PROJECT SCOPING REPORT SCREENING CHECKLIST

SPOT ID: H185357	FACILITY: CAPE FEAR MEMORIAL BRIDGE, NEW HANOVER & BRUNSWICK COUNTIES	DIVISION: 3	FIRM: HDR
------------------	---	-------------	-----------

	Scientific Name	Common Name	Brunswick County	New Hanover County	Federal Status			
	Alligator mississippiensis	American alligator	\checkmark	\checkmark	T (S/A)			
	Haliaeetus leucocephalus	Bald eagle		\checkmark	BGPA			
	Thalictrum cooleyi	Cooley's meadowrue		\checkmark	E			
	Laterallus jamaicensis ssp. jamaicensis	Eastern black rail		\checkmark	Т			
	Carex lutea	Golden sedge		\checkmark	E			
	Chelonia mydas	Green sea turtle		\checkmark	Т			
	Eretmochelys imbricata	Hawksbill sea turtle			Е			
	Lepidochelys kempii	Kemp's (=Atlantic) ridley sea turtle			E			
	Dermochelys coriacea	Leatherback sea turtle	√	√	E			
	Caretta	Loggerhead sea turtle		√	<u> </u>			
	Myotis septentrionalis	Northern long-eared bat	√	<u></u>	T			
	Charadrius melodus	Piping plover	N	<u> </u>	T			
	Picoides borealis	Red-cockaded woodpecker	<u>N</u>	N	E			
	Calidris canutus rufa	Red knot	<u>N</u>	N	T			
	Lysimachia asperulaefolia Amaranthus pumilus	Rough-leaved loosestrife Seabeach amaranth	<u> </u>	N 1	<u>Е</u> Т			
	Menidia extensa	Waccamaw silverside-Range by basin		N	<u> </u>			
	Trichechus manatus	West Indian manatee	 √	V	<u> </u>			
	Mycteria americana BGPA- Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act E= endangered	Wood stork T (S/A)= Threatened due to Similar Appeara T= threatened	v √ ance	N	T			
	(BGPA)? The Bald eagle is listed for both N	s subject to the conditions of the Bald New Hanover and Brunswick counties	5.					
	Does the project generate substantial controversy or public opposition, for any reason, following appropriate public involvement?							
	None uncovered during preliminary analysis.							
	Does the project cause disproportionately high and adverse impacts relative to low-income and/or minority populations?							
	Observations based on aerial photography indicate that the area surrounding the project within a 0.5 mile radius is mostly urban residential, with commercial and industrial land uses in New Hanover County and wetlands or vacant land in Brunswick County.							
	Census data indicated that there	is a notable presence of minority ar	nd low income	populations	in the City			
		on the New Hanover County side of t						

Minority		White, Non-H	lispanic	Minority Population*			Meets Thresholds	
Geography	Total Population	#	%	#	%	50%	10% over County	
CT 202.02, BG 1	6,535	5,898	90.3%	637	9.7%	No	No	
CT 201.04, BG 2	3,008	1,861	61.9%	1,147	38.1%	No	Yes	
CT 111, BG 1	800	202	25.3%	598	74.8%	Yes	Yes	
CT 115, BG 2	2,038	879	43.1%	1,159	56.9%	Yes	Yes	
CT 111, BG 2	1,924	116	6.0%	1,808	94.0%	Yes	Yes	
CT 113, BG 2	881	510	57.9%	371	42.1%	No	Yes	
CT 112, BG 3	874	210	24.0%	664	76.0%	Yes	Yes	
CT 112, BG 2	1,177	603	51.2%	574	48.8%	No	Yes	
CT 113, BG 1	935	795	85.0%	140	15.0%	No	No	
DSA	18,172	11,074	60.9%	7,098	39.1%	No	N/A	
Brunswick County	126,860	103,713	81.8%	23,147	18.2%			
New Hanover County	224,231	172,855	77.1%	51,376	22.9%			
North Carolina	10,155,624	6,433,039	63.3%	3,722,585	36.7%			

* Minority population includes all races that are Non-White and Hispanic populations that are also White.

Source: US Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-year Estimates (2014-2018), Table B03002, "Hispanic or Latino Origin by Race."

