# The Underline - Segment 6 BUILD Grant FY 2018 Appendix J

Underline NEPA Type I Categorical Exclusion Checklist

# TYPE 1 CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION CHECKLIST

Financial Management No. Initial Segment 435501-1-58-01  FAP No. TBD  CE Number: ⊠(c) 3 or □(d)						
	pject Description (include project title, limits, and brief description of the proposed scope of	work):				
M-Path Underline/M-Path GreenLink: from Dadeland South Metrorail Station to the Miami River Greenway						
FM Number 435501-1-58-01: The Brickell Backyard from SW 13 <sup>th</sup> St./Coral Way to the Miami River Greenway is the initial segment						
The Underline Scope of Work: Proposed improvements address pedestrian, vehicular, and bicycle safety and include the addition of a second designated pedestrian path separated from the existing bicycle path, intersection improvements, pedestrian bridges, recreational and exercise facilities, landscaping, lighting, signing and pavement markings.						
Not CFF	<b>Note</b> : The criteria below also consider the conditions listed in 23 CFR 771.117(e) for the CEs described in 23 CFR 771.117(c)(26), (27) and (28).					
		YES	NO			
1	Will the action cause major adverse impacts on travel patterns, planned growth, land use for the area or access control?  Based on a review of the Underline Framework Plan and Demonstration Projects and the ETDM (GIS) layers, no adverse impacts to travel patterns, planned growth, land use, or access control are anticipated. This will be reevaluated on a segment by segment basis during Final Design.		⊠			
2	Will the action cause adverse impacts to air, noise or water quality?  Based on a review of the Underline Framework Plan and Demonstration Projects and the ETDM (GIS) layers, no long-term air quality or noise impacts are anticipated as a result of this project, since it is not a traffic capacity improvement. The scope of work does not involve construction of additional travel lanes, and no impacts are expected as per 23 CFR 772; therefore, a noise study is not required. This will be reevaluated on a segment by segment basis during Final Design.					
	The project corridor crosses the Coral Gables Waterway, Mahi Waterway, Twin Lakes Canal, and the C-2 Snapper Creek Canal and is adjacent to the Miami River. However, the Framework Plan does not specify any proposed work in, across, or adjacent to the canals or river. Therefore, based on the current scope of work, no adverse impacts to water quality are anticipated. The potential for impacts to water quality will be reevaluated on a segment by segment basis during Final Design.					
3	Will the action cause wetland impacts that would require an individual Section 404 Permit from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) under the Clean Water Act, Section 404, 33 U.S.C. § 1344 and/or section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act? Based on a review of the Underline Framework Plan and Demonstration Projects and the ETDM (GIS) layers, there are no wetlands within or adjacent to the project corridor. The potential for wetland impacts will be reevaluated on a segment by segment basis during Final Design.		⊠			
4	Will the action cause impacts to navigation that would require an individual U.S. Coast Guard (USCG) Bridge Permit?  Based on a review of the Underline Framework Plan and Demonstration Projects and the ETDM (GIS) layers, the project corridor does not cross any Navigable Waterways as defined by 33 CFR § 2.36. Therefore, no impacts to paying tion that would require an		⊠			

# TYPE 1 CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION CHECKLIST

individual U.S. Coast Guard Bridge Permit are anticipated. This will be reevaluated on a segment by segment basis during Final Design.

