Washington State Department of Transportation

Environmental Classification Summary

U16701C Initial Version

STATUS/HISTORY			
Creation Date	Last Modified	Revision No	Form Status
	9/8/2008		Approved

PART 1 - PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Statement of Deficiencies/Needs: The SR 167 Corridor is highly congested during peak hours.

Statement of Purpose: To improve mobility, traffic operation, safety and reduce congestion on SR 167.

DESCRIPTION OF WORK

WIN Description

U16701C SR 167 / 8th St. E Vic. to S 277th St. Vic. - Managed Lane

Version: SR 167 / 8th St. E Vic to S 277th St Vic. - Managed Lane

Type of Work:	NHS Status:	Roadway:	New/ Reconstruction?	Functional Class:
Managed Lane Construction	NHS	Multi-lane	Yes	Urban Principal Arterial

SR/WIN Mile Posts

State Rt. 167 | Other SR(s)? ☐ | Begin MP 9.20 | End MP 18.24 | Ctrline Length 9.04 | Resurfacing Length

Location Information

WIN Region: Urban Corridors

Township, Range, Section: 036, 001, 012, 013, 014, 023, 026, 035,

County/Counties

King

Water Resource Inventory Area

9	Duwamish-Green
10	Puyallup-White

816701C SR 167 / 8th St. E Vic to S 277th St Vic. - Managed Lane

Type of Work: Managed Lane Construction

816700U SR 167 / SR 161 to Renton - Corridor Study

Type of Work: Study of Corridor

PART 2 - ENVIRONMENTAL CLASSIFICATION

NEPA Documented Categorical Exclusion (DCE) per 23 CFR 771.117 (d) to FHWA

SEPA Determination of Non-Significance (DNS)

Exempt: _____

Original EIS Title: _____ ROD Date: _____ Federal Doc ID Number: _____

SIGNATURES

Hanson, Allison — 09/08/2008
Regional Environmental Manager — Date

Federal Highway Administration — 9/16/2008
Date

Sallis, Michael — 09/08/2008
Regional Environmental Contact — Date

Completed by — Date
Telephone: 206.464.1230
Fax:

U16701C Initial Version

FEDERAL DOCUMENTATION

Endangered Species Act

Anticipated USFWS Consultation Type: Informal - Complete

Anticipated NOAA Consultation Type: Informal - Complete

Part 2C. National Historic Preservation Act: Section 106

Exempt per 2000 Programmatic Agreement: ○ Yes ◉ No Exempt per 2007 Programmatic Agreement: ○ Yes ◉ No

Section A ◉ Yes ○ No — Highways and bridge activities presumed to have minimal potential to cause effects:

All construction work will occur within the existing WSDOT right of way.

Section B ◉ Yes ○ No — Highways and bridge activities presumed to have minimal potential to cause effects, with

Site C, identified in the Cultural Resource Report is the only area not located in the WSDOT right of way. The project will have minimal to no effect to cultural, historical, or archaeological resources at this site.

Section C ○ Yes ◉ No — Washington State Ferries activities presumed to have minimal potential to cause effects:

Section D ○ Yes ◉ No — Washington State Ferries activities presumed to have minimal potential to cause effects, with

PART 3 - PERMITS & APPROVALS

JARPA

◉ Yes ○ No Corps of Engineers Permit Type: ☒ Section 404 ☐ Section 10

Nationwide #: 23 Individual Permit #:

○ Yes ◉ No Coast Guard Bridge Permit

◉ Yes ○ No Coastal Zone Management Certification

○ Yes ◉ No Short-Term Water Quality Modification

◉ Yes ○ No Water Quality Certification — Section 401 Issued By: DOE

○ Yes ◉ No Shoreline Permit

◉ Yes ○ No Hydraulic Project Approval

○ Yes ◉ No DNR Use Authorization

Other State/Federal

○ Yes ◉ No Water Use Permit

◉ Yes ○ No Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Baseline General for Construction

◉ Yes ○ No Temporary Erosion Sediment Control Plan (TESC)

○ Yes ◉ No State Waste Discharge Permit

○ Yes ◉ No Tribal Permit(s) (ARPA, other)

○ Yes ◉ No Forest Practices Approval

○ Yes ◉ No Section 4(f)/6(f): Wildlife Refuges, Recreation Areas, Historic Properties

Local/Other

○ Yes ◉ No Critical Area Ordinance (CAO) Permit

The City of Auburn does require a CAO Review.

