



INTEGRATED PROJECT DELIVERY (IPD)

Candidate Project Screening Tools Guidance

Version 4.0

August 31, 2021

Executive Summary

This guidance serves to identify and provide direction on the application of a series of screening tools designed to aid the Department in advancing projects through the Candidate Project (CP) phase of the Project Delivery program, avoiding duplication of effort by establishing criteria for work needed to advance the projects to programming in the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program and issuance of Notice to Proceed at the start of the subsequent Project Development phase.

The Candidate Project phase is the planning and programming phase of NCDOT's broader Integrated Project Delivery (IPD) initiative. The primary goal of IPD is to streamline NCDOT's overall Project Delivery process, reduce delays and associated cost overruns, eliminate unneeded steps in the process, and ultimately deliver the Department's program of much-needed transportation system improvements to the public more quickly and efficiently.

The primary objective of each of the Candidate Project activities and the screenings is to develop project-specific information earlier in the Candidate Project phase, to improve the quality of projects being submitted for programming consideration, to reduce risks, and to streamline downstream project development efforts.

To aid in identifying and efficiently advancing projects through the Candidate Project phase, a series of screening tools have been developed for completion by various units involved in different phases of the CP process. Application of these tools will aid in the decision as to how a project should advance. For each of the tools defined below, objectives, screening benefits, designated preparers, and screening considerations are identified.

Following are the screening tools that are presented in this Guidance:

1. Preliminary Prioritization Candidate Project List
2. Pre-Prioritization Design Concept & Scope Sufficiency Form
3. Traffic Safety Screening
4. Project Scoping Report Level-of-Detail Screening
5. Merger Pre-Screening

Templates and application instructions for each are provided as attachments to this Guidance. Upon completion and approval (as needed) of any of the screening tools presented here, the forms are to be uploaded to the project's ATLAS Workbench, to become a part of the project record. Uploading would be the responsibility of the identified preparing unit or personnel.

Table of Contents

Executive Summary.....	1
Guidance Purpose.....	3
Application of Screening Tools.....	4
Preliminary Prioritization Project List	4
Pre-Prioritization Design Concept & Scope Sufficiency	4
Traffic Safety Screening	4
Project Scoping Report Level-of-Detail Screening	4
Merger Pre-Screening	4

Guidance Purpose

The purpose of this Guidance is to identify and provide direction on the application of a series of screening tools designed to aid the Department in advancing projects through the Candidate Project process, avoiding duplication of effort by establishing criteria for work needed to advance the projects. As NCDOT efforts to integrate and streamline project delivery have improved through the Integrated Project Delivery initiative, the Candidate Project phase of project delivery has been more clearly defined and certain activities such as Express Design have been accelerated. The objective of these refinements is to provide better project data to support Project Prioritization and development of the State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) and to streamline downstream project development activities. Generally, the Candidate Project (CP) process includes:

- Identification of high-priority projects for submittal to Strategic Prioritization Office of Transportation (SPOT) for project scoring
- Refinement of project design concept and scope through Express Design and Project Scoping Report development to reduce later risk of delay or cost escalation
- Scoring of projects to identify high-priority projects for STIP
- Preparation of the draft and final STIP for adoption by the Board of Transportation with a high probability of successful implementation

As part of this sharpened Candidate Project process, new focus has been given to three early Candidate Project activities, all to better support efficient and accurate scoring of submitted projects in Project Prioritization:

1. Early Project Scope and Cost Evaluation, to refine projects beyond the less-detailed information available at the systems planning level; these evaluations mirror the level of detail set out in early Express Designs.
2. Development of standardized Preliminary Prioritization Candidate Project Lists by Project Sponsors, with support from NCDOT's Division Corridor Development Engineers (Div CDE), to identify high priority highway improvement projects; this step is intended to focus professional resources for the next activity.
3. Earlier development of project Express Designs to refine project scope and cost estimates before the project is submitted to SPOT for prioritization; advancing Express Design to occur earlier in the Project Initiation phase will provide a higher level of confidence in the constructability and cost of projects before those projects are submitted for Project Prioritization.

In addition, the Department has determined that project refinement and delivery will benefit from managing projects to identify:

1. Projects needing involvement by the Traffic Mobility and Safety Division
2. Significant risks that must be managed to avoid unexpected cost escalation and schedule delay
3. Projects likely to require entry into the Merger Process due to potential impact to critical environmental features

The primary objective of each of these three early activities and the screenings listed below and documented in this Guidance is to develop project-specific information earlier in the Candidate Project phase, to improve the quality of projects being submitted for programming consideration, to reduce risks, and to streamline downstream project development efforts.

Following are the screening tools that are presented in this Guidance:

1. Preliminary Prioritization Candidate Project List
2. Pre-Prioritization Design Concept & Scope Sufficiency
3. Traffic Safety Screening
4. Project Scoping Report Level-of-Detail Screening
5. Merger Pre-Screening

Application of Screening Tools

To aid in identifying and efficiently advancing projects through the Candidate Project process, a series of screening tools have been developed for completion by various units involved in different phases of the CP process. Application of these tools will aid in the decision as to how a project should advance. For each of the tools defined below, objectives, screening benefits, designated preparers, and screening considerations will be identified. Templates and application instructions for each are provided as attachments to this Guidance.

Upon completion and approval (as needed) of any of the screening tools presented here, the forms should be uploaded to the project's ATLAS Workbench, to become a part of the project record. Uploading would be the responsibility of the identified preparing unit or personnel.

Background

In establishing a unified Integrated Project Delivery (IPD) process, the Department has identified a project planning workflow for project identification, refinement, and programming that occurs during what has been defined as the Project Initiation phase of overall Project Delivery. As shown on the Candidate Project Flow Chart, this phase of IPD consists of the following three related sets of project planning activities:

- Systems Planning – in which transportation system improvement needs are identified in adopted long-range transportation plans and initial projects are described
- Project Refinement – in which projects are further refined using Express Design and cost estimate refinement and are tested in SPOT On!ine
- Prioritization/Programming – in which projects are scored during Project Prioritization, are refined during Project Scoping Report preparation, and are programmed for further project development in the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP)

To advance projects from Systems Planning to programming in the STIP in a consistent manner, a series of screening tools has been developed, with the objective of providing reviewers with consistent project information regarding readiness of a project to advance through the Project Initiation phase. For each of the screening tools, guidance has been prepared to assist project planners and reviewers in completing the tools.

What is Preliminary Prioritization Candidate Project List Development?

The first in the series of Project Initiation screening tools is the Preliminary Prioritization Candidate Project List (PPCPL). Following adoption of regional long-range transportation plans (either Comprehensive Transportation Plans [CTP] or Metropolitan Transportation Plans [MTP]) by MPOs and RPOs, NCDOT is requesting that Project Sponsors, with assistance from Division Corridor Development Engineers (Div CDEs) and the Transportation Planning Division, prepare a listing of projects from long-range transportation planning activities that are considered to be of highest priority for submittal to SPOT for scoring and possible inclusion in the State Transportation Improvement Program.

