**Deliverables List for a Projects Covered by a Type III Categorical Exclusion**

This document shows the deliverables that are required to develop a project covered by a Type III Categorical Exclusion (CE) from Notice to Proceed (NTP) through project letting.

Note: This document is presented as an aid in the overall project development process, it is not intended to explain how to develop each deliverable. Its purpose is to help avoid missing steps and maintain project schedules.

NCDOT has a training on how to develop a Type III CE document, which can be found by clicking here: [NCDOT CE Checklist Training](https://connect.ncdot.gov/resources/dmpdt/dmpdt%20documents/forms/allitems.aspx?rootfolder=/resources/dmpdt/dmpdt+documents/categorical+exclusion+checklist&view=%7Bbfc488f5-7e20-450a-9b9c-9325567cf049%7D). The training includes information on how to fill in the CE checklist and how to comply with the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA). Other guidance materials cover the other deliverables mentioned for this document.

In this document, deliverables are broken down by discipline:

* Start of Study
* Traffic
* Roadway
* Planning
* Hydraulics
* Merger
* Permits
* Geoenvironmental and Geotechnical
* Other Design components
* Turnpike Projects

Deliverables are also shown by deliverable type:

* Request
* Report
* Design and Data (permit drawings or data files)
* Agreement
* Permit

When you click on a deliverable on the interactive chart on page 2, the following information will be displayed

* **Applicability**: Is this done for all projects, or only certain types of projects?
* **Predecessor / Successor:** What is required before this deliverable can be finalized/what can only be finalized after this deliverable is complete?
* **Developer:** Who generally develops this deliverable?
* **Reviewer / Approver:** Who generally reviews or approves this deliverable?
* **Review Timeframe**: How long you should expect before a review or approval takes place?
* **Where stored on Sharepoint:** Where should the deliverable be stored on the project Sharepoint site?
* **Common Issues**: What is a common issue that often delays finalizing this deliverable?
* **Suggested improvements:** This row is left blank. We are asking NCDOT Project Managers to share with us their suggestions on how each deliverable could be developed more efficiently. Please go to the following email address (LIST EMAIL ADDRESS) with your suggestions on how to develop these deliverables earlier and more efficiently.

**Deliverables**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Scoping Package** | |
| Applicability | All Projects – includes Start of Study Letters, ETRACS requests, Vicinity Map, Environmental Features Map, background information, and proposed schedule. Merger Screening may be included for simple projects. May be sent out as a letter. For more complex projects, a scoping meeting may be required. |
| Predecessor / Successor | NTP/All other tasks |
| Developer | NCDOT or Consultant |
| Reviewer / Approver | NCDOT PM, package sent to NCDOT, stakeholders, and agencies |
| Review Timeframe | One week or less for NCDOT PM review, request for comments within two weeks |
| Where Stored on SharePoint | Disciplines -> Project Management -> PM Topic: Scoping |
| Common Issues | Incomplete or Missing information |
| Suggested Improvements |  |
| **Orthophoto Request** | |
| Applicability | Sometimes County-Level data may be readily available, otherwise a request is required |
| Predecessor / Successor | NTP/All other tasks |
| Developer | Request should be submitted by NCDOT, can be prepared by Consultant |
| Reviewer / Approver | PM review, NCDOT Photogrammetry Unit receives request and schedules flights |
| Review Timeframe | One week or less for NCDOT PM review; Sites are flown in winter to minimize vegetative obstruction |
| Where Stored on SharePoint | Disciplines -> Project Management -> PM Topic: Scoping |
| Common Issues | Incomplete or Missing information in form |
| Suggested Improvements |  |
| **Crash Analysis** | |
| Applicability | Any project with perceived accident concerns, projects with bad geometry or congestion concerns |
| Predecessor / Successor | Pre-scoping or after scoping/Traffic Forecast, Roadway Design, Planning Document |
| Developer | NCDOT or Consultant |
| Reviewer / Approver | Generally, no review required |
| Review Timeframe | Not applicable |
| Where Stored on SharePoint | Disciplines -> Congestion Management -> CM Topic: |
| Common Issues | Study area changes could require re-analysis |
| Suggested Improvements |  |
| **Traffic Forecast** | |
| Applicability | Any project with anticipated capacity issues, new location projects; used to determine future base year and future year traffic volumes |
| Predecessor / Successor | Scoping / Traffic Analysis |
| Developer | NCDOT or Consultant |
| Reviewer / Approver | NCDOT Transportation Planning Division or Consultant |
| Review Timeframe | Two to three weeks |
| Where Stored on SharePoint | Disciplines -> Congestion Management -> CM Topic: Forecast |
| Common Issues | Design Changes, changes to project termini, issues with input data |
| Suggested Improvements |  |
| **Traffic Analysis** | |
| Applicability | Applied to projects to determine future level of service (LOS) and laneage needs |
| Predecessor / Successor | Traffic Forecast/Roadway Design Criteria, Environmental Document, IAR (if needed) |
| Developer | NCDOT or Consultant |
| Reviewer / Approver | NCDOT Congestion Management or Consultant |
| Review Timeframe | Three weeks |
| Where Stored on SharePoint | Disciplines -> Congestion Management -> CM Topic: Analysis |
| Common Issues | Design changes |
| Suggested Improvements |  |
| **Interstate Access Request (IAR)** | |
| Applicability | Projects that involve interstates or interstate ramps. |
| Predecessor / Successor | Traffic Analysis / Letting |
| Developer | Consultant |
| Reviewer / Approver | NCDOT and FHWA |
| Review Timeframe | 2 weeks local review by FHWA, then 4 weeks for FHWA’s DC office |
| Where Stored on SharePoint | Disciplines -> Congestion Management -> CM Topic: IAR |
| Common Issues | Design changes not incorporated |
| Suggested Improvements |  |
| **Design Criteria** | |
| Applicability | All projects |
| Predecessor / Successor | Project Scoping/15 Percent or 25 Percent Plans |
| Developer | NCDOT or Consultant |
| Reviewer / Approver | NCDOT or Consultant |
| Review Timeframe | One to two weeks |
| Where Stored on SharePoint | Disciplines -> Roadway Design -> RDY Topic: Consultant Submittals |
| Common Issues | Changes during design process that require rework |
| Suggested Improvements |  |
| **15 Percent Line and Grade** | |
| Applicability | Projects with questions on potential roadway concerns to verify alignment profile; uncommon currently |
