

**ANNUAL REPORT**

**IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PROGRAMMATIC AGREEMENT REGARDING  
ALASKA'S HIGHWAY SYSTEM ROADS AFFECTED BY THE FEDERAL-AID  
HIGHWAY PROGRAM IN ALASKA.**

**November 1, 2010 – October 31, 2011**

**Alaska Department of Transportation and Public Facilities  
Statewide Design and Engineering Services  
Environmental Office**

**October 2011**

## Table of Contents

	Page
I. Background	1
II. Reporting Requirements	1
III. Interim Guidance	2
IV. Summary Results	3
a. By Region	3
b. Effect Findings	4
V. Effectiveness of the Alaska Road PA	4
a. Efficiencies	4
b. Accomplishments	4
i. Draft Interim Guidance	4
ii. Tribal and Local Govt. Consultation Letters for the Alaska Road PA	5
iii. Applied Historic Context for Alaska Historic Roads, RFP	6
c. Interagency Partnership	6
VI. Challenges and Issues	6
a. Administration	6
b. Interim Guidance	6
c. Delays in the Alaska Road PA Deliverables	7
d. Clarification of TE List Road Bridges	7
e. CE and Reevaluation Approvals by the Statewide Office	7
VII. Conclusion	7

### List of Appendices

Roads to be Treated as Eligible (TE List Roads)  
Stipulation 4 Reporting Spreadsheet

## **LIST OF APPENDICES**

**Roads to be Treated as Eligible (TE List Roads)**

**Alaska Road PA Stipulation 4 Reporting Spreadsheet**

## ANNUAL REPORT

### Implementation of the Programmatic Agreement Regarding Alaska's Highway System Roads Affected by the Federal-Aid Highway Program in Alaska

November 1, 2010 – October 31, 2011

#### I. Background

The *Programmatic Agreement among the Federal Highway Administration, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, the Alaska State Historic Preservation Officer, and the Alaska Department of Transportation and Public Facilities Regarding Alaska's Highway System Roads Affected by the Federal-Aid Highway Program in Alaska* (Alaska Road PA) went into effect on February 23, 2010. The Alaska Road PA provides for an efficient, systematic approach for evaluating the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) eligibility of roads through the development of historic context and guidance tools. The Agreement also provides an alternative process and establishes thresholds for Program undertakings with low potential to affect features that may make a road eligible for NRHP listing. The Alaska Road PA only pertains to effects on roads. When undertakings satisfy the exemption requirements listed in Appendix A, the project will not need individual Section 106 review.

The Alaska Road PA also directs the participating agencies to develop guidance that would address historic road eligibility and project effects during the interim period before the historic road context and final guidance stipulated in the PA are ready. During the previous reporting period, an Alaska Historic Roads Study Group Workshop was held, as stipulated in the PA (September 28-30, 2010). The workshop developed (1) shared interagency goals and understandings for the research and applied guidance tools; and (2) established the direction of the Interim Guidance. The Alaska Road PA will be formally amended to replace the current Appendix A with the Interim Guidance, which will be in effect until the Historic Roads Context and the Final Guidance are established. One result of the workshop consultation was that during the interim period, a selected group of roads would be treated as NRHP eligible. These roads have become the focus of the current year's project-level consultation.

#### II. Reporting Requirements

This report documents the *Stipulation 4 Annual Reporting Requirements*. By October 31<sup>st</sup> for each year the Alaska Road PA is in effect, the Department of Transportation and Public Facilities (DOT&PF) shall submit a report to the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) to document the projects determined by a DOT&PF Professional Qualified Individual (PQI) to be subject to *Stipulation 3.B.1 Exemption from Considering Effects to Roads* of the Agreement.

The Stipulation 3.B.1 exemption states that:

FHWA and DOT&PF will not need to comply with Section 106 with regard to the effects of an undertaking on roads within the scope of this Agreement when the DOT&PF PQI determines that the undertaking falls within the thresholds established under Appendix A of this Agreement. FHWA and DOT&PF will still

need to comply with Section 106 for the undertaking, as applicable, with regard to effects on other properties.

The Stipulation 4 reporting submittal requires a summary of the following information:

1. federal number
2. project name
3. indication of whether DOT&PF has been assigned federal agency responsibility under SAFETEA-LU 6004(a)
4. type of undertaking
5. basis for determination under Stipulation 3.B.1 of this Agreement.

