

# Draft Environmental Assessment

## Kenney Fort Boulevard Segments 2 & 3 City of Round Rock, Austin District

Project limits: From Forest Creek Drive south to State Highway 45 North

CSJ Number: 0914-05-195

Williamson County, Texas

October 2020

The environmental review, consultation, and other actions required by applicable Federal environmental laws for this project are being, or have been, carried-out by TxDOT pursuant to 23 U.S.C. 327 and a Memorandum of Understanding dated December 9, 2019, and executed by FHWA and TxDOT.

## Table of Contents

<ol> <li>Introduction</li> <li>Project Description</li> </ol>	1 2
<ul><li>2.1 Existing Facility</li><li>2.2 Proposed Facility</li></ul>	2 2
3.0 Purpose and Need	4
<ul><li>3.1 Need</li><li>3.2 Supporting Facts and/or Data</li><li>3.3 Purpose</li></ul>	4 4 5
4.0 Alternatives	6
<ul> <li>4.1 Build Alternative</li></ul>	6 6 ation 6
5.0 Affected Environment and Environmental Consequences	8
<ul><li>5.1 Right-Of-Way/Displacements</li><li>5.2 Land Use</li><li>5.3 Farmlands</li></ul>	8 9 9
5.4 Utility Relocation	9
5.5 Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities	10
5.7 Visual/Aesthetic Impacts	11
5.8 Cultural Resources	12
5.9 Protected Lands	13
5.10 Water Resources	13
5.11 Biological Resources	20
5.13 Hazardous Materials	
5.14 Traffic Noise	26
5.15 Induced Growth	28
5.16 Cumulative Impacts	30
5.17 Construction Phase Impacts	30
6.0 Agency Coordination	32
7.0 Public Involvement.	33
8.0 Post-Environmental Clearance Activities and Design/Construction	31
8.1 Post-Environmental Clearance Activities	34
	33
9.0 Conclusion	40
11.0 Appendices	41

	List of Abbreviations and Acronyms
AADT	Average Annual Daily Traffic
ACT	Antiquities Code of Texas
ADT	Average Daily Traffic
AOI	Area of Influence
APE	Area of Potential Effects
BMPs	Best Management Practices
CAMPO	Capital Area Metropolitan Planning Organization
CEQ	Council on Environmental Quality
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
CGP	Construction General Permit
CO	Carbon Monoxide
CWA	Clean Water Act
EA	Environmental Assessment
EMST	Ecological Mapping Systems of Texas
EO	Executive Order
EPA	Environmental Protection Agency
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency
FHWA	Federal Highway Administration
FPPA	Farmland Protection Policy Act
IBWC	International Boundary Water Commission
ISA	Initial Site Assessment
LEP	Limited English Proficiency
MBTA	Migratory Bird Treaty Act
MOU	Memorandum of Understanding
MSAT	Mobile Source Air Toxics
MS4	Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System
NAAQS	National Ambient Air Quality Standards
NDD	Natural Diversity Database
NEPA	National Environmental Policy Act of 1969
NHL	National Historic Landmark
NRHP	National Register of Historic Places
NWP	Nationwide Permit
PCN	Pre-construction Notification
PCR	Project Coordination Request
PM	Particulate Matter
PS&E	Plans, Specifications, and Estimates
ROW	Right-of-Way
RTHL	Recorded Texas Historic Landmark
SAL	State Antiquities Landmark
SGCN	Species of Greatest Conservation Need
SH	Śtate Highway
SHPO	State Historic Preservation Officer
SSA	Survey Study Area
SWP3	Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan
TAC	Texas Administrative Code
TCEQ	Texas Commission on Environmental Quality
THC	Texas Historical Commission

TMDL	Total Daily Maximum Load
TPDES	Texas Pollutant Discharge Elimination System
TPWD	Texas Parks and Wildlife Department
TWDB	Texas Water Development Board
TxDOT	Texas Department of Transportation
US	United States Highway
U.S.	United States
USACE	United States Army Corps of Engineers
USFWS	United States Fish and Wildlife Service
VPD	Vehicles Per Day

## **1.0 INTRODUCTION**

The City of Round Rock, in partnership with Williamson County and the Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT), is developing a project to construct Segments 2 and 3 of Kenney Fort Boulevard (KFB). KFB, also referred to as Arterial A, is identified as a major arterial roadway in the City of Round Rock's Transportation Master Plan. It has been included in the City's Transportation Master Plan since 1999 and is being constructed in phases. KFB Segment 1, which extends between Joe DiMaggio Boulevard (just north of US 79) and Forest Creek Drive, was completed during the summer of 2013. KFB Segments 2 and 3, contemplated in this environmental assessment (EA), would extend from Forest Creek Drive south to State Highway (SH) 45. Completing KFB Segments 2 and 3 would eliminate an existing gap in the city's transportation network while enhancing mobility and providing an additional route for north/south traffic in this rapidly developing quadrant of the City of Round Rock. **Appendix A** shows the project location in relation to the City of Round Rock and Williamson County. **Appendix B** contains photographs of the project area.

The proposed project would be to construct a limited-access six-lane divided major arterial. Three 12-foot travel lanes would be constructed in each direction. Continuous sidewalk and a shared use path to connect neighborhoods along the route to the existing Brushy Creek Trail System and Old Settler's Park would also be constructed. A schematic (plan view) of the proposed improvements in included in **Appendix C** and typical sections are included in **Appendix D**.

The City initiated development of KFB Segments 2 and 3 in 2016. At that time, no federal funding was anticipated. In late 2017, the City applied for federal construction funding through the Capital Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (CAMPO). In the spring of 2018, CAMPO awarded \$12,250,000 to the City of Round Rock to construct this regionally significant roadway. Award of the construction funding triggered the requirements of TxDOT's environmental review rules and the National Environmental Policy Act.

The purpose of this EA is to study the potential environmental consequences of the proposed KFB Segments 2 and 3 project and determine whether those consequences warrant preparation of an environmental impact statement. If, upon completion of the environmental review process, TxDOT determines the proposed project would have no significant adverse effects, TxDOT will prepare and sign a finding of no significant impact (FONSI) and make the FONSI available to the public.

## 2.0 PROJECT DESCRIPTION

#### 2.1 Existing Facility

The proposed KFB Segments 2 and 3 project would be a new location facility; therefore, there is no existing facility within the project limits. Proposed KFB Segments 2 and 3 would serve as an extension of existing KFB Segment 1. Segments 2 and 3, as described below, continue the design and typical section of Segment 1.

#### 2.2 Proposed Facility

The proposed KFB Segments 2 and 3 project would be on a new location beginning at Forest Drive and would terminate at SH 45 North in Round Rock, Williamson County, Texas. When SH 45 North was constructed, it included a grade separation specifically intended to accommodate what was then referred to as Arterial A (now known as KFB). As proposed, KFB would terminate at that existing grade separation.

The proposed KFB Segments 2 and 3 typical section would match KFB Segment 1. The roadway would be a limited-access six-lane divided major arterial consisting of three 12-foot travel lanes. Directions of travel would be separated by a variable-width raised median. Curb, gutter and storm sewer would be installed the entire length of the project. A continuous sidewalk and a shared use path would connect neighborhoods along the route to the existing Brushy Creek Trail System and Old Settler's Park. Improvements to the intersections of KFB with Gattis School Road and SH 45 North would be included in the project.

Much of the project corridor has been preserved for transportation use, including a portion of an abandoned MKT rail line (the "MoKan corridor") (purchased in the early 1990s by TxDOT through a multi-jurisdictional partnership of local entities and currently held in the name of the State of Texas). In total, 35.9 acres of right-of-way (ROW) is required for the proposed project. Of that, 12.6 acres is currently owned by TxDOT and/or the State of Texas and 23.04 acres is owned by the City of Round Rock (purchased "at risk" for the KFB Segments 2 and 3 project). The City is currently negotiating with the owner of the remaining 0.26 acre to purchase the needed ROW. In addition, a permanent easement would occur on 0.2 acre of private land.

Federal regulations require that federally funded transportation projects have logical termini (23 CFR 771.111(f)(1)). Simply stated, this means that a project must have rational beginning and end points. Those end points may not be created simply to avoid proper analysis of environmental impacts. KFB Segments 2 and 3 will extend existing KFB limits from Forest Creek Drive to Gattis School Road (Segment 2) and from Gattis School Road to SH 45 North (Segment 3). These begin/end points are rational for the proposed project as they close the gap between the existing Kenney Fort Boulevard Segment 1 and SH 45 North creating the much-needed north/south travel corridor in an area that is lacking that connection.

Federal regulations require that a project have independent utility and be a reasonable expenditure even if no other transportation improvements are made in the area (23 CFR 771.111(f)(2)). This means a project must be able to provide benefit by itself, and that the

project not compel further expenditures to make the project useful. Stated another way, a project must be able to satisfy its purpose and need with no other projects being built. As proposed, the KFB Segments 2 and 3 project addresses specific transportation needs identified within the project area. Specifically, the proposed project would create a north/south travel corridor between Forest Drive and SH 45 North where one currently does not exist. The project does not depend on another project since it would begin at the intersection of Forest Creek Drive and existing KFB Segment 1. The proposed project would terminate at SH 45 North – a major thoroughfare which connects to IH 35 (to the west) and SH 130 (to the east). Although the connections to IH 35 and SH 130 greatly enhance the regional transportation network, the mobility benefits of the proposed Kenney Fort Boulevard project stand alone. Realization of these benefits is not dependent upon other projects/future actions; thus, the proposed project passes the test of independent utility. Further, because the project would stand alone and is not dependent upon other (future) improvements to properly function, it would not compel further expenditure of funds. For this reason, it cannot and does not irretrievably commit future federal funds.

Federal law prohibits a project from restricting consideration of alternatives for other reasonably foreseeable transportation improvements (23 CFR 771.111(f)(3)). This means that a project must not dictate or restrict any future roadway alternatives. SH 45 North would be the ultimate terminus for KFB. SH 45 serves as the boundary between Round Rock and the City of Pflugerville. Pflugerville has no plans to extend KFB south of SH 45. As proposed, the KFB Segments 2 and 3 project would in no way limit consideration of improvements, or alternatives for construction of such improvements, in adjoining sections of KFB (north of Forest Creek Drive) or other transportation projects in the region. For this reason, the proposed project does not foreclose consideration of alternatives for other reasonably foreseeable transportation improvements.

The project location can be reviewed in **Appendix A** and schematics and typical sections are included in **Appendices C** and **D**, respectively. The estimated cost of the proposed KFB Segments 2 and 3 project is \$21.4 million. The project would be financed with a combination of local and federal financing. The proposed KFB project is included in the City of Round Rock Transportation Master Plan, Williamson County Long Range Plan, and Capitol Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (CAMPO) 2045 Regional Transportation Plan. A copy of applicable pages from these plans are included in **Appendix E**.

## 3.0 PURPOSE AND NEED

 Table 3-1 outlines the purpose and need for the proposed KFB Segments 2 and 3 project.

Desired Outcome (Purpose)	Condition to be Addressed (Need)						
<ul> <li>Enhance mobility in the project area</li> <li>Facilitate north/south movement of traffic</li> <li>Eliminate a gap between the existing KFB and SH 45 North</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Increasing traffic volumes are adversely affecting mobility with the project area</li> <li>Lack of north/south travel corridors within the project area</li> <li>Gap between the existing KFB and SH 45 North</li> </ul>						

#### Table 3-1: Summary of Purpose and Need

#### 3.1 *Need*

The proposed KFB Segments 2 and 3 project is needed due to the increasing traffic volumes within the project area; the lack of adequate north/south travel corridors in the southeast quadrant of the city; and the system gap that occurs (between Forest Creek Drive and SH 45 North) as a result of the current termination of KFB.

## 3.2 Supporting Facts and/or Data

#### Population Growth and Traffic Volumes

Population in the region has steadily increased over the past approximately 20 years and is anticipated to continue to increase through 2050. Population in Williamson County grew 55.9 percent from 249,967 to 566,719 between 2000 and 2018. The City of Round Rock grew from 61,136 to 128,739, 52.5 percent, between the same time period. Williamson County is expected to reach a population of 1,638,796 by 2050 while Round Rock is expected to reach 158,217 by 2030. This growth results in a 65.4 and 18.6 percent growth for Williamson County and Round Rock, respectively. The Austin-Round Rock area has been listed as one of the fastest growing cities in the U.S. Round Rock was ranked as the 15<sup>th</sup> fastest growing (percentage wise) city, with populations of 50,000 or more in the country between July 1, 2017 and July 1, 2018. The effects of population growth are reflected in area traffic volumes.

Average daily traffic (ADT) on the existing KFB (between US 79 and Forest Creek Drive) in 2016 was 5,779 vehicles per day. The 2040 projected traffic for KFB north of Gattis School Road is 34,800 and south of Gattis School Road is 34,600. The proposed facility would help to accommodate the increased traffic demand resulting from population growth.

#### Lack of North/South Travel Corridors

Within the southeast quadrant of Round Rock, direct north/south travel options are limited. Existing A.W. Grimes Boulevard and Red Bud Lane carry most of the north/south traffic in and around the project area. Both of these roadways are heavily traveled and experience congestion, delays, and slowdowns, particularly during peak periods. Adding an additional north/south corridor will help alleviate traffic on these roadways and facilitate future increases in traffic.

#### System Connectivity

Currently, KFB ends at Forest Creek Drive, leaving traffic to utilize residential streets such as Double Creek Drive, to gain access to SH 45 North. By completing KFB Segments 2 and 3, traffic needing to access SH 45 would be able to avoid residential roads and the connectivity gap would be closed. As demonstrated by the regional transportation plans, the gap would facilitate mobility and traffic within the project area.

#### 3.3 Purpose

The purpose of the proposed project is to enhance mobility in the project area, facilitate north/south movement of traffic, and, consistent with the City of Round Rock's Transportation Master Plan, eliminate a gap between existing KFB and SH 45 North.

