State of Alaska Department of Transportation & Public Facilities Statewide
Design & Engineering Services

CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION DOCUMENTATION FORM

Project Name: Point MacKenzie Road Improvement (Don Young Road Upgrades)
Project Number (state/federal): 58168/SDP-0001(370)

Date: May 19, 2008

Attachments:
Appendix
Project Figures
Agency Correspondence

I. Purpose of Project

The purpose of this project is to make repairs to Don Young Road in order to increase vehicle safety and improve access to the Port MacKenzie Dock, which is located in the Matanuska-Susitna (Mat-Su) Borough.

Trucks are often unable to drive to the Port MacKenzie dock in the winter because the grade of Don Young Road is too steep and the road becomes glaciated. This project will reduce the grade of the road and improve water drainage; actions that are critical to the safety of truckers, dock workers, and future ferry commuters, especially during the winter when conditions are particularly hazardous and seeping water glaciates the road. The repairs will enable safe access to the dock in the winter.

II. Project Description

The Mat-Su Borough in cooperation with the Alaska Department of Transportation and Public Facilities (DOT&PF) and the Alaska Division of Federal Highway Administration is proposing repairs to Don Young Road at Port MacKenzie in the Mat-Su Borough. Port MacKenzie is approximately 45 miles southwest of Wasilla in the Mat-Su Borough, directly west of Cairn Point, and 2.5 miles northwest across Knik Arm from downtown Anchorage (Township 14N, Range 4W, Sections 24 and 25, Seward Meridian). See Figure 1 (Appendix pg 4) for the project location.

In order to improve drainage, manage erosion, and reduce the grade of the 1.2 mile Don Young Road, the following measures will be taken: (See Figures 2a and 2b; Appendix pg 5, 6)

- The grade of the road will be reduced from 10% to 5% through cut and fill of material from the existing road.
- In the vicinity of the cut, the road will be shifted approximately 50 feet (ft) eastward to accommodate flattening of slope and improvements to roadway geometry. The 400 ft high by 2,000 ft long side slope on the west side of the road will be reduced from a slope of 2:1 to a slope of 3:1 to decrease the amount of erosion and icing related to seepage (Figure 2a; Appendix pg 5).
- Benches will be built into the slope that parallels the road on the west side. The benches will be built at 25-30 ft vertical intervals up the hillside and at 75 ft horizontal intervals. The farthest edge of the last bench will extend approximately 300 ft from the edge of the road. Each bench will be 10 ft wide. The benches will improve slope stability and resistance to erosion (Figure 2a; Appendix pg 5).

- A rock-lined ditch, approximately 8 ft wide and 2,000 ft long, will be constructed along the west side of the road at the bottom of the benched slope. This ditch will collect drainage and groundwater seepage to alleviate icing and glaciation that currently occurs when water overtops the road. A perforated under drain will be placed in the bottom of the ditch to lower the water table and improve drainage.

- The pond west of the road and on the top of the slope was drained in the winter of 2005 because water from the pond seeped through the slope contributing to glaciation problems on the road. No disturbance to the drained pond is anticipated from this project. A drainage flume will be installed to gather water from the benches on the cut slope. The water collection basin at the bottom will be approximately 1,600 ft^2 and between 8 and 9 ft deep, and the water collected in the basin will be piped under the roadway through a culvert. The volume of the basin is intended to be sufficient to maintain cross drainage while storing ice that accumulates during the winter from the drainage flume and roadside ditch. Slope tracking, temporary seed and mulch, and standard Best Management Practices (BMPs) will be implemented during slope construction to prevent erosion and sedimentation.

- Approximately seven culverts will be placed under Don Young Road to drain water to the east side of the road.

- The road will be widened to provide a safer roadway for large trucks. The existing road is approximately 20 ft wide, and the proposed road will vary between 32 and 36 ft in width.

- Access to the existing overlook will be relocated approximately 500 ft south of the existing entrance (Figure 2b; Appendix pg 6).

- Material stockpile/disposal areas will be located on the west and the east side of the road. A total of four material stockpile/disposal sites will be located adjacent to the road, including three material stockpile/disposal areas on the west side, approximately 4.1 acres, 5.9 acres, and 5.6 acres (north to south) and one approximately 2.7 acre material stockpile/disposal site on the east side. The purpose of the stockpile/disposal sites is to store excess excavation material (useable, unuseable, and discarded).

- It is expected that the contractor will remove material from the sloped area west of Don Young Road using a scraper. Material will be removed working down from the top of slope which would be accessed via the small road to the west. The excess material would then be transported by truck to the planned material stockpile sites. The material will be placed per stockpile requirements 203, in accordance with DOT&PF's standard stockpile specifications Section 641. The stockpiles will be available for use; however, the contractor will not be required to use the material. To stabilize the material sites against erosion, the contractor will follow their Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). The SWPPP will include standard BMPs, topsoil placement, and seeding of the material stockpiles.

III. Environmental Consequences

Complete the following. For each yes, summarize the activity evaluated and the magnitude of the impact and the potential for significant impact based on context and intensity. An alternatives analysis (e.g. Avoidance and Minimization Checklist) is required for any consequence category with an asterisk (*). Summarize impacts in this form with detailed analysis attached as appropriate.

