

State of Alaska
Department of Transportation & Public Facilities



CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION DOCUMENTATION FORM
(NEPA Assignment Program Projects)

The environmental review, consultation, and other actions required by the applicable Federal environmental laws for this project are being, or have been carried out by the DOT&PF pursuant to 23 U.S.C 327 and a Memorandum of Understanding dated November 3, 2017, and executed by FHWA and DOT&PF.

I. Project Information:

A. Project Name: Parks Highway MP 163-183 Rehabilitation

B. Federal Project Number: EAP-0A4-3(20)

C. State Project Number: Z612970000

D. Primary/Ancillary Project Connections:

None

E. CE Designation: 23 CFR 771.117(d)(13)

F. List of Attachments:

Appendix A: Project Figures

Appendix B: Environmental Figures

Appendix C: Class of Action

Appendix D: Section 106 Compliance

Appendix E: Nationwide Permit No. 14; POA-2017-00570

Appendix F: Fish Habitat Survey Report

Appendix G: Section 4(f) and 6(f) Applicability and Consultation

Appendix H: ADF&G Fish Habitat Permits, DNR Special Park Use Permit, and USACE Permit Application

Appendix I: Scoping, Agency Coordination, Affidavits of Publication

Appendix J: Noise Study Analysis Report

Appendix K: Location and Hydraulics Study

G. Project Scope (*Use STIP Project Description*)

Rehabilitate the Parks Hwy between MP 163 and 183 improve drainage, and construct passing lanes. Also includes a grade separated crossing at MP 169 (Hurricane). This is the overall design project for the entire termini. Construction will happen in three stages. MP 163-174 excluding the grade separated crossing at MP 169 will take place under NID 30278, MP 174-183 under NID 30279 and the final segment for the grade separated railroad crossing at MP 169 under this need [22331].

H. Project Purpose and Need:

The George Parks Highway is the primary overland route connecting Fairbanks with Anchorage and southcentral Alaska, and is also very important to the tourism industry providing access to the Denali National Park and Preserve and the Denali State Park. Local and commercial truck traffic use this route year round to deliver goods and services between Anchorage and Fairbanks and other communities along the highway. The highway experiences increasing traffic volumes throughout the summer months

due to seasonal activities, primarily recreation and tourism. Denali Parks' seasonal tourism increases the number of large and slow moving vehicles traveling along the highway.

The purpose of this project is to bring a section of the George Parks Highway (Parks Highway), between MP 163 through 183, into compliance with current FHWA design standards. Its purpose is also to improve the safety and efficiency for highway users and to improve drainage issues that exist along the project segment of highway.

The project need is that preliminary crash data indicates that a substandard curve between milepost (MP) 176 and 177 has experienced higher crash rates (nine crashes) than the other segments of this highway. This referenced curve will require flattening and adjustments to its vertical alignment in order to meet current design standards. Safety issues also exist at the highway crossing of the Alaska Railroad Corporation's (ARRC) rail tracks near MP 169; a crash at this railroad crossing occurred during 2014 that resulted in a fatality and petroleum tanker spill. Furthermore, passing lanes are needed to provide safe passing opportunities in order to reduce the potential for collisions among commuters, commercial operators, and slower moving recreational vehicle traffic.

Additionally, all but four of the culverts in the project segment are the original culverts that were installed when the Parks Highway's construction was completed in 1971 and as such, these culverts are at the end of their useful life. Furthermore, it's been 16 years since the last highway pavement overlay was installed in the project segment of roadway. Since that time, the roadway has become rutted and the pavement is deteriorating, in part due to the frequent and heavy truck traffic.

I. Project Description:

The proposed project corridor (MP 163 through MP 183) is depicted on Figure 1 in Appendix A and is located (from north to south) within:

Sections 3, 4, 8, 9, 10, 17, 19, 20, 30, 31, T21S, R10W, Fairbanks Meridian;

Sections 36, T21S, R11W, Fairbanks Meridian;

Sections 1, 2, 11, 12, 14, 22, 23, 27, 34, T22S, R11W, Fairbanks Meridian;

Sections 16, 20, 21, 29, 30, 31, T33N, R2W, Seward Meridian, and;

Sections 1, 2, T32N, R3W, Seward Meridian.

The proposed project consists of:

1. Improving an highway alignment section between MP 176 and MP 178, identified as having a high crash rate due to sharp horizontal and vertical curves and to comply with current highway design standards (Figures 2-6 in Appendix A).
2. Reducing or eliminating areas that have road weight restrictions through pavement and subgrade improvements.
3. Repaving and rehabilitating the highway as needed between MP 163 and 183.
4. Replacing or extending culverts as needed.
5. Flattening side slopes or adding guardrail as needed.
6. Constructing passing lanes, and extending culverts as needed for the passing lanes (Figure 7 in Appendix A illustrates a typical passing lane profile).
 - a. South and Northbound passing lanes between MP 166 – 168
 - b. Northbound passing lane between MP 170 – 172

c. Northbound passing lane between MP 178 – 180

7. Constructing a grade separated overpass at the highway crossing of the ARRC rail tracks near MP 169. The overpass will raise the Parks Highway approximately 35.5 feet and the maximum embankment width would be approximately 220 feet. The highway would shift south approximately 35 feet to keep the embankment within the existing right-of-way (ROW). The length of overpass, including the realignment is approximately 3,800 feet. Utility modifications will be needed to accommodate the overpass footings. The overpass would consist of a single span bridge structure and retaining walls, as illustrated on Figure 8 in Appendix A.

DOT&PF has a material sale agreements emplace with the Department of Natural Resources (DNR) for existing material sites at approximate MP 183 and at MP 181 that can be made available for construction.

The project components are illustrated on the figures in Appendix A.

The proposed project actions are identified as “d” list actions, and no unusual circumstances are identified, per 23 CFR Part 771.117(b). A copy of the DOT&PF Class of Action determination is provided in Appendix C.

