



PROJECT PROSPECTUS

Part 1 — Project Request (Page 1 of 2)

						Key Number: 18280		Jurisdiction: Sherwood				
Section: Cedar Creek/Tonquin Trail: Roy Rogers - OR 99W						Region: 1		Area: Metro-West		District: 2B		
State Highway No.: N/A		Highway Name: Local				Mile Point From: N/A To: N/A		Length: (MI) 1.02				
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Urban <input type="checkbox"/> Rural		City: Sherwood		MPO: P	Within UGB	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No	County: Washington		Road/Street Name: SW Trailblazer Pl, SW Edy Rd, SW Roy Rogers Rd			
Route No.: Local		NHS <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO		HPMS: 6		FC: 20		Applicant (If other than State): City of Sherwood				
US Congressional District: 1				State Senate District: 13				State Representative District: 26				
Cost Estimates (x \$ 1,000)				Project Components				Right Of Way				
Preliminary Engineering		\$ 960		Grading		x		Files (#)		10		
Right Of Way		\$ 90		Paving		x		Acres (#)		0.1		
Utility Reimbursement		\$ 20		Structures		x		Relocations (#)		0		
				Signing		x		Acquisitions (#)		4		
Roadway		\$ 2,070		Signals		x		Easements (#)		6		
Structures		\$ 557		Illumination		x		Work By: State / Consultant / Applicant				
Signals		\$ 120		Detour				Preliminary Engineering (S,C,A)		C		
Illumination		\$ 60						Construction Engineering (S,C,A)		C		
Temp. Protection		\$ 290						Right of Way Descriptions (S,C,A)		C		
Const. Contingencies		\$ 730						Right Of Way Acquisitions (S,C,A)		C/A		
Const. Engineering		\$ 550		Project Categories				Constructed By				
Environmental Mitigation		\$ 500		Environmental Class (1, 2, 3, PCE)		2		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Contract <input type="checkbox"/> County Force <input type="checkbox"/> State Force <input type="checkbox"/> Other <input type="checkbox"/> City Force				
				Design Category (1-7)		7						
Total CE and Construction:		\$ 4,877		Work Type Code (1-13)		6						
Total Estimate:		\$ 5,947		Primary STIP Work Type:		Bike/Ped						
Recommended Let Date By Federal Fiscal Year (Quarter-Year): 1st Qtr 2018 (PE) 3rd Qtr 2019 (Con)												
PE Fund: Fed TBD, Local			R/W Fund: Fed TBD, Local			UR Fund:			CE-CN Fund: Fed TBD, Local			
PE EA:			R/W EA:			UR EA:			CE-CN EA:			
Item		Existing		Proposed		Define The Problem:						
Travel Lanes (#)		N/A		N/A		Sherwood currently lacks completed pedestrian and bicycle connections through the City. The existing path system is incomplete or obstructed by a principal arterial and collector road barriers, SW Edy Road and SW Roy Rogers Road. There are inadequate connections to significant destinations within and around Sherwood, including schools, parks, industrial, employment, residential, mixed-use areas, and the city's Town Center. Additionally, the City bike/ped system is not connected with the regional trails or the National Wildlife Refuge.						
Structures (#)		0		3								
Signals (#)		0		3								
Bike Way (#)		0		1								
Average Daily Traffic		N/A		N/A								
Year of ADT		N/A		N/A								
Throughway Y/N		N/A		N/A								
						Describe Proposed Solution: - Attach Sketch Map						
						This grant will fund the design, permitting and construction of the Cedar Creek Trail from Roy Rogers Rd to OR99W, which will provide connections between neighborhoods and multiple land-uses. The project will construct 1.02 miles of shared-use path, beginning with the addition of an at-grade crossing of SW Roy Rogers Rd. The crossing will include a rectangular rapid flashing beacon. The shared-use path will then head northwest toward Cedar Creek via a powerline corridor. The shared-use path will follow the Cedar Creek corridor until the crossing of SW Edy Rd. The project will add a pedestrian activated beacon at the Edy Rd crossing and the shared-use path will continue south along the Cedar Creek corridor until it connects with an existing path at a housing development north of the OR99W & SW Meinecke Rd intersection.						
Prepared By: X				Date:		OTC Approval Date:			Program Year:		Funding Amount:	



PROJECT PROSPECTUS

Part 1 Project Request (Page 2 of 2)

Key Number:	Jurisdiction:
18280	Sherwood

Section:	Cedar Creek/Tonquin Trail: Roy Rogers - OR 99W	Region:	1	Area:	Metro-West	District:	2B
----------	--	---------	---	-------	------------	-----------	----

Project Justification

Sherwood has two major barriers to a multi-modal transportation system that connects neighborhoods and adjacent communities to schools, retail and jobs. One barrier is Cedar Creek itself, which runs north-south with only four creek crossings within the city limits that connect east and west Sherwood. All four of the existing creek crossings are made along roads at culverts and bridges, some with and without sidewalks. This project will construct two bicycle/pedestrian bridge structures over Cedar Creek between Roy Rogers Rd and OR99W. The other barrier is OR99W. This project will connect to the Cedar Creek/Tonquin Trail: OR99W - Murdock project via a new crosswalk constructed as part of that earlier project. .

This project improves bicycle & pedestrian safety, provides better access for residents, especially underserved populations, improves access to/from employment areas, schools and essential services, ultimately reducing traffic congestion, pollution, noise and the immediate need for highway expansion because it provides a safer, alternate mode of transportation away from the major east-west OR99W arterial.

Additionally, the City is known as "the Home of the Tualatin River National Wildlife Refuge" and one of the City's goals is to provide better access to the wildlife refuge for pedestrians and bicyclists. This project extends the City's existing shared-use path system closer to the northern city limits and wildlife refuge. The project also connects to the future segment of the Cedar Creek Trail located south of OR99W, thus making it a complete and usable system at day of opening.

