

APPENDIX A – DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT ERRATA

Contents

P	PREFACE
PC	SPECIAL PROJECT COMMITMENTS
S	SUMMARY
Ch. 1	PURPOSE AND NEED FOR ACTION
Ch. 2	ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED
Ch. 3	HUMAN ENVIRONMENT
Ch. 4	PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT
Ch. 5	CULTURAL RESOURCES
Ch. 6	NATURAL RESOURCES
Ch. 7	INDIRECT AND CUMULATIVE EFFECTS
Ch. 8	OTHER IMPACT CONSIDERATIONS
Ch. 9	PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT AND AGENCY COORDINATION
Ch. 10	LIST OF PREPARERS
Ch. 11	LIST OF AGENCIES, ORGANIZATIONS, AND PERSONS WHOM COPIES OF THIS STATEMENT ARE SENT
Ch. 12	REFERENCES AND SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION
APP. A	FEDERAL REGISTER NOTICES AND AGENCY CORRESPONDENCE

Appendix A includes minor corrections and clarifications to the March 2009 Draft Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

P - PREFACE

No corrections or clarifications were made to the Preface of the Draft EIS.

PC - PROJECT COMMITMENTS

No corrections or clarifications were made to the Project Commitments of the Draft EIS.

S - SUMMARY

SECTION S.7

The second bullet under Human Environment Considerations should read: “Although DSA D is higher in the range of business relocations at ~~45~~ 48 (the range being 14 to ~~48~~ 49 business relocations)...” The number of business relocations for DSA D was reported incorrectly in this section; however, the correct number of business relocations was presented in Table S-2 and Table 3-6 of the Draft EIS.

SECTION S.8.3.2

The following should be added to the second paragraph: “It is important to note that this project is part of a conforming transportation plan. However, compliance with the ozone and/or CO NAAQS is not demonstrated if the project is included in a conforming transportation plan. Conformity is not equivalent to meeting the NAAQS.”

CHAPTER 1 – PURPOSE AND NEED FOR ACTION

SECTION 1.4.2

In the third paragraph, SR 1758 should be noted as Main Street, not Whitmore Road.

FIGURE 1-2

This figure should show I-485 as being completed between NC 16 and NC 115.

CHAPTER 2 – ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED

SECTION 2.4.4.3

In the section “Traffic Studies for PSA G”, the “*Technical Memorandum for TIP Projects R-2559 & R-3329 US 74 Upgrade Scenario*” prepared by Wilbur Smith Associates should be dated June 2008 instead of July 25, 2008.

SECTION 2.6.1

The source document for the 2030 No-Build Alternative traffic forecast should be “*Traffic Forecasts for the No-Build Alternatives for the NCDOT State TIP Project No. R-3329 and NCDOT State TIP Project No. R-2559, Monroe Connector/Bypass Study* (Martin/Alexiou/Bryson, June 2008).” The document is incorrectly referenced in the Draft EIS as June 2007.

The source document for the 2035 No-Build Alternative traffic forecast should be “*Traffic Forecast for the Monroe Connector/Bypass* (Wilbur Smith Associates, September 2008).”

TABLE 2-7

The source for Table 2-7 is listed as “*Traffic Forecast for TIP Projects R-3329 and R-2259, Monroe Connector/Bypass* (WSA, July 25, 2008 and addenda September 2008 for Scenario 3A).” The source should be “*Traffic Forecast for the Monroe Connector/Bypass* (Wilbur Smith Associates, September 2008).”

A comment on the Draft EIS noted that values in Table 2-7 for the No-Build Alternative appeared to be overestimated. In response to this comment, the following documents were reviewed:

- 2030 No-Build Alternative traffic forecasts documented in *Traffic Forecasts for the No-Build Alternatives for the NCDOT State TIP Project No. R-3329 and NCDOT State TIP Project No. R-2559, Monroe Connector/Bypass Study* (Martin/Alexiou/Bryson, June 2007)
- 2030 No-Build Alternative traffic operations analyses documented in *Existing and Year 2030 No-Build Traffic Operations Technical Memorandum* (PBS&J, March 2008)

APPENDIX A

- 2035 No-Build Alternative traffic forecasts documented in *Traffic Forecast for TIP Projects R-3329 and R-2559, Monroe Connector/Bypass* (Wilbur Smith Associates, September 2008)
- 2035 Build Alternative traffic forecasts documented in *Traffic Forecast for TIP Projects R-3329 and R-2559, Monroe Connector/Bypass* (Wilbur Smith Associates, September 2008)
- 2035 Build Alternative traffic operations analyses documented in *Year 2035 Build Traffic Operations Technical Memorandum* (PBS&J, December 2008)

It was determined that the 2030 No-Build Alternative forecast and analyses are correct. These were used to document the purpose and need for the project; therefore, documentation related to the traffic need for the project included in Section 1 of the Draft EIS remains valid. The 2035 Build Alternative traffic forecast and analyses were also determined to be correct. This forecast was used for development and analysis of the Detailed Study Alternatives.