Poverty

Coordination	Population for whom	Below Po Leve		Under 5 Poverty		Between and 149 Poverty	% of		leets sholds
Geography	Poverty Status is Determined	#	%	#	%	#	%	25%	5% over County
CT 202.02, BG 1	6,376	165	2.6%	109	1.7%	525	8.2%	No	No
CT 201.04, BG 2	2,971	964	32.4%	316	10.6%	344	11.6%	Yes	Yes
CT 111, BG 1	800	95	11.9%	55	6.9%	187	23.4%	No	Yes
CT 115, BG 2	2,033	424	20.9%	100	4.9%	446	21.9%	No	Yes
CT 111, BG 2	1,924	1,290	67.0%	657	34.1%	264	13.7%	Yes	Yes
CT 113, BG 2	881	358	40.6%	152	17.3%	58	6.6%	Yes	Yes
CT 112, BG 3	800	347	43.4%	196	24.5%	118	14.8%	Yes	Yes
CT 112, BG 2	1,165	498	42.7%	471	40.4%	32	2.7%	Yes	Yes
CT 113, BG 1	915	178	19.5%	74	8.1%	145	15.8%	No	Yes
DSA	17,865	4,319	24.2%	2,130	11.9%	2,119	11.9%	No	N/A
Brunswick County	125,787	16,201	12.9%	6,994	5.6%	9,710	7.7%		
New Hanover County	217,333	37,602	17.3%	19,670	9.1%	18,272	8.4%		
North Carolina	9,881,292	1,523,949	15.4%	663,550	6.7%	1,002,739	10.1%		

Source: US Census Bureau, American Community Survey 5-year Estimates (2014-2018), Table C17002, "Ratio of Income to Poverty Level in the Past 12 Months."

5 Does the project involve a residential or commercial displacement, or a substantial amount of right of way acquisition?

Parcels identified below are expected to have some degree of right of way impacts.

There are three anticipated business displacements or relocations and one residential relocation. The potential relocations are identified in Bold in the table. Potential right of way impacts on the remaining parcels are on vacant/unimproved land. Parcels impacts by the temporary alignment are italicized and identified first. Total parcel acreage is included in the table. If the proposed project moves forward with detailed analysis the impacts will be calculated in the next planning phase.

The first five parcels in Brunswick County listed in the table below are vacant with wetlands. Three of the parcels would be impacted with a temporary alignment. Government-owned parcels [New Hanover Soil and Water Conservation District parcel and United States of America (USACE) parcel] are located on Eagle Island in addition to privately-owned parcels.

Design Options 1, 3 and 4 primarily have the same footprint, therefore, the parcels below will be impacted equally by these designs. Option 4, which includes a railroad track spur option along Front Street, does not impact additional parcels for the proposed Cape Fear Memorial Bridge project, other than those listed in the table below. Option 2 extends further east along Dawson and Wooster streets to accommodate the 135-foot clearance. Under this option, the proposed edge of travel along Dawson and Wooster streets generally remains within the existing right of way. If Option 2 is selected for detailed analysis, right of way along Dawson and Wooster streets could be impacted with structural supports. Additionally, resources along these two streets are in a historic district, however, properties are identified as Surveyed Only. Two properties identified with twin asterisks appear to be properties surveyed as a part of the National Register of Historic Places, however the structures no longer remain. The Option 2 design also includes reconstruction of the US 17/US 74/US 421 interchange west of the bridge. This Option would impact parcels in Brunswick County with the construction of a temporary alignment needed to reconstruct the interchange, however the parcels are currently vacant/undeveloped with many owned by NCDOT.

Parcel Owner	Description	Property Address	Property Record ID	County	Land Type/ Zoning	Parcel Acres
	•	Tempo	orary Condition			
Holdings of TCM Inc.	Township 02 Neighborhood: 2001/ South Leland	None	Parcel 03900011	Brunswick	Marsh/ Industrial	11.95
Wilmington Unique Places LLC	Township 02 Neighborhood: 2001/ South Leland	None	Parcel 03900009	Brunswick	Marsh/ Industrial	5.19
Wilmington Unique Places LLC	Township 02 Neighborhood: 2001/ South Leland	None	Parcel 03900007	Brunswick	Marsh/ Industrial	34.89
		Perma	nent Condition			
Orrell Family LLC	380 Battleship Road NE	None	Parcel 03900017	Brunswick	Marsh/ Industrial	125.74
New Hanover Soil & Water Conservation District	Township 02 Neighborhood: 2001/ South Leland	None	Parcel 03900014	Brunswick	Marsh/ Industrial	5.52
Floyd M Hufham	Township 02 Neighborhood: C201/ Blackwell/Ploof	235 Battleship Road	Parcel 03900013	Brunswick	Marsh/ Industrial	4.90
United States of America	Township 02 Neighborhood: C201/ Blackwell/Ploof	232 Battleship Road	Parcel 03900015	Brunswick	Industrial	2.40
Alan E Rusher	Township 02 Neighborhood: C201/ Blackwell/Ploof	262 Battleship Road	Parcel 03900016	Brunswick	Industrial	2.70
Riverman LLC	Lots 4, 5 ,6 Block 71	610 Surry Street	R05312-004- 001-000	New Hanover	Industrial	0.79