- **Objective:** to identify highway improvement projects that are of high priority and for which the Project Sponsor (MPO, RPO, and Highway Division) will likely request funding through the STIP by submittal to SPOT for scoring during Prioritization.
- **Screening Benefit:** NCDOT wishes to accelerate preparation of Express Designs to occur in advance of submittal of projects to SPOT for scoring during Prioritization. This project list will assist the CDU/FSU to prepare for potential Express Design requests from Project Sponsors.
- **Submittal date:** During release of current DRAFT STIP, applied to upcoming Prioritization cycle.
- **Preparer:** Project Sponsors, with preparation facilitated by the Div CDE
- **Reviewer/Approver:** Not applicable or needed (NA)
- **References:** NA
- **Supporting NCDOT unit(s):** Transportation Planning Division (TPD), Division Planning Engineer, Corridor Development/Feasibility Studies Unit (CDU/FSU), State Transportation Improvement Program Unit, Strategic Prioritization Office of Transportation
- **Considerations:**
 - Mobility and safety benefits
 - Economic development support
 - Potential environmental effects and implementation risk
 - Cost

- Decision options: Once the Pre-Prioritization Design Concept and Scope Sufficiency Assessment (Screening Tool #2) is complete, the recommendation from that assessment will be added to this form for the specified project.
- Screening Product: Preliminary Prioritization Candidate Project List
- Recipient/Use: CDU/FSU
- Location of Screening Tool Documentation (SharePoint/ATLAS/Both): Both

Instructions for Completing the Preliminary Prioritization Candidate Project List

Following long-range transportation plan adoption and prior to assignment of projects for Express Design, Project Sponsors, facilitated by Div CDEs, will identify projects expected to be submitted to SPOT for Prioritization scoring and in need of further Design Concept and Scope development. This listing will assist NCDOT in the allocation of resources needed to complete the further study.

Fill in the applicable information for the proposed project on the form.

Agency	<i>Provide name of agency submitting Preliminary Prioritization Candidate Project List (MPO, RPO, or Division of Highways)</i>
Project Sponsor Preparer, representing, contact information	<i>Provide preparer's name, agency of preparer, if different than above, and contact information</i>
Supporting Division Corridor Development Engineer	<i>Provide name of the Div CDE for the Highway Division in which agency is located.</i>
Date submitted by Project Sponsor	<i>Provide date of submittal</i>
Date updated and submitted by Project Sponsor	<i>Provide date on which PPCPL is being resubmitted, if it has been returned with request for additional information</i>
Project Name and Local Identifier	<i>Provide descriptive name of the project, preferably carried over from adopted LRTP; e.g., five mile widening of US ** in (name) municipality/county</i>
Project Description	<i>Provide brief description of the project summarizing details in the Project Sheet, including roadway name, length of project, existing/new location, facility type, type of project (e.g., widening from 2 to 5 lanes on existing location).</i>
Adoption Date and Name of Adopted Plan	<i>Provide date of adopted plan and name of adopted plan associated with project, if applicable</i>
Division/County	<i>Enter NCDOT Highway Division and County in which project is located</i>
Project Description Availability	<i>State whether the Project Sheet or other documentation is available and attached</i>
Next Steps from DC&S Sufficiency Assessment	<p><i>To be provided by Div CDE, enter Sufficiency Assessment Rating (1, 2, or 3 below) from Screening Tool #2 (Pre-Prioritization DC&S Sufficiency Form)</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>Sufficient scope and cost estimate development for direct submittal to SPOT for Prioritization Scoring</i> 2. <i>Recommend updating cost estimate</i> 3. <i>Recommend completing Express Design prior to submittal to SPOT for Prioritization Scoring</i>

Preliminary Prioritization Candidate Project List

Agency:	
Preparer, representing:	
Supporting Division Corridor Development Engineer (Div CDE):	
Date submitted:	
Date updated and submitted:	

Project Name & Local Identifier	Project Description (new location, widening, modern.)	Adoption Date and Name of Adopted Plan	Division/County	Project Description Availability (Attached or "Not Available")	Next Steps (From Pre-Prioritization Design Concept & Scope Sufficiency Form)

Form processing and disposition:
 Form is to be completed by Project Sponsor (Rural Planning Organization [RPO], Metropolitan Planning Organization [MPO], or Highway Division), with preparation facilitated by the Div CDE:

- Form should be forwarded to Feasibility Studies Unit (FSU)/Corridor Development Unit (CDU) for information in preparation of upcoming assignments.
- Div CDE should establish an ATLAS Workbench record for each project on the list and upload this form to each project's Workbench record.

Background

In establishing a unified Integrated Project Delivery (IPD) process, the Department has identified a project planning workflow for project identification, refinement, and programming that occurs during what has been defined as the Project Initiation phase of overall Project Delivery. As shown on the Candidate Project Flow Chart, this phase of IPD consists of the following three related sets of project planning activities:

- Systems Planning – in which transportation system improvement needs are identified in adopted long-range transportation plans and initial projects are described
- Project Refinement – in which projects are further refined using Express Design and cost estimate refinement and are tested in SPOT Online
- Prioritization/Programming – in which projects are scored during Project Prioritization, are refined during Project Scoping Report preparation, and are programmed for further project development in the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP)

To advance projects from Systems Planning to programming in the STIP in a consistent manner, a series of screening tools has been developed, with the objective of providing reviewers with consistent project information regarding readiness of a project to advance through the Project Initiation phase. For each of the screening tools, guidance has been prepared to assist project planners and reviewers in completing the tools.

What is Pre-Prioritization Design Concept & Scope Sufficiency?

The second Project Initiation screening tool is intended to assess the readiness of projects that have received preliminary prioritization by Project Sponsors for project scoring as part of NCDOT's Project Prioritization Process. Building from information provided by Project Sponsors and generated by Div CDEs, each prioritized project will be assessed by CDU/FSU to recommend whether projects:

- Recommend full Express Design
- Recommend only a cost estimate update
- Can be submitted directly to SPOT through the SPOT Online tool.

This screening tool is intended to determine which of those next steps is appropriate.