Additional Information For Project Requested By Local Jurisdictions

Responsible Local Office To Be Contacted For The Following Activities:

1. Public Hearing / Citizen Involvement	City of Sherwood/Planning			
	Michelle Miller, AICP	(Office)	503.625.4242	(Phone)
2. Environmental / Planning	Michelle Miller, AICP	(Office)	503.625.4242	(Phone)
3. Pre-Engineering	City of Sherwood/Engineering	(Office)	503.925.2304	(Phone)
	Jason Waters, PE			

This Official Request is From:

City of: Sherwood and/or _____ County

By: _____ By: _____

By: _____ By: _____

By: _____

Applicable Intergovernmental Agreements:

IGA Number:	Jurisdiction Name:	Agreement Date:
<u>29237</u>	<u>City of Sherwood</u>	<u>12/20/2013</u>
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____
_____	_____	_____

Administrative Recommendation



PROJECT PROSPECTUS

Part 2 Project Details (Page 1 of 2)

Key Number:

18280

Jurisdiction:

Sherwood

Section:

Cedar Creek/Tonquin Trail: Roy Rogers - OR 99W

Region:

1

Area:

Metro-West

District:

2B

Enter: S-State C - Consultant A - Applicant E - Existing N - No

Activity Responsibilities**Permits and Clearances**

Surplus Property	N	Signs (Permanent)	C	Storm Sewer	C	Airport Clearance	N	Wetlands	C
Citizen's Advisory	A	Striping (Permanent)	C	Landscaping	C	Land Use Actions/Permits	C	Endangered Species	C
Photogrammetry	N	Project Signing	C	Irrigation	C	Flood Plain	C	Hazmat	C
Reconnaissance Survey	C	Detour	N	Borrow Source	N	Building	N	Historic Resource	C
Public Hearing	A	Illumination	C	Material Source	N	Corps Engrs/DSL Remove/Fill	C	DEQ Indirect Source Air	N
Field Survey	C	RR Crossing	N	Disposal Source	N	Coast Guard	N	DEQ Non-Point Source Water	C
Vicinity Map	A	RR Protection	N	Local Agreement	S	Geology and Minerals	C	Archaeology Survey	C
Soils/Geotech Investigation	C	RR Separation	N	Sensitive Land	C	Signals Warrants	C	Noise Study	C
Hydraulic Study	C	RR Encroachment	N	Value Engineering	N	Utilities (see below)	C	Section4(F)	C
Utility Coordination	C	Utility Verify Vert Horiz (VVH)	C	Right of Way	C				

Right-Of -Way

Right-Of-Way Liaison	G. Casebeer Local: Consultant	Access Control (Y/N)	Curr N	Propsd N
----------------------	----------------------------------	----------------------	-----------	-------------

Acquisitions**Relocations**

Simple No.	Complex No.	Business No.	Residential No.
6	0	0	0

List of Utilities:

City of Sherwood Water
City of Sherwood Storm Sewer
PGE Overhead Power
Clean Water Services Sewer
Bonneville Power Administration Overhead Transmission

Design Standards
AASHTODesign Speeds
N/AException (Y/N)
N**Suggested Base Design**

Item	New Work Surface (in)	Over Existing Surface (in)	Item	New Work Surface (in)	Over Existing Surface (in)
Geotextile Fabric	Yes	0	Asphaltic Concrete	2"	0
1-1/2"-0" aggregate	4"		Concrete	4"	0
3/4"-0" aggregate	2"				

Structures

Structures	Length	Width	Height	Cost	Structure	Length	Width	Height	Cost
Ped bridge 1	40'	14'	10'-12'	\$60,000					
Ped bridge 2	40'	14'	6'-8'	\$60,000					
Boardwalk	490'	14'	2'-15'	\$437,000					

Approved Area Manager

Date

X



PROJECT PROSPECTUS

Part 2 — Project Details (Page 2 of 2)

Key No.: 18280	Jurisdiction: Sherwood
--------------------------	----------------------------------

SECTION: Cedar Creek/Tonquin Trail: Roy Rogers - OR 99W	Region: 1	Area: Metro-West	District: 2B
---	---------------------	----------------------------	------------------------

Segment of Alternative 1:

Comments on Segment or Alternative: north of OR99W/Meinecke to Cedar Creek Corridor to Edy Road

Existing (below) Units In: Feet Comment on Existing: no existing crossing of Edy Road

Bike Path	Side-Walk	Curb Type	Parking	Shoulder	Lane 3	Lane 2	Lane 1	Shared Path	Lane 1	Lane 2	Lane 3	Shoulder	Parking	Curb Type	Side-Walk	Bike Path
				2				12				2				

Proposed (above) Units In: Feet Comment on Proposed: add crosswalk with rectangular rapid flashing beacon to Edy Road

Segment or Alternative 2:

Comments on Segment or Alternative: Edy Road/Trailblazer Place to Roy Rogers Road via Cedar Creek Corridor

Existing (below) Units In: Feet Comment on Existing: Testing second alternative

Bike Path	Side-Walk	Curb Type	Parking	Shoulder	Lane 3	Lane 2	Lane 1	Shared Path	Lane 1	Lane 2	Lane 3	Shoulder	Parking	Curb Type	Side-Walk	Bike Path
				2				12				2				

Proposed (above) Units In: Feet Comment on Proposed: 12' hard surface path and boardwalk within creek corridor

Segment or Alternative 3:

Comments on Segment or Alternative:

Existing (below) Units In: Comment on Existing: existing trail on north side of Roy Rogers

Bike Path	Side-Walk	Curb Type	Parking	Shoulder	Lane 3	Lane 2	Lane 1	Shared Path	Lane 1	Lane 2	Lane 3	Shoulder	Parking	Curb Type	Side-Walk	Bike Path
				2				12				2				

Proposed (above) Units In: Comment on Proposed: add crosswalk with rectangular rapid flashing beacon to Roy Rogers Rd

Segment or Alternative 4:

Comments on Segment or Alternative:

Existing (below) Units In: Comment on Existing:

Bike Path	Side-Walk	Curb Type	Parking	Shoulder/Bikelane	Lane 3	Lane 2	Lane 1	Median	Lane 1	Lane 2	Lane 3	Shoulder/BIKELANE	Parking	Curb Type	Side-Walk	Bike Path

Proposed (Above) Units In: Comment on Proposed:

See attached segment/alternative alignment map for locations



PROJECT PROSPECTUS

Part 3 Project Environmental Classification

Project Classification

- ☐ Class 1 DEIS FEIS
☒ Class 2 Categorical Exclusion
☐ Programmatic Categ. Exclusion
☐ Class 3 EA Revised EA

Key Number: 18280	Jurisdiction: Sherwood
----------------------	---------------------------

Project Name: Cedar Creek/Tonquin Trail: Roy Rogers - OR 99W	Bridge No.: N/A	County: Washington	Region: 1	Area: Metro- West	District: 2B
--	--------------------	-----------------------	--------------	-------------------------	-----------------

1) Provide a brief description of the Project

The City of Sherwood will construct: (A) 1.0 mile of the shared-use Cedar Creek/Tonquin Trail from the existing trail terminus southwest of the SW Ladyfern Drive/SW Roellich Avenue intersection to the terminus at SW Roy Rogers Road, and (B) at-grade pedestrian/bike crossing of SW Edy Road. Degraded wetlands and Vegetated Corridors will be restored or enhanced along the alignment.

USGS Quad Name, Township, Range, Section:

Sherwood, OR 2S 1W 30

2) Estimated Right-of-Way Impacts (Including Easements, Number of Parcels, Acreage, and Improvements)

Permanent easements will be required at 4 locations on 4 properties belonging to 4 owners (2540 SF total). Temporary construction easements will be required at 6 locations on 6 properties belonging to 6 owners (1900 SF total).

3) Estimated Traffic Volume, Flow Pattern and Safety Impacts (Including Construction Impacts, Detours, etc.)

No additional traffic volume is anticipated. The trail segment will be the west fork of the Ice Age Tonquin Trail between OR99W to the City limits at Roy Rogers Road, and provide multimodal community connections between Sherwood and Wilsonville, Tualatin, and portions of unincorporated Washington and Clackamas counties. During daylight-only construction, only short-term partial lane closures of SW Edy Road or SW Roy Rogers Road are expected to construct the crosswalk and trail terminus. Lane closures will follow MUTCD as supplemented by the State of Oregon and Oregon Temp Traffic Control Handbook. No road closures or traffic detours are expected during construction.

4) Estimated Land Use and Socioeconomic Impact (Including Consistency with Comprehensive Plan)

The proposed project is consistent with the Sherwood Comprehensive Plan. No negative impact is expected. The trail project will provide safe pedestrian and bicycle travel corridors to expand a regional multi-modal trail network linking residential, commercial and public land uses. The socioeconomic benefits from this project will be realized through enhanced public access to the creek corridor, viewing of wildlife and natural habitat, and educational opportunities. The project is identified in the City of Sherwood's Transportation System Plan (2005 TSP) as Cedar Creek Trail, Parks Master Plan, and Metro's 2035 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) as Project #10701. The trail was approved in the 2004 Tonquin Trail Feasibility Study, and the 2013 Ice Age Tonquin Trail Master Plan. The City selected the preferred alignment after alternatives evaluation and public involvement process.

5) Estimated Wetlands, Waterways and Water Quality Impacts

Cedar Creek and associated federal and state wetlands occur in the project area, and require boundary delineation. Removal-fill impacts to wetlands appear unavoidable and require permits. The multi-span bridge crossing of Cedar Creek will have a hydraulic opening of at least 2.2 times the active channel width. As feasible, wetland areas will be crossed by boardwalk system. Construction will occur mostly during the drier summer months. Cedar Creek below the ordinary high water elevation may be temporarily disturbed, which might require in-water work isolation and dewatering plans. Wetland impacts will be mitigated either by creation or enhancement of degraded wetlands in the Cedar Creek corridor, or via payment in lieu.

Vegetated Corridors under Clean Water Services jurisdiction occur in the project area, require delineation, and permit for permanent and temporary disturbance. There are sufficient mitigation opportunities on City-owned property in the Cedar Creek corridor to address impacts to CWS Vegetated Corridors.

DEQ's 303(d) list identifies Cedar Creek as water-quality-limited for Biological Criteria year-round. Stormwater quality

treatment will not be provided for any new impervious surface area.

Any fill in the 100-year floodplain will be balanced by an equivalent quantity of cut for "no rise."

6) Estimated Biological & Threatened & Endangered Species Impacts:

The Oregon Biodiversity Information Center (ORBIC) and StreamNet indicate that ESA-listed fish (winter steelhead) are present in Cedar Creek within the project area. ESA critical habitat has not been designated, but MSA Essential Fish Habitat is present. Temporary impacts to protected fish species may occur from installation of bridge abutments and boardwalk piles, and trail construction in riparian areas. The ODOT-FHWA FAHP programmatic biological opinion will cover incidental take of ESA-listed species under the jurisdiction of NMFS. Conservation and general construction measures will minimize impacts to species and habitats.

ORBIC did not identify any ESA-listed species subject to the jurisdiction of the US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) as present in the project area. A botanical survey to determine the presence of protected plants subject to the jurisdiction of the USFWS is required.

Habitat for migratory birds exists in the project area. Construction practices must comply with the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, which protects most species of birds in Oregon (except pigeons, house sparrows, and starlings) and prohibits the removal of nests containing eggs and dependent young. Do not disturb a migratory bird nest containing eggs or dependent young, or the surface the nest is built on, without a permit. Plan to clear vegetation between Sept. 1st and Feb. 28th of each year.

