

## Chapter 9. Appendices

One of the most common strategies for increasing the readability of NEPA documents is to shift some content from the main body to appendices. This approach is not new; in fact, it was recommended by the CEQ in its “40 Questions” guidance more than 30 years ago:

The body of the EIS should be a succinct statement of all the information on environmental impacts and alternatives that the decision-maker and the public need, in order to make the decision and to ascertain that every significant factor has been examined. The EIS must explain or summarize methodologies of research and modeling, and the results of research that may have been conducted to analyze impacts and alternatives.

Lengthy technical discussions of modeling methodology, baseline studies, or other work are best reserved for the appendix. In other words, if only technically trained individuals are likely to understand a particular discussion then it should go in the appendix, and a plain language summary of the analysis and conclusions of that technical discussion should go in the text of the EIS.<sup>1</sup>

Techniques for using appendices effectively include:

- *Provide specific cross-references to relevant content in the appendices.* Many appendices are quite lengthy, often hundreds of pages. If the main body includes a cross-reference to the appendix as a whole, it can be difficult for the reader to know where to find the relevant information within that appendix. It is often more useful to include a cross-reference to a specific section or sub-section within the appendix.
- *Provide a detailed list of the appendices in the main volume of the NEPA document.* When the main body of a NEPA document is condensed, it

---

<sup>1</sup> Council on Environmental Quality, “Forty Most Asked Questions Concerning CEQ’s National Environmental Policy Act Regulations” (March 1981), Question 25, at <http://energy.gov/sites/prod/files/G-CEQ-40Questions.pdf>.

becomes more important to provide the reader with a clear roadmap to the information contained in the appendices. For example, rather than simply listing an appendix titled “Technical Reports,” the table of contents can provide a complete list of the technical reports that are included in the appendices. In addition, rather than simply noting that appendices are included on a DVD, the table of contents can include a detailed listing of the contents of the DVD.

- *Provide aids to navigation within the appendices, if the appendices are lengthy or include several parts.* The appendices themselves should be organized and formatted in a manner that enables the reader to find relevant information. Relatively simple aids to navigation can be very effective – for example, providing a table of contents at the beginning of the appendix, and providing consistent pagination throughout the appendix. It also is helpful to make electronic versions of the appendices (PDFs) fully text-searchable.
- *Include key appendices in the printed document, if they are not voluminous.* Reducing the length of the printed NEPA document is not an end in itself; the goal is to make the document more usable. In some cases, usability is enhanced by including key appendices in the printed volume. For example, the printed appendices might include important agency correspondence, alternatives screening reports, Section 4(f) documentation, or a Section 106 memorandum of agreement.

Lastly, it is important to remember that effective use of appendices requires planning, which should begin early in the development of the NEPA document. It is a good practice to develop a written plan for the document that identifies the list of appendices and the materials that will be included in each appendix. This plan is likely to evolve, but developing it early in the NEPA process helps to provide a framework for deciding what to include in the main body and what to include in each of the appendices.

# Cross-References to Technical Reports in Main Volume of EIS

- OH: Opportunity Corridor DEIS

**Techniques to note:**  
 - includes supporting studies in appendices, referenced in main body;  
 - note that these appendices are on the CD, not in the printed copy.

findings<sup>8</sup> for the impacts to historic resources. FHWA concurred with the *de minimis* finding on Jan. 18, 2013.

For additional details about the Cleveland Opportunity Corridor project’s potential impacts on cultural resources, please refer to the *Phase I History/Architecture Survey Report for the Opportunity Corridor Project* (January 2010), the *Phase I Archaeological Literature Review, Prehistoric Context, and Archaeological Sensitivity Assessment for the Opportunity Corridor Project* (February 2010), and the *Phase I Archaeological Resource Review and Disturbance Assessment for the Proposed Opportunity Corridor Project* (November 2012). These reports, as well as the Section 106 and Section 4(f) coordination, are on the CD included with this DEIS.

The No-Build Alternative is not expected to impact historic resources.

### WHAT RESOURCES ARE NOT PRESENT WITHIN THE STUDY AREA?

The following resources do *not* exist within the study area:

- Streams or surface water bodies;
- Wetlands;
- Aquatic habitat;
- Threatened and endangered species or habitat;
- Federally regulated floodplains;
- Farmland;
- Unique, rare or high-quality plant communities; or
- Drinking water resources.