- **Objective:** to assess the needed next steps of high priority projects identified by Project Sponsors in the Preliminary Prioritization Candidate Project List for advancement to Prioritization, and to avoid conducting Express Design studies on projects that are already well defined in terms of concept, scope, and cost.
- **Screening Benefit:** will optimize available staff resources, avoiding redundant or unneeded evaluation expenditure
- **Preparer:** Project Sponsors, with preparation facilitated by the Div CDE
- **Reviewer/Approver:** CDU/FSU
- **References:** Express Design Evaluation & Project Scoping Process Guidance (CDU/FSU)
- **Supporting NCDOT unit(s):** Division Planning Engineer, Transportation Planning Division
- **Considerations (for use in screening tool):**
 - Source of project (CTP/MTP, developer request through Division Engineer, etc.)
 - Extent of design (ranging from none to conceptual design, including plan and profile)
 - Basis for cost estimates (ranging from simple per-mile to quantity take-offs and application of NCDOT unit costs)

- Risk assessment
- Decision options:
 1. Sufficient project development to allow for direct submittal to SPOT for Prioritization Scoring
 2. Recommend updating cost estimate only
 3. Recommend completion of Express Design, for better design concept and scope definition
- Screening Product: Pre-Prioritization Design Concept & Scope Sufficiency Form
- Recipient/Use: CDU/FSU
- Location of Screening Tool Documentation (SharePoint/ATLAS/Both): Both

Instructions for Completing the Pre-Prioritization Design Concept & Scope Sufficiency Form

Completion of this form will allow screening of projects to assess the readiness of high priority projects for advancement to Prioritization. Completion of this screening tool will draw on entries made in the Preliminary Prioritization Candidate Project List and information on previous scope and cost.

The Pre-Prioritization Design Concept & Scope Sufficiency Form is to be prepared by Project Sponsors and Div CDEs by completing the following steps:

1. For each project listed on the Preliminary Prioritization Candidate Project List (and any additional projects identified since list was provided to FSU/CDU), Project Sponsors and Div CDEs will assemble the Pre-Prioritization Design Concept & Scope Sufficiency Form
2. Based on the screening elements, the CDU/FSU will choose among the following sufficiency assessment ratings:
 - a. Scope and cost estimate development are sufficient for direct submittal of project to SPOT for Prioritization Scoring
 - b. Recommend updating cost estimate only
 - c. Recommend completion of Express Design, for better design concept and scope definition

Div CDE inserts Pre-Prioritization Design Concept & Scope Sufficiency assessment into corresponding Preliminary Prioritization Candidate Project List submitted by Project Sponsors, then forwards package of Screening Tools (*Preliminary Prioritization Candidate Project List, Pre-Prioritization Design Concept & Scope Sufficiency Form*) to FSU/CDU for concurrence.

Fill in the applicable information for the proposed project on the form.

Project Name and Local Identifier	Provide descriptive name of the project, preferably carried over from adopted long range transportation plan; e.g., five mile widening of US ** in (name) municipality/county
Division/County	Enter NCDOT Highway Division and County in which project is located
Project Description (Attach Project Sheet consistent with Transportation Planning Division requirements)	Provide brief description of the project summarizing details in the Project Sheet, including roadway name, length of project, existing/new location, facility type, type of project (e.g., widening from 2 to 5 lanes on existing location).
Source of project (CTP, MTP, developer request, etc., with Plan adoption date).	Provide name and date of adoption of any systems plan that identifies project, or other basis for nomination for implementation (e.g., developer request)
Is project on Preliminary Prioritization Candidate Project List? If not, why not?	Enter "Yes" or "No." If "No," provide statement from Project Sponsor indicating why.
Cost Estimate	Provide estimate of construction, right-of-way, and utility costs, as available. Construction \$ _____ Right of Way \$ _____ Utilities \$ _____ Contingencies \$ _____ Total \$ _____
Cost Estimate Basis & Certification <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Basis of cost estimate • Age of cost estimate 	Identify age, and basis and level of confidence in, cost estimate, using one of the following: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Based on NCDOT Visualization and Cost Estimating Tools 2. Uses unit costs applied at systems plan level only; no project scope & cost evaluation completed 3. Uses cost estimating tool developed by FSU/CDU Units 4. Uses another detailed tool (identify)
Known Environmental Risks to Project Advancement	After consultation with Project Sponsor, briefly describe environmental risks identified during system planning or special studies (e.g., corridor or sub-area studies) which could adversely affect project delivery.
Preparer/Date of submittal	Provide name and contact information of Div CDE and date of submittal to FSU/CDU
Sufficiency Reviewer/Date of Review	Enter name of FSU/CDU representative and date of review
Sufficiency Assessment Rating	Choose from among following four sufficiency assessment ratings: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Scope and cost estimate development are sufficient for direct submittal of project to SPOT for Prioritization Scoring b. Recommend updating cost estimate only c. Recommended to complete Express Design prior to Project Prioritization

Pre-Prioritization Design Concept & Scope Sufficiency Form

Project Sponsor to complete rows 1-5.

Project Name and Local Identifier:	
Division/County:	
Project Description (Attach Project Sheet consistent with Transportation Planning Division requirements):	
Source of project (CTP, MTP, developer request, etc.) with Plan adoption date:	
Is project on Preliminary Prioritization Project List? If not, why not?	

Div CDE to complete rows 6-9.

Cost Estimate:	Construction: \$ _____ Right of Way: \$ _____ Utilities: \$ _____ Contingencies \$ _____ Total: \$ _____
Cost Estimate Basis & Certification:	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Basis of cost estimate • Age of cost estimate 	
Known Environmental Risks to Project Advancement:	
Preparer/ Date of Submittal:	

FSU/CDU to complete rows 10-11.

Sufficiency Reviewer/ Date of Review:	
Sufficiency Assessment Rating:	

- Attachments (if available):**
- Project Sheet (from RPO or MPO systems planning)
 - Any additional project specific documentation

Form processing and disposition:
 Form is to be completed by Project Sponsor and Div CDE and submitted to Feasibility Studies Unit (FSU)/Corridor Development Unit (CDU). Upon submittal, Div CDE to upload form to project's ATLAS Workbench project record. Upon FSU/CDU review and assessment, form will be returned to Project Sponsor and Div CDE, then uploaded by FSU/CDU to ATLAS Workbench project record.

Background

In establishing a unified Integrated Project Delivery (IPD) process, the Department has identified a project planning workflow for project identification, refinement, and programming that occurs during what has been defined as the Project Initiation phase of overall Project Delivery. As shown on the Candidate Project Flow Chart, this phase of IPD consists of the following three related sets of project planning activities:

- Systems Planning – in which transportation system improvement needs are identified in adopted long-range transportation plans and initial projects are described
- Project Refinement – in which projects are further refined using Express Design and cost estimate refinement and are tested in SPOT Online
- Prioritization/Programming – in which projects are scored during Project Prioritization, are refined during Project Scoping Report preparation, and are programmed for further project development in the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP)

To advance projects from Systems Planning to programming in the STIP in a consistent manner, a series of screening tools has been developed, with the objective of providing reviewers with consistent project information regarding readiness of a project to advance through the Project Initiation phase. For each of the screening tools, guidance has been prepared to assist project planners and reviewers in completing the tools.

What is Traffic Safety Screening?

The Candidate Project process includes multiple opportunities to identify traffic safety issues that may be appropriately addressed through the scope of the proposed project. The evolving project scope shall be reviewed to identify the need for further traffic safety analysis/consultation through the employment of a Traffic Safety Screening tool at a minimum at the time of the Express Design development and the Project Scoping Report development.