However, it has been determined that the 2035 No-Build Alternative forecast was inadvertently overestimated. A revised No-Build Alternative forecast for years 2008 and 2035 has been prepared to correct this error and is documented in *Revised Monroe Connector/Bypass No-Build Traffic Forecast Memo* (HNTB, March 2010). Section 2.6 of the Draft EIS was reviewed, and other than corrections noted below for Table 2-7, all other conclusions and discussions remain valid. No additional corrections are needed to the Draft EIS.

DEIS TABLE 2-7: Projected 2035 Traffic Volumes Along Mainline

Segment	Monroe Connector/Bypass Mainline Average Daily Traffic Volumes		Existing US 74 Average Daily Traffic Volumes		
	Scenario 1A (DSAs A, B, A1, B1, A2, B2, A3, B3)	Scenario 3A (DSAs C, D, C1, D1, C2, D2, C3, D3)	Scenario 1A (DSAs A, B, A1, B1, A2, B2, A3, B3)	Scenario 3A (DSAs C, D, C1, D1, C2, D2, C3, D3)	No-Build Alternative
I-485 to Stallings Rd (SR 1365)	41,400	95,600 <u>90,700</u>	79,600	95,600 <u>29,400</u> ²	140,200 <u>89,100</u>
Stallings Rd (SR 1365) to Indian Trail-Fairview Rd (SR 1520)	49,100	48,200	66,300	67,400	134,300 <u>86,300</u>
Indian Trail-Fairview Rd (SR 1520) to Unionville-Indian Trail Rd (SR 1367)	50,700	51,200	49,000-50,100	51,300-52,400	123,400 <u>69,400</u>
Unionville-Indian Trail Rd (SR 1367) to Rocky River Rd (SR 1514)	51,500	52,300	32,000-35,700	34,500-38,200	112,800-123,500 <u>67,100-72,300</u>
Rocky River Rd (SR 1514) to US 601	46,200	46,600	26,300-45,900	28,800-48,100	101,800-121,400 <u>59,800-72,100</u>
US 601 to Morgan Mill Rd (NC 200)	35,000	35,200	54,300-55,200	56,600-57,200	115,300-116,200 <u>69,800-74,800</u>
Morgan Mill Rd (NC 200) to Austin Chaney Rd (SR 1758)	24,400	24,800	32,200-59,300	33,100-60,000	74,300-101,400 <u>39,400-66,900</u>
Austin Chaney Rd (SR 1758) to Forest Hills School Rd	19,300	19,600	25,200-26,600	25,200-26,100	48,600-51,700 <u>34,900-35,900</u>
Forest Hills School Rd to US 74	15,400	16,400	21,700	20,700	44,200 <u>31,600</u>

Source: *Traffic Forecast for TIP Projects R-3329 and R-2559, Monroe Connector/Bypass* (Wilbur Smith Associates, September 2008) and Revised Monroe Connector/Bypass No-Build Traffic Forecast Memo (HNTB, March 2010).

¹Updated to reflect current tolling configuration.

²Projected traffic volume on service roads (US 74 Business).

CHAPTER 3 – HUMAN ENVIRONMENT

SECTION 3.2.1

The second sentence in the second paragraph incorrectly refers to Lake Park as a subdivision. The Village of Lake Park is an incorporated town.

SECTION 3.3.1

The third bullet in the second paragraph should read “Sardis Road North” instead of “Sardis Road (SR 1695).” Sardis Road North is city-maintained and does not have a secondary route number.

CHAPTER 4 – PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT

SECTION 4.2.2

The last sentence of the subsection entitled “Regional Conformity Analysis” should be revised as follows: “If there is no approved SIP, the MPO must apply an ‘interim emissions test’ – which requires, in essence, a finding that emissions will be ~~no greater~~ less with the proposed improvements in the LRTP/TIP than they would be without those improvements.”

SECTION 4.2.5.1

The first sentence of the subsection entitled “Conformity Determinations for LRTPs” should state, “MUMPO currently has an approved LRTP with a horizon year of 2030, which was adopted on May 3, 2005.” The date is incorrectly noted in the Draft EIS as April 20, 2005.

Additionally, the third paragraph of the subsection entitled “Status of SIP for Metrolina Region” should be revised as follows: “On December 19, 2008, NCDENR-DAQ sent a letter to USEPA requesting that the previously submitted SIP be withdrawn and explained that NCDENR-DAQ intended to submit an updated SIP by November 2009, demonstrating attainment of the ozone standard ~~by the June 15, 2010 deadline~~ (letter included in Draft EIS Appendix A-6).”

TABLE 4-10

The calculations presented in Table 4-10 of the Draft EIS did not include several soil types that should have been classified as statewide important farmland soils. As a result, the acreages given for statewide important farmland soils within the DSAs, as well as the total acres and percentages of prime and important farmland soils, were lower than they should have been. The prime and important farmland soil acreages presented in the Farmland Rating Conversion Forms completed by NRCS and included in Appendix F of the Draft EIS were correct. An updated table presenting impacts to prime and important farmland soils for each of the DSAs is included as **Table 1-4** in the Final EIS. The updated table uses the most recent classifications of prime and important farmland soils from NRCS, as listed in **Table 1-3**.

