

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: Seppala Drive Upgrades
- B. Federal Project Number: 000S828
- C. State Project Number: Z620030000
- D. Primary/Ancillary Project Connections:

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

F. List of Attachments:

Figures

Appendix A: Agency and Public Coordination

Appendix B: Supporting Documents

G. Project Scope (Use STIP Project Description)

Realign and rehabilitate Seppala Drive in Nome from the intersection of Bering Street to the intersection of Airport Terminal Road.

H. Project Purpose and Need:

The purpose is to improve safety, extend the service life, and reduce maintenance associated with degraded roadways and poor drainage. The project is needed to address poor pavement conditions, drainage issues, driving safety concerns, and lack of continuous pedestrian facilities. The road shoulders along Seppala Drive from Bering Street to Belmont Street are badly deteriorated due to poor surface drainage, unstable soil conditions beneath the road and sidewalks, and settlement near utility service laterals in some areas. The north side of Seppala has no road shoulder between F Street and Belmont. The Dry Creek crossing gets overtopped during high storm surge events and the culverts are showing signs of damage. The Center Creek Road to Jafet Road portion of Seppala Drive is a concern due to the steep grade and turns within close proximity. These two intersections are utilized quite heavily by truck traffic accessing Port Road. Slick or icy conditions can make this series of turns difficult to navigate. Pedestrian routes do not currently meet the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) standards. The embankment along Seppala Drive from the bridge to the airport is being degraded in some places due to erosion from high flow or storm surge events. This could impact the road and pedestrian facilities in the future.

I. Project Description:

The Seppala Drive Upgrades project proposes to rehabilitate the full length of Seppala Drive, approximately 1.3 miles in length, between Bering Street and Airport Terminal Road. Work includes pavement and pavement structure rehabilitation, roadside hardware, drainage improvements, intersection improvements, ADA improvements, and utilities. Work also includes widening of the road or a separate pathway in places to accommodate pedestrian facility improvements. The proposed work for Seppala Drive includes the following:

- Reconstruct and pave Seppala Drive from Bering Street to Airport Terminal Road, including select subgrade improvements.

- Replace and construct pedestrian improvements along Seppala Drive. Improvements include replacing sidewalk on both sides of Seppala Drive between Bering Street and F Street, adding sidewalk on the south side of Seppala Drive from F Street to Prospect Place, and adding a separated path from Prospect Place to the airport. One or more portions of the separated path between Prospect Place and the Airport may require a widened shoulder due to space limitations.
- Repair sinkhole near F Street.
- Widen the northern road shoulder between F Street and the curve west of Belmont Street.
- Replace existing 6-foot diameter Dry Creek culverts. This includes raising the height of Seppala Drive to prevent the flow of water over the road surface during storm surges. New culverts will be larger diameter and longer than existing to accommodate added embankment and a portion of Dry Creek will require realignment.
- Raise profile grade between Jafet Road and a few hundred feet west of Center Creek Road to improve sight distance and turning movement. To match this grade will require tying into Center Creek Road approximately 322 feet.
- Install intersection lighting at Jafet Road.
- Replace guardrail.
- Widen Seppala Drive to the north in order to accommodate pedestrian improvements west of Center Creek Road. Add slope protection to the south along the Snake River between the old bridge location and Jafet Road.
- Replace damaged 36-inch diameter culvert at Center Creek.
- ROW acquisition will be needed along the project corridor.
- Relocate or repair utilities impacted by the project.

II. Environmental Consequences

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

A. Right-of-Way Impacts

	<u>N/A</u>	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>
1. Additional right-of-way required. If no, skip to 2.		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a. Permanent easements required.		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Estimated number of parcels: <u>1</u>			
b. Full or partial property acquisition required.		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
Estimated number of full parcels: <u>11</u>			
Estimated number of partial parcels: <u>17</u>			
c. Property transfer from state or federal agency required. <i>If yes, list agency in No. 4 below.</i>		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
d. Business or residential relocations required. If yes, insert the number of relocations below, summarize the findings of the conceptual stage relocation study in No. 4 below and attach the conceptual stage relocation study. If no, skip to 2.		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
i. Number of business relocations: <u>N/A</u>			
ii. Number of residential relocations: <u>N/A</u>			
e. Last-resort housing required.			

