

ARDOT Job 080499

HIGHWAY 123 BRIDGE REPLACEMENT:

GEE CREEK STR. & APPRS.

Environmental Assessment



U.S. Department of Transportation
Federal Highway
Administration

Arkansas Department
of Transportation



MAY 2021

Gee Creek Str. & Apprs. (S)

F.A.P. Number STP-0036(18)

Environmental Assessment

Submitted pursuant to:

The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)

42 U.S.C. §4322(2)(c) and 23 C.F.R. §771

Submitted by:


FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION

and

ARKANSAS DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

in cooperation with

U.S. FOREST SERVICE, OZARK-ST. FRANCIS NATIONAL FORESTS



Randal Looney
Environmental Coordinator
Federal Highway Administration

May 26, 2021

Date of Approval



U.S. Department of Transportation
Federal Highway
Administration

The following people may be contacted for additional information concerning this document:

Randal Looney

FHWA
700 W. Capitol, Room 3130
Little Rock, AR 72201-3298
(501) 324-6430

John Fleming

ARDOT
P.O. Box 2261
Little Rock, AR 72203-2261
(501) 569-2281

In compliance with the National Environmental Policy Act, this Environmental Assessment (EA) describes a Build Alternative to replace the Highway 123 bridge over Gee Creek and the No Action Alternative. No significant adverse environmental effects were associated with either alternative.

Comments should be directed to:

Mail: Environmental - Public Involvement
ARDOT
P.O. Box 2261
Little Rock, AR 72203-2261

Email: info@ardot.gov

This EA is also available for review online at:

<http://www.ardot.gov/>





Title VI

The Arkansas Department of Transportation (ARDOT) ensures full compliance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 by prohibiting discrimination against any person on the basis of race, color, national origin or sex in the provision of benefits and services resulting from its federally assisted programs and activities. The ARDOT public involvement process did not exclude any individuals due to income, race, color, religion, national origin, sex, age, or disability. For questions regarding ARDOT 's Title VI Program, you may contact the Department's EEO/DBE Section Head (ADA/504/Title VI Coordinator) at (501) 569-2298 (Voice/TTY 711), or at the following email address: EEO_DBE_Section_Head@ardot.gov.

Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Information

Materials can be provided in alternative formats: large print, Braille, or audiotape for people with disabilities by contacting ARDOT's EEO/DBE Section Head (ADA/504/Title VI Coordinator) at (501) 569-2298 (Voice/TTY 711), or at the following email address: EEO_DBE_Section_Head@ardot.gov. Persons who are deaf or hard of hearing may contact ARDOT through the Arkansas Relay Service at 7-1-1.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTERS

Chapter 1: Purpose & Need

1.1	What is the Highway 123 bridge replacement project?	1
1.2	Why does the Highway 123 bridge over Gee Creek need to be replaced?	3
1.3	What is the purpose of this project?	4
1.4	What is the purpose of this Environmental Assessment?	4
1.5	Who is leading this project?	4

Chapter 2: Development of Alternatives

2.1	What are the project limits and how were they chosen?	5
2.2	What alternatives were developed & evaluated in this EA?	5
2.3	How were these alternatives developed?	6
2.4	How has the public been involved?	7
2.5	How have tribal governments been involved?	7
2.6	Which of these alternatives will be considered?	7

Chapter 3: Project Effects

3.1	How would the project affect traffic and safety?	8
3.2	How much would the proposed project cost?	8
3.3	How would the project affect properties and land use in the area?	9
3.4	Would the project affect any public lands?	9
3.5	How would the project affect cultural resources?	12
3.6	How would views in the project area be affected?	12
3.8	How would natural water resources be affected?	14
3.9	Would the project cause flooding in surrounding areas?	15
3.10	Would any wildlife be impacted by the project?	16
3.11	Does the project have any indirect impacts?	17
3.12	Does the project have any cumulative impacts?	18
3.13	What other resource areas were examined but not impacted?	20

Chapter 4: Recommendations

4.1	What are the results of this EA?.....	23
4.2	Is the NEPA process finished?.....	23

REFERENCE PAGE

Acronyms	24
----------------	----

APPENDICES

Appendix A: U.S. Forest Service Correspondence
Appendix B: State Historic Preservation Officer Clearance
Appendix C: Visual Impacts
Appendix D: Biological Evaluation

FIGURES

1	Bridge M1864: Highway 123 over Gee Creek	1
2	Project Location	2
3	Official Detour	5
4	Build Alternative: Proposed Alignment	6
5	Build Alternative: Property Impacts	10
6	Typical View in Project Area.....	13

TABLES

1	Alternative Impact Comparison	23
---	-------------------------------------	----

Chapter 1: Purpose & Need

What's in Chapter 1?

Chapter 1 explains the purpose of the project, why the Highway 123 bridge needs to be replaced, and who is leading the project.

1.1 What is the Highway 123 bridge replacement project?

The Arkansas Department of Transportation (ARDOT) is proposing to replace the Highway 123 bridge over Gee Creek, bridge number M1864 (Figure 1), located approximately 7.4 miles south of Highway 7 in Johnson County.

Bridge M1864: Highway 123 over Gee Creek



Figure 1

Project Location




Figure 2

1.2 Why does the Highway 123 bridge over Gee Creek need to be replaced?

Highway 123

Highway 123 is functionally classified as a major collector and connects Interstate 40 in Clarksville to Highway 65 south of Harrison. It crosses the Ozark-St. Francis National Forests, connecting several U.S. Forest Service (USFS) recreational areas and campgrounds, the Buffalo National River, the Gene Rush Buffalo River Management Area, and several state highways including an arterial route, Highway 7.

In the project area ([Figure 2](#)), Highway 123 winds through the Ozark-St. Francis National Forests, providing recreational access to Haw Creek Falls Recreation Area and Campground and serving as the local link to arterial highways, primarily for logging trucks. In the project area, the 2018 average daily traffic was approximately 90 vehicles per day, projected to 100 vehicles per day by 2038. Trucks account for approximately 2% of the total traffic.

In the project area, Highway 123 consists of two 10' wide travel lanes with 2' wide paved shoulders. These narrow shoulders do not meet current design standards and potentially pose additional safety concerns.

Gee Creek Bridge

The subject bridge over Gee Creek was originally built in 1938. The bridge was constructed with multiple steel I-beam stringers on one rock masonry pier, two more recent metal bents, and two masonry abutments with wing walls. The deck is asphalt over corrugated metal decking.

The existing bridge has had numerous interim reinforcements added in the past to remove weight restrictions to accommodate heavy loads for highway bridge work further down Highway 123 and to extend the life of the bridge until it could be replaced. The bridge would continue to need more extensive repairs as the condition deteriorates if it is not replaced. The inspection report for the bridge lists the condition of the superstructure as 4 (poor, indicative of advanced deterioration) and deck and substructure as 5 (fair, indicative of minor section loss).

What is a major collector?

Collector highways, such as Highway 123, generally serve travel within counties and of shorter distances than arterials, such as Highway 7. Major collectors are distinguished from minor collectors by their links to business and industrial districts, major cities, or roads of higher classification, such as Highway 7.

1.3 What is the purpose of this project?

The purpose of this project is to correct the existing structural deficiencies with the Highway 123 bridge over Gee Creek that would otherwise result in escalating maintenance costs and the eventual closure of Highway 123.

1.4 What is the purpose of this Environmental Assessment?

This Environmental Assessment (EA) is being prepared under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) to:

- Evaluate the environmental effects of replacing the Highway 123 bridge over Gee Creek.
- Inform and receive feedback from the public and decision makers about the environmental effects of the project alternatives.
- Determine whether effects are significant and require an Environmental Impact Statement or if the project effects can be sufficiently documented through an EA and Finding of No Significant Impacts (FONSI).

1.5 Who is leading this project?

This project is led by a partnership between the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and ARDOT. The FHWA is involved because it is funding a portion of the project and has the primary responsibility for the content and accuracy of this NEPA document.

The project is also being funded through state funds allocated to ARDOT. ARDOT is responsible for administering and maintaining the state highway system, which includes Highway 123 and associated structures. For these reasons, ARDOT is a co-lead agency with the FHWA.

The USFS, specifically the Ozark-St. Francis National Forests, was invited to be a cooperating agency in the NEPA process. The proposed project involves Ozark-St. Francis National Forests land, including the protected Gee Creek Inventoried Roadless Area (IRA). See [Section 3.4](#) of this EA for more information on USFS and IRA impacts and [Appendix A](#) for USFS correspondence.

What is NEPA?

The National Environmental Policy Act of 1969 (NEPA) requires Federal agencies to consider the potential environmental consequences of their actions, document the analysis, and provide a public involvement process prior to project implementation. Federal agencies are subject to NEPA as part of their decision making process as part of their own projects, by providing funding to other organizations or agencies, through regulatory or permitting processes, or through the involvement of their resources or property.

What are significant impacts?

NEPA regulations do not provide specific thresholds to determine if project impacts are considered significant, but they do discuss the process that should be used to evaluate impacts.

Consideration is given both to context, where the significance of impacts varies with the setting of the proposed action, and intensity, the severity of the impacts.

Chapter 2: Development of Alternatives

What's in Chapter 2?

Chapter 2 identifies the project limits and briefly describes how the alternatives were developed for this EA.

2.1 What are the project limits and how were they chosen?

The project limits include the area required to construct the new structure and approaches and remove the existing structure and approaches. Building the replacement structure on new alignment adjacent to the existing structure allows for traffic to be maintained on the existing bridge during construction. If Highway 123 were closed, the shortest official detour using state highways would be approximately 60 miles in length (Figure 3).

2.2 What alternatives were developed & evaluated in this EA?

Two alternatives were considered for this project: the No Action Alternative and the Build Alternative.

No Action Alternative

The No Action Alternative would provide only routine maintenance for the Highway 123 bridge over Gee Creek. By taking no action other than routine maintenance, the No Action Alternative would not address the structural deficiencies associated with the bridge, requiring increasing maintenance to maintain the bridge for even lighter traffic and eventual closure of the bridge to all vehicular traffic.

Build Alternative

The Build Alternative would replace the existing bridge with a three-sided/bottomless culvert immediately downstream of the existing structure. The new culvert would likely be constructed of precast concrete with three spans/barrels, with each barrel approximately 16'x9'. An approved alternate structure design or type could be considered for constructability reasons or to save construction costs.

Official Detour




Figure 3

Why would you consider an alternative that does nothing?

NEPA requires decision makers to consider a “no action” alternative in all NEPA studies. This alternative usually does not meet the project’s purpose and need but is used to compare the beneficial and adverse impacts of “action” alternatives and determine their significance.

Highway 123 would have two 11' wide paved travel lanes, and 4' shoulders with 2' paved and 2' unpaved. The proposed alignment for the Build Alternative is shown in [Figure 4](#).

Build Alternative: Proposed Alignment



Figure 4

2.3 How were these alternatives developed?

Initially, a standard four-sided reinforced concrete box culvert was proposed to replace the existing bridge. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and USFS expressed concerns regarding the restriction of aquatic species passage typically associated with four-sided structures, so a bottomless structure will be used instead. Gee Creek also has a naturally-occurring exposed bedrock streambed conducive to the construction of the foundations for bottomless structures.

2.4 How has the public been involved?

The ARDOT and the USFS provided the opportunity for early public input into the development of the proposed project through the USFS scoping process. Letters were sent to adjacent property owners and the Ozark-St. Francis National Forests citizen contact list. No comments were received.

2.5 How have tribal governments been involved?

Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act requires federal agencies to consult with tribes where projects could affect tribal areas with historical or cultural significance. The FHWA initiated tribal coordination during the scoping process with the tribes that have an active cultural interest in the area.

The Tribal Historic Preservation Officers were given the opportunity to comment on the proposed project. No objections to the proposed project were received.

2.6 Which of these alternatives will be considered?

Both alternatives identified in this chapter are reasonable under NEPA regulations. The No Action Alternative does not meet the project’s purpose and need, but will be considered in the remainder of the EA as a baseline for comparison of project impacts. The Build Alternative meets the project’s purpose and need and its impacts will be analyzed in the remainder of this EA.

Which tribal governments were contacted?

- Absentee Shawnee Tribe
- Caddo Nation
- Cherokee Nation of Oklahoma
- Choctaw Nation
- Eastern Shawnee Tribe of Oklahoma
- Muscogee (Creek) Nation
- The Osage Nation
- Quapaw Tribe of Oklahoma
- Shawnee Tribe
- Thlopthlocco Tribal Town
- United Keetowah Band of Cherokee Indians
- Wichita and Affiliated Tribes

Chapter 3: Project Effects

What's in Chapter 3?

Chapter 3 identifies permanent and construction impacts that are expected as a result of the proposed project. Only elements that would be affected by the project are discussed. The impact areas discussed in Chapter 3 are summarized in [Table 1](#), found in Chapter 4.

3.1 How would the project affect traffic and safety?

How would traffic patterns and volumes on Highway 123 and intersecting roads change with the project?

Normal traffic patterns would not change with the construction of the Build Alternative or the No Action Alternative. Traffic would be maintained on the existing structure during construction of the Build Alternative, although short-term lane closures may be required as the new approaches are tied into existing Highway 123 and local/USFS roads.

The No Action Alternative does not involve any improvements to the Highway 123 bridge over Gee Creek other than routine maintenance. As the structural deterioration worsens, the bridge would have weight restrictions reintroduced and eventually have to be closed to traffic, resulting in the detour of all vehicles ([Figure 3](#)).

How would the project affect safety?

The Build Alternative would prevent safety concerns associated with the No Action Alternative: the collapse of a failing bridge or the severance of emergency access on Highway 123 if the bridge were closed to all traffic.

3.2 How much would the proposed project cost?

Using 2019 dollars, the Build Alternative is estimated to have a total construction cost of \$3,900,000 and no right of way or utility relocation costs other than the minor cost of the USFS timber sale, which would be determined during the federal land transfer process following NEPA. The No Action Alternative would not result in any construction and would only involve routine maintenance costs.

3.3 How would the project affect properties and land use in the area?

The project is located within the Boston Mountain Ecoregion. The Boston Mountains are one of the Ozark plateaus and are characterized as mountainous and typically forested. The immediate project area consists of hardwood forest with rock outcrops on the steep slopes southwest of the bridge.

The project would impact undeveloped USFS property (see [Figure 5](#) and [Section 3.4](#)). No development is anticipated to occur through the proposed project corridor and surrounding areas, regardless of the implementation of this project. No cumulative land use impacts are expected outside of the direct land use conversions outlined above.

The No Action Alternative would not result in any right of way acquisition, relocations, or land use changes, and would not encourage any additional development in or around the project area. No indirect or cumulative impacts related to land use are expected with the No Action Alternative.

3.4 Would the project affect any public lands?

Section 4(f) of the U.S. Department of Transportation (USDOT) Act of 1966 prohibits the use of publicly owned parks, national wildlife and refuge areas, and significant historic sites unless it can be shown that: 1) There is no prudent and feasible alternative that meets the project's purpose and need that would avoid use of the land; and 2) All possible planning to minimize harm to the property has been examined. Impacts to publicly-owned resources are described below.

Ozark-St. Francis National Forest

The Ozark-St. Francis National Forests was first established in 1908 as the Ozark National Forest (now managed jointly with the St. Francis National Forest) and covers 1.2 million acres in the state of Arkansas. The Ozark-St. Francis National Forests is not considered a Section 4(f) resource as it functions as a multiple-use public land holding, as described by FHWA Section 4(f) policy.

Approximately 2.3 acres of right of way and 0.1 acre of temporary construction easements would be required from Ozark-St. Francis National Forests property for the Build Alternative, as seen in [Figure 5](#).

Build Alternative: Property Impacts




Figure 5

The No Action Alternative would not involve Ozark-St. Francis National Forests lands. If deterioration of the existing bridge lead to its closure, both logging and recreational activities within the national forest would be affected.

Gee Creek Inventoried Roadless Area (IRA)

IRAs are areas within USFS lands that were designated as “Roadless” under the Roadless Area Conservation Rule on January 12, 2001. The Roadless Area Conservation Rule allows for road construction to

improve road safety concerns (36 CFR 294.12(b)(5)). The proposed bridge replacement addresses safety concerns associated with a failing bridge or closing a highway, severing emergency access routes. The Gee Creek IRA is not considered a Section 4(f) resource as it functions as a multiple-use public land holding, as described by FHWA Section 4(f) policy.

Approximately 0.3 acre of proposed right of way that would be acquired from the USFS for the Build Alternative is within the Gee Creek IRA, as seen in [Figure 5](#).

The No Action Alternative would not impact any IRAs.

Haw Creek Falls Recreation Area

The Haw Creek Falls Recreation Area consists of a primitive campground on the banks of Haw Creek Falls, a scenic waterfall. The access drive to the Haw Creek Falls Recreation Area, a Section 4(f) resource, is located within the east approach to the bridge on the southeast side of Highway 123.

Although the proposed alignment of the Build Alternative is to the same side of the highway and there would be some minor additional easements required on this side of the highway, access to the recreation area would be maintained throughout construction and none of the impacts would be within the USFS boundary of the recreation area.

The eventual closure of the Gee Creek bridge associated with the No Action Alternative would impact the Haw Creek Falls Recreation Area by cutting off access to the south and west on Highway 123, forcing travelers from this direction to use the detour route seen on [Figure 3](#).

Ozark Highlands Trail

The Ozark Highlands Trail (OHT) is a 270-mile hiking trail across northern Arkansas with the west end at Lake Fort Smith and the east end at the Missouri border. The OHT crosses Highway 123 at the Haw Creek Falls access drive, within the east approaches of the existing and proposed bridges.

Hiking access to the OHT and Haw Creek Falls Recreation Area would be maintained throughout construction of the Build Alternative.

No impacts to the OHT are anticipated with either alternative.

3.5 How would the project affect cultural resources?

Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act requires agencies to consider the effects of Federal actions on historic properties. In compliance with Section 106 requirements, ARDOT cultural resource specialists consult with the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) and Native American tribes.

Preliminary records reviews with the Arkansas Archeological Survey and Arkansas Historic Preservation Program, as well as early maps of the project area, were checked for indications of known archeological sites or historic structures. An archeological survey of the project area was also performed as well as a cultural resources survey to check for historic structures.

One archeological site was identified in the survey. The site is an abandoned dirt road fragment located along the east side of Gee Creek north of Haw Creek. No association of the road fragment to a significant trend/event or important person was found and the site was determined to be ineligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places.

The Gee Creek bridge to be replaced was built in 1938. Because a substantial amount of the structure has been altered or replaced, including several piers and the parapet walls, it is no longer the best example of a steel multi-beam bridge. It was determined to be ineligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places, and is not subject to Section 4(f) protection.

Neither the Build Alternative nor the No Action Alternative are anticipated to have any impacts to cultural resources.

SHPO coordination, including the submission of a cultural resources report, resulted in a finding of “no adverse effect” associated with the Build Alternative. SHPO clearance can be found in [Appendix B](#).

3.6 How would views in the project area be affected?

The proposed project is located in the Big Piney Ranger District of the Ozark-St. Francis National Forests. The landscape of the Big Piney Ranger District is naturally forested with some evidence of human development in the form of roads, pastures, small towns and communities, and occasional residential clearings. The typical topography includes broad rounded ridges, terraces, bluff tops, and rugged mountains with sharply-defined narrow valleys.

What are cultural resources?

Cultural resources include elements of the built environment (buildings, structures, or objects) or evidence of past human activity (archeological sites). Those that are listed on or eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) are defined as historic properties.

Why are visual impacts important?

Visual impacts caused by a highway project are seen both by people traveling on the road and by those using the land adjacent to it, in this case, those using the Haw Creek Falls Recreation Area and OHT hikers. People are concerned with the visual character of highways, especially those with high scenic value such as

Typical View in Project Area




Figure 6

The majority of travelers through the project corridor are presumed to be recreationists and tourists and commercial logging operations. Multiple chambers of commerce and tourism websites and publications reference Highway 123's scenic qualities. According to the USFS scenery management system, Highway 123's scenic qualities have public value and the preservation of these qualities is important. It is likely that there is a high level of viewer sensitivity to changes in visual quality in the project area.

The Build Alternative would be built on new alignment adjacent to the existing highway. This new alignment would require the removal of trees and other vegetation within the project limits, altering the view for motorists on Highway 123 and for OHT hikers. Replacing the bridge, which currently has deteriorated guardrail as a barrier, with a culvert that would be mostly hidden under the highway, would likely result in beneficial impacts for travelers along Highway 123.

Project construction would cause temporary negative visual impacts to highway motorists and OHT users with the presence of construction vehicles and equipment and soil disturbance as the new alignment is cleared and slopes are established. ARDOT's native grass and native

wildflower mixes would be planted on the final surface of all disturbed areas.

Overall, the impacts to views as a result of the project are expected to be minor and would lessen considerably over time as vegetation is reestablished. Adverse impacts to the overall visual quality are not anticipated as a result of the Build Alternative. The screening questionnaire used to determine the level of visual impact analysis required and the technical memorandum assessing potential impacts can found in [Appendix C](#).

No impacts to views in the project area are expected as a result of the No Action Alternative.

3.8 How would natural water resources be affected?

Streams

The proposed project is on Gee Creek approximately 225' upstream of its confluence with Haw Creek. Gee Creek and Haw Creek are both perennial streams subject to flash flood-type events due to the mountainous topography in the area. Gee Creek has an exposed bedrock streambed at the existing and proposed structure locations. Haw Creek meets the Big Piney Creek National Wild & Scenic River approximately 1.7 mile downstream of its confluence with Gee Creek. The locations of these streams can be seen on [Figure 2](#).

Because they can restrict aquatic species passage, as discussed in [Section 2.3](#), a four-sided box culvert was not considered for this project. The three-sided/bottomless structure proposed with the Build Alternative would retain the native bedrock streambed which should provide easier construction of the in-stream piers compared to previous bottomless culverts that required excavation down to bedrock. The Build Alternative is anticipated to impact less than 125 linear feet and 0.1 acre of Gee Creek.

There is a small unnamed ephemeral tributary of Haw Creek where the new alignment would tie in to the existing alignment at the end of the project. The Build Alternative would require a 14' extension of the four pipe culverts at the crossing of this tributary under Highway 123.

Best practices to avoid water quality impacts would be implemented, such as filter socks below disturbed soils to trap and filter sediment before stormwater leaves the construction site and enters Gee Creek or

Where can I find ARDOT sediment and erosion control best practices?

Any potential sediment-related impacts to Big Piney Creek are mitigated by Section 110 of the *AHTD Standard Specifications, 2014 Edition: Protection of Water Quality and Wetlands*, the *ARDOT Erosion and Sediment Control Manual*, and the measures to be outlined in the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan required as part of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permit issued by the Arkansas Department of Environmental Quality.

the unnamed tributary of Haw Creek. Vegetation impacts along Gee Creek would be minimized as much as practicable to retain a riparian buffer. Storage of petroleum and other chemical products would not be allowed near any waterway. Demolition of the existing bridge would be conducted in such a way as to minimize turbidity and sedimentation in Gee Creek.

The Build Alternative would not require mitigation and, as such, would be allowed under the terms of a U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Section 404 Nationwide Permit 14 for Linear Transportation Projects, as defined in Federal Register 82(4):1860-2008. An Arkansas Division of Environmental Quality Short-term Activity Authorization for in-stream work and National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System permit and associated Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan would also be required for soil disturbance. ARDOT will obtain all required waterway and stormwater permits before construction begins.

As the bridge continued to deteriorate under the No Action Alternative, impacts to Gee Creek would eventually result if the bridge failed and collapsed into the stream.

National Wild & Scenic Rivers

Big Piney Creek, a National Wild and Scenic River (WSR) and Arkansas Extraordinary Resource Water, is approximately 1.8 mile downstream of the proposed project. The sediment and erosion control best practices related to water quality described in the section above are intended to prevent any type of impacts to Big Piney Creek and its outstandingly remarkable value of scenery, recreation, fish, botany, and geology as a result of the Build Alternative. No adverse impacts to Big Piney Creek WSR are anticipated as a result of either alternative.

3.9 Would the project cause flooding in surrounding areas?

The project was reviewed to identify any encroachments into special flood hazard areas, also known as the 100-year floodplain, as shown on the Flood Insurance Rate Maps issued by the Federal Emergency Management Agency. No special flood hazard areas were identified within the project area and no adverse impacts to regulated floodplains are expected with either alternative.

At the existing structure, the highway is overtopped by water at approximately a 25-year flood event. The Build Alternative would raise the elevation of the highway and structure to a 25-year flood design,

What is mitigation?

Impacts to natural resources, such as streams or wetlands, are often unavoidable during highway construction projects. Restoration, establishment, enhancement, or preservation of wetlands and streams may be legally required under the Clean Water Act, depending on the severity of the impacts.

What is a floodplain?

Floodplains are land areas that become covered by water in a flood event. Special flood hazard areas, also known as 100-year floodplains, are areas that would be covered by a 100-year flood event. This is the floodplain commonly used for insurance and regulatory purposes.

What is a flood event?

Specific flood events, such as a 25-year or 100-year flood event, involve flood waters covering the associated floodplain. A 100-year flood event has a 1% chance of occurring in any given year, a 25-year flood event has a 4% chance of occurring in any given year, and a 7-year flood event has a 14% chance of occurring in any given year.

meaning that in the case of a 25-year flood event, the culvert would convey the flood waters and the highway would not be overtopped.

The No Build Alternative would not result in any floodplain impacts or affect the flooding frequency of Highway 123 or adjacent properties.

3.10 Would any wildlife be impacted by the project?

Federally Threatened and Endangered Species

The endangered gray bat (*Myotis grisescens*), the endangered Indiana bat (*Myotis sodalis*), the endangered Ozark big-eared bat (*Corynorhinus townsendii ingens*) and the threatened northern long-eared bat (*Myotis septentrionalis*) have the potential to occur in the project area. Mist netting surveys nearby did not capture any of these four species.

The U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service determined that the Build Alternative **may affect, but not is not likely to adversely affect**, these species. More information on threatened and endangered species can be found in the biological evaluation in [Appendix D](#).

No impacts to federally-protected species are anticipated with the No Action Alternative.

USFS Sensitive Species

The USFS Region 8 Forester's sensitive species list contains 11 species with the potential to occur in the project area. These species include three plants, two mussels, two insects, a fish, a bat, and two crustaceans. Most of these species lack suitable habitat in the project area and plant surveys did not identify any individuals of the sensitive plant species. The USFS determined that the Build Alternative **may impact individuals, but is not likely to cause a trend to federal listing or loss of viability** of these species. More information on the USFS sensitive species can be found in the biological evaluation in [Appendix D](#).

No impacts to the USFS sensitive species are anticipated with the No Action Alternative.

Migratory Birds

Several migratory bird species, such as the Eastern Phoebe (*Sayornis phoebe*), Cliff Swallow (*Petrochelidon pyrrhonota*), and Barn Swallow (*Hirundo rustica*), build nests underneath bridges and culverts. No bird nests from previous nesting seasons were observed under the bridge

What is the difference between threatened and endangered species?

An endangered species is one that is in danger of extinction throughout all or a significant portion of its range. Endangered species receive the highest level of protection. A threatened species is one that is likely to become endangered in the near future. Both threatened and endangered species receive federal protection under the Endangered Species Act. Sensitive species are not protected by the Endangered Species Act but have been identified by the USFS Regional Forester as having population viability concerns.

during a recent inspection. Impacts to migratory birds associated with the Build Alternative would be minimized by requiring the contractor either to erect nets before the beginning of the active nesting season or to remove inactive nests before beginning work, as well as to monitor and remove the results of any nest-building activities before they can be established.

The Build Alternative would require the conversion of approximately 1.7 acres of forest into transportation use. Tree removal on the new alignment may destroy nests and or otherwise impact migratory birds, but the creation of small patches of early successional habitat along highways has been shown to benefit certain species of forest interior birds and to increase overall bird diversity in forests.

No impacts to migratory birds are associated with the No Action Alternative.

Other Fish and Wildlife

The Build Alternative would convert roughly 1.7 acres of mature forest to transportation use. This creation of early successional habitat could create minor alterations to wildlife foraging patterns and travel corridors. Impacts could include mortality of small mammals and temporary avoidance of the area during construction. The increase in early successional habitat could increase wildlife diversity in the forest locally. The increased sedimentation and disturbance within Gee Creek would have temporary negative impacts on aquatic species, but populations would be expected to rebound soon after construction is complete.

No impacts to fish and wildlife are expected as a result of the No Action Alternative.

3.11 Does the project have any indirect impacts?

Council of Environmental Quality and FHWA regulations require that potential indirect effects be considered during the NEPA process. Indirect effects are reasonably foreseeable effects that may be caused by the project but would occur in the future or outside of the project area.

Encroachment-Alteration Effects

Encroachment-alteration effects are physical, chemical, or biological changes in the environment that occur as a result of the project but are removed in time or distance from the direct effects. Impacts to water

quality that occur as a result of the project but are then distributed off-site as water moves downstream beyond the project area, are the primary encroachment-alteration effect for this project. These impacts are discussed in [Section 3.8](#).

Induced-Growth Effects

Changes in the pattern of land use, growth patterns, population density, or growth rate due to the construction of a highway project also may occur, and the resulting induced development can impact sensitive resources. This is another type of indirect effect that is categorized as induced-growth effects.

The Build Alternative is unlikely to induce any additional development of the area as the entire project area is within ownership of the Ozark-St. Francis National Forests and no other improvements are proposed. The No Action Alternative involves no work other than regular maintenance and would not result in any indirect effects other than the continued deterioration and eventual failure of the subject bridge.

Neither alternative is expected to result in adverse indirect impacts on any natural, cultural, or social resources.

3.12 Does the project have any cumulative impacts?

Cumulative impacts result from the total effects of a proposed project when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future projects or actions. Cumulative impacts include the direct and indirect impacts of a project together with the reasonably foreseeable future actions of others: e.g., other federal, state, and local governments, non-governmental organizations, and private entities. The direct impacts that result from an action may be undetectable but can add to other disturbances and eventually lead to a measurable environmental change. Cumulative effects are studied so that the public, decision makers, and project proponents take the time to consider the “big picture” effects a project could have on the community and environment. For any given resource, a cumulative impact would only potentially exist if the resource were also directly or indirectly impacted by the proposed project.

Ozark-St. Francis National Forests

There are no other ARDOT projects near the proposed project that would require USFS property. ARDOT does have other projects that are

programmed or under construction in the Ozark-St. Francis National Forests, including several emergency landslide repair projects throughout the Forests, the replacement of the Highway 23 bridge over the Mulberry River, the replacement of the Highway 215 bridge over Wolf Pen Creek, several passing lanes on Highway 7, improvements to a Baxter County road, and the replacement of the Johnson County bridge over Panther Creek. Cumulatively, these projects are not expected to result in significant impacts to the 1.2 million acres of the Ozark-St. Francis National Forests and will support USFS transportation needs as well as those of the general traveling public.

The USFS does not have any proposed projects in the area that would require the conversion of USFS property to other uses. Neither alternative would result in significant cumulative impacts to the Ozark-St. Francis National Forests.

Gee Creek IRA

The subject project is the only ARDOT project programmed or under construction impacting the Gee Creek IRA, and there are no other USFS or outside projects expected to contribute cumulatively to impacts to the IRA due to protections placed upon these areas. Neither alternative would result in significant cumulative impacts to Gee Creek IRA.

Highway 123 Visual Quality

The USFS recently implemented a 5,730-acre prescribed burn, “Hess Knob,” along the south/east side of Highway 123 in the project area in March 2021. An additional 1595-acre burn, “Gee Creek,” has been approved for the north/west side of Highway 123 beginning at the proposed bridge replacement and continuing towards Highway 7.

The negative effects of these burns, most commonly observed as black marks on trees, would be visible from Highway 123 but are expected to only last for a single growing season. Overall, prescribed burns contribute positively to scenic quality by clearing underbrush, discouraging the growth of invasive species, and encouraging greater plant species diversity, especially for native flowering plants.

In addition, ARDOT recently replaced the Highway 123 bridge over Haw Creek towards Highway 7 with a bottomless arch culvert. The culvert was replaced on new alignment adjacent to the existing structure, so project visual impacts included primarily the clearing of trees. Disturbed areas were revegetated with ARDOT’s native grass and

wildflower seed mixes and the limited topsoil found on the project was retained and reused to promote revegetation and preserve the seed bank.

ARDOT will also be implementing the recently-approved USFS project for non-native invasive plant species control and roadside vegetation management that included provisions for the use of herbicides in the project area for highway roadside maintenance. When herbicide is used for highway vegetation management, it can have short-term negative visual effects as the target plants die, but these effects are only temporary and minor. Overall, implementation of this project is anticipated to have long-term visual quality benefits throughout the Ozark-St. Francis National Forests by allowing state and local jurisdictions to more effectively manage vegetation and to control non-native invasive plants on roadway corridors, one of the primary modes of spread for invasive species.

The cumulative visual impacts of the Build Alternative and the other USFS and ARDOT actions described above are anticipated to be only temporary and minor. The No Action Alternative would not contribute to any impacts on visual quality.

Threatened and Endangered Species

Information on cumulative impacts to endangered, threatened, and sensitive species can be found in the biological evaluation in [Appendix D](#). Neither alternative is expected to contribute to significant cumulative impacts to any listed species.

3.13 What other resource areas were examined but not impacted?

Air Quality

This project is located in an area that is designated as in attainment for all transportation pollutants. The Build Alternative has been determined to generate minimal air quality impacts for Clean Air Act criteria pollutants and has not been linked with any special mobile source air toxics (MSAT) concerns. The Build Alternative would not result in changes in traffic volumes, vehicle mix, basic project location, or any other factor that would cause a meaningful increase in MSAT impacts of the project from that of the No Action Alternative.

What is air quality attainment?

Areas are considered in attainment for air pollutants when measured levels are below the National Ambient Air Quality Standards set by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.

Noise

Noise predictions have been made for this project utilizing FHWA's Traffic Noise Model 2.5. These predictions indicated that there would be no discernable difference in noise levels between the Build Alternative and No Action Alternative, and between existing and forecasted (2038) traffic volumes. No noise impacts are anticipated as a result of either alternative. [Appendix E](#) provides more detailed information on the noise analysis.

Important Farmland

Most of the agriculture activity in the project area is related to timber production on USFS lands. Right of way acquisition for the proposed project would not significantly reduce the amount of land in the Ozark-St. Francis National Forests, as discussed in [Section 3.4](#). No Important Farmland would be impacted by either alternative.

Environmental Justice

Environmental justice refers to social equity in bearing the burden of adverse environmental impacts, especially with regards to low income and minority populations. The Build Alternative property impacts are all on USFS property and there are no private properties of any kind located near the project area. The Build Alternative would not have any adverse or disproportionate impacts on environmental justice/Title VI populations; therefore, in accordance with the provisions of Executive Order 12898, Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and FHWA Order 6640.23, no further analysis is necessary.

Public Water Supplies

The Arkansas Department of Health database of public water supplies was examined to determine if any surface water intakes, wellheads, or associated protection areas of either type were present in the project area. No known public water supplies are located in or near the project area, and there are no impacts to public water supplies anticipated with either alternative.

Utilities

The ARDOT Right of Way Division - Utility Section was contacted to determine if any public or private utilities would be impacted by the proposed project. No utilities are anticipated to be impacted by either alternative.