A. Right-of-Way Impacts	N/A	YES	NO
1. Additional right-of-way required.	☐	☐	☒
a. Permanent easements required.	☐	☐	☒

Estimated number of parcels: N/A;

b.	Full or partial property acquisition required. Estimated number of parcels: N/A	☐	☐	☒
c.	Property transfer from state or federal agency required. List agencies in No. 3 below.	☐	☐	☒
d.	Business or residential relocations required. If yes, summarize the findings of the conceptual stage relocation study in No. 3, below and attach the conceptual relocation study. No. of relocations: N/A Type of relocation: Residential: ☐ ☐ Business: ☐☐ Residential (Indicate number: N/A) Business (Indicate number: N/A)	☐	☐*	☒
e.	Last-resort housing required.	☐	☐	☒
2.	Low-income and minority populations are disproportionately high and adversely affected by the project as defined in E.O. 12898 (DOT Order 6640.23, December 1998).	☐	☐	☒

3. Summarize impact.

There will be no right-of-way requirements. The land is Borough-owned, and the Borough will maintain the road.

There are no low-income or minority populations in the 10,180 acre Port MacKenzie Port District (shown on Figure 1; Appendix pg 4). The port district has no residential development. Approximately 12% of the total population of the Mat-Su Borough is made up of a minority population. The population in the Point MacKenzie area has a racial makeup similar to the rest of the borough. The area shows a higher percentage of low-income people than the rest of the borough. However, the percentage with incomes below poverty level (15% and 13%) is about 3% lower than the borough as a whole. Based on the low overall percentage of minority persons, low overall percentage of low-income households, and lack of any apparent aggregation of those persons or households into "populations" in the affected project area, no Environmental Justice concerns will occur with this project. No disproportionately high and adverse effects on low-income groups or minority populations are expected.

B. Social Impacts	N/A	YES	NO
1. The project will affect neighborhoods or community cohesion.	☐	☐	☒
2. The project will affect travel patterns and accessibility (e.g. vehicular, commuter, bicycle, or pedestrian).	☐	☐	☒
3. The project will affect school boundaries, recreation areas, churches, businesses, police and fire protection, etc. Include the direct and indirect impacts from the displacement of businesses in the analysis.	☐	☐	☒
4. The project will adversely affect the elderly, handicapped, nondrivers, transit-dependent, minority and ethnic groups, or the economically disadvantaged.	☐	☐	☒

5. Summarize impacts, if any.

There are no neighborhoods within the Port MacKenzie Port District. The project involves a slight alignment shift to an existing road, but travel patterns will not change. No adverse impacts on traffic patterns, accessibility, or businesses are foreseen. The proposed road improvements will increase safety and ease of access to the Port MacKenzie Dock.

The Port MacKenzie Port District has been designated by the Mat-Su Borough for industrial and commercial purposes. There are no neighborhoods or neighborhood related public services (schools, police, fire, etc) within the port area. The proposed project will enhance the long-term development of this area by improving port access.

C. **Economic Impacts**	N/A	YES	NO
1. The project will have 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.	☐	☒	☐
2. The project will affect established businesses or business districts.	☐	☒	☐

3. Summarize impacts, if any.

The project will have positive impacts on the local economy and the port district. The road improvements will improve accessibility and increase safety of dock workers, truckers, and future ferry commuters to and from the dock. Improved winter access will enable the continued development and growth of the Port Mackenzie Port District in accordance with Mat-Su Borough plans for the area. Improved access could further Mat-Su Borough efforts to develop the port area and diversify the local economy; however, induced growth as a results of the proposed road improvements is expected to be minor.

D. **Local Land Use and Transportation Plan**	N/A	YES	NO
1. Project is consistent with local land use plan.	☐	☒	☐
2. Project is consistent with local transportation plan.	☐	☒	☐
3. Project would induce adverse secondary and cumulative effects.	☐	☐	☒

4. Summarize any adverse effect on the local transportation and land use plan, including secondary and cumulative effects.

No adverse secondary or cumulative effects are expected to the local transportation and land use plan because the project is consistent with the Port MacKenzie Port District Plan and transportation plans (Appendix pg 9). The existing road provides good access to the area. Proposed improvements would make this access safer and more convenient for existing users. Induced growth resulting from these road improvements is not expected
The Point MacKenzie Area which Merits Special Attention (AMSA) Plan (Mat-Su Borough) states that the purpose of the plan is threefold:

- Facilitate development of a port, associated upland uses, and transportation corridors, including anticipating permit approval requirements;
- Protect other important uses and values of the area, and minimize conflicts with port development; and
- Plan for future development of the port district and wise utilization of its coastal resources.

This project is located within Port Industrial District (PID) as designated in the Point MacKenzie Port Special Use District (SpUD). The PID has been "designated for port uses necessary to operate a commercial/industrial port," as described in the SpUD. The road repairs will enable the port to operate effectively in accordance with Mat-Su Borough plans.

