

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 305-325 Reconstruction

**B.** Federal Project Number: 0A45028

**C.** State Project Number: Z606570000

**D.** Primary/Ancillary Project Connections: None

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

**F.** List of Attachments:

Appendix A – Figures

Appendix B – Class of Action

Appendix C – Government to Government

Appendix D – Wetlands

Appendix E – Public Involvement Documentation

Appendix F – Section 106

Appendix G – Noise

Appendix H – Section 4(f)

Appendix I – Location Hydraulic Study

Appendix J – Agency Scoping

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

Reconstruct the Parks Highway including drainage improvements, passing lanes, and replacement of Little Goldstream Creek Bridge No. 678.

**H.** Project Purpose and Need:

The Alaska Department of Transportation and Public Facilities (DOT&PF) is proposing to reconstruct the Parks Highway from MP 305 (Tanana River Bridge No. 202) to MP 325, including drainage improvements, realignment of curves for safety, passing lanes, and replacement of Little Goldstream Creek Bridge No. 678.

One of the primary purposes of this project is to improve the safety of the transportation corridor. Using the most current 10 years of available crash data (2007-2016), this segment of the Parks Highway in Northern Region has the second highest rate of injury and fatal crashes, second only to MP 164-185 which also has a current project in design.

This project will also serve to upgrade this Interstate corridor to eliminate seasonal load restrictions, and enhance commercial and recreational function. New and improved turnouts will also provide commercial and recreational traffic a safe location to rest or chain up prior to negotiating the mountainous terrain between Nenana and Fairbanks.

The Parks Highway is the primary overland route between Alaska’s two largest cities, Anchorage and Fairbanks, and also serves as a tourist corridor for the Denali National Park and Preserve and other scenic interests. Both local and commercial truck utilize this route to deliver goods and services between these two cities and their outliers year round. The highway experiences increasing traffic volumes throughout the summer months due to time-sensitive seasonal activities like construction and tourism.

Currently the highway is subject to seasonal load restrictions resulting in higher costs to commercial operators. Pavement data for the project area indicates that the pavement is nearing the end of its useful life.

The Park Highway in the project area was upgraded in 1967 from the original Nenana-Fairbanks highway (1950’s era construction). It was rehabilitated, paved, and truck climbing lanes added in 1985. Since then there have been two Highway Safety Improvement (HSIP) funded projects linked to the deficient curves in the MP 321 area for enhanced signage. Beyond the HSIP project and occasional M&O projects such as crack sealing the project corridor has remained largely unimproved since the 1985 construction, increasing the risk to travelers of this corridor due to safety deficiencies. In addition to the deficient curves in the MP 321 area, the existing paved surface is in poor condition and there are insufficient cross culverts starting around MP 319 that lead to failed pavement areas and sediment in the ditches. The Little Goldstream Creek Bridge No. 678 is also structurally deficient and functionally obsolete.

**I. Project Description:**

The Parks Highway MP 305 to 325 Reconstruction Project is located between the Tanana River Bridge at Nenana (MP 305) and the Fairbanks North Star Borough boundary (MP 325). The total project length is approximately 19 miles. See Figures 1-5.

This project includes the following work items:

- Road realignments to eliminate sub-standard horizontal and vertical geometry;
- Additional passing and climbing lanes and improvements to existing passing and climbing lanes to meet current standards;
- New and relocated turnouts;
- Pavement section improvements;
- Improved sight distance at intersections;
- New and improved ditching;
- Culvert replacements and installation of new culverts;
- Replacement of the structurally deficient Little Goldstream Creek Bridge (No. 678);
- Signing, striping, tree and brush clearing for visibility, and installation of rumble strips.

On September 21, 2018 DOT&PF confirmed the project to be a categorical exclusion under 23 CFR 771.117. A copy of the Class of Action and correspondence is located in Appendix B.

**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**

N/A    YES    NO

1. Additional right-of-way required. If no, skip to 2.

  

a. Permanent easements required.