| Predecessor / Successor | Design Criteria/25 Percent Plans |
| Developer | NCDOT or Consultant |
| Reviewer / Approver | NCDOT or Consultant |
| Review Timeframe | 2 weeks |
| Where Stored on SharePoint | Disciplines -> Roadway Design -> RDY Topic: PDF Plans |
| Common Issues | Incomplete scoping notes, thorough review of submissions required to move ahead efficiently |
| Suggested Improvements |  |
| **25 Percent Plans** | |
| Applicability | All projects |
| Predecessor / Successor | Design Criteria or 15 Percent Plans, Traffic Analysis / 65 Percent Plans, Traffic Noise Report, Environmental Document |
| Developer | NCDOT or Consultant |
| Reviewer / Approver | NCDOT Roadway Design or Consultant |
| Review Timeframe | 2-4 weeks depending on complexity |
| Where Stored on SharePoint | Disciplines -> Roadway Design -> Precon Phase: 25%-To Hydro: RDY Topic: PDF Plans |
| Common Issues | Inconsistency between traffic, design, and other disciplines, failure to follow NCDOT protocols, thorough review of submissions required to move ahead efficiently |
| Suggested Improvements |  |
| **Construction Cost Estimate Request** | |
| Applicability | All projects |
| Predecessor / Successor | Can be done for any level of design, primarily done after 25 Percent Plans / Environmental Document |
| Developer | NCDOT or Consultant |
| Reviewer / Approver | NCDOT or Consultant |
| Review Timeframe | Two weeks |
| Where Stored on SharePoint |  |
| Common Issues | Cost estimates at 25 Percent Plans have a contingency for other design elements, may over or underestimate costs |
| Suggested Improvements |  |
| **Right of Way and Relocation Estimate** | |
| Applicability | All projects; note that this estimate if done at 25 Percent Plans, will not have all potential impacts associated with drainage and utilities, etc. |
| Predecessor / Successor | 25 Percent Plans / Environmental Document |
| Developer | NCDOT or Consultant |
| Reviewer / Approver | NCDOT |
| Review Timeframe | Up to six months |
| Where Stored on SharePoint | Disciplines -> Right of Way -> ROW Topic: DOT Transmittals |
| Common Issues | Design changes |
| Suggested Improvements |  |
| **Utility Estimate** | |
| Applicability | All projects, estimate may be revised at 65 Percent Plans |
| Predecessor / Successor | 25 Percent Plans / Environmental Document |
| Developer | NCDOT or Consultant |
| Reviewer / Approver | NCDOT Utilities Unit or Consultant |
| Review Timeframe | Varies depending on length and complexity of project |
| Where Stored on SharePoint | Disciplines -> Utilities -> UT Topic: Hearing Maps |
| Common Issues | Changes at 65 Percent Plans can cause issues making right of way date |
| Suggested Improvements |  |
| **Public Hearing Map** | |
| Applicability | Any project where detailed information about the project will be shared with the public |
| Predecessor / Successor | Can be done for any level of design, typically done after 25 Percent Plans / public hearing or public meeting |
| Developer | NCDOT or Consultant |
| Reviewer / Approver | NCDOT Roadway Design or Consultant |
| Review Timeframe | Two weeks |
| Where Stored on SharePoint | Disciplines -> Roadway Design -> RDY Topic: Hearing Maps |
| Common Issues | Right of way may be changed later after drainage and utilities added. |
| Suggested Improvements |  |
| **Value Engineering Recommendation** | |
| Applicability | Generally for complex projects, often but not exclusively for interchange projects |
| Predecessor / Successor | Most commonly after 75 Percent Plans / 90 Percent Plans |
| Developer | NCDOT or Consultant |
| Reviewer / Approver | NCDOT Roadway Design |
| Review Timeframe | Generally, approximately one month |
| Where Stored on SharePoint | Disciplines -> Roadway Design -> Transmittals from NCDOT |
| Common Issues | May require substantial re-design if major changes found |
| Suggested Improvements |  |
| **Amenities Request** | |
| Applicability | All projects, most common for projects within municipalities if improvements to existing amenities are requested by a jurisdiction |
| Predecessor / Successor | The jurisdiction can request at any time (most commonly requests happen at internal scoping or prior to local officials informational meeting) / final design |
| Developer | NCDOT or Consultant develops to provide a cost estimate for the amenty(ies) and the estimated costs and cost share; municipality must sign an agreement before amenities are included on maps. |
| Reviewer / Approver | Signed agreement needed |
| Review Timeframe | Generally, one month for review |
| Where Stored on SharePoint |  |
| Common Issues | Questions over costs, changing municipality leadership can change goals for project |
| Suggested Improvements |  |
| **65 Percent Plans – Hydraulics + Design** | |
| Applicability | All Projects |
| Predecessor / Successor | 25 Percent Plans and hydraulics report / Field inspection |
| Developer | NCDOT or Consultant |
| Reviewer / Approver | NCDOT Roadway Design or Consultant |
| Review Timeframe | One month for most projects |
| Where Stored on SharePoint | Disciplines -> Roadway Design -> RDY Topic: PDF Plans |
| Common Issues | Issues with drainage may require redesign of roadway |
| Suggested Improvements |  |
| **Field Inspection Plan Set** | |
| Applicability | All projects |
| Predecessor / Successor | Done twice at 65 Percent Plans and 90 Percent Plans / 75 Percent Plans and Final Design |
| Developer | NCDOT or Consultant |
| Reviewer / Approver | NCDOT Roadway Design or Consultant |
| Review Timeframe | 30 days to review prior to field meeting |
| Where Stored on SharePoint |  |
| Common Issues | Can lead to typical section changes or pavement design changes |
| Suggested Improvements |  |
| **75 Percent Plans – Right of Way Plans** | |
| Applicability | All Projects |
| Predecessor / Successor | Done after 65 Percent Plans and field inspection / 90 Percent Plans and ROW acquisition |
| Developer | NCDOT or Consultant |
| Reviewer / Approver | NCDOT Roadway Design or Consultant |
| Review Timeframe | Two weeks, verifying no changes are required |
| Where Stored on SharePoint | Disciplines -> Roadway Design -> RDY Topic: PDF Plans |
| Common Issues | Design changes not previously requested |
| Suggested Improvements |  |
| **90 Percent Plans – Updates to Design through Right of Way, Structures, Updates for Pavement Design or other changes** | |
| Applicability | All projects, minor changes from previous, includes quantities, roadway incorporates other discipline plans |
| Predecessor / Successor | 75 Percent Plans |
| Developer | NCDOT or Consultant |
| Reviewer / Approver | NCDOT Roadway Design or Consultant |
| Review Timeframe | Two to four weeks |
| Where Stored on SharePoint | Disciplines -> Roadway Design -> RDY Topic: PDF Plans |
