

APPENDIX D
CONCEPTUAL STAGE RELOCATION PLAN

**Michigan Department of Transportation
Real Estate Division
Conceptual Stage Relocation Plan
I-196 Corridor
Control Section: 41027, Job Number: 48564-0**

October 12, 2005

GENERAL AREA AND PROJECT INFORMATION

The proposed project consists of three segments: I-196 from US-131 to I-96; I-96 from east of Leonard Street to east of Cascade Road; and M-37/M-44 (East Beltline) through the Knapp Street Intersection, with all three segments located in the City of Grand Rapids or the Grand Rapids Township, Kent County, Michigan. The purpose of the project is to widen I-196 from two lanes to three lanes and to adjust the bridges over the freeway to accommodate the widening.

DISPLACEMENTS

No Build Alternative: 0 Displacements
Construct Alternative: 1 Residential Displacement

DISPLACEMENT EFFECTS AND ANALYSIS:

Property acquired for this project will be purchased in segments or phases, providing for the efficient and complete relocation of all eligible displaced residents, businesses and nonprofit organizations impacted by the project. Completing the project in phases will allow an adequate period of time for the relocation process and ensure the availability of a sufficient number or replacement properties in the local area for all eligible displacees.

Residential: The project may cause the displacement of approximately 1 residential unit. A study of the housing market in the project area indicates a sufficient number of replacement homes and rentals will be available throughout the relocation process. It is anticipated that the local residential real estate market will have the capacity to absorb the residential displacements impacted by this project.

ASSURANCES:

The acquiring agency will offer assistance to all eligible residents, businesses, farms, and nonprofit organizations impacted by the project, including persons acquiring special services and assistance. The agency's relocation program will provide such services in accordance with Act 31, Michigan P.A. 1970; Act 227, Michigan P.A. 1972; Act 87, Michigan P.A. 1980 as amended, and the Federal Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 (Uniform Act), as amended. The acquiring agency's relocation program is realistic and will provide for the orderly, timely, and efficient relocation of all eligible displaced persons in compliance with state and federal guidelines.

APPENDIX E
EARLY COORDINATION LETTERS



JENNIFER GRANHOLM
GOVERNOR

STATE OF MICHIGAN
DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY, ARTS AND LIBRARIES
LANSING

DR. WILLIAM ANDERSON
DIRECTOR

December 17, 2004

ABDELMOEZ ABDALLA
FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION
315 W ALLEGAN STREET
ROOM 207
LANSING MI 48933

RE: ER05-111 I-196 / I-96 Corridor, Grand Rapids, Kent County (FHWA)

Dear Mr. Abdalla:

Under the authority of Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended, we have reviewed and accept the Environmental Assessment (EA) for the above-cited undertaking at the location noted above.

In addition we have reviewed the report, *Reconnaissance and Intensive Level Survey of Above-Ground Resources*, prepared by Sigrid Bergland, and we concur with the conclusions of the report that the properties at 523 and 529 College, NE, appear national register-eligible as contributing resources within a national register-eligible neighborhood area preliminarily named the Belknap-Lookout Historic District that was defined in the course of survey work in the 1980s. Inspections by SHPO staff in recent years have confirmed the conclusion that this area still meets the national register criteria.

We also concur with the report's conclusion that the former Ionia Avenue Mission Hall at 737 Ionia, NW, appears to meet the national register criteria.

No other buildings and structures, including the portions of I-96 and I-196 and any engineering features related to them, within the project area appear eligible for the national register.

We have also reviewed the report, *Phase I Archaeological Survey of 3840 Fulton St., SE, Grand Rapids*, prepared by David Ruggles, and we concur with its conclusions that site #20KT298 does not appear to meet the criteria for listing in the National Register of Historic Places.

The State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) is not the office of record for this **undertaking**. You are therefore asked to maintain a copy of this letter with your environmental review record for this undertaking. If the scope of work changes in any way, or if artifacts or bones are discovered, please notify this office immediately.

If you have any questions, please contact Martha MacFarlane Faes, Environmental Review Coordinator, at (517) 335-2721 or by email at ER@michigan.gov. **Please reference our project number in all communication with this office regarding this undertaking.** Thank you for this opportunity to review and comment, and for your cooperation.

