# U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) <br> APPLICATION FOR DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY PERMIT 

33 CFR 325. The proponent agency is CECW-CO-R.

Form Approved -
ОМВ No. 0710-0003
Expires: 02-28-2022

The public reporting burden for this collection of information, OMB Control Number 0710-0003, is estimated to average 11 hours per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding the burden estimate or burden reduction suggestions to the Department of Defense, Washington Headquarters Services, at whs.mc-alex.esd.mbx.dd-dod-information-collections@mail.mil. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to any penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number, PLEASE DO NOT RETURN YOUR APPLICATION TO THE ABOVE EMAIL.

## PRIVACY ACT STATEMENT

Authorities: Rivers and Harbors Act, Section 10, 33 USC 403; Clean Water Act, Section 404, 33 USC 1344; Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act, Section 103, 33 USC 1413; Regulatory Programs of the Corps of Engineers; Final Rule 33 CFR 320-332. Principal Purpose: Information provided on this form will be used in evaluating the application for a permit. Routine Uses: This information may be shared with the Department of Justice and other federal, state, and local government agencies, and the public and may be made available as part of a public notice as required by Federal law. Submission of requested information is voluntary, however, if information is not provided the permit application cannot be evaluated nor can a permit be issued. One set of original drawings or good reproducible copies which show the location and character of the proposed activity must be attached to this application (see sample drawings and/or instructions) and be submitted to the District Engineer having jurisdiction over the location of the proposed activity. An application that is not completed in full will be returned. System of Record Notice (SORN). The information received is entered into our permit tracking database and a SORN has been completed (SORN \#A1145b) and may be accessed at the following website: hittp://dpcid.defense.gov/Privacy/SORNsindex/DOD-wide-SORN-Article-View/Article/570115/a1145b-ce.aspx
(ITEMS 1 THRU 4 TO BE FILLED BY THE CORPS)

| 1. APPLICATION NO. ${ }^{\text {2. FIELD OFFICE CODE }}$ | 3. DATE RECEIVED 4. DATE APPLICATION COMPLETE |
| :---: | :---: |
| (ITEMS BELOW TO BE FILLED BY APPLICANT) |  |
| 5. APPLICANT'S NAME <br> First - Scot Middle - Last - Ehrgott <br> Company - Mississippi Dept. of Transportation <br> E-mail Address - sehrgott@mdot.ms.gov | 8. AUTHORIZED AGENT'S NAME AND TITLE (agent is not required) <br> First - Adam <br> Middle - <br> Last - Johnson <br> Company - Mississippi Dept. of Transportation, Environmental Div. <br> E-mail Address -ajohnson@mdot.ms.gov |
| 6. APPLICANT'S ADDRESS: <br> Address- P. O. Box 1850 <br> City - Jackson State-Ms Zip-39215 Country-USA | 9. AGENT'S ADDRESS: <br> Address- P. O. Box 1850 <br> City-Jackson State - Ms Zip-39215 Country-USA |
| 7. APPLICANT'S PHONE NOs w/AREA CODE <br> a. Residence <br> b. Business <br> c. Fax (601)359-7007 | 10. AGENTS PHONE NOs w/AREA CODE <br> a. Residence <br> b. Business <br> c. Fax <br> (601)359-7920 (601)359-7355 |

## STATEMENT OF AUTHORIZATION

11. I hereby authorize, Adam Johnson to act in my behalf as my agent in the processing of this application and to furnish, upon request, supplemental information in support of this permit application.

## 12. PROJECT NAME OR TITLE (see instructions)

MDOT Jackson 57 103060-301000
13. NAME OF WATERBODY, IF KNOWN (if applicable)

Multiple - See attached "Final Table of Impacts"
15. LOCATION OF PROJECT

Longitude: oW -88 4227.64
14. PROJECT STREET ADDRESS (if applicable)

Address SR 57 from I-10 to Vancleave

City - Gautier and Vancleave State- Ms

Zip- 39564
16. OTHER LOCATION DESCRIPTIONS, IF KNOWN (see instructions)

## State Tax Parcel ID

Municipality
Section - $5,6,7,8$, and 9 Township - 6S
18. Nature of Activity (Description of project, include all features)

This is a Mississippi Department of Transportation construction project that will widen the existing SR 57 2-lane facility to a newer 4-lane facility between Interstate $10(\mathrm{I}-10)$ and Vancleave, MS. The work will include grading and filling. New bridges will be placed along the west side of the existing alignment.
19. Project Purpose (Describe the reason or purpose of the project, see instructions)

The purpose and need for this project is to maintain or increase the regional traffic mobility and safety of the facility by adding capacity. Traffic studies indicate that current traffic patterns on this facility contribute to congested traffic flow during peak traffic hours which adversely affects regional mobility in the City of Vancleave and surrounding area. These studies show that a 4-lane facility will sufficiently serve the projected traffic demand. Further details can be found in attached Environmental Assessment.

| 20. Reason(s) for Discharge <br> Not applicable |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |
| 21 Type(s) of Material Being Discharged and the Amount of Each Type in Cubic Yards: Type Amount in Cubic Yards <br> Type Not Applicable Type <br> Amount in Cubic Yards Amount in Cubic Yards  <br> Not applicable Not Applicable  |  |

22 Surface Area in Acres of Wetlands or Other Waters Filled (see instructions)
Acres 114.56 acres -- See attached "Final Table of Impacts" for details
or
Linear Feet 1737 linear feet -- -- See attached "Final Table of Impacts" for details
23. Description of Avoidance, Minimization, and Compensation (see instructions)

Bridges and/or box culverts are primarily proposed for hydraulic crossings. Stream channel relocation has been minimized and stream banks will be restored to a condition similar in elevation and shape to original conditions to facilitate natural regeneration of vegetation. Impacts to wetlands were minimized to the extent possible while also considering other natural, historical, and human impacts. MDOT proposes mitigating unavoidable jurisdictional Waters of the United States impacts using approved MDOT mitigation banks. Further details can be found in "Description of Alternatives" section (page 6) of attached Environmental Assessment.
25. Addresses of Adjoining Property Owners, Lessees, Etc., Whose Property Adjoins the Waterbody (if more than can be entered here, please attach a supplemental list) a. Address- See "Attachment A - Drawings" of the Joint Application and Notification

| City - | State - | Zip - |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| b. Address- | State - | Zip - |
| City - | State - | Zip - |
| c. Address- |  |  |
| City - | State - | Zip - |
| d. Address- |  | State - |
| City - |  | Zip - |

26. List of Other Certificates or Approvals/Denials received from other Federal, State, or Local Agencies for Work Described in This Application,

| AGENCY | TYPE APPROVAL* | IDENTIFICATION |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| NUMBER | DATE APPLIED |  |

None


The Application must be signed by the person who desires to undertake the proposed activity (applicant) or it may be signed by a duly authorized agent if the statement in block 11 has been filled out and signed.

18 U.S.C. Section 1001 provides that: Whoever, in any manner within the jurisdiction of any department or agency of the United States knowingly and willfully falsifies, conceals, or covers up any trick, scheme, or disguises a material fact or makes any false, fictitious or fraudulent statements or representations or makes or uses any false writing or document knowing same to contain any false, fictitious or fraudulent statements or entry, shall be fined not more than $\$ 10,000$ or imprisoned not more than five years or both.

# JOINT APPLICATION AND NOTIFICATION 

U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS<br>MISSISSIPPI DEPARTMENT OF MARINE RESOURCES<br>MISSISSIPPI DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITYIOFFICE OF POLLUTION CONTROL

This form is to be used for proposed activities in waters of the United States in Mississippi and for the erection of structures on suitable sites for water dependent industry. Note that some items, as indicated, apply only to projects located in the coastal area of Hancock, Harrison and Jackson Counties.
2. Applicant name, mailing address, phone number and email address:
MS Department of Transportation
Scot Ehrgott
P.O. Box 1850; Jackson, MS; 39215
601.359.7007, sehrgott@mdot.ms.gov

Agent name, mailing address, phone number and email address:
MS Department of Transportation
Adam Johnson
P.O. Box 1850 (87-01); Jackson, MS; 39215 601.359.7920, ajohnson@mdot.ms.gov

1. Date

December 2, 2021
month day year
3. Official use only COE $\qquad$
DMR $\qquad$
DEQ $\qquad$
A95 $\qquad$
DATE RECEIVED

## 4. Project location

$\qquad$ City/Community Gautier and Vancleave
Name of Waterway Multiple - See W/OW Report Latitude $30.527180^{\circ}$ Longitude (if known)-88.703623 ${ }^{\circ}$
Geographic location: Section $5,6,7,8, \& 9$
5. Project description

## New work_ Maintenance work___

Dredging

| _Channel | length |
| :--- | :--- |
| _Canal | length |
| _Boat Slip | length |
| _-Marina | length |

$\qquad$ existing depth $\qquad$ proposed depth $\qquad$ proposed depth existing depth $\qquad$ existing depth $\qquad$ proposed depth existing depth $\qquad$ proposed depth existing depth $\qquad$ proposed depth $\qquad$

Cubic yards of material to be removed $\qquad$ Type of material $\qquad$ Location of spoil disposal area
Dimensions of spoil area $\qquad$ Method of excavation $\qquad$
How will excavated material be contained?

## Construction of structures

| _Bulkhead |
| :--- |
| $\ldots \quad$ Pier |
| $\ldots \quad B o a t ~ R a m p ~$ |

Total length
length
length
length Height above water $\qquad$ height $\qquad$
Boat Ramp
length width
$\qquad$ slope $\qquad$

Structures on designed sites for water dependent industry (Coastal area only). Explain in item 11 or include as attachment. $x$ Other (explain) New road

## Filling

Dimensions of fill area $\qquad$
Cubic yards of fill $\qquad$ Type of fill
Other regulated activities (i.e. Seismic exploration, burning or clearing of marsh) Explain.
6. Additional information relating to the proposed activity

Does project area contain any marsh vegetation? Yes $\qquad$ No $x$
(If yes, explain) $\qquad$
$\qquad$ No $\times$
Is any portion of the activity for which authorization is sought now complete? Yes
(If yes, explain)
Month and year activity took place N/A
If project is for maintenance work on existing structures or existing channels, describe legal authorization for the existing work. Provide permit number, dates or other form(s) of authorization. N/A
Has any agency denied approval for the activity described herein or for any activity that is directly related to the activity described herein?
Yes__ No____(If yes, explain) $\qquad$
7. Project schedule

Proposed start date unknown
Proposed completion date unknown
Expected completion date (or development timetable) for any projects dependent on the activity described herein $\qquad$ N/A
8. Estimated cost of the project $\$ 67,850,000.00$
9. Describe the purpose of this project. Describe the relationship between this project and any secondary or future devel mobility of the existing facility by adding capacity.

Intended use: Private____Commercial____ Public_ x __Other (Explain)
10. Describe the public benefits of the proposed activity and of the projects dependent on the proposed activity. Also describe the extent of public use of the proposed project.
Reduce traffic congestion of the local highway, thereby providing a safer and more convenient driving enironment.

## 11. Narrative Project Description:

The project area is a two lane highway facility with an added center turn lane through the town of Vancleave. Existing access to this facility consists of Type 3-"Regulated Access Control".

The project will involve constructing an additional two-lane roadway facility adjacent to and 88 feet west of the existing two-lane alignment of SR 57 resulting in a divided four-lane facility.

See Attachment B for further detail.
12. Provide the names and addresses of the adjacent property owners. Also identify the property owners on the plan view of the drawing described in Attachment "A". (Attach additional sheets if necessary.)

1. See Attachment A.
2. 
3. List all approvals or certifications received or applied for from Federal, State and Local agencies for any structures, construction, discharges, deposits or other activities described in this application. Note that the signature in Item 14 certifies that application has been made to or that permits are not required from the following agencies. If permits are not required, place N/A in the space for Type Approval.
Agency $\quad$ Type Approval Application Date Approval Date
Dept. of Environmental Quality
Dept. of Marine Resources
Army Corps of Engineers
City/County $\qquad$
Other

## 14. Certification and signatures

Application is hereby made for authorization to conduct the activities described herein. I agree to provide any additional information/data that may be necessary to provide reasonable assurance or evidence to show that the proposed project will comply with the applicable state water quality standards or other environmental protection standards both during construction and after the project is completed. I also agree to provide entry to the project site for inspectors from the environmental protection agencies for the purpose of making preliminary analyses of the site and monitoring permitted works. I certify that I am familiar with and responsible for the information contained in this application, and that to the best of my knowledge and belief, such information is true, complete and accurate. I further certify that I am the owner of the property where the proposed project is located or that I have a legal interest in the property and that I have full legal authority to seek this permit.
U.S.C. Section 1001 provides that: Whoever, in any manner within the jurisdiction of any department or agency of the United States knowingly and willingly falsifies, conceals, or covers up by any trick, scheme or device a material fact or makes any false, fictitious or fraudulent statements or representations or makes or uses any false writing or document knowing same to contain any false, fictitious or fraudulent statement or entry, shall be fined not more than $\$ 10,000$ or imprisoned not more than five years, or both.

## Mississippi Coastal Program (Coastal area only)

I certify that the proposed project for which authorization is sought complies with the approved Mississippi Coastal Program and will be conducted in a manner consistent with the program.


## 15. Fees

Payable to MS Dept. of Marine Resources
\$50.00 Single-family residential application fee
\$500.00 Commercial application fee
Please include appropriate fees for all projects proposed in coastal areas of Hancock, Harrison and Jackson Counties.
Public notice fee may be required
16. If project is in Hancock, Harrison or Jackson Counties, send one completed copy of this application form and appropriate fees listed in Item 15 to:

Department of Marine Resources
Bureau of Wetlands Permitting
1141 Bayview Avenue
Biloxi, MS 39530
(228) 374-5000

If project IS NOT in Hancock, Harrison or Jackson Counties, send one completed copy of this application form to each agency listed below:

|  | Director |
| :--- | :--- |
| District Engineer | Mississippi Dept. of Environmental Quality |
| Vicksburg District | Office of Pollution Control |
| Regulatory Branch | P.O. Box 10385 |
| Attn: CEMVK-OD-F | Jackson, MS 39289 |
| 4155 Clay Street |  |
| Vicksburg, MS 39183-3435 |  |

17. In addition to the completed application form, the following attachments are required:

## Attachment "A" Drawings

Provide a vicinity map showing the location of the proposed site along with a written description of how to reach the site from major highways or landmarks. Provide accurate drawings of the project site with proposed activities shown in detail. All drawings must be to scale or with dimensions noted on drawings and must show a plan view and cross section or elevation. Use $81 / 2 \times 11$ " white paper or drawing sheet attached.

## Attachment "B" Authorized Agent

If applicant desires to have an agent or consultant act in his behalf for permit coordination, a signed authorization designating said agent must be provided with the application forms. The authorized agent named may sign the application forms and the consistency statement.

## Attachment "C" Environmental Assessment (Coastal Area Only)

Provide an appropriate report or statement assessing environmental impacts of the proposed activity and the final project dependent on it. The project's effects on the wetlands and the effects on the life dependent on them should be addressed. Also provide a complete description of any measures to be taken to reduce detrimental offsite effects to the coastal wetlands during and after the proposed activity. Alternative analysis, minimization and mitigation information may be required to complete project evaluation.

## Attachment "D" Variance or Revisions to Mississippi Coastal Program (Coastal area only)

If the applicant is requesting a variance to the guidelines in Section 2, Part III or a revision to the Coastal Wetlands Use Plan in Section 2, Part IV of the Rules, Regulations, Guidelines and Procedures of the Mississippi Coastal Program, a request and justification must be provided.

## Attachment A-Drawings
























## March 2022 Re-Evaluation

# Re-evaluation of "Finding of No Significant Impact" (FONSI) Project No. SP-STP-0066-01(008) / 103060/301000 <br> SR 57, From I-10 to Vancleave, Jackson County 

The anticipated social, economic, and environmental impacts were evaluated as a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) under Project Number SP-STP-0066-01(008)/103060, Jackson County, and MDOT received approval from FHWA on September 25, 2005. Due to plan modifications and three years passing since the previous approval, a re-evaluation was submitted and approved on December 10, 2010. After the 2010 re-evaluation, the design was completed and the ROW was purchased. In 2021, the document was re-evaluated due to the time that had passed and the project area was assessed for any T\&E species. The re-evaluation was approved on November 23, 2021.

Shortly after the last re-evaluation, the Mississippi Department of Archives and History (MDAH) submitted comments expressing concern with the methodologies used to perform the original archaeological survey for the project area. Based on communication between MDOT and MDAH, it was agreed that areas of the project would receive additional survey. MDOT and MDAH both participated in the final archaeological survey. There was nothing significant found during the survey and MDAH submitted a letter stating that they have determined there will be no effect to historic properties from the proposed project.

Shortly after MDOT applied for the 404 permit, EPA provided comments regarding their concerns with the project and the permit. EPA's comments and the response addressing the comments have been included in the re-evaluation. While language was included in the response to address and help allay EPA's concerns, no changes were made to the project.

Updated coordination the USFWS has been included concurring that the project will have no effect on any Threatened or Endangered Species in the project area.

In compliance with FHWA Policy, we have reviewed the environmental document to determine if there have been any unforeseen changes in the project, its surroundings, and impacts that would result in a significant environmental impact. We have concluded that there are no additional modifications that would result in a significant impact to the environment.


Environmental Division Director
Mississippi Department of Transportation

## Kim D Thurman

## Reevaluation of "Finding of No Significant Impact" (FONSI) Project No. SP-STP-0066-01(008) / 103060/301000 <br> SR 57, From I-10 to Vancleave, Jackson County

The anticipated social, economic, and environmental impacts were evaluated as a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) under Project Number SP-STP-0066-01(008) / 103060, Jackson County, and MDOT received approval from FHWA on September 25, 2005. Due to plan modifications and three years passing since the previous approval, a re-evaluation was submitted and approved on December 10,2010. Since then, the design has been completed and the right-of-way necessary to construct the proposed project has been purchased.

Based on the time that has passed and the changes to the listed threatened and endangered species, a Threatened and Endangered Species survey was performed in 2019 and 2020. The report was submitted to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) for review. The USFWS responded and stated they were appreciative of MDOT's commitment to the use of best management practices (BMP) and that based on the T\&E Survey report they had no additional concerns regarding the project other than what they had initially expressed in their original August 22, 2005 consultation response.

In compliance with FHWA Policy, we have reviewed the environmental document to determine if there have been any unforeseen changes in the project, its surroundings, and impacts that would result in a significant environmental impact. We have concluded that there are no additional modifications that would result in a significant impact to the environment. This reevaluation is requested due to a period of time in excess of three years that has past.


Adam Johnson
Environmental Division Director Mississippi Department of Transportation

## Kim D Thurman

for
Donald E. Davis
Division Administrator
Federal Highway Administration

# Re-evaluation of "Finding of No Significant Impact" (FONSI) <br> Project No. SP-STP-0066-01(008) / 103060 <br> SR 57, From I-10 to Vancleave, Jackson County 

The anticipated social, economic, and environmental impacts were evaluated as a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) under Project Number SP-STP-0066-01(008) / 103060, Jackson County, and MDOT received approval from FHWA on September 25, 2005.

In compliance with FHWA Policy, we have reviewed the environmental document to determine if there have been any unforeseen changes in the project, its surroundings, and impacts that would result in a significant environmental impact. We have concluded that there are no additional modifications that would result in a significant impact to the environment. This reevaluation is to comply with the period in excess of three years that has expired.

If you have any questions or require additional information, please contact the Rhea Vincent at telephone number (601) 359-7920.

Approved by:


Environmental Division Administrator, MDOT

Approved by:


Division Administrator, FHWA

# Final Environmental Assessment - 

## Finding Of No Significant Impacts

For Alternative " $C$ "

State Route 57 from Interstate 10 to Vancleave

## Jackson County

Project Number - SP-STP-0066-01(008)
FMS - 103060/301000


# FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION <br> FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT FOR <br> Project SP-STP-066-1(08), Jackson County, Mississippi <br> Reconstruct SR 57 from 1 -10 to Vancleave 

The Federal Highway Administration has determined that this project's Proposed Action, Alternative C, as described in the project's Environmental Assessment, will have no significant impact on the human or natural environment. This Finding of No Significant Impact is based on the attached Environmental Assessment, which has been independently evaluated by the Federal Highway Administration and determined to adequately and accurately discuss the needs, environmental issues, and impacts of the proposed project and mitigation measures. It provides sufficient evidence and analysis for determining that an Environmental Impact Statement is not required. The Federal Highway Administration takes full responsibility for the accuracy, scope, and content of the attached Environmental Assessment and its attachments.

September 26, 2005 Date

For: Andrew H. Hughes, Division Administrator, FHWA




# MDOT Commitments to Environmental Excellence 



All practical and standard procedures and measures, including Best Management practices will be implemented to avoid or minimize impacts.

- These commitments should be carried throughout each phase of the project development including Design, Right of Way, Construction, and Maintenance.
*Value Engineering (VE) Studies are recommended for projects on the NHS System and/or an Intermodal Connector with an estimated project costs approaching \$25 Million


## MDOT Commitments to Environmental Excellence



- These commitments should be carried throughout each phase of the project development including Design, Right of Way, Construction, and Maintenance.
*Value Engineering (VE) Studies are recommended for projects on the NHS System and/or an Intermodal Connector with an estimated project costs approaching \$25 Million

| From: | Walters, Chuck |
| :--- | :--- |
| To: | "Mccartney, Alison" |
| Subject: | RE: [EXTERNAL] SR 57 Jackson Co Vancleave Bypass 103060 |
| Date: | Monday, February 28, 2022 7:32:00 AM |

Alison,

Good Morning and Hope it was a "Great Weekend"!

Reflecting back to the "Report" and Field Surveys as you have stated and based on our observations suitable habitat for the T\&E Species is not found within the Footprint of the Project. Therefore I would think the Project would have No Bearing or No Effect on many of the Listed Species.

In the case of the Gopher tortoise though Suitable and Marginal Soils are found in the Footprint each of the areas were surveyed and no evidence was found to support their presence.

As stated a Determination should be "Straight Forward" based on surveys of the area.

If we can be of any other assistance please call on us.

Thank you,

Chuck

From: Mccartney, Alison [mailto:alison_mccartney@fws.gov]
Sent: Friday, February 25, 2022 12:03 PM
To: Walters, Chuck [CWalters@mdot.ms.gov](mailto:CWalters@mdot.ms.gov)
Subject: Re: [EXTERNAL] SR 57 Jackson Co Vancleave Bypass 103060

Hey Chuck,

Hope you're doing good! Adam called me yesterday about this project and we discussed the need for effect determinations, particularly with large or high profile projects and/or projects that the Corp is requiring FWS determination concurrence to approve 404 permits. Based on your findings during your T\&E surveys as documented in your email below, do you feel like you would be able to make effect determinations for each of these species? If no suitable habitat is present in the project area, as is the case with many of the species listed in your report, it would be a no effect determination. If suitable habitat is present and there is potential for the species to be there, although it wasn't observed, a may affect, not likely to adversely affect determination may be warranted. I think it's pretty straight forward and shouldn't be too difficult to determine, but if I'm wrong about that, please let me know.

Please let me know if we need to talk about this further.

Thanks,

Alison

Alison McCartney
Wildlife Biologist
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

Mississippi Ecological Services Field Office
6578 Dogwood View Parkway
Jackson, MS 39213
Cell: (601) 455-8780
Email: alison_mccartney@fws.gov

From: Walters, Chuck [CWalters@mdot.ms.gov](mailto:CWalters@mdot.ms.gov)
Sent: Wednesday, September 8, 2021 12:50 PM
To: Mccartney, Alison [alison_mccartney@fws.gov](mailto:alison_mccartney@fws.gov)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] SR 57 Jackson Co Vancleave Bypass 103060

## This email has been received from outside of DOI - Use caution before clicking on links, opening attachments, or responding.

Alison,

How goes it?

The attached will be the report which we would submit to you for the Surveys conducted on SR 57 Vancleave Bypass (FMS 103060) of all Threatened and Endangered Species listed in IPaC. Please forgive me for submitting this a little late, had a few Compliance Issues to deal with over the last month.

Please review this report and let us know your findings.

Thanks,

## Charles Walters

Office: 601. 545.9348
Cell Phone: 601.946.7861
cwalters@mdot.ms.gov

# Threatened/Endangered Species Survey <br> SR 57 Widening from I-10 to north of Vancleave, MS (Vancleave Bypass) <br> Jackson County Mississippi <br> Prepared By <br> Chuck Walters, Environmental Scientist, MDOT Environmental DIV. 

August 2, 2021

## INTRODUCTION

A Threatened and Endangered Species survey was conducted in 2019 and 2020 for the New State Route 57 alignment beginning at I-10 and continuing north by-passing the town of Vancleave, Mississippi then tying back into State Route 57 north of Vancleave, Mississippi. The Project Corridor is located in Sections 6 and 7 of Township 7 S and Range 7W, Sections 5, 8, 9, 17, 20, 21, 29, and 31 of Township 6S and Range 7W, Sections 5, 21, 31 of Township 5S and Range 7W, Sections 8 and 9 of Township 2W and 7W all in Jackson County. Location maps are attached to show the exact location of the project area. The referenced project area is to be surveyed in accordance with the Endangered Species Act ( 87 Stat. 884; as amended; 16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.) A visual survey of the project area was conducted in 2019 and 2020 for the species listed below.
Scientific Name

| Laterallus jamaicensis | Eastern Black Rail | Threatened |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Grus Canadensis pulla | Mississippi Sandhill Crane | Endangered |
| Pituophis melanoleucus <br> lodingi | Black Pine Snake | Threatened |
| Gopherus polyphemus | Gopher Tortoise | Threatened |
| Rana sevosa | Dusky Gopher Frog | Endangered |
| Isoetes louisianensis | Louisiana Quillwort | Endangered |

## PROJECT AREA DESCRIPTION

The project area will be a new Bypass of the town of Vancleave, MS and will placed on new alignment as described in the "Introduction". Land Use in the Project Corridor is described as Forest Lands, Agricultural, and Residential. Forest Lands dominated by bottomland hardwoods with communities of Sweet Bay (Magnolia virginiana), Gallberry (Ilex coreiacea), Tupelo Gum (Nyssa aquatic) and Wax Myrtle (Morella Caroliniensis). Agricultural Lands dominated by Pasture with communities of Bahia grasses (Paspalum notatum).

Soils found in the project area are mapped as Atmore loam, Benndale fine sandy loam, Daleville silt loam, Hyde silt loam, Smithton loam, Vancleave loamy sand, Escambia sandy loam, Smithdale-Boykin complex, Malbis fine sandy loam, Rusto fine sandy loam, Croatan and Johnson, Freest sandy loam, and Nugent and Jena soils. Soils ranged predominantly from sandy soils in the southern end of the project to clayey loamy soils at the northern end of the project. Consulting the US Fish and Wildlife Service Gopher Tortoise Soil Classification and looking at the Soils found within State Route 57 Project there are only two Suitable Soils (Benndale and Smithdale) and two Marginal Soils (Malbis and Freest) for Gopher Tortoises. There were no Priority Soils found for Gopher tortoises within the Project.

## METHODS

The boundaries of the project area were clearly defined. All available sources of information were reviewed prior to initiating field work. MDOT Biologist transected $100 \%$ of the project area on foot to collect wetland/stream data, and to survey for Gopher Tortoises Burrows.

## RESULTS

## Eastern Black Rail- (Laterallus jamaicenis)

The Eastern Black Rail is listed by Ipac to be in the area, but the Rail is mainly a Marsh Bird and there are no Marsh Lands within the Project Footprint so none were observed. Plant Communities are comprised of Palustrine Forest and Pasture Lands.

## Mississippi Sandhill Crane- (Grus Canadensis pulla)

The MS Sandhill Crane Refuge is located to the east of the Project Footprint and there are Open Pasture Lands on the North End of the Project, but none were observed and nor does the "Refuge" have any record of the Sandhill Cranes in the Project Footprint.

## Black Pine Snake- (Pituophis melanoleucus lodingi)

Majority of the Project Footprint is Bottomland Hardwoods, and in the 2019 and 2020 surveys some stumps and stump holes were explored and in all no Black Pine Snake were observed.

## Gopher Tortoise- (Gopherus polyphemus)

Typically, these reptiles are found in colonies on well-drained sandy soils under scattered pines and hardwoods where sunlight reaches the surface. The Gopher Tortoise typically requires a succulent herbaceous layer for a food source. Pictures and GPS locations of what open fields (areas) on the Project Footprint are included within this report.

No Gopher Tortoise burrows were observed in the project area.

## Dusky Gopher Frog- (Rana sevosa)

No Dusky Gopher Frog were observed.