A. Right-of-Way Impacts

N/A YES NO

- 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)? YES NO
- 3. The project will involve use of ANILCA land that requires an [ANILCA Title XI](#) approval. YES NO
- 4. Summarize the right-of-way impacts, if any:

This project will be confined largely to the existing DOT ROW. The attached Project Details figures identify those areas where the proposed improvements fall outside the ROW limits.

ROW needs include:

- The riprap suggested along the Snake River does fall outside of the DOT ROW. An easement will likely be needed from the Alaska Department of Natural Resources for work below the Ordinary High Water (OHW) level. Work above OHW will require ROW acquisition unless a temporary construction easement sufficiently covers DOT&PF's access needs.
- A portion of Seppala drive, both East and West of the F Street intersection is currently located outside the ROW.
- Raising Seppala Drive at the Dry Creek crossing will require additional embankment from F Street to Belmont Street. Dry Creek will require realignment to accommodate the additional embankment.
- Widening Seppala Drive west of Center Creek Road will require shifting the road to the north slightly to accommodate pedestrian access on the river side.
- A small portion of ROW is needed between Seppala Drive and the Snake River just west of the bend in order to facilitate the separated path.

There are several locations where the need for ROW acquisition is avoided or minimized by shifting roads within existing DOT ROW:

- Prospect Street at the intersection with Center Creek Road will be shifted back to the center of the existing ROW. Minor adjustments to the alignment of Center Creek Road may be needed at this intersection to avoid ROW acquisition.
- Belmont Street at the intersection with Seppala Drive will be shifted to the center of the existing ROW.
- F Street at the intersection with Seppala Drive will be shifted to the center of the existing ROW

The EPA's EJSCREEN report for the project shows a high minority population relative to State, Regional, and National percentages. EJSCREEN references census block groups and the entire Seppala Drive project falls within one census block group covering 168 square miles with a population of 804 people. The ROW acquisitions will not result in any business or residential relocations. The widening of the road will result in increased pedestrian facilities. As such, the impacts to the high percentage minority population in this area is not anticipated to be adverse.

B. Social and Cultural Impacts

YES NO

- 1. The project will affect neighborhoods or community cohesion. YES NO
- 2. The project will affect travel patterns and accessibility (e.g. vehicular, commuter, bicycle, or pedestrian). YES NO
- 3. The project will affect school boundaries, recreation areas, churches, businesses, police and fire protection, etc. YES NO

- | B. <u>Social and Cultural Impacts</u> | <u>YES</u> | <u>NO</u> |
|---|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 4. The project will affect the elderly, handicapped, nondrivers, transit-dependent, minority and ethnic groups, or the economically disadvantaged. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 5. There are unresolved project issues or concerns of a federally-recognized Indian Tribe [as defined in 36 CFR 800.16(m)]. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 6. Summarize the social and cultural impacts, if any:

The improvements do not include any realignment that may alter or impact community cohesion. The sidewalks improvements, widened shoulder and separated path will provide safer pedestrian access between the airport and the city center. Business parking between F Street and Bering Street will be impacted as vehicles currently drive over the sidewalk to access off-road parking. Planned sidewalk improvements will allow for driveways but may reduce the amount of overall parking as driving over sidewalks may not be allowed. The parking lot at Kawerak in particular will be reduced in order to maintain sufficient setbacks from the intersection of Seppala Drive and C Street. | | |

- | C. <u>Economic Impacts</u> | <u>YES</u> | <u>NO</u> |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 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. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. The project will adversely affect established businesses or business districts. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. Summarize the economic impacts, if any:

The stated improvements will improve travel between the airport, Port of Nome and downtown Nome. This will provide an economic benefit to the City as tourists have better access between transit centers and the main business district. Improvements to the deteriorated sections of Seppala Drive between F Street and Bering Street will provide a benefit to motorists and pedestrians. Temporary traffic delays and business impacts are addressed in Section P. Construction Impacts. | | |

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

Identify the land use plan(s) and date <u>Nome Comprehensive Plan 2020 (May 2012), Nome Zoning Code, Title 18 (2008)</u> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Project is consistent with transportation plan(s).