What is noise?

Sound is anything we hear, while noise is unwanted or undesirable sound. Traffic noise is a combination of the noises produced by vehicle engines, exhaust, and tires.

What is Important Farmland?

Important Farmland is defined by the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA) as land suited to food, feed, forage, fiber, and oilseed crops. Prime Farmland has the best combination of physical and chemical characteristics for the production of crops, while Farmland of Statewide Importance is land other than Prime Farmland which has a good combination of these characteristics

What is EJ/Title VI?

An EJ evaluation determines whether low-income or minority populations would suffer disproportionately high and adverse effects from an action.

Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (Title VI) prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color, sex, national origin, religion or disability under any program or activity receiving Federal financial assistance.

Wetlands

There were no wetlands identified within the project alternative. Neither alternative would impact jurisdictional wetlands.

Hazardous Materials

A visual survey and database search were performed to determine if any hazardous materials were located in the project area. No hazardous materials, landfill sites, leaking underground storage tanks, or hazardous areas were noted within the immediate project area.

If hazardous materials are identified, observed or accidentally uncovered by any ARDOT personnel, contracting company(s), or state regulating agency, it would be ARDOT's responsibility to determine the type, size and extent of contamination. ARDOT would develop a remediation plan and coordinate disposal methods to be employed for the type of contamination identified. All remediation work would be conducted in conformance with the Arkansas Division of Environmental Quality, Environmental Protection Agency, and Occupational Safety and Health Administration regulations.

No hazardous materials are anticipated to be impacted by either alternative.

What is a wetland?

Wetlands are areas typically inundated or saturated by surface or groundwater to the extent that they can support vegetation adapted for life in wet soil conditions.

What are hazardous materials?

A hazardous material is any item or chemical that can cause harm to people, plants, or animals when released into the environment.

Chapter 4: Recommendations

What’s in Chapter 4?

Chapter 4 contains the results and conclusions of this Environmental Assessment.

4.1 What are the results of this EA?

The environmental analysis of the proposed project did not identify any significant impacts to the natural, cultural, or social environment as a result of either alternative. A summary of the impacts associated with each alternative can be found in [Table 1](#).

Table 1

Alternative Impact Comparison

Alternative	Total Cost	Length	USFS ROW/TCE	IRA ROW	Stream Impacts	Visual Impacts	Wildlife Habitat
No Action	None	N/A	None	None	None	None	None
Build	\$3.9M	794	2.4 acres/ 0.1 acre	0.3 acre	140 linear feet	Temporary & minor during construction	1.7 acres

4.2 Is the NEPA process finished?

After this EA is signed by the FHWA and approved for public dissemination, a public hearing and 30-day comment period will be offered jointly with the USFS as a NEPA cooperating agency.

After a review of comments received from citizens, public officials, and governmental agencies, the next step in the environmental process will be to identify a Preferred Alternative based on the information contained in the EA and the comments received.

After the Preferred Alternative design is finalized, a FONSI document will be prepared by the ARDOT and submitted to the FHWA. Approval of the FONSI by the FHWA will identify the Selected Alternative and conclude the NEPA process.

Reference Page: Acronyms

ADA	Americans with Disabilities Act of 1990
ARDOT	Arkansas Department of Transportation
EA	Environmental Assessment
FHWA	Federal Highway Administration
FONSI	Finding of No Significant Impacts
IRA	Inventoried Roadless Area
MSAT	Mobile Source Air Toxics
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act
OHT	Ozark Highlands Trail
WSR	National Wild & Scenic River
SHPO	State Historic Preservation Officer
USDOT	U.S. Department of Transportation
USFS	U.S. Forest Service
USFWS	U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service

Appendix A: U.S. Forest Service Correspondence



United States
Department of
Agriculture

Forest
Service

Ozark-St. Francis National Forest

605 West Main Street
Russellville, AR 72801
479-964-7200
Fax: 479-964-7255

File Code: 1950
Date: June 19, 2019

John Fleming
Division Head, Environmental Division
P.O. Box 2261
Little Rock, AR 72203-2261

Dear Mr. Fleming:

In response to your letter dated October 16, 2017, I accept cooperating agency status for the Forest Service on Job Number 080499, due to the involvement of National Forest System lands and a National Wild and Scenic River in two bridge replacements and installation of a new culvert along Highway 123 in Johnson County, Arkansas. The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Arkansas Department of Transportation (ARDOT) will be responsible for NEPA and other related consultation document preparation that will include Forest Service requirements. Outlined below are the Ozark-St. Francis National Forests' NEPA requirements for ARDOT projects, followed by my staff's comments on the project design. We appreciate all of you and your staff's efforts on this project to come to a workable solution for this stretch of Highway 123 in Johnson County.

Analysis and Documentation

ARDOT is responsible for including connected actions in the effects analysis and environmental documentation for the highway project. These actions could include projects such as merchantable timber removal and utility line relocation in the project area. This project is led by a partnership between the FHWA and ARDOT. The FHWA is involved because it is funding a portion of the project and has the primary responsibility for the content and accuracy of this NEPA document. The project is also being funded with state funds allocated to ARDOT. ARDOT is responsible for administering and maintaining the state highway system, which includes Highway 123 and associated structures. For these reasons, FHWA will be the lead federal agency responsible for NEPA content and approval, while ARDOT will be conducting the environmental reviews and consultations and will be responsible for NEPA documentation preparation. These processes must comply with NEPA and its implementing regulations at 40 CFR §1500-1508. In accordance with the 1999 Memorandum of Understanding between the USDA Forest Service and the FHWA, we have determined that the Forest Service does not have a NEPA decision to authorize FHWA and ARDOT activities concerning this proposal.

As a cooperating agency, the Forest Service's anticipated level of involvement will include activities and coordination pursuant to NEPA implementing regulations (40 CFR §1501.6(b)). Forest Service participation in the NEPA process will include review of environmental analyses and related consultation documents completed by ARDOT that pertain to activities on Forest Service lands. Where the Forest Service has expertise, we will provide input to draft NEPA and consultation documents, including the sufficiency of proposed measures to protect resources on Forest Service lands, evaluate consistency with the Forest Plan, and identify any potential areas of concern or public interest. The Forest Service will also review and submit separate analyses

needed for compliance with Section 7(a) of the Wild & Scenic River Act and Inventoried Roadless Areas (IRAs) affected by the project.

In support of the public participation process, the Forest Service will provide ARDOT with a list of interested parties to include as part of the public participation plan for scoping and subsequent public involvement periods relating to review of the Draft Environmental Assessment. The project will be posted to our Ozark-St. Francis National Forests external web site with relevant documents available for review and will link to any other established project web site as needed. My staff will be available to assist ARDOT in considering relevant public comments and responses, and subsequent changes needed to the environmental analysis and consultations. Since we have determined there is no Forest Service NEPA decision for this project, the Forest Service project-level objection process in accordance with 36 CFR §218 does not apply to this project.

Proposed Action

The Proposed Action includes one bridge replacement in a new alignment over Gee Creek, one new bridge construction parallel to an existing bridge over Big Piney Creek, and one new culvert in Sugar Creek to support a new road alignment. The Proposed Action would include a modification of the Gee Creek easement, a new easement for the Sugar Creek culvert, and retention of the existing easement for the single-lane Big Piney Creek Bridge to become a pedestrian bridge, potentially under a maintenance agreement with Johnson County, and a new easement for the new Big Piney Creek Bridge structure. ARDOT would continue to be responsible for all maintenance and costs associated with these easements and structures that FHWA has issued on behalf of the USFS.

The Forest Service has multiple concerns that will need to be addressed in planning this project. The project team met many times over the last eight months to discuss these issues, and the following items will need to be addressed in the environmental documentation and design for these projects:

GEE CREEK SITE:

- Roadless Area considerations will need to be addressed at this site. To complete the analysis of impacts to the Roadless Area, the Forest Service will need project details, such as amount and size of timber to be removed and the project area of disturbance.
- Culvert considerations for this site would need to account for the following: fish passage, culvert slope and alignment matching streambed slope and alignment, structure bottom depth counter-sunk below maximum scour depth of the stream, and streambed material replaced within the culvert. At this site, due to the presence of bedrock near the culvert surface, the Forest Service recommends a bottomless culvert structure.

BIG PINEY CREEK SITE:

- Bridge design considerations: the bridge needs to blend with the natural environment as much as possible. New structure should be subordinate in design and reflect the historic structure where possible. This can be accomplished by minimizing any new design elements and matching the color, texture and lines of the existing historic bridge materials.
- Abutments also need to follow the above criteria in terms of color and texture matching the existing bridge and the natural environment as much as possible. Abutment footprints will also need to be minimized to lessen impacts to the free-flow characteristics of the

Big Piney Creek. This could include minimizing the number of piers below the Ordinary High Water Mark and lining up piers on the new bridge with the old bridge structure.

- The access site under the existing bridge west of Big Piney Creek will need to have a defined boundary to remove and/or limit vehicular access north and south along the riparian area to reduce potential sedimentation and turbidity of the river. For areas like this in the project area, where there is existing access to roads and structures, Service requests that access features be incorporated into the design for new bridges. Some areas, such as this access site, may potentially require Forest Service gates as warranted.
- For temporary construction pads, the design should minimize compaction of the streambed and allow for all construction material to be removed from the site, minimizing disturbance of the native channel. In-stream work should be performed in low flow conditions.
- The apron at the east footing of the proposed bridge over Big Piney Creek involves placing riprap near the top of the bank of the creek. We are concerned that the bank would erode over time and the apron may require follow-up treatments. It is also undesirable to have visible riprap in the Wild and Scenic River corridor. We would request consideration of alternative methods to protect this bank and bridge footing that better align with the intent of the Wild and Scenic qualities of the Big Piney Creek.
- Considerations for the Ozark Highlands Trail and access will need to be included in project design and implementation/construction. These include: trail alignment changes that will need to be made after the project is complete, safety considerations for pedestrians on the current bridge once it is transitioned to pedestrian use (bollards of some type to restrict vehicular access), and no construction-related use of Ozark Highlands Trail trailheads and parking areas during project implementation.

SUGAR CREEK SITE:

- Due to its proximity to Big Piney Creek, the Sugar Creek proposed culvert area, downstream of the existing Hwy 123 culvert, would also be within the Big Piney Creek Wild and Scenic River corridor. For this reason, additional requirements may be needed for this site to ensure we meet the intent of maintaining the Wild and Scenic River qualities for Big Piney Creek.
- Culvert considerations for this site would need to account for the following, whether a bottomless or box culvert design was chosen: fish passage, culvert slope and alignment matching streambed slope and alignment, structure bottom depth counter-sunk below maximum scour depth of the stream, and streambed material replaced within the culvert. The new culvert would need to be designed to meet or exceed the flood capacity and channel width of the existing upstream culvert. This could be accomplished with an oversized culvert with larger and fewer barrels.
- Fill needed for elevated roadbed above culvert will need detailed evaluation and justification in environmental documents. Alternative designs that involve a steeper slope, different materials, and stabilization will be needed to minimize the amount of fill and sedimentation in this area, since it is within the Wild and Scenic River corridor. Since this site is also within the Wild and Scenic River corridor, it is undesirable to have visible riprap on this site. Aesthetic considerations noted above for the Big Piney Creek would also apply to the Sugar Creek site.

If you or your staff have any questions concerning this letter, please contact Mike Mulford at (870) 428-5528, ext 5136 or Amy Burt at (479) 964-7282.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'T. Jones', with a stylized flourish extending to the right.

TIMOTHY E. JONES
Acting Forest Supervisor

Mike Mulford, Amy Burt

Appendix B: State Historic Preservation Officer Clearance



THE DEPARTMENT OF ARKANSAS
HERITAGE

Asa Hutchinson
Governor

Stacy Hurst
Secretary
Parks, Heritage & Tourism

Arkansas Arts Council

Arkansas Historic
Preservation Program

Arkansas Natural
Heritage Commission

Arkansas State Archives

Delta Cultural Center

Historic Arkansas Museum

Mosaic Templars Cultural Center

Old State House Museum



1100 North Street
Little Rock, AR 72201

(501) 324-9880
fax: (501) 324-9184

info@arkansaspreservation.org
www.arkansaspreservation.com

An Equal Opportunity Employer

October 11, 2019

Mr. John Fleming
Division Head
Environmental Division
Arkansas State Highway and Transportation Department
P.O. Box 2261
Little Rock, AR 72203-2261

RE: Johnson County — General
Section 106 Review — FHWA
Gee Creek Str. & Apprs. (S)
Route 123, Section 3
ARDOT Job Number: 080499
AHPP Tracking Number: 99492.04

Dear Mr. Fleming:

The staff of the Arkansas Historic Preservation Program (AHPP) reviewed the Project Identification Form (PIF) for the above-referenced job in Section 19, Township 12 North, Range 21 West in Johnson County. According to your correspondence, the altered plans for the undertaking entail replacement of Bridge M1864 that spans Gee Creek with a box culvert. The project length is 605.6 meters and the proposed right-of-way (ROW) acquisition is 2.46 acres.

The AHPP concurs that Site 3JO0827 is not eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places.

Based on the provided information and the negative results of the field investigation, the AHPP concurs with a finding of **no historic properties affected pursuant to 36 CFR § 800.4(d)(1)** for the proposed undertaking.

In the event of a post-review discovery of historic properties within the area of potential effects, please contact the AHPP and other consulting parties in accordance with 36 CFR § 800.13(b)(3).

Tribes that have expressed an interest in the area include the Cherokee Nation (Ms. Elizabeth Toombs), the Chickasaw Nation (Ms. Karen Brunso), the Muscogee (Creek) Nation (Ms. Corain Lowe-Zepeda), the Osage Nation (Dr. Andrea Hunter), the Quapaw Nation (Mr. Everett Bandy), the Shawnee Tribe (Ms. Tonya Tipton), and the United Keetoowah Band of Cherokee Indians (Ms. Erin Thompson and Charlotte Wolfe). We recommend consultation in accordance with 36 CFR § 800.2(c)(2).

Please refer to the AHPP Tracking Number listed above in all correspondence. If you have any questions, please call Eric Mills of my staff at 501-324-9784 or email eric.mills@arkansas.gov.

Sincerely,

Eric R. Mills

for Scott Kaufman
Director, AHPP

cc: Mr. Randall Looney, Federal Highway Administration
Dr. Ann Early, Arkansas Archeological Survey

Appendix C: Visual Impacts



ARKANSAS DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

ARDOT.gov | IDriveArkansas.com | Scott E. Bennett, P.E., Director

10324 Interstate 30 | P.O. Box 2261 | Little Rock, AR 72203-2261 | Phone: 501.569.2000

INTEROFFICE MEMORANDUM

March 13, 2020

TO: Project File

FROM: Mary Pearson, Assessments Section, Environmental Division

SUBJECT: Job Number 080499
FAP Number NHPP-0036(18)
Gee Creek Str. & Apprs.
Route 123, Section 3
Johnson County
Visual Impact Assessment Technical Memorandum

Purpose of this Memorandum

The purpose of this Visual Impact Assessment (VIA) Memorandum (memo) is to evaluate potential visual impacts associated with the subject project. The VIA was prepared using guidance outlined in the *Guidelines for the Visual Impact Assessment of Highway Projects* published by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) in January 2015.

Visual Impact Assessment

The VIA Scoping Questionnaire was completed. As shown in Attachment 1, the response to each question has a corresponding value of either 1 or 2, resulting in an overall score of 11. Consistent with FHWA guidelines, a score of 10 to 14 recommends the preparation of a brief visual impact assessment in memo format. This memo documents the recommended level of assessment.

Visual resource and VIA definitions for the concepts and terms used in the remainder of this memo are provided in Attachment 2. The visual impacts described are associated with the Build Alternative; no impacts are anticipated under the No Action Alternative.

Job Number 080499
Visual Impact Assessment
Page 2 of 3

Proposed project viewers are categorized as either neighbors or travelers. Neighbors include residents and business occupants. Travelers include users of the project corridor and adjacent roadways.

Existing Visual Character

The proposed project involves replacing an existing bridge with a reinforced concrete box culvert. The box culvert would be placed slightly east of the existing bridge, requiring a segment of new alignment. The two existing travel lanes would be widened from 10 feet to 11 feet, and the existing shoulders would be widened from 2 feet to 4 feet.

The project corridor extends approximately 0.34 mile within the Highway 123 winds to the east, following the course of Haw Creek. Bluffs and rock formations line the steep slopes near the roadway. The forest includes a mix of oak, hickory, and pine on the hillsides, with mostly beech and maple growing along the creek bed. Topography and forest density prevent most views beyond the immediate foreground, conditions that highlight contrasting areas of exposed rock and diversely-patterned foliage lining both sides of the roadway.

The entrance to the Haw Creek Falls Campground is located in the project footprint, although the roadway is not visible from the campground facilities. The Ozark Highlands Trail also crosses Highway 123 at the campground entrance. In the absence of project neighbors, project viewers would be limited to travelers – primarily motorists, but also including trail users and recreationists at limited vantage points along Haw Creek in the immediate project vicinity.

Permanent Impacts

The increase in roadway width and profile would slightly modify the appearance of the existing roadway. Removing the bridge and clearing trees and vegetation would alter the project corridor's current appearance. Depending on viewer exposure and sensitivity, these changes could be experienced as either beneficial, neutral, or adverse.

The proposed roadway cross section and materials are typical of transportation improvements made to highways throughout the state. Visual elements uncommon in the area would not be introduced, and landforms would not be noticeably altered. Based on predicted viewer exposure and sensitivity, permanent impacts would be minor and localized.

Job Number 080499
Visual Impact Assessment
Page 3 of 3

Temporary Impacts

Project construction would result in the short-term presence of construction vehicles and equipment, grading and excavation, and vegetation clearing throughout the project area. The areas where construction and grading would remove existing natural vegetation would be viewable by travelers and site-specific neighbors. Grading and excavation activities and the presence of construction vehicles and equipment would result in a temporary change in the visual character of the project corridor. These activities would be short-term. Impacts in roadside cleared areas would be short/medium-term until new vegetation becomes established. These temporary visual impacts would be minor and not expected to result in an adverse response by typical viewers.

Avoidance, Minimization and/or Mitigation Measures

Construction of this project would introduce minor changes to views but would not alter the overall character of the project corridor. Impacts to existing vegetation would be minimized through revegetation efforts as part of the process to ensure that biological resources are not adversely affected. Coordination with the Ozark National Forest during project development could help minimize adverse impacts and promote beneficial impacts. As a result, adverse impacts to the overall visual character of the project corridor are not expected as a result of the proposed project.

Attachments

1. VIA Scoping Questionnaire
2. VIA Definitions

Visual Impact Assessment Scoping Questionnaire

Project Name: Gee Creek Str. & Apprs. (S)

Location: Highway 123, Johnson County

Special Conditions/Notes:

Conducted By: M. Pearson

Environmental Compatibility

1. *Will the project result in a noticeable change in the physical characteristics of the existing environment? (Consider all project components and construction impacts - both permanent and temporary, including landform changes, structures, noise barriers, vegetation removal, railing, signage, and contractor activities.)*

- ☐ High level of permanent change (3)
 ☒ Moderate level of permanent change (2)
 ☐ Low level of permanent or temporary change (1)
 ☐ No Noticeable Change (0)

2. *Will the project complement or contrast with the visual character desired by the community? (Evaluate the scale and extent of the project features compared to the surrounding scale of the community. Is the project likely to give an urban appearance to an existing rural or suburban community? Do you anticipate that the change will be viewed by the public as positive or negative? Research planning documents, or talk with local planners and community representatives to understand the type of visual environment local residents envision for their community.)*

- ☐ Low Compatibility (3)
 ☐ Moderate Compatibility (2)
 ☒ High compatibility (1)

3. *What level of local concern is there for the types of project features (e.g., bridge structures, large excavations, sound barriers, or median planting removal) and construction impacts that are proposed? (Certain project improvements can be of special interest to local citizens, causing a heightened level of public concern, and requiring a more focused visual analysis.)*

- ☐ High concern (3)
 ☐ Moderate concern (2)
 ☒ Low concern (1)
 ☐ Negligible Project Features (0)

4. *Is it anticipated that to mitigate visual impacts, it may be necessary to develop extensive or novel mitigation strategies to avoid, minimize, or compensate for adverse impacts or will using conventional mitigation strategies, such as landscape or architectural treatment adequately mitigate adverse visual impacts?*

- ☐ Extensive Non-Conventional Mitigation Likely (3) ☐ Some non-conventional Mitigation Likely (2)
- ☒ No Mitigation Likely (0) ☐ Some Mitigation Likely (1)

5. Will this project, when seen collectively with other projects, result in an aggregate adverse change (cumulative impacts) in overall visual quality or character? (Identify any projects [both state and local] in the area that have been constructed in recent years and those currently planned for future construction. The window of time and the extent of area applicable to possible cumulative impacts should be based on a reasonable anticipation of the viewing public's perception.)

- ☐ Cumulative Impacts likely: 0-5 years (3) ☒ Cumulative Impacts likely: 6-10 years (2)
- ☐ Cumulative Impacts unlikely (1)

Viewer Sensitivity

1. *What is the potential that the project proposal may be controversial within the community, or opposed by any organized group? (This can be researched initially by talking with the state DOT and local agency management and staff familiar with the affected community's sentiments as evidenced by past projects and/or current information.)*

- ☐ High Potential (3) ☐ Moderate Potential (2)
- ☒ Low Potential (1) ☐ No Potential (0)

2. *How sensitive are potential viewer-groups likely to be regarding visible changes proposed by the project? (Consider among other factors the number of viewers within the group, probable viewer expectations, activities, viewing duration, and orientation. The expected viewer sensitivity level may be scoped by applying professional judgment, and by soliciting information from other DOT staff, local agencies and community representatives familiar with the affected community's sentiments and demonstrated concerns.)*

- ☐ High Sensitivity (3) ☐ Moderate Sensitivity (2)
- ☒ Low Sensitivity (1)

3. *To what degree does the project's aesthetic approach appear to be consistent with applicable laws, ordinances, regulations, policies or standards?*

☐ Low Compatibility (3)

☐ Moderate Compatibility (2)

☒ High compatibility (1)

4. *Are permits going to be required by outside regulatory agencies (i.e., Federal, State, or local)?*
(Permit requirements can have an unintended consequence on the visual environment. Anticipated permits, as well as specific permit requirements - which are defined by the permitter, may be determined by talking with the project environmental planner and project engineer. Note: coordinate with the state DOT representative responsible for obtaining the permit prior to communicating directly with any permitting agency. Permits that may benefit from additional analysis include permits that may result in visible built features, such as infiltration basins or devices under a storm water permit or a retaining wall for wetland avoidance or permits for work in sensitive areas such as coastal development permits or on Federal lands, such as impacts to Wild and Scenic Rivers.)

☐ Yes (3)

☐ Maybe (2)

☒ No (1)

5. *Will the project sponsor or public benefit from a more detailed visual analysis in order to help reach consensus on a course of action to address potential visual impacts? (Consider the proposed project features, possible visual impacts, and probable mitigation recommendations.)*

☐ Yes (3)

☐ Maybe (2)

☒ No (1)

Total Project Score: 11

Determining the Level of Visual Impact Assessment

Total the scores of the answers to all ten questions on the Visual Impact Assessment Scoping Questionnaire. Use the total score from the questionnaire as an indicator of the appropriate level of VIA to perform for the project. Confirm that the level suggested by the checklist is consistent with the project teams' professional judgments. If there remains doubt about whether a VIA needs to be completed, it may be prudent to conduct an Abbreviated VIA. If there remains doubt about the level of the VIA, begin with the simpler VIA process. If visual impacts emerge as a more substantial concern than anticipated, the level of VIA documentation can always be increased.

The level of the VIA can initially be based on the following ranges of total scores:

☐ **Score 25-30**

An *Expanded VIA* is probably necessary. It is recommended that it should be preceded by a formal visual scoping study prior to beginning the VIA to alert the project team to potential highly adverse impacts and to develop new project alternatives to avoid those impacts. These technical studies will likely receive state-wide, even national, public review. Extensive use of visual simulations and a comprehensive public involvement program would be typical.

☐ **Score 20-24**

A *Standard VIA* is recommended. This technical study will likely receive extensive local, perhaps state-wide, public review. It would typically include several visual simulations. It would also include a thorough examination of public planning and policy documents supplemented with a direct public engagement processes to determine visual preferences.

☐ **Score 15-19**

An *Abbreviated VIA* would briefly describe project features, impacts and mitigation requirements. Visual simulations would be optional. An Abbreviated VIA would receive little direct public interest beyond a summary of its findings in the project's environmental documents. Visual preferences would be based on observation and review of planning and policy documents by local jurisdictions.

☒ **Score 10-14**

A *VIA Memorandum* addressing minor visual issues that indicates the nature of the limited impacts and any necessary mitigation strategies that should be implemented would likely be sufficient along with an explanation of why no formal analysis is required.

☐ **Score 6-9**

No noticeable physical changes to the environment are proposed and no further analysis is required. Print out a copy of this completed questionnaire for your project file to document that there is no effect. A *VIA Memorandum* may be used to document that there is no effect and to explain the approach used for the determination.

Visual Impact Assessment Definitions

The FHWA guidelines recognize three types of visual resources:

- **Natural visual resources** include landforms and land cover such as trees, vegetation, and water.
- **Cultural visual resources** include manmade elements such as roadways, embankments, bridges, and buildings
- **Project visual resources** include the existing highway's geometrics, structures, and fixtures and those that will be placed in the environment as part of the proposed project.

The overall composition of visual resources helps determine the **visual character** of a scene or landscape. For highway project assessment purposes, visual resources and character are considered from two perspectives:

1. The view of the project to the surrounding community (neighbors).
2. The view from the project to motorists (travelers).

Neighbors who can see a highway project and travelers who use it are defined as **viewers**. Visual resource changes are assessed by considering the compatibility and/or contrast of the proposed projects with the visual character of existing environments. Viewer responses to these changes are predicted by considering both exposure and sensitivity.

Viewer exposure considers the physical limits of the views and the number and type of viewers. **Viewer sensitivity** considers the expectations of viewers based on existing environments and the extent to which various visual resources may be important to them.

The predicted viewer response to changes in the existing landscape are used to determine **visual quality** impacts. Potential impacts may be identified as neutral, adverse, or beneficial and described in the following terms:

- **Extent** – Are the effects site-specific, local, or even regional?
- **Duration** – Are the effects temporary or permanent, or short-term or long-term?
- **Scale** – Are the effects negligible, minor, moderate, or major?

Potential impact durations are defined below.

- Short-term – during construction.
- Short/medium-term – 1 to 5 years while new vegetation becomes established after construction.
- Medium/long-term – 5 to 15 years after construction when new vegetation would be effective mitigation.
- Long-term – Over 15 years.

Potential impact scales are defined below.

Negligible: Changes would be non-detectable or, if detected, effects would be slight and local. Impacts would not require mitigation.

Minor: Changes would be noticeable, although the changes would be small and localized. Conventional mitigation measures may be necessary to reduce potential effects.

Moderate: Changes would be noticeable and have localized and potentially regional scale impacts; historical conditions would be altered. Conventional mitigation measures may be necessary to reduce potential effects.

Major: Changes would be noticeable and would have substantial consequences on a local and/or regional level. Mitigation measures to offset the effects would be required to reduce impacts, although long-term changes to the resource would be possible.

Appendix D: Biological Evaluation

BIOLOGICAL EVALUATION

for

Activities Related to

Job Number 080499

Gee Creek Strs. and Apprs. (S)

Ozark-St. Francis National Forest

Big Piney Ranger District

Johnson County, Arkansas

by

Joe Ledvina

Botanist

Arkansas Department of Transportation

P.O. Box 2261

Little Rock, AR 72203

(501) 569-2520 (voice)

(501) 569-2009 (fax)

joseph.ledvina@ardot.gov

August 2020

CONTENTS

Project Description and Location.....	4
Purpose and Need for the Proposed Action	4
Alternatives Considered – No Action	4
Purpose and Need for the Biological Evaluation.....	4
Proposed Management Actions	7
Inventory History	7
Cumulative Effects.....	7
Species Considered and Species Evaluated	7
Evaluated Species Survey Information	8
Environmental Baseline and Effects of Proposed Management Actions	8
Gray bat (<i>Myotis grisescens</i>) – Endangered	9
Indiana bat (<i>Myotis sodalis</i>) – Endangered.....	10
Northern long-eared bat (<i>Myotis septentrionalis</i>) – Threatened.....	12
Ozark big-eared bat (<i>Corynorhinus townsendii ingens</i>) - Endangered.....	13
Boston Mountains Crayfish (<i>Cambarus causeyi</i>) – Sensitive	14
Eastern small-footed bat (<i>Myotis leibii</i>) – Sensitive	14
Isopod (<i>Lirceus bicuspidatus</i>) – Sensitive	15
Longnose darter (<i>Percina nasuta</i>) - Sensitive	16
Monarch Butterfly (<i>Danaus plexippus</i>) – Sensitive.....	17
Nearctic Paduniellan caddisfly (<i>Paduniella neartica</i>) – Sensitive	17
Purple Lilliput (<i>Toxolasma lividum</i>) – Sensitive	18
Tricolored bat (<i>Perimyotis subflavus</i>) – Sensitive	19
Western fanshell (<i>Cyprogenia aberti</i>) – Sensitive.....	19
Consultation History with the U.S. Department of the Interior – U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service	20

Coordination History with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	20
Determination of Effects	20
Literature Cited	25
Appendix A: Regional Forester’s Sensitive Species List.	30
Appendix B: Vascular Plant Survey Results	38
Appendix C: US Fish and Wildlife Service Consultation	42

PROJECT DESCRIPTION AND LOCATION

The Arkansas Department of Transportation (ARDOT) proposes to replace the Highway 123 bridge over Gee Creek (Bridge No. M1864) in Johnson County, see Figure 1. The project area is found in Township 12 North, Range 21 West, Section 19, and lies in the Dardanelle Reservoir Watershed (8-digit HUC 11110202) within the Lower Arkansas-Fourche La Fave Basin (6-digit HUC 111102).

Proposed improvements at Gee Creek consist of replacing the existing 41' x 23.5' bridge with a quadruple 12' x 9' x 62' three-sided box culvert, widening the travel lanes to 11' and adding 4' shoulders. Currently, the bridge has 10-foot travel lanes and two-foot shoulders. The three-sided box culvert will be replaced on a new location, from approximately 15 to approximately 76 feet downstream of the downstream edge of the existing bridge. The existing bridge will remain open during construction to maintain traffic. Once the new bridge is open to traffic, the existing bridge and its approaches will be demolished.

All disturbed areas will be seeded in accordance with the ARDOT's Special Seeding Special Provision, which includes three native grasses and seven native wildflower species. A cover crop is also included to obtain vegetative coverage while the other native species become established.

PURPOSE AND NEED FOR THE PROPOSED ACTION

The purpose of the proposed project is to replace one bridge along Highway 123 over Gee Creek. The Gee Creek Bridge is considered to be in poor condition. In addition, this bridge is weight posted.

ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED – NO ACTION

This alternative involves only maintenance activities on the Gee Creek Bridge. Maintenance activities may not be able to address all of the structural deficiencies and would not bring the bridge and approaches up to current design safety standards. No alternatives, other than the no build alternative, were considered.

PURPOSE AND NEED FOR THE BIOLOGICAL EVALUATION

This Biological Evaluation (BE) documents the potential effects of the proposed highway construction activities, including utility relocation and timber harvesting, on both known and potentially occurring populations and habitat of the OSFNF Proposed, Endangered, Threatened, and Sensitive species (PETS) (USDI FWS 1999). This BE was conducted in accordance with methods given in Forest Service Manual 2672.43 (USDA FS 2005c).

As part of the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) decision-making process, the BE provides a review of ARDOT's activities in sufficient detail to determine the potential affects of the proposed action on the listed PETS species. Objectives of the BE are as follows:

- to ensure that ARDOT's actions do not contribute to loss of viability of any native or desired non-native plant or animal species or contribute to trends toward Federal listing of any species.

- to comply with all requirements of the Endangered Species Act (ESA), that actions of federal agencies not put at risk or adversely modify critical habitat of federally listed species.
- to provide standardized procedures for evaluation of PETS species to ensure they receive full consideration in the decision-making process, so that no species is placed in jeopardy as a result of inadequate management actions.
- to adhere to the requirements of the Forest Service Manual 2672.43(USDA FS 2005c), which provides direction for the inventory of PETS species in preparation of site-specific BEs.
- to address any potential impacts from management activities and incorporate conservation measures related to known PETS habitat or potential habitat.

Only those PETS species known to occur or have suitable habitat in the action area will be considered in this BE, see *Appendix A*.

Figure 1. Project location map



PROPOSED MANAGEMENT ACTIONS

Proposed management actions include the use of Best Management Practices (BMPs) outlined in the National Pollution Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) and Section 404, Clean Water Act permits. These BMPs ensure that construction related activities associated with the project will not have detrimental effects on the water quality within the watershed.

INVENTORY HISTORY

This BE is based on Arkansas Natural Heritage Commission (ANHC) 2010, 2016, and 2018 records database, Information for Planning and Conservation (IPaC) system, OSFNF PETS checklist (2018) from the Ozark-St. Francis National Forests, NatureServe Explorer Data (2020), and literature as cited for the various listed species known to occur on the OSFNF.

Based on the recommendation of the US Fish and Wildlife Service and the proximity of locality records, a summer presence/absence survey was conducted for federally listed bat species. A summer mist net bat survey was conducted from July 9-12, 2019 near the project area: at the Highway 123 bridge over Big Piney Creek and at the Highway 123 bridge over Haw Creek. A total of ten bats representing three species were captured, including four evening bats (*Nycticeius humeralis*), four red bats (*Lasiurus borealis*), and two big-brown bats (*Eptesicus fuscus*) (see Appendix C).

A vascular plant survey was conducted in 2017 by ARDOT Natural Resources Specialist Kayti Ewing. The results of the plant survey are included in *Appendix B*. Other pertinent literature and information concerning PETS populations and habitats are used as cited.

CUMULATIVE EFFECTS

Current and planned Forest Service activities could have additional adverse impacts on these species; however, these cumulative effects would be minimal due to the fact that this species is protected under the Endangered Species Act (ESA) and the Forest Plan (USDA FS 2005a) and FEIS (USDA FS 2005b). Highway construction activities occurring within the OSFNF are reviewed to ensure compatibility with the Forest Plan (USDA FS 2005a) and FEIS (USDA FS 2005b). Further development within the area will likely be minimized due to the rural nature of the area, and the amount of property currently owned or maintained by the forest service. As a result, no cumulative effects are expected to occur for any PETS species.

SPECIES CONSIDERED AND SPECIES EVALUATED

All PETS species will be evaluated and/or inventoried according to Forest Service Manual 2672.43 (USDA FS 2005c). All inventory and analysis for PETS species is based on “best available science.” *Appendix A* lists the OSFNF PETS species and indicates whether or not each is known to occur within the action area. The status of each species within the Big Piney Ranger District and within the action area is based on a literature review of known surveys and information. As expressed for each species listed in *Appendix A*, additional surveys are not needed at this time to provide more definitive information to improve the determination of effects on the evaluated PETS species.