E. **Impacts to Historic Properties**	N/A	YES	NO
1. National Register-listed or eligible properties are in area of potential effect. If yes, consult with FHWA.	☐	☐	☒

E. **Impacts to Historic Properties**	N/A	YES	NO
2. There will be an adverse effect on a historic property. *If yes, consult with FHWA, summarize alternatives evaluated, attach SHPO correspondence, and attach signed MOA).*	☐	☐*	☒
3. This project would have no potential to cause effect to historic properties. *This project does meet the criteria for no formal review under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act [36 CFR 800.3(a)(1)] per the May 2, 2006 determination by the Alaska Division of FHWA. If yes, note applicability in number 4 below or attach email from the FHWA. Attach SHPO and other appropriate correspondence as appropriate.*	☐	☐	☒

4. Summarize impacts to historic properties.

A review of the Alaska Department of Natural Resources (ADNR) Alaska Heritage Resources Survey (AHRS) for known cultural or historical resources that may be affected by this project was conducted December 2006. The review found that there are no cultural or historic sites within the project area (Appendix pg 75). The National Register of Historic Places does not list any eligible properties in the project area. A Finding of No Effect Letter was submitted to the State Historic Preservation Officer by FHWA on May 21, 2007 (Appendix pg 30). On July 11, 2007, SHPO responded by requesting a survey (Appendix pg 29). The survey was conducted in August and October of 2007 and revealed no historical properties in the project area. No sites were found on the bluffs leading from the Port or along the bluffs above the Port. The SHPO concurred with FHWA's finding of No Historic Properties Affected on March 4, 2008 (Appendix pg 11). All material sites will need Section 106 concurrence once they have been selected by the contractor.

F. **Wetlands Impacts**	N/A	YES	NO
1. Project involves wetlands as defined by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE). *If yes, document public and agency coordination required per E.O. 11990, Protection of Wetlands.*	☐	☐*	☒
2. Wetlands delineated in accordance with DOT&PF/FHWA/USACE 1992 Permit Accord.	☒	☐	☐

3. Estimated area of involvement (i.e. acres): 0
4. Estimated fill quantities (cubic yards): 0
5. Estimated dredge quantities (cubic yards): 0
6. USACE authorization anticipated: None ☐☒
   Type: NWP ☐☐ Individual ☐☐ Other ☐☐
7. Summarize wetlands impacts and attach following supporting documentation as appropriate:

   - Avoidance and Minimization Checklist.
   - Wetlands Delineation.
   - Jurisdictional Determination.
   - Copies of public and resource agency letters received in response to the request for comments.

   Wetlands impacts are as follows:

Based on wetland mapping conducted in the area (Appendix pg 79), the drained pond west of the road and on top of the slope is wetland. The pond was drained in the winter of 2005. This project will not impact the drained pond. No fill or dredging would occur within this or any other wetland area.

	N/A	YES	NO
8. Wetlands Finding:			
Are there practicable alternatives to the proposed construction in wetlands? *If yes, the project cannot be approved as proposed.*	☒	☐	☐
Does the project include all practicable measures to minimize harm to wetlands? *If no, the project cannot be approved as proposed.* List any commitments and mitigative measures in Section VII.	☒	☐	☐
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. *If no, the project cannot be approved as proposed.*	☒	☐	☐

G. Fish and Wildlife	N/A	YES	NO
1. Anadromous or resident fish habitat.			
a. Adverse effect on spawning habitat.	☐	☐*	☒
Adverse effect on rearing habitat.	☐	☐*	☒
Adverse effect on migration corridors.	☐	☐*	☒
Adverse effect on subsistence species.	☐	☐*	☒
2. Essential Fish Habitat (EFH).			
a. EFH present in project area.	☐	☐	☒
b. Project proposes construction in EFH. *If yes describe EFH impacts in Section G, No. 5.*	☐	☐	☒
Project may adversely affect EFH. *If yes, attach EFH Assessment.*	☐	☐*	☒
Project includes conservation recommendations proposed by NOAA Fisheries. If no, formal notification must be made to NOAA Fisheries. (Summarize the final conservation measures in No. 5 and list in Section VII).	☒	☐	☐
3. Wildlife Resources (game/subsistence species):			
a. Project is in area of high wildlife/vehicle accidents.	☐	☐	☒
Project would bisect migration corridors.	☐	☐	☒
Project would segment habitat.	☐	☐	☒
Project would adversely affect species of concern to Alaska Department of Fish and Game (ADF&G). *If yes, attach appropriate documentation from ADF&G that demonstrates the project would not result in significant adverse impacts.*	☐	☐*	☒
4. Bald Eagle and Golden Eagle Protection Act			
a. Project slope limits are within 660 feet of eagle nesting tree. *If yes, consult USF&WS and attach documentation of consultation.*	☐	☐*	☒
Project would adversely affect eagles or their nests. *If yes, project cannot be approved as proposed.*	☐	☐*	☒

5. Summarize adverse fish and wildlife impacts.

No anadromous or resident fish streams will be affected by this project because no fish anadromous or resident streams are located in the project area. ADNR Office of Habitat Management and Permitting (OHMP) reviewed the project plans and stated that the project will not occur in waters important for spawning, rearing, or migration of anadromous fishes or block fish passage to known resident fish streams. Therefore, a permit from the OHMP

is not required (Appendix pg 81). In addition, it has been determined that there will be no adverse effects on EFH as a result of this project; therefore, an EFH Assessment is not required. NOAA Fisheries does not anticipate adverse effects to EFH (Appendix pg 87).

This project will not increase traffic, bisect migration corridors, or segment habitats. Don Young Road already exists, and the proposed project only involves realigning and widening the existing road. There are no species of special concern in the project area (Appendix pg 82). The side slope along the road will be seeded and stabilized with native grasses to control erosion and sedimentation.

To avoid interactions with moose, the vegetation along the road will be cleared approximately 10 ft beyond the cut limits and cleared vegetation will be removed from site. A seed mix containing 10% annual ryegrass (a grass upon which moose graze) will be used to stabilize and control erosion on road slopes. Moose may graze on the annual ryegrass as a minor part of their diet; however the surrounding Point Mackenzie area has an abundant food source available for moose away from the project corridor (Appendix pg 83).