## Louisiana Quillwort- (Isoetes louisianensis)

The survey of the Black Water Systems with in Project Footprint resulted in incised systems, channelized systems, or perennial streams which none supported habitat conducive for Louisiana Quillwort.
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Example of intermittent stream found in the SR 57 Row, these Black Water systems are incised and does not support the Louisiana Quillwort. This stream is found at GPS Location $\mathbf{N}$ 30.445176 W -88.717253


Example of Channelized Ephemeral Stream does not support Louisiana
Quillwort GPS Location N 30.500544 W-88.706594


Example of Upland Drain did not support Louisiana Quillwort; GPS Location N 30.53371 W-88.6952


Example of Intermittent Stream did not support Louisiana Quillwort; GPS Location N 30.535047 W-88690526


Example of Open Field which there were Gopher Tortoise Burrows found in 2019 or 2020 surveys; GPS Location N 30.495014 W-88.705721


Example of Open Field which there were Gopher Tortoise Burrows found in 2019 or 2020 surveys; GPS Location N 30.567048 W-88.719769


# United States Department of the Interior 

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE<br>Mississippi Ecological Services Field Office<br>6578 Dogwood View Parkway, Suite A Jackson, Mississippi 39213

Phone: (601)965-4900 Fax: (601)965-4340
March 2, 2022

Mr. Adam Johnson<br>Mississippi Department of Transportation<br>401 North West Street<br>Jackson, MS 39201

Dear Mr. Johnson:
The Fish and Wildlife Service has received your correspondence dated June 10, 2021, regarding the proposed widening of SR 57 from I-10 to north of Vancleave, Mississippi. A consultation request for this project was initially submitted to our office in 2005. A consultation response was signed on April 22, 2005. Due to the amount of time that has passed, consultation was reinitiated by the Mississippi Department of Transportation (MDOT) on June 10, 2021. Our comments are provided in accordance with the Endangered Species Act (87 Stat. 884, as amended; 16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.).

The proposed project falls within the range of several federally listed species including the wood stork (Mycteria americana), gopher tortoise (Gopherus polyphemus), black pinesnake (Pituophis melanoleucus lodingi), dusky gopher frog (Lithobates sevosus), eastern black rail (Laterallus jamaicensis), Mississippi sandhill crane (Grus canidensis pulla), and Louisiana quillwort (Isoetes louisianensis). Suitable habitat is present at the site for the gopher tortoise, Mississippi sandhill crane and Louisiana quillwort.

The gopher tortoise occupies a wide range of upland habitat types. The general physical and biotic features thought to characterize suitable adult tortoise habitat are a presence of welldrained, sandy soils, which allow easy burrowing; an abundance of herbaceous ground cover; and generally open canopy and sparse shrub cover, which allows sunlight to reach the ground floor. We received your threatened and endangered species survey report on September 8, 2021. Gopher tortoise burrow surveys were conducted in 2019, 2020, and 2021 with no burrows observed.

Suitable habitat for the Louisiana quillwort includes all ephemeral, intermittent, 1st, and 2nd order perennial freshwater streams in the following Mississippi counties: George, Greene, Forrest, Hancock, Harrison, Jackson, Jones, Pearl River, Perry, Stone, and Wayne. Tidally influenced streams and streams greater than 2nd order are not considered suitable habitat. Louisiana quillwort can be found in sandy soils and gravel bars, in or near wet meadows adjacent to streams, shallow blackwater streams, and overflow channels in riparian woodland/bay-head forests of pine flatwoods and upland longleaf pine. Plants may grow singly or in the hundreds in
highly localized sites with stable sand and/or gravel bars and moist overflow channels with silty or silty-sand substrates. The species can also be found on low, sloping banks near and below water levels where they occur in a relatively firm substrate of fine sandy loam, coarser sands, and small to medium-sized gravel. Periodic flood scouring of stream channels and floodplains are needed to maintain suitable habitat. Surveys were conducted for this species in 2019, 2020, and 2021 with no individuals observed.

The Mississippi sandhill crane can only be found in wet pine savannas in Mississippi. Thousands of individuals of this species could once be seen in Mississippi, Alabama and Louisiana but was reduced to approximately thirty-five birds by 1975. The Mississippi Sandhill Crane National Wildlife Refuge was opened in 1975 and began a recovery program for this species which included a captive breeding program. The wild population has been increased to approximately one hundred thirty animals by 2016. A small portion of the proposed project is along the western boundary of part of the refuge. The refuge was contacted regarding this undertaking in 2021. They have no records of the Mississippi sandhill crane within the footprint of the proposed project. The only concerns that the refuge has with the proposed project is that any seeding that occurs should discourage foraging by this species.

MDOT has agreed to the following conditions for the proposed project:

- Temporary and permanent seeding will discourage foraging by sandhill cranes
- The typical section of the highway will be minimized from 125 feet (centerline to centerline) to 88 feet
- Stream and wetland impacts will be mitigated

The Service concurs with your determination of no effect for threatened and endangered species whose ranges occur within the project area. If you have any questions, please contact Alison McCartney in our office at: (601) 455-8780 or via email: alison_mccartney @fws.gov or visit our website at: https://www.fws.gov/office/mississippi-ecological-services.

Sincerely,

James Austin
Acting Field Supervisor
Mississippi Field Office

From:<br>Sent:<br>To:<br>Cc:<br>Subject:<br>Ainslie, William [Ainslie.William@epa.gov](mailto:Ainslie.William@epa.gov)<br>Thursday, January 6, 2022 8:50 AM<br>Johnson, Adam<br>Monroe, Ashley; Wodtke, Andrea R; Dean, Kenneth<br>EPA Wetlands Program Review of MDOT SR57 Proposal

Adam:

As per the email request dated December 8, 2021 from Ken Dean (EPA NEPA Program) I have reviewed the information MDOT submitted to the Corps of Engineers and to EPA in support of a Section 404 permit application for the proposed MDOT SR57 expansion between I-10 and Vancleave, MS. This review comes from the perspective of evaluating the information submitted by MDOT for compliance with the Section 404 (b)(1) Guidelines (Guidelines) of the Clean Water Act (CWA). Under the Guidelines a project must be the least environmentally damaging practicable alternative; comply with other environmental standards (i.e., Endangered Species Act, state water quality standards, toxic effluent standards, and/or does not jeopardize a Marine Sanctuary); result in impacts that are not considered significant; and compensate for any unavoidable project impacts to aquatic resource functions with appropriate mitigation. These 4 aspects of the Guidelines and their relationship with the proposed project are briefly discussed below.

1) Alternatives - The alternatives evaluated by MDOT primarily consider effects on the adjacent human communities, on the Sandhill Crane Refuge, and on cost. However, there is very little information comparing the effects of the project on aquatic resources (i.e., wetlands and streams) between Alternative A-D. This comparison of alternatives must consider the effects of each alternative on wetlands and streams affected by each and then justify why the preferred alternative is the "least environmentally damaging practicable alternative" (LEDPA). This aspect of the Guidelines strives to avoid impacts to aquatic resources whenever feasible. It is not clear from the documentation that the preferred alternative is the LEDPA. This needs to be addressed.
2) Compliance with other environmental standards - MDOT environmental documentation does address Sandhill Cranes and other endangered species and it appears that MDOT has consulted with the US Fish and Wildlife Service. Therefore this aspect of the Guidelines appears to have been satisfied. However, MDOT will need to coordinate with MDEQ to ensure that state water quality or toxic effluent standards are not violated and with DMR to ensure that the project will not interfere with any marine sanctuaries. This last point is likely not an issue but is included here for the purpose of completeness.
3) Significance of impacts - The data collected from individual plots throughout the project area is that which is typically collected in connection with wetland delineations. However, this data does not provide much information on the level of function the wetlands in the project area are performing. A wetland assessment should be performed to ascertain wetland condition, the level of function it is likely performing, and the level of functional impact of the proposed project.

Wetland type (i.e., hydrogeomorphic class and subclass) should be identified for each of the wetlands delineated. Wetland descriptions included in the environmental assessment indicate that wetlands in the project area are likely pine savannas, riverine forested, and headwater slope bayhead drains wetland subclasses. All three wetland classes are common in the project area and should be replaced in the mitigation area. However, the area of each type should be determined to better evaluate amounts of appropriate compensatory mitigation.

The Executive Summary of the "Wetland and Other Waters Assessment Report", prepared in 2011, indicated that a total of 121 acres of wetlands and 4119 linear feet of stream are found in the project area. The report goes on to tally "permanently filled" and "temporarily filled" areas yet does not discuss potential secondary impacts (e.g., hydrologic and biologic) that might occur on either side of the road. Given the potential for floodplains in the project area being severed, additional secondary impacts could occur in addition to the direct impacts of fill and should be considered. Also, "temporary fills" should be counted as impacts, just as the "permanent fills", because of the likely effects on wetland hydric soils and hydrology in these areas.
4) Minimization and compensatory mitigation - It was not clear what steps would be taken to minimize impacts and there was no discussion of potential mitigation for the various wetland and stream types occurring in the project area.

I appreciate the opportunity to comment on this proposal. Feel free to contact me if you have any concerns or questions about these comments.

Regards,

Bill Ainslie

William Ainslie
Wetlands Regulatory Section
EPA Region IV
61 Forsyth St., NE
Atlanta, GA 30303
(404) 562-9400
"We are drowning in information, while starving for wisdom. The world henceforth will be run by synthesizers, people able to put together the right information at the right time, think critically about it, and make important choices wisely." E.O. Wilson (via Rob Brooks)

## Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Concerns and FHWA/MDOT Response

1) EPA: The alternatives evaluated by MDOT primarily consider effects on the adjacent human communities, on the Sandhill Crane Refuge, and on cost. However, there is very little information comparing the effects of the project on aquatic resources (i.e., wetlands and streams) between Alternative A-D. This comparison of alternatives must consider the effects of each alternative on wetlands and streams affected by each and then justify why the preferred alternative is the "least environmentally damaging practicable alternative" (LEDPA). This aspect of the Guidelines strives to avoid impacts to aquatic resources whenever feasible. It is not clear from the documentation that the preferred alternative is the LEDPA. This needs to be addressed.

FHWA/MDOT: The following table provides a view of the impacts to wetlands, other waters, residences, businesses, non-profits, and minority residences from Alternatives B, C, and D. It also shows the level of support each alternative received at the public hearing.

Alternative C would impact a larger area of riverine forested wetlands and would relocate more residences. However, it would have a smaller economic impact on the area as it would impact a substantially smaller number of businesses. It would have a smaller adverse impact on the community as it would avoid impacts to non-profits such as the Vancleave Public Library, Vancleave High School, Jackson County School, and the M.L.K., Jr. Memorial Park. Alternative C also impacts a smaller percentage of minority residences than Alternative B does. Finally Alternative C received the greatest amount of support of the proposed alternatives presented at the public hearing.

Based largely on these findings in the matrix, Alternative C was selected as the least environmentally damaging practicable alternative and approved with a Finding of No Significant Impact.

SR 57 Environmental Assessment Matrix

| Environmental Parameter | Alt "B" | Alt "C" | Alt "D" |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |
| Wetlands (potential) (Pine Savanna acres) | 11.1 | 11.1 | 11.1 |
| Wetlands (potential) (Riverine Forested acres) | 63 | 110 | 108.98 |
| Other Waters (potential) (linear feet) | 2,633 | 4,119 | 4,919 |
| Residential Relocations | 26 | 48 | 55 |
| Percent Minority Residential Relocations | $35 \%$ | $15 \%$ | $15 \%$ |
| Business Relocations | 48 | 14 | 17 |
| Non-Profit Impacts | 6 | 0 | 1 |
| Public Hearing Comments of Support | 7 | 21 | 6 |

2) EPA: MDOT environmental documentation does address Sandhill Cranes and other endangered species and it appears that MDOT has consulted with the US Fish and Wildlife Service. Therefore this aspect of the Guidelines appears to have been satisfied. However, MDOT will need to coordinate with MDEQ to ensure that state water quality or toxic effluent standards are not violated and with DMR to ensure that the project will not interfere with any marine sanctuaries. This last point is likely not an issue but is included here for the purpose of completeness.

FHWA/MDOT: The appropriate coordination is currently underway to ensure that toxic effluent standards are not violated and that the project will not interfere with any marine sanctuaries.
3) EPA: The data collected from individual plots throughout the project area is that which is typically collected in connection with wetland delineations. However, this data does not provide much information on the level of function the wetlands in the project area are performing. A wetland assessment should be performed to ascertain wetland condition, the level of function it is likely performing, and the level of functional impact of the proposed project.

Wetland type (i.e., hydrogeomorphic class and subclass) should be identified for each of the wetlands delineated. Wetland descriptions included in the environmental assessment indicate that wetlands in the project area are likely pine savannas, riverine forested, and headwater slope bayhead drains wetland subclasses. All three wetland classes are common in the project area and should be replaced in the mitigation area. However, the area of each type should be determined to better evaluate amounts of appropriate compensatory mitigation.

FHWA/MDOT: The requested data for each wetland identified in the wetland assessment is shown below. The Wetland Areas (1-19) account for 121 Acres of impact. 11.1 acres are Pine Savanna, and the remaining 110 acres are Riverine Forested. These are all found within the right-of-way for Alternative C.

The wetland conditions provided in the following descriptions are defined by the Charleston Methodology "Existing Condition". The "Conditions" fall under one of four categories: Fully Functional, Partially Impaired, Impaired, and Very impaired.

- Fully Functional means that the typical suite of functions attributed to the aquatic resource type are functioning naturally. Existing disturbances do not substantially alter important functions. Examples include: pristine (undisturbed) wetlands, aquatic resources with non-functional ditches or old logging ruts with no effective drainage, or minor selective cutting.
- Partially Impaired means that site disturbances have resulted in partial or full loss of one or more functions typically attributed to the aquatic resource type but functional recovery is expected to occur through natural processes. Examples include: clear-cut wetlands, aquatic areas with ditches that impair but do not eliminate wetland hydrology, or temporarily cleared utility corridor.
- Impaired means that site disturbances have resulted in the loss of one or more functions typically attributed to the aquatic resource type and functional recovery is unlikely to occur through natural processes. Restoration activities are required to facilitate recovery. Examples include: areas that have been impacted by surface drainage and converted to pine monoculture or agriculture, areas that are severely fragmented, or wetlands within maintained utility corridors.
- Very Impaired means that site disturbances have resulted in the loss of most functions typically attributed to the aquatic resource type and functional recovery would require a significant restoration effort. Examples include: filled areas excavated areas, or effectively drained wetlands (hydrology removed or significantly altered.)
- Wetland 1 (Data Point 2)- Cowardin Classification (PFO), Hydrogoemorphic Class and Subclass (HGM) wetland type is assessed as being Pine Savanna that is abutting a RPW that flows into a TNW (Old Fort Bayou). Condition is Partially Impaired, and function is of Medium Quality within a small area of the RPW drainage. Restricted to an area on the west side of present SR 57 and Old Fort Bayou, does not exist on the eastside because of Development.
- Wetland 2 (Data Point 4)-Cowardin Classification (PFO), Hydrogoemorphic Class and Subclass (HGM) wetland type is assess as being Pine Savanna that is adjacent to a RPW that flows into a TNW (Old Fort Bayou). Condition is Impaired, and function is of Low Quality by increased shrub layer. Restricted to an area on the west side of present SR 57 and Old Fort Bayou, does not exist on the eastside because of Development (Fragmented).
- Wetland 3 (Data Point 6)- Cowardin Classification (PEM), Hydrogoemorphic Class and Subclass (HGM) wetland type is assess as being Pine Savanna that is adjacent to a RPW that flows into a TNW (Old Fort Bayou). Condition is Impaired, pasture lands and surrounded by County Roads/Two-Lane Highway System (Fragmented).
- Wetland 4 (Data Point 8)- Cowardin Classification (PFO), Hydrogoemorphic Class and Subclass (HGM) wetland type is assess as being Pine Savanna that is adjacent to a RPW that flows into a TNW (Old Fort Bayou). Condition is Impaired, with fragmentation from a utility corridors and Two-Lane Highway system. Function is limited and purposed project will have little impact of recovery, structures will be added to keep hydrology in place.
- Wetland 5 (Data Point 10)- Cowardin Classification (PFO), Hydrogoemorphic Class and Subclass (HGM) wetland type is assess as being Pine Savanna that is abutting a RPW that flows into a TNW (Old Fort Bayou). Condition is Impaired, fragmentation from County Roads and Two-Lane System within a residential area, structures will be kept in place or added to maintain hydrology CA-3 and abutting wetland.
- Wetland 6 (Data Point 11)Cowardin Classification (PFO/PEM), Hydrogoemorphic Class and Subclass (HGM) wetland type is assess as being Riverine Forested that is abutting a RPW that flows into a TNW (Old Fort Bayou). Condition is Partially Impaired, aquatic areas with ditches and fragmentation of County Roads and Residential Areas. Hydrology will be maintained by structures (Piping).
- Wetland 7 (Data Point 17) Cowardin Classification (PFO), Hydrogoemorphic Class and Subclass (HGM) wetland type is assess as being Headwater Bayhead that is abutting a RPW that flows into a TNW (Old Fort Bayou). Condition is Impaired, fragmentation from County Roads, Commercial Development, and Residential Areas. Hydrology will be maintained by structures.
- Wetland 8 (Data Point 18\&32)-Cowardin Classification (PFO), Hydrogoemorphic Class and Subclass (HGM) wetland type is assess as being Riverine Forested that is abutting a RPW that flows into a TNW (Bluff Creek). Condition is Partially Impaired, some clear-cut wetlands with aquatic areas and ditches which maintain hydrology. Adjacent Lands are made up of Residential Areas with constructed impoundments. Remaining Wetland hydrology will be maintained by structures.
- Wetland 9 (Data Point 19)- Cowardin Classification (PFO), Hydrogoemorphic Class and Subclass (HGM) wetland type is assess as being Riverine Forested that is abutting a RPW that flows into a TNW (Bluff Creek). Condition is Partially Impaired, some clear-cut wetlands with aquatic areas and ditches which maintain hydrology. Adjacent Lands are made up of Residential Areas with constructed impoundments. Remaining Wetland hydrology will be maintained by structures.
- Wetland 10 (Data Point 20)- Cowardin Classification (PFO), Hydrogoemorphic Class and Subclass (HGM) wetland type is assess as being Riverine Forested that is abutting a RPW that flows into a TNW (Bluff Creek). Condition is Partially Impaired, temporarily cleared utility corridor on south end, wetland abuts Little Bluff Creek and will be bridged to keep hydrology intact.
- Wetland 11 (Data Point 21) - Cowardin Classification (PFO), Hydrogoemorphic Class and Subclass (HGM) wetland type is assess as being Riverine Forested that is abutting a RPW that flows into a TNW (Bluff Creek). Condition is Impaired, some clear-cut wetlands with aquatic areas and ditches which maintain hydrology. Adjacent Lands are made up of Residential Areas with fragmentation caused County Roads. Hydrology will be maintained by drainage structures.
- Wetland 12 (Data Point 22) - Cowardin Classification (PFO), Hydrogoemorphic Class and Subclass (HGM) wetland type is asses as being Riverine Forested that is abutting a RPW that flows into a TNW (Bluff Creek). Condition is Impaired, some clear-cut wetlands with aquatic areas and ditches which maintain hydrology. Adjacent Lands are made up of Residential Areas with fragmentation caused County Roads. Hydrology will be maintained by drainage structures.
- Wetland 13 (Data Point 23) - Cowardin Classification (PFO), Hydrogoemorphic Class and Subclass (HGM) wetland type is assess as being Riverine Forested that is abutting a RPW that flows into a TNW (Bluff Creek). Condition is Partially Impaired, temporarily cleared
utility corridor on south end, wetland abuts Bluff Creek and will be bridged to keep hydrology intact.
- Wetland 14 (Data Point 25) - Cowardin Classification (PFO), Hydrogoemorphic Class and Subclass (HGM) wetland type is assess as being Riverine Forested that is abutting a RPW that flows into a TNW (Bluff Creek). Condition is Partially Impaired, some clear-cut wetlands with aquatic areas and ditches which maintain hydrology. Adjacent Lands are made up of Residential Areas with constructed impoundments. Remaining Wetland hydrology will be maintained by structures.
- Wetland 15 (Data Point 26)- Cowardin Classification (PFO), Hydrogoemorphic Class and Subclass (HGM) wetland type is assess as being Riverine Forested that is abutting a RPW that flows into a TNW (Bluff Creek). Condition is Partially Impaired, some clear-cut wetlands with aquatic areas and ditches which maintain hydrology. Adjacent Lands are made up of Residential Areas with constructed impoundments. Remaining Wetland hydrology will be maintained by structures.
- Wetland 16 (Data Point 28)- Cowardin Classification (PFO), Hydrogoemorphic Class and Subclass (HGM) wetland type is assess as being Riverine Forested that is abutting a RPW that flows into a TNW (Bluff Creek). Condition is Partially Impaired, temporarily cleared utility on south end, fragmented by residential development. Hydrology will be maintained by drainage by structures.
- Wetland 17 (Data Point 29)- Cowardin Classification (PFO), Hydrogoemorphic Class and Subclass (HGM) wetland type is assess as being Riverine Forested that is abutting a RPW that flows into a TNW (Bluff Creek). Condition is Impaired, Land Use is fragmented by residential development and man- made impoundments.
- Wetland 18 (Data Point 30)- Cowardin Classification (PFO), Hydrogoemorphic Class and Subclass (HGM) wetland type is assess as being Riverine Forested that is abutting a RPW that flows into a TNW (Bluff Creek). Condition is Impaired, fragmented by County Road System and residential development. Hydrology will remain connected by drainage structures.
- Wetland 19 (Data Point 33)- Cowardin Classification (PFO), Hydrogoemorphic Class and Subclass (HGM) wetland type is assess as being Riverine Forested that is abutting a RPW that flows into a TNW (Bluff Creek). Condition is Impaired, Two lane System fragments wetland on the east side, also fragmentation occur from commercial development and residential areas. Hydrology will be kept intact with the placement of drainage structures.

EPA: The Executive Summary of the "Wetland and Other Waters Assessment Report", prepared in 2011, indicated that a total of 121 acres of wetlands and 4119 linear feet of stream are found in the project area. The report goes on to tally "permanently filled" and "temporarily filled" areas yet does not discuss potential secondary impacts (e.g., hydrologic and biologic) that might occur on either side of the road. Given the potential for floodplains in the project area being severed, additional secondary impacts could occur in addition to the direct impacts of fill and should be considered. Also,
"temporary fills" should be counted as impacts, just as the "permanent fills", because of the likely effects on wetland hydric soils and hydrology in these areas.

FHWA/MDOT: The Old Fort Bayou, the Little Bluff Creek, and the Bluff Creek floodplain hydraulic connectivity will not be severed or restricted due to the appropriate design and construction methodologies. The design of all hydraulic crossings has been completed to meet or exceed FEMA regulations as it relates to floodplain elevations and velocities.

Temporary and permanent fills are both considered impacts and will be mitigated via coordination with the USACE. However, temporary fills are short term and are removed to reestablish the hydrology and hydric conditions and restore the wetland.
4) EPA: It was not clear what steps would be taken to minimize impacts and there was no discussion of potential mitigation for the various wetland and stream types occurring in the project area.

FHWA/MDOT: Roadway and Hydraulic design have worked to minimize the project impacts to wetlands by minimizing the project footprint, maximizing bridge lengths over hydraulic crossings, and reducing any hydraulic barriers.

Early coordination with USFWS provided the impetus to minimize the median width to 88 feet from centerline to centerline of the roadway or 64 feet from edge of pavement to edge of pavement.

For the sections of SR 57 on new alignment, access to SR 57 will be limited to only the interchanges to help limit future development along SR 57 and minimize future impacts.

During the 404 permitting process with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, all stream and wetland impacts will be identified and mitigated by MDOT via an approved USACE mitigation bank.

November 2021 Re-Evaluation December 2010 Re-Evaluation September 2001 Approval

## Final Environmental Assessment -

Finding Of No Significant Impacts
For Alternative "C"

State Route 57 from Interstate 10 to Vancleave

## Jackson County

Project Number - SP-STP-0066-01(008)
FMS - 103060/301000


## Re-evaluation of "Finding of No Significant Impact" (FONSI) Project No. SP-STP-0066-01(008) / 103060/301000 <br> SR 57, From I-10 to Vancleave, Jackson County

The anticipated social, economic, and environmental impacts were evaluated as a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) under Project Number SP-STP-0066-01(008) / 103060, Jackson County, and MDOT received approval from FHWA on September 25, 2005. Due to plan modifications and three years passing since the previous approval, a re-evaluation was submitted and approved on December 10, 2010. Since then, the design has been completed and the right-of-way necessary to construct the proposed project has been purchased.

Based on the time that has passed and the changes to the listed threatened and endangered species, a Threatened and Endangered Species survey was performed in 2019 and 2020. The report was submitted to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) for review. The USFWS responded and stated they were appreciative of MDOT's commitment to the use of best management practices (BMP) and that based on the T\&E Survey report they had no additional concerns regarding the project other than what they had initially expressed in their original August 22, 2005 consultation response.

In compliance with FHWA Policy, we have reviewed the environmental document to determine if there have been any unforeseen changes in the project, its surroundings, and impacts that would result in a significant environmental impact. We have concluded that there are no additional modifications that would result in a significant impact to the environment. This reevaluation is requested due to a period of time in excess of three years that has past.


Adam Johnson
Environmental Division Director Mississippi Department of Transportation


11/19/2021
Date
for

Donald E, Davis
Division Administrator
Federal Highway Administration

# Re-evaluation of "Finding of No Significant Impact" (FONSI) Project No. SP-STP-0066-01(008) / 103060 <br> <br> SR 57, From I-10 to Vancleave, <br> <br> SR 57, From I-10 to Vancleave, Jackson County 

 Jackson County}

The anticipated social, economic, and environmental impacts were evaluated as a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) under Project Number SP-STP-0066-01(008) / 103060, Jackson County, and MDOT received approval from FHWA on September 25, 2005.

In compliance with FHWA Policy, we have reviewed the environmental document to determine if there have been any unforeseen changes in the project, its surroundings, and impacts that would result in a significant environmental impact. We have concluded that there are no additional modifications that would result in a significant impact to the environment. This reevaluation is to comply with the period in excess of three years that has expired.

If you have any questions or require additional information, please contact the Rhea Vincent at telephone number (601) 359-7920.


Environmental Division Administrator, MDOT

Approved by:


Division Administrator, FHWA

# FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION 

## FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

 FORProject SP-STP-066-1(08), Jackson County, Mississippi
Reconstruct SR 57 from $1-10$ to Vancleave
The Federal Highway Administration has determined that this project's Proposed Action, Alternative C, as described in the project's Environmental Assessment, will have no significant impact on the human or natural environment. This Finding of No Significant Impact is based on the attached Environmental Assessment, which has been independently evaluated by the Federal Highway Administration and determined to adequately and accurately discuss the needs, environmental issues, and impacts of the proposed project and mitigation measures. It provides sufficient evidence and analysis for determining that an Environmental Impact Statement is not required. The Federal Highway Administration takes full responsibility for the accuracy, scope, and content of the attached Environmental Assessment and its attachments.

September 26, 2005 Date

[^0]
## MDOT Commitments to Environmental Excellence



All practical and standard procedures and measures, including Best Management practices will be implemented to avoid or minimize impacts.

- These commitments should be carried throughout each phase of the project development including Design, Right of Way, Construction, and Maintenance.
*Value Engineering (VE) Studies are recommended for projects on the NHS System and/or an Intermodal Connector with an estimated project costs approaching \$25 Million


## MDOT Commitments to Environmental Excellence

| Project No: |  | Highway: <br> County: |  |  | Revision Date: <br> Page 1 of | $\frac{05 / 25 / 05}{2}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| *Value Engineering Study Recommended | Ye |  |  |  |  |  |
| Commitments/Requirements | Source of Commitment | Responsible Office | Place on Plans | Requires A Special Provision | Status | tment/Requirement |
| Perform a biological survey prior to clearing and/or project construction to ensure that no federally-protected species are present. | EA/FONSI | Environmental Division | No | No |  |  |
| Perform a detailed Wetland and Stream Impact Assessment following project design for mitigation efforts with USACE. | EA/FONSI | Environmental Division | No | No |  |  |
| Locate the final 2.5 -mile segment of proposed alignment to avoid or minimize effect to a minority neighborhood along Lowpoint Road. | EA/FONSI | Roadway Design Division | No | No | Perf | ring project design. |
| Complete a Storm Water Construction Notice of Intent (CNOI) and Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) using Best Management Practices (BMP's) and postconstruction storm water plan. | EA/FONSI | Roadway Design Division | Yes | No | Perfo | ring project design. |

All practical and standard procedures and measures, including Best Management practices will be implemented to avoid or minimize impacts.

- These commitments should be carried throughout each phase of the project development including Design, Right of Way, Construction, and Maintenance.