II. Environmental Consequences

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

A. Right-of-Way Impacts

	<u>N/A</u>	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>
1. Additional right-of-way required. If no, skip to 2.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
a. Permanent easements required.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Estimated number of parcels: _____			
b. Full or partial property acquisition required.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Estimated number of full parcels: _____			
Estimated number of partial parcels: _____			
c. Property transfer from state or federal agency required. <i>If yes, list agency in No. 4 below.</i>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Business or residential relocations required. If yes, insert the number of relocations below, summarize the findings of the conceptual stage relocation study in No. 4 below and attach the conceptual stage relocation study. If no, skip to 2.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
i. Number of business relocations: _____			
ii. Number of residential relocations: _____			
e. Last-resort housing required.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Will the project or activity have disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects on minority populations and low-income populations as defined in E.O. 12898 (FHWA Order 6640.23A, June 2012)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
3. The project will involve use of ANILCA land that requires an ANILCA Title XI approval.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
4. Summarize the right-of-way impacts, if any:			

A. Right-of-Way Impacts

N/A YES NO

No right-of-way (ROW) acquisition is required for this project.

However, it should be noted that the existing alignment of the Parks Highway within the project corridor, as it was originally constructed 1971, near the location of Honolulu Creek goes through two Native allotments, USS 7492 Lot 3 & Lot 4. The DOT&PF's ROW and legal departments have researched this issue and have concluded that the existing DOT&PF ROW is valid and is supported by legal precedence. However, understanding the sensitivity of this issue the DOT&PF has made sure that the proposed highway design will be constructed entirely within the existing ROW and that a temporary construction easement will not be required in USS 7492 Lot 3 or Lot 4.

B. Social and Cultural Impacts

YES NO

- 1. The project will affect neighborhoods or community cohesion. YES NO
- 2. The project will affect travel patterns and accessibility (e.g. vehicular, commuter, bicycle, or pedestrian). YES NO
- 3. The project will affect school boundaries, recreation areas, churches, businesses, police and fire protection, etc. YES NO
- 4. The project will affect the elderly, handicapped, nondrivers, transit-dependent, minority and ethnic groups, or the economically disadvantaged. YES NO
- 5. There are unresolved project issues or concerns of a federally-recognized Indian Tribe [as defined in [36 CFR 800.16\(m\)](#)]. YES NO
- 6. Summarize the social and cultural impacts, if any:

The addition of passing lanes would have a positive effect to the traffic patterns by reduced highway traffic delays resulting from slow moving vehicles and providing more safe passing opportunities, thus increasing safety. Additionally, the construction of a grade separated railroad crossing at MP 169 will increase safety for highway users. No adverse social or cultural impacts are foreseen for this project.

C. Economic Impacts

YES NO

- 1. The project will have adverse economic impacts on the regional and/or local economy, such as effects on development, tax revenues and public expenditures, employment opportunities, accessibility, and retail sales. YES NO
- 2. The project will adversely affect established businesses or business districts. YES NO
- 3. Summarize the economic impacts, if any:

No adverse economic impacts are foreseen for this project. This highway segment has little adjacent development and is surrounded primarily by undeveloped state land with few residences or businesses adjacent to the project corridor.

D. Land Use and Transportation Plans

N/A YES NO

- 1. Project is consistent with land use plan(s). YES NO N/A

Identify the land use plan(s) and date [Matanuska-Susitna Borough Comprehensive Development Plan, 2005](#); the [George Parks Highway Scenic Byway Corridor Partnership Plan, 2008](#); [2030 Let's Get Moving! ADOT&PF Statewide Long-Term Transportation Policy Plan](#), and; [Parks Highway Visioning Document, 2006](#).

D. Land Use and Transportation Plans

N/A YES NO

2. Project is consistent with transportation plan(s).

Identify the transportation plan(s) and date. State of Alaska Department of Transportation & Public Facilities 2016-2019 Statewide Transportation Program (STIP) Amendment 3, June 28, 2017; "Mat-Su Borough Long-Range Transportation Plan" (LRTP) 2007; Interior Alaska Transportation Plan, 2010.

3. Project would induce adverse indirect and cumulative effects on land use or transportation. *If yes, attach analysis.*

*

4. Summarize how the project is consistent or inconsistent with the land use plan(s) and transportation plan(s):

The project is consistent with the Matanuska-Susitna Borough Comprehensive Development Plan in that it would facilitate the efficient movement of people, goods, and services throughout the region. The project is consistent with the George Parks Highway Scenic Byway Corridor Partnership Plan by providing travelers with a safe, comfortable journey.

The project is consistent with the Mat-Su Borough LRTP in that it would improve safety at road/rail crossings, would facilitate the efficient movement of people and goods, and would work to reduce the rate of transportation-related accidents and mortality.

The project is consistent with the Interior Alaska Transportation Plan in that it would flatten side slopes or add guardrail as needed to prevent vehicles from rolling if they run off the road, would improve poor surface and subsurface conditions, would realign the roadway to eliminate curvature at Honolulu Hill (an area of special interest in the Plan, stated as MP 168 in the Plan but is actually at MP 176-178), install passing lanes (safety strategy for reducing head-on crashes), and restore drainage as needed.

The project is consistent with the 2030 Let's Get Moving! ADOT&PF Statewide Long-Term Transportation Policy Plan by addressing the goal of removing spring weight restrictions on the Parks Highway and reconstructing many segments of the Parks Highway between Houston and Fairbanks.

The project is consistent with the Parks Highway Visioning Document, 2006, by constructing a grade separation at the railroad crossing at MP 169, adding passing and climbing lanes, and improving the steep grades at Honolulu Hill at MP 177.

E. Impacts to Historic Properties

N/A YES NO

Consider the [February 2015 DOT&PF Cultural Resources Confidentiality Guidelines](#) for cultural resource attachments.