  

Estimated number of parcels: 14

- A. Right-of-Way Impacts** N/A YES NO
- b. Full or partial property acquisition required.    
 Estimated number of full parcels: 0  
 Estimated number of partial parcels: 19
- c. Property transfer from state or federal agency required. *If yes, list agency in No. 4 below.*
- 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.    
 i. Number of business relocations: 0  
 ii. Number of residential relocations: 0
- e. 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](#) (FHWA Order 6640.23A, June 2012)?
3. The project will involve use of ANILCA land that requires an [ANILCA Title XI](#) approval.
4. Summarize the right-of-way impacts, if any:
- An estimated 81 acres from 33 parcels would be needed for this project, with 14 being acquired from the Alaska Department of Natural Resources (ADNR) and 19 from the Toghothele Corporation (with subsurface permanent interest being obtained from Doyon Native Corporation). The ADNR lands would be acquired by perpetual easement acquisition to the DOT&PF; and lands from the Toghothele Corporation would be acquired by fee acquisition to the DOT&PF.

- B. Social and Cultural Impacts** 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 federally-recognized Indian Tribe [as defined in [36 CFR 800.16\(m\)](#)].
6. Summarize the social and cultural impacts, if any:

On April 20, 2018 an EPA Environmental Justice Report was generated and revealed that, of an approximated population of 396 within one mile of the existing centerline of the project area, 37% and 35% percent of the population are minority and low income, respectively. However, the project will not disproportionately adversely affect minorities or low income populations as accessibility to and use of the Parks Highway will be made safer for all users.

No adverse social impacts to neighborhood or community cohesion are anticipated. The project would positively affect travel patterns and accessibility for Parks Highway users by providing a highway with an improved alignment that is safer and more convenient to travel, including improved sight distances at residential driveways that open onto the highway within the project area. Project improvements would not alter the Parks Highway in a

way that would create adverse human health or environmental effects as defined in Executive Order 12898. Access to residential properties and through-traffic will be maintained throughout construction.

- 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.
  2. The project will adversely affect established businesses or business districts.
  3. Summarize the economic impacts, if any:  

The Project would not have any impacts related to socioeconomic concerns. Beneficial impacts would occur to the State through reduced trucking costs by eliminating seasonal load restrictions, and reduced maintenance and safety driven costs.

- D. Land Use and Transportation Plans** N/A   YES   NO
1. Project is consistent with land use plan(s).         

Identify the land use plan(s) and date: Alaska Department of Natural Resources Yukon Tanana Area Plan (YTAP), adopted January 3, 2014.
  2. Project is consistent with transportation plan(s).         

Identify the transportation plan(s) and date.

    - Draft Alaska Statewide Long-Range Transportation Plan 2036, September 2016.
    - State of Alaska DOT&PF Interior Alaska Transportation Plan (IATP), approved November 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):

Table 1 detail's the project's consistency with local land use and transportation plans:

Table 1: Land Use and Transportation Plans

Plan	Plan Goal/Policy	Project Consistency
Yukon Tanana Area Plan (YTAP) (January 3, 2014)	<b>Land Use Designations and Management Intent:</b> agricultural; settlement; forestry; mineral, habitat, and public recreation.	The project is consistent with the YTAP because improved safety and mobility of the highway supports the land use designations or management intent and guidelines. ANDR's scoping comment also confirmed that the project is consistent with the YTAP.
DRAFT Alaska Statewide Long-Range Transportation Plan 2036 (September 2016)	<b>Modernization:</b> Make the existing transportation system better and safer through transportation system improvements that support productivity, improve reliability, and reduce safety risks to improve performance of the system. <b>System Preservation:</b> Manage the Alaska Transportation System to meet infrastructure condition performance targets and acceptable levels of service for	The project is consistent with this goal by improving the safety of users by bringing the deficient highway to current geometric and structural standards.  Project is consistent with goal by: improving pavement condition and replacing a structurally deficient bridge.

---

all modes of transportation.

---

**Economic Development:** Promote and support economic development by ensuring safe, efficient, and reliable access to local, national, and international markets for Alaska’s people, goods, and resources, and for freight-related activity critical to the State’s economy.

The project is consistent with this goal by eliminating seasonal load restrictions, and reduced maintenance and safety driven costs.

---

**Safety and Security:** Improve transportation system safety and security.

The project is consistent with this goal by improving the safety and mobility of highway users in the project area through the realignment and reconstruction of the geometrically and structurally deficient facility.

---

**Livability, Community, and the Environment:** Incorporate livability, community, and environmental considerations in planning, delivering, operating, and maintaining the Alaska Transportation System.

The project is consistent with this goal by incorporating community and environmental concerns during the project design process through public and agency scoping.