Under the Interim Guidance, reporting focuses on projects that may affect the TE list roads. Although the Interim Guidance has not been formally accepted, the Federal-Aid projects are moving forward using the TE List Roads, which have already been accepted by the Alaska Road PA Signatories.

### **III. Interim Guidance**

The details of the Interim Guidance are being refined through ongoing consultation and it is presently in draft form waiting acceptance by DOT&PF before final review approval by FHWA, SHPO, and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP).

Interim Guidance goals:

1. Focus consultation on a set of roads that are being treated as NRHP eligible (TE List Roads appended) during the interim period.
  - The Interim Guidance allows projects on roads that are not on the TE list to move forward with no further consultation on historic road status (with a few exceptions stipulated in the PA).
2. Reduce consultation on minor projects on those roads.
  - When a TE List Road is involved, the Interim Guidance identifies actions that do not require any further consultation regarding effects to that road.
  - For actions that trigger consultation on possible effects to a TE List Road, the Interim Guidance identifies programmatic mitigations that can result in findings of No Adverse Effect.

Interim Guidance key points:

1. Identifies 15 roads within Alaska to be treated as NRHP eligible (TE List Roads) through an up-front agreement among the Alaska Road PA Signatories. Other roads (with the exception of roads within historic districts or National Historic Landmarks) will not be subject to Section 106 considerations until the Historic Roads Context and the Final Guidance is developed for formal NRHP determinations of road eligibility.
2. Provides two lists of project activities for internal DOT&PF screening and documentation that will not require further Section 106 consultation on effects to the road. Provides opportunity for adjusting the project activities lists without the need to formally amend the Alaska Road PA.
3. Includes programmatic mitigation options to resolve adverse effects and allow findings of no adverse effect, which would not trigger the need for project related Memorandums of Agreement or Section 4(f) Evaluations.

4. Provides for a streamlined 15-day SHPO review if a project requires consultation on the TE List Road but does not affect other historic properties.
5. Provides a reevaluation clause for projects affecting a TE List Road in which Section 106 consultation was completed before the TE Road List was originally established (September 30, 2010). Section 106 consultation would not be revisited provided the previously reviewed project scope remains the same and no other changes in conditions warrant an updated review.

#### **IV. Summary Results**

Although the full Interim Guidance has not been formally accepted, the Federal-Aid projects are moving forward using the TE List Roads, which have already been accepted by the Alaska Road PA Signatories. For those projects that have been determined by a DOT&PF PQI to involve a TE List Road, formal Section 106 consultation has continued to assess project affects on the roads since the Interim Guidance project activities lists for internal DOT&PF screening and documentation are not final. As shown on the appended spreadsheet, DOT&PF processed seven projects under the Alaska Road PA involving Interim Guidance TE List Roads during this reporting period. The spreadsheet provides the Stipulation 4 reporting summaries.

Six of the projects were assigned to DOT&PF in accordance with SAFETEA-LU 6004(a). On April 11, 2011, a DOT&PF Chief Engineer Directive authorized Section 106 regional delegation for 6004 assigned projects. The delegation allows the PQI staff in each region to process their respective projects with regional 106 signature authority. Two projects were processed through the regional delegation.

##### **a. By Region**

*Northern Region (NR)* has eight TE List Roads. Five Federal-Aid projects were processed within NR that involved TE List Roads; four of these were 6004 assigned projects. The Nome Council Road MP 4-16 project was processed by NR PQI, while the remaining four were processed by Statewide PQI.

1. Dalton Highway MP 362-414: DP-065-7(3)/61366
2. Dalton Highway Holden Creek Bridge: BR-065-5(10)/63571
3. Dalton Highway Delineators: BR-065-5(10)/63573
4. Dalton Highway Bridge Repair: NH-065-5(11)/63880
5. Nome Council Road MP 4-16: STP-0130(32)/66166

*Central Region (CR)* has four TE List Roads. Two Federal-Aid projects were processed within CR that involved TE List Roads; both were 6004 assigned projects. The FY11 Ditch Maintenance project was processed by CR PQI.