		Lots 1, 2, Part of							
	Riverman LLC	4 and Queen Street Block 57	712 Surry Street	004-000	New Hanover	Industrial	4.27		
	Riverman LLC	Lots 5 & 6 Block 57	732 Surry Street	R05312-005- 003-000	New Hanover	Industrial	2.0		
	William L Seale II	Part Lots 5-6 Block 57	728 Surry Street	002-000	New Hanover	Urban Mixed Use	0.34		
	FMO Real Estate LLC**	58 NW 3	711 Surry Street	R05312-006- 001-000	New Hanover	Commercial (Vacant)	0.06		
	FMO Real Estate LLC**	Part SW 3 Block 58	715 Surry Street	D05212 006	New Hanover	Commercial (Vacant)	0.06		
	William A Robinson Jr and Elizabeth V Robinson	Part Lots 3-6 Block 58	721 Surry Street	R05312-006- 003-000	New Hanover	Commercial (Waterline Brewing Company)	0.93		
	Colonial Carolina Inc.	Part ½ 1 Part 2 Block 44	801 Surry Street	R05312-006- 004-000	New Hanover	Industrial	1.39		
	Scott Lynette Anderson	M 1 Block 31	108 Dawson Street	R05409-031- 006-000	New Hanover	Residential (Vacant)	0.05		
	Marie Galloway Heirs	Part EM 1 Block 31	110 Dawson Street	R05409-031- 005-000	New Hanover	Residential	0.05		
	Le Dome Holdings LLC	Part Lots 1-6 Block 31	910 S 2 nd Street	002-000	New Hanover	Commercial	2.60		
6		els for the National Regis t require an Indivi							
	proposed footpr	Park is located on int or right of way area but are not co	, construction ac			-			
	under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) or have an adverse effect on a National Historic Landmark (NHL)?								
		Site Name		ID	Status		Acres		
		S North Carolina (NI	,	NH0004	National Regis		4		
		nington Historic Dis		NH0003	National Regis		2,032		
	No. The proposed project will not impact the parcel or USS North Carolina resource. This World War II battleship is a National Historic Landmark listed in the National Register. The historic resource is located on Eagle Island, in the Cape Fear River, north of the existing bridge. Option 2 is proposed for construction south of the existing bridge, and therefore, will not impact this resource. Wilmington has seven districts listed on the National Register of Historic Places (NR). Relative to the proposed project, the Wilmington Historic and Archaeological District (NH0003) extends west of Battleship Road on Eagle Island, south between Wright Street and Meares Street, and east along Eighth Street and between Third and								
		Preferred Option 2			-		h and west of		
	Within the NR district boundary, two historic resources are found south of US 17 Business North and west of the cloverleaf interchange with S. Front Street. The resources are identified in the NC State Historic Preservation Office GIS Web site as NH 2239 and NH 2237, respectively. These resources are on the east and west sides of Surry Street, north and across from Waterline Brewing Company. These resources are identified as Surveyed Only. On-line research using street-view mapping indicates no structures at these two sites.								
	Only. On-line re	search using stre	et-view mapping	indicates no struc	ctures at these	two sites.			

