

**FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION**

**FINDING OF NO SIGNIFICANT IMPACT**

**FOR**

**ROUTE:** Route 606 Reconstruction Project  
**LOCATION:** Loudoun County, Virginia  
**STATE PROJECT:** 0606-053-983, P101; UPC 97529  
**FEDERAL PROJECT:** STP-5A01 (165)

The Federal Highway Administration has determined that this project will have no significant impact on the environment. This Finding of No Significant Impact is based on the approved Environmental Assessment and the Revised Environmental Assessment which have been independently evaluated by the Federal Highway Administration and determined to adequately and accurately discuss the need, environmental issues, and impacts of the proposed project. It provides sufficient evidence and analysis for determining that an Environmental Impact Statement is not required.

11/20/13

Date

John Armkins

Bar: FHWA Division Administrator

## FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION

### **Rationale for the Finding of No Significant Impact** Route 606 Reconstruction Project **State Project Number:** 0606-053-983, P101; UPC 97529

---

We have reviewed the Virginia Department of Transportation's October 23, 2013 letter requesting a Finding of No Significant Impact, which includes the Revised Environmental Assessment (REA), and the transcript from the Design Public Hearing. The REA is attached to the Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI) and is hereby incorporated by reference into this rationale supporting the FONSI.

Route 606 (Loudoun County Parkway/Old Ox Road) connects two major roads, US Route 50 and the Dulles Greenway (Route 267), and provides a desirable route for motorists from points west to Washington Dulles International Airport and the Dulles North Transit Center (a 750-space park and ride lot), as well as the business commerce centers in the Ashburn, Sterling, and Herndon areas. For the section of Route 606 north of Route 621 and south of Route 267, 2011 traffic counts were 21,500 Average Daily Traffic (ADT), with a projected traffic count of 35,250 ADT for the design year of 2036. This data indicates that existing traffic counts on the section of Route 606 between Route 621 and Route 267 substantially exceed the Daily Service Value (DSV) of 6,700, thereby emphasizing the need for additional capacity. From 2007 to the end of 2010, a total of 158 accidents were reported on Route 606 between Route 621 (Evergreen Mills Road) and Route 267 (Dulles Greenway). Because of a very high demand for the Dulles North Transit Center, the existing lot is chronically oversubscribed and improved circulation along roadways presently serving the facility (such as Route 606) is critically needed. The purpose of the Route 606 Reconstruction Project is to improve the capacity and safety of a heavily trafficked roadway and to provide a critical leg of the proposed Dulles Loop by widening the existing two-lane roadway to a four-lane roadway with divided median and signalized intersections.

### **Environmental Impacts**

The environmental impacts for the Preferred Build Alternative (PBA) that involves improvements along the existing corridor were described in the approved Environmental Assessment (EA). The EA was made available for public review prior to and at the Public Hearing. Substantive comments were addressed in the REA and FONSI request. No comments were received from the environmental resource agencies or any member of the public that suggested that the project would have a significant environmental impact.

The following is a summary of the project's environmental impacts.

## Land Use

The area immediately surrounding the Route 606 study area is largely a mosaic of forest lands and fallow fields interspersed among commercial and general industrial developed lands ranging from low to high density. Areas along the existing corridor are predominantly developed. Two residential communities are present within the study area – an unnamed community located near southern end of the project corridor (along Evergreen Mill Road (Rt. 621)) and the Loudoun Valley Estates III community located in the central portion of the corridor (between Overland Drive and several hundred feet north of Stukely Drive). Hay production is associated with several parcels in the central portion of the corridor (along Weather Service Road).

The more intensely developed residential portions of the region occur northwest of and south of the study area. Dulles International Airport property abuts the southeastern side of Route 606 near the southern terminus and the northern terminus of the project. The project is located within a transportation corridor that is crucial to the economy derived from and associated with adjacent Washington Dulles International Airport.

