MEMORANDUM

State of Alaska

Department of Transportation and Public Facilities
Central Region Design and Engineering Services
Preliminary Design and Environmental

To:	Taylor Horne 6004 NEPA Program Manager	Date:	8/13/2012
From:	Brian Elliott BE Regional Environmental Manager	Project Name:	Abbott Road Rehabilitation
Subject:	Programmatic Categorical Exclusion (PCE)	Project No:	53942/STP-MGS-0506(3)

The subject project is assigned to the DOT&PF in accordance with Section 6004(a) of the *Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users* (SAFETEA-LU). The project meets the criteria for classification as a categorical exclusion per 23 CFR 771.117(d)(1) and meets the conditions outlined in the April 23, 2009, Programmatic Categorical Approval 2.

Enclosures: PCE Documentation

cc: Matt Dietrick, Environmental Impact Analyst, PD&E (w/o attachment)
Angela Hunt, Environmental Team Leader, PD&E (w/o attachment)
Gerry Welsh, P.E., Project Manager, PD&E (w/ attachment)

State of Alaska
Department of Transportation & Public Facilities

CATEGORICAL EXCLUSION DOCUMENTATION FORM
FOR FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION PROJECTS

Project Name: Abbott Road Rehabilitation
Project Number (state/federal):53942/STP-MGS-0506(3)
Date: 8/13/2012
CE Designation: *Include all that apply.*
23 CFR 771.117(d)(1)
23 CFR 771.117( )( )
List of Attachments: Figure 1: Location and Vicinity Map
Figures 2A-D: Project Information
Appendix A: Section 106 Consultation
Appendix B: Wetland Delineation Trip Report
Appendix C: Phase I Environmental Site Assessment
Appendix D: Traffic Noise Study
Appendix E: Section 4(f) Resource Information and Consultation
Appendix F: Agency and Public Coordination

I. Project Purpose and Need

The Alaska Department of Transportation & Public Facilities (DOT&PF), in accordance with Section 6004(a) of the *Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users* (SAFETEA-LU), is proposing to rehabilitate Abbott Road between Lake Otis Parkway and Birch Road in Anchorage, Alaska (Figure 1). The proposed project is located in the southeast corner of Anchorage, an area that is known locally as the Hillside. This segment of Abbott Road has a high level of congestion, with drivers experiencing delays and long queues during morning and evening commutes. Crash rate analysis indicates this segment of Abbott Road has one of the highest crash rates of any Hillside roadway. The purpose of the proposed project is to extend the service life of the facility, enhance safety, and improve traffic flow.

II. Project Description

The proposed project would (Figures 2A-D):

- Widen the existing facility from two to three lanes along the existing alignment
  - This includes one lane in each direction and the addition of a center two-way-left-turn-lane
- Add an eastbound auxiliary lane approximately 1,800 feet in length beginning at Lake Otis Parkway
- Add an eastbound right turn lane from Abbott Road onto Birch Road
- Flatten vertical curves
- Rehabilitate existing pathway on north side of the road with minor re-alignments as necessary
- Clear vegetation along roadside

- Replace the Little Campbell Creek culvert
- Replace or upgrade guardrail, signs, and striping, as needed
- Provide a short pathway on the south side of the road between Nickel Circle and Autumn Ridge Circle
- Install school zone signage and flashing yellow beacons as needed, dependent on coordination with the Anchorage School District

III. Environmental Consequences

- For each yes, summarize the activity evaluated, the magnitude of the impact and the potential for significant impact based on context and intensity.
- For any consequence category with an asterisk (*), an avoidance alternatives analysis is required. Attach avoidance alternatives analysis as appropriate.
- Include direct and indirect impacts in each analysis.

A. Right-of-Way Impacts	N/A	YES	NO
1. Additional right-of-way required.		☒	☐
a. Permanent easements required.	☐	☐	☒
b. Estimated number of parcels: N/A			
c. Full or partial property acquisition required.	☐	☒	☐
d. Estimated number of full parcels: 0			
e. Estimated number of partial parcels: 24			
f. Property transfer from state or federal agency required. *If yes, list agency in No. 4 below.*	☐	☐	☒
g. Business or residential relocations required. *If yes, summarize the findings of the conceptual stage relocation study in No. 4 below and attach the conceptual stage relocation study.*	☐	☐*	☒
h. Number of relocations: N/A			
i. Type of relocation: Residential: ☐ Business: ☐ Residential (Indicate number: N/A) Business (Indicate number: N/A)			
j. Last-resort housing required.	☐	☐	☒
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 (DOT Order 6640.23, December 1998)?		☐	☒
3. The project will involve use of ANILCA land that requires an ANILCA Tile XI approval. *If yes, the project is not assigned to the State per SAFETEA-LU Section 6004 MOU and the CE must be processed by FHWA.*		☐	☒

4. Summarize the right-of-way impacts, if any:

The proposed project would require the partial acquisition of 24 parcels, but would not precipitate any business or residential relocations. Acquisition of this land is necessary to accommodate the wider road surface. Parcels for acquisition were identified at various locations along the corridor and are considered "strip takes." The size of each strip take varies widely, but the total area of acquisition is approximately two acres. Right-of-way requirements will be refined as additional

design information becomes available. The partial acquisitions would not have disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects on minority or low-income populations. Adverse right-of-way (ROW) impacts are not likely as a result of the proposed project.