Identify the transportation plan(s) and date. <u>Nome Eskimo Community Tribal Transportation Plan (2007)</u> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. Project would induce adverse indirect and cumulative effects on land use or transportation. <i>If yes, attach analysis.</i> | | <input type="checkbox"/> * | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 4. Summarize how the project is consistent or inconsistent with the land use plan(s) and transportation plan(s): | | | |

D. Land Use and Transportation Plans

N/A YES NO

Public input during development of the Nome Comprehensive Plan identified improving road system/maintenance as one of the top 10 highest priority issues. The Nome Zoning Code, Title 18, stipulates that developments in Nome should encourage the proper arrangement of streets in relation to existing and planned streets and ensure that streets facilitate safe, efficient, and pleasant walking, biking and driving. The Nome Eskimo Community (NEC) Tribal Transportation Plan promotes the proper arrangement of streets and calls for the general improvement of non-motorized vehicle trails and sidewalks in order to ensure safe, efficient, and pleasant walking, biking and driving throughout the city.

E. Impacts to Historic Properties

N/A YES NO

Consider the February 2015 DOT&PF Cultural Resources Confidentiality Guidelines for cultural resource attachments.

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

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

3. Date Consultation/Initiation Letters sent September 7, 2017 *Attach copies to this form.*
a. List consulting parties SHPO, Nome Museum and Library Commission, Bering Straits Native Corporation, City of Nome, King Island Native Corporation, King Island Native Community, Nome Eskimo Community, and Sitnasuak Native Corporation.

b. If no letters were sent, explain why not. *Attach “Section 106 Proceed Directly to Findings Worksheet”, if applicable* N/A

4. Date “Finding of Effect” Letters sent December 20, 2018 *Attach copies to this form*

a. State “Finding of Effect” No Historic Properties Affected

b. State any changes to consulting parties None

5. List responding consulting parties, comment date, and summarize:
AK SHPO response received September 14, 2017 stating no objections to proposed study area and level of effort described in Initiation Letter.

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” January 8, 2019 *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.*

One potential NRHP eligible property, the Subsurface Historic District (NOM-00158), is located within the project Area of Potential Effect. No determination of eligibility has been made for this district. The Subsurface Historic District overlaps the eastern portion of the project area. No subsurface ground disturbing activities associated with this project are to occur at depths below the boundary of this subsurface district, estimated to be below 4-7 feet. SHPO concurred with a finding of No Historic Properties Affected on January 8, 2019.

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): 0.82

4. Estimated fill quantities (cubic yards): 1700

5. Estimated dredge quantities (cubic yards): 0

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.*

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.*

F. Wetland Impacts

YES NO

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

The wetland acres calculated above utilize the National Wetlands Inventory data available for Nome. 0.28 acres of E2EM1P type wetlands are identified near the western boundary of the project at the airport. The remaining 0.25 acres are R5UBH type wetlands which occur at the Center Creek Rd crossing and 0.66 acres at the Dry Creek crossing. Portions of the wetland impacts along Dry Creek may fall into the City of Nome's Wetland General Permit (POA-2006-214-M2). Development is limited to previously disturbed/developed areas except for the Dry Creek crossing. In order to raise the roadway surface to prevent overtopping during high storm surge events, the embankment must be widened as well. The embankment along this section is being designed with the steepest allowable slope in order to reduce the amount of fill in wetlands. A wetland permit will be obtained for this project. Any commitments or mitigation strategies developed through the permitting process will be required as part of the permit conditions.