---

**Economic:** Support the economic vitality of the State, metropolitan and non-metropolitan areas, especially by enabling global competitiveness, productivity, and efficiency. Prioritize projects that support, project or enhance economic development.

The project is consistent with this goal by eliminating seasonal load restrictions, and reduced maintenance and safety driven costs.

---

**Health, Safety and Security:** Improve the overall Interior Regional Transportation System to promote the health, safety and security of residents and visitors and for all motorized and non-motorized users.

The project is consistent with this goal by improving the safety and mobility of highway users in the project area through the realignment and reconstruction of the geometrically and structurally deficient facility.

Interior Alaska  
Transportation Plan (IATP)  
(November 2010)

---

**Preservation:** Emphasize preservation of the existing transportation facilities.

Project is consistent with goal by: bringing a geometrically and structurally deficient facility into compliance with standards through highway realignment and bridge replacement; improving pavement structures to reduce the need for seasonal weight restrictions by extending pavement life; and promoting access management strategies by paving and improving sight distance at intersection.

---

**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](#).

**E. Impacts to Historic Properties**

N/A YES NO

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 December 24, 2015. *Attach copies to this form.*
- a. List consulting parties Alaska State Historic Preservation Office; Doyon, Limited; the City of Nenana; Nenana Native Association; Tanana Chiefs Conference; and Toghothle Corporation.
- b. If no letters were sent, explain why not. *Attach "Section 106 Proceed Directly to Findings Worksheet", if applicable \_\_\_\_\_*
4. Date "Finding of Effect" Letters sent June 19, 2018 *Attach copies to this form*
- a. State "Finding of Effect" The DOT&PF has concluded that a **no historic properties adversely affected** determination is appropriate for this project as a whole.
- b. State any changes to consulting parties No changes have been made.
5. List responding consulting parties, comment date, and summarize:
- Doyon, Limited. January 20, 2016. No additional historic properties known within the APE.
  - Alaska SHPO. January 7, 2016. No objections to APE or level of effort proposed for resource identification at this time.
  - Alaska SHPO. July 5, 2018. Concurrence of findings.
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" July 5, 2018. *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.*

**E. Impacts to Historic Properties**

N/A   YES   NO

**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.*

Government to Government consultation was confirmed to be completed by the Federal Highway Administration on December 11, 2017, with no concerns in regards to potential impacts of the proposed project.

The affected sites are as follows:

- *FAI-01736* – Site is exempt from section 106 review under the Exemption Regarding Historic Preservation Review Process for Effects to the Interstate Highway System (ACHP 2005) and the Program Comment on Common Post-1945 Concrete and Steel Bridges (ACHP 2012). No determination of effect is required for impacts to this site.
- *FAI-02398* – DOT&PF will install temporary fencing under the terms of the recommendation by NLURA for this site. Provided stand-off fencing is installed, a no historic properties adversely affected finding is appropriate for this site. See the Environmental Commitments and Mitigation Measure for details.
- *FAI-02439-02444* – Throughout the implementation of the Alaska Historic Roads Programmatic Agreement Interim Guidance (Roads PA), DOT&PF has understood that the Roads PA applied to all segments of road in Program funded projects. The project is funded by the Program; therefore, these roads and others similarly situated are covered under the Roads PA and its Interim Guidance. Interim guidance on the Roads PA provides that abandoned road segments are exempt from review until the Roads PA is completed and a methodology for evaluation is agreed on by the signatories. As such, DOT&PF finds the road segments within the project area exempt from review.

**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): <0.25

**4.** Estimated fill quantities (cubic yards): 60

**5.** Estimated dredge quantities (cubic yards): N/A

**6.** Is a USACE authorization anticipated?

 

*If yes, identify type:*

NWP    Individual    General Permit    Other

**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.*

**F. Wetland Impacts**

YES   NO

- 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](#).*

Impacts to wetlands and waters of the U.S. (WOUS) are anticipated to occur at Little Goldstream Creek, where the Little Goldstream Creek Bridge will be replaced. Impacts will involve the removal and placement of fill, including bridge piers and temporary structures as required, within the wetland and WOUS area in order to facilitate the bridge replacement. Impacts are not anticipated to exceed 0.012 acres (<1/10<sup>th</sup> acre, reporting is not required) with 60 cubic yards of fill (temporary and permanent quantities are to be determined), and a NWP 3 Maintenance is anticipated.

