

State of Alaska
Department of Transportation & Public Facilities



CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION DOCUMENTATION FORM
FOR FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION PROJECTS

Project Name: Parks Highway MP 231 Enhancements

Project Number (state/federal):61299/0A44020

Date: June 26, 2015

CE Designation: 23 CFR 771.117(c)(3)

23 CFR 771.117(d)(5,13)

List of Attachments:

Figure 1: Location and Vicinity Map

Figure 2: Proposed Improvements

Appendix A: Class of Action Determination

Appendix B: Section 106 Consultation

Appendix C: Traffic Noise Analysis

Appendix D: Water Quality Consultation

Appendix E: Section 4(f)

Appendix F: Public and Agency Coordination

I. Project Purpose and Need

The Parks Highway MP 231 Enhancements project is designed to improve vehicle and pedestrian safety in the vicinity of MP 231 (McKinley Village) area through the construction of dedicated pedestrian facilities and vehicle turn lanes.

Purpose: Enhance safety and accommodations for motorized and non-motorized traffic between MP 229.7 and 232.3 on the Parks Highway.

Need: The Parks Highway MP 231 area (also known as McKinley Village) experiences a high volume of commercial traffic (buses, vans with boat trailers, and tractor trailers) as well as increased pedestrian and vehicle traffic during tourist season.

Pedestrians must cross the highway to access commercial facilities at McKinley Village and Grizzly Bear Cabins on the south end of the project, and must cross the Nenana River highway bridge via five-foot shoulders to access Denali National Park and Preserve (DNP&P) trails on the north end of the project.

At present there are no turn lanes for the facilities at MP 231 (which include a heavily used public boat launch in addition to the two commercial establishments), or the subdivision at MP 230, resulting in risk of conflict between 65 mph through traffic and turning traffic. The risk is exacerbated at MP 231 due to the nearly 6% grades on the south and north approaches to the intersection.

II. Project Description

The Alaska Department of Transportation and Public Facilities (ADOT&PF), in cooperation with the Alaska Division of the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), proposes to construct intersection and pedestrian improvements at Parks Highway milepost (MP) 231 (also known as McKinley Village). The proposed project is located in Sections 25, 26, 35, & 36, Township 14 South, Range 7 West, Fairbanks Meridian (U.S. Geological Survey Quadrangle Healy C-4) (Figure 1).

The Parks Highway will be reconstructed from MP 229.7 to MP 232.3, including (Figures 2A-2C):

- Dedicated left and right turn lanes at MP 230 (Village View Subdivision access), MP 231 (hotel

facilities, public boat launch, and Denali Education Center access), and MP 231.5 (new DNP&P wayside);

- Replacement of the existing Nenana River bridge with a wider structure that will accommodate through traffic, turn lanes for MP 231, a separated multi-use path, and 8-ft shoulders for commuter bicyclists;
- Construction of a pedestrian tunnel under the Parks Highway near the MP 231 intersection;
- A new DNP&P owned and maintained wayside near the northeast quadrant of the Nenana River bridge;
- Relocation of the existing Denali National Park entrance sign to the new wayside to enhance photo opportunities;
- A grade separated connection between the existing Oxbow and Triple Lakes Trails, routed underneath the new highway bridge;
- Relocation of Triple Lakes and Oxbow trailheads to coincide with the proposed wayside and trail connection;
- Drainage and pavement improvements throughout the project;
- And utility relocations (buried fiber optic and overhead power).

The FHWA determined the Class of Action for the project to be a Categorical Exclusion under Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 23 CFR 771.117(c)(3) and (d)(5 &13). The Class of Action Determination form is included in Appendix A.

III. Environmental Consequences

- For each yes, summarize the activity evaluated and the magnitude of the impact.
- For any consequence category with an asterisk (*), additional information must be attached such as an alternatives analysis, agency coordination or consultation, avoidance measures, public notices, or mitigation statement.
- Include direct and indirect impacts in each analysis.

| A. <u>Right-of-Way Impacts</u> | <u>N/A</u> | <u>YES</u> | <u>NO</u> |
|---|-------------------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1. Additional right-of-way required. | | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| • Permanent easements required. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| • Estimated number of parcels: <u>0</u> | | | |
| • Full or partial property acquisition required. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| • Estimated number of full parcels: <u>0</u> | | | |
| • Estimated number of partial parcels: <u>0</u> | | | |
| • Property transfer from state or federal agency required. <i>If yes, list agency in No. 4 below.</i> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| • Business or residential relocations required. <i>If yes, summarize the findings of the conceptual stage relocation study in No. 4 below and attach the conceptual stage relocation study.</i> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> * | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| • Number of relocations: <u>0</u> | | | |
| • Type of relocation: Residential: <input type="checkbox"/> Business: <input type="checkbox"/> Residential (Indicate number: <u>N/A</u>) Business (Indicate number: <u>N/A</u>) | | | |
| • Last-resort housing required. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

- | A. <u>Right-of-Way Impacts</u> | <u>N/A</u> | <u>YES</u> | <u>NO</u> |
|--|------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 2. Will the project or activity have disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects on minority populations and low-income populations as defined in E.O. 12898 (DOT Order 6640.23, December 1998)? | | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. The project will involve use of ANILCA land that requires an ANILCA Title XI approval. <i>If yes, the project is not assigned to the State per the 6004 MOU and the CE must be processed by FHWA.</i> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 4. Summarize the right-of-way impacts, if any: The proposed project is not anticipated to require acquisition of additional right-of-way or permanent easements. Temporary construction permits may be required for driveway work. Facilities within DNP&P will remain the property of DNP&P and no land transfer will occur. | | | |