B. Social and Cultural 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.		☒	☐
4. The project will affect the elderly, handicapped, nondrivers, transit-dependent, minority and ethnic groups, or the economically disadvantaged.		☐	☒
5. There are unresolved project issues or concerns of a local Indian tribe [as defined in 36 CFR 800.16(m)]. *If yes, the project is not assigned to the State per SAFETEA-LU Section 6004 MOU and the CE must be processed by FHWA.*		☐	☒

6. Summarize the social and cultural impacts, if any:

The proposed project will permanently improve travel conditions and accessibility along Abbott Road by providing dedicated lane space for turning vehicle movements. Removing turning vehicles from through-traffic lanes improves flow and reduces travel times. The project would also improve traffic safety by bringing a portion of the roadway up to current design standards. Creation of a school zone would increase safety for vehicles and pedestrians by providing reduced speed limits and signage warning motorists of increased foot traffic. A school zone may increase travel times in the near vicinity.

The proposed project would not generate adverse impacts to any social group, school, recreation area, or church. Since the road already exists and divides major neighborhoods, the project would not add to the divide or disruption of these established communities or impact planned community development.

C. Economic Impacts	N/A	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.		☐	☒
2. The project will adversely affect established businesses or business districts.		☐	☒

3. Summarize the economic impacts, if any:

There are few established businesses and no business districts located in the vicinity of the proposed project. The few businesses present are destination locations and are not likely to experience permanent impacts from the project. Access to these businesses will not be permanently altered and would be maintained during construction. The proposed project would improve the safety and efficiency of travel along Abbott Road which may result in positive economic benefits through improved travel conditions along the corridor. No adverse, long-term impacts to the local economy are anticipated. Economic impacts during construction are discussed in Section III, Part P.

D. **Land Use and Transportation Plans**	N/A	YES	NO
1. Project is consistent with land use plan(s).	☐	☒	☐
a. Identify the land use plan(s) and date Anchorage 2020: Anchorage Bowl Comprehensive Plan, November 2000			
2. Project is consistent with transportation plan(s).	☐	☒	☐
a. Identify the local transportation plan(s) and date. AMATS 2010-2013 Transportation Improvement Program; Anchorage Bowl 2025 Long Range Transportation Plan, December 2005			
3. Project would induce adverse indirect and cumulative effects.		☐	☒

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

Land use in the proposed project area is primarily residential, with some institutional and recreational uses also present. There are also a few businesses located along the corridor. Municipality of Anchorage (MOA) zoning maps show all adjacent property is zoned for residential or public lands and institutional use. Although not specifically identified in the Anchorage Bowl Comprehensive Plan, the project is consistent with its goals of improving transportation infrastructure. Because the majority of the project area is already developed for residential use and the project is simply enhancing traffic flow without increasing capacity, changes in future land use are not likely.

As currently proposed, the project is consistent with the scope described in the AMATS Transportation Improvement Plan. The Anchorage Bowl Long Range Transportation Plan does not specifically identify the proposed project, but recommends upgrades to east-west arterials in the Southeast Anchorage area. The proposed project is consistent with the goals of all transportation and land use plans and no adverse, direct, indirect, or cumulative impacts to local land use or transportation systems are foreseen.

E. **Impacts to Historic Properties**	N/A	YES	NO
1. Does the project qualify as a listed activity that has no potential to cause effects to historic properties? *If yes, attach concurrence from the FHWA Area Engineer (non-assigned projects) or Statewide NEPA Manager or regional Professionally Qualified Individual for 6004-assigned projects.*		☐	☒
a. Indicate the appropriate policy directive or memo that qualifies the project for no potential to cause effects to historic properties: N/A			
2. Is a National Register of Historic Places listed or eligible property in the Area of Potential Effect?	☐	☐	☒

3. Date Consultation/Initiation Letters sent 4/20/2012 *Attach copies to this form. If no letters sent, explain why not in E.9.*

a. List consulting parties State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), MOA, Cook Inlet Region, Inc. (CIRI), Eklutna, Inc., Native Village of Eklutna

E. Impacts to Historic Properties N/A YES NO

b. If no letters were sent, explain why not N/A

4. Date "Finding of Effect" Letters sent 7/3/2012 *Attach copies to this form*
   a. State any changes to consulting parties None
5. List responding consulting parties, comment date, and summarize:
   - SHPO, 7/19/2012, Concurred with finding
   - MOA, 7/9/2012, No comments
   - Eklutna, Inc., 7/24/2012, No comments
   - CIRI and Native Village of Eklutna, Contacted on 7/24/2012 to confirm they have no comments, but did not receive a response

6. Are there any unresolved issues with consulting parties? ☐ ☐ ☒
   a. If yes, list N/A
7. Date SHPO concurred with "Finding of Effect" 7/19/2012 *Attach copy to this form.*
8. Will there be an adverse effect on a historic property? *If yes, attach correspondence and signed MOA. If yes, Programmatic Agreements (PCEs) do not apply.* ☐ ☐ ☒
9. Summarize any effects to historic properties. *List affected sites (by AHRS number only) and any commitments or mitigative measures. Also include any commitments or mitigative measures in Section VI.*

The Area of Potential Effect (APE) for the proposed project includes all areas anticipated to be disturbed by construction and the first row of adjacent properties that are within the viewshed of the proposed project. The limits of construction disturbance consist of the road surface and generally extend up to 100-feet from the existing roadway centerline where widening and vegetation clearing would occur.