## 4.0 ALTERNATIVES

#### 4.1 Build Alternative

Under the Build Alternative, KFB Segments 2 and 3 would be constructed. Constructing KFB Segments 2 and 3 would enhance mobility by providing an additional facility to accommodate population growth and traffic demand in the project area. It would provide an additional north/south facility; thus, helping to relieve congestion on existing north/south roadways (A.W. Grimes and Red Bud Lane) serving the area. And, consistent with the City's long-range transportation plan and the Capital Area Metropolitan Planning Organization's long range plan for the region, it would eliminate the gap between existing KFB and SH 45 North; thus, enhancing system connectivity. Because the Build Alternative satisfies the project's purpose and need, it is the preferred alternative.

#### 4.2 No Build Alternative

Under the no build alternative, KFB Segments 2 and 3 would not be constructed. As the population of the project area increases, traffic would increase as well. Continuing to accommodate increasing traffic demand on the existing roadway network would increase congestion and reduce mobility. Congestion and resulting delays on existing A.W. Grimes and Red Bud Lane (existing north/south routes serving the project area) would impact mobility. And, the existing gap between existing KFB and SH 45 North would remain; thus, system connectivity would not be enhanced. Because the area and the region would not realize the benefits of the proposed facility (the area's needs would go unmet), the No Build Alternative is not recommended. Although the Build Alternative is the preferred alternative, the No Build Alternative is evaluated in this EA for comparison purposes.

#### 4.3 Preliminary Alternatives Considered but Eliminated from Further Consideration

The MoKan corridor extends from south of Georgetown in Williamson County to southeast of Austin in Travis County. As indicated previously, much of the corridor, including that portion in the vicinity of the KFB Segments 2 and 3 project, was purchased in the early 1990s as a means of preserving the corridor for future transportation use. For the past 30 years, the corridor has been held in the name of the State of Texas pursuant to agreements between TxDOT and local entities which participated in the cost of acquisition. **Kenney Fort and MoKan Corridors** map in **Appendix F** shows the MoKan Corridor in relation to KFB Segments 2 and 3. As can be seen, from approximately a half mile north of Gattis School Road, south to SH 45 North, the alignments must either coincide or parallel one another.

When identifying and evaluating options for KFB Segments 2 and 3, an overarching goal was to maintain and preserve the possibility of future development of a regional transportation facility within the MoKan corridor. To that end, several preliminary configurations of KFB were developed. These configurations included:

• Options that would result in dual designation (KFB and MoKan) of the portion of the facility south of the point where KFB would intersect the MoKan Corridor; and

• Options which would, south of the point where KFB would intersect the MoKan Corridor, locate KFB along the outer portions of the corridor while providing a wide center median (between the KFB lanes) for the future MoKan facility.

These options were eliminated from consideration because of construction and operational complexities that made them less viable than the Build Alternative proposed in this EA.

# 5.0 AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT AND ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

In support of this EA, the following technical documentation was prepared:

- Air Quality Technical Report
- Archeological Survey Report
- Biological Evaluation Form and Tier I Site Assessment
- Community Impacts Assessment Technical Report Form
- Hazardous Materials Initial Site Assessment (ISA)
- Project Coordination Request (PCR) for Historic Studies Project
- Indirect Impacts Technical Report
- Risk Assessment for Cumulative Impacts
- Traffic Noise Technical Report
- Water Resources Technical Report
- Neighborhood Leaders Meeting Summary Report
- Open House Summary Report

The technical reports and documents listed above are incorporated by reference in this EA. Copies of the technical reports are on file and available for review at TxDOT Austin District office located at 7901 N. I-35, Austin, Texas.

For purposes of environmental study, project-related effects are categorized as direct, indirect, and cumulative. Direct effects are defined as those impacts which are caused by the action and occur at the same time and place. Indirect effects, while being reasonably foreseeable, are also caused by the action, but occur later in time or are farther removed in distance. Other indirect effects pertain primarily to induced growth. Cumulative effects result from the incremental impacts of an action when considered together with other past, present and reasonably foreseeable future actions regardless of who takes the other actions. This section (Section 5.0) addresses direct, indirect (encroachment-alteration and growth induced) and cumulative effects that would result from the proposed KFB project.

## 5.1 Right-Of-Way/Displacements

<u>Build Alternative</u>: The Build Alternative would require 35.9 acres of ROW. Of this,12.6 acres are owned by the State of Texas and fall under the jurisdiction of TxDOT. The City and TxDOT are currently negotiating a Municipal Use Agreement that would allow Round Rock to utilize the State-owned ROW for the KFB project. The remaining 23.3 acres involves acquisition from private property owners and impacts 15 individual tracts of land. The City has initiated acquisition of this ROW at-risk (to date, all but one parcel has been acquired). The purchase of the ROW in advance of the environmental clearance has not influenced the selection of alternatives or findings of the environmental review. The ROW acquisition was conducted in accordance with the Federal Uniform Relocation and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970. In addition to the 35.9 acres of ROW, 0.2 acre of permanent drainage easement would be required.

**Appendix C** contains a schematic which illustrates the proposed design and ROW needs. There are not any business or residential structures within the proposed ROW; therefore, no displacements would occur.

ROW acquisition would be limited to those properties required for roadway construction. KFB has been part of the City of Round Rock's Transportation Master Plan for many years. Land use planning and development of the adjacent area, which includes both commercial and residential uses, has been done with the premise that KFB Segments 2 and 3 would someday be constructed. For this reason, the project is not anticipated to change the function of neighboring properties or in the surrounding area.

<u>No Build Alternative</u>: Under the No Build Alternative, while most of the ROW has been acquired at-risk, the project would not be constructed. Round Rock would evaluate other uses for the purchased ROW.

## 5.2 Land Use

The land use abutting the project area consists of predominantly single-family homes and undeveloped land. Much of the currently undeveloped land is planned for development that is currently or will soon be constructed. A small parcel at the northern limits of the project is designated as agriculture; however, the parcel is wooded and currently unused. In general, the area is composed of predominantly single and multi-family developments along with community facilities such as schools and churches, along with minor areas of commercial businesses.

<u>Build Alternative</u>: Given the nature of the corridor and limited unplanned or undeveloped land adjacent to the corridor, it is not anticipated that the proposed improvements (Build Alternative) would alter development patterns within the city of Round Rock. Land use on some of the acquired parcels would change from residential or open space to transportation uses.

<u>No Build Alternative</u>: Under the No Build Alternative, there would be no project-related land use impacts.

#### 5.3 Farmlands

The Farmland Protection Policy Act (FFPA) does not apply.

## 5.4 Utility Relocation

<u>Build Alternative</u>: It is reasonably foreseeable that utilities will have to be relocated as a result of this project. The impacts resulting from removal of any utilities from within roadway right-ofway have been considered as part of the project impacts under each of the resource area subheadings within this EA. Additionally, if utilities will be re-located within roadway right-ofway, then the impacts resulting from re-installation of the utilities within roadway right-ofway has also been considered as part of the project impacts under each of the resource area subheadings within this EA. To the extent that the owner of any displaced utility determines to re-install the displaced utility at a location outside of roadway right-of-way, such location will be determined by the owner of the utility subject to the rules and policies governing the utility relocation process.

<u>No Build Alternative</u>: Under the No Build Alternative there would be no project-related impacts to utilities.

### 5.5 Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities

<u>Build Alternative</u>: There are currently no bicycle or pedestrian facilities within the project limits. The project would comply with TxDOT's Guidelines for Emphasizing Bicycle and Pedestrian Accommodations as a continuous sidewalk and a shared-use path is included in the proposed design. Walking and cycling conditions would be improved as a result of these features. The proposed project would offer a more direct north/south route for walking and cycling than what currently exists in the area. It would also provide infrastructure suited to each mode in the form of a continuous sidewalk and shared-use path. The sidewalk and shared-use path would also connect to the Brushy Creek Trail System and Old Settlers Park, both of which are north of the project limits.

<u>No Build Alternative</u>: Under the No Build Alternative there would be no project-related impacts, positive or negative, to bicycle and pedestrian facilities.

## 5.6 Community Impacts

The project is in a rapidly developing area of the City of Round Rock, a town of approximately 128,739 people, located within Williamson County. Approximately 27 community facilities are located within the project community impact assessment study area and consist of five schools, two preschools or Montessori schools, one children's dance studio, four churches, three fire stations, six recreational facilities, three senior service facilities, one U.S. Postal Service office, one community garden, and one cemetery. Socioeconomic and demographic information about the affected communities is found in the Community Impact Assessment Technical Report.

<u>Build Alternative</u>: Populated census blocks with minority populations are scattered geographically throughout the study area. The minority population makes up 48.3 percent of the total study area population. Individuals who identified themselves as being 'Hispanic or Latino' make up the largest portion of the study area's total minority population (49.7 percent), followed by 'Black or African American alone' (27.9 percent), and 'Asian alone' (16.9 percent). Other minority groups present in the study area each make up less than 6 percent of the total minority population. Project impacts would not affect predominantly minority census geographies differently than non-minority census geographies. There are no low-income geographies in the proposed project study area.

No displacements would occur as a result of the project.

The proposed project would improve community access and travel patterns by eliminating an existing north/south gap in this rapidly developing quadrant of Round Rock. The proposed project is anticipated to divert traffic from surrounding roadways, including A.W. Grimes Boulevard, Red Bud Lane, Forest Creek Drive, Double Creek Drive, Gattis School Road, and

High Country Boulevard. Cut-through traffic in adjacent subdivisions is also expected to decrease and improve safety conditions for residents.

Proposed design elements such as a continuous sidewalk and shared-use path would offer users of other transportation modes, such as walking and cycling, a direct north/south route from which they can access local services, facilities, and subdivisions located within the study area. Connectivity would improve between subdivisions located adjacent to the proposed project and the rest of the community. The proposed project would also increase community access to the regional Brushy Creek Trail System and Old Settler's Park. Emergency response times would also improve due to increased access to adjacent subdivisions and highways, as well as more dispersed traffic patterns within the study area.

The proposed project would improve community access to local services and facilities for all existing modes by providing an alternative north/south route that would connect SH 45 North and US 79 and eliminating a gap in the city's existing transportation network. These changes are anticipated to enhance mobility and help to alleviate congestion in the area overall. The continuous sidewalk and shared-use path included in the project's design would improve conditions for walking and cycling in the area and make these modes more viable options for functional transportation purposes, such as commuting to schools or places of employment. The proposed project is expected to have an overall positive impact on community cohesion.

Out of the 15 census block groups located within the study area, 14 block groups have a limited English proficiency (LEP) population. LEP persons make up 5.9 percent of the total study area population. Spanish speakers make up the largest portion of the LEP population, comprising 2.3 percent of the total study area population. Other LEP populations present in the study area are 'Indo-European' (1.3 percent), 'Asian and Pacific Islander' (1.5 percent), and 'Other' (0.8 percent). Public outreach efforts, to date, have included block walking (to distribute information to residents adjacent to the corridor), a neighborhood leaders meeting (May 2016), and a project open house (October 2017). These activities were carried out in accordance with City of Round Rock requirements, prior to award of federal construction funding for the project. Per City requirements, notice of the public open house was published on the City's website and an email blast was sent to area residents. Federalization of the project triggered National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) requirements and the need for a public hearing. The public hearing, which will be scheduled after approval of the draft EA, will meet all TxDOT standards for LEP inclusion and accommodations.

<u>No Build Alternative</u>: No KFB Segments 2 and 3 project-related community impacts would occur under the No Build Alternative as the proposed project would not be constructed.

#### 5.7 Visual/Aesthetic Impacts

<u>Build Alternative</u>: Visual impacts are anticipated because the proposed project would be a new roadway where there is currently undeveloped land. Fences and noise walls, if constructed, would have a surface treatment consistent with others used within the city. Landscaping will be added to the corridor, where possible. Potential impacts to the visual and aesthetic environment would be limited to the immediate vicinity of the proposed roadway.

<u>No Build Alternative</u>: The No Build Alternative would not result in KFB Segments 2 and 3 project-related visual impacts along the corridor as the proposed project would not be constructed.

### 5.8 Cultural Resources

Evaluation of impacts to cultural resources has been conducted under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act in accordance with the Programmatic Agreement among Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), TxDOT, the Texas State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation Regarding the Implementation of Transportation Undertakings. Agency coordination is included in **Appendix G**.

## 5.8.1 Archeology

<u>Build Alternative</u>: An intensive cultural resources survey was conducted for the proposed project. As the City of Round Rock is a political subdivision of the State of Texas, the project is subject to review and approval by the Texas Historical Commission (THC) under the Antiquities Code of Texas (ACT); therefore, the work was conducted under Texas Antiquities Permit No. 9390 and complied with requirements of the ACT.

A background literature and records review indicated that 18 previously recorded archaeological sites are present within a 1-mile radius of the project area, including one archaeological site (41WM1167) that intersects the project area. In addition to the records review, a pedestrian survey, augmented with shovel testing, within the entire 1.5-mile-long project area was performed. For linear projects, the THC/Council of Texas Archaeologists survey standards require a minimum of 16 shovel tests per mile, or minimally 16 shovel tests per 100-foot-wide survey transect across the project area, with thorough documentation of all exceptions (e.g., disturbance, slope, and impervious surfaces) noted. Based on these standards, the project area required approximately 72 shovel tests. A total of 92 shovel tests were conducted within the project limits, exceeding the THC's required survey standards. No cultural materials were identified on the ground surface or within any of the shovel tests excavated within the project area. During the current survey, it was found that 41WM1167 had been previously destroyed. No cultural materials were observed on surface or subsurface and the site has been impacted by industrial and residential construction. On June 7, 2007, the THC determined the site was not eligible for the National Register of Historic Places.