Sincerely,


Martha MacFarlane Faes
Environmental Review Coordinator

for Brian D. Conway
State Historic Preservation Officer

MMF:DLA:ROC:bgg

copy: Sigrid Bergland, MDOT
David Ruggles, MDOT



STATE OF MICHIGAN
DEPARTMENT OF HISTORY, ARTS AND LIBRARIES
LANSING

JENNIFER GRANHOLM
GOVERNOR

DR. WILLIAM ANDERSON
DIRECTOR

March 11, 2005

ABDELMOEZ ABDALLA
FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION
315 W ALLEGAN STREET
ROOM 207
LANSING MI 48933

RE: ER05-111 I-196 / I-96 Corridor, Grand Rapids, Kent County (FHWA)

Dear Mr. Abdalla:

Under the authority of Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended, we have reviewed the above-cited undertaking at the location noted above. Based on the information provided for our review, it is the opinion of the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) that the effects of the proposed undertaking do not meet the criteria of adverse effect [36 CFR § 800.5(a)(1)]. Therefore, the project will have no adverse effect [36 CFR § 800.5(b)] on the Ionia Avenue Mission Hall and on the potential Belknap-Lookout Historic District, which appear to meet the criteria for listing in the National Register of Historic Places.

The views of the public are essential to informed decision making in the Section 106 process. Federal Agency Officials or their delegated authorities must plan to involve the public in a manner that reflects the nature and complexity of the undertaking, its effects on historic properties and other provisions per 36 CFR § 800.2(d). We remind you that Federal Agency Officials or their delegated authorities are required to consult with the appropriate Indian tribe and/or Tribal Historic Preservation Officer (THPO) when the undertaking may occur on or affect any historic properties on tribal lands. In all cases, whether the project occurs on tribal lands or not, Federal Agency Officials or their delegated authorities are also required to make a reasonable and good faith effort to identify any Indian tribes or Native Hawaiian organizations that might attach religious and cultural significance to historic properties in the area of potential effects and invite them to be consulting parties per 36 CFR § 800.2(c).

This letter evidences the FHWA's compliance with 36 CFR § 800.4 "Identification of historic properties" and 36 CFR § 800.5 "Assessment of adverse effects", and the fulfillment of the FHWA's responsibility to notify the SHPO, as a consulting party in the Section 106 process, under 36 CFR § 800.5(e) "Consulting party review".

The State Historic Preservation Office is not the office of record for this undertaking. You are therefore asked to maintain a copy of this letter with your environmental review record for this undertaking. If the scope of work changes in any way, or if artifacts or bones are discovered, please notify this office immediately.

If you have any questions, please contact Martha MacFarlane Faes, Environmental Review Coordinator, at (517) 335-2721 or by email at ER@michigan.gov. **Please reference our project number in all communication with this office regarding this undertaking.** Thank you for this opportunity to review and comment, and for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Brian D. Conway
State Historic Preservation Officer

BDC:ROC:bgg

copy: Sigrid Bergland, MDOT



STATE OF MICHIGAN

DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES
LANSING

JENNIFER M. GRANHOLM
GOVERNOR

REBECCA A. HUMPHRIES
DIRECTOR

August 12, 2004

Ms. Margaret M. Barondess
Michigan Department of Transportation
Project Planning Division
P.O. Box 30050
Lansing, Michigan 48909

Dear Ms. Barondess:

Proposed I-196 Road Improvements

The location of the proposed project was checked against known localities for rare species and unique natural features, which are recorded in a statewide database. This continuously updated database is a comprehensive source of information on Michigan's endangered, threatened and special concern species, exemplary natural communities and other unique natural features. Records in the database indicate that a qualified observer has documented the presence of special natural features at a site. The absence of records may mean that a site has not been surveyed. Records may not always be up-to-date. In some cases, the only way to obtain a definitive statement on the presence of rare species is to have a competent biologist perform a field survey. Projects that are submitted to the Department of Environmental Quality are routinely checked for such features regardless if they are on public or private land.

Under Act 451 of 1994, the Natural Resources and Environmental Protection Act, Part 365, Endangered Species Protection, "a person shall not take, possess, transport, ...fish, plants, and wildlife indigenous to the state and determined to be endangered or threatened," unless first receiving an Endangered Species Permit from the Department of Natural Resources, Wildlife Division. *Responsibility to protect endangered and threatened species is not limited to the list below. Other species may be present that have not been recorded in the database.*

The presence of threatened or endangered species does not preclude activities or development, but may require alterations in the project plan. Special concern species are not protected under endangered species legislation, but recommendations regarding their protection may be provided. Protection of special concern species will help prevent them from declining to the point of being listed as threatened or endangered in the future.