| Common Issues | Design changes, ensuring designs from other disciplines are the latest version and compatible with existing design |
| Suggested Improvements |  |
| **100 Percent Plans – Sealed but not signed design** | |
| Applicability | All projects |
| Predecessor / Successor | 90 percent plans / Final Sealed Plans |
| Developer | NCDOT or Consultant |
| Reviewer / Approver | NCDOT Roadway Design or Consultant |
| Review Timeframe | Up to two months |
| Where Stored on SharePoint | Disciplines -> Roadway Design -> RDY Topic: PDF Plans |
| Common Issues | Multiple rounds of comments may be required |
| Suggested Improvements |  |
| **Final Sealed – DocuSign Plan Set** | |
| Applicability | All projects, may include plan checking for larger projects (over $5 million) |
| Predecessor / Successor | 100 percent plans / Project letting |
| Developer | NCDOT or Consultant |
| Reviewer / Approver | NCDOT or Consultant |
| Review Timeframe | Final document, not reviewed |
| Where Stored on SharePoint | LET Preparation -> Final Plans -> Locked |
| Common Issues | Ensure designs, etc. consistent between disciplines |
| Suggested Improvements |  |
| **Merger Screening** | |
| Applicability | All projects |
| Predecessor / Successor | Can be done with scoping package or as a stand-alone meeting/Develop Environmental Document or go through Section 404/NEPA Merger Process. |
| Developer | NCDOT or Consultant |
| Reviewer / Approver | Reviewed and approved by Merger Team, USACE often makes final decision |
| Review Timeframe | Generally, agreement reached during meeting, subsequent to the meeting via email, key questions are amount of stream/wetland impacts and the presence of competing resources |
| Where Stored on SharePoint | Team Collaboration |
| Common Issues | Limited information for project definition |
| Suggested Improvements |  |
| **Merger Concurrence Point 1 - Purpose and Need and Study Area Defined** | |
| Applicability | Merger Projects only (generally due to competing resources); Can be combined with CP2 |
| Predecessor / Successor | Merger Screening, information to document Purpose and Need, Logical Termini, and Independent Utility / Merger Point CP2 or CP2A |
| Developer | NCDOT or Consultant |
| Reviewer / Approver | Reviewed by NCDOT Environmental Policy Unit, approved by Merger Team |
| Review Timeframe | Generally, agreement reached during meeting, subsequent to the meeting via email, or with a second Merger Team meeting |
| Where Stored on SharePoint | Collaboration-> External Collaboration -> EXT Topic: Merger Coordination |
| Common Issues | Failure to agree on Purpose and Need or Logical Termini |
| Suggested Improvements |  |
| **Merger Concurrence Point 2 - Detailed Study Alternatives Carried Forward** | |
| Applicability | Merger Projects only |
| Predecessor / Successor | CP1 Concurrence (or Merger Screening if combined with CP1), may be combined with CP2A / CP2A or CP3 |
| Developer | NCDOT or Consultant |
| Reviewer / Approver | Reviewed by NCDOT Environmental Policy Unit, approved by Merger Team |
| Review Timeframe | Generally, agreement reached during meeting, subsequent to the meeting via email, or with a second Merger Team meeting. |
| Where Stored on SharePoint | Collaboration-> External Collaboration -> EXT Topic: Merger Coordination |
| Common Issues | Disagreement on whether an alternative could be a potential LEDPA |
| Suggested Improvements |  |
| **Merger Concurrence Point 2A - Bridging Decisions and Alignment Review** | |
| Applicability | Merger Projects only |
| Predecessor / Successor | Hydraulics Report, CP2 Concurrence (or Merger Screening if CP 2 combined with CP1) / CP3 |
| Developer | NCDOT or Consultant |
| Reviewer / Approver | Reviewed by NCDOT Environmental Policy Unit, approved by Merger Team |
| Review Timeframe | Generally, agreement reached during meeting, subsequent to the meeting via email, or with a second Merger Team meeting |
| Where Stored on SharePoint | Collaboration-> External Collaboration -> EXT Topic: Merger Coordination |
| Common Issues | Insufficient information on required bridge or culvert lengths |
| Suggested Improvements |  |
| **Merger Concurrence Point 3 - LEDPA/Preferred Alternative Selection** | |
| Applicability | Merger Projects only |
| Predecessor / Successor | CP2A Concurrence, sometimes combined with CP4A / CP4A or CP4B |
| Developer | NCDOT or Consultant |
| Reviewer / Approver | Reviewed by NCDOT Environmental Policy Unit, approved by Merger Team |
| Review Timeframe | Generally, agreement reached during meeting, subsequent to the meeting via email, or with a second Merger Team meeting |
| Where Stored on SharePoint | Collaboration-> External Collaboration -> EXT Topic: Merger Coordination |
| Common Issues | Insufficient information to quantify human and natural environmental impacts |
| Suggested Improvements |  |
| **Merger Concurrence Point 4A - Avoidance and Minimization** | |
| Applicability | Merger Projects only |
| Predecessor / Successor | CP3 Concurrence (or CP2A concurrence if combined with CP3) / CP4B |
| Developer | NCDOT or Consultant |
| Reviewer / Approver | Reviewed by NCDOT Environmental Policy Unit, approved by Merger Team |
| Review Timeframe | Generally, agreement reached during meeting, subsequent to the meeting via email, or with a second Merger Team meeting |
| Where Stored on SharePoint | Collaboration-> External Collaboration -> EXT Topic: Merger Coordination |
| Common Issues | Insufficient documentation of minimization steps developed throughout the project, design changes |
| Suggested Improvements |  |
| **Merger Concurrence Point 4B - 30 Percent Hydraulic Review** | |
| Applicability | Merger Projects Only |
| Predecessor / Successor | Hydraulics Design, CP4A / Permit Drawings, CP4C |
| Developer | NCDOT or Consultant |
| Reviewer / Approver | Reviewed by NCDOT Environmental Policy Unit, approved by Merger Team |
| Review Timeframe | Generally, agreement reached during meeting, subsequent to the meeting via email, or with a second Merger Team meeting |
| Where Stored on SharePoint | Collaboration-> External Collaboration -> EXT Topic: Merger Coordination |
| Common Issues | Design changes |
| Suggested Improvements |  |
| **Merger Concurrence Point 4C - Permit Drawings Review** | |
| Applicability | Merger Projects Only |
| Predecessor / Successor | Permit Drawings, CP4B / 404 Permit Application, 401 Permit Application |
| Developer | NCDOT or Consultant |
| Reviewer / Approver | Reviewed by NCDOT Environmental Policy Unit, approved by Merger Team |
| Review Timeframe | Generally, agreement reached during meeting, subsequent to the meeting via email, or with a second Merger Team meeting |
| Where Stored on SharePoint | Collaboration-> External Collaboration -> EXT Topic: Merger Coordination |