TABLE 4-14

The number of floodway crossings for the DSAs presented in Table 4-14 of the Draft EIS should have been updated based on the new Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRM) released for Union County in November 2008. The number of floodway crossings for each DSA listed in Table 4-14 did not account for the floodways at North Fork Crooked Creek, Meadow Branch, or Negro Head Creek. Figure 4-4 of the Draft EIS used the latest FIRMs and shows the correct number of

crossings. Draft EIS Table 4-14 is included below showing the number of crossings presented in the Draft EIS along with the revised floodway crossings. Updated numbers of floodway crossings for the DSAs are presented in **Table 1-5** of the Final EIS.

DEIS TABLE 4-14: Summary of Major Drainage Structures and Floodway and Floodplain Crossings

DSA	Bridge Crossings over Streams	Major Culverts or Pipes (>72 inches in diameter)	Floodway Crossings		Floodplain Crossings
			DEIS	Revised	
A	9	38	3	7	14
B	9	36	3	7	14
C	6	37	3	5	11
D	6	35	3	5	11
A1	8	36	2	6	13
B1	8	34	2	6	13
C1	5	35	2	4	10
D1	5	33	2	4	10
A2	9	38	3	7	14
B2	9	36	3	7	14
C2	6	37	3	5	11
D2	6	35	3	5	11
A3	8	36	2	6	13
B3	8	34	2	6	13
C3	5	35	2	4	10
D3	5	33	2	4	10

Source: Preliminary Hydraulic Technical Memorandum (PBS&J, December 2008).

CHAPTER 5 – CULTURAL RESOURCES

No corrections or clarifications were made to Chapter 5 of the Draft EIS.

CHAPTER 6 – NATURAL ENVIRONMENT

TABLE 6-4

The intermittent stream impacts for all DSAs reported in Table 6-4 of the Draft EIS should have included 354 linear feet of impact to Stream SX162z, which is located along Forest Hills School Road near the eastern end of the project (**Figure 2-3s**). This stream is located along the proposed realignment of Forest Hills School Road and was not included in the area initially surveyed for jurisdictional resources. This area was surveyed after the Draft EIS was published. The inclusion of Stream SX162z adds the same length of intermittent stream impact to each DSA, and therefore the relative differences between the DSAs as reported in the Draft EIS still apply.

CHAPTER 7 – INDIRECT AND CUMULATIVE EFFECTS

SECTION 7.3.2

The third sentence in the second paragraph incorrectly refers to Lake Park as a subdivision. The Village of Lake Park is an incorporated town.

SECTION 7.3.4

The second paragraph of this section implies that Union County adopted the Union County Stormwater Discharge and Quality Control Ordinance. This ordinance was posted on the Union County website as a draft document that has since been removed from the website and was never adopted or implemented. The only Union County stormwater requirements in effect at this time are Article XVI, Drainage and Stormwater Management, and Article XII Section 187, Incentives for Cluster Development, found in the Union County Land Use Ordinance. The NCDENR-DWQ Stormwater Section implements stormwater post-construction requirements for the County as well as the site specific management plan for the Goose Creek watershed. The third paragraph of this section incorrectly states that the towns of Fairview, Unionville, and Marshville adhere to this ordinance.

SECTION 7.7.3

The first sentence of this section should be revised as follows: “As shown in Table 7-3, estimates of land cover in Union County between 1984 and 2003 show a nearly 30 percent reduction in trees and ~~an almost 64 percent~~ a more than 175 percent increase in urban area.”

CHAPTER 8 – OTHER IMPACT CONSIDERATIONS

No corrections or clarifications were made to Chapter 8 of the Draft EIS.

CHAPTER 9 – PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT AND AGENCY COORDINATION

No corrections or clarifications were made to Chapter 9 of the Draft EIS.

CHAPTER 10 – LIST OF PREPARERS

No corrections or clarifications were made to Chapter 10 of the Draft EIS.

CHAPTER 11 – LIST OF AGENCIES, ORGANIZATIONS, AND PERSONS WHOM COPIES OF THIS STATEMENT ARE SENT

No corrections or clarifications were made to Chapter 11 of the Draft EIS.

CHAPTER 12 – REFERENCES AND SUPPORTING DOCUMENTATION

No corrections or clarifications were made to Chapter 12 of the Draft EIS.

APPENDIX A – FEDERAL REGISTER NOTICES AND AGENCY CORRESPONDENCE

NCTA distributed a second scoping letter on January 22, 2007 to solicit comments and invite local officials to a scoping meeting. This letter should be included in Draft EIS Appendix A-3 immediately following the January 5, 2007 agency scoping letter.

In addition, comment letters from the following agencies in response to the scoping letters and should be included in Draft EIS Appendix A-3:

- NC Department of Administration State Clearinghouse (January 9, 2007)
- NC Department of Environment and Natural Resources (NCDENR) Natural Heritage Program (February 7, 2007)
- Town of Stallings (February 13, 2007)
- Town of Indian Trail (February 15, 2007)
- Town of Mint Hill (February 15, 2007)
- Mecklenburg-Union Metropolitan Planning Organization (February 17, 2007)

These letters are included in this appendix.