- **Objective:** to assess the need for further consultation with/analysis from the NCDOT Traffic Safety Unit at key points in project development and evolution of project scope.
- **Screening Benefit:** This screening will serve two primary purposes: (1) efficiently involve the Traffic Safety Unit in project development to address existing and potential traffic safety issues, and (2) streamline communication between the Corridor Development/Feasibility Studies Units (CDU/FSU) and the NCDOT Traffic Safety Unit towards addressing a project's traffic safety needs.
- **Preparer:** CDU/FSU
- **Reviewer/Approver:** Traffic Safety Unit
- **References:** Express Design Evaluation & Project Scoping Process Guidance (CDU/FSU)
- **Supporting NCDOT unit(s):** Div CDE, Division Planning Engineer, Project Sponsor, Transportation Planning Division
- **Considerations (for use in screening tool):**
 - NCDOT project SPOT Online Inputs
 - Existing/Proposed Multimodal Features
 - Project Speed Limit
- **Decision options:**
 1. (Through the "Screening Tool Results (Next Steps):" box) - Contact Traffic Safety Unit
 2. (Through the "Screening Tool Results (Next Steps):" box) - Your Project is good to go!
- **Screening Product:** Traffic Safety Screening Tool (Attachment 5)

- [Recipient/Use: Traffic Safety Unit, CDU/FSU](#)
- [Location of Screening Tool Documentation \(SharePoint/ATLAS/Both\): Both](#)

Instructions for Completing the Traffic Safety Screening Tool

At assignment of projects for Express Design, the Feasibility Studies Unit will utilize the Traffic Safety Screening Tool to identify which projects require further coordination with the NCDOT Traffic Safety Unit. The screening tool results from this stage will be verified at the assignment of projects to Project Scoping Report development. If any project scoping details require changes to inputs on the Traffic Safety Screening Tool, the tool must be re-run to produce results at Project Scoping Report development.

Fill in the applicable information for the proposed project on the form.

SIT Type	Users should select the same "SIT Type" used in submitting this project for Prioritization (see https://connect.ncdot.gov/projects/planning/Pages/PrioritizationResources.aspx)
Identified Needs	Users should select the same 'Primary Needs Category' used in submitting a P6.0 Identified Needs Form for this project for Prioritization (see https://connect.ncdot.gov/projects/planning/Pages/PrioritizationResources.aspx) Select ONLY the Primary Need Category used on the P6.0 Identified Needs Form. DO NOT Select Secondary Need Categories.
Existing Multimodal Features	Users should select multimodal features existing within the current right of way occupied by the proposed project.
Proposed Multimodal Features	Users should select multimodal features within the right of way of the project. Users should include selection of any multimodal features that are existing in the current right of way which will continue to exist in the proposed project.
Proposed Cross Section Type	Users should select the same 'Highway Typical Sections' used in submitting this project for Prioritization (see https://connect.ncdot.gov/projects/planning/Pages/PrioritizationResources.aspx)
Project Speed Limit	Users should select the range of speeds representing the highest speed limit desired on the mainline portion of the project.
Intersection/Interchange	Users should select the analogous 'Interchange and Intersection Designs' used in submitting this project for Prioritization (see https://connect.ncdot.gov/projects/planning/Pages/PrioritizationResources.aspx) <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. Grade-Separated Intersection/Interchange b. Roundabout c. Directional Crossover (Reduced-Conflict Intersection) d. At-Grade Quadrant
Project Access Control	Users should select the same 'Project Access Control' used in submitting this project for Prioritization (see https://connect.ncdot.gov/projects/planning/Pages/PrioritizationResources.aspx)
Screening Tool Results	Choose from among two screening tool results: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. (Through the "Screening Tool Results (Next Steps):" box) - Contact Traffic Safety Unit b. (Through the "Screening Tool Results (Next Steps):" box) - Your Project is good to go!
Project Conditions Justifying Further NCDOT Traffic Safety Unit Review	Explanation

Traffic Safety Unit Project Screening Tool

Start Over

Get Screening Result

A SIT Type

(Optional Project Inputs)

B Identified Needs

- System Linkage/Connectivity
- Capacity/Congestion
- Modal Interrelationships
- Safety
- Facility Deficiencies
- Mobility
- Other

Project Local ID :

NOTE :

Enter Desired Notes Here.

C Existing Multimodal Features

- None
- Sidewalks
- Pedestrian Crossings
- Striped Bicycle Lanes
- Sidepaths/ Multi-Use Paths
- Wide Outside Lanes
- Paved Shoulders
- Fixed Transit Routes

D Proposed Multimodal Features

- None
- Sidewalks
- Pedestrian Crossings
- Striped Bicycle Lanes
- Sidepaths/ Multi-Use Paths
- Wide Outside Lanes
- Paved Shoulders
- Fixed Transit Routes

E Proposed Cross Section Type

F Project Speed Limit

G Intersection/Interchange

- Grade-Separated Intersection
- SPUI
- DDI
- Roundabout
- Directional Crossover
- At-Grade Quadrant
- Other At-Grade Intersection

H Project Access Control

Screening Tool Results (Next Steps):

Project Conditions Justifying Further NCDOT Traffic Safety Unit Review:

- 1
- 2
- 3
- 4
- 5

Print PDF

Background

In establishing a unified Integrated Project Delivery (IPD) process, the Department has identified a project planning workflow for project identification, refinement, and programming that occurs during what has been defined as the Project Initiation phase of overall Project Delivery. As shown on the Candidate Project Flow Chart, this phase of IPD consists of the following three related sets of project planning activities:

- Systems Planning – in which transportation system improvement needs are identified in adopted long-range transportation plans and initial projects are described
- Project Refinement – in which projects are further refined using Express Design and cost estimate refinement and are tested in SPOT Online
- Prioritization/Programming – in which projects are scored during Project Prioritization, are refined during Project Scoping Report preparation, and are programmed for further project development in the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP)

To advance projects from Systems Planning to programming in the STIP in a consistent manner, a series of screening tools has been developed, with the objective of providing reviewers with consistent project information regarding readiness of a project to advance through the Project Initiation phase. For each of the screening tools, guidance has been prepared to assist project planners and reviewers in completing the tools.

What is Project Scoping Report Level-of-Detail Screening?

Following the programming of a highway improvement project in the draft Statewide Transportation Improvement Program, NCDOT will proceed to prepare a Project Scoping Report (PSR). PSRs are the last round of technical analyses prepared during the Candidate Project process. They serve to refine projects prior to their programming in the adopted STIP and issuance of Notice to Proceed to kick off Project Development (environmental clearance and design), and in certain instances, can serve to advance and streamline Project Development through expanded public involvement and focused resource agency coordination. By engaging resource agencies normally involved in the Merger Process, certain pre-NEPA decisions can be made. A prime example of this would be gaining formal approval of project Purpose and Need and gaining Resource Agency agreement on early reduction of alternatives supporting formal screening of alternatives in Project Development. Three tiers of PSRs are envisioned:

1. Streamlined PSR for small, straightforward projects, to include only a Screening Checklist and Project Initiation Form
2. Regular PSR, to include a Screening Checklist and Project Initiation Form, plus a more detailed Technical Report
3. Plus PSR, to include the Screening Checklist, Project Initiation Form, and Technical Report of the Regular PSR, plus Public Involvement Documentation and Resource Agency Documentation needed to define Merger Screening and document achieving Merger Concurrence Point 1

Each of these three PSR tiers are defined in the NCDOT Feasibility Studies/Corridor Development Unit Express Design Evaluation & Project Scoping Report Guidance. This screening tool is intended to determine which of those next steps is appropriate.