G. Water Body Involvement

N/A YES NO

1. Does the project affect the following:

- | | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| a. A water body. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b. A navigable water body as defined by USCG, (i.e. Section 9)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> * |
| c. Waters of the U.S. as defined by the USACE, Section 404? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> * |
| d. Navigable Waters of the U.S. as defined by the USACE (Section 10)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> * |
| e. Fish passage across a stream frequented by salmon or other fish (i.e. Title 16.05.841)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| f. A resident fish stream (Title 16.05.841)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| g. A cataloged anadromous fish stream, river or lake (i.e. Title 16.05.871)? | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> * |
| h. A designated Wild and Scenic River or land adjacent to a Wild and Scenic River? <i>If yes, the Regional Environmental Manager should consult with the NEPA Program Manager to determine applicability of Section 4(f).</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

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 200 MHW 3000 HTL 0

Approximately 200 cy of fill within the Dry Creek and Bourbon Creek drainage area as embankment fill and approximately 3,000 cy of fill along Snake River as bank stabilization

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

According to communication from the Alaska Department of Natural Resources, Dry Creek is not likely navigable but Snake River is listed on the State's Navigable Waters online mapper. The Snake River is also listed on USACE's List of Navigable Waters. None of the project components proposed would impede navigability on the Snake River but work below the OHW would require DNR authorization and a USACE Section 10 permit. Movement of fish will not be prohibited and therefore no temporary fish passage measures will be needed. The ADF&G anadromous waters catalog identifies Dry Creek as supporting rearing Coho Salmon and Dolly Varden. Coho salmon may also spawn in Dry Creek. The Snake River contains all 5 Pacific salmon species and provides spawning habitat within the project location for pink and sockeye salmon. The Snake River also supports Dolly Varden and whitefish. Work below OHW on the Snake River would be limited to bank stabilization measures to mitigate current bank erosion that if left unchecked could begin to impact the roadway. Work along Dry Creek includes raising the roadway to prevent overtopping during large storm surge events as well as replacement of the Dry Creek culverts. The USFWS supports the opportunity to replace the Dry Creek culverts and establish tidal exchange with the Dry Creek and Bourbon Creek wetland systems. Raising the roadway will result in embankment fill within the Dry Creek and Bourbon Creek wetlands. Dry Creek will also need to be shifted to the north along the northern edge of the embankment. DOT&PF will continue to coordinate with ADF&G and USFWS during design to address any further concerns and to incorporate recommendations into the Dry Creek culvert replacement and realignment.

H. Fish and Wildlife

N/A YES NO

1. Anadromous and resident fish habitat. *Any activity or project that is conducted below the ordinary high water mark of an anadromous stream, river, or lake requires a Fish Habitat Permit.*

a. Database name(s) and date(s) queried: ADF&G Anadromous Waters Catalog, August 31, 2017

- | | | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| b. Anadromous fish habitat present in project area. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | * | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Resident fish habitat present in project area | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | * | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| d. Adverse effect on spawning habitat. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | * |
| e. Adverse effect on rearing habitat. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | * |
| f. Adverse effect on migration corridors. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | * |
| g. Adverse effect on subsistence species. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | * |

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, December 17, 2017

- | | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| b. EFH present in project area | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Project proposes construction in EFH. <i>If yes, describe EFH impacts in H.6.</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d. Project may adversely affect EFH. <i>If yes, attach EFH Assessment.</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| e. Project includes conservation recommendations proposed by NMFS. <i>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.</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

3. Wildlife Resources:

- | | | |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| a. Project is in area of high wildlife/vehicle accidents. | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
|---|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|

H. Fish and Wildlife

N/A YES NO

- 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, 5/24/2018
- b. Project visible from an eagle nesting tree? *
- c. Project within 330 feet of an eagle nesting tree? *
- d. Project within 660 feet of an eagle nesting tree? *
- e. Will the project require blasting or other activities that produce extreme loud noises within 1/2 a mile from an active nest? *
- f. Is an eagle permit required? *