**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 \_\_\_\_\_   MHW \_\_\_\_\_   HTL \_\_\_\_\_

Fill amounts within the water body are to be determined, but are not anticipated to exceed 60 cubic yards.



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

The Little Goldstream Creek is shallow and meandering with no known interstate commerce. The Alaska Department of Natural Resource (ADEC), Navigable Waters Web Map (accessed June 6, 2018 at [http://dnr.alaska.gov/mlw/nav/map\\_disclaimer.htm](http://dnr.alaska.gov/mlw/nav/map_disclaimer.htm)) did not list the Little Goldstream Creek as a navigable waterbody. An estimated 60 cubic yards of fill will occur within and/or surrounding this waterbody during the Little Goldstream Creek Bridge replacements. The category of fish habitat for this vicinity was not specified by communications with ADF&G.

**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 Fish Resource Monitor; accessed June 6, 2018.
  - 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: NOAA Essential Fish Habitat Mapper, accessed June 6, 2018.
  - b. EFH present in project area.
  - c. Project proposes construction in EFH. *If yes, describe EFH impacts in H.6.*
  - 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) : USFWS agency scoping response, received December 30, 2015.
  - b. Project visible from an eagle nesting tree? \*
  - c. Project within 330 feet of an eagle nesting tree? \*

**H. Fish and Wildlife**

N/A   YES   NO

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

The Alaska Department of Fish and Game (ADF&G), Fish Resource Monitor (accessed June 6, 2018 at <http://www.adfg.alaska.gov/index.cfm?adfg=fishpassage.mapping>) lists that there have been no fish collection efforts on the Little Goldstream Creek. However, per the ADF&G agency scoping response the creek is suspected to be a residential fish stream; and there is a potential that a Fish Habitat Permit may be needed for the bridge replacement work at the creek. The Fish Resource Monitor also did not list the creek as an anadromous stream.

The National Oceanic and Atmospheric Association (NOAA) Essential Fish Habitat Mapper (accessed June 6, 2018 at <https://www.habitat.noaa.gov/protection/efh/efhmapper/index.html>) indicated that there is no essential fish habitat within the project area.

Two migratory bird species of conservation concern (Bald Eagle and Golden Eagle) are expected to occur or may be affected by activities at this location, and are protected under the Migratory Bird Act and the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act. No eagle nests were observed within the project area during the 2015 wetland delineation. The USFWS 2015 agency scoping response indicated the presence of an eagle nest about two miles west of MP 310, and that while no nests were identified within the immediate project area it is the Department’s responsibility for preventing disturbance to eagles and their nests. If an eagle nest is discovered within a half-mile of the project area, the USFWS will be contacted. In addition, if raptor or swallow nest colonies are found in material sites, the USFWS will be contacted for further recommendations, although no known nest locations were identified.

The Department intends to adhere to the USFWS guidance on avoiding mechanized vegetation clearing during the recommended bird nesting window for the project area (May 1- July 15).

**I. Threatened and Endangered Species (T&E)**

YES   NO

- 1. Database name(s) and date(s) queried: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service IPaC Database, accessed June 9, 2018.
- 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.* \*

**I. Threatened and Endangered Species (T&E)** YES NO

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 USFWS was included in the agency scoping process and did not provide any concerns for resources managed by the USFWS. In addition, the IPaC database, accessed June 9, 2018, revealed that there are no threatened and endangered species expected to occur at this location.

**J. Invasive Species** YES NO

1. Database name(s) and date(s) queried: AKEPIC Data Portal, accessed June 9, 2018.

2. Does the project include all practicable measures to minimize the introduction or spread of invasive species, making the project consistent with [E.O. 13112](#) (Invasive Species)? *If yes, list measures in J.3.*

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

Per the AKEPIC Data Portal, access June 9, 2018, the following non-native species are present in the project area: white sweet clover (*Melilotus albus Medik.*), common dandelion (*Taraxacum officinale F.H. Wigg.*), common plantain (*Plantago major L.*), alsike clover (*Trifolium hybridum L.*), foxtail barley (*Hordeum jubatum L.*), pineappleweed (*Matricaria discoidea DC.*), smooth brome (*Bromus inermis Leyss.*), narrowleaf hawksbeard (*Crepis tectorum L.*), yellow sweetclover (*Melilotus officinalis (L.) Lam.*), lambsquarters (*Chenopodium album L.*), prostrate knotweed (*Polygonum aviculare L.*), and common pepperweed (*Lepidium densiflorum Schrad.*).