- Objective: to identify the PSR scope for projects to streamline the Project Development process.
- Screening Benefit: This screening will support identification of projects that will be subjected to the Regular PSR or Plus-PSR, which is intended to serve as a pre-NEPA decision document that achieves and documents Merger Concurrence

- Preparer: Corridor Development/Feasibility Studies Units (CDU/FSU)
- Reviewer/Approver: Environmental Policy Unit
- References: Express Design Evaluation & Project Scoping Process Guidance (CDU/FSU); FHWA Planning and Environmental Linkage guidance
- Supporting NCDOT unit(s): Transportation Planning Division, Div CDE, Division Planning Engineer, Project Sponsor, Project Manager
- Considerations (for use in screening tool):
 - Sufficiency of alternatives analysis
 - Needed public involvement
 - Needed resource agency engagement
 - Potential environmental effects
 - Overall project complexity
- Decision options:
 1. Streamlined PSR
 2. Regular PSR
 3. Plus PSR
- Screening Product: Project Scoping Report Level-of-Detail Screening Form
- Recipient/Use: CDU/FSU, for PSR scope and budget development
- Location of Screening Tool Documentation (SharePoint/ATLAS/Both): Both

Instructions for Completing the Project Scoping Report Level-of-Detail Screening Form

Completion of this form will facilitate development of the scope-of-work of Project Scoping Reports, by considering completeness of previous project planning and need for greater detail to support complex projects. For each project that has received a sufficiently high Project Prioritization score to be considered for inclusion in the STIP, the Feasibility Studies or Corridor Development Units, in consultation with the Div CDE who is shepherding the project from early in the PI process, will complete the Project Scoping Report Level-of-Detail Screening Form. The form will recommend the PSR level-of effort commensurate with previous analysis for the project. The form, together with the supporting documentation, will be reviewed by NCDOT's Environmental Policy Unit. Should EPU disagree with the FSU/CDU scope recommendation, the units will meet to resolve the discrepancy.

Fill in the applicable information for the proposed project on the form.

Project	<i>Provide descriptive name of the project, preferably carried over from adopted LRTP; e.g., five mile widening of US 64 in Cary</i>
Identifier <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning • SPOT • STIP 	<i>Provide any identifying project number from LRTP development or previous Prioritization</i>
Division/County	<i>Enter NCDOT Highway Division and County in which project is located</i>
Project Description	<i>Provide brief description of the project summarizing details in the Project Description Sheet, including roadway name, length of project, existing/new location, facility type, type of project (e.g., widening from 2 to 5 lanes on existing location)</i>
Source of project (CTP, MTP, developer request, etc., with Plan adoption date)	<i>Provide name and date of adoption of any systems plan that identifies project, or other basis for nomination for implementation (e.g., developer request)</i>
Status of Express Design Evaluation	<i>Provide Express Design information shown below:</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Design Concept & Scope Assessment Rating, from Pre-Prioritization Design Concept & Scope Sufficiency Form (Screening Tool #2); attach completed and reviewed Screening Tool #2 for each project</i> • <i>Date of completion of Express Design or Cost Estimate update</i> • <i>Name and contact information of preparer of Express Design or Cost Estimate update</i>
Other considerations	<i>List and describe other project planning efforts that may impact the needed level of detail of the PSR; e.g., alternatives analysis, multimodal alternatives, public involvement, tribal or environmental resource agency consultations.</i>
Sufficiency of Traffic Safety Coordination	<i>Provide summary of status and findings of Traffic Safety Screening Tool, including any update since preparation of Screening Tool #3.</i>
Known Environmental Risks to Project Advancement	<i>Update entry from Screening Tool #2 with summary of finding from Express Design of environmental risks which could adversely affect project delivery. Specifically identify any coordination efforts with environmental resource agencies that represent pre-NEPA decision-making.</i>
Recommended level of PSR detail	<i>To support FSU/CDU study scope development, with reference to the (add name of ED/PSR guidance document), recommend one of following PSR levels of detail:</i> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>Streamlined PSR</i> 2. <i>Regular PSR</i> 3. <i>Plus PSR</i>
Preparer/Date of submittal	<i>Provide name and contact information of Corridor Development/Feasibility Studies Unit preparer and date of submittal to Environmental Policy Unit</i>
Sufficiency Reviewer/Date of Review	<i>Enter name of Environmental Policy Unit reviewer and date of review</i>

Project Scoping Report Level-of-Detail Screening Form

Project:	
Identifier <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning • SPOT • STIP 	
Division/County:	
Project Description:	
Source of project (CTP, MTP, developer request, etc.) with Plan adoption date:	
Status of Express Design Evaluation:	
Other considerations:	
Sufficiency of Traffic Safety Coordination:	
Known Environmental Risks to Project Advancement:	
Recommended level of PSR detail:	
Preparer/ Date of Submittal:	
Sufficiency Reviewer/ Date of Review:	

Attachments (if available):

- Project Description Sheet (from RPO or MPO systems planning)
- Preliminary Project Scope and Cost Evaluation Screening Form
- Preliminary Project Scope and Cost Evaluation Report
- Express Design Evaluation
- Traffic Safety Screening

Form processing and disposition:

Form is to be completed by Corridor Development Unit (CDU)/Feasibility Studies Unit (FSU) and submitted to Environmental Policy Unit (EPU) for review. Upon submittal, CDU/FSU to upload form to project's ATLAS Workbench project record. Upon EPU review, to be returned to submitting CDU/FSU and uploaded to ATLAS Workbench project record.

Background

In establishing a unified Integrated Project Delivery (IPD) process, the Department has identified a project planning workflow for project identification, refinement, and programming that occurs during what has been defined as the Project Initiation phase of overall Project Delivery. As shown on the Candidate Project Flow Chart, this phase of IPD consists of the following three related sets of project planning activities:

- Systems Planning – in which transportation system improvement needs are identified in adopted long-range transportation plans and initial projects are described and prioritized
- Candidate Project Scope Refinement – in which projects are further refined using Express Design and cost estimate refinement and are tested in SPOT Online
- Prioritization/Programming – in which projects are scored during Project Prioritization, are refined during Project Scoping Report preparation, and are programmed for further project development in the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP)

To advance projects from Systems Planning to programming in the STIP in a consistent manner, a series of screening tools has been developed, with the objective of providing reviewers with consistent project information regarding readiness of a project to advance through the Project Initiation phase. For each of the screening tools, guidance has been prepared to assist project planners and reviewers in completing the tools.