EVALUATED SPECIES SURVEY INFORMATION

Based on the ANHC 2010, 2016, and 2018 records database, IPaC, NatureServe Explorer Data (2020), ARDOT field surveys, and other pertinent information as cited, seventeen PETS species are known to occur or may potentially occur within the action area. IPaC identified nine federally listed species to occur in the region: the threatened northern long-eared bat (*Myotis septentrionalis*), the endangered Ozark big-eared bat (*Corynorhinus townsendii ingens*), the endangered Indiana bat (*Myotis sodalis*), the endangered gray bat (*Myotis grisescens*), the threatened Missouri bladderpod (*Physaria filiformis*), the threatened Piping Plover (*Charadrius melodus*) and Red Knot (*Calidris canutus rufa*), and the endangered American burying beetle (*Nicrophorus americanus*). Only four federally listed species have the potential to occur in the project area (see *Appendix A*). The other thirteen PETS species are considered sensitive by the USFS, and include one bird, three plant species, one fish species, one crayfish, two bats, one isopod, two insects, and two mussels (see *Appendix A*). Only these seventeen species will be evaluated in this BE for potential impacts from the proposed actions.

ENVIRONMENTAL BASELINE AND EFFECTS OF PROPOSED MANAGEMENT ACTIONS

Each specific activity that is being considered will be evaluated to determine potential effects to the seventeen PETS species of concern in this BE. The specific activities were listed in the “

Project Description and Location” section above. The most likely *general* effects from the specific activities are as follows:

Highway Construction Activities:

- Would remove trees (forested habitat) from the site prior to other construction activities
- Would demolish the existing Gee Creek Bridge (potential roosting habitat)
- Would cause temporary soil disturbance from heavy equipment operation
- Could temporarily increase sedimentation by exposing soils susceptible to erosion before the action area could be revegetated
- Could impact or crush individual plants and animals on the ground directly by heavy equipment operation
- Would create small patches of early successional habitat through the conversion of forested tracts to highway rights-of-way

These activities can be grouped or simplified into the four following impacts:

- **Soil disturbance impacts**
- **Sedimentation impacts**
- **Heavy equipment impacts (includes bridge demolition)**
- **Creation of early successional habitat impacts (includes timber harvest)**

These four impacts will be evaluated below for the four federally listed and thirteen PETS species that are known to occur or may occur within the action area.

Gray bat (*Myotis grisescens*) – Endangered

The gray bat is found in 14 states across most of the southeastern United States. In Arkansas, the gray bat’s range includes over 30 counties, mostly in the Ozark Highlands, Boston Mountains, Arkansas River Valley and Mississippi Alluvial Plain Ecoregions. Gray bats are year-round cave residents, although different caves are usually occupied in summer rather than winter. Few individuals are found outside of caves. They hibernate primarily in deep, vertical caves during winter, and roost in limestone karst caves along rivers in summer months. Foraging habitat occurs primarily over water such as along rivers and lakes, where they feed on aquatic insects, within intact forested interiors near summer caves (Moore et al. 2017, NatureServe 2020). Fukui et al. (2006) showed that an abundance of aquatic insects positively correlated to increased activity of riparian foraging bat species; therefore, loss of riparian vegetation or degradation of stream habitat quality may have negative effects on bat activities in riparian areas through the reduction of aquatic insects (food resources). Gray bat populations are threatened by a range of

stressors including disease, land use change, and direct human disturbance. Factors directly influencing this species include white-nose syndrome (WNS), winter and summer habitat modification, disturbance and destruction such as cave vandalism, and climate change (NatureServe 2020).

Surveys were conducted to determine presence or absence of the species from the project area. There are several known occurrence records in the project vicinity, but these are all along Big Piney Creek, a much wider foraging corridor, and gray bats are less likely to use the small riparian corridor along Gee Creek. Under the FHWA Range-wide Programmatic Consultation for Indiana Bat and Northern Long-eared Bat, a Bridge/Structure Assessment was completed and obligatory avoidance and minimization measures were committed to as part of our Section 7 consultation for Indiana and northern long-eared bats. Mist net surveys near the project location in July of 2019 did not capture any gray bats (see appendix C), and the bridge assessment yielded no evidence of any bats using the Gee Creek Bridge (see Appendix C). A special provision will be included in the job to minimize effects to gray bats by limiting construction to daylight hours, 30 minutes after sunrise until 30 minutes before sunset.

Direct Effects

No direct effects are expected due to the distances of known occupied caves from the immediate project area and the special provision prohibiting tree clearing during the active season, April 1 through November 15. No evidence of bats using the bridge was observed; therefore, no direct effects are expected due to the heavy equipment impacts from demolishing the existing bridge.

Indirect Effects

Proposed construction activities will result in the conversion of approximately 1.7 acres of riparian forest (i.e., foraging habitat) to highway right-of-way. Temporary soil disturbance and sedimentation caused by construction activities could result in decreased water quality temporarily; however, sediment and erosion control BMPs will be in place to minimize these activities' effects on water quality and aquatic insect assemblages. This creation of early successional habitat and sedimentation could alter this species' foraging habitat; however, because they prefer open habitats in riparian zones, the increased width of the forest opening in the Gee Creek riparian zone could increase available, though marginal, habitat along this relatively small creek.

Determination of Effects

The proposed highway construction activities “may affect” but are “not likely to adversely affect” gray bats. A bridge assessment was conducted and found no evidence of bats using the existing bridge; however, there are known occurrences near the project area. The project area is largely forested and contains suitable foraging habitat or corridors to the more optimal foraging habitat along Big Piney Creek. A daytime-construction-only special provision will accompany the job to minimize effects on gray bats.

Indiana bat (*Myotis sodalis*) – Endangered

The Indiana bat is found in 24 states across most of the eastern United States. In Arkansas, the Indiana bat's range includes 27 counties, mostly in the Ozark Highlands, Boston Mountains, Arkansas River Valley and Crowley's Ridge Ecoregions. Indiana bats hibernate in caves during

winter (NatureServe 2020). In summer, Indiana bats are known to roost underneath the peeling bark of dead or dying trees in intact to semi-intact wooded areas, often along streams. Menzel et al. (2001) found that preferred tree roosts, across the species' range, were in dead snags in sunny openings because the crevices under the bark stayed warmer. Also, they're known to roost and forage in upland forests within 1 to 3 miles of small to medium rivers and streams and in riparian areas. The nearest known occurrences are 13 miles northeast of the project area in Newton County (ANHC 2018). Indiana bat populations are primarily threatened by WNS and disturbance of cave habitats by humans (NatureServe 2020).

The project area lies within the consultation area of the federally endangered Indiana bat. Mist net surveys following the USFWS Indiana bat summer survey guidelines were completed near the project location in July of 2019, and no Indiana bats were captured (see Appendix C). Under the FHWA Range-wide Programmatic Consultation for Indiana Bat and Northern Long-eared Bat, a Bridge/Structure Assessment was completed and obligatory avoidance and minimization measures were committed to as part of our Section 7 consultation for Indiana and northern long-eared bats. During the bridge assessment, no evidence of bats using the Gee Creek Bridge was observed (see Appendix C).

Direct Effects

Tree clearing and bridge demolition could kill or injure roosting bats. There are no records of Indiana bats near the project area, and mist-net surveys near the project area did not capture any Indiana bats. In addition, no evidence of bats using the bridge was observed; therefore, no direct effects are expected due to tree removal and the removal of the existing bridge. Regardless, a special provision will be included in the job to minimize the likelihood of effects to Indiana bats by limiting construction to daylight hours, 30 minutes after sunrise until 30 minutes before sunset.

Indirect Effects

Proposed construction activities will result in the conversion of approximately 1.7 acres of forest to highway right-of-way, removing some potential roost trees. Temporary soil disturbance and sedimentation caused by construction activities could contribute to a temporary decrease in water quality, which could in turn affect aquatic insect assemblages. Erosion control BMPs will be in place to minimize sedimentation and potential indirect effects. The creation of early successional habitat could alter potential foraging habitat.

Determination of Effects

The proposed highway construction activities “may affect” but are “not likely to adversely affect” Indiana bats under the FHWA Range-Wide Programmatic Biological Opinion (see Appendix C). A bridge assessment found no evidence of bats using the existing bridge. Suitable foraging and roosting habitat exists, but there are known occurrences nearby. ARDOT will include a special provision requiring that construction activities not occur 30 minutes prior to sunset and 30 minutes prior to sunrise. Erosion control BMPs will be applied to minimize sediment leaving the job site.

Northern long-eared bat (*Myotis septentrionalis*) – Threatened

The northern long-eared bat is found in 37 states across most the eastern and north central United States. In Arkansas, the northern long-eared bat's range includes over 40 counties, mostly in the Ozark Highlands, Boston Mountains, Ouachita Mountains and the western part of South Central Plains Ecoregions. Hibernation primarily occurs in caves (USFWS 2011). Summer roosting and foraging habitat includes intact forested interiors with a large number of old trees, multiple forest strata and standing snags and woody debris. Foraging typically occurs within forests and along forest edges (NatureServe 2020). In Missouri, northern long-eared bats almost exclusively foraged in upland forested areas, rather than in floodplain and riparian forests (LaVal et al. 1980). In Iowa, this species was found primarily foraging in mature deciduous upland forests adjacent to riparian areas (Kunz 1973). Northern long-eared bat populations are threatened by a range of stressors including disease, land use change, and direct human disturbance. Factors directly influencing this species include WNS, winter and summer habitat modification, disturbance and destruction such as roost tree removal, cave vandalism and climate change (NatureServe 2020).

Mist net surveys following the USFWS Indiana bat summer survey guidelines were completed near the project location in July of 2019, and no northern long-eared bats were captured (see Appendix C). Under the FHWA Range-wide Programmatic Consultation for Indiana Bat and Northern Long-eared Bat, a Bridge/Structure Assessment Form and a Northern Long-Eared Bat 4(d) Rule Streamlined Consultation were completed as part of our Section 7 consultation for Indiana and northern long-eared bats. No evidence of bats using the Gee Creek Bridge was observed during the bridge assessment.

Direct Effects

Tree clearing and bridge demolition could kill or injure roosting bats. This bat is known to forage more often in more upland areas rather than in riparian areas, mist-net surveys near the project area did not capture any northern long-eared bats, and no evidence of bats using the bridge was observed; therefore, no direct effects are expected due to tree removal and the removal of the existing bridge. This species has been documented within 0.5 miles of the project area, so it is possible that individuals of this species could be overlooked or not avoided during highway construction activities. Under the proposed construction activities, heavy equipment disturbance and noise associated with construction activities could temporarily disrupt potential foraging and roosting opportunities in the adjacent upland areas. A special provision will be included in the job to minimize the likelihood of effects to northern long-eared bats by limiting construction to daylight hours, 30 minutes after sunrise until 30 minutes before sunset.

Indirect Effects

Proposed construction activities will result in the conversion of approximately 1.7 acres of forest (i.e., foraging and roosting habitat) to highway right-of-way. The creation of early-successional habitat could alter insect assemblages and thereby affect this species' foraging opportunities.

Determination of Effects

The proposed highway construction activities “may affect” but are “not likely to adversely affect” northern long-eared bats under the FHWA Range-Wide Programmatic Biological Opinion. The proposed highway construction project additionally meets the Final 4(d) Rule and

is exempt from any take, according to the FHWA Indiana bat and northern long-eared bat programmatic and accompanying Biological Opinion. Avoidance and minimization measures incorporated into the job contract will include a daytime-construction-only special provision. A bridge assessment found no evidence of bats using the bridge. This species has been documented to occur near the project area, and there is the possibility that individuals of this species could be overlooked or not avoided during highway construction activities.

Ozark big-eared bat (*Corynorhinus townsendii ingens*) - Endangered

The Ozark big-eared bat is found in the Ozark Plateau Region of Arkansas, Missouri and Oklahoma. In Arkansas, the range of the Ozark big-eared bat includes 20 counties, mostly in Ozark Highlands, Boston Mountains and Arkansas River Valley Ecoregions. Ozark big-eared bats inhabit caves year-round, which are typically located in karst regions dominated by oak-hickory forests. Weyandt et al. (2005) and Graening et al. (2011) suggest that Ozark big-eared bats could also use bluff faces and bluff lines as roosting habitat, and these types of habitats could potentially garner additional populations. Ozark big-eared bats may move among hibernacula during winter (NatureServe 2020). During the summer months, Ozark big-eared bats primarily forage in forests and along forest edges of streams and mountain slopes, typically only a little over a mile from their roosting sites (Graening et al. 2011, NatureServe 2020). Although, some tracking studies of Ozark big-eared bats documented bats traveling up to 5 miles in a 24-hour period (Graening et al. 2011, Wethington et al. 1996). Clark et al. (2002) found that the mean emergence time for Ozark big-eared bats was 25.7 minutes after sunset in both summer and winter months.

Arkansas Natural Heritage Commission's (ANHC) records database shows a single record of an Ozark big-eared bat in Newton County, 14 miles northeast of the project location (ANHC 2018). The nearest records of hibernacula are more than 30 miles to the west, in Franklin County.

Under the FHWA Range-wide Programmatic Consultation for Indiana Bat and Northern Long-eared Bat, a Bridge/Structure Assessment Form was completed as part of our Section 7 consultation for Indiana and northern long-eared bats. No evidence of any bats using the Gee Creek Bridge was observed. Mist net surveys near the project location in July of 2019 did not capture any Ozark big-eared bats (Appendix C).

Direct Effects

There are no known roost caves near the project area, and no direct effects to roosts are expected due to the distances of known cave habitats and the lack of blasting during bridge construction. No evidence of any bats using the bridge was observed; therefore, no direct effects are expected due to the heavy equipment impacts from demolishing the existing bridge.

Indirect Effects

Proposed construction activities will result in the conversion of approximately 1.7 acres of forest to highway right-of-way. This conversion is not expected to affect this species foraging or roosting habitat

Determination of Effects

The proposed highway construction activities will have “no effect” on Ozark big-eared bats. The nearest record of Ozark big-eared bats is 14 miles away, and mist-net surveys near the project area or on the Big Piney Ranger District have not captured any bats of this species. A bridge assessment found no evidence of bats using the existing bridge. ARDOT is anticipating that the new structure over Gee Creek will be a three-sided box culvert, and therefore no blasting or drilling that could disturb hibernating bats will be required during construction. ARDOT will commit to a daytime-construction-only special provision requiring that construction activities not occur after 30 minutes prior to sunset and before 30 minutes prior to sunrise.

Boston Mountains Crayfish (*Cambarus causeyi*) – Sensitive

All but a few of the known populations of the Boston Mountains crayfish are located within the Boston Mountains ecoregion, with just a few populations known near the northern edge of the Arkansas Valley ecoregion. It occurs in Franklin, Madison, Newton, Pope, Searcy, and Stone Counties, but the majority of the known occurrences are in Johnson County (NatureServe 2020, ANHC 2018). This primary burrowing crayfish is most often found in association with springs and seepage areas (Robison and Leeds 1996). While Johnson County has the largest number of populations, all of the known occurrences are at least eight miles from the project area.

Direct Effects

There was a small area with persistent moisture in the project area during the plant surveys. This could be a seepage area, but may also represent a small basin with poor drainage. Though the Boston Mountains crayfish is not known from the project area, suitable habitat may occur. Under the proposed construction activities, operation of heavy equipment during bridge construction could crush individuals.

Indirect Effects

Under the proposed activities, temporary soil disturbance, creation of early successional habitat and sedimentation may alter this species' preferred habitat.

Determination of Effects

The proposed highway construction activities “may impact individuals but are not likely to cause a trend to federal listing or loss of viability” for the Boston Mountains crayfish. Although the species is not known to occur near the project area, there is the possibility that individuals of this species could be overlooked or not avoided during highway construction activities.

Eastern small-footed bat (*Myotis leibii*) – Sensitive

The eastern small-footed bat is found in southeastern Canada and in 20 states of the eastern United States. In Arkansas, its range includes much of northern and western Arkansas. Known occurrences are recorded from Crawford, Logan, Franklin, Searcy and Newton Counties (ANHC 2016, 2016). The eastern small-footed bat has mostly been recorded hibernating in caves in winter, near the entrance. This species exhibits a high degree of fidelity to hibernacula (NatureServe 2020). Warm-season roosts are primarily in cracks and crevices of rocky outcrops but have also been found in buildings, bridges, and hollow trees, underneath loose bark, in road cuts, and in caves. Generally roosts are often exposed to the sun but may be under mid to high canopy cover (NatureServe 2020). This species relies heavily on rock roosts during the summer

months. Long distance migrations have not been documented with the eastern small-footed bat; summer roost sites may be as close as 0.1 km from winter hibernacula. This bat species' foraging habitat includes riparian forests, upland forests, clearings and ridgetops (NatureServe 2020). These bats have been observed travelling from 0.8 to 13.2 km between day roosts and foraging sites (USFWS 2013a). According to the ANHC records database (2018), an eastern small-footed bat was captured less than two miles northeast of the project area in 2011. Mist net surveys near the project location in July of 2019 did not capture any eastern small-footed bats (Appendix C), and the bridge assessment yielded no evidence of any bats using the Gee Creek Bridge (Appendix C). The most serious threat to the eastern small-footed bat, like most other bats in the eastern US, is WNS.

Direct Effects

Under the proposed construction activities, operation of heavy equipment during bridge construction could temporarily disrupt foraging opportunities. A special provision limiting work to daylight hours will make direct effects from tree clearing unlikely. There was no evidence of bats using the existing bridge, and no direct effects are expected to occur during demolition of the existing structure.

Indirect Effects

Under the proposed activities, tree clearing activities would result in the creation of early successional habitat, which could remove potential foraging and roosting habitat. Temporary soil disturbance and sedimentation could lead to a temporary decrease in water quality, which could affect aquatic insect assemblages, and indirectly affect foraging opportunities for eastern small-footed bats.

Determination of Effects

The proposed highway construction activities “may impact individuals but are not likely to cause a trend to federal listing or loss of viability” for the eastern small-footed bat. Although the species was not detected near the project area, there is the possibility that individuals of this species could be overlooked or not avoided during highway construction activities.

Isopod (*Lirceus bicuspidatus*) – Sensitive

This isopod is endemic to 12 Arkansas Counties: Independence, Jackson, Johnson, Logan, Madison, Marion, Newton, Perry, Pope, Pulaski, Saline, Searcy, Stone and Yell (NatureServe 2020). The nearest known occurrences are in Johnson County, near Clarksville, 17 miles from the project area. This isopod inhabits a variety of aquatic habitats from small seeps, springs, streams and cave streams. There is not much more known concerning the biology of this species, although it has a fairly large range in mountainous regions (Robison and Allen 1995).

Direct Effects

Although this species is not known to occur in the project area, there is potential habitat present. Under the proposed activities, no direct effects are expected.

Indirect Effects

Under the proposed activities, operation of heavy equipment, temporary soil disturbance and sedimentation could temporarily disturb aquatic habitat by reducing water quality, which this

isopod could be susceptible to. Known downstream populations are not likely to be impacted from proposed construction activities due to distance from the project. Creation of early successional habitat should have no effect.

Determination of Effects

The proposed highway construction activities “may impact individuals but are not likely to cause a trend to Federal listing or loss of viability” for the isopod, Lirceus bicuspidatus. The species is not known to occur in the project area. Although this species is not known to occur within the project area, there is potential habitat present; therefore, there is the possibility that individuals of this species could be overlooked or not avoided during highway construction activities.

Longnose darter (*Percina nasuta*) - Sensitive

The longnose darter is found in the St. Francis, White, Arkansas and Ouachita River drainages in the Ozark and Ouachita Mountains of Arkansas, southern Missouri and eastern Oklahoma. In Arkansas, the longnose darter has been found in Lee Creek, Frog Bayou, Mulberry River, upper White River, War Eagle Creek, Big Piney Creek, Illinois Bayou Drainage, Ouachita River, Caddo River and the South Fourche La Fave River (Robison and Harp 1988, NatureServe 2020). The longnose darter is known from 12 Arkansas counties, including Johnson County, and has been documented from several stretches of Big Piney Creek near the project area (ANHC 2018). The longnose darter can be found in small to medium sized rivers with clear water. It inhabits gravel riffles in the spring and slower moving water over sand and silt in the fall (NatureServe 2020). Longnose darter populations are susceptible to habitat alteration from stream impoundments and any activities leading to reduced water quality. Historical declines were due to habitat modifications resulting from reservoir construction (NatureServe 2020).

Direct Effects

The longnose darter occurs in Big Piney Creek, about two miles downstream of the project area, via Haw Creek. This species has not been documented from any smaller tributaries to Big Piney Creek, and is most likely limited to larger creeks and small rivers. Direct effects to the longnose darter are not expected.

Indirect Effects

Under the proposed activities, temporary soil disturbance and sedimentation are not likely to alter this species' habitat downstream. Downstream population is about two miles away so increased turbidity in Big Piney Creek is unlikely, especially with erosion control BMPs in place to minimize sedimentation.

Determination of Effects

The proposed highway construction activities “may impact individuals but are not likely to cause a trend to federal listing or loss of viability” on the longnose darter. Proposed construction activities could result in temporary soil disturbance and sedimentation leading to a decrease in water quality; however, sedimentation is unlikely to be significant two miles downstream in Big Piney Creek, especially with erosion control BMPs employed to minimize sedimentation.

Monarch Butterfly (*Danaus plexippus*) – Sensitive

Monarch butterflies range across the United States and the southern Canadian provinces (NatureServe 2020). In Arkansas, Monarchs are all members of the eastern population that overwinters in Mexico which has seen a severe decline of up to 90% during recent decades (NatureServe 2020). Various factors have been considered as the primary driver of this decline, including deforestation of the overwintering habitat in Mexico and direct mortality from neonicotinoid pesticides. There is good evidence, however, that the primary driver is the loss of milkweeds, the primary larval host plants, to agriculture and herbicide use across the Midwest (Pleasants and Overhauser 2013). Monarchs are rare in Arkansas during the summer, but nectar resources within Arkansas are important to fall-migrating Monarch butterflies (Rudolph et al. 2006). Monarchs are known to breed in the southern states during the spring migration, with adults from Mexico generally not reaching further north than Texas (NatureServe 2020), so migrating monarchs may use ONF milkweeds during the spring. The vascular plant survey (Appendix B) found four-leaf milkweed (*Asclepias quadrifolia*), a common forest understory plant in the Ozark Mountains.

Direct Effects

Small openings, like the area around Gee Creek along Highway 123, are not primary habitat for the monarch butterfly, though they may be important during migration. It is possible that individuals could travel through this area and may even deposit eggs on four-leaf milkweed. Under the proposed construction activities, the operation of heavy equipment during bridge construction could crush adult or larval monarch butterflies.

Indirect Effects

The proposed activities will create a larger canopy opening around Gee Creek and promote early-successional ruderal communities. This may reduce habitat availability for four-leaf milkweed and thus reduce larval habitat, but will increase nectar availability for adult monarch butterflies and may provide colonization opportunities for other, full-sun milkweed species.

Determination of Effects

The proposed highway construction activities “may impact individuals but are not likely to cause a trend to federal listing or loss of viability” for the monarch butterfly. The species could occur in the project area, there is the possibility that individuals of this species could be overlooked or not avoided during highway construction activities.

Nearctic Paduniellan caddisfly (*Paduniella neartica*) – Sensitive

The nearctic paduniellan caddisfly has been documented from only Johnson and Washington Counties in Arkansas (ANHC 2018), but it is suspected to occur in Missouri (NatureServe 2020) and may have a broader distribution in Arkansas. The nearest known population to the project area was found in Granny Creek, 11 miles to the south. The ecology and precise habitat is unknown, but ANHC records indicate that this species was found in clear, spring-fed, high-gradient streams with a gravel-bottom (NatureServe 2020 and ANHC 2018).

Direct Effects

There is no record of this species within the project area; however, suitable habitat exists and occurrence data for this species could be scarce due to the area being under-surveyed. Although

this species is not known to occur in the project area, there is the possibility that individuals of this species could be overlooked or not avoided during highway construction activities, given the suitable habitat available. Under the proposed activities, sedimentation and operation of heavy equipment could directly impact individuals. Operation of heavy equipment could crush individuals. Temporary soil disturbance and creation of early successional habitat should not have any direct effects on this species.

Indirect Effects

Under the proposed activities, operation of heavy equipment, temporary soil disturbance and creation of early successional habitat may alter this species' preferred habitat by temporarily decreasing water quality and increasing turbidity.

Determination of Effects

The proposed highway construction activities “may impact individuals but are not likely to cause a trend to Federal listing or loss of viability” for the nearctic paduniellian caddisfly. The caddisfly is known to occur within the project area; however, there is the possibility that individuals of this species could be overlooked or not avoided during highway construction activities, given the suitable habitat present.

Purple Lilliput (*Toxolasma lividum*) – Sensitive

This species is found primarily in the Ozark Plateau Region of southern Missouri and northern Arkansas (NatureServe 2020). Habitat includes small to medium clear, upland rivers with high gradient and permanent strong flow. This species is commonly found near riffles, usually just below, in slight to moderate current, in runs and flowing pools, over gravel, cobble or sand stream bottoms (NatureServe 2020). It is known from rivers and large streams like War Eagle Creek, the Buffalo River, and Illinois Bayou (ANHC 2018). The nearest known populations are in Big Piney Creek, documented less than 1.5 miles both upstream and downstream of the confluence of Haw Creek (which Gee Creek flows into). Habitat destruction, modification and fragmentation of habitat from impoundments with cold water releases had been identified as the primary threat affecting their populations. Additional threats include increases in turbidity and siltation due to surrounding land uses (NatureServe 2020).

Direct Effects

This species is unlikely to occur in a stream as small as Gee Creek in the project area. Under the proposed activities, no direct effects on this species are expected.

Indirect Effects

Under the proposed activities, temporary soil disturbance during construction could temporarily increase turbidity by introducing sediment into Gee Creek. An increase in turbidity is unlikely to impact known populations downstream in Big Piney Creek due to the distance from the project to occupied habitats; furthermore, proper installation and maintenance of erosion control BMPs will minimize sediment leaving the site and entering Gee Creek.

Determination of Effects

The proposed highway construction activities “may impact individuals but are not likely to cause a trend to federal listing or loss of viability” on the purple lilliput. There is no suitable

habitat for this species in the project area, and sedimentation from temporary soil disturbance is unlikely to affect Big Piney Creek, two miles downstream, especially with erosion control BMPs in place.

Tricolored bat (*Perimyotis subflavus*) – Sensitive

The tricolored bat has a large range across eastern North America, into the Plains States, and down into Central America (NatureServe 2020, Moore 2018). Populations within the area affected by WNS, and it is considered vulnerable to critically imperiled in most states and provinces within its range (NatureServe 2020). It is classified as secure in Arkansas (NatureServe 2020), but declines have already been documented (Moore 2018). It has been found in many Arkansas Counties, including most of the Ozark and Ouachita regions, including much of the Big Piney Ranger District. This small bat roosts in tree canopies during the summer, often in bundles of dead deciduous leaves (Moore et al 2018), and can travel as much as six to ten miles to forage over lakes and rivers. It hibernates in warmer and more humid sites in caves, mines, and culverts than other bats, which could increase its susceptibility to WNS, especially in colder regions. It also sees significant mortality at wind turbines used for energy generation (NatureServe 2020).

Direct Effects

No tricolored bats were found in 2019 mist-netting surveys near the project area (Appendix C), though a regional mist-netting survey did capture some individuals within a few miles of the project area (Johnson 2010). Gee Creek is relatively small, with small pools, and is not likely to be suitable foraging habitat. It is possible that tree-clearing activities could injure or kill individuals, because some of the trees to be cleared may provide daytime roosts for tricolored bats during the summer. Heavy equipment and construction activities could disturb foraging bats or bats traveling to larger waterbodies to forage. A daytime-only-construction special provision will be applied to the job to prevent disturbance to bats.

Indirect Effects

Under the proposed activities, tree clearing activities would result in the creation of early successional habitat, which could remove potential foraging and roosting habitat. Temporary soil disturbance and sedimentation could lead to a temporary decrease in water quality, which could affect aquatic insect assemblages, and indirectly affect foraging opportunities for the tricolored bat.

Determination of Effects

The proposed highway construction activities “may impact individuals but are not likely to cause a trend to federal listing or loss of viability” for the tricolored bat. Although the species was not detected near the project area, there is the possibility that individuals of this species could be overlooked or not avoided during highway construction activities.

Western fanshell (*Cyprogenia aberti*) – Sensitive

The western fanshell occurs in Arkansas, Missouri, and Kansas, and is believed to have been extirpated from Oklahoma, Louisiana, and Mississippi. In Arkansas, the vast majority of populations occur in the White, Spring, and Strawberry Rivers in northeastern Arkansas, with some occurrences in the Buffalo River and War Eagle Creek in Northwest Arkansas. The only

record in the Arkansas River drainage within the state of Arkansas occurs in big Piney Creek, 19 miles downstream of where Haw Creek flows into Big Piney Creek (ANHC 2018). This species is restricted to riffles in medium-sized rivers on a variety of substrates including rock, gravel, and mud, with most populations known from relatively shallow riffles with clean gravel and sand substrate (NatureServe 2020).

Direct Effects

This species is found only in medium-sized rivers, and would not be found in a stream as small as Gee Creek in the project area, or even in Haw Creek, just downstream. Under the proposed activities, no direct effects on this species are expected.

Indirect Effects

Under the proposed activities, temporary soil disturbance and sedimentation may temporarily decrease water quality and increase turbidity by unavoidably introducing sediment into Gee Creek during construction, but this disturbance would not affect any potential habitat for this species due to area affected, duration of effects, installation of erosion BMPs and distance downstream to potential habitat.

Determination of Effects

The proposed highway construction activities will have “no impact” on the western fanshell. This species is not known to occur in the project area, and potential habitat is only present several miles downstream.

CONSULTATION HISTORY WITH THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR – U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

Four federally listed species are known to occur in or near the proposed action area: the endangered gray bat (*Myotis grisescens*), the endangered Indiana bat (*Myotis sodalis*), the endangered Ozark big-eared bat (*Corynorhinus townsendii ingens*), and the threatened northern long-eared bat (*Myotis septentrionalis*). Based on the findings of this document as well as previous consultation between the USFWS, a determination of ‘may affect, not likely to adversely affect’ is appropriate for the gray bat, Indiana bat, Ozark big-eared bat, and northern long-eared bat. Concurrence will be sought from the US Fish and Wildlife Service.

COORDINATION HISTORY WITH THE U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS

The proposed construction activities will require excavation or discharge of dredged or fill material into jurisdictional waters of the U.S.; thus, an USACE issued permit under the Section 404 of the Clean Water Act will need to be obtained for this project. A permit application will be submitted to the Little Rock District for this project.

DETERMINATION OF EFFECTS

Based on the preceding documentation, discussions, and “best available science,” the “determination of effects” for the proposed actions are as follows:

Proposed, Threatened and Endangered Species

☒ **No Effect**

☐ **May affect, Not likely to adversely affect**

☐ **Likely to adversely affect**

Ozark big-eared bat: The proposed highway construction activities will have “**no effect**” on Ozark big-eared bats. The nearest record of Ozark big-eared bats is 14 miles away, and mist-net surveys near the project area did not capture any bats of this species. A bridge assessment found no evidence of bats using the existing bridge. ARDOT is anticipating that the new structure over Gee Creek will be a three-sided box culvert, and therefore no blasting or drilling that could disturb hibernating bats will be required during construction. ARDOT will commit to a day-time-construction-only special provision requiring that construction activities not occur after 30 minutes prior to sunset and before 30 minutes prior to sunrise.

Proposed, Threatened and Endangered Species

☐ **No Effect**

☒ **May affect, Not likely to adversely affect**

☐ **Likely to adversely affect**

Gray bat: The proposed highway construction activities “may affect” but are “not likely to adversely affect” gray bats. Additionally, a bridge assessment was conducted and found no evidence of bats using the existing bridge; however, there are known occurrences within the project area. The project area is largely forested and contains suitable foraging habitat; therefore, a daytime-construction-only special provision will accompany the job to minimize effects on gray bats. There is the possibility that individuals of this species could be overlooked or not avoided during highway construction activities.

Indiana bat: The proposed highway construction activities “may affect” but are “not likely to adversely affect” Indiana bats under the FHWA Range-Wide Programmatic Biological Opinion (see Appendix C). A bridge assessment found no evidence of bats using the existing bridge. Suitable foraging and roosting habitat exists, but there are known occurrences nearby. ARDOT will include a special provision requiring that construction activities not occur 30 minutes prior to sunset and 30 minutes prior to sunrise. Erosion control BMPs will be applied to minimize sediment leaving the job site.

Northern long-eared bat: The proposed highway construction activities “may affect” but are “not likely to adversely affect” northern long-eared bats under the FHWA Range-Wide Programmatic Biological Opinion. The proposed highway construction project additionally meets the Final 4(d) Rule and is exempt from any take, according to the FHWA Indiana bat and northern long-eared bat programmatic and accompanying Biological Opinion. Avoidance and minimization

measures incorporated into the job contract will include a daytime-construction-only special provision will be incorporated into the job contract. A bridge assessment found no evidence of bats using the bridge. This species has been documented to occur near the project area, and there is the possibility that individuals of this species could be overlooked or not avoided during highway construction activities.

Sensitive Species

_____ No impact

_____ Beneficial impact

 X May impact individuals but is not likely to cause a trend to federal listing or loss of viability:

Boston Mountains crayfish: The proposed highway construction activities “may impact individuals but are not likely to cause a trend to federal listing or loss of viability” for the Boston Mountains crayfish. Although the species is not known to occur near the project area, there is the possibility that individuals of this species could be overlooked or not avoided during highway construction activities.

Eastern small-footed bat: The proposed highway construction activities “may impact individuals but are not likely to cause a trend to federal listing or loss of viability” for the eastern small-footed bat. Although the species was not detected near the project area, there is the possibility that individuals of this species could be overlooked or not avoided during highway construction activities.

Isopod: The proposed highway construction activities “may impact individuals but are not likely to cause a trend to Federal listing or loss of viability” for the isopod, *Lirceus bicuspidatus*. The species is not known to occur in the project area. Although this species is not known to occur within the project area, there is suitable habitat present; therefore, there is the possibility that individuals of this species could be overlooked or not avoided during highway construction activities.

Longnose darter: The proposed highway construction activities “**may impact individuals but are not likely to cause a trend to federal listing or loss of viability**” on the longnose darter. Proposed construction activities could result in temporary soil disturbance and sedimentation leading to a decrease in water quality; however, sedimentation is unlikely to be significant two miles downstream in Big Piney Creek, especially with erosion control BMPs employed to minimize sedimentation.

Monarch Butterfly: The proposed highway construction activities “may impact individuals but are not likely to cause a trend to federal listing or loss of viability” for the monarch butterfly. The species could occur in the project area, there is the possibility that individuals of this species could be overlooked or not avoided during highway construction activities.

Nearctic Paduniellan caddisfly: The proposed highway construction activities “may impact individuals but are not likely to cause a trend to Federal listing or loss of viability” for the nearctic paduniellan caddisfly. The caddisfly is known to occur within the project area; however, there is the possibility that individuals of this species could be overlooked or not avoided during highway construction activities, given the suitable habitat present.

Tricolored Bat: The proposed highway construction activities “may impact individuals but are not likely to cause a trend to federal listing or loss of viability” for the tricolored bat. Although the species was not detected near the project area, there is the possibility that individuals of this species could be overlooked or not avoided during highway construction activities.