[^1]



From:
Mccartney, Alison [alison_mccartney@fws.gov](mailto:alison_mccartney@fws.gov)
Sent: Thursday, October 7, 2021 9:45 AM
To:
Subject:

Walters, Chuck
Re: [EXTERNAL] SR 57 Jackson Co Vancleave Bypass 103060

## Good Morning Chuck,

Thank you for the threatened and endangered survey report submitted to our office on August 2, 2021 for the SR 57 widening project from I-10 to north of Vancleave. We appreciate your commitment to the following BMPs for this project:

- Temporary and permanent seeding that discourages foraging by Sandhill Cranes (no grass)
- Minimize the typical section of the highway from 125 feet (centerline to centerline) to 88 feet
- Perform a biological survey prior to construction
- Mitigate for any stream and wetland impacts

Our original consultation response was written on August 22, 2005. We have no additional concerns regarding this project. Thank you for the opportunity to comment.

Alison

Alison McCartney
Wildlife Biologist
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

Mississippi Ecological Services Field Office
6578 Dogwood View Parkway
Jackson, MS 39213
Cell: (601) 455-8780
Email: alison mccartney@fws.gov

From: Walters, Chuck [CWalters@mdot.ms.gov](mailto:CWalters@mdot.ms.gov)
Sent: Wednesday, September 8, 2021 12:50 PM
To: Mccartney, Alison [alison_mccartney@fws.gov](mailto:alison_mccartney@fws.gov)
Subject: [EXTERNAL] SR 57 Jackson Co Vancleave Bypass 103060

This email has been received from outside of DOI - Use caution before clicking on links, opening attachments, or responding.

Alison,

The attached will be the report which we would submit to you for the Surveys conducted on SR 57 Vancleave Bypass (FMS 103060) of all Threatened and Endangered Species listed in IPaC. Please forgive me for submitting this a little late, had a few Compliance Issues to deal with over the last month.

Please review this report and let us know your findings.

Thanks,

## Charles Walters

Office: 601. 545.9348
Cell Phone: 601.946.7861
cwalters@mdot.ms.gov
CONFIDENTIALITY NOTICE This e-mail and any files or attachments may contain confidential and privileged information.
If you have received this message in error, please notify the sender at the above e-mail address and delete it and all copies from your system.

# Threatened/Endangered Species Survey <br> SR 57 Widening from I-10 to north of Vancleave, MS (Vancleave Bypass) <br> Jackson County Mississippi <br> Prepared By <br> Chuck Walters, Environmental Scientist, MDOT Environmental DIV. 

August 2, 2021

## INTRODUCTION

A Threatened and Endangered Species survey was conducted in 2019 and 2020 for the New State Route 57 alignment beginning at I-10 and continuing north by-passing the town of Vancleave, Mississippi then tying back into State Route 57 north of Vancleave, Mississippi. The Project Corridor is located in Sections 6 and 7 of Township 7 S and Range 7W, Sections 5, 8, 9, 17, 20, 21, 29, and 31 of Township 6S and Range 7W, Sections 5, 21, 31 of Township 5S and Range 7W, Sections 8 and 9 of Township 2W and 7W all in Jackson County. Location maps are attached to show the exact location of the project area. The referenced project area is to be surveyed in accordance with the Endangered Species Act ( 87 Stat. 884; as amended; 16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.) A visual survey of the project area was conducted in 2019 and 2020 for the species listed below.
Scientific Name

| Laterallus jamaicensis | Eastern Black Rail | Threatened |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Grus Canadensis pulla | Mississippi Sandhill Crane | Endangered |
| Pituophis melanoleucus <br> lodingi | Black Pine Snake | Threatened |
| Gopherus polyphemus | Gopher Tortoise | Threatened |
| Rana sevosa | Dusky Gopher Frog | Endangered |
| Isoetes louisianensis | Louisiana Quillwort | Endangered |

## PROJECT AREA DESCRIPTION

The project area will be a new Bypass of the town of Vancleave, MS and will placed on new alignment as described in the "Introduction". Land Use in the Project Corridor is described as Forest Lands, Agricultural, and Residential. Forest Lands dominated by bottomland hardwoods with communities of Sweet Bay (Magnolia virginiana), Gallberry (Ilex coreiacea), Tupelo Gum (Nyssa aquatic) and Wax Myrtle (Morella Caroliniensis). Agricultural Lands dominated by Pasture with communities of Bahia grasses (Paspalum notatum).

Soils found in the project area are mapped as Atmore loam, Benndale fine sandy loam, Daleville silt loam, Hyde silt loam, Smithton loam, Vancleave loamy sand, Escambia sandy loam, Smithdale-Boykin complex, Malbis fine sandy loam, Rusto fine sandy loam, Croatan and Johnson, Freest sandy loam, and Nugent and Jena soils. Soils ranged predominantly from sandy soils in the southern end of the project to clayey loamy soils at the northern end of the project. Consulting the US Fish and Wildlife Service Gopher Tortoise Soil Classification and looking at the Soils found within State Route 57 Project there are only two Suitable Soils (Benndale and Smithdale) and two Marginal Soils (Malbis and Freest) for Gopher Tortoises. There were no Priority Soils found for Gopher tortoises within the Project.

## METHODS

The boundaries of the project area were clearly defined. All available sources of information were reviewed prior to initiating field work. MDOT Biologist transected $100 \%$ of the project area on foot to collect wetland/stream data, and to survey for Gopher Tortoises Burrows.

## RESULTS

## Eastern Black Rail- (Laterallus jamaicenis)

The Eastern Black Rail is listed by Ipac to be in the area, but the Rail is mainly a Marsh Bird and there are no Marsh Lands within the Project Footprint so none were observed. Plant Communities are comprised of Palustrine Forest and Pasture Lands.

## Mississippi Sandhill Crane- (Grus Canadensis pulla)

The MS Sandhill Crane Refuge is located to the east of the Project Footprint and there are Open Pasture Lands on the North End of the Project, but none were observed and nor does the "Refuge" have any record of the Sandhill Cranes in the Project Footprint.

## Black Pine Snake- (Pituophis melanoleucus lodingi)

Majority of the Project Footprint is Bottomland Hardwoods, and in the 2019 and 2020 surveys some stumps and stump holes were explored and in all no Black Pine Snake were observed.

## Gopher Tortoise- (Gopherus polyphemus)

Typically, these reptiles are found in colonies on well-drained sandy soils under scattered pines and hardwoods where sunlight reaches the surface. The Gopher Tortoise typically requires a succulent herbaceous layer for a food source. Pictures and GPS locations of what open fields (areas) on the Project Footprint are included within this report.

No Gopher Tortoise burrows were observed in the project area.

## Dusky Gopher Frog- (Rana sevosa)

No Dusky Gopher Frog were observed.

## Louisiana Quillwort- (Isoetes louisianensis)

The survey of the Black Water Systems with in Project Footprint resulted in incised systems, channelized systems, or perennial streams which none supported habitat conducive for Louisiana Quillwort.
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Example of intermittent stream found in the SR 57 Row, these Black Water systems are incised and does not support the Louisiana Quillwort. This stream is found at GPS Location $N$ 30.445176 W -88.717253


Example of Channelized Ephemeral Stream does not support Louisiana Quillwort GPS Location N 30.500544 W-88.706594


Example of Upland Drain did not support Louisiana Quillwort; GPS Location N 30.53371 W-88.6952


Example of Intermittent Stream did not support Louisiana Quillwort; GPS Location N 30.535047 W-88.690526


Example of Open Field which there were no Gopher Tortoise Burrows found in 2019 or 2020 surveys; GPS Location N $\mathbf{3 0 . 4 9 5 0 1 4} \mathbf{W}$ - 88.705721


Example of Open Field which there were no Gopher Tortoise Burrows found in 2019 or 2020 surveys; GPS Location N $\mathbf{3 0 . 5 6 7 0 4 8} \mathbf{W}$ - 88.719769
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## Introduction

MS State Route 57 (SR 57) between Interstate 10 (I-10) and Vancleave, MS in Jackson County is a two lane highway facility with an added center turn lane through the town of Vancleave. Existing access to this facility consists of Type 3 - "Regulated Access Control".

Current traffic patterns on this facility contribute to congested traffic flow during peak traffic hours which adversely affects regional mobility in the town of Vancleave, a "bedroom community". A traffic study performed in 2000 analyzed these patterns and revealed a significant difference in traffic volume between the section of SR 57 from I-10 to GautierVancleave Road and from Gautier-Vancleave Road through Vancleave. The Average Daily Traffic (ADT) count south of Gautier-Vancleave Road was approximately 6,100 vehicles per day which provides a Level of Service (LOS) rating of "C", or "Acceptable" for this rural section of highway. The ADT count north of Gautier-Vancleave Road was approximately 11,500 vehicles per day which provides an LOS rating of "D", or "Acceptable" for this rural/urban section of highway. However, using normal traffic projections, the study forecasts an increase in the ADT through the year 2020 which corresponds to decreased LOS ratings of "D" and "F" respectively, or "Unacceptable" (see Appendix Exhibit A).

A subsequent traffic study was performed in 2004 which compared the benefits of improving the existing two-lane/three-lane facility to a fivelane facility versus a four lane bypass alignment. The study concluded that a "four lane bypass to the west of Vancleave better serves the projected travel demand" (see Appendix Exhibit A).

## Study Termini

To ensure that regional mobility of the traffic is adequately addressed, this environmental study begins at the existing four-lane interchange of SR 57 with I-10 and extends northerly approximately 3.5 miles beyond the town of Vancleave to a point where the congested traffic has dissipated into this "bedroom community". An approximate landmark for this location is Plantation Road. The limits of the study are depicted on the following location map:

Location Map


## Purpose and Need

The purpose and need for this project is to maintain or increase the regional traffic mobility of the facility by adding capacity. This should provide for the maintaining of the acceptable LOS for the foreseeable future and should serve to reduce traffic congestion of the local highway network, thereby providing a safer driving environment.

## Scoping and Early Coordination

The Mississippi Department of Transportation (MDOT) and Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) held a Scoping Meeting on September 16, 2003 attended by the Mississippi Development Authority (MDA), U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), Mississippi Department of Wildlife and Fisheries (MDWF) and Jackson County Supervisor John McKay to discuss three potential alternatives addressing the capacity issues outlined in the traffic study. Initial alternatives included: 1.) Alternative A - The "NoBuild" alternative, 2.) Alternative B - Reconstructing the existing alignment of SR 57, 3.) Alternative C - Reconstructing existing SR 57 to GautierVancleave Road, then bypassing Vancleave on new westerly alignment, and 4.) Alternative D - Completely bypassing existing SR 57 and Vancleave on an extreme westerly alignment. The Scoping Meeting was followed by a Public Meeting to further discuss these alternatives and to gather public input. The public response indicated that none of the alternatives presented at that time fully served the traffic needs of Vancleave and that Alternative A, the "No Build" alternative, was a considered option although it did not serve that traffic needs either.

To meet the traffic needs of Vancleave, the then-current Alternative D alignment was completely discarded and Alternative C was modified by moving the new alignment portion easterly toward Vancleave. A variation of Alternative C, currently referred to as Alternative D, was also
developed with an interchange at Gautier-Vancleave Road on the east side of existing SR 57.

A follow-up Public Involvement Meeting was held on April 27, 2004 to discuss the alternative revisions and gather additional public input. The public response indicated an equal preference for either of the revised alternatives as long as local businesses and schools were minimally affected by the chosen alternative, but the consensus was that the local mobility issues were still not being addressed. Consequently, the MDOT Planning Division performed a traffic study in November, 2004 to assess the mobility issues presented by the public. Recommendations from that study included an improved connecting corridor to Mounger Creek Road, a connector road between the interchange at John Ramsey Road and SR 57 and to relocate the intersection of Poticaw Bayou Road (see Appendix Exhibit A). Each of these recommendations has been incorporated into the alignments of Alternatives $C$ and $D$.

## Description of Alternatives

## Potential for an Eastern Alternative

Due to the presence of the Gautier Unit of the Mississippi Sandhill Crane National Wildlife Refuge on the east side of existing SR 57 and the close proximity of the north-south alignment of Bluff Creek, an alternative route for SR 57 east of Vancleave was not considered viable.

## Alternative A - No-Build

Under the No-Build Alternative, no action would be performed for the facility. This alternative does not address the decreasing LOS, traffic mobility or congestion issues and, therefore, may not be a viable alternative.

## Vicinity Map of Alternatives B, C, D




#### Abstract

Alternative B Alternative B involves constructing an additional two-lane roadway facility adjacent to and 88 feet west of the existing two-lane alignment of SR 57 (resulting in a divided four-lane facility) from the beginning of the project (BOP) to Quaeve Road. Construction on the west side of SR 57 would serve to avoid directly affecting the Gautier Unit of the Mississippi Sandhill Crane National Wildlife Refuge located on the east side of SR 57 south of Quave Road (see Appendix Exhibit B). The reduced median width, recommended by the USFWS, serves to minimize the potential for the Sandhill Crane to forage within the roadway median. Additionally, the median and roadway slopes will be planted with vegetation that will further discourage foraging by the Sandhill Crane.


The two existing lanes of SR 57 along this segment of the alignment would be reconstructed to meet current safety design standards. Access would remain Type 3 - "Regulated Access Control".

The divided four-lane roadway will continue to north of Gautier-Vancleave Road where it will transition to a five-lane facility by widening the existing two-lane/three-lane facility to five lanes. The five-lane roadway would continue northerly through Vancleave to the end of the project (EOP). Access along this alignment from the BOP to the EOP would also remain Type 3 - "Regulated Access Control".

The estimated cost of this alternative is approximately $\$ 35$ million.

A Relocation Study was performed to analyze the potential relocation effects to local residences and businesses as a result of constructing this alternative (see Appendix Exhibit C). That study revealed Alternative B would displace 26 residences and 48 businesses. It would also have a

## Alternative B - con't

potential effect to 6 non-profit community facilities including the Jackson County Road Department, the Vancleave Public Library, Vancleave High School, Jackson County School and Alternative School and the M.L.K., Jr. Memorial Park. Alternative B also affects $16^{\text {th }}$ section school property in the Vancleave community.

In a letter dated April 22, 2005 (see Appendix Exhibit D), the USFWS suggested that "based on the sensitive nature of the project area . . . Alternative $B$ be pursued to the extent possible." However, due to the substantial commercial, residential and community effects associated with this alternative as well as the conclusion of the 2004 traffic study that a "four lane bypass to the west of Vancleave better serves the projected travel demand", this alternative is not recommended as the Preferred Alternative.

## Alternative C - The Preferred Alternative

Alternative $C$ involves constructing an additional two-lane roadway facility adjacent to and 88 feet west of the existing two-lane alignment of SR 57 resulting in a divided four-lane facility. Construction on the west side of SR 57 will serve to avoid directly affecting the Gautier Unit of the Mississippi Sandhill Crane National Wildlife Refuge located on the east side of SR 57 south of Quave Road (see Appendix Exhibit B). The reduced median width, recommended by the USFWS, serves to minimize the potential for the Sandhill Crane to forage within the roadway median. Additionally, the median and roadway slopes will be planted with vegetation that will further discourage foraging by the Sandhill Crane.

## Alternative C - con't

The two existing lanes of SR 57 along this segment of the alignment will be reconstructed to meet current safety design standards. Access will remain Type 3 - "Regulated Access Control".

The divided four-lane roadway will continue along the existing SR 57 alignment before veering to the west on new location adjacent to GautierVancleave Road. An interchange with Gautier-Vancleave Road will be constructed approximately 0.1 mile west of the existing intersection with a 2 -lane connector road to existing SR 57. Existing SR 57 will remain operational through Vancleave for local traffic.

The proposed alignment will then run northerly approximately 1.5 miles on new location to a second interchange with Twin Magnolia Lane. This interchange, constructed approximately 0.2 miles west of existing SR 57, will include an easterly connector road to existing SR 57 for the local Vancleave traffic.

Proposed SR 57 will continue north on new location to a third interchange at Jim Ramsey Road. This interchange, constructed approximately 1 mile west of existing SR 57, will include a 2 -lane connector road along existing Jim Ramsey Road to existing SR 57 for the local Vancleave traffic. A second 2 -lane connector road will be constructed from Jim Ramsey Road to existing SR 57 beginning east of the new interchange and running northeasterly to Moungers Creek Road.

Access along the segment of relocated SR 57 from the Gautier-Vancleave Road interchange to the Jim Ramsey Road interchange will be designated Type 1 - "No Access".

Proposed SR 57 will continue north and northwest approximately 2.5 miles on new location and will tie into existing SR 57 near Mariposa Lane.

## Alternative C - con't

Design considerations through this final 2.5 -mile segment of proposed SR 57 will be made to ensure that Alternative $C$ will avoid affecting a minority neighborhood that is currently located along Lowpoint Road (the original alignment of Alternative C divided this local community). Preliminary design efforts reveal that Alternative C may safely be located south of the minority neighborhood without adversely affecting the community.

Access along the segment of relocated SR 57 from the Jim Ramsey Road interchange to the End Of Project will be designated Type 2B - "Partial Access Control".

The estimated cost of this alternative is approximately $\$ 52$ million.
A Relocation Study was performed to analyze the potential relocation effects to local residences and businesses as a result of constructing this alternative (see Appendix Exhibit C). That study revealed that Alternative C will displace 48 residences, 14 businesses and will affect 1 farm.

Although Alternative C affects a larger number of residences than Alternative B, it has a substantially lower effect on local businesses, schools and community facilities in Vancleave. Minimizing these effects appeared to be the primary concern of the Vancleave citizens at the public involvement meetings as well as consideration for the reduced mobility in the area. And of the bypass alternatives, the USFWS stated that "Alternative C would appear to have fewer potential impacts to MS Sandhill Cranes." (see Appendix Exhibit D). Therefore, due to the minimized effect to local businesses, schools, community facilities and the MS Sandhill Crane, and due to the potential for increased area
mobility, Alternative C is designated the Preferred Alternative for this project.

## Alternative D

Alternative D involves constructing an additional two-lane roadway facility adjacent to and 88 feet west of the existing two-lane alignment of SR 57 resulting in a divided four-lane facility. Construction on the west side of SR 57 would serve to avoid directly affecting the Gautier Unit of the Mississippi Sandhill Crane National Wildlife Refuge located on the east side of SR 57 south of Quave Road (see Appendix Exhibit B). The reduced median width, recommended by the USFWS, serves to minimize the potential for the Sandhill Crane to forage within the roadway median. Additionally, the median and roadway slopes would be planted with vegetation that would further discourage foraging by the Sandhill Crane.

The two existing lanes of SR 57 along this segment of the alignment would be reconstructed to meet current safety design standards. Access would remain Type 3 - "Regulated Access Control".

The proposed alignment would then run northeasterly approximately 1 mile on new location to Gautier-Vancleave Road. An interchange with Gautier-Vancleave Road would be constructed approximately 0.2 miles southeast of the existing intersection with a 2 -lane connector road to existing SR 57. Existing SR 57 would remain operational through Vancleave for local traffic.

Proposed SR 57 would then continue northwesterly on new location east of existing SR 57 to a second interchange at the intersection of Twin Magnolia Lane and existing SR 57. Access to existing SR 57 would be provided for the local Vancleave traffic.

## Alternative D - con't

A letter from the USFWS states that this segment of Alternative $D$ from Quave Road to Twin Magnolia Lane (on the east side of existing SR 57) "included foraging habitat for the federally listed endangered Mississippi Sandhill Crane." (see Appendix Exhibit D).

Proposed SR 57 would continue north on new location west of existing SR 57 to a third interchange at Jim Ramsey Road. This interchange, constructed approximately 1 mile west of existing SR 57, would include a 2-lane connector road along existing Jim Ramsey Road to existing SR 57 for the local Vancleave traffic. A second 2-lane connector road would be constructed from Jim Ramsey Road to existing SR 57 beginning east of the new interchange and running northeasterly to Moungers Creek Road.

Access along the segment of relocated SR 57 from the Gautier-Vancleave Road interchange to the Jim Ramsey Road interchange would be designated Type 1 - "No Access".

Proposed SR 57 would continue north and northwest approximately 2.5 miles on new location and would tie into existing SR 57 near Mariposa Lane.

Design considerations through this final 2.5-mile segment of proposed SR 57 would be made to insure that Alternative D would avoid affecting a minority neighborhood that is currently located along Lowpoint Road (the original alignment of Alternative D divided this local community). Preliminary design efforts reveal that Alternative D may safely be located south of the minority neighborhood without adversely affecting the community.

## Alternative D - con't

Access along the segment of relocated SR 57 from the Jim Ramsey Road interchange to the End Of Project would be designated Type 2B - "Partial Access Control".

The estimated cost of this alternative is approximately $\$ 55$ million.

A Relocation Study was performed to analyze the potential relocation effects to local residences and businesses as a result of constructing this alternative (see Appendix Exhibit C). That study revealed Alternative D would displace 55 residences and 17 businesses. It would also have a potential effect on 1 farm and 1 non-profit community facility, the Vancleave Public Library. Alternative D would also affect a small portion of the northeast corner of the First Pentecostal Church of Vancleave property parcel on Russell Drive.

Due to the public response of the Vancleave citizens to minimize the potential effects to local commercial, residential and community facilities, and due to the effect on upland foraging habitat for the federally listed endangered Mississippi Sandhill Crane, this alternative is not recommended as the Preferred Alternative.

## Initial Western Alternatives

Consideration was initially given to constructing an additional two-lane roadway facility adjacent to and 125 feet west of the existing two-lane alignment of SR 57 (resulting in a divided four-lane facility) from the beginning of the project to an interchange west of existing SR 57 between Quaeve Road and Gautier-Vancleave Road. Construction on the west side of SR 57 would serve to avoid directly affecting the Gautier Unit of the Mississippi Sandhill Crane National Wildlife Refuge located on the east side of SR 57 south of Quave Road (see Appendix Exhibit B).

## Initial Western Alternatives - con't

From that interchange, the 125 -foot wide divided four-lane roadway would continue on a north-northwesterly alignment located approximately 2.5 miles west of the existing two-lane alignment of SR 57 to a second interchange at Jim Ramsey Road. The alignment would then continue northeasterly and tie into existing SR 57 near Irwin Lane.

Existing SR 57 would remain operational for the traveling public from Gautier-Vancleave Road northerly through Vancleave.

Another consideration for a western alignment was to construct a 4-lane facility with a 125 -foot median completely on new alignment located approximately 3 miles west of existing SR 57 .

Several issues emerged during preliminary evaluation of these alternatives that reduced their viability. Some of those issues include higher construction costs, increased natural environment effects and a reduced economic benefit for local businesses. However, the primary issue is the far-removed proximity of this alignment to the local highway network in and around Vancleave and the minimal potential for relieving the existing traffic congestion. For these reasons, neither of these alternatives are considered viable.

## Environmental Effects

## Land Use

There would be little to no effect to existing land use from the beginning of the project to south of the Gautier-Vancleave Road Interchange for any of the alternatives as the current Type 3 - "Regulated Access Control" will be maintained. Access at the interchanges will be Type 1 - "No Access".

## Land Use - con't

Land use from north of the Gautier-Vancleave Road Interchange to the end of the project along the Alternative B corridor consists of Type 3 access with some residential development, however, there is significant commercial development within the town of Vancleave. Acquisition of the necessary right of way for construction of Alternative B may negatively affect residential property by encroaching on the existing landscape, however that land use may not change. Land use within areas of existing commercial development, however, may be significantly affected due to the acquisition of existing parking lots and/or entire commercially-used parcels of land.

Land use from Gautier-Vancleave Road to the end of the project along the corridors for both Alternative C and D is primarily undeveloped rural property primarily due to the lower elevation and the drainage basins. The lack of public sewer or water systems within this area may also contribute to the lack of development.

Access along Alternative C and D corridors from Gautier-Vancleave Interchange to Jim Ramsey Interchange will be Type 1 - "No Access". However, access to property located adjacent to these corridors will be maintained, therefore, current land use potential throughout this area will be largely unaffected.

## Farmland

A Farmland Conversion Effect Rating For Corridor Type Projects was prepared to evaluate the conversion of potentially-affected farmland into nonagricultural use. As a result, it was determined that there is no relative value of farmland within any of the alternative corridors to be converted.

## Air Quality

None of the alternatives should have any significant adverse effect on air quality as the State Implementation Plan does not contain any transportation control measures in this area. Conformity procedures for 40 CFR Parts 51 and 93 are not applicable. Previous analysis of the effect of carbon monoxide on similar projects was found to be insignificant.

## Floodplains

An examination of Floodplain Insurance Rate Maps indicated that each of the alternatives encounter approximately 300 feet of the 100-year floodplain of Old Fort Bayou, 2000 feet of the 100-year floodplain of Old Fort Bayou Tributary, 500 feet of the 100-year floodplain of Bluff Creek and transversely crosses approximately 800 feet of the Bluff Creek floodway (see Appendix Exhibit E). This results in a total of approximately 25 acres.

Due to the expanse of these floodplains, avoidance of these areas is deemed unfeasible. Adverse effects to the floodplain resulting from development along the existing alignment of SR 57, if any, should be minimal due to the presence of the existing roadway.

Due to the expanse of the floodway, avoidance of this area is also deemed unfeasible. However, due to the transverse crossing alignment of each of the alternatives, there is little, if any, anticipated risk or effect to the floodway and surrounding areas. Additionally, the design of the drainage structure(s) across this area will comply with Executive Order 11988/12148, Floodplain Management and 23 CFR 650A which dictates that designs selected for an encroachment shall be supported by analyses

## Floodplains - con't

of design alternatives with consideration to capital costs, risks and economic, engineering, social and environmental concerns. To minimize the effect of these encroachments, bridges and/or box culverts will be the primary consideration at hydraulic crossings. MDOT Best Management Practices will also be utilized during construction to minimize erosion.

## Water Quality

The MDOT construction contract will require compliance with the State Bureau of Pollution Control's General NPDES Permit process for Construction Storm Water Discharge which is required for construction projects disturbing an area of five acres or more. Contractors are required to furnish a Construction Notice of Intent and, if applicable, a Mining Notice of Intent for compliance with the provisions of the Mississippi Water Pollution Control Law (Section 49-17-1 et. seq., MS Code of 1972) and the regulations and standards stated therein.

The construction contract will also require compliance with MDOT Erosion Control Standards which outline methods for abating the pollution of adjacent streams and other water bodies.

Any additional requirements by the Bureau of Pollution Control will also be included in the contract specifications and/or construction plans for the proposed project.

## Water Body Modification

Each alternative corridor was evaluated to determine the boundaries of all Waters of the United States regulated under Section 404 of the Clean

## Water Body Modification - con't

Water Act. Waters of the United States include rivers, streams and their impoundments.

A review of USGS topographical maps and a field inspection to the area revealed encounters with Little Bluff Creek and Bluff Creek by both Alternatives C and D which will require minor modification to those water bodies. To minimize the effect of these encounters, bridges and/or box culverts will be the primary consideration at hydraulic crossings. Stream channel relocation will be minimized and stream banks will be restored to a condition similar in elevation and shape to current conditions to facilitate natural regeneration of vegetation. Mitigation efforts for any unavoidable stream impacts will coordinated with the United States Army Corps of Engineers (USACE).

## Wildlife

Following the initial Scoping Meeting on September 16, 2003, the USFWS issued a letter dated October 1, 2003, identifying several federally listed species that could potentially be found within the initial alternative corridors. This letter also referenced the close proximity of the Gautier Unit of the Mississippi Sandhill Crane National Wildlife Refuge.

To avoid directly affecting the refuge (located on the east side of SR 57), widening of the existing roadway is proposed on the west side of existing SR 57. An agreement with the USFWS also reduces the standard median width of 125 ' to $88^{\prime}$ within this area to reduce the potential for crane foraging within the roadway median. Additionally, the median and roadway slopes will be planted with vegetation that will further discourage foraging by the Sandhill Crane.

## Wildlife - con't

A result of improving the existing SR 57 corridor would also be the alleviation of existing traffic on Gautier-Vancleave Road, a concern of the USFWS for the refuge outlined in a letter dated April 29, 2005.

In this letter, the USFWS indicated that no federally-protected species were found during preliminary surveys within proposed corridors for Alternatives B or C, but that "Alternative D included foraging habitat for the federally listed endangered Mississippi Sandhill Crane." (see Appendix Exhibit D).

Prior to clearing and/or project construction, a final biological survey of the Preferred Alternative corridor will be performed by representatives from USFWS and MDOT to further ensure that no federally-protected species are present.

## Wetlands

A preliminary assessment of potential wetland effects was performed by evaluating hydric soil maps for each of the alternative corridors. Wetlands are defined as areas of hydric soils that are inundated or saturated by surface or groundwater at a frequency and duration sufficient to support vegetation typically associated with saturated soil conditions.