Because they do not exist in the study area, these natural resources would not be impacted by either the No-Build Alternative or the Cleveland Opportunity Corridor project.

Ohio EPA Division of Drinking and Groundwater Water maps were reviewed to identify drinking water resources located near the project area. The project is not located within a federally designated Sole Source Aquifer (SSA) or within

any source water protection area for public water systems. Additionally, there are no community or non-community public water systems that use groundwater located near the project. The City of Cleveland has a public water supply system that obtains drinking water from Lake Erie. For additional details about drinking and groundwater resources, please refer to the Ohio EPA mapping on the CD included with this DEIS.

For additional details about the natural resources field studies and conclusions, please refer to the *Level 2 Ecological Survey Report for Opportunity Corridor* (PID 77333) (January 2010). This report is on the CD included with this DEIS. A copy of the correspondence from ODOT confirming that no further ecological coordination was required for the Cleveland Opportunity Corridor project is also on the CD.

### HOW WOULD WATER QUALITY BE AFFECTED?

The Cleveland Opportunity Corridor project area is currently drained by a combined sewer system, in which a single sewer pipe carries both sanitary waste and stormwater flows (Figure 4-31, page 4-36). During dry weather, sanitary waste flows directly to a wastewater treatment plant; during wet weather, sanitary and stormwater combine and continue to flow to the wastewater treatment plant.

Extra flow is stored in the sewer pipes until the pipes fill. Once the pipes are full, they overflow to local waterways – allowing untreated wastewater to enter streams and rivers. In the project area, these include the Cuyahoga River, Lake Erie and Doan Brook. The Northeast Ohio Regional Sewer District (NEORS) has been ordered by EPA to reduce the number of combined sewer overflows.

The Cleveland Opportunity Corridor project would improve water quality by:

- Building depressed grassy areas in the boulevard median between East 55th Street

<sup>8</sup> In accordance with 23 CFR 774.3 (b).

**Table 4-4: Temporary Impacts to Current and Planned Expansion Areas of Kenneth L. Johnson Recreation Center**

TOTAL AREA (ACRES)	TEMPORARY EASEMENT LOCATION	TOTAL PARCELS IMPACTED	IMPACT AREA (ACRES)
11.6	Buckeye Rd	5	0.07
	Woodland Ave	4	0.06
	New Boulevard	4	0.06
<b>Total</b>		<b>13</b>	<b>0.19</b>

Note: The impacts listed in this table differ from the Section 6(f) impacts previously discussed because impacts to planned expansion areas are included.

planned expansion would be approximately 11.6 acres, see Figure 4-15 on page 4-13.

During construction, the Cleveland Opportunity Corridor project would need about 0.19 acres (8,420 square feet) of land from the planned park expansion area (Table 4-4). The land would only be needed on a temporary basis for grading and seeding that would take place when Buckeye Road and Woodland Avenue are widened and when the new boulevard is built.

Specific requirements within Section 4(f) describe when a “use” of a resource occurs. The temporary impacts listed above would not result in a use of or impact to Section 4(f) resources. This finding was agreed to by the City of Cleveland on Sept. 24, 2012. ODOT determined that the project does not require Section 4(f) approval on Oct. 23, 2012.<sup>5</sup>

As part of this agreement, the following commitments would be included in the final design plans:

<sup>5</sup> In accordance with 23 CFR 774 and the Programmatic Agreement for Processing of Non-Individual Section 4(f) Actions Between the Federal Highway Administration and the Ohio Department of Transportation (Agreement Number 17220), executed Aug. 24, 2012, ODOT Office of Environmental Services has determined that the project qualifies as an exception to the requirement for Section 4(f) approval.

- The contractor is required to protect the rec center areas and users with warnings signs, gates, barricades, and/or fences during construction;
- Rec center access would be maintained at all times. The contractor would be required to coordinate the construction schedule with the City of Cleveland. Two weeks before construction starts, the contractor would notify the city, in writing, of the occupation dates;
- Any disturbed areas would be put back to a condition at least as good as or better than what existed before construction started;
- Staging and storage of construction equipment would not take place on the rec center property; and
- If unexpected work on the rec center property is needed, advance notice would be given to the City of Cleveland and ODOT to decide if additional coordination is needed.

A copy of the Section 4(f) coordination documents, including a copy of the coordination between ODOT and the City of Cleveland, are on the CD included with this DEIS.