In accordance with the ACT, a reasonable and good faith effort was made to identify cultural resources within the project area. No archaeological sites were identified that meet the criteria for designation as a State Antiquities Landmark (SAL), per 13 Texas Administrative Code (TAC) 26.12; therefore, the archeological principal investigator recommended that no additional cultural resources investigations were warranted within the project area, as currently defined. The survey report is currently under review with TxDOT and THC.

Given the lack of resource material found in the survey, the proposed project would not have an impact to archeological resources. <u>No Build Alternative</u>: As construction of the proposed KFB Segments 2 and 3 project would not occur, there would be no project-related impacts on archaeological resources associated with the No Build Alternative.

## 5.8.2 Historic Properties

<u>Build Alternative:</u> An Historic Project Coordination Request was completed for the proposed project. In compliance with the Section 106 Programmatic Agreement, TxDOT historians determined project activities would have no adverse effect to historic properties as there are no known National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) listed, previously recommended or determined eligible, or potentially eligible properties within the Area of Potential Effect (APE). Nor are there any known listed or eligible National Historic Landmarks (NHL), SALs, or Registered Texas Historic Landmarks (RTHL) resources within the survey study area (SSA).

<u>No Build Alternative:</u> Because the proposed KFB Segments 2 and 3 project would not be constructed, the No Build alternative would not result in project-related impacts to historic resources.

## 5.9 Protected Lands

The proposed project would not require the use of, nor substantially impair the purposes of, any publicly owned land from a public park, recreational area, wildlife and waterfowl refuge lands, or historic sites of national, state, or local significance; therefore, a Section 4(f) Evaluation is not required. There are no Section 4(f) properties present in the project area.

Section 6(f) of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act requires that recreational facilities receiving U.S. Department of Interior funding from the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act as allocated by the Texas Parks and Wildlife Department (TPWD) may not be converted to non-recreational uses unless approval is received from TPWD and the National Park Service. There are no Section 6(f) resources in the proposed project area.

Chapter 26 of the Texas Parks and Wildlife Code includes provisions similar to the federal Section 4(f) regulation, including requiring a finding that there is no feasible and prudent alternative to the use or taking of the protected land, that the project includes all reasonable planning to minimize harm and that a public hearing be held prior to the approval of the use of land from these publicly-owned park properties. There are no Chapter 26 resources in the proposed project area.

## 5.10 Water Resources

## 5.10.1 Clean Water Act Section 404

As detailed in the Water Resources Technical Report, a total of nine surface water features are found in the project area (see the **Water Resources** map in **Appendix F**). They include three likely jurisdictional waters of the United States (U.S.) (Dyer Branch, and two tributaries to Dyer Branch), three likely non-jurisdictional waters of the U.S., two wetland sites (both of which are potentially jurisdictional), and one man-made impoundment (of which is likely jurisdictional).

<u>Build Alternative:</u> This project will involve regulated activity in jurisdictional waters and therefore will require authorization under Section 404. **Table 5-1** identifies the waters that are anticipated to be jurisdictional waters in which regulated activity is anticipated to take place. It also indicates whether the impacts are anticipated to be authorized under Section 404 by a non-reporting nationwide permit (NWP) (i.e., no pre-construction notification (PCN) required), or if it is anticipated that a nationwide permit with PCN, individual permit, letter of permission, or regional general permit will be required. Refer to the **Water Resources** map included in **Appendix F** for the location of these water features.

Approximately 0.12 acre of temporary impacts and 0.362 acre of permanent impacts are expected to occur to waters of the U.S. due to the proposed project. Any single and complete crossing that would incur 0.1 acre or greater of permanent impacts would require a PCN. Feature 1 exceeds this threshold and therefore requires a PCN. In addition, two special aquatic sites (Wetland Features 1 and 2) will be impacted, also triggering the need for a PCN. A mitigation plan would need to be developed to off-set permanent stream impacts and coordination with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) would be required. Coordination with USACE is pending but would be completed prior to the start of construction.

The need for an individual permit under Section 404 is not anticipated. If it is later determined that an individual permit under Section 404 is needed, compliance with Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) Section 404(b)(1) Guidelines will be confirmed prior to submittal of the individual permit application.

<u>No Build Alternative</u>: Because proposed KFB Segments 2 and 3 would not be constructed, the No Build alternative would not result in project-related impacts to wetlands and waters of the U.S.

			Delineated Area	Permar	nent Fill	Temporar	y Impacts		
Feature ID	Feature Name	Type of Water Body	(Linear Feet / Acres)	Open Waters	Wetlands or other special aquatic sites	Open Waters	Wetlands or other special aquatic sites	Anticipated Permit	Likely Jurisdictional
1	Unnamed Tributary to Dyer Branch	Intermittent Stream	754.35 / 0.19	754.35 lf / 0.19 ac		0 linear feet/ 0 ac		NWP 14, w/ PCN	Yes
2	Unnamed Tributary to Dyer Branch	Ephemeral Stream	391.92 / 0.02	214.57 lf / 0.01 ac		176.43 linear feet/ 0.01		None	No
3	Dyer Branch	Intermittent Stream	178.82 / 0.17	50.02 lf / 0.07 ac		128.8 linear feet/ 0.10 ac		NWP 14, no PCN	Yes
4	Unnamed Tributary to Dyer Branch	Ephemeral Stream	1,196.33 / 0.16	836.59 lf / 0.10 ac		359.74 linear feet/ 0.06 ac		None	No
5	Unnamed tributary to Dyer Branch	Ephemeral Stream	389.65 / 0.04	237.29 lf / 0.03 ac		152.36 linear feet/ 0.01 ac		None	No
6	Man-made impoundment	Pond	42.4 / 0.083	42.4 lf / 0.08 ac		0 linear feet/ <0.01 ac		NWP 14, no PCN	Yes
7	Unmapped tributary to Dyer Branch	Intermittent Stream	106.98 / 0.02	91.72 lf / 0.02 ac		15.26 linear feet/ <0.01ac		NWP 14, no PCN	Yes
8	Wetland Feature 1	Wetland	0.001 ac		0.001 ac		0.0 ac	NWP 14, w/ PCN	Yes
9	Wetland Feature 2	Wetland	0.001 ac		0.001 ac		0.0 ac	NWP 14, w/ PCN	Yes
TOTALS – Juris	dictional Waters		1,082.55 lf / 0.465 ac	938.49 lf / 0.36 ac	0.002 ac	143.8 lf / 0.103 ac	0.0 ac		
TOTALS – Non-	Jurisdictional Waters		1,977.90 lf / 0.22 ac	1,288.45 lf / 0.14 ac	0 ac	688.53 lf / 0.08 ac	0 ac		

## 5.10.2 Clean Water Act Section 401

<u>Build Alternative</u>: For a project that will use a NWP under Section 404 or Section 10, regardless of whether the NWP is non-reporting (i.e., assumed) or reporting (i.e., requires submittal of a PCN), TxDOT complies with Section 401 of the Clean Water Act by implementing Texas Commission on Environmental Quality's (TCEQ) conditions for NWPs. For projects that require authorization under Section 404 or Section 10 beyond a NWP, TxDOT complies with Section 401 of the Clean Water Act by including a Tier I or Tier II checklist (depending upon the amount of disturbance/impact) in the individual permit, letter of permission, or regional general permit application that is submitted to the USACE, and then complying with the conditions of the Tier I or Tier II checklist.

<u>No Build Alternative</u>: Because proposed KFB Segments 2 and 3 would not be constructed, the No Build alternative would not result in project-related impacts to water quality.

#### 5.10.3 Executive Order 11990 Wetlands

The purpose of Executive Order (EO) 11990 is to "minimize the destruction, loss or degradation of wetlands and to preserve and enhance the natural and beneficial values of wetlands." The EO requires federal agencies to consider alternatives to wetland sites and limit potential damage if an activity affecting a wetland cannot be avoided. The proposed project would comply with EO 11990.

<u>Build Alternative</u>: Two potential wetlands were identified within the project area. Both features (Features 8 and 9) met all three wetland criteria and would be considered a wetland. The design of the roadway was revised in order to minimize impacts to wetlands; however, minor permanent impacts would occur to these wetlands. During construction, care would be taken to ensure that temporary impacts are mitigated by restoring pre-construction contours and revegetation of disturbed areas. Additionally, mats would be placed over wetlands during construction in order to minimize soil disturbance. Wetlands could receive an increased amount of sediment if storm water were released from the project area despite the use of best management practices (BMPs). To minimize the potential for adverse impacts, BMPs would be regularly inspected and proactively maintained.

<u>No Build Alternative</u>: Because proposed KFB Segments 2 and 3 would not be constructed, the No Build alternative would not result in project-related impacts to wetlands.

#### 5.10.4 Rivers and Harbors Act

Based on a project scoping analysis, it was determined that neither the build nor the nobuild alternative would have an impact on this resource category or subject matter.

### 5.10.5 Clean Water Act Section 303(d)

The State of Texas is required, under Sections 305(b) and 303(d) of the federal Clean Water Act (CWA), to prepare biennial statewide water quality assessments that identify the status of use attainment for water bodies and to identify water bodies for which effluent limitations are not stringent enough to implement water quality standards. Based on the assessments, the areas of potential effect are accounted for on the 303(d) list. According to the provisions of the TxDOT-TCEQ Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), coordination with TCEQ is required for environmental review documents if all or part of the project drains to an impaired assessment unit that is within five miles of the project and in the same watershed as the project.

<u>Build Alternative:</u> According to the approved 2020 Texas Integrated Report for CWA Section 303(d) list, the project would not directly discharge into an impaired waterbody but is within five miles upstream of an impaired waterbody (**Table 5-2**).

Watershed	Segment Name	Segment Number	Assessment Unit Number
San Gabriel	Brushy Creek	1244 – From the confluence with the San Gabriel River in Milam County to the confluence of South Brushy Creek in Williamson County	03 – From the confluence of Cottonwood Creek upstream to the confluence of Lake Creek

Table 5-2: Impaired Waters

To date, TCEQ has not identified (through either a total maximum daily load [TMDL] or the review of projects under the TCEQ MOU) a need to implement control measures beyond those required by the construction general permit (CGP) on road construction projects. Therefore, compliance with the project's CGP, along with coordination under the TCEQ MOU for certain transportation projects, collectively meets the need to address impaired waters during the environmental review process. As required by the CGP, the project and associated activities will be implemented, operated, and maintained using best management practices to control the discharge of pollutants from the project site.

<u>No Build Alternative</u>: Because proposed KFB Segments 2 and 3 would not be constructed, the No Build Alternative would not result in project-related impacts to impaired waterways.

## 5.10.6 Clean Water Act Section 402

<u>Build Alternative</u>: Since Texas pollutant discharge elimination system (TPDES) CGP authorization and compliance (and the associated documentation) occur outside of the environmental clearance process, compliance is ensured by the policies and procedures that govern the design and construction phases of the project. The Project Development Process Manual and the Plans, Specifications, and Estimates (PS&E) Preparation Manual require a storm water pollution prevention plan (SWP3) be included in the plans of all projects that disturb one or more acres. The Construction Contract Administration Manual requires that the appropriate CGP authorization documents (notice of intent or site notice) be completed, posted, and submitted, when required by the CGP, to TCEQ and the municipal separate storm sewer system (MS4) operator. It also requires that projects be inspected to ensure compliance with the CGP.

The PS&E Preparation Manual requires that all projects include Standard Specification Item 506 (Temporary Erosion, Sedimentation, and Environmental Controls), and the "Required Specification Checklists" require Special Provision 506-003 on all projects that need authorization under the CGP. These documents require the project contractor to comply with the CGP and SWP3, and to complete the appropriate authorization documents.

<u>No Build Alternative</u>: Because proposed KFB Segments 2 and 3 would not be constructed, the No Build alternative would not result in project-related impacts to water resources.

## 5.10.7 Floodplains

<u>Build Alternative</u>: As detailed in the Water Resources Technical Report 0.94 acre of the proposed project is located within a Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) designated 100-year floodplain along Dyer Branch and Gattis School Road. The hydraulic design for this project would be in accordance with current FHWA and TxDOT design policies. The facility would permit the conveyance of the 100-year flood, inundation of the roadway being acceptable, without causing damage to the facility, stream, or other property. The proposed project would not increase the base flood elevation to a level that would violate applicable floodplain regulations and ordinances. Coordination with the local Floodplain Administrator would be required.

Since the proposed project crosses floodplains, the following is provided:

- Avoiding and minimizing floodplain crossings were considered during design of the Build Alternative. The proposed project must be located in floodplains because in order to avoid floodplains, the tie-in to Gattis School Road and KFB would have to be altered. Additionally, no longitudinal encroachments on the floodplain would occur.
- 2) The only alternative considered during the course of project development that would avoid encroachments on floodplains was the No Build Alternative, which does not satisfy the purpose and need for the proposed project.
- 3) The proposed project would conform to state and local floodplain protection standards.

This project is subject to and will comply with federal EO 11988 on Floodplain Management. The department implements this EO on a programmatic basis through its Hydraulic Design Manual. Design of this project will be conducted in accordance with the department's Hydraulic Design Manual. Adherence to the TxDOT Hydraulic Design Manual ensures that this project will not result in a "significant encroachment" as defined by FHWA's rules implementing EO 11988 at 23 CFR 650.105(q).

<u>No Build Alternative</u>: Because proposed KFB Segments 2 and 3 would not be constructed, the No Build alternative would not result in project-related impacts to floodplains.

## 5.10.8 Wild and Scenic Rivers

The Wild and Scenic Rivers Act does not apply.

## 5.10.9 Coastal Barrier Resources

The Coastal Barrier Resources Act does not apply.

## 5.10.10 Coastal Zone Management

The project is not within the Texas coastal zone management boundary.