7) Estimated Archaeology and Historical Impacts

State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) records indicate there are no previously recorded archaeological sites within the Cedar Creek corridor or within the existing rights-of-way; however, the area along Cedar Creek near the confluence with Chicken Creek is a high probability area for archaeological sites. A minimum of a Phase I Archaeological Survey will be required.

A review of the Oregon SHPO historic sites database indicates that there is one property near the APE, the Granther House located at tax map/lot 2S 1 30C 00100, that is recommended eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). However, the trail will not cross or abut the Granther House property. Other properties within the project area may be potentially eligible for listing in the NRHP. A historic resources baseline report will be required. The project is anticipated to be cleared according to the 2011 Section 106 Programmatic Agreement.

8) Estimated Park, Visual Impacts and 4(f) Potential

The project will extend the Cedar Creek/Tonquin shared-use trail, part of the City of Sherwood's multi-modal transportation system. The trail project will not change the aesthetic of the surrounding properties. Construction-related temporary visual impacts to adjacent private properties will be minimal.

The work will take place on land zoned Low Density Residential or LDR-PUD, and High Density Residential. Much is owned by the City of Sherwood or in existing public right of way, but four parcels are privately owned. The proposed trail will intersect several Section 4(f)-protected properties. However, because the sole purpose of the project is to enhance the activities, features, and attributes of the public parks in the study area, project actions at any public park in the study are excepted from the requirements of Section 4(f) per 23 CFR 774.13(g).

There are no 6(f) properties purchased using Land and Water Conservation Funds in the project area, according to the National Park Service database. Therefore, no Section 6(f) coordination and evaluation will be required.

9) Estimated Air, Noise and Energy Impacts

The project will not add motorized vehicle traffic lanes. Most construction activity will be located at a distance of 100 feet or more from nearby residential and recreational uses. Construction along existing SW Edy Road will occur during weekday/daytime hours and within noise ordinance allowances. Temporary air, noise and energy impacts from construction will be minimal. The completed project will improve pedestrian/bicycle circulation and reduce potential conflicts with motorized traffic in the area. No air or noise permits are anticipated. The project is anticipated to have some beneficial effects to air quality, noise and energy. The City of Sherwood is located in an air quality attainment area. The project is identified in the City of Sherwood's Transportation System Plan (2005 TSP) as the Cedar Creek Trail, Parks Master Plan, and Metro's 2035 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) as Project #10701. For MSAT considerations, this project falls in the category of 'Exempt or a Project with No Meaningful Potential MSAT Effects' because it qualifies as a categorical exclusion under 23 CFR 771.117(c)(3) "Construction of bicycle and pedestrian lanes, paths, and facilities." No hot spot analysis is required for this project.

10) Estimated Hazardous Materials Impacts

ODEQ's hazmat database identifies two DEQ Environmental Cleanup Site Information System (ECSI sites), four Leaking Underground Storage Tank (LUST) sites, and six active Underground Storage Tank (UST) sites in the general vicinity of the project area. Each of the ECSI and LUST sites have been conferred either No Further Action or Administrative Closure status. West of the project area is a gas station that is listed as a Hazardous Waste Generator, and to the east of the project area there are two former Hazardous Waste Generator sites, although none of the three businesses are within the project area. These sites do not appear to constitute an environmental concern for the trail project. The project will complete a Level 1 Hazmat Assessment.

11) Preliminary Identification of Potential Areas of Critical Concern and Controversial Issues

The proposed project is consistent with the Sherwood Comprehensive Plan and is identified in the Sherwood TSP, other Master Plans, and the Metro 2035 RTP. Primary concerns are balancing the temporary and permanent wetland, water, Vegetated Corridor, and floodplain impacts with enhancement of the degraded natural resources; and balancing the need for community connectivity with the apprehension of property owners adjacent to the trail. The Tualatin Basin ESEE identifies the project area as a "Habitat of Concern." The trail will run parallel to the riparian area, occasionally close to floodplain wetlands or eliminating a large percentage of riparian areas that remain after prior residential development. The Cedar Creek crossing structure will maintain a fully functional floodplain. Existing slopes are steeper than 25% in several areas. Trail design should consider how future feeder trails can be constructed efficiently and compatibly.

12) Documentation Requirements

1. Wetland Delineation Report
2. Wetland Mitigation Plan & Report
3. Wetland removal-fill permit application for USACE/ODSL
4. Natural Resource Site Assessment for CWS Vegetated Corridors and Service Provider Letter application
5. Hydraulic (Storm) Report
6. ESA No Effect Technical Memorandum
7. FHWA-ODOT FAHP programmatic biological opinion Notification Form
8. Botanical Survey
9. ODFW Fish Passage Plan
10. Phase 1 Archaeological Survey and Report (shovel probe contingency)
11. Historic Baseline Report
12. Section 4(f) and 6(f) Documentation
13. Level 1 Hazardous Material Assessment
14. Geotechnical Report
15. Utility Report
16. Technical Report on Pavement Surfaces/Structure/Permeability
17. Alignment Needs Assessment & Confirmation Report
18. Traffic study w/ current ADT (all modes), projections, crosswalk analysis/warrants to state highway engineer

13) Estimated Pre-Construction Activity Impacts (drilling, survey work, etc

Pre-construction activities, including minor clearing, will include topographic survey, property boundary survey, survey staking, tree assessment, all necessary environmental site assessments, test pits/drillings (~8-12' deep) for the geotechnical explorations and soil profiles, approximately 20 total. Permanent and temporary easements will be acquired, including all necessary ROW and facility permits for the approaches and connections to public roads.