The No-Build Alternative would have no direct effect on parks and recreational opportunities.

**HOW WOULD CULTURAL RESOURCES BE AFFECTED?**

Cultural resources include historic properties that are currently listed on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) or that qualify for listing on the NHRP. Cultural resources can include districts, sites, buildings, structures and objects. They can be readily visible, or they can be below the ground – as is the case with archaeological resources.

Cultural resources are protected under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, which requires agencies to consider the effects of their actions on historic properties. Section 106

*(This page is intentionally left blank.)*

# Technical Reports Included in Appendices in Electronic Format

- CO: I-70 PEIS
- WA: SR 520 FEIS
- WA: Mukilteo FEIS

**Techniques to note:**

- table of contents in printed documents lists each of the technical reports that is included on DVD.

**Table of Contents**

Table 2-2. Localized Highway Improvement Alternative Elements .....2-10  
Table 2-3. Fixed Guideway Transit Alternative Elements .....2-13  
Table 2-4. Rubber Tire Transit Alternative Elements .....2-16  
Table 2-5. Highway Improvement Alternative Elements .....2-18  
Table 2-6. Alternate Route Alternative Elements .....2-20  
Table 2-7. Aviation Alternative Elements .....2-22  
Table 2-8. Tunnel Alternative Elements .....2-23  
Table 2-9. Minimal Action Components Associated with Action Alternatives .....2-42  
Table 2-10. Components of Preferred Alternative .....2-47  
Table 2-11. Comparison of Action Alternatives .....2-65  
Table 2-12. Protected Species Impact Determinations .....2-70  
Table 3.1-1. Estimated Pollutant Emissions by Alternative .....3.1-3  
Table 3.2-1. Vegetation Communities and Associated Life Zone .....3.2-6  
Table 3.2-2. Gold Medal and “High-Value” Fisheries .....3.2-9  
Table 3.2-3. Protected Species Impact Determinations .....3.2-18  
Table 3.3-1. Comparison of Wetlands Impacts by Resource and Alternatives (acres) .....3.3-5  
Table 3.4-1. Summary of Stream Channel Impacts (Miles) .....3.4-9  
Table 3.6-1. Federal and State Superfund Sites, Generators, and Releases .....3.6-3  
Table 3.6-2. Listed Storage Tank Sites .....3.6-4  
Table 3.6-3. Summary of Impacts .....3.6-10  
Table 3.7-1. Summary of Corridor County Master Plan Topics Related to the Corridor .....3.7-4  
Table 3.9-1. Environmental Justice Impact Analysis .....3.9-7  
Table 3.10-1. Measured Noise Levels 2001–2004 .....3.10-4  
Table 3.10-2. 2035 Predicted Noise Levels .....3.10-5  
Table 3.12-1. Annual Change in National Forest Destination Trips .....3.12-8  
Table 3.13-1. Comparison of Direct Impacts on Historic Properties .....3.13-7  
Table 3.14-1. Potential for Use of Historic Properties by Alternative .....3.14-15  
Table 3.14-2. Potential Use of Section 4(f) Parks, Recreation Areas, and Wildlife  
Refuges .....3.14-18  
Table 3.16-1. Daily Operational Energy Consumption – Based on 2035 Travel Demand .....3.16-4  
Table 3.16-2. Construction Energy Consumption – Based on 2035 Travel Demand,  
in Billion BTU .....3.16-5  
Table 3.19-1. Mitigation Strategies .....3.19-3  
Table 4-1. Cumulative Impacts Issues .....4-2  
Table 4-2. Cumulative Impacts (acres) on Key Wildlife Habitat in the Corridor .....4-14  
Table 4-3. Annual Carbon Dioxide Emissions .....4-27

**List of Technical Reports Contained in Electronic Appendix**

- I-70 Mountain Corridor PEIS Travel Demand Technical Report*
- I-70 Mountain Corridor PEIS Transportation Analysis Technical Report*
- I-70 Mountain Corridor PEIS Alternatives Development and Screening Technical Report*
- I-70 Mountain Corridor PEIS Safety Technical Report*
- I-70 Mountain Corridor PEIS Climate and Air Quality Technical Report*
- I-70 Mountain Corridor PEIS Biological Resources Technical Report*
- I-70 Mountain Corridor PEIS Wetlands and Other Waters of the U.S. Technical Report*
- I-70 Mountain Corridor PEIS Water Resources Technical Report*
- I-70 Mountain Corridor PEIS Geologic Hazards Technical Report*
- I-70 Mountain Corridor PEIS Regulated Materials and Historic Mining Technical Report*