Implemented measures to minimize and control the spread of invasive species will be defined in the Erosion and Sediment Control Plan (ESCP). Standard contract specifications such as seeding disturbed areas with certified weed-free native, perennial grass seed mixtures will help minimize erosion as well as the establishment of invasive weed species. With the implementation of practicable measure to minimize the introduction or spread of invasive species, the project is expected to result in no substantial non-native species-related impacts.

**K. Contaminated Sites** YES NO

1. Database name(s) and date(s) queried: ADEC Contaminated Sites Mapper, accessed June 9, 2018.

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.* \*

3. There are contaminated sites with 1,500 feet of where excavation dewatering is anticipated? *If yes, attach ADEC coordination correspondence and summarize below in IV.K.4.*

**K. Contaminated Sites**

YES NO

- 4. Summarize the contaminated site impacts and mitigation, if any. *Include any commitments or mitigative measure in Section IV.*

Per the ADEC Contaminated Site Mapper, accessed June 9, 2018, there are no known contaminated sites within the project area. However, agency scoping responses (located in Appendix G) from ADEC indicated that there is a known contaminated site at MP 321, where a fuel tanker truck rolled over off the highway in the mid-1990s and released approximately 10,000 gallons of Jet A fuel. The Department will coordinate with ADEC Spill Prevention and Response if contamination is encountered from this site.

**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.*  \*
- 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 area is not located in an air quality maintenance area or nonattainment area (CO or PM-10 or PM-2.5).

**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 Flood Map Service Center, accessed June 11, 2018.

\*   

*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](#).*

Floodplains within the project area are unmapped, and are comprised of the floodplain within the Little Goldstream Creek and the DOT&PF ROW. Temporary minor impacts are anticipated to occur within the floodplain due to the replacement of the Little Goldstream Creek Bridge; significant encroachments and the support of incompatible floodplain development are not anticipated to occur. A Location Hydraulic Study was completed in October 2018 and is attached (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:

The proposed action is considered a Type I project according to 23 CFR 772 because it would add an auxiliary lane/passing lanes to the Parks. Existing land uses in the project area include residential, commercial, open space, light industrial, and undeveloped/vacant land uses. A noise analysis was completed in October 2018, and determined that the proposed action would not result in noise impacts at any sensitive receptors in the project area, and noise abatement analysis was not required.

**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:  
\_\_\_\_\_
4. Estimate the acreage of ground-disturbing activities that will result from the project?  
600 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: \_\_\_\_\_
6. Would the project discharge storm water to a water body within a national park or state park; a national or state wildlife refuge?

**O. Water Quality Impacts**

N/A   YES   NO

- 7. Summarize the water quality impacts and mitigation, if any. *Include any commitments or mitigative measures in [Section V](#).*

The ADEC Division of Water, accessed August 21, 2018, does not list the Little Goldstream Creek as an impaired waterbody. Temporary water quality impacts from disturbed soils are anticipated within Little Goldstream Creek during the replacement of the Little Goldstream Creek Bridge. BMPs to minimize impacts to water quality from the bridge replacement and from storm water runoff during project construction will be utilized as stipulated in the 2016 Alaska Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Construction General Permit, and will be defined in the Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP).

While total project disturbed ground is approximately 600 acres, the area would not be worked simultaneously. Project construction packages are proposed to be staged in 5-10 mile segments and contract provisions would limit the amount of ground that could be disturbed and destabilized at one time.

**P. Construction Impacts**

N/A   YES   NO

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. There will be temporary degradation of water quality.</li> <li>2. There will be a temporary stream diversion.</li> <li>3. There will be temporary degradation of air quality.</li> <li>4. There will be temporary delays and detours of traffic.</li> <li>5. There will be temporary impacts on businesses.</li> <li>6. There will be temporary noise impacts.</li> <li>7. There will be other construction impacts (e.g. TCEs/TCPs, utility relocates, staging areas, etc.).</li> <li>8. Summarize construction impacts and mitigation for each 'yes' above. <i>Include any commitments or mitigative measures in <a href="#">Section V</a>.</i></li> </ul> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/><br><input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/><br><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/><br><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/><br><input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/><br><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/><br><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/><br><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> |
|--|--|

Water Quality: Temporary degradation of water quality may result during project construction due to a minor increase of erosion and other sediment entering storm water runoff. Implementing a SWPPP would help alleviate temporary water quality impacts.