- | B. <u>Social and Cultural Impacts</u> | <u>N/A</u> | <u>YES</u> | <u>NO</u> |
|---|------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1. The project will affect neighborhoods or community cohesion. | | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. The project will affect travel patterns and accessibility (e.g. vehicular, commuter, bicycle, or pedestrian). | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. The project will affect school boundaries, recreation areas, churches, businesses, police and fire protection, etc. | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 4. The project will affect the elderly, handicapped, nondrivers, transit-dependent, minority and ethnic groups, or the economically disadvantaged. | | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 5. There are unresolved project issues or concerns of a federally-recognized Indian Tribe [as defined in 36 CFR 800.16(m)]. <i>If yes, the project is not assigned to the State per the 6004 MOU and the CE must be processed by FHWA.</i> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 6. Summarize the social and cultural impacts, if any: The proposed project will provide a long-term benefit to the traveling public, residents, and businesses within the project area by improving travel conditions and safety in the project area. Post construction travel patterns and accessibility will be improved through added turn lanes, dedicated pedestrian facilities, and a new driving surface. The project will have a beneficial impact to recreation areas and businesses by adding pedestrian and parking facilities to accommodate visitor use of the area. Adverse social or cultural impacts are not expected. No project issues or concerns have been identified related to a federally-recognized Indian Tribe as defined by 36 CFR 800.16(m). Road users may be temporarily affected by traffic delays caused by construction activities. Refer to Section III, Part P for discussion of construction related traffic impacts. | | | |

- | C. <u>Economic Impacts</u> | <u>N/A</u> | <u>YES</u> | <u>NO</u> |
|--|------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1. The project will have adverse economic impacts on the regional and/or local economy, such as effects on development, tax revenues and public expenditures, employment opportunities, accessibility, and retail sales. | | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. The project will adversely affect established businesses or business districts. | | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. Summarize the economic impacts, if any: The proposed project will provide a long-term economic benefit by improving | | | |

safety and efficiency of commercial traffic on the roadway. Several businesses are located in the vicinity of the proposed project area and are anticipated to experience beneficial impacts as a result of the project's pedestrian and intersection improvements.

Refer to Section III, Part P for discussion of construction related economic impacts.

D. Land Use and Transportation Plans

- | | <u>N/A</u> | <u>YES</u> | <u>NO</u> |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1. Project is consistent with land use plan(s). a. Identify the land use plan(s) and date <u>Denali Borough Comprehensive Plan, January 2009 (amended November 2011); DNP&P Entrance Area and Road Corridor Development Concept Plan, February 1997.</u> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Project is consistent with transportation plan(s). a. Identify the transportation plan(s) and date. <u>Alaska Statewide Long-Range Transportation Plan, Let's Get Moving 2030, February 2008 (updated December 2010); Interior Alaska Transportation Plan (IATP), November 2010; 2012-2015 Alaska Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP), February 2012 (amended June 2015).</u> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. Project would induce adverse indirect and cumulative effects on land use or transportation. <i>If yes, attach analysis.</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 4. Summarize how the project is consistent or inconsistent with the land use plan(s) and transportation plan(s): | | | |

Land Use Plans

Land use in the proposed project area consists of primarily undeveloped land and parkland, with some residential and commercial properties occurring south of the Nenana River Bridge. Short- and long-term land use changes are expected as a result of the proposed project, including increased recreational use of lands north of the Nenana River. The changes are consistent with the existing land use and development plan for DNP&P that includes developing recreational facilities. The proposed project is not identified in the Denali Borough Comprehensive Plan; however, the Denali Borough Assembly and Planning Commission each passed resolutions in support of the project.

Transportation Plans

Although not specifically identified in the transportation plans listed above, the project is consistent with their goals of improving transportation and recreational infrastructure. The project is consistent with the IATP objectives to provide rest stops or waysides along highways at reasonable intervals and implement the National Highway Safety Improvement Program, including goals for accommodating cyclists and pedestrians. The project is consistent with the Let's Get Moving 2030 policy to develop the multimodal transportation system to provide safe, cost-effective, and energy-efficient accessibility and mobility for people and freight. The project is identified in the latest amended version of the 2012 – 2015 STIP (Amendment 12, March 2015) and is consistent with the project description contained therein.

- | E. <u>Impacts to Historic Properties</u> | <u>N/A</u> | <u>YES</u> | <u>NO</u> |
|--|-------------------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1. Does the project involve a road that is included on the “ List of Roads Treated as Eligible ” in the Alaska Historic Roads PA? <i>If yes, follow the Interim Guidance for Addressing Alaska Historic Roads.</i> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Does the project qualify as a listed activity that has no potential to cause effects to historic properties? <i>If yes, attach concurrence from the FHWA Area Engineer (non-assigned projects) or Statewide NEPA Manager for 6004-assigned projects.</i> | | <input type="checkbox"/> * | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| a. Indicate the appropriate policy directive or memo that identifies the project as an action with no potential to cause effects to historic properties: <u>N/A</u> | | | |
| 3. Is a National Register of Historic Places listed or eligible property in the Area of Potential Effect? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 4. Date Consultation/Initiation Letters sent <u>June 12, 2013</u> <i>Attach copies to this form.</i> | | | |
| a. List consulting parties <u>State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), Native Village of Cantwell, Lake Minchumina Traditional Council, Nenana Native Association, Edzeno Village Council/Nikolai Village, Telida Native Village Council/Telida Village, Denali Borough, Denali National Park & Preserve, Ahna, Inc., Doyon, Ltd.</u> | | | |
| b. If no letters were sent, explain why not. <i>Attach “Section 106 Proceed Directly to Findings Worksheet”, if applicable</i> <u>N/A</u> | | | |
| 5. Date “Finding of Effect” Letters sent <u>June 1, 2015</u> <i>Attach copies to this form</i> | | | |
| a. State any changes to consulting parties <u>None.</u> | | | |
| 6. List responding consulting parties, comment date, and summarize: DNP&P responded to initiation letter on July 10, 2013 identifying a potential cultural resource located outside the Area of Potential Effect (APE). Doyon, Limited responded to initiation letter on June 3, 2013 indicating the project does not impact any Doyon owned lands. | | | |
| 7. Are there any unresolved issues with consulting parties? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| a. If yes, list <u>N/A</u> | | | |
| 8. Date SHPO concurred with “Finding of Effect” <u>June 8, 2015</u> <i>Attach copy to this form.</i> | | | |
| 9. Will there be an adverse effect on a historic property? <i>If yes, attach correspondence (including response from ACHP) and signed MOA. If yes, Programmatic Agreements (PCEs) do not apply.</i> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 10. Summarize any effects to historic properties. <i>List affected sites (by AHRS number only) and any commitments or mitigative measures. Include any commitments or mitigative measures in Section VI.</i> The proposed project does not impact cultural or historic resources. See Appendix B for figures and consultation related to Section 106 compliance. If cultural, archaeological, or historical sites are discovered during construction, all work that may impact these sites would cease and the SHPO would be notified. | | | |