Efforts to identify historic properties within the APE included a review of the Alaska Heritage Resources Survey (1/20/2012) and informal consultations with the SHPO. A building survey was also conducted to assess eligibility of structures over 45 years in age. No eligible historic properties were identified as a result of these efforts. The SHPO concurred with a "finding of no historic properties affected" on 7/19/2012. No other consulting parties responded with comments. See Appendix A for Section 106 consultation documentation.

F. Wetland Impacts N/A YES NO

1. Project affects 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. 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): 0.77
4. Estimated fill quantities (cubic yards): 5,500
5. Estimated dredge quantities (cubic yards): 3,900
6. Is a USACE authorization anticipated? ☐ ☒ ☐
   If yes, identify type: NWP ☒ Individual ☐ General Permit ☐ Other ☐

F. Wetland Impacts

	N/A	YES	NO
7. Wetlands Finding			
Attach the 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.*			
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, if any:

The DOT&PF performed a wetland delineation of the project area in November 2004. Results of the delineation show several Class A wetland areas located adjacent to the proposed project area on the south side of the roadway between Lake Otis Parkway and Elmore Road (see Figures 2A and 2B). These wetlands are either adjacent or possibly connected by subsurface hydrology to the South Fork of Little Campbell Creek. The wetland locations were re-verified by checking the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) National Wetlands Inventory (NWI) and MOA Wetland Mapper (reviewed 1/10/2012). Both sources are consistent with the results of the 2004 DOT&PF wetland delineation. Additionally, there has been no development in the vicinity of the identified wetlands since 2004 that would affect their wetland status or alter their size.

Impacts to these wetlands would result from the placement of fill to construct an eastbound auxiliary lane beginning at Lake Otis Parkway and extending approximately 1,800 feet to the east. The existing alignment of Abbott Road is directly adjacent to these wetlands and total avoidance of wetland impacts is not feasible in order to meet the purpose and need for the project. Relocating or realigning the highway is not reasonable or feasible due to high construction costs and ROW requirements. Only the minimum amount of fill necessary to construct and protect the new road embankment would be placed into wetlands. Side slopes could be steepened and headwalls could be used to minimize the project footprint within wetland resources. The contractor will use clean fill material for this project. As further design information becomes available, compensatory mitigation for unavoidable wetland impacts will be determined in accordance with USACE Section 404(b)(1) guidelines and the Anchorage Wetland Debit-Credit Analysis. See Appendix B for the 2004 DOT&PF wetland delineation trip report.

G. **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 USACE, Section 404.	☐	☒*	☐
4. Project affects Navigable Waters of the U.S. as defined by the USACE (Section 10)	☐	☐*	☒
5. Project affects a resident fish stream (i.e. A.S. 16.14.841)	☐	☒	☐
6. Project affects a cataloged anadromous fish stream (i.e. A.S. 16.14.871).	☐	☒*	☐
7. Project affects 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 Statewide NEPA Manager for 6004 (assigned CEs) or FHWA Area Engineer and FHWA Environmental Program Manager (non-assigned CEs) to determine applicability of Section 4(f).*		☐	☒
8. Proposed water body involvement: Bridge ☐ Culvert ☒ Embankment Fill ☐ Relocation ☐ Diversion ☒ Temporary ☒ Permanent ☐ Other ☐	☐		
9. Type of stream or river habitat impacted: Spawning ☒ Rearing ☒ Pool ☐ Riffle ☐ Undercut bank ☐ Other ☐	☐		

10. Amount of fill below (cubic yards): OHW 300 MHW _____ HTL _____

11. Summarize the water body impacts, if any:

The South Fork of Little Campbell Creek passes underneath the roadway in a culvert located between Little Creek Drive and Little Brook Street (see Figure 2B) and drains into Turnagain Arm, a traditional navigable water. Replacement of the culvert is anticipated as part of the proposed project and would require the discharge of a minor amount of fill material below OHW. However, only the minimum amount of fill necessary to replace the culvert and protect the road embankment would be placed into waters of the U.S. The contractor will use clean fill material for this project. The new culvert will be designed in accordance with the *Memorandum of Agreement between ADF&G and DOT&PF for the Design, Permitting, and Construction of Culverts for Fish Passage.* Because the affected stream reach is already contained within a culvert and the project only proposes to replace the culvert, adverse impacts to the Creek are not likely to occur. The new culvert design will remove the perched outlet and have a reduced gradient that will improve stream conditions and fish passage near the culvert. The new culvert will also reduce scour and erosion effects at the inlet and outlet. Construction impacts are discussed in Section III, Part P.