1. Does the project involve a road that is included on the "[List of Roads Treated as Eligible](#)" in the Alaska Historic Roads PA? *If yes, follow the [Interim Guidance for Addressing Alaska Historic Roads](#).*

2. Does the project qualify as a Programmatic Allowance under the Section 106 Programmatic Agreement? *If yes, attach the Section 106 PA Streamlined Project Review Screening Record approved by the Regional PQI and skip to 10.*

*

3. Date Consultation/Initiation Letters sent 1/8/15 *Attach copies to this form.*

a. List consulting parties Alaska State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), Director of Alaska State Parks, Ahtna Incorporated, Alaska Railroad Corporation, Bureau of Indian Affairs, Matanuska-Susitna Borough, Native Village of Cantwell, and Tanana Chiefs Conference.

b. If no letters were sent, explain why not. *Attach "Section 106 Proceed*

E. Impacts to Historic Properties

N/A YES NO

Directly to Findings Worksheet”, if applicable N/A

4. Date “Finding of Effect” Letters sent 6/3/15 Attach copies to this form

a. State “Finding of Effect” no historic properties affected

b. State any changes to consulting parties no changes

5. List responding consulting parties, comment date, and summarize:

In reply to the Consultation/Initiation letter, the Matanuska-Susitna Borough (6/15/15) "concurred with finding of no historic properties affected"; and the Alaska Railroad (6/11/15) "supported the finding of no historic properties affected." BIA verbally responded that they have concerns that there may be ROW conflicted with Native Allotments. DOT&PF ROW Section reviewed and found no ROW conflicts. The correspondence is included in Appendix D.

6. Are there any unresolved issues with consulting parties?

*

If yes, the Section 106 process may not be complete, Statewide Cultural Resources Manager consultation is required. Attach consultation.

7. Date SHPO concurred with “Finding of Effect” 6/8/15 Attach copy to this form.

8. Is a National Register of Historic Places listed or eligible property in the Area of Potential Effect?

9. Will there be an adverse effect on a historic property? If yes, attach correspondence (including response from ACHP) and signed MOA. If yes, Programmatic Categorical Exclusions (PCEs) do not apply.

10. Summarize any effects to historic properties. List affected sites (by AHRS number only) and any commitments or mitigative measures. Include any commitments or mitigative measures in Section V.

SHPO concurred with DOT&PF's finding of No Historic Properties Affected on 6/8/15, File Number 3130-1K FHWA (Appendix D).

F. Wetland Impacts

YES NO

1. Project affects wetlands as defined by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE). If yes, complete the remainder of this section and document public and agency coordination required per E.O. 11990, Protection of Wetlands. If no, skip to Section G.

2. Are the wetlands delineated in accordance with the “Regional Supplement to the Corps of Engineers Wetland Delineation Manual: Alaska Region (Version 2.0) Sept. 2007”?

3. Estimated area of wetland involvement (acres): 1.8 acres of permanent wetland impacts and 0.40 acre of temporary wetland impacts.

4. Estimated fill quantities (cubic yards): 23,813 cubic yards of clean earthen fill

5. Estimated dredge quantities (cubic yards): 19,860 cubic yards would be dredged from Waters of the U.S.

6. Is a USACE authorization anticipated?

If yes, identify type:

NWP Individual General Permit Other

F. Wetland Impacts

YES NO

7. Wetlands Finding *Attach the following supporting documentation as appropriate:*

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

- a. Are there practicable alternatives to the proposed construction in wetlands?
If yes, the project cannot be approved as proposed.
- b. Does the project include all practicable measures to minimize harm to wetlands? *If no, the project cannot be approved as proposed.*
- c. Only practicable alternative: Based on the evaluation of avoidance and minimization alternatives, there are no practicable alternatives that would avoid the project’s impacts on wetlands. The project includes all practicable measures to minimize harm to the affected wetlands as a result of construction. *If no, the project cannot be approved as proposed.*

8. Summarize the wetlands impacts and mitigation, if any. *Include any commitments or mitigative measures in [Section V](#).*

Wetland delineations were completed for this project by HDR Alaska, Inc.; their report is on file at the DOT&PF Northern Region office and is titled: Preliminary Jurisdictional Determination Report George Parks Highway, Mileposts 163 to 188, Alaska, December 2014.

The proposed project avoids and minimizes impacts to wetlands to the maximum extent practicable through an alternatives evaluation process that sited project elements within areas that would have the least environmentally damaging practicable alternative, while still maintaining compliance with current FHWA design standards. Measures to enhance wetland connectivity and fish habitat have been incorporated where possible to create ecological uplift. All disturbed ground resulting from the construction of this project will be permanently stabilized. Detailed discussions of the wetland avoidance and minimization efforts implemented for this project are provided in Appendix H

On November 22, 2017 the DOT&PF submitted an application to the United States Army of Corps of Engineers (USACE) requesting authorization to place approximately 28,813 cubic yards of clean fill onto 1.83 of acres of wetlands, including waters of the United States, and for temporary impacts to 0.40 acre of wetland impact.

On March 2, 2018, the DOT&PF received authorization from the USACE to permanently impact 1.83 of wetland and for temporary impacts to 0.40 acres of wetland under a Nationwide Permit Number 14; POA-2017-00570 (Appendix E). Compensatory mitigation was not required by the USACE under POA-2017-00570.

G. Water Body Involvement

N/A YES NO

1. Does the project affect the following:

- a. A water body.
- b. A navigable water body as defined by USCG, (i.e. Section 9)? *
- c. Waters of the U.S. as defined by the USACE, Section 404? *
- d. Navigable Waters of the U.S. as defined by the USACE (Section 10)? *
- e. Fish passage across a stream frequented by salmon or other fish (i.e. [Title 16.05.841](#))?
- f. A resident fish stream ([Title 16.05.841](#))?
- g. A cataloged anadromous fish stream, river or lake (i.e. [Title 16.05.871](#))? *

- h. A designated Wild and Scenic River or land adjacent to a Wild and Scenic River? *If yes, the Regional Environmental Manager should consult with the NEPA Program Manager to determine applicability of Section 4(f).*
2. Proposed water body involvement:
- Bridge Culvert Embankment Fill Relocation
 Diversion Temporary Permanent Other
3. Type of stream or river habitat impacted:
- Spawning Rearing Pool Riffle Undercut bank
 Other
4. Amount of fill below (cubic yards):
 OHW 429 cubic yards MHW _____ HTL _____

5. Summarize the water body impacts and mitigation, if any. *Include any commitments or mitigative measures in Section V.*

The US Coast Guard considers the entire length of Honolulu Creek as navigable. However no work will occur over or in the creek as part of this project. None of the waterbodies in the project area are listed on the USACE Alaska Navigable water list, nor are they subject to ebb and flow of the tide. Honolulu and Hurricane Creeks are Waters of the U.S., but neither will be impacted by this project.