| Common Issues | Design changes |
| Suggested Improvements |  |
| **Hydraulics Technical Memorandum** | |
| Applicability | All projects with major stream crossings (require a culvert or 72 inches in diameter or more or a bridge) |
| Predecessor / Successor | Natural Resources Technical Report / 65 Percent Roadway Plans |
| Developer | NCDOT Hydraulics Unit or Consultant |
| Reviewer / Approver | NCDOT Hydraulics Unit |
| Review Timeframe | Two to four weeks, depending on length of project and number of crossings |
| Where Stored on SharePoint | Disciplines-> Hydraulics -> HYD Topic: Consultant Submittals |
| Common Issues |  |
| Suggested Improvements |  |
| **Red Line Drainage Plans** | |
| Applicability | All projects with stream impacts or drainage design needs |
| Predecessor / Successor | 25 Percent Plans / 65 Percent Plans |
| Developer | Consultant |
| Reviewer / Approver | NCDOT |
| Review Timeframe | Two weeks |
| Where Stored on SharePoint | Disciplines-> Hydraulics -> HYD Topic: Drainage |
| Common Issues | Insufficient ditch design |
| Suggested Improvements |  |
| **Stormwater Management Plan/Permit Drawings** | |
| Applicability | All projects that increase impervious surface |
| Predecessor / Successor | 65 Percent Plans / 75 Percent Plans or 90 Percent Plans, depending on complexity |
| Developer | Consultant |
| Reviewer / Approver | NCDOT Roadside Environmental and Hydraulics Unit |
| Review Timeframe | Two weeks to review, must be submitted three months before project letting |
| Where Stored on SharePoint |  |
| Common Issues | Missing best management practices (BMPs) |
| Suggested Improvements |  |
| **Final Survey** | |
| Applicability | All Projects |
| Predecessor / Successor | Can be requested any time, needed when final alternative selected / 25 Percent Plans |
| Developer | NCDOT or Consultant |
| Reviewer / Approver | NCDOT Location and Surveys Unit or Consultant |
| Review Timeframe | Generally considered a final deliverable when received |
| Where Stored on SharePoint | Disciplines -> Location and Surveys -> LS Topic: Final Surveys |
| Common Issues | Design changes require additional surveys |
| Suggested Improvements |  |
| **Work Zone Plans (Concepts)** | |
| Applicability | Projects with over 7,500 ADT and either lane closures or detours (check with Work Zone Traffic Control Unit) |
| Predecessor / Successor | 25 Percent Plans, Environmental Document, may be done after 65 Percent Plans if hydraulics issues are complex / Field Inspection after 65 Percent Plans, 90 Percent Work Zone Plans |
| Developer | NCDOT or Consultant |
| Reviewer / Approver | Work Zone Traffic Control Unit |
| Review Timeframe | Two weeks |
| Where Stored on SharePoint | Disciplines -> Work Zone Traffic Control -> WZ Topic: PDF Plans |
| Common Issues | Make sure consistent with current roadway design and hydraulic design; Congestion, bike and pedestrian effects |
| Suggested Improvements |  |
| **90 Percent Work Zone Plans** | |
| Applicability | All projects with Work Zone Concept Plans |
| Predecessor / Successor | Work Zone Concept Plans, 75 Percent Roadway Plans / 90 Percent Field Inspection |
| Developer | NCDOT or Consultant |
| Reviewer / Approver | Work Zone Traffic Control Unit |
| Review Timeframe | Two weeks |
| Where Stored on SharePoint | Disciplines -> Work Zone Traffic Control -> WZ Topic: PDF Plans |
| Common Issues | Make sure quantities and special provisions are included, consistent with structure design and signals, make sure there is coordination with Geotech on the need for temporary shoring |
| Suggested Improvements |  |
| **100 Percent Work Zone Plans** | |
| Applicability | All projects with 90 Percent Work Zone Plans |
| Predecessor / Successor | 90 Percent Work Zone Plans / DocuSign Plan Set |
| Developer | NCDOT or Consultant |
| Reviewer / Approver | Work Zone Traffic Control Unit |
| Review Timeframe | Two weeks |
| Where Stored on SharePoint | LET Preparation -> Final Plans -> Locked |
| Common Issues | Ensuring all designs current and previous changes made |
| Suggested Improvements |  |
| **75 Percent Signal Plans** | |
| Applicability | All projects with traffic signals or cable routing |
| Predecessor / Successor | 65 Percent Roadway Plans/75 Percent Roadway Plans |
| Developer | Consultant |
| Reviewer / Approver | Division Traffic Engineer, Regional Traffic Engineer, sometimes Central Signals & ITS (if requested) |
| Review Timeframe | Three weeks |
| Where Stored on SharePoint |  |
| Common Issues | Coordination with other disciplines |
| Suggested Improvements |  |
| **90 Percent Signal Plans** | |
| Applicability | All projects with traffic signals or cable routing |
| Predecessor / Successor | 75 Percent Roadway Plans / 90 Percent Roadway Plans |
| Developer | Consultant |
| Reviewer / Approver | Division Traffic Engineer, Regional Traffic Engineer, sometimes Central Signals & ITS (if requested) |
| Review Timeframe | Three weeks |
| Where Stored on SharePoint |  |
| Common Issues | Changes in project design |
| Suggested Improvements |  |
| **100 Percent Signal Plans** | |
| Applicability | All projects with traffic signals or cable routing |
| Predecessor / Successor | 90 Percent Roadway Plans/100 Percent Roadway Plans |
| Developer | Consultant |
| Reviewer / Approver | Division Traffic Engineer, Regional Traffic Engineer, sometimes Central Signals & ITS (if requested) |
| Review Timeframe | Two weeks |
| Where Stored on SharePoint | LET Preparation -> Final Plans -> Locked |
| Common Issues | Coordination between disciplines, addressing previous comments |
| Suggested Improvements |  |
| **25 Percent Guide Signing and Routing Review** | |
| Applicability | Projects with Type A, B, and D signs |
| Predecessor / Successor | 25 Percent Roadway Plans / 65 Percent Plans |
| Developer | Consultant |
| Reviewer / Approver | Division Traffic Engineer, Regional Traffic Engineer, sometimes Central Signing (if US or Interstate) |
| Review Timeframe | Two weeks |
| Where Stored on SharePoint |  |
| Common Issues | Nonconformance with standards and practices |
| Suggested Improvements |  |
| **25 Percent Sign Structure Location** | |
| Applicability | Projects with overhead sign structures |
| Predecessor / Successor | 25 Percent Roadway Plans/65 Percent Plans |
| Developer | Consultant |
| Reviewer / Approver | NCDOT Roadway and Utilities |
| Review Timeframe | Two weeks |
| Where Stored on SharePoint |  |
| Common Issues | Failure to account for overhead signs |
| Suggested Improvements |  |
| **50 Percent Stop Bars and Crosswalk Locations** | |
| Applicability | All projects with signals |
| Predecessor / Successor | 65 Percent Roadway Plans / 75 Percent Roadway Plans |
| Developer | Consultant |
| Reviewer / Approver | NCDOT Signals Design Section |
| Review Timeframe | Three weeks |
