

Environmental Re-Evaluation Checklist

Environmental Re-Evaluation Checklist



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

ENVIRONMENTAL RE-EVALUATION

Project Name: Juneau Access Improvements
Project Number (State/Federal): 71100/STP-000S(131)

Document Type & Approval Date: DEIS, June 23, 1997

Re-Evaluation Number: 1

Date of Last Re-Evaluation:

The purpose of this re-evaluation is to assure that the conclusions of the original environmental document or subsequent re-evaluation remain valid.

I. Introduction:

1. Have changes occurred in the project scope since approval of the original environmental document or subsequent environmental re-evaluation?

YES NO

2. Describe changes: The basic project scope and design parameters have not changed. Some alternatives and studies need to be updated as described below. The state identified the East Lynn Canal Highway (ELCH) as its preferred alternative on January 24, 2000, but at the same time suspended most work on the project. The project has been restarted at the direction of the Governor.

II. Purpose and Need of Project:

1. Has there been a change in the project purpose and need from that described in the approved environmental document or subsequent environmental document?

YES NO

2. Describe changes: The overall purpose and need for the project has not changed. Appendices A (User Benefit Analysis and Traffic Forecast Analysis) and C (Household Survey) need to be updated to determine if the original needs are still valid. New cost estimates are needed to supply recent information for the User Benefit Analysis.

III. Alternatives:

1. Have there been changes to the alternatives advanced?

Yes NO

2. Have additional alternatives been considered?

3. Describe changes: All alternatives need to be updated. Alternative 1 (No Build) needs to be updated, as the mainline ferry system has changed over the past five years (e.g. Malaspina has run as a summer day boat). Appendix B (Technical Alignment Report) needs to be revised to more accurately determine the alignment of Alternative 2 (ELCH) and the layout of Alternative 4 (All Marine) terminals. The Marine Segments Report also needs to be updated with regard to the suitability of the proposed shuttle ferry for Alternative 2 and the 105 vehicle ferries in Alternative 4. New alternatives have been considered since the draft was released. All alternatives should be analyzed in a new technical appendix. This alternatives analysis would also re-examine alternatives previously considered not reasonable to verify the validity of that determination.

IV. Affected Environment:

- | | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| | <u>YES</u> | <u>NO</u> |
| 1. Has there been a change in the affected environment within or adjacent to the project area that could affect any of the impact categories (i.e. new legislation, transportation infrastructure, or protected resources)? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Describe changes: New legislation, changes in the communities involved and changes in the natural environment affected (as well as gaps in the previous studies) all necessitate updates to technical appendices and the DEIS. The Traffic Forecast Analysis needs to be updated. An Essential Fish Habitat Assessment needs to be prepared. The Snow Avalanche Report in Appendix B needs to be revised to reflect more recent data, as do the Stellar Sea Lion, Bald Eagle, Wetlands, and Wildlife Technical Reports in Appendix D. | | |

V. Environmental Consequences: *Identify if there have been any changes in project impacts from those identified in the original environmental document or subsequent re-evaluations. For each "yes," describe the magnitude of the change and the potential for significant impact.*

A. Right-of-Way Impacts

- | | | |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| | <u>YES</u> | <u>NO</u> |
| 1. Have the right-of-way requirements changed? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Have the project's effects on minorities or disadvantaged persons or those disproportionately affected changed? (E.O 12898)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. Describe changes: No changes are known at this time, however more detailed alignment information may change anticipated Right of Way needs. | | |

B. Social Impacts:

- | | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| | <u>YES</u> | <u>NO</u> |
| 1. Would there be any changes in the neighborhoods or community cohesion for the various social groups as a result of the proposed action? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Are there any changes in travel patterns and accessibility (e.g., vehicular, commuter, bicycle, or pedestrian)? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. Are there any changes to the impacts on school districts, recreation areas, churches, businesses, police and fire protection, etc.? Include the direct impacts and the indirect impacts that may result from the displacement of households and businesses. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 4. Are there any changes to the effects of the project on the elderly, handicapped, nondrivers, transit-dependent, minority and ethnic groups, or the economically disadvantaged? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 5. Describe changes, if any. There have been changes in the past five years in all of the communities potentially affected. The Socio-economic Effects study in Appendix C needs to be updated and expanded to address concerns raised in DEIS comments. Recent traffic and population data should be obtained, and new projections generated. | | |

C. Economic Impacts:

- | | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| | <u>YES</u> | <u>NO</u> |
| 1. Are there any changes to the economic impacts of the action on the regional and/or local economy, such as the effects of the project on development, tax revenues and public expenditures, employment opportunities, accessibility, and retail sales? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Are there any changes to the potential impacts of the proposed action on established businesses or business districts, or changes to any opportunities to minimize or reduce such impacts by the public and/or private sectors? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. Describe changes: The economies of Haines, Skagway and Juneau have changed in the past five years, particularly in the tourism sector. Updating and expanding the | | |

Socio- economic Effects study would address potential changes in impacts. More detail in the Visual Impact Assessment Technical Report would also help address changes.