## 5.10.11 Edwards Aquifer

The TCEQ Edwards Aquifer Rules do not apply. The EPA Edwards Aquifer MOU does not apply.

## 5.10.12 International Boundary and Water Commission

This project does not cross or encroach upon the floodway of the International Boundary Water Commission (IBWC) right-of-way or an IBWC flood control project.

## 5.10.13 Drinking Water Systems

<u>Build Alternative:</u> The City of Round Rock provides water service to the area. The Texas Water Development Board (TWDB) does not identify any water wells within the project area but two wells are located approximately 0.10 miles from the project area. These wells are not expected to be impacted by proposed activities due to their distance and difference in topography from the project area. The project would not impact water services or drinking water systems. Utilities conflicts would be coordinated with the city department and resolved prior to construction commencing.

In accordance with TxDOT's Standard Specifications for Construction and Maintenance of Highways, Streets and Bridges (Item 103, Disposal of Wells), any drinking water wells would need to be properly removed and disposed of during construction of the project.

<u>No Build Alternative</u>: Because proposed KFB Segments 2 and 3 would not be constructed, the No Build alternative would not result in project-related impacts to the drinking water systems.

#### 5.11 Biological Resources

### 5.11.1 Texas Parks and Wildlife Coordination

Early coordination with TPWD has been completed for the project. The coordination letters are included in **Appendix G**.

#### 5.11.2 Impacts to Vegetation

The Biological Evaluation Form, prepared for this proposed project, describes five different vegetation communities that were mapped within the project area. These are shown below on **Table 5-3**.

Ecoregion	MOU Vegetation Type	Common Name	EMST* Mapped Acreage	MOU Acreage	Field Verified Acreage
	Disturbed	Native Invasive: Deciduous Woodland	10.99	13 1/	12.85
	Prairie	Native Invasive: Mesquite Shrubland	2.15	13.14	12.00
Edwards Plateau		Edwards Plateau: Deciduous Oak /Evergreen Motte and Woodland	1.98		
Savannan, Woodland, and Shrubland	Edwards Plateau: Oak/Hardwood Motte and Woodland	1.41	7.12	7.12	
and F	Onitionalia	Edwards Plateau: Savanna Grassland	3.74		
Riparian	Riparian	Central Texas: Riparian Hardwood Forest	1.43		
		Central Texas: Riparian Deciduous Shrubland	0.00	1.59	1.46
		Central Texas: Riparian Herbaceous Vegetation	0.17		
	Tallgrass Prairie, Grassland	Blackland Prairie: Disturbance or Tame Grassland	6.17	6.17	6.17
Urban		Urban: High Intensity Urban: Low Intensity	0.34 13.41	13.75	14.18

Table 5-3: Project Area Vegetation
------------------------------------

\*EMST – Ecological Mapping Systems of Texas

Additionally, unusual vegetation features or special habitat features occurring within the proposed project area (existing and proposed ROW) were identified and described

during field investigations in accordance with the 2013 TxDOT-TPWD MOU. Unusual vegetation features identified during field investigations include unmaintained vegetation, fencerow vegetation and riparian vegetation. Special habitat features identified during field investigations include water bodies. These features are described in more detail in the Biological Evaluation Form. The natural diversity database (NDD) also indicated elemental occurrences of Verstidol Blackland Prairie Blackland Prairie and Little Bluestem-Indiangrass series. These areas were confirmed in the field and would be considered remnant vegetation.

As detailed in §2.206 of the 2013 MOU, coordination with the TPWD is required for projects based on certain triggers, including the disturbance of habitat in an area equal to or greater than the area of disturbance indicated in the Threshold Table Programmatic Agreement. Vegetation within the proposed project falls into five MOU vegetation types: Disturbed Prairie; Edwards Plateau Savannah, Woodland, and Shrubland; Riparian; Tallgrass Prairie, Grassland; and Urban. The Threshold Table Programmatic Agreement sets a disturbance threshold of 3.0 acres for Disturbed Prairie; 1.0 acre for Edwards Plateau Savannah, Woodland, and Shrubland; 0.1 acre for Riparian; and 2.0 acres for Tallgrass Prairie, Grassland. No thresholds have been established for Urban vegetation.

<u>Build Alternative</u>: Vegetation impacts quantified in **Table 5-3** show that the proposed project would exceed the threshold for four MOU vegetation types: Disturbed Prairie; Edwards Plateau Savannah, Woodland, and Shrubland; Riparian; and Tallgrass Prairie, Grassland. TxDOT initiated Early Coordination with TPWD in January 2020 in accordance with provisions of the 2013 MOU. Coordination was completed on April 17, 2020. Copies of the coordination letters are included in **Appendix G**.

Impacts to vegetation would be avoided or minimized by limiting disturbance to only that which is necessary to construct the proposed project. The removal of native vegetation, particularly mature native trees and shrubs and the remnant vegetation of the Verstidol Blackland Prairie and Little Bluestem-Indiangrass series, would be avoided to the greatest extent practicable. A native and locally adapted seed mix would be used in the landscaping and re-vegetation of disturbed areas.

<u>No Build Alternative</u>: If the No Build Alternative were implemented, the proposed project would not be constructed. No effects to vegetation related to the construction of KFB Segments 2 and 3 would occur.

#### 5.11.3 Executive Order 13112 on Invasive Species

<u>Build Alternative</u>: This project is subject to and will comply with federal EO 13112 on Invasive Species. The department implements this EO on a programmatic basis through its Roadside Vegetation Management Manual and Landscape and Aesthetics Design Manual. <u>No Build Alternative</u>: If the No Build Alternative were implemented, the proposed project would not be constructed; thus, the provisions of EO 13112 would not be triggered.

## 5.11.4 Executive Memorandum on Environmentally and Economically Beneficial Landscaping

<u>Build Alternative</u>: This project is subject to and will comply with the federal Executive Memorandum on Environmentally and Economically Beneficial Landscaping, effective April 26, 1994. The department implements this Executive Memorandum on a programmatic basis through its Roadside Vegetation Management Manual and Landscape and Aesthetics Design Manual.

<u>No Build Alternative</u>: If the No Build Alternative were implemented, the proposed project would not be constructed; thus, the provisions of the EO would not be triggered.

## 5.11.5 Impacts to Wildlife

Within the urban area of Round Rock, native vegetation/natural habitat is minimal due to development of residential and commercial properties and wildlife is limited to those species adapted to an urban environment. No notable wildlife was observed during the field investigations.

<u>Build Alternative</u>: The proposed project would result in vegetation clearing along the proposed ROW. This clearing activity would remove habitat for wildlife. Adjacent areas are similar in vegetative composition and create wildlife corridors connecting various riparian and floodplain areas. These wildlife corridors are in close proximity to the construction limits which allow wildlife to relocate to nearby parcels. Revegetation would occur within the disturbed areas and clearing of trees and shrubs would be avoided to the extent possible.

<u>No Build Alternative</u>: Under the No-Build Alternative, proposed KFB Segments 2 and 3 would not be constructed; thus, there would be no project-related impacts to wildlife.

## 5.11.6 Migratory Bird Protection

The Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1918 and the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act serve to regulate impacts to wildlife. Specifically, the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA) makes it unlawful to kill, capture, collect, possess, buy, sell, trade or transport any migratory bird, nest or egg in part or in whole, without a federal permit issued in accordance with the Act's policies and regulations.

<u>Build Alternative</u>: This project will comply with applicable provisions of the MBTA and Texas Parks and Wildlife Code Title 5, Subtitle B, Chapter 64, Birds. It is the department's policy to avoid removal and destruction of active bird nests except through

federal or state approved options. In addition, it is the department's policy to, where appropriate and practicable:

- use measures to prevent or discourage birds from building nests on man-made structures within portions of the project area planned for construction, and
- schedule construction activities outside the typical nesting season.

<u>No Build Alternative</u>: Under the No-Build Alternative, proposed KFB Segments 2 and 3 would not be constructed; thus, there would be no project-related impacts to migratory birds.

## 5.11.7 Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act

The Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act does not apply to this project.

## 5.11.8 Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act

This project is not within 660 feet of an active or inactive Bald or Golden Eagle nest. Therefore, coordination with U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) pursuant to the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act is not required.

## 5.11.9 Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation Management Act

The Essential Fish Habitat /Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act does not apply.

#### 5.11.10 Marine Mammal Protection Act

The project area does not contain suitable habitat for marine mammals.

## 5.11.11 Threatened, Endangered, and Candidate Species

As detailed in the Biological Evaluation Form and Tier I Site Assessment Form, desktop analysis and field investigations conducted in January 2018 indicate that potential habitat for federally listed threatened, endangered, or candidate species does not occur in the project area (existing and proposed ROW). The desktop and field survey indicate that suitable habitat for one state threatened species, timber rattlesnake (*Crotalus horridus*), could exist within the project area. It was determined that there is no suitable habitat within the project area for any other state-listed species.

Those species included on TPWD's county list, but which have no federal or state regulatory status are classified as species of greatest conservation need (SGCN). Native animals or plants designated as a SGCN are generally those that are declining or rare and in need of attention to recover or to prevent the need to list under state or federal regulations. Lists of SGCN were developed through expert consultation and

public feedback. Ranks are based on multiple criteria including range extent, known occurrences, abundance, and threats. It should be noted that none of these species is currently afforded regulatory protection. Potentially suitable habitat for 29 SGCN exists within the proposed project area: the Texas garter snake (Thamnophis sirtalis annectens), mink (Neovison vison), Streacker's chorus frog (Pseudacris streckeri), Woodhouse's toad (Anaxyrus woodhousii), , timber (canebrake) rattlesnake (Crotalus horridus), western burrowing owl (Athene cunicularis), Eastern spotted skunk (Spilogale putorius), the long-tailed weasel (Mustela frenata), slender glass lizard (Ophisaurus attenuates), cave myotis bat (Myotis velifer), big free-tailed bat (Nyctinomops macrotis), Mexican free-tailed bat (Tadarida brasiliensis), big brown bat (Eptesicus fuscus), southern short-tailed shrew (*Blarina carolinensis*), western hog-nosed skunk (Conepatus leuconotus), eastern box turtle (Terrapene carolina), western box turtle (Terrapene ornata), eastern red bat (Lasiurus borealis), tricolor bat (Perimyotis subflavus), hoary bat (Lasiurus cinereus), American badger (Taxidea taxus), woodland vole (*Microtus pinetorum*), thirteen-lined ground squirrel (*Ictidomys tridecemlineatus*), plateau milkvine (Matelea edwardensis), bigflower cornsalad (Valerianella stenocarpa), Texas almond (Prunus minutiflora), southern crawfish frog (Lithobates areolatus areolatus), and two mayfly species (Pseudocentroptiloides morihari and Procloen distinctum).

<u>Build Alternative</u>: Since there is no suitable habitat for any federally listed threatened or endangered species within the project area, there would be no effects to any federally listed species.

One state-listed species may be impacted by the proposed project since suitable habitat for the species occurs within the project area. BMPs for the timber rattlesnake outlined in the Tier I Form consist of advising contractors of their potential occurrence in the project area, and to avoid harming the species if they are encountered.

BMPs are only defined by TPWD for the Western burrowing owl, cave myotis bat, big free-tailed bat, timber rattlesnake, Texas garter snake, and southern crawfish frog. Per the MOU, implementation of these BMPs by TxDOT eliminates the need for coordination for these species, but coordination would still be required for the remaining 23 species. In accordance with the BMP Programmatic Agreement between TxDOT and TPWD, BMPs have been identified and will be implemented to mitigate impacts to these species and are outlined in the Tier I Form. The BMPs are further discussion in **Section 8.0**. Copies of the TPWD coordination documents are included in **Appendix G**.

<u>No Build Alternative</u>: Under the No Build Alternative, proposed KFB Segments 2 and 3 would not be constructed; therefore, there would be no project-related effects on any federally- or state-listed threatened, endangered, or candidate species.

#### 5.12 Air Quality

<u>Build Alternative</u>: The project is located in an area in attainment or unclassifiable for all national ambient air quality standards (NAAQS); therefore, the transportation conformity rules do not apply. This project is within an attainment or unclassifiable area for ozone and CO; therefore, a project level Congestion Management Process analysis is not required.

Traffic data for the estimated time of completion (ETC) year 2020 and design year 2040 is 25,000 vehicles per day and 35,000 vehicles per day, respectively. A prior TxDOT modeling study and previous analyses of similar projects demonstrated that it is unlikely that the CO standard would ever be exceeded as a result of any project with an average annual daily traffic (AADT) below 140,000 vehicles per day (vpd). The AADT projections for the project do not exceed 140,000 vpd; therefore, a Traffic Air Quality Analysis is not required.

A qualitative mobile source air toxics (MSAT) assessment has been conducted relative to the Build and No Build Alternatives. As documented in the technical report, all project alternatives may result in increased exposure to MSAT emissions in certain locations although the concentrations and duration of exposure are uncertain. Because of this uncertainty, the health effects from these emissions cannot be estimated. However, on a regional basis, EPA's vehicle and fuel regulations, coupled with fleet turnover, will over time cause substantial reductions that, in almost all cases, will cause region-wide MSAT levels to be significantly lower than today.

<u>No Build Alternative</u>: Under the No-Build Alternative, proposed KFB Segments 2 and 3 would not be constructed; therefore, there would be no project-related impacts on air quality.

#### 5.13 Hazardous Materials

In July 2019, a Hazardous Materials ISA was completed to summarize potential hazardous materials within and adjacent to the project corridor. The ISA included a site reconnaissance and environmental regulatory database search for the proposed ROW. The ISA was completed to identify sites or facilities that might pose a potential for hazardous materials impacts to the proposed project.