1. Iliamna River Bridge: Federal #TBA/51892
2. FY11 Ditch Maintenance: Federal #TBA/53451

*Southeast Region (SER)* has three TE List Roads. No Federal-Aid projects were processed within SER that involved TE List Roads.

### **b. Effect Findings**

As will be discussed in Section V. Challenges and Issues, DOT&PF engineers have issue with the original Alaska Road PA Appendix A undertaking thresholds. Therefore, FHWA, DOT&PF, and SHPO decided to not continue with the original Appendix A threshold list. Consultation has generated revised Interim Guidance activity lists for projects with no or limited potential to cause effects to TE List Roads and for projects with no adverse effects. While the Interim Guidance is being developed, projects determined by a DOT&PF PQI to involve a TE List Road require formal Section 106 consultation to assess project affects on the road. This will continue until the Interim Guidance project activities lists for internal DOT&PF screening and documentation are final.

Of the seven projects that were processed during this reporting period, one project is at the initiation of consultation step with no comments received from the Section 106 consulting parties. The remaining six projects resulted in no adverse effect findings, all receiving SHPO concurrence.

## **V. Effectiveness of the Alaska Road PA**

### **a. Efficiencies**

Although actual dollars and hours saved were not estimated, the ability for these projects to move forward without determinations of eligibility for the affected roads allowed these projects to proceed with time and cost savings, while also reducing the development and review workload of each agency (i.e., SHPO, FHWA, and DOT&PF). Of the seven projects, the FHWA project involved a contracted cultural resource survey investigation in 2011. The six 6004 assigned projects were evaluated in-house by DOT&PF PQI staff and three of those projects included findings of effect on other historic properties within the APE. The turn-around time for the SHPO compliance review on the project findings averaged 10.2 days and SHPO concurred with each finding. The submittal date (representing the actual date of the findings letter and not the receipt date at SHPO) of each project finding and SHPO concurrence are noted on the spreadsheet.

The streamlined approach shortened the project delivery time frames by (1) eliminating the amount of time that it would take for the consultant to assess the road and produce an evaluation report, and (2) for the consultation amongst the consulting parties to make the determination of NRHP eligibility to reach a finding of effect of the affected road, including SHPO compliance review. Individual projects no longer have to bear a heavy research and analysis burden to determine eligibility status of a road in the absence of context data. This also eliminated interagency disputes over eligibility status arising from lack of historic context information and shared protocols for analysis which were time consuming to resolve.

### **b. Accomplishments**

#### **i. Draft Interim Guidance**

As previously mentioned, the second task of the Alaska Road PA was to develop and implement the Interim Guidance. The preliminary draft Interim Guidance was developed by the SRI Foundation, who was engaged under contract for the first two tasks of the Alaska Road PA: (1) the Alaska Historic Roads Study Group Workshop to meet Stipulation 5.A.1, and (2) the Interim Guidance of Stipulation 5.B.1 to evaluate roads and highways in Alaska for NRHP eligibility until a more developed Historic Road Context is completed.

The preliminary draft Interim Guidance was circulated for a 3-week review and comment period to the Alaska Road PA Signatories and the Alaska Road PA Core Team on February 17, 2011. The Core Team includes: FHWA, SHPO, DOT&PF Statewide Office and NR, ACHP, and the National Park Service (NPS). Comments were received from FHWA, SHPO, and DOT&PF Statewide Office. A revised draft was informally circulated and included submittals to the Region PQIs to facilitate early reviews within the regions on June 21, 2011. No comments were received. The revised draft was formally circulated to the Alaska Road PA Signatories, Core Team, and the three DOT&PF Regions for a 2-week review and comment period on July 21, 2011. No comments were received from FHWA, SHPO, ACHP, or NPS. However, substantive comments were received from the DOT&PF regions.

The DOT&PF Statewide Office has been working to adjudicate comments received on the Interim Guidance to bring it to resolution. Because of the extensive comments, the Statewide Office decided to final the Interim Guidance in-house and closed the SRI contract on August 31, 2011. The Department anticipates that a revised final draft Interim Guidance will be available to the Alaska Road PA Signatories for review and acceptance approval by the end of November 2011. The 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment to the Alaska Road PA, along with its appended Interim Guidance, is scheduled for implementation by the end of 2011.