Based on a bald eagle survey conducted from the air for the Knik Arm Crossing in the summer 2005, there are no known bald eagles nests in the project area (Appendix pg 84). An additional bald eagle nest survey was conducted from the ground on April 14, 2007. Based on this survey no bald eagle nests were found near the project area (Appendix pg 93). The closest nests are approximately 1 mile north and a half mile southeast from Don Young Road. Should active bald eagle nests be discovered within ½ mile of project during the year of construction, then the USFWS will be consulted with on appropriate actions.

In accordance with guidance from the USFWS and the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, no vegetation clearing between May 1 and July 15 will occur (Appendix pg 84).

H. Threatened and Endangered Species (T&E)	N/A	YES	NO
1. Listed threatened or endangered species present.	☐	☐	☒
2. Threatened or endangered species migrate through the project area.	☐	☐	☒
3. Proposed species present in project area.	☐	☐	☒
4. Candidate species present in project area.	☐	☐	☒
5. Project not likely to adversely affect T&E species. *If yes, go to Section I.*	☐	☒	☐
6. Project may adversely affect T&E species. *If yes, attach biological assessment and the appropriate documentation from agency with jurisdiction.*	☒	☐*	☐
7. Project would jeopardize a T&E species. *If yes the project cannot be approved as proposed.*	☒	☐*	☐

8. Summarize the findings of the biological assessment and the opinion of the agency with jurisdiction.

According to Charla Stern with the USFWS, the proposed improvements to Don Young Road are not expected to adversely affect threatened or endangered species managed by the USFWS; there are no listed species managed by the USFWS in the project area (Appendix pg 98). No threatened or endangered species managed by NOAA Fisheries are in the project area (Appendix pg 99).

I. Water Body Involvement	N/A	YES	NO
1. Project affects a water body.	☐	☐*	☒
2. Project affects a navigable water body as defined by USCG, (i.e. Section 9).	☐	☐*	☒
3. Project affects Waters of the U.S. (as defined by the Corps), Section 404.	☐	☐*	☒
4. Project affects Navigable Waters of the U.S. (as defined by the Corps) Section 10.	☐	☐*	☒

I. Water Body Involvement

	N/A	YES	NO
5. Project affects a resident fish stream (i.e. A.S. 41.14.840)	☐	☐	☒
6. Project affects a cataloged anadromous fish stream (i.e. A.S. 41.14.870).	☐	☐*	☒
7. Project affects a designated Wild and Scenic River or land adjacent to a Wild and Scenic River. *If yes, Regional Environmental Coordinator must consult with the FHWA Environmental Program Manager to determine applicability of Section 4(f).*	☐	☐	☒

8. Proposed river or stream involvement: Bridge ☐☐ Culvert ☐☐ Embankment Fill ☐☐ Relocation ☐☐ Diversion ☐☐ Temporary ☐☐ Permanent ☐☐ N/A ☐☒
9. Type of stream or river habitat impacted: Spawning ☐ Rearing ☐☐ Pool ☐☐ Riffle ☐☐ Undercut bank ☐☐ N/A ☒☐
10. Amount of fill below: OHW 0 MHW 0 HTL 0
11. Summarize impacts:

This project will not impact any water body.

J. Alaska Coastal Management Program (ACMP)

	N/A	YES	NO
1. Project is within the Alaska Coastal Management Program boundary.	☐	☒	☐
2. Project is within a local coastal management district. *If yes, consult with the local coastal management official and attach correspondence.*	☐	☒	☐
3. Project is consistent with local and state coastal management plans. *If no, the project cannot be approved as proposed.*	☐	☒	☐

4. Finding:

The project is consistent with the Alaska Coastal Management Program and enforceable policies of the Mat-Su Borough Coastal Management Plan (Appendix pg 103-113).

K. Hazardous Waste (HW)

	N/A	YES	NO
1. There are known or potentially contaminated sites along the corridor.	☐	☐	☒
2. The existing and/or proposed ROW is contaminated.	☐	☐	☒
3. Extensive excavation is proposed adjacent to, or within, a known HW site.	☐	☐*	☒
4. Potential for encountering hazardous waste during construction is high.	☐	☐	☒

5. Summarize impacts of any yes marked in 1-4 and attach appropriate HW investigation report.

According to the following websites reviewed on February 20, 2008, no contaminated sites are found in the Port MacKenzie Port District (Appendix pg 116-125):

- Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation (ADEC). Contaminated Sites Program Database Search. Division of Spill Prevention and Response. Contaminated Sites and Leaking Underground Storage Tanks (UST). <http://www.dec.alaska.gov/spar/csp/search/results.asp>. Accessed February 20, 2008.
- Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation (ADEC). Spills Database On-line Query. Division of Spill Prevention and Response. Prevention and Emergency Response Program. Spill Data. Oil and Hazardous Substance Spill Data Summaries. <http://www.dec.state.ak.us/spar/perp/search/Search.asp>. Accessed February 20, 2008.
- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). "CERCLIS Database." Superfund Site Information. <http://cfpub.epa.gov/supercpad/cursites/srchsites.cfm>. Accessed February 20, 2008.
- Environmental Protection Agency Region 10 (EPA). "Hazardous Waste Reports for Handlers in Alaska, Idaho, Oregon, and Washington." Alaska Reports. <http://yosemite.epa.gov/r10/owcm.nsf/ea6b351e337b08a288256b5800612787/d26539284e2898aa88256e71

0072c3ff!OpenDocument>. Accessed February 20, 2008.