Two creeks that support anadromous or resident fish cross under the highway in culverts in the passing lane locations: the culverts for Division Creek (MP 168) and Granite Creek (MP 171) will require extending to accommodate the passing lanes. The culvert for Little Honolulu Creek (MP 178) will be replaced to accommodate the realignment. An additional five culverts would be replaced in anadromous or resident streams (discussed in Section H below). To install or replace culverts in anadromous or resident fish habitat and Waters of the U.S., authorization by the USACE and ADF&G (Title 16 Fish Habitat Permit) is required. For all construction activities, BMPs will be used to prevent erosion and sediment from entering water bodies, in accordance with the permits mentioned above and in Section IV.

H. Fish and Wildlife

N/A YES NO

1. Anadromous and resident fish habitat. *Any activity or project that is conducted below the ordinary high water mark of an anadromous stream, river, or lake requires a Fish Habitat Permit.*
- a. Database name(s) and date(s) queried: ADF&G Anadromous Waters Catalog (AWC); 1/26/18
- b. Anadromous fish habitat present in project area. *
- c. Resident fish habitat present in project area. *
- d. Adverse effect on spawning habitat. *
- e. Adverse effect on rearing habitat. *
- f. Adverse effect on migration corridors. *
- g. Adverse effect on subsistence species. *
2. Essential Fish Habitat (EFH). *EFH includes any anadromous stream used by any of the five species of Pacific salmon for migration, spawning or rearing, as well as other coastal, nearshore and offshore areas as designated by NMFS.*
- a. Database name(s) and date(s) queried: queried AWC on 1/26/18, and; NOAA Fisheries' EFH Mapper website on 1/26/18
- b. EFH present in project area.
- c. Project proposes construction in EFH. *If yes, describe EFH impacts in H.6.*

H. Fish and Wildlife

N/A YES NO

- d. Project may adversely affect EFH. *If yes, attach EFH Assessment.* *
- e. Project includes conservation recommendations proposed by NMFS. *If NMFS conservation recommendations are not adopted, formal notification must be made to NMFS. Summarize the final conservation measures in H.6 and list in [Section V](#).*
- 3. Wildlife Resources:
 - a. Project is in area of high wildlife/vehicle accidents.
 - b. Project would bisect migration corridors.
 - c. Project would segment habitat.
- 4. [Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act](#). *If yes to any below, consult with USFWS and attach documentation of consultation.*
 - a. Eagle data source(s) and date(s) : Site investigation completed on June 23-29, 2014
 - b. Project visible from an eagle nesting tree? *
 - c. Project within 330 feet of an eagle nesting tree? *
 - d. Project within 660 feet of an eagle nesting tree? *
 - e. Will the project require blasting or other activities that produce extreme loud noises within 1/2 a mile from an active nest? *
 - f. Is an [eagle permit](#) required? *
- 5. Is the project consistent with the [Migratory Bird Treaty Act](#)?

H. Fish and Wildlife

N/A YES NO

6. Summarize fish and wildlife impacts and mitigation, including timing windows, if any. *Include any commitments or mitigative measures in [Section V](#).*
Anadromous and Resident Fish Streams and EFH

A review of the websites listed above and a 2014 site investigation (Appendix F) indicated multiple anadromous and resident fish streams occur in the project area. Two streams, Pass Creek and Little Honolulu Creek, are known to provide habitat for Pacific salmon in the project area, and would be considered essential fish habitat EFH. The remainder of the listed creeks in the project area have EFH well downstream of the project area. No in-water work will occur in Little Coal Creek or in Honolulu Creek, so USACE and ADF&G permits will not be needed for these. No Name Creek 10 was found to have resident fish (Appendix F) but this culvert was replaced in 2013 so no in-water work will occur. The remaining seven creeks will require USACE and ADF&G permits for culvert replacement. Copies of the ADF&G permits and USACE permit applications are provided in appendix H. Antimony Creek is not listed in the AWC, however, resident fish were found during the 2014 site investigation.

The replacement culverts are designed to provide efficient fish passage; in accordance with the Memorandum of Agreement between the ADF&G and the DOT&PF for the Design, Permitting, and Construction of Culverts for Fish Passage, dated August 3, 2001. The DOT&PF Hydraulics Department has been working closely with the ADF&G Division of Habitat to ensure there would not be an adverse effect to EFH, anadromous fish, or resident fish populations as a result of the proposed culvert installations or maintenance of these culverts. All work will be conducted in accordance with the ADF&G Title 16 Fish Habitat Permits and the USACE authorization.

As stipulated in the Title 16 Fish Habitat permits issued to this project, the ADF&G authorizes temporary blockage of fish passage during culvert installation provided that in-stream construction activities occur between the months of June and July. However, the applicant [DOT&PF] is responsible to maintain free fish passage throughout the course of construction if in-stream activities occur prior to June 1 or after July 31 (Appendix H).

Wildlife Resources: A review of the Statewide Moose-Vehicle Collision Rankings (2006 to 2010) indicated no areas with disproportionately high levels of moose-vehicle collisions occur in the project area. As the proposed project involves in-kind replacement of existing facilities, it would not further bisect migration corridors or segment wildlife habitat. In addition, the improvements would remain consistent with existing road conditions, capacity, and travel patterns. No adverse impacts to wildlife or wildlife habitat are anticipated from the proposed project.

Bald Eagles and Migratory Birds: Vegetation near multiple project sites includes mature trees suitable for eagle and other migratory bird nests. A February 27, 2015 review of the FWS IPaC website (provided in Appendix B) indicated that Bald eagles (*Haliaeetus leucocephalus*) occur year-round and breed in the project area. On June 23-29, 2014, Kinney Engineering staff completed a reconnaissance of the project area, which in part included scouting for the presence of raptors or raptor nests; none were observed.