<u>Build Alternative</u>: An evaluation of the sites identified in the environmental regulatory databases was completed. No potentially hazardous sites were identified through the GeoSearch Radius Report. A review of historic aerial photographs of the project area did not reveal any previous contamination or identifiable hazards. Site reconnaissance of the project area was conducted on January 18, 2018 and November 21, 2018. The majority of the land use along the project area consists of residential, community resources (church and fire station), pipeline ROW, or rural/ undeveloped. Pastureland is present in the project area and is being utilized by livestock such as horses, cattle, sheep, goats, and donkeys.

No unresolved hazardous materials concerns were identified and/or all potential concerns were resolved within the ISA. No further hazardous materials action is required. Any unanticipated hazardous materials impacts encountered during the project construction phase shall be addressed in accordance with regulatory requirements and TxDOT standard specifications.

<u>No Build Alternative</u>: If construction of proposed KFB Segments 2 and 3 would not occur, there would be no project-related hazardous material impacts associated with the No Build Alternative.

#### 5.14 Traffic Noise

A traffic noise analysis was conducted for the proposed project in accordance with TxDOT's (FHWA approved) 2011 Guidelines for Analysis and Abatement of Highway Traffic Noise. The Traffic Noise Analysis Report (2020), which includes details about the analysis, is available for public review at the Round Rock and TxDOT Austin District offices.

<u>Build Alternative</u>: Existing and predicted traffic noise levels were modeled at representative land use activity areas (receptors) adjacent to the project that might be impacted by traffic noise and would potentially benefit from feasible and reasonable noise abatement (**Table 5-4**).

Receiver		NAC	NAC         NAC         Predicted Traffic Noise Level			NAC	Noise
ID	Land Use	Category	Level	Existing (2020)	Predicted (2040)	Change (+/-)	Impact
R1	Single-Family Residential	В	67	49*	59	+10	Ν
R2	Single-Family Residential	В	67	47*	68	+21	Y
R3	Single-Family Residential	В	67	46²	57	+11	Y
R4	Single-Family Residential	В	67	46²	56‡	+10	Ν
R5	Single-Family Residential	В	67	46²	72	+26	Y
R6	Single-Family Residential	В	67	65*	70	+5	Y
R7	Single-Family Residential	В	67	63*	66	+3	Y
R8	Place of Worship/Day Care	С	67	49*	57	+8	Ν
R9	Single-Family Residential	В	67	581	62‡	+4	Ν
R10	Single-Family Residential	В	67	581	62‡	+4	N

Table 5-4: Traffic Noise Levels [dB(A) Leq]

Receiver		NAC         NAC         Predicted Traffic Noise           Image: NAC         Image: Ima	NAC NAC	Predicted Traffic Noise Level [dB(A) Leq]			Noise
ID	Land Use	Category	Level	Existing (2020)	Predicted (2040)	Change (+/-)	Impact
R11	Multi-Family Residential	В	67	581	63‡	+5	Ν
*Existing model result <sup>1</sup> Ambient measurement (AR-1) <sup>2</sup> Ambient measurement (AR-2) ‡Incorporates decibel additions							

Modeled noise-sensitive locations were primarily residential, but also included a place of worship/day care facility. The traffic noise analysis determined that out of 11 representative receptors, five were predicted to have noise levels that approach or exceed the FHWA noise abatement criteria or that substantially exceed the existing noise levels; therefore, the proposed project would result in traffic noise impacts.

Noise abatement measures were considered and analyzed for each impacted receptor location. Before any abatement measure can be proposed for incorporation into the proposed project, it must be both feasible and reasonable. In order to be "feasible," the abatement measure must be able to reduce the noise level at greater than 50% of impacted, first-row receivers by at least five dB(A); and to be "reasonable," it must not exceed the cost-effectiveness criterion of \$25,000 for each receiver that would benefit by a reduction of at least five dB(A) and the abatement measure must be able to reduce the noise level for at least five dB(A).

Two noise barriers were found to be both reasonable and feasible and are recommended for incorporation into the proposed project. These noise barriers are identified in **Table 5-4** and are discussed below. Noise barriers were not reasonable and feasible for the remaining impacted representative receivers, and abatement is not proposed for those locations. Additional details regarding the barrier analysis can be found in the Traffic Noise Analysis Report (2020).

Traffic Noise Barrier	Representative Receiver(s)	Total # Benefitted Receivers	Height (feet)	Length (feet)	Total Cost	Cost per Benefitted Receiver
Preserve at Dyer Creek	R2	11	10	855	\$153,900	\$13,990
Rolling Ridge	R5 – R6	36	8	2,404	\$346,176	\$9,616

Table 5-5: Noise Barrier Proposal (preliminary)

**Preserve at Dyer Creek (R2):** This receiver represents the Preserve at Dyer Creek residential subdivision on the east side of the proposed project. A noise barrier modeled on the ROW at 855 feet in length and 10 feet in height would reduce noise levels by at least five dB(A) for all 11 first-row, impacted receivers and reduce the noise level at one or more receivers by at least seven dB(A). The total cost of the barrier would be \$153,900 or \$13,990 per benefitted receiver. Therefore, a barrier at this location is proposed for incorporation into the project.

**Rolling Ridge (R5 – R6):** These receivers represent the Rolling Ridge residential subdivision on the east side of the proposed project. A noise barrier modeled on the ROW at 2,404 feet in length and 8 feet in height would reduce noise levels by at least five dB(A) for all 29 first-row, impacted receivers and reduce the noise level at one or more receivers by at least seven dB(A). The proposed noise barrier would benefit 36 total receivers at a cost of \$346,176 or \$9,616 per benefitted receiver. Therefore, a barrier at this location is proposed for incorporation into the project.

Any subsequent project design changes may require a reevaluation of this preliminary noise barrier proposal. The final decision to construct the proposed noise barriers would not be made until completion of the project design, utility evaluation and polling of adjacent property owners. The **Representative Noise Receivers** map included in **Appendix F** depicts the representative noise receivers and the noise barriers that are being proposed for the project.

To avoid noise impacts that may result from future development of properties adjacent to the proposed project, local officials responsible for land use control programs must ensure, to the maximum extent possible, no new activities are planned or constructed along or within the following predicted (2040) noise impact contours identified in **Table 5-6**.

	Distance from ROW			
Location	NAC Category B & C 66 dB(A)	NAC Category E 71 dB(A)		
From SH 45 North to Gattis School Road (west side of proposed project)	40 feet	Within ROW		
From Gattis School Road to Forest Creek Drive (west side of proposed project)	20 feet	Within ROW		

Table 5-6: Traffic Noise Contours [dB(A) Leq]

A copy of this traffic noise analysis will be available to local officials to assist in future land use planning. On the date of approval of this document (Date of Public Knowledge), FHWA and City of Round Rock are no longer responsible for providing noise abatement for new development adjacent to the project.

<u>No Build Alternative</u>: Under the No-Build Alternative, the proposed KFB Segments 2 and 3 project would not be constructed; therefore, future traffic noise levels would be similar to existing conditions and would be anticipated to increase with increasing traffic in those areas with adjacent existing roadways.

#### 5.15 Induced Growth

The Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ) defines indirect effects as those "caused by the action and are later in time or farther removed in distance, but are still reasonably foreseeable. Indirect impacts may include growth inducing effects and other effects related to induced changes in the pattern of land use, population density or growth rate, and related effects on air and water and other natural systems, including ecosystems" (40 CFR Section 1508.8).

The Indirect Impacts Analysis Technical Report provides a detailed discussion of the indirect effects analysis and is available for review at the City of Round Rock and TxDOT Austin District offices.

<u>Build Alternative:</u> An analysis of indirect impacts was conducted that followed the processes outlined in TxDOT's Indirect Impacts Analysis Guidance. The Area of Influence (AOI) for the proposed project encompasses the entire Build Alternative and adjacent areas where development or accelerated rates of development could potentially occur. The AOI for the proposed project encompasses approximately 3.4 square miles (2,145.4 acres) in Williamson County and located entirely within the City of Round Rock.

Based on the preceding analysis of existing and future land use, historic and projected population, and access, the proposed project would not induce growth in the AOI. Roughly 13.8 percent of the AOI is developable (see **Appendix F**, **Land Development Status in AOI** map), and it is anticipated that future development will be driven primarily by increased population growth in the region. Local planning officials queried during the development of the indirect impact analysis stated all undeveloped areas are going to be developed regardless of the construction of the proposed KFB Segments 2 and 3 project.

The responsive local officials stated roadway improvements and the presence of the future Kalahari Resort (currently under construction on the southeast quadrant of the US 79/KFB intersection – north of the Segment 2 and 3 project area) are the largest influences on the rate of development. The proposed extension (Segments 2 and 3) of KFB would enhance mobility and provide an additional route for north/south traffic in this rapidly developing quadrant of the City of Round Rock. Local planning officials believe that connecting SH 45 North and US 79 with KFB would allow for access to planned development and may increase the rate of that development, particularly mixed-use development, would occur along the corridor.

Encroachment-alteration effects may occur to vegetation/wildlife habitat and water resources, including floodplains, Section 303(d) impaired waters, and waters of the U.S. as a result of the proposed project. The potential for project-related encroachment-alteration effects on waters of the U.S. and water quality could occur during construction, which has the highest likelihood of creating pollutants and sediment if storm water runoff enters surface water features prior to being treated. Build-up of sediment could also reduce the water storage capacity of the floodplain. Temporary (construction phase) and permanent (post-construction) BMPs would minimize the potential for encroachment-alteration effects to vegetation/wildlife habitat and water resources.

<u>No Build Alternative</u>: As construction of the proposed KFB Segment 2 and 3 project would not occur, there would be no project-induced growth under the No Build Alternative.

### 5.16 Cumulative Impacts

The CEQ defines cumulative impacts as those which result from the incremental impact of the action when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions regardless of what agency (Federal or non-Federal) or person undertakes such other actions. Cumulative impacts can result from individually minor but collectively significant actions taking place over a period of time (40 CFR §1508.7).

Based on the Risk Assessment for Cumulative Impacts form, it was determined that a cumulative impacts analysis was not necessary because the project would not have a substantial direct or indirect impact on any resource and no resources are in poor or declining health.

#### 5.17 Construction Phase Impacts

Construction-phase impacts are temporary (short-term; only occurring during actual construction) and potentially encompass a range of issues.

<u>No Build Alternative</u>: As the KFB Segments 2 and 3 project would not be constructed under the No Build Alternative, there would be no construction phase effects. For that reason, the No Build Alternative is not discussed further in this section.

*Encroachment-Alteration Effects of the Build Alternative*: By definition, encroachmentalteration affects are removed from the project in "both time and distance". Because construction-phase impacts are temporary (limited to the duration of actual construction), construction-related encroachment-alteration effects are not possible. For that reason, encroachment-alterations affects are not discussed further in this section.

#### Construction-Phase Noise Impacts

<u>Build Alternative</u>: Noise associated with the construction of the proposed project is difficult to predict. Heavy machinery, the major source of noise in construction, is constantly moving in unpredictable patterns. However, construction normally occurs during daylight hours when occasional loud noises are more tolerable. None of the receivers are expected to be exposed to construction noise for a long duration; therefore, any extended disruption of normal activities is not expected. Provisions would be included in the plans and specifications that require the contractor to make every reasonable effort to minimize construction noise through abatement measures such as work hour controls and proper maintenance of muffler systems.

#### Construction-Phase Air Quality Impacts

<u>Build Alternative</u>: During the construction phase of this project, temporary increases in PM and MSAT emissions may occur from construction activities. The primary

construction-related emissions of PM are fugitive dust from site preparation, and the primary construction-related emissions of MSAT are diesel particulate matter from diesel powered construction equipment and vehicles. The potential impacts of PM emissions will be minimized by using fugitive dust control measures contained in standard specifications, as appropriate. Considering the temporary and transient nature of construction-related emissions, as well as the mitigation actions to be utilized including compliance with applicable regulatory requirements, it is not anticipated that emissions from construction of this project will have a significant impact on air quality in the area.

#### **Construction-Phase Water Quality Impacts**

<u>Build Alternative</u>: NWP 14 would be used for impacts to jurisdictional waters in the project area. During the construction phase, appropriate measures would be taken to maintain normal downstream flows to the maximum extent practicable. Construction activities would require compliance with the State of Texas Water Quality Certification Program. The 401 Certification requirements for a NWP 14 would be met by implementing BMPs from the TCEQ 401 Water Quality Certification Conditions for NWPs. Construction equipment, spoil material, supplies, forms, and buildings shall not be placed or stored in the floodway during construction activities. Any item that may be transported by flood flows shall not be stored within the floodway. Any work within jurisdictional areas would be coordinated with USACE and permitted, as necessary.

#### **Construction-Phase Biological Impacts**

<u>Build Alternative</u>: Temporary impacts to natural resources due to construction could result from the implementation of the proposed project. These include disturbances to wildlife and vegetative communities. Implementation of the Build Alternative would involve the removal of grasses, shrubs and trees during the construction phase, affecting the natural, erosion-inhibiting ground cover and resulting in the loss of habitat for both resident and migratory species. Disturbed areas would be restored, reseeded and re-contoured as necessary according to TxDOT specifications, making these effects largely temporary.

## 6.0 Agency Coordination

An archaeological resource survey has been conducted and an associated survey report has been prepared. Survey findings have been coordinated with the THC and ENV's Archaeological and Historical Branches (see **Appendix G**).

The proposed project includes work within a FEMA designated 100-year floodplain; therefore, coordination with the local Floodplain Administrator would be required.

Coordination with the TPWD was required because the proposed project would disturb habitat in an area equal to or greater than the area of disturbance indicated in the TxDOT-TPWD Threshold Table Programmatic Agreement, including over 0.10 acre of riparian vegetation. Early coordination with TPWD has occurred and TPWD has provided recommendations to be implemented, to the extent possible, by TxDOT (see **Appendix G**).