H. **Fish and Wildlife**	N/A	YES	NO
1. Anadromous or resident fish habitat.			
a. Database name(s) and date(s) queried: ADF&G Atlas to the Catalog of Waters Important to the Spawning, Rearing or Migration of Anadromous Fishes, reviewed 8/7/2012			
b. Anadromous or resident fish habitat present in project area		☒*	☐
c. Adverse effect on spawning habitat.	☐	☐*	☒
d. Adverse effect on rearing habitat.	☐	☐*	☒
e. Adverse effect on migration corridors.	☐	☐*	☒

H. Fish and Wildlife	N/A	YES	NO
f. Adverse effect on subsistence species.	☐	☐*	☒
2. Essential Fish Habitat (EFH).			
a. Database name(s) and date(s) queried: ADF&G Atlas to the Catalog of Waters Important to the Spawning, Rearing or Migration of Anadromous Fishes, reviewed 8/7/2012			
b. EFH present in project area.		☒	☐
c. Project proposes construction in EFH. *If yes, describe EFH impacts in H.5.*	☐	☒	☐
d. Project may adversely affect EFH. *If yes, attach EFH Assessment.*	☐	☐*	☒
e. 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 VI).*	☒	☐	☐
3. Wildlife Resources (game/subsistence species):			
a. Project is in area of high wildlife/vehicle accidents.		☐	☒
b. Project would bisect migration corridors.		☐	☒
c. Project would segment habitat.		☐	☒
d. Project would adversely affect species of concern to ADF&G. *If yes, attach appropriate documentation from ADF&G that demonstrates the project would not result in significant adverse impacts.*		☐*	☒
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) : USFWS Alaska Bald Eagle Nest Atlas, reviewed 1/9/2012			
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. Summarize fish and wildlife impacts, if any:

Anadromous, Resident, and Essential Fish Habitat

The South Fork of Little Campbell Creek is the only anadromous fish stream (AWC No. 247-60-10340-2018-3006) located within the project area. It passes underneath the project roadway in a culvert located between Little Creek Drive and Little Brook Street (see Figure 2B) and is proposed for replacement. The Creek supports Coho Salmon (*Oncorhynchus kisutch*) spawning and rearing habitat and Dolly Varden (*Salvelinus malma*) are present. Work below OHW would be required to replace the culvert, including the permanent placement of fill. All disturbed areas would be stabilized and revegetated in accordance with the Alaska Pollution Discharge Elimination System (APDES) Construction General Permit for Storm Water Discharges from Large and Small Construction Sites, the Alaska Department of Natural Resources Re-vegetation Manual for Alaska and an ADF&G Title 16 Fish Habitat Permit. The culvert is currently assumed inadequate for fish passage by the ADF&G, but the new culvert design and installation will follow the *Memorandum of Agreement between ADF&G and DOT&PF for the Design, Permitting, and*

Construction of Culverts for Fish Passage. The new culvert will improve anadromous, resident, and essential fish habitat by making more stream habitat available and providing easier migration for fish. Because of this long term benefit, no permanent, adverse impacts resulting from replacement of this culvert were identified.

Pursuant to section 305(b)(2) and 305(b)(4)(B) of the Magnuson-Stevens Act, DOT&PF has determined that there would be no adverse effects to EFH from the proposed project. The long-term, post construction effects are expected to be beneficial to EFH by improving fish passage and habitat. The proposed project would temporarily disturb Little Campbell Creek within the project area during construction and is discussed in Section III, Part P.

Wildlife Resources

The proposed project area does not have a disproportionately high rate of wildlife/vehicle accidents and will not further bisect migration corridors or segment habitat. A wider road surface may be more difficult for wildlife to negotiate. Migratory bird species may pass through the proposed project area and could be affected by vegetation clearing activities. Clearing activities would be performed within existing ROW and generally extend up to 100 feet from the existing roadway centerline. However, the majority of existing ROW has been previously cleared and the loss of potential habitat will be negligible. The loss of additional vegetation through clearing of newly acquired ROW is not anticipated to adversely impact birds or wildlife due to the abundance of similar habitat in the area. All vegetation clearing activities will follow the USFWS *Recommended Time Periods for Avoiding Vegetation Clearing in Alaska in Order to Protect Migratory Birds* advisory. If clearing during sensitive time periods is necessary, the DOT&PF will consult with the USFWS for guidance on how to proceed. No adverse impacts to wildlife resources are anticipated.

Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act

No Bald Eagle nests have been identified within 0.5 mile of the project area and no adverse impacts to Bald Eagles (*Haliaeetus leucocephalus*), Golden Eagles (*Aquila chrysaetos*), their habitat, or nesting areas as a result of the proposed project are anticipated. It is unlikely that Eagles or their nest will be found near the project due to existing anthropogenic disturbance and presence of less disturbed habitat in the project vicinity. Should they become necessary, Section VI of this document provides measures to prevent disturbance to these species during construction.