No Agricultural or Forestal Districts are currently designated within the project study area or surrounding areas and therefore, no Agricultural / Forestal Districts would be affected. Approximately 1,997 acres (or 52 percent) of the study area (including 5.1 acres presently designated as VDOT right-of-way) is comprised of mixed evergreen/deciduous and deciduous forest stands typical to the region. Approximately 107.9 acres of forest cover located outside of existing right-of-way would be affected by the Preferred Build Alternative. The 107.9 acres of forest cover that would be affected by construction of the Preferred Build Alternative comprises 5.4 percent of the total 1,997 acres mapped within the study area and, as such, impacts would be minor. Approximately 2,324 acres (or 60 percent) of the study area (including 45 acres presently designated as VDOT right-of-way) is underlain by soils mapped as prime farmland soils by USDA. Of the total 117 acres of prime farmland soils affected by the project, 72 acres are located outside of existing right-of-way. The 72 acres of prime farmland soils that would be newly affected by construction of the Preferred Build Alternative comprises 3.1 percent of the total 2,324 acres mapped within the study area and, as such, impacts would be minor. Also considering that these 72 acres of prime farmland soils are located within a county planned urbanized transportation corridor and are not zoned agricultural, they are not considered to be contributors to potential prime farmlands.

According to the Virginia Outdoors Foundation (VOF), no VOF-designated open space easements are located in or near the project study area. Temporary construction easements may be required within small portions of a county-designated open space surrounding the Loudoun Valley Estates III subdivision. Southeast of Route 606 the northern and southern portions of the study area are zoned “Washington-Dulles International Airport” (IAD). The remainder of parcels adjoining Route 606 are zoned “Planned Development-General Industrial”. The Preferred Build Alternative would be consistent with local and regional land use plans, including Loudoun County’s

Comprehensive Plan. The Preferred Build Alternative would also be consistent with the National Capital Region Transportation Plan, Constrained Long Range Transportation Plan (CLRP) for the Washington Metropolitan Area.

FHWA finds that the impacts to land use are not significant.

### Social

*Community Facilities/Services.* The PBA would not have any divisive or disruptive effect on the community and would not hinder the accessibility of the public to any of the essential community or public services (schools, places of worship, shopping centers or medical facilities/hospitals) as well as police/fire and rescue emergency response services. The more intensely developed residential portions of the region occur northwest of and south of the study area. Dulles International Airport property abuts the southeastern side of Route 606 near the southern terminus and the northern terminus of the project. The project is located within a transportation corridor that is crucial to the economy derived from and associated with adjacent Washington Dulles International Airport. The project would improve access to major activity centers around Washington Dulles International Airport for passengers and freight from the west and south

*Neighborhood and Community Cohesion.* Areas along the existing corridor are predominantly developed. Two residential communities are present within the study area – an unnamed community located near southern end of the project corridor (along Evergreen Mill Road (Rt. 621)) and the Loudoun Valley Estates III community located in the central portion of the corridor (between Overland Drive and several hundred feet north of Stukely Drive). The 2003 Loudoun County Bicycle and Pedestrian Mobility Master Plan identifies a planned shared-use path around the perimeter of the proposed Dulles Loop, including the portion of Route 606 within the study area. As part of the Preferred Build Alternative, 10-foot-wide shared-use paths would be provided along both sides of the improved Route 606.

FHWA finds that the social impacts are not significant.

### Environmental Justice

This project has been developed in accordance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 as amended, and Executive Order 12898 - Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low Income Populations.

*Public Participation.* A comprehensive and ongoing public participation program has been established for this project to allow affected parties to review the proposed project concepts and provide comments. Section 4 of the approved EA discussed the numerous public involvement efforts that have been associated with the project development process. The EA was approved by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) for public availability on June 11, 2013. A Design Public Hearing was subsequently held for the project at the J. Lunsford Middle School in Chantilly, Virginia on June 26, 2013. A total of 79 citizens signed in at the hearing. A total of 85 written comments were submitted to VDOT during the public hearing and within the comment period. The only

comments received to environmental related issues were in regards to a proposed sound wall barrier identified in the EA. A Final Noise Analysis has been performed based upon more detailed engineering information as the project design advances. No changes have been made to the proposed action or associated mitigation measures as a result of comments received on the EA.

*Environmental Justice Impacts.* In light of Executive Order 12898, a review of the potential disproportionate effects of the Preferred Build Alternative was conducted. The study area is located almost entirely within US Census Block Group 511076118001. A reported 4.2 percent of the population within this block group is considered low-income, while a reported 14 percent of the population within this block group is minority. No minority or low-income populations have been identified within the study area that would be adversely affected by the Preferred Build Alternative; therefore, in accordance with the provisions of Executive Order 12898 and FHWA Order 6640.23, the proposed project is not anticipated to cause disproportionately high and adverse effects on minority population. VDOT will ensure meaningful opportunities to participate by conducting all required public outreach to give minority or low-income populations the opportunity to comment on the project.

FHWA finds that the Preferred Build Alternative would not have disproportionately high and adverse effects on minority and low income populations, and finds that the impacts would not be significant.