As a result of the assessment, it was determined that Alternative B may potentially affect approximately 18 acres of bottomland hardwood wetlands. Alternatives C and D may each potentially affect approximately 34 acres of bottomland hardwood wetlands individually. A detailed wetland delineation will be performed within the preliminary right of way corridor of the preferred alternative to mitigate for wetland effects.

## Wetlands - con't

Affected wetlands will be mitigated for from the Deaton Tract, which is also located in southeast Mississippi.

## Native American Notification

The six federally-recognized Native American tribes of MS were notified of the proposed project on August 29, 2003 (see Appendix Exhibit F). No adverse response to initial notification of the proposed project was received. Each tribe will be provided the results of the cultural resource study for review and comment as required by the National Environmental Policy Act.

## Cultural Resources

In accordance with the requirements of Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act and Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act, a cultural resources study of the corridor areas was performed by combining data obtained during an investigation along the Alternative B corridor with information from cultural resources studies performed within or adjacent to the Alternative $C$ and $D$ corridors to develop a comprehensive model to evaluate the probability of the occurrence of significant cultural resources within the corridor areas.

Based on a review of the results of this study, the Mississippi Department of Archives and History (MDAH) concluded that no sites or properties listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places exist within any of the alternative corridors (see Appendix Exhibit G).

A report of the cultural resource study has been forwarded to each of the six federally-recognized Native American Tribes of Mississippi.

## Social

A primary goal of locating the preliminary alignments for further consideration was to avoid or minimize any effect to neighborhoods, communities or churches.

Following a comprehensive study, it was discovered that a minority neighborhood along Lowpoint Road was potentially being divided by the Preferred Alternative alignment. The alignment was therefore modified to ensure that the neighborhood would not be affected.

As a result of this process, the Preferred Alternative should not adversely affect neighborhoods, schools or churches nor should any local communities be divided. Disruptive effects should be limited to those persons directly involved in right-of-way acquisition and the temporary, unavoidable inconvenience experienced during the project's construction phase.

## Relocation

A Relocation Study was performed to analyze the potential effects to local residences and businesses as a result of constructing an improved SR 57 alignment (see Appendix Exhibit C). As outlined in the Alternative Description, Alternate $C$ would require the least number of total displacements at 63 which includes 48 residences and 14 businesses and would affect 1 farm.

Alternative D would require 74 displacements including 55 residences and 17 businesses with a potential effect to 1 farm and 1 non-profit community facility, the Vancleave Public Library. Alternative D would also affect a small portion of the northeast corner of the First Pentecostal Church property of Vancleave property parcel on Russell Drive.

## Relocation - con't

Alternative B would require 80 displacements including 26 residences and 48 businesses. It would also have a potential effect to 6 non-profit community facilities including the Jackson County Road Department, the Vancleave Public Library, Vancleave High School, Jackson County School and Alternative School and the M.L.K., Jr. Memorial Park. Alternative B also affects $16^{\text {th }}$ section school property in the Vancleave community.

A table of the relocation study results is provided for comparison of each of the alternatives:

| TYPE OF <br> DISPLACEE | B | C | D |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| RESIDENTIAL | 26 | 48 | 55 |
| BUSINESS | 48 | 14 | 17 |
| FARM | 0 | 1 | 1 |
| NON PROFIT | 6 | 0 | 1 |
| TOTALS | $\mathbf{8 0}$ | $\mathbf{6 3}$ | $\mathbf{7 4}$ |

A survey of local realtors, internet and local newspaper was completed to determine the availability of replacement properties. The survey of local realtors and local newspapers indicates an ample supply of replacement housing and lots. The survey was limited to the Vancleave, Gautier and Hurley listings. Some acreage listings were located but most would be suited for residential type development. The tables below provide results of the survey:

INVENTORY OF RESIDENTIAL REPLACEMENT PROPERTIES

| $\#$ | SQUARE <br> FOOTAGE | TYPE OF <br> CONSTRUCTION | NO. OF <br> BEDROOMS | STATE OF <br> REPAIR | AGE | PRICE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 22 | $900-1,000$ | BRICK/FRAME | $2-3$ | AVERAGE | $10-40$ | $\$ 45,000-\$ 59,500$ |
| 55 | $1,250-1,500$ | BRICK/FRAME | $2-3$ | AVERAGE | $10-40$ | $\$ 63,000-\$ 115,000$ |
| 45 | $1,400-1,700$ | BRICK | $3-4$ | AVERAGE | $10-40$ | $\$ 119,000-\$ 149,500$ |
| 40 | $2,500-3,464$ | BRICK | $3-4$ | AVERAGE | $10-40$ | $\$ 152,000-\$ 350,000$ |
| 162 | TOTAL |  |  |  |  |  |

## VACANT ACREAGES FOR SALE

| NUMBER | SIZE | USE | PRICE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 9 | $3-4 \mathrm{Ac}$ | N/A | $\$ 20,000-\$ 50,000$ |
| 8 | $4-7.70$ | N/A | $\$ 50,000-100,000$ |
| 8 | $12.6-40$ | N/A | $\$ 119,777-995,000$ |
| 25 | TOTAL |  |  |

## VACANT LOTS FOR SALE

| NUMBER | SIZE | USE | PRICE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 40 | RESIDENTAL LOT | RESIDENTAL | $\$ 20,000-55,000$ |
| 21 | RESIDENTAL LOT | RESIDENTAL | $\$ 55,000-\$ 99,500$ |
| 24 | RESIDENTAL LOT | RESIDENTAL | $\$ 119,777-$ |
|  |  |  | $\$ 400,000$ |
| 85 | TOTAL |  |  |

Relocation efforts would include one or more relocation assistance officers be assigned to the project. Each displaced person shall be contacted individually and informed of their rights and benefits which may be available through the Relocation Assistance Program. Displacees shall be provided the name and telephone number of the assigned Relocation Assistance Officer as well as that of the MDOT Central Office and any local MDOT Right-of-Way office.

## Environmental Justice

Executive Order 12898, "Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations", requires that federal agencies consider adverse environmental effects of proposed projects on minority and low-income communities. Compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) ensures these effects are identified and considered prior to further project development.

## Environmental Justice - con't

To assist in the identification and consideration of environmental justice issues, a series of scoping meetings and public meetings were held with local public officials and the general public. All comments and feedback was documented and considered prior to further project development.

During the relocation study, it was discovered that a minority neighborhood along Lowpoint Road was potentially being divided by the Preferred Alternative alignment. Preliminary design efforts revealed that Alternative C could safely be relocated to the south of the minority neighborhood which should minimize any effect to the community.

As a result of the environmental justice measures taken, the Preferred Alternative has minimal to no effect on minority and low-income communities.

## Joint Development

None of the alternative corridors include any plans for joint development.

## Economic

Vancleave is a "bedroom community" for industrial and manufacturing companies along the Mississippi Gulf Coast meaning that a majority of the Vancleave population is primarily employed outside of the local community. The largest of these employers, based on numbers of employees, is:

- Northrop Grumman Ship System/Ingalls - 12,250 employees.
- Chevron Products Co. - 1,200 employees.
- VT Halter Marine, Inc.-Moss Point - 679 employees.
- VT Halter Marine, Inc.- Escatawpa - 450 employees.
- VT Halter Marine, Inc.- Pascagoula - 442 employees.

The Preferred Alternative should provide more efficient means of access to the Mississippi Gulf Coast, the primary employment area for Vancleave residents, resulting in a less congested traffic movement through the town of Vancleave and improving access to the existing businesses.

## Pedestrian and Bicycle

None of the alternatives include any plans for bicycle or pedestrian facilities nor will it hinder any existing facilities for bicycles or pedestrians.

## Noise

The effect of highway traffic noise is defined in 23 CFR 772 as "effects which occur when the predicted traffic noise levels approach or exceed the Noise Abatement Criteria or when the predicted traffic noise levels substantially exceed the existing noise levels."

A Traffic Noise Study was conducted in the winter of 2004-2005 along the corridors of Alternatives B, C and D based on the FHWA Highway Traffic Noise Prediction Model 2.5. Potential traffic noise effects were analyzed at 112 facilities on Alternative B, 127 facilities on Alternative C and 107 facilities on Alternative D. It was determined that there would be no effects associated with Alternative B, 12 potential effects along Alternative C and 10 potential effects along Alternative D.

Because some degree of potential effect was detected at occupied facilities, the feasibility of noise abatement using the MDOT Highway Traffic Noise Policy, dated June 18, 1996, was considered. Key aspects of that policy state that:

- Construction of a noise barrier is not reasonable unless the barrier will provide a minimum noise level reduction of 5 decibels (dBA) at four or more affected residences.
- Total barrier cost (including costs for right of way, materials, construction, etc.) is no more than $\$ 20,000$ per affected residence.
- Future-build noise levels are a minimum of 5 dBA higher than existing noise levels.
- Future-build noise levels are a minimum of 3 dBA higher than future "no-build" noise levels.

Due to the rural nature of this area, none of the analysis sites contained "four or more affected residences" to further justify noise abatement consideration. Therefore, construction of a noise barrier is not considered reasonable for noise abatement on any of the alternatives. (A table of this analysis is provided in Appendix Exhibit H).

Noise abatement measures and specifications will be incorporated in the contract plans to prevent adverse construction noise effects in the vicinity of the proposed project. This includes the contractor's compliance with all state and local sound control and noise level rules, regulations and ordinances which applies to any work performed pursuant to the contract. Also, each internal combustion engine used for any purpose on work related to the project will be equipped with a muffler of a type recommended by the manufacturer.

## Permits

The placement of fill in waters of the United States, including wetlands, requires a permit from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act of 1977.

## Hazardous Waste

An Initial Site Assessment Survey of the project area was performed to identify potentially hazardous waste sites. This survey included:

- A review of federal and state lists of environmentally regulated sites in order to identify sites with documented contamination and sites considered to be potential sources of contamination.
- A physical inspection of the site conditions within the project area.

As a result, no contaminated or potentially contaminated sites were identified within any of the alternative corridors.

## Matrix of Alternatives

A table of various environmental effects is provided for comparison of each of the alternatives:

## Environmental Matrix

| Environmental Parameter | Alt. "B" | Alt. "C" | Alt. "D" |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |
| Farmland (acres) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Residential Relocations | 26 | 48 | 55 |
| Business Relocations | 48 | 14 | 17 |
| Noise Affected Sites | -- | -- | -- |
| Floodplains (acres) | 25 | 25 | 25 |
| Historical and Archaeological <br> Preservation/4(f) Sites | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Wetlands (potential)(acres) | 18 | 34 | 34 |
| Streams (potential)(linear feet) | 700 | 2700 | 1000 |
| Hazardous Waste Sites (potential) | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Estimated Construction Cost (million) | $\$ 35$ | $\$ 52$ | $\$ 55$ |

## Public Hearing

A Public Hearing was held on June 20, 2005 at the Vancleave Public Library, 12604 Hwy 57, Vancleave, MS. A total of 263 people registered their attendance (including Mississippi Department of Transportation and Federal Highway Administration officials). A total of forty-three written comments were received in response to the information presented during the hearing. Twenty-one of those comments expressed a preference for Alternative C. Seven comments supported Alternative B, six comments supported Alternative D and three comments offered additional alternatives. A more detailed summary of the hearing and comments is provided in Appendix $I$.

## Conclusion/Preferred Alternative

As a result of the Environmental Assessment (including public response from the Public Hearing), it has been concluded that Alternative " $C$ " more thoroughly addresses the stated purpose and need for the project by increasing the regional traffic mobility without significantly impacting any aspect of the natural or human environment within the project area. Therefore, Alternative " $C$ " is selected as the Preferred Alternative.

# APPENDIX EXHIBIT A 

Traffic Studies


In accordance with your request, the Planning Division has conducted a capacity analysis to determine current and design year levels of service (LOS), and year need for segments of MS 27 from its junction with I-10 to Vancleave in Jackson County A detailed report of our analysis is attached for your consideration and use as appropriate

Our analysis shows that the segment of MS 57 from its junction with the Gautier-Vancleave Road is already operating at LOS D, and the segment between I 10 and the Gautier-Vancleave Road will deteriorate to LOS D by late 2004 The northern segment will deteriorate to saturation, LOS E, in 2002

Based on the analysis, the Planning Division recommends that you consider fou lanes for the entire segment from 1-10 to Vancleave, and that the added capacity have as high priority as your other commitments will allow Our analysis shows that fou lanes will maintain at least LOS B in the design hour and peak direction through at least the year 2020 We analyzed the section as a four-lane divided highway with no control of access Any degree of access control that you decide to apply will improve the operational service over our baseline analysis.

If you have any questions or require additional information concerning this analysis, please contact Mr Wayne Parrish or Ms Kim Thuman, the Iransportation Planners for this project Either may be reached in the Planning Division at telephone number (601) 359-7685

WRB:GWP:tbs
Attachment
pc Mr Marrin D Collier. Director, Office of Intermodal Planning

Capacity Analysis<br>MS 57 from I-10 to Vancleave, Jackson County Planning Division<br>December, 2000

Background. In accordance with a request from the District Engineer, the Planning Division has conducted a Capacity Analysis on MS 57 from I-10 to Vancleave in Jackson County The analysis included determination of current Level of Service (LOS), the design year (2020) LOS, and the year of need for added capacity The year of need is defined as the year in which the level of service becomes unacceptable for rural segments, level of service is considered acceptable if it is LOS C or better; LOS D is generally acceptable in urban areas
Methodology Levels of Service were determined in accordance with the methods of the Highway Capacity Manual (HCM), $3^{\text {rd }}$ Edition, 1994, with the 1997 update, and the Highway Capacity Software (HCS), version 32 . Iraffic volumes for the current year, 2000, were obtained from the most recently available Planning Division counts, and future traffic was projected using the current Planning Division growth rates for the geographic area and functional class
Study Area The study area for this analysis was defined to be MS 57 from I-10 (Exit 57) northward to Vancleave, all in Jackson County
Analysis. The study segment of MS 57 from I-10 to Vancleave was broken into two segments for analysis due to a significant difference in traffic The first analysis segment extends along MS 57 from 1 - 10 northward to the intersection with the Gautier-Vancleave Road Ihe Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) on this segment was 6,100 vehicles per day for the current yeat (2000) North of the intersection with the Gautier-Vancleave Road, the traffic increases to an AADI of 11,500 vehicles per day HCS Analysis Sheets 1 and 2, attached in the Appendix detail the current levels of service and two-lane rural volume to capacity (v/c) ratios for these two segments The results of the current year analysis are summarized in Table 1

| Segment | ADT | V/c | I OS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I-10 to Gautier-Vancleave Road | 6,100 | 030 | C |
| Gautier-Vancleave Road to Vancleave | 11,500 | 057 | D |
| Table 1, Current Year (2000), | MS 57 from 1-10 to Vancleave |  |  |

As shown in Iable 1, the southern analysis segment, from I-10 to Gautier-Vancleave Road reflects a curtently acceptable IOS C, but the northern segment from the Gautier-Vancleave Road to Vancleave is alteady I OS D

| Segment | ADT | v/c | LOS |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| I-10 to Gautier-Vancleave Road | 12,000 | 59 | D |  |  |  |  |
| Gautier-Vancleave Road to Vancleave | 23,000 | 113 | F |  |  |  |  |
| Table 2, Design Year (2020), MS 57 from I-10 to Vancleave, two-lanes |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

If the current two-lane rural highway geometry is retained through the design year, 2020, the LOS on both analysis segments will deteriorate as shown in Iable 2

The year of need analysis is conducted to determine the year that additional capacity is required to prevent the level of service from deteriorating to unacceptable levels The analysis summarized in Tables 1 and 2, and detailed in the HCS Analysis Sheets cleatly show that the northern analysis segment (from I-10 to Gautier-Vancleaye Road) justifies four-lanes now, and the southem analysis segment will justify four lanes well before the design year. Ihe year of need analysis also indicates that the southem analysis segment is expected to deteriorate to an unacceptable I OS D in the second half of 2004 However, the northern analysis segment, already with unacceptable LOS, will reach saturation (LOS E) in 2002

The final step in the analysis was to examine the capability of a fou-lane section to accommodate the projected design year traffic. In the absence of any additional guidance as to selection of the typical section, a rural four-lane without any control of access, except by permit, was assumed. The results of the four-lane analyses are shown in the Appendix in HCS Analysis Sheets 3 and 4 and are summarized in Table 3

| Segment | ADT, 2020 | LOS 2020 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| I-10 to Gautier-Vancleave Road | 12,000 | A |
| Gautier-Vancleave Road to Vancleave | 23,000 | B |
| Table 3, Design Year (2020), MS 57 from | (-10 to Vancleave, four-lane |  |
| divided, rural, without control of access |  |  |

The levels of service shown in Table 3 are for the peak direction in the design hour The offpeak direction LOS for the design hour are A for both the northern and southern segments No analysis was conducted for either a limited or full control of access facility, however, the Planning Division will conduct such analyses upon request of the District Engineer Either case will at least improve the density, if not a full letter grade of the I OS

There are one or two additional observations that the analysts identified as important in this analysis Clearly from the traffic statistics shown in the above analysis, there is a significant addition to the volume on MS 57 from the Gautier-Vancleave Road. The year 2000 AADT of the Gautier-Vancleave Road is about 6,700 vehicles per day The Gautier-Vancleave road is currently operating at LOS D, and the road is about 5 years from saturation at LOS E Since the Gautier-Vancleave Road traverses a portion of the Mississippi Sandhill Crane Refuge, the analysts consider it unlikely that the road could be considered for four lanes Once the GautierVancleave Road reaches LOS E, motorists will begin to divert from the road to MS 57 as an access route to and from I-10 Ihis will result in the volume on the southern analysis segment of MS 57 to be somewhat closer to that of the nothern segment in the design year. Our analysis showed that this diversion to MS 57 from the Gautier-Vancleave Road will not change the IOS reflected in Table 3, but the densities will be slightly highex than those shown in HCS Analysis Sheets 3 and 4 of the Appendix
Conclusion Ihe analysis described above shows that MS 57 should probably be considered for four lanes from $1-10$ to Vancleave, and that the added capacity should merit a reasonably high priority Even though the southern analysis segment LOS is currently acceptable, the total distance from I-10 to Vancleave would probably lend itself to a single project This should be noted as a Planning Division analyst observation only, and that project termini decisions are solely the prerogative of the District. Likewise, in accordance with the MDOI policy of
beginning four-lane projects at the termini with greatest need, consideration should prioritize the segment between the Gautier-Vancleave Road and Vancleave first
Roadways leading north from Vancleave were not analyzed, but the analysts did consider the current year volumes The traffic volumes on MS 57 south of Vancleave appear to dissipate to residential areas in the immediate vicinity No route northbound from Vancleave appears to have a volume that merited any detailed analysis at this time
The analysts also observed that MS 57 lies adjacent to the boundary of the Mississippi Sandhill Crane National Wildlife Refuge. This environmental issue will be significant in location selection along portions of the roadway
Recommendations. Based on the analysis and the conclusions detailed above, the Planning Division recommends that:

- The District 6 Engineer consider MS 57 for four lanes from I-10 to Vancleave with as high a priority as possible, consistent with other known needs
- Ihe District Engineer consider at least limited access control on the facility, to provide maximum mobility and best achievable LOS Note: The Planning Division will refine the LOS analysis upon request when typical section and access control decisions are made


Laryy L. "Butch" Brown

Hatry Lee James Deputy Executive Director/ Chief Engineer

Brenda Znachko
Deputy Executive Director/ Administration

Interdepartmental Memorandum
Date: December 16, 2004

To: $\quad$| Mr Claiborne Barnwell |
| :--- |
| Environment/Location Engineer |

From: Jeff A Pierce of
State Planning Engineer
Subject: Capacity Analysis of Alternatives for MS 57, Jackson County
In accordance with your request, the Planning Division has conducted an analysis of MS 57 from its interchange with I-10 to the George County Line Our analysis examined current operations and compared design yeat (2030) operations of two alternatives The first altemative was a fivelane typical section through Vancleve on existing location, and the second was a four-lane divided bypass to the west of Vancleve. We used the Highway Capacity Software and a TSIS traffic simulation model of each alternative. The analysis clearly shows that the four-lane bypass to the west of Vancleve better serves the projected travel demand. A detailed report of our analysis is attached The Highway Capacity Analysis worksheets and the animated TSIS models are also available for your review in the Planning Division

The Planning Division, based on the attached analysis, recommends a four-lane bypass of Vancleve, with full control of access between the junctions of the proposed bypass with existing MS 57, south and north of Vancleve We also recommend that right of way acquisition include a large enough footprint at the interchange with John Ramsey Road to accommodate the eventual addition of loops in the northeast and northwest quadrants, as explained in the attachment If you have any questions or require additional information, please contact Wayne Parrish in the Planning Division at telephone number (601) 359.7685

Attachment
JAP:GWP:gwp
Pc: Mr Richard A Lee, District 6 Engineer
Mr John B. Pickering, Roadway Design Division Engineer
Mr Ray Balantine, Director, Office of Intermodal Planning
Ms. Elaine Wilkinson, Executive Director, Gulf Regional Planning Commission
Ms Michelle Bishop, Director, Jackson County Planning Commission


Background and Purpose. In accordance with a request from the Environmental Division Engineer, the Planning Division has conducted an analysis of alternatives for additional capacity on MS 57 in the vicinity of Vancleve, Jackson County. The purpose of the study was defined to examine and compare the operation of a four lane divided highway on new location to a five lane section on existing location The scope also included the examination of intersections and/or interchanges and connecting roads The Planning Division had completed a capacity analysis of the MS 57 corridor in the Vancleve area in January 2000 The earlier study concluded that the corridor from Interstate 10 to Vancleve required additional capacity, and merited a reasonable high priority from the District 6 Engineer. The Vision 21 analysis also indicated early need for the added capacity.


Study Area. Ithe study area consists of the MS 57 contidor from its interchange with I-10 to just north of Wade-Vancleve Road in the north The study area is bounded on the east by the Pascagoula River basin, and on the west by Old Fort Bayou Road. The general study area is shown in the figure at left.

Vancleve is unincorporated, and as a "Census Defined Place" had a population of 4,878 in the latest census However, within the study area, there are approximately 2,500 households, with a population of almost 7,500 The Vancleve area serves as a "bedroom" community for Gulf Coast employment, chief of which is the shipyard and associated industries at Pascagoula The rapid growth of the past decade is continuing, with existing subdivisions expanding, and new subdivisions being approved periodically by the Jackson County Planning Commission.


Within the study area, MS 57 is a two lane state highway, with turn lanes at Gautier-Vancleve Road, Humphrey Road, Poticaw Bayou Road, and Mounger Creek Road There is also a short three lane section (one travel lane in each direction with a two-way center left tum lane) from Little Bluff Road to Jim Ramsey Road. The Jim Ramsey Road and the Mounger Creek Road intersections are signalized.

MS 57 is functionally classified as a rural minor arterial throughout the study area Current (2004) daily traffic volumes range from about 1,000 to over 16,000 within the study area The
current daily volume on MS 57 between I-10 and Gautier-Vancleve Road is about 8,500. This two lane road is functionally classified a Rual Major Collector within the study area Ihe roadway traverses the Mississippi Sandhill Ctane National Wildlife Refuge, an environmentally sensitive area

Methodology. Ihis analysis was conducted in accordance with the Highway Capacity Manual, 2000 , using the Highway Capacity Softwate, version 41 d, current as of the date of the analysis Synchro, version 60 (build 610), current as of the time of the analysis was also used Synchro has a companion component, SimIraffic 60 , which provides an animation of network operation Ihe visual component is very valuable in comparing analysis results to actual network operations, and to demonstrating service levels to staff and to the public. Synchro determines level of service of signatized intersections in accordance with Highway Capacity Manual procedures, but also facilitates optimization of signal timing and coordination The analysts used the HCS for unsignalized intersection analysis

Current (2004) Operation and Level of Service. A brief analysis of current LOS within the study area was completed in the process of constructing the Synchro network for the real task of evaluation alternatives However, it is valuable to compare the results based on current traffic with the previous analysis conducted four years ago

The segment of MS 57 between I-10 and Gautier-Vancleve road is currently serving almost 10,000 vehicles per day, and is operating at LOS D in both moming and afternoon peaks. Gautier-Vancleve Road from I-10 to MS 57 is also currently operating at LOS D. The intersection of MS 57 with Gautier-Vancleve Road is an overall LOS E, but has individual movements that are LOS F during peak hours It should be noted that the Highway Capacity Software does not assign an overall intersection LOS per se, but the analysts have assigned an intersection LOS based on the movement and approach LOS weighted by the volumes on each movement and approach.

North of Gautier-Vancleve Road, the two-lane segment of MS 57 to Humphrey Road is operating at LOS E during peak hours The Humphrey Road intersection LOS was estimated to be a C, but the left turn from Humphrey Road to MS 57 is LOS F during both moming and evening peak hours

Neither the Highway Capacity Software or the Synchro software is fully adequate for assessing the operation of the three-lane section (one travel lane in each direction and a two-way left-turn lane) from Little Bluff Road to Jim Ramsey Road in Vancleve. The three-lane section in Vancleve, based on the daily volumes, can reasonably be classified as an urban fringe area in Highway Capacity Manual terms In such areas

At higher-volurne urbar fringe sites, greater delay raduction was round with TWLTLs on e two-lans highway. Exhibit A20.6 shows the expected delay reauction per left-turning yehlcle ss a functian of lopposing volume. As the delay reduction increases, a TWLTL can be justified for improving both traffic operation and safoty. the Highway Capacity Manual states that significant delay zeduction is provided for left turning vehicles, and through traffic delay behind left turning vehicles is eliminated The SimTraffic animation allows the analyst to view the segment operation in real-time simulation, and the three lane segment was placed at LOS D, or perhaps even a low LOS C, during peak hours The level of service does show marked
improvement toward the north end of the three lane section, and the segment between the high school and Jim Ramsey Road is definitely LOS C

Future Traffic Operations. In recent years, Vancleve has experienced rapid growth in traffic, and this trend is expected to continue for the foreseeable future. The current development is still on the east of MS 57 along the Pascagoula, but as this area fills, over the next ten years or so, even more growth is expected to the west along the Jim Ramsey Road corridor

The analysis addressed two alternatives for MS 57. The first alternative is for a five-lane typical section (two lanes in each direction, with a two way left turn lane. The second alternative is a four lane divided highway, bypassing the Vancleve to the west. Ihe Planning Division constructed traffic models for both alternatives using Synchro with SimTraffic software The Highway Capacity Software was also used

Alternative 1, Five lanes on existing location. The five-lane alternative on existing location provides marginally acceptable service for the design year The term marginally acceptable is used because the five-lane alternative can provide minimally acceptable level of service for signalized intersections with design year traffic projections. However, in some cases, dual left turn lanes will be required, and in others, left turn lanes will be needed on the surface streets As an unincorporated area, Vancleve has no capability to maintain signal equipment, so all this would fall to MDOT While unsignalized intersections along the five-lane route would provide overall acceptable service, there would be LOS F for left turns at several locations

Alternative 2, Four-lane divided highway on new location. The divided highway west of the existing location provides highly adequate levels of service throughout the corridor. In addition, with the improved connecting conridor to Mounger Creek Road, it diverts sufficient volume that the existing route also maintains acceptable service through the design period, within its existing capacity The greatest advantage for the new location alternative is that it not only serves well the projected growth in the Pascagoula basin, but also provides reduced travel times and much better service for the projected growth in the Jim Ramsey Road corridor west of existing MS 57

Alternative 2 includes a connector toad between the interchange at John Ramsey Road and the intersection with existing MS 57 at Mounger Creek. This connector will assume most of the traffic destined for the Pascagoula River Basin residential areas Our analysis shows that the intersection of this connector/Mounger Creek Road with existing MS 57 will operated at LOS A or B for all movements in the design year However, the analysis also shows that it is necessary to relocate the intersection of Poticaw Bayou Road and existing MS 57. The separation distance between the existing Poticaw Bayou Road intersection and the signalized intersection at Mounger Creek is barely 300 feet Relocation southward will improve safety and operations between the intersections

It is difficult to project travel demand with precision, but if the projected growth rates for the area retain, the ramp junctions on John Ramsey will warrant signalization at some point after 2020. With the characteristics of the area remaining predominately tural, despite the high volumes, signals are not desirable Loops, first in the northwest quadrant, then later in the northeast quadrant will forestall the requirement for signalization at the ramp junctions, and
maintain acceptable levels of service through the entire design period Ihe loops will not be required at the initial build of the bypass, but could be added sequentially at later times in the design period Consideration should be given to acquiring sufficient right of way to accommodate the addition of the loops as part of the initial planning This will ensure availability, and probably be cost effective as weil

Conclusions and Recommendations. Ihe capacity analysis clearly shows that the four-lane, divided highway on new location offers significant advantages for both level of service and travel time. The analysis also shows that the intersection of Poticaw Bayou Road with existing MS 57 should be moved south to provide greater separation from the signalized intersection at Mounger Creek Road and the new connector to the proposed bypass Based on our traffic projections the ramp junctions at the interchange of the proposed bypass and John Ramsey Road will requie signalization by the design year. The signalization could be avoided by the addition of loops at the approptiate point in the design period The Planning Division recommends that:

- MS 57 be reconstructed as a four lane divided highway from I-10 northward to a convenient appropriate point north of John Ramsey Road. Fully controlled access from the diverge from existing MS 57 south of Van Cleve through the John Ramsey Road interchange is highly desirable
- The intersection of Poticaw Bayou Road with existing MS 57 should be relocated southward to provide separation from the signalized intersection at Mounger Creek Road
- Ihe District Engineer should considered acquiring sufficient right of way at the interchange of the proposed bypass and John Ramsey Road to accommodate the eventual addition of loops in the northeast and northwest quadrants.