I. Threatened and Endangered Species (T&E)	N/A	YES	NO
1. Database name(s) and date(s) queried: USFWS and ADF&G threatened and endangered species list, 8/7/2012			
2. Listed threatened or endangered species present in the project area.		☐	☒
3. Threatened or endangered species migrate through the project area.		☐	☒
4. Proposed species present in project area.		☐	☒
5. Candidate species present in project area.		☐	☒

I. Threatened and Endangered Species (T&E)	N/A	YES	NO
6. Project is likely to adversely affect a listed T&E species or critical habitat. *If yes, formal Section 7 consultation is required. The project is not assigned to the State per SAFETEA-LU Section 6004 MOU and the CE must processed by FHWA.*		☐	☒

7. Summarize the findings of the biological assessment and the opinion of the agency with jurisdiction, or state why no biological assessment was conducted:

No threatened or endangered species with ranges that include the proposed project area were identified. Adverse impacts to this resource are not anticipated.

J. Invasive Species	N/A	YES	NO
1. Does the project include all practicable measures to minimize the introduction or spread invasive species?		☒	☐
a. If yes, list measures: see J.4			
2. Database name(s) and date(s) queried: Alaska Exotic Plants Information Clearinghouse, 8/7/2012			
3. The project is consistent with E.O. 13112 (Invasive Species)		☒	☐

4. Summarize invasive species impacts, if any:

Invasive plant species were identified near the proposed project area. The DOT&PF will comply with all federal, state, and local laws and regulations regarding invasive species during construction of the proposed project. Any erosion control materials made from straw or hay will be made from certified weed free straw or hay. If certified materials are not available, locally produced products will be used to minimize potential importation of new weed propagules from outside Alaska. All disturbed areas will be reseeded with certified weed-free seed and vegetated with native species in accordance with the DNR re-vegetation manual.

K. Hazardous Waste	N/A	YES	NO
1. Database name(s) and date(s) queried: ADEC Contaminated Sites Mapper, 8/7/2012			
2. There are potentially contaminated sites within or adjacent to the existing and/or proposed ROW.		☐	☒
3. There are identified contaminated sites within or adjacent to the existing and/or proposed ROW.		☐	☒
4. Extensive excavation is proposed adjacent to, or within, a known hazardous waste site, or the potential for encountering hazardous waste during construction is high. *If yes, attach the hazardous waste investigation report and approved ADEC Corrective Action Plan.*		☐*	☒

5. Summarize the hazardous waste impacts, if any:

A Phase I Environmental Site Assessment (ESA) of the Abbott Road ROW was completed in August 2005. The ADEC Contaminated Sites Mapper was reviewed 8/7/2012 and does not show any active contaminated sites located within 0.5 mile of the project area. The Phase I ESA revealed the following recognized environmental conditions in connection with the project area:

- Limited soil and groundwater contamination might exist in isolated pockets

close to the subject property. The site assessment provides a map showing the properties where cleanup actions have been conducted.

- A diesel spill occurred at 9441 Abbott Loop Road (Sonshine Enterprises), but the contamination extent has not been defined (site not identified on ADEC mapper). Groundwater in this area flows from the spill site towards the project, but there is low potential for impact because the site is more than 500 feet south of the proposed project area.
- Information regarding PCB content of one electrical transformer on the subject property is not available. Prior to construction, its contents should be sampled to verify the absence or presence of PCBs.

As additional design information becomes available, excavation or drilling activities that may affect these areas will be determined and proceed in accordance with ADEC and EPA regulations. Adverse impacts resulting from hazardous waste are not anticipated. Measures for dealing with unexpected hazardous waste encounters are stated in Section VI. See Appendix C for the Phase I ESA report.

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.*		☒	☐
2. 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: 4/8/2011			
3. The project is exempt from an air quality analysis per 40 CFR 93.126 (Table 2 and Exempt Projects). *A project-level air quality conformity analysis 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.*	☐	☐	☒
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.*	☒	☐*	☐
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, if any:

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency's list of Maintenance Areas for Carbon Monoxide (CO) in Alaska (reviewed 1/20/2012) shows a portion of the proposed project to be located within a CO maintenance area. The maintenance area extends from the centerline of Lake Otis Parkway (beginning of project) to 500-feet east of

the centerline of Lake Otis Parkway along Abbott Road. The project as proposed is identified in the conforming AMATS 2010-2013 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP). A CO project-level analysis (hot spot analysis) was not required because the proposed project does not meet any of the conditions outlined in 40 CFR 93.123(a)(1)(i-iv) that would require the analysis. Construction of an eastbound auxiliary from Lake Otis Parkway would improve the roadway Level-of-Service, further reducing the possibility of a localized CO violation. Adverse air quality impacts are not anticipated as a result of the proposed project. Air Quality impacts during construction are discussed in Section III, Part P.