### Historic Properties

Context. Cultural resource investigations were conducted along a 4.85-mile-long and approximately 300-foot-wide Area of Potential Effects (APE) for archaeological resources (which was subsequently expanded to encompass proposed stormwater management facility sites) and a view shed-based APE for historic architectural resources. Communities along each APE were evaluated for the presence of potential historic districts. No areas within the APEs are recommended as an eligible historic district. Field investigation included the documentation of nine architectural resources. Five previously unrecorded architectural resources were surveyed as part of reconnaissance survey. VDOT recommended that none are eligible for listing on the NRHP because these resources lack significance and/or have lost integrity through modern alterations.

A Phase I archaeological field investigation was conducted, which included a walkover of the APE for archaeology and the excavation of 144 shovel tests. Although the APE falls within the boundaries of previously identified Sites 44LD169, 44LD170, and 44LD172, no additional artifacts were encountered. Field investigation also showed that much of the APE has very low potential for archaeological resources because it has been impacted by the installation of utilities and by modern development. No significant archaeological resources were identified and it was determined that no further archaeological work is warranted.

Based on the limits of the study, DHR could not concur that portions of sites 44LD169,

44LD170, 44LD172, 44LD968, and 44LD969 located outside the APE are not eligible; however, DHR determined that no further work is required as long as VDOT does not encroach upon portions of the aforementioned sites falling outside the designated APE. On October 19, 2012, the Virginia Department of Historic Resources (DHR) concurred with VDOT's determination of "no effect" on historic properties within the APE as long as the archeological sites outside the designated APE were not encroached upon by the project. A supplemental Phase I Cultural Resources Survey was necessitated for an expanded APE due to revision of the stormwater design which included additional stormwater management pond locations either partially within or outside the original APE. The supplemental survey assessed two archeological resources and two architectural resources within the expanded APE to conclude they do not meet the criteria for NHRP eligibility. On July 2, 2013, VDHR reconfirmed the project would have "no effect" on historic properties.

FHWA finds that the impacts to historic properties are not significant.

#### Section 4(f) Properties

No public recreational properties subject to Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act are located within the study area. No waterfowl or wildlife refuges would be affected. No Virginia Natural Heritage resources would be affected. No Virginia Outdoors Foundation (VOF) open space easements would be affected. With respect to direct and indirect effects on historic architectural properties and archaeological sites, DHR issued a determination of "no effect" for the Preferred Build Alternative. No right-of-way, permanent easements or temporary easements would be needed from these historic properties; therefore, no "use" of a Section 4(f) property would be required.

FHWA finds that the impacts to Section 4(f) properties are not significant

#### Right of Way / Relocation

The Preferred Build Alternative would require acquisition of approximately 45 acres of right-of-way. In addition, approximately 67 acres of permanent easement (primarily for storm water management basins) and 24 acres of temporary easement would be required. In addition to acquisition, 55.02 acres of permanent easement and 7.03 acres of temporary easement would be required on Dulles International Airport/MWAA property, while 11.54 acres of permanent easement and 3.82 acres of temporary easement would be required on NOAA property. No displacements or relocations would be required.

The acquisition and relocation program will be conducted in accordance with the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, as amended. Relocation resources are available to all residential and business relocatees without discrimination.

FHWA finds that the right-of-way and relocation impacts are not significant.

## Air Quality

The Route 606 corridor is located within a Carbon Monoxide Attainment Area, a Moderate Ozone Nonattainment Area, a Fine Particulate Matter (PM<sub>2.5</sub>) Nonattainment Area, and a volatile organic compounds (VOC) and oxides of nitrogen (NO<sub>x</sub>) Emissions Control Area. The Route 606 Reconstruction Project is included in the conformity analysis for the FY10-FY16 TIP and 2010 LRP which received federal approval on February 9, 2011.

An Air Report was completed for the project in January 2013. The report concludes that the design year 24-hour forecasted traffic does not exceed the thresholds contained in VDOT's Project-Level Carbon Monoxide Air Quality Studies Agreement with FHWA dated February 27, 2009, and therefore does not require a project-level CO air quality analysis. Although the project is located within an 8-hour Ozone Nonattainment Area, the scope and concept of the project is consistent with what was modeled in the conformity analysis of the 11-16 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and 2010 Long Range Plan (LRP). The Clean Air Act and 40 CFR 93.116 requirements were met without a PM<sub>2.5</sub> hot-spot analysis, since this project has been found not to be of air quality concern under 40 CFR 93.123(b)(1). All reasonable precautions will be taken during construction to limit the emissions of VOC and NO<sub>x</sub>.

