NEW JERSEY DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION DOCUMENTATION
CED Form Updated September 18, 2007

I. GENERAL INFORMATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DOT Job Code No.</th>
<th>1237-523</th>
<th>Federal Project No.</th>
<th>Nh-29 (154)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Management Team</td>
<td>Group C–MarkRollo</td>
<td>Data Base No.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Route &amp; Section</td>
<td>18 3A</td>
<td>Structure No.</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Road Name</td>
<td>Hoes Lane</td>
<td>Municipality(ies)</td>
<td>Piscataway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County(ies)</td>
<td>Middlesex</td>
<td>Type of Project</td>
<td>Rehabilitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>From Milepost</td>
<td>45.38</td>
<td>To Milepost</td>
<td>47.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congressional District</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Legislative District</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROW Cost</td>
<td>12m</td>
<td>Construction Cost</td>
<td>$49M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EXISTING FACILITY</th>
<th>PROPOSED FACILITY</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ROW Width</td>
<td>104 ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No. Lanes &amp; Width</td>
<td>4-12ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoulder Width</td>
<td>8ft &amp; 1ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>20 ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall Roadway Width</td>
<td>86ft</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. PROJECT DESCRIPTION (attach location map; USGS map suggested)

A. Project Need (briefly explain why the project is needed):
This project will convert Hoes Lane (Piscataway Township) to State Highway Route 18 and complete the connection of Route 18 to I-287. Improvements include bike/ped paths, Pedestrian Bridge, sidewalks and revised signalized intersections. In order to process this change in jurisdiction, these safety improvements are required.

B. Proposed Improvements (provide a brief description of proposed improvements):
Converting Hoes Lane to Route 18 requires total replacement of the pavement box; four signals to be eliminated with remaining signals being updated and connected; realignment of Hoes Lane West with Morris Avenue; construction of two local street connections to proposed signals will allow closure of median openings; multi-use paths and sidewalks will be added for pedestrian safety along Route 18; two new pedestrian structures located at the northern and southern end of project; and the utility poles will be removed from the center median.

C. Right-of-Way Taking

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total area needed: 11.81ac.-fee</th>
<th>5.71 ac. - easements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Est. No. parcels: In fee-33</td>
<td>easements-42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Est. No. relocations: residences-4</td>
<td>businesses-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Facilities Affected: 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area of public recreation land taken: 0.78 (acres)</td>
<td>Out of a total area of: 225 (acres)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

☐ Green Acres/State-owned Land Involvement
☐ Federally Owned/Federally Funded Land Involvement

Comments:
### III. ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS

#### A. Noise

- Sensitive receptors exist within 200 feet for two lanes or 400 feet for four lanes.
- Project substantially changes the vertical or horizontal alignment of the roadway.
- Traffic volumes or speeds substantially increase.

**Conclusion:**

- Noise study not required. No significant impact anticipated.
- Potential noise impacts were studied and are discussed in comments. Project still meets CE criteria.

**Comments:** The land use in the area is largely commercial with the exception of ten residences south of Morris avenue, adjacent to Rt. 18 and tennis courts at the intersection of Knightsbridge Rd. There is also a church and a public library at the intersection of Skiles Avenue but these buildings have air conditioning and no interior noise impact is expected. Using the design year (2030) traffic, the projected noise levels at the residences and the tennis courts will be 63dBa or less with the project and below the NAC.

#### B. Air Quality: CONFORMITY WITH THE CLEAN AIR ACT AMENDMENTS (CAAA) OF 1990

**Section 1:** Regional Emissions Analysis (STIP or MPO’s conforming transportation plan)

- Project is included in the FY 2008 - 2011 approved State Transportation Improvement Plan (STIP).
- Project is not listed in the FY 20_ - 20_ approved STIP but is included in the MPO’s conforming transportation plan.
- Project is not included in either the approved STIP or the MPO’s conforming transportation plan.