| Where Stored on SharePoint |  |
| Common Issues | Coordination issues |
| Suggested Improvements |  |
| **50 Percent Signing and Delineation Plans** | |
| Applicability | All projects |
| Predecessor / Successor | 75 Percent Roadway Plans / 90 Percent Roadway Plans |
| Developer | Consultant |
| Reviewer / Approver | Division Traffic Engineer and Regional Traffic Engineer, Central NCDOT for interstates and US routes |
| Review Timeframe | Two weeks |
| Where Stored on SharePoint |  |
| Common Issues | Comments that modify previous designs |
| Suggested Improvements |  |
| **90 Percent Signing and Delineation Plans** | |
| Applicability | All projects |
| Predecessor / Successor | 75 Percent Roadway Plans/100 Percent Roadway Plans |
| Developer | Consultant |
| Reviewer / Approver | Division Traffic Engineer and Regional Traffic Engineer, Central NCDOT for interstates and US routes |
| Review Timeframe | Two Weeks |
| Where Stored on SharePoint | LET Preparation -> Final Plans -> Locked |
| Common Issues | Coordination between disciplines |
| Suggested Improvements |  |
| **100 Percent Signing and Delineation Plans** | |
| Applicability | All projects |
| Predecessor / Successor | 90 Percent Roadway Plans / 100 Percent Roadway Plans |
| Developer | Consultant |
| Reviewer / Approver | Division Traffic Engineer and Regional Traffic Engineer, Central NCDOT for interstates and US routes |
| Review Timeframe | Two weeks |
| Where Stored on SharePoint | LET Preparation -> Final Plans -> Locked |
| Common Issues | Ensuring comments are addressed |
| Suggested Improvements |  |
| **Utility Construction Plan** | |
| Applicability | All projects with “dry” utilities |
| Predecessor / Successor | 65 Percent Roadway Plans / 75 Percent Roadway Plans |
| Developer | NCDOT or Consultant |
| Reviewer / Approver | NCDOT Roadway |
| Review Timeframe | Varies depending on length and complexity of project |
| Where Stored on SharePoint |  |
| Common Issues | Missing or incomplete information on existing utilities |
| Suggested Improvements |  |
| **Utilities by Others Plans** | |
| Applicability | All projects with “wet” utilities |
| Predecessor / Successor | 65 Percent Roadway Plans / 75 Percent Roadway Plans |
| Developer | Utility Company |
| Reviewer / Approver | Received from utility company, incorporated into 75 Percent Roadway Plans |
| Review Timeframe | Varies depending on length and complexity of project |
| Where Stored on SharePoint |  |
| Common Issues | Utility company not responsive |
| Suggested Improvements |  |
| **Utility Construction Request** | |
| Applicability | All projects with utilities |
| Predecessor / Successor | 90 Percent Roadway Plans / 100 Percent Roadway Plans |
| Developer | NCDOT or Consultant |
| Reviewer / Approver |  |
| Review Timeframe | Varies depending on length and complexity of project |
| Where Stored on SharePoint |  |
| Common Issues |  |
| Suggested Improvements |  |
| **401 Permit (Water Quality Certification)** | |
| Applicability | All projects with stream or wetland impacts |
| Predecessor / Successor | WEX file with approved jurisdictional stream and wetland impacts / Construction |
| Developer | NCDOT |
| Reviewer / Approver | Approved by NC Department of Water Resources |
| Review Timeframe | 30 days |
| Where Stored on SharePoint | Disciplines -> Natural Environment -> Environmental Coordination and Permitting (ECAP) |
| Common Issues |  |
| Suggested Improvements |  |
| **Section 10 Navigable Waters Permit** | |
| Applicability | Obtained when impacting navigable waters as defined by the US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) |
| Predecessor / Successor | Identify issue when developing Environmental Features Map / coordination through final design |
| Developer | NCDOT or Consultant |
| Reviewer / Approver | US Army Corps of Engineers |
| Review Timeframe | Varies according to complexity of the project |
| Where Stored on SharePoint | Disciplines -> Natural Environment -> Environmental Coordination and Permitting (ECAP) |
| Common Issues | Check with Coast Guard before submitting |
| Suggested Improvements |  |
| **USACE Certification (404 Permit: Nationwide or Individual)** | |
| Applicability | Projects that have impacts to jurisdictional streams and wetlands |
| Predecessor / Successor | WEX file with approved jurisdictional stream and wetland impacts / Construction |
| Developer | NCDOT or Consultant |
| Reviewer / Approver | US Army Corps of Engineers |
| Review Timeframe | 120 days for an individual permit, 45 days for a nationwide permit |
| Where Stored on SharePoint | Disciplines -> Natural Environment -> Environmental Coordination and Permitting (ECAP) |
| Common Issues | Ensure address for an individual permit is included and it includes mandatory public notice minimum 15 days to 30 days. |
| Suggested Improvements |  |
| **Coast Guard Permit** | |
| Applicability | Bridges that cross tidally influenced or deep, unobstructed waters |
| Predecessor / Successor | Identify issue when developing Environmental Features Map/coordination through final design |
| Developer | NCDOT or Consultant, coordinate with FHWA |
| Reviewer / Approver | Coast Guard |
| Review Timeframe | Advanced approval 3 to 6 months, full Coast Guard Approval 12 months |
| Where Stored on SharePoint | Disciplines -> Natural Environment -> Environmental Coordination and Permitting (ECAP) |
| Common Issues | Make sure public notice is included |
| Suggested Improvements |  |
| **Coastal Area Management Act (CAMA) Permit** | |
| Applicability | Impacts to CAMA action areas in 20 coastal counties covered in CAMA (Currituck, Camden, Pasquotank, Perquimans, Chowan, Gates, Hertford, Bertie, Washington, Tyrrell, Dare, Hyde, Beaufort, Pamlico, Carteret, Craven, Onslow, Pender, New Hanover, and Brunswick) |
| Predecessor / Successor | Environmental Document / Letting |
| Developer | NCDOT or Consultant |
| Reviewer / Approver | North Carolina Division of Coastal Management |
| Review Timeframe | 25 to 50 days for minor projects, longer for major projects |
| Where Stored on SharePoint | Disciplines -> Natural Environment -> Environmental Coordination and Permitting (ECAP) |
| Common Issues | Includes 30 day public notice period |
| Suggested Improvements |  |
| **Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC) Permit** | |
| Applicability | Projects in the area of influence of a FERC dam; if the dam or associated recreational features unaffected, it’s a FERC conveyance; if changes take place affecting the FERC license, application filed with FERC in Washington, DC |
| Predecessor / Successor | Identify issue when developing Environmental Features Map / coordination through final design |
| Developer | NCDOT |
| Reviewer / Approver | Relevant Utility, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission |
| Review Timeframe | Up to six months for conveyance; 12 months plus if DC involvement |
| Where Stored on SharePoint | Disciplines -> Natural Environment -> Environmental Coordination and Permitting (ECAP) |
| Common Issues | Failure to identify impacts to FERC influenced waters early in project development |
| Suggested Improvements |  |
| **TVA Permit** | |
| Applicability | Projects that impact land or lakes under the control of the Tennessee Valley Authority (only in Division 14)\* -Includes portions of Fontana Lake, Lake Hiwassee, and Chatuga Lake |
| Predecessor / Successor | Environmental Document (submitted same time as 401/404 permits / Letting |
| Developer | NCDOT or Consultant |
| Reviewer / Approver | TVA |
| Review Timeframe | 60 days |
| Where Stored on SharePoint | Disciplines -> Natural Environment -> Environmental Coordination and Permitting (ECAP) |
| Common Issues | Number of potential lakes and areas has been reduced, don’t apply for unnecessarily |
| Suggested Improvements |  |
| **Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Permit (No Rise) Memorandum of Agreement** | |
| Applicability | All projects that have stream impacts but do not increase the 100-year base flood elevation (BFE) |
| Predecessor / Successor | WET file/Construction |
| Developer | NCDOT or Consultant, generally submitted by NCDOT |
| Reviewer / Approver | North Carolina Floodplain Mapping Program |
| Review Timeframe | 90 days |
| Where Stored on SharePoint |  |
| Common Issues |  |
| Suggested Improvements |  |
| **CLOMR** | |
| Applicability | Projects that will result in an increase in the 100-year base flood elevation (BFE) require a FEMA Conditional Letter of Map Revision (CLOMR) |
| Predecessor / Successor | WET file / Letter of Map Revision (LOMR) |
| Developer | NCDOT or Consultant, generally submitted by NCDOT |
| Reviewer / Approver | North Carolina Floodplain Mapping Program and the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) |
| Review Timeframe | Nine to twelve months |
| Where Stored on SharePoint |  |
| Common Issues | Not including the 65 Percent plans or a list of affected property owners |
| Suggested Improvements |  |
| **LOMR** | |
| Applicability | All projects with a Conditional Letter of Map Revision (CLOMR) will require a Letter of Map Revision (LOMR) after construction |
| Predecessor / Successor | CLOMR, Project Construction / No follow up activity once accepted |
| Developer | NCDOT or Consultant |
| Reviewer / Approver | North Carolina Floodplain Mapping Program |
| Review Timeframe | Must be submitted within six months of construction |
| Where Stored on SharePoint |  |
| Common Issues | Not including the As-Built plans or a list of affected property owners |
| Suggested Improvements |  |
| **Riparian Buffer Authorization** | |
| Applicability | All projects in the following river basins or watersheds: Neuse, Tar-Pamlico, Catawba, Randleman, Jordan, or Goose Creek |
| Predecessor / Successor | Environmental Document, supplied with 401 permit / Construction |
| Developer | NCDOT |
| Reviewer / Approver | North Carolina Department of Environmental Quality Water Quality Committee |
| Review Timeframe | Minor projects: two to four weeks. For major projects, goes in with permit |
| Where Stored on SharePoint | Disciplines -> Natural Environment -> Environmental Coordination and Permitting (ECAP) |
| Common Issues | Proper determination of buffer impact types and zones, easy to double count effects |
| Suggested Improvements |  |
| **State Storm Water Permit** | |
| Applicability | Talk to andy mcdaniel in hydro |
| Predecessor / Successor |  |
| Developer |  |
| Reviewer / Approver |  |
| Review Timeframe |  |
| Where Stored on SharePoint |  |
| Common Issues |  |
| Suggested Improvements |  |
| **Utility Construction Permit** | |
| Applicability | Utilities have to ask a permit, typically taken care of with 404 permit; may be needed early to accommodate some utility movement |
| Predecessor / Successor | 75 percent design/90 percent design (varies by project) |
| Developer | Consultant |
| Reviewer / Approver | ECAP review, NCDOT Utilities |
| Review Timeframe | 2 weeks |
| Where Stored on SharePoint |  |
| Common Issues | Failure to coordinate up front |
| Suggested Improvements |  |
| **Geoenvironmental Report** | |
| Applicability | Projects that acquire right of way |
| Predecessor / Successor | Request at Scoping / if potentially contaminated sites found, a detailed Phase I Site Assessment may be required prior to completion of the Environmental Document |
| Developer | NCDOT Geoenvironmental |
| Reviewer / Approver |  |
| Review Timeframe |  |
| Where Stored on SharePoint | Disciplines -> Geoenvironmental -> GE Topic: NCDOT Transmittals |
| Common Issues | Changes to study area require revisiting |
| Suggested Improvements |  |
| **Phase 1 Site Assessment** | |
| Applicability | Projects that have potentially contaminated sites |
| Predecessor / Successor | Geoenvironmental Report / Environmental Document |
| Developer | NCDOT or Consultant |
| Reviewer / Approver | NCDOT |
| Review Timeframe | Two weeks |
| Where Stored on SharePoint | Disciplines -> Geoenvironmental -> GE Topic: NCDOT Transmittals |
| Common Issues | Changes to study area |
| Suggested Improvements |  |
| **Geotechnical Report** | |
| Applicability | All projects with structures, retaining walls, or large cuts into bedrock |
| Predecessor / Successor | 75 Percent Roadway Plans / 90 Percent Roadway Plans |
| Developer | Consultant |
| Reviewer / Approver | NCDOT Geotechnical Engineering Unit |
| Review Timeframe | Varies depending on length of project and complexity |
| Where Stored on SharePoint | Disciplines -> Geotechnical -> GT Topic: NCDOT Transmittals |
| Common Issues |  |
| Suggested Improvements |  |
| **Community Characteristics Report** | |
| Applicability | Projects with only one build alternative or very simple projects |
| Predecessor / Successor | Determination of Study Area/Generally sufficient to develop determinations for Environmental Document. If critical human or endangered species impacts, Public Involvement Plan or Indirect and Cumulative Effects Report may be required. |
| Developer | NCDOT or Consultant |
| Reviewer / Approver | NCDOT EAU, Public Involvement, Community Studies and Visualization |
| Review Timeframe | Generally, two weeks for review |
| Where Stored on SharePoint | Disciplines -> Human Environment |
| Common Issues | Failure to reach agreement with reviewer on Direct Community Impact Area, failure to check on latest guidance, missed resources |
| Suggested Improvements |  |
| **Community Impact Assessment** | |
| Applicability | Used to evaluate projects with multiple alternatives |