While it is possible that localized increases in MSAT emissions may occur as a result of this project, emissions will likely be lower than present levels in the design year of this project as a result of EPA's national control programs that are projected to reduce annual MSAT emissions by 72 percent between 1999 and 2050. Although local conditions may differ from these national projections in terms of fleet mix and turnover, VMT growth rates, and local control measures, the magnitude of the EPA-projected reductions is so great (even after accounting for VMT growth) that MSAT emissions in the study area are likely to be lower in the future in nearly all cases.

In summary, the project would not significantly impact air quality and would not cause or contribute to a new violation, increase the frequency or severity of an existing violation, or delay timely attainment of the National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS).

FHWA finds that the air quality impacts are not significant.

## Noise

The noise impacts are not significant in the context of NEPA.

### Context

A preliminary traffic noise study was completed which evaluated potential traffic noise impacts and abatement measures associated with the project.

Noise monitoring was performed at four locations, while noise modeling was conducted for 13 additional sites to gain a thorough understanding of the existing noise environment and to determine how the proposed improvements would change the noise levels throughout the project area. Due to the proximity of the project area to Dulles International Airport, off-peak noise monitoring was performed in order to minimize the influence of aircraft flying overhead. Any observed aircraft and their time overhead was recorded so that they could be accounted for when determining the existing monitored levels. Noise modeling was completed for Existing (2011) and Design Year Build (2036) conditions.

Common Noise Environment (CNE) A contains four noise monitoring sites (R2, R3, R4, R5), and 11 modeling-only sites (M1-M8, M11-M13) which represent a total of 49 residences and one playground. Monitored noise levels within CNE A were found to range from 54.1 to 57.8 decibels (dB(A)). Existing worst-case noise levels within CNE A were found to range from 55 to 64 dB(A).

CNE B contains two modeling-only sites (M9 and M10), which represent three residences. Modeled noise levels within CNE B were found to range from 62 to 69 dB(A). The dominant noise source within CNE B is Old Ox Road (Route 606). CNE B includes one modeled receptor (M10) with an existing noise level that is predicted to exceed the Noise Abatement Criteria (NAC).

Common Noise Environment (CNE) C is located west of Route 606 and north of Overland Drive in Sterling, VA. There is a playground that is part of the Minnieland Academy at Dulles daycare facility beyond the southern end of CNE A. While noise monitoring was not performed at the daycare facility itself, short-term noise measurements were performed within CNE A, which is adjacent to CNE C, including at one site (M1) located very near the daycare facility.

### Intensity

All traffic data used in the Design Year (2036) noise analyses were derived from traffic engineering studies performed during the preliminary engineering phase of the project. Design Year Build (2036) noise levels are predicted to exceed the FHWA/VDOT Noise Abatement Criteria (NAC) at four of the modeled sites (M4, M6, M12, and M13) and one of the monitored sites (R4) within CNE A and one modeled noise sensitive receptor within CNE B (M10). The noise impacts within CNE A would affect 14 residences within the Loudoun Valley Estates subdivision, along Summerstown Place, Rogersdale Place, and Camerons Point Court. The noise impacts within CNE B would affect one

residence located on Evergreen Mills Road (Route 621), near the intersection with Loudoun County Parkway. Within CNE C, one non-residential recreational receptor would be exposed to noise levels that approach or exceed the Federal Highway Administration Noise Abatement Criteria (FHWA NAC) for Activity Category C with the design-year (2036) Build alternative.

### Mitigation

Design Year Build (2036) noise levels are predicted to create an exceedance at 14 residential properties within CNE A. To effectively protect the residences, and provide some neighborhood continuity, a three barrier noise barrier system was evaluated along the southbound lanes of Old Ox Road (Route 606) from Beaver Meadow Road to Freeport Place (Barrier A1), between Freeport Place and Stukely Drive (Barrier A2) and a northern extension to protect the impacted residences along Rogersdale Place (Barrier A3). The three-barrier system for CNE A has a total length of approximately 2,864 feet. This barrier system provides feasible (>5dBA) noise reductions to approximately 27 residences. Noise abatement for CNE A is considered feasible, per VDOT procedures. This barrier system achieves the design goal of at least a 7 dB(A) insertion loss at an impacted receptor. This barrier is considered reasonable because it has a Maximum Square Footage of Abatement per Benefited Receptor (MaxSF/BR) value of 1,273, thus within the (MaxSF/BR) value of 1,600. On October 22, 2013, FHWA concurred with VDOT's determination that Barrier System A has been determined to be warranted, feasible, and reasonable; therefore the construction of the noise barrier is recommended.

