NATURAL GAS **Yes** IN CONFLICT **Yes**

OTHER IN CONFLICT -----

BASED ON THE PAST HISTORY NEAR THIS PROJECT SITE, WHAT IS THE ESTIMATED TIME REQUIRED TO
COMPLETE UTILITY ADJUSTMENTS MONTHS

IS THERE ANY FUTURE UTILITY CONSTRUCTION ANTICIPATED IN THE PROJECT AREA -----

IS A FEMA BUY-OUT PROPERTY BEING IMPACTED **NO**

HYDRAULICS UNIT (COMPLETED BY HYDRAULICS UNIT STAFF PRIOR TO THE FSM)

WILL THIS PROJECT REQUIRE A FEMA PERMIT? **NO**

IS THERE UNUSUAL SCOUR POTENTIAL? **NO** IS PROTECTION NEEDED? **NO**

ARE BANKS STABLE? **Yes** IS PROTECTION NEEDED? **No**

DOES STREAM CARRY APPRECIABLE AMOUNT OF LARGE DEBRIS? **No**

WILL THE PLACEMENT OF BENTS IN THE WATER BE ALLOWED **Yes** COMMENTS

WERE HYDRAULIC ALTERNATIVES BESIDES A BRIDGE CONSIDERED **No** COMMENTS

POSSIBLE SPAN LAYOUT: **36" PS Girder with 4-ft caps**

WAIVE OFFSETS: **Yes**

GEOTECHNICAL UNIT (COMPLETED BY GEOTECHNICAL UNIT PRIOR TO THE FSM)

EXISTING FOUNDATION REPORTS? ----- IF SO, ATTACH.

KNOWN GEOLOGICAL FEATURES IN AREA WHICH MAY AFFECT DESIGN

ARE PERMITS NEEDED FOR INVESTIGATIVE WORK AT SITE ----- COMMENTS:

ARE THERE ANY HISTORICAL AND / OR VIBRATION SENSITIVE STRUCTURES NEAR BY ----- COMMENTS:

ARE THERE ANY KNOWN LANDFILLS AND / OR GEOENVIRONMENTAL HAZARD SITES AT OR WITHIN CLOSE PROXIMITY TO THE PROJECT SITE ----- COMMENTS:

DEPTH OF WEATHERED ROCK OR ROCK BELOW STREAMBED (FT.)

ARE ANY IMPACTS ANTICIPATED TO NATURAL SPRINGS OR ARTESIAN WELLS ----- COMMENTS:

POSSIBLE FOUNDATION TYPE: **Driven piles; 3:1 or flatter side slopes needed for vegetation and erosion control.**

PD & EA AND NEU UNIT (COMPLETED BY PDEA STAFF PRIOR TO THE FSM)

TRAFFIC FORECAST (AS PREPARED BY TRANSPORTATION PLANNING BRANCH AND PROVIDED BY PDEA)

Accident History:

-L- BASE YEAR (2015) ANNUAL AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC **2100** % TRUCKS/DUALS **12/5**
 -L- DESIGN YEAR (2040) ANNUAL AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC **2800** % TRUCKS/DUALS **12/5**

SHOW -Y-LINE TRAFFIC IF APPLICABLE FOR BRIDGES OVER / UNDER.

-Y- BASE YEAR (20) ANNUAL AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC % TRUCKS/DUALS
 -Y- DESIGN YEAR (20) ANNUAL AVERAGE DAILY TRAFFIC % TRUCKS/DUALS

TRAFFIC SAFETY (AS PREPARED BY THE TRAFFIC SAFETY UNIT AND PROVIDED BY PDEA)

OPERATING SPEED: **55 MPH**CRASH RATE: **0.75 MVMT**WETLANDS AT SITE **Yes** COMMENTS:KNOWN ENDANGERED SPECIES POPULATIONS IN AREA **No** COMMENTS: **No habitat for listed species in project area.**TROUT OR TVA COUNTY **No** COMMENTS:CAMA COUNTY **Yes** PRIMARY NURSERY AREA **No**MORATORIA **No** IF YES-DURATION

COMMENTS:

IS WATER FEATURE CLASSIFIED AS A WILD AND SCENIC RIVER **No** COMMENTS:WHAT IS THE WATER QUALITY CLASSIFICATION FOR THIS PROJECT: **C, NSW (Warwick Creek)**WILL A COAST GUARD PERMIT BE REQUIRED **No** COMMENTS:

IS THE PROJECT SITE IN OR NEAR ANY OF THE FOLLOWING:

NATIONAL FOREST **No**WILDLIFE REFUGE **No**STATE, COUNTY, OR LOCAL PARK **No**AIRPORT **No**A LAKE FOR RECREATION OR POWER GENERATION **No**WATER SUPPLY RESERVOIR **No**NUTRIENT SENSITIVE WATERS **Yes**PUBLIC USE BOAT RAMP **No**CEMETARIES **No**WILL A FEDERAL ENERGY REGULATORY COMMISSION PERMIT BE REQUIRED **No**