## APPENDIX EXHIBIT B

Map of Sandhill Crane Refuge


# APPENDIX EXHIBIT C 

Relocation Study

The unavailability of public sewer and water facilities in the project area will also impact the cost of providing replacement housing and the time necessary to relocate into decent, safe and sanitary housing. Additional review of the project's alignment during the design phase may further reduce replacement housing costs and shorten the right of way time necessary to bring this project to construction. Some potential areas where this can be accomplished have been identified in the above section, Alternate C - High Risk Impacts Identified along Alternate C Alternate Cl was developed to mitigate some of these high Risk Impacts and the study for frontage roads within the Type 1 access area may further reduce impacts.

Alternate B revealed the largest concerns with potential community impacts and/or 4(F) issues as 6 non profits would be impacted to some degree as listed below:

1. Jackson County Road Department
2. Vancleave Public Library
3. Vancleave Hi School
4. Jackson County Alteınative School
5. Jackson County School Pioperty
6. M L K Jr. Memorial Park

Storage Yard, Office Building and Mechanic Shop
Front Circle Drive
Parking area and Green Space
Parking area

## 2 buildings

Softball field, basketball court \& concession stand (located on Jackson County School Property, non 16 section land)

Alternate B's alignment also impacts a 1 mile segment of 16 section school property in the Vancleave Community. This would most likely lengthen the right of way schedule for Alternate B due to the complex title issues concerning the 16 section leases and the school board. The Vancleave business community is heavily impacted along this segment and most would have to relocate from their current location as the properties they reside on would not accommodate the relocation of the business. The Jackson County Tax Assessor has almost competed a survey of the number of businesses in the Vancleave area. To date the Tax Assessors survey count shows 66 businesses of which Alternate B would impact 48. The survey for Alternate B revealed the majority of the businesses in the Vancleave area are located along the east side of SR 57 which is also the area indicated for new right of way. The successful relocation of these businesses would be subject to availability of 16 section school board property within the business district. Alternates C and D lie to the west of the 16 section school lands, except for the connector road along Jim Ramsey to existing SR 57

Alternates C and D impacted the following non profit:
Vancleave Public Library - Front circle drive
Alternates C and D's impact to the Public Library could be mitigated by lessening improvements to SR 57 south of Jim Ramsey or relocating Jim Ramsey intersection with SR 57 a little to the north

Alternate C 1 mitigates the impact to the Public Library by lessening the improvements along SR 57

Alternate D will have minor impacts to the First Pentecostal Church of Vancleave located on Russell Drive. The northeast corner of the parcel would be impacted but the Church building, parking and etc would remain in place. There could be some minor impact to the septic system field lines but this could be handled in the appraisal process

Alternate $\mathrm{B}, \mathrm{C}$ and D displace a similar number of minority and low income families, 9 in Alternate B and 8 in Alternates C and D . However, there is a difference between Alternates C and D , (common alignment area), and Alternate B concerning minority and low income impacts.. The impacts along Alternates C and D could most likely be avoided by shifting the common alignment to the west and/or south around the south end of Lowpoint Road. This would eliminate any Environmental Justice Issues as discussed earlier. Alternate B's minority and low income impacts are adjacent to SR 57 and mostly on the east side between McCregor Road and Irwin Lane. Shifting the alignment to the west in this area would impact about the same number and type displacements as impacted on the east side of SR 57.

Alternate C 1 mitigates these impacts by reducing the number of minority and low income displacements to 3 located at the most western and southern end of Lowpoint Road. It also minimizes the neighborhood/subdivision impacts without moving the alignment into wetland or flood plain and maintains a desirable level of curvature. See Tables for further information.

TABLE NO. 5
TYPE OF DISPLACEE AND DISPLACEE COUNT

| TYPE OF <br> DISPLACEE | B | C | C1 | D |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| RESIDENTIAL | 26 | 52 | 48 | 55 |
| BUSINESS | 48 | 15 | 14 | 17 |
| FARM | 0 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| NON PROFIT | 6 | 1 | 0 | 1 |
| TOTALS | 80 | 69 | 63 | 74 |

TABLE NO. 6
CHARACTERISTICS OF DISPLACEMENT DWELLINGS

| TYPE OF <br> CONSIRUCIION |  | NO OF <br> BEDROOMS | AVERAGE AGE <br> OF DWELLINGS | CONDITION <br> OF <br> DWELLING | NO OF |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DWELLINGS |  |  |  |  |  |

TABLE NO. 7
CHARACTERISTICS OF DISPLACEES

| TYPE OF DISPLACEE | NO OF OWNERS | NO OF TENANIS | TOTAL | NO OF MINORITIES | NO OF HANDICAP | NO OF LRG <br> FAMILY | NO OF SENIORS | NO. OF EMPLOYEES |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| RESIDENTIAL |  | W, | 24xay | + | Wer | ${ }^{2}$ | Wix | tatil |
| B | 26 | 0 | 26 | 9 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| C | 53 | 0 | 53 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| C1 | 48 | 0 | 48 | 3 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| D | 55 | 0 | 55 | 8 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| BUSINESS |  | 5183 |  | \% | 2 | \%iasa | 2w | ** |
| B | 30 | 18 | 48 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 240 |
| C | 15 | 0 | 15 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 45 |
| C1 | 14 | 0 | 14 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 40 |
| D | 17 | 0 | 17 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 70 |
| FARM |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| B | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| C | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| C1 | 1 | 0 | I | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| D | 1 | 0 | 1 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| NON-PROFIT |  |  |  |  |  | $5$ |  |  |
| B | 6 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| C | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| C1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| D | 1 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

INCOME LEVELS**

|  | B | C | C1 | D |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LOW | 9 | 8 | 3 | 8 |
| MEDIUM | 17 | 46 | 45 | 46 |

**Income levels include residential displacees

A survey of local realtors, internet and local newspaper was completed to determine the availability of replacement properties. The survey of local realtors and local newspapers indicates an ample supply of replacement housing and lots. The survey was limited to the Vancleave, Gautier and Hurley listings. Some acreage listings were located but most would be suited for residential type development Commercial properties within the Vancleave area would be subject to 16 section school board property availability. Tables below provide results of the survey

TABLE NO. 8
INVENTORY OF RESIDENTIAL REPLACEMENT PROPERTIES

| $\#$ | SQUARE <br> FOOTAGE | TYPE OF <br> CONSTRUCIION | NO. OF <br> BEDROOMS | STATE OF <br> REPAIR | AGE | PRICE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 22 | $900-1,000$ | BRICK/FRAME | $2-3$ | AVERAGE | $10-40$ | $\$ 45,000-\$ 59,500$ |
| 55 | $1,250-1,500$ | BRICK/FRAME | $2-3$ | AVERAGE | $10-40$ | $\$ 63,000-\$ 115,000$ |
| 45 | $1,400-1,700$ | BRICK | $3-4$ | AVERAGE | $10-40$ | $\$ 119,000-\$ 149,500$ |
| 40 | $2,500-3,464$ | BRICK | $3-4$ | AVERAGE | $10-40$ | $\$ 152,000-\$ 350,000$ |
| 162 | $T 0 T A L$ |  |  |  |  |  |

TABLE NO. 9
VACANT ACREAGES FOR SALE

| NUMBER | SIZE | USE | PRICE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 9 | $3-4 \mathrm{Ac}$ | N/A | $\$ 20,000-\$ 50,000$ |
| 8 | $4-7.70$ | N/A | $\$ 50,000-100,000$ |
| 8 | $12.6-40$ | N/A | $\$ 119,777-995,000$ |
| 25 | TOI AL |  |  |

TABLE NO. 10
VACANT LOTS FOR SALE

| NUMBER | SIZE | USE | PRICE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 40 | RESIDENTAL LOT | RESIDENTAL | $\$ 20,000-55,000$ |
| 21 | RESIDENTAL LOT | RESIDENTAL | $\$ 55,000-\$ 99,500$ |
| 24 | RESIDENTAL LOT | RESIDENTAL | $\$ 119,777-\$ 400,000$ |
| 85 | TOIAL |  |  |

According to the Zoning \& Zoning Enforcement for Jackson County there are two zones for housing. The A-1 rating, general agriculture, has a minimum requirement of 1 acre of land for housing or mobile homes. The R-4 rating requires 5000 square feet per dwelling for high density residential areas.

As reported earlier, the majority of the study area including Vancleave has no access to public water or sewer. The Jackson County Port Authority Sewer Utility District provides sewer service to a small area just a few hundred feet north of I-10 along SR 57. In addition the City of Gautier has annexed an area over to the east side of Hwy 57 from the Navy housing unit to I-10. According to the Public Works Department of Gautier, water/sewer services should be provided to this area by the end of April 2005.

Areas north of those described above will require individual waste water treatment plants, (IWWIP), which must be apptoved in accordance with Health Department guidelines. Some home sites may require more than the minimum zoning acreage to insure proper disposal of effluent and distance requirements from private water sources. IWWTP are required maintain a distance of a minimum of 100 feet from the dwelling's water source and water line Soil test are required to decide the type of IWWIP to be used based on the number of bedrooms in the residence.

## LEAD TIME:

Lead time for right-of-way is estimated to be 24 to 30 months due to the large number of displacements and length of the project. Alternate B impacts the right of way schedule due to the 16 section school lands in the Vancleave area and a large number of business displacements. Alternates C, C1 and D do not impact the 16 section lands, except for the Jim Ramsey Road connector to SR 57 Alternates C, C1 and D impact more residential displacements, a high percentage of these being older mobile homes which may not be suitable to move Generally if suitable lands are available mobile home relocations can be accomplished. As Alternate C1 has the least number of displacements it would most likely require least amount of right of way time

## RELOCATION ASSISTANCE:

Final determination as to the need of a Right-of Way office will be made at the right-of way stage One or more relocation assistance officers would normally be assigned to the project. Each displaced person will be contacted individually and informed of their rights and benefits, which may be available though the Relocation Assistance Program. Displacees will be provided the name of the Relocation Assistance Officer assigned, and his/her phone number, as well as, the location and telephone numbers of the Jackson offices, and any local Right-of-Way office

Of the four alternatives Alternate C 1 has the least number of displacements, 63, verses 69 for Alternate C, 74 for Alternate D and 80 for Alternate B. Alternate C, C1 and D are very similar in the number and type of displacements. However, Alternate B has a greater impact on the business community of Vancleave, 48, verses 14 for Alternate C1, 15 for Alternate C and 17 for Alternate D. Potential estimated employment loss for Alternate B is also greater, 240, verses 40 for Alternate C1, 45 for Alternate C and 70 for Alternate D. The suıvey revealed 19 of Alternate B's 48 business displacements were due to loss of front parking as the size of the lots would prohibit replacement of the parking spaces. Alternate B also impacts several community facilities some with possible 4(F) implications. Alternate C 1 has the fewest impacts to minority and low income families, 3, verses 8 for Alternates C and D and 9 for Alternate B . Alternate C and D share a minor community facility impact which could be possibly mitigated in the design phase. Alternate C 1 mitigates this community facility impact.

Common displacements between the three Alternates are as follows:
Common Residential Displacements

| B C C1 and D | 5 |
| :--- | :--- |
| C and C1 | 7 |
| B C and C1 | 1 |
| C C1 and D | 22 |
| C and D | 39 |

Common Business Displacements

| B C and D | 8 |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\mathrm{~B} \mathrm{C} \mathrm{C1} \mathrm{and} \mathrm{D}$ | 7 |
| B and D | 1 |
| $\mathrm{C} \mathrm{C1} \mathrm{and} \mathrm{D}$ | 2 |
| $\mathrm{~B} \mathrm{C} \mathrm{and} \mathrm{C1}$ | 2 |

A review of the aerial photos and the residential displacement's acreage indicated less that $10 \%$ of these displacements would have enough remaining land for a suitable home site. This would result in most of the potential residential displacements having to relocate to existing housing or purchase land and rebuild

About $40 \%$ of the residential displacements for alternates C, C1 and D are mobile homes which may result to housing of last resort issues. The condition and/or age of the mobile homes could also be a factor in determining the use of housing of last resort. Minimum lot requirements, soil type and water table issues impact the areas suitable for individual waste water treatment plants, (IWWTP), and the type of IWWTP which can be installed. Only $27 \%$ of the residential displacements in Alternate B were identified as mobile homes.

## APPENDIX EXHIBIT D

## Letter from U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

# United States Department of the Interior 

FISH AND WII.DLIFE SERVICE<br>Mississippi Field Office<br>6578 Dogwood View Parkway, Suite A Jackson, Mississippi 39213

April 22, 2005

Mr Claiborne Barnwell<br>Environmental Division<br>Mississippi Department of Transportation<br>Post Office Box 22625<br>Jackson, Mississippi 39225-2625

Dear Mr Barnwell:
The U S Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) has reviewed the biological survey report regarding the proposed SR 57 upgrade from a two -lane highway to a four-lane highway in Jackson County, Mississippi Our comments ate submitted in accordance with the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (16 U S C 661-667e) and the Endangered Species Act (ESA) (87 Stat 884, as amended; 16 US C 1531 et seq)

There are currently three build alternatives proposed and one no-build alternative (Alternative A) Alternative B would be the expansion of the existing alignment with additional rights-of-way (ROW) being required adjacent to the existing ROW Alternative C would use existing alignment south of Gautier-Vancleave Road but would bypass the town of Vancleave to the West on new alignment. Alternative D is similar to $C$ except that it uses new alignment east of the VancleaveGautier Road/Highway 57 intersection as well

The biological survey focused on seven federal protected species that may be found in the project area No federal protected species were found during preliminary surveys for Alternatives B and C However, the area designated as Alternative D included foraging habitat for the federally listed endangered Mississippi Sandhill Crane (Grus Canadensis pulla) This alternative would impact pasture lands near the Gautier-Vancleave Road/Highway 57 interchange that are occasionally used as crane foraging habitat Additionally, all alternatives south of Quave Road may impact crane foraging habitat Finally, critical habitat has been designated for the MS Sandhill Crane, which begins just north of Quave Road, and may also be impacted

Additionally, the northwest corner of the MS Sandhill Crane Refuge in T7S R7W Section 6, abuts the existing Highway 57 and may be impacted directly by the proposed highway project

The Service concurs with the determination that a final biological survey will need to be completed once a preferred alternative has been chosen and the centerline marked Further consultation under the ESA will be necessary following completion of the final survey

The Service recommends that the construction ROW south of Vancleave-Gautier Road be reduced to the greatest extent possible to minimize potential adverse impacts to cranes Cranes are often found in their preferred pine savannah habitat but are also frequently found in crop fields, pastures, and marshes on and off the refuge Large open ROWs typically found along new four -lane highways would likely serve as new foraging habitat for cranes and, therefore, could result in increased vehicular collisions. Replanting the new ROW with vegetation not used by cranes as foraging habitat would also help minimize potential adverse effects

The Service is also concerned about what impact the Highway 57 expansion would have on Gautier -Vancleave Road Traffic volumes on Gautier :Vancleave Road continue to increase as a result of residential growth in the area and as an alternative route to I-10 from Vancleave. This road runs through some of the more sensitive habitat for the cranes, and the Service is particularly concerned about future efforts to four lane this toad and the associated impacts to the cranes that could result

Based on the sensitive nature of the project area, the Service recommends Alternative $B$ be pursued to the extent possible This alternative would upgrade the existing alignment where primary and secondary impacts are already occurring, which would result in the fewest impacts to federal listed species as well as other fish and wildlife resources Of the two "bypass" alternatives, Alternative C would appear to have fewer potential impacts to MS Sandhill Cranes

The Service recommends that the following be included in the draft NEPA document
1 A final biological survey will be completed once the preferred alignment is identified and the ROW is clearly marked
2 New ROW widths south of the Gautier-Vancleave Road will be reduced to the extent possible to minimize potential use of ROW by cranes
3 Utilization of vegetation plantings to discourage crane foraging within ROW
4 Replacement of upland foraging habitat lost
5 Design project to reduce traffic on Gautier-Vancleave Road
6 The Bluff Creek floodplain will be bridged along the new alignment including connector roads to reduce impacts to the floodplain and associated wetlands
7 Compensatory mitigation will be used for all unavoidable stream impacts
The Service appreciates your extensive early coordination efforts regarding the proposed project If you have any questions, please contact David Felder in our office, telephone: (601) 321-1139


Curtis B James
Assistant Field Supervisor

## APPENDIX EXHIBIT E

Flood Zone Map


# APPENDIX EXHIBIT F 

Native American Notification Letter

U S DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION Mississippi Division 666 North Street, Suite 105 Jackson, Mississippi 39202

IN REPLY REFER TO HRW-MS

Chief Phillip Martin
Mississippi Band of Choctaw Indians
P.O Box 6010

Philadelphia, MS 39350
Dear Chief Martin:
Subject: Invitation to Participate in Project Review for Environmental Assessment for State Route 57, from Interstate 10 to Vancleave, Jackson County, Mississippi

The Mississippi Department of Transportation (MDOT), in cooperation with the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), is pursuing an Environmental Assessment (EA) for highway widening to four lanes on State Route 57 in Jackson County, MS between Interstate 10 and Vancleave, MS, per the location on the attached map

The Advisory Council on Historic Preservation regulations stipulate that Indian tribes, which attach religious and cultural significance to historic properties that may be affected by an undertaking, be invited to participate in the project review process as consulting parties

This letter is a request for your participation in the project EA and to provide any comments you may have on the identification of historic properties in the project's area of potential effect that may be of traditional religious and cultural significance to your tribe

If you would like additional information, please contact Mr Dickie Walters at your earliest convenience via letter, by telephone (601) $965-4217$ or e-mail at Dickie. Walters@fhwa dot.gov Thank you for your assistance regarding this important matter and I look forward to hearing from you

Sincerely yours,

Andrew H. Hughes
Division Administrator

## Attachment

cc: $\quad \mathrm{Mr}$ Claiborne Barnwell, 87-01
Mr. Elbert Hilliard, Mississippi Department of Archives and History
File G:IUSER\DW alters\NativeAmericanInfo\Hwy57JacksonCountyNativeAmConsultLtr doc (dwalters) Dwalters:dw/jh 08-29-03

# APPENDIX EXHIBIT G 

## MS DEPARTMENT OF ARCHIVES <br> \& HISTORY LETTER



ARCHIVES \& HISTORY

HISIORIC PRESERVATION
PO Box 571, Jackson, MS 39205-0571
601-576-6940 • Fax 601-576-6955
mdah state ms us

May 18, 2005
Mr. E Claiborne Barnwell
Mississippi Department of Transportation
Post Office Box 1850
Jackson, Mississippi 39215-1850

## Dear Mr Barnwell:

RE: Addendum to a Phase I Cultural Resources Survey of the proposed 57 from l-10 to North of Vancleave, Jackson County, report \#05-102

We have reviewed the April 2005, cultural resources survey report of Mr Noel R Stowe for the above referenced undertaking. No sites or properties listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places will be affected. We, therefore, have no further reservations with this undertaking

In addition, we are not aware of any potential of this undertaking to affect Indian cultural or religious sites However, if you require confirmation of this, the tribal entities will have to be contacted directly

There remains a very remote possibility that unrecorded cultural resources may be encountered during construction If this occurs, we would appreciate your contacting this office immediately in order that we may offer appropriate comments under 36 CFR 800.13 within forty-eight hours Your continued cooperation is appreciated

Sincerely,
H. T Holmes

State Historic Preservation Officer
Thomas 灰 Wageqencen
By: Thomas H Waggener Review and Compliance Officer
cc: Clearinghouse for Federal Programs

## APPENDIX EXHIBIT H

## NOISE STUDY RECOMMENDATIONS

Table la
Alternative B Exterior Noise Levels
MS 57 from I-10 to Plantation Road

| Facility Number | Cateogry/ <br> 23 CFR 772 Noise <br> Abatement Level <br> (Leq dBA) | Traffic Noise Source | Existing |  | No Build |  | Build - Alternative B |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Estimated <br> Leq dBA | Noise <br> Impact (Yes, No) | Esitmated <br> Leq dBA | Noise Impact (Yes, No) | Estimated <br> Leq dBA | Noise Impact (Yes, No) |
| 1 | Commercial/72 | MS 57 | 56.2 | No | 59.2 | No | 62.8 | No |
| 2 | RV Park/67 | MS 57 | 58.5 | No | 61.5 | No | 64.2 | No |
| 3 | Residentia//67 | MS 57 | 55.3 | No | 58.2 | No | 62.2 | No |
| 4 | Residential/67 | MS 57 | 48.0 | No | 51.2 | No | 55.7 | No |
| 5 | Commercial/72 | MS 57 | 45.9 | No | 49.0 | No | 53.7 | No |
| 6 | Residential/67 | MS 57 | 46.0 | No | 48.9 | $\mathrm{N}_{0}$ | 54.5 | No |
| 7 | Residential/67 | MS 57 | 45.6 | No | 48.5 | No | 54.1 | No |
| 8 | Residential/67 | MS 57 | 45.4 | No | 48.3 | No | 53.8 | No |
| 9 | Sandhill Crane Refuge/67 | MS 57 | 51.8 | No | 54.6 | No | 60.3 | No |
| 10 | Residential/67 | MS 57 | 49.9 | No | 52.6 | No | 59.1 | No |
| 11 | Residential/67 | MS 57 | 44.9 | No | 47.8 | No | 53.6 | No |
| 12 | Residential/67 | MS 57 | 50.8 | No | 53.6 | No | 59.7 | No |
| 13 | Residential/67 | MS 57 | 53.0 | No | 55.8 | No | 60.8 | No |
| 14 | Commercial/72 | MS 57 | 44.3 | No | 47.2 | No | 53.6 | No |
| 15 | Residential/67 | MS 57 | 47.4 | No | 50.3 | No | 57.5 | No |
| 16 | Residential/67 | MS 57 | 51.1 | No | 53.9 | No | 59.7 | No |
| 17 | Residential/67 | MS 57 | 52.3 | No | 55.1 | No | 60.3 | No |
| 18 | Residential/67 | MS 57 | 48.6 | No | 51.4 | No | 58.2 | No |
| 19 | Commercial/72 | MS 57 | 41.5 | No | 44.4 | No | 49.7 | No |
| 20 | Residential/67 | MS 57 | 46.1 | No | 49.0 | No | 56.6 | No |
| 21 | Residential/67 | MS 57 | 46.1 | No | 49.0 | No | 56.6 | No |
| 22 | Residential/67 | MS 57 | 46.4 | No | 49.2 | No | 56.7 | No |
| 23 | Residential/67 | MS 57 | 46.9 | No | 49.5 | No | 53.1 | No |
| 24 | Residential/67 | MS 57 | 54.9 | No | 57.5 | No | 62.8 | No |
| 25 | Residential/67 | MS 57 | 52.7 | No | 55.3 | No | 61.6 | No |
| 26 | Residential/67 | MS 57 | 46.7 | No | 49.3 | No | 56.9 | No |
| 27 | Residential/67 | MS 57 | 45.1 | No | 47.8 | No | 54.6 | No |

Table la
Alternative B Exterior Noise Levels MS 57 from I-10 to Plantation Road

| Facility Number | Cateogy/ <br> 23 CFR 772 Noise <br> Abatement Level <br> (Leq dBA) | Iraffic Noise Source | Existing |  | No Build |  | Build - Alternative B |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Estimated <br> Leq dBA | $\begin{gathered} \text { Noise } \\ \text { Impact } \\ \text { (Yes, No) } \end{gathered}$ | Esitmated Leq dBA | $\begin{gathered} \text { Noise } \\ \text { Impact } \\ (\text { Yes, No }) \end{gathered}$ | Estimated <br> Leq dBA | Noise Impact (Yes, No) |
| 28 | Commercial/72 | MS 57 | 54.6 | No | 57.2 | No | 62.7 | No |
| 29 | Residential/67 | MS 57 | 48.9 | No | 51.6 | No | 59.3 | No |
| 30 | Commercial/72 | MS 57 | 54.6 | No | 57.2 | No | 62.7 | No |
| 31 | Commercial/72 | MS 57 | 57.0 | No | 59.6 | No | 64.0 | No |
| 32 | Commercial/72 | MS 57 | 57.8 | No | 60.4 | No | 64.4 | No |
| 33 | Commercial/72 | MS 57 | 58.3 | No | 60.9 | No | 64.7 | No |
| 34 | Commercial/72 | MS 57 | 55.7 | No | 58.3 | No | 63.3 | No |
| 35 | Commercial/72 | MS 57 | 55.2 | No | 57.9 | No | 63.1 | No |
| 36 | Residential/67 | MS 57 | 58.5 | No | 61.1 | No | 64.7 | No |
| 37 | Church/67 | MS 57 | 58.2 | No | 60.9 | No | 64.5 | No |
| 38 | Residential/67 | MS 57 | 48.8 | No | 51.5 | No | 59.4 | No |
| 39 | Residential/67 | MS 57 | 50.3 | No | 52.9 | No | 60.4 | No |
| 40 | Residential/67 | MS 57 | 52.3 | No | 55.0 | No | 61.7 | No |
| 41 | Residential/67 | MS 57 | 54.9 | No | 57.5 | No | 63.2 | No |
| 42 | Residential/67 | MS 57. | 54.4 | No | 57.0 | No | 62.9 | No |
| 43 | Commercial/72 | MS 57 | 56.1 | No | 58.7 | No | 63.8 | No |
| 44 | Commercial/72 | mS 57 | 56.5 | No | 59.2 | No | 64.0 | No |
| 45 | Commercial/72 | MS 57 | 56.2 | No | 58.9 | No | 63.9 | No |
| 46 | Commercial/72 | MS 57 | 59.7 | No | 62.3 | No | 65.7 | No |
| 47 | Commercial/72 | MS 57 | 56.2 | No | 58.8 | No | 63.8 | No |
| 48 | Commercial/72 | MS 57 | 56.0 | No | 58.6 | No | 63.7 | No |
| 49 | Commercial/72 | MS 57 | 56.8 | No | 59.5 | No | 64.2 | No. |
| 50 | Commercial/72 | MS 57 | 55.6 | No | 58.2 | No | 63.5 | No |
| 51 | Commercial/72 | MS 57 | 55.2 | No | 57.9 | No | 63.3 | No |
| 52 | Commercial/72 | MS 57 | 56.8 | No | 59.4 | No | 64.2 | No |
| 53 | Commercial/72 | MS 57 | 55.1 | No | 57.8 | No | 63.2 | No |
| 54 | Commercial/72 | MS 57 | 55.6 | No | 58.3 | No | 63.4 | No |