5. Is the project consistent with the Migratory Bird Treaty Act?

6. Summarize fish and wildlife impacts and mitigation, including timing windows, if any. *Include any commitments or mitigative measures in Section V.*

Correspondence with ADF&G states that the Snake River contains all 5 Pacific salmon species and provides spawning habitat within the project area for pink and sockeye salmon. It also supports anadromous Dolly Varden and whitefish. Dry Creek is documented as supporting rearing coho salmon and Dolly Varden. Local biologists also report coho salmon spawning in Dry Creek. Replacement of Dry Creek culverts provides an opportunity to reestablish tidal exchange to Dry Creek and Bourbon Creek wetlands which according to communication from USFWS are ecosystems which support a variety of plants and animals often valued by wildlife and uncommon near Nome. A restricted timing window for work in Dry Creek and Snake river is anticipated to protect salmon spawning, which will be included in the Fish Habitat Permit. Additional coordination will occur with ADF&G when final design is completed. A search of the ADF&G website and USFWS Critical Habitat online mapper on August 31, 2017 revealed no state refuges, critical habitats, or sanctuaries in the proposed project's vicinity. The IPaC Trust Resource Report generated for the project on August 31, 2017 identified ten migratory bird species that may be present in the area during breeding and wintering seasons. No migratory bird nesting impacts are anticipated due to project location being in an urban environment with very little potential nesting habitat. Correspondence with the USFWS on May 24, 2018 confirmed that Bald and Golden eagle nests are not documented within the project area. This correspondence can be found in Appendix B.

I. Threatened and Endangered Species (T&E)

YES NO

- 1. Database name(s) and date(s) queried: IPaC Trust Resource Report generated on August 31, 2017
- 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.

I. Threatened and Endangered Species (T&E)

YES NO

- b. Project is not likely to adversely affect a listed or proposed T&E species or designated critical habitat. *Informal Section 7 consultation is required. Attach consultation documentation, including concurrence from the Federal agency, to this form.* *
- c. Project is likely to adversely affect a listed or proposed T&E species or designated critical habitat. *If yes, consult the NEPA Program Manager.* *
7. Summarize the findings of the consultation, conferencing, biological evaluation, or biological assessment and the opinion of the agency with jurisdiction, or state why no coordination was conducted. *Include any commitments or mitigative measures in Section V.*
Scoping letters were sent to state and federal agencies including the USFWS and ADF&G on October 26, 2017. Spectacled and Steller's eiders, both of which are listed as threatened under the Endangered Species Act, may migrate through the area. Polar bears, also listed as a threatened species, occasionally occur in the Nome area. Section 7 consultation was completed on August 27, 2018 with the USFWS concurring that the proposed action will not adversely effect listed eiders or polar bears. This correspondence can be found in Appendix A.

J. Invasive Species

YES NO

1. Database name(s) and date(s) queried: Alaska Exotic Plants Information Clearinghouse, August 31, 2017
2. Does the project include all practicable measures to minimize the introduction or spread invasive species, making the project consistent with [E.O. 13112](#) (Invasive Species)? *If yes, list measures in J.3.*
3. Summarize invasive species impacts and minimization measures, if any. *Include any commitments or mitigative measures in Section V.*
A search of the Alaska Exotic Plants Information Clearinghouse found two instances of a non-native plant occurrence within the project area. These records date back to 1923 and 1919. The USFWS recommends implementing current Best Management practices to minimize the introduction and proliferation of invasive species. Any reseeding needed as part of this project will require a native seed mix to reduce the risk of introducing non-native species. This requirement will be stated in the construction specifications for this project.

