

Project Number: VA ST FB KNGMNWLKR GT Date: 11/18/2020

Project Name: Highway Improvements at Entrance to Fort

Belvoir Kingman and Walker Gates

Location: US Army Fort Belvoir

Fairfax County, VA

CE Category 23 CFR 771.117 (c)(26): Modernization of a

highway by resurfacing, restoration, rehabilitation,

reconstruction, adding shoulders, or adding auxiliary lanes (including parking, weaving, turning, and climbing lanes), if the action meets

the constraints in paragraph (e)[..]

See 23 CFR 771.117 for full description of CE categories, including additional requirements when applying (c)26-28.

Project Description

The Federal Highway Administration's Eastern Federal Lands Highway Division (FHWA), in cooperation with U.S. Army Fort Belvoir, proposes road improvements at Walker Gate and Kingman Gate in Fairfax County, Virginia.

Kingman Gate is located at the intersection of Kingman Road and Fairfax County Parkway (Route 286). The project purpose is to increase left turn lane queuing capacity along Route 286 into Fort Belvoir's Kingman Gate along Kingman Road to reduce the occurrence and queuing of left-turning vehicles into the main thru lane southbound along Route 286, in addition to reviewing any need for adjusting the traffic signal at Kingman Road for improving performance during rush hour, peak traffic. Currently, two left turn lanes exist along southbound Route 286 for turning into the Fort at Kingman Road. These two lanes have insufficient length to store queuing vehicles for current and projected traffic.

Walker Gate is located at the intersection of Mount Vernon Memorial Highway (Route 235) and Mount Vernon Road. The project purpose is to increase left turn lane queuing capacity along Mount Vernon Highway into Fort Belvoir's Walker Gate to reduce queuing of left turning vehicles into the main thru lane northbound along Mount Vernon Highway, in addition to reviewing any need for a traffic signal during rush hour peak traffic. Because of the required security checks at Fort Belvoir's Walker Gate, cars sometimes need to wait within the left turn lane on Mount Vernon Highway northbound, until the queue decreases before turning into the



Walker Gate entrance. The Mount Vernon Memorial Highway Trail Project, under development by Fairfax County, is being designed and constructed on the northern side of the road separately from this project. The project team has closely coordinated with the county, who is designing and constructing the Trail project.

This action is consistent with requirements listed in 23 CFR 771.117(e):

- 1. Exact right of way boundaries will be determined during final design. At most, this action would require sliver easements from Fort Belvoir along the project corridors to accommodate extended and added turn lanes. No residential or business displacements will occur.
- 2. Action does not need a U.S. Coast Guard Permit. If a 404, 401, or Section 10 permit is needed, this activity will meet terms and conditions of a nationwide or general permit. Permit needs will be finalized during final design. As of 40% design, FHWA is expecting 404/401 permit may be needed due to minor wetland impacts.
- 3. Action does not adversely affect historic properties, result in a 4(f) use greater than *de minimis*, and is not likely to adversely affect ESA species or critical habitats.
- 4. Construction impacts for this action are in line with typical intersection reconstruction projects. Any lane or road closures to accommodate construction will be brief and not result in major traffic disruptions.
- 5. No changes in interstate access control are triggered by this action
- 6. Floodplain encroachment other than functionally dependent uses not anticipated.

Environmental Commitments and Mitigation Measures

None identified at time of CE date.

Summary of Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act Compliance

FHWA obtained official species lists from the Fish and Wildlife Service's IPaC service on 10/16/2020. The Northern Long Eared Bat is the only species generated from our inquiry. FHWA received verification letters authorizing this action to continue under the January 5, 2016 Programmatic Biological Opinion on Final 4(d) Rule for the Northern Long Eared Bat. In accordance with the 4(d) rule, this activity *may affect, but is not likely to adversely affect* the Northern Long Eared Bat.

Summary of Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act Compliance

FHWA completed a Phase I cultural resources survey. FHWA's consultant completed a report on October 1, 2020. FHWA consulted with the Virginia Department of Historic Resources, which concurred with FHWA's determination of *no historic properties affected* in a letter dated 11/13/2020.



Additional Agency Coordination and Compliance

The US Army, in coordination with FHWA and the Virginia Department of Transportation, will complete a Record of Environmental Certification as part of the Army's environmental compliance process.

FHWA is coordinating with state-level biological protection agencies as a courtesy. On 10/20/2020, FHWA requested project review from the Virginia Department of Wildlife and Recreation. On 11/4/2020, DWR responded that they are unable to review the project due to staffing limitations. On 10/30/2020, FHWA requested project review from the Virginia Department of Conservation and Recreation (DCR). Consultation is ongoing and FHWA will consider all project recommendations received by Virginia DCR.

Project-level coordination with the NCPC is not required per direction from FHWA's planning team.

FHWA has been coordinating this project design with Fairfax County, who is designing and constructing the Mount Vernon Memorial Highway Trail Project. The Mount Vernon Memorial Highway Trail Project is expected to move to construction before FHWA's Kingman and Walker gates project. Although close in proximity to the Walker Gate entrance work, FHWA anticipates the projects will not be in conflict.