| Predecessor / Successor | Determination of Study Area/Generally sufficient to develop determinations for Environmental Document. If critical human or endangered species impacts, Public Involvement Plan or Indirect and Cumulative Effects Report may be required. |
| Developer | NCDOT or Consultant |
| Reviewer / Approver | NCDOT EAU, Public Involvement, Community Studies and Visualization |
| Review Timeframe | Generally, two weeks for review |
| Where Stored on SharePoint | Disciplines -> Human Environment |
| Common Issues | Failure to reach agreement with reviewer on Direct Community Impact Area, failure to check on latest guidance, missed resources |
| Suggested Improvements |  |
| **Public Involvement Plan** | |
| Applicability | For projects with impacts to specific communities, most commonly Environmental Justice communities |
| Predecessor / Successor | CCR or CIA/Environmental Document |
| Developer | NCDOT or Consultant |
| Reviewer / Approver | NCDOT EAU, Public Involvement, Community Studies and Visualization |
| Review Timeframe | Two weeks |
| Where Stored on SharePoint | Disciplines -> Human Environment |
| Common Issues | Coordination on outreach approach, stakeholder buy-in |
| Suggested Improvements |  |
| **Indirect and Cumulative Effects Determination** | |
| Applicability | Generally part of the screening with a CCR or a CIA, can require a separate document if there are impacts to certain endangered species |
| Predecessor / Successor | CCR or CIA |
| Developer | NCDOT or Consultant |
| Reviewer / Approver | Reviewed and approved by NCDOT EAU, Public Involvement, Community Studies and Visualization and NCDOT EAU, Environmental Coordination and Permitting |
| Review Timeframe |  |
| Where Stored on SharePoint | Disciplines -> Human Environment |
| Common Issues |  |
| Suggested Improvements |  |
| **Natural Resources Technical Report** | |
| Applicability | All Projects |
| Predecessor / Successor | Determination of Study Area/ Environmental Document, WET file |
| Developer | NCDOT or Consultant |
| Reviewer / Approver | Division Environmental Officer or NCDOT EAU, Environmental Coordination and Permitting |
| Review Timeframe | Generally, two weeks for review |
| Where Stored on SharePoint | Disciplines -> Natural Environment -> NE Topic: Environmental Coordination and Permitting (ECAP) |
| Common Issues | Changes in study area, need to accommodate narrow T&E survey windows, insufficient documentation for review |
| Suggested Improvements |  |
| **WEX File** | |
| Applicability | All projects with stream or wetland impacts |
| Predecessor / Successor | Natural Resources Technical Report/ Preliminary Jurisdictional Determination Package |
| Developer | NCDOT or Consultant |
| Reviewer / Approver | NCDOT EAU, Environmental Coordination and Permitting |
| Review Timeframe | Two to four weeks |
| Where Stored on SharePoint | Disciplines -> Natural Environment -> NE Topic: Environmental Coordination and Permitting (ECAP) |
| Common Issues |  |
| Suggested Improvements |  |
| **Preliminary Jurisdictional Determination Package** | |
| Applicability | All projects with stream or wetland impacts |
| Predecessor / Successor | WEX File/WET File |
| Developer | NCDOT or Consultant |
| Reviewer / Approver | NCDOT EAU, Environmental Coordination and Permitting |
| Review Timeframe | Two to four weeks |
| Where Stored on SharePoint | Disciplines -> Natural Environment -> NE Topic: Environmental Coordination and Permitting (ECAP) |
| Common Issues |  |
| Suggested Improvements |  |
| **WET File** | |
| Applicability | All projects with stream or wetland impacts |
| Predecessor / Successor | Preliminary Jurisdictional Determination Package/404 Permit, Environmental Document |
| Developer | NCDOT or Consultant |
| Reviewer / Approver | NCDOT EAU, Environmental Coordination and Permitting |
| Review Timeframe | Two weeks |
| Where Stored on SharePoint | Disciplines -> Natural Environment -> NE Topic-> Environmental Coordination and Permitting (ECAP) |
| Common Issues |  |
| Suggested Improvements |  |
| **Biological Assessment** | |
| Applicability | Projects that require formal consultation with US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) or National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) for impacts to federally protected species |
| Predecessor / Successor | Natural Resources Technical Report (NRTR) / Biological Opinion (BO) |
| Developer | NCDOT or Consultant |
| Reviewer / Approver | NCDOT EAU, Environmental Coordination and Permitting followed by applicable federal agency |
| Review Timeframe | Agency has up to 6 months for review |
| Where Stored on SharePoint | Disciplines -> Natural Environment -> NE Topic: Biological Survey Group |
| Common Issues | Changes in design during development |
| Suggested Improvements |  |
| **Biological Opinion** | |
| Applicability | Projects that require formal consultation with US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) or National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) for impacts to federally protected species |
| Predecessor / Successor | Biological Assessment (BA)/Environmental Document |
| Developer | USFWS or NMFS (whichever agency has jurisdiction) |
| Reviewer / Approver | NCDOT receives the BO from the lead federal agency |
| Review Timeframe | Received within six months of submittal of the BA |
| Where Stored on SharePoint | Disciplines -> Natural Environment -> NE Topic: Biological Survey Group |
| Common Issues | Changes in design during development |
| Suggested Improvements |  |
| **Traffic Noise Report** | |
| Applicability | Any Type I Project federal aid project as per FHWA guidelines (adds capacity or cuts the distance from roadway to receptors by 50 percent), MCDC projects that increase capacity on access controlled US routes. |
| Predecessor / Successor | 25 Percent Plans / Generally sufficient to develop determinations for Environmental Document |
| Developer | NCDOT or Consultant |
| Reviewer / Approver | NCDOT Noise, Air Quality, and Cultural Resources |
| Review Timeframe | NCDOT has 30 days to review |
| Where Stored on SharePoint | Disciplines -> Human Environment -> Traffic Noise & Air Quality |
| Common Issues | Insufficient model validation |
| Suggested Improvements |  |
| **Design Noise Report** | |
| Applicability | If there are impacted noise receptors found in the TNR that potentially meet criteria for a noise wall |
| Predecessor / Successor | Traffic Noise Report, 65 Percent Plans (Post-NEPA)/75 Percent Plans |
| Developer | Design Build Team or Consultant |
| Reviewer / Approver | NCDOT Noise, Air Quality, and Cultural Resources |
| Review Timeframe | Design Build 10 working days; Design Bid Build 30 days |
| Where Stored on SharePoint | Disciplines -> Human Environment -> Traffic Noise & Air Quality |