Sensitive Species

☒ No impact

☐ Beneficial impact

☐ May impact individuals but is not likely to cause a trend to federal listing or loss of viability:

Western fanshell: The proposed highway construction activities will have “no impact” on the western fanshell. This species is not known to occur in the project area, and suitable habitat is only present several miles downstream.



Joe Ledvina

Botanist, ARDOT Environmental Division

August 6, 2020

Date

Reviewed by:

8/14/2020

X 

Signed by: RONALD RAMBO

Dwayne Rambo

Big Piney Ranger District Wildlife Biologist

Date

LITERATURE CITED

- ARKANSAS NATURAL HERITAGE COMMISSION (ANHC). 2010. Arkansas element of occurrence records. Arkansas Natural Heritage Commission, Department of Arkansas Heritage.
- ARKANSAS NATURAL HERITAGE COMMISSION (ANHC). 2018. Arkansas element of occurrence records. Arkansas Natural Heritage Commission, Department of Arkansas Heritage.
- CLARK, B.S., CLARK, B.K. AND D.M. LESLIE, JR. 2002. Seasonal variation in activity patterns of the endangered Ozark big-eared bat (*Corynorhinus townsendii ingens*). *Journal of Mammalogy* 83(2): 590-598.
- FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION, FEDERAL RAILROAD ADMINISTRATION, AND FEDERAL TRANSIT ADMINISTRATION. 2016. Programmatic Biological Assessment for Transportation Projects in the Range of the Indiana Bat and Northern Long-eared Bat. Available at <https://www.fws.gov/midwest/endangered/section7/fhwa/pdf/BAforFHWAibatNLEBFnlRev07Dec2016%20.pdf>. (Accessed January 18, 2020).
- FUKUI, D., MURAKAMI, M., NAKANO, S., AND T. AOI. 2006. Effect of emergent aquatic insects on bat foraging in a riparian forest. *Journal of Animal Ecology* 75:1252-1258.
- GRAENING, G.O., HARVEY, M.J., PUCKETTE, W.L., STARK, R.C., SASSE, D.B., HENSLEY, S.L. AND R.K. REDMAN. 2011. Conservation status of the endangered Ozark big-eared bat (*Corynorhinus townsendii ingens*) – a 34-year assessment. *Publications of the Oklahoma Biological Survey* 11:1-16.
- GRAENING, G.O., SLAY, M.E., FENOLIO, D.B., AND H.W. ROBISON. 2007. Annotated Checklist of the Isopods (Subphylum Malacostraca) of Arkansas and Oklahoma, with emphasis upon the subterranean habitats. *Proceedings of the Oklahoma Academy of Science* 87:1-14.
- HARRIS, J.L., W.R. POSEY II, C.L. DAVIDSON, J.L. FARRIS, S.R. OETKER, J.N. STOECKEL, B.G. CRUMP, M.S. BARNETT, H.C. MARTIN, M.W. MATTHEWS, J.H. SEAGRAVES, N.J. WENTZ, R. WINTERRINGER, C. OSBORNE, AND A.D. CHRISTIAN. 2009. Unionoida (Mollusca: Margaritiferidae, Unionidae) in Arkansas, Third Status Review. *Journal of the Arkansas Academy of Science* 63:50-86.
- HOWELLS, R.G., NECK, R.W., AND H.D. MURRAY. 1996. Freshwater Mussels of Texas. University of Texas Press.
- JOHNSON, K.A., 2010. Mist Net Survey Report USDA Forest Service Big Piney Ranger District Ozark-St. Francis National Forest. Mountain State Biosurveys, LLC. Lesage, WV. 78 pp.
- KRAL, R. 1983. A report on some rare, threatened or endangered forest-related vascular plants of the South. U.S. Dept. of Agriculture Forest Service Technical Publication R8-TP2. Athens, Georgia. 1305 pp.
- KUNZ, T.H. 1973. Temporal and spatial components of bat activity in central Iowa. *Journal of Mammalogy* 54(1):14-22.

- LARSEN, S., PACE, G. AND S.J. ORMEROD. 2011. Experimental effects of sediment deposition on the structure and function of macroinvertebrate assemblages in temperate streams. *River Research and Applications* 27(2):257-267.
- LAVAl, R.K. AND M.L. LAVAl. 1980. Ecological studies and management of Missouri bats, with emphasis on cave dwelling species. *Terrestrial Species* 8, Missouri Department of Conservation.
- MOORE, D.M., 1939. DELPHINIUM NEWTONIANUM, A NEW SPECIES FROM THE ARKANSAS OZARKS. *RHODORA*, 41(486), PP.193-197.
- MOORE, P.R., RISCH, T.S., MORRIS, D.K. AND V. ROLLAND. 2017. Habitat use of female gray bats assessed using aerial telemetry. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 81:1242-1253.
- NATURESERVE. 2020. NATURESERVE EXPLORER: AN ONLINE ENCYCLOPEDIA OF LIFE [WEB APPLICATION]. Version 7.1. Arlington, Virginia. Available at <http://explorer.natureserve.org>. (Accessed: January 2020).
- OKLAHOMA NATURAL HERITAGE INVENTORTY. 2006. Rare and vulnerable plant species of Oklahoma: *Cypripedium kentuckiense* (Southern lady's slipper). Available at <http://www.oknaturalheritage.ou.edu/cypkent.htm>. (Accessed: November 17, 2017).
- OKLAHOMA NATURAL HERITAGE INVENTORTY. 2006. Rare and vulnerable plant species of Oklahoma: *Castanea pumila* var. *ozarkensis* (Ozark chinquapin). Available at http://www.oknaturalheritage.ou.edu/castan_pum_oz.htm. (Accessed: November 17, 2017).
- PERRY, R.W., MOORE, P.R., ARMSTRONG, K.M., AND L.W. ROBBINS. 2018. *Bats of Arkansas*. Publication Number 8. Indiana State University Center for Bat Research, Outreach, and Conservation.
- PETERSON, R. T. 1980. *Peterson Field Guides: Eastern Birds*. Fourth edition. Houghton Mifflin Company, Boston and New York, USA.
- PLEASANTS, J.M. AND K.S. OBERHAUSER. 2013. Milkweed loss in agricultural fields because of herbicide use: effect on the monarch butterfly population. *Insect Conservation and Diversity*, 6(2): 135-144.
- ROBISON, H. W. 1997. Distribution and Status of the Ozark Shiner, *Notropis ozarcanus* Meek, in Arkansas. *Journal of the Arkansas Academy of Science* 51: 150-158.
- ROBISON, H. W. AND R. T. ALLEN. 1995. *Only in Arkansas*. The University of Arkansas Press, Fayetteville, Arkansas, USA.
- ROBISON, H. W. AND T. M. BUCHANAN. 1988. *Fishes of Arkansas*. The University of Arkansas Press, Fayetteville, Arkansas, USA.

- ROBISON, H., McALLISTER, C., CARLTON, C., AND G. TUCKER. 2008. The Arkansas endemic biota: An update with additions and deletions. *Journal of the Arkansas Academy of Science* 62: 84-96.
- ROBISON, H.W. AND G. LEEDS. 1996. Distribution and natural history aspects of the Arkansas endemic crayfish, *Cambarus causeyi* Reimer. *Journal of the Arkansas Academy of Science*, 50(1): 105-109.
- RUDOLPH, D.C., C.A. ELY, R.R. SCHAEFER, J.H. WILLIAMSON, AND R.E. THILL. 2006. Monarch (*Danaus plexippus* L. Nymphalidae) migration, nectar resources and fire regimes in the Ouachita Mountains of Arkansas. *Journal of the Lepidopterists' Society*. 60(3): 165-170.
- SAUGEY, D. A., V. R. MCDANIEL, D. R. ENGLAND, M. C. ROWE, L. R. CHANDLER-MOZISEK, AND B. G. COCHRAN. 1993. Arkansas range extensions of the eastern small-footed bat (*Myotis leibii*), and northern long-eared bat (*Myotis septentrionalis*) and additional county records for the silver-haired bat (*Lasiorycteris noctivagans*), hoary bat (*Lasiurus cinereus*), southeastern bat (*Myotis austroriparius*), and Rafinesque's big-eared bat (*Plecotus rafinesquii*). *Proceedings of the Arkansas Academy of Science* 47:102-106.
- SMITH, E. B. 1978. An atlas and annotated list of the vascular plants of Arkansas. The University of Arkansas Press, Fayetteville, Arkansas, USA.
- USDA FOREST SERVICE. 2000. Conservation assessment *Cypripedium kentuckiense* Reed on the Ouachita and Ozark St. Francis National Forests. Ouachita National Forest, Hot Springs, Arkansas, USA. 12 pp.
- USDA FOREST SERVICE. 2005a. Revised Land and Resource Management Plan, Ozark-St. Francis National Forests. US Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, Southern Region, Management Bulletin R8-MB 125 A.
- USDA FOREST SERVICE. 2005b. Final Environmental Impact Statement, Revised Land and Resource Management Plan, Ozark-St. Francis National Forest, Arkansas. Forest Service, Southern Region, Management Bulletin R8-MB 125 B.
- USDA FOREST SERVICE. 2005c. Forest Service Manual 2600. National Headquarters, Washington D.C., USA.
- US FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE. 1999. CFR Title 50—Wildlife and Fisheries. Part 17—Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants. Subpart—Lists. § 17.11 Endangered and threatened wildlife and § 17.12 Endangered and threatened plants. pp. 1-55.
- US FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE. 2007. 50 CFR Parts 13 and 22—Protection of Eagles and Authorizations under the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act for Take of Eagles; Final Rule and Proposed Rule; Protection of Eagles and National Bald Eagle Management Guidelines. *Federal Register* 72(107):31132-31140.

- US FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE. 2011. Endangered and threatened wildlife and plants: 90-day finding on a petition to list the eastern small-footed bat and the northern long-eared bat as threatened or endangered. Federal Register 76(125):38095-38106.
- US FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE. 2011. 5-Year Review: Summary and Evaluation Ozark cavefish (*Amblyopsis rosae*). Prepared by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Arkansas Field Office (AFO). USFWS Southeast Region, Atlanta, GA. Available at https://ecos.fws.gov/docs/five_year_review/doc3850.pdf. (Accessed November 1, 2017).
- US FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE. 2012. American Burying Beetle Consultation Area Shapefile.
- US FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE. 2013a. 12-month finding on a petition to list the eastern small-footed bat and northern long-eared bat as endangered or threatened species; listing the northern long-eared bat as an endangered species. Federal Register 78(191):61046-61080.
- US FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE. 2013b. Fire Management Species Profile: Bachman's Sparrow (*Peucaea aestivalis*). Prepared by the Division of Strategic Resource Management and the Division of Fire Management. USFWS Southeast Region, Atlanta, GA. Available at http://www.fws.gov/southeastfire/documents/Bachmans-Sparrow_Fire-Mgmt.pdf. (Accessed November 17, 2015).
- US FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE. 2015. 50 CFR Part 17 – Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Designation of Critical Habitat for Neosho Mucket (*Lampsilis rafinesqueana*) and Rabbitsfoot (*Quadrula cylindrica cylindrica*); Final Rule.
- US FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE. 2015. Neosho Mucket Critical Habitat Shapefile.
- US FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE. 2016. Revised Programmatic Biological Opinion for Transportation Projects in the Range of the Indiana Bat and Northern Long-Eared Bat. Consultation Code: 09E00000-2016-F-0001. USFWS Midwest Region, Bloomington, Minnesota. Available at <https://www.fws.gov/midwest/endangered/section7/fhwa/pdf/BOwFHWAibatAndNLEBreviseDec2016.pdf>. (Accessed November 17, 2015).
- WAGNER, B.K., TAYLOR, C.A., AND M.D. KOTTMYER. 2010. Status and distribution of *Orconectes williamsi* (Williams' crayfish) in Arkansas, with new records from the Arkansas River Drainage. Southeastern Naturalist 9(sp3):175-184.
- WETHINGTON, T.A., LESLIE, JR., D.M., GREGORY, M.S., AND M.K. WETHINGTON. 1996. Prehibernation habitat use and foraging activity by endangered Ozark big-eared bats (*Plecotus townsendii ingens*). American Midland Naturalist 135:128-230.
- WEYANDT, S.E., VAN DEN BUSSCHE, R.A., HAMILTON, M.J., AND D.M. LESLIE, JR. 2005. Unraveling the effects of sex and dispersal: Ozark big-eared bat (*Corynorhinus townsendii ingens*) conservation genetics. Journal of Mammalogy 86:1136-1143.

- WILLIAMS, J.D., BOGAN, A.E., BUTLER, R.S., CUMMINGS, K.S., GARNER, J.T., HARRIS, J. L., JOHNSON, N.A., AND G.T. WATTERS. 2017. A revised list of the freshwater mussels (Mollusca: Bivalvia: Unionida) of the United States and Canada. *Freshwater Mollusk Biology and Conservation* 20:33-58.
- WITSELL, T. 2006. Arkansas Natural Heritage Commission. Personal communication with NatureServe.
- WITSELL, T. AND B. BAKER. 2011. Final Report on *Ptilimnium nodosum* (Rose) Mathias [Harperella] Survey Work in Arkansas, 2009-2010. Unpublished report submitted to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Arkansas Field Office. Conway, Arkansas.

APPENDIX A: REGIONAL FORESTER'S SENSITIVE SPECIES LIST.

Bold type indicates those species reviewed in the BE due to occurrence or potential habitat.

PETS Species Checklist

Survey Needs Based on FSM 2672.43(USDA FS 2005c)

Proposed, Endangered, Threatened, and Sensitive Species List
(Ozark Portion of the Ozark-St. Francis National Forest Only)

Common Name	Scientific Name	Status*	Potentially Affected	Notes and Comments
FEDERALLY ENDANGERED and THREATENED SPECIES				
American burying beetle	<i>Nicrophorus americanus</i>	E	No	Occurrence is not expected; project area lies outside designated American Burying Beetle Consultation Area (USFWS Consultation Area Shapefile 2012). A "no effect" determination was made.
Cave Crayfish	<i>Cambarus aculabrum</i>	E	No	Does not occur on the Big Piney Ranger District. Known occurrences are located in two caves in Benton County, Arkansas (NatureServe 2020).
Gray Bat	<i>Myotis grisescens</i>	E	Yes	Known to occur on the Big Piney Ranger District. (ANHC 2018). Was not found during mist-netting surveys near the project area (Appendix C). Suitable foraging and roosting habitat is present.
Harperella (plant)	<i>Ptilimnium nodosum</i>	E	No	Not reported on the OSFNF and is not known to occur in project area (Witsell and Baker 2011, USDA-FS 2005b, ANHC 2018, NatureServe 2020). It is thought that the Boston Mountains could have suitable habitat for this species based on similar geology to where it is found; however, an extensive plant survey of the project area has revealed nothing.
Hell Creek Cave Crayfish	<i>Cambarus zophonastes</i>	E	No	Does not occur on the Big Piney Ranger District. Known occurrences are located in two caves in Marion and Stone County, Arkansas (NatureServe 2020).
Indiana bat	<i>Myotis sodalis</i>	E	Yes	Known to occur on the Big Piney Ranger District (ANHC 2018). Was not found during mist-netting surveys near the project area (Appendix C). Suitable foraging and roosting habitat is present.
Least Tern (bird)	<i>Sterna antillarum</i>	E	No	Nests on sandbars of large rivers (USFWS 2013). Suitable habitat not available in project area.
Missouri bladderpod (plant)	<i>Physaria (Lesquerella) filiformis</i>	T	No	Not reported on the OSFNF, not known from the project area. Closest known location is Washington County (Witsell 2006). Known from shale, sandstone, limestone and dolomite glades; such habitat does not exist in project area. A "no effect" determination was made.

Common Name	Scientific Name	Status*	Potentially Affected	Notes and Comments
Neosho Mucket mussel	<i>Lampsilis rafinesqueana</i>	E	No	Not known to occur on the Big Piney Ranger District. Known occurrences and critical habitat designations on the Illinois River in Benton and Washington County (NatureServe 2020, USFWS Critical Habitat Shapefile 2015).
Northern long-eared bat	<i>Myotis septentrionalis</i>	T	Yes	Previously thought to be common forest-wide, a recent precipitous decline is attributed to WNS. Known to occur near the project area (ANHC 2018), but not found during 2019 mist-netting surveys (Appendix C).
Ozark Big-eared Bat	<i>Corynorhinus townsendii ingens</i>	E	Yes	Known from the Big Piney Ranger District, and project is within its range; however, there are no known occurrences near the project area. The closest known occurrence is in Newton County (ANHC 2018), and it was not found during 2019 mist-netting surveys (Appendix C).
Ozark Cavefish	<i>Troglichthys (Amblyopsis) rosae</i>	T	No	Not known from the Big Piney Ranger District. Known from nine caves in Benton County, Arkansas (USFWS 5-year Review 2011, NatureServe 2020).
Ozark hellbender	<i>Cryptobranchus alleganiensis bishopi</i>	E	No	This species is not known to occur in the Big Piney Ranger District or the project area. Known occurrences are in Baxter, Fulton, Independence, Izard & Randolph Counties in Arkansas (NatureServe 2020).
Pink Mucket	<i>Lampsilis abrupta</i>	E	No	Not recorded on the OSFNF. Known from White River, Black River, Ouachita River, Saline River, Little Missouri River (Harris et al. 2009, NatureServe 2020).
Piping Plover	<i>Charadrius melodus</i>	T	No	During fall and spring migration, they use rest sites including shore lines of lakes, rivers, and wetlands with muddy and sandy substrates. Migration rest area habitat is not well documented, but, in Arkansas, they are usually found along the Arkansas River. Similar habitat is not present in the project area. A “no effect” determination was made.
Red Knot	<i>Calidris canutus rufa</i>	T	No	Suitable migration stopover habitat includes marshes, sand dunes or sandbars (NatureServe 2020), which do not occur in the project area. A “no effect” determination was made.
Eastern Black Rail	<i>Laterallus jamaicensis ssp. jamaicensis</i>	P	No	No suitable herbaceous marsh habitat (NatureServe 2020) occurs in the project area. A “no effect” determination was made.
Rabbitsfoot mussel	<i>Theliderma cylindrica (Quadrula cylindrica cylindrica)</i>	T	No	Does not occur within or downstream from the project area (Harris et al. 2009, USDI-FWS 2012). Populations occur in Spring and Black River Drainages; Illinois River, War Eagle Creek, and Buffalo River.
Scaleshell mussel	<i>Leptodea leptodon</i>	E	No	Not recorded on the OSFNF. Closest known occurrence is a record in Frog Bayou, near Rudy in Crawford County (Harris et al. 2009, NatureServe 2020, ANHC 2018).
Snuffbox	<i>Epioblasma triquetra</i>	E	No	This species is not known to occur in the Big Piney Ranger District. Known from Baxter, Independence, Izard, Lawrence, Marion, Randolph & Sharp Counties in Arkansas (NatureServe 2020).

Common Name	Scientific Name	Status*	Potentially Affected	Notes and Comments
Speckled Pocketbook mussel	<i>Lampsilis streckeri</i>	E	No	Not known to occur on OSFNF. Known from Cleburne, Searcy, Stone and Van Buren Counties in Arkansas (NatureServe 2020). Only known from the Upper Little Red Watershed.
Spectaclecase mussel	<i>Margaritifera (Cumberlandia) monodonta</i>	E	No	Not known to occur on the Big Piney Ranger District. Known occurrences on lower Ouachita River and Mulberry River (Harris et al. 2009, Williams et al. 2017, NatureServe 2020).
Yellow-cheek darter	<i>Etheostoma moorei</i>	E	No	Critical habitat is designated outside of OSFNF. Known to occur in Searcy, Stone and Van Buren Counties in Arkansas (NatureServe 2020). Not known to occur in the project area.
FOREST SERVICE SENSITIVE SPECIES - ANIMALS				
Bachman's Sparrow	<i>Peucaea (Aimophila) aestivalis</i>	S	No	Prefers mature to old-growth open pine forest that has been subjected to fires creating a well-developed herbaceous layer with limited shrub and midstory cover (NatureServe 2020). Habitat not found in project area.
Boston Mountains Crayfish	<i>Cambarus causeyi</i>	S	Yes	Known from springs and roadside seepages in Franklin, Johnson, Madison, Newton, Pope, Searcy, and Stone Counties (NatureServe 2020). There are several known occurrences in Johnson County, with the closest one being ~7.0 miles southwest from the project area. There is a roadside seepage area (may just be poor drainage, not associated with seep/spring) near the Haw Creek Falls Recreation Area.
Eastern small-footed bat	<i>Myotis leibii</i>	S	Yes	Forages near riparian areas and water sources, canopy openings, and near field edges. Suitable habitat does occur in the project area. Known mainly from Newton, Searcy, Stone, and Franklin Counties, but they are scattered throughout the Big Piney Ranger District (Saughey et al. 1993, ANHC 2018). Was not found during mist-netting surveys near the project area (Appendix C).
Henslow's Sparrow	<i>Passerculus henslowii</i>	S	No	Breeding habitat range includes Benton, Franklin, Fulton, and Washington Counties; non-breeding or migratory habitat range includes Ashley, Bradley, Calhoun, Cleveland, Drew, Hempstead, Monroe, Prairie, and Pulaski Counties. Breeding habitat is characterized by open fields and meadows interspersed with shrubby vegetation, especially in low-lying areas. Known to use unowned hayfields. It is not known to occur in Johnson County.
Isopod (no common name)	<i>Lirceus bicuspidatus</i>	S	Yes	No records in project area. ANHC records indicate occurrences in Independence, Johnson, Logan, Newton, Searcy, Stone, and Yell Counties (ANHC 2018). Closest known occurrences are in southern Johnson County, near Clarksville. Arkansas Endemic (Robison and Allen 1995, Robison et al. 2008). Suitable habitat; e.g., seeps and springs exist in the project area. May just be poor drainage, see above.

Common Name	Scientific Name	Status*	Potentially Affected	Notes and Comments
Longnose darter	<i>Percina nasuta</i>	S	Yes	Does occur just downstream of the project area in Big Piney Creek (ANHC 2018). Habitat includes silt-free upland large streams and small rivers with cobble and gravel bottoms (NatureServe 2020).
Monarch butterfly	<i>Danaus plexippus</i>	S	Yes	Thought to be forest-wide. Habitat is complex for this species, but the Ozarks are known to be major migratory stopovers for Monarchs traveling both northwards and back southwards. Breeding areas are virtually all patches of milkweed, while spring and fall migratory habitat is largely dependent on nectar sources, such as wildflowers (NatureServe 2020).
Mount Magazine shagreen	<i>Inflectarius (Mesodon) magazinensis</i>	S	No	Restricted to one steep talus slope in rich mesic hardwood forests on Mt. Magazine in Logan County (NatureServe 2020).
Nearctic Paduniellan caddisfly	<i>Paduniella nearctica</i>	S	Yes	Known from the Big Piney Ranger District and Johnson County. Closest known occurrence is ~11.0 miles south near Hagarville (ANHC 2018). Suitable habitat includes clear, spring-fed, high-gradient, gravel-bottomed creeks to medium-sized rivers.
Ozark shiner	<i>Notropis ozarcanus</i>	S	No	Known from the Big Piney Ranger District. Closest known occurrences are in Newton County, in the Buffalo River (ANHC 2018). Suitable habitat includes small to medium clear rivers with high gradient and permanent strong flows (NatureServe 2020). Suitable habitat exists within the project area; however, it is not known to occur in Johnson County.
Purple Lilliput	<i>Toxolasma lividum</i>	S	Yes	Known from the Big Piney Ranger District. Known from Big Piney Creek, just upstream from the project area (ANHC 2018). Habitat includes headwater streams and small- to medium-sized rivers of various substrates (NatureServe 2020).
Rafinesque's Big-eared Bat	<i>Corynorhinus rafinesquii</i>	S	No	Known from the Big Piney Ranger District (Pope County) (NatureServe 2020, ANHC 2018). Winter habitat, in the northern mountain regions, most often occurs in caves or similar sites. Winter habitat in the south is poorly known, but usually this species in not found in caves; e.g., in the coastal plain, they use hollow trees for winter roosts. In Arkansas, these bats are frequently found in cisterns and wells rather than caves. Summer roosts often are in hollow trees, under bridges, or in culverts in or near wooded areas (NatureServe 2020). Although suitable foraging and roost habitat exists in the project area; they are not known to occur in Johnson County, and were not captured in mist-net surveys near the project area (Appendix C).
Regal fritillary	<i>Speyeria idalia</i>	S	No	Not known from the Big Piney Ranger District. It is only known to occur in Benton and Washington Counties. (NatureServe 2020).
Slippershell	<i>Alasmidonta viridis</i>	S	No	Known from the Big Piney Ranger District: Buffalo River (Newton County). Also known from the South Fork of the Spring River (Fulton County), Caddo River (Pike County), and the White River (Independence County). Not known from the project area.

Common Name	Scientific Name	Status*	Potentially Affected	Notes and Comments
Southeastern myotis	<i>Myotis austroriparius</i>	S	No	Known from southern and eastern Arkansas (NatureServe 2020). The St. Francis portion of the Ozark-St. Francis National Forests is part of this species range. Not known from the project area.
Southern cavefish	<i>Typhlichthys subterraneus</i>	S	No	Not known from the Big Piney Ranger District (ANHC 2018). Known from cave streams in eastern Ozarks—Baxter, Fulton, Randolph, and Stone Counties (NatureServe 2020).
Tricolored bat	<i>Perimyotis subflavus</i>	S	Yes	Known to occur on the Big Piney Ranger District. Range is statewide. It has only been reported from surrounding counties: Franklin, Madison, Newton, and Pope Counties (Perry et al. 2018), but it has been known to travel up to 10 miles from daytime roosts to forage (Perry et al. 2018). Forages near trees and along waterways. Hibernation site are often in caves. Suitable foraging habitat exists in the project area, but it was not documented during 2019 mist-net surveys (Appendix C).
Western Fanshell	<i>Cyprogenia aberti</i>	S	Yes	Known from the Big Piney Ranger District. This species is known from Big Piney Creek, but downstream from project area in Pope County. Other nearby occurrences include the Buffalo River (Marion, Newton, and Searcy Counties.) and War Eagle Creek (Madison County). Habitat includes medium-sized rivers with rock, gravel, and soft mud bottoms (NatureServe 2020).
Williams' crayfish	<i>Orconectes williamsi</i>	S	No	In Arkansas, most records are from extreme headwater streams in the White River drainage, but its range has been expanded to the Arkansas River Drainage (Wagner et al. 2010). Closest known occurrences are in the Frog-Mulberry and Beaver Reservoir Hydrologic Units, and they are not known from the Dardanelle Reservoir HUC (ANHC 2016). Suitable habitat includes gravelly, headwater creeks, cave streams, and pools of larger substrates (NatureServe 2020).
FOREST SERVICE SENSITIVE SPECIES - PLANTS				
Alabama snow-wreath	<i>Neviusia alabamensis</i>	S	No	Known from Conway, Faulkner, Newton and Pope Counties Suitable habitat includes riparian areas, forested bluffs, talus slopes, & streambanks on various substrates, soil types, & aspects (NatureServe 2020). The species has a restrictive range, and it was not found in 2017 field surveys.
Bay starvine	<i>Schisandra glabra</i>	S	No	Known only from the St. Francis portion of the Ozark-St. Francis National Forest.
Bush's poppymallow	<i>Callirhoe bushii</i>	S	No	Not known from the Big Piney Ranger District. Found in Benton, Carroll, Logan, Marion, Van Buren, and Washington Counties (ANHC 2018). Suitable habitat includes highway rights-of-way, fencerows, rocky open woods, and edges of limestone glades.

Common Name	Scientific Name	Status*	Potentially Affected	Notes and Comments
Butternut	<i>Juglans cinerea</i>	S	No	Known only from the Sylamore Ranger District (ANHC 2018). Suitable habitat includes rich, mesic forests, lower slopes, ravines, banks and terraces of creeks and streams and floodplain forests (NatureServe 2020). Although suitable habitat exists in the project area, this species is not known from Johnson County and was not found during field surveys in 2017. The closest localities are in Newton and Searcy Counties.
Church's wildrye	<i>Elymus churchii</i>	S	No	Not known from the Big Piney Ranger District. This species is known to occur in Benton, Carroll, Logan, Montgomery, Polk, and Scott Counties. Habitat includes pine-oak forest/woodland on dry, rocky, and basic soils in open woods and on ridges, bluffs, and river banks (NatureServe 2020). This species is not known from the project area.
Creeping St. John's wort	<i>Hypericum adpressum</i>	S	No	Not known from the Big Piney Ranger District or the Ozark National Forest (ANHC 2018).
Earleaf false foxglove	<i>Agalinis auriculata</i>	S		Not known from the Big Piney Ranger District. Known to occur in Carroll, Hempstead, and Washington Counties (ANHC 2018). Habitat includes mesic to dry prairies, fallow fields, and borders of upland woods, glades, barrens, and other openings (NatureServe 2020).
Glade larkspur	<i>Delphinium treleasei</i>	S	No	Not known from the Big Piney Ranger District. Known to occur in eight counties: Baxter, Boone, Carroll, Fulton, Marion, Searcy, and Stone Counties (ANHC 2018). Occurs on limestone/dolomite barrens, slopes, glades, bluffs and rocky roadsides throughout the Ozark highlands (NatureServe 2020). No suitable habitat (e.g., glades) present.
Gulf pipewort	<i>Eriocaulon koernickianum</i>	S	No	Known from the Big Piney Ranger District in Johnson, Madison, and Pope Counties. Also known from Conway and Van Buren Counties (ANHC 2018). Habitat includes moist to wet open areas such as sandstone glade seeps, bogs, and prairie stream banks (NatureServe 2020). No suitable habitat (e.g., open seepy glade areas) present in the project area.
Largeleaf grass of Parnassus	<i>Parnassia grandifolia</i>	S	No	Distribution is not well known in Arkansas. Habitat includes swampy open meadows in small valleys fed by calcareous spring water, moist limestone ledges along streams, and moist crevices at the base of north-facing limestone bluffs (NatureServe 2020). Suitable habitat is not present in the project area, and this species was not found during field surveys in 2017.
Maple-leaved oak	<i>Quercus acerifolia</i>	S	No	Not known from the Big Piney Ranger District. Arkansas Endemic known only from Mt. Magazine Ranger District in Logan and Sebastian Counties and from the Ouachita National Forest in Montgomery and Polk Counties (Robison and Allen 1995, ANHC 2018).

Common Name	Scientific Name	Status*	Potentially Affected	Notes and Comments
Moore's delphinium	<i>Delphinium newtonianum</i>	S	No	Known from the Big Piney Ranger District (ANHC 2018). Arkansas Endemic that is found in Montgomery, Newton, Pike, Polk, Pope, Searcy, and Van Buren Counties (ANHC 2018, Robison and Allen 1995). One population was known nearby in Johnson County, but it was last observed in 1954 (ANHC 2010). Suitable habitat includes rich mesic or dry-mesic forests in the Boston and Ouachita Mtns of Arkansas (NatureServe 2020). Suitable habitat does exist in the project area, but it was not found during field surveys in 2017.
Nuttall's cornsalad	<i>Valerianella nuttallii</i>	S	No	Not known from the Ozark National Forest (ANHC 2018). Habitat includes shale glades and prairies with shale substrates (NatureServe 2020). No suitable habitat (e.g., shale glades and prairies) present in the project area.
Open-ground draba	<i>Draba aprica</i>	S	No	Not known from the Big Piney Ranger District. In Arkansas, it is found in Faulkner, Garland, Hot Spring, Madison, Montgomery, Polk, Pope, Saline, and Stone Counties (ANHC 2018). In the Ozarks, this species occurs on dolomitic rocky glade/barren margins with very thin soils (NatureServe 2020). No suitable habitat present in the immediate project area, and this species was not found during 2017 field surveys.
Ouachita false indigo	<i>Amorpha ouachitensis</i>	S	No	Not known from the Big Piney Ranger District (ANHC 2018). Closest known occurrence is in Johnson County, but on the Pleasant Hill Ranger District. Suitable habitat includes clearings of rocky creeks, streams banks, rocky ridges, glades and dry, rocky sandstone slopes (NatureServe 2020); however, this species was not found during 2017 field surveys.
Ouachita Mtn. Goldenrod	<i>Solidago ouachitensis</i>	S	No	Known distribution does not include Big Piney Ranger District (ANHC 2018). Suitable habitat includes mesic, wooded, north-facing slopes of the Ouachita Mountains (NatureServe 2020). No suitable habitat present in immediate project area.
Ovate catchfly	<i>Silene ovata</i>	S	No	Known from the Big Piney Ranger District, in Van Buren County. (ANHC 2018). Found in rich woods, occasionally in forests with soil over calcareous rocks. Was not found during field surveys in 2017.
Ozark chinquapin	<i>Castanea pumila</i> var. <i>ozarkensis</i>	S	No	Several occurrences on the Big Piney Ranger District (ANHC 2018). Commonly found as stump sprouts and will continue to re-sprout as long as herbicide not used. Species was not identified in the project area during 2017 field surveys.
Ozark cornsalad	<i>Valerianella ozarkana</i>	S	No	Not known from the Big Piney Ranger District; closest known occurrence is in southern Johnson County (ANHC 2018). Suitable habitat includes rocky glades and open woods on calcareous soils. Habitat absent from project area, and this plant was not found during 2017 field surveys.

Common Name	Scientific Name	Status*	Potentially Affected	Notes and Comments
Ozark least trillium	<i>Trillium pusillum</i> var. <i>ozarkanum</i>	S	No	Not known from Big Piney Ranger District. Found in Benton, Boone, Carroll, Madison, Montgomery, Newton, Polk, Pulaski, and Washington Counties (ANHC 2018). Suitable habitat includes dry to mesic oak-hickory upland woods with a partially open canopy (NatureServe 2020). Potential habitat does exist in the project area; however, the plant was not found during field surveys in 2017.
Ozark spiderwort	<i>Tradescantia ozarkana</i>	S	No	Known from the Big Piney Ranger District; closest known occurrences are ~14.0 miles northwest of the project area (ANHC 2018). Habitat includes steep, rocky, and wooded slopes, ravines, bases & lower slopes of bluffs, and dry to moist woodland ledges (NatureServe 2020). Suitable habitat is likely in the project area; however, the species was not found during 2017 field surveys.
Royal catchfly	<i>Silene regia</i>	S	No	Known occurrences in Benton, Boone, Carroll, Fulton, Hot Spring, Madison, Marion, Newton, Searcy, Sharp, and Stone Counties (ANHC 2018). Habitat includes open woodlands, rock outcrops, prairies and along roadsides (NatureServe 2020). No suitable habitat is present in the project area, and this plant species was not found during field surveys in 2017.
Southern lady's slipper	<i>Cypripedium kentuckiense</i>	S	No	Known from the Big Piney Ranger District. Several known occurrences in Johnson, Newton, and other counties (ANHC 2018). Habitat includes mesic, shaded area in mature floodplain forests, near streams and creeks. Suitable habitat exists in project area; however, this species was not identified during 2017 field surveys.