According to the FWS IPAC website, other than the Bald Eagle, the project area may provide habitat for nine other Birds of Conservation Concern. No impacts to these species or their habitat are expected as a result of this highway rehabilitation project. A copy of the Trust Resources List from the FWS IPAC website is provided in Appendix B. The FWS' Timing Recommendations for Land Disturbance & Vegetation Clearing, dated June 2017, recommends that for Interior Alaska land disturbance and vegetation clearing should be avoided between May 1 through July 15. As such, no mechanized vegetation clearing would occur between May 1 through July 15 to avoid adverse impacts to migratory birds and Birds of Conservation Concern. Approximately 260 acres of ground disturbance, primarily from embankment work, would occur from the construction of the proposed project, which will be conducted in phases. Long-term adverse impacts to wildlife are not expected. Refer to Section P for construction impacts.

- I. Threatened and Endangered Species (T&E)** YES NO
1. Database name(s) and date(s) queried: FWS' Information for Planning and Consultation (IPaC) website, 10/14/14, 2/27/15, and 1/26/18
 2. Listed threatened or endangered species present in the project area.
 3. Threatened or endangered species migrate through the project area.
 4. Designated critical habitat in the project area.
 5. Proposed or Candidate species present in project area.
 6. What is the effect determination for the project? *Select one.*
 - a. Project has no effect on listed or proposed T&E species or designated critical habitat.
 - b. Project is not likely to adversely affect a listed or proposed T&E species or designated critical habitat. *Informal Section 7 consultation is required. Attach consultation documentation, including concurrence from the Federal agency, to this form.* *
 - c. Project is likely to adversely affect a listed or proposed T&E species or designated critical habitat. *If yes, consult the NEPA Program Manager.* *
 7. Summarize the findings of the consultation, conferencing, biological evaluation, or biological assessment and the opinion of the agency with jurisdiction, or state why no coordination was conducted. *Include any commitments or mitigative measures in [Section V](#).*
The FWS advised on 10/14/14 (Appendix I) that no T&E species or designated critical habitat are known to occur in the project area. The proposed project would have no effect on T&E species or designated critical habitat.

- J. Invasive Species** YES NO
1. Database name(s) and date(s) queried: Alaska Exotic Plants Information Clearinghouse, (AKEPIC) <http://aknhp.uaa.alaska.edu/maps-js/integrated-map/akepic.php#>, UAA Alaska Natural Heritage Program, on 3/6/15 and 1/26/18
 2. Does the project include all practicable measures to minimize the introduction or spread invasive species, making the project consistent with [E.O. 13112](#) (Invasive Species)? *If yes, list measures in J.3.*

J. Invasive Species

YES NO

- 3. Summarize invasive species impacts and minimization measures, if any. *Include any commitments or mitigative measures in [Section V](#).*

A search of the AKEPIC clearinghouse noted the following invasive species (in order of invasiveness score) are known to occur in the project area. Species outside the project area but nearby were also noted; they are:

white sweetclover, invasiveness score 81; yellow sweetclover, invasiveness score 81; cheatgrass, invasiveness score 78; bird vetch, invasiveness score 73; foxtail barley, invasiveness score 63; common tansy, invasiveness score 60; common dandelion, invasiveness score 58; alsike clover, invasiveness score 57; narrowleaf hawksbeard, invasiveness score 56; timothy grass, invasiveness score 54; brittlestem hempnettle, invasiveness score 50; scentless false mayweed, invasiveness score 48; annual bluegrass, invasiveness score 46; prostrate knotweed, invasiveness score 45; common plantain, invasiveness score 44; pineapple weed, invasiveness score 32; rough hawkbit, invasiveness score NA

The majority of species found reproduce by creeping along the ground, the remainder spread by seed. With the implementation of practicable measures to minimize the introduction or spread of invasive species, the project is expected to result in no substantial spread of invasive species. Minimization measures proposed are:

- Sequence construction activities to minimize disturbed areas.
- Stabilize disturbed areas as soon as practicable.
- Minimized ground disturbance by maintaining as much native vegetation as practicable and disturb only areas necessary for staging and construction.
- Implement timely seeding of project-disturbed areas with non-invasive species providing adequate cover.
- Contract specifications will include DOT&PF 2004 Standard Specification for Highway Construction, Special Modification Section 724-2.02 Seed Materials that states: Construction Contractor shall comply with the DNR Division of Agriculture, "Seed Regulations" latest edition. Grass seed shall be furnished in standard containers on which states the name of the seed species and cultivars of seed.
- The DOT&PF will recommend that the awarded contractor use erosion control products composed of forage material (straw bales, straw wattles, straw blankets, coir logs, etc.) and be weed free certified.

However, should invasive species become a problem then the DOT&PF would implement its Integrated Vegetation Management Plan for the use of herbicides as a maintenance tool, along with non-chemical maintenance and vegetation control measures, following the required posting and notification requirements specified in 18 AAC 90.640. All herbicide application shall comply with state and federal regulations. All herbicide application will be applied by certified applicators and using state-approved herbicides in accordance with their labels. A copy of the database information is included in Appendix B.

K. Contaminated Sites

YES NO

- 1. Database name(s) and date(s) queried: ADEC Contaminated Sites Database, 6/26/15 and on 1/29/18.
- 2. There are known or potentially contaminated sites within or adjacent to the existing and/or proposed ROW. *If yes, attach ADEC coordination documentation and summarize below in IV.K.4.*

*

K. Contaminated Sites

YES NO

- 3. There are contaminated sites within 1,500 feet of where excavation dewatering is anticipated? *If yes, attach ADEC coordination correspondence and summarize below in IV.K.4.*
- 4. Summarize the contaminated site impacts and mitigation, if any. *Include any commitments or mitigative measure in Section IV.*

A spill on 8/18/14 at the railroad crossing at MP 169 was added to the ADEC Contaminated Sites List on 3/20/15. The ADEC file number is 150.38.043. Responsible parties are Lynden Transport, the Alaska Railroad Corporation, and DOT&PF.