What is Merger Pre-Screening?

Merger Pre-Screening is an internal NCDOT process to determine if a project could benefit from following the Merger Process and if formal Merger Screening should be pursued. Merger Pre-Screening is documented in the project's ATLAS Workbench on the NCDOT Connect Scoping Site. The Merger Pre-Screening tab in the Workbench should be completed as part of the Project Scoping Report or during project initiation by the NCDOT Project Manager, or their designee.

There are two possible outcomes of pre-screening: 1) the Merger Process is not recommended for the project; or 2) Merger Screening is recommended. The recommendation is made based on an evaluation of available project information with respect to key merger indicators, including Clean Water Act Section 404 requirements, proposed project activities, potential conflicting impacts to resources, and intensity of potential impacts. Merger Screening is the formal process of coordinating with the Merger MOU Signatories to decide if a project should be placed into the Merger Process.

Updates or revisions to the Merger Pre-Screening process will be discussed and reviewed by the Merger Management Team (MMT).

- Objective: to identify projects that should be considered for application of the Merger Process, to facilitate needed environmental clearance during Project Development.
- Screening Benefit: This screening will support identification of an expected small number of projects that will be subjected to a more rigorous Plus PSR, which is intended to serve as a pre-NEPA decision document that achieves and documents Merger Concurrence
- Preparer: CDU/FSU
- Reviewer/Approver: Environmental Policy Unit
- References: Express Design Evaluation & Project Scoping Process Guidance (CDU/FSU); FHWA Planning and Environmental Linkage guidance

- Supporting NCDOT unit(s): Transportation Planning Division, Division Corridor Development Engineer (Div CDE), Division Planning Engineer, Project Manager, Project Sponsor
- Considerations (for use in screening tool):
 - Potential Section 404 approval
 - Potential for higher level of environmental documentation than Level III Categorical Exclusion
 - Potential environmental resources affected by the project
 - Potential conflicting resources
- Decision options:
 1. Continue Regular PSR
 2. Expand scope to provide Plus-PSR
 3. Advance to Merger Screening
- Screening Product: Project Scoping Report Level-of-Detail and Merger Pre-Screening Form

- Recipient/Use: Environmental Policy Unit, Project Management Unit; for scoping Project Development activities
- Location of Screening Tool Documentation (SharePoint/ATLAS/Both): Both

Instructions for Completing the Merger Pre-Screening Form & Checklist

Use the instructions found in the Express Design/Project Scoping Report Guidance to complete the Merger Pre-Screening Form to determine if a project could benefit from using the Merger Process. A copy of the completed form should be uploaded to the project's ATLAS Workbench with notification to NCDOT Environmental Policy Unit (EPU) that screening has been completed. Additional information may be attached to the Merger Pre-Screening Form to justify responses as needed. If the Merger Pre-Screening Form indicates that Merger coordination is required, see the Merger Screening Guidance for additional information.

Fill in the applicable information for the proposed project on the form.

SPOT ID or STIP	<i>Note the project's SPOT ID and/or STIP number</i>
Division	<i>Indicate which NCDOT Division the project is in</i>
NCDOT Contact	<i>Insert the name of the current NCDOT contact</i>
WBS	<i>If available, note the project's WBS number</i>
Prepared By	<i>Enter the name of the person (and their organization) who prepared the form</i>
Lead Federal Agency	<i>Note the anticipated federal agency</i>
Existing Number of Lanes	<i>Number of existing lanes on the facility</i>
Proposed Number of Lanes	<i>Number or proposed lanes on the facility</i>
Document Type	<i>Indicate if the project is expected to be federal (NEPA) or state (SEPA) funded. Select the likely document type (CE/MCDC, EA/SEA, or EIS)</i>
Project Type	<i>Is the project being Centrally-managed or Division-managed?</i>
Existing Control of Access	<i>Select the existing type of access control</i>
Proposed Control of Access	<i>Select the proposed type of access control</i>
Identified Need	<i>Include the identified need for the project as defined on the Identified Need Form or Project Scoping Report or other available information. Note this is not necessarily the Project Purpose and Need that will be identified in Concurrence Point 1.</i>
Project Description	<i>Identify and describe the proposed action, including its location. Include the termini (project beginning and end) and design features, such as lanes proposed, typical section, and other design assumptions.</i>
Vicinity Map & Project Scoping Study Area	<i>Insert a map of the project vicinity and project scoping study area. Additional figures showing environmental features should be attached as needed.</i>

Project Data

SPOT ID OR STIP #: <input type="text"/>		DIVISION: <input type="text"/>	Existing No. of Lanes: <input type="text"/>	
NCDOT CONTACT: <input type="text"/>		WBS: <input type="text"/>	Proposed No. of Lanes: <input type="text"/>	
PREPARED BY: <input type="text"/>		LEAD FEDERAL AGENCY: <input type="text"/>		
DOCUMENT TYPE: <input type="checkbox"/> NEPA <input type="checkbox"/> CE/MCDC <input type="checkbox"/> SEPA <input type="checkbox"/> EA/SEA <input type="checkbox"/> EIS		PROJECT TYPE: <input type="checkbox"/> DIVISION <input type="checkbox"/> CENTRAL		Existing control of access: <input type="checkbox"/> No Control <input type="checkbox"/> Partial Control <input type="checkbox"/> Limited Control <input type="checkbox"/> Full Control
Proposed control of access: <input type="checkbox"/> No Control <input type="checkbox"/> Partial Control <input type="checkbox"/> Limited Control <input type="checkbox"/> Full Control				
IDENTIFIED NEED: Include the identified need for the project as defined on the Identified Need form or Project Scoping Report or other available information. Note this is not necessarily the Project Purpose and Need that will be identified in Concurrence Point 1.				
<input type="text"/>				
PROJECT DESCRIPTION: Identify and describe the proposed action, including its location. Include the termini (project beginning and end) and design features, such as laneage proposed, typical section, and other design assumptions.				
<input type="text"/>				
VICINITY MAP & PROJECT SCOPING STUDY AREA: Insert a map of the project vicinity and project scoping study area. Additional figures showing environmental features should be attached as needed.				
<input type="text"/>				

Merger Pre-Screening Checklist

Use the following instructions to complete the Merger Pre-Screening tab in the ATLAS Workbench. If Merger Pre-Screening indicates that Merger Screening is recommended, see the Merger Screening Guidance for additional information. Once completed, notify NCDOT EPU that the pre-screening has been completed. Additional information may be uploaded or included in the project record to justify responses as needed.

MERGER PRE-SCREENING QUESTIONNAIRE

Answer the Merger Pre-Screening Questionnaire questions in the Workbench based on the best available information to determine if the project should be considered for the Merger Process. Select the appropriate response and follow the instructions for that answer.

Question 1: Is the project likely to require Section 404 approval?