The following is a summary of the results for the project in Kent County, (your Figures 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 20, & 21).

The following list includes special features that are known to occur on or near the site(s) and may be impacted by the project:

<u>common name</u>	<u>status</u>	<u>scientific name</u>
Eastern box turtle	State special concern	<i>Terrapene carolina carolina</i>

The special concern **eastern box turtle** (*Terrapene carolina carolina*) has been known to occur in T7N R11W, Section 16, north of I-196 (in your Figure 14). The Eastern box turtle is Michigan's only truly terrestrial turtle. This species typically inhabits open woodlands, often near water, but may wander into thickets, meadows, grassy dunes, and gardens. They will soak at the edges of ponds or streams in hot weather but avoid deep water and swim poorly. Most box turtles remain in a rather small home range (often less than 5 acres) for most of their lives. Nesting takes place in June, with eggs being buried in an open, often elevated location. Incubation requires from 75 to 90 days. Management recommendations

include protection of forests. Loss of wooded habitat to various human uses is the most serious threat to the species, but many box turtles are killed on roads or collected as pets each year. As a species of special concern, the eastern box turtle is not protected under state or federal endangered species legislation, but it is becoming rare throughout its range and it is protected under the authority of the Department of Natural Resources Director's Order, Regulations on the Take of Reptiles and Amphibians, dated October 12, 2001 (section 324 of PA 451).

Thank you for your advance coordination in addressing the protection of Michigan's natural resource heritage. If you have further questions, please call me at 517-373-1263.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Lori G. Sargent". The signature is written in black ink and is positioned above the typed name and title.

Lori G. Sargent
Endangered Species Specialist
Wildlife Division

LGS:MEH:pmg
cc: Ms. Mindy Koch, DNR



IN REPLY REFER TO:

United States Department of the Interior

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE

East Lansing Field Office (ES)
2651 Coolidge Road, Suite 101
East Lansing, Michigan 48823-6316

March 25, 2005

Ms. Lori Noblet
Environmental Section
Project Planning Division
Michigan Department of Transportation
P.O. Box 30050
Lansing, Michigan 48909

Re: Request for Early Coordination Comments for the Environmental Assessment for the Proposed I-196/96 Improvement Project in Kent County, Michigan

Dear Ms. Noblet:

We are responding to your request for additional information and/or clarification for the Environmental Assessment (EA) of the proposed I-196/96 Improvement Project in Kent County, Michigan. You have indicated the Michigan Department of Transportation (MDOT) in cooperation with the Federal Highway Administration is preparing an EA for the proposed improvement of I-196 from just east of US-131 to the I-96 junction; I-96 from west of Cascade Road to west of Leonard Street; and M-37/M-44 (East Beltline) south of M-21 to north of the Knapp Street intersection in the city of Grand Rapids and Grand Rapid Township, Kent County, Michigan. These comments are prepared under the authority of the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act and are consistent with section 7 of the Endangered Species Act (Act) of 1973, as amended.

Endangered Species Act Comments

As indicated during our on-site review of the project area conducted on August 31, 2004, our files do not indicate the presence of any federally endangered, threatened, or proposed species, or designated or proposed critical habitat, in the action area. If the project requires modification, or new information becomes available that suggests species listed or proposed for listing may be present and/or affected, you should initiate consultation with us as required by section 7 of the Act.

Since threatened and endangered species data changes continuously, we recommend you contact this office for an updated Federal list of the species occurring in the project area every six months during the remaining planning and building period.

Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act Comments

During the course of the field review, a limited number of potential wetland areas were identified in the project area. We recommend MDOT avoid and minimize potential impacts to the extent possible during project construction. We understand the proposed project is to include replacement of the existing bridge over the Grand River. We recommend MDOT include provisions for the collection and retention of bridge deck runoff in future bridge design and construction.

If, in the future, the proposed work requires a Michigan Department of Environmental Quality permit, our office would have review responsibilities. In the review of these permit applications, we may provide additional comments and/or recommendations depending upon whether specific construction practices may impact public trust fish and wildlife resources of concern.

We appreciate the opportunity to review the document. Please refer any questions directly to Jack Dingedine of this office at (517) 351-6320 or the above address.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'C.A. Czarnecki', with a stylized flourish at the end.

Craig A. Czarnecki
Field Supervisor



June 27, 2005

Ms. Ann M. Lawrie
Bureau of Transportation Planning
Michigan Department of Transportation
425 W. Ottawa Street
P.O. BOX 30050
Lansing, Michigan 48909

Dear Ms. Lawrie:

The City of Grand Rapids supports the efforts of MDOT to reconstruct and widen the I-196 bridges over the Grand River.