**Section 2:** Based on its scope, the project is categorized by the Transportation Conformity Rule (TCR) as:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A project type listed in Table 2 of the TCR, i.e., Exempt from the conformity requirements of the CAA (i.e., exempt from regional emissions analysis, Carbon Monoxide (CO) analysis, and Particulate Matter PM2.5 and PM10 analyses requirements) and may proceed towards implementation even in the absence of a conforming transportation plan and TIP.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A project listed in Table 3 of the TCR, i.e., Exempt from regional emissions analysis requirement, but local effects of this project with respect to CO, PM2.5 and PM10 concentrations must be considered to determine if a hot-spot analysis is required. Complete Section 2a below.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A project type not listed in Table 2 or Table 3 of the TCR, i.e., must be part of a conforming STIP and/or a MPO’s conforming transportation plan and requires CO, PM2.5 and PM10 hot-spot analyses. Complete Section 2a below.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Section 2a(1): Project type listed in Table 3 of the TCR for CO analysis**

**Project type not listed in either Table 2 or Table 3 of the TCR for CO analysis**

- Project located in **CO Attainment Area.** CO analysis not required. Project may proceed to the project development process.
- The total eight-hour Carbon Monoxide levels are expected to be reasonably below the NAAQS of 9 ppm. This is based on LOS data for the intersection(s) and the total highest traffic volumes at this (those) intersection(s) and the distance of the sensitive receptors to the roadway. No quantitative analysis is required. Project may proceed to the project development process even in the absence of a conforming transportation plan and TIP.
- Project located in a Carbon Monoxide **Non-Attainment/Maintenance Area** and requires a Carbon Monoxide hot-spot analysis. A CO Analysis was completed at the following intersection(s):
  
  And the results are:
Section 2a(2): Project type listed in Table 3 of the TCR for PM2.5 analysis
Project type not listed in Table 2 or Table 3 of the TCR for PM2.5 analysis

☐ The project is located in PM2.5 Attainment Area. PM2.5 hot-spot analysis is not required. Project may proceed to the project development process.

☒ The project is located in a PM2.5 Non-Attainment/Maintenance Area and the project is not an air quality concern under 40CFR 93.123(b) (1). Quantitative/qualitative analysis is not required. Project may proceed to the project development process.

☐ The project is located in a PM2.5 Non-Attainment/Maintenance Area and the project is an air quality concern under 40CFR 93.123(b) (1). A PM2.5 hot-spot analysis was completed at the following location(s): ______.

And the results are: ______

Section 2a(3): Project type listed in Table 3 of the TCR for PM10 analysis
Project type not listed in Table 2 or Table 3 of the TCR for PM10 analysis

☒ The project is located in PM10 Attainment Area. PM10 hot-spot analysis is not required. Project may proceed to the project development process.

☐ The project is located in a PM10 Non-Attainment/Maintenance Area and the project is not an air quality concern under 40CFR 93.123(b) (1). Quantitative/qualitative analysis is not required. Project may proceed to the project development process.

☐ The project is located in a PM10 Non-Attainment/Maintenance Area and the project is an air quality concern under 40CFR 93.123(b) (1). A PM10 hot-spot analysis was completed at the following location(s): ______.

And the results are: ______

Comments (include LOS, if appropriate): The project will not result in increase in diesel traffic. No significant impact on air quality is anticipated.

C. Potential Ecological Constraints (check those that apply)

☒ Floodplains ☐ Shellfish Habitat
☒ Wetlands ☐ Acid Producing Soils
☐ Vernal Pools ☐ Submerged Aquatic Vegetation
☒ Waterbody:
☐ Category One ☐ Sole Source Aquifer
☒ Trout Production ☒ Forested Areas
☐ Trout Maintenance ☒ Threatened and Endangered Species:
☒ Non-Trout ☐ State-listed species
☒ Wild and Scenic River ☒ Federally listed species
☐ Essential Fish Habitat ☐ Other (specify):

Federally Listed Threatened & Endangered Species Checklist:

(Please see http://www.fws.gov/northeast/njfieldoffice/Endangered/consultation.html for guidance on the current US Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) Consultation Procedures. County/municipal species lists are only valid for 90 days.)