Design Year Build (2036) noise levels are predicted exceed the NAC at one property within CNE B located along Old Ox Road (Route 606) / Evergreen Mills Road (Route 621). A continuous post and panel noise barrier was evaluated along the southbound lanes of Old Ox Road (Route 606), just south of Evergreen Mills Road (Route 621). Barrier B has been determined to be warranted, feasible, but not reasonable; therefore the construction of the noise barrier is not recommended.

Design Year Build (2036) noise levels are predicted to approach or exceed the NAC at one non-residential recreational receptor. Barrier C would provide benefits for one (1) impacted noise sensitive receptor. The barrier would further benefit two (2) additional non-impacted sites. Barrier C has been determined to be warranted, feasible, but not reasonable; therefore construction of the noise barrier is not recommended.

FHWA finds that the noise impacts are not significant.

## Water Quality & Aquatic Resources

The 100-year floodplain along Horsepen Run is located within the northern portion of the study area. The 100-year floodplain along Stallion Creek parallels the southeastern boundary of the study area. The 100-year floodplain along Broad Run Creek parallels the northwestern boundary of the study area. No regulated floodways are located within the study area. Construction of the Preferred Build Alternative would encroach into approximately 1.3 acres of the 100-year floodplain along Horsepen Run and approximately 0.8 acre of the 100-year floodplain along Broad Run.

As the project design advances, impacts to these floodplains would be avoided, if practicable, or encroachments minimized and mitigated to the extent that no net increase in base flood levels would occur. No regulated floodways would be affected.

FHWA finds that the impacts to water quality and aquatic resources are not significant.

## Wetlands and Waters of the U.S.

Waters of the U.S. are defined by US Army Corps of Engineers (COE) and EPA regulations, and are described generically in EPA's 404 (b) (1) Guidelines as rivers, streams, ponds, and special aquatic sites, (*e.g.*, sanctuaries and refuges, wetlands, mud flats, vegetated shallows, coral reefs, and riffle and pool complexes).

Approximately 225,495 linear feet (47.6 miles) of streams are located within the project study area. The Preferred Build Alternative would impact 7,577 linear feet (1.4 miles) of streams. Streams potentially affected by the Preferred Build Alternative comprise less than 3.0 percent of all streams present within the study area. As the project design advances, streams will be avoided, if practicable, or modifications minimized and mitigated to the extent that no net loss in stream functions and/or values would occur.

Approximately 12.06 acres of palustrine wetlands and 5.63 acres of palustrine open water bodies are located within the project study area. The Preferred Build Alternative would impact 3.46 acres of palustrine emergent wetlands, 0.22 acre of palustrine scrub-shrub wetlands, and 1.18 acre of palustrine forested wetland. The Preferred Build Alternative would impact 0.82 acres of palustrine open water bodies. Wetlands potentially affected by the Preferred Build Alternative total approximately 4.86 acres (or approximately 40 percent of all wetlands present with the study area). Open water bodies potentially affected by the Preferred Build Alternative total approximately 0.82 acre (or approximately 15 percent of all open water bodies present with the study area). As the project design advances, the discharge of dredged or fill material into wetlands will be avoided, if practicable, or minimized and mitigated to the extent that no net loss in wetlands would occur.

A State Programmatic General Permit issued by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, a Virginia Water Protection Permit issued by the Virginia Department of Environmental Quality, and a subaqueous lands permit from the Virginia Marine Resources Commission will be required for impacts to wetlands and streams that are deemed to be practicably unavoidable during final design phases. Wetland mitigation plans and stream restoration

plans will be submitted for agency review and approval as part of the permit application process. Any mitigation required would occur prior to or concurrent with the construction activity under which mitigation is required.

FHWA finds that the impacts to wetlands and waters of the U.S. are not significant.

#### Groundwater

No portion of the study area is located within a watershed for a public water supply or in proximity to a water supply intake. No water supply wells located within or near the study area. No impaired waters are located within or near the study area. The potential for non-point source pollutants to enter groundwater or surface water from storm water runoff would be managed by implementing an erosion and sediment control plan and a storm water management plan (including a pollution prevention plan) in accordance with VDOT's most current Road and Bridge Specifications. These specifications prohibit contractors from discharging any contaminants that could affect water quality. In the event of accidental releases, the contractor will be required to immediately notify all appropriate local, state, and federal agencies and take immediate action to contain and remove contaminants in accordance with the approved pollution prevention plan.