	north of the existing bridge. The Option 2 footprint along impacts within the historic district due to the length of the length	g Wooster and Dawson Streets is expected to have visual the approach for the 135-foot vertical height structure.
		are not anticipated to have direct impacts. Surveyed kisting bridge. Minor indirect impacts may occur due to
		is over 50 years old and, as such, eligible for listing in the nined during project development in coordination with the
	Memorial Bridge is determined eligible for listing in the	urces are not anticipated to be impacted. If the Cape Fear e NR, this resource will be impacted if it is removed from storic districts or archaeological resources are determined n as possible.
8	Does the project result in a finding of "may affect not li critical habitat under Section 7 of the Endangered Spe	kely to adversely affect" for listed species, or designated ocies Act (ESA)?
	See Question #1 above	
9	Is the project located in anadromous fish spawning wa	iters?
	Yes. The project is located in fish spawning waters re the Wildlife Resource Commission (WRC).	gulated by the Marine Fisheries Commission (MFC) and
10	Does the project impact waters classified as Outstand Water Supply Watershed Critical Areas, 303(d) listed i Aquatic Vegetation (SAV)?	ing Resource Water (ORW), High Quality Water (HQW), mpaired water bodies, buffer rules, or Submerged
	Surface Water Name	Classification
		Classification SC
	Cape Fear River	SC
	Cape Fear River Northeast Cape Fear River	SC SC; SW
	Cape Fear River	SC
	Cape Fear River Northeast Cape Fear River Alligator Creek SC= Tidal Salt Water, SW= Swamp Water The project does not impact ORW, HQW, or Water S the Cape Fear River is identified in the 2018 303(d)	SC SC; SW SC; SW upply Watershed Critical Areas. Within the project area list of impaired water as "Exceeding Criteria". The Cape
11	Cape Fear River Northeast Cape Fear River Alligator Creek SC= Tidal Salt Water, SW= Swamp Water The project does not impact ORW, HQW, or Water S the Cape Fear River is identified in the 2018 303(d) Fear River is not subject to buffer rules. SAV is not identified	SC SC; SW SC; SV SC; SV
11	Cape Fear River Northeast Cape Fear River Alligator Creek SC= Tidal Salt Water, SW= Swamp Water The project does not impact ORW, HQW, or Water S the Cape Fear River is identified in the 2018 303(d) Fear River is not subject to buffer rules. SAV is not identified	SC SC; SW SC; SV SC; SV
11	Cape Fear River Northeast Cape Fear River Alligator Creek SC= Tidal Salt Water, SW= Swamp Water The project does not impact ORW, HQW, or Water S the Cape Fear River is identified in the 2018 303(d) I Fear River is not subject to buffer rules. SAV is not identified Map. Does the project impact waters of the United States in	SC SC; SW SC; SW upply Watershed Critical Areas. Within the project area list of impaired water as "Exceeding Criteria". The Cape entified within the project area on the Division 3 Resource any of the designated mountain trout streams?
	Cape Fear River Northeast Cape Fear River Alligator Creek SC= Tidal Salt Water, SW= Swamp Water The project does not impact ORW, HQW, or Water S the Cape Fear River is identified in the 2018 303(d) I Fear River is not subject to buffer rules. SAV is not ide Map. Does the project impact waters of the United States in No. Does the project require a U.S. Army Corps of Engine Based on a preliminary review of NWI mapping, NCD	SC SC; SW SC; SW SC; SW upply Watershed Critical Areas. Within the project area list of impaired water as "Exceeding Criteria". The Cape entified within the project area on the Division 3 Resource any of the designated mountain trout streams? ers (USACE) Individual Section 404 Permit? EQ's online mapping for streams, and conceptual ROW ould impact approximately 16 acres of wetlands with
	Cape Fear River Northeast Cape Fear River Alligator Creek SC= Tidal Salt Water, SW= Swamp Water The project does not impact ORW, HQW, or Water S the Cape Fear River is identified in the 2018 303(d) I Fear River is not subject to buffer rules. SAV is not ide Map. Does the project impact waters of the United States in No. Does the project require a U.S. Army Corps of Engine Based on a preliminary review of NWI mapping, NCD limits conducted on April 7, 2020, the project wor approximately 6 acres of that being the Cape Fear River	SC SC; SW SC; SW SC; SW upply Watershed Critical Areas. Within the project area list of impaired water as "Exceeding Criteria". The Cape entified within the project area on the Division 3 Resource any of the designated mountain trout streams? ers (USACE) Individual Section 404 Permit? EQ's online mapping for streams, and conceptual ROW ould impact approximately 16 acres of wetlands with
12	Cape Fear River Northeast Cape Fear River Alligator Creek SC= Tidal Salt Water, SW= Swamp Water The project does not impact ORW, HQW, or Water S the Cape Fear River is identified in the 2018 303(d) I Fear River is not subject to buffer rules. SAV is not ide Map. Does the project impact waters of the United States in No. Does the project require a U.S. Army Corps of Engine Based on a preliminary review of NWI mapping, NCD limits conducted on April 7, 2020, the project wor approximately 6 acres of that being the Cape Fear River	SC SC; SW SC; SW upply Watershed Critical Areas. Within the project area ist of impaired water as "Exceeding Criteria". The Cape entified within the project area on the Division 3 Resource any of the designated mountain trout streams? ers (USACE) Individual Section 404 Permit? PEQ's online mapping for streams, and conceptual ROW ould impact approximately 16 acres of wetlands with
12	Cape Fear River Northeast Cape Fear River Alligator Creek SC= Tidal Salt Water, SW= Swamp Water The project does not impact ORW, HQW, or Water S The project does not impact ORW, HQW, or Water S The Cape Fear River is identified in the 2018 303(d) I Fear River is identified in the 2018 303(d) I Fear River is not subject to buffer rules. SAV is not ide Map. Does the project impact waters of the United States in No. Does the project require a U.S. Army Corps of Engine Based on a preliminary review of NWI mapping, NCD Imits conducted on April 7, 2020, the project wor approximately 6 acres of that being the Cape Fear Riv Will the project require an easement from a Federal Engine Image: Not State S	SC SC; SW SC; SW SC; SW upply Watershed Critical Areas. Within the project area, list of impaired water as "Exceeding Criteria". The Cape entified within the project area on the Division 3 Resource any of the designated mountain trout streams? ers (USACE) Individual Section 404 Permit? EQ's online mapping for streams, and conceptual ROW ould impact approximately 16 acres of wetlands with rer. nergy Regulatory Commission (FERC) licensed facility?