***Status:**

P = proposed for federal listing as threatened

E = federal endangered species

T = federal threatened species

S = Amended Regional Forester's Sensitive Species List (2017)

APPENDIX B: VASCULAR PLANT SURVEY RESULTS

Vascular plant surveys were conducted in March, April, and June of 2017 in the Ozark National Forest near the Gee Creek Bridge on State Highway 123 by ARDOT botanist, Kayti Ewing. Surveys identified 151 species, including the seventeen (11.3%) non-native species denoted with asterisks below. No plant species tracked by the ANHC were located in the project area, and no plant species listed as PETS by the US Forest Service were located in the project area.

Scientific Name	Common Name
Ferns – 4 species	
<i>Adiantum pedatum</i>	northern maidenhair fern
<i>Asplenium platyneuron</i>	ebony spleenwort
<i>Cystopteris protrusa</i>	southern bladder fern, southern fragile fern
<i>Polystichum acrostichoides</i>	Christmas fern
Forbs – 71 species	
<i>Achillea millefolium</i>	yarrow, common milfoil
<i>Actaea pachypoda</i>	doll's-eyes, white baneberry
<i>Ambrosia artemisiifolia</i>	common ragweed
<i>Ambrosia trifida</i>	giant ragweed
<i>Anemone americana</i>	round-lobed hepatica
<i>Antennaria parlinii</i>	pussytoes, ladies'-tobacco
<i>Arabis</i> sp.	rockcress
<i>Arisaema triphyllum</i>	Jack-in-the-pulpit, Indian-turnip
<i>Asarum canadense</i>	wild ginger
<i>Asclepias quadrifolia</i>	four-leaf milkweed
<i>Boehmeria cylindrica</i>	false nettle
<i>Cardamine angustata</i>	slender toothwort
<i>Chaerophyllum tainturieri</i>	wild chervil
<i>Claytonia virginica</i>	spring-beauty
<i>Coreopsis tinctoria</i>	Plains coreopsis, tickseed, calliopsis
<i>Corydalis</i> sp.	fumewort
<i>Cynoglossum virginianum</i>	wild comfrey
* <i>Daucus carota</i>	Queen Anne's-lace, wild carrot
<i>Desmodium rotundifolium</i>	dollar-leaf, round-leaf tick-trefoil
<i>Desmodium</i> sp.	Tick trefoil
* <i>Duchesnea indica</i>	Indian-strawberry
<i>Echinacea pallida</i>	pale purple coneflower
<i>Epifagus virginiana</i>	beechdrops
<i>Erythronium albidum</i>	white trout-lily, white dog-tooth-violet
<i>Euphorbia</i> sp.	spurge
<i>Galium circaeazans</i>	wild licorice
<i>Galium triflorum</i>	sweet-scent bedstraw
<i>Gamochaeta</i> sp.	cudweed
<i>Geranium dissectum</i>	cut-leaf crane's-bill
<i>Geum canadense</i>	white avens
<i>Goodyera pubescens</i>	downy rattlesnake-plantain

Scientific Name	Common Name
<i>Gratiola</i> sp.	hedgelyssop
<i>Helianthus divaricatus</i>	woodland sunflower
<i>Hypericum mutilum</i>	dwarf St. John's-wort
<i>Krigia biflora</i>	two-flower dwarf-dandelion
<i>Lactuca canadensis</i>	wild lettuce
<i>Lespedeza cuneata</i>	sericea lespedeza
* <i>Leucanthemum vulgare</i>	ox-eye daisy
<i>Maianthemum racemosum</i>	false Solomon's-seal, false spikenard
* <i>Medicago lupulina</i>	black medick
<i>Mitchella repens</i>	partridge-berry
<i>Monarda bradburiana</i>	Bradbury's beebalm
<i>Monotropa uniflora</i>	Indian-pipe
<i>Packera</i> sp.	ragwort
<i>Pedicularis canadensis</i>	wood-betony, lousewort
* <i>Perilla frutescens</i>	beefsteak-plant
<i>Phlox pilosa</i>	Ozark downy phlox
<i>Plantago</i> sp.	plantain
<i>Podophyllum peltatum</i>	May-apple, mandrake
<i>Polygonatum biflorum</i>	Solomon's-seal
* <i>Potentilla recta</i>	sulphur cinquefoil, rough-fruit cinquefoil
<i>Prenanthes</i> sp.	prenanthes
<i>Rudbeckia hirta</i>	black-eyed Susan
* <i>Rumex crispus</i>	curly dock, sour dock
<i>Salvia lyrata</i>	lyre-leaf sage, cancer-weed
<i>Sanicula canadensis</i>	Canadian black-snakeroot
<i>Silene virginica</i>	fire-pink
<i>Spigelia marilandica</i>	Indian-pink, pinkroot
<i>Taenidia integerrima</i>	yellow pimpernel
<i>Thalictrum thalictroides</i>	rue-anemone, windflower
<i>Thaspium trifoliatum</i>	meadow-parsnip
<i>Tipularia discolor</i>	crane-fly orchid
* <i>Trifolium incarnatum</i>	crimson clover
* <i>Trifolium pratense</i>	red clover
<i>Trillium viridescens</i>	green trillium
<i>Triodanis perfoliata</i>	small Venus'-looking-glass
<i>Urtica chamaedryoides</i>	stinging nettle
<i>Valerianella radiata</i>	cornsalad
* <i>Verbascum thapsus</i>	woolly mullein
<i>Vicia</i> cf. <i>caroliniana</i>	Vetch
<i>Viola pubescens</i>	downy yellow violet, smooth yellow violet
Graminoids – 18 species	
<i>Allium</i> sp.	onion
* <i>Avena sativa</i>	oats
<i>Briza minor</i>	little quaking grass

Scientific Name	Common Name
<i>Carex bushii</i>	Bush's sedge
<i>Carex flaccosperma</i>	blue sedge
<i>Carex rosea</i>	sedge
<i>Carex</i> sp.	Sedge
<i>Chasmanthium latifolium</i>	river-oats, inland sea-oats
<i>Cyperus</i> sp.	flatsedge
<i>Danthonia spicata</i>	poverty oat grass
<i>Dichanthelium clandestinum</i>	deer-tongue rosette grass, deer-tongue panic grass
<i>Elymus hystrix</i>	bottle-brush grass
<i>Iris cristata</i>	dwarf crested iris
<i>Luzula</i> sp.	wood rush
<i>Melica mutica</i>	two-flower melic
* <i>Microstegium vimineum</i>	Japanese stilt grass, Nepalese brown-top
* <i>Poa annua</i>	annual blue grass
* <i>Schedonorus arundinaceus</i>	tall fescue
Vines and scrambling shrubs – 11 species	
<i>Convolvulus</i> sp.	bindweed
<i>Dioscorea villosa</i>	wild yam
<i>Euonymus americanus</i>	strawberry-bush, hearts-a-bursting-with-love
* <i>Lonicera japonica</i>	Japanese honeysuckle
<i>Parthenocissus quinquefolia</i>	Virginia-creeper, woodbine
<i>Rosa carolina</i>	Carolina rose
* <i>Rosa multiflora</i>	multiflora rose
<i>Smilax rotundifolia</i>	common greenbrier, horsebrier
<i>Toxicodendron radicans</i>	poison-ivy
<i>Vitis cinerea</i>	winter grape, downy grape, gray-bark grape
<i>Vitis rotundifolia</i>	muscadine
Shrubs – 12 species	
<i>Alnus serrulata</i>	alder, smooth alder, tag alder
<i>Amorpha</i> sp.	Lead plant
<i>Asimina triloba</i>	pawpaw
<i>Azalea</i> sp.	azalea
<i>Callicarpa americana</i>	American beauty-berry, French-mulberry
<i>Corylus americana</i>	hazelnut, American hazelnut
<i>Hamamelis virginiana</i>	American witch-hazel
<i>Hypericum prolificum</i>	shrubby St. John's-wort
<i>Rhus glabra</i>	smooth sumac
<i>Sideroxylon lanuginosum</i>	gum bumelia, chittamwood
<i>Symphoricarpos orbiculatus</i>	coral-berry
<i>Vaccinium</i> sp.	blueberry

Scientific Name	Common Name
Trees – 35 species	
<i>Acer rubrum</i>	swamp red maple
<i>Acer saccharum</i>	southern sugar maple
<i>Carpinus caroliniana</i>	musclewood, ironwood, American hornbeam
<i>Carya alba</i>	mockernut hickory
<i>Carya texana</i>	black hickory
<i>Cercis canadensis</i>	eastern redbud
<i>Cornus florida</i>	flowering dogwood
<i>Dirca palustris</i>	leatherwood
<i>Fagus grandifolia</i>	beech
<i>Fraxinus americana</i>	white ash
<i>Fraxinus pennsylvanica</i>	green ash
<i>Gleditsia triacanthos</i>	honey locust
<i>Ilex decidua</i>	deciduous holly, possumhaw
<i>Juglans nigra</i>	black walnut
<i>Juniperus virginiana</i>	eastern red-cedar, cedar
<i>Liquidambar styraciflua</i>	sweet-gum
<i>Magnolia tripetala</i>	umbrella magnolia, umbrella-tree
<i>Nyssa sylvatica</i>	black-gum
<i>Ostrya virginiana</i>	hop-hornbeam, ironwood
<i>Pinus echinata</i>	short-leaf pine, yellow pine
<i>Platanus occidentalis</i>	sycamore, plane-tree
<i>Quercus alba</i>	white oak
<i>Quercus muehlenbergii</i>	chinquapin oak, chestnut oak
<i>Quercus pagoda</i>	cherrybark oak
<i>Quercus rubra</i>	northern red oak
<i>Quercus stellata</i>	post oak
<i>Quercus velutina</i>	black oak
<i>Robinia pseudoacacia</i>	black locust
<i>Salix caroliniana</i>	Carolina willow, Ward's willow
<i>Salix nigra</i>	black willow
<i>Sassafras albidum</i>	sassafras
<i>Styrax americanus</i>	American snowbell, storax
<i>Tilia americana</i>	American basswood, linden
<i>Vaccinium arboreum</i>	farkleberry, sparkleberry
<i>Viburnum rufidulum</i>	rusty blackhaw, southern blackhaw

APPENDIX C: US FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE CONSULTATION

Re: [EXTERNAL] ArDOT job 080499 - Gee Creek Str. & Apprs. (S)

Lewis, Lindsey <lindsey_lewis@fws.gov>

Tue 2020-08-18 12:30

To: Ledvina, Joseph <Joseph.Ledvina@ardot.gov>

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of ARDOT. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Joe,

As stated in the Consistency Letter, "The Service concurs with these "NLAA" and "No Effect" determination(s) for the listed species identified. No further consultation for this project is required for these species. The verification letter confirms you may rely on effect determinations provided in the Arkansas Determination Key for project review and guidance for federally listed species to satisfy agency consultation requirements under Section 7(a)(2) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (87 Stat. 884, as amended 16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.; ESA)."

"The Service has received your concurrence verification letter and request to verify that the Proposed Action may rely on the concurrence provided in the revised February 5, 2018, FHWA, FRA, FTA Programmatic Biological Opinion for Transportation Projects within the Range of the Indiana Bat and Northern Long-eared Bat (PBO) to satisfy requirements under Section 7(a)(2) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (ESA) (87 Stat. 884, as amended; 16 U.S.C 1531 et seq.). Based on the information you provided, you have determined that the Proposed Action is within the scope and adheres to the criteria of the PBO, including the adoption of applicable avoidance and minimization measures, may affect, but is not likely to adversely affect (NLAA) Indiana Bat and Northern Long-Eared Bat. The Service verification letter confirms the concurrence that this action may rely on the PBO."

Please keep in mind that you must report any departures from the plans submitted; results of any surveys conducted; or any dead, injured, or sick listed bats that are found to this office. If this project is not completed within one year of this letter, you must update your determination and resubmit the required information.

The Service has no additional comments or concerns and agrees with the determinations and concurrences made through the Arkansas Dkey and Indiana Bat and Northern Long-eared Bat (PBO) Dkey.

Thanks,

Lindsey Lewis
Biologist

US Fish & Wildlife Service
Arkansas Field Office
110 South Amity Rd., Suite 300
Conway, Arkansas 72032

(501) 513-4489 - voice

(501) 513-4480 - fax

Lindsey_Lewis@fws.gov

<http://www.fws.gov/arkansas-es/>

From: Ledvina, Joseph <Joseph.Ledvina@ardot.gov>
Sent: Monday, August 17, 2020 4:06 PM
To: Lewis, Lindsey <lindsey_lewis@fws.gov>
Subject: [EXTERNAL] ArDOT job 080499 - Gee Creek Str. & Apprs. (S)

This email has been received from outside of DOI - Use caution before clicking on links, opening attachments, or responding.

Lindsey,

ARDOT proposes to replace the Highway 123 bridge over Gee Creek, in Johnson County (35.678179, -93.262010). The bridge has been reinforced in the past but numerous structural deficiencies remain and the bridge would continue to deteriorate if it remained in use. The bridge will be replaced with a 3-sided box culvert a few feet south-southeast of the existing bridge. Typical soil disturbance during construction may temporarily impair water quality, but these effects will be minimized with the use of sediment reduction best management practices (BMPs). Along with standard BMPs, we will include cave discovery and water pollution control special provisions in the contract. A Biological Evaluation (attached) has been completed with coordination from the USDA Forest Service.

The species list (attached) generated by IPaC includes ten threatened or endangered species: Gray Bat (*Myotis grisescens*), Indiana Bat (IBat, *Myotis sodalis*), Northern Long-eared Bat (NLEB, *Myotis septentrionalis*), Piping Plover (*Charadrius melodus*), Red Knot (*Calidris canutus rufa*), American Burying Beetle (*Nicrophorus americanus*), and Missouri Bladderpod (*Physaria filiformis*).

We request your concurrence with our determination that this project will have **"no effect"** on the Piping Plover, Red Knot, American Burying Beetle, and Missouri Bladderpod due to lack of habitat and distance from known populations.

Gray Bats have been documented a few miles away along Big Piney Creek, but have not been documented in the immediate vicinity of the project. We seek concurrence for our determination of **"may affect, but not likely to adversely affect"** for the Gray Bat. A bridge inspection (attached) found no evidence of bats using the bridge.

Following the Programmatic Biological Opinion, a determination of **"may affect, but not likely to adversely affect"** was reached for Indiana bat and/or NLEB (see attached consistency letter). We request your concurrence with our determination. Summer bat surveys were done 1.5 miles to the east, at Big Piney Creek, and 1.4 miles to the south-southwest, at Haw Creek (see attached survey results).

Regards,
Joe Ledvina

Joe Ledvina | Botanist

Arkansas Department of Transportation

Environmental Division | Natural Resources Section

☎: 501.569.2520 | ✉: Joseph.Ledvina@ardot.gov

http://ardot.gov/wildflower_program/wildflower.aspx



United States Department of the Interior

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE
Arkansas Ecological Services Field Office
110 South Armony Suite 300
Conway, AR 72032-8975
Phone: (501) 513-4470 Fax: (501) 513-4480
<http://www.fws.gov/arkansas-es>



In Reply Refer To:

July 21, 2020

Consultation Code: 04ER1000-2020-SLI-0359

Event Code: 04ER1000-2020-E-03026

Project Name: 080499 Gee Creek Strs. & Apprs.

Subject: Updated list of threatened and endangered species that may occur in your proposed project location, and/or may be affected by your proposed project

To Whom It May Concern:

The enclosed species list identifies endangered, threatened, proposed, and candidate species, as well as proposed and final designated critical habitat, that may occur within the boundary of your proposed project and/or may be affected by your proposed project. The species list fulfills the requirements of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) under section 7(c) of the Endangered Species Act (Act) of 1973, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1531 *et seq.*). **This letter only provides an official species list and technical assistance; if you determine that listed species and/or designated critical habitat may be affected in any way by the proposed project, even if the effect is wholly beneficial, consultation with the Service will be necessary.**

If you determine that this project will have no effect on listed species and their habitat in any way, then you have completed Section 7 consultation with the Service and may use this letter in your project file or application.

The purpose of the Act is to provide a means whereby threatened and endangered species and the ecosystems upon which they depend may be conserved. Under sections 7(a)(1) and 7(a)(2) of the Act and its implementing regulations (50 CFR 402 *et seq.*), federal agencies are required to utilize their authorities to carry out programs for the conservation of threatened and endangered species and to determine whether projects may affect threatened and endangered species and/or designated critical habitat. More information on the regulations and procedures for section 7 consultation, including the role of permit or license applicants, can be found on our website.

Please visit our website at <http://www.fws.gov/arkansas-es/IPaC/home.html> for species-specific guidance to avoid and minimize adverse effects to federally endangered,

threatened, proposed, and candidate species. Our web site also contains additional information on species life history and habitat requirements that may be useful in project planning.

If your project involves in-stream construction activities, oil and natural gas infrastructure, road construction, transmission lines, or communication towers, please review our project specific guidance at <http://www.fws.gov/arkansas-es/IPaC/ProjSpec.html>.

The karst region of Arkansas is a unique region that covers the **northern third of Arkansas** and we have specific guidance to conserve sensitive cave-obligate and bat species. **Please visit <http://www.fws.gov/arkansas-es/IPaC/Karst.html> to determine if your project occurs in the karst region and to view karst specific-guidance.** Proper implementation and maintenance of best management practices specified in these guidance documents is necessary to avoid adverse effects to federally protected species and often avoids the more lengthy formal consultation process.

If your species list includes any mussels, Northern Long-eared Bat, Indiana Bat, Yellowcheek Darter, Red-cockaded Woodpecker, or American Burying Beetle, your project may require a presence/absence and/or habitat survey prior to commencing project activities. Please check the appropriate species-specific guidance on our website to determine if your project requires a survey. We strongly recommend that you contact the appropriate staff species lead biologist (see office directory or species page) prior to conducting presence/absence surveys to ensure the appropriate level of effort and methodology.

Under the ESA, it is the responsibility of the Federal action agency or its designated representative to determine if a proposed action "may affect" endangered, threatened, or proposed species, or designated critical habitat, and if so, to consult with the Service further. Similarly, it is the responsibility of the Federal action agency or project proponent, not the Service, to make "no effect" determinations. If you determine that your proposed action will have "no effect" on threatened or endangered species or their respective critical habitat, you do not need to seek concurrence with the Service. Nevertheless, it is a violation of Federal law to harm or harass any federally-listed threatened or endangered fish or wildlife species without the appropriate permit.

Through the consultation process, we will analyze information contained in a biological assessment that you provide. If your proposed action is associated with Federal funding or permitting, consultation will occur with the Federal agency under section 7(a)(2) of the ESA. Otherwise, an incidental take permit pursuant to section 10(a)(1)(B) of the ESA (also known as a habitat conservation plan) is necessary to harm or harass federally listed threatened or endangered fish or wildlife species. In either case, there is no mechanism for authorizing incidental take "after-the-fact." For more information regarding formal consultation and HCPs, please see the Service's Consultation Handbook and Habitat Conservation Plans at www.fws.gov/endangered/esa-library/index.html#consultations.

New information based on updated surveys, changes in the abundance and distribution of species, changed habitat conditions, or other factors could change this list. Please feel free to contact us if you need more current information or assistance regarding the potential impacts to

federally proposed, listed, and candidate species and federally designated and proposed critical habitat. Please note that under 50 CFR 402.12(e) of the regulations implementing section 7 of the Act, **the accuracy of this species list should be verified after 90 days.** This verification can be completed formally or informally as desired. The Service recommends that verification be completed by visiting the ECOS-IPaC website at regular intervals during project planning and implementation for updates to species lists and information. An updated list may be requested through the ECOS-IPaC system by completing the same process used to receive the enclosed list.

We appreciate your concern for threatened and endangered species. The Service encourages Federal agencies to include conservation of threatened and endangered species into their project planning to further the purposes of the Act. **Please include the Consultation Tracking Number in the header of this letter with any request for consultation or correspondence about your project that you submit to our office.**

Attachment(s):

- Official Species List

Official Species List

This list is provided pursuant to Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act, and fulfills the requirement for Federal agencies to "request of the Secretary of the Interior information whether any species which is listed or proposed to be listed may be present in the area of a proposed action".

This species list is provided by:

Arkansas Ecological Services Field Office

110 South Amity Suite 300

Conway, AR 72032-8975

(501) 513-4470

Project Summary

Consultation Code: 04ER1000-2020-SLI-0359

Event Code: 04ER1000-2020-E-03026


Project Name: 080499 Gee Creek Strs. & Apprs.

Project Type: BRIDGE CONSTRUCTION / MAINTENANCE

Project Description: Replacement of the bridge over Gee Creek on Highway 123 in the Big Piney Ranger District of the Ozark National Forest. The new structure will be a three-sided box culvert on a new alignment to the south of the existing bridge.

Project Location:

Approximate location of the project can be viewed in Google Maps: <https://www.google.com/maps/place/35.67914255650004N93.26056521324644W>



Counties: Johnson, AR

Endangered Species Act Species

There is a total of 8 threatened, endangered, or candidate species on this species list.

Species on this list should be considered in an effects analysis for your project and could include species that exist in another geographic area. For example, certain fish may appear on the species list because a project could affect downstream species.

IPaC does not display listed species or critical habitats under the sole jurisdiction of NOAA Fisheries¹, as USFWS does not have the authority to speak on behalf of NOAA and the Department of Commerce.

See the "Critical habitats" section below for those critical habitats that lie wholly or partially within your project area under this office's jurisdiction. Please contact the designated FWS office if you have questions.

-
1. [NOAA Fisheries](#), also known as the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS), is an office of the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration within the Department of Commerce.

Mammals

NAME	STATUS
Gray Bat <i>Myotis grisescens</i> No critical habitat has been designated for this species. Species profile: https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/6329	Endangered
Indiana Bat <i>Myotis sodalis</i> There is final critical habitat for this species. Your location is outside the critical habitat. Species profile: https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/5949	Endangered
Northern Long-eared Bat <i>Myotis septentrionalis</i> No critical habitat has been designated for this species. Species profile: https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/9045	Threatened

Birds

NAME	STATUS
Eastern Black Rail <i>Laterallus jamaicensis ssp. jamaicensis</i> No critical habitat has been designated for this species. Species profile: https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/10477	Proposed Threatened
Piping Plover <i>Charadrius melodus</i> Population: [Atlantic Coast and Northern Great Plains populations] - Wherever found, except those areas where listed as endangered. There is final critical habitat for this species. Your location is outside the critical habitat. Species profile: https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/6039	Threatened
Red Knot <i>Calidris canutus rufa</i> No critical habitat has been designated for this species. Species profile: https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/1864	Threatened

Insects

NAME	STATUS
American Burying Beetle <i>Nicrophorus americanus</i> Population: Wherever found, except where listed as an experimental population No critical habitat has been designated for this species. Species profile: https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/66	Endangered

Flowering Plants

NAME	STATUS
Missouri Bladderpod <i>Physaria filiformis</i> No critical habitat has been designated for this species. Species profile: https://ecos.fws.gov/ecp/species/5361	Threatened

Critical habitats

THERE ARE NO CRITICAL HABITATS WITHIN YOUR PROJECT AREA UNDER THIS OFFICE'S JURISDICTION.



United States Department of the Interior

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE
 Arkansas Ecological Services Field Office
 110 South Armity Suite 300
 Conway, AR 72032-8975
 Phone: (501) 513-4470 Fax: (501) 513-4480
<http://www.fws.gov/arkansas-es>



IPaC Record Locator: 990-22660201

July 21, 2020

Subject: Consistency letter for '080499 Gee Creek Strs. & Apprs.' for specified federally threatened and endangered species and designated critical habitat that may occur in your proposed project area consistent with the Arkansas Determination Key for project review and guidance for federally listed species (Arkansas Dkey).

Dear Joseph Ledvina:

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) received on **July 21, 2020** your effect determination(s) for the '080499 Gee Creek Strs. & Apprs.' (the Action) using the Arkansas DKey within the Information for Planning and Consultation (IPaC) system. The Service developed this system in accordance with the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (ESA) (87 Stat. 884, as amended; 16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.).

Based on your answers and the assistance in the Service's Arkansas DKey, you made the following effect determination(s) for the proposed Action:

Species	Determination
Endangered American Burying Beetle (<i>Nicrophorus americanus</i>)	NLAA
Proposed Threatened Eastern Black Rail (<i>Laterallus jamaicensis ssp. jamaicensis</i>)	No Effect
Threatened Red Knot (<i>Calidris canutus rufa</i>)	No Effect
Threatened Piping Plover (<i>Charadrius melodus</i>)	No Effect
Endangered Gray Bat (<i>Myotis grisescens</i>)	NLAA
Endangered Indiana Bat (<i>Myotis sodalis</i>)	May Affect
Threatened Northern Long-eared Bat (<i>Myotis septentrionalis</i>)	May Affect
Threatened Missouri bladderpod (<i>Physaria filiformis</i>)	NLAA

Status

Consultation with the Service is not complete. Further consultation or coordination with the Arkansas Ecological Services Office is necessary for those species with a determination of "may affect" listed above. Please contact our office at 501-513-4470, arkansas_es_clearance@fws.gov,

or your agency point of contact in the Arkansas Ecological Services Office to discuss methods to avoid or minimize potential adverse effects to those species.

The Service concurs with the NLAA determination(s) for the species listed above. Your agency has met consultation requirements by informing the Service of the “No Effect” determinations. No further consultation for this project is required for these species. This letter confirms you may rely on effect determinations provided in the Arkansas Determination Key for project review and guidance for federally listed species to satisfy agency consultation requirements under Section 7(a)(2) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (87 Stat. 884, as amended 16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.; ESA).

The Service recommends that your agency contact the Arkansas Ecological Services Field Office or re-evaluate this key in IPaC if: 1) the scope, timing, duration, or location of the proposed project changes, 2) new information reveals the action may affect listed species or designated critical habitat; 4) a new species is listed or critical habitat designated. If any of the above conditions occurs, additional consultation with the Arkansas Ecological Services Field Office should take place before project changes are final or resources committed.

FHWA projects should not use this key for Northern Long-eared Bat determinations. Please complete the FHWA, FRA, FTA Programmatic Consultation for Transportation Projects affecting NLEB or Indiana Bat Release date: December 2, 2019

The key is intended for projects funded or authorized by FHWA, FRA, or FTA, that may affect the endangered Indiana bat and/or the threatened northern long-eared bat, which requires consultation with the USFWS under Section 7 of the ESA.

Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act: The following resources are provided to project proponents and consulting agencies as additional information. Bald and golden eagles are not included in this section 7(a)(2) consultation and this information does not constitute a determination of effects by the Service.

The Service developed the National Bald Eagle Management Guidelines to advise landowners, land managers, and others who share public and private lands with Bald Eagles when and under what circumstances the protective provisions of the BGEPA may apply to their activities. The guidelines should be consulted prior to conducting new or intermittent activity near an eagle nest. This document may be downloaded from the following site: <https://www.fws.gov/southeast/our-services/permits/eagles/>

To determine if your proposed activity is likely to take or disturb Bald Eagles, complete our step-by-step online self-certification process, which is located at <https://www.fws.gov/southeast/our-services/eagle-technical-assistance/>.

If the recommendations detailed in the National Bald Eagle Management Guidelines cannot be followed, you may apply for a permit to authorize removal or relocation of an eagle nest in certain instances. The application form is located at <http://www.fws.gov/forms/3-200-72.pdf>.

Action Description

You provided to IPaC the following name and description for the subject Action.

1. Name

080499 Gee Creek Strs. & Apprs.

2. Description

The following description was provided for the project '080499 Gee Creek Strs. & Apprs.':

Replacement of the bridge over Gee Creek on Highway 123 in the Big Piney Ranger District of the Ozark National Forest. The new structure will be a three-sided box culvert on a new alignment to the south of the existing bridge.

Approximate location of the project can be viewed in Google Maps: <https://www.google.com/maps/place/35.67914255650004N93.26056521324644W>



Species Protection Measures

Qualification Interview

1. Have you made an effects determination of "no effect" for all species in the area of the project? A "no effect" determination means the project will have no beneficial effect, no short-term adverse effects, and no long-term adverse effects on any of the species on the IPaC-generated species list for the proposed project or those species habitat. A project with effects that cannot be meaningfully measured, detected or evaluated, effects that are extremely unlikely to occur, or entirely beneficial effects should not have a "no effect" determination. (If unsure, select "No").

No

2. Is the action authorized, funded, or being carried out by a Federal agency?

Yes

3. Choose the Federal agency you represent in this consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service:

d. Federal Highway Administration

4. Will project proponents follow [Special Provisions for avoidance and minimization](#) measures for listed species in Arkansas?

Yes

5. [Semantic] Does the project intersect designated critical habitat for the Leopard Darter?

Automatically answered

No

6. [Semantic] Does the project intersect designated critical habitat for the Neosho Mucket?

Automatically answered

No

7. [Semantic] Does the project intersect designated critical habitat for Yellowcheek Darter?

Automatically answered

No

8. [Semantic] Does the project intersect designated critical habitat for Rabbitsfoot?

Automatically answered

No

9. [Semantic] Does the project intersect the American burying beetle consultation area ?

Automatically answered

Yes

10. Will the project involve 3.0 acres or greater of ground-disturbing activities (including, but not limited to grubbing, bulldozing, tree and shrub removal, disking/plowing, compaction by heavy machinery, timber harvest or timber stand improvement)?

No

11. [Semantic] Does the project intersect the red-cockaded woodpecker AOI?

Automatically answered

No

12. [Semantic] Does the project intersect the Eastern black rail AOI?

Automatically answered

Yes

13. Will the project affect sand and gravel areas or shorelines along rivers, lakes, or reservoirs?

No

14. Does the project take place in marshy or flooded open field habitat?

No

15. [Semantic] Does the project intersect the red knot AOI?

Automatically answered

Yes

16. [Semantic (same answer as "8.1.3")] Will the project affect sand and gravel areas or shorelines along rivers, lakes, or reservoirs?

Automatically answered

No

17. [Semantic (same answer as "8.2")] Does the project take place in marshy or flooded open field habitat?

Automatically answered

No

18. [Semantic] Does the project intersect the Piping Plover AOI?

Automatically answered

Yes

19. [Semantic (same answer as "8.1.3 or 9.3")] Will the project affect sand and gravel areas or shorelines along rivers, lakes, or reservoirs?

Automatically answered

No

20. [Semantic] Does the project intersect the Whooping Crane AOI?

Automatically answered

No

21. [Semantic] Does the project intersect the interior least tern AOI?

Automatically answered

No

22. [Semantic] Does the project intersect the Gray Bat AOI?

Automatically answered

Yes

23. Does the project involve changes to an existing bridge or large culvert?

Yes

24. Does the project involve changes to an existing bridge or large culvert?

Yes

25. Were bats of any species noted on inspection?

No

26. [Semantic] Does the project intersect the Ozark Big-eared Bat AOI?

Automatically answered

No

27. [Semantic] Does the project intersect the Indiana bat AOI?

Automatically answered

Yes

28. [Semantic] Does the project intersect the Northern Long-eared bat AOI?

Automatically answered

Yes

29. [Semantic] Does the project intersect the Benton County Cave Crayfish AOI?

Automatically answered

No

30. [Semantic] Does the project intersect the Hell Creek Cave Crayfish AOI?

Automatically answered

No

31. [Semantic] Does the project intersect the Ozark cavefish AOI?

Automatically answered

No

32. [Semantic] Does the project intersect the Missouri bladderpod AOI?

Automatically answered

Yes

33. [Semantic] Does the project intersect the Geocarpon AOI?

Automatically answered

No

34. [Semantic] Does the project intersect the running buffalo clover AOI?

Automatically answered

No

35. [Semantic] Does the project intersect the Pondberry AOI?

Automatically answered

No

Project Questionnaire

1. **If the project includes forest conversion, report the appropriate acreages below. Otherwise, type '0' in questions 1-3.**

1. Estimated total acres of forest conversion:

1.4

2. 2. If known, estimated acres of forest conversion from April 1 to October 31

1.4

3. 3. If known, estimated acres of forest conversion from June 1 to July 31

0

4. **If the project includes timber harvest, report the appropriate acreages below. Otherwise, type '0' in questions 4-6.**

4. Estimated total acres of timber harvest

0

5. 5. If known, estimated acres of timber harvest from April 1 to October 31

0

6. 6. If known, estimated acres of timber harvest from June 1 to July 31

0

7. **If the project includes prescribed fire, report the appropriate acreages below. Otherwise, type '0' in questions 7-9.**

7. Estimated total acres of prescribed fire

0

8. 8. If known, estimated acres of prescribed fire from April 1 to October 31

0

9. 9. If known, estimated acres of prescribed fire from June 1 to July 31

0

10. **If the project includes new wind turbines, report the megawatts of wind capacity below. Otherwise, type '0' in question 10.**

10. What is the estimated wind capacity (in megawatts) of the new turbine(s)?

0



United States Department of the Interior

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE
Arkansas Ecological Services Field Office
110 South Armity Suite 300
Conway, AR 72032-8975
Phone: (501) 513-4470 Fax: (501) 513-4480
<http://www.fws.gov/arkansas-es>



IPaC Record Locator: 990-20003762

January 27, 2020

Subject: Consistency letter for the '080499 Gee Creek Strs. & Apprs.' project (TAILS 04ER1000-2020-R-0359) under the revised February 5, 2018, FHWA, FRA, FTA Programmatic Biological Opinion for Transportation Projects within the Range of the Indiana Bat and Northern Long-eared Bat.

To whom it may concern:

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) has received your request to verify that the **080499 Gee Creek Strs. & Apprs.** (Proposed Action) may rely on the concurrence provided in the revised February 5, 2018, FHWA, FRA, FTA Programmatic Biological Opinion for Transportation Projects within the Range of the Indiana Bat and Northern Long-eared Bat (PBO) to satisfy requirements under Section 7(a)(2) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (ESA) (87 Stat.884, as amended; 16 U.S.C. 1531 *et seq.*).

Based on the information you provided (Project Description shown below), you have determined that the Proposed Action is within the scope and adheres to the criteria of the PBO, including the adoption of applicable avoidance and minimization measures, and may affect, but is not likely to adversely affect the endangered Indiana bat (*Myotis sodalis*) and/or the threatened Northern long-eared bat (*Myotis septentrionalis*). Consultation with the Service pursuant to Section 7(a)(2) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (ESA) (87 Stat. 884, as amended; 16 U.S.C. 1531 *et seq.*) is required.

This "may affect - not likely to adversely affect" determination becomes effective when the lead Federal action agency or designated non-federal representative requests the Service rely on the PBO to satisfy the agency's consultation requirements for this project.

Please provide this consistency letter to the lead Federal action agency or its designated non-federal representative with a request for review, and as the agency deems appropriate, to submit for concurrence verification through the IPaC system. The lead Federal action agency or designated non-federal representative should log into IPaC using their agency email account and click "Search by record locator". They will need to enter the record locator **990-20003762**.

For Proposed Actions that include bridge/structure removal, replacement, and/or maintenance activities: If your initial bridge/structure assessments failed to detect Indiana bats, but you later detect bats during construction, please submit the Post Assessment Discovery of Bats at Bridge/Structure Form (User Guide Appendix E) to this Service Office. In these instances, potential incidental take of Indiana bats may be exempted provided that the take is reported to the Service.

If the Proposed Action may affect any other federally-listed or proposed species and/or designated critical habitat, additional consultation between the lead Federal action agency and this Service Office is required. If the proposed action has the potential to take bald or golden eagles, additional coordination with the Service under the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act may also be required. In either of these circumstances, please advise the lead Federal action agency accordingly.