M. Floodplain 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 in M.7.and attach the "Location Hydraulic Study" developed per 23 CFR 650.111.*		☐*	☒
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. Is there significant encroachment as defined by 23 CFR 650.105(q)? *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 approval.*		☐*	☒
5. Project conforms to local flood hazard requirements.	☐	☒	☐
6. Project is consistent with E.O. 11988 (Floodplain Protection). *If no, the project cannot be approved as proposed.*		☒	☐

7. Summarize floodplain impacts, if any:

The Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) Flood Maps (reviewed 1/20/2012) show the proposed project to be located within areas designated as Zone X. Zone X areas are determined to be outside the 0.2% annual chance floodplain. The proposed project is located on FEMA Flood Insurance Rate Map numbers 020005 0764D and 020005 0768D (revised September 25, 2009). The proposed project will not alter existing drainage patterns along the length of the project and adverse impacts to this resource are not anticipated.

N. Noise Impacts (23 CFR Part 772)	N/A	YES	NO
1. Does the project involve any of the following?		☒	☐

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

N.	**Noise Impacts (23 CFR Part 772)**	N/A	YES	NO
	an auxiliary lane.			
	g. Addition of a new or substantial alteration of a weigh station, rest stop, ride-share lot or toll plaza.			
2.	Are there noise-sensitive receivers/land uses adjacent to the proposed project?		☒	☐
3.	Identify which category of land uses are adjacent: *If any lands in Categories A through E are identified, and the response to N.1 is yes, a noise analysis is required and must be attached to this document.*			
	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.*	☐	☐	☒

4. Summarize the findings of the attached noise analysis, if required:

A traffic noise study of the proposed project corridor was performed by DOT&PF in May 2012. The purpose of the analysis was to determine if a noise impact would occur as a result of the proposed project and determine if mitigation for that impact would be feasible and reasonable. Receivers for the study were located at various points along the corridor and satisfactorily represent noise levels for all properties adjacent to the roadway. Adjacent land uses are almost exclusively residential, with a properties being institutional and recreational uses.

The FHWA Procedures for Abatement of Highway Traffic Noise and Construction Noise (23 CFR 773, 7/13/2010) and the DOT&PF Noise Policy (April 2011) require consideration of abatement measures if the existing or predicted future traffic noise levels approach within 1 dBA (Hourly A-weighted sound level in decibels) of the FHWA Noise Abatement Criteria (NAC) or if the increase in noise levels is 15 dBA over the existing. For Land Use Categories B and C the NAC is 67 dBA. Results of the analysis indicate that existing noise levels along the corridor are below 66dBA and increases as a result of the proposed project would not be greater than 1.8 dBA. Therefore, a noise impact does not currently exist and would not occur after construction and consideration of noise abatement measures is not warranted. Noise impacts during construction are discussed in Section III, Part P. See Appendix D for the traffic noise study report.

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 water body. *If any of the impaired water bodies 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:

Little Campbell Creek, fecal coliform

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

a. How much of this acreage is within a Section 404 permit area? 1 acre

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?		☒	☐
6. Would the project discharge storm water to a water body within a national park or state park; a national or state wildlife refuge; or a water body designated by ADEC as Tier 3?		☐	☒

a. If yes, list APDES permit number and type*:* AKS-052558

7. Summarize the water quality impacts, if any:

Storm water sheet flows off the roadway and is captured by roadside ditches and cross culverts where it infiltrates the ground or evaporates. At the west end of the project small amounts of storm water may flow into storm drains authorized by the MOA MS4 APDES permit. A small amount of storm water also may flow directly into Little Campbell Creek which is listed on the Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation's (ADEC) Impaired Waters List (reviewed 1/10/2012) as a Category 4a impaired water. The Creek is impaired by elevated levels of fecal coliform from urban runoff and has an established TMDL. The proposed project would increase the amount of impervious surface area and thus the amount of storm water leaving the roadway. However, exceedances of the TMDL due to the proposed project are not anticipated for the following reasons:

- Storm water runoff from road surfaces doesn't usually contain fecal coliform
- The majority of storm water runoff is given the opportunity to infiltrate adjacent ground before reaching the creek

Water quality impacts related to construction are discussed in Section III, Part P.

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.		☒	☐

8. Summarize construction impacts, if any:

Water Quality

Water quality degradation during construction may result from sedimentation of storm water run-off. There is no other pollutant input anticipated during construction. This impact is anticipated to be mitigated by the use of Best Management Practices (BMP) and implementation of a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan in accordance with the APDES CGP.

Stream Diversion

General stream disturbance during this activity may temporarily affect anadromous, resident, and essential fish habitat and fish populations through increased stress levels, avoidance of the area, or physical impariment resulting from the diversion. All in-water construction for this project would be timed to avoid critical life history periods of affected fish species. A diversion may also impact water quality through disruption of sediment. A small amount of temporary fill will likely be required during the diversion, but would be completely removed after the new culvert is installed. All impacts would be relatively short in duration and all reasonable and effective measures would be utilized to protect resident fish populations and maintain water quality.

Air Quality

Air quality degradation during construction may result from equipment exhaust and disturbed soil particles that become airborne. These impacts can be mitigated through use of BMP's such as watering to minimize dust and routine equipment maintenance.

Traffic Impacts

Traffic impacts may include delays or detours for travelers. Other roads in the vicinity of the project may experience increased traffic volume as travelers try to avoid the construction area. These impacts can be mitigated by informing the public of delays in advance through newspaper ads, signage, and other community outreach.