Table la
Alterrative B Exterior Noise Levels MS 57 from I-10 to Plantation Road

| Facility Number | Cateogy/ <br> 23 CFR 772 Noise <br> Abatement Level <br> (Leq dBA) | Traffic Noise Source | Existing |  | No Build |  | Build - Alternative B |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Estimated Leq dBA | Noise <br> Impact <br> (Yes, No) | Esitmated Leq dBA | Noise Impact (Yes, No) | Estimated <br> Leq dBA | Noise Impact (Yes, No) |
| 55 | Residential/67 | MS 57 | 52.7 | No | 55.4 | No | 61.5 | No |
| 56 | Residential/67 | MS 57 | 52.2 | No | 54.9 | No | 61.3 | No |
| 57 | Commercial/72 | MS 57 | 61.5 | No | 64.1 | No | 66.8 | No |
| 58 | Commercial/72 | MS 57 | 62.6 | No | 65.2 | No | 67.3 | No |
| 59 | Residential/67 | MS 57 | 55.4 | No | 58.1 | No | 63.1 | No |
| 60 | Residential/67 | MS 57 | 56.1 | No | 58.8 | No | 63.7 | No |
| 61 | Commercial/72 | MS 57 | 56.0 | No | 58.7 | No | 63.7 | No |
| 62 | Commercial/72 | MS 57 | 61.6 | No | 64.3 | No | 66.8 | No |
| 63 | Commercial/72 | MS 57 | 61.0 | No | 63.6 | No | 66.4 | No |
| 64 | Commercial/72 | MS 57 | 59.0 | No | 61.7 | No | 65.3 | No |
| 65 | Church/67 | MS 57 | 54.5 | No | 57.2 | No | 62.8 | No |
| 66 | Commercial/72 | MS 57 | 59.2 | No | 61.8 | No | 65.3 | No |
| 67 | Commercial/72 | MS 57 | 57.8 | No | 60.4 | No | 64.8 | No |
| 68 | School/67 | MS 57 | 56.9 | No | 59.6 | No | 64.1 | No |
| 69. | Commercial/72 | MS 57 | 55.7 | No | 58.4 | No | 63.6 | No |
| 70 | Commercial/72 | MS 57 | 55.0 | No | 57.7 | No | 63.2 | No |
| 71 | Commercial/72 | MS 57 | 58.4 | No | 61.0 | No | 64.9 | No |
| 72 | Commercial/72 | MS 57 | 60.2 | No | 62.8 | No | 66.0 | No |
| 73 | Commercial/72 | MS 57 | 55.0 | No | 57.7 | No | 63.2 | No |
| 74 | Residential/67 | MS 57 | 48.7 | No | 51.3 | No | 59.1 | No |
| 75 | Commercial/72 | MS 57 | 52.0 | No | 54.6 | No | 61.1 | No |
| 76 | Residential/67 | MS 57 | 53.1 | No | 55.7 | No | 60.7 | No |
| 77 | Residential/67 | MS 57 | 49.3 | No | 51.9 | No | 58.6 | No |
| 78 | Residential/67 | MS 57 | 50.0 | No | 52.7 | No | 58.9 | No |
| 79 | Residential/67 | MS 57 | 53.2 | No | 56.0 | No | 60.7 | No |
| 80 | Residential/67 | MS 57 | 53.4 | No | 56.2 | No | 60.8 | No |
| 81 | Residential/67 | MS 57 | 48.8 | No | 51.8 | No | 58.4 | No |

Table 1a
Alternative B Exterior Noise Levels
MS 57 from I-10 to Plantation Road

| Facility Number | Cateogry/ <br> 23 CFR 772 Noise <br> Abatement Level (Leq dBA) | Traffic Noise Source | Existing |  | No Build |  | Build - Afternative B |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Estimated <br> Leq dBA | Noise Impact (Yes, No) | Esitmated <br> Leq dBA | $\begin{gathered} \text { Noise } \\ \text { Impact } \\ \text { (Yes, No) } \end{gathered}$ | Estimated <br> Leq dBA | Noise Impact <br> (Yes, No) |
| 82 | School/67 | MS 57 | 48.8 | No | 52.0 | No | 58.9 | No |
| 83 | Residential/67 | MS 57 | 50.2 | No | 53.4 | No | 59.0 | No |
| 84 | Residential/67 | MS 57 | 49.1 | No | 52.2 | No | 57.9 | No |
| 85 | Commercial/72 | MS 57 | 52.2 | No | 55.4 | No | 60.3 | No |
| 86 | Residential/67 | MS 57 | 54.4 | No | 57.4 | No | 61.2 | No |
| 87 | Residential/67 | MS 57 | 54.8 | No | 57.5 | No | 60.8 | No |
| 88 | Residentia1/67 | MS 57 | 56.1 | No | 58.8 | No | 61.5 | No |
| 89 | Residential/67 | MS 57 | 56.4 | No | 59.1 | No | 61.7 | No |
| 90 | Residential/67 | MS 57 | 51.7 | No | 54.4 | No | 59.4 | No |
| 91 | Residential/67 | MS 57 | 54.8 | No | 57.5 | No | 61.0 | No |
| 92 | Residential/67 | MS 57 | 50.0 | No | 52.6 | No | 58.3 | No |
| 93 | Residential/67 | MS 57 | 49.4 | No | 52.1 | No | 58.1 | No |
| 94 | Residential/67 | MS 57 | 51.5 | No | 54.2 | No | 59.5 | No |
| 95 | Residential/67 | MS 57 | 47.4 | No | 50.1 | No | 56.4 | No |
| 96 | Residential/67 | MS 57 | 43.6 | No | 46.3 | No | 54.2 | No |
| 97* | Residential/67 | MS 57 | 50.0 | No | 52.6 | No | 58.1 | No |
| 99 | Residential/67 | MS 57 | 47.6 | No | 50.3 | No | 56.7 | No |
| 100 | Residential/67 | MS 57 | 50.4 | No | 53.0 | No | 58.4 | No |
| 101 | Residential/67 | MS 57 | 51.3 | No | 54.0 | No | 59.2 | No |
| 102 | Residential/67 | MS 57 | 47.7 | No | 50.4 | No | 56.2 | No |
| 103 | Residential/67 | MS 57 | 52.9 | No | 55.6 | No | 58.8 | No |
| 104 | Residential/67 | MS 57 | 48.4 | No | 51.1 | No | 57.1 | No |
| 105 | Residential/67 | MS 57 | 45.1 | No | 47.8 | No | 55.1 | No |
| 106 | Residential/67 | MS 57 | 41.3 | No | 44.0 | No | 51.3 | No |
| 107 | Residential/67 | MS 57 | - 46.3 | No | 49.0 | No | 55.9 | No |
| 108 | Commercial/72 | MS 57 | 44.6 | No | 47.3 | No | 54.9 | No |
| 109 | Residential/67 | MS 57 | 47.3 | No | 50.0 | No | 56.5 | No |

Table la
Alternative B Exterior Noise Levels MS 57 from I-10 to Plantation Road

| Facility Number | Cateogy/ <br> 23 CFR 772 Noise <br> Abatement Level <br> (Leq dBA) | Traffic Noise Source | Existing |  | No Build |  | Build - Alternative B |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Estimated Leq dBA | $\begin{gathered} \text { Noise } \\ \text { Impact } \\ \text { (Yes, No) } \end{gathered}$ | Esitmated Leq dBA | $\begin{gathered} \text { Noise } \\ \text { Impact } \\ \text { (Yes, No) } \end{gathered}$ | Estimated Leq dBA | Noise Impact (Yes, No) |
| 110 | Residential/67 | MS 57 | 40.7 | No | 43.4 | No | 50.5 | No |
| 111 | Residential/67 | MS 57 | 48.7 | No | 51.4 | No | 57.3 | No |
| 112 | Residential/67 | MS 57 | 43.3 | No | 45.9 | No | 53.7 | No |
| 113 | Residential/67 | MS 57 | 45.3 | No | 48.0 | No | 54.3 | No |

*Receptor 98 ommitted due to ROW acquisition

Tabie 16
Alternative C Exterior Noise Levels MS 57 from I-10 to Plantation Road

| Facility <br> Number | Cateogry/ <br> 23 CFR 772 Noise <br> Abatement Level <br> (Leq dBA) | Iraffic Noise Source | Existing |  | No Build |  | Build - Alternative C |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Estimated <br> Leq dBA | $\begin{gathered} \text { Noise } \\ \text { Impact } \\ \text { (Yes, No) } \end{gathered}$ | Esitmated <br> Leq dBA | $\begin{gathered} \text { Noise } \\ \text { Impact } \\ \text { (Yes, No) } \end{gathered}$ | Estimated Leq dBA | Noise Impact (Yes, No) |
| 1 | Commercial/72 | Existing MS 57 | 56.2 | No | 59.2 | No | 59.5 | No |
| 2 | RV Park/67 | Existing MS 57 | 58.5 | No | 61.5 | No | 61.8 | No |
| 3 | Residential/67 | Existing MS 57 | 55.3 | No | 58.2 | No | 58.4 | No |
| 4 | Residential/67 | Existing MS 57 | 48.0 | No | 51.2 | No | 51.5 | No |
| 5 | Commercial/72 | Existing MS 57 | 45.9 | No | 49.0 | No | 49.2 | No |
| 6 | Residential/67 | Existing MS 57 | 46.0 | No | 48.9 | No | 49.2 | No |
| 7 | Residential/67 | Existing MS 57 | 45.6 | No | 48.5 | No | 48.8 | No |
| 8 | Residential/67 | Existing MS 57 | 45.4 | No | 48.3 | No | 48.6 | No |
| 9 | Sandhill Crane Refuge/67 | Existing MS 57 | 51.8 | No | 54.6 | No | 54.9 | No |
| 10 | Residential/67 | Existing MS 57 | 49.9 | No | 52.6 | No | 53.0 | No |
| 11 | Residential/67 | Existing MS 57 | 44.9 | No | 47.8 | No | 48.1 | No |
| 12 | Residential/67 | Existing MS 57 | 50.8 | No | 53.6 | No | 54.3 | No |
| 13 | Residential/67 | Existing MS 57 | 53.0 | No | 55.8 | No | 56.6 | No |
| 14 | Commercial/72 | Existing MS 57 | 44.3 | No | 47.2 | No | 47.8 | No |
| 15 | Residential/67 | Existing MS 57 | 47.4 | No | 50.3 | No | 51.0 | No |
| 16 | Residential/67 | Existing MS 57 | 51.1 | No | 53.9 | No | 54.7 | No |
| 17 | Residential/67 | Existing MS 57 | 52.3 | No | 55.1 | No | 56.0 | No |
| 18 | Residential/67 | Existing MS 57 | 48.6 | No | 51.4 | No | 52.3 | No |
| 19 | Commercial/72 | Existing MS 57 | 41.5 | No | 44.4 | No | 45.9 | No. |
| 20 | Residential/67 | Existing MS 57 | 46.1 | No | 49.0 | No | 50.0 | No |
| 21 | Residential/67. | Existing MS 57 | 46.1 | No | 49.0 | No | 50.1 | No |
| 22 | Residential/67 | Existing MS 57 | 46.4 | No | 49.2 | No | 59.0 | No |
| 23 | Residential/67 | Existing MS 57 | 46.9 | No | 49.5 | No | 51.7 | No |
| 24 | Residentia/67 | Existing MS 57 | 54.9 | No | 57.5 | No | 56.1 | No |
| 25 | Residential/67 | Existing MS 57 | 52.7 | No | 55.3 | No | 54.7 | No |
| 26 | Residential/67 | Existing MS 57 | 46.7 | No | 49.3 | No | 50.8 | No |
| 27 | Residential/ 67 | Existing MS 57 | 45.1 | No | 47.8 | No | 49.6 | No |
| 28 | Commercial/72 | Existing MS 57 | 54.6 | No | 57.2 | No | 55.7 | No |

Table 1b
Alternative C Exterior Noise Levels
MS 57 from I-10 to Plantation Road

| Facility <br> Number | Cateogry/ <br> 23 CFR 772 Noise <br> Abatement Level <br> (Leq dBA) | Itaffic Noise Source | Existing |  | No Build |  | Build - Alternative C |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Estimated <br> Leq dBA | $\begin{gathered} \text { Noise } \\ \text { Impact } \\ \text { (Yes, No) } \end{gathered}$ | Esitrnated <br> Leq dBA | $\begin{gathered} \text { Noise } \\ \text { Impact } \\ \text { (Yes, No) } \end{gathered}$ | Estimated <br> Leq dBA | Noise Impact (Yes, No) |
| 29 | Residential/67 | Existing MS 57 | 48.9 | No | 51.6 | No | 52.2 | No |
| 30 | Commercial/72 | Existing MS 57 | 54.6 | No | 57.2 | No | 55.6 | No |
| 31 | Commercial/72 | Existing MS 57 | 57.0 | No | 59.6 | No | 57.1 | No |
| 32 | Commercial/72 | Existing MS 57 | 57.8 | No | 60.4 | No | 63.1 | No |
| 33 | Commercial/72 | Existing MS 57 | 58.3 | No | 60.9 | No | 63.0 | No |
| 34 | Commercial/72 | Existing MS 57 | 55.7 | No | 58.3 | No | 56.3 | No |
| 35 | Commercial/72 | Existing MS 57 | 55.2 | No | 57.9 | No | 56.0 | No |
| 36 | Residential/67 | Existing MS 57 | 58.5 | No | 61.1 | No | 63.0 | No |
| 37 | Church/67 | Existing MS 57 | 58.2 | No | 60.9 | No | 63.1 | No |
| 38 | Residential/67 | Existing MS 57 | 48.8 | No | 51.5 | No | 51.1 | No |
| 39 | Residential/67 | Existing MS 57 | 50.3 | No | 52.9 | No | 51.1 | No |
| 40 | Residential/67 | Existing MS 57 | 52.3 | No | 55.0 | No | 51.3 | No |
| 41 | Residential/67 | Existing MS 57 | 54.9 | No | 57.5 | No | 53.4 | No |
| 42 | Residential/67 | Existing MS 57 | 54.4 | No | 57.0 | No | 52.9 | No |
| 43 | Commercial/72 | Existing MS 57 | 56.1 | No | 58.7 | No | 54.3 | No |
| 44 | Commercial/72 | Existing MS 57 | 56.5 | No | 59.2 | No | 54.6 | No |
| 45 | Commercial/72 | Existing MS 57 | 56.2 | No | 58.9 | No | 54.4 | No |
| 46 | Commercial/72 | Existing MS 57 | 59.7 | No | 62.3 | No | 57.7 | No |
| 47 | Commercial/72 | Existing MS 57 | 56.2 | No | 58.8 | No | 54.3 | No |
| 48 | Commercial/72 | Existing MS 57 | 56.0 | No | 58.6 | No | 54.0 | No |
| 49 | Commercial/72 | Existing MS 57 | 56.8 | No | 59.5 | No | 54.8 | No |
| 50 | Commercial/72 | Existing MS 57 | 55,6 | No | 58.2 | No | 53.6 | No |
| 51 | Commercial/72 | Existing MS 57 | 55.2 | No | 57.9 | No | 53.3 | No |
| 52 | Commereial/72 | Existing MS 57 | 56.8 | No | 59.4 | No | 54.8 | No |
| 53 | Commercial/72 | Existing MS 57 | 55.1 | No | 57.8 | No | 53.1 | No |
| 54 | Commercial/72 | Existing MS 57 | 55.6 | No | 58.3 | No | 53.6 | No |
| 55 | Residential/67 | Existing MS 57 | 52.7 | No | 55.4 | No. | 50.8 | No |
| 56 | Residential/67 | Existing MS 57 | 52.2 | No | 54.9 | No | 50.4 | No |

Table Ib
Alternative C Exterior Noise Levels MS 57 from I-10 to Plantation Road

| Facility Number | Cateogry/ 23 CFR 772 Noise Abatement Level (Leq dBA) | Traffic Noise Source | Existing |  | No Build |  | Build - Alternative C |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Estimated Leq dBA | Noise <br> Impact (Yes, No) | Esitmated Leq dBA | Noise <br> Impact (Yes, No) | Estimated <br> Leq dBA | Noise Impac (Yes, No) |
| 57 | Commercial/72 | Existing MS 57 | 61.5 | No | 64.1 | No | 59.4 | No |
| 58 | Commercial/72 | Existing MS 57 | 62.6 | No | 65.2 | No | 60.5 | No |
| 59 | Residential/67 | Existing MS 57 | 55.4 | No | 58.1 | No | 53.4 | No |
| 60 | Residential/67 | Existing MS 57 | 56.1 | No | 58.8 | No | 54.1 | No |
| 61 | Commercial/72 | Existing MS 57 | 56.0 | No | 58.7 | No | 54.0 | No |
| 62 | Commercial/72 | Existing MS 57 | 61.6 | No | 64.3 | No | 59.5 | No |
| 63 | Commercial/72 | Existing MS 57 | 61.0 | No | 63.6 | No | 58.9 | No |
| 64 | Commercial/72 | Existing MS 57 | 59.0 | No | 61.7 | No | 56.9 | No |
| 65 | Church/67 | Existing MS 57 | 54.5 | No | 57.2 | No | 52.5 | No |
| 66 | Commercial/72 | Existing MS 57 | 59.2 | No | 61.8 | No | 57.1 | No |
| 67 | Commercial/72 | Existing MS 57 | 57.8 | No | 60.4 | No | 55.7 | No |
| 68 | School/67 | Existing MS 57 | 56.9 | No | 59.6 | No | 54.9 | No |
| 69 | Commercial/72 | Existing MS 57 | 55.7 | No | 58.4 | No | 53.7 | No |
| 70 | Commercial/72 | Existing MS 57 | 55.0 | No | 57.7 | No | 53.0 | No |
| 71 | Commercial/72 | Existing MS 57 | 58.4 | No | 61.0 | No | 56.3 | No |
| 72 | Commercial/72 | Existing MS 57 | 60.2 | No | 62.8 | No | 58.3 | No |
| 73 | Commercial/72 | Existing MS 57 | 55.0 | No. | 57.7 | No | 52.4 | No |
| 74 | Residential/67 | Existing MS 57 | 48.7 | No | 51.3 | No | 46.5 | No |
| 75 | Commercial/72 | Existing MS 57 | 52.0 | No | 54.6 | No | 55.6 | No |
| 76 | Residential/67 | Existing MS 57 | 53.1 | No | 55.7 | No | 53.4 | No |
| 77 | Residential/67 | Existing MS 57 | 49.3 | No | 51.9 | No | 49.8 | No |
| 78 | Residential/67 | Existing MS 57 | 50.0 | No | 52.7 | No | 50.4 | No |
| 79 | Residentia//67 | Existing MS 57 | 53.2 | No | 56.0 | No | 53.5 | No |
| 80 | Residential/67 | Existing MS 57 | 53.4 | No | 56.2 | No | 53.5 | No |
| 81 | Residential/67 | Existing MS 57 | 48.8 | No | 51.8 | No | 49.0 | No |
| 82 | School/67 | Existing MS 57 | 48.8 | No | 52.0 | No | 48.9 | No |
| 83 | Residential/67 | Existing MS 57 | 50.2 | No | 53.4 | No | 50.3 | No |
| 84 | Residential/67 | Existing MS 57 | 49.1 | No | 52.2 | No | 49.2 | No |

Iable 1b
Alternative C Exterior Noise Levels
MS 57 from I-10 to Plantation Road

| Facility <br> Number | Cateogry/ <br> 23 CFR 772 Noise <br> Abaternent Level <br> (Leq dBA) | Itaffic Noise Source | Existing |  | No Build |  | Build - Alternative C |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Estimated <br> Leq dBA | $\begin{gathered} \text { Noise } \\ \text { Impact } \\ \text { (Yes, No) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Esitmated <br> Leq dBA | Noise <br> Impact (Yes, No) | Estimated <br> Leq dBA | Noise Impact (Yes, No) |
| 85 | Commercial/72 | Existing MS 57 | 52.2 | No | 55.4 | No | 52.1 | No |
| 86 | Residential/67 | Existing MS 57 | 54.4 | No | 57.4 | No | 54.3 | No |
| 87 | Residential/67 | Existing MS 57 | 54.8 | No | 57.5 | No | 54.8 | No |
| 88 | Residential/67 | Existing MS 57 | 56.1 | No | 58.8 | No | 56.1 | No |
| 89 | Residential/67 | Existing MS 57 | 56.4 | No | 59.1 | No | 56.3 | No |
| 90 | Residential/67 | Existing MS 57 | 51.7 | No | 54.4 | No | 51.7 | No |
| 91 | Residential/67 | Existing MS 57 | 54.8 | No | 57.5 | No | 54.7 | No |
| 92 | Residential/67 | Existing MS 57 | 50.0 | No | 52.6 | No | 50.1 | No |
| 93 | Residential/67 | Existing MS 57 | 49.4 | No | 52.1 | No | 49.5 | No |
| 94 | Residential/67 | Existing MS 57 | 51.5 | No | 54.2 | No | 51.6 | No |
| 95 | Residential/67 | Existing MS 57 | 47.4 | No | 50.1 | No | 47.6 | No |
| 96 | Residential/67 | Existing MS 57 | 43.6 | No | 46.3 | No | 47.2 | No |
| 97* | Residential/67 | Existing MS 57 | 50.0 | No | 52.6 | No | 52.9 | No |
| 99 | Residential/67 | Existing MS 57 | 47.6 | No | 50.3 | No | 50.6 | No |
| 100 | Residential/67 | Existing MS 57 | 50.4 | No | 53.0 | No | 54.2 | No |
| 101* | Residential/67 | Proposed MS 57 | 51.3 | No | 54.0 | No | 58.3 | No |
| 105 | Residential/67 | Proposed MS 57 | 45.1 | No | 47.8 | No | 55.1 | No |
| 106 | Residential/67 | Proposed MS 57 | 41.3 | No. | 44.0 | No | 50.7 | No |
| 107 | Residential/67 | Proposed MS 57 | 46.3 | No | 49.0 | No | 55.4 | No |
| 108 | Commercial/72 | Proposed MS 57 | 44.6 | No | 47.3 | No | 55.9 | No |
| 109 | Residential/67 | Proposed MS 57 | 47.3 | No | 50.0 | No | 58.0 | No |
| 110 | Residential/67 | Proposed MS 57 | 40.7 | No | 43.4 | No | 49.7 | No |
| 111 | Residentia1/67 | Proposed MS 57 | 48.7 | No | 51.4 | No | 56.3 | No |
| 112 | Residential/67 | Proposed MS 57 | 43.3 | No | 45.9 | No | 52.9 | No |
| 113 | Residential/67 | Proposed MS 57 | 45.3 | No | 48.0 | No | 57.3 | No |
| 114 | Residential/67 | Proposed MS 57 | 53.9 | No | 61.3 | No | 63.4 | No |
| 1.15 | Residential/67 | Proposed MS 57 | 53.1 | No | 60.2 | No | 63.3 | No |
| 116 | Residential/67 | Proposed MS 57 | 53.3 | No | 60.5 | No | 63.1 | No |

Table 16
Alternative C Exterior Noise Levels MS 57 from I-10 to Plantation Road

| Facility Number | Cateogry/ <br> 23 CFR 772 Noise <br> Abatement Level <br> (Leq dBA) | Iraffic Noise Source | Existing |  | No Build |  | Build - Alternative C |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Estimated <br> Leq dBA | $\begin{gathered} \text { Noise } \\ \text { Impact } \\ \text { (Yes, No) } \end{gathered}$ | Esitmated <br> Leq dBA | $\begin{gathered} \text { Noise } \\ \text { Impact } \\ \text { (Yes, No) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Estimated <br> Leq dBA | Noise Impact (Yes, No) |
| 117 | Residential/67 | Proposed MS 57 | 37.5 | No | 40.2 | No | 63.6 | Yes |
| 118 | Residential/67 | Proposed MS 57 | 37.5 | No | 40.2 | No | 64.4 | Yes |
| 119 | Residential/67 | Proposed MS 57 | 34.9 | No | 37.6 | No | 62.5 | Yes |
| 120 | Residential/67 | Proposed MS 57 | 34.7 | No | 37.4 | No | 56.2 | Yes |
| 121 | Residential/67 | Proposed MS 57 | 34.0 | No | 36.8 | No | 57.3 | Yes |
| 122 | Residential/67 | Proposed MS 57 | 33.5 | No | 36.3 | No | 58.9 | Yes |
| 123 | Commercial/72 | Proposed MS 57 | 36.0 | No | 39.3 | No | 57.3 | Yes |
| 124 | Residential/67 | Proposed MS 57 | 35.1 | No | 37.8 | No | 58.0 | Yes |
| 125 | Residential/67 | Proposed MS 57 | 35.5 | No | 38.2 | No | 54.4 | Yes |
| 126 | Residential/67 | Proposed MS 57 | 35.3 | No | 38.0 | No | 51.9 | Yes |
| 127 | Residential/67 | Proposed MS 57 | 35.6 | No | 38.3 | No | 51.5 | Yes |
| 128 | Residential/67 | Proposed MS 57 | 35.9 | No | 38.5 | No | 49.3 | No |
| 129 | Residentia//67 | Proposed MS 57 | 40.0 | No | 42.7 | No | 49.6 | No |
| 130 | Commercial/72 | Jim Ramsey Rd | 43.4 | No | 46.6 | No | 52.4 | No |
| 131 | Commercial/72 | Jim Ramsey Rd | 43.4 | No | 46.6 | No | 58.3 | No |

Table ic
Alternative D Exterior Noise Levels MS 57 from I-10 to Plantation Road

| Facility <br> Number | Cateogry/ <br> 23 CFR 772 Noise Abatement L.evel (Leq dBA) | Traffic Noise Source | Existing |  | No Build |  | Build |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Estimated Leq dBA | $\begin{gathered} \text { Noise } \\ \text { Impact } \\ \text { (Yes; No) } \end{gathered}$ | Esitmated Leq dBA | $\begin{gathered} \text { Noise } \\ \text { Impact } \\ \text { (Yes, No) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Estimated } \\ & \text { Leq dBA } \end{aligned}$ | Noise Impact (Yes, No) |
| 1 | Commercial/72 | Existing MS 57 | 56.2 | No | 59.2 | No | 59.5 | No |
| 2 | RV Park/67 | Existing MS 57 | 58.5 | No | 61.5 | No | 61.8 | No |
| 3 | Residential/67 | Existing MS 57 | 55.3 | No | 58.2 | No | 58.4 | No |
| 4 | Residential/67 | Existing MS 57 | 48.0 | No | 51.2 | No | 51.5 | No |
| 5 | Commercial/72 | Existing MS 57 | 45.9 | No | 49.0 | No | 49.2 | No |
| 6 | Residential/67 | Existing MS 57 | 46.0 | No | 48.9 | No | 49.2 | No |
| 7 | Residential/67 | Existing MS 57 | 45.6 | No | 48.5 | No | 48.9 | No |
| 8 | Residential/67 | Existing MS 57 | 45.4 | No | 48.3 | No | 48.6 | No |
| 9 | Sandhill Crane Refuge/67 | Existing MS 57 | 51.8 | No | 54.6 | No | 54.9 | No |
| 10 | Residential/67 | Existing MS 57 | 49.9 | No | 52.6 | No | 53.0 | No |
| $11^{*}$ | Residential/67 | Existing MS 57 | 44.9 | No | 47.8 | No | 48.9 | No |
| 14* | Commercial/72 | Existing \& Proposed MS 57 | 44.3 | No | 47.2 | No | 60.0 | Yes |
| 17 | Residential/67 | Existing \& Proposed MS 57 | 52.3 | No | 55.1 | No | 59.0 | No |
| 18 | Residential/67 | Existing \& Proposed MS 57 | 48.6 | No | 51.4 | No | 59.4 | No |
| 19 | Commercial/72 | Existing MS 57 | 41.5 | No | 44.4 | No | 45.2 | No |
| 20 | Residential/67 | Existing \& Proposed MS 57 | 46.1 | No | 49.0 | No | 56.9 | No |
| 21 | Residential/67 | Existing \& Proposed MS 57 | 46.1 | No | 49.0 | No | 55.5 | No |
| 22 | Residential/67 | Existing \& Proposed MS 57 | 46.4 | No | 49.2 | No | 49.7 | No |
| 23 | Residential/67 | Existing MS 57 | 46.9 | No | 49.5 | No | 58.8 | No |
| 24 | Residential/67 | Existing \& Proposed MS 57 | 54.9 | No | 57.5 | No | 53.4 | No |
| 25 | Residential/67 | Existing \& Proposed MS 57 | 52.7 | No | 55.3 | No | 57.2 | No |
| 26 | Residential/67 | Existing \& Proposed MS 57 | 46.7 | No | 49.3 | No | 62.0 | Yes |
| 27 | Residential/67 | Existing \& Proposed MS 57 | 45.1 | No | 47.8 | No | 65.7 | Yes |
| 28 | Commercial/72 | Existing \& Proposed MS 57 | 54.6 | No | 57.2 | No | 58.3 | No |
| 29 | Residential/67 | Existing \& Proposed MS 57 | 48.9 | No | 51.6 | No | 62.5 | No |