5	Will the action cause impacts greater than minimal floodplain encroachments, which will affect flood heights or base floodplain limits?  Based on a review of the Underline Framework Plan and Demonstration Projects and the ETDM (GIS) layers, the project corridor is within Zone AE of the 100 Year Floodplain. However, based on the current scope of work, no encroachment onto the base of the floodplain is anticipated. The potential for impacts to floodplains will be reevaluated on a segment by segment basis during Final Design.	
6	Will the action require construction in, across, or adjacent to a river designated as a component of, or proposed for inclusion in, the National System of Wild and Scenic Rivers (for 23 CFR 771.117 (c)(26), (27) and (28)?  Based on a review of the Underline Framework Plan and Demonstration Projects and the ETDM (GIS) layers, the project corridor is not within or adjacent to a river designated as a component of the National System of Wild and Scenic Rivers. This will be reevaluated on a segment by segment basis during Final Design.	
7	Will the action result in a determination other than, (1) "no involvement," (2) "no effect," or (3) with concurrence from US Fish and Wildlife Service or National Marine Fisheries Service, as appropriate, a "may affect but not likely to adversely affect" determination concerning impacts to endangered and threatened species and/or their critical habitat in accordance with Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended, 16 U.S.C. § 1536(a)-(d)?  Based on a review of the Underline Framework Plan and Demonstration Projects and the ETDM (GIS) layers, the project corridor includes critical habitat for the West Indian manatee and is within the Consultation Area for the American crocodile, piping plover, and Florida bonneted bat. However, based on the current scope of work, no adverse impacts to endangered and threatened species are anticipated. The potential for impacts to endangered and threatened species and/or their critical habitat will be reevaluated on a segment by segment basis during Final Design.	
8	Will the action require more than minor amounts of right-of-way and result in any residential or non-residential displacements?  Based on a review of the Underline Framework Plan and Demonstration Projects, there is no right-of-way acquisition. This will be reevaluated on a segment by segment basis during Final Design.	⊠
9	Will the action impact any properties protected by Section 4(f) of the U.S. Department of Transportation Act, 49 U.S.C. § 303? [NOTE: If it has been determined that Section 4(f) is not applicable in accordance with 23 CFR 774 and Part 2, Chapter 13 of the PD&E Manual, then the answer to this question is no.]  Based on a review of the Underline Framework Plan and Demonstration Projects and the ETDM (GIS) layers, the project corridor is adjacent to Simpson Park and Southside Park. However, based on the current scope of work, no impacts to any Section 4(f) properties are anticipated. The potential for impacts to Section 4(f) properties will be reevaluated on a segment by segment basis during Final Design.	
10	Will the action result in a determination other than, (1) "no involvement," (2) "no effect," or (3) "no adverse effect" regarding properties protected under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act?  A desktop review of the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) Historic and Archaeological Site and the FDOT State Historic Highway Geographic Information System (GIS) layers identified two SHPO National Register Sites adjacent to the project corridor: Southside School (DA01418) and Vizcaya (DA00173). The University of Miami (DA14332) is also adjacent to the project corridor and is a SHPO Resource Group eligible for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). The project corridor is within the Sunset Drive	

## TYPE 1 CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION CHECKLIST

Historic District (DA06509) and the Miami Roads Neighborhood (DA08039). The project corridor crosses four State Historic Highways: Calle Ocho, Red Road, LeJeune Road, and Ludlam Road. Miami Rock Mound 2 (DA00017) is within the project corridor. Multiple additional archaeological resources are in the vicinity of the project corridor including the SHPO National Register Site Miami Circle at Brickell Point (DA00012) and the Brickell Archaeological District (DA05360) which is a SHPO Resource group. In addition, multiple potentially historic resources that have not been evaluated by SHPO were identified along the project corridor. However, based on the current scope of work, no impacts to historical resources are anticipated. The need for Coordination with the SHPO for historic and archaeological resources will be reevaluated on a segment by segment basis during Final Design.

Does the action have known contamination sites which would have more than a minimal П  $\boxtimes$ impact to design, and right-of-way or construction activities once assessed as described in Part 2, Chapter 22, Contamination Impacts of the PD&E Manual, and can't be avoided or remediated? Based on a review of the Underline Framework Plan and Demonstration Projects, a contamination impact review utilizing the FDOT District 6 Contamination Screening Tool was performed for the project corridor. The Contamination Screening Tool contains Geographic Information System layers depicting contaminated sites identified by the Florida Department of Environmental Protection and Miami Dade County Department of Regulatory Economic Resources. Based on said review, approximately 20 known contaminated sites have been identified within a 500-ft radius of the project corridor. however they are not immediately adjacent to the corridor. If dewatering is performed, dewatering limitation environmental notes may need to be included on the Contract Plans General Notes Sheet depending on the project segment scope of work to avoid potential contamination plume exacerbation and to determine proper groundwater management associated with such sites. This will be reevaluated on a segment by segment basis during Final Design. 12 Will the action have substantial controversy on environmental grounds? X Based on a review of the Underline Framework Plan and Demonstration Projects, no controversy on environmental grounds is anticipated. This will be reevaluated on a segment by segment basis during Final Design.

**IMPORTANT:** If all answers are **No**, the project is a Type 1 Categorical Exclusion and this checklist will be the NEPA document. If the answer to any of these questions is **Yes**, follow the Minor Categorical Exclusion Determination Key and coordinate with FHWA as appropriate.

This project has been evaluated and has been determined to meet the conditions as set forth in Florida's Programmatic Agreement for Categorical Exclusions effective October 2015, as a Type 1 Categorical Exclusion.

Signature:

District Environmental Administrator or designee

Date: 2 25 2016

The following is a list of any supporting activities (e.g., field reviews, as appropriate, etc.), reports, or technical studies that were prepared and are included in the project file that were necessary to support the conclusions reached on the checklist:

## TYPE 1 CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION CHECKLIST

- The Underline Framework Plan and Demonstration Projects dated December 18, 2015 including Section 4.5 Agency and Public Comment Log amended on February 6, 2016. Reviewed by Environmental Impact Reviewer Samantha Owen on February 8, 2016.
- FDOT Project Memorandum to File by Steven C. James dated February 25, 2016.
- The project will require NEPA Reevaluations as segments advance to Final Design and Construction phases, and Environmental Certifications will be required for obligation of Federal construction funds.
- The need for environmental permits will be reviewed on a segment by segment basis during Final Design.