Representatives from the MDOT have spoken with me (Director of Parks & Recreation) regarding the proposed construction of reconstruction and widening the I-196 bridges over the Grand River in the City of Grand Rapids, Kent County. The proposed work will involve the closure of the two trails during bridge construction. MDOT will detour pedestrian traffic during construction and provide pedestrian detour signing. MDOT will also restore the trails to their original condition when construction has been completed. The proposed work will not permanently affect the use or activities of the City of Grand Rapids trails.

The City of Grand Rapids appreciates the coordination efforts made on behalf of your department. If I can be of further assistance, please feel free to contact me at (616) 456-4234.

Sincerely,

Jay D. Steffen
Director of Parks & Recreation

JDS/krc

cc: Kurt Kimball
Victor Vasquez
Eric DeLong
Bill Cole
Rick DeVries

Tom Zelinski
Maryanne McIntyre
Darlene O'Neal

APPENDIX F

COMPARISON OF EXISTING AND PREDICTED NOISE LEVELS

TABLE 2 COMPARISON OF EXISTING AND PREDICTED NOISE LEVELS

Noise Sensitive Area	Receiver	Existing Noise Level (decibels)	2030 Projected Noise Level (decibels)	
1	1-M01	73.7	75.4	
	1-M02	51.2	53.9	
	1-M03	69.2	72.0	
	1-M04	61.4	62.3	
	1-01	49.9	52.0	
	1-02	57.1	59.8	
	1-03	60.4	63.1	
	1-04	58.1	59.9	
	1-05	62.6	64.0	
2	1-06	55.9	57.9	
	1-07	56.8	58.3	
	1-08	56.3	57.2	
	2-M05	65.7	67.4	
	2-01	63.8	65.6	
	2-02	56.2	58.3	
	3	3-M06	58.6	60.3
		3-M07	66.2	67.9
3-01		65.2	67.8	
3-02		59.2	62.9	
3-03		63.7	67.5	
4	3-04	63.4	66.0	
	4-M09	67.6	70.6	
	4-M10	65.2	67.4	
	4-01	55.8	58.8	
	4-02	51.8	54.6	
	4-03	56.9	59.3	
5	4-04	54.8	56.4	
	5-M08	69.1	73.0	
	5-M13	67.8	70.6	
	5-01	51.7	54.3	
	5-02	46.9	49.5	
	5-03	46.0	48.9	
	5-04	50.6	53.4	
	5-05	47.1	49.2	
6	5-06	52.0	53.6	
	6-M14	63.7	65.3	
	6-M15	60.0	61.8	
	6-01	57.3	59.1	
	6-02	57.7	59.8	
	6-03	50.8	52.4	
7	6-04	54.2	55.0	
	7-M11	57.0	59.5	
	7-M12	57.6	59.4	
	7-01	50.5	52.1	
8	7-02	57.2	59.4	
	8-M16	70.3	72.0	
	8-01	55.3	56.5	
9	8-02	63.3	65.5	
	9-M17	64.6	66.3	
	9-M18	72.7	74.0	
	9-01	64.1	66.4	
	9-02	64.5	66.6	

TABLE 2 (cont.) COMPARISON OF EXISTING AND PREDICTED NOISE LEVELS

Noise Sensitive Area	Receiver	Existing Noise Level (decibels)	2030 Projected Noise Level (decibels)
10	10-M19	64.5	66.4
	10-M20	71.0	72.7
	10-01	64.8	66.7
	10-02	56.2	58.2
	10-03	55.8	57.9
11	11-M22	57.9	57.8
	11-M23	46.8	49.0
	11-M24	57.1	59.6
	11-01	55.5	57.4
	11-02	50.0	51.7
	11-03	46.3	48.0
12	11-04	52.6	51.8
	11-05	51.5	51.0
	12-M21	68.2	71.2
	12-M29	58.7	60.6
	12-M30	60.8	60.6
	12-01	57.0	59.8
	12-02	53.5	55.6
	12-03	49.1	53.2
	12-04	55.1	62.0
	12-05	56.8	61.9
	12-06	56.6	59.0
	12-07	55.2	58.2
	12-08	53.6	57.3
	12-09	51.9	54.5
	12-10	52.1	53.8
12-11	52.8	54.3	
12-12	53.7	53.7	
12-13	54.5	55.1	
12-14	56.9	58.8	
12-15	61.1	62.8	
12-16	56.6	56.5	
12-17	54.0	54.3	
12-18	51.8	52.7	
12-19	58.5	58.8	
12-20	62.0	62.0	
13	13-M25	56.1	56.3
	13-M26	64.9	64.9
	13-M27	60.5	62.3
	13-01	59.5	48.6
	13-02	58.8	55.3
	13-03	53.8	53.6
	13-04	56.6	56.9
	13-05	63.6	63.4
	13-06	61.5	62.4
	13-07	52.6	52.0
	13-08	53.5	53.5
13-09	51.7	50.8	
13-10	62.7	61.6	
13-11	50.3	49.4	