In 2006, the Knik Arm Bridge and Toll Authority (KABATA) completed an Initial Site Assessment (ISA) for the Knik Arm Crossing Project. The Point MacKenzie Road Improvement Project is located within the boundaries of the Knik Arm Crossing project; therefore, the same determinations are applicable. Based on the ISA screening process, no hazardous waste or contaminated sites were located within the project area. The potential for encountering hazardous materials or contaminated soil appears to be low. The project will be constructed within the Former Susitna Gunnery Range where the potential for unexploded ordnance and explosives is being studied; however, it has been confirmed by the USACE in the *Defense Environmental Restoration Program for Formally Used Defense Sites Ordnance and Explosives Final Archive Search Report for Susitna Gunnery Range Southcentral Alaska Project Number F10AK022506* (March) 2006 that there are no unexploded ordnance in the project area. (See map in Appendix page 115.)

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). *If yes,* indicate CO ☐☐ or PM-10 ☐☐ and complete the remainder of this section. *If no, continue to next section.*	☐	☐	☒
2. If applicable, the project is included in a conforming Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) and Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) (state dates of FHWA/FTA conformity determination). Date:	☒	☐	☐
3. The project is exempt from an air quality analysis per 40 CFR 93.126 (Table 2 and Exempt Projects). *If yes, continue to next section. If no, complete the remainder of this section. Note: A project-level air quality conformity analysis is required for CO nonattainment and maintenance areas and a qualitative project-level analysis is required for PM-10 nonattainment and maintenance areas.*	☒	☐	☐
4. Have there been any significant changes in the design, concept, and/or scope as discussed in the most recent conforming TIP and LRTP? *If yes, describe changes in No. 7. 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).*	☒	☐	☐
5. If required, 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 maintenance areas or 93.116(b) for nonattainment areas. *Attach a copy of the analysis.*	☒	☐	☐
6. If required, 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(a). (The thresholds are different for PM-10 than they are for CO). *Attach a copy of the analysis.*	☒	☐	☐

7. Summarize air quality impacts:

No affects to air quality are expected. Air quality during construction is discussed in Section IV.

M. Floodplains Impacts (23 CFR Part 650, Subpart A)	N/A	YES	NO
1. Project encroaches longitudinally into the 100-year floodplain (i.e. base floodplain in fresh or marine waters). *If yes, public comments on the action must be requested and comments received attached. Summarize the findings and attach the "Location Hydraulic Study" developed per 23CFR 650.111.*	☐	☐	☒

M. **Floodplains Impacts (23 CFR Part 650, Subpart A)**	N/A	YES	NO
2. Project encroaches into a regulatory floodway. *If yes attach the location hydraulic study.*	☐	☐*	☒
3. The proposed action would increase the base flood elevation one-foot or greater. *If yes attach the location hydraulic study.*	☐	☐	☒
4. The encroachment is significant as defined by 23CFR 650.105. *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 FHWA approval.*	☐	☐	☒
5. Project conforms to local flood hazard ordinances. *If no, consult with FHWA.*	☒	☐	☐
6. Project is consistent with E.O. 11988 (Floodplain Protection). If no the project cannot be approved as proposed.	☐	☒	☐
7. Summarize risk and adverse floodplain impacts:			

Comment: No floodplains, including coastal floodplains, would be impacted by this project. The code compliance manager with the Mat-Su Borough confirmed that the project area does not have floodplain mapping because there are no rivers, creeks, or major lakes in the project area (Appendix pg 129); therefore there are no water bodies that could flood in the area. There are no mapped or expected unmapped floodplains in the study area (Appendix pg 127). There are no streams in the project area. In addition, in the work completed for the Knik Arm Crossing project, project engineers confirmed that there are no floodplains in the project area (Federal Highway Administration [FHWA]. 2007. Knik Arm Crossing. Final Environmental Impact Statement and Final Section 4(f) Evaluation. Prepared by Knik Arm Bridge and Toll Authority and Alaska Department of Transportation & Public Facilities. Agreement No. P 42070. Federal Project No. ACSTP-0001[227]. AKSAS Project No. 56047. December 18, 2007. Anchorage, Alaska.). The project is in conformance with flood hazard development policy, and a flood hazard development permit is not required (Appendix pg 129).

N. **Noise Impact (23 CFR Part 772)**	N/A	YES	NO
1. There are noise-sensitive receivers/land uses adjacent to the proposed project. *If yes attach the noise analysis, if applicable. If no, go to section "O".*	☐	☐	☒
Category A: There are adjacent lands where serenity and quiet are of extraordinary significance and serve an important public need and where the preservation of those qualities is essential if the area is to continue to serve its intended purpose.	☒	☐	☐
Category B: There are adjacent picnic areas, recreation areas, playgrounds, active sports areas, parks, residences, hotels, motels, schools, churches, libraries, or hospitals.	☒	☐	☐
Category C: There are adjacent developed lands, properties, or activities not included in categories A or B above. *This would include commercial properties.*	☒	☐	☐
2. The project is located on new location, would result in substantial changes in vertical or horizontal alignment, or would increase the number of through lanes. *If yes, a noise analysis is required. If not, go to Section O.*	☒	☐	☐
3. There is an existing noise impact.	☒	☐	☐
4. The project would create a noise impact.	☒	☐	☐
5. Noise analysis demonstrates potential noise impacts.	☒	☐	☐
6. There are feasible and reasonable measures that can reduce noise impacts.	☒	☐	☐

N. Noise Impact (23 CFR Part 772)	N/A	YES	NO
7. The noise abatement measures listed in 23 CFR 772.13(c)(1-5) have been considered for those receivers where a noise impact would occur.	☒	☐	☐

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

The project is within a designated port area and therefore there are not sensitive-noise receivers or land uses near the project area.