K. Contaminated Sites

YES NO

1. Database name(s) and date(s) queried: ADEC Contaminated Sites Database, January 31, 2019
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 within 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.*

A search of the ADEC Contaminated Sites Database on January 31, 2019 identified 4 Active sites located near Seppala Drive. These sites are listed here:

- Evergreen Helicopters/Former MarkAir. Active Status. Hazard ID 25380. Located at Nome Airport, 145 feet northwest of the Seppala Drive/Airport Terminal Road intersection. GRO and DRO contaminated soil from leaking aboveground storage tanks.
- MarkAir - Nome. Active Status. Hazard ID 2940. Located at Nome Airport, 365 feet north of the Seppala Drive/Airport Terminal Road intersection. DRO, GRO and RRO contaminated groundwater from underground storage tank.
- Crowley Nome South Tank Farm. Active Status. Hazard ID 26950. Located at West F Street and West 2nd Avenue, 500 feet south of Seppala Drive. Contamination related to removal of five aboveground fuel storage tanks removed from site in 2016. DRO, GRO, RRO, and VOCs in soil and groundwater above DEC cleanup levels.
- East Nome Harbor Upgrade. Active Status. Hazard ID 4043. Located at East Side of Nome Harbor, Turning Basin, approximately 700 feet south of Seppala Drive. Gasoline and diesel contaminated soils in the Crowley dock area. Low concentrations of PCBs and high concentrations of arsenic also detected.

The project is expected to avoid excavation work deeper than a few feet for the embankment pavement structural section with the exception of the culvert replacements at Dry Creek and the small culvert just west of Center Creek Road. The Dry Creek culverts are approximately 650 feet northwest, and upgradient, of the Crowley Nome South Tank Farm. The Crowley site was recently added as a contaminated site and has not yet been delineated. ADEC recommends that the Contractor review the site information at that time to determine the potential for encountering contamination. That correspondence can be found in Appendix A.

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: [Alaska 2016-2019 Statewide Transportation Improvement Program Amendment 3, approved June 28, 2017](#)
- 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).*

L. Air Quality (Conformity)

N/A YES NO

- | | | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|----------------------------|--------------------------|
| 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. <i>Attach a copy of the analysis.</i> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> * | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 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 . <i>Attach a copy of the analysis.</i> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> * | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 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 . <i>Attach a copy of the analysis.</i> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> * | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 8. Summarize air quality impacts, mitigation, and agency coordination, if any. <i>Include any commitments or mitigative measures in Section V.</i>
No air quality impacts area anticipated. | | | |

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 : <u>FEMA FIRM Map Number 0200690043C and 0200690039C Revised May 3, 2010</u> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> * | <input type="checkbox"/> |
|---|---------------------------------------|--------------------------|

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? | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> * | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| b. Is there significant encroachment as defined by 23 CFR 650.105(q) ? <i>If yes, attach a copy of FHWA's finding required by 23 CFR 650.115.</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> * | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| c. Project encroaches into a regulatory floodway. | <input type="checkbox"/> * | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| d. The proposed action would increase the base flood elevation one-foot or greater. | <input type="checkbox"/> * | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Project conforms to local flood hazard requirements. | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. Project is consistent with E.O. 11988 (Floodplain Protection). <i>If no, the project cannot be approved as proposed.</i> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |

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

YES NO

- 4. Summarize floodplain impacts and mitigation, if any. *Include any commitments or mitigative measures in Section V.*

The FIRM panels referenced above show that almost all of Seppala Drive is located within the base (100-year) floodplain of the Snake River as well as Bourbon and Dry Creek. Work in the floodplain includes raising Seppala Drive at the Dry Creek crossing 1.4 feet to provide one foot of freeboard and prevent overtopping of the roadway during storm surge events. The culverts at Dry Creek will be replaced with larger diameter culverts. A hydrology and hydraulics report will accompany design of the Dry Creek culverts. Replacing the Dry Creek culverts will improve the function of the floodplain by reestablishing tidal exchange to the Dry Creek and Bourbon Creek wetlands. Seppala Drive at Center Creek Road will be raised about 4 feet to provide a safer grade for turning between Center Creek Road and the Snake River bridge. This will also put the road above the base flood elevation given on the FEMA Firm panel as 15 feet. The raise at Center Creek Road ties into the existing grade just before the Center Creek culvert to the west. At this location Seppala Drive is below the base flood elevation. The 36-inch culvert at Center Creek is being replaced as part of this project and will be assessed during design for proper sizing. A floodplain permit from the City of Nome will be obtained for the project. A Location Hydraulic Study has been prepared for the project and can be found in Appendix B and public involvement including correspondence with the City of Nome can be found in Appendix A.