TABLE 2 (cont.) COMPARISON OF EXISTING AND PREDICTED NOISE LEVELS

Noise Sensitive Area	Receiver	Existing Noise Level (decibels)	2030 Projected Noise Level (decibels)
14	14-M28	52.9	54.7
	14-01	61.9	63.8
	14-02	68.1	68.9
	14-03	52.3	53.6
	14-04	52.5	53.3
	14-05	55.2	55.4
	14-06	54.0	55.2
	14-07	49.9	51.1
	14-08	52.3	53.4
15	15-M32	56.3	59.0
	15-01	56.2	58.0
	15-02	58.5	62.5
	15-03	55.5	58.1
	15-04	55.7	56.7
	15-05	54.5	54.2
	15-06	64.9	65.3
	15-07	63.3	63.5
	15-08	63.2	63.4
	15-09	51.3	51.9
16	16-M35	61.2	65.2
	16-01	67.0	69.5
	16-02	58.8	62.1
	16-03	56.4	58.7
	16-04	58.7	59.2
17	17-M33	54.5	55.5
	17-M34	60.9	63.8
	17-M36	63.5	63.9
	17-01	64.1	66.5
	17-02	53.3	55.8
	17-03	47.2	50.4
	17-04	56.5	58.6
	17-05	58.8	59.9
	17-06	58.0	58.3
	17-07	56.9	57.7
	17-08	55.1	56.0
	17-09	55.6	56.0
	17-10	55.4	56.2
	17-11	62.2	62.3
	17-12	51.6	52.5
17-13	59.1	59.3	
17-14	55.0	55.5	
18	18-M40	61.8	60.2
	18-M41	63.5	61.3
	18-M42	59.9	61.1
	18-01	62.5	61.9
	18-02	55.4	60.6
	18-03	60.1	59.9
	18-04	59.5	55.6
	18-05	69.9	70.1
	18-06	68.5	68.0
	18-07	63.5	63.5
	18-08	59.1	55.8
	18-09	54.4	59.5
	18-10	57.0	57.8
	18-11	65.8	59.6
18-12	57.7	58.0	
18-13	60.9	62.1	

TABLE 2 (cont.) COMPARISON OF EXISTING AND PREDICTED NOISE LEVELS

Noise Sensitive Area	Receiver	Existing Noise Level (decibels)	2030 Projected Noise Level (decibels)
	18-14	66.4	63.2
	18-15	62.5	63.2
19	19-M44	66.3	65.3
	19-01	59.4	56.2
	19-02	58.6	58.6
	19-03	60.3	60.3
	19-04	62.7	62.7
	19-05	65.4	65.4
20	20-01	50.0	50.4
	20-02	52.7	52.9
	20-03	44.9	45.6
21	21-M45	65.6	67.4
	21-01	59.8	61.1
22	22-M46	53.4	56.0
	22-M47	61.8	63.5
	22-01	45.2	46.8
	22-02	49.6	51.5
	22-03	43.6	45.7
	22-04	45.5	47.5
	22-05	58.1	60.2
	22-06	49.8	51.3
	22-07	54.7	56.7
	22-08	51.5	52.4
	22-09	59.1	59.8
23	23-01	64.7	64.7
	23-02	57.5	57.4
	23-03	68.3	68.3
	23-04	65.6	65.6
24	24-M43	62.2	62.3
	24-01	52.5	52.6
	24-02	57.9	58.1
25	25-M37	66.2	67.3
	25-01	68.3	69.4
	25-02	63.2	62.5
26	26-M38	59.7	60.5
	26-01	53.7	53.9
27	27-M39	63.4	65.3
	27-01	64.6	66.3
	27-02	53.6	55.8
	27-03	56.5	58.8
	27-04	66.1	67.9
	27-05	68.3	69.9