◉ Yes ○ No Flood Plain Development Permit

○ Yes ◉ No General HPA

List of Other Permits (1)

Noise Variance from the cities of Auburn, Algona, and Pacific.

PART 4 - ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS

1. Water Related Issues

Rivers, Streams (continuous, intermittent), or **Tidal Waters**

a. Identify all waterbodies within 300 ft of the project limits or that will be otherwise impacted:

Stream Name (if known)	Fisheries WA Stream No.	Latitude/Longitude ID.
Mill Creek, Milwaukee		47° 21' 13.28" N122° 14'

b. Identify stream crossing structures by type

Mill Creek is a major creek that flows within our project area on SR 167. The creek crosses under SR 167 two times through culverts within our project area. Begin: 47° 21' 13.28" N122° 14' 40.98" W End: 47° 15' 00.76"N122° 15' 27.07" W

There are two culverts that we are retrofitting to improve fish passage. One culvert is an unknown tributary that flows into Milwaukee Ditch and the other is Jovita Creek that also flows to Milwaukee Ditch. The culverts ID numbers are 65 and 73.

Water Quality/Storm Water

Has a NPDES municipal general permit been issued for this WRIA? (●) Yes ( ) No

Total sq ft of existing impervious surface within project limits: 4,397,382

Total sq ft of new impervious surface: 473,497

Water quality treatment for existing impervious? (●) Yes ( ) No

Will the project impact a 303d or TMDL listed water body? (●) Yes ( ) No

Describe proposed water quality/quantity treatment for new and any existing impervious surface upon completion of project.

Site C Floodplain Storage: In the Mill Creek Subbasin, Site C will be constructed to provide stormwater flow control, as opposed to traditional detention facilities. This demonstrative approach will create additional storage adjacent to Mill Creek to offset potential impacts caused by increased runoff from the project corridor. This method is preferred due to the lack of appropriate sites for conventional detention considering the adjacent wetlands, high groundwater table, and the environmental benefits of this approach compared to open ponds or stormwater vaults. This project will treat stormwater by using compost-amended vegetated filter strips (CAVFS), Ecology Embankments, and Stormwater Detention Ponds. WSDOT will install 6.15 acres of CAVFS, 1.97 acres of Ecology Embankments, 0.46 acres of a Wetland Cell, and 1.67 acres of existing Ecology Embankments being converted to CAVFS.

2. Wetlands

Impacted wetland categories and known acreage

Are wetlands present? (●) Yes ( ) No If already known, estimated acres impacted: 0.32

A Wetland Mitigation Plan was prepared for this project.

If already known, list anticipated wetland mitigation requirements: (●) Onsite ( ) Offsite ( ) None

If already known, estimate anticipated wetland mitigation acres: 1.8

All mitigation will be done onsite. Please refer to the Wetland Mitigation Report if more information is needed.

3. Habitat

a. Are there potential Migratory Bird Treaty Act issues? (●) Yes ( ) No

b. Threatened/Endangered Species or Priority Habitat or Species (include species of concern). Indicate state or federal listing.

Chinook Salmon, steelhead, bull trout, and coho salmon. Also, a Biological Assessment has been prepared for this project.

c. General fish and wildlife habitat

TES or PHS species including species of concern. Include state or federal listing:

Species:	Status

PART 4 - ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS

Chinook salmon	Federal threatened
steelhead	Federal threatened, State Priority species
bull trout	Federal threatened,
coho	Federal species of concern, state priority species
chum	State priority species
bald eagles	Federal species of concern, state sensitive species
Chinook salmon critical habitat	Federal designated in lower portion of Mill Creek in project area

General fish and wildlife habitat:

d. Describe habitat mitigation proposals (include anticipated work windows).

4. Flood Plains or Ways & Groundwater

Is the project located in a 100-year flood plain?	◉ Yes ○ No
If yes, is the project located in a 100-year floodway?	○ Yes ◉ No
Will the project impact a 100-year flood plain?	◉ Yes ○ No
Will the project impact a 100-year floodway?	○ Yes ◉ No

Describe type(s) of impact that are expected (new structure, fill, stormwater discharge, etc...)