D. Local Land Use and Transportation Plan:

- | | <u>YES</u> | <u>NO</u> |
|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. Have there been changes in the local land use or transportation plan? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. If yes, is the project consistent with the changes to the local transportation land use plan? This needs to be determined; see #4. Below. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. Would project changes induce adverse secondary and cumulative effects? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 4. Describe changes: The Land Use and Coastal Zone Technical Report needs to be updated to reflect each community's most recent plan. A new Secondary and Cumulative Impacts Analysis is needed to look at these potential impacts based on the latest land use developments. The New Forest Service Tongass Land Management Plan (TLMP) needs to be incorporated into the analysis. | | |

E. Cultural Resource Impacts:

- | | <u>YES</u> | <u>NO</u> |
|---|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1. Are there changes in the project's effect on cultural resource? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Has there been a change in the status of National Register listed, eligible, or potentially eligible sites in the project area? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. Describe changes: Some additional potential historic sites need to be evaluated. SHPO concurrence with our determination of no adverse effect is no longer valid due to the time lapse. New Section 106 regulations are in effect, requiring greater coordination with the public and tribal entities. Further evaluation, particularly of the Skagway tie-in, will be necessary after the alignment is refined. | | |

F. Wetland Impacts: *(If yes, resource coordination required).*

- | | <u>YES</u> | <u>NO</u> |
|---|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1. Are there changes in project scope or design that affect the wetland impacts? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Is there a need for additional wetland impact analysis? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. Describe changes: A new Technical Alignment Report, with survey in the field, will make field mapping of impacted wetlands more accurate. This and a more detailed functional analysis should be used to update the Wetlands Technical Report. The type of functional analysis used should be determined through interagency coordination. Impacts of road segments on downslope wetlands need to be analyzed. Mitigation for wetland impacts needs to be developed further. | | |

G. Fish & Wildlife Impacts:

- | | <u>YES</u> | <u>NO</u> |
|---|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. Are there changes in the effects to fish and wildlife resources? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Do project changes require consultation with NMFS per Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) regulations? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. Has there been a change in the effects to wildlife resources? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 4. Does the project affect bald eagles or golden eagles? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 5. Describe changes. The DEIS was released prior to the issuance of EFH regulations. An EFH Assessment is needed. Monitoring of eagle nests in the project area by USF&WS has been ongoing. The Bald Eagle Technical Report needs to be updated. Impacts to trumpeter swan, deer, wolf, goat and moose populations need to be analyzed further. | | |

H. Threatened and Endangered Species (T&E):

- | | <u>YES</u> | <u>NO</u> |
|--|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 1. Has there been a change in status of listed T&E species directly or indirectly affected by the project? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Describe changes: Informal consultation with NMFS regarding impacts to Stellar sea lions was never concluded. A joint program between ADOT&PF and NMFS to monitor the Gran Point haulout is ongoing. The results of this monitoring will be used to proceed with, and possibly conclude, informal consultation. | | |

- I. Water Body Involvement:
- | | <u>YES</u> | <u>NO</u> |
|--|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1. Have there been any changes to the project effects on water bodies? If yes complete 2-4 and describe in 5. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Project affects a navigable water body (as listed by USCG). | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. Project affects navigable waters of the U.S. (as defined by the Corps). | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 4. Project affects a Cataloged Anadromous Fish Stream (i.e. 16.05.870). | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 5. Describe any changes: No changes are known at this time. Potential Wild & Scenic Rivers need to be reevaluated. | | |

- J. Alaska Coastal Management Program (ACMP):
- | | <u>YES</u> | <u>NO</u> |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1. Are there changes that affect the standards of the ACMP? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Are there changes to a local coastal management district that affect the consistency finding? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. If yes to # 2, is the project consistent with local coastal management policies? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 4. Describe changes. There are no changes at this time; any ACMP changes should be captured in an updated Land Use and Coastal Zone Technical Report. | | |

- K. Hazardous Waste:
- | | <u>YES</u> | <u>NO</u> |
|---|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1. Have there been any changes in the status of known or potentially contaminated sites along the corridor? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. If buildings or residences are relocated, have they been evaluated for hazardous waste (i.e. asbestos?). | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. Describe changes. An Initial Site Assessment was completed for this project. No alternative would impact a known hazardous waste site. This assessment needs to be updated after alignments and locations are refined. | | |

- L. Air Quality Conformity:
- | | <u>YES</u> | <u>NO</u> |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1. Does the project as proposed affect a non-attainment area, which will require a revised conformity determination? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Describe any changes. None at this time. | | |

- M. Floodplains Impacts:
- | | <u>YES</u> | <u>NO</u> |
|---|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1. Have there been changes in the project effects to a regulatory floodway? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Does the project remain consistent with local flood protection standards and E.O. 11988? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. Have there been changes in the status of local flood hazard ordinances? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 4. Describe changes. None. | | |