14) Preliminary Identification of Public/Stakeholder Concerns

The trail, which is identified in City master plans, is supported by a robust public involvement program including outreach to affected public and private landowners, potential trail users, jurisdictional partners, and other interested members of the community. The Ice Age Tonquin Trail steering committee included staff from Washington and Clackamas Counties; the cities of Wilsonville, Sherwood, and Tualatin; ODOT; citizen-appointees from Sherwood, Tualatin, and Wilsonville; a countywide cycling advocate; and Clean Water Services. Public outreach included open houses; booths at summer events; publications in local newsletters; feature articles in local and regional newspapers; Metro GreenScene; Metro's social media channels; postcards; and project website with online surveys and "virtual open houses." The Cedar Creek/Tonquin Trail representatives met with the Local Trail Advisory Committee, and Parks and Recreation Board, to identify opportunities and constraints. There are no major public stakeholder concerns; however, concern has been expressed about: ownership/private property impacts, user safety, and environmental compatibility. Balancing wetland/environmental impacts with property owner needs and overall public access are the greatest concerns of the City, CWS, and citizens of Sherwood. Reducing vehicles-miles traveled, improving air quality, connecting neighborhoods and land uses, improving the natural environment, and nature experience are the primary goals of the project, which has been presented to and is understood by the public.

Env-Cat Exclusions

A "Categorical Exclusion" (Class 2) is a category of actions which does not individually or cumulatively have a significant environmental effect (40 CFR 1508.4, 23 CFR 771.115).

The NEPA context of "significant" is defined at 40 CFR 1508.27 in order to determine whether a U.S. DOT project is excluded from preparation of an Environmental Assessment (EA) or Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

Please answer the following questions:

Categorical Exclusions

23 CFR 771.117(a) - Would the project involve any of the following effects:

Y N U N/A <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	1. Induce significant impacts to planned growth or land use for an area?
Y N U N/A <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	2. Require relocation of significant numbers of people?
Y N U N/A <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	3. Have a significant impact on any natural, cultural, recreational, historic or other resources?
Y N U N/A <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	4. Involve significant air, noise, or water quality impacts?
Y N U N/A <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	5. Have significant impacts on travel patterns?

23 CFR 771.117(b) - Would the project involve unusual circumstances such as:

Y N U N/A <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	1. Significant environmental impacts?
Y N U N/A <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	2. Substantial controversy on environmental grounds?
Y N U N/A <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	3. Significant impacts to properties protected by Section 4(f) of the DOT Act or Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act?
Y N U N/A <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	4. Inconsistencies with any federal, state, or local law, requirements or administrative determination relating to the environmental aspects of the project?

If you answered "YES" to one or more of the above questions, you likely DO NOT have a Class II project. If you answered "UNKNOWN" to one or more of the above questions, you MAY NOT have a Class II project.

In either of these cases, you should discuss the NEPA classification with an Environmental Manager, the REC Program Coordinator, the NEPA Program Coordinator, and/or the FHWA Environmental Coordinator prior to classifying the project of the Prospectus Part 3.

If you answered "NO" to ALL of the above questions, the project is likely a Class II Action.*

Type of Categorical Exclusions:

Y N U N/A <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	A. Is the proposed action specifically listed under 23 CFR 771.117 (c)? If "YES" please identify what: Construction of bicycle and pedestrian lanes, paths, and facilities.
	Bicycle and pedestrian lanes, paths, and facilities are specifically listed under 23 CFR 771.117 (c), 3.
Y N U N/A <input type="radio"/> <input checked="" type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/> <input type="radio"/>	B. Is the proposed action specifically listed under 23 CFR 771.117 (d)? If "YES" please identify what:
	are not specifically listed under section (d).

*While Class 2 actions do not require preparation of an EA or EIS, they may yet require additional environmental analysis of impacts to the natural and built environment.

Some 23 CFR 771.17 (d) list Class II actions may require a NEPA type process to facilitate coordination with regulatory agencies and stakeholder involvement.

Prepared By: Steve Mader/CH2M			FHWA or State Official Approval:	
Date: June 30, 2016	Revised: Nov. 23, 2016		Date:	Phone Number:

REGION ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST

ATTACHMENT TO PART 3 (PROJECT ENVIRONMENTAL CLASSIFICATION)

Project: Cedar Creek/Tonquin Trail: Roy Rogers-OR 99W	Key No: 18280
--	----------------------

Instructions:

This checklist should be completed and attached to the Part 3. It will provide information to assist in appropriately classifying projects. A "Yes" answer indicates areas of concern, a "No" answer indicates no concerns. The primary intent of the checklist is to ensure these items have been considered, and where appropriate, researched. When something of potential impact is found, explain in the appropriate section of the Part 3. If you have any questions, please call (503) 986-3477. The receptionist will transfer you to the appropriate resource person for assistance.

1. Prepared By: Steve Mader
3. Date: June 30, 2016
4. Applicable Bridge Number:
5. A brief description of the project: The City of Sherwood will construct: (A) 1.0 mile of the shared-use Cedar Creek/Tonquin Trail from the existing trail terminus southwest of the SW Ladyfern Drive/SW Roellich Avenue intersection to the terminus at SW Roy Rogers Road, and (B) at-grade pedestrian/bike crossing of SW Edy Road. Degraded wetlands and Vegetated Corridors will be restored or enhanced along the alignment.

Air Quality

Y N U <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	6. Is the project in an air quality non-attainment or maintenance area? Y N U CO <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Y N U PM10 <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>
Y N U <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	7. Is project missing from: Y N U STIP <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Y N U RTIP <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Y N U MTIP <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Comment: Local agency
Y N U <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	8. Does the project involve adding lanes, signalization, channelization, and/or alignment changes? Comment:

Archaeology

Y N U <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	9. Are archaeologically sensitive areas potentially affected (confluence of rivers, headlands, coves, overlooks, etc.)? Comment:
Y N U <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	10. Will the project entail disturbance of previously undisturbed ground (Farmed land is not considered disturbed)?
Y N U <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	11. Does project entail new ground disturbances? Comment:

Biology

Y N U <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	12. Does contact with local ODFW biologist indicate any issues? Name of ODFW Liaison and Comments:
Y N U <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	13. Is there any local knowledge of federal terrestrial (plant or animal) T&E (threatened & endangered) or candidate species in the area? Comment:
Y N U <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	14. Is there any local knowledge of state terrestrial (plant or animal) T&E or candidate species in the area? Comment: Steelhead trout
Y N U <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	15. Are any Federal Aquatic T&E Species present? Comment: Steelhead trout
Y N U <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	16. Are any State Aquatic T&E Species present? Comment: Steelhead trout

Y N U <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	17. Does the project occur on or adjacent to BLM or USFS land?
Y N U <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	18. Does contact with local BLM or USFS biologists indicate any issues? Name of BLM or USFS Biologist and Comments:
Y N U <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	19. What are the results from a Natural Heritage Database search? Steelhead trout, bald eagle
Y N U <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	20. If impacts to a waterway are possible, what are the aquatic resources i.e. (fish presence or absence, distribution etc.) at or immediately downstream of the project location? http://www.streamnet.org/ Comment: Steelhead trout
Y N U <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	21. Confirmed ODFW preferred in-water work period(s) for project area? (List if applicable): http://www.dfw.state.or.us/lands/inwater/inwater_guide.pdf July 15 - September 30
Y N U <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	22. List any streams impacted by project: Cedar Creek
Y N U <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	23. Are there any culverts within the project limits which will be worked on and will trigger the Oregon State Fish Passage Statute (ORS 509.585)? Comment:
Y N U <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	24. Are there any culverts within the project limits that are on the ODFW priority list for replacement/retrofit? Comment:
Y N U <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	25. Is the creek or river classified as Essential Salmonid Habitat by the Oregon Department of State Lands? Comment:
Y N U <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	26. Any known noxious weed populations in the area? Comment: Project is located in FOUR COUNTY COOPERATIVE WEED MANAGEMENT AREA

Energy:

Y N U <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	27. Does project affect energy use as a result of changes to traffic patterns or volumes, or involve speed zone changes? Comment:
---	--

Geology:

Y N U <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	28. Do discussions with Region Geologist indicate any major concerns? Comment:
Y N U <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	29. Will ODOT owned/permitted material sources be offered for this project? http://www.cr.nps.gov/nr/research/
Y N U <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	30. Is drilling / exploration anticipated? Comment:

Hazardous Materials:

Y N U <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	31. Does a search of the DEQ's hazmat databases indicate any sites in the project area? http://www.deq.state.or.us/wmc/ Comment: No HazMat sites within ~0.5 mile of project area												
Y N U <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	32. Does a search of the State Fire Marshal's hazmat databases indicate any sites in the project area? http://egov.oregon.gov/OOHS/SFM/CR2K_Databases_Intro.shtml Comment:												
Y N U <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	33. Will R/W Acquisition(s) include gas stations, repair facilities, industrial sites, landfills or any other non-residential facilities that may have used or stored hazardous materials? Comment:												
Y N U <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	34. Will R/W Acquisition(s) include residential or industrial home oil tanks (above or below ground)? Comment:												
Y N U <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	35. Are ground disturbances anticipated (excavation / drilling, etc.) near known or potential hazmat sites? Comment:												
	36. Check the following for adjacent or nearby sites listed in the DEQ & Fire Marshal Databases:												
	<table border="0"> <tr> <td>Y N U</td> <td>UST</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Y N U</td> <td>Spill listed by State Fire Marshal</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/></td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Y N U</td> <td>RCRA Generator</td> </tr> <tr> <td><input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/></td> <td></td> </tr> </table>	Y N U	UST	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>		Y N U	Spill listed by State Fire Marshal	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>		Y N U	RCRA Generator	<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	
Y N U	UST												
<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>													
Y N U	Spill listed by State Fire Marshal												
<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>													
Y N U	RCRA Generator												
<input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>													

Y N U	Solid Waste
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Y N U	TSD
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Y N U	Leaking UST
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Y N U	Environmental Cleanup Site Information (ECSI) listed site
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Y N U	Other
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
List any occurrence on the above items: 6 active USTs within 0.5 mile of site; 4 Leaking UST sites all closed or have received NFA determination; all 2 ECSI listed sites have received NFA determination	

Historical

Y N U	37. Does any city/county comprehensive plan list any buildings/items in the project area as Goal 5 resources?
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Comment:
Y N U	38. Will there be any impacts to known historic resources either listed or determined eligible for the National Register of Historic Places according to the National Register Information System?
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Comment:
Y N U	39. Are any buildings in the project area thought to be 50 years or older?
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Comment:
Y N U	40. Are any apparent / unique / suspect structures of possible historical interest?
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Comment:
Y N U	41. Are there any Historic District/trails/bridges/railroads?
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Comment:
Y N U	42. Was the SHPO historic database consulted?
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Comment:

Land Use / Planning:

Y N U	43. Is the project identified in local Transportation System Improvement Plan?
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Comment:
Y N U	44. Does the project need permit or land use actions from local jurisdictions?
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Comment:
Y N U	45. Is the project outside of a jurisdiction's UGB?
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Comment:
Y N U	46. Does project cross or touch a jurisdiction's UGB?
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Comment:
Y N U	47. Does Coastal Zone Management Act apply?
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Comment:
Y N U	48. Are areas of Forest or EFU zoning impacted by the project?
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Comment:
Y N U	49. Are other protected resources (i.e. estuary, wetlands, greenways, etc.) impacted by the project?
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	If Yes, list: Wetland, other water, Vegetated Corridor, floodplain, Greenway
Y N U	50. Does the project impact areas designated by NRCS as "High-Value Farmland?"
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	http://www.nrcs.usda.gov/technical/ Comment:
Y N U	51. Will the project result in the conversion of prime farmland, unique farmland, or land of statewide or local importance as defined by Farmland Protection Policy Act (FPPA)?
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Comment:
Y N U	52. List Comprehensive Plan designations being impacted:
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Wildlife/Habitat & Wetlands
Y N U	53. List zoning designations being impacted:
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Low Density Residential-LDR, LDR-PUD, High Density Residential-HDR (PUD)
Y N U	54. Does project have potential to improve multi-modal transportation options (rail, bus, bicycle paths, pedestrian walkways, etc.)?
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Comments:
Y N U	55. Region Planner's opinion that the project conforms with:
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	(If NOT Explain):
Y N U	Transportation Planning Rule
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Comment:

Y N U <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	Statewide Planning Goals Comment:
Y N U <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	Comprehensive Plan and/or Transportation System Improvement Plan (county/city or both). (Requests for this information should be directed to local ODOT planning staff. Request should be made via email.) Comment:

Noise:

Y N U <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	56. Will there be any shift in horizontal or vertical alignment? If so, amount of shift: Horizontal: Vertical:
Y N U <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	57. Does project increase the number of through travel lanes? Number of existing lanes: Number of proposed lanes:
Y N U <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	58. Is this a new roadway located on a new alignment? Comment:
Y N U <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	59. Are there any known noise problems / complaints? Comment:
Y N U <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	60. Will this project result in the removal of topographical features which currently shield receptors? Comment:
	61. Approximate number of buildings / activity areas within 61 meters (200 feet) of proposed right of way line: Commercial: 0 Industrial: 0 Public: 1 Residences: 38 Schools: 0 Churches: 0 Parks: 0

Section 4(f) Potential:

Y N U <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	62. Are any parks, wildlife refuges, historic buildings, recreational areas, railroads etc., impacted? If yes, explain:
---	--

Section 6(f) Potential:

Y N U <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	63. Were Land & Water Conservation Funds used to acquire parks, or to make improvements, etc.? If yes, explain:
---	--

Socioeconomics:

Y N U <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	64. Do building displacements appear key to economy / neighborhood? Comment:
	65. Number of building displacements? 0
	66. General use of adjacent land: Y N U Residential <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Y N U Commercial <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Y N U Farm/Range <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Y N U Public <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> Y N U Other <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> If Other, Explain:
	67. Estimate of number of people living adjacent to project: 100+
	68. Estimate of number of people working adjacent to project: 0-30
Y N U <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	69. Does this project divide or disrupt an established community, or affect neighborhood character or stability? Comment:

Y N U <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	70. Does this project affect minority, elderly, handicapped, low income, transit-dependent, or other specific interest group? Comment:
---	---

Visual:

Y N U <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	71. Is the project on a designated state or federal scenic route? http://www.byways.org/browse/states/OR/ If Yes, indicate the designation (National Scenic Byway, All-American Road, Oregon Scenic Byway, Oregon Tour Route, or Oregon Memorial Drive):
Y N U <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	72. Does the Oregon Forest Practices Act apply? If Yes, indicate whether restrictions apply to operation of power driven machinery or to harvest/clearing on private property or ODF lands:
Y N U <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	73. Are major cuts/fills associated with this project? Comment:
Y N U <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	74. Are bridges or large retaining walls anticipated? Comment:
Y N U <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	75. Does project affect river segments or lakes designated as Oregon Scenic Waterways? If Yes, will work occur within 1/4 mile of the bank of the Oregon Scenic Waterway:
Y N U <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	76. Does project affect waterways designated as National Wild and Scenic Rivers? http://www.nps.gov/rivers/wildriverslist.html If Yes, list the classification (e.g., Recreation):

Waterways/Water Quality:

Y N U <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	77. Does city / county comp plan list any water resources as Goal 5 resources? Comment: Cedar Creek, wetlands, Greenway
Y N U <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	78. Is the project within FEMA 100-year flood plain? http://www.msc.fema.gov/ Comment: CWS 100-year floodplain
Y N U <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	79. Is the project within FEMA regulated floodway? Comment:
Y N U <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	80. Will a water quality limited stream be impacted? http://www.deq.state.or.us/wq/303dlist/303dpage.htm Comment:
Y N U <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	81. Will any active wells be impacted? Comment:
	82. Select range of ADT: Comment: <750
Y N U <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	83. Are there navigable waterway(s) within the project area? Comment:
Y N U <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	84. Will new impervious surface be added within the project limit? Comment:
Y N U <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	85. Will new impervious surface area be \geq 1,000 sq. meters? Comment:
Y N U <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	86. Are any irrigation districts impacted? Comment:
Y N U <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	87. Are there T&E aquatic species in the receiving water? Comment:
Y N U <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	88. Is there an existing storm drain system? Comment:

Wetlands:

Y N U <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	89. Does National Wetlands Inventory Maps, Local Wetlands Inventory Maps, and/or ODOT Salmon Resource & Sensitive Area Database show any potential wetlands in the project area? http://www.fws.gov/nwi/downloads.htm Comment:
Y N U <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	90. Do soil survey conservation maps indicate hydric soils in project area? http://www.or.nrcs.usda.gov/technical/soil/index.html Comment:
Y N U <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	91. Do local Comprehensive Plans show any wetlands as protected resources? Comments:
Y N U <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	92. Is riparian or wetland vegetation evident from visual inspection? Comment:

Permits: (Note: If answer is "Unknown" please explain in comment box below)

Comment:

Y N U <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	US Corps of Engineers Section 404
Y N U <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	US Corps of Engineers Section 10 (tidal waters)
Y N U <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	DSL Removal and Fill
Y N U <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	DEQ Indirect Source (Air)
Y N U <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	DOGAMI
Y N U <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	Coast Guard
Y N U <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	Local Jurisdiction National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES)
Y N U <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	Rail Division
Y N U <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	Other: None identified

Clearances: (Note: If answer is "Unknown" please explain in comment box below)

Comments:

Y N U <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	State and/or Federal Endangered Species Act
Y N U <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	State Historic Preservation Office (Historic)
Y N U <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	State Historic Preservation Office (Archaeological)
Y N U <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	FHWA Noise
Y N U <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	Air Conformity
Y N U <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	DEQ Commercial / Industrial Noise Regulation
Y N U <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	Hazmat Materials Clearance
Y N U <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	ODOT Erosion Control Plan
Y N U <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	ODOT Rail Division Order (Is any portion of the project within 500' of a railroad in any direction?)