Business Impacts

Impacts to businesses may result from temporary traffic delays, detours, or avoidance of the area by travelers during construction. This may result in reduced business transactions, but the impacts would be temporary and access to all adjacent businesses would be maintained during construction.

Noise Impacts

Noise impacts during construction may be caused by equipment operation, power tools or construction personnel. These impacts can be mitigated by maintaining equipment noise control devices. In order to avoid traffic impacts, construction may take place at night and a noise permit would be obtained from the MOA.

Other Impacts

During construction it may be necessary to obtain temporary construction easements (TCE) or temporary construction permits (TCP). The TCE/TCP may affect the property owner during construction through general construction disturbance, but access will be maintained at all times and all property will be returned to original

condition.

Q. Section 4(f)/6(f) - (23 CFR 774)	N/A	YES	NO
1. Project is adjacent to a Section 4(f) resource. *If yes, consult with the Statewide NEPA Manager for 6004 (assigned CEs) or FHWA Environmental Program Manager (non-assigned CEs) to determine applicability of "constructive use".*		☒	☐
2. Section 4(f) properties would be affected by the proposed action. *Attach documentation of coordination with the land manager or agency with jurisdiction.*		☐	☒
3. There would be a "use" of land from 4(f) properties.		☐	☒
4. The project will require an Individual Section 4(f) Evaluation. *If yes, the project is not assigned to the State per SAFETEA-LU Section 6004 MOU and the CE must processed by FHWA.*		☐	☒
5. Funds from the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act (LWCFA) were used for improvement to a 6(f) property.		☐	☒
6. The project would affect a Section 6(f) property.	☐	☐	☒
7. 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.*	☐	☐	☒
8. Summarize Section 4(f)/6(f) involvement, if any: *Attach "de minimus" finding or4(f) evaluation, if applicable.*			

Three properties protected by Section 4(f) were identified adjacent to the proposed project area, Ruth Arcand Park, Service High School, and Far North Bicentennial Park. On 6/14/2012, the Statewide 6004 NEPA Manager determined that Section 4(f) does not apply.

The National Park Service LWCF list of grants to the Municipality of Anchorage (reviewed 3/16/2012) does not identify any resources protected by Section 6(f) that would be impacted by the proposed project.

See Appendix E for Section 4(f) resource information and Statewide 6004 NEPA Manager consultation documentation.

IV. Permits and Authorizations	N/A	YES	NO
1. USACE, Section 404/10 *Includes Abbreviated Permit Process, Nationwide Permit, and General Permit*		☒	☐
2. Coast Guard, Section 9		☐	☒
3. ADF&G Fish Habitat Permit (T16.871 and 16.841)		☒	☐
4. Flood Hazard		☒	☐
5. ADEC Non-domestic Wastewater Plan Approval		☐	☒
6. ADEC 401		☒	☐
7. ADEC APDES		☒	☐
8. Noise		☒	☐
9. Eagle Permit		☐	☒

IV. Permits and Authorizations

	N/A	YES	NO
10. Other. *If yes, list below.*		☐	☒

V. Comments and Coordination

	N/A	YES	NO
1. Public/agency involvement for project. *Required if protected resources are involved.*		☒	☐
2. Public Meetings. Date(s): 5/22/2012		☒	☐
3. Newspaper ads. *Attach certified affidavit of publication as an appendix.* Name of newspaper and date: Anchorage Daily News, 5/8/2012		☒	☐
4. Agency scoping letters. Date sent: 5/8/2012		☒	☐
5. Agency scoping meeting. Date of meeting: N/A		☐	☒
6. Field review. Date: N/A		☐	☒

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

Public coordination for the proposed project included a Notice of Intent to Begin Engineering and Environmental Studies and public scoping meeting announcement published as indicated above, a State of Alaska on-line public notice, and a project website.

On 5/22/2012, a public meeting was held to present the proposed project design to the public and provide an opportunity for public input about the project. Meeting announcements were mailed to area property owners and local and state officials, published in the Anchorage Daily News, posted on the project website and State of Alaska Public Notices website, and displayed on a roadside message board located on Abbott Road. The meeting was held in the evening at Trailside Elementary School on Abbott Road. In addition to eight DOT&PF staff, 117 people signed in at the meeting.

Approximately 65 public comments were received via comment cards, letters, the website, e-mail, and phone calls. The majority of comments received focused on the following issues:

- Additional traffic noise resulting from road widening and vegetation clearing
- Left turns on to Abbott Road during peak travel times, especially from Spring Hill Drive, Sahalee Drive, and Jupiter Drive
- Project should construct a four lane roadway
- Project should construct a five lane roadway
- Improved sight distance at intersection of Abbott Road and Birch Road
- Additional lighting from Lake Otis Parkway to Elmore Road
- Install a school zone for Trailside Elementary/Service High School
- Right-of-way acquisition
- Support for the project as proposed

The vast majority of comments did not warrant individual responses, but all of them were recorded and will be carried forward and considered during the final design process. Five comments received substantive responses that explained further design information was needed in order to more specifically address project concerns, including congestion, right-of-way requirements, and safety. One response explained the results of the traffic noise study did not warrant analysis noise abatement measures. Further public communication and coordination will be conducted as the design progresses and impacts are more clearly defined.