Initial response activities were undertaken, and diesel fuel was removed from the nearby creek and wetlands. Confirmation sampling indicated approximately 2-3 cubic yards of diesel-contaminated material above ADEC cleanup levels remain in place at the railroad crossing arm foundation under a concrete utility vault in the railroad embankment. Further cleanup activities, if any, are unknown at this time. The clean-up contractor indicated that this small amount of contamination would require excavating the railroad and highway infrastructure, and disrupting service at the crossing. Other than utility work, no construction work is planned for the railroad infrastructure at this location. If the ADEC file is still Active by project construction, DOT&PF will consult ADEC for further guidance.

A record of conversation and copy of email with the spill response contractor, and the ADEC spill record are included in Appendix B.

L. Air Quality (Conformity)

N/A YES NO

- 1. The project is located in an air quality maintenance area or nonattainment area (CO or PM-10 or PM-2.5). *If yes, indicate CO or PM-10 or PM-2.5 , and complete the remainder of this section. If no, skip to Section M.*
- 2. The project is exempt from an air quality analysis per [40 CFR 93.126](#) (Table 2 and Exempt Projects). *If no, a project-level air quality conformity determination is required for CO nonattainment and maintenance areas, and a qualitative project-level analysis is required for both PM-2.5 and PM-10 nonattainment and maintenance areas.*
- 3. The project is included in a conforming Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) and Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).
 - a. List dates of FHWA/FTA conformity determination: _____
- 4. Have there been a significant change in the scope or the design concept as described in the most recent conforming TIP and LRTP? *If yes, describe changes in L.8. In addition, the project must satisfy the conformity rule's requirements for projects not from a plan and TIP, or the plan and TIP must be modified to incorporate the revised project (including a new conformity analysis).*
- 5. A CO project-level analysis was completed meeting the requirements of [Section 93.123](#) of the conformity rule. The results satisfy the requirements of [Section 93.116\(a\)](#) for all areas or [93.116\(b\)](#) for nonattainment areas. *Attach a copy of the analysis.* *
- 6. A PM-2.5 project-level air quality analysis was completed meeting the requirements of [Section 93.123](#) of the conformity rule. The results satisfy the requirements of [Section 93.116](#). *Attach a copy of the analysis.* *

L. Air Quality (Conformity)

N/A YES NO

- 7. A PM-10 project-level air quality analysis was completed meeting the requirements of [Section 93.123](#) of the conformity rule. The results satisfy the requirements of [Section 93.116](#). *Attach a copy of the analysis.* *
- 8. Summarize air quality impacts, mitigation, and agency coordination, if any. *Include any commitments or mitigative measures in [Section V](#).*
The project is not located in an air quality nonattainment or maintenance area

M. Floodplain Impacts (23 CFR 650, Subpart A)

YES NO

- 1. Project encroaches into the base (100 year) flood plain in fresh or marine waters. Identify floodplain map source and date : FEMA Panel 0200211325C, 12/22/17 *

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

If no, skip to M.2.

- a. Is there a longitudinal encroachment into the 100-year floodplain? *
- b. Is there significant encroachment as defined by [23 CFR 650.105\(q\)](#)? *If yes, attach a copy of FHWA's finding required by 23 CFR 650.115.* *
- c. Project encroaches into a regulatory floodway. *
- d. The proposed action would increase the base flood elevation one-foot or greater. *
- 2. Project conforms to local flood hazard requirements.
- 3. Project is consistent with [E.O. 11988](#) (Floodplain Protection). *If no, the project cannot be approved as proposed.*
- 4. Summarize floodplain impacts and mitigation, if any. *Include any commitments or mitigative measures in [Section V](#).*

Little Honolulu Creek is in a mapped floodplain downstream from the Parks Highway (FEMA map included in Appendix B), and no work will occur in the mapped floodplain. All work will occur under and upstream of the highway.

On April 24, 2018, the DOT&PF Norther Region Hydraulic Department completed a Location and Hydraulics Study of the project corridor. This referenced study concluded, in part, that "The project will not involve significant encroachments and should not support incompatible floodplain development. Proposed work will improve water conveyance and no adverse floodplain impacts are anticipated. There will also be no loss of flow conveyance to carry base flood and storage capacity will not be affected by proposed improvements in this project's final condition." This referenced Location and Hydraulics Study is attached.

Public and Agency Scoping included the following statement as part of the published documents: "This project has been developed in accordance with the following special purpose regulations including Sections 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act; 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act; 7 of the Endangered Species Act; and the Executive Orders 11988 (Floodplain Management); 1990 (Wetland Protection); 12898 (Environmental Justice); 11593 (Protection and Enhancement of the Cultural Environment); and 13112 (Invasive Species)." (Appendix I)

N. Noise Impacts (23 CFR 772)

YES NO

1. Does the project involve any of the following? *If yes, complete N.2. If no, a noise analysis is not required. Skip to section O.*
- a. Construction of highway on a new location.
 - b. Substantial alteration in vertical or horizontal alignment as defined in [23 CFR 772.5](#).
 - c. An increase in the number of through lanes.
 - d. Addition of an auxiliary lane (except a turn lane).
 - e. Addition or relocation of interchange lanes or ramps added to a quadrant to complete an existing partial interchange.
 - f. Restriping existing pavement for the purpose of adding a through-traffic lane or an auxiliary lane.
 - g. Addition of a new or substantial alteration of a weigh station, rest stop, ride-share lot or toll plaza.

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

Category A: Lands on which serenity and quiet are of extraordinary significance and serve an important public need and where the preservation of those qualities is essential if the area is to continue to serve its intended purpose.

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

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

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

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

3. Does the noise analysis identify a noise impact? *If yes, explain in N.4*

4. Summarize the findings of the attached noise analysis and noise abatement worksheet, if applicable:
 A noise study analysis was completed for this project; the report from this study is provided in Appendix J and is titled: Parks Highway MP 163-183 Rehabilitation Final Noise Study Report, December 2017, Kinney Engineering, LLC. The analysis was conducted in compliance with DOT&PF's Noise Policy and noise abatement criteria and in compliance with 23 CFR Part 772. The traffic noise levels were modeled and predicted using FHWA's Traffic Noise Model version 2.5 software.