☐ The proposed project is not located in an area with county-wide distribution of a federally listed species and is not within or adjacent to a municipality with a known occurrence of a federally listed species. Documentation of this determination is in the project file. No further action is
The proposed project is located in an area with county-wide distribution of a federally listed species and/or is within or adjacent to a municipality with occurrence of federally listed species. Habitat requirements for each of the species have been reviewed and the project’s impact area (i.e., action area) was assessed to determine whether it contains potentially suitable habitat. Based on existing information or field surveys, the results revealed:

- The project’s impact area (i.e., action area) does not contain potentially suitable habitat for a federally listed species. Documentation of this determination is in the project file. No further action is required under the ESA. Concurrence from the USFWS is not required.

- The project’s impact area (i.e., action area) does or may contain potentially suitable habitat for a federally listed species. The assessment and all relevant project information:
  - Have been submitted to the US Fish and Wildlife Service’s NJ Field Office for ESA Section 7 consultation. Correspondence is attached. See comments below.
  - Will be submitted to the New Jersey Division of Land Use Regulation Program during the permitting process. Project requires authorization under the NJ Freshwater Wetlands Protection Act. See comments below.

*Action Area: The action area is defined by regulation as all areas to be affected directly or indirectly by the Federal action and not merely the immediate area involved in the action (50 CFR §402.02). This analysis is not limited to the "footprint" of the action nor is it limited by the Federal agency's authority. Rather, it is a biological determination of the reach of the proposed action on listed species. Subsequent analyses of the environmental baseline, effects of the action, and levels of incidental take are based upon the action area.

**Conclusion:**
- No significant impact anticipated
- Further studies are needed to obtain permits. Project still satisfies CE criteria.

**Comments** (briefly describe all potential ecological constraints): The roadway within the project area crosses a tributary to Ambrose Brook. Ambrose Brook is classified as FW2-NT. USFWS and the Natural Heritage database were contacted in 2004 and found no occurrences of state or federal threatened or endangered species in the project area. Updated consultation with USFWS resulted in a finding that the proposed project is not likely to adversely affect Indiana bats due to conservation measures proposed by DOT.

**D. Anticipated Environmental Permits/Approvals/Coordination** (check those that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Permit/Approval/Coordination</th>
<th>Check</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>US Coast Guard</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USACOE Section 10 (Navigable Waters)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USACOE Section 404 (Nationwide)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USACOE Section 404 (Individual)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USEPA Sole Source Aquifer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NJDEP Freshwater Wetlands—GP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NJDEP Freshwater Wetlands—IP</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NJDEP Transition Area Waiver</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NJDEP Coastal Wetlands</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NJDEP Waterfront Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NJDEP CAFRA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NJDEP Stream Encroachment (minor)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NJDEP Stream Encroachment (major)</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NJDEP Stormwater Management:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥ 0.25 acre impervious surface</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥ 1.0 acre disturbance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown at this time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Marine Fisheries Service</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NJDEP Parks &amp; Forestry (PL 2001 Chapter 10 Reforestation)</td>
<td>x</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D&amp;R Canal Commission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meadowlands Commission</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Approval through NJDEP LURP Permit (or) □ Pinelands Commission
□ NJDOT self-certification □ Endangered Species Act Section 7 Consultation
☑ NJPDES Construction Activity Stormwater GP (RFA) □ NJDEP Threatened & Endangered Species Coordination
☑ NJDEP Water Quality Certificate □ Other (specify):

Comments: The proposed project will impact approximately 1 acre of wetlands, requiring an individual wetlands permit and the associated mitigation. Green Acres approval will be required for impacts to Ambrose & Doty’s Brook Park.

