

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

ENVIRONMENTAL RE-EVALUATION CHECKLIST

Project Name: University Avenue Widening

Project Number (State/Federal): 63213/RS-M-0617(3)

Date: 11/6/2008

Document Type and Approval Date: FONSI 9/30/2005

Re-Evaluation Number: 1
Date of Last Re-Evaluation:

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

I.	Proposed Action	<u>N/A</u>	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>
1.	Have changes occurred in the project scope since approval of the original environmental document or subsequent environmental re-evaluation?			\boxtimes
2.	Has there been a change in the project design parameters since the original environmental document or subsequent environmental document was approved?			\boxtimes
3.	Describe changes:			
II.	Purpose and Need	<u>N/A</u>	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>
4.	Has there been a change in the project purpose and need from that described in the approved environmental document or subsequent environmental document?			
5.	Describe changes.			
III	. Environmental Consequences	<u>N/A</u>	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>
ide	ntify (yes or no) if there have been any changes in project impacts from those attified in the original environmental document or subsequent re-evaluations. For h "yes," describe the magnitude of the change and potential for significant impact. Has there been a change in the affected environment within or adjacent to the project area that could affect any of the impact categories (i.e. new legislation, transportation infrastructure, or protected resources)?			
The Bor	Describe changes. For has been no change in the impact categories. The legislative advancement of the properties of the properties of the properties of the properties of the project. The bonding provided funding assurance for the project to move	ıl did not a		
A.	Right-of-Way Impacts	<u>N/A</u>	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>
1.	Have the right-of-way requirements changed?			\boxtimes
2.	Have the project's effects on minorities or disadvantaged persons or those			\boxtimes

N/A YES NO A. Right-of-Way Impacts disproportionately affected changed? (E.O. 12898) 3. Describe changes. Access to the DNR and BLM offices west of University will not be removed, the access will remain right-turn-in and right-turn-out. N/A YES NO **B.** Social Impacts 1. Would there be any changes in the neighborhoods or community cohesion for the \boxtimes various social groups as a result of the proposed action? 2. Are there any changes in travel patterns and accessibility (such as vehicular, П \boxtimes commuter, bicycle, or pedestrian)? \boxtimes 3. Are there any changes to the impacts on school districts, recreation areas, churches, businesses, police and fire protection, etc.? Include the direct impacts and the indirect impacts that may result from the displacement of households and businesses. 4. Are there any changes to the effects of the project on the elderly, handicapped, \boxtimes nondrivers, transit-dependent, minority and ethnic groups, or the economically disadvantaged? 5. Describe changes. N/A YES NO C. Economic Impacts 1. Are there any changes in the economic impacts of the action on the regional and/or \boxtimes local economy, such as the effects of the project on development, tax revenues and public expenditures, employment opportunities, accessibility, and retail sales? \boxtimes 2. Are there any changes in the potential impacts of the proposed action on established businesses or business districts, or changes in any opportunities to minimize or reduce such impacts by the public and/or private sectors? 3. Describe changes. N/AYES NO D. Local Land Use and Transportation Plan 1. Have there been changes in the local land use or transportation plan? \times \times 2. If yes, is the project consistent with the changes to the local transportation land use \boxtimes 3. Would project changes induce adverse secondary and cumulative effects? 4. Describe changes. YES N/A NO E. Cultural Resources Impacts \times 1. Are there changes in the project's effect on cultural resources?

Project Name: University Avenue Widening

E.	Cultural Resources Impacts	<u>N/A</u>	YES	<u>NO</u>
2.	Has there been a change in the status of National Register-listed eligible, or potentially eligible, sites in the project area?	LJ		
3.	Describe changes.			
F.	Wetlands Impacts	<u>N/A</u>	YES	<u>NO</u>
	yes, resource coordination required)			
1.	Are there changes in project scope or design that affect the wetland impacts?			\boxtimes
2.	Acres (original/proposed): 0.17/0.17			
3.	Fill quantities (original/proposed: 2300cy/2300 cy			
4.	Dredge quantities (original/proposed): 12cy/12cy			
5.	Describe any changes from the original environmental document and subsequent environmental re-evaluations.			
No	changes			
		N/A	YES	NO
	Fish and Wildlife Impacts	<u>/ 1// 1 x</u>	1135	
1.	Are there changes in the effects on fish and wildlife resources?		LJ	\boxtimes
2.	Do project changes require consultation with NMFS per Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) regulations?			\boxtimes
3.	Has there been a change in the effects on wildlife resources?			\boxtimes
4.	Does the project affect bald eagles or golden eagles?			\boxtimes
5.	Describe changes.			
11	Threatened and Endangered Species (T&E) Impacts	N/A	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>
1.	Has there been a change in status of listed T&E species directly or indirectly		[]	\boxtimes
* •	affected by the project?			
2.	Describe changes.			
¥	Water Pady Involvement	N/A	YES	<u>NC</u>
I.	Water Body Involvement Have there been any changes in the project's effects on water bodies? If yes,			\boxtimes
1.	complete 2-4 and describe in 5.	LJ	Ш	K-Si
2.	Does the project affect a navigable water body (as listed by USCG)?		\boxtimes	
3.	Does the project affect navigable waters of the U.S. (as defined by the Corps)?		\boxtimes	
4.	Does the project affect a Catalogued Anadromous Fish Stream (41.14.870)?		\boxtimes	
5.	Describe changes.			
No	changes			