Prepared by: Steve Mader	Phone Number: 503-736-4312	Date: June 30, 2016
--------------------------	----------------------------	---------------------

PRELIMINARY - COST ESTIMATE - 2016 Items					
OREGON STATE HIGHWAY DIVISION - ROADWAY ENGINEERING					
SECTION				COUNTY	
Cedar Creek/Tonquin Trail: Roy Rogers - OR99W				Washington	
KEY NUMBER	KIND OF WORK	LENGTH	DATE	ROADWAY DESIGNER	
18280	Grading, Structures, Paving, Signals, Illumination	1	8/8/16	Sharon Daleo	
ITEM NUMBER	ITEM DESCRIPTION	UNIT	AMOUNT	UNIT COST	TOTAL
MOBILIZATION AND TRAFFIC CONTROL					
0210-0100000A	MOBILIZATION	LS	All	10.00%	\$327,518.62
0280-0100000A	EROSION CONTROL	LS	All		\$290,000.00
See Traffic Control Estimate, without Mob. And E&C.		LS	All	3.00%	\$86,947.17
ROADWORK					
0305-0100000A	CONSTRUCTION SURVEY WORK	LS	All	3.00%	\$61,893.18
0310-0106000A	REMOVAL OF STRUCTURES AND OBSTRUCTIONS	LS	All	3.00%	\$59,166.78
0320-0100000R	CLEARING AND GRUBBING	ACRE	3.3	\$9,610.00	\$31,713.00
0330-0123000K	EMBANKMENT IN PLACE	CUYD	11,630	\$20.00	\$232,600.00
0330-0126000K	STONE EMBANKMENT	CUYD	1,100	\$50.00	\$55,000.00
0340-0100000Q	WATERING	MGAL	20	\$16.00	\$313.19
0350-0105000J	SUBGRADE GEOTEXTILE	SQYD	8,500	\$1.00	\$8,500.00
DRAINAGE AND SEWERS					
0445-010012AF	12 INCH CULVERT PIPE, 5 FT DEPTH	FOOT	120	\$80.00	\$9,600.00
0445-010018AF	18 INCH CULVERT PIPE, 5 FT DEPTH	FOOT	60	\$105.00	\$6,300.00
0490-0120000E	MINOR ADJUSTMENT OF MANHOLES	EACH	4	\$1,080.00	\$4,320.00
0490-0104000E	CONNECTION TO EXISTING STRUCTURES	EACH	4	\$1,050.00	\$4,200.00
0445-010036BF	36 INCH CULVERT PIPE, 10 FT DEPTH	FOOT	20	\$150.00	\$3,000.00
WALLS					
XXXXXXXXXXXX	SOIL REINFORCED SLOPE	SQFT	11,300	\$50.00	\$565,000.00
XXXXXXXXXXXX	ROCKERY CUT WALL	SQFT	6,800	\$42.00	\$285,600.00
BRIDGES					
See Bridge Estimate, without Mob. And E&C.		(Mike Lopez, CH2M, 503-872-4549)			\$480,000.00
BASES					
0640-0100000M	AGGREGATE BASE	TON	1,600	\$27.00	\$43,200.00
WEARING SURFACES					
0730-0100000M	EMULSIFIED ASPHALT FOR TACK COAT	TON	4	\$210.00	\$840.00
0745-0202000M	LEVEL 2, 1/2 INCH ACP	TON	1,264	\$92.00	\$116,287.62
0745-0620000M	PG 64-22 ASPHALT IN ACP	TON	76	\$170.00	\$12,892.76
0759-0105000F	CONCRETE CURBS, CURB AND GUTTER, MODIFIED	FOOT	120	\$37.00	\$4,440.00
0759-0153000E	CONCRETE SIDEWALK RAMPS	EACH	6	\$2,550.00	\$15,300.00
0759-0128000J	CONCRETE WALKS	SQYD	200	\$6.20	\$1,240.00
0748-0114000J	24 INCH ASPAHLT CONCRETE PAVEMENT REPAIR	SQYD	254	\$75.00	\$19,050.00
PERMANENT TRAFFIC CONTROL AND GUIDANCE DEVICES					
0587-0127000A	PEDESTRIAN RAIL	FOOT	2,240	\$40.00	\$89,600.00
1050-0135000F	_____ CHAIN-LINK FENCE	FOOT	500	\$26.00	\$13,000.00
0867-0145100J	PAVEMENT BAR, TYPE B-HS	SQFT	240	\$8.00	\$1,920.00
0860-0200000F	LONGITUDINAL PAVEMENT MARKINGS - PAINT	FOOT	150	\$0.15	\$22.50
0910-0100000K	WOOD SIGN POSTS	FBM	30	\$20.00	\$600.00
0940-0124000J	TYPE "W1" SIGNS IN PLACE	SQFT	12	\$40.00	\$480.00
0940-0134000J	TYPE "Y1" SIGNS IN PLACE	SQFT	54	\$40.00	\$2,160.00
ILLUMINATION AND SIGNALS					
Illumination (3 lights		EACH	3	\$20,000.00	\$60,000.00
Signals (3 RRFBs)		EACH	3	\$40,000.00	\$120,000.00
PLANTINGS					
Environmental Mitigation					\$500,000.00
RIGHT OF WAY					
					\$90,000.00
SUBTOTAL, Construction Items					\$3,602,704.81
	UTILITIES, for all work listed				\$20,000.00
	CONSTRUCTION ENGINEERING			15.0%	\$550,000.00
	CONTINGENCIES, for all work listed			20.0%	\$730,000.00
	Preliminary Engineering			20.0%	\$960,000.00
TOTAL CONSTRUCTION COST					\$5,862,704.81
Current Programmed Funding Amount				#DIV/0!	