Table 1c
Alternative D Exterior Noise Levels MS 57 from I-10 to Plantation Road

| Facility <br> Number | Cateogryl <br> 23 CFR 772 Noise <br> Abatement Level <br> (Leq dBA) | Traffic Noise Source | Existing |  | No Build |  | Build |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Estimated Leq dBA | Noise Impact (Yes, No) | Esitmated Leq dBA | $\begin{gathered} \text { Noise } \\ \text { Impact } \\ \text { (Yes, No) } \end{gathered}$ | Estimated Leq dBA | Noise Impact (Yes, No) |
| 30 | Commercial/72 | Existing \& Proposed MS 57 | 54.6 | No | 57.2 | No | 60.5 | No |
| 31 | Commercial/72 | Existing \& Proposed MS 57 | 57.0 | No | 59.6 | No | 60.6 | No |
| 32 | Commercial/72 | Existing MS 57 | 57.8 | No | 60.4 | No | 54.6 | No |
| 33 | Commercial/72 | Existing MS 57 | 58.3 | No | 60.9 | No | 55.3 | No |
| 34 | Commercial/72 | Existing \& Proposed MS 57 | 55.7 | No | 58.3 | No | 61.4 | No |
| 35 | Commercial/72 | Existing \& Proposed MS 57 | 55.2 | No | 57.9 | No | 62.4 | No |
| 36 | Residential/67 | Existing MS 57 | 58.5 | No | 61.1 | No | 56.9 | No |
| 37* | Church/67 | Existing MS 57 | 58.2 | No | 60.9 | No | 57.6 | No |
| 43 | Commercial/72 | Existing MS 57 | 56.1 | No | 58.7 | No | 54.9 | No |
| 44 | Commercial/72 | Existing MS 57 | 56.5 | No | 59.2 | No | 54.8 | No |
| 45 | Commercial/72 | Existing MS 57 | 56.2 | No | 58.9 | No | 55.0 | No |
| 46 | Commercial/72 | Existing MS 57 | 59.7 | No | 62.3 | No | 57.8 | No |
| 47 | Commercial/72 | Existing MS 57 | 56.2 | No | 58.8 | No | 54.4 | No |
| 48 | Commercial/72 | Existing MS 57 | 56.0 | No | 58.6 | No | 54.1 | No |
| 49 | Commercial/72 | Existing MS 57 | 56.8 | No | 59.5 | No | 54.9 | No |
| 50 | Commercial/72 | Existing MS 57 | 55.6 | No | 58.2 | No | 53.6 | No |
| 51 | Commercial/72 | Existing MS 57 | 55.2 | No. | 57.9 | No | 53.3 | No |
| 52 | Commercial/72 | Existing MS 57 | 56.8 | No | 59.4 | No | 54.8 | No |
| 53 | Commercial/72 | Existing MS 57 | 55.1 | No | 57.8 | No | 53.2 | No |
| 54 | Commercial/72 | Existing MS 57 | 55.6 | No | 58.3 | No | 53.7 | No. |
| 55 | Residential/67 | Existing MS 57 | 52.7 | No | 55.4 | No | 50.9 | No |
| 56 | Residential/67 | Existing MS 57 | 52.2 | No | 54.9 | No | 50.4 | No |
| 57 | Commercial/72 | Existing MS 57 | 61.5 | No | 64.1 | No | 59.4 | No |
| 58 | Commercial/72 | Existing MS 57 | 62.6 | No | 65.2 | No | 60.5 | No |
| 59 | Residentia/67 | Existing MS 57 | 55.4 | No | 58.1 | No | 53.4 | No. |

Table 1c
Alternative D Exterior Noise Levels MS 57 from I-10 to Plantation Road

| Facility Number | Cateogry/ <br> 23 CFR 772 Noise <br> Abatement Level (Leq dBA) | Traffic Noise Source | Existing |  | No Build |  | Build |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Estimated Leq dBA | $\begin{gathered} \text { Noise } \\ \text { Impact } \\ \text { (Yes, No) } \end{gathered}$ | Esitmated <br> Leq dBA | $\begin{gathered} \text { Noise } \\ \text { Impact } \\ \text { (Yes, No) } \end{gathered}$ | Estimated Leq dBA | Noise Impact (Yes, No) |
| 60 | Residential/67 | Existing MS 57 | 56.1 | No | 58.8 | No | 54.1 | No |
| 61 | Commercial/72 | Existing MS 57 | 56.0 | No | 58.7 | No | 54.0 | No |
| 62 | Commercial/72 | Existing MS 57 | 61.6 | No | 64.3 | No | 59.5 | No |
| 63 | Commercial/72 | Existing MS 57 | 61.0 | No | 63.6 | No | 58.9 | No |
| 64 | Commercial/72 | Existing MS 57 | 59.0 | No | 61.7 | No | 56.9 | No |
| 65 | Church/67 | Existing MS 57 | 54.5 | No | 57.2 | No | 52.5 | No |
| 66 | Commercial/72 | Existing MS 57 | 59.2 | No | 61.8 | No | 57.1 | No |
| 67 | Commercial/72 | Existing MS 57 | 57.8 | No | 60.4 | No | 55.7 | No |
| 68 | School/67 | Existing MS 57 | 56.9 | No | 59.6 | No | 54.9 | No |
| 69 | Commercial/72 | Existing MS 57 | 55.7 | No | 58.4 | No | 53.7 | No |
| 70 | Commercial/72 | Existing MS 57 | 55.0 | No | 57.7 | No | 53.0 | No |
| 71* | Commercial/72 | Existing MS 57 | 58.4 | No | 61.0 | No | 56.3 | No |
| 73* | Commercial/72 | Existing MS 57 | 55.0 | No | 57.7 | No | 52.3 | No |
| 75 | Commercial/72 | Existing MS 57 | 52.0 | No | 54.6 | No | 55.5 | No |
| 76 | Residentia//67 | Existing MS 57 | 53.1 | No | 55.7 | No | 53.5 | No |
| 77 | Residential/67 | Existing MS 57 | 49.3 | No | 51.9 | No | 49.8 | No |
| 78 | Residential/67 | Existing MS 57 | 50.0 | No | 52.7 | No | 50.4 | No |
| 79 | Residential/67 | Existing MS 57 | 53.2 | No | 56.0 | No | 53.5 | No |
| 80 | Residential/67 | Existing MS 57 | 53.4 | No | 56.2 | No | 53.5 | No |
| 81 | Residential/67 | Existing MS 57 | 48.8 | No | 51.8 | No | 49.0 | No |
| 82 | School/67 | Existing MS 57 | 48.8 | No | 52.0 | No | 48.9 | No |
| 83 | Residential/67 | Existing MS 57 | 50.2 | No | 53.4 | No | 50.3 | No |
| 84 | Residential/67 | Existing MS 57 | 49.1 | No | 52.2 | No | 49.2 | No |
| 85 | Commercial/72 | Existing MS 57 | 52.2 | No | 55.4 | No | 52.1 | No |
| 86 | Residential/67 | Existing MS 57 | 54.4 | No | 57.4 | No | 54.3 | No |

Table 1c
Alternative D Exterior Noise Levels
MS 57 from I-10 to Plantation Road

| Facility Number | Cateogry/ <br> 23 CFR 772 Noise <br> Abatement Level (Leq dBA) | Traffic Noise Source | Existing |  | No Build |  | Build |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Estimated Leq dBA | $\begin{gathered} \text { Noise } \\ \text { Impact } \\ \text { (Yes, No) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Esitmated Leq dBA | $\begin{gathered} \text { Noise } \\ \text { Impact } \\ \text { (Yes, No) } \end{gathered}$ | Estimated Leq dBA | Noise Impact (Yes, No) |
| 87 | Residential/67 | Existing MS 57 | 54.8 | No | 57.5 | No | 54.8 | No |
| 88 | Residential/67 | Existing MS 57 | 56.1 | No | 58.8 | No | 56.1 | No |
| 89 | Residential/67 | Existing MS 57 | 56.4 | No | 59.1 | No | 56.3 | No |
| 90 | Residential/67 | Existing MS 57 | 51.7 | No | 54.4 | No | 51.7 | No |
| 91 | Residential/67 | Existing MS 57 | 54.8 | No | 57.5 | No | 54.7 | No |
| 92 | Residential/67 | Existing MS 57 | 50.0 | No | 52.6 | No | 50.1 | No |
| 93 | Residential/67 | Existing MS 57 | 49.4 | No | 52.1 | No | 49.5 | No |
| 94 | Residential/67 | Existing MS 57 | 51.5 | No | 54.2 | No | 51.6 | No |
| 95 | Residential/67 | Existing MS 57 | 47.4 | No | 50.1 | No | 47.6 | No |
| 96 | Residential/67 | Existing MS 57 | 43.6 | No | 46.3 | No | 47.2 | No |
| 97* | Residential/67 | Existing MS 57 | 50.0 | No | 52.6 | No | 52.9 | No |
| 99 | Residential/67 | Existing MS 57 | 47.6 | No | 50.3 | No | 50.6 | No |
| 100 | Residential/67 | Existing MS 57 | 50.4 | No | 53.0 | No | 54.1 | No |
| $101^{*}$ | Residential/67 | Proposed MS 57 | 51.3 | No | 54.0 | No | 58.0 | No |
| 105 | Residential/67 | Proposed MS 57 | 45.1 | No | 47.8 | No | 48.6 | No |
| 106 | Residentia//67 | Proposed MS 57 | 41.3 | No | 44.0 | No | 44.8 | No |
| 107 | Residential/67 | Proposed MS 57 | 46.3 | No | 49.0 | No | 49.3 | No |
| 108 | Commercial/72 | Proposed MS 57 | 44.6 | No | 47.3 | No | 47.8 | No |
| 109 | Residential/67 | Proposed MS 57 | 47.3 | No | 50.0 | No | 50.3 | No |
| 110 | Residential/67 | Proposed MS 57 | 40.7 | No | 43.4 | No | 44.0 | No |
| 111 | Residential/67 | Proposed MS 57 | 48.7 | No | 51.4 | No | 51.7 | No |
| 112 | Residential/67 | Proposed MS 57 | 43.3 | No | 45.9 | No | 46.3 | No |
| 113 | Residential/67 | Proposed MS 57 | 45.3 | No | 48.0 | No | 48.3 | No |
| 114 | Residential/67 | Proposed MS 57 | 46.7 | No | 49.4 | No | 52.0 | No. |
| 115 | Residential/67 | Proposed MS 57 | 56.1 | No | 58.6 | No | 56.1 | No |

Iable 1c
Alternative D Exterior Noise L.evels MS 57 from 1-10 to Plantation Road

| Facility Number | CateogryI <br> 23 CFR 772 Noise Abatement Level (Leq dBA). | Traffic Noise Source | Existing |  | No Build |  | Build |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Estimated Leq dBA | Noise Impact (Yes; No) | Esitmated Leq dBA | $\begin{gathered} \text { Noise } \\ \text { Impact } \\ \text { (Yes, No) } \end{gathered}$ | Estimated Leq dBA | $\begin{gathered} \text { Noise } \\ \text { Impact } \\ \text { (Yes, No) } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| 116 | Residential/67 | Existing \& Proposed MS 57 | 44.3 | No | 47.0 | No | 61.2 | Yes |
| 117 | Residential/67 | Proposed MS 57 | 37.5 | No. | 40.2 | No | 63.2 | Yes |
| 118 | Residential/67 | Proposed MS 57 | 36.6 | No | 39.4 | No | 63.2 | Yes |
| 119 | Residential/67 | Proposed MS 57 | 33.9 | No | 36.7 | No | 58.2 | Yes |
| 120 | Residential/67 | Proposed MS 57 | 34.8 | No | 37.6 | No | 56.7 | Yes |
| 121 | Residentia1/67 | Proposed MS 57 | 36.6 | No | 37.5 | No | 58.6 | Yes |
| 122 | Commercia//72 | Proposed MS 57 | 33.4 | No | 36.2 | No | 57.3 | Yes |

* Receptors $12,13,15,16,38,39,40,41,42,72,74,99$ 102, 103, and 104 removed due to right-of-way acquisition

Table 3
Locations Warranting Noise Abatement Consideration MS 57 from I-10 to Plantation Road

| Site Number and Location | Effectiveness and Cost Data |  |  |  | Barrier Data |  | Evaluation Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Receptors Impacted | Receptors Protected | Iotal Cost | Cost per <br> Receptor | Lenth | Height |  |
| Alternative C |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| R117 | 1 | 0 | n/a | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | n/a | n/a | Min insertion loss can not be achieved because a barrier shoud reduce the noise level by at least 5 dBA at 4 or more residences that are expected to receive an impact. |
| R118-119 | 2 | 0 | $n / a$ | n/a | n/a | n/a | Min insertion loss can not be achieved because a barrier shoud reduce the noise level by at least 5 dBA at 4 or more residences that are expected to receivc an impact. |
| R120, 127 | 2 | 0 | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | Min insertion loss can not be achieved because a bartier shoud reduce the noise level by at least 5 dBA at 4 or more residences that are expected to receive an impact. |
| R121, 125, 126 | 3 | 0 | n/a | $n / a$ | n/a | n/a | Min insertion loss can not be achieved because a barrier shoud reduce the noise level by at least 5 dBA at 4 or more residences that are expected to receive an impact. |
| R122 | 1 | 0 | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | Min insertion loss can not be achieved because a barrier shoud rednce the noise level by at least 5 dBA at 4 or more residences that are expected to receive an impact. |

Table 3
L.acations Warranting Noise Abatement Consideration MS 57 from 1-10 to Plantation Road

| Site Number and Location | Effectiveness and Cost Data |  |  |  | Barrier Data |  | Evaluation Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Receptors <br> Impacted | Receptors Protected | Iotal Cosi | Cost per <br> Receptor | Lentb | Height |  |
| R123 | 1 | 0 | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | Min insertion loss can not be achieved because a barrier shoud reduce the noise level by at least 5 dBA at 4 or more residences that are expected to receive an impact. |
| R124 | 1 | 0 | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | Min insertion loss can not be achieved because a barrier shoud reduce the noise level by at least 5 dBA at 4 or more residences that are expected to receive an impact. |
| Alternative D |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| R14 | 1 | 0 | n/a | $\mathrm{n} / \mathrm{a}$ | n/a | n/a | Min insertion loss can not be achieved because a barrier shoud reduce the noise level by at least 5 dBA at 4 or more residences that are expected to receive an impact. |
| R26-27 | 2 | 0 | n/a | n/2 | n/a | n/a | Min insertion loss can not be achieved because a barrier shoud reduce the noise level by at least 5 dBA at 4 or more residences that are expected to receive an impact. |
| R116 | 1 | 0 | n/a | $n / a$ | n/a | n/a | Min insertion loss can not be achieved because a barrier shoud reduce the noise level by at least 5 dBA at 4 or more residences that are expected to receive an impact. |

Table 3
Locations Warranting Noise Abatement Consideration MS 57 from I-10 to Plantation Road

| Site Number and Location | Effectiveness and Cost Data |  |  |  | Barrier Data |  | Evaluation Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Receptors Impacted | Receptors Protected | Iotal Cost | Cost per <br> Receptor | Lenth | Height |  |
| R117 | 1 | 0 | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | Min insertion loss can not be achieved because a barrier shoud reduce the noise level by at least 5 dBA at 4 ot more residences that are expected to receive an impact. |
| R118 | 1 | 0 | n/a | n/a | r/a | n/a | Min insertion loss can not be achieved because a barrier shoud reduce the noise level by at least 5 dBA at 4 or more residences that are expected to receive an impact. |
| R119 | 1 | 0 | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | Min insertion loss can not be achieved because a barrier shoud reduce the noise level by at least 5 IBA at 4 or more residences that are expected to receive an impact. |
| R120 | 1 | 0 | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | Min insertion loss can not be achieved because a barrier shoud reduce the noise level by at least 5 dBA at 4 or more residences that are expected to receive an impact. |
| R121 | 1 | 0 | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | Min insertion loss can not be achieved because a barrier shoud reduce the noise level by at least 5 dBA at 4 or more residences that are expected to receive an impact. |

Table 3
L.ocations Warranting Noise Abatement Consideration MS 57 from l-10 to Plantation Road

| Site Number and Location | Effectiveness and Cost Data |  |  |  | Barrier Data |  | Evaluation Comments |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Receptors <br> Impacted | Receptors Protected | Iotal Cost | Cost per <br> Receptor: | Lenth | Height |  |
| R122 | 1 | 0 | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | Min insertion loss can not be achieved because a banrier shoud reduce the noise level by at least 5 dBA at 4 or more residences that are expected to receive an impact. |

# APPENDIX EXHIBIT I 

SUMMARY OF PUBLIC HEARING

# SUMMARY OF PUBLIC HEARING 

# STATE ROUTE 57 

Interstate 10 to Vancleave Jackson County

June 20, 2005

Vancleave Public Library Vancleave, Mississippi

## Summary of Public Hearing

On June 20, 2005, the Mississippi Department of Transportation (MDOI) in conjunction with the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) held an open forum public hearing to discuss the proposed reconstruction of State Route 57 from Interstate 10 to Vancleave. The hearing took place from 4:00-7:00 p.m. at the Vancleave Public Library, 12604 Highway 57 Vancleave, Miss.

Citizens were welcomed to come and view proposed alternatives and to speak to MDOT representatives concerning preliminary design, right-of-way acquisition and environmental issues They were also encouraged to make witten or verbal comments that became a part of the hearings permanent record. Public participation was solicited through legal notices, display ads, a message board and newspaper articles.

SR 57 Public Hearing

| Total Attendance | 263 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Staff | 18 |
| Registered Attendees | 245 |

Based on input received from the public hearing, the proposed reconstruction of SR 57 is needed and acceptable. A total of 43 written comments were received in response to the information presented during the hearing Twenty-one of those comments expressed a preference for Alternative C, which provides for constructing two lanes 88 feet west of the existing route beginning at I-10 to the south side of Vancleave. The project would consist of an interchange at Vancleave-Gautier Road followed by four-lane construction that would continue from the new interchange on new location west of Vancleave. The new alignment would cross Humphrey Road approximately 0.1 mile west of the existing SR 57. A second interchange will be constructed approximately 0.5 mile from Humphrey Road at Iwin Magnolia Lane followed by a third interchange at Jim Ramsey Road on the new alignment which is approximately one mile from the existing alignment The new alignment will rejoin the existing SR 57 near Mariposa Lane.

Alternative B also involves constructing two lanes 88 feet west of existing SR 57 from I-10 to the south side of Vancleave. However, the existing lanes would be widened to five lanes from that point to the north side of Vancleave. Seven written comments from registered attendees support Alternative B citing that it was believed to be a more a cost effective method to improve SR 57

Alternative D involves constructing two lanes 88 feet west of existing SR 57 from I-10 to Quave Road and reconstructing existing lanes to current design standards. Four lanes will be constructed on new location North of Quave Road to the east of SR 57. Interchanges will be constructed at Vancleave-Gautier Road, Twin Magnolia Lane and in the vicinity of Seaman and Jim Ramsey Road The new alignment will be approximately one mile west of the existing alignment and will rejoin the existing alignment near Mariposa Lane Six individuals showed interest in Alternative D according to the written comments

The No Build Alternative provides no improvements to the existing location and one written comment support this option. Preliminary studies also indicate the need for a capacity increase could not be developed with routine maintenance alone and it is evident that many in attendance are supportive of making some improvements to address safety issues.

Although undecided on a specific alternative, three of the comments did indicate support for improving SR 57 using improvements other than those presented at the hearing. The remaining written comment expressed disappointment in all concepts.

In addition to the written information received by MDOT, a certified court reporter was available to record verbal input. Nine individuals took part in this process, but it should also be known that one of the participants' comments duplicated a written comment that was submitted
by the same individual. As a result, three participants supported Alternative $C$ while the others provided recommendations for adjustments in the proposed project such as adding bike trails and moving natural gas lines across the road. There was one verbal comment who supporting all three build alternatives.

Prior to the public hearing, a letter was drafted and addressed to the Southern District Transportation Commissioner indicating opposition to the proposed project. This letter was copied and signed by seven individuals who were all residents of Vancleave. Among the listed concerns with proposal was a possible stunt in the growth and development of Vancleave should a bypass altemative be constructed.

## Conclusion

As a result of public participation, the purpose and need for improving SR 57 to a four-lane roadway has garnered more support in comparison to utilizing the existing two-lane facility for future traffic needs. However, all concerns and recommendations that were provided during and following the public hearing will be addressed through environmental documentation.


Larry L. "Butch" Brown Executive Director

## Harry Lee James

Deputy Executive Director/ Chief Engineer

Brenda Znachko
Deputy Executive Director/ Administration

## TO: DISTRICT ENGINEER (6)

Ricky Lee
FROM: ENVIRONMENTAL DIVISION ENGINEER E. CLAIBORNE BARNWELL

Re: $\quad$ State Route 57 from I-10 to Vancleave Jackson County
pc: Federal Highway Administration w/att.
Project Office ( $16-11$ ) w/att.
Civil Rights Division w/att.
Roadway Design Division w/att
Planning Division w/att.
Bridge Division w/att/
Right of Way Division w/att
Construction Division w/att.
Central Records w/att
External Affairs w/att
We are enclosing a copy of the Environmental Assessment and Legal Notice for an open forum public hearing.

The Public Hearing will be held from 4:00 to 7:00 p.m. Monday, June 20, 2005 at the Vancleave Public Library, 12604 Highway 57, Vancleave, Miss.

Please make this information available for public inspection until July 5, 2005, the deadline for receiving witten comments.

William R. "Bill" Minor Nörthern District Commissioner

Dick Hall
Central District Commissioner
Wayne H. Brown
Jouthern District Commissioner


Larry L. "Butch" Brown Executive Director

Harry Lee James
Deputy Executive Director/ Chief Engineer

Brenda Znachko
Deputy Executive Director/ Administration

June 3, 2005

Jackson County Board of Supervisors
P.O Box 998

3104 Magnolia Street
Pascagoula, MS 39568
Dear Sir/Madam:
We are enclosing a copy of the Environmental Assessment and Legal Notice for an open forum public hearing.

The Public Hearing will be held from 4:00 to 7:00 p.m. Monday, June 20, 2005 at the Vancleave Public Library, 12604 Highway 57, Vancleave, Miss.

Please make this information available for public inspection until July 5, 2005, the deadline for receiving written comments.

Sincerely,


## E. Claiborne Barnwell <br> Environmental Division Engineer

ECB/SVD
Enclosures

June 3, 2005

Vancleave Public Library
12604 Highway 57
Ocean Springs, MS 39565
Dear Sir/Madam:
We are enclosing a copy of the Environmental Assessment and Legal Notice for an open forum public hearing

The Public Hearing will be held from 4:00 to 7:00 p.m. Monday, June 20, 2005 at the Vancleave Public Library, 12604 Highway 57, Vancleave, Miss..

Please make this information available for public inspection until July 5, 2005, the deadline for receiving written comments.

Sincerely,


E. Claiborne Barnwell<br>Environmental Division Engineer

ECB/SVD
Enclosures

June 3, 2005

Jackson County Chancery Clerk
P.O Box 998

3104 Magnolia Street
Pascagoula, MS 39568
Dear Sir/Madam:
We are enclosing a copy of the Environmental Assessment and Legal Notice for an open forum public hearing.

The Public Hearing will be held from 4:00 to 7:00 pm. Monday, June 20, 2005 at the Vancleave Public Library, 12604 Highway 57, Vancleave, Miss.

Please make this information available for public inspection until July 5, 2005, the deadline for receiving written comments.

Sincerely,

E. Claiborne Barnwell

Environmental Division Engineer

ECB/SVD
Enclosures

## LEGAL NOTICE FOR OPEN PUBLIC HEARING SIATE ROUTE 57 FROM I-10 to VANCLEAVE JACKSON COUNTY

The Mississippi Department of Transportation (MDOI) has scheduled an open forum public hearing to discuss the proposed widening of State Route 57 from Interstate 10 to Vancleave. The hearing will be held from $4-7 \mathrm{pm}$. on Monday, June 20, 2005 at the Vancleave Public Library, 12604 Highway 57, Vancleave, MS

Citizens are invited to come and go as they please during the hours of the hearings to view the department's alternatives and to speak to MDOT representatives concerning design, right-of-way acquisition, and environmental issues. Although there will be no provisions made for formal presentations by individuals or groups, citizens are encouraged to make written and/or taped comments that will become part of the hearing's permanent record.

The Draft Environmental Assessment document will be available for public inspection at the Mississippi Department of Transportation Administrative Office Building, Environmental/Location Division, 401 Northwest Street, Jackson, MS; the MDOT Sixth District Office, Hattiesburg, MS; the MDOT Sixth District Project Office, Ocean Springs, MS; the Jackson County Board of Supervisors, Pascagoula, MS; the Jackson County Chancery Clerk's Office, Pascagoula, MS; the Vancleave Public Library, Vancleave, MS; and the Federal Highway Administration, 666 North Street, Suite 105, Jackson, MS

Any individual who needs auxiliary aids or special accommodations to attend the hearing should call the MDOT Environmental Division at (601) 359-7920.

E. Claibome Barnwell<br>Environmental Division Engineer<br>Miss. Dept. of Transportation

## THE MISSISSIPPI PRESS

ACCOUNTNO 3597001 MIS PERIOD END 06/13/05

NAME MISS, DEFARTMEMT REP. 3597

```
NTSS, DRPARTMIENE OP TRANGPORTA
P.O. BOZ 1850
JACRSON, HS 39275-1850
```



TERMS: Due on Receipt

## Covering The Coast



Advertising Department

# AFFIDAVIT <br> Proof of Publication 

DATE: $\qquad$ $6.17-2025$
 correctly in The Sun Herald as follows


## STATE OF MISSISSIPPI

Harrison County
Gulfport, Mississippi

I hereby certify that the above said advertisements) was published in
The Sun Herald. Please accept this affidavit as proof of publication for your records.



## 

## Open Forum

 PUBLIC HEARING
# WIDENING OF STATE ROUTE 57 FROM T-10 TO VANCLEAVE 

The Mississippi Department of Transportation hás schedúled an open forum public hearing to discuss proposed plans to widen State Route 57 from Interstate 10 to Vancleave: The hearing will take place Monday, $\mathrm{June} 20,2005$ from 47 p . . at the Vandeave Public Library, 12604 Highway 57 , Vancleave, Miss:
Citizens are invited to a come and go as they please during the hours of the hearing to view the department's alternatives and speak to MDOT representatives concerning design, fight-of way and environmental issues. Although there will be Do provisions made for formal presentations by individuals or groups, citizens are nvited and encouraged to make witten and/or taped comments that will become part of the hearing's permanent record.

## THEPUBLCIS ENCOURAGED TO. ATMEND <br> Monday, June 20,2005 4:00 PM $-7: 00$ PM Vancleave Public Library <br> 12604 Vancleave, MS 39565
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## Statement

## Dcean Springs Recorid



ACCT: 78495
MS DEPT.. OF TRANSPORTAITION
ENVIRONMENIAL DIVISION (87-01)
PO BOX 1850
JACKSON MS 39215



Account balances not paid by the due date are subject to a $1.5 \%$ monthly ( $18 \%$ annual) service charge


Teddy Bear Workshop recently marked its opening with a ribbon cutting. Participating in the event were, from left, chamber ambassadors Jude Martin and Cindy Ricketts, Mayor Seren Ainsworth, employee Emily Mountjoy, owner Shelly Robinson, and chamber ambassadors Dave Philo, Dawn Gibson and Jill DeBerry. Teddy Bear Workshop is located at 704 Church St. in Ocean Springs. The workshop is open Monday through Saturday from 10 a.m. to $6 \mathrm{p} . \mathrm{m}$


THE MISSISSIPPI PRESS

Remit to:
PO. Box 390 Mobile, AL. 36601-0390

Tel 228-762-1111
Advertising Fax 228-934-1454 Accounting Fax 251-219-5456





PLEASE DETACH AND RETURN UPPER PORTION WITH YOUR REMITTANCE

;TATEMENT OF ACCOUNT aging of past due amounts



| Words of thanks are inadequate for the love and care given by our church family at Bethel Assembly of God (Pastor Joe \& Donna Spence) and our sister churches, New Horizon Ministries (Pastor Don \& Geraldine Edeker) and Church On The Rock (Pastor Roger \& Stacy Bradley). <br> "We continually remember before our God and Father your work produced by faith, your labor prompted by love and your endurance inspired by hope in our' Lord Jesus Christ. " I Thessalonians 1:3. <br> Steve Parker \& Family |
| :---: |



# State Route 57 From I-10 to North of Vancleave Proposed Road and Safety Improvements 

## Open Forum Public Hearing

Monday, June 20, 2005 • 4 p.m. - 7:00 p.m. Vancleave Public Library 12604 Hwy 57 ,Vancleave, MS



## Welcome

The Mississippi Department of Transportation (MDOT) and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) welcome you to this public hearing. We are here to provide an opportunity for the public to view photography and voice opinions and/or concerns relating to the proposed reconstruction of of State Route 57 in Jackson County

Public hearings benefit citizens as well as MDOT. They allow for an exchange of opinions, ideas, information and suggestions before a final plan is made for a highway design or its construction. The hearing also gives MDOT and FHWA personnel the opportunity to share information about the project and to hear citizens' comments, which are often helpful in determining the project's final design.

## Your Comments are Important

All who attend this hearing are encouraged to voice their opinions by visiting the table marked "Comments" and completing a Comment Sheet. Your comments can be mailed to MDOT Environmental Division, P.O. Box 1850, Jackson, Mississippi 39215, or sent by email to environmental_comments@mdot state..ms us.
This study is ongoing and your continued involvement and suggestions will be most appreciated It is anticipated that the study on this proposed project will be completed in the upcoming year.