The results of this noise study concluded that none of the receptor sites have existing noise impacts and that the predicted noise levels for the 2040 design-year would not substantially increase the noise levels or approach the noise abatement criteria under both the no-build and build conditions. Therefore, no noise impacts are expected to occur as a result of the proposed Parks Highway MP 163-183

Rehabilitation project. As such, no noise abatement measures are proposed as part of this project.

O. Water Quality Impacts

N/A YES NO

- 1. Project would involve a public or private drinking water source. *If yes, explain in O.7*
- 2. Project would result in a discharge of storm water to a Water of the U.S. (per [40 CFR 230.3\(s\)](#))
- 3. Project would discharge storm water into or affect an ADEC designated Impaired Waterbody. *If any of the Impaired Waterbodies have an approved or established Total Maximum Daily Load, describe project impacts in O.7*
 - a. List name(s), location(s), and pollutant(s) causing impairment:
NA
- 4. Estimate the acreage of ground-disturbing activities that will result from the project?
260 acres.
- 5. Is there a Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) APDES permit, or will runoff be mixed with discharges from an APDES permitted industrial facility?
 - a. If yes, list APDES permit number and type: NA
- 6. Would the project discharge storm water to a water body within a national park or state park; a national or state wildlife refuge?
- 7. Summarize the water quality impacts and mitigation, if any. *Include any commitments or mitigative measures in [Section V](#).*

Approximately 260 acres will be disturbed, of which approximately 1.8 acres are within wetlands or Waters of the U.S. However, the project will be phased and ground disturbance will occur as the project progresses. Soil will be permanently stabilized as work is completed in each phased segment. All construction activities will be required to comply with the USACE permit conditions and ADF&G Title 16 Fish Habitat Permit stipulations, as well as the Alaska Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (APDES) Construction General Permit. Refer to Section P below for construction impacts.

No impaired water bodies occur in the project area (Alaska’s Final 2010 Integrated Water Quality Monitoring and Assessment Report, July 15, 2012).

P. Construction Impacts

N/A YES NO

- 1. There will be temporary degradation of water quality.
- 2. There will be a temporary stream diversion.
- 3. There will be temporary degradation of air quality.
- 4. There will be temporary delays and detours of traffic.
- 5. There will be temporary impacts on businesses.
- 6. There will be temporary noise impacts.
- 7. There will be other construction impacts (e.g. TCEs/TCPs, utility relocates, staging areas, etc.).

P. Construction Impacts

N/A YES NO

- 8. Summarize construction impacts and mitigation for each 'yes' above. *Include any commitments or mitigative measures in Section V.*

Water Quality

A temporary deterioration of water quality may result during project construction due to replacing culverts (stream diversion), constructing passing lanes, realigning a road segment and to a minor increase of erosion and other pollutants entering storm water runoff. Implementing a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) and best management practices (BMPs) would help alleviate temporary water quality impacts.

It's the awarded contractor's responsibility to select the construction methods for each respective culvert installation. However, whether the method is a temporary stream diversion or pump-around coordination with the ADF&G Habitat and Restoration Division to ensure there would not be an adverse effect to EFH will be required.

Air Quality

Temporary impacts to air quality may result during project construction from increased equipment exhaust and dust upheaval due to ground disturbance and hauling materials. Abatement measures such as watering disturbed ground would help alleviate air quality deterioration. No permanent impacts to air quality would result from the proposed project.

Traffic

Temporary delays in traffic, rerouting of traffic, and rerouting of access to local properties may occur during project construction. However, these would be temporary delays; there would be no permanent blocking of access to businesses and residents due to the proposed project. A traffic control plan would be implemented and the public notified prior to construction.

Noise Levels

A temporary increase in noise levels would result during project construction due to the use of heavy equipment and other general construction activities. This could potentially disrupt the normal foraging and breeding behavior of wildlife species however, wildlife near the highway are acclimated to the noise produced by the existing highway traffic conditions. In addition, temporary noise increases could affect nearby residences. However, noise impacts during construction would be temporary and not result in a substantial increase in noise levels throughout the project area.

Utility Relocate

There is a fiber optic cable, owned by GCI, that's buried within DOT&PF's ROW along the project corridor. GCI has waived their relocation rights for this cable and would be responsible for its relocation, if necessary. The DOT&PF will keep GCI informed of the project's construction schedule so that GCI can relocation their cable concurrently with the project's construction if they chose to do so.

Refer to Section VI for environmental commitments and mitigation measures regarding project construction.

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

YES NO

- 1. Section 4(f) ([23 CFR 774](#))

- a. Was detailed Section 4(f) resource identification conducted for this project, other than that required for Section 106 compliance? *If no, attach consultation with the NEPA Program Manager stating further Section 4(f) resource identification was not required.* *

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

YES NO

- b. Does a Section 4(f) resource exist within the project area; or is the project adjacent to a Section 4(f) resource? *If yes, attach consultation with the NEPA Program Manager to determine applicability of Section 4(f). If no, skip to Q.2.* *
 - c. Does an exception listed in [23 CFR 774.13](#) apply to this project? *If yes, attach consultation with the NEPA Program Manager, and documentation from the official with jurisdiction, if required.* *
 - d. Does the project result in the “use” of a Section 4(f) property? “Use” includes a permanent incorporation of land, adverse temporary occupancy, or constructive use. *If no, attach consultation with the NEPA Program Manager and skip to Q.2.* *
 - e. Has a *de minimis* impact finding been prepared for the project? *If yes, attach the finding.* *
 - f. Has a Programmatic Section 4(f) Evaluation been prepared for the project? *If yes, attach the evaluation.* *
 - g. Has an Individual Section 4(f) Evaluation been prepared for the project? *If yes, attach the evaluation.* *
2. Section 6(f) (36 CFR 59)
- a. Were funds from the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act (LWCFA) used for improvement to a property that will be affected by this project?
 - b. 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 Administrator.*

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

YES NO

3. Summarize Section 4(f)/6(f) involvement, if any:
 There is an existing culvert at the highway crossing of the Pass Creek Tributary that was installed in the 1960s and its current condition does not allow for fish passage. The replacement culvert has been designed to provide efficient fish passage; in accordance with the Memorandum of Agreement between Alaska Department of Fish and Game [ADF&G] and Alaska Department of Transportation and Public Facilities for the Design, Permitting, and Construction of Culverts for Fish Passage, August 3, 2001, where it's mutually agreed upon that when it's been "...determined that culverts are the appropriate stream crossing structure and are utilized in fish-bearing waters, they are designed and installed to provide efficient fish passage ...".