FHWA finds that the impacts to groundwater are not significant.

#### Threatened and Endangered Species

The Project study area does not contain suitable habitat to support any federally threatened and endangered species, as such, a "No Effect" determination was made under Section 7. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) concurred with this determination on May 24, 2013. Additionally, no state listed species are reported in the project study area.

FHWA finds that the impacts to threatened and endangered species are not significant.

#### Hazardous Materials

The environmental evaluation showed that no potential hazardous materials are located within the project area. No properties documented to contain or suspected of containing hazardous substances are known to exist within the study area. All hazmat issues have been addressed and no additional hazardous materials investigations are needed. If contaminated soils are discovered during construction, VDOT will develop and implement procedures for their proper management through coordination with the regulatory agencies, and/or through the development of special provisions. No adverse impact is anticipated due to hazardous materials within the project area.

FHWA finds that the hazardous materials impacts are not significant.

#### Construction Impacts

During construction, temporary environmental impacts can occur but can be controlled, minimized or mitigated through careful attention to prudent construction practices and methods. Potential temporary construction impacts and preventive practices are summarized below.

*Water Quality.* Through implementation and monitoring of best management practices during and after construction, water quality impacts would be effectively avoided or minimized and mitigated. Specifically, the potential for non-point source pollutants to enter groundwater or surface water from storm water runoff would be managed by implementing an erosion and sediment control plan and a storm water management plan (including a pollution prevention plan) in accordance with VDOT's most current *Road and Bridge Specifications*. These specifications prohibit contractors from discharging any contaminants that could affect water quality. In the event of accidental releases, the contractor will be required to immediately notify all appropriate local, state, and federal agencies and take immediate action to contain and remove contaminants in accordance with the approved pollution prevention plan.

*Air quality.* Construction-related air quality impacts such as emissions from diesel-powered equipment, burning of debris, fugitive dust, and the use of cutback asphalt would be temporary. The proposed improvements would comply with all applicable local, state, and federal regulations (including the Virginia Environmental Regulation 9 VAC 5-40-5600 *et seq.* on fugitive dust emissions, and 9 VAC 5-40-5490 *et seq.* regarding cutback asphalt). Measures to control dust would include minimizing exposed earth by stabilization practices (including grass, mulch, pavement, and/or other types of cover) as early as possible following ground disturbance. Other stabilization practices would be implemented in accordance with VDOT's most current *Road and Bridge Specifications* manual.

*Noise.* Construction activity may cause intermittent fluctuations in noise levels. Temporary noise impacts would be attenuated through implementation of the VDOT-developed and FHWA approved noise limit specification for construction activities (as specified in VDOT's most recent *Road and Bridge Specifications*). The contractor will be required to conform to this specification to reduce the impact of construction noise on the surrounding community.

*Solid Waste and Hazardous Materials Disposal.* Solid waste and hazardous materials generated during construction activities (such as clearing, grubbing, demolition, and earthworks) would be removed from the work area and disposed of in accordance with applicable local, state, and federal statutes, regulations, and policy. If previously unknown conditions (such as contaminated soils or groundwater) are encountered during construction, the contractor will be required to implement procedures for proper removal, disposal, and/or treatment of contaminated substances. Pollution Prevention Plans and Spill Prevention Control and Countermeasure (SPCC) Plans will be prepared and approved prior to construction.

FHWA finds that the construction impacts would not be significant.

### Indirect Impacts

The long-range land use plan presented in the most current version of the Loudoun County Comprehensive Plan identifies most areas along the corridor for General Industry Planned Development. Independent of local land use plans, however, the proposed improvements are intended to provide a much-needed north-south corridor within eastern Loudoun County and to provide enhanced vehicular and freight access in to and out of Dulles Airport. As such, the project is consistent with the level and nature of planned growth already anticipated under the Loudoun County's Comprehensive Plan and would not, by itself, directly induce local development.

FHWA finds that the indirect impacts from the project would not be significant.

