

**M. Floodplains Impacts (23 CFR Part 650, Subpart A)**

N/A YES NO

6. Project is consistent with E.O. 11988 (Floodplain Protection). *If no, the project cannot be approved as proposed.*

7. Summarize risk and adverse floodplain impacts:

A Hydrologic and Hydraulic Report was completed for the project, including alternatives, in 2007 (Appendix E). The project as proposed would include replacing culverts at Bear Creek, Ball Field Creek, and Subdivision Creek. The new culverts are not expected to adversely impact the floodplain or regulatory floodway.

On July 1, 2010, the DOT&PF searched the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Insurance Rate Maps (FIRM) (FEMA FIRM 0200050500 B and 020005150 D), which indicated that the areas immediately adjacent to Bird Creek and Indian Creek are within Zone A (100-year flood zone) and within the regulatory floodway. The rest of the project area lies in Zone C (areas of minimal flooding). The proposed project involves constructing a pedestrian underpass along Indian Creek within the 100-year floodplain. The underpass would allow for safe pedestrian passage under the highway without conflicting with vehicle traffic. The underpass is not expected to impact the base flood elevation, and therefore, not increase the risk of flooding or have substantive impacts to the Indian Creek floodplain.

A Flood Hazard Permit will be obtained from the Municipality of Anchorage Prior to construction.

**N. Noise Impact (23 CFR Part 772)**

N/A YES NO

1. There are noise-sensitive receivers/land uses adjacent to the proposed project. *If yes, attach the noise analysis if applicable (see 2). If no, go to Section O.*

*Category A:* There are adjacent lands on which serenity and quiet are of extraordinary significance and serve an important public need and where the preservation of those qualities is essential if the area is to continue to serve its intended purpose.

*Category B:* There are adjacent picnic areas, recreation areas, playgrounds, active sports areas, parks, residences, hotels, motels, schools, churches, libraries, or hospitals.

*Category C:* There are adjacent developed lands, properties, or activities not included in Categories A or B above. *This would include commercial properties.*

2. The project is located on a new location and would result in substantial changes in vertical or horizontal alignment, or would increase the number of through lanes. *If yes, a noise analysis is required. If not, go to Section O.*

3. There is an existing noise impact.

4. The project would create a noise impact.

5. Noise analysis demonstrates potential noise impacts.

6. There are feasible and reasonable measures that can reduce noise impacts (attach analysis).

7. The noise abatement measures listed in 23CFR 772.13(c)(1-5) have been considered for those receivers where a noise impact would occur.

8. Summarize noise impact and abatement measures considered, if applicable.

A noise analysis for the project was conducted in September 2006. A 2009 report

**N. Noise Impact (23 CFR Part 772)**

N/A YES NO

documenting the analysis is included in Appendix G. Existing noise levels were measured in seven locations throughout the project corridor. Traffic volume data were obtained from the 2005 DOT&PF Annual Traffic Report and supplemented by manual turning movement counts performed in the corridor in July and August 2006. Future noise levels were predicted at twenty-one locations in the corridor using the FHWA's Traffic Noise Model Version 2.5 that predicts noise levels based on vehicle volume, speed, fleet mix, distance to receiver and area terrain.

The noise analysis indicated that the proposed new passing lanes were not adjacent to any noise sensitive receivers. In addition, there is no significant change in vertical or horizontal alignment. Therefore, the project would cause no noise impacts to the corridor.

**O. Water Quality Impacts**

N/A YES NO

- 1. Project would involve a public or private drinking source. *If yes, explain in No. 7.*  N/A  YES  NO
- 2. Project would result in a discharge of storm water to a Waters of the U.S.  N/A  YES  NO
- 3. Project would discharge stormwater into or affect an Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation (ADEC)-designated impaired water body. *If yes, list in No. 4 and describe in No. 7.*  N/A  YES  NO
- 4. List name(s) and location(s). NA
- 5. Estimate the acreage of ground-disturbing activities that will result from the project.  
4 acres
- 6. Is there a municipal separate storm sewer system (MS4) Alaska Pollution Discharge Elimination System (APDES) permit, or will runoff be mixed with discharges from an APDES permitted industrial facility? *If yes, APDES Permit No.: NA*  N/A  YES  NO
- 7. Summarize the impacts of any "yes" marked in Section O.