The proposed project would result in permanent impacts to emergent wetlands and more than 300 linear feet of stream. These impacts trigger the need for a Section 404 permit with PCN to the USACE. Mitigation for the stream impacts would be required and is currently being evaluated. Coordination with USACE has begun and approval would be required before moving forward with construction.
## 7.0 Public Involvement

On May 10, 2016, the City of Round Rock hosted a neighborhood leaders' meeting in the cafeteria of Gattis Elementary School, located at 2920 Round Rock Ranch Boulevard in Round Rock. The meeting was held from 5:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. The purpose of the meeting was to give neighborhood leaders an update on the proposed project and an opportunity to provide feedback. Informational boards and a fact sheet were provided to address the proposed goals and history of the project. Nine (9) neighborhood leaders attended the meeting. Stakeholders (neighborhood leaders) were able to ask questions and share concerns/comments with project team members.

On May 14, 2016, four members of the project team walked from door-to-door visiting houses along the project corridor within adjacent neighborhoods. The project team walked for approximately three hours distributing flyers containing information about the project and the timeline. The project team members recorded stakeholder project comments and concerns. Thirty-four (34) stakeholders (residents) made comments about issues that were important to them. The issues that were mentioned most frequently were sound impacts (11), concerns about the proximity of KFB to their homes (9) and impacts to property values (9). Seventy-one (71) stakeholders were contacted and given a flyer but did not provide any specific feedback.

On October 11, 2017, the City of Round Rock hosted an open house in the cafeteria of Gattis Elementary School, located at 2920 Round Rock Ranch Boulevard in Round Rock. The open house was held from 5:30 p.m. to 7:30 p.m. The purpose of the open house was to discuss developments on KFB Segments 2 and 3, present the proposed alternative, and solicit comments/feedback. Information boards provided project goals and history, a fact sheet offered information about the project, and a schematic of the proposed alternative was displayed. Fifty-one (51) stakeholders attended the meeting.

A public hearing would be held upon the approval of the Draft EA. At the public hearing, members of the public will be able to review the Draft EA and other project information and provide comments. Further, because the project would include the construction of four or more lanes on new location, a notice of availability of the final EA will be issued. A FONSI, if applicable, would not be signed until 30 days after the notice of availability of the final EA.

Since the project consists of construction on a new location, a notice of impending construction would be provided to owners of adjoining property and affected local governments and public officials. While not determined at this time, the notice would be provided via a sign or signs posted in the ROW of existing roadways, mailed notice, printed notice distributed by hand, notice via website when the recipient has previously been informed of the relevant website address, or other means. The notice would be provided after the environmental decision, but before earthmoving or other activities requiring the use of heavy equipment begin.

# 8.0 Post-Environmental Clearance Activities and Design/Construction Commitments

#### 8.1 Post-Environmental Clearance Activities

- During the final design phase of project development, an SWP3 would be developed. The SWP3 would identify a system of temporary BMPs to be employed during construction to mitigate construction-related water quality impacts. The SWP3 would be site-specific and tailored to project-area conditions. The SW3P would utilize the temporary control measures/BMPs outlined in TxDOT's Standard Specification for the Construction of Highways, Streets and Bridges. Construction phase quality BMPs could include, but would not be limited to, the following:
  - Temporary vegetation
  - Soil retention blankets/mats
  - Silt fences
  - Filter dams
  - Rock gabions
  - Vegetated filter strips
  - Water quality (detention) ponds
- 2. Impacts to storm water would be minimized as much as possible by utilizing approved temporary and permanent erosion and sediment control BMPs as specified by the TCEQ General Permit (TXR 150000). Prior to construction, the General Permit requires that an SW3P and Notice of Intent be prepared for the proposed project. Following construction, a Notice of Termination must be prepared. The proposed project is located within the boundaries of an MS4; therefore, MS4 regulations will need to be followed.
- 3. The hydraulic design for this project would be in accordance with current FHWA and TxDOT design policy and standards. The facility would permit conveyance of the design year flood levels, inundation of the roadway being acceptable, without causing substantial damage to the roadway, stream or other property. The proposed project would not increase the base flood elevation to a level that would violate the applicable floodplain regulations or ordinances. Prior to construction, coordination with the local floodplain administrator would be required.
- 4. A USACE Section 404 NWP 14 for Linear Transportation Projects would be required for the placement of temporary or permanent dredge or fill material into jurisdictional waters. Impacts to jurisdictional waters are above the threshold for USACE notification, therefore a NWP 14 with PCN would be utilized. A mitigation plan would be coordinated with USACE and a permit obtained prior to construction beginning.

#### 8.2 Design/Construction Commitments

Because the proposed project would require a Section 404 NWP, construction activities would require compliance with the State of Texas Water Quality Certification Program. The 401 Certification requirements for a NWP 14 would be met by implementing BMPs from each category listed in the TCEQ Section 401 Water Quality Certification Conditions. Erosion control BMPs, sediment control BMPs, and post-construction total suspended solid control BMPs would be required for the project.

Project coordination with TPWD led to the identification several BMPs specific to SGCN. These BMPs would be reflected in the Environmental Permits, Issues, and Commitments sheet included in the construction plan documents. The BMPs (and the applicable SGCN) are listed below:

1. **Amphibian and Aquatic Reptile BMPs** (applicable to Strecker's chorus frog, Wood house's toad, and southern crawfish frog)

Unless absence of the species can be demonstrated, assume presence in suitable habitat and implement the following BMPs. Absence can only be demonstrated using TPWD-approved survey efforts (contact TPWD for minimum survey protocols for species and project site conditions).

- a. For project within one mile of a known occupied location or observation of the species recorded from 1980 until the current year and suitable habitat is present, coordinate with TPWD.
- b. For projects that require acquisition of additional ROW and work within that new ROW is in water or will permanently impact a water feature, implement the following BMPs:
  - i. Contractors will be advised of potential occurrence in the project area, and to avoid harming the species if encountered.
  - ii. Minimize impacts to wetland, temporary and permanent open water features, including depressions, and riverine habitats.
  - iii. Maintain hydrologic regime and connections between wetlands and other aquatic features.
  - iv. Use barrier fencing to direct animal movements away from construction activities and areas of potential wildlife-vehicle collisions in construction areas directly adjacent, or that may directly impact, potential habitat for the target species.
  - Apply hydromulching and/or hydroseeding in areas for soil stabilization and/or revegetation of disturbed areas where feasible. If hydromulching and/or hydroseeding are not feasible due to site conditions, using erosion control blankets or mats that contain no netting, or only contain loosely woven natural fiber netting is preferred. Plastic netting should be avoided to the extent practicable.

- vi. Project specific locations (PSLs) proposed within state-owned ROW should be located in uplands away from aquatic features.
- vii. When work is directly adjacent to the water, minimize impacts to shoreline basking sites (e.g., downed trees, sand bars, exposed bedrock) and overwinter sites (e.g., brush and debris piles, crayfish burrows) where feasible.
- viii. Avoid or minimize disturbing or removing downed trees, rotting stumps, and leaf litter, which may be refugia for terrestrial amphibians, where feasible.
- ix. If gutters and curbs are part of the roadway design, where feasible install gutters that do not include the side box inlet and included slope (i.e. mountable) curbs to allow small animals to leave roadway. If this modification to the entire curb system is not possible, install sections of sloped curb on either side of the storm water drain for several feet to allow small animals to leave the roadway. Priority areas for these design recommendations are those with nearby wetlands or other aquatic features.
- x. For sections of roadway adjacent to wetlands or other aquatic features, install wildlife barriers that prevent climbing. Barriers should terminate at culvert openings in order to funnel animals under the road. The barriers should be of the same length as the adjacent feature or 80 feet long in each direction, or whichever is the lesser of the two.
- xi. For culvert extensions and culvert replacement/installation, incorporate measure to funnel animals toward culverts such as concrete wingwalls and barrier walls with overhangs.
- xii. When riprap or other bank stabilization devices are necessary, their placement should not impede the movement of terrestrial or aquatic wildlife through the water feature. Where feasible, biotechnical streambank stabilization methods using live native vegetation or a combination of vegetative and structural materials should be used.
- c. For the southern crawfish frog, minimize impacts to wetland habitats including isolated ephemeral pools
- d. Implement Water Quality BMPs (listed below)
- 2. **Water Quality BMPs** (applicable to Strecker's chorus frog, Woodhouse's toad, and southern crawfish frog)

When working in or around waterbodies and wetlands, the following BMPs will be applied, as practicable, to minimize impacts to aquatic resources:

a. Minimize impacts to wetland, temporary and permanent open water features, including depressions, and riverine habitats.

- b. Maintain hydrologic regime and connections between wetlands and other aquatic features.
- c. When work is directly adjacent to the water, minimize impacts to shoreline basking sites (e.g., downed trees, sand bars, exposed bedrock) and overwinter sites (e.g., brush and debris piles, crayfish burrows) where feasible.
- d. Avoid or minimize disturbing or removing downed trees, rotting stumps, and leaf litter, which may be refugia for terrestrial amphibians, where feasible.
- e. When riprap or other bank stabilization devices are necessary, their placement should not impede the movement of terrestrial or aquatic wildlife through the water feature. Where feasible, biotechnical streambank stabilization methods using live native vegetation or a combination of vegetative and structural materials should be used.
- 3. **Terrestrial Reptile BMPs** (applicable to Timber rattlesnake, Texas garter snake, eastern box turtle, western box turtle, and slender glass lizard)
  - a. Apply hydromulching and/or hydroseeding in areas for soil stabilization and/or revegetation of disturbed areas where feasible. If hydromulching and/or hydroseeding are not feasible due to site conditions, utilize erosion control blankets or mats that contain no netting or contain loosely woven, natural fiber. netting is preferred. Plastic netting should be avoided to the extent practicable.
  - b. For open trenches and excavated pits, install escape ramps at an angle of less than 45 degrees (1:1) in areas left uncovered. Visually inspect excavation areas for trapped wildlife prior to backfilling.
  - c. Inform contractors that if reptiles are found on project site allow species to safely leave the project area.
  - d. Avoid or minimize disturbing or removing downed trees, rotting stumps, and leaf litter where feasible.
  - e. Contractors will be advised of potential occurrence in the project area, and to avoid harming the species if encountered.
- 4. Bird BMPs (applicable to Western Burrowing Owl)
  - a. In addition to complying with the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA), perform the following BMPs:
  - b. Prior to construction, perform daytime surveys for nests including under bridges and in culverts to determine if they are active before removal. Nests that are active should not be disturbed.
  - c. Do not disturb, destroy, or remove active nests, including ground nesting birds, during the nesting season.

- d. Avoid the removal of unoccupied, inactive nests, as practicable.
- e. Prevent the establishment of active nests during the nesting season on TxDOT owned and operated facilities and structures proposed for replacement or repair.
- f. Do not collect, capture, relocate, or transport birds, eggs, young, or active nests without a permit.
- 5. **Bat BMPs** (applicable to Cave myotis bat, big free-tailed bat, big brown bat, eastern red bat, hoary bat, Mexican free-tailed bat, and tricolored bat)

All bat surveys and other activities that include direct contact with bats shall comply with TPWD-recommended white-nose syndrome protocols located on the TPWD Wildlife Habitat Assessment Program website under "Project Design and Construction". The following survey and exclusion protocols should be followed prior to commencement of construction activities. For the purposes of this document, structures are defined as bridges, culverts (concrete or metal), wells and buildings.

- a. For activities that have the potential to impact structures, cliffs or caves, or trees; a qualified biologist will perform a habitat assessment and occupancy survey of the feature(s) with roost potential as early in the planning process as possible or within one year before project letting.
- b. For roosts where occupancy is strongly suspected but unconfirmed during the initial survey, revisit feature(s) at most four weeks prior to scheduled disturbance to confirm absence of bats.
- c. If bats are present or recent signs of occupation (i.e., piles of guano, distinct musky odor, or staining and rub marks at potential entry points) are observed, take appropriate measures to ensure that bats are not harmed, such as implementing non-lethal exclusion activities or timing or phasing of construction.
- d. Exclusion devices can be installed by a qualified individual between September 1 and March 31. Exclusion devices should be used for a minimum of seven days when minimum nighttime temperatures are above 50°F AND minimum daytime temperatures are above 70°F. Prior to exclusion, ensure that alternate roosting habitat is available in the immediate area. If no suitable roosting habitat is available, installation of alternate roosts is recommended to replace the loss of an occupied roost. If alternate roost sites are not provided, bats may seek shelter in other inappropriate sites, such as buildings, in the surrounding area. See Section 2: Standard Recommendations for recommended acceptable methods for excluding bats from structures if needed.
- e. If feature(s) used by bats are removed as a result of construction, replacement structures should incorporate bat-friendly design or artificial roosts should be constructed to replace these features, as practicable.

- f. Conversion of property containing cave or cliff features to transportation purposes should be avoided where feasible.
- g. Large hollow trees, snags (dead standing trees), and trees with shaggy bark should be surveyed for colonies and, if found, should not be disturbed until the bats are no longer occupying these features. Postoccupancy surveys should be conducted by a qualified biologist prior to tree removal from the landscape.
- h. Retain mature, large diameter hardwood forest species and native/ornamental palm trees where feasible.
- i. In all instances, avoid harm or death to bats. Bats should only be handled as a last resort and after communication with TPWD.
- 6. **Plains Spotted Skunk BMPs** (applicable to Plains spotted skunk, American badger, eastern spotted skunk, Long-tailed weasel, mink, southern short-tailed shrew, thirteen-lined ground squirrel, western hog-nosed skunk, and woodland vole)
  - a. Contractors will be advised of potential occurrence in the project area, and to avoid harming the species if encountered, and to avoid unnecessary impacts to dens.
- 7. The Blackland Prairie will be identified on construction plans. No project specific locations (PSLs) (field office, staging areas, etc.) will be allowed within the limits of the prairie site.