| F. <u>Wetland Impacts</u> | <u>N/A</u> | <u>YES</u> | <u>NO</u> |
|---|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1. Project affects wetlands as defined by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE). <i>If yes, document public and agency coordination required per E.O. 11990, Protection of Wetlands.</i> | | <input type="checkbox"/> * | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Are the wetlands delineated in accordance with the “ Regional Supplement to the Corps of Engineers Wetland Delineation Manual: Alaska Region (Version 2.0) Sept. 2007 ”? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. Estimated area of wetland involvement (acres): <u>0</u> | | | |
| 4. Estimated fill quantities (cubic yards): <u>0</u> | | | |
| 5. Estimated dredge quantities (cubic yards): <u>0</u> | | | |
| 6. Is a USACE authorization anticipated? <i>If yes, identify type:</i> NWP <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Individual <input type="checkbox"/> General Permit <input type="checkbox"/> Other <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 7. Wetlands Finding <i>Attach the following supporting documentation as appropriate:</i> | | | |
| • <i>Avoidance and Minimization Checklist, and Mitigation Statement</i> | | | |
| • <i>Wetlands Delineation.</i> | | | |
| • <i>Jurisdictional Determination.</i> | | | |
| • <i>Copies of public and resource agency letters received in response to the request for comments.</i> | | | |
| a. Are there practicable alternatives to the proposed construction in wetlands? <i>If yes, the project cannot be approved as proposed.</i> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Does the project include all practicable measures to minimize harm to wetlands? <i>If no, the project cannot be approved as proposed.</i> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Only practicable alternative: Based on the evaluation of avoidance and minimization alternatives, there are no practicable alternatives that would avoid the project’s impacts on wetlands. The project includes all practicable measures to minimize harm to the affected wetlands as a result of construction. <i>If no, the project cannot be approved as proposed.</i> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 8. Summarize the wetlands impacts and mitigation, if any. <i>Include any commitments or mitigative measures in Section VI.</i> | | | |
| <p>A wetlands delineation of a 236-acre study area in the vicinity of the project, conducted in September 2012, identified and mapped 5.97 acres of wetlands under USACE jurisdiction.</p> <p>The proposed project is not anticipated to directly impact wetlands under Section 404 jurisdiction as a result of the proposed improvements; therefore, USACE authorization for impacts to wetlands is not required. The project will, however, require USACE approval for work below the ordinary high water mark (OHWM) of Nenana River, a Section 404/10 water body (see Section G, Water Body Involvement).</p> | | | |

| G. <u>Water Body Involvement</u> | <u>N/A</u> | <u>YES</u> | <u>NO</u> |
|--|--------------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. Project affects a water body. | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Project affects a navigable water body as defined by USCG, (i.e. Section 9). | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> * | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. Project affects Waters of the U.S. as defined by the USACE, Section 404. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> * | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 4. Project affects Navigable Waters of the U.S. as defined by the USACE (Section 10) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> * | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 5. Project affects fish passage across a stream frequented by salmon or other fish (i.e. Title 16.05.841) | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

G. Water Body Involvement

N/A YES NO

6. Project affects a cataloged anadromous fish stream, river or lake (i.e. [Title 16.05.871](#)). *
7. Project affects a designated Wild and Scenic River or land adjacent to a Wild and Scenic River. *If yes, the Regional Environmental Manager should consult with the Statewide NEPA Manager (assigned CEs) or FHWA Area Engineer and FHWA Environmental Program Manager (non-assigned CEs) to determine applicability of Section 4(f).*
8. Proposed water body involvement: Bridge Culvert Embankment Fill Relocation Diversion Temporary Permanent Other
9. Type of stream or river habitat impacted: Spawning Rearing Pool Riffle Undercut bank Other
10. Amount of fill below (cubic yards): OHW 600 MHW _____ HTL _____
11. Summarize the water body impacts and mitigation, if any. *Include any commitments or mitigative measures in [Section VI](#).*

The Parks Highway crosses the Nenana River near MP 231 and is a navigable water under the U.S. Coast Guard (USCG) and USACE jurisdiction.

The project proposes to replace and widen the existing Parks Highway bridge over the Nenana River, which would involve removal of the existing bridge, including piers (2 concrete piers), and installation of a new bridge and new piers (2 steel pile piers). Estimated acreage below OHW is less than 0.25.

Fill below OHW will consist of concrete filled steel piles. Pier locations will be selected to minimize hydraulic changes to the Nenana River.

The project will require USCG authorization under Section 9 jurisdiction and USACE authorization under Section 10/404 jurisdiction prior to construction.