E. Cultural Resources

Technical Findings:
☐ Project is not an undertaking for Section 106 purposes; concurrence has been received from FHWA.
☐ No Effect per FHWA/SHPO Agreement of 7/6/00; subject to conditions identified in the Agreement.
☐ No Section 106 Consultation per 5/25/01 SHPO concurrence with Section 106 Compliance Procedures, Federally Funded Drainage Improvement Program; subject to conditions identified in the Agreement.
☐ No Effect to significant properties if they exist in APE per 36CFR800.3(a)(1) with SHPO concurrence. (Because the Section 106 regulations allow for a level of effort for conducting and evaluating cultural resources to be commensurate with the undertaking, this category of finding was developed to be used for certain projects when no cultural resources survey has been conducted; and self-imposed conditions, if applicable, are presented as part of the undertaking, e.g., Pipeline 3 or other small-scale projects.)
☑ No National Register (NR) listed or eligible properties in APE (Section 106 Findings = No Historic Properties Affected).
☐ National Register listed/eligible properties exist within APE (see consultation summary below).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Archaeology</th>
<th>Architecture</th>
<th>Section 106 Finding</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bridge</td>
<td>Building</td>
<td>District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR listed/eligible property(ies)—No Historic Properties Affected</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR listed/eligible property(ies)—No Adverse Effect (NAE)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR listed/eligible property(ies)—NAE with conditions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NR listed/eligible property(ies)—Adverse Effect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 106 Consultation Summary
☐ FHWA concurred with Adverse Effect Finding
☒ SHPO provided Section 106 consultation comments 3/28/06
☐ FHWA concurred with no Adverse Effect with Conditions
☐ ACHP notified of Adverse Effect
☐ ACHP responded to notification (check one/enter date):
☐ ACHP will participate in consultation
☐ ACHP declined to participate in consultation
☐ MOA executed by FHWA (check one/enter date):
☐ MOA filed with ACHP
☐ ACHP accepted/signed MOA

Comments (include MOA stipulations or other conditions, if applicable):
F. Section 4(f) Involvement

Section 1: Historic Sites

- No Section 4(f) Involvement
- Project results in a “constructive use” of Section 4(f) property.
- Project results in a use of Historic site(s) on or eligible for the National Register of Historic Places (check one below):
  - Section 4(f) Involvement. Project is covered under *de minimis Evaluation of Impacts* and all applicability criteria have been met, including concurrence *first* by the FHWA that the project meets the applicability criteria, and *then* concurrence by SHPO with the “No Effect” or “No Adverse Effect” determination after they are notified of the intent to use a *de minimis* finding.
  - Section 4(f) Involvement. Project is covered under the *Nationwide Section 4(f) Programmatic Evaluation for minor involvement* and all applicability criteria have been met, including concurrence by the SHPO (or ACHP) with the “No Effect” or “No Adverse Effect” determination.
  - Section 4(f) Involvement. Project is covered under the *Nationwide Section 4(f) Programmatic Evaluation for Net Benefits* and all applicability criteria have been met, including notification to and concurrence by the FHWA with the determination.
  - Section 4(f) Involvement. Project has an “Adverse Effect” determination. Individual Section 4(f) was prepared.

Comments:

Section 2: Historic Bridges

- No Section 4(f) Involvement
- Section 4(f) Involvement. Project is covered under the *Nationwide Section 4(f) Programmatic Evaluation for Historic Bridges*.

Comments:

Section 3: Publicly Owned Park, Recreation Area, Wildlife or Waterfowl Refuge

- No Section 4(f) Involvement
- Project results in a “Constructive Use” of Section 4(f) property (fill out Site Information below)
- Project requires acquisition from publicly owned recreation land (fill out Site Information below):
  - Section 4(f) Involvement. Project is covered under *de minimis Evaluation of Impacts* and all applicability criteria and conditions have been met, including concurrence *first* by the FHWA that the project meets the applicability criteria, and *then* notification to the officials with jurisdiction of the intent to use a *de minimis* finding.
  - Section 4(f) Involvement. Project is covered under *Nationwide Section 4(f) Programmatic Evaluation for minor involvement* and all applicability criteria and conditions have been met, including concurrence by the officials having jurisdiction over the property.
  - Section 4(f) Involvement. Project is covered under the *Nationwide Section 4(f) Programmatic Evaluation for Net Benefits* and all applicability criteria have been met, including notification to and concurrence by the FHWA with the determination.
  - Section 4(f) Involvement. Nationwide Section 4(f) Programmatic applicability criteria were not met; Individual Section 4(f) Evaluation was prepared.

