



**Juneau Access Improvements Project
Final Supplemental
Environmental Impact Statement**

**2014 Update to Appendix S
Steller Sea Lion Technical Report
*2017 Errata***

Prepared for:

**Alaska Department of Transportation
& Public Facilities
6860 Glacier Highway
Juneau, Alaska 99801-7999**

**State Project Number: 71100
Federal Project Number: STP-000S(131)**

Prepared by:

**HDR
2525 C Street, Suite 500
Anchorage, Alaska 99503**

2017

This page intentionally left blank

2017 ERRATA

2014 Update to Appendix S – Steller Sea Lion Technical Report

ERRATA

Page, Section	Reads	Should Read (changes shown)
<p>Page 2-3, Section 1.1.2, para 1</p>	<p>Similar to Alternative 1, Alternative 1B includes a continuation of mainline ferry service in Lynn Canal; the AMHS would continue to be the NHS route from Juneau to Haines and Skagway; no new roads or ferry terminals would be built; and in addition to the Day Boat ACFs, programmed improvements include improved vehicle and passenger staging areas at the Auke Bay and Haines ferry terminals to optimize traffic flow on and off the Day Boat ACFs as well as expansion of the Haines Ferry Terminal to include a new double bow berth to accommodate the Day Boat ACFs. Service to other communities would remain the same as with the No Action Alternative. Alternative 1B keeps the M/V Malaspina in service after the second Day Boat ACF is brought online to provide additional capacity in Lynn Canal.</p>	<p>Similar to Alternative 1, Alternative 1B includes a continuation of mainline ferry service in Lynn Canal; the AMHS would continue to be the NHS route from Juneau to Haines and Skagway; no new roads or ferry terminals would be built; and in addition to the Day Boat ACFs, programmed improvements include improved vehicle and passenger staging areas at the Auke Bay and Haines Ferry Terminals to optimize traffic flow on and off the Day Boat ACFs as well as expansion of the Haines Ferry Terminal to include a new double bow berth to accommodate the Day Boat ACFs. Service to other communities would remain the same as Alternative 1 – No Action. Alternative 1B keeps the <i>M/V Malaspina</i> in service after the second Day Boat ACF is brought online to provide additional capacity in Lynn Canal.</p>
<p>Page 3, Section 1.1.2, para 2</p>	<p>During the summer, the M/V Malaspina would make one round trip per day seven days per week on a Skagway-Auke Bay-Skagway route, while one Day Boat ACF would make one round trip between Auke Bay and Haines six days per week, and one would make two round trips per day between Haines and Skagway six days per week. The Day Boat ACFs would not sail on the seventh day because the mainliner would be on a similar schedule.</p>	<p>During the summer, the <i>M/V Malaspina</i> would make one round trip per day five days per week on a Skagway-Auke Bay-Skagway route. On the sixth day, the <i>M/V Malaspina</i> would sail on the Skagway-Auke Bay-Haines-Skagway route, and on the seventh day, it would sail that route in reverse (Skagway-Haines-Auke Bay-Skagway). One Day Boat ACF would make one round trip between Auke Bay and Haines seven days per week. The other Day Boat ACF would make two round trips per day between Haines and Skagway six days per week; it would not sail on the seventh day because the mainliner would be on a similar schedule.</p>