Site C Floodplain Storage: Rather than provide conventional flow control, Ecology allows alternatives to the presumptive flow control requirement if it can be shown that the project will not adversely impact water quality and will meet the flood control objectives of the local jurisdictions. The Site C floodplain storage proposal is a demonstrative (vs. presumptive) approach to demonstrate that floodplain storage will mitigate the increase in peak runoff from the impervious surface added from the project. The approach essentially proposes to create flood storage capacity within the Mill Creek floodplain in excess of stormwater runoff generated by the road project. This proposal involves excavating a backwater area within an existing wetland and upland habitats in the Mill

Aquifer Recharge Area, Wellhead Protection Area, or Sole Source Aquifer.

If located within a sole aquifer, is project exempt from EPA approval? ◉ Yes ○ No

This project is within an Aquifer Recharge Area and near a Well Head Protection Zone.

5. Air Quality

a. Is project included in Metropolitan Transportation Plan?	◉ Yes ○ No
MTP adoption date:	1/1/1995
Is regional conformity required?	○ Yes ◉ No
Is project-level conformity required?	○ Yes ◉ No
Is an Air Quality Study required?	○ Yes ◉ No

Located in an Air Quality	CO	PM10
Maintenance	◉	○
Not Applicable	○	○

Explain answers given above (eg., identify triggers, regulations, policy, location, type of document, reasons for air study, etc...)

Traffic improvements proposed by this project will create smoother driving conditions. More specifically, the extension of a HOT lane will reduce stop and go conditions thereby conserving fuel. It will also promote more efficient energy consumption by moderating speeds. This proposed project will enable better movement of vehicles in from year of opening in 2012/2014 through 2030 for project area intersections and on the mainline, thereby reducing traffic and collisions.

It is anticipated that there will be no adverse impact on air quality as the project is expected to improve traffic flow and reduce vehicle idle time (Michael Minor and Associates, 2008a) as compared to not constructing these improvements.

PART 4 - ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS

b. Yes to any of the following questions means that a Mobile Source Air Toxic (MSAT) emission evaluation is likely to be needed:

Future design year AADT > 140,000 (both traffic directions)	◉ Yes ○ No
If yes, roadway capacity increased >= 10% (capacity = total vehicle space added, not anticipated future traffic volume)	◉ Yes ○ No
New roadway / alignment on existing road designed for or used by heavy duty vechicles / freight more than the 8% standard usage	○ Yes ◉ No
Completed project allows larger/heavier vechicles and more frieght due to elimination of weight restrictions	○ Yes ◉ No
Sensitive receivers may be located within 1,000 feet of the project	◉ Yes ○ No
Decision: Is a Mobile Source Air Toxic Emission Evaluation Needed?	○ Yes ◉ No

Type? ○ Quantitative ◉ Qualitative

Smaller capacity building projects may need a qualititve MSAT. Catagoricial exclusion/ exemption projects are also exempt from MSAT. Provide notes or comments below:

6. Noise

a. Is this a Type 1 noise project? ◉ Yes ○ No ○ Need additional information

If known, estimate total length of mitigation (in miles). .82 in miles

Explain/describe mitigation:

There will be a noise wall constructed on the east side of SR 167, between Ellingson Road and 6th Avenue South. The overall noise reduction for this wall will range from 4 to 8 dBA, producing an average reduction for all receivers of 5.9 dBA, an average reduction of 6.9 dBA for front-row receivers and an average reduction for locations with effects of 6.5 dBA. The wall will have a length of 4,340 feet, range in height between 7 to 12 feet, and have an average height of 10.9 feet (Michael Minor and Associates, 2008b).

b. Has any other noise mitigation been committed to at this location?	○ Yes ◉ No
c. Is project located within a noise barrier retrofit locations (Type 2)?	○ Yes ◉ No
d. Will a nighttime noise variance be needed?	◉ Yes ○ No

e. Identify any anticipated noise issues.

For construction related noise impacts the project will comply with local city ordinances and King County Ordinance 14114 and Pierce County Title 8.76.070. These noise ordinances are largely similar and mostly regulate sounds originating between the hours of 10 p.m. and 7 a.m. from temporary construction sites as a result of construction activity.