## 9.0 Conclusion

As proposed, the KFB Segments 2 and 3 project would be on a new location beginning at Forest Drive and would terminate at SH 45 North in Round Rock, Williamson County, Texas. The typical section would match Segment 1 of the existing KFB. The roadway would be a limited-access six-lane divided major arterial consisting of three 12-foot travel lanes. Continuous sidewalks and a shared use path to connect neighborhoods along the route to the existing Brushy Creek Trail System and Old Settler's Park would also be constructed. Improvements to the intersections of KFB with Gattis School Road and SH 45 North would be included in the project. The length of the proposed project is approximately 1.5 miles.

The Build Alternative, described in **Section 2.2**, satisfies the project purpose and need by enhancing mobility within the area, facilitating north/south movement of traffic, and eliminating the gap between the existing KFB and SH 45 North. Because the Build Alternative satisfies the project's purpose and need, it is the recommended alternative.

The engineering, social, economic, and environmental investigations conducted thus far for the proposed project indicate that it would result in no significant adverse impacts to the quality of the human or natural environment. Implementation of the proposed project would not result in a significant impact on the human or natural environment. Therefore, a finding of no significant impact is recommended.

## 10.0 References

Kenney Fort Boulevard Technical Reports:

- Air Quality Technical Report (2020)
- Archeological Survey Report (2020)
- Biological Evaluation Form and Tier I Site Assessment (2019)
- Community Impacts Assessment Technical Report Form (2019)
- Hazardous Materials Initial Site Assessment (ISA) (2019)
- Project Coordination Request (PCR) for Historic Studies Project (2019)
- Indirect Impacts Technical Report (2020)
- Risk Assessment for Cumulative Impacts (2020)
- Traffic Noise Technical Report (2020)
- Water Resources Technical Report (2020)
- Neighborhood Leaders Meeting Summary Report (2016)
- Open House Summary Report (2017)

TCEQ. 2020. 2020 Texas Integrated Report – Texas 303(d) List (Category 5). https://www.tceq.texas.gov/assets/public/waterquality/swqm/assess/20txir/2020\_ 303d.pdf. Accessed August 20, 2020.

USA Today. May 9, 2019. Florida, Texas, and Carolinas home to many of America's fastest growing cities. <u>https://www.usatoday.com/story/money/2019/05/09/americas-fastest-growing-cities/39442201/</u> Accessed July 11, 2019.

U.S. Census Bureau. American Fact Finder. City of Round Rock Population. Accessed July 2, 2019.

U.S. Census Bureau. American Fact Finder. Williamson County Population. Accessed July 2, 2019.

U.S. Census Bureau. May 23,2019. Fastest-Growing Cities Primarily in the South and West. <u>https://www.census.gov/newsroom/press-releases/2019/subcounty-population-estimates.html</u> Accessed July 11, 2019.

# 11.0 Appendices

Appendix A – Project Location Map

Appendix B – Project Photos

Appendix C – Schematics (Plan View)

Appendix D – Typical Sections

Appendix E – Plan and Program Excerpts

Appendix F – Resource Specific Maps

Appendix G – Resource Agency Coordination

Appendix A – Project Location Map



ProposeendγeKoFrtoBlv FromoeFts0eekdBottvSH\_45

6 010, 2 0 02 , 4 ( Basemap: ESRI Streets

0

Appendix B – Project Photos



Photograph 1. Northern project limit looking east with the Existing Kenney Fort Blvd to the left.



Photograph 2. Northern project limit looking south with a single family development/Urban Habitat Type to the left and Edwards Plateau, Savannah, Woodland, and Shrubland MOU Habitat Type to the right.



Photograph 3. View of debris located within the project area. This debris would need to be removed and disposed of properly before construction could commence.



Photograph 4. View looking south along the project area at Disturbed Prairie Habitat Type of undeveloped land.



Photograph 5. View looking east at Feature 6, an impoundment, within the project area. This Feature and its adjacent wetland, Feature 8, would likely be considered jurisdictional.



Photograph 6. View of Features 7, an unnamed tributary to Dyer Branch, and its associated wetland, Feature 9, within the project area. Both of these features would likely be considered jurisdictional.



**Photograph 7.** OHWM of Feature 4, an unnamed Tributary to Dyer Branch identified within project ROW. Features 2, 4, and 5 would likely be non-jurisdictional due to their ephemeral flow regimes.



Photograph 8. View looking north up state-owned project ROW. This area would be considered Urban Habitat Type.



Photograph 9. A view looking north along Feature 3, Dyer Branch, within the project area. This is likely a jurisdictional waterbody exhibiting Riparian Habitat along its banks.



**Photograph 10**. A view looking east along Gattis School Road from the proposed project location. Several community resources are located along this roadway but would not be impacted by the proposed project.



**Photograph 11**. A view looking south within the project area at an undeveloped pasture exhibiting Tallgrass Prairie, Grassland Habitat Type.



**Photograph 12.** A view looking south along Feature 1, an unnamed tributary to Dyer Branch. This feature would likely be considered jurisdictional and would require compensatory mitigation due to impacts exceeding 300LF.



Photograph 13. View looking north from the southern project limits.



Photograph 14. View looking south from the southern project limits at the existing US-45 overpass.

Appendix C – Schematics (Plan View)





Appendix D – Typical Sections



Northbound Left Turn and Right Turn Lane Configuration



Northbound Dual Left Turn and Right Turn Lane Configuration

#### **Gattis School Road Typical Sections at Intersection**



Appendix E – Plan and Program Excerpts

# SHORT-TERM IMPROVEMENTS PROVIDE IMMEDIATE IMPACT TO MOBILITY ENHANCEMENTS.

# SHORT-TERM IMPROVEMENTS (2017-2020)

Corridor	Project Limits	Project Length (mi)	CIP Rank	Total Cost (2017 \$)	
Mays Street	McNeil Road to Hesters Crossing	1.23	1	\$7,939,288	
McNeil Road Extension	McNeil Road to Georgetown St.	0.52	2	\$5,404,994	
US 79	Mays Street to A.W. Grimes Blvd.	1.66	3	\$9,319,564	
Gattis School Road	Mays Street to Red Bud Ln.	3.76	4	\$34,803,267	
Update ITS and Traffic Management Infrastructure	-	-	-	\$20.9M*	

\*Source: City of Round Rock Traffic Management System Improvement Study

# MID-TERM IMPROVEMENTS (2020-2030)

Corridor	Project Limits	Project Length (mi)	CIP Rank	Total Cost (2017 \$)	
A.W. Grimes Blvd.	US 79 to Old Settlers Blvd.	1.80	5	\$11,176,231	
Round Rock Ave/RM 620	North of Shady Ln. to south of Cornerwood Dr.	0.24	6	\$2,353,681	
US 79	A.W. Grimes Blvd. to SH 130	3.88	7	\$67,177,078	
FM 3406/Old Settlers Blvd.	Sam Bass Rd. to Greenhill Dr.	3.08	8	34,918,059	
Gattis School Road	Red Bud Ln. to Priem Ln.	0.56	9	\$3,624,468	
Teravista Parkway	South of Centerbrook Place to west of Engadina Pass	0.20	10	\$1,739,001	
Kenney Fort Blvd.	SH 45 to Forest Creek Dr.	1.46	11	\$21,412,128	
Kenney Fort Blvd.	Joe Dimaggio Blvd. to Old Settlers Blvd.	1.73	12	\$28,276,013	
Sam Bass Rd.	University Blvd. to FM 3406	2.12	13	34,235,126	
Hesters Crossing Rd.	Dry Creek Dr. to west of IH 35 SBFR	0.32	14	\$2,680,564	
Old Settlers Blvd.	Greenhill Dr. to Kenney Fort Blvd.	3.08	15	\$22,712,450	
University Blvd.	Sunrise Rd. to A.W. Grimes Blvd.	1.98	16	\$16,486,652	
Round Rock Ave/RM 620	Deepwood Dr. to IH 35	0.92	17	\$27,028,968	

Precinct 4 Long Range Plan Projects						
Roadway Name	Project Limits	Project Description	Jurisdiction	Length (mile)		
Arterial A (Kenney Fort Blvd.)	CR 112/CR 117 - Joe DiMaggio Blvd.	Construct new 4 lanes with median roadway	ROUND ROCK	2.1		
Arterial A (Kenney Fort Blvd.)	Joe DiMaggio Blvd, - 1000' S. of US 79	Widen from 2 lanes with a median to 6 lanes with a median	ROUND ROCK	0.6		
Arterial A (Kenney Fort Blvd.)	1000' South of US 79 - Gattis School Rd.	Widen from 2 lanes with a median to 6 lanes with a median	ROUND ROCK/ WILLIAMSON	1.9		
Arterial A (Kenney Fort Blvd.)	Gattis School Rd Louis Henna Blvd. (SH 45 N)	Construct new 6 lanes with median roadway	ROUND ROCK/ WILLIAMSON	0.6		
Carl Stern Blvd.	US 79 - FM 685	Widen from 2 lanes to 4 lanes with a median	HUTTO	2.4		
Carl Stern Blvd.	FM 685 - FM 1660	Widen from 2 lanes to 4 lanes with a median	HUTTO	1.3		
Carl Stern Blvd.	FM 1660 - CR 134	Widen from 2 lanes to 4 lanes with a median	HUTTO	1.7		
Chandler Rd.	FM 1460 - CR 110	Widen from 2 lanes to 4 lanes with a median	ROUND ROCK	2.3		
Chandler Rd.	CR 110 - SH 130	Widen from 2 lanes to 4 lanes with a median	ROUND ROCK	1.4		
Chandler Rd.	SH 130 - FM 1660	Widen from 2 lanes to 4 lanes with a median	WILLIAMSON	3.5		
Chandler Rd.	FM 1660 - SH 95	Widen from 2 lanes to 4 lanes with a median	WILLIAMSON	7.1		
Chandler Rd. Ext.	SH 95 - FM 619	Construct new 2 lane roadway	WILLIAMSON	1.8		
Chandler Rd. Ext./ FM 619	On FM 619, at Chandler Rd. Ext US 79	Reconstruct 2 lane roadway	WILLIAMSON	3.5		
Collector 4-1	SH 130 - CR 110	Construct 4 lane undivided roadway on new location	WILLIAMSON	1.5		
Collector 4-2	Limmer Loop - US 79	Construct 4 lane undivided roadway along Haybarn Ln. and Tradesman Park Dr.	WILLIAMSON	2.0		
CR 100 Intersection	CR 119 Ext Chandler Rd.	Widen from 2 lanes to 4 lanes with a median	WILLIAMSON	0.5		
CR 101	US 79 - Chandler Rd.	Reconstruct 2 lane road to 4 lanes with a median	WILLIAMSON	3.9		
CR 108	US 79 - CR 118	Widen from 2 lanes to 4 lanes with a median	HUTTO	2.8		
CR 110/Southwestern Blvd.	CR 111/Westinghouse Rd US 79	Widen from 2 lanes to 4 lanes with a median	WILLIAMSON	5.7		
CR 112	University Blvd FM 1460	Widen from 2 lanes to 4 lanes with a median	WILLIAMSON	2.1		
CR 112	FM 1460 - CR 110/Southwestern Blvd.	Widen from 2 lanes to 4 lanes with a median	WILLIAMSON	1.6		
CR 119/Ed Schmidt Rd.	US 79 – Limmer Loop	Widen from 2 lanes with a median to 4 lanes with a median	HUTTO/WILLIAMSON	1.2		
CR 119 Ext.	Limmer Loop – CR 100	Construct 4 lanes with a median on new location	WILLIAMSON	1.8		
CR 137	FM 1660 - Rowe Ln.	Widen from 2 lanes to 4 lanes with a median	PFLUGERVILLE	2.8		
CR 138	SH 130 - CR 137	Widen from 2 lanes to 4 lanes with a median	WILLIAMSON	2.2		
CR 366/Old Georgetown Rd.	FM 397 - Chandler Rd	Reconstruct and widen to 4 lanes	TAYLOR	2.0		
Double Creek Dr.	US 79 - Forest Creek Dr.	Construct new 4 lanes with median roadway	ROUND ROCK	0.7		
FM 1460	CR 111/Westinghouse Rd Chandler Rd.	Widen from 2 lanes to 4 lanes with a median	TXDOT / WILLIAMSON	1.2		
FM 1660 (Existing Alignment)	US 79 - CR 134	Widen from 2 lanes to 2 lanes with a median at a new location	тхрот	3.3		
FM 1660 (New Alignment)	SH 29 to Chandler Rd.	Widen from 2 lanes to 4 lanes with a median	TXDOT	3.0		
FM 1660 (New Alignment)	Chandler Rd FM 3349	Widen from 2 lanes to 4 lanes with a median	TXDOT/WILLIAMSON	7.4		
FM 1660 (New Alignment)	FM 3349 to FM 973	Extend 4 lane roadway with median on new location	TXDOT	2.2		
FM 1660 (New Alignment)	FM 973 to SH 95	Extend 2 lane roadway on a new location	TXDOT	2.1		
FM 397/Taylor Loop	SH 95 - CR 411	Construct new 4 lanes with median roadway	TXDOT	0.9		

#### **Roadway Projects**

MPO ID	Sponsor(s)	County	Roadway	Limits (From)	Limits (To)	Description	Let Year	Total Cost
61-00064-00	Austin	Williamson	Howard Ln	SH 45/RM 620	McNeil Rd	New MAD-6	2030	\$22,700,000.00
61-00065-00	Round Rock	Williamson	Kenney Fort Boulevard Segment 2	Forest Creek Drive	Gattis School Road	Construct new MAD-6 with sidewalks and shared use path	2018	\$8,400,000.00
61-00066-00	Round Rock	Williamson	Kenney Fort Boulevard Segment 3	Gattis School Road	SH 45	Construct new MAD-6 with sidewalks and shared use path	2018	\$8,400,000.00
61-00067-00	Round Rock	Williamson	Kenney Fort Boulevard Segment 4	Old Settlers Blvd	Chandler Creek Drive	Construct new MAD-4 with sidewalks and shared use path	2025	\$9,600,000.00
61-00068-00	Round Rock	Williamson	Kenney Fort Boulevard Segment 5	CR 112	Old Settlers Blvd	Construct new MAD-4 with sidewalks and shared use path	2025	\$10,300,000.00

Appendix F – Resource Specific Maps












Appendix G – Resource Agency Coordination

## **Amy Esguerra**

Subject: RE: Kenney Fort Blvd - PCR

From: Troy Olney <<u>Troy.Olney@txdot.gov</u>>
Sent: Tuesday, October 22, 2019 12:09 PM
To: Stacey Benningfield <<u>sbenningfield@cpyi.com</u>>
Cc: Gerald Pohlmeyer <<u>gpohlmeyer@roundrocktexas.gov</u>>; Victoria Raines <<u>vraines@cpyi.com</u>>; Lindsey Kimmitt
<<u>Lindsey.Kimmitt@txdot.gov</u>>
Subject: RE: Kenney Fort Blvd - PCR

Stacey,

The TxDOT historian has cleared the project as far as impacts to historical resources under Section 106 is concerned.