The project is located along Turnagain Arm and crosses five streams, two of which are listed as anadromous by ADF&G (See Section D for additional information). None of the waterways in the project area are listed as impaired on the State of Alaska's Section 303(d) Listed Water Quality-Limited Water Bodies (State of Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation, 2011).

Stormwater run-off is currently handled through roadside ditches and culverts. The proposed project does involve approximately 11,100 cubic yards of fill in waters of the U.S. Proposed culvert replacements involve larger diameter pipes in Bear, Ball Field, and Subdivision Creeks to improve drainage and fish passage conditions. Only these three identified streams would involve direct water quality impacts as a result of the in-stream work. Impacts to water quality during the in-stream work would be temporary in nature and would not constitute an adverse effect.

Numerous drinking water wells are adjacent to the project area and outside the existing DOT&PF ROW. Most are located close to Bird and Indian. No adverse impacts to drinking water wells in the project vicinity are expected.

The project would increase impervious surface area (in area proposed for the construction of two 12-foot-wide auxiliary lanes) which will increase the amount of stormwater run-off. The existing system of roadside ditches carrying stormwater to culverts is expected to adequately handle the additional stormwater. Temporary water quality impacts will be mitigated through implementation of BMPs for stormwater

**O. Water Quality Impacts** N/A YES NO  
 and a DOT&PF approved Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan.

- P. Construction Impacts** N/A YES NO
1. There will be temporary degradation of water quality.
  2. There will be temporary stream diversion.
  3. There will be temporary degradation of air quality.
  4. There will be temporary delays and detours of traffic.
  5. There will be temporary impact on businesses.
  6. There will be other construction impacts, including noise.
  7. Summarize construction impacts associated with any "yes."

During construction, water quality impacts would be minimized with BMPs and the implementation of a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan.

Temporary stream diversion is anticipated to occur at Bear, Ball Field, and Subdivision Creeks during culvert replacement. DOT&PF will continue to coordinate with state and federal resource agencies about the culvert replacements and stream diversions as the design process continues.

Short-term traffic delays and temporary lane closures may have a minor temporary effect on travelers and area businesses; although, DOT&PF will maintain continuous access to all businesses during normal business hours throughout construction. A traffic control plan would be in place during construction and travelers would be notified prior to and during construction of possible traffic delays.

Construction activity will have temporary impacts to noise receptors in the area, as well as, air quality impacts from construction vehicles and dust. Precautions such as timely equipment maintenance and watering disturbed areas would minimize these impacts.

- Q. Section 4(f)/6(f) - (CFR 774)** N/A YES NO
1. Section 4(f) properties would be affected by the proposed action.
  2. There would be a "use" of any land from these 4(f) properties.
  3. The project will require an Individual Section 4(f) Evaluation. *If yes, the project is excluded from State assignment and the CE and Section 4(f) Evaluation must be approved by FHWA.*
  4. The project would affect Section 6(f) properties.
  5. Funds from the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act (LWCFA) were used for improvement to the 4(f) property.
  6. If the use of the property receiving LWCFA funds a "conversion of use" per Section 6(f) of the LWCFA? Attach the correspondence received from the ADNR 6(f) Grants Administrator.
  7. Project is adjacent to a Section 4(f) resource. *If yes, consult with the Statewide NEPA Manager for 6004 (assigned CEs) or FHWA Environmental Program Manager (non-assigned CEs) to determine applicability of "constructive use."*

**Q. Section 4(f)/6(f) - (CFR 774)**

N/A YES NO

8. Summarize the type of involvement. Coordinate with the land manager and attach appropriate documentation (i.e., Section 4(f) or Section 6(f) Evaluation).

There are several 4(f)/6(f) properties adjacent to the project corridor, most notably the Chugach State Park, under the ADNR, Division of Parks and Outdoor Recreation. Other adjacent park facilities include Bird Creek Recreation Area (ADNR), Little Penguin Creek Rest Stop (DOT&PF/ADNR), Bird Ridge Parking Lot (ADNR), Bird Creek Campground (ADNR), Indian Creek Recreation Area (ADNR), and a sports field run by ADNR on land leased from the Alaska Railroad.

The proposed project would be constructed completely within the existing DOT&PF ROW and no additional ROW would be acquired. Access to the above mentioned 4(f)/6(f) properties would not be impacted. On August 27, 2010, Linda Heck, Statewide NEPA Program Manager, concurred with the DOT&PF that the proposed project would not result in a use of 4(f)/6(f) property (Appendix H).