archaeological remains in the Cape Fear River are primarily located on the west side of the river with a majority identified as being north of the existing bridge. Construction activity for the bridge supports are expected within the river, not along the river banks. Based on the current express design, archaeological remains are not expected to be impacted, however additional evaluation will be done during project development. See Question 7 above.

15 Does the project involve hazardous materials and/or landfills?

Based on aerial photography and NC OneMap data potential hazardous materials sites include:

Inactive Hazardous Sites

Facility Name	Facility Address	Facility ID
Old ATC Refinery	801 Surry Street	NCD986186518
Wilmington Coal Gas Plant	Castle and Surry Street	NCD986188910
Southern Metals Recycling, Inc.	13 Wright Street	NCN000407584
CTI of North Carolina, Inc.	1002 South Front Street	NCD98146708

Underground Storage Tank Incidents

Facility Name	Facility Address	Facility ID
Exxon #4-3957	315 Wooster Street	#10031
Shell Minute Man Food Mart #11	901 South Third Street	#14965
Dawson Street-406	406 Dawson Street	#32881
Dash-n #8	602 Dawson Street	#17504

Aboveground Storage Tank Incidents

Facility Name	Facility Address	Facility ID
Eagle Island Engineer Yard	SR 1300, West Side Cape Fear Road	#85428
Unocal Chemicals-Carolina Terminal	1 Wooster Street	#8250
MVC-Intersection I-140 Off-ramp and Hwy 421	I-40 and Hwy 421 Intersection	#94216
Queen Street - 310	310 Queen Street	#94256
Tony Richardson Residence	808 South 7 th Street	#86016

Underground Storage Tank Active Facilities

Facility Name	Facility Address	Facility ID
Unocal Chemicals Div/Union Oil	1 Wooster Street	#00-0-0000023412
Scotchman 3325	901 South 3 rd Street	#00-0-0000021405
JLM Terminals, Inc.	1002 South Front Street	#00-0-0000022441

16 Does the project require work encroaching and adversely affecting a regulatory floodway or work affecting the base floodplain (100-year flood) elevations of a water course or lake, pursuant to Executive Order 11988 and 23 CFR 650 subpart A?

The project area requires work encroaching in AE flood zones.