O. Water Quality Impact	N/A	YES	NO
1. Project would involve a public or private drinking source. *If yes, explain in no. 7.*	☐	☐	☒
2. Project would result in a discharge of storm water to a Waters of the U.S.	☐	☒	☐
3. Project would discharge storm water into or affect an ADEC designated impaired water body. *If yes, list in no. 4 and describe in no. 7.*	☐	☐	☒

4. List name(s) and location(s).

5. Estimate the acreage of ground-disturbing activities that will result from the project?
   24.9 acres

6. Is there a municipal separate storm sewer system (MS4) NPDES permit, or will runoff be mixed with discharges from an NPDES permitted industrial facility? If yes, NPDES permit #: _____	☐	☐	☒

7. Summarize the impacts of any "yes" marked in Section O.

There is potential for short and long term water quality impacts due to erosion and sedimentation. Runoff and groundwater from the benched slope will be directed to the collection basin at the bottom of the slope. From the collection basin, the water will flow through a culvert into Knik Arm (Figure 2a; Appendix pg 131). Work will be done in compliance with the NPDES Construction General Permit for construction activity in Alaska, and Best Management Practices for erosion and sedimentation control will be implemented throughout construction.

P. Permits and Authorizations	N/A	YES	NO
1. Corps, Section 404/10	☐	☐	☒
2. Coast Guard, Section 9	☐	☐	☒
3. Department of Natural Resources (DNR), Fish Habitat Permit (T41.870 and .840)	☐	☐	☒
4. Flood Hazard	☐	☐	☒
5. Department of Environmental Conservation (ADEC) Non-domestic Wastewater Plan Approval.	☐	☐	☒
6. ADEC 401	☐	☐	☒
7. DNR, ACMP consistency	☐	☒	☐
8. Other. *If yes, list.*	☐	☒	☐

ADEC Excavation Dewatering Permit

Work will be done in compliance with NPDES Construction General Permit for Construction Activities. A U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) Section 404/10 permit is not required for this project because no work will be conducted within delineated wetlands or Waters of the U.S.

IV. Construction Impacts

	N/A	YES	NO
1. There will be temporary degradation of water quality.	☐	☒	☐
2. There will be temporary stream diversion.	☐	☐	☒
3. There will be temporary degradation of air quality.	☐	☒	☐
4. There will be temporary delays and detours of traffic.	☐	☒	☐
5. There will be temporary impact on businesses.	☐	☒	☐
6. There will be other construction impacts, including noise.	☐	☒	☐

7. Summarize construction impacts associated with any "yes" in Section IV.

The project will have a minor, direct, short-term effect on air quality during construction. Operation of construction equipment will result in localized, temporary increases in emissions of exhaust. Ground disturbing activities and stockpiling of cut and fill material may result in increased emissions of fugitive dust from the construction area.

There should be minimal impacts to traffic flow because the contractor will be required to keep access open to the dock for vehicle traffic. Adverse impacts to businesses at the Port are not expected. If a company has to load or unload a vessel during the construction period, the contractor will be required to allow them access to and from the dock.

There will be short-term direct noise impacts associated with the use of heavy machinery during construction. Anchorage, the closest community to the project, is approximately 2.5 miles across Knik Arm from the project area, an agricultural district located along Port MacKenzie Road, is approximately 5 miles north of the project area, and the community of Knik, located along the Knik Goose Bay Road, is approximately 14.5 miles north of the project area. Noise impacts resulting from the project will be minor and temporary in duration and far enough away from any population center to not impact communities.

Erosion and sediment controls will be implemented to prevent impacts during construction. Temporary and permanent stabilization measures will be initiated as soon as practicable by the contractor, but at least 14 days on all portions of the site where construction activities have temporarily or permanently ceased. Stabilization measures include slope tracking, seeding, and mulch. Silt fencing, fiber rolls, or rip rap will be placed against slopes to prevent erosion and sedimentation. Temporary rock check dams will be installed at intervals to provide less than or equal to two feet of vertical drop in roadside ditches. Culvert inlet protection and velocity dissipaters will be installed at every culvert, existing, replaced, or new until the project site is stabilized.

V. Section 4(f)/6(f)

	N/A	YES	NO
1. Section 4(f) properties would be affected by the proposed action.	☐	☐	☒
2. There would be a "use" of any land from these 4(f) properties.	☒	☐	☐
3. The project would affect Section 6(f) properties.	☐	☐	☒
4. Funds from the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act (LWCFA) were used for improvement to the 4(f) property.	☒	☐	☐
5. Is the use of the property receiving LWCFA funds a "conversion of use" per Section 6(f) of the LWCFA? *Attach the correspondence received from the ADNR 6(f) Grants Administer. If yes, consult with FHWA.*	☒	☐	☐
6. Project is adjacent to a Section 4(f) resource. *If yes, consult with the FHWA Environmental Programs Manager to determine applicability of "constructive use".*	☐	☐	☒

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

There are no parks, recreation lands, refuges, or waterfowl refuges located in the project vicinity and the project

is located on Mat-Su Borough land that has been set aside for commercial and industrial development; therefore, it does not qualify for Section 4(f) protection.