IS THE PROJECT AREA KNOWN FOR POTENTIAL INDIAN, COLONIAL, OR OTHER ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES

KNOWN OR POTENTIAL HISTORIC PROPERTIES IN THE AREA **No**IS THE BRIDGE STRUCTURE ITSELF, OR ANY PART THEREOF, CONSIDERED HISTORIC **No**WILL THE PROJECT IMPACT A CHURCH, COMMUNITY CENTER, OR OTHER PUBLIC FACILITY **No**IS THIS PROJECT ON A STATEWIDE BICYCLE ROUTE OR A LOCAL NON-MARKED BICYCLE ROUTE **None**

ANY CLARIFICATION OR COMMENTS ON ITEMS ABOVE:

ROADWAY DESIGN UNIT (COMPLETED BY ROADWAY DESIGN UNIT PRIOR TO FSM)ALIGNMENT: EXISTING HORIZONTAL **Good**EXISTING VERTICAL **Good**

POSSIBLE DESIGN STANDARDS

POSSIBLE DESIGN SPEED **55 (MPH)**POSSIBLE DESIGN EXCEPTIONS **No** COMMENTAPPROXIMATE PROJECT LENGTH **(FT)** NUMBER AND WIDTH OF LANES **2-12**SHOULD THIS PROJECT HAVE CURB AND GUTTER OR SHOULDER APPROACHES **Shoulders**
COMMENTTOTAL SHOULDER WIDTH **10 (FT)** PAVED SHOULDER WIDTH **4 (FT)**CLEAR ROADWAY ON STRUCTURE **40 (FT)**WILL EXISTING DRIVEWAYS, BUSINESS ACCESS, -Y- LINES OR RAMPS NEED TO BE RELOCATED **No**
COMMENTS:IS THERE ADDITIONAL RIGHT OF WAY / PERMANENT EASEMENTS / TEMPORARY EASEMENTS ANTICIPATED FOR
CONSTRUCTION ----- COMMENTARE ANY RETAINING WALLS ANTICIPATED **No**

IS THERE A POSSIBILITY OF RELOCATEES ----- IF SO, DESCRIBE

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:

STRUCTURE DESIGN UNIT (COMPLETED BY THE STRUCTURE DESIGN UNIT PRIOR TO THE FSM)

POSSIBLE SUPERSTRUCTURE:

TYPE:

NUMBER OF SPANS LENGTH OF SPANS **(FT)**

WILL RAILROAD INVOLVEMENT BE REQUIRED -----

WILL STRUCTURE REQUIRE DESIGN FOR VESSEL IMPACT OR FENDER SYSTEM -----

DESCRIPTION:

ARE ANY RETAINING WALLS ANTICIPATED -----

CONSTRUCTABILITY AND ACCESS (DISCUSSED AT THE FSM BY DIVISION BRIDGE MANAGER)

METHOD OF ACCESS:

TOP-DOWN -----

(WORK BRIDGE / CAUSEWAY) PROPOSED LOCATION RELATIVE TO EXISTING STRUCTURE:

PROPOSED LENGTH (FT) WIDTH (FT)

MATERIAL AND EQUIPMENT ACCESS TO SITE:

TRACTOR-TRAILER ACCESS ----- BARGE ACCESS ----- HEAVY EQUIPMENT ACCESS -----

POSTED ROADS AND POSTED BRIDGES IN VICINITY THAT MAY AFFECT ACCESS -----

ARE CONSTRUCTION STAGING AREAS AVAILABLE NEAR SITE -----

ANY ANTICIPATED AREAS OF TEMPORARY SHORING REQUIRED -----

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:

ITEMS TO BE DISCUSSED / RESOLVED AT FSM BY ATTENDEES

LIST ALTERNATIVES TO BE STUDIED BY ROADWAY DESIGN:

- 1) **Replace in place**
- 2)
- 3)

DESCRIBE ANY DISCUSSION REGARDING HOW THE ALTERNATIVES WERE DECIDED UPON, WHY CERTAIN ALTERNATIVES WERE REJECTED, AND IF AN ALTERNATIVE WAS SELECTED, WHY.

Detour routesCHECK ONE

TYPE OF ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENT (CHECK ONE)

CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION (CE) ☒PROGRAMMATIC CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION (PCE) ☐

THE OPTIMUM LET DATE FOR THIS PROJECT IS:

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS AND/OR UNRESOLVED ISSUES TO BE ADDRESSED: **Per Rail Division, no rail interaction needed. At FSM, changed to 2 lane on-site detour. The roadway grade should be raised in order to accommodate the thicker superstructure.**