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:
N/A

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:
N/A
4. Estimate the acreage of ground-disturbing activities that will result from the project?
16.2 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?
7. Summarize the water quality impacts and mitigation, if any. *Include any commitments or mitigative measures in [Section V](#).*

Runoff from the project area flows to Dry Creek and the Snake River. No excavation is planned as part of the project except where needed to replace the culvert at Center Creek and Dry Creek. There will be some removal of base material along the existing road surface as needed to prepare the road for resurfacing. Erosion and sediment control measures will be required to prevent sediment-laden runoff from leaving the project area. In response to the agency scoping letter sent on October 26, 2017, the ADEC Division of Environmental Health, Drinking Water Program confirmed that the project lies outside the Drinking Water Protection Area for Nome's public drinking water supply and they had no other concerns regarding the project

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.

P. Construction Impacts

N/A YES NO

- 4. There will be temporary delays and detours of traffic.
- 5. There will be temporary impacts on businesses.
- 6. There will be temporary noise impacts.
- 7. There will be other construction impacts (e.g. TCEs/TCPs, utility relocates, staging areas, etc.).

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

1) Best Management Practices (BMPs) will be called for in the Erosion and Sediment Control Plan for this project to mitigate sediment-laden runoff leaving the project area. An approved Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) is required by the Contractor prior to any construction activity in order to obtain coverage under the Alaska Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (APDES) Construction General Permit (CGP). This SWPPP will detail the BMPs to be used to mitigate polluted stormwater runoff from leaving the project area.

2) The replacement of the Dry Creek culverts will require temporary stream diversion. DOT&PF will work closely with USFWS and ADF&G to develop appropriate fish passage procedures including timing windows during which work is prohibited.

3) Water or a dust palliative may be used during construction to reduce air quality impacts related to airborne dust during construction.

4 & 5) Short-term impacts to vehicular traffic are expected throughout the construction phase of the project. A traffic control plan will be developed that meets all DOT&PF requirements. The traffic control plan will include provisions to provide the greatest level of access possible to existing businesses while maintaining safe working conditions for construction personnel. The plan will be implemented and maintained throughout the project. Advance notice of construction activities, scheduling, and anticipated delays will be published in The Nome Nugget newspaper to reduce impacts to businesses. No adverse short-term impacts to emergency services are anticipated. The Emergency Services Department in Nome asks that they be notified of the construction schedule as soon as it is determined, that they be given 72 hours' notice of planned road closures, be notified of emergency closures as soon as possible, and be given information regarding the movement of large machinery including date, time and route. Emergency services will require access to buildings and facilities along Seppala Drive in the event of an emergency if no alternate access is possible.

6) Seppala Drive is a highly traveled road with primarily commercial and industrial development, particularly between F Street and the airport. Noise impacts related to construction are therefore not expected to cause an impact that would require special mitigation along this section. There are businesses and residences between Bering Street and F Street. When feasible, noise-generating construction activities may be limited to between 7:00 am and 9:00 pm. Equipment and vehicle staging areas will be located away from residential areas as much as practicable. Internal combustion engine driven equipment will be equipped with intake and exhaust mufflers that are in good condition and appropriate for the equipment. Unnecessary idling of equipment will be limited.

7) Temporary construction easements may be required at various locations within the project area for the purposes of moving equipment or where additional room needed to lay forms for the construction of new sidewalks extends outside the existing ROW. The contractor is responsible for identifying and securing a staging area. Best management practices will be called for to reduce the chances of construction equipment introducing invasive species

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

YES NO

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

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

YES NO

- 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 September 2017 review of the City of Nome, ADEC, U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service (USFWS), and Alaska Department of Natural Resources Division of Parks & Outdoor Recreation websites indicated that there is one 4(f) property located near the project area. Anvil City Square, a public park managed by the City of Nome Parks and Recreation Department, is located on Bering Street, across from the intersection with Seppala Drive. This project ends before the intersection with Bering Street and will not impact the park. Consultation with the NEPA Program Manager is included in Appendix B. No 6(f) properties were found within or adjacent to the project area. The Section 106 process resulted in a finding of No Historic Properties Affected.