H. Fish and Wildlife

N/A YES NO

1. Anadromous and resident fish habitat. *Any activity or project that is conducted below the ordinary high water mark of an anadromous stream, river, or lake requires a Fish Habitat Permit.*
- a. Database name(s) and date(s) queried: Alaska Department of Fish and Game (ADFG) Anadromous Waters Catalog and Fish Resource Monitor, February 24, 2015; ADFG correspondence, June 26, 2013.
- b. Anadromous fish habitat present in project area. *
- c. Resident fish habitat present in project area *
- d. Adverse effect on spawning habitat. *
- e. Adverse effect on rearing habitat. *
- f. Adverse effect on migration corridors. *
- g. Adverse effect on subsistence species. *
2. Essential Fish Habitat (EFH). *EFH includes any anadromous stream used by any of the five species of Pacific salmon for migration, spawning or rearing, as well as other coastal, nearshore and offshore areas as designated by NMFS.*
- a. Database name(s) and date(s) queried: Anadromous Waters Catalog, February 24, 2015.
- b. EFH present in project area

- | H. <u>Fish and Wildlife</u> | <u>N/A</u> | <u>YES</u> | <u>NO</u> |
|--|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| c. Project proposes construction in EFH. <i>If yes, describe EFH impacts in H.6.</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d. Project may adversely affect EFH. <i>If yes, attach EFH Assessment.</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> * | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e. Project includes conservation recommendations proposed by NMFS. <i>If NMFS conservation recommendations are not adopted, formal notification must be made to NMFS. Summarize the final conservation measures in H.6 and list in Section VI.</i> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. Wildlife Resources: | | | |
| a. Project is in area of high wildlife/vehicle accidents. | | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Project would bisect migration corridors. | | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Project would segment habitat. | | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 4. Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act. <i>If yes to any below, consult with USFWS and attach documentation of consultation.</i> | | | |
| a. Eagle data source(s) and date(s) : N/A | | | |
| b. Project visible from an eagle nesting tree? | | <input type="checkbox"/> * | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Project within 330 feet of an eagle nesting tree? | | <input type="checkbox"/> * | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d. Project within 660 feet of an eagle nesting tree? | | <input type="checkbox"/> * | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e. Will the project require blasting or other activities that produce extreme loud noises within 1/2 a mile from an active nest? | | <input type="checkbox"/> * | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| f. Is an eagle permit required? | | <input type="checkbox"/> * | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 5. Is the project consistent with the Migratory Bird Treaty Act? | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 6. Summarize fish and wildlife impacts and mitigation, including timing windows, if any. Include any commitments or mitigative measures in Section VI. | | | |

Anadromous or Resident Fish and Essential Fish Habitat

A review of ADF&G's Anadromous Waters Catalog and Fish Resource Monitor online mapping applications indicated there are no streams supporting anadromous or resident fish in the project area. The ADF&G responded during agency scoping, however, that the project could affect fish passage, and is considered to support resident fish. The project has the potential to impact resident fish and their efficient passage as a result of bridge pier installation below the OHWM of the Nenana River. Measures to minimize impacts to resident fish and their habitat will be developed in consultation with ADF&G and implemented during pier installation. As such, the proposed work is not likely to adversely affect resident fish or their habitat. Measures to protect water quality during construction are listed in Section III, Part P.

Wildlife

According to ADOT&PF's Moose-Vehicle Collision Rankings 2006-2010, this segment of the Parks Highway is not considered to be a top moose-vehicle collision corridor in the state. The proposed changes to roadway configuration and travel patterns are not likely to increase the frequency of moose-vehicle collisions as capacity will remain the same. The proposed project will have the potential for minor impacts on wildlife habitat as a result of constructing the proposed parking area in undisturbed forest.

Migratory Birds

A review of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's (USFWS) Information, Planning,

and Conservation (IPaC) system and the Alaska Natural Heritage Program BIOTICS Data Portal indicated there are several migratory bird species protected by the Migratory Bird Treaty Act that may pass through or inhabit the project area and could be disturbed by construction. To avoid adverse impacts to migratory birds and their nests, ADOT&PF would follow the USFWS's Recommended Time Periods for Avoiding Vegetation Clearing in Alaska in Order to Protect Migratory Birds advisory.

Within the project area the USFWS recommends avoiding vegetation clearing from May 1st through July 15.

Bald and Golden Eagles

Suitable eagle nesting habitat may exist adjacent to the proposed project corridor along the Nenana River. Adverse impacts to eagles are not anticipated. Should construction be necessary within 330 feet or 660 feet (the primary or secondary zones, respectively) of an active eagle nest, work would stop in the area and the USFWS would be notified.

| I. <u>Threatened and Endangered Species (T&E)</u> | <u>N/A</u> | <u>YES</u> | <u>NO</u> |
|---|------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1. Database name(s) and date(s) queried: IPaC, February 24, 2015. | | | |
| 2. Listed threatened or endangered species present in the project area. | | <input type="checkbox"/> * | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. Threatened or endangered species migrate through the project area. | | <input type="checkbox"/> * | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 4. Designated critical habitat in the project area. | | <input type="checkbox"/> * | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 5. Proposed species present in project area. | | <input type="checkbox"/> * | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 6. Candidate species present in project area. | | <input type="checkbox"/> * | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 7. What is the effect determination for the project? <i>Select one.</i> | | | |
| a. Project has no effect on listed or proposed T&E species or designated critical habitat. | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | |
| b. Project is not likely to adversely affect a listed or proposed T&E species or designated critical habitat. <i>Informal Section 7 consultation is required. Attach consultation documentation, including concurrence from the Federal agency, to this form.</i> | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | |
| c. Project is likely to adversely affect a listed or proposed T&E species or designated critical habitat. <i>If yes, consult the FHWA Area Engineer (non-assigned projects) or Statewide NEPA Manager for 6004-assigned projects.</i> | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | |
| 8. Summarize the findings of the consultation, conferencing, biological evaluation, or biological assessment and the opinion of the agency with jurisdiction, or state why no coordination was conducted. <i>Include any commitments or mitigative measures in Section VI.</i> | | | |
| A review of the USFWS's IPaC system indicated there are no listed threatened or endangered species or critical habitats found in the vicinity of the project area. The project will have no effect on threatened or endangered species or critical habitat as a result of the proposed project. | | | |

| J. <u>Invasive Species</u> | <u>N/A</u> | <u>YES</u> | <u>NO</u> |
|---|------------|------------|-----------|
| 1. Database name(s) and date(s) queried: Alaska Exotic Plants Information Clearinghouse (AKEPIC), February 25, 2015 | | | |