17	Is the project in a Coastal Area Management Act (CAMA) county and substantially affects the coastal zone and/or any Area of Environmental Concern (AEC)?
	Both New Hanover and Brunswick are CAMA counties.
18	Does the project require a U.S. Coast Guard (USCG) permit?
	Yes. A USCG permit is required.
19	Does the project involve construction activities in, across, or adjacent to a designated Wild and Scenic River present within the project area?
20	No.
20	Does the project involve Coastal Barrier Resources Act (CBRA) resources?
	Based on the Division 3 Resource Map the project does not involve CBRA resources.
21	Does the project impact federal lands (e.g. U.S. Forest Service (USFS), USFWS, etc.) or Tribal Lands?
	Based on the Division 3 Resource Map, Federal lands (USACE property) are located on Eagle Island south of the existing bridge, in the footprint for the proposed bridge.
22	Does the project involve any changes in access control?
	The proposed project would continue to have full control of access.
	Kinder Morgan, a petroleum products transporter, located north of the bridge could have a change in access due to restricting clearance to 65' fixed in Option 1. Currently, ships pass under the Cape Fear Memorial Bridg to access the Kinder Morgan terminal northeast of Downtown Wilmington. If a fixed bridge option is selecter Kinder Morgan waterway access could be impacted. At this stage of feasibility, a right of way estimate to determine property impacts to the Kinder Morgan facility has not been prepared. However, cost estimates are expected to be extensive.
23	Does the project have a permanent adverse effect on local traffic patterns or community cohesiveness?
	Based on the proposed preliminary designs Options 1, 2, and 3 will not have a permanent adverse effect or local traffic patterns or community cohesiveness. In Wilmington, Wooster Street and Dawson Street would be realigned south of S. 3 rd Street to tie into a new southern alignment of the bridge. Due to the longer footprint of Option 2 the existing traffic signal at S. 5 th Street is proposed to be modified. Entrance/exit ramp loops to the bridge would be flattened by extending them further along S. Front Street. Access to community resources Drar Tree Park, located on the east side of the river north of the current bridge location, may temporarily impact the municipal park or boat launch access.
	The railroad component for Option 4 could tie into an out of service line/spur southwest of S. Front Street. If thi option is selected for construction, S. Front Street would be impacted. Potential roadway impacts would be determined in future analysis if this option is selected for further development.
	In Brunswick County the temporary alignment to allow reconstruction activities to occur on the existin interchange will have a minor effect on the local travel pattern.
24	Will maintenance of traffic cause substantial disruption?
	Maintenance of traffic and construction sequencing would be planned and scheduled to minimize traffic delay within the project limits. A weekend loop closure may be needed to make the final ties between the temporar alignment and existing westbound and eastbound loops at the US 17/US 76/US 421 interchange. Lane closure may be required at times during construction. A traffic control plan would be prepared during the final desig phase of the project, which would detail impacts to existing traffic patterns and road closures or realignments. The plan would also define detour routes, designated truck routes, and parking areas for construction equipment. Signs would be used where appropriate to provide notice of the temporary alignment and other pertinent information to the traveling public. Access to businesses and residences would be maintained to the extent practical during construction. An offsite detour is not recommended.
)E	Is the project inconsistent with the STIP or the Metropolitan Planning Organization's (MPO's) Transportation
25	Improvement Program (TIP) (where applicable)?

26	Does the project require the acquisition of lands under the protection of Section 6(f) of the Land and Water Conservation Act, the Federal Aid in Fish Restoration Act, the Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act, Tennessee Valley Authority (TVA), or other unique areas or special lands that were acquired in fee or easement with public-use money and have deed restrictions or covenants on the property?
	Based on the Division 3 Resource Map, the project does not require the acquisition of lands with deed restrictions.
27	Does the project involve Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) buyout properties under the Hazard Mitigation Grant Program (HMGP)?
	No. There are not any FEMA properties under the HMGP.
28	Does the project include a de minimis or programmatic Section 4(f)?
	See #6 above
29	Is the project considered a Type I under the NCDOT's Noise Policy?
	IF THE PROJECT IS FEDERALLY FUNDED
	Is the project a Type I project? TBD. Level of noise analysis will be determined when project funding source is clarified. IF THE PROJECT IS STATE FUNDED
	Is the project on an interstate or full control of access US route and does it involve adding additional through lanes? Will the project require a state EA or EIS?
	TBD. Level of noise analysis will be determined when project funding source is clarified.
30	Is there prime or important farmland soil impacted by this project as defined by the Farmland Protection Policy Act (FPPA)?
	N/A
31	Are there other issues that may affect project decisions?
	The Cape Fear Memorial Bridge is:
	a hurricane evacuation route
	 a major truck route for the Port of Wilmington a commuter and emergency route for southeastern NC
	 a commuter and emergency route for southeastern NC a STRATNET Corridor
	• intermittently raised for ships and personal boats to travel north/south on the Cape Fear River
	eligible for listing on the Federal Register of Historic Places
	The Cape Fear River is identified as tidally influenced waters with the entire project area in a tidally influenced zone.
32	Is a project-level analysis for direct, indirect, or cumulative effects required based on the NCDOT community studies screening tool?
	N/A
33	Is a project level air quality Mobile Source Air Toxics (MSAT) analysis required?
	No. The 2019 base year traffic is 60,900 Average Annual Daily Traffic (AADT). Projected 2045 Future Year AADT is 81,900 vehicles. Traffic counts, forecasts and truck traffic will be updated when the project goes into project development and final design. However, the volume is not expected to be greater than 140,000 vehicles per day. The proposed project does not add substantial new capacity or expected to change the vehicle mix.