Air Quality: Temporary impacts to air quality may result during project construction from increased equipment exhaust and dust upheaval from ground disturbance. Construction impacts to air quality will be mitigated with the use of BMPs including watering, sweeping, and stabilizing construction entrances/exits, and will be defined in the ESCP and SWPPP.

Traffic: Temporary delays in traffic, rerouting of traffic, and rerouting of access to local properties may occur during project construction, and will be minimized to the greatest extent practicable. A Traffic Control Plan would be implemented and the public notified prior to construction.

Noise: A minor and temporary increase in noise levels may result during project construction due to the use of heavy equipment and other general construction activities. However, noise impacts from construction would not result in a substantial increase or permanent change in noise levels in the project areas.

**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.*        \*
- 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.*

3. Summarize Section 4(f)/6(f) involvement, if any:

A cultural resource site (FAI-02398) determined to be eligible for the National Register of Historic Places is located within the project area and qualifies as a Section 4(f) property. Project work adjacent to the site includes repaving and new and improved ditching. No Section 4(f) involvement is proposed and complete avoidance of the Section 4(f) property will be facilitated through an environmental commitment to provide standoff fencing, as required for a finding of no adverse impact for this site. On September 28, 2018 a no use determination was made by DOT&PF for this property, therefore the requirements of Section 4(f) do not apply. See Appendix H.

**III. 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 ([Title 16.05.871](#) and [Title 16.05.841](#))
- 4. Flood Hazard
- 5. ADEC Non-domestic Wastewater Plan Approval
- 6. ADEC 401



**III. Permits and Authorizations**

N/A    YES    NO

- 7. ADEC APDES
- 8. Noise
- 9. Eagle Permit
- 10. Other. If yes, list below.

**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):  
  - February 8, 2018: Meeting with Doyon, Limited and DOT&PF.
  - February 15, 2018: Public Open House.
- 3. Newspaper ads. *Attach certified affidavit of publication as an appendix.*     
 Name of newspaper and date: Fairbanks Daily News-Miner: February 1, 2018 & February 12, 2018.
- 4. Alaska Online Public Notice date: February 1, 2018
- 5. Agency scoping letters. Date sent: December 23, 2015
- 6. Agency scoping meeting. Date of meeting: \_\_\_\_\_
- 7. Field review. Date: \_\_\_\_\_
- 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.*

Public and agency comment summaries can be found in Appendices G and H, respectively. There were no unresolved issues. DOT&PF responses to public and agency comments were provided to commenters. An abbreviated summary of the primary issues raised by the public during public scoping efforts and the Department's responses to the issues are provided in the table below:

Category	Comment	DOT&PF Response
Curves	Multiple hazardous curves are present within the area.	Curves within the project area will be realigned to meet current design standards for curvature and grade with the preferred alternative.
Sight Distance	Insufficient sight distance within some areas of the project.	Areas will be reconstructed and vegetation will be managed to ensure adequate sight distance.
Passing Lanes	Passing lanes are needed in project area, and proposed passing lanes conflict with local land use in some areas.	Passing lanes have been added to the project area, and proposed passing lanes have been revised to better match the area setting.
Rest Areas	Closed rest areas are being used due to year-round signage, and the rest area at MP 315 is a local nuisance.	M&O has been notified of the year-round use of the seasonal rest areas. Alterations to the existing rest area at MP 315 is not within the scope of this project.



**VII. Environmental Documentation Approval Signatures**

Reviewed by:  Date: 11/14/2018  
[Signature] Engineering Manager

Lauren Little  
[Print Name] Engineering Manager

**Programmatic CE**

Approved by: \_\_\_\_\_ Date: \_\_\_\_\_  
[Signature] Regional Environmental Manager

\_\_\_\_\_  
[Print Name] Regional Environmental Manager

**Non-Programmatic CE**

Approval Recommended by:  Date: 11-14-18  
[Signature] Regional Environmental Manager

Brett Nelson  
[Print Name] Regional Environmental Manager

Approved by:  Date: 11/14/18  
[Signature] NEPA Program Manager

Melissa Goldstein  
[Print Name] NEPA Program Manager