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
- 7. ADEC APDES

- | III. Permits and Authorizations | <u>N/A</u> | <u>YES</u> | <u>NO</u> |
|---|------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 8. Noise | | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 9. Eagle Permit | | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 10. Other. If yes, list below. | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| City of Nome Excavation/Fill Permit | | | |
| Floodplain Permit | | | |
| DNR permit for work below OHW of Snake River, if outside DOT&PF ROW | | | |

- | IV. Comments and Coordination | <u>N/A</u> | <u>YES</u> | <u>NO</u> |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1. Public/agency involvement for project. <i>Required if protected resources are involved.</i> | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Public Meetings. Date(s): <u>11/14/17</u> | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. Newspaper ads. <i>Attach certified affidavit of publication as an appendix.</i> | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| Name of newspaper and date: <u>10/26/17, 11/2/17, 11/9/17</u> | | | |
| 4. Alaska Online Public Notice date: <u>10/27/17</u> | | | |
| 5. Agency scoping letters. Date sent: <u>10/26/17</u> | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 6. Agency scoping meeting. Date of meeting: _____ | | <input type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 7. Field review. Date: <u>7/27/17</u> | | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 8. Summarize comments and coordination efforts for this project. Discuss pertinent issues raised. <i>Attach correspondence that demonstrates coordination and that there are no unresolved issues.</i> | | | |
| The attached Public Involvement Report (Appendix A) details the actions taken during the public and agency review process as well as all comments received. | | | |

V. Environmental Commitments and Mitigation Measures

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

Contractor to review site information from ADEC regarding Crowley Nome South Tank Farm prior to construction to determine potential for encountering contamination.

- | VI. Environmental Documentation Approval | <u>N/A</u> | <u>YES</u> | <u>NO</u> |
|--|------------|----------------------------|-------------------------------------|
| 1. Do any unusual circumstances exist, as described in <u>23 CFR 771.117(b)</u> ? <i>If yes, attach consultation with the NEPA Program Manager demonstrating that a CE is appropriate.</i> | | <input type="checkbox"/> * | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

VI. Environmental Documentation Approval

N/A YES NO

2. The project meets the criteria of one of the following DOT&PF Programmatic Approvals authorized in the Nov. 13, 2017 "Chief Engineer Directive – Programmatic Categorical Exclusions".

- If yes, select the appropriate Programmatic Approval below, and the CE documentation form may be approved by the Regional Environmental Manager.
- If no, the CE documentation form must be approved by a NEPA Program Manager.

- a. Programmatic Approval 1
- b. Programmatic Approval 2
- c. Programmatic Approval 3

VII. Environmental Documentation Approval Signatures

Prepared by:

Melissa Jensen

Date: 3-11-19

[Signature] Environmental Impact Analyst

Melissa Jensen

[Print Name] Environmental Impact Analyst

Reviewed by:

Christopher Johnston

Date: 3/11/2019

[Signature] Engineering Manager

Christopher Johnston

[Print Name] Engineering Manager

Programmatic CE

Approved by:

Date: _____

[Signature] Regional Environmental Manager

[Print Name] Regional Environmental Manager

Non-Programmatic CE

Approval

Recommended by:

Brett Nelson

Date: 3-11-19

[Signature] Regional Environmental Manager

Brett Nelson

VII. Environmental Documentation Approval Signatures

[Print Name] Regional Environmental Manager

Approved by:

[Signature] NEPA Program Manager

Date: 03/11/19

[Signature] NEPA Program Manager

Melissa Goldstein

[Print Name] NEPA Program Manager