## Table of Contents

*I-70 Mountain Corridor PEIS Land Use Technical Report*  
*I-70 Mountain Corridor PEIS Social and Economic Values Technical Report*  
*I-70 Mountain Corridor PEIS Environmental Justice Technical Report*  
*I-70 Mountain Corridor PEIS Noise Technical Report*  
*I-70 Mountain Corridor PEIS Visual Resources Technical Report*  
*I-70 Mountain Corridor PEIS Recreation Resources Technical Report*  
*I-70 Mountain Corridor PEIS Historic Properties and Native American Consultation Technical Report*  
*I-70 Mountain Corridor PEIS Section 4(f) Evaluation Technical Report*  
*I-70 Mountain Corridor PEIS Paleontological Resources Technical Report*  
*I-70 Mountain Corridor PEIS Energy Technical Report*  
*I-70 Mountain Corridor PEIS Cumulative Impacts Technical Report*  
*I-70 Mountain Corridor PEIS Financial Considerations Technical Report*  
*I-70 Mountain Corridor PEIS Cost Estimating Technical Report*  
*I-70 Mountain Corridor PEIS Public and Agency Involvement Technical Report*

**Techniques to note:**  
 - table of contents in printed documents lists each of the technical reports that is included on DVD.

7.6 How did WSDOT identify other present and reasonably foreseeable actions? .....7-5

7.7 What cumulative effects on the natural environment did WSDOT identify? .....7-9

7.8 What cumulative effects on the built environment did WSDOT identify? .....7-22

**Chapter 8: Other Considerations ..... 8-1**

8.1 Are there any adverse effects that cannot be mitigated? .....8-1

8.2 What irreversible decisions or irretrievable resources would be committed to building the project?.....8-3

8.3 What are the tradeoffs between the short-term uses of environmental resources and long-term gains (or productivity) from the project? .....8-4

8.4 Do any areas of controversy remain to be resolved? .....8-4

**Chapter 9: Final Section 4(f) Evaluation..... 9-1**

9.1 Introduction .....9-1

9.2 Affected Environment.....9-14

9.3 Coordination Plan .....9-35

9.4 Potential Effects of the Project.....9-39

9.5 Avoidance, Minimization of Harm, and Mitigation..... 9-104

9.6 Conclusion..... 9-163

**Chapter 10: Section 6(f) Evaluation ..... 10-1**

10.1 What is Section 6(f) and why does it apply to this project?.....10-1

10.2 What are the Section 6(f) resources that would be affected by the project? .....10-2

10.3 How would the conversion occur, and how would it affect the Section 6(f) resources? .....10-6

10.4 What was the Section 6(f) process for the project? ..... 10-11

10.5 What site was chosen as the Section 6(f) replacement site and how could it be used?..... 10-15

10.6 What steps did WSDOT take to avoid and minimize Section 6(f) conversions? ..... 10-18

**Chapter 11: Public and Agency Comments..... 11-1**

11.1 What was the review process for the Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Statement? .....11-1

11.2 What was the Draft EIS review process? .....11-4

**Attachments**

- 1 Acronyms and Abbreviations
- 2 Index
- 3 List of Preparers
- 4 Distribution List
- 5 References
- 6 Federal Register Notices

*Note: For all hard copies, Attachments 7 through 19 are provided on the DVD attached to the Executive Summary.*

- 7 **Discipline Reports:  
2011 Discipline Reports and Discipline Report Addenda**