Public Outreach and Involvement

FHWA is generally following the VDOT procedures for <u>Notice of Willingness</u>. FHWA is sending letters to adjacent property owners. FHWA is placing legal notices in the Washington Post, El Tiempo Latino, and Belvoir Eagle; notices will run two times one week apart. Comments are due 12/31/2020.



| On the basis of the environmental impact informate which I am familiar, I believe the project should be analysis. | · · |
|---|--|
| anary 515. | |
| | |
| Christopher P Hansen | Date |
| Environmental Protection Specialist | |
| Eastern Federal Lands Highway Division | |
| Federal Highway Administration | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| | |
| Categorical Exclusion Determination: | |
| On the basis of the environmental impact information. | tion in the statutory compliance file, with |
| which I am familiar, I am categorically excluding | |
| analysis. The project meets the 23 CFR 771.117(a | a) definition of a categorical exclusion. No |
| unusual circumstances per 23 CFR 771.117(b) app | oly. |
| | |
| | |
| Kevin S. Rose | Date |
| Environmental Team Leader | Date |
| Eastern Federal Lands Highway Division | |
| Federal Highway Administration | |
| | |



Appendix A: Environmental Checklist

| Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act: | | |
|--|--|--|
| • | Are Federally-listed species potentially present in the study area? ⊠Yes, see Notes¹ □No | |
| | If Yes, effects determination: | |
| | □No Effect ⊠May Affect, Not Likely to Adversely Affect □May Affect, Likely to Adversely | |
| | Affect | |
| Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act: | | |
| • | Are historic properties known to be present in the study area? ⊠Yes □No | |
| | If Yes, will they be impacted by the project? □Yes ⊠No | |
| • | Will previously undisturbed ground be disturbed? | |
| | ⊠Yes □No | |
| • | Effects determination: | |
| | ⊠No Historic Properties Affected □No Adverse Effect □Adverse Effect, MOA Executed | |
| • | Was tribal consultation completed? □Yes □No | |
| Water and Wetlands: | | |
| • | Section 404 of the Clean Water Act | |
| | Are impacts to Waters of the US anticipated? ⊠Yes □No | |
| | If Yes, approval anticipated: | |
| | ⊠Nationwide Permit (NWP) □Regional General Permit □Individual Permit | |
| • | | |
| | NWP certified by State □Individual Certification | |
| • | • Section 402 of the Clean Water Act (National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System) | |
| | Will the land disturbance threshold likely be exceeded to require a permit and SWPPP? | |
| | ⊠Yes □ No | |
| • | Is post-construction stormwater management review/approval anticipated? □Yes ☒No | |
| • | ⊠Project is consistent with Executive Order 11990, Protection of Wetlands | |
| Floodplains: | | |
| • | Is the project in a FEMA floodplain? | |
| | □Yes ⊠No □ Floodplain not mapped | |
| • | ☑ Project is consistent with Executive Order 11988, Floodplain Management | |
| Section 4(f) of the USDOT Act: | | |
| • | Does the project meet the Section 4(f) exemption for Federal lands transportation facilities under | |
| | Section 1119(c)(2) of MAP-21, 23 U.S.C. 138(a)? □Yes ⊠No | |
| • | Is there a use of a Section 4(f) property in the study area? ⊠Yes □No | |



| If Yes, De Minimis Finding:⊠ Programmatic:□ Individual 4(f): □ | | |
|---|--|--|
| Section 6(f) of the Land and Water Conservation Fund: | | |
| Was the property purchased with grant funds from the Land and Water Conservation Fund? | | |
| □Yes ⊠No | | |
| If Yes, was documentation of approval from National Park Service Director received for the | | |
| conversion or replacement of $6(f)$ property? $\square Yes \square No$ | | |
| Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972: | | |
| Is the project in a Coastal Zone? □Yes ⊠No | | |
| If yes, will a Federal Consistency Review be completed? □Yes □No | | |
| Right of Way: | | |
| • Is the project completely within the transportation facility's right-of-way? □Yes ⊠No | | |
| • If no, will the project require relocations or easements? ⊠Yes □No | | |
| [Easements expected. No relocations expected] | | |
| Hazardous Waste and Materials: | | |
| Are hazardous materials or contamination exceeding regulatory thresholds (as set by U.S. EPA, | | |
| County Environmental Health, etc.) present? □Yes ⊠No | | |
| If Yes, is the nature and extent of the hazardous materials or contamination fully | | |
| known? □Yes □No, plan for securing information provided in Notes | | |
| Section 7(a) of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act: | | |
| Are there Wild and Scenic Rivers? □Yes ☒No □Eligible | | |
| If Yes, has review by the river-administering agency been completed? □Yes □No | | |
| Clean Air Act: | | |
| • Is the project in a non-attainment area? ⊠Yes □No | | |
| If Yes, is the project on the Transportation Improvement Program(TIP)/State Implementation | | |
| Plan(SIP)? ⊠ Yes □No | | |
| Highway Traffic and Construction Noise Regulations: | | |
| • ☐ The proposed project is a Type I project (highway on a new location, substantial horizontal or | | |
| vertical alteration, new through or auxiliary lanes). Noise analysis is required. | | |
| • ☐ The proposed project is a Type II project (retrofit for noise abatement). | | |
| \Bigsi The proposed project is a Type III project (noise analysis not required). | | |
| ■ Does not apply. | | |
| Environmental Justice and Title IV Act: | | |
| • Is an Environmental Justice population, as identified in Executive Order 12898, present? | | |
| \Box Yes, explanation provided in Notes section \boxtimes No | | |
| Will the project induce disproportionately high and adverse impacts to minority, low income, or | | |
| special groups? □Yes, additional analysis is needed □No | | |
| Farmland Protection Policy Act for Highway Projects: | | |



| Does the project displace, require acquisition of, or require an easement from farmland? | | |
|--|--|--|
| □Yes ⊠No | | |
| Does the project affect any other resources not listed above? Explain below and list anticipated | | |
| permits: | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |
| | | |

ⁱ Federally-listed species per U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's IPaC: Northern Long-Eared Bat