The project does not impact property or infrastructure that was built using Land and Water Conservation Funds Act (LWCFA) funds.

VI. Comments and Coordination

	N/A	YES	NO
1. Public/agency involvement for project *(required if protected resources are involved).*	☐	☒	☐
2. Meetings	☐	☒	☐
3. Newspaper ads Name of newspaper: _____	☐	☐	☒
4. Scoping letters	☐	☐	☒
5. Scoping meeting	☐	☐	☒
6. Field review	☐	☐	☒

7. Summarize comments and coordination efforts for this project. Discuss pertinent issues raised during public and agency scoping and public meetings. *Attach agency correspondence that demonstrates coordination and that there are no unresolved issues.*

Communication and correspondence occurred with the following agency representatives regarding this project (Table 1; see the Appendix for full documentation of this correspondence):

The project is located in a commercial/industrial area and no residents live in this area; however, the public is invited to all Port MacKenzie Port Commission meetings. The Port Commission meetings held on the following dates included discussion on the Point MacKenzie Road Improvement (Don Young Road Upgrades) project:

- June 19, 2006
- July 17, 2006
- September 18, 2006
- December 18, 2006
- January 15, 2007
- March 19, 2007

All Port Commission meetings are advertised in the Frontiersman (Mat-Su) Newspaper.

Original scoping and public meetings included the placement of intertidal fill for the road, which has since been removed from the project.

Scoping letters were not sent to the agencies because the project was already permitted; however, scoping with individual agencies was completed by telephone, email, or in person as shown in the table below. For detailed correspondence refer to the Appendix.

Table 1. Agency Comments on Point MacKenzie Road Improvement (Don Young Road Upgrades)

Agency/Date/Forum	Comments	Response to Comments
Tony Kavalok (ADF&G) March 8, 2007 Telephone	• Moose are the biggest concern for this project.	• Refer to sections G., Fish and Wildlife, and VII Environmental Commitments and Mitigation Measures.
	• Come up with an estimate for increase traffic due to the road improvements.	• This project will not increase traffic in this area.

	• An issue is how we deal with vegetation along the road. It must literally be removed from the site. If it is simply cut down and left on-site, it is a moose attractant. DOT&PF would also be able to provide suggestions on the size of the buffer sufficient for the visual corridor.	• Refer to sections G., Fish and Wildlife, and VII Environmental Commitments and Mitigation Measures. The vegetation will be cleared approximately 10 ft beyond the cut limits
	• A visual corridor is a good way to minimize the impacts and frequency of moose-vehicle collisions.	• Refer to sections G., Fish and Wildlife. The vegetation will be cleared approximately 10 ft beyond the cut limits.
	• Suggestions have been made to put radio collars on moose (30-40 animals) in the area in order to gauge the effect of the increased development on the animals. The techniques that we use to minimize effects could set a precedent as to what works, how big of a buffer is sufficient, etc.	• The Mat-Su Borough determined the amount of work to complete this study was not practicable for the size of this project. The project will not increase traffic. A minor amount of moose habitat in the Point MacKenzie area will be affected by the proposed project; however the Point MacKenzie area will continue to have abundant moose habitat undisturbed.
	• Bears are not a problem at this point.	• No response required.
	• There are no species of concern in the project area.	• No response required.
Steve Duncan (Environmental Protection Agency) April 17, 2006 Email	• EPA has no objections to this project.	• No response required.
	• Future projects will likely require compensatory mitigation as part of the project design and certainly prior to project permitting.	• No response required.
Charla Sterne (USFWS) March 3, 2006 Telephone	• The project will not likely affect listed threatened or endangered species because there are no listed species in	• No response required.

	the area. • Provide information on the consultation process concerning the boat launch that was used to acquire the Corps permit. USFWS thinks there is likely little or no concern for potential affects on threatened or endangered species in the area. • An important distinction as to whether or not the boat launch/parking area should be included in the road improvement project depends on if the boat launch/parking area happens with or without the road improvement. If the boat launch is dependent on the road improvements, they should be kept together.	 • Not included in this project any longer. No response required. • Not included in this project any longer. No response required.
Joseph Connor (USFWS) March 8, 2006 Email	• Based on the survey conducted for the Knik Arm Crossing on October 5, 2005, there are no bald eagle nests in present in the project area. • USFWS recommends no vegetation clearing during the nesting period for migratory birds, from May 1 through July 15, to comply with the Migratory Bird Treaty Act.	• No response required. • Refer to section VII. Environmental Commitments and Mitigation Measures, Migratory Birds.
Mary Lynn Nation (USFWS) March 3, 2006 Telephone	• Sending over bird timing matrix for migratory birds. • Consultation is complete unless the project needs to apply for another Corps permit.	• No response required. • No response required.
Susan Lee (MSB) August 4, 2006 Email	• The project is consistent with the local land use plan. • The project is consistent	• No response required. • No response required