*CSJ # 0914-05-195* Kenney Fort Blvd. was CLEARED by HIST on 10/22/2019 in ECOS under the Obtain 106 Approval activity with the following language:

"The undertaking was reviewed as an Appendix 6 project with a negative survey. See WPD for project description and KenneyFort\_PCR\_Attachments.pdf in Documents for additional project information. - 10/22/2019

HIST Finding: In compliance with the Section 106 PA, TxDOT historians determined project activities will not affect historic properties. In compliance with the Antiquities Code of Texas and the MOU, TxDOT historians determined project activities have no potential for adverse effects. Individual project coordination with SHPO is not required. TxDOT historians reviewed project plans alongside historic aerials and Williamson County Central Appraisal District records, and found no historic-aged properties, nor any properties listed or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places, within the project's Area of Potential Effects."

Thank you,



Troy Olney | Environmental Specialist Austin District 7901 N IH 35, Austin, TX 78753 Phone: (512) 832-7056 | Email: <u>Troy.Olney@txdot.gov</u>

From: Stacey Benningfield [mailto:sbenningfield@cpyi.com]
Sent: Thursday, October 17, 2019 12:10 PM
To: Troy Olney <Troy.Olney@txdot.gov>; Lindsey Kimmitt <Lindsey.Kimmitt@txdot.gov>
Cc: Gerald Pohlmeyer <gpohlmeyer@roundrocktexas.gov>; Victoria Raines <vraines@cpyi.com>
Subject: Kenney Fort Blvd - PCR

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

Troy and Lindsey,

Attached is the completed PCR form. The attachments will be sent separately.

Sb

(PCR: 1 of 2)



From: Suzanne Walsh [mailto:Suzanne.Walsh@tpwd.texas.gov]
Sent: Friday, April 17, 2020 4:28 PM
To: Troy Olney <Troy.Olney@txdot.gov>
Subject: RE: Request for TPWD Early Coordination: City of Round Rock Kenney Fort Blvd. Extension Project, Williamson County (0914-05-195)

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

Hi Troy,

I appreciate the commitment to implement the additional BMPS for the project.

Thank you for submitting the following project for early coordination: Kenney Fort Blvd from Forest Creek Drive to SH 45 to IH-2 (CSJ: 0914-05-195). TPWD appreciates TxDOT's commitment to implement the practices listed in the Tier I Site Assessment form submitted on January 3, 2020 and in emails below. Based on a review of the documentation, the avoidance and mitigation efforts described, and provided that project plans do not change, TPWD considers coordination to be complete. However, please note it is the responsibility of the project proponent to comply with all federal, state, and local laws that protect plants, fish, and wildlife.

According to §2.204(g) of the 2013 TxDOT-TPWD MOU, TxDOT agreed to provide TXNDD reporting forms for observations of tracked SGCN (which includes federal- and state-listed species) occurrences within TxDOT project areas. Please keep this mind when completing project due diligence tasks. For TXNDD submission guidelines, please visit the following link: <u>http://tpwd.texas.gov/huntwild/wild/wildlife\_diversity/txndd/submit.phtml</u>

Sincerely,

Suzanne Walsh Transportation Conservation Coordinator (512) 389-4579 From: Troy Olney <<u>Troy.Olney@txdot.gov</u>> Sent: Friday, April 17, 2020 4:04 PM To: Suzanne Walsh <<u>Suzanne.Walsh@tpwd.texas.gov</u>> Subject: FW: Request for TPWD Early Coordination: City of Round Rock Kenney Fort Blvd. Extension Project, Williamson County (0914-05-195)

## ALERT: This email came from an external source. Do not open attachments or click on links in unknown or unexpected emails.

Hi Suzanne,

See attached for the BMPs that the City of Round Rock will include in the project EPICs and general notes for the Kenney Fort Blvd. Project.

A survey was conducted recently to look for Texas almond within the project area. None was identified.

The Blackland prairie site will be identified in the construction plans. No PSLs (field office, staging areas, etc) will be allowed within the limits of the Prairie site.

Please let me know if you have any other questions or concerns.

Thank you, Troy



Troy Olney | Environmental Specialist Austin District 7901 N IH 35, Austin, TX 78753 Phone: (512) 832-7056 | Email: <u>Troy.Olney@txdot.gov</u>

From: Suzanne Walsh [mailto:Suzanne.Walsh@tpwd.texas.gov]
Sent: Friday, February 21, 2020 4:41 PM
To: Troy Olney <<u>Troy.Olney@txdot.gov</u>>
Cc: Lindsey Kimmitt <<u>Lindsey.Kimmitt@txdot.gov</u>>
Subject: RE: Request for TPWD Early Coordination: City of Round Rock Kenney Fort Blvd. Extension Project, Williamson
County (0914-05-195)

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

Thank you for your patience. I appreciate that the full language of the Amphibian, Water Quality, Bird, Bat, and Terrestrial Reptile BMPs from the 2017 BMP PA will be implemented for the project.

- TPWD recommends also applying the full Terrestrial Reptile BMPs of the 2017 BMP PA to the following
  additional species not yet included in the BMP PA:
  eastern box turtle, western box turtle, and slender glass lizard
- TPWD recommends also applying the Amphibian and Aquatic Reptile BMPs of the 2017 BMP PA to the following additional species not yet included in the BMP PA: Strecker's chorus frog, Woodhouse's toad
- TPWD recommends also applying the Bat BMPs of the 2017 BMP PA to the following species not yet included in the BMP PA: big brown bat, eastern red bat, hoary bat, Mexican free-tailed bat, tricolored bat
- TPWD recommends applying the Plains Spotted Skunk BMP of the 2017 BMP PA to the following species: American badger, eastern spotted skunk, long-tailed weasel, mink, southern short-tailed shrew, thirteen-lined ground squirrel, western hog-nosed skunk, and woodland vole
- The Tier I form indicated that both the Vertisol Blackland prairie and Little bluestem-indiangrass series were
  confirmed in the field by the district. How would they be impacted? Are they in the footprint of the project or
  are they in adjacent areas? We recommend avoiding impacts to these rare plant communities where
  practicable. We encourage the district to keep in mind measures to alert and discourage contractors from
  causing any unintentional impacts to these sensitive areas, including placing staging areas, stock piles, and other
  project related sites outside of these areas.
- There is a NDD record for Texas Almond within the project area. Did the district survey for this species? If not, would the district be willing to survey to confirm presence/absence?

If you have any questions, please let me know.

Thanks, Suzanne

From: Troy Olney <<u>Troy.Olney@txdot.gov</u>>
Sent: Monday, February 10, 2020 10:28 AM
To: Suzanne Walsh <<u>Suzanne.Walsh@tpwd.texas.gov</u>>
Subject: RE: Request for TPWD Early Coordination: City of Round Rock Kenney Fort Blvd. Extension Project, Williamson
County (0914-05-195)

I still haven't received it from the City's consultant. Thanks for the reminder. I will ask again.



Troy Olney | Environmental Specialist Austin District 7901 N IH 35, Austin, TX 78753 Phone: (512) 832-7056 | Email: Troy.Olney@txdot.gov From: Suzanne Walsh [mailto:Suzanne.Walsh@tpwd.texas.gov]
Sent: Monday, February 10, 2020 10:25 AM
To: Troy Olney <<u>Troy.Olney@txdot.gov</u>>
Subject: RE: Request for TPWD Early Coordination: City of Round Rock Kenney Fort Blvd. Extension Project, Williamson
County (0914-05-195)

Hi Troy,

I'm checking if you could send the schematic to me. I did not receive an email with a dropbox link.

Thanks, Suzanne

From: Troy Olney <<u>Troy.Olney@txdot.gov</u>>
Sent: Tuesday, January 28, 2020 9:49 AM
To: Suzanne Walsh <<u>Suzanne.Walsh@tpwd.texas.gov</u>>
Cc: Lindsey Kimmitt <<u>Lindsey.Kimmitt@txdot.gov</u>>
Subject: RE: Request for TPWD Early Coordination: City of Round Rock Kenney Fort Blvd. Extension Project, Williamson
County (0914-05-195)

Hi Suzanne,

Thank you for your review and comments. I will send over the latest schematic ASAP.

I will notify the City and make sure the following full BMPs are included in the project plans and EPICs:

- Amphibian BMPs and Water Quality BMPs for the Southern crawfish frog.
- Full Bird, Bat, and Terrestrial Reptile BMPs

I will also get the Tier 1 form revised to include all the above BMPs.

Thank you, Troy

From: Suzanne Walsh [mailto:Suzanne.Walsh@tpwd.texas.gov]
Sent: Friday, January 24, 2020 4:54 PM
To: Troy Olney
Cc: Lindsey Kimmitt
Subject: RE: Request for TPWD Early Coordination: City of Round Rock Kenney Fort Blvd. Extension Project, Williamson County (0914-05-195)

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

Hi Troy,

I have initiated review of this project and would like some additional information.

• Could you provide a project schematic? I did not see a file in ECOS.

- Can you confirm that the district will implement the Amphibian BMPs and Water Quality BMPs in their entirety for the Southern crawfish frog?
- For the Bird, Bat, and Terrestrial Reptile BMPs listed in the Tier I, several of the BMPs have been omitted from those listed in the 2017 BMP PA. If a project is within the range of a threatened, endangered, or SCGN species and there is potential for suitable habitat for the species, then the full list of BMPs in Section I of the 2017 BMP PA should be applied for the project. Can the district confirm that these BMPs will be implemented in their entirety for those species?

Thanks, Suzanne

Suzanne Walsh Transportation Conservation Coordinator Wildlife Division – Wildlife Habitat Assessment Program Texas Parks and Wildlife Department Phone: (512) 389-4579

From: WHAB\_TxDOT <<u>WHAB\_TxDOT@tpwd.texas.gov</u>>
Sent: Monday, January 6, 2020 1:34 PM
To: Troy Olney <<u>Troy.Olney@txdot.gov</u>>; Lindsey Kimmitt <<u>Lindsey.Kimmitt@txdot.gov</u>>
Cc: Jessica Schmerler <<u>Jessica.Schmerler@tpwd.texas.gov</u>>; Suzanne Walsh <<u>Suzanne.Walsh@tpwd.texas.gov</u>>
Subject: RE: Request for TPWD Early Coordination: City of Round Rock Kenney Fort Blvd. Extension Project, Williamson
County (0914-05-195)

This project has been reassigned to Suzanne Walsh due to it being an EA.

Thank you,

John Ney Administrative Assistant Texas Parks & Wildlife Department Wildlife Diversity Program – Habitat Assessment Program 4200 Smith School Road Austin, TX 78744 Office: (512) 389-4571

From: WHAB\_TxDOT <<u>WHAB\_TxDOT@tpwd.texas.gov</u>>
Sent: Friday, January 3, 2020 12:55 PM
To: Troy Olney <<u>Troy.Olney@txdot.gov</u>>; Lindsey Kimmitt <<u>Lindsey.Kimmitt@txdot.gov</u>>
Cc: Jessica Schmerler <<u>Jessica.Schmerler@tpwd.texas.gov</u>>
Subject: RE: Request for TPWD Early Coordination: City of Round Rock Kenney Fort Blvd. Extension Project, Williamson
County (0914-05-195)

The TPWD Wildlife Habitat Assessment Program has received your request and has assigned it project ID # 42952. The Habitat Assessment Biologist who will complete your project review is copied on this email.

Thank you,

John Ney Administrative Assistant Texas Parks & Wildlife Department Wildlife Diversity Program – Habitat Assessment Program 4200 Smith School Road Austin, TX 78744 Office: (512) 389-4571

From: Troy Olney <<u>Troy.Olney@txdot.gov</u>>
Sent: Friday, January 3, 2020 8:41 AM
To: WHAB\_TxDOT <<u>WHAB\_TxDOT@tpwd.texas.gov</u>>
Cc: Lindsey Kimmitt <<u>Lindsey.Kimmitt@txdot.gov</u>>
Subject: Request for TPWD Early Coordination: City of Round Rock Kenney Fort Blvd. Extension Project, Williamson
County (0914-05-195)

Consistent with the memorandum of understanding signed by our two agencies, attached is a copy of the coordination document [as required by 43 TAC §2.207(b)] covering the subject project for your review and comment. Supporting documents have also been uploaded to the ECOS file for your review (CCSJ 0914-05-195).

If you have any questions regarding this project, or need additional information, please feel free to contact me at 512-832-7056.

Sincerely, Troy Olney



Troy Olney | Environmental Specialist Austin District 7901 N IH 35, Austin, TX 78753 Phone: (512) 832-7056 | Email: <u>Troy.Olney@txdot.gov</u>