The following species may occur in your project area and **are not** covered by this determination:

- American Burying Beetle, *Nicrophorus americanus* (Endangered)
 - Eastern Black Rail, *Laterallus jamaicensis ssp. jamaicensis* (Proposed Threatened)
 - Gray Bat, *Myotis grisescens* (Endangered)
 - Missouri Bladderpod, *Physaria filiformis* (Threatened)
 - Ozark Big-eared Bat, *Corynorhinus (=Plecotus) townsendii ingens* (Endangered)
 - Piping Plover, *Charadrius melodus* (Threatened)
 - Red Knot, *Calidris canutus rufa* (Threatened)
 - Whooping Crane, *Grus americana* (Experimental Population, Non-Essential)
-

Project Description

The following project name and description was collected in IPaC as part of the endangered species review process.

Name

080499 Gee Creek Strs. & Apprs.

Description

Replacement of the bridge over Gee Creek on Highway 123 in the Big Piney Ranger District of the Ozark National Forest. The new structure will be a three-sided box culvert on a new alignment to the south of the existing bridge.

Determination Key Result

Based on your answers provided, this project(s) may affect, but is not likely to adversely affect the endangered Indiana bat and/or the threatened Northern long-eared bat, therefore, consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service pursuant to Section 7(a)(2) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (ESA) (87 Stat. 884, as amended 16 U.S.C. 1531 *et seq.*) is required. However, also based on your answers provided, this project may rely on the concurrence provided in the revised February 5, 2018, FHWA, FRA, FTA Programmatic Biological Opinion for Transportation Projects within the Range of the Indiana Bat and Northern Long-eared Bat.

Qualification Interview

1. Is the project within the range of the Indiana bat^[1]?

[1] See [Indiana bat species profile](#)

Automatically answered

Yes

2. Is the project within the range of the Northern long-eared bat^[1]?

[1] See [Northern long-eared bat species profile](#)

Automatically answered

Yes

3. Which Federal Agency is the lead for the action?

A) Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)

4. Are *all* project activities limited to non-construction^[1] activities only? (examples of non-construction activities include: bridge/abandoned structure assessments, surveys, planning and technical studies, property inspections, and property sales)

[1] Construction refers to activities involving ground disturbance, percussive noise, and/or lighting.

No

5. Does the project include *any* activities that are **greater than** 300 feet from existing road/rail surfaces^[1]?

[1] Road surface is defined as the actively used [e.g. motorized vehicles] driving surface and shoulders [may be pavement, gravel, etc.] and rail surface is defined as the edge of the actively used rail ballast.

No

6. Does the project include *any* activities **within** 0.5 miles of a known Indiana bat and/or NLEB hibernaculum^[1]?

[1] For the purpose of this consultation, a hibernaculum is a site, most often a cave or mine, where bats hibernate during the winter (see suitable habitat), but could also include bridges and structures if bats are found to be hibernating there during the winter.

No

7. Is the project located **within** a karst area?

Yes

8. Will the project include *any* type of activity that could impact a **known** hibernaculum^[1], or impact a karst feature (e.g., sinkhole, losing stream, or spring) that could result in effects to a **known** hibernaculum?

[1] For the purpose of this consultation, a hibernaculum is a site, most often a cave or mine, where bats hibernate during the winter (see suitable habitat), but could also include bridges and structures if bats are found to be hibernating there during the winter.

No

9. Is there *any* suitable^[1] summer habitat for Indiana Bat or NLEB **within** the project action area^[2]? (includes any trees suitable for maternity, roosting, foraging, or travelling habitat)

[1] See the Service's [summer survey guidance](#) for our current definitions of suitable habitat.

[2] The action area is defined as all areas to be affected directly or indirectly by the Federal action and not merely the immediate area involved in the action (50 CFR Section 402.02). Further clarification is provided by the [national consultation FAQs](#).

Yes

10. Will the project remove *any* suitable summer habitat^[1] and/or remove/trim any existing trees **within** suitable summer habitat?

[1] See the Service's [summer survey guidance](#) for our current definitions of suitable habitat.

Yes

11. Will the project clear more than 20 acres of suitable habitat per 5-mile section of road/rail?

No

12. Have presence/probable absence (P/A) summer surveys^{[1][2]} been conducted^{[3][4]} **within** the suitable habitat located within your project action area?

[1] See the Service's [summer survey guidance](#) for our current definitions of suitable habitat.

[2] Presence/probable absence summer surveys conducted within the fall swarming/spring emergence home range of a documented Indiana bat hibernaculum (contact local Service Field Office for appropriate distance from hibernacula) that result in a negative finding requires additional consultation with the local Service Field Office to determine if clearing of forested habitat is appropriate and/or if seasonal clearing restrictions are needed to avoid and minimize potential adverse effects on fall swarming and spring emerging Indiana bats.

[3] For projects within the range of either the Indiana bat or NLEB in which suitable habitat is present, and no bat surveys have been conducted, the transportation agency will assume presence of the appropriate species. This assumption of presence should be based upon the presence of suitable habitat and the capability of bats to occupy it because of their mobility.

[4] Negative presence/probable absence survey results obtained using the [summer survey guidance](#) are valid for a minimum of two years from the completion of the survey unless new information (e.g., other nearby surveys) suggest otherwise.

Yes

SUBMITTED DOCUMENTS

- 080499_Big Piney and Gee Creek_Bat_survey_Report.pdf <https://ecos.fws.gov/ipac/project/OIC7GH3WLJAQFMPZ2R5JOR6UKY/projectDocuments/19597337>

13. Did the presence/probable absence (P/A) summer surveys detect Indiana bats and/or NLEB^[1]?

[1] P/A summer surveys conducted within the fall swarming/spring emergence home range of a documented Indiana bat hibernaculum (contact local Service Field Office for appropriate home range) that result in a negative finding requires additional consultation with the local Service Field Office to determine if clearing of forested habitat is appropriate and/or if seasonal clearing restrictions are needed to avoid and minimize potential adverse effects on fall swarming and spring emerging Indiana bats.

No

14. Were the P/A summer surveys conducted **within** the fall swarming/spring emergence range of a documented Indiana bat hibernaculum^[1]?

[1] Contact the local Service Field Office for appropriate distance from hibernacula.

No

15. Does the project include activities **within documented Indiana bat habitat**^{[1][2]}?

[1] Documented roosting or foraging habitat – for the purposes of this consultation, we are considering documented habitat as that where Indiana bats and/or NLEB have actually been captured and tracked using (1) radio telemetry to roosts; (2) radio telemetry triangulation/triangulation to estimate foraging areas; or (3) foraging areas with repeated use documented using acoustics. Documented roosting habitat is also considered as suitable summer habitat within 0.25 miles of documented roosts.)

[2] For the purposes of this key, we are considering documented corridors as that where Indiana bats and/or NLEB have actually been captured and tracked to using (1) radio telemetry; or (2) treed corridors located directly between documented roosting and foraging habitat.

No

16. Will the removal or trimming of habitat or trees occur **within** suitable but **undocumented Indiana bat** roosting/foraging habitat or travel corridors?

Yes

17. What time of year will the removal or trimming of habitat or trees **within** suitable but **undocumented Indiana bat** roosting/foraging habitat or travel corridors occur^[1]?

[1] Coordinate with the local Service Field Office for appropriate dates.

C) During both the active and inactive seasons

18. When in the active season will the removal or trimming of habitat or trees occur **within** suitable but **undocumented Indiana bat** roosting/foraging habitat or travel corridors?

C) During the active season both during and outside of the period May 1 to July 31

19. Will the removal or trimming of habitat or trees **within** suitable but **undocumented Indiana bat** roosting/foraging habitat or travel corridors that occurs between May 1 and July 31 be limited such that all trees can be visually assessed for use by bats?

No

20. Does the project include activities **within documented NLEB habitat**^{[1][2]}?

[1] Documented roosting or foraging habitat – for the purposes of this consultation, we are considering documented habitat as that where Indiana bats and/or NLEB have actually been captured and tracked using (1) radio telemetry to roosts; (2) radio telemetry triangulation/triangulation to estimate foraging areas; or (3) foraging areas with repeated use documented using acoustics. Documented roosting habitat is also considered as suitable summer habitat within 0.25 miles of documented roosts.)

[2] For the purposes of this key, we are considering documented corridors as that where Indiana bats and/or NLEB have actually been captured and tracked to using (1) radio telemetry; or (2) treed corridors located directly between documented roosting and foraging habitat.

No

21. Will the removal or trimming of habitat or trees occur **within** suitable but **undocumented NLEB** roosting/foraging habitat or travel corridors?

Yes

22. What time of year will the removal or trimming of habitat or trees **within** suitable but **undocumented NLEB** roosting/foraging habitat or travel corridors occur?

C) During both the active and inactive seasons

23. Will *any* tree trimming or removal occur **within** 100 feet of existing road/rail surfaces?

Yes

24. Will the tree removal alter *any* **documented** Indiana bat or NLEB roosts and/or alter any surrounding summer habitat **within** 0.25 mile of a documented roost?

No

25. Will *any* tree trimming or removal occur **between** 100-300 feet of existing road/rail surfaces?

Yes

26. Are *any* trees being removed **greater than** 9 inches diameter at breast height (dbh)?

Yes

27. Are *all* trees that are being removed clearly demarcated?

Yes

28. Will the removal of habitat or the removal/trimming of trees involve the use of **temporary** lighting?

No

29. Will the removal of habitat or the removal/trimming of trees include installing new or replacing existing **permanent** lighting?

No

30. Does the project include wetland or stream protection activities associated with compensatory wetland mitigation?

No

31. Does the project include slash pile burning?

No

32. Does the project include *any* bridge removal, replacement, and/or maintenance activities (e.g., any bridge repair, retrofit, maintenance, and/or rehabilitation work)?

Yes

33. Is there *any* suitable habitat^[1] for Indiana bat or NLEB **within** 1,000 feet of the bridge? (includes any trees suitable for maternity, roosting, foraging, or travelling habitat)

[1] See the Service's current [summer survey guidance](#) for our current definitions of suitable habitat.

Yes

34. Has a bridge assessment^[1] been conducted **within** the last 24 months^[2] to determine if the bridge is being used by bats?

[1] See [User Guide Appendix D](#) for bridge/structure assessment guidance

[2] Assessments must be completed no more than 2 years prior to conducting any work below the deck surface on all bridges that meet the physical characteristics described in the Programmatic Consultation, regardless of whether assessments have been conducted in the past. Due to the transitory nature of bat use, a negative result in one year does not guarantee that bats will not use that bridge/structure in subsequent years.

Yes

SUBMITTED DOCUMENTS

- *BridgeInspectionReport_2019-04-29.pdf* <https://ecos.fws.gov/ipac/project/OIC7GH3WLJAQFMPZ2R5JOR6UKY/projectDocuments/19597413>
 - *080499BatBridgeAssessment2020-01-07.pdf* <https://ecos.fws.gov/ipac/project/OIC7GH3WLJAQFMPZ2R5JOR6UKY/projectDocuments/19808287>
-

35. Did the bridge assessment detect *any* signs of Indiana bats and/or NLEBs roosting in/under the bridge (bats, guano, etc.)^[1]?

[1] If bridge assessment detects signs of *any* species of bats, coordination with the local FWS office is needed to identify potential threatened or endangered bat species. Additional studies may be undertaken to try to identify which bat species may be utilizing the bridge prior to allowing *any* work to proceed.

Note: There is a small chance bridge assessments for bat occupancy do not detect bats. Should a small number of bats be observed roosting on a bridge just prior to or during construction, such that take is likely to occur or does occur in the form of harassment, injury or death, the PBO requires the action agency to report the take. Report all unanticipated take within 2 working days of the incident to the USFWS. Construction activities may continue without delay provided the take is reported to the USFWS and is limited to 5 bats per project.

No

36. Will the bridge removal, replacement, and/or maintenance activities include installing new or replacing existing **permanent** lighting?

No

37. Does the project include the removal, replacement, and/or maintenance of *any* structure other than a bridge? (e.g., rest areas, offices, sheds, outbuildings, barns, parking garages, etc.)

No

38. Will the project involve the use of **temporary** lighting *during* the active season?

No

39. Will the project install new or replace existing **permanent** lighting?

No

40. Does the project include percussives or other activities (**not including tree removal/trimming or bridge/structure work**) that will increase noise levels above existing traffic/background levels?

No

41. Are *all* project activities that are **not associated with** habitat removal, tree removal/trimming, bridge and/or structure activities, temporary or permanent lighting, or use of percussives, limited to actions that DO NOT cause any additional stressors to the bat species?

Examples: lining roadways, unlighted signage , rail road crossing signals, signal lighting, and minor road repair such as asphalt fill of potholes, etc.

Yes

42. Will the project raise the road profile **above the tree canopy**?

No

43. Are the project activities that are not associated with habitat removal, tree removal/trimming, bridge and/or structure activities, temporary or permanent lighting, or use of percussives consistent with a No Effect determination in this key?

Automatically answered

Yes, other project activities are limited to actions that DO NOT cause any additional stressors to the bat species as described in the BA/BO

44. Is the location of this project consistent with a Not Likely to Adversely Affect determination in this key?

Automatically answered

Yes, because no bats were detected during presence/probable absence surveys conducted during the summer survey season and outside of the fall swarming/spring emergence periods. Additionally, all activities were at least 0.5 miles from any hibernaculum.

45. Is the bridge removal, replacement, or maintenance activities portion of this project consistent with a No Effect determination in this key?

Automatically answered

Yes, because the bridge has been assessed using the criteria documented in the BA and no signs of bats were detected

46. **General AMM 1**

Will the project ensure *all* operators, employees, and contractors working in areas of known or presumed bat habitat are aware of *all* FHWA/FRA/FTA (Transportation Agencies) environmental commitments, including all applicable Avoidance and Minimization Measures?

Yes

47. **Hibernacula AMM 1**

Will the project ensure that on-site personnel will use best management practices^[1], secondary containment measures, or other standard spill prevention and countermeasures to avoid impacts to possible hibernacula?

[1] Coordinate with the appropriate Service Field Office on recommended best management practices for karst in your state.

Yes

48. **Hibernacula AMM 1**

Will the project ensure that, where practicable, a 300 foot buffer will be employed to separate fueling areas and other major containment risk activities from caves, sinkholes, losing streams, and springs in karst topography?

Yes

Project Questionnaire

1. Have you made a No Effect determination for *all* other species indicated on the FWS IPaC generated species list?

No

2. Have you made a May Affect determination for *any* other species on the FWS IPaC generated species list?

Yes

3. How many acres^[1] of trees are proposed for removal between 0-100 feet of the existing road/rail surface?

[1] If described as number of trees, multiply by 0.09 to convert to acreage and enter that number.

1.4

4. How many acres^[1] of trees are proposed for removal between 100-300 feet of the existing road/rail surface?

[1] If described as number of trees, multiply by 0.09 to convert to acreage and enter that number.

0.3

5. Please describe the proposed bridge work:

Replacement of the bridge of Highway 123 over Gee Creek with a three-sided box culvert on a new alignment to the south

6. Please state the timing of all proposed bridge work:
during the active and inactive season

7. Please enter the date of the bridge assessment:
January 7, 2020

Avoidance And Minimization Measures (AMMs)

This determination key result includes the commitment to implement the following Avoidance and Minimization Measures (AMMs):

GENERAL AMM 1

Ensure all operators, employees, and contractors working in areas of known or presumed bat habitat are aware of all FHWA/FRA/FTA (Transportation Agencies) environmental commitments, including all applicable AMMs.

HIBERNACULA AMM 1

For projects located within karst areas, on-site personnel will use best management practices, secondary containment measures, or other standard spill prevention and countermeasures to avoid impacts to possible hibernacula. Where practicable, a 300 foot buffer will be employed to separate fueling areas and other major containment risk activities from caves, sinkholes, losing streams, and springs in karst topography.

Determination Key Description: FHWA, FRA, FTA Programmatic Consultation For Transportation Projects Affecting NLEB Or Indiana Bat

This key was last updated in IPaC on December 02, 2019. Keys are subject to periodic revision.

This decision key is intended for projects/activities funded or authorized by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), Federal Railroad Administration (FRA), and/or Federal Transit Administration (FTA), which may require consultation with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act (ESA) for the endangered **Indiana bat** (*Myotis sodalis*) and the threatened **Northern long-eared bat** (NLEB) (*Myotis septentrionalis*).

This decision key should only be used to verify project applicability with the Service's [February 5, 2018, FHWA, FRA, FTA Programmatic Biological Opinion for Transportation Projects](#). The programmatic biological opinion covers limited transportation activities that may affect either bat species, and addresses situations that are both likely and not likely to adversely affect either bat species. This decision key will assist in identifying the effect of a specific project/activity and applicability of the programmatic consultation. The programmatic biological opinion is not intended to cover all types of transportation actions. Activities outside the scope of the programmatic biological opinion, or that may affect ESA-listed species other than the Indiana bat or NLEB, or any designated critical habitat, may require additional ESA Section 7 consultation.



Indiana Bat and Northern Long-Eared Bat Mist-Net Survey of the Big Piney and Gee Creek Structures and Approaches Project, Johnson County, Arkansas.

ARDOT Job No. 080499

Prepared by:
Copperhead Environmental Consulting, Inc.
471 Main St.
P.O. Box 73
Paint Lick, KY 40461

For:
Arkansas Department of Transportation
10324 Interstate 30
P.O. Box 2261
Little Rock, AR 72203

2 August 2019

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES	I
LIST OF FIGURES	I
PROJECT INTRODUCTION	1
METHODS	1
Site Selection/ Mist-Netting	1
RESULTS	3
Habitat	3
Mist-Net Survey	4
CONCLUSIONS	4
LITERATURE CITED	5

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Mist-net locations for the Big Piney and Gee Creek Structures and Approaches Project, Johnson County, AR.	1
Table 2. Summary of bat species captured by site for the proposed Big Piney and Gee Creek Structures and Approaches Project, Johnson County, AR, July 2019.	4

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1. Mist-net Site Locations for the Big Piney and Gee Creek Structures and Approaches Project, Johnson County, AR.....	2
--	---

Appendices

Appendix A: Mist-net Site Photographs

Appendix B: Mist-net Data Sheets

PROJECT INTRODUCTION

Copperhead Environmental Consulting, Inc. (Copperhead) was contracted by Arkansas Department of Transportation (ARDOT) to conduct Indiana bat (*Myotis sodalis*) and northern long-eared bat (*Myotis septentrionalis*) presence/probable absence (P/A) surveys for the proposed Big Piney and Gee Creek Structures and Approaches Project (Figure 1). A Study Plan was submitted to the US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) Arkansas Field Office on 24 May 2019 and concurrence was received on 29 May 2019. Surveys were conducted under USFWS Permit #TE94849B-1 and Arkansas Game & Fish Commission (AGFC) Scientific Permit #121120173.

METHODS


Site Selection/Mist-Netting

Mist-netting was implemented in accordance with USFWS “2019 Range-wide Indiana Bat Summer Survey Guidelines.” One mist-net site was surveyed for the Big Piney Structure and one mist-net site was surveyed for the Gee Creek Structure (Table 1). Four net nights (nn) were completed at each structure based on the estimated forested impacts (< 1km). Mist-net site locations were selected after field reconnaissance of the project area and where habitat was best (Table 1 and Figure 1). Mist-net site photographs are provided in Appendix A.

Table 1. Mist-net locations for the Big Piney and Gee Creek Structures and Approaches Project, Johnson County, AR.

Site No.	Bridge Structure	Description	Dates (2019)	Latitude	Longitude
AR-1	Big Piney Creek	County Rd 5881 northeast of Hwy 123	9-10 July	35.67810	-93.23533
AR-2	Gee Creek	Haw Creek north of Hwy 123	11-12 July	35.67190	-93.26637

Mist-nets were set to maximize coverage of flight paths used by bats along suitable travel corridors or foraging areas. Placement of mist-nets was based on the extent of canopy cover, presence of an open flyway, and forest conditions near the site. Actual location and orientation of each net was determined in the field by a qualified biologist. Nets were deployed at sunset each night, left open for at least 5 hours, checked every 10 minutes, and disturbance near the nets was kept to a minimum. Weather data, including temperature, wind speed, and cloud cover was recorded for each site on an hourly basis to ensure compliance with the mist-netting guidelines (e.g., temperature during survey greater than 50°F).



Bats were live-caught and released unharmed near the point of capture. Biological and morphometric data (e.g., species, sex, age class, reproductive condition, mass, and forearm length) were recorded on data sheets for each individual captured. In addition, the height and the specific net set of capture are recorded for each bat. Processing of bats was completed within 30 minutes from the time a bat was removed from the net.

White-Nose Syndrome Protocol

In an effort to minimize the transmission of White-nose Syndrome (WNS) between captured bats, all netting and field activities followed the most recent guidelines established by USFWS. All hard, non-porous netting equipment was sanitized with Isopropyl alcohol wipes prior to arrival and after each survey night; all other equipment was submersed in hot water (131°F) for a minimum of 20 minutes. Individual bats were kept in unused paper bags while waiting for processing. Disposable latex gloves were worn over sanitized handling gloves and changed or sanitized following the handling of each bat. All non-disposable equipment (e.g., Pesola scales, rulers, calipers, etc.) coming into contact with bats was sanitized immediately following the handling of each bat. Bats were evaluated for potential WNS infection through wing scoring following the “*Wing-Damage Index Used for Characterizing Wing Condition of Bats Affected by White-nose Syndrome*” (Reichard and Kunz 2009).

RESULTS

Habitat

The Big Piney and Gee Creek Structures and Approaches are located within the Ozark National Forest. Habitat types that could be used by foraging and commuting bats, including forest gaps, wooded creek corridors and gravel roads were present near each structure. Land cover at the survey sites was optimal due to surrounding habitat being primarily forested with connectivity to adjacent forested habitat by forested streams and corridors. Forest structure was optimal due to the presence of mature trees and diverse age classes of trees with varying tree height and treefalls creating frequent openings and gaps that facilitate bat foraging. Dominate tree species near mist-net sites included white oak (*Quercus alba*), Eastern redbud (*Cercis canadensis*), pecan (*Carya illinoensis*), and flowering dogwood (*Cornus florida*). Big Piney Creek, Gee Creek, Sugar Creek, and Haw Creek could provide drinking and foraging resources throughout the summer. Roosting habitat was available in the form of snags with sloughing bark or cavities that were 5-15” diameter at breast height.

The Big Piney Creek and Gee Creek structures were investigated for signs of bat use. The Gee Creek structure over Haw Creek does provide some suitable roosting habitat for bats due to the rough concrete underdeck and numerous cracks and crevices suitable for bats to roost in, however, the bridge structure is less than 10ft above the creek and has been overwhelmed by

nesting swallows. Due to the size of the Big Piney Creek structure and safety concerns, a thorough investigation of the bridge was not conducted. No bats of any species or sign of bats was identified roosting under areas of the bridges that were checked.

Mist-Net Survey

Mist-netting was conducted from 9 July – 12 July 2019. A total of 10 bats of three species were captured (Table 2). No Indiana or northern long-eared bats were captured.

Table 2. Summary of bat species captured by site for the proposed Big Piney and Gee Creek Structures and Approaches Project, Johnson County, AR, July 2019.

Species	Site AR-1		Site AR-2		Total
	Male	Female	Male	Female	
<i>Eptesicus fuscus</i>	1	1	0	0	2
<i>Lasiurus borealis</i>	0	0	2	2	4
<i>Nycticeius humeralis</i>	0	0	4	0	4
Total	1	1	6	2	10

Weather conditions during the surveys were within the parameters outlined in the USFWS survey guidance, including no rain or heavy winds and temperatures above 50°F during the entire five-hour survey period. No deviations from the survey methodology occurred during the field survey. Captured bats were examined for signs of WNS by using the Reichard Wing-Damage Index (WDI). No major traumas (i.e., WDI > 1) were observed on captured bats.

CONCLUSIONS

The mist-net survey effort (4 nm at each bridge structure) was conducted under the appropriate weather conditions to determine P/A of Indiana and northern long-eared bats during the maternity season (USFWS 2019).

No Indiana or northern long-eared bats were captured during the survey, indicating these species are not likely present within the project area during the maternity season or are present in numbers too low to be detected by approved USFWS protocols.

LITERATURE CITED

- Reichard, J. D. and T. H. Kunz. 2009. *White-nose syndrome inflicts lasting injuries to the wings of little brown myotis (Myotis lucifugus)*. *Acta Chiropterologica*, 11(2) 457-464.
- (USFWS) U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2019. *2019 Range-Wide Indiana Bat Summer Survey Guidelines*.

Appendix A: Mist-net Site Photographs

 COPPERHEAD ENVIRONMENTAL CONSULTING	Mist-Net Survey of the Big Piney and Gee Creek Structures and Approaches Project. Johnson County, AR. Photographic Record	
ARDOT Job No.: 080499	Counties, State: Johnson County, AR	Client: ARDOT

Photo No.: AR-1, Net A		
Dates: 9-10 July 2019		
Location: Johnson Co., 35.67810, -93.23533		
Habitat: Corridor		
Description: CR-5881 northeast of Big Piney Creek		

Photo No.: AR-1, Net B	
Dates: 9-10 July 2019	
Location: Johnson Co., 35.67945, -93.23646	
Habitat: Corridor	
Description: CR-5881 northeast of Big Piney Creek	

Photo No.: AR-2, Net A	
Dates: 11-12 July 2019	
Location: Johnson Co., 35.67190, -93.26637	
Habitat: Creek	
Description: Haw Creek north of Hwy 123	

Photo No.: AR-2, Net B	
Dates: 11-12 July 2019	
Location: Johnson Co., 35.67215, -93.26627	
Habitat: Creek	
Description: Haw Creek north of Hwy 123	

Appendix B: Mist-net Data Sheets

Mist Netting Data Form 2017

Sheet _____ of _____

Site No. <u>AR-1</u>		Project Phase# <u>818.02</u>		Project Name <u>ARDOT Big Piney and Gee Creek</u>		Dates <u>09 July - 10 July 2019</u>	
Site Location <u>CR-5881, HAGARVILLE</u>		State <u>AR</u>		Permittee <u>Nikki Davis</u>		Technician(s) <u>Clellan McMurray</u>	
County <u>Johnson</u>		Lat/Lon or UTM (circle one): N/Easting <u>35.67810</u>		W/Northing <u>093.23533</u>		UTM Zone <u>-</u>	
		Datum <u>NAD 83</u>				Habitat Type* <u>Upland Forest</u>	

#	Date	Time	Species	Age	Sex	Repro	Mass (g)	RFA (mm)	Net	Height (m)	WDI	Band# Type	Freq.	Comments
1	09 July	2106	EPFU	A	F	PL	17	50	A	2.5	-	-	-	-
2	09 July	2324	EPFU	A	M	NR	16	46	A	3	-	-	-	-
	10 July	NO	BATS											

Date	Time	Temp (°F)	Sky	Wind	Comments
09 July	2032	80	0	0	-
	2132	78	0	0	-
	2232	77	0	0	-
	2332	77	0	0	-
	0032	76	0	0	-
	0132	75	0	0	-
10 July	2031	73	1	0	-
	2131	72	1	0	-
	2231	71	1	0	-
	2331	71	0	0	-
	0031	70	0	0	-
	0131	70	0	0	-

Sky Code	
0	Clear
1	Few Clouds
2	Partly Cloudy
3	Cloudy or overcast
4	Fog or smoke
5	Drizzle or light rain
6	Heavy rain - thunder storm

Beaufort Wind Scale	
0	Calm: <1 mph
1	Light air: 1-3 mph
2	Light breeze: 4-6 mph
3	Gentle breeze: 7-10 mph
4	Moderate breeze: 11-16 mph

Species Abbreviations: *Corynorhinus rafinesquii* (CORA); *Corynorhinus l. virginianus* (COVI); *Eptesicus fuscus* (EPFU); *Lasinus borealis* (LABO); *Lasinus cinereus* (LACI); *Lasinus seminolis* (LASE); *Lasionycteris noctivagans* (LANO); *Myotis austroriparius* (MYAU); *Myotis grisescens* (MYGR); *Myotis leibii* (MYLE); *Myotis lucifugus* (MYLU); *Myotis septentrionalis* (MYSE); *Myotis sodalis* (MYSO); *Nycticeius humeralis* (NYHU); *Perimyotis subflavus* (PESU); *Tadarida brasiliensis* (TABR)

Other Abbreviations: Male: M; Female: F; Pregnant: P; Lactating: L; Post Lactating: PL; Testes Descended: TD; Non Repro: N; Unknown: U

* Habitat Type: Creek/riparian; Bottomland forest; Upland forest; Pond; Cave entrance; Mine portal; Bridge; Structure; Field edge; Open field; Other


Site No. <u>AR-1</u>		Project Phase# <u>818.02</u>		Project Name <u>ARDOT Big Piney and Bee Creek</u>		Dates <u>09 July - 10 July 2019</u>					
Net Site Diagram											
	Net height x net length (m)		Dates		Net Set by Habitat						
	A = <u>5.2</u> x <u>6m</u>		<u>09 July - 10 July</u>		Habitat	A	B	C	D	E	F
	B = <u>5.2</u> x <u>6m</u>		<u>09 July - 10 July</u>		Corridor	X	X				
	C = _____ x _____		_____		Road Rut						
	D = _____ x _____		_____		Creek						
	E = _____ x _____		_____		River						
	F = _____ x _____		_____		Pond						
	Net Set GPS Location (UTM or Lat/Long)				Forest Gap						
	A = <u>35.67810</u>		<u>-093.23533</u>		Cave						
	B = <u>35.67945</u>		<u>-093.23646</u>		Mine						
C = _____		_____		Tree							
D = _____		_____		Other: list							
E = _____		_____		Date	Time nets up		Time nets down				
F = _____		_____		<u>09 July</u>	<u>2032</u>		<u>0132</u>				
Transmitters				<u>10 July</u>	<u>2031</u>		<u>0131</u>				
Band# _____		Band# _____		Dominant Vegetation							
Freq. _____		Freq. _____		1. <u>Quercus alba</u>				4. <u>Cornus drummondii</u>			
Brand _____		Brand _____		2. <u>Cercis canadensis</u>				5. _____			
Weight _____		Weight _____		3. <u>Carya illinoensis</u>				6. _____			
#days _____		#days _____									
Potential listed bat habitat at site:											
<u>2</u> Roost habitat: 1. Poor: No or few snags $\geq$ ~5" DBH with sloughing bark or other usable roost features (cracks, crevices, etc) 2. Moderate: Snags with sloughing bark or other roost features present ~5-15 inch DBH within 1000 feet of forested areas. 3. Optimal: Snags with sloughing bark or other roost features present $\geq$ ~15 inch DBH within 1000 feet of forested areas. <u>3</u> Water Resources: 1. Poor: bat drinking resources not present at the site. 2. Moderate: Ephemeral or intermittent streams or ponded areas present but too cluttered to allow many bats to drink easily or simultaneously. No corridors, openings or canopy gaps allow bats easy access to the resource. 3. Optimal: Streams or ponds (including road ruts) present that appear to offer drinking resource throughout the majority of the summer. Flyways to resources are available. <u>3</u> Forest Structure: (if hardwoods are absent or nearly absent or if stand is monoculture, area automatically qualifies as a 1: poor). 1. Poor: Habitat even aged and young. Trees smaller than 5 inch DBH. Understory growth cluttered and restricts flying/foraging 2. Moderate: some diversity in age of trees in the stand. Trees 5 to 15 inches present. Understory clutter dominant but not ubiquitous. Trees greater than 15" DBH may be present but rare. 3. Optimal: Mature forest. Diverse age classes of trees present. Trees > 15 inch DBH frequent. Varying tree height and treefalls allow for frequent small openings and gaps that facilitate bat foraging. <u>3</u> Land Cover: 1. Poor: Area surrounding site predominantly un-forested. Few mature trees present not connected to other areas of trees. 2. Moderate: Trees present in the form of small woodlots and wooded fence rows. Little connection to adjacent forested areas. 3. Optimal: Area is largely forested. Wooded stands are connected to other wooded stands via wooded stream, fence row, or other wooded corridor.											
Comments:											

Sheet of

Copperhead Consulting Ph:859-925-9012 Please return to: P.O. Box 73, Paint Lick, KY 40461

Site No. AR-2 Project Phase# 818.02 Project Name ARDOT Big Piney and Gee Creek Dates 11 July - 12 July 2019

Net Site Diagram



Net height x net length (m)		Dates	Net Set by Habitat						
A = 5.2	x 9m	11-12 July	Habitat	A	B	C	D	E	F
B = 7.8	x 9m	11-12 July	Corridor						
C =	x		Road Rut						
D =	x		Creek	X	X				
E =	x		River						
F =	x		Pond						
Net Set GPS Location (UTM or Lat/Long)			Forest Gap						
A = 35.67190	-93.26637		Cave						
B = 35.67215	-93.26627		Mine						
C =			Tree						
D =			Other: list						
E =									
F =									
Transmitters			Date	Time nets up	Time nets down				
Band#		Band#	11 July	2031	0031				
Freq.		Freq.	12 July	2030	0130				
Brand		Brand	Dominant Vegetation						
Weight		Weight	1. <i>Quercus alba</i>						
#days		#days	2. <i>Cercis canadensis</i>						
			3. <i>Carya illinoensis</i>						
			4. <i>Cornus florida</i>						
			5. _____						
			6. _____						

Potential listed bat habitat at site:

2 **Roost habitat:** 1. **Poor:** No or few snags ≥ 5 " DBH with sloughing bark or other usable roost features (cracks, crevices, etc) 2. **Moderate:** Snags with sloughing bark or other roost features present ~ 5 -15 inch DBH within 1000 feet of forested areas. 3. **Optimal:** Snags with sloughing bark or other roost features present > 15 inch DBH within 1000 feet of forested areas.

3 **Water Resources:** 1. **Poor:** bat drinking resources not present at the site. 2. **Moderate:** Ephemeral or intermittent streams or ponded areas present but too cluttered to allow many bats to drink easily or simultaneously. No corridors, openings or canopy gaps allow bats easy access to the resource. 3. **Optimal:** Streams or ponds (including road ruts) present that appear to offer drinking resource throughout the majority of the summer. Flyways to resources are available.

3 **Forest Structure:** (if hardwoods are absent or nearly absent or if stand is monoculture, area automatically qualifies as a 1: poor). 1. **Poor:** Habitat even aged and young. Trees smaller than 5 inch DBH. Understory growth cluttered and restricts flying/foraging 2. **Moderate:** some diversity in age of trees in the stand. Trees 5 to 15 inches present. Understory clutter dominant but not ubiquitous. Trees greater than 15" DBH may be present but rare. 3. **Optimal:** Mature forest. Diverse age classes of trees present. Trees > 15 inch DBH frequent. Varying tree height and treefalls allow for frequent small openings and gaps that facilitate bat foraging.

3 **Land Cover:** 1. **Poor:** Area surrounding site predominantly un-forested. Few mature trees present not connected to other areas of trees. 2. **Moderate:** Trees present in the form of small woodlots and wooded fence rows. Little connection to adjacent forested areas. 3. **Optimal:** Area is largely forested. Wooded stands are connected to other wooded stands via wooded stream, fence row, or other wooded corridor.