Since the purpose of the Merger Process is to coordinate the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)/North Carolina Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) process with Clean Water Act Section 404 approvals, the first step in deciding if a project should use Merger is to determine if the project is likely to require any type of Section 404 approval. Section 404 approval is required from the US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) for any project that impacts Waters of the US (e.g., rivers, streams, wetlands, lakes, ponds, seeps, springs, etc., that are determined to be jurisdictional). This includes impacts that would require a General Permit (e.g., Nationwide or Regional General Permit) or an Individual Permit (IP).

Review available data for streams, wetlands, and surface waters. At this point, available data could be from ATLAS and/or field surveys. If there are any streams, wetlands, and/or other surface waters present in the study area (as defined in the express design/project scoping process or during project initiation for the project), then select **YES**. If the project is unlikely to have impacts to these resources, either because there are no jurisdictional resources or the resources are so far from the proposed project that there is no chance of an impact, then select **NO**.

Question 1 Response:

If **YES**, Section 404 approval is likely to be required, proceed to question 2.

If **NO**, Section 404 approval is not likely to be required, then the pre-screening is complete, and Merger is not recommended for the project. Skip to the Conclusion section of the Merger Pre-Screening tab and notify NCDOT EPU that screening has been completed and Merger is not recommended.

Question 2: Is the project likely to require a Type III Categorical Exclusion (CE) or higher level of documentation?

Regardless of the actual funding for the project, review the FHWA/NCDOT [CE Agreement](#) (*Documentation Requirements and Approval Procedures for Federal-Aid Projects Classified as Categorical Exclusions*, October 21, 2019) to determine if the project would qualify as a CE and the type of CE the action would be considered. Appendices A, B, and D of the CE Agreement include listings of actions that are Type I and II. Appendix C describes Type III actions. Other actions that could have greater levels of

impacts would require an Environmental Assessment (EA)/ State EA (SEA) or Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). Consult with NCDOT-EPU if it is unclear what documentation the action may need.

If the project would fall into the **CE Type I (A, B, or C)** (see *Type I exception below*) or **Type II (A or B)** categories (see *Type II exception below*), the project is not likely to have conflicting impacts to regulated resources that would require Merger-level agency coordination. Therefore, select **NO**.

Type I Exception: For purposes of Merger Screening, Type I Action #23 (federal funding and project cost) should not be used as the sole criteria for determining that an action would be a Type I.

Type II Exception: If the project is a Type II Action #13 (Actions described in paragraphs 26, 27, and 28 of Appendix A [Type I Actions] that do not meet the constraints in 23 CFR 771.117(e)(1-6)), then select **YES**. These actions may have conflicting impacts to resources and should be considered further.

If the project would be a **CE Type III** or would require an **EA/SEA** or **EIS**, then it could have conflicting impacts to multiple resources and may benefit from being in Merger. Select **YES**.

Question 2 Response:

If **YES**, the project would require a Type III CE or higher level of documentation (or Type II #13), proceed to question 3.

If **NO**, the project would be classified as a Type I or II CE (except Type II #13), then Merger is not recommended for the project and the pre-screening is complete. Skip to the Conclusion section of the Merger Pre-Screening tab and notify NCDOT EPU that screening has been completed and Merger is not recommended.

Question 3: What resources have the potential to be impacted by the project?

At this phase of project development, the exact impacts of the proposed project are not known. Identify the resources that could be impacted by the project based on the environmental screening completed for the Project Scoping Report or during project initiation. The resources listed in question 3 are not all the resources that a project could affect; however, they are the resources that could trigger involvement of one or more regulatory agency(ies) and indicate that the project could be a candidate for the Merger Process.

Review the Project Scoping Report, specifically the Project Scoping Screening Checklist, to determine what resources were identified in the vicinity of the project and if impacts are possible. **Table 1** notes the applicable Project Scoping Screening Checklist question(s) for each resource. In general, select the resources that appear to be within the proposed right of way or in the study area and have the potential to be impacted by the project. When in doubt, err on the side of caution and select the resource. The responses will be used for discussion with agency representatives if it is concluded that Merger Screening is recommended.

Table 1. Study Area Resources

Resource	Project Scoping Screening Checklist Question(s)
NATURAL ENVIRONMENT	
Stream(s)	12
Wetland(s)	12
Surface water(s)	12
Water supply critical area(s)	10
Wild & Scenic River(s)	19
CAMA Area(s) of Environmental Concern	17
T/E species or potential habitat	1, 2, 8
Protected land(s)	20, 26, 27
HUMAN ENVIRONMENT	
Historic site(s)/District(s)	7, 14
Archaeological resource(s)	7, 14
EJ community(ies)	4
Park(s)/recreation area(s)	6, 26, 28
Federal land(s)	21
Major change(s) in access	22, 23, 24
Unusually large number of relocations	5
Other resource(s) of local importance	31
PUBLIC/STAKEHOLDER	
Substantial negative comments/organized opposition	3
Local government opposition	25
Other permit(s) required (FERC, USGC, etc.)	13, 18

Question 3 Response:

Select all that apply and proceed to question 4.

Question 4: Do any of the resource impacts conflict?

In reviewing the potential impacts of projects, it is important to consider the potential conflict of the important resources. Conflict means that avoiding or minimizing impacts to one resource could create impacts to another resource(s). Multiple resources may be involved or impacted by the project, but if they are not in conflict then Merger may not be needed. Resources should be shown on environmental features mapping, so develop through ATLAS or review existing mapping (available from the Project Scoping Report or project initiation process) to determine if there is a potential conflict between two or more resources. If there does appear to be a potential conflict or if it is unclear, select **YES**. If there do not appear to be any conflicts, then select **NO**.

Question 4 Response:

If **YES**, Merger Screening is recommended. Provide the completed Merger Pre-Screening Form, with attachments as needed, to NCDOT EPU for review. NCDOT EPU will review the form and attachments and coordinate with the NCDOT Project Manager to determine the next steps.

If **NO**, there do not appear to be conflicting resources. Proceed to the question 5.

Question 5: If there are not conflicting resources, could there be substantial impacts to one or more resource(s)?

This question is intended to look at the intensity of potential project impacts to one or more resource(s) when there are no conflicting resources. The level of potential impacts and permitting should be evaluated to determine if the project could benefit from being placed in Merger.

Determine potential impacts to Waters of the US (streams, wetlands, and surface waters) and other resources identified in question 3 using available GIS or field data for the resources for the proposed right of way (if available) for the project from the express design and project scoping process. Thresholds for potential impacts to most resources are subjective. In general, if the impacts seem high based on professional judgement or the project may benefit from the enhanced interagency coordination provided through the Merger Process, select **YES** and coordinate with NCDOT EPU.

Potential impacts should be rounded to the nearest 0.1 acre (for wetlands, surface waters, and other property impacts) or to the nearest 100 feet for streams. If proposed right of way limits are not available, another method of estimating potential impacts could be used. Whatever method is used, it should be documented and attached to the Merger Pre-Screening Form. It should also ensure that potential impacts are not underestimated. At this early phase of the project, it is better to be conservative and overestimate potential impacts.