- N. Noise Impact:
- | | <u>YES</u> | <u>NO</u> |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1. Has there been a change in noise sensitive receivers/land uses adjacent to the proposed project? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Has there been a substantial change in vertical or horizontal alignment? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. Has the number of through lanes or the project itself created a noise impact? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 4. Has a noise analysis demonstrated potential noise impacts? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 5. Are there feasible and reasonable measures that can reduce impacts? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 6. Do changes in the project require a local noise permit? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 7. Describe changes. None. | | |

- | <u>O. Water Quality Impacts:</u> | <u>YES</u> | <u>NO</u> |
|---|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1. Does the project now involve a public or private drinking source? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Would project changes affect the potential discharge of storm water into Waters of the U.S.? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. Does the project affect a designated impaired water body?
(If yes, complete "a"). | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| a. List name(s) and location(s): | | |
| 4. Will the project now involve a municipal separate storm sewer system (MS4) NPDES permit, or will runoff be mixed with discharges from an NPDES permitted industrial facility? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 5. Describe changes: No changes are known at this time. Road alignment and/or terminal location changes may change stormwater runoff characteristics, but are not expected to change water quality impacts. | | |

- | <u>P. Permits and Authorization:</u> | <u>YES</u> | <u>NO</u> |
|---|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1. Are there any changes in the status of the following permits and authorizations? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| a. Corps, Section 404/10: | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Coast Guard, Section 9: | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c. ADF&G, Title 16: | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d. Flood Hazard: | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| e. ADEC 401: | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| f. ADEC Storm Water Plan: | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| g. DGC, ACMP: | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| h. Other. If "yes, list. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Describe changes. Draft 404 applications and 404b(1) analyses were not included in the DEIS. Per the 1992 streamlining agreement, these elements should be prepared after the Wetland Technical report is updated. | | |

- | <u>Q. Construction Impacts.</u> | <u>YES</u> | <u>NO</u> |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| Have the following potential construction effects changed: | | |
| 1. Construction timing commitments? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Temporary degradation of water quality? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. Temporary stream diversion? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 4. Temporary degradation of air quality? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 5. Temporary delays and detours of traffic ? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 6. Temporary impact to businesses? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 7. Other construction impacts, including noise? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 8. Describe changes. There are no changes at this time. Specific timing commitments as well as the need for stream diversions or traffic detours have not yet been determined. | | |

- | <u>R. Section 4(f)/6(f):</u> | <u>YES</u> | <u>NO</u> |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1. Has there been a change in status of Section 4(f) properties affected by the proposed action? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Would the project "use" property from Section 4(f) properties? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. Has there been a change in status in Section 6(f) properties affected by the proposed action? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 4. Is the use of 6(f) property a conversion of use per Section 6(f) of the LWCFA? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 5. Describe changes: There are no changes known at this time. Potential affects to Section 4(f) properties (e.g. Ships Registry and Dewey Lakes Trails system in Skagway) need to be reassessed after alignments are refined. | | |

VI. Comments and Coordination Conducted for the Re-Evaluation:

YES NO

- 1. Has public/agency coordination occurred since the environmental document was approved or since the last re-evaluation?
- 2. Discussion: *Describe comments and coordination efforts taken for this project since approval of the environmental document or re-evaluation. Discuss pertinent issues raised by the public and government agencies. Attach applicable correspondence and responses.*

Very little public or agency coordination has occurred since the DEIS comment period ended in December 1997. In January 2000 Governor Knowles announced the East Lynn Canal Highway as the State's preferred alternative, but suspended work on the EIS. Shortly after that the ADOT&PF Preferred Alternative Report was presented to the public at a forum sponsored by the Juneau Chamber of Commerce. No formal communication with agencies has occurred in the interim. ADOT&PF staff have met with EPA, NMFS and USF&WS staff to brief them regarding ongoing studies to collect specific project related data. A new coordination effort should be conducted to inform agencies and the public how the EIS process will be restarted and to solicit input as to the scope.

VII. Changes in Environmental Commitments or Mitigation Measures:

YES NO

- 1. Have any changes in the environmental commitments or mitigation occurred?
- 2. Describe changes. The DEIS contained many commitments and possible mitigative actions throughout the document. Also, some mitigation commitments were offered but not formally acted on (e.g. Stellar sea lion avoidance measures). Toward the end of document preparation, after avoidance and minimization efforts have been identified, a Project Mitigation Report should be prepared and specific commitments should appear in a separate Commitments & Mitigation section.

VIII. Environmental Re-Evaluation:

YES NO

- 1. The conclusions and commitments of the original environmental document approval or subsequent re-evaluations remain valid (if no, go to # 2).
- 2. Substantial changes in the project scope, purpose and need, range of alternatives or outdated information require a new DEIS (if no, go to # 3).
- 3. Changes in the project's affected environment, new regulations and/or the need for additional studies require a supplemental EIS.

Prepared by: <u>Reuben Myford</u> Regional Environmental Coordinator	Date: <u>1/3/03</u>
Approved by: <u>[Signature]</u> Preconstruction Engineer	Date: <u>1/3/03</u>
Approved by: <u>[Signature]</u> FHWA Environmental Program Manager	Date: <u>1/3/03</u>