The DOT&PF ROW at the location of the Pass Creek Tributary (MP 165.2) extends 200-feet from centerline towards the west (downstream) and 100-feet from centerline towards the east (Figure 2).

Through consultations between the ADF&G Division of Habitat and the DOT&PF Hydraulics Department it's been determined that due to the requirements of the culvert design, land outside the DOT&PF ROW and within the boundary of Denali State Park would be temporarily impacted by the action of re-grading the stream channel above the culvert's inlet to provide for efficient fish passage.

The Denali State Park is a 4(f) resource. However, the DOT&PF Statewide NEPA Manager, has determined that the Pass Creek Tributary culvert installation activities (described above) proposed to occur within Denali State Park as part of the Parks Highway MP 163-183 Rehabilitation project meet the conditions of Section 4(f) exception 23 CFR 774.13(d) for temporary occupancies of land that are so minimal as to not constitute a use within the meaning of Section 4(f). As such, the DOT&PF Statewide NEPA Manager "has determined that Section 4(f) does not apply." Determination documents are provided in Appendix G.

The Alaska Department of Natural Resources (DNR), Division of Parks and Outdoor Recreation has accepted grants from the U.S. Department of the Interior Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) to both acquire property and to develop areas within the Denali State Park. As such, the area is protected under Section 6(f)(3) of the Land and Water Conservation Fund (LWCF) Act of 1965, and the Park property must be protected in perpetuity for public outdoor recreation use. On June 18, 2015, the Grants Administrator for the DNR Division of Parks and Outdoor Recreation determined that "Based on the information provided in the proposal I [DNR Grants Administrator] determine that no 6(f)(3) protected property will be converted to other than public outdoor recreational use. The proposed work will not result in a negative impact on the current or future recreational usefulness of the area." Consultation and determination document are provided in Appendix G.

III. Permits and Authorizations

N/A YES NO

- | | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1. USACE, Section 404/10 Includes Abbreviated Permit Process, Nationwide Permit, and General Permit | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Coast Guard, Section 9 | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. ADF&G Fish Habitat Permit (Title 16.05.871 and Title 16.05.841) | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 4. Flood Hazard | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 5. ADEC Non-domestic Wastewater Plan Approval | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 6. ADEC 401 | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 7. ADEC APDES | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 8. Noise | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 9. Eagle Permit | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

III. Permits and Authorizations

N/A YES NO

10. Other. If yes, list below.

DNR, Division of Parks and Outdoor Recreation's Special Park Use Permit; required for the culvert installation activities proposed to occur within Denali State Park at the Pass Creek Tributary near MP 162.2. On November 23, 2015 the DNR issued the DOT&PF this required Special Park Use Permit; Permit No. LAS 30386 (Appendix H).

IV. Comments and Coordination

N/A YES NO

1. Public/agency involvement for project. *Required if protected resources are involved.*

2. Public Meetings. Date(s): DOT&PF conducted public meetings and posted flyers in the communities along the project road corridor for the Parks Highway MP 163-305 Passing Lanes project (No. 63515) in 2010. No comments were noted for the passing lanes in this MP 163-183 segment.

3. Newspaper ads. *Attach certified affidavit of publication as an appendix.*

Name of newspaper and date: Fairbanks Daily News Miner; October 19 & 26, 2014

4. Alaska Online Public Notice date: October 14, 2014

5. Agency scoping letters. Date sent: October 14, 2014

6. Agency scoping meeting. Date of meeting: NA

7. Field review. Date: NA

8. Summarize comments and coordination efforts for this project. Discuss pertinent issues raised. *Attach correspondence that demonstrates coordination and that there are no unresolved issues.*

Agency Scoping letters were sent and comments were received from the DNR Office of History and Archaeology, ADEC, MSB, ADFG and FWS.

ADFG advised that in-water work timing window is May 15—July 15. ADEC advised a 401 Water Quality Certification or waiver would be required, confirmed no impaired water bodies would be crossed, and the new Excavation Dewatering General Permit removed the volume threshold and reduced distance threshold to a contaminated site from 1 mile to 1,500 feet. MSB advised about activities that would require a MSB Permit (material sites, work in floodplains, and material sites in Denali State Park). No unusual circumstances or potential adverse impacts were identified.

In compliance with the Migratory Bird Treaty Act, the awarded contractor is to avoid land disturbance and vegetation clearing activities during the nesting season. The FWS's Timing Recommendations for Land Disturbance & Vegetative Clearing, published June 2017, recommends the time periods to avoid land disturbance and vegetation clearing for the Interior Region is May 1 through July 15.

Refer to Appendix I for copies of the scoping letters and responses, affidavits of publication in the Fairbanks Daily News Miner.

V. Environmental Commitments and Mitigation Measures

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

The awarded contractor will be required to coordinate with the ADEC and follow their guidance for the contaminated site at the MP 169 railroad crossing.

VII. Environmental Documentation Approval Signatures

Non-Programmatic CE

Approval

Recommended by:

Brett Nelson
[Signature] Regional Environmental Manager

Date:

9-10-18

Brett Nelson
[Print Name] Regional Environmental Manager

Approved by:

[Signature]
[Signature] NEPA Program Manager

Date:

09/11/18

Melissa Goldstein
[Print Name] NEPA Program Manager