Review permitting requirements and thresholds for a Section 404 IP, GP 31, and applicable NWPs (available at <https://www.saw.usace.army.mil/Missions/Regulatory-Permit-Program/Permits/>), and discuss potential impacts to Waters of the US with NCDOT ECAP, the Division Environmental Officer (DEO), or another permitting specialist. If a Section 404 IP is required, or likely to be required due to potential project impacts, then it may benefit from the Merger Process. Select **YES** and coordinate with NCDOT-EPU.

Question 5 Response:

If **YES**, the project could have substantial impacts to one or more resource(s), and Merger Screening is recommended. Skip to the Conclusion section of the Merger Pre-Screening tab and notify NCDOT EPU that Merger Screening is recommended. NCDOT EPU will review the form and attachments and coordinate with the NCDOT Project Manager to determine the next steps.

If **NO**, the project is not anticipated to have substantial impacts then pre-screening is complete, and Merger is not recommended. Skip to the Conclusion section of the Merger Pre-Screening tab and notify NCDOT EPU that pre-screening has been completed and Merger is not recommended.

MERGER PRE-SCREENING CONCLUSION

Merger Pre-Screening will conclude either:

Merger is not recommended. Screening is complete; notify NCDOT EPU that pre-screening is complete, and Merger is not recommended.

OR

Merger Screening is recommended. If Merger Screening is recommended, notify NCDOT EPU. NCDOT EPU will coordinate with the NCDOT Project Manager to determine if the project will proceed to formal Merger Screening and discussion with Merger MOU Signatory Agencies.

If Merger is not recommended based on Merger Pre-Screening, select **YES** in response to “Is the Merger Pre-Screening considered complete?” and select **NO** in response to “Is Merger Screening recommended?”. Notify NCDOT EPU that pre-screening has been completed and Merger was not recommended. NCDOT EPU will review the completed Merger Pre-Screening tab, and if NCDOT EPU agrees with the conclusion, no additional action is required.

If Merger Screening was recommended, select **YES** in response to “Is the Merger Pre-Screening considered complete?” and select **YES** in response to “Is Merger Screening recommended?”. Notify NCDOT EPU that pre-screening has been completed and Merger is recommended. NCDOT EPU will review the completed Merger Pre-Screening tab, and if NCDOT EPU agrees with the conclusion, then proceed with Merger Screening.


If NCDOT EPU disagrees with the pre-screening outcome, they will coordinate with the NCDOT Project Manager to resolve and determine a path to move forward.

Merger Pre-Screening Checklist

See [Merger Pre-Screening Instructions](#) and answer the following questions based on the best available information to determine if Merger Screening is required. If additional information becomes available later, the Project Team may determine that the project should be re-evaluated for Merger.

1) IS THE PROJECT LIKELY TO REQUIRE SECTION 404 APPROVAL?


Section 404 approval is required from the US Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) for any project that impacts Waters of the US (jurisdictional streams or wetlands). This includes impacts permitted with a General Permit (Nationwide, GP31, etc.) or Individual Permit.

- YES, SECTION 404 APPROVAL IS LIKELY**
Proceed to Question 2.
- NO, SECTION 404 APPROVAL IS NOT LIKELY**
 Pre-Screening is complete, and Merger is not recommended.

2) IS THE PROJECT LIKELY TO REQUIRE A TYPE III CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION OR HIGHER LEVEL OF DOCUMENTATION?

Regardless of actual funding for the project, review the [CE Agreement](#) to determine if the project qualifies as a Type I, II, or III Categorical Exclusion, or if an EA/FONSI or EIS would be required. Check the anticipated class of action:

- CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION
 - TYPE I (C)
 - TYPE I (A/B)
 - EA/SEA
- TYPE II (A/B) (EXCEPT #13)
- TYPE III (OR TYPE II #13)
- EIS

- YES, THE PROJECT IS A TYPE II (A/B) #13 OR TYPE III CE OR HIGHER LEVEL DOCUMENT**
Proceed to Question 3.
- NO, THE PROJECT WOULD BE CLASSIFIED AS A TYPE I OR II CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION (EXCEPT TYPE II #13)**
 Pre-Screening is complete, and Merger is not recommended.


3) WHAT RESOURCES HAVE THE POTENTIAL TO BE IMPACTED BY THE PROJECT?

See [Merger Pre-Screening Instructions](#) for guidance. Check all that apply and proceed to Question 4.

NATURAL ENVIRONMENT	HUMAN ENVIRONMENT	PUBLIC / STAKEHOLDER
<input type="checkbox"/> Stream(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Wetland(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Surface water(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Water supply critical area(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Wild & Scenic Rivers <input type="checkbox"/> CAMA Area(s) of Env Concern <input type="checkbox"/> T/E species or potential habitat <input type="checkbox"/> Protected land(s)	<input type="checkbox"/> Historic site(s)/District(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Archaeological resource(s) <input type="checkbox"/> EJ community(ies) <input type="checkbox"/> Park(s)/recreation area(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Federal land(s) <input type="checkbox"/> Major change(s) in access <input type="checkbox"/> Unusually large number of relocations <input type="checkbox"/> Other resource(s) of local importance	<input type="checkbox"/> Substantial negative comments <input type="checkbox"/> Organized opposition <input type="checkbox"/> Local government opposition <input type="checkbox"/> Other permit(s) required



4) COULD ANY OF THE RESOURCE IMPACTS CONFLICT?


Conflict means that avoiding or minimizing impacts to one resource could create additional impacts to another resource. Multiple resources may be involved or impacted, but if they are not in conflict then Merger may not be beneficial. Resources should be shown on an environmental features map and attached to this form.


- YES, THERE APPEAR TO BE CONFLICTING RESOURCES**
 Merger Screening is recommended.
- NO, THE INVOLVED RESOURCE(S) ARE NOT IN CONFLICT**
Proceed to Question 5.

5) IF THERE ARE NOT CONFLICTING RESOURCES, COULD THERE BE SUBSTANTIAL IMPACTS TO ONE OR MORE RESOURCE(S)?

See [Merger Pre-Screening Instructions](#) for guidance.

- YES, THERE COULD BE SUBSTANTIAL IMPACTS TO RESOURCE(S)**
 Merger Screening is recommended.
- NO, SUBSTANTIAL IMPACTS ARE NOT ANTICIPATED**
 Pre-Screening is complete, and Merger is not recommended.

 If Merger Screening is recommended, provide this completed form and supporting information to NCDOT EPU for review and follow-up.

 If Merger is not recommended; select NO below under Merger Screening Determination, and upload this completed form and supporting information to the ATLAS Workbench and notify NCDOT EPU that pre-screening was completed, and Merger was not recommended.

MERGER SCREENING DETERMINATION: Upload Merger Screening documentation or Merger Screening Meeting summary.

- YES, PROJECT WILL PROCEED THROUGH MERGER**
- NO, PROJECT WILL NOT USE MERGER**