2017 ERRATA

2014 Update to Appendix S – Steller Sea Lion Technical Report

Page, Section	Reads	Should Read (changes shown)
<p><i>Page 6, Section 2, para 4 (page 6) and para 1 (page 7)</i></p>	<p>The JAI Project began formal consultation with NMFS in 1994 regarding potential impacts to Steller sea lions and has had continued contact with NMFS throughout the project’s development. NMFS has concurred with FHWA twice (in 1998 and 2005) that, with appropriate mitigation measure, the preferred alternatives (Alternative 2 in 1998 and Alternative 2B in 2005) are not likely to adversely affect ESA-listed species, including Steller sea lion, or their critical habitat. FHWA intends to re-initiate ESA consultation with NMFS following completion of the JAI Project 2014 Draft SEIS and selection of a preferred alternative.</p> <p>It is anticipated that formal ESA consultation will be required if either Alternative 2B or 3 is selected. For Alternative 2B, this is because of the designated critical habitat at the Gran Point haulout as well as the presence of individuals of the western DPS at Gran Point and Met Point that may be adversely affected by project construction; and for Alternative 3, because NMFS previously advised that early spring ferry operations in Berners Bay would adversely affect Steller sea lions and humpback whales. Measures to minimize impacts to the eastern DPS population would be developed under the Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA).</p>	<p>The JAI Project began formal consultation with NMFS in 1994 regarding potential impacts to Steller sea lions and has had continued contact with NMFS throughout the project’s development. NMFS has concurred with FHWA twice (in 1998 and 2005) that, with appropriate mitigation measure, the preferred alternatives (Alternative 2 in 1998 and Alternative 2B in 2005) are not likely to adversely affect ESA-listed species, including Steller sea lion, or their critical habitat. <u>With identification of Alternative 1 – No Action as the preferred alternative, FHWA withdrew from the Section 7 consultation process.</u></p>
<p><i>Page 20, Section 4.2.1.1 (Screening Structures), para 2</i></p>	<p><i>The following paragraph is removed in its entirety from Section 4.2.1.1:</i></p> <p>Within 3,000 feet of Met Point, screening structures/pedestrian barriers would be installed approximately 500 feet north and south of the haulout. One option for such structures includes roadside chain-link fencing with slats. This fencing could be used for light attenuation to minimize the impact of light pollution on Steller sea lions. As such, Steller sea lions would not be visible from the road, and would not see vehicles or their headlights on the road within 1,000 feet of the Met Point haulout. Further, fencing would deter pedestrian access from the roadway to the haulout.</p>	

2017 ERRATA

2014 Update to Appendix S – Steller Sea Lion Technical Report

Page, Section	Reads	Should Read (changes shown)
<p><i>Page 20, Section 4.2.1.1 (Temporary Barge Landings and In-Water Fill), para 3</i></p>	<p>The 2005 LOC (NMFS, 2005a) included a minimization measure stating that no temporary barge landings would be constructed within 3,000 feet of either haulout. Temporary barge landings would be used occasionally, but would not be permanent features of the project. Because landing sites must be free of rocks (i.e., sandy/cobbly beaches), since barges are beached at high tide and unloaded at low tide, no haulout rocks would be impacted. Individual Steller sea lions that may be foraging or otherwise occupying waters near the barge landing sites (to be determined) could be disturbed during landing activities, which would involve the placement and transfer of construction-related materials for a few hours, typically, between tidal events. Tug boats and associated underwater noise could also disturb individual Steller sea lions, causing them to avoid the general area of activity during the landing and “undocking” process; however, potential effects to Steller sea lions are anticipated to be insignificant. No barge landing sites would occur within 1,000 feet of Met Point or Gran Point.</p>	<p>Temporary barge landings would be used occasionally, but would not be permanent features of the project. Because landing sites must be free of rocks (i.e., sandy/cobbly beaches), since barges are beached at high tide and unloaded at low tide, no haulout rocks would be impacted. Individual Steller sea lions that may be foraging or otherwise occupying waters near the barge landing sites (to be determined) could be disturbed during landing activities, which would involve the placement and transfer of construction-related materials for a few hours, typically, between tidal events. Tug boats and associated underwater noise could also disturb individual Steller sea lions, causing them to avoid the general area of activity during the landing and “undocking” process.</p>
<p><i>Page 28, Section 5.0</i></p>	<p><i>Section 5.0 is replaced in its entirety with the following:</i> Alternative 1 – No Action would not result in impacts to Steller sea lions; therefore, no mitigation is required or proposed.</p>	

2017 ERRATA

2014 Update to Appendix S – Steller Sea Lion Technical Report

This page intentionally left blank