	with the local transportation plan. • The project would not induce adverse secondary and cumulative effects.	 • No response required.
Ken Hudson (MSB) September 7, 2006 Telephone	• The project area has not been mapped.	• No response required.
Brad Smith (NOAA Fisheries) February 15,2007 Email	• The intertidal work should not present significant concerns to beluga whales.	• No response required
Skip Joy (USACE) May 4, 2006 Memorandum	• A public notice was published on March 31, 2006. The Corps received no negative comments on the proposed project. No comments were received from any other federal agency.	• The public notice was issued for a permit to place fill in tidelands, which is no longer included in this project. No response required.
Matt Eagleton (NOAA Fisheries) February 15, 2007 Email	• Given the small project footprint and fill amount, NMFS can offer that no adverse effects to EFH area anticipated.	• No response required.
Phil Brna (USFWS) April 13, 2006 Email	• Recently, the USFWS has been requesting compensatory mitigation for projects in Knik Arm where adverse impacts to anadromous fish cannot be avoided or minimized. Because the project fill is at the upper range of the tide level and it is so small, we believe fish use of the fill footprint area will be low. Therefore, we are not requesting compensatory mitigation at this time.	• Originally, this project proposed placing fill in Knik Arm. Fill in Knik Arm is no longer proposed. • Refer to section G, Fish and Wildlife, and Appendix pg 85. No adverse effects on anadromous fish are anticipated with this project.
Fran Seager-Boss (MSB) December 29, 2006 Email	• In 2005, MSB conducted an on-ground survey, on either side of the road from the bluff down to the water, within the Area of Potential Effect (APE) and found no cultural resource sites visible on the surface. No subsurface testing was conducted and the road	• No response required.

	above the bluff was not surveyed. If work is carried out above the bluff, MSB recommends a survey for cultural resources be conducted.	
Fran Seager-Boss (MSB) November 9, 2007 Fax to Mark VanDongen, Port Director	• Nothing of cultural significance was found in the project area.	• No response required.
Christine Ballard (ADNR OPMP) February 21, 2007 Email	• ACMP Consistency Determination stands. Additional coordination with ACMP not needed, since the Corps issued an in house modification to an existing permit and the activity is less than what was previously reviewed.	• No response required.
Robert Guvertin (Mat-Su Borough) November 7, 2007 Telephone	• Floodplains are not mapped in the project area because there is nothing in the area that would be expected to flood; the project is not located near any rivers or lakes. • The project is in conformance with flood hazard development policy. • A flood hazard development permit is not necessary.	• No response required • No response required. • No response required.
Judith Bittner (SHPO) March 4, 2008	• SHPO concurs that no historic properties will be affected by the Point MacKenzie Road Improvement project (Don Young Road Upgrades) provided that SHPO's stipulations are implemented.	• No response required

VII. Environmental Commitments and Mitigation Measures

List environmental commitments or mitigation measures included in the project.

- A Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) will be implemented by the construction contractor. The contractor shall include any revisions and/or additions to the Erosion and Sediment Control Plan (ESCP) in the SWPPP.
- Construction limits will be staked and clearly demarcated to prevent encroachment into adjacent properties.
- Temporary and permanent stabilization measures will be initiated as soon as practicable by the contractor, but within at least 14 days on all portions of the site where construction activities have temporarily or permanently ceased. Stabilization measures include slope tracking, seeding, and mulch.
- Silt fencing, fiber rolls, or rip rap will be placed against slopes to prevent erosion and sedimentation. Temporary rock check dams will be installed at intervals to provide less than or equal to two feet of vertical drop in roadside ditches. Culvert inlet protection will be installed at every culvert, existing, replaced, or new until the project site is stabilized.
- Sediment prevention measures (i.e. silt fence or other means) will be placed and maintained. These devices will remain in place until fill and other exposed earthwork attributable to the project are stabilized and revegetated.
- Permanent storm water management will be provided by reducing the slope angle, installing spring drains, and benching on cut slopes known to be susceptible to erosion. A roadside ditch, culverts, and drainage flume will prevent surface runoff, groundwater, and icing from eroding the roadway.
- The contractor shall install measures during construction to prevent sediment and pollutant laden runoff from discharging off site.
- All non-storm water discharges will be directed through sediment control measures before leaving the site. Non-storm water that will be discharged from the site during construction includes uncontaminated groundwater (from dewatering excavation).
- All waste materials will be collected and stored in a securely lidded metal dumpster.
- The contractor shall develop and execute a Hazardous Material Control Plan.
- Cleared vegetation will be removed from the site or chipped and placed off site, away from the corridor, to avoid attracting moose (Appendix pg 132).
- There will be no vegetation clearing from May 1 through July 15.
- If active eagle nests are discovered within 1/2 mile of the project area, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) will be consulted on appropriate actions.
- If contaminated or hazardous materials are encountered during construction, all work in the vicinity of the contaminated site will be stopped until ADEC is contacted and a corrective action plan is approved by ADEC.
- If cultural, archeological, or historical sites are discovered during project construction, the SHPO will be contacted and any work that might impact these sites will be stopped. Work shall not resume in the vicinity of the site until a written clearance from the SHPO is issued to the Project Engineer.
- When material sources are selected, they will be reviewed in accordance with Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

VIII. Environmental Documentation Approval

	N/A	YES	NO
1. Project listed as a CE, per FHWA 23 CFR 771.117(c).	☐	☐	☒
2. Project listed as a CE, per FHWA 23 CFR 771.117(d). If no, consult with FHWA, Area Liaison.	☐	☒	☐
3. Project meets the criteria for programmatic approval under a Programmatic CE Agreement between FHWA and DOT&PF.	☐	☐	☒

Prepared by: _____ Date: _____

Environmental Analyst

Reviewed by: _____ Date: _____

Engineering Manager

Approved by: _____ Date: _____

Regional Environmental Coordinator

Approved by: _____ Date: _____

FHWA Area Liaison *(signature required only for non-programmatic CEs)*