#### **ii. Tribal and Local Government Consultation Letters for the Alaska Road PA**

Consultation letters prepared by DOT&PF for FHWA's signature were sent to Alaska Tribes and Local Governments on July 28, 2011. The purpose of these letters was to inform the entities that FHWA, DOT&PF, and SHPO were initiating a program to identify State and locally significant roads that could be considered as historic properties under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act, and to identify measures to resolve adverse effects of transportation projects on those roads. The letters also asked for their interest to participate in the larger historic roads context study. A 45-day review period was provided and a limited number of comments were received by FHWA, who will be providing a compilation of the comments to DOT&PF.

#### **iii. Applied Historic Context for Alaska Historic Roads, Request for Proposals**

The Applied Historic Roads Context Study is one of the products stipulated in the Alaska Road PA. The scope of the study was developed from the recommendations of the Alaska Historic Roads Study Group Workshop. The primary goal of the applied historic context is to address NRHP eligibility of State and regionally significant roads. A secondary goal is to propose general recommendations to guide future eligibility determinations for locally significant roads. The tasks of this study are to prepare: (1) Historic Overview, (2) Methodology for Assessing Eligibility, and (3) Application of Methodology to Specific Roads.

The Request for Proposals (RFP) for this study has been prepared by the Statewide Office. Supplemental funding for the Alaska Road PA was received through 2010-2013 Alaska Statewide Transportation Improvement Program Revision 27 Funding and is awaiting FHWA approval which is pending DOT&PF Statewide Office Administrative closeout of a project unrelated to the Alaska Road PA. It is anticipated that the project closure and FHWA approval of the funding will be received by the end of 2011. The RFP will be advertised upon receipt of FHWA's approval.



### **c. Interagency Partnership**

The development and initial processing of this Agreement has strengthened the working relationship amongst FHWA, SHPO, and DOT&PF. This interagency partnership will strive to foster good faith efforts to resolve historic road eligibility issues, provide guidance and assistance to assess project effects on historic properties, and promote the successful and expedited delivery of the State's transportation projects.

## **VI. Challenges and Issues**

### **a. Administration**

The DOT&PF is reluctant to accept the Alaska Road PA and the Interim Guidance due to perceived processing issues with regard to Section 106 and Section 4(f) that could complicate and increase project delivery time and costs. The FHWA and the DOT&PF Statewide Office have been consulting with DOT&PF during this period to inform the regions and Administration of the merits and benefits of the Alaska Roads PA. Since the issue of historic roads had only surfaced previously on a few recent projects within the State, DOT&PF regions do not comprehend the implications of the Alaska Road PA or the rationale on why Alaska is taking a proactive stance on the NRHP eligibility evaluation of its roads when there is no national or other state guidance on historic roads. While historic roads in Alaska and nationally were sporadically addressed in the past, there is recognition that roads are becoming a more common element in Section 106 considerations. Roads as potential historic properties are no longer being overlooked because of interests by historic road advocates and cultural resource consultants.

Debate continues within DOT&PF over the Interim Guidance and the TE Road List. Contributing to this is the recognition that the historic context and character defining features of the roads are not defined, and the regions are uncertain of the ability to assess project effects when there is insufficient information to make NRHP eligibility determinations. There is also a concern on the need to conduct separate Section 106 processing when a TE List Road project has potential to affect other historic properties through ground disturbance or indirect effects. Project Managers are not convinced that the proposed systemic statewide evaluation approach will provide noticeable Section 106 processing gains on their individual projects.

### **b. Interim Guidance**

As previously indicated, DOT&PF engineers have issue with the original Alaska Road PA Appendix A undertaking thresholds. The established thresholds do not accommodate project design standards and an overall concern was that projects were not realizing the benefits that the PA intended to provide. Therefore, while the Interim Guidance was being drafted, FHWA, DOT&PF, and SHPO decided to not continue with the original Appendix A threshold list. Interagency consultation has generated revised Interim Guidance activity lists for projects with no or limited potential to cause effects to TE List Roads and for projects with no adverse effects. However, debate over these lists and the overall drafting of the Interim Guidance has continued to delay its implementation.

While the Interim Guidance is being developed, projects determined by a DOT&PF PQI to involve a TE List Road require formal Section 106 consultation to assess project affects on the road. This will continue until the Interim Guidance project activities lists for internal DOT&PF screening and documentation are final.