Comments:

APPENDIX D: Bridge/Structure Assessment Form

This form will be completed and submitted to the District Environmental Manager by the Contractor prior to conducting any work below the deck surface either from the underside; from activities above that bore down to the underside; from activities that could impact expansion joints; from deck removal on bridges; or from structure demolition for bridges/structures within 1000 feet of suitable bat habitat.

DOT Project # 080499	Water Body Gee Creek	Date/Time of Inspection Jan. 7, 2020, 10am	Within 1,000ft of suitable bat habitat (circle one) Yes No
--------------------------------	--------------------------------	--	---

Route	County	Federal Structure ID
123	Johnson	M1864

If the bridge/structure is 1,000 feet or more from suitable bat habitat (e.g., an urban or agricultural area without suitable foraging habitat or corridors linking the bridge to suitable foraging habitat), check box and STOP HERE. No assessment required. ☐

Please submit to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

Areas Inspected (Check all that apply)

Bridges		Culverts/Other Structures		Summary Info (circle all that apply)			
All vertical crevices sealed at the top and 0.5-1.25" wide & ≥4" deep	None	Crevices, rough surfaces or imperfections in concrete		Human disturbance or traffic under bridge/in culvert or at the structure	High	Low	None
All crevices >12" deep & not sealed	✓	Spaces between walls, ceiling joists		Possible corridors for netting	None/poor	Marginal	Excellent
All guardrails	✓						
All expansion joints	✓						
Spaces between concrete end walls and the bridge deck	✓						

Last Revised May 31, 2017

Vertical surfaces on concrete I-beams							
---------------------------------------	---	--	--	--	--	--	--

Evidence of Bats (Circle all that apply) Presence of one or more indicators is sufficient evidence that bats may be using the structure.

None

No evidence of bats

Visual (e.g. survey, thermal, emergent etc.)

- Live ___number seen
- Dead ___number seen

Photo documentation Y/N

Guano

Odor Y/N

Photo documentation Y/N

Staining definitively from bats

Photo documentation Y/N

Audible

Assessment Conducted By: <u>Joe Ledvina</u>	Signature(s): 
District Environmental Use Only: Date Received by District Environmental Manager: _____	

DOT Bat Assessment Form Instructions

1. Assessments must be completed no more than 2 years prior to conducting any work below the deck surface on all bridges, regardless of whether assessments have been conducted in the past.
2. Any bridge/structure suspected of providing habitat for any species of bat will be removed from work schedules until such time that the DOT has coordinated with the USFWS. Additional studies may be undertaken by the DOT to determine what species may be utilizing each structure identified as supporting bats prior to allowing any work to proceed.
3. Any questions should be directed to the District Environmental Manager.

Appendix E: Noise Impacts

NOISE ASSESSMENT REPORT
SCREENING LEVEL NOISE ANALYSIS
ARDOT JOB NUMBER 080499
GEE CREEK STR. & APPRS. (S)

Fundamentals of Sound and Noise

Noise is defined as unwanted or undesirable sound. The three basic parameters of how noise affects people are summarized below.

Intensity is determined by the level of sound expressed in units of decibels (dB). A 3 dB change in sound level is barely perceptible to most people in a common outdoor setting. However, a 5 dB increase presents a noticeable change and a 10 dB sound level increase is perceived to be twice as loud. Outdoor conversation at normal levels at a distance of 3 feet becomes difficult when the sound level exceeds the mid-60 dBA range.

Frequency is related to the tone or pitch of the sound. The amplification or attenuation of different frequencies of sound to correspond to the way the human ear “hears” these frequencies is referred to as “A-weighting.” The A-weighted sound level in decibels is expressed as dBA.

Variation with time occurs because most noise fluctuates from moment to moment. A single level called the equivalent sound level (L_{eq}) is used to compensate for this fluctuation. The L_{eq} is a steady sound level containing the same amount of sound energy as the actual time-varying sound evaluated over the same time period. The L_{eq} averages the louder and quieter moments, but gives more weight to the louder moments.

For highway noise assessment purposes, L_{eq} is typically evaluated over the worst 1-hour period and written as $L_{eq}(h)$. The $L_{eq}(h)$ commonly describes sound levels at locations of outdoor human use and activity, and reflects the conditions that will commonly produce the worst traffic noise (e.g., the highest traffic volumes traveling at the highest possible speeds).

Noise Impact and Abatement Criteria

Traffic noise impacts are determined by comparing design year $L_{eq}(h)$ values to: (1) a set of Noise Abatement Criteria (NAC) for different land use categories; and (2) existing $L_{eq}(h)$ values. A noise impact occurs when design year (future build) levels approach, meet, or exceed the NAC value or when a substantial increase in noise occurs. “Approach” is defined as a level within 1 dBA of the NAC value, and a substantial increase is defined as 10 dBA or greater than existing noise levels. For screening level noise analysis (screening analysis) purposes, the

ARDOT Policy on Highway Traffic Noise Abatement requires determining noise levels within 4 decibels of the NAC.

A *noise sensitive receptor* (receptor) is defined as a representative location of a noise sensitive area for various land uses. Most receptors associated with highway traffic noise analysis are categorized as NAC Activity Category B (residential) and C (e.g., trails and trail crossings, campgrounds, schools). Since the NAC for Activity Categories B and C is 67 dBA, noise impacts would occur at the approach level of 66 dBA. The screening analysis threshold would be 63 dBA.

Consideration of noise abatement measures is required when the NAC value is approached or exceeded, or when a substantial increase is predicted. Noise barriers (e.g., walls or berms) are the most common noise abatement measures.

Screening Level Noise Analysis

A screening analysis may be performed for projects that are unlikely to cause noise impacts and/or where noise abatement measures are likely to be unfeasible for engineering reasons. Factors common to these types of projects include low traffic volumes, slower speeds, the presence of few or no receptors, and the need for roadway access points (e.g., driveways, Main Street scenarios, etc.).

Screening analysis results represent a worst-case scenario with higher sound levels than would be expected in detailed modeling, and may be used to determine the need for detailed analysis if noise impacts are likely and the placement of noise barriers is feasible. It may also be used for projects that lack receptors in order to assess impacts on undeveloped or developing land.

The FHWA Traffic Noise Model Version 2.5 (TNM) software program is used to predict existing and future Leq(h) traffic noise levels. The TNM straight line model uses the existing year and design year traffic and roadway information. Receivers (discrete points modeled in the TNM program) are incrementally placed away from the roadway centerline to determine the distances to which noise impacts and noise levels within 4 dBA of the NAC extend. The model assumes that the roadway and receivers were located at the same elevation with no intervening barriers such as topography or dense vegetation.

Project Evaluation and Screening Analysis Results

The proposed project will replace the existing Hwy. 123 bridge over Gee Creek with a box culvert. Located in the Ozark National Forest, the entrance to the

Haw Creek Falls Campground is in the project footprint, while the campground and other recreational areas are located south-southeast of the roadway. The Ozark Highlands Trail also crosses Hwy. 123 at the campground entrance. These uses represent Activity Category C land uses.

Hwy. 123 has very low traffic volumes and only two potential receptors (trail crossing and campground/recreational area). Additionally, noise barriers would not be feasible due to both the terrain and established land uses requiring access points. A screening analysis was therefore considered appropriate for this project.

TNM modeling was completed using the existing year 2018 and design year 2038 (future build) traffic and roadway information. The purpose of the modeling was to determine the distances correlating to the 66 dBA noise impact level for Activity Category C receptors under existing and future build conditions. Receivers were incrementally extended from the centerline of Hwy. 123 to a maximum distance of 325 feet. The model calculation tables and input data are attached. The modeling results are summarized below.

Noise impacts were not predicted under existing and future build conditions. The noise level increases under future build conditions were less than 1 dB, which is undiscernible. A detailed noise analysis is not necessary for this project. Project construction operations typically increase noise levels. These increases would be temporary and have minimal to minor adverse effects on land uses and activities in the project area.

Table 1 presents the NAC values.

Table 1. Noise Abatement Criteria (NAC)

Activity Category	L_{eq(h)} dBA	Evaluation Location	Activity Description
A	57	Exterior	Lands on which serenity and quiet are of extraordinary significance and serve an important public need and where the preservation of those qualities is essential if the area is to continue to serve its intended purpose.
B*	67	Exterior	Residential properties.
C*	67	Exterior	Active sport areas, amphitheaters, auditoriums, campgrounds, cemeteries, day care centers, hospitals, libraries, medical facilities, parks, picnic areas, places of worship, playgrounds, public meeting rooms, public or nonprofit institutional structure, radio stations, recording studios, recreation areas, Section 4(f) sites, schools, television studios, trails, and trail crossings.
D	52	Interior	Auditoriums, day care centers, hospitals, libraries, medical facilities, places of worship, public meeting rooms, public or nonprofit institutional structure, radio studios, recording studios, schools, and television studios.
E*	72	Exterior	Hotels, motels, offices, restaurants/bars, and other developed lands, properties or activities not included in A-D, or F.
F	---	---	Agriculture, airports, bus yards, emergency services, industrial, logging, maintenance facilities, manufacturing, mining, rail yards, retail facilities, shipyards, utilities (water resources, water treatment, electrical), and warehousing.
G	---	---	Undeveloped lands that are not permitted.

* Includes undeveloped lands permitted for this activity category.

NOISE DATA WORKSHEET

Job No: 080499

Job Name: Gee Creek Str. & Apprs. (S)

Roadway Reference: Hwy. 123

County: Johnson

Design Year: 2038

Year(s) To Be Modeled: 2018 2038

Roadway Cross-Sections: 2 10' lanes; 2 2' shoulders total 24' wide

2018 EXISTING

Note: $DHV = (ADT)(K)$
 $DDHV = (ADT)(K)(D)$
 K - Percent of ADT occurring in design hour
 D - Directional Distribution

Operating Speed: 55 Kfactor 11%

Traffic Data:

YEAR	ADT	%TRUCK	DHV	CARS	MT	HT	CARS/2	MT/2	HT/2
					10%	90%			
				0	0	0	0	0	0
2018	90	14%	10	9	0	1	4	0	1

NOISE DATA WORKSHEET

Job No:

Job Name:

Roadway Reference:

County:

Design Year:

Year(s) To Be Modeled:

Roadway Cross-Sections:

Note: DHV = (ADT)(K)
 DDHV = (ADT)(K)(D)
 K - Percent of ADT occurring in design hour
 D - Directional Distribution

Operating Speed:

Traffic Data:

YEAR	ADT	%TRUCK	DHV	CARS	MT	HT	CARS/2	MT/2	HT/2
					10%	90%			
				0	0	0	0	0	0
2038	100	14%	11	9	0	1	5	0	1

RESULTS: SOUND LEVELS

Job 080499

ARDOT
M.Pearson

10 March 2020

TNM 2.5

Calculated with TNM 2.5

RESULTS: SOUND LEVELS

PROJECT/CONTRACT:

Job 080499

RUN:

Existing 2018

BARRIER DESIGN:

INPUT HEIGHTS

Average pavement type shall be used unless
a State highway agency substantiates the use
of a different type with approval of FHWA.

ATMOSPHERICS:

68 deg F, 50% RH

Receiver

Name	No.	#DUs	Existing LAeq1h	No Barrier LAeq1h Calculated	Crit'n	Increase over existing Calculated	Crit'n Sub'l Inc	Type Impact	With Barrier Calculated LAeq1h	Noise Reduction Calculated	Goal	Calculated minus Goal
			dBA	dBA	dBA	dB	dB		dBA	dB	dB	dB
20	1	1	0.0	56.1	66	56.1	10	----	56.1	0.0	8	-8.0
50	2	1	0.0	51.9	66	51.9	10	----	51.9	0.0	8	-8.0
75	3	1	0.0	49.9	66	49.9	10	----	49.9	0.0	8	-8.0
100	4	1	0.0	48.3	66	48.3	10	----	48.3	0.0	8	-8.0
125	5	1	0.0	46.0	66	46.0	10	----	46.0	0.0	8	-8.0
150	6	1	0.0	44.1	66	44.1	10	----	44.1	0.0	8	-8.0
175	7	1	0.0	42.5	66	42.5	10	----	42.5	0.0	8	-8.0
200	9	1	0.0	41.2	66	41.2	10	----	41.2	0.0	8	-8.0
225	10	1	0.0	40.0	66	40.0	10	----	40.0	0.0	8	-8.0
250	11	1	0.0	39.0	66	39.0	10	----	39.0	0.0	8	-8.0
275	12	1	0.0	38.1	66	38.1	10	----	38.1	0.0	8	-8.0
300	13	1	0.0	37.2	66	37.2	10	----	37.2	0.0	8	-8.0
325	14	1	0.0	36.5	66	36.5	10	----	36.5	0.0	8	-8.0

Dwelling Units	# DUs	Noise Reduction		
		Min	Avg	Max
		dB	dB	dB
All Selected	13	0.0	0.0	0.0
All Impacted	0	0.0	0.0	0.0
All that meet NR Goal	0	0.0	0.0	0.0

RESULTS: SOUND LEVELS

Job 080499

ARDOT
M.Pearson

10 March 2020
TNM 2.5
Calculated with TNM 2.5

RESULTS: SOUND LEVELS

PROJECT/CONTRACT:

Job 080499

RUN:

Proposed 2038

BARRIER DESIGN:

INPUT HEIGHTS

Average pavement type shall be used unless
a State highway agency substantiates the use
of a different type with approval of FHWA.

ATMOSPHERICS:

68 deg F, 50% RH

Receiver

Name	No.	#DUs	Existing LAeq1h	No Barrier			With Barrier			Calculated LAeq1h	Noise Reduction		Calculated minus Goal
				LAeq1h	Crit'n	Increase over existing Calculated	Type Impact	Crit'n Sub'l Inc	Calculated		Goal		
			Calculated	dB						dB		dB	dB
			dBA	dBA	dBA	dB	dB		dBA	dB	dB	dB	
20	1	1	0.0	56.2	66	56.2	10	----	56.2	0.0	8	-8.0	
50	2	1	0.0	51.9	66	51.9	10	----	51.9	0.0	8	-8.0	
75	3	1	0.0	49.9	66	49.9	10	----	49.9	0.0	8	-8.0	
100	4	1	0.0	48.5	66	48.5	10	----	48.5	0.0	8	-8.0	
125	5	1	0.0	47.1	66	47.1	10	----	47.1	0.0	8	-8.0	
150	6	1	0.0	45.1	66	45.1	10	----	45.1	0.0	8	-8.0	
175	7	1	0.0	43.5	66	43.5	10	----	43.5	0.0	8	-8.0	
200	9	1	0.0	42.0	66	42.0	10	----	42.0	0.0	8	-8.0	
225	10	1	0.0	40.8	66	40.8	10	----	40.8	0.0	8	-8.0	
250	11	1	0.0	39.7	66	39.7	10	----	39.7	0.0	8	-8.0	
275	12	1	0.0	38.7	66	38.7	10	----	38.7	0.0	8	-8.0	
300	13	1	0.0	37.8	66	37.8	10	----	37.8	0.0	8	-8.0	
325	14	1	0.0	37.0	66	37.0	10	----	37.0	0.0	8	-8.0	

Dwelling Units	# DUs	Noise Reduction		
		Min	Avg	Max
		dB	dB	dB
All Selected	13	0.0	0.0	0.0
All Impacted	0	0.0	0.0	0.0
All that meet NR Goal	0	0.0	0.0	0.0



ARKANSAS DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

ArDOT.gov | IDriveArkansas.com | Lorie H. Tudor, P.E., Director

10324 Interstate 30 | P.O. Box 2261 | Little Rock, AR 72203-2261

Phone: 501.569.2000 | Voice/TTY 711 | Fax: 501.569.2400

October 7, 2021

Ms. Vivian N. Hoang, P.E.
Division Administrator
Federal Highway Administration
700 West Capitol, Room 3130
Little Rock, Arkansas 72201-3298

RE: Job 080499
FAP STP-0036(18)
Gee Creek Str. & Apprs. (S)
Johnson County
FONSI Request

Dear Ms. Hoang:

An Environmental Assessment (EA) for the referenced project was prepared by and submitted for your approval. The document was signed and approved for public dissemination on May 26, 2021. The public hearing offering, comment period, and EA were made available from July 15, 2021 through September 20, 2021.

A review of the project and its impacts indicates that its construction would have no significant impact on the environment. We have included a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) document with the public hearing information for your review and approval, if acceptable.

The EA and public hearing offering can be viewed at the following location:

<https://vpiph01-job-080499-gee-creek-str-apprs-hwy-123-vphearing-ardot.hub.arcgis.com/>

Should you have questions or require additional information, please contact Don Nichols at (501) 569-2521.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads 'John Fleming'.

John Fleming
Division Head
Environmental Division

Enclosures

JF:SS:sw

ARDOT JOB 080499

HIGHWAY 123 BRIDGE REPLACEMENT:

GEE CREEK STR. & APPRS. (S)

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT



U.S. Department of Transportation
Federal Highway
Administration

Arkansas Department
of Transportation



OCTOBER 2021



Title VI

The Arkansas Department of Transportation (ARDOT) ensures full compliance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 by prohibiting discrimination against any person on the basis of race, color, national origin or sex in the provision of benefits and services resulting from its federally assisted programs and activities. The ARDOT public involvement process did not exclude any individuals due to income, race, color, religion, national origin, sex, age, or disability. For questions regarding ARDOT 's Title VI Program, you may contact the Department's EEO/DBE Section Head (ADA/504/Title VI Coordinator) at (501) 569-2298 (Voice/TTY 711), or at the following email address: [EEO DBE Section Head@ardot.gov](mailto:EEO_DBE_Section_Head@ardot.gov).

Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Information

Materials can be provided in alternative formats: large print, Braille, or audiotape for people with disabilities by contacting ARDOT's EEO/DBE Section Head (ADA/504/Title VI Coordinator) at (501) 569-2298 (Voice/TTY 711), or at the following email address: [EEO DBE Section Head@ardot.gov](mailto:EEO_DBE_Section_Head@ardot.gov). Persons who are deaf or hard of hearing may contact ARDOT through the Arkansas Relay Service at 7-1-1.

A federal agency may publish a notice in the Federal Register, pursuant to 23 USC §139(I), indicating that one or more federal agencies have taken final action on permits, licenses, or approvals for a transportation project. If such notice is published, claims seeking judicial review of those federal agency actions will be barred unless such claims are filed within 180 days after the date of publication of the notice, or within such shorter time period as is specified in the federal laws pursuant to which judicial review of the federal agency action is allowed. If no notice is published, then the periods of time that otherwise are provided by the federal laws governing such claims will apply.

GEE CREEK STR. & APPRS. (S)

ARDOT JOB NUMBER 080499

F.A.P. NUMBER STP-0036(18)

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

Submitted by the U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, Arkansas Division

The Arkansas Department of Transportation (ARDOT) has completed the assessment of the proposed project and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) issues a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) for the Highway 123 bridge replacement (Bridge Number M1864) over Gee Creek in Johnson County, Arkansas.

Upon consideration of the FHWA-approved Environmental Assessment (EA) for the proposed project, public comments, and the considerations following in this document, FHWA has determined that the Preferred Alternative, a bottomless arch culvert, will have no significant impact on the human environment and hereby issues a FONSI pursuant to 23 CFR §771.121(a).

This FONSI is based on FHWA's independent evaluation. The information contained in the EA has been determined to adequately and accurately discuss the need, environmental issues, and impacts of the proposed project and its appropriate mitigation measures. The EA provides sufficient evidence and analysis for determining that an Environmental Impact Statement is not required. No impacts identified would cause any significant adverse effects to the human or natural environment.

Based upon the EA, additional information included in this document, and public, agency, and organization comments, FHWA concludes that no additional environmental documentation is required for ARDOT job 080499, the Highway 123 bridge replacement project for bridge number M1864 over Gee Creek.



Randal Looney
Environmental Specialist

October 12, 2021

Date of Approval



TABLE OF CONTENTS

FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT

1	What is the Highway 123 bridge replacement project?	1
2	Has the project changed since the publication of the EA?.....	1
3	How has the public been involved during the EA comment period?.....	1
4	How have state and federal agencies been involved during the EA comment period?	3
5	Which alternative was recommended?	3
6	What impacts are expected with the Preferred Alternative?.....	3
7	What commitments have been made?	4
8	Are significant impacts expected as a result of the Preferred Alternative?	4
9	What is the FHWA determination for the Preferred Alternative?	7

APPENDICES

Appendix A:	Public Hearing Packet
Appendix B:	Agency EA Comments
Appendix C:	Inventoried Roadless Area Approval

FIGURES

1	Project Location Map.....	2
---	---------------------------	---

Finding of No Significant Impact

This Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) document updates the Environmental Assessment (EA), identifies the Preferred Alternative, and incorporates all applicable comments and responses received during the review period.

When does FHWA issue a FONSI?

A FONSI is issued when the environmental analysis and review finds a project to have no significant impacts on the quality of the natural, cultural, or human environment.

1 What is the Highway 123 bridge replacement project?

The Arkansas Department of Transportation (ARDOT), in conjunction with the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), and in cooperation with the U.S. Forest Service (USFS), is proposing to replace the Highway 123 bridge over Gee Creek approximately 7.4 miles southwest of Highway 7 in Johnson County. See Figure 1 for the project location.

An EA was approved by the FHWA on May 26, 2021. The EA did not identify any significant adverse environmental impacts.

Where can I find the EA and other project documents?

The project documents are available for review at the following locations:

By mail or in person:
ARDOT Central Office
10324 Interstate 30
Little Rock, AR

By calling:
(501) 569-2281

On the ARDOT website:
<http://www.ardot.gov>
*search "080499"

2 Has the project changed since the publication of the EA?

No changes were made to the proposed design for either build alternative considered in the EA, and no additional impacts have been identified. The conditions in the project area have not changed. The EA did mistakenly list the Section 106 finding as “no adverse effect,” when it was actually “no historic properties affected.” This error does not change the findings of the EA.

3 How has the public been involved during the EA comment period?

A Location and Design Public Hearing and public comment period were offered from July 15, 2021 through September 20, 2021. The hearing offering, comment period, and EA availability were advertised in The Courier out of Russellville, Arkansas on August 19 & 24, 2021 and The Johnson County Graphic out of Clarksville, Arkansas on July 7 & 14, 2021. The EA and plan set were available for public inspection on the ARDOT website, the ARDOT Resident Engineer Office in Clarksville, Arkansas, and the Johnson County Public Library in Clarksville, Arkansas. No comments or hearing requests were received. The public hearing packet can be found in [Appendix A](#).

Project Location Map



Figure 1

4 How have state and federal agencies been involved during the EA comment period?

The Arkansas Historic Preservation Program (AHPP) and Arkansas Department of Parks, Heritage & Tourism (ADPHT) submitted comments on the Environmental Assessment as members of the Arkansas Technical Review Committee. The only comments submitted by AHPP were to correct the Section 106 finding in the EA, as mentioned in Section 2 above, and to uphold their previous findings and concurrences.

ADPHT's comments noted that the project would not conflict with public outdoor recreation sites involved in the Outdoor Recreation Grants Program, and that they were pleased that the project appeared to have no adverse effect on the Ozark Highlands Trail and Haw Creek Falls Recreation Area.

These comments can be found in [Appendix B](#).

5 Which alternative was recommended?

After considering the findings of the EA and comments from resource and regulatory agencies, the Build Alternative, which involved replacing the existing bridge with a bottomless culvert downstream of the existing structure, was identified as the Preferred Alternative. The Preferred Alternative meets the project's purpose and need of replacing the existing deteriorated bridge while accommodating aquatic species passage and minimizing impacts to the Gee Creek Inventoried Roadless Area.

6 What impacts are expected with the Preferred Alternative?

The Preferred Alternative is estimated to have a total cost of \$3.9M and would require approximately 2.4 acres of right of way, all of which is within the Ozark-St. Francis National Forests and 0.3 acre of which is within the Gee Creek Inventoried Roadless Area (IRA). There would be approximately 140 linear feet of stream impacts and only temporary and minor visual impacts. All stream impacts will be permitted by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and Arkansas Division of Environmental Quality before construction may begin. The project "may affect, but is not likely to adversely affect" the federally-listed species that have the potential to occur in the project area. There are no cultural resources, wetlands, Section 4(f) properties, air quality, environmental justice, prime farmland, or floodplain impacts associated with the Preferred Alternative.

A review of regulations covering management of Inventoried Roadless Areas and impacts of the project on Gee Creek IRA was conducted by the Regional Forester over the USFS Southern Region. The Regional Forester's authorization to proceed with the NEPA process can be found in [Appendix C](#).

7 What commitments have been made?

- ARDOT will comply with all requirements of *The Clean Water Act, as Amended*, for the construction of this project. This includes Section 401: Water Quality Certification, Section 402: National Pollutant Discharge Elimination Permit (NPDES), and Section 404: Permits for Dredged or Fill Material.
- The construction of the proposed project should be allowed under the terms of a Nationwide Permit 14 for Linear Transportation Projects as defined in Federal Register 82(4) 1860-2008. All waterway and stormwater permits will be obtained before construction may begin.
- If hazardous materials, unknown illegal dumps, or underground storage tanks are identified or accidentally uncovered by any ARDOT personnel, contractors, contracting companies, or state regulatory agency, ARDOT will determine the type, size, and extent of the contamination according to the ARDOT response protocol. ARDOT, in consultation with ADEQ, will decide the type of containment, remediation, and disposal methods to be employed for that particular type of contamination.

8 Are significant impacts expected as a result of the Preferred Alternatives?

The 2020 Council on Environmental Quality regulations require consideration of a project's affected environment and degree of effect in determining whether the project would have a significant impact (40 CFR §1501.3):

“Agencies should consider, as appropriate to the specific action, the affected area (national, regional, or local) and its resources, such as listed species and designated critical habitat under the ESA. Significance varies with the setting of the proposed action. For instance, in the case of a site-specific action, significant would usually depend only upon the effects in the local area.”

“In considering the degree of the effects, agencies should consider the following, as appropriate to the specific action: (i) Both short- and long- term effects. (ii) Both beneficial and adverse effects. (iii) Effects on public health and safety. (iv) Effects that would violate Federal, State, Tribal, or local law protecting the environment.”

The following factors were used to determine if there were any significant impacts associated with the Preferred Alternative:

Impacts that may be both beneficial and adverse.

The adverse impacts as a result of the Preferred Alternative are discussed above in Section 2. The beneficial impacts associated with the Preferred Alternative include an improved and safer roadway typical section and a safer structure with the reduced likelihood of failure.

The degree to which the project affects public health or safety.

By providing a safer roadway and structure, the project not only positively benefits the motoring public, but those who live in areas where emergency vehicles use Highway 123 to get to their

property. If the structure were to fail, the highway would be closed to all vehicles, including emergency responders, who would be forced to use a detour of up to 60 miles. There are no adverse impacts to public health or safety anticipated as a result of the Preferred Alternative.

Unique characteristics of the geographical area such as proximity to historic or cultural resources, parks, prime farmland, wetlands, wild and scenic rivers, or ecological critical areas.

The Preferred Alternative would have positive effects on parks and recreational areas, including wild and scenic rivers, by maintaining access to these facilities in the area. These facilities include Haw Creek Falls Recreation Area and the Ozark Highlands Trail in the immediate project area and Big Piney Creek Wild and Scenic River (WSR), located 1.8 mile northeast on Highway 123 (also 1.8 mile downstream on Gee Creek and Haw Creek) of the proposed project. These resources are discussed in the EA and are not anticipated to have any adverse impacts as a result of the Preferred Alternative.

The project is located wholly within the Ozark-St. Francis National Forests. The U.S. Forest Service was a NEPA cooperating agency on the project and was consulted with throughout the project development process and EA preparation. Approximately 2.3 acres of right of way and 0.1 acre of temporary construction easements would be required from the Ozark-St. Francis National Forests for the Preferred Alternative. The Gee Creek Inventoried Roadless Area (IRA) is USFS-protected land within the Ozark-St. Francis National Forests. Approximately 0.3 acre of proposed right of way would be required from the Gee Creek IRA for the Preferred Alternative. The impacts to the Ozark-St. Francis National Forest and Gee Creek IRA are considered minor and acceptable by the U.S. Forest Service in order to maintain the highway infrastructure.

Approximately 140 linear feet of stream impacts would be covered under a Section 404 Nationwide 14 permit. There are no cultural resources, prime farmland, wetlands, or ecological critical areas that would be impacted as a result of the Preferred Alternative.

The degree to which the effects on the environment are expected to be highly controversial.

Scoping letters were sent to property owners in the project area and a list of citizens who wish to be notified of projects occurring in the Ozark-St. Francis National Forests Big Piney Ranger District. No comments were received.

A Location and Design Public Hearing and EA comment period were also offered following the release of the EA for public dissemination by FHWA. No comments were received from the public. The responses received from other state agencies as part of their technical review are discussed in Section 4, but no agencies indicated concerns related to the Preferred Alternative or opposed the proposed project.

The degree to which the effects on the quality of the human environment are highly uncertain or involve unique or unknown risks.

The impacts to the human environment are documented in the EA. There are no known impact areas related to the quality of the human environment that could be considered highly uncertain or involve unique or unknown risks.

The degree to which the action may establish a precedent for future actions with significant effects or represents a decision in principle about a future consideration.

The FHWA regulations at 23 CFR §771.115(a) list the types of actions typically requiring the preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement. A minor bridge replacement project, such as the replacement of the Highway 123 bridge over Gee Creek, is not included in this list. The project has logical termini and independent utility; it represents a reasonable expenditure; and it does not force additional improvement to be made to the transportation system. The Preferred Alternative would not set a precedent for future actions with significant effects or represent a decision in principle about a future consideration.

Whether the action is related to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant impacts.

As outlined in the EA, Section 3.12, only minor cumulative impacts on resources such as the Ozark-St. Francis National Forests, Gee Creek IRA, the visual quality of Highway 123, and threatened and endangered species are expected as a result of the Preferred Alternative. No significant cumulative effects have been identified with the proposed project.

The degree to which the action may adversely affect districts, sites, highways, structures, or objects listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places or may cause loss of significant scientific, cultural, or historic resources.

Pursuant to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, a cultural resources survey of the project area was conducted. No cultural or historic resources were identified that would be impacted by the Preferred Alternative, and the State Historic Preservation Officer determined that the project would not impact historic properties.

The degree to which the action may adversely affect and endangered or threatened species or its habitat that has been determined to be critical under the Endangered Species Act.

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service identified eight federally-listed species as potentially occurring in the project area: the Gray Bat (*Myotis grisescens*), Indiana Bat (*Myotis sodalis*), Northern Long-eared Bat (*Myotis septentrionalis*), Eastern Black Rail (*Laterallus jamaicensis ssp. jamaicensis*), Piping Plover (*Charadrius melodus*), Red Knot (*Calidris canutus rufa*), American Burying Beetle (*Nicrophorus americanus*), and Missouri Bladderpod (*Physaria filiformis*).

Mist net surveys conducted in the project area did not capture any of the federally-listed bat species. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service determined that this project “may affect, but is not

likely to adversely affect” these bat species. The Preferred Alternative would have “no effect” on the remaining species due to a lack of suitable habitat in the project area.

More information on all federally-listed species and the project impacts can be found in the biological evaluation in Appendix D of the EA.

Whether an action threatens a violation of federal, state, or local law or requirements imposed for the protection of the environment.

The proposed action does not knowingly threaten a violation of federal, state, or local environmental protections. Project clearance has already been obtained for the Preferred Alternative under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act and Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act. Approval to proceed with the NEPA process has been obtained from the U.S. Forest Service for impacts to the Gee Creek IRA. All applicable permits would be acquired prior to construction.

9 What is the FHWA determination for the Preferred Alternative?

Based upon the findings of the EA, public and agency scoping, the public hearing offering and EA comment period, and the agency technical review of the EA, FHWA concludes that the Preferred Alternative would not have a significant impact on the environment and no additional NEPA documentation is required for the proposed project. If changes in laws or regulations that apply to the project occur during design or construction, or there are major design changes that result in substantially greater impacts than those described in this document, a re-evaluation of the EA would be performed. The assessment of the proposed project is complete and FHWA issues a “finding of no significant impact” for the proposed bridge replacement on Highway 123 over Gee Creek in Johnson County, Arkansas.

Appendix A – PUBLIC HEARING PACKET



**NOTICE OF OFFERING
A PUBLIC HEARING
ON HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENTS**

**Gee Creek Str. & Apprs. (Hwy. 123)
Job 080499
Johnson County**

The Arkansas Department of Transportation (ARDOT) is planning improvements to Highway 123 approximately 7.4 miles south of Highway 7 in Johnson County. The proposed improvements to Highway 123 include replacing the existing bridge over Gee Creek structural deficiencies with a three sided box culvert.

Plans showing location and design features of the anticipated work and information relative to environmental studies are available for public inspection and commenting from July 15 through August 19, 2021 at the following locations:

- ARDOT's website: www.ardot.gov/publicmeetings
- ARDOT's Resident Engineer Office #82, 2702 West Main, Clarksville, AR 72830. The office is open weekdays from 7:00 a.m. until 4:30 p.m.
- Johnson County Public Library, 2 Taylor Circle, Clarksville, AR 72830. The library hours vary, please contact (479) 754-3135.

Any interested citizen, in the vicinity of this proposed project, may request that a public hearing be held regarding this project and its economic and environmental effects by submitting a written request to the Arkansas Department of Transportation, Environmental Division, P.O. Box 2261, Little Rock, AR, 72203-2261 or email environmentalmeetings@ardot.gov. Requests must be received on or before **August 19, 2021 at 4:30 p.m.**

In the event requests are received, a notice of the date, time, and place of the public hearing will be published and advertised in the local media.



ARKANSAS DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

ARDOT.gov | IDriveArkansas.com | Lorie H. Tudor, P.E., Director

ENVIRONMENTAL DIVISION

10324 Interstate 30 | P.O. Box 2261 | Little Rock, AR 72203-2261 | Phone: 501.569.2281 | Fax: 501.569.2009

August 17, 2021

Patricia Spears
Russellville Courier
Legal Advertising
201 E. Second St.
Russellville, AR 72801
Email: legals@couriernews.com

Re: ARDOT Job 080499

Greetings:

Please publish the enclosed "Notice of Offering a Public Hearing" legal ad in the local news section on the following dates:

Thursday, August 19, 2021
Tuesday, August 24, 2021

Send one copy of the proof of publication with invoice for payment to:

Arkansas Department of Transportation
Attention: Environmental Division / Shaná Williams
Reference Job 080499
P. O. Box 2261
Little Rock, Arkansas 72203
Phone: 501-569-2563
Fax: 501-569-2009

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read 'Ruby Jordan-Johnson', is written over a horizontal line.

for Ruby Jordan-Johnson
Section Head - Public Involvement
Environmental Division

Enclosure

NOTICE OF OFFERING A PUBLIC HEARING ON HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENTS

**Gee Creek Str. & Apprs. (Hwy. 123)
Job 080499
Johnson County**

The Arkansas Department of Transportation (ARDOT), in cooperation with the United States Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, is planning improvements to Highway 123 approximately 7.4 miles south of Highway 7 in Johnson County. The proposed improvements to Highway 123 include replacing the existing bridge over Gee Creek with a three-sided box culvert.