### Cumulative Impacts

Cumulative impacts are the impact on the environment resulting from the incremental impact of the project when added to other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions. Other past, present, and reasonably foreseeable future actions in the study area underway by the city, state and federal governments that could cumulatively impact the environment include:

Reasonably foreseeable projects in close proximity to the Route 606 study area that are expected to be in place prior to the design year of 2036 include:

- Route 50 Widening from four to six lanes between Route 28 and Route 742 (Poland Road).
- Loudoun County Parkway Extension between Route 842 and Route 772.
- Route 659 Widening from two to four lanes between Route 620 (Braddock Road) and Route 50.
- Route 28 Widening from six to eight lanes between I-66 and Route 7.
- Route 50 Widening from four to six lanes between Route 742 and Route 659 Relocated (Northstar Boulevard).
- Proposed Interchange at Route 50 and Route 606.
- Tri-County Parkway - four lanes on new alignment between I-66 and Route 50.
- The Dulles North Transit Center (a 750-space park and ride lot which, in Phase III, becomes the 2,750-space Route 606 Metrorail station).
- The Dulles Corridor Metrorail Project.
- Dulles Air Cargo, Passenger Metro Access Highway (formerly known as the "Dulles Spur").

- Route 606 / Loudoun County Parkway – improve road to 8-lane limited access median divided urban arterial between Arcola Road and John Mosby Highway.

The information provided below summarizes the environmental resources in the project study area that would be impacted by the Preferred Build Alternative, the impact that these resources have experienced from past and present actions, the incremental impact expected from the proposed project, identification of potential reasonably foreseeable future actions, and the potential impact that may occur from the reasonably foreseeable future actions in or near the study area.

Environmental Resource or Area-of-Concern	Impacts from Past and Present Actions	Impact from Proposed Action	Potential Impact from Reasonably Foreseeable Actions	Cumulative Impact
Land Use and Socioeconomics	Widespread conversion to commercial and air transport uses	Minor land use conversions. Positive effect on local, regional and state economics	Moderate	Moderate to severe, but not attributable to proposed action
Parks and Recreation	Minor	None	Minor	Minor
Water Resources / Water Quality	Widespread conversion to commercial and air transport uses	None	Minor	Minor
Floodplains and Floodways	Minor	Minor	Minor	Minor
Waters of the U.S., including Wetlands	Widespread conversion to commercial and air transport uses	Moderate (less than 20% of total in vicinity)	Minor to Moderate	Moderate to severe, but not attributable to proposed action
Agricultural and Forestal Districts	None	None	None	None
Forest Lands	Widespread conversion to commercial and air transport uses	Minor (less than 3% of total in vicinity)	Minor to Moderate	Moderate to severe, but not attributable to proposed action
Prime Farmland Soils	Widespread conversion to commercial and air transport uses	Minor (less than 3% of total in vicinity)	Minor	Moderate to severe, but not attributable to proposed action
Threatened and Endangered Species	Minor	None	None	None to minor
Air Quality	Minor	Positive effects attributable to more efficient traffic flow	Positive effects attributable to more efficient traffic flow	None to minor
Noise	Minor	Minor	Minor	Minor
Light Emissions and Visual Impacts	Widespread conversion to commercial and air transport uses	None for light emissions. Minor for visual impacts.	Minor to Moderate	Moderate, but not attributable to proposed action
Cultural Resources	Widespread conversion to commercial and air transport uses	None	Minor	Moderate, but not attributable to proposed action or related transportation projects

All of these actions have had or will have an impact on the environment. For purposes of cumulative impact analysis for this EA, the primary issue is whether or not the proposed project would significantly impact the same resources as the actions listed above, resulting in an accumulation of impacts to the resource in question. Given that the impacts from the project on individual environmental resources are relatively minor, the effects of Alternative A would not significantly contribute to adverse cumulative impacts.

FHWA finds that the cumulative impacts would not be significant.

### **Council on Environmental Quality's Regulations**

The Council on Environmental Quality's regulations requires consideration of a project's context and intensity in determining whether the project will have a significant impact (40 C.F.R. 1508.27). Regarding context, the regulations state, "Context means that the significance of an action must be analyzed in several contexts such as society as a whole (human, national), the affected region, the affected interests, and the locality. Significance varies with the setting of the proposed action. For instance, in the case of a site-specific action, significance would usually depend upon the effects in the locale rather than in the world as a whole. Both short- and long-term effects are relevant." Since this project is a site-specific action, significance depends upon the effects of the project on the project area.