#### **c. Delays in the Alaska Road PA Deliverables**

Delays have also hindered the deliverable dates of the Alaska Road PA products which were scheduled according to the effective date of the Agreement. The DOT&PF is proposing that the 2<sup>nd</sup> Amendment be structured to afford DOT&PF flexibility on the delivery dates in order to fulfill the obligations of Stipulations 5.B (Linear Feature Guidance) and 5.C (Historic Roads Context). The deliverables would be finalized and submitted to the Alaska Road PA Signatories by December 31, 2014, the date corresponding with the duration of the Agreement document.

#### **d. Clarification of TE List Road Bridges**

There is uncertainty on whether TE List Roads would be included within the Area of Potential Effect (APE) for bridge repair/maintenance projects. Is a bridge along a TE List Road to be considered part of the road or separate from the road? The Williamsport-Pile Bay Road was included within the APE of the Iliamna River Bridge project for riprap replacement and the Denali Highway was included in the APE for the Denali Highway Bridge Repair project. However, two Yukon River Bridge projects, a retrofit on the underside of the bridge and a wearing surface replacement did not include the Dalton Highway within the APE. The DOT&PF Statewide PQI will consult with FHWA and SHPO for clarification.

#### **e. Categorical Exclusion (CE) and Reevaluation Approvals by the Statewide Office**

The following two projects involving TE List Roads did not have sufficient consultation with either the Regional or Statewide PQI : NR July 2010 Flood Repairs Taylor Highway (CE approved 4/26/11, federal project number pending/63752) consultation with the Regional PQI did not take place when the project was moved from a state-funded project to a federally funded project and neither the Regional or Statewide PQI were consulted regarding the full change in scope for the Nome-Council Road MP 62-73.6 (8/8/11 reevaluation). Corrective action is being implemented at the Statewide Office to improve its quality assurance reviews and the 6004 NEPA Managers are being instructed to review the TE List Roads with their CE determinations and reevaluations processing. When a TE List Road is identified, the 6004 NEPA Manager will consult with the appropriate PQI regarding the assessment of effect to the TE List Road before giving final approval on the NEPA documentation.

### **VII. Conclusion**

The Alaska Road PA has been in effect since the end of February of 2010. To date, the objectives, benefits, and efficiencies of the Agreement and the Interim Guidance have not been realized because of the reluctance on the part of DOT&PF to accept the Alaska Road PA. Training DOT&PF staff will be instrumental to their understanding of the program's merits. Until the Interim Guidance is fully in effect and some internal processing of projects occurs, the regions will continue to doubt the streamlining opportunities that have been built into the program.

### Roads to be Treated as Eligible for the National Register of Historic Places (TE List Roads)

10/25/2011

Route Description	DOT&PF Region	CDS Route Number	Beginning Milepoint	Descriptive Feature, Beginning	End Milepoint	Descriptive Feature, End	AHRS Number
Dalton Hwy	NR	150000	0.000	Jct Elliott Hwy	414.437	Boundary change	LIV-501, TAN-118, BET-200, WIS-408, CHN-070, PSM-570, SAG-097, XBP-114
Williamsport-Pile Bay Rd	CR	74000	0.000	Cook Inlet, Iliamna Bay	15.030	Pile Bay, Iliamna Lake	ILI-132
Denali Highway	NR	140000	0.000	Jct Richardson Hwy	134.558	Jct Parks Hwy	XMH-1428, HEA-450
McCarthy Road (in CDS as Edgerton/McCarthy Road)	NR	198000	34.542	End Edgerton Hwy (end pavement, Chitina)	92.616	Kennicott River tram	XMC-495
Basin Road	SER	296023	0.000	Jct East St/6th St	1.182	Perseverance Trail	JUN-1125
Palmer-Fishhook Road (Palmer to Hatcher Pass)*	CR	137000	6.828	Wasilla/Fishhook Jct	17.237	Hatcher Pass, by Gold Chord Rd	ANC-3417
Willow-Fishhook Road (Hatcher Pass to Willow)*	CR	137700	0.000	Hatcher Pass, by Gold Chord Rd	31.355	Jct Parks Hwy	ANC-3418
Old Glenn Highway Segment – Glenn Highway Jct to Palmer	CR	136000	0.649	Old Glenn Access Road (past the off-ramp)	16.841	Mat River bridge, east approach	ANC-3419
Nabesna Road	NR	237000	0.000	Jct Tok Cutoff	41.096	Road end	NAB-472
Richardson Highway Segment – Gulkana Junction to Delta Junction city limits	NR	190000	132.491	Gulkana Jct (Tok Cutoff Jct)	269.312	South end, Delta Jct city limits	GUL-385, XMH-1429, XBD-379
South Tongass Highway	SER	291400	3.406	South end Coast Guard station	15.503	Road end	KET-1135
Thane Road	SER	296011	0.868	Jct end of So. Franklin St.	5.639	Road end	JUN-1126
Nome – Council Road	NR	166500	0.000	Jct Nome ByPass Rd	71.941	Niukluk River	NOM-242, SOL-172
Taylor Highway	NR	250000	0.000	Jct AK Hwy	157.756	8th Ave, Eagle	TNX-238, EAG-743
Steese Highway Segment – U.S. Creek Road to Circle (approx. MP 57-162)	NR	152000	55.112	Jct U.S. Creek Rd	155.382	River St., Circle	CIR-194