Project Name: University Avenue Widening

N/A YES NO J. Alaska Coastal Management Program (ACMP) X 1. Are there changes that affect the standards of the ACMP? 2. Are there changes to a local coastal management district that affect the consistency \boxtimes finding? \boxtimes 3. If yes to #2, is the project consistent with local coastal management policies? 4. Describe changes. N/AYES NO K. Hazardous Waste \boxtimes 1. Have there been any changes in the status of known or potentially contaminated sites along the corridor? 2. If buildings or residences are relocated, have they been evaluated for hazardous \boxtimes waste, such as asbestos? 3. Describe changes. There remains a low probability of encountering hazardous material in the acquired residential buildings. N/A YES NO L. Air Quality Conformity X П 1. Does the project as proposed affect a nonattainment area, which will require a revised conformity determination? 2. Describe changes. The emission calculation remains valid. Changes to vehicle usage include the acquisition of new low-particulate emission mass transport busses for the area. This would further lower the vehicle emissions predicted in the analysis. N/A YES NO M. Floodplains Impacts 1. Have there been changes in the project effects on a regulatory floodway? X \boxtimes \Box 2. Does the project remain consistent with local flood protection standards and E.O. 11988? 3. Have there been changes in the status of local flood hazard ordinances? \boxtimes 4. Describe changes. N/A YES NO N. Noise Impacts \boxtimes 1. Has there been a change in noise sensitive receivers/land uses adjacent to the proposed project? X2. Has there been a substantial change in vertical or horizontal alignment? \boxtimes 3. Has the number of through lanes or the project itself created a noise impact? 4. Has a noise analysis demonstrated potential noise impacts? 5. Are there feasible and reasonable measures that can reduce impacts? \boxtimes 6. Do changes in the project require a local noise permit?

Project Name: University Avenue Widening

7.	De	ise Impacts scribe changes. s previously determined remain unchanged.	<u>N/A</u>	YES	<u>NO</u>
O. 1,		nter Quality Impacts es the project now involve a public or private drinking water source?	<u>N/A</u>	YES	<u>NO</u> ⊠
2.	Wo	ould project changes affect the potential discharge of storm water into Waters of U.S.?			
3.	Do	es the project affect a designated impaired water body? (If yes, complete "a".) List names and locations.			
	Ch	ena River and Noyes Slough			
4.	NP	If the project now involve a municipal separate storm sewer system (MS4) DES permit, or will runoff be mixed with discharges from an NPDES permitted ustrial facility?			
5.	Des	scribe changes.			
No	cha	nges			
P. 1.		rmits and Authorizations there any changes in the status of the following permits and authorizations?	<u>N/A</u>	YES	<u>NO</u>
	a.	Corps, Section 404/10			\boxtimes
	и. b.	Coast Guard, Section 9			
	c.	Department of Natural Resources (DNR), Title 41			
	d.	Flood Hazard			
	e.	ADEC 401			\boxtimes
	f.	ADEC Storm Water Plan			\boxtimes
	g.	DNR, ACMP	\boxtimes		
	h.	Other. If yes, list.			\boxtimes
	No	tice of Intent to operate under NPDES Storm water Pollution Prevention Plan			
2.	Des	scribe changes.			
		s required include a, b, c, d, e, and h listed above. The EPA NPDES Stormwater p State Department of Environmental Conservation, but all terms and conditions rem			umed
IV		Construction Impacts	<u>N/A</u>	YES	<u>NO</u>
На	ve tl	ne following potential construction effects changed: nstruction timing commitments?			\boxtimes

Project Name: University Avenue Widening

IV. Construction Impacts	<u>N/A</u>	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>	
 Have the following potential construction effects changed: Temporary degradation of water quality? Temporary stream diversion? Temporary degradation of air quality? Temporary delays and detours of traffic? Temporary impacts on businesses? Other construction impacts, including noise? 				
8. Describe changes.				
 V. Section 4(f)/6(f) 1. Has there been a change in status of Section 4(f) properties affected by the proposed action? 	<u>N/A</u>	YES	<u>NO</u> ⊠	
2. Would the project "use" property from Section 4(f) properties?3. Has there been a change in status in Section 6(f) properties affected by the proposed action?	\boxtimes			
4. Is the use of 6(f) property a conversion of use per Section 6(f) of the LWCFA? If yes to any of the above, attach appropriate Section 4(f) and Section 6(f) documentation.				
VI. Comments and Coordination Conducted for the Re-Evaluation	N/A	YES	NO	
Has public/agency coordination occurred since the environmental document was approved or since the last re-evaluation?			\boxtimes	
2. Describe comments and coordination efforts taken for this project since approval of the environmental document or re-evaluation. Discuss pertinent issues raised by the public and government agencies. Attach applicable correspondence and responses.				
	31/4	VPO	NO	
VII. Changes in Environmental Commitments or Mitigation Measures 1. Have there been any changes in the environmental commitments or mitigation?	<u>N/A</u>	YES	<u>NO</u>	
 Have there been any changes in the environmental commitments or mitigation? Describe changes. 				
DOT&PF advance acquired the parcels required to relocate the entrance of the Chena River State Recreation Site (protected under 6(f)(3)) prior to the construction of the project.				

Project Name: University Avenue Widening

Date: 11/6/2008

VΙ	II. Environmental Re-Evaluation	<u>N/A</u>	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>
1.	The conclusions and commitments of the original environmental document approval or subsequent re-evaluation remain valid. <i>If no, go to #2</i> .		\boxtimes	
2.	The changes in the project scope, environmental consequences, or public controversy require a new, supplemental environmental document or EIS. No. 2 requires prior consultation with the FHWA area liaison and environmental specialist.			
	Prepared by:	Date: <u>/</u> 2-	8-0	8
	Approved by: S.C., Coordinator	Date: <u>[] -</u>	-	
	Approved by: FHWA Area Liaison	Date: <u>12-</u> 1	16-08	

Copy: Design Manager