J. Invasive Species

N/A YES NO

- 2. Does the project include all practicable measures to minimize the introduction or spread invasive species, making the project consistent with [E.O. 13112](#) (Invasive Species)? *If yes, list measures in J.3.*
- 3. Summarize invasive species impacts and minimization measures, if any. *Include any commitments or mitigative measures in [Section VI](#).*

A review of the AKEPIC mapping application indicated there are several non-native and invasive species known to occur within the project area. Because the proposed project will be disturbing new ground, there is potential to introduce or spread invasive species during construction. To minimize the risk of introducing or spreading invasive species, ADOT&PF will comply with all federal, state, and local laws and regulations regarding invasive species during construction of the proposed project. Additionally, the area of ground disturbance will be kept to a minimum and certified weed-free seed will be used to re-establish vegetation after construction.

K. Hazardous Waste

N/A YES NO

- 1. Database name(s) and date(s) queried: Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation (ADEC) Contaminated Sites Database, February 25, 2015.
- 2. There are potentially contaminated sites within or adjacent to the existing and/or proposed ROW.
- 3. There are identified contaminated sites within or adjacent to the existing and/or proposed ROW.
- 4. Extensive excavation is proposed adjacent to, or within, a known hazardous waste site, or the potential for encountering hazardous waste during construction is high. *If yes, attach the hazardous waste investigation report and approved ADEC Corrective Action Plan.*
- 5. Summarize the hazardous waste impacts and mitigation, if any. *Include any commitments or mitigative measures in [Section VI](#).*

*

A review of the ADEC Contaminated Sites Database mapping application indicated there are no sites listed as “active” or “cleanup with institutional controls” near the proposed project area. If contaminated or hazardous materials are encountered during construction, all work in the vicinity of the contaminated site would be stopped and ADEC would be notified.

L. Air Quality (Conformity)

N/A YES NO

- 1. The project is located in an air quality maintenance area or nonattainment area (CO or PM-10 or PM-2.5). *If yes, indicate CO or PM-10 or PM-2.5 , and complete the remainder of this section.*
- 2. The project is included in a conforming Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) and Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).
 - a. List dates of FHWA/FTA conformity determination: N/A

- | L. <u>Air Quality (Conformity)</u> | <u>N/A</u> | <u>YES</u> | <u>NO</u> |
|---|-------------------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|
| 3. The project is exempt from an air quality analysis per 40 CFR 93.126 (Table 2 and Exempt Projects). <i>If no, a project-level air quality conformity determination is required for CO nonattainment and maintenance areas, and a qualitative project-level analysis is required for both PM-2.5 and PM-10 nonattainment and maintenance areas.</i> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 4. Have there been a significant change in the scope or the design concept as described in the most recent conforming TIP and LRTP? <i>If yes, describe changes in L.8. In addition, the project must satisfy the conformity rule's requirements for projects not from a plan and TIP, or the plan and TIP must be modified to incorporate the revised project (including a new conformity analysis).</i> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 5. A CO project-level analysis was completed meeting the requirements of Section 93.123 of the conformity rule. The results satisfy the requirements of Section 93.116(a) for all areas or 93.116(b) for nonattainment areas. <i>Attach a copy of the analysis.</i> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> * | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 6. A PM-2.5 project-level air quality analysis was completed meeting the requirements of Section 93.123 of the conformity rule. The results satisfy the requirements of Section 93.116 . <i>Attach a copy of the analysis.</i> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> * | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 7. A PM-10 project-level air quality analysis was completed meeting the requirements of Section 93.123 of the conformity rule. The results satisfy the requirements of Section 93.116 . <i>Attach a copy of the analysis.</i> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> * | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 8. Summarize air quality impacts, mitigation, and agency coordination, if any. <i>Include any commitments or mitigative measures in Section VI.</i> | | | |

A review of the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's (EPA) list of Non-attainment Areas for Criteria Pollutants in Alaska indicated the proposed project is not within a non-attainment or maintenance area. According to Alaska Administrative Code (AAC) 18 AAC 50, DNP&P is considered a Class I area. As such, there are designated maximum allowable increases for PM-10, nitrogen oxide, and sulfur dioxide. Activities in these areas must operate in such a way that they do not exceed listed air quality controls for these compounds.

The proposed project would result in a minor change in traffic patterns, and traffic volumes would likely increase in areas where new parking facilities are proposed. The nature and extent of the proposed project is not likely to significantly change or increase emissions along the project corridor or contribute to a violation of an ambient air quality standard or exceed a maximum allowable increase for a Class I area.

No adverse impacts to air quality are expected to occur as a result of the proposed project. Refer to Section III, Part P for discussion of construction-related air quality impacts and mitigation measures.

- | | |
|---|--|
| M. <u>Floodplain Impacts (23 CFR 650, Subpart A)</u> | <u>N/A</u> <u>YES</u> <u>NO</u> |
| 1. Project encroaches into the base (100 year) flood plain in fresh or marine waters. Identify floodplain map source and date : <u>N/A</u> | <input type="checkbox"/> * <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

If yes, attach documentation of public involvement conducted per [E.O. 11988](#) and [23 CFR 650.109](#). Consult with the regional or Statewide Hydraulics/Hydrology expert. Attach the required location hydraulic study developed per [23 CFR 650.111](#). Answer questions M.1.a through d.

If no, skip to M.2.

- | | |
|--|---|
| a. Is there a longitudinal encroachment into the 100-year floodplain? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> * <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Is there significant encroachment as defined by 23 CFR 650.105(q) ? <i>If yes, the project cannot be approved as proposed without a finding that the proposed action is the “Only Practicable Alternative” as defined in 23 CFR 650.113. Attach the finding for approval.</i> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> * <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Project encroaches into a regulatory floodway. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> * <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d. The proposed action would increase the base flood elevation one-foot or greater. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> * <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Project conforms to local flood hazard requirements. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. Project is consistent with E.O. 11988 (Floodplain Protection). <i>If no, the project cannot be approved as proposed.</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 4. Summarize floodplain impacts and mitigation, if any. <i>Include any commitments or mitigative measures in Section VI.</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> |

A review of the Federal Emergency Management Agency’s (FEMA) Map Service Center website indicates that FEMA has not completed a study to determine flood hazards for the proposed project area and, therefore, a flood map has not been published. There are no regulatory floodplains or floodways within the proposed project area. Adverse impacts to floodplains are not anticipated.

| | |
|---|---------------------------------|
| N. <u>Noise Impacts (23 CFR 772)</u> | <u>N/A</u> <u>YES</u> <u>NO</u> |
|---|---------------------------------|

- | | |
|--|--|
| 1. Does the project involve any of the following? <i>If yes, complete N.1.a.</i> <i>If no, a noise analysis is not required. Skip to section O.</i> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--|

- Construction of highway on a new location.
- Substantial alteration in vertical or horizontal alignment as defined in [23 CFR 772.5](#).
- An increase in the number of through lanes.
- Addition of an auxiliary lane (except a turn lane).
- Addition or relocation of interchange lanes or ramps added to a quadrant to complete an existing partial interchange.
- Restriping existing pavement for the purpose of adding a through-traffic lane or an auxiliary lane.
- Addition of a new or substantial alteration of a weigh station, rest stop, ride-share lot or toll plaza.

N. Noise Impacts (23 CFR 772) N/A YES NO

- a. Identify below which category of land uses are adjacent: *A noise analysis is required if any lands in Categories A through E are identified, and the response to N.1 is 'yes'.*

Category A: 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: Residential. *This includes undeveloped lands permitted for this category.*

Category C (exterior): Active sport areas, amphitheaters, auditoriums, campgrounds, cemeteries, daycare centers, hospitals, libraries, medical facilities, parks, picnic areas, places of worship, playgrounds, public meeting rooms, public or nonprofit institutional structures, radio studios, recording studios, recreation areas, Section 4(f) sites, schools, television studios, trails, and trail crossings. *This includes undeveloped lands permitted for this category.*

Category D (interior): Auditoriums, day care centers, hospitals, libraries, medical facilities, places of worship, public meeting rooms, public or nonprofit institutional structures, radio studios, recording studios, schools, and television studios.

Category E: Hotels, motels, offices, restaurants/bars, and other developed lands, properties or activities not listed above. *This includes undeveloped lands permitted for this category.*

2. Does the noise analysis identify a noise impact? *If yes, explain in N.3*

3. Summarize the findings of the attached noise analysis and noise abatement worksheet, if applicable:

A Traffic Noise Analysis was completed in June 2015 using the FHWA Traffic Noise Model Version 2.5. Existing noise levels were measured at five locations within the project corridor and were modeled at an additional 13 locations in noise sensitive areas. Existing peak-hour noise levels do not approach or exceed the ADOT&PF Noise Abatement Criteria (NAC) at any location, and predicted future peak-hour noise levels would not approach or exceed the NAC at any location under the 'build' or 'no-build' scenario.

The feasibility and cost-reasonableness of using noise abatement measures to reduce traffic noise levels were not analyzed since no impacts have been identified, and the report proposes no noise abatement measures for the project.

The June 2015 Traffic Noise Analysis is included in Appendix C.

O. Water Quality Impacts N/A YES NO

1. Project would involve a public or private drinking water source. *If yes, explain in O.7*

2. Project would result in a discharge of storm water to a Water of the U.S. (per [40 CFR 230.3\(s\)](#))

3. Project would discharge storm water into or affect an ADEC designated Impaired Waterbody. *If any of the Impaired Waterbodies have an approved or established Total Maximum Daily Load, describe project impacts in O.7*

- a. List name(s), location(s), and pollutant(s) causing impairment:

N/A

O. Water Quality Impacts N/A YES NO

4. Estimate the acreage of ground-disturbing activities that will result from the project?
45 acres
5. Is there a municipal separate storm sewer system (MS4) APDES permit, or will runoff be mixed with discharges from an APDES permitted industrial facility?
a. If yes, list APDES permit number and type: N/A
6. Would the project discharge storm water to a water body within a national park or state park; a national or state wildlife refuge? *If yes and Alaska Construction General Permit applies to the project, consultation with ADEC is required at least 30 days prior to planned start of construction activities.*
7. Summarize the water quality impacts and mitigation, if any. *Include any commitments or mitigative measures in [Section VI](#).*

Storm water within the proposed project area sheet flows off the roadway into vegetated areas and adjacent ditches where it infiltrates into the ground or is conveyed and discharged into the Nenana River. A review of ADEC's Impaired Waters mapping application and Alaska's FINAL 2012 Integrated Water Quality Monitoring and Assessment Report indicated the Nenana River is not designated as impaired. There are no MS4 facilities in the area. A review of the ADEC Drinking Water Protection Areas mapping application indicated there are multiple private drinking water sources within the project area, none of which will be impacted by new ground disturbance resulting from the proposed project.

The proposed project would increase the amount of impervious surfaces as a result of a new parking area and roadway widening to accommodate turning lanes. Post-construction BMP's, including drainage conveyance and storage will be designed to reduce impacts to the Nenana River.

The Nenana River is the eastern boundary of the DNP&P in the project area. The ADEC was consulted to determine if specific water quality protection measures or an antidegradation analysis are needed to meet the requirements of the 2011 Alaska Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (APDES) Construction General Permit (CGP). The ADEC responded and determined that no additional information is required to be in compliance with the CGP. A Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) will be required for the project that implements Best Management Practices (BMPs) to limit storm water discharge into the Nenana River.

No long-term adverse impacts to water quality are expected to occur as a result of the proposed project. Refer to Section III, Part P for discussion of construction related water quality impacts.

See Appendix D for ADEC Water Quality Consultation.

P. Construction Impacts N/A YES NO

1. There will be temporary degradation of water quality.
2. There will be a temporary stream diversion.
3. There will be temporary degradation of air quality.
4. There will be temporary delays and detours of traffic.

P. Construction Impacts

N/A YES NO

- | | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 5. There will be temporary impacts on businesses. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 6. There will be temporary noise impacts. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 7. There will be other construction impacts. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 8. Summarize construction impacts and mitigation for each ‘yes’ above. <i>Include any commitments or mitigative measures in Section VI.</i> | | |

Water Quality

Temporary water quality degradation during construction may result from installation of piers for bridge construction, ground disturbance, and sedimentation of storm water runoff. These impacts will be minimized through the development and implementation of a SWPPP in accordance with ADOT&PF's contract specifications and the APDES & NPDES CGPs for storm water discharge in Alaska. BMPs would be implemented during construction to minimize transport of sediment beyond the construction site.

Air Quality

The operation of construction equipment may lead to a temporary decrease in air quality because of increased airborne dust and emission-related particulate matter. Air quality impacts would be temporary and mitigated through the use of BMP's such as watering and sweeping disturbed and dust prone surface areas and ensuring that construction equipment receives regular maintenance.

Traffic Impacts

Temporary traffic impacts may include delays or detours for road users. These impacts will be mitigated by providing advance notice to the public and an approved traffic control plan.

Business Impacts

Businesses may be impacted by commercial and tourism traffic delays during construction. However, these impacts would be temporary and access would be maintained throughout construction.

Noise Impacts

Temporary noise impacts will result from the operation of heavy equipment, the presence of construction crews, and other associated construction activities. Noise from construction equipment can be minimized by maintaining their noise control devices.

Other – Invasive Species

Soil disturbance provides opportunity for invasive plants to become established, out-compete native plants, and/or spread invasive plants present in the project area. Practicable measures would be implemented to minimize the introduction or spread of invasive species, such as the use of certified weed-free seed.

Other – Hazardous Materials

The contractor will be required to develop a Hazardous Materials Control Plan to address containment, cleanup, and disposal of all construction related discharges of petroleum fuels, oils, and other hazardous substances. Wastes generated during construction would be properly handled, contained, and disposed of at an appropriately permitted disposal facility, in accordance with State and Federal laws.

- | Q. Section 4(f)/6(f) | <u>N/A</u> | <u>YES</u> | <u>NO</u> |
|---|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1. Section 4(f) (23 CFR 774) | | | |
| a. Does a Section 4(f) resource exist within the project area; or is the project adjacent to a Section 4(f) resource? <i>If yes, attach consultation with the Statewide NEPA Manager (assigned CEs) or FHWA Environmental Program Manager (non-assigned CEs) to determine applicability of Section 4(f)</i> | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Does an exception listed in 23 CFR 774.13 apply to this project? <i>If yes, attach consultation with the Statewide NEPA Manager (assigned CEs) or FHWA Environmental Program Manager (non-assigned CEs), and documentation from the official with jurisdiction, if required.</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Does the project result in the “use” of a Section 4(f) property? “Use” includes a permanent incorporation of land, adverse temporary occupancy, or constructive use. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d. Has a <i>de minimis</i> impact finding been prepared for the project? <i>If yes, attach the finding.</i> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e. Has a Programmatic Section 4(f) Evaluation been prepared for the project? <i>If yes, attach the evaluation.</i> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| f. Does the project require an Individual Section 4(f) Evaluation? <i>If yes, the project is not assigned to the State per the 6004 MOU and the CE must be processed by FHWA. Attach the evaluation.</i> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Section 6(f) (36 CFR 59) | | | |
| a. Were funds from the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act (LWCFA) used for improvement to a property that will be affected by this project? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Is the use of the property receiving LWCFA funds a “conversion of use” per Section 6(f) of the LWCFA? <i>Attach the correspondence received from the ADNR 6(f) Grants Administrator.</i> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. Summarize Section 4(f)/6(f) involvement, if any: | | | |
| <p>The Parks Highway is located within DNP&P north of the Nenana River Bridge. DNP&P is a publicly-owned national park that is protected under Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act of 1966. The proposed project would construct a new rest area within DNP&P on the east side of the Parks Highway at approximately MP 231.5 and trail connections on DNP&P property. All facilities constructed on DNP&P property would remain the property of DNP&P and will be maintained by the Park Service. The work in DNP&P is being done at the request of the National Park Service. The FHWA determined, and the official with jurisdiction over the property concurred in writing on June 29, 2015, that the project is solely for the purpose of preserving or enhancing the activities, features, or attributes that qualify DNP&P for protection under Section 4(f). The FHWA determined that the exception to the requirement for Section 4(f) approval for transportation enhancement activities (23 CFR 774.13(g)) is applicable to the proposed project.</p> | | | |

A temporary occupancy under 23 CFR 774.11(d) was also utilized for staging on the proposed wayside. The official with jurisdiction concurred with this exception on June 29, 2015.

Section 4(f) consultation documents are included in Appendix E.

IV. Permits and Authorizations

| | <u>N/A</u> | <u>YES</u> | <u>NO</u> |
|--|------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1. USACE, Section 404/10 <i>Includes Abbreviated Permit Process, Nationwide Permit, and General Permit</i> | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Coast Guard, Section 9 | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. ADF&G Fish Habitat Permit (Title 16.05.871 and Title 16.05.841) | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 4. Flood Hazard | | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 5. ADEC Non-domestic Wastewater Plan Approval | | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 6. ADEC 401 | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 7. ADEC APDES | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 8. Noise | | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 9. Eagle Permit | | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 10. Other. <i>If yes, list below.</i> | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

The project area is partially within DNP&P and is required to obtain permit coverage under the EPA National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Construction General Permit for storm water discharges. The Contractor would be responsible for obtaining all necessary permits and clearances for material and disposal sites, and borrow or equipment storage areas, including compliance with the NPDES & APDES CGP for storm water discharge.

V. Comments and Coordination

| | <u>N/A</u> | <u>YES</u> | <u>NO</u> |
|---|------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1. Public/agency involvement for project. <i>Required if protected resources are involved.</i> | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Public Meetings. Date(s): <u>August 28, 2014; September 30, 2014; April 15, 2015</u> | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. Newspaper ads. <i>Attach certified affidavit of publication as an appendix.</i> Name of newspaper and date: <u>Fairbanks Daily News-Miner, August 24 and September 28, 2014, March 29, April 5, and April 12, 2015; ADOT&PF Online Public Notice, August 19 and September 5, 2014; Alaska Dispatch News, March 29, April 5, and April 12, 2015.</u> | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 4. Agency scoping letters. Date sent: <u>May 30, 2013</u> | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 5. Agency scoping meeting. Date of meeting: <u>N/A</u> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 6. Field review. Date: <u>N/A</u> | | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 7. Summarize comments and coordination efforts for this project. Discuss pertinent issues raised. <i>Attach correspondence that demonstrates coordination and that there are no unresolved issues.</i> | | | |

Public Involvement

Notices of a public open house in Healy, Alaska and two public meetings in McKinley Village, Alaska were posted in the ADOT&PF Online Public Notice system, the Fairbanks Daily News-Miner, and the Anchorage Daily News. Flyers were also posted in Healy, Denali National Park & McKinley Village.

The first two meetings provided the team an opportunity to understand the issues and problems to be solved with the project and seek comment on early concept designs. The third meeting sought input on two alternatives developed from input received at the first two meetings and coordination with the Park Service and

Denali Borough.

The ADOT&PF received several comments from residents in the project area. Pertinent issues raised include:

- Concern regarding the safety of pedestrians traveling and crossing the roadway in the McKinley Village business area, at the Nenana River Bridge, at the Triple Lakes and Oxbow trailheads, and at the DNP&P boundary sign.
- Concern about construction impacts including traffic, noise, and materials sources.
- Support for the wider bridge with turn lanes and a separated pedestrian walkway, rest area, and turn lanes.

The project manager responded to commenters on June 26, 2015 and has maintained a project website to keep the public informed. Coordination will continue throughout the design process.

Agency Scoping

A request for early coordination was sent to the following parties: ADEC, ADF&G, Alaska Department of Natural Resources, Bureau of Land Management, Denali Borough, Doyon, Ltd., Ahna, Inc., EPA, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, National Park Service (NPS), Representative David Guttenberg, USCG, and USFWS.

The proposed parking area and trail connections are being developed in consultation with the NPS. The ADOT&PF and NPS have conducted regular meetings to discuss development of the proposed improvements. The conceptual layout and design of the parking area is being completed by NPS.

Other comments received from agencies and other parties include the following:

- A resolution from the Denali Borough in support of the project;
- ADF&G indicated that the project has the potential to block the efficient passage and movement of fish, and that a fish habitat permit will be required for work below the ordinary high water mark;
- and NPS commented on proposed location of the parking area and provided suggested pedestrian and wayside facilities to be considered throughout the project area.

See Appendix F for Public and Agency Coordination.

VI. Environmental Commitments and Mitigation Measures

List all environmental commitments and mitigation measures included in the project.

Standard environmental commitments and mitigation measures are outlined within each section above. Environmental commitments and mitigation measures that are unique to this project include the following:

1. The ADOT&PF will continue to coordinate with the NPS and the community surrounding MP 231 as the project develops to minimize construction impacts.

VII. Environmental Documentation Approval

N/A YES NO

1. Do any unusual circumstances exist, as described in [23 C.F.R. 771.117 \(b\)](#)? *If yes, the CE Documentation form cannot be approved.*

2. Does this 6004 Program approval statement apply?
“The State has determined that this project has no significant impact(s) on the environment and that there are no unusual circumstances as described in [23 CFR 771.117\(b\)](#). As such, the project is categorically excluded from the requirements to prepare an environmental assessment or environmental impact statement under the National Environmental Policy Act. The State has been assigned, and hereby certifies that it has carried out, the responsibility to make this determination pursuant to Chapter 3 of title 23, United States Code, Section 326 and a Memorandum of Understanding dated September 20, 2012, executed between the FHWA and the State.” *If no, the CE must be approved by FHWA.*

3. **For 6004 projects:** The project meets the criteria of the [DOT&PF Programmatic Approval 2](#) authorized in the November 6, 2012 “[CE Directive – Delegation of Approval Authority for Certain CEs under 6004 MOU](#)”. *If yes, the CE may be approved by the Regional Environmental. If no, the CE may be approved by a Statewide NEPA Manager.*

4. **For non-assigned projects:** The project meets the criteria of the April 13, 2012 “Programmatic Categorical Exclusion for Use on Federal-Aid Highway Projects in Alaska” between FHWA and DOT&PF. *If yes, the CE may be approved by the Regional Environmental Manager. If no, the CE may be approved by FHWA Area Engineer.*

VIII. Environmental Documentation Approval Signatures

Prepared by: Melissa L. Jensen
[Sign] Environmental Impact Analyst

Date: 7/9/2015

Melissa L. Jensen
[Print Name] Environmental Impact Analyst

Reviewed by: Lauren Little
[Sign] Engineering Manager

Date: 7/9/2015

Lauren Little
[Print Name] Engineering Manager

Approved by: Brett D. Nelson
[Sign] Regional Environmental Manager

Date: 7-9-15

Brett Nelson
[Print Name] Regional Environmental Manager

Assigned CE

Approved by: _____
[Sign] DOT&PF Statewide NEPA Manager

Date: _____

[Print Name] DOT&PF Statewide NEPA Manager

Non-Assigned CE

Approved by: Austin Armstrong
[Sign] FHWA Area Engineer

Date: 8/4/15

Austin Armstrong
[Print Name] FHWA Area Engineer