Regarding intensity, the regulations identify issues that should be considered in determining if the intensity of a project's impacts is substantial enough to warrant the preparation of an environmental impact statement (40 C.F.R. 1508.27(b)(1-10)). These issues are considered in the determination of whether there is a significant impact. The issues are addressed as follows:

*1. Impacts that may be both beneficial and adverse* – The project would result in a few beneficial impacts on the human environment. The project would improve capacity, reduce congestion, improve safety and provide improved connectivity with the regional multimodal transportation network. Additional beneficial impacts include the construction of a 10-foot wide shared use path located along both sides of the improved Route 606. We find that these beneficial impacts, when taken in conjunction with the adverse impacts, do not reach the level of significant requiring the preparation of an environmental impact statement.

*2. The degree to which the project affects public health or safety* – It is not anticipated that the project will adversely affect public health and safety. Since the project would enhance the capacity of Route 606, congestion would be reduced, while safety and traffic operations should be improved. Also, the project would not significantly impact air quality and would not cause or contribute to a new violation, increase the frequency or severity of an existing violation, or delay timely attainment of the National Ambient Air Quality Standards.

*3. Unique characteristics of the geographical area such as proximity to historic or cultural resources, park lands, prime farmlands, wetlands, wild and scenic rivers or ecologically critical area* – No park lands, wild and scenic rivers, or ecologically critical

areas would be impacted by the project. There would be no effect to historic properties. As discussed earlier, the impacts to prime farmlands and wetlands are not significant.

*4. The degree to which the effects on the environment are expected to be highly controversial* – The term “controversial” refers to cases where substantial dispute exists as to the size, nature, or effect of the action rather than to the existence of opposition to a use, the effect of which is relatively undisputed. On this project, there has been no documented dispute regarding the size, nature, or effect of the project from the state or federal environmental resource agencies or any other entity. Further, no environmental resource agency has opposed the project. Based on the above, we find that the degree to which the effects on the environment are expected to be highly controversial does not require an environmental impact statement for this project.

*5. The degree to which the effects on the quality of human environment are highly uncertain or involve unique or unknown risks* – There are no known impacts on the quality of the human environment that can be considered highly uncertain or involve unique or unknown risks. The Preferred Build Alternative would require the acquisition of approximately 45 acres of right-of-way. In addition, approximately 67 acres of permanent easement (primarily for storm water management basins) and 24 acres of temporary easement would be required. In addition to acquisition, 55.02 acres of permanent easement and 7.03 acres of temporary easement would be required on Dulles International Airport/MWAA property, while 11.54 acres of permanent easement and 3.82 acres of temporary easement would be required on NOAA property. No community facilities, services or access would be adversely affected by the project. The project will not cause or contribute to an exceedance of the National Ambient Air Quality Standards.

*6. The degree to which the action may establish a precedent for future actions with significant effects or represents a decision in principle about a future consideration* – This action will not set a precedent for future actions with significant effects or represent a decision in principle about a future consideration. FHWA’s regulations at 23 CFR 771.115(a) list the types of actions that normally have a significant effect on the environment thereby requiring the preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement. The reconstruction and widening of an existing roadway is not on the list. The project has logical termini and independent utility and represents a reasonable expenditure; it does not force additional improvements to be made to the transportation system. This decision will not establish a precedent regarding the requirements of NEPA as they will be applied to future projects.

*7. Whether the action is related to other actions with individually insignificant but cumulatively significant impacts* - This action has logical termini and independent utility and does not force additional transportation improvements to be made to the transportation system. Cumulative impacts were addressed in the EA and in this document, and we find that they are not significant.

*8. The degree to which the action may adversely affect districts, sites, highways, structures, or objects listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places or may cause loss of significant scientific, cultural, or historic resources* – No

districts, sites, highways, structures, or objects listed in or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places would be adversely affected by the project.

9. *The degree to which the action may adversely affect an endangered or threatened species or its habitat that has been determined to be critical under the Endangered Species Act* – No endangered or threatened species or its critical habitat would be affected by the project.

10. *Whether the action threatens a violation of Federal, State, or local law or requirements imposed for the protection of the environment* – The proposed action does not knowingly threaten a violation of any Federal, State, or local law for the protection of the environment. All applicable permits will be acquired prior to construction.

### **Conclusion**

Based on the foregoing information and other supporting information, we find that the proposed project will not have a significant impact on the environment. Therefore, an environmental impact statement is not warranted, and the Finding of No Significant Impact is being issued accordingly. The Finding of No Significant Impact will be reevaluated as appropriate pursuant to 23 C.F.R. 771.129(c) as major approvals are requested from FHWA.