**IV. Permits and Authorizations**

N/A YES NO

- 1. USACE, Section 404/10 (includes APP, NWP, and GP)
- 2. USCG, Section 9
- 3. ADF&G Fish Habitat Permit (T16,871 and 16.841)
- 4. Flood Hazard
- 5. ADEC Non-domestic Wastewater Plan Approval
- 6. ADEC 401
- 7. ADNR, ACMP Consistency
- 8. Other. If yes, list.

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Prior to construction DOT&PF and the construction Contractor would obtain, and be co-permittees on the Alaska Pollutant Discharge Elimination System – Construction General Permit.

**V. Comments and Coordination**

N/A YES NO

- 1. Public/agency involvement for project (required if protected resources are involved).
- 2. Public Meetings. Date: Girdwood Board of Supervisors Meetings 2.20.2006, 3.20.2006, 6.19.2006; Public Meeting in Indian, AK 3.13.2006; Public Meeting in Girdwood, AK 2.27.2007; Public Meeting in Indian, AK 9.10.2007
- 3. Newspaper ads.  
Name of newspaper: Anchorage Daily News, Turnagain Times
- 4. Agency scoping letters. Date sent: March 14, 2006
- 5. Agency scoping meeting. Date of meeting: March 28, 2006
- 6. Field review
- 7. Summarize comments and coordination efforts for this project. Discuss pertinent issues raised. *Attach correspondence that demonstrates coordination and that there are no unresolved issues.*

<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

## V. Comments and Coordination

N/A YES NO

### Agency Scoping

A scoping letter was distributed to resource agencies on March 14, 2006, and a meeting was held on March 28, 2006. The following Agencies were included in scoping and provided comments: Anchorage Metropolitan Area Transportation Solutions; Alaska Railroad Corporation; Anchorage School District; Department of Environmental Conservation; Alaska Department of Fish and Game; Department of ADNR Office of Habitat Management and Permitting; ADNR Division of Parks and Outdoor Recreation; MOA; NMFS; USFWS; U.S. Environmental Protection Agency; and USACE. Only the Alaska Department of Commerce, Community, and Economic Development did not respond to the scoping letter. See Appendix H for scoping letters and correspondence. The majority of the comments focused on other build alternatives involved in the earlier analysis. Many comments involving fill in Turnagain Arm, property acquisition and park impacts [4(f)/6(f)] were directed towards "Alternative 3" considered under the earlier EA and are no longer part of this proposed project. As a result of the agency scoping, a Technical Advisory Group (TAG) was formed. This group was comprised of various local, state, and federal resource agencies gathered to identify the technical/environmental studies needed, provide input and appropriate study methods, collect information for those studies, and review and provide comments on the study results. The first TAG meeting was held on June 19, 2006, and a second on January 27, 2007. All meeting notes, comments, and correspondence are documented in Appendix H, Public Involvement and Agency Scoping. Agency comments are summarized in a table in Appendix H.

### Public Scoping

Newspaper Public Notices were submitted for print in the Anchorage Daily News and the Turnagain Times prior to each meeting. Publishing dates include February 27, 2006, and March 13, 2006, for the March 13, 2006, meeting; February 13, 2007, for the meeting February 27, 2007; and August 27, 2007, and September 10, 2007, for the meeting September 10, 2007. During the formal comment period from February 2006 to May 1, 2006, over two-hundred public comments were received. Since then, many comments were made at public meetings and are summarized in meeting notes in Appendix H, Public Involvement. Comments were reviewed and considered during the preliminary design phase. The majority of the comments involve the impacts of the "Frontage Road" option in the earlier EA. The frontage road is not part of the current design moving forward.

### Project Update

A newspaper advertisement was submitted for print in the Anchorage Daily News to update the public and agencies on the project. The advertisement was published on February 13, 2011. In addition, a newsletter was put on the website which also provided an update on the project.

Other comments include (but are not limited to):

- Desire for a divided highway,
- Desire for a 4-lane highway,
- Desire for barriers between opposing traffic flow,
- Reduce the speed limit,
- Add separate turning lanes for the communities of Indian and Bird,
- Add more police presence,
- Add more pull-offs and viewing areas to reduce traffic parking along the roadside, and

**V. Comments and Coordination**

N/A YES NO

- People also stated they didn't want the road to change and maintain its existing character.

**VI. Environmental Commitments and Mitigation Measures**

List environmental commitments or mitigation measures included in the project.