Plans showing location and design features of the anticipated work and information relative to environmental studies are available for public inspection and comment at the following locations:

- Website: www.ardot.gov/publicmeetings
- Email: environmentalpublicmeetings@ardot.gov
- ARDOT's District 8 Office, 372 Aspen Lane, Russellville, AR 72811. The office is open weekdays from 7:00 a.m. until 4:30 p.m.
- Pope County Library-Russellville Main Branch, 116 East 3rd Street, Russellville, AR 72801. The Library is open from 8:30am to 5:30pm. For questions, please contact (479) 968-4368.

Any interested citizen may request that a public hearing be held regarding this project and its economic and environmental effects by submitting a written request to the Arkansas Department of Transportation, Environmental Division, P.O. Box 2261, Little Rock, AR, 72203-2261. Requests must be received on or before **September 20, 2021 at 4:30 p.m.** In addition, comments may be submitted at comments-southern-ozark-stfrancis@usda.gov up to 30 days following the date of publication of this legal notice in the *Courier*.

In the event requests are received, a notice of the date, time, and place of the public hearing will be published and advertised in the local media.

The Courier
 The Courier
 PO Box 1200
 Paducah, KY 42002-1200

Shana Williams
 Arkansas Department of Transportation
 P.O. Box 2261
 Little Rock, AR 72203

ADVERTISING INVOICE / STATEMENT 1/1

BILLING DATE	TERMS OF PAYMENT
08/29/2021	Standard Terms

BILLED ACCOUNT NO.	AGENCY/CLIENT
70041730	70041730
NAME OF AGENCY/CLIENT	
Arkansas Department of Transportation	

DATE	AD #	TRANS #	DESCRIPTION	INS	UNITS	AMOUNT	TOTAL
08/19/2021	70141336	300346801	Reference Job 080499 - 70141336 Reference 120RCD1 Russellville Courier -	1	8.43in	94.68	94.68
08/24/2021	70141336	300354802	120RCI1 RC Website - Reference Job Reference Job 080499 - 70141336 Reference 120RCD1 Russellville Courier -	1	8.43in	94.68	189.36
			120RCI1 RC Website - Reference Job	1	8.43in		

AUGUST 2021	AGING			
	July 2021	June 2021	May 2021	April 2021
\$ 189.36	\$ 0.00	\$ 0.00	\$ 0.00	\$ 0.00

TOTAL NET AMOUNT DUE**\$ 189.36**

**PLEASE RETURN THIS PORTION
 WITH YOUR REMITTANCE**

PMG underwent a system
 upgrade on March 24. You
 will see your balance
 transferred from the old
 system on that date.

If you desire to charge this amount to your credit card, please complete the following information
 and return to the address below: [] Visa [] Mastercard [] Discover [] American Express
 Acct# _____ Exp Date: _____
 Signature _____

BILLED ACCOUNT NO.	BILLED ACCOUNT NAME	AMOUNT DUE
120 70041730	Arkansas Department of Transportation	\$ 189.36

REMIT TO

The Courier
 c/o Paxton Media Group
 PO Box 1200
 Paducah, KY 42002-1200

Phone: 270-575-8731
 Fax: 270-575-8726

12070041730000000000000018936

Payment in full is due upon receipt of the statement. A service charge on all
 balances over 30 days will be computed by a 'Periodic Rate' of 1-1/2% per
 month, which is an ANNUAL PERCENTAGE RATE OF 18%, this applies to the
 previous balance after deducting current payments and credits appearing on
 your statement. Refunds less than \$10.00 will be refunded electronically,
 donated to NIE, or collected in cash at the newspaper.

Remittance Advice

700417300000000000000018936

Billing Date
 09/08/2021



ARKANSAS DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

ArDOT.gov | IDriveArkansas.com | Lorie H. Tudor, P.E., Director

ENVIRONMENTAL DIVISION

10324 Interstate 30 | P.O. Box 2261 | Little Rock, AR 72203-2261 | Phone: 501.569.2281 | Fax: 501.569.2009

June 29, 2021

Gerald Sanders
The Johnson County Graphic
Legal Advertising
P. O. Box 289
Clarksville, AR 72830
Email: gerald@thegraphic.org

Re: ARDOT Job 080499

Greetings:

Please publish the enclosed "Notice of Offering a Public Hearing" legal ad in the local news section on the following dates:

Wednesday, July 7, 2021
Wednesday, July 14, 2021

Send one copy of the proof of publication with invoice for payment to:

Arkansas Department of Transportation
Attention: Environmental Division / Shaná Williams
Reference Job 080499
P. O. Box 2261
Little Rock, Arkansas 72203
Phone: 501-569-2563
Fax: 501-569-2009

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Ruby Jordan-Johnson". The signature is written in a cursive, flowing style.

Ruby Jordan-Johnson
Section Head - Public Involvement
Environmental Division

Enclosure

NOTICE OF OFFERING A PUBLIC HEARING ON HIGHWAY IMPROVEMENTS

**Gee Creek Str. & Apprs. (Hwy. 123)
Job 080499
Johnson County**

The Arkansas Department of Transportation (ARDOT) is planning improvements to Highway 123 approximately 7.4 miles south of Highway 7 in Johnson County. The proposed improvements to Highway 123 include replacing the existing bridge over Gee Creek structural deficiencies with a three sided box culvert.

Plans showing location and design features of the anticipated work and information relative to environmental studies are available for public inspection and comment at the following locations:

- Website: www.ardot.gov/publicmeetings
- ARDOT's Resident Engineer Office #82, 2702 West Main, Clarksville, AR 72830. The office is open weekdays from 7:00 a.m. until 4:30 p.m.
- Johnson County Public Library, 2 Taylor Circle, Clarksville, AR 72830. The library hours vary, please contact (479) 754-3135.

Any interested citizen, in the vicinity of this proposed project, may request that a public hearing be held regarding this project and its economic and environmental effects by submitting a written request to the Arkansas Department of Transportation, Environmental Division, P.O. Box 2261, Little Rock, AR, 72203-2261 or email environmentalpublicmeetings@ardot.gov. Requests must be received on or before **August 19, 2021 at 4:30 p.m.**

In the event requests are received, a notice of the date, time, and place of the public hearing will be published and advertised in the local media.

-INVOICE-		203 EAST CHERRY STREET
JOHNSON COUNTY GRAPHIC, INC.		479-754-2005 • Fax: 479-754-2098
		Published Wednesday ads@TheGraphic.org
Date <u>7-14-21</u>	<u>P.O. Box 289 • Clarksville, AR 72830-0289</u>	
Arkansas Department of Transportation Environmental Division P.O. Box 2261 Little Rock, AR 72203		
LEGAL NOTICE		
Public Hearing Notice: Highway Improvements..Gee Creek Str. & Apprs. (Hwy 123) Job 080499		
236 words @ .35 per word per insertion.....\$165.20		
Published 7-7-21 and 7-14-21		

KS

RECEIVED
ARDOT
JUL 15 2021
ENVIRONMENTAL
DIVISION

**LEGAL NOTICES**

**NOTICE OF OFFERING A
PUBLIC HEARING
ON HIGHWAY
IMPROVEMENTS**

Gee Creek Str. and Apprs.
(Hwy123), Job 080499, Johnson
County

The Arkansas Department of Transportation (ARDOT) is planning improvements to Highway 123 approximately 7.4 miles south of Highway 7 in Johnson County. The proposed improvements to Highway 123 include replacing the existing bridge over Gee Creek structural deficiencies with a three sided box culvert.

Plans showing location and design features of the anticipated work and information relative to environmental studies are available for public inspection and comment at the following location:

- Website: www.ardot.gov/publicmeetings
- ArDOT's Resident Engineer Office #82, 2702 West Main, Clarksville, AR 72830. The office is open weekdays from 7:00 a.m. until 4:30 p.m.
- Johnson County Public Library, 2 Taylor Circle, Clarksville, AR 72830. The library hours vary, please contact (479) 754-3135.

Any interested citizen, in the vicinity of this proposed project, may request that a public hearing be held regarding this project and its economic and environmental effects by submitting a written request to the Arkansas Department of Transportation, Environmental Division, P.O. Box 2261, Little Rock, AR, 72203-261 or email environmentalmeetings@ardot.gov. Requests must be received on or before August 19, 2021, at 4:30 p.m.

In the event requests are received, a notice of the date, time, and place of the public hearing will be published and advertised in the local media.

(Published in the *Johnson County Graphic* July 7 and 14, 2021)



Proof of Publication

STATE OF ARKANSAS

COUNTY OF JOHNSON

I, RON WYLIE, publisher of The Johnson County Graphic, a weekly newspaper published at Clarksville in the County of Johnson, State of Arkansas, solemnly swear that the legal notice, of which the annexed is a true copy, was published in said newspaper 2 times, as follows:

7-07-21

7-14-21

and that the said newspaper was published and had a bona fide circulation in Johnson County, Arkansas, for more than one year before the first insertion and during the time of publication of the said legal notice.

Subscribed and sworn to before me this
15 day July, 2021.

Cost of Publication: \$ 165.20

My Commission Expires 7-11-30

ARKANSAS DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION (ARDOT)

CITIZEN COMMENT FORM

Public Hearing Offering

ARDOT Job 080499

Gee Creek Str. & Apprs. (Hwy. 123)

Johnson County

Location:

**Johnson County Public Library
2 Taylor Circle, Clarksville, AR, 72830**

July 15, 2021 through August 19, 2021

Please Print

Date: _____

Name: _____

Address: _____

Street Address

City, State, Zip

Comments:

(Use additional sheets if necessary)

Mail, fax or email you comments by 4:30 p.m., Thursday, August 19, 2021 to the following information below:

Arkansas Department of Transportation

Environmental Division

P.O. Box 2261

Little Rock, Arkansas 72203-2261

Telephone: 501-569-2281

Fax: 501-569-2009

Email: environmentalpmmeetings@ardot.gov

For additional information, please visit our website at www.ardot.gov/publicmeetings



PUBLIC REGISTER

Date: July 15, 2021

Location: Johnson County Public Library
Job Name: Gee Creek Str. & Apprs.

Job 080499

<i>PLEASE PRINT</i> Name	Street or P.O. Box	City, Zip	Representing: Organization or "Self"	How did you hear about this meeting? (Radio, Newspaper, Flyer, etc.)
1.				
2.				
3.				
4.				
5.				
6.				
7.				
8.				
9.				
10.				
11.				
12.				
13.				
14.				
15.				
16.				
17.				
18.				
19.				
20.				

ARKANSAS DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION (ARDOT)

CITIZEN COMMENT FORM

Public Hearing Offering

ARDOT Job 080499

Gee Creek Str. & Apprs. (Hwy. 123)

Johnson County

Location:

Pope County Library-Russellville Main Branch

116 E 3rd St., Russellville, AR, 72801

August 19, 2021 through September 20, 2021

Please Print

Date: _____

Name: _____

Address: _____

Street Address

City, State, Zip

Comments:

(Use additional sheets if necessary)

Mail, fax or email you comments by 4:30 p.m., Monday, September 20, 2021 to the following information below:

Arkansas Department of Transportation

Environmental Division

P.O. Box 2261

Little Rock, Arkansas 72203-2261

Telephone: 501-569-2281

Fax: 501-569-2009

Email: environmentalpmmeetings@ardot.gov

For additional information, please visit our website at www.ardot.gov/publicmeetings



PUBLIC REGISTER**Date: August 19, 2021****Location: Pope County Library-Russellville Main Branch****Job 080499****Job Name: Gee Creek Str. & Apprs.**

<i>PLEASE PRINT Name</i>	Street or P.O. Box	City, Zip	Representing: Organization or "Self"	How did you hear about the availability of the project information?
1.				
2.				
3.				
4.				
5.				
6.				
7.				
8.				
9.				
10.				
11.				
12.				
13.				
14.				
15.				
16.				
17.				
18.				
19.				

ARKANSAS DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION (ARDOT)**CITIZEN COMMENT FORM****Public Hearing Offering****ARDOT Job 080499****Gee Creek Str. & Apprs. (Hwy. 123)****Johnson County****Location:****ARDOT District 8 Office****372 Aspen Lane, Russellville, AR, 72811****August 19, 2021 through September 20, 2021**

Please Print

Date: _____

Name: _____

Address: _____

Street Address

City, State, Zip

Comments:

(Use additional sheets if necessary)

Mail, fax or email you comments by 4:30 p.m. Monday, September 2021, to the following information below:

Arkansas Department of Transportation

Environmental Division

P.O. Box 2261

Little Rock, Arkansas 72203-2261

Telephone: 501-569-2281

Fax: 501-569-2009

Email: environmentalpublicmeetings@ardot.govFor additional information, please visit our website at www.ardot.gov/publicmeetings

PUBLIC REGISTER

Date: August 19, 2021

Location: ARDOT District 8 Office
Job Name: Gee Creek Str. & Apprs.

Job 080499

<i>PLEASE PRINT Name</i>	Street or P.O. Box	City, Zip	Representing: Organization or "Self"	How did you hear about the availability of the project information?
1.				
2.				
3.				
4.				
5.				
6.				
7.				
8.				
9.				
10.				
11.				
12.				
13.				
14.				
15.				
16.				
17.				
18.				
19.				
20.				

ARKANSAS DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION (ARDOT)**CITIZEN COMMENT FORM****Public Hearing Offering****ARDOT Job 080499****Gee Creek Str. & Apprs. (Hwy. 123)****Johnson County****Location:****ARDOT Resident Engineer Office
2702 West Main, Clarksville, AR, 72830****July 15, 2021 through August 19, 2021**

Please Print

Date: _____

Name: _____

Address: _____

Street Address

City, State, Zip

Comments:

(Use additional sheets if necessary)

Mail, fax or email you comments by 4:30 p.m., Monday, August 19, 2021 to the following information below:

Arkansas Department of Transportation

Environmental Division

P.O. Box 2261

Little Rock, Arkansas 72203-2261

Telephone: 501-569-2281

Fax: 501-569-2009

Email: environmentalpmmeetings@ardot.govFor additional information, please visit our website at www.ardot.gov/publicmeetings

PUBLIC REGISTER**Date: July 15, 2021****Location: Resident Engineer Office #82**
Job Name: Gee Creek Str. & Apprs.**Job No: 080499**

<i>PLEASE PRINT</i> Name	Street or P.O. Box	City, Zip	Representing: Organization or "Self"	How did you hear about this meeting? (Radio, Newspaper, Flyer, etc.)
1.				
2.				
3.				
4.				
5.				
6.				
7.				
8.				
9.				
10.				
11.				
12.				
13.				
14.				
15.				
16.				
17.				
18.				
19.				
20.				

Appendix B – AGENCY EA COMMENTS



STATE OF ARKANSAS

Department of Finance and Administration

OFFICE OF INTERGOVERNMENTAL SERVICES

1515 West Seventh Street, Suite 412

Post Office Box 8031

Little Rock, Arkansas 72203-8031

Phone: (501) 682-1074

Fax: (501) 682-5206

<https://www.dfa.arkansas.gov/intergovernmental-services>

MEMORANDUM

TO: Technical Review Committee Members

FROM: State Clearinghouse

DATE: June 16, 2021

SUBJECT: Environmental Assessment # 3170
Arkansas Dept. of Transportation-Job 080499-Hwy 123 Bridge Replacement
Randal Looney FHWA, John Fleming ArDOT- Johnson County, Arkansas

Please review the above stated document under the provisions of the National Historic Preservation Act (1966), National Environmental Policy Act (1969), Clean Water Act (1972), Environmental Assessments / Environmental Impact Statements and the Arkansas Project Notification and Review System.

Your comments should be emailed by **July 7th** to [Laura Brown](mailto:Laura.Brown@arkansas.gov), Laura.Brown@arkansas.gov from the office of Arkansas Natural Resources Commission (ANRC). The Director of ANRC and the Technical Review Committee Chairman is Bruce Holland. Ms. Brown will ensure that he is informed of any needed information.

It is imperative that your response be sent by the date requested. If you have "No Comments," this should be indicated below and submitted. Should your Agency anticipate having a response which will be delayed beyond the stated deadline for comments, please contact [Laura Brown](mailto:Laura.Brown@arkansas.gov) at (501) 682-3985 or the [State Clearinghouse Office](mailto:State.Clearinghouse@arkansas.gov) at (501) 683-0927.

☐ Support	☐ Do Not Support (Comments Attached)
☐ Comments Attached	☐ Support with Following Conditions
☒ No Comments	☐ Non-Degradation Certification Issues (Applies to ADEQ Only)

Name (Print) Jeff LeMaster Date July 7, 2021

Agency Division of Environmental Quality Phone Number 501.682.0740



Asa Hutchinson
Governor

ARKANSAS DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

1 Natural Resources Drive, Little Rock, AR 72205
agriculture.arkansas.gov
(501) 225-1598



Wes Ward
Secretary of Agriculture

MEMORANDUM

TO: Christopher Rice
State Clearinghouse

FROM: Bruce Holland, Chairman
Technical Review Committee

SUBJECT: # 3170 Environmental Assessment
Arkansas Dept. of Transportation Job #080499
Hwy 123 Bridge Replacement – Johnson County, Arkansas

DATE: July 7, 2021



Members of the Technical Review Committee have reviewed the above referenced project:

The Arkansas Department of Transportation is proposing to replace the Highway 123 roadway bridge over Gee Creek in Johnson County. Highway 123 is functionally classified as a major collector connecting Interstate 40 near Clarksville and Highway 65 south of Harrison. It crosses the Ozark-St. Francis national Forests, connecting several U.S. Forest Service recreational areas and campgrounds, the Buffalo National River, the Gene Rush Buffalo River Management Area, and several state highways including an arterial route, Highway 7. Highway 123 provides recreational access to Haw Creek Falls Recreation Area and Campground and serving as an arterial highway for logging trucks. The bridge over Gee Creek was constructed in 1938 and has been reinforced many times since its original construction. The purpose of the project is to correct existing structural deficiencies in the bridge that if not corrected will result in escalating maintenance costs and eventual closure. No significant environmental concerns have been identified at this time as long as proper permits are obtained before construction begins. Agency comments are included for your review.

The Committee supports this project with the following conditions:

- 1) The applicant obtains a Construction Stormwater General Permit and short-term activity authorization from the Arkansas Division of Environmental Quality before construction activity begins.
- 2) If proposed activities disturb at least one acre or more on the project site, a Construction Stormwater Permit will need to be obtained from the Division of Environmental Quality before any activity begins.

Memorandum

Page 2.

July 7, 2021

- 3) Appropriate erosion control measures should be implemented during demolition and construction activities to minimize impacts to Gee Creek water quality.

The opportunity to comment is appreciated.

BH/lab



STATE OF ARKANSAS

Department of Finance and Administration

OFFICE OF INTERGOVERNMENTAL SERVICES

1515 West Seventh Street, Suite 412

Post Office Box 8031

Little Rock, Arkansas 72203-8031

Phone: (501) 682-1074

Fax: (501) 682-5206

<https://www.dfa.arkansas.gov/intergovernmental-services>

MEMORANDUM

TO: Technical Review Committee Members

FROM: State Clearinghouse

DATE: June 16, 2021

SUBJECT: Environmental Assessment # 3170
Arkansas Dept. of Transportation-Job 080499-Hwy 123 Bridge Replacement
Randal Looney FHWA, John Fleming ArDOT- Johnson County, Arkansas

Please review the above stated document under the provisions of the National Historic Preservation Act (1966), National Environmental Policy Act (1969), Clean Water Act (1972), Environmental Assessments / Environmental Impact Statements and the Arkansas Project Notification and Review System.

Your comments should be emailed by **July 7th** to [Laura Brown](mailto:Laura.Brown@arkansas.gov), Laura.Brown@arkansas.gov from the office of Arkansas Natural Resources Commission (ANRC). The Director of ANRC and the Technical Review Committee Chairman is Bruce Holland. Ms. Brown will ensure that he is informed of any needed information.

It is imperative that your response be sent by the date requested. If you have "No Comments," this should be indicated below and submitted. Should your Agency anticipate having a response which will be delayed beyond the stated deadline for comments, please contact [Laura Brown](mailto:Laura.Brown@arkansas.gov) at (501) 682-3985 or the [State Clearinghouse Office](mailto:State.Clearinghouse@arkansas.gov) at (501) 683-0927.

☐ Support	☐ Do Not Support (Comments Attached)
☐ Comments Attached	☐ Support with Following Conditions
☒ No Comments	☐ Non-Degradation Certification Issues (Applies to ADEQ Only)

Name (Print) John Beasley BMP Forester _____

Date 6/23/21 _____

Agency Arkansas Agriculture Department _____ Phone _____

Number 870-312-9999 _____



STATE OF ARKANSAS

Department of Finance and Administration

OFFICE OF INTERGOVERNMENTAL SERVICES

1515 West Seventh Street, Suite 412

Post Office Box 8031

Little Rock, Arkansas 72203-8031

Phone: (501) 682-1074

Fax: (501) 682-5206

<https://www.dfa.arkansas.gov/intergovernmental-services>

MEMORANDUM

TO: Technical Review Committee Members

FROM: State Clearinghouse

DATE: June 16, 2021

SUBJECT: Environmental Assessment # 3170
Arkansas Dept. of Transportation-Job 080499-Hwy 123 Bridge Replacement
Randal Looney FHWA, John Fleming ArDOT- Johnson County, Arkansas

Please review the above stated document under the provisions of the National Historic Preservation Act (1966), National Environmental Policy Act (1969), Clean Water Act (1972), Environmental Assessments / Environmental Impact Statements and the Arkansas Project Notification and Review System.

Your comments should be emailed by **July 7th** to [Laura Brown, Laura.Brown@arkansas.gov](mailto:Laura.Brown@arkansas.gov) from the office of Arkansas Natural Resources Commission (ANRC). The Director of ANRC and the Technical Review Committee Chairman is Bruce Holland. Ms. Brown will ensure that he is informed of any needed information.

It is imperative that your response be sent by the date requested. If you have "No Comments," this should be indicated below and submitted. Should your Agency anticipate having a response which will be delayed beyond the stated deadline for comments, please contact [Laura Brown](mailto:Laura.Brown@arkansas.gov) at (501) 682-3985 or the [State Clearinghouse Office](mailto:State.Clearinghouse@arkansas.gov) at (501) 683-0927.

_____ Support _____ Do Not Support (Comments Attached)

_____ Comments Attached _____ Support with Following Conditions

X _____ No Comments _____ Non-Degradation Certification Issues
(Applies to ADEQ Only)

Name (Print) _____ Trevor Drown _____ Date _____ June 23, 2021 _____

Agency _____ Commissioner of State Lands _____ Phone Number _____ 501-291-9430 _____



STATE OF ARKANSAS

Department of Finance and Administration

OFFICE OF INTERGOVERNMENTAL SERVICES

1515 West Seventh Street, Suite 412
Post Office Box 8031
Little Rock, Arkansas 72203-8031
Phone: (501) 682-1074
Fax: (501) 682-5206

<https://www.dfa.arkansas.gov/intergovernmental-services>

MEMORANDUM

TO: Technical Review Committee Members

FROM: State Clearinghouse

DATE: June 16, 2021

SUBJECT: Environmental Assessment # ³¹⁷⁰3169
Arkansas Dept. of Transportation-Job 080499-Hwy 123 Bridge Replacement
Randal Looney FHWA, John Fleming ArDOT- Johnson County, Arkansas

Please review the above stated document under the provisions of the National Historic Preservation Act (1966), National Environmental Policy Act (1969), Clean Water Act (1972), Environmental Assessments / Environmental Impact Statements and the Arkansas Project Notification and Review System.

Your comments should be emailed by (DATE) to [Laura Brown](mailto:Laura.Brown@arkansas.gov), Laura.Brown@arkansas.gov from the office of Arkansas Natural Resources Commission (ANRC). The Director of ANRC and the Technical Review Committee Chairman is Bruce Holland. Ms. Brown will ensure that he is informed of any needed information.

It is imperative that your response be sent by the date requested. If you have "No Comments," this should be indicated below and submitted. Should your Agency anticipate having a response which will be delayed beyond the stated deadline for comments, please contact [Laura Brown](mailto:Laura.Brown@arkansas.gov) at (501) 682-3985 or the [State Clearinghouse Office](mailto:Laura.Brown@arkansas.gov) at (501) 683-0927.

☒ Support ☐ Do Not Support (Comments Attached)

☐ Comments Attached ☐ Support with Following Conditions

☒ No Comments ☐ Non-Degradation Certification Issues
(Applies to ADEQ Only)

Name (Print) William Lee Prior Date 6-21-2021

Agency) Arkansas Geological Survey- E & E. Phone Number 501-684-0117



STATE OF ARKANSAS

Department of Finance and Administration

OFFICE OF INTERGOVERNMENTAL SERVICES

1515 West Seventh Street, Suite 412
Post Office Box 8031
Little Rock, Arkansas 72203-8031
Phone: (501) 682-1074
Fax: (501) 682-5206

<https://www.dfa.arkansas.gov/intergovernmental-services>

MEMORANDUM

TO: Technical Review Committee Members

FROM: State Clearinghouse

DATE: June 16, 2021

SUBJECT: Environmental Assessment # 3170
Arkansas Dept. of Transportation-Job 080499-Hwy 123 Bridge Replacement
Randal Looney FHWA, John Fleming ArDOT- Johnson County, Arkansas

Please review the above stated document under the provisions of the National Historic Preservation Act (1966), National Environmental Policy Act (1969), Clean Water Act (1972), Environmental Assessments / Environmental Impact Statements and the Arkansas Project Notification and Review System.

Your comments should be emailed by **July 7th** to [Laura Brown](mailto:Laura.Brown@arkansas.gov), Laura.Brown@arkansas.gov from the office of Arkansas Natural Resources Commission (ANRC). The Director of ANRC and the Technical Review Committee Chairman is Bruce Holland. Ms. Brown will ensure that he is informed of any needed information.

It is imperative that your response be sent by the date requested. If you have "No Comments," this should be indicated below and submitted. Should your Agency anticipate having a response which will be delayed beyond the stated deadline for comments, please contact [Laura Brown](mailto:Laura.Brown@arkansas.gov) at (501) 682-3985 or the [State Clearinghouse Office](mailto:State.Clearinghouse@arkansas.gov) at (501) 683-0927.

☐ Support	☐ Do Not Support (Comments Attached)
☐ Comments Attached	☐ Support with Following Conditions
☒ No Comments	☐ Non-Degradation Certification Issues (Applies to ADEQ Only)

Name (Print) Darren Spinks Date 6/25/2021

Agency Arkansas Department of Agriculture, Forestry Division Phone Number (501) 944-2577



STATE OF ARKANSAS

Department of Finance and Administration

OFFICE OF INTERGOVERNMENTAL SERVICES

1515 West Seventh Street, Suite 412

Post Office Box 8031

Little Rock, Arkansas 72203-8031

Phone: (501) 682-1074

Fax: (501) 682-5206

<https://www.dfa.arkansas.gov/intergovernmental-services>

MEMORANDUM

TO: Technical Review Committee Members

FROM: State Clearinghouse

DATE: June 16, 2021

SUBJECT: Environmental Assessment # 3170
Arkansas Dept. of Transportation-Job 080499-Hwy 123 Bridge Replacement
Randal Looney FHWA, John Fleming ArDOT- Johnson County, Arkansas

Please review the above stated document under the provisions of the National Historic Preservation Act (1966), National Environmental Policy Act (1969), Clean Water Act (1972), Environmental Assessments / Environmental Impact Statements and the Arkansas Project Notification and Review System.

Your comments should be emailed by **July 7th** to [Laura Brown](mailto:Laura.Brown@arkansas.gov), Laura.Brown@arkansas.gov from the office of Arkansas Natural Resources Commission (ANRC). The Director of ANRC and the Technical Review Committee Chairman is Bruce Holland. Ms. Brown will ensure that he is informed of any needed information.

It is imperative that your response be sent by the date requested. If you have "No Comments," this should be indicated below and submitted. Should your Agency anticipate having a response which will be delayed beyond the stated deadline for comments, please contact [Laura Brown](mailto:Laura.Brown@arkansas.gov) at (501) 682-3985 or the [State Clearinghouse Office](mailto:Laura.Brown@arkansas.gov) at (501) 683-0927.

☐ Support	☐ Do Not Support (Comments Attached)
☒ Comments Attached	☐ Support with Following Conditions
☐ No Comments	☐ Non-Degradation Certification Issues (Applies to ADEQ Only)

No apparent or immediate conflict with public outdoor recreation sites monitored by the Outdoor Recreation Grants Program.

We are pleased that the project appears to have no adverse effect on the adjacent Ozark Highlands Trail and Haw Creek Falls Recreation Area (USFS – OSFNF).

Name: (Print) Randy Roberson Date June 25, 2021
Arkansas Department of Parks, Heritage & Tourism,
Agency: Outdoor Recreation Grants Program Phone Number 682-6946



STATE OF ARKANSAS

Department of Finance and Administration

OFFICE OF INTERGOVERNMENTAL SERVICES

1515 West Seventh Street, Suite 412
Post Office Box 8031
Little Rock, Arkansas 72203-8031
Phone: (501) 682-1074
Fax: (501) 682-5206

<https://www.dfa.arkansas.gov/intergovernmental-services>

MEMORANDUM

TO: Technical Review Committee Members

FROM: State Clearinghouse

DATE: June 16, 2021

SUBJECT: Environmental Assessment # 3170
Arkansas Dept. of Transportation-Job 080499-Hwy 123 Bridge Replacement
Randal Looney FHWA, John Fleming ArDOT- Johnson County, Arkansas

Please review the above stated document under the provisions of the National Historic Preservation Act (1966), National Environmental Policy Act (1969), Clean Water Act (1972), Environmental Assessments / Environmental Impact Statements and the Arkansas Project Notification and Review System.

Your comments should be emailed by **July 7th** to [Laura Brown](mailto:Laura.Brown@arkansas.gov), Laura.Brown@arkansas.gov from the office of Arkansas Natural Resources Commission (ANRC). The Director of ANRC and the Technical Review Committee Chairman is Bruce Holland. Ms. Brown will ensure that he is informed of any needed information.

It is imperative that your response be sent by the date requested. If you have "No Comments," this should be indicated below and submitted. Should your Agency anticipate having a response which will be delayed beyond the stated deadline for comments, please contact [Laura Brown](mailto:Laura.Brown@arkansas.gov) at (501) 682-3985 or the [State Clearinghouse Office](mailto:State.Clearinghouse@arkansas.gov) at (501) 683-0927.

☒ Support	☐ Do Not Support (Comments Attached)
☐ Comments Attached	☐ Support with Following Conditions
☒ No Comments	☐ Non-Degradation Certification Issues (Applies to ADEQ Only)

Name (Print) KEN BRADY Date 6/30/21

Agency ADA, NATURAL RESOURCES DIVISION Phone Number _____



Asa Hutchinson
Governor
Stacy Hurst
Secretary

July 15, 2021

Mr. John Fleming
Division Head
Environmental Division
Arkansas Department of Transportation
P.O. Box 2261
Little Rock, AR 72203-2261

Re: Johnson County – General
Section 106 Review – FHWA
Gee Creek Str. & Apprs. (S)
Route 123, Section 3
Environmental Assessment – *ARDOT Job 080499 Highway 123 Bridge Replacement: Gee Creek Str. & Apprs. Environmental Assessment* (May 2021)
ARDOT Job Number 080499
AHPP Tracking Number 99492.06

Dear Mr. Fleming:

The staff of the Arkansas Historic Preservation Program (AHPP) reviewed the above-referenced environmental assessment (EA) for Arkansas Department of Transportation Job 080499. The EA provides the incorrect effect finding for the Build Alternative. The EA notes the State Historic Preservation Officer review resulted in a finding of no adverse effect. Our letter dated October 11, 2019 (AHPP Tracking Number 99492.04) in Appendix B of the EA, provided our concurrence with a finding of no historic properties affected. We request amending the EA to provide the correct effect finding.

In correspondence dated April 1, 2019 (AHPP Tracking Number 99492.02), the AHPP concurred that Bridge M1864 is not eligible for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). The AHPP also upholds our concurrence that Site 3JO0827 is not eligible for inclusion in the NRHP and with the finding of **no historic properties affected pursuant to 36 CFR § 800.4(d)(1).**

Thank you for the opportunity to review this EA. If you have any questions, please contact Eric Mills of my staff at (501) 324-9784 or eric.mills@arkansas.gov.

Sincerely,

for
Scott Kaufman
Director, AHPP

cc: Mr. Randal Looney, Federal Highway Administration
Dr. Melissa Zabecki, Arkansas Archeological Survey

Appendix C – INVENTORIED ROADLESS AREA APPROVAL



Forest Service

Southern Region

1720 Peachtree Street, NW
Atlanta, GA 30309**File Code:** 1920**Date:** August 31, 2021**Route To:****Subject:** Ozark-St. Francis Gee Creek**To:** Forest Supervisor, Ozark-St. Francis National Forest

This is in response to your letter of July 20, 2021 and supporting documentation, requesting Regional Forester review of a proposed highway improvement including the replacement of the Gee Creek bridge structures and approaches on State Highway 123 in Johnson County, Arkansas. The proposal is consistent with 36 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 294. The Forest is seeking concurrence of the proposed project in cooperation with the Arkansas Department of Transportation (ARDOT).

This project is a Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)-funded project. Public safety and environmental damage would be improved by the project and the Roadless Rule allows for these activities. The project would prevent bridge failure and highway closures and accidents by replacing a bridge that is not structurally sound. The existing bridge has had numerous interim reinforcements added in the past to remove weight restrictions to accommodate heavy loads for highway bridge work further down Highway 123 and extend the life of the bridge until it could be replaced. The bridge would continue to need more extensive repairs as the condition deteriorates if it is not replaced. The inspection report for the bridge lists the condition of the superstructure as 4 (poor, indicative of advanced deterioration) and deck and substructure as 5 (fair, indicative of minor section loss).

The proposed bridge replacement over Gee Creek would require only 0.5 acre of easements from the Gee Creek IRA and an additional 2.0 acres of easements from the Ozark-St. Francis National Forests, negligible compared to the total acreage of the Gee Creek IRA (7,948 acres) and the Ozark-St. Francis National Forests (over 1.2 million acres). Existing access points within the Gee Creek IRA would be maintained, but no additional access points into the IRA would be constructed under the subject project.

The bridge would be replaced next to the existing structure, on the non-IRA downstream side of the existing highway, in order to maintain traffic during construction. The new structure would be a bottomless concrete culvert to accommodate fish passage and better maintain the natural channel over time. An FHWA Environmental Assessment (EA) will be prepared with the Forest Service participating as a National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) cooperating agency.

The proposed project affects only Forest Service land on existing and proposed ARDOT easements. Merchantable timber that would be impacted by the proposed project within the Gee Creek IRA has been inventoried by certified Forest Service timber cruisers. A Location and Design Public Hearing will be offered following the approval of the EA for public dissemination. No public opposition is expected.



Forest Supervisor, Ozark-St. Francis National Forest

2

The Regional Office believes that changing the southern boundary of Gee Creek IRA is appropriate for improving the safety of highway users. Therefore, I approve your request to proceed with the respective NEPA documentation.

If you have any questions or concerns, please contact Stephanie "Lee" Madson at 404-527-9659 or Stephanie Medlin 423-790-2817.



KENDERICK ARNEY
Regional Forester

cc: Stephanie Medlin, Amy Burt