| Common Issues | Obtaining public input (voting) on noise walls |
| Suggested Improvements |  |
| **Air Quality Report** | |
| Applicability | Qualitative Mobile Source Air Toxics (MSAT) analysis needed for projects with less than 140,000 annual average daily traffic (AADT), quantitative analysis needed for projects over 140,000 AADT |
| Predecessor / Successor | Scoping, alternatives analysis/Environmental document |
| Developer | NCDOT or Consultant |
| Reviewer / Approver | NCDOT Noise, Air Quality, and Cultural Resources |
| Review Timeframe | Two weeks |
| Where Stored on SharePoint | Disciplines -> Human Environment -> Traffic Noise & Air Quality |
| Common Issues | Not following template language |
| Suggested Improvements |  |
| **Historic Architecture Screening/Report** | |
| Applicability | All Projects |
| Predecessor / Successor | After the project study area determined (note, if study area changes, may need to redo) / Environmental Document |
| Developer | Requested via ETRACS, developed by NCDOT Human Environment or Qualified Historian |
| Reviewer / Approver | NCDOT Noise, Air Quality, and Cultural Resources (also NC State Historic Preservation Office if resources impacted). FHWA approval for adverse effects for federally funded projects |
| Review Timeframe | One month (+) for screenings, six months if resources are found and a report is needed |
| Where Stored on SharePoint | Disciplines -> Human Environment -> Historic Architecture |
| Common Issues | Study Area Map, GIS or CAD file with study area is needed to expedite review, need US Geologic Survey Quad Map name |
| Suggested Improvements |  |
| **Archaeology Screening/Report** | |
| Applicability | All Projects |
| Predecessor / Successor | After the project study area determined (note: if study area changes may need to redo)/Environmental Document |
| Developer | Requested via ETRACS, developed by NCDOT Human Environment or Qualified Historian |
| Reviewer / Approver | NCDOT Noise, Air Quality, and Cultural Resources (also North Carolina Office of State Archaeology if resources impacted). FHWA approval for adverse effects for federally funded projects |
| Review Timeframe | One month (+) for screenings, six months if resources are found and a report is needed |
| Where Stored on SharePoint | Disciplines -> Human Environment -> Archaeology |
| Common Issues | Study Area Map, GIS or CAD file with study area is needed to expedite review, need US Geologic Survey Quad Map name |
| Suggested Improvements |  |
| **Section 4(f) Evaluation** | |
| Applicability | Properties that have 4(f) effects to federal aid transportation projects |
| Predecessor / Successor | 25 Percent Plans / final agreement included in Environmental Document |
| Developer | NCDOT or Consultant |
| Reviewer / Approver | NCDOT Noise, Air Quality, and Cultural Resources, Federal Highway Administration |
| Review Timeframe | 2 to 4 weeks, depends on scale |
| Where Stored on SharePoint | Disciplines -> Project Management -> Final Planning Document |
| Common Issues | Waiting to approve MOA, need minimization measures and avoidance documented, include evaluation of avoidance alternative |
| Suggested Improvements |  |
| **Section 106 Memorandum of Agreement** | |
| Applicability | When there is an adverse effect to a property listed in or eligible for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) |
| Predecessor / Successor | Effects determination meeting / Environmental Document and Permitting |
| Developer | NCDOT |
| Reviewer / Approver | NCDOT Noise, Air Quality, and Cultural Resources, and North Carolina State Historic Preservation Office, FHWA, and any consulting parties (tribes, property owners, local preservation groups, National Parks Service, US Forest Service, etc.) |
| Review Timeframe | 1 month, longer if Advisory Council on Historic Preservation is involved |
| Where Stored on SharePoint | Disciplines -> Human Environment -> Historic Architecture |
| Common Issues | Ensure responsible party for mitigation is identified as well as a timeframe for mitigation; there must be an opportunity for public comment |
| Suggested Improvements |  |
| **Land and Water Conservation Fund Memorandum or Agreement** | |
| Applicability | Projects that acquire right of way from park or public recreation facilities purchased all or in part using Land and Water Act Conservation Fund |
| Predecessor / Successor | Identify during development of Environmental Features Map, conclude prior to finalizing document |
| Developer | NCDOT or Consultant; NCDOT submits to North Carolina Parks and Recreation |
| Reviewer / Approver | US Department of Interior has final approval once submitted through North Carolina Parks Service |
| Review Timeframe | Allow 30 to 45 days |
| Where Stored on SharePoint | Disciplines -> Natural Environment -> NE Topic: Environmental Coordination and Permitting (ECAP) |
| Common Issues | Identifying replacement parcels |
| Suggested Improvements |  |
| **Type III Categorical Exclusion Document** | |
| Applicability | Federal Aid Projects where there is a very limited possibility of significant environmental impacts |
| Predecessor / Successor | 25 Percent Plans, Merger Concurrence Point CP3/Permitting, 75 Percent Plans, Construction |
| Developer | NCDOT or Consultant |
| Reviewer / Approver | NCDOT or Consultant, and FHWA |
| Review Timeframe | Generally two weeks for NCDOT review, 2 weeks for FHWA review if all supplemental information available. |
| Where Stored on SharePoint | Disciplines -> Project Management -> Final Planning Document |
| Common Issues | Missing documentation, inconsistency between determinations in the checklist and the information in the NRTR or scoping notes |
| Suggested Improvements |  |
| **Construction Consultation** | |
| Applicability | Needed if a there is more than one year between CE signature and right of way acquisition or right of way acquisition and start of construction |
| Predecessor / Successor | CE / right of way or construction |
| Developer | NCDOT or Consultant |
| Reviewer / Approver | FHWA for Type III CEs |
| Review Timeframe | Generally can be reviewed in less than one month |
| Where Stored on SharePoint | Disciplines -> Project Management -> Reevaluations & Consultations |
| Common Issues | Changes to protected species listed in county |
| Suggested Improvements |  |
| **Traffic and Revenue Study** | |
| Applicability | Projects under consideration as toll projects |
| Predecessor / Successor | Should be evaluated pre-scoping |
| Developer | North Carolina Turnpike Authority or Consultant |
| Reviewer / Approver | NCTA |
| Review Timeframe | Depending on complexity, two for six weeks |
| Where Stored on SharePoint |  |
| Common Issues | Coordination on traffic models and ensuring most recent version of models used |
| Suggested Improvements |  |