Agency Coordination and Public Involvement Discipline Report Addendum and Errata
Air Quality Discipline Report Addendum and Errata
Construction Techniques and Activities Discipline Report Addendum and Errata
Description of Alternatives Discipline Report Addendum
Ecosystems Discipline Report Addendum and Errata
Energy Discipline Report Addendum and Errata
Environmental Justice Discipline Report Addendum and Errata
Final Cultural Resources Assessment and Discipline Report)
Final Indirect and Cumulative Impacts Discipline Report
Final Transportation Discipline Report
Geology and Soils Discipline Report Addendum and Errata
Hazardous Materials Discipline Report Addendum and Errata
Land Use, Economics, and Relocations Discipline Report Addendum and Errata
Navigable Waterways Discipline Report Addendum and Errata
Noise Discipline Report Addendum and Errata
Recreation Discipline Report Addendum and Errata
Social Elements, Public Services, and Utilities Discipline Report Addendum and Errata
Visual Quality and Aesthetics Discipline Report Addendum and Errata
Water Resources Discipline Report Addendum and Errata
<b>2009 Discipline Reports</b>
Agency Coordination and Public Involvement Discipline Report
Air Quality Discipline Report (2009)
Construction Techniques and Activities Discipline Report
Cultural Resources Discipline Report
Description of Alternatives Discipline Report
Ecosystems Discipline Report
Energy Discipline Report
Environmental Justice Discipline Report
Geology and Soils Discipline Report
Hazardous Materials Discipline Report
Indirect and Cumulative Effects Analysis Discipline Report
Land Use, Economics, and Relocations Discipline Report
Navigable Waterways Discipline Report
Noise Discipline Report
Range of Alternatives and Options Evaluated
Recreation Discipline Report
Social Elements Discipline Report
Transportation Discipline Report
Visual Quality and Aesthetics Discipline Report

Water Resources Discipline Report
-----------------------------------

8	<b>Correspondence</b>
9	<b>Mitigation Plans</b>
10	<b>2010 Supplemental Draft EIS</b>
11	<b>Responses to 2010 SDEIS Comments</b>
12	<b>2006 Draft EIS (without appendices)</b>
13	<b>Draft EIS Comment Summary Report</b>
14	<b>Health Impact Assessment</b>
15	<b>Section 6(f) Environmental Evaluation</b>
16	<b>ESSB 6392: Design Refinements and Transit Connections Workgroup Recommendations Report</b>
17	<b>Section 4(f) Constructive Use Analysis Technical Memorandum</b>
18	<b>Biological Opinions</b>
19	<b>Transportation Analysis Technical Memoranda</b>

**Tables**

1-1	Cost Estimates for SR 520 Corridor Projects.....	1-19
1-2	Committed Funding Sources for SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV Program.....	1-19
2-1	History of SR 520, I-5 to Medina Project NEPA Process and Alternatives .....	2-5
2-2	Regional High Capacity and Light Rail Planning.....	2-23
2-3	Design Elements in Preferred Alternative that Respond to Public Agency and Tribal Comments .....	2-28
2-4	Proposed Stormwater Treatment Facilities - Preferred Alternative and SDEIS Options .....	2-34
2-5	Preferred Alternative Compared to SDEIS Options .....	2-37
2-6	Comparison of Portage Bay Bridge - Preferred Alternative and Options A, K, and L.....	2-45
2-7	West Approach Structures.....	2-59
2-8	Area and Dimensions for the Floating Portion of the Evergreen Point Bridge.....	2-67
2-9	East Approach Structure Elements - Preferred Alternative and Options A, K, and L.....	2-70
3-1	Typical Construction Equipment .....	3-4
3-2	Estimated Number of Peak Construction Period Haul Route Trips on Local Highways .....	3-9
3-3	In-Water Work Windows .....	3-13
3-4	Work Bridge Elements by Area – Preferred Alternative .....	3-15
3-5	I-5 Area – Construction Elements and Truck Trips .....	3-22
3-6	Portage Bay Area – Construction Elements and Truck Trips .....	3-25
3-7	Montlake Interchange Area – Construction Elements and Truck Trips .....	3-29

Techniques to note:  
 - table of contents in printed documents lists each of the technical reports that is included on CD (and project website)

Figure 4.9-2. Per Capita Transportation Greenhouse Gas Emissions by State (2005).....4-130

Figure 4.9-3. Construction Greenhouse Gas Emissions .....4-133

Figure 4.10-1. Landslide Susceptibility and Steep Slopes .....4-140

Figure 4.10-2. Seismic Hazards .....4-141

Figure 4.11-1. Water Resources in the Project Vicinity.....4-151

Figure 4.11-2. Water Resources in the Study Area.....4-152

Figure 4.12-1. Wildlife Habitat in the Project Vicinity.....4-167

Figure 4.13-1. Public Services.....4-187

Figure 5-1. Section 4(f) Resources.....5-3

**List of Appendices**

Appendix A..... Correspondence

Appendix B.....References

Appendix C ..... Index

Appendix D ..... List of Contributors

Appendix E.....Alternatives No Longer Considered

Appendix F..... Distribution List

Appendix G ..... Visual Simulations

Appendix H .....Coordination Plan, Tribal Consultation Plan, Public Involvement Plan