Agency coordination included scoping letters as indicated above and were delivered to resource agencies, local government, tribes, and native corporations. One response to agency scoping was received from the MOA Flood Hazard Administrator. The comment states that a Flood Hazard Development Permit will be required to replace the Little Campbell Creek Culvert. Prior to construction this permit will be obtained.

Appendix F contains copies of all meeting notification and informational materials, mailing lists, comment cards, comment summary, comment responses, agency scoping materials, and responses from the agency scoping request.

VI. Environmental Commitments and Mitigation Measures

List the environmental commitments or mitigation measures included in the project.

1. If cultural, archaeological, or historical sites are discovered during construction, then all work that may impact these sites would stop. The SHPO would be consulted for guidance on how to proceed.

2. If active Bald or Golden Eagle nests are found within 660 feet of the project area (primary and secondary protection zones), then construction activities would stop and the USFWS would be consulted for guidance on how to proceed is conducted.

3. If contaminated or hazardous materials are encountered during construction, all work in the vicinity of the contaminated site would be stopped and ADEC would be consulted for guidance on how to proceed.

4. The Contractor would be required to create a traffic control plan and provide advance notice to businesses and the public of construction activities that will cause delays, require detours or affect access to adjacent properties.

5. The Contractor would be required to prepare and implement a SWPPP in accordance with DOT&PF's contract specifications and the ADEC CGP for storm water discharge.

6. The Contractor would be responsible for obtaining all necessary permits and clearances for material and disposal sites, and borrow or equipment storage areas, including compliance with the APDES CGP for storm water discharge.

7. Vegetation clearing will follow the USFWS Recommended Time Periods for Avoiding Vegetation Clearing in Alaska in order to protect Migratory Birds unless the USFWS has been consulted to determine the most appropriate method to avoid impacts to nesting birds.

8. Air quality BMP's such as watering, sweeping, maintaining construction exits, and equipment emission control devices would be used to maintain air quality.

VII. Environmental Documentation Approval

	N/A	YES	NO
1. Do any unusual circumstances exist, as described in 23 C.F.R. 771.117 (b)? *If yes, the CE Documentation form cannot be approved.*		☐	☒
2. The State has determined that the project has no significant impacts on the environment and that the project is categorically excluded from the requirements to prepare an EA or EIS under NEPA. The State has been assigned, and hereby certifies that it has carried out, the responsibility to make this determination pursuant to Chapter 3 of title 23, United States Code, Section 326 and the MOU dated September 22, 2009 executed between the FHWA and the State. *If no, the CE must be approved by FHWA.*		☒	☐
3. The project meets the criteria of a DOT&PF programmatic agreement. *If yes, the CE may be approved by the Regional Environmental Manager and would require Statewide concurrence (see shaded block). If no, the CE may be approved by a Statewide NEPA Manager for 6004.*	☐	☒[1]	☐
If yes, identify programmatic agreement name, date, and number: Programmatic Categorical Exclusions for Use on Federal Aid Highway Program Projects Authorized Under the State Assumption of Responsibilities for Categorical Exclusions Pursuant to 23 U.S.C. 326 August 23, 2009 Programmatic Approval 2			
4. The project meets the criteria of a FHWA programmatic agreement. *If yes, the CE may be approved by the Regional Environmental Manager and would require FHWA concurrence (see shaded block). If no, the CE may be approved by FHWA Area Engineer.*	☒	☐[1]	☐
If yes, identify programmatic agreement name and date:			

VIII. Environmental Documentation Approval Signatures

Prepared by: Matt Dietrick Date: 8/14/2012
[Signature] Environmental Impact Analyst

Matt Dietrick
[Print Name] Environmental Impact Analyst

Reviewed by: [signature] Date: 8/14/12
[Signature] Engineering Manager

Kim Stricklan for Gerry Welsh
[Print Name] Engineering Manager

Approved by: Brian Elliott Date: 8/14/12
[Signature] Regional Environmental Manager

Brian Elliott
[Print Name] Regional Environmental Manager

Assigned CE

Approved by: _____ Date: _____
[Signature] DOT&PF Statewide NEPA Manager for 6004

_____
[Print Name] DOT&PF Statewide NEPA Manager for 6004

Non-Assigned CE

Approved by: _____ Date: _____
[Signature] FHWA Area Engineer

_____
[Print Name] FHWA Area Engineer

[1] If the REM indicates that the CE meets the conditions of either a DOT&PF Programmatic Agreement (DOT&PF Statewide NEPA Manager for 6004 verifies) or a FHWA Programmatic Agreement (FHWA Area Engineer verifies) then the appropriate signature is required below:

☒ I concur that this project meets the conditions of the programmatic agreement.
☐ I do not concur that this project meets the conditions of the programmatic agreement.

[signature] Date: 8/17/12
[Signature] DOT&PF Statewide NEPA Manager or FHWA Area Engineer

Taylor C Horne
[Print Name] DOT&PF Statewide NEPA Manager or FHWA Area Engineer