## Project Description and Need

In order to improve safety and mobility for the traveling public and to prepare for future anticipated needs, MDOT is proposing a project to widen and improve approximately 9 miles of State Route 57 between the interchange at Interstate 10 and Plantation Road.
Traffic studies indicate that there will be sufficient traffic demand to warrant improvements to the existing highway. The proposed project will also address traffic needs on surrounding routes depending on the constraints provided by the public and required design safety standards
Preliminary reviews of the existing facilities indicate inadequate future capacity and insufficient shoulder width. To overcome these and other deficiencies, MDOT proposes to construct additional lanes, construct interchanges, and increase shoulder widths to accommodate commuting and local traffic

[^3]Registration Sign-in Sheet
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# PROJECT BEING CONSIDERED <br> <br> State Route 57 Vancleave 

 <br> <br> State Route 57 Vancleave}

## Public Hearing COMMENT SHEET

June 20, 2005 Vancleave, MS

| PROJECT BEING CONSIDERED |
| :--- |
| State Route 57 Vancleave |
| Project number: SP-STP-0066-01(001) |
| Environmental Division FAX Number: 601-359-7355 |
| E-mail: environmental_comments@mdot.state.ms.us |
| www goMDOT.com |

Telephone $\qquad$
Address $\qquad$
City $\qquad$ State $\qquad$ Zip $\qquad$

What are the major issues?

| $\square$ Relocations | $\square$ Noise |
| :--- | :--- |
| $\square$ Wetlands | $\square$ Safety |
| $\square$ Wildlife | $\square$ Social |
| $\square$ Traffic Volume | $\square$ Economics |
| $\square$ Other- |  |

- Other $\qquad$ -

MDOT is interested in your comments about the proposed project. Please indicate:
The alternative you like best and why: $\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
Issues and/or concerns about the project: $\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
Recommendations for the project: $\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$
$\qquad$

# APPENDIX EXHIBIT J 

## Letter from Jackson County Board of Supervisors

# BOARD OF SUPERVISORS JACKSON COUNTY, MISSISSIPPI POST OFFICE BOX 998 

The Honorable Wayne Brown

State of Mississippi Highway Commissioner
Southern District (2)
Post Office Box 551
Hattiesburg, Mississippi 39403-0551
Dear Commissioner Brown:
On behalf of the Jackson County Board of Supervisors, I am partitioning the Department of Transportation (MDOT) to consider the following change to the Mississippi Highway 57 widening project

We're asking MDOT to add a service road on the west side of the new Highway 57, from the interchange at Gautier/Vancleave road to the interchange just north of Humphrey Road. This would allow reasonable access to the Humphrey Road area from north and south bound traffic on Highway 57. It would also allow property owners west of the new Highway 57 to continue to have access to this property

Sincerely,


Manly Barton, President
Jackson County Board of Supervisors
cd

Phone 228-769-3403 • Fax 228 769-3475 • e-mail manly_barton@co jackson ms us

2010 Re-evaluation

Melinda L. McGrath
Deputy Executive Director?
Chief Engineer
Brenda Znachko
Depury Executive Director/
Administration


Larry L. "Butch" Brown
Executive Director

Steven K. Edwards
Director Office of Intermodal Planning

## Willie Huff

Director

```
P. O. Bax 1850 (Jackson, Missssippi 39215-1850 /Telephone (601) 359-7001 / FAX (601) 359-7110 / GoMDOTinat
```


# 20 <br> December $\$ 7,2010$ 

Mr. Andrew H. Hughes
Division Administrator
Federal Highway Administration
666 North Street, Suite 105
Jackson, MS 39202
RE: Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) Re-Evaluation
Project No. SP-STP-0066-01(008)
SR 57 from I-10 to North of Vancleave Jackson County

Dear Mr. Hughes:
Enclosed are three copies of a request for approval of a re-evaluation for the 'Finding of No Significant Impact' (FONSI), issued September 26, 2005, for the Environmental Assessment on the captioned project. There have been no changes to the original proposed project that would alter the value of the original assessment.

Your earliest return of two (2) executed copies to this office for distribution will be appreciated.

With best regards,


Environmental Division Administrator

Cc: Kelly Castleberry, P.E., District Engineer, District 6

# Re-evaluation of "Finding of No Significant Impact" (FONSI) Project No. SP-STP-0066-01(008) / 103060 <br> <br> SR 57, From I-10 to Vancleave, <br> <br> SR 57, From I-10 to Vancleave, Jackson County 

 Jackson County}

The anticipated social, economic, and environmental impacts were evaluated as a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) under Project Number SP-STP-0066-01(008) / 103060, Jackson County, and MDOT received approval from FHWA on September 25, 2005.

In compliance with FHWA Policy, we have reviewed the environmental document to determine if there have been any unforeseen changes in the project, its surroundings, and impacts that would result in a significant environmental impact. We have concluded that there are no additional modifications that would result in a significant impact to the environment. This reevaluation is to comply with the period in excess of three years that has expired.

If you have any questions or require additional information, please contact the Rhea Vincent at telephone number (601) 359-7920.


Environmental Division Administrator, MDOT

Approved by:


Division Administrator, FHWA

Final Environmental Assessment Finding Of No Significant Impacts

For Alternative "C"

State Route 57 from Interstate 10 to Vancleave Jackson County

> Project Number - SP-STP-0066-01(008)
> FMS - $103060 / 301000$


## MDOT Commitments to Environmental Excellence



All practical and standard procedures and measures, including Best Management practices will be implemented to avoid or minimize impacts.

[^4]
## MDOT Commitments to Environmental Excellence



All practical and standard procedures and measures, including Best Management practices will be implemented to avoid or minimize impacts.

- Dhese commitments should be carried throughout each phase of the projeet development including Design. Right of Way, Construction, and Maintenance
*Value Enemeerime (VI) Studies are recommended for projects on the NIIS System and/or an Intermodal Connector with an estimated projeet costs approaching \$25 Million


# FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION 

## FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

 FORProject SP-STP-066-1(08), Jackson County, Mississippi
Reconstruct SR 57 from $1-10$ to Vancleave
The Federal Highway Administration has determined that this project's Proposed Action, Alternative C, as described in the project's Environmental Assessment, will have no significant impact on the human or natural environment. This Finding of No Significant Impact is based on the attached Environmental Assessment, which has been independently evaluated by the Federal Highway Administration and determined to adequately and accurately discuss the needs, environmental issues, and impacts of the proposed project and mitigation measures. It provides sufficient evidence and analysis for determining that an Environmental Impact Statement is not required. The Federal Highway Administration takes full responsibility for the accuracy, scope, and content of the attached Environmental Assessment and its attachments.

September 26, 2005 Date

[^5]
# REEVALUATION of FONSI 

State Route 57

From I-10 to Vancleave<br>Jackson County, MS

PROJECT SP-STP-0066-01(008)
FMS 103060

## Purpose and Need:

The purpose and need for this project is to maintain or increase the regional traffic mobility of the facility by adding capacity. This should provide for the maintaining of the acceptable Level of Service (LOS) for the foreseeable future and should serve to reduce traffic congestion of the local highway network, thereby providing a safer driving environment.

## Background:

Mississippi State Route 57 (SR 57) between Interstate 10 (I-10) and Vancleave, MS in Jackson County is a two lane highway facility with an added center turn lane through the town of Vancleave. Existing access to this facility consists of Type 3 - "Regulated Access Control". Current traffic patterns on this facility contribute to congested traffic flow during peak traffic hours which adversely affect regional mobility in the town of Vancleave, a "bedroom community". A traffic study performed in 2000 analyzed these patterns and revealed a significant difference in traffic volume between the section of SR 57 from I-10 to GautierVancleave Road and from Gautier-Vancleave Road through Vancleave. The Average Daily Traffic (ADT) count south of Gautier-Vancleave Road was approximately 6,100 vehicles which provides a LOS rating of "C", or "Acceptable" for this rural section of highway. The ADT count north of Gautier-Vancleave Road was approximately 11,500 vehicles per day which provides an LOS rating of "D", or "Acceptable" for this rural/urban section of highway. However, using normal traffic projections, the study forecasts an increase in the ADT through the year 2020 which corresponds to decreased LOS ratings of "D" and "F" respectively, or "Unacceptable". A subsequent traffic study was performed in 2004 which compared the benefits of improving the existing two-lane/three-lane facility to a five-lane facility versus a four-lane bypass alignment. The study concluded that a four-lane bypass to the west of Vancleave better serves the projected travel demand. The traffic studies can be found in the original FONSI in Appendix A.

## Alternatives

Four alternatives were proposed in the original Environmental Assessment (EA), Alternative A, the "No Build" alternative and three "Build" Alternatives B, C, and D. Alternatives B and D are not being re-evaluated as it was demonstrated in the original EA that they either did not meet the purpose and need or proved to have fewer impacts then the selected Alternative C.

Maps 1, 2, and 3 on the attached pages display Alternative C.

## No Build Alternative:

Alternative A: The No Build Alternative - This alternative maintains the existing traffic along SR 57. Alternative A does not meet the purposes and need; it does not improve capacity or safety. Therefore, Alternative A is not being considered for further study.

Alternative C: The Build Alternative - This proposed alternative evolved through extensive scoping and public involvement. It creates a Type III "Regulated Access Control" roadway between I-10 and the proposed interchange at Gautier-Vancleave Road; a Type I "Full Access Control" roadway from Gautier-Vancleave Road to just north of Jim Ramsey Road; a type IIB "Partial Access Control" roadway from just north of Jim Ramsey Road to the tie with existing SR 57.

Modifications to Alternative C which have taken place since the original FONSI are as follows.
The proposed alignment was shifted to the west between I-10 and Gautier-Vancleave Road. The distance in the shift was between 47 and 52 feet depending on location, based on aerial photography. The cause of the shift was the placement of a large sewer line on the existing eastern right-of-way line. Utilizing the existing north bound lane as proposed in the document would force the existing right-of-way, because of design standards, eastward encompassing the sewer line; this in turn would require the relocation of the sewer line. The shift, based on aerial photography, impacts two homes and between ten and twelve spaces in a privately owned recreational trailer park.

The shift also allowed for a better angle of intersection between the proposed alignment and Gautier-Vancleave Road. This improved angle of intersection allowed for the avoidance of three houses and one barn, all located in what would best be described as the north-east quadrant of the intersection of Gautier-Vancleave Road and SR 57.

The shift of the proposed alignment was highlighted at the public hearing held for this project.
The proposed bridge used to cross Morningside Drive along the proposed alignment was eliminated. The elimination of the bridge forces the alternative to sever all property connections along Morningside Drive. This, in turn, disconnects a significant amount of property for any public access. To compensate for the disconnection, the eastern remaining portion of Morningside Drive was tied to existing SR 57 utilizing a connector road. The approximate length of the proposed eastern tie is 1730 feet. The eastern tie will start approximately 1950 feet north of the existing SR 57 proposed SR 57 intersection. According to aerial photography, there are no relocations impacts. Once the connection is made, full access to all properties will be reestablished.

The proposed standard diamond interchange at Jim Ramsey Road has been replaced with a partial clover interchange. The clover loops are located to the south of Jim Ramsey Road. The configuration was proposed after the northern legs of the proposed diamond interchange were
discovered to be in a flood zone, thus requiring portions of them to be on bridge structure. The new configuration reduces the impact to the flood zone and will reduce wetland impacts.

Finally, the existing Jim Ramsey Road alignment from the proposed alternative of SR 57 to existing SR 57 will not be upgraded. The omission of this action allows building relocation impacts to be reduced by one.

## High Volume Change Soils:

High Volume Change Soils were discovered during the design phase of the project. The locations of the high volume change soils are displayed on maps 4 through 6. Station locations are outlined in an attached letter.

## CONTROL OF ACCESS (From the January 2001 MDOT Roadway Design Manual)

Access control is defined as the condition where the public authority fully or partially controls the right of abutting owners to have access to and from the public highway. The functional classification of a highway is partially determined by the degree of access it allows. Access control may be exercised by statute, zoning, right-of-way purchases, driveway controls, turning and parking regulations or geometric design (e.g., grade separations and frontage roads) The following provides definitions for the basic types of access control:

1. Type 1-Full Control. Full control of access is achieved by providing access only at interchanges with selected public roads. No at-grade crossings or private driveway connections are allowed.
2. Type 2 - Partial Control. Partial control of access is an intermediate level between full control and regulatory restriction. Priority is given to through traffic, but a few at-grade intersections and private driveway connections may be allowed. The two types of partial control of access are:
a. Type 2A. Access to through traffic lanes permitted only at designated exits and entrances. Frontage roads may be provided for abutting property owners.
b. Type 2B. Access to through traffic lanes permitted only at designated exits and entrances.
3. Type 3 - Control by Regulation. All highways warrant some degree of access control. If access points are properly spaced and designed, the adverse effects on highway capacity and safety will be minimized. These points should be located where they can best suit the traffic and land-use characteristics of the highway under design. Their design should enable vehicles to enter and exit safely with a minimum of interference to through traffic. In Type 3, access to traffic lanes is permitted directly from the abutting property. Special permits are required for new access points after construction.

## Impacts:

Land Use: This issue was addressed in previously submitted EA/FONSI. No significant increased impacts are anticipated from the proposed project.

Farmland: This issue was addressed in previously submitted EA/FONSI. No significant increased impacts are anticipated from the proposed project.

Social: This issue was addressed in previously submitted EA/FONSI. No significant increased impacts are anticipated from the proposed project.

Economic: This issue was addressed in previously submitted EA/FONSI. No significant increased impacts are anticipated from the proposed project.

Relocations: This issue was addressed in previously submitted EA/FONSI.
MDOT's Parcel Tracking System and a review of the Right-of-Way (ROW) Appraisal Maps were employed to update the Social and Economic Impact Study.

ROW Division has completed Maps and Deeds for the above project. Further ROW activities are pending full authorization. The ROW project is in two phases, Phase 1 from I-10 to Humphreys Road and Phase 2 from Humphrey Road to SR 57 N of Vancleave. Recent cost estimates for both sections have been completed by ROW Division including relocation assistance impacts. ROW impacts for the termini concerning the reevaluation, SR 57 from I-10 to SR 57 North of Vancleave are as follows:

| Impacts |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: | :---: |
| Total Parcels: |  |  |  |
| Displacements: |  | 193 |  |
|  | Residential | 44 |  |
|  | Businesses | 7 |  |
|  | Miscellaneous <br> Personal Property | 16 |  |
| Total Displacements |  | 9 |  |
| Contaminated <br> Sties |  | 97 |  |
|  |  |  |  |

See attachment for breakdown.
During the design phase of the project, it was discovered that there exists high volume change soils within the projected boundary of alternative $C$ alignment. The existence of high volume change soils will require, based on current design guidelines, the reduction of side slope angles
and the expansion of right-of-way. At those locations, increased impacts are anticipated. From aerial photography displayed in maps 4 through 6 , it is anticipated that up to 6 houses will be impacted due to high volume soils.

Environmental Justice: This issue was addressed in previously submitted EA/FONSI. No significant increased impacts are anticipated from the proposed project.

Pedestrian and Bike: This issue was addressed in previously submitted EA/FONSI No significant increased impacts are anticipated from the proposed project.

Air Quality: This issue was addressed in previously submitted EA/FONSI. No significant increased impacts are anticipated from the proposed project.

Noise: A detailed noise study for the proposed project was conducted on the alternative outlined in this document. This noise study predicts the effects of the proposed project, locates areas within the project area where noise impacts may occur, determines if noise abatement measures are required based on impacts, and satisfies the requirements of 23 CFR, Part 772.

There are no practical noise abatement measures which will eliminate or reduce the noise impact at the occupied facilities which are expected to receive noise impact for the following reasons:
(a) The occupied facilities that are expected to receive noise impact are located along sections of the proposed project that will not have any limit on the number of points of ingress or egress except through the exercise of control over the placement and the geometrics of connections as necessary for the safety of the traveling public. This means that noise barriers cannot be used since noise barriers would require limiting the points of ingress or egress.
(b) The alignment of the proposed highway in the vicinity of the occupied facilities which are expected to receive noise impact is determined by the alignment of the existing highway; therefore, changes in alignment cannot be used to reduce the noise levels.
(c) There are no feasible traffic control measures which will reduce the expected noise levels at the occupied facilities which are expected to receive noise impact.

Water Quality: Each individual contractor involved with the proposed project would comply with water quality standards. The MDOT's Standards and Plans contain provisions for preventing and abating pollution of streams and water bodies. The Mississippi Department of Environmental Quality-Office of Pollution Control (MDEQ-OPC), recognize MDOT's Standards and Plans as reflective of best management practices.

Permits: The United States Army Corps of Engineers, under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act of 1977, requires a permit to place fill in the waters of the United States, including wetlands. All required permits would be obtained once actual impacts are known.

Wetlands: This issue was addressed in previously submitted EA/FONSL No significant increased impacts are anticipated from the proposed project.

It is expected that there will be a net decrease in impacted wetlands due to the change in the configuration of the interchange at Jim Ramsey Road.

In and around the areas of high volume change soils, there may be an increase in impacted wetlands due to widening of the roadway footprint.

Wetland impact summaries will be calculated at the time of final design.
Water Bodies: The project area was evaluated to determine the boundaries of all waters of the United States regulated under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. Waters of the United States include rivers, streams and their impoundments. Field reviews and reviews of USGS topographical maps and USDA soil survey maps that indicate there are streams/rivers in the project area.

As part of the proposed project, drainage structures would be constructed at hydraulic crossings. Stream channel relocation would be minimized to the maximum extent possible. Stream banks would be restored to a condition similar in elevation and shape to that which exists now to facilitate natural regeneration of vegetation. Erosion control measures adopted as part of the MDOT's Best Management Practices would be installed to minimize increased turbidity levels. These changes would not adversely affect wildlife and domestic wildlife use of these water bodies.

There are five streams listed in the 2010 Section 303(d) list of impaired water bodies in Jackson County as prepared by the Mississippi Department of Environmental Quality. Four fall within the Coastal Streams Basin; one is within the Pascagoula River Basin. None fall within the project area. Therefore, there are no Clean Water Act 303d listed streams impacted by the project.

Floodplains: Issue addressed in previously submitted EA/FONSI. No significant increased impacts are anticipated from the proposed project.

Wild and Scenic Rivers: There are no wild and Scenic Rivers within the project boundaries. No impacts are anticipated from the proposed project.

Coastal Barriers: There are no Coastal Barriers within the project boundaries. No significant increased impacts are anticipated from the proposed project.

Coastal Zone: The project falls outside of all coastal zones. No significant increased impacts are anticipated from the proposed project.

Threatened and Endangered Species: Issue addressed in previously submitted EA/FONSI. No significant increased impacts are anticipated from the proposed project.

Historical, Cultural, and Archaeological: This issue was addressed in previously submitted EA/FONSI. No significant increased impacts are anticipated from the proposed project.

Native American Coordination: This issue was addressed in previously submitted EA/FONSI. No significant increased impacts are anticipated from the proposed project.

Hazardous Waste: This issue was addressed in previously submitted EA/FONSI. There were a total of nine (9) contaminated sites reported in MDOT's Parcel Tracking System. All sites will be decontaminated during the right-of-way phase of this project.

Further increased impacts are not anticipated from the proposed project.
Visual: Issue addressed in previously submitted EA/FONSI. No significant increased impacts are anticipated from the proposed project.

Energy: Issue addressed in previously submitted EA/FONSI. No significant increased impacts are anticipated from the proposed project.

Construction: Issue addressed in previously submitted EA/FONSI. No significant increased impacts are anticipated from the proposed project.

Endangered Species Coordination: Ms Sandra Kilpatrick and Mr. David Felder, both of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, at the request of MDOT contacted Mr. Scott Hereford, biologist at the Sandhill Crane Refuge, to discuss possible options for discouraging Sandhill Cranes from feeding within the median and edge of pavement. His comments were as follows: Mr. Hereford stated that the median should NOT be maintained in grass. "Open, grassy areas attract the crane for feeding and can cause mortality when associated with roads." He recommends that either native trees or shrubs be planted, or the median be left un-vegetated. MDOT, as stated in the original Gold Sheets, will include temporary and permanent seeding within the Vegetation Schedule that discourages foraging by Sandhill Cranes. See the original Gold Sheets for more details.

## Observations:

Two design changes have incurred from the original FONSI signing.
First, the proposed alignment was shifted to the west between I-10 and Gautier-Vancleave Road. The shift was necessary to avoid impacting a recently placed sewer line. The shift, based on aerial photography, impacted two homes and between ten and twelve spaces in a recreational trailer park. The shift also allowed for a better angle of intersection between the proposed alignment and Gautier-Vancleave Road. This improved angle of intersection allowed for the missing of three houses and one barn, all located in the north-east quadrant of the intersection of Gautier-Vancleave Road and SR 57.

Second, the proposed standard diamond interchange at Jim Ramsey Road has been replaced with a partial clover interchange. The new configuration reduces the impact to the flood zone and will reduce wetland impacts.

## Late Discovery:

During the design phase information gathering portion of the project it was discovered that there exists high volume change soils within the proposed road bed of Alternative C. The likelihood of high volume change soils being within all alternatives is very high because of the nature of the high volume change soil locations. The station locations are outlined in the attached consultant letter dated December 8, 2010.

## Conclusion:

Some right-of-way changes have taken place during the design phase of this project. Most were caused by the recent required storm water requirements placed upon all projects by the Environmental Protection Agency. Those changes generally occurred in low lying areas with sparse or no population.

There are high volume soils within this project; as such, right-of-way changes can be expected in accordance with current design standards.

Significant changes to the proposed project since the EA/FONSI approval in 2004 have not taken place. While high volume change soils may influence and expand the proposed right-of-way, no new evidence, findings, conclusions, or proposed changes alter the intent of the previous findings of the original Environmental Assessment.







| From: | Sandra_Kilpatrick@fws.gov |
| :--- | :--- |
| Sent: | Wednesday, December 08, 2010 9:46 AM |
| To: | Vincent, Rhea |
| Cc: | Forward to Felder, David |
| Subject: | Fw: I-10 Vancleave Road Lighting layout |

Is this what you were looking for?
Sandie Kilpatrick
Fish and Wildlife Biologist
MDOT Liaison
U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service 6578 Dogwood View Parkway Jackson, MS 39213
(601) 321-1135 office
(601) 941-1854 cell
(601) 965-4340 fax
..- Forwarded by Sandra Kilpatrick/R4/FWS/DOI on 12/08/2010 09:45 AM .--
Sandra Kilpatrick/R4/FWS/DOI

11/08/2010 03:09 PM
To "Vincent, Rhea" [vincent@mdot.state.ms.us](mailto:vincent@mdot.state.ms.us) cc "Thurman, Kim" [kthurman@mdot.state.ms.us](mailto:kthurman@mdot.state.ms.us)
(1082010 03.05 คM Subject Re: I-10 Vancleave Road Lighting layoutLink

Rhea,
I spoke with Scott Hereford, biologist at the Sandhill Crane Refuge.
He stated that he does not see any problems with the lighting as proposed. Lighting outside of your ROW should be avoided.

Also, on the SR57 project. You asked about what to plant in the median to discourage crane use. Scott stated that the median should NOT be maintained in grass. Open, grassy areas attract the crane for feeding and can cause mortality when associated with roads. We recommend that either native trees or shrubs be planted, or the median is left unvegetated. An non-vegetated surface would definitely discourage use by cranes and other wildlife species.

If you have any questions, please let me know!

## Sandie Kilpatrick

Fish and Wildlife Biologist
MDOT Liaison
U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service

6578 Dogwood View Parkway
Jackson, MS 39213
(601) 321-1135 office
(601) 941-1854 cell
(601) 965-4340 fax
"Vincent, Rhea" <yincent(@mdot.state.ms.us>

11/08/2010 10:18 AM

[^6]From:
Sent:
To:
Subject:
Attachments:

Peyton, Lockett
Tuesday, November 23, 2010 3:51 PM
Vincent, Rhea
SR 57 Jackson County 103060 Reevaluation
57 Jackson 103060 Counts for Reevualation.xlsx

An update to the Social and Economic Impact Study includes recent information from the Parcel Tracking System (PTS) and a review of the ROW Appraisal Maps. ROW Division has completed Maps and Deeds for the above project. Further ROW activities are pending full authorization. The ROW project is in two phases, a 20100 detail from l-10 to Humphreys Road and a 20200 detail from Humphrey Road to SR 57 N of Vancleave. Recent cost estimates for both sections have been completed by ROW Div. including relocation assistance impacts. ROW impacts for the termini concerning the reevaluation, SR 57 from 1-10 to SR 57 North of Vancleave are as follows:

No. of Parcels 193
Displacements
Residential 44
Businesses 7
Misc. PP 16
Total Displacements 67
Contaminated Sties 9
Estimated Cost $\quad \$ 24,483,000$
(Utility costs have been estimated, but PTS does not list the number of Utilities to be relocated)
See attachment for breakdown

## Lackett Peytan

Enuiranmental Diwision
MDOT
601-359-7920
Counts for Reevaluation of
103060-101000 SDP-0066-01-007
Jackson County
SR 57 From I-10 to Humphrey Road
103060-201000
Parcels ..... 73
Displacements
Residential ..... 5
Business ..... 4
MPP ..... 1625
Contaminated Sites ..... 4
Estimated Cost ..... \$10,866,000
SR 57 From Humphrey Road to 57 North of Vancleave103060-202000
Parcels ..... 120
Displacements
Residential ..... 39
Business ..... 3
MPP
Total Displacements42
Contaminted Sites ..... 5
Estiamted Costs ..... \$13,617,000
Total of both Sections
Parcels ..... 193
Displacements
Residential ..... 44
Businesses ..... 7MPP16
Total Displacements ..... 67
Total Contaminted Sites ..... 9
Total Estimated costs ..... \$24,483,000

December 8, 2010

## MEMORANDUM:

To: Assistant Chief Engineer-Preconstruction<br>Mr. Keith Purvis, PE<br>From: Roadway Design Division Engineer<br>John Reese, PE

RE: Project No: SDP-0066-01(007) V21 103060/101000 (PE) STP-0066-01(008) 103060/301000 (CON)

SR 57 from I-10 to North of Vancleave Jackson County

The proposed 9.5 -mile project is for the grading of 2 lanes on SR 57 from I-10 to Vancleave. Approximately 3 miles of the project will include two parallel lanes and the remaining 6.5 miles will include 4 lanes on new alignment.

## GRADING:

High volume change soil is present in the design soil prism of the proposed lanes at the locations shown below. It is proposed that all high volume change material within the design soil prism be removed and replaced with B7-6 borrow material. The undercut material will be disposed of off the right-of-way. All other required borrow material shall meet a B7 specification. According to District representatives, these materials are available within the area. It is anticipated that this material will yield a minimum CBR of five. Other unclassified excavation (Non-High Volume Change) may be used to construct the embankment in all other locations. The subgrade will be chemically treated. Plan quantities will be based on lime fly ash ( $3 \%$ lime, $12 \%$ fly ash) or soil cement treating ( $4 \%$ cement) $60 \%$ of the project and lime treating ( $6 \%$ ) the remaining $40 \%$ of the project.


[^0]:    For: Andrew H. Hughes, Division Administrator, FHWA

[^1]:    *Value Engineering (VE) Studies are recommended for projects on the NHS System and/or an Intermodal Connector with an estimated project costs approaching \$25 Million

[^2]:    The Draft Environmental Assessment document will be available for pubic' inspection at the Mississippi Department of Transpoitation Administrative Office Bulaing Environmental/ Location Division, 40, Noithwest Street, lackson, MS; the MDOT Sixth Districtoffice, Hattiesburg, MS; the MDOT Sixth District project Office, ocean springs, MS; the Jackson County ooard of Supervisors, Pascagoula, MS, the ackson County Chancery Clerk's Office Passca oula, MS, the Vancleave Public Library, Vancle ve, MS, and the Feder Mighway Administration, 666 Noith Stret, Suite 105; Jackson, MS.

    Any Individual who needs auxiliary, aids or special accommodations to attend the meetino should Advíse MDOT of their needs by caling the Environmental Division at ( 601 ) $359-7920$

[^3]:    Mississippi Department of Transportation
    Environmental Division (87-01)
    P. O. Box 1850

    Jackson, MS 39215-1850
    (60î) 359-7920 Fax (601) 359-7355
    Email:
    environmental_comments@mdot.state.ms us

[^4]:    - These commitments should be carried throughout each phase of the project development including Design, Right of Way, Construction, and Maintenance
    *Value Engineering (VE) Studies are recommended for projects on the NIS System and/or an Intermodal Connector with an estimated project costs approaching \$25 Million

[^5]:    For: Andrew H. Hughes, Division Administrator, FHWA

[^6]:    To "Sandra Kilpatrick@fws.gov" <Sandra Kilpatrick@fws.gov>
    cc "Thurman, Kim" [kthurman@mdot.state.ms.us](mailto:kthurman@mdot.state.ms.us)