7. Social / EJ / Public Involvement

Are minority and/or low income communities impacted by the project? ○ Yes ◉ No

If Yes, describe the impacts below. If known, also describe the community issues including: changes in access, property acquisition and relocation, land-use/zoning changes, utilities, public services and effects on other transportation systems:

There are no minority or low income populations being disproportionately affected by this project.

8. Cultural Resources/Historic Properties

Are there any National Register listed / eligible properties or structures?	◉ Yes ○ No
Identify any historic or archaeological resources or bridges within the project's Area of Potential Effect (APE)?	◉ Yes ○ No

If yes, explain:

PART 4 - ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS

Address	Tax Parcel	Year Built	Recommendations	Structure
1508 West Main Street	42104-9036	1939	Not Eligible	Concrete Silo
879 West Valley Highway E	0420021042	1898	Eligible	Building
36042 West Valley Highway S	85600-0990	1950	Not Eligible	Building
36102 West Valley Highway S	85600-1510	1915	Not Eligible	Building

Are there any historic bridges (or bridges over 40 years of age that need historic significance evaluation)? ○ Yes ◉ No

If yes, List these bridges (include year built) and briefly describe bridge status and requirements:

Will this project require a Cultural Resources Survey? ◉ Yes ○ No

Will this project have material sources, disposal sites, and/or staging areas that need to be surveyed for cultural resources? ○ Yes ◉ No

Has a Cultural Resources Specialist reviewed this project? ◉ Yes ○ No

9. Tribal Consultation

Is the project on tribal lands? ○ Yes ◉ No

Per WSDOT Executive Order 1025 (Feb 19, 2003) list all tribes you will consult (note: consultation is required for projects off tribal lands):

The project area lies within the limits of the usual and accustomed areas of these federally recognized tribes; the Muckleshoot, the Yakama, and Puyallup Tribes which have been consulted. We also consulted with the non-federally recognized Duwamish Tribal Community.

Does your project have the potential to impact a tribal treaty right? (impacts to: fishing resources, access to fishing grounds, hunting grounds, gathering areas, etc): ○ Yes ◉ No

The construction and operation of the project is not expected to reduce fish populations. WSDOT expects that with the construction of our off-channel floodplain approach will improve habitat for off-channel juvenile salmoids. Also, this project does not change, hinder, or deny access to tribal fishing grounds.

10. Parks, Recreation Areas, Wildlife Refuges, Historic Properties, or 4(f)/6(f) Scenic Rivers/Byways, Lands

Identify areas of impact.

None

11. Resource Lands

Identify resource lands within 300 feet of project and those lands otherwise impacted by the project. Describe the impacts:

a. Agricultural

We may use lands that were historically used for agriculture, for floodplain storage and stormwater treatment.

b. Forest/Timber

None

c. Mineral

None

12. Hazardous and Problem Waste

a. Is the project located within a one-mile radius of a site or sites listed on either the

PART 4 - ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS

National Priorities List (Superfund) or Confirmed or Suspected Contaminated Sites List (CSCSL) maintained by Dept. of Ecology? ◉ Yes ○ No

b. Is the project located within a 1/2 mile radius of a site or sites listed on any of the following Dept. of Ecology databases? ◉ Yes ○ No

- ☐ Voluntary Cleanup Program (VCP)
- ☒ Underground Storage Tank (UST)
- ☐ Leaking Underground Storage Tank (LUST)

c. Describe the general findings of the Dept. of Ecology database search in questions a and b. Please specify whether an Environmental Records search service report (e.g., EDR) was obtained or if the information was gathered through other means (e.g., WSDOT's Environmental GIS Workbench). Specify how many properties fit the criteria of questions a and b and what the property activities include across the project (e.g., gas station, dry cleaners, service station, etc.)

The underground storage tank was removed from Site C. There is one property that may affect the project that is identified in the Hazardous Materials Technical Report. Yahn and Sons Funeral Home is the only property that is considers a moderate risk because of its proximity to Site C. The funeral home is across from in the northwest corner of Site C, but on the opposite side of West Valley Highway. This funeral home has been in use since 1965. Mortuaries historically have used arsenic, lead and other heavy metals, and formaldehyde. However, there is no evidence that indicate the funeral home have contaminated soils within Site C.

d. If a site reconnaissance (windshield survey) has been performed, identify any properties not identified in the database search that may affect the project [name, address, property use activity].

None