Site Information (for projects involving “Constructive Use” or acquisition from publicly owned recreation land, wildlife or waterfowl refuge):

- **Name of Site** (use local name): Ambrose Doty’s Park
- **Lot and Block**: Block 457.4 Lot 2.03
- **Total acreage of site**: 225 acres
**Acreage of site affected** (acquisition and permanent easements): 0.78 acres

| ☐ Federal encumbrances involved (e.g., Wild and Scenic Rivers Act, Land and Water Conservation Fund Act, Rivers and Harbors Act). |

**Comments:** Middlesex County lists the size of the conservation area as 225 acres. This is an undeveloped linear park along the Ambrose Brook and the Doty's Brook providing floodplain protection to both streams and greenways in a highly developed area of the County. These greenways connect to the ninety acres occupied by the Raritan Landing Golf Course operated by the Middlesex County Improvement Authority. The County’s concurrence with a finding of *de minimus* impact has been received.

The amount of the park to be acquired through fee taking and easements is the minimum necessary for the roadway improvements and only involves minor strips of land adjacent to the road. A public information center was held 6/30/03 in which the project in its entirety was presented to solicit public comments. Design changes have necessitated another public information center at which time comments on the taking of parkland will again be accepted. This next meeting has not been scheduled to date.

---

**Section 4: Independent Walkway & Bikeway Construction Projects**

| ☒ No Section 4(f) Involvement |
| ☐ Section 4(f) Involvement. Project is covered under the **Nationwide Section 4(f) Programmatic Evaluation**. Project requires use of recreation and park areas established and maintained primarily for active recreation, open space, or similar purposes. All applicability criteria have been met, including approval in writing by the official with jurisdiction over the property that the project is acceptable and consistent with the designated use of the property and that all possible planning to minimize harm has been accomplished in the location and design of the bikeway or walkway facility. |

**Comments:**

---

**G. Hazardous Materials and Landfills**

| ☒ Involvement with known or suspected contaminated site. |
| ☐ Involvement with underground storage tanks. |

**Conclusion:**

| ☐ Low potential for involvement with contamination; no further investigation required. |
| ☒ Further investigation and/or sampling required to determine extent of involvement with contamination. Project still meets FWHA criteria for a CE. |

**Comments:** Investigation of the Peter Chesson property (Parcel 15/Block 593, Lot 23) has been deemed necessary due to the presence of underground tanks at one time. There are several monitoring wells on the property near to where the Skiles Avenue Extension is proposed.

---

**H. Socioeconomics**

| ☒ The project will not result in any significant socioeconomic impacts. |

**Comments:** Two businesses that had occupied residential buildings were relocated as part of the project. Additionally 4 residences have been relocated.

---

**I. Environmental Justice**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Project</strong></th>
<th><strong>Conclusion</strong></th>
<th><strong>Comments</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project will have <strong>no</strong> disproportionately high or adverse effects on low income and/or minority communities.</td>
<td>Project is in compliance with the goals of Executive Order 12898 and the requirements of the Civil Rights Act of 1964.</td>
<td>The project results in only 4 residential relocations, and project improvements include multi-use paths, additional sidewalks, and two new pedestrian overpasses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project will have disproportionately high and adverse effects on low income and/or minority communities.</td>
<td>Project is in compliance with the goals of Executive Order 12898 and the requirements of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, through the identification of measures to address disproportionate effects, including actions to avoid or mitigate them. Project satisfies CE criteria.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**J. Public Reaction**  
(briefly describe input from the Office of Community Relations or current status of public reaction):  
A public information center was held 6/30/03 at which time the response to the project was favorable. The town and county continue to support the project and another public information center is anticipated to update the public as to changes in the project.

**K. Environmental Commitments**  
(refer to MOA stipulations or other conditions noted in Section D, if applicable; permit conditions, etc.):  
As a condition of receiving a finding that the project is not likely to adversely affect Indiana bats DOT must adhere to a seasonal restriction on tree clearing (April 1 to September 30). Also the replacement of suitable tree species in the project area to offset impacts to 3 acres of forest land is required and should be in accordance with USFWS planting recommendations.

- Implement soil erosion and sediment control measures during construction.
- Implement standard measures for minimization of construction–related noise impacts during construction.
DETERMINATION OF CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION

Project name and location: Route 18 Section 3A, Piscataway Township, Middlesex County

CE #: 771.117 (d)(1) Modernization of a highway by resurfacing, restoration, rehabilitation, reconstruction, adding shoulders, or adding auxiliary lanes

The proposed project satisfies the Categorical Exclusion definition outlined in 23 CFR 771.117 (a) and will not result in significant environmental impacts.
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