Appendix I..... Final Section 4(f) Evaluation

Appendix J ..... Draft Section 106 Memorandum of Agreement

Appendix K.....Draft EIS Comments and Responses

Appendix L ..... Biological Assessment

**Discipline Reports**

The discipline reports are available on the project’s website ([www.wsdot.wa.gov/projects/ferries/mukilteoterminal/multimodal](http://www.wsdot.wa.gov/projects/ferries/mukilteoterminal/multimodal)), on CD (free), or in print (for the cost of reproduction).

- Cultural Resources Discipline Report
- Ecosystems Discipline Report
- Hazardous Materials Discipline Report
- Noise and Vibration Discipline Report
- Transportation Discipline Report

*(This page is intentionally left blank.)*

# Key Appendices Included in Paper Copy of NEPA Document

(if not voluminous)

- MD: Red Line FEIS - Paper Copy Includes Draft Section 106 PA, Supporting Documents for Section 4(f) Evaluation

**Techniques to note:**

- some appendices are included in the printed copy as well as the DVD - e.g., Section 106 PA, Section 4(f) supporting documents, and agency correspondence - making this material more accessible to readers

## Table of Contents

The Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) is divided into two volumes: Volume 1 includes the No-Build Alternative and the Preferred Alternative, and contains information from A through K. Volume 2 includes mapping of transportation and environmental features in the project study corridor, including a set of six Environmental Plate Series, and the Preferred Alternative Plans and Profiles.

The DVD contains all content of Volumes 1 and 2, including all appendices. Appendix A and Appendix I are only included on the enclosed DVD.

### Volume 1

ES. Executive Summary.....	ES-1
ES.1 Purpose of the Final Environmental Impact Statement .....	ES-1
ES.2 Organization of the FEIS.....	ES-2
ES.3 Project Study Corridor .....	ES-2
ES.4 Project Purpose and Need .....	ES-4
ES.5 Alternatives Development .....	ES-4
ES.6 Alternatives Evaluated in the FEIS .....	ES-5
ES.6.1 No-Build Alternative .....	ES-5
ES.6.2 Preferred Alternative .....	ES-5
ES.6.3 Stations and Park-and-Ride Facilities.....	ES-7
ES.6.4 Operations and Maintenance Facility.....	ES-8
ES.6.5 System Components .....	ES-8
ES.7 Construction of the Preferred Alternative.....	ES-8
ES.8 Summary of Potential Transportation, Socioeconomic and Environmental Effects	ES-10
ES.8.1 Transportation .....	ES-10
ES.8.2 Environment.....	ES-14
ES.8.3 Short-term Effects/Long-term Benefits .....	ES-32
ES.9 Draft Section 4(f) Evaluation.....	ES-32
ES.10 Summary of Preferred Alternative Long-Term Effects .....	ES-33
ES.11 Next Steps .....	ES-38



9.3.20 Extend the Tunnel Further East Under Boston Street..... 9-11

9.3.21 Effects on Traffic on Boston Street with the Red Line..... 9-12

9.3.22 Parking Impacts on Boston Street ..... 9-13

9.4 Responses to Comments..... 9-13

Index..... Index-1

**Appendices**

A. Responses to AA/DEIS Comments (*Included on enclosed DVD*)..... A-1

B. List of Preparers ..... B-1

C. Distribution List..... C-1

D. References ..... D-1

E. Glossary..... E-1

F. Acronyms and Abbreviations..... F-1

G. Agency Coordination Letters ..... G-1

H. Draft Programmatic Agreement ..... H-1

I. Technical Reports (*Included on enclosed DVD*) ..... I-1

J. Draft Section 4(f) Supporting Documents ..... J-1

K. Property Impacts..... K-1

**Volume 2**

- Plate Series 1: Community Facilities and Property Impacts
- Plate Series 2: Natural Resources
- Plate Series 3: Section 106 Built Historic Properties
- Plate Series 4: Archeology
- Plate Series 5: Air Quality, Noise, Vibration and Hazardous Materials
- Plate Series 6: Stormwater Management
- Plans and Profiles

*(This page is intentionally left blank.)*