1. If cultural, archeological, or historical sites are discovered during project construction, the SHPO would be contacted and any work that might impact these sites would be stopped. Work shall not resume in the vicinity of the site until a written non-objection from the SHPO is issued to the Project Engineer.
2. Prior to ground disturbing activities in the vicinity of MP 102, DOT&PF will locate and record the unrecorded historic archeological site discussed in a phone call between Laurie Mulcahy and Judith Bittner on August 12, 2010. DOT&PF will map the site's location and submit a completed AHRs card to the Office of History and Archeology. (See Appendix B for correspondence).
3. If contaminated or hazardous materials are encountered during construction, all work in the vicinity of the contaminated site would be stopped until ADEC is contacted and a corrective action plan is approved by ADEC and implemented.
4. Advanced public notice of construction activities would be published to reduce construction impacts on local businesses, residents, and road travelers. A traffic control plan will be created to mitigate traffic delays.
5. If, during construction, an eagle nest is found within 660 feet of the project, all construction within a quarter mile of the nest will be stopped and DOT&PF will immediately coordinate with USFWS to determine the best course of action. Eagles and their nests are protected under the Bald Eagle Protection Act and Migratory Bird Treaty Act, but are not considered a threatened or endangered species under the Endangered Species Act.
6. Clearing and grubbing would occur outside the migratory bird nesting period between May and July 15. In-stream work will take place during the ADF&G recommended fish window of July 1 through September 1.
7. The proposed project may result in minor discharges of storm water to Waters of the U.S. during construction. To minimize erosion and sedimentation during construction, DOT&PF would utilize BMPs as described in the Alaska Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan Guide. The construction Contractor would be required to prepare and implement a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) in accordance with DOT&PF's contract specifications and the APDES General Permit for Construction Activities in Alaska.
8. All exposed project slopes and fills that are susceptible to erosion would be permanently stabilized at the earliest practicable date. Fill slopes would be seeded with native seed mixes to establish permanent vegetation and minimize potential soil erosion into water bodies and wetlands. All construction wastewater would be filtered through filters such as grassy swales, silt bags or other similar filtering mechanisms prior to discharge into water bodies or wetlands.
9. Refueling and servicing of equipment would not be performed within 100 feet of wetlands or water bodies.
10. Wetlands will be protected to the maximum extent practicable. Compensatory mitigation for the 0.012 acre of unavoidable wetland impacts may not be necessary, due to the small amount of wetlands being impacted, and the fact that the ditch would be replaced in-kind. If the USACE does require compensatory mitigation, it would most likely be done through an in-lieu fee payment to the Great Land Trust, or any other organization with an established agreement with the USACE for accepting in-lieu-fee payments for wetlands mitigation.

**VII. Environmental Documentation Approval**

YES NO

1. The project meets the criteria of a Department or FHWA programmatic agreement. If yes, the CE may be approved by the Regional Environmental Manager, but needs a Quality Assurance/Quality Control check (see shaded block).

\*

**VII. Environmental Documentation Approval**

YES NO

2. The State has determined that the project has no significant impacts on the environment, and that the project is categorically excluded from the requirements to prepare an Environmental Assessment or Environmental Impact Statement under NEPA. The State has been assigned and hereby certifies that it has carried out the responsibility to make this determination pursuant to Chapter 3 or Title 23, United States Code, Section 326 and the Memorandum of Understanding dated September 22, 2009, executed between the FHWA and the State. *If yes, the CE must be approved by the FHWA.*

Prepared by: Angele Hunt Date: 4/27/11  
Environmental Impact Analyst

Reviewed by: Kelly Peterson Date: 4/27/11  
Engineering Manager

Approved by: Brian Elliott Date: 4/27/11  
Regional Environmental Manager

If Assigned CE:

Approved by: Benjamin M. White Date: 4/28/11  
[Print] DOT&PF Statewide NEPA Manager for 6004  
[Signature] DOT&PF Statewide NEPA Manager for 6004

Benjamin M. White

If Non-Assigned CE:

Approved by: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
FHWA Area Engineer

\* If the CE meets the conditions of either the Internal Programmatic Agreement (DOT&PF Statewide NEPA Manager for 6004 verifies) or one of the Programmatic Agreements with FHWA (FHWA Area Engineer verifies) then:

Concurrence by: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
DOT&PF Statewide NEPA Manager of FHWA Area Engineer