\* "Hatcher Pass Road" has two parts: Palmer Fishhook 137000 connecting with Willow Fishhook 137700

Programmatic Agreement Regarding Alaska's Highway System Roads Affected by the Federal-Aid Highway Program in Alaska  
October 29, 2011 Annual Stipulation 4 Reporting

Project Name	Federal/State Numbers	6004 Assignable	Type of Undertaking	Historic Properties in APE	Basis for Determination of Effect on TE List Road	Initiation* Date	Finding* and Date	SHPO Concur Date
Dalton Hwy MP 362-414	DP-065-7(3)/61366	No	Establish consistent 32 foot width, with road widening (or narrowing) as needed; grade raises up to four feet on average; repair or replace culverts; slope protection; enhance existing truck pullouts and approaches to match the new road profile; and apply asphalt concrete to the surface. Minor vertical and horizontal realignments	Dalton Hwy (TE List Road). No other historic properties identified in APE.	Pending	7/7/2011		
Dalton Hwy Holden Creek Bridge	BR-065-5(10)/63571	Yes	Replace existing 28 foot wide bridge (not original to highway) with a similar 36 foot wide bridge on the same horizontal alignment, but approx 80 feet longer. New structure requires an elevation rise of 8 feet at the abutments, and embankment widening as much as 16 feet on each side of the road, tapering back to meet the existing roadway width approximately 1000 feet south, and 840 feet north of the bridge. Project removes material between the new abutments to open the channel and improve hydraulic capacity, and place riprap along stream bank.	Dalton Hwy (TE List Road). No other historic properties identified in APE.	"The project proposes to make minor alterations to the road along only a very small segment, in support of the project's main effort to replace a damaged bridge that is not original to the Dalton Highway. A consultation between DOT&PF and SHPO on April 26, 2011 indicated that the primary road characteristics to be considered were the Dalton Highway's existing vertical and horizontal alignments, road bed dimensions and surface material. The project proposes to raise the road's vertical alignment a maximum of 8 feet at the bridge abutments, and to widen the embankments at the bridge approaches up to 32 feet to support the higher road grade at the bridge. There will be no change to the horizontal alignment of the road. While the new bridge will have a different running surface than the existing bridge, the surface material of the road will remain the same. The project would take place at an isolated location (Holden Creek) that has seen substantial material development since 1982, and would not affect the existing Dalton Highway for more than 2000 feet of its overall 414 mile length. The proposed work along this small segment of the road is modest in scope and would not alter the Dalton Highway's primary characteristics in a manner that would adversely affect NRHP eligibility of the Dalton Highway."	11/9/2010	NAE 7/14/2011	7/19/2011
Dalton Hwy Delineators	NH-065-5(11)/63573	Yes	Install reflective shoulder delineators within the road embankment every 100 feet on alternate sides of the roadway (200 feet apart on each side).	Dalton Hwy (TE List Road). No other historic properties in direct effects APE; the only properties identified in visual indirect effects area were archaeological sites, not affected by project	"DOT&PF has consulted with [SHPO] regarding this project and finds that installation of the new delineators will not adversely affect any of the qualities that could qualify the Dalton Highway for the NRHP, as these delineators are already present in this segment of the Dalton, and constitute a characteristic feature of the highway. Any effects to the Dalton Highway's setting would be extremely minor, as DOT&PF removes the reflective plastic arms—the most visible part of the delineator—every summer for cleaning and repair, and replaces them in late fall. The project would also be consistent with other Arctic adaptations and improvements made to the road, which are part of its character. The segment of the road where DOT&PF proposes to install delineators includes areas of flat topography, with high wind speeds and prodigious snow drifts, where delineators have become an essential safety feature of the winter road facility by enabling drivers to identify the contours of the roadway. In this sense, delineators can also potentially benefit retention and preservation of certain historic features—such as existing road grade, contours, and materials—along the Dalton Highway."	1/4/2011	NAE 2/25/2011	3/4/2011
Denali Hwy Bridge Repair	BH-000S(765)/63880	Yes	Preventive maintenance on two bridges to install steel diaphragms to the underside of each bridge.	Denali Hwy (TE List Road) and the two bridges	"The project proposes to make no changes to any externally visible characteristics of the bridge and no changes to the road. Consequently, the project would not affect the Denali Highway or any of the attributes that could potentially make it eligible for the National Register."	DTF	NAE 2/25/2011	3/4/2011

Project Name	Federal/State Numbers	6004 Assignable	Type of Undertaking	Historic Properties in APE	Basis for Determination of Effect on TE List Road	Initiation* Date	Finding* and Date	SHPO Concur Date
Nome Council Road MP 4-16	STP-0130(32)/66166	Yes	Resurface roadway, adding six inches of gravel; clean culverts; replace selected culverts; raise grade 2 to 24 ft in four selected bluff locations and bring driveways up to new grade; shift centerline at grade raise locations; add a frontage road for driveway access at one location; replace fill.	Nome Council Road (TE List Road) and two eligible sites within direct effects APE.	"While the proposed project would alter existing characteristics of the road in four bluff areas where the road grade would be raised and the centerline shifted to prevent snowdrifting, these changes are mainly sympathetic to the appearance of the road before the cuts were created during a DOT &PF drainage improvement project from 1984-1986. At the current height of the tundra, the former alignment is evident in several places. As mentioned in the supplemental report, the Nome Council Road has undergone several modifications since its construction between 1905 and 1909. Also in a 1994 cultural resource report covering much of the current project area, McMahan cites Buzzell as stating that the Nome Council Road does not retain much of the appearance it had during the early gold mining days when it was constructed. Near Cape Nome in particular, devastating storms in 1913, the 1970s and in 1992 destroyed much of the former roadbed. Characteristics of the former road that remain are its routing between Nome, the old Fort Davis site, Solomon and Council, its modest dimensions, a non-paved driving surface, its generally low grade and its closeness to Norton Sound. The proposed project would not cause the road to lose any of these characteristics, nor cause them to be diminished."	4/13/2011	NAE 6/16/2011	7/1/2011
Iliamna River Bridge	TBA/51892	Yes	Place 150 cubic yards of riprap on the northwest riverbank under Bridges #2137 and #487 (ILI-131) where scour removed previous material used to backfill the headwall. The riverbanks were previously disturbed to install the headwall.	Williamsport to Pile Bay Road (TE List Road) and bridge #487	"The proposed project of adding riprap to Bridges #2137 and #487 (ILI-131)...would not alter the historic bridge's key character defining features, there will be no impact to the historic road (ILI-132), and the area has a low potential for encountering archaeological resources as it has been previously disturbed when the headwall was constructed."	DTF	NAE 2/112011	3/4/2011
FYII Ditch Maintenance	TBA/53451	Yes	Remove sediment, vegetation, and debris from ditches, restoring to "as-built" conditions and not excavate beyond existing ditch prism. Clean and reshape culvert inlets and outlets or if necessary in-kind replacement.	Willow Fishhook Road (TE List Road) and three additional sites	"As the scope of work is limited to the previously disturbed ditch prism and known cultural resources will not be directly impacted by the work, DOT&PF finds that FY11 Central Region Ditch Maintenance Program will have no adverse effect..."	DTF	NAE 8/24/11	6/25/2010

\*Initiation and Finding Codes
 DTF = Direct to Findings
 NHPA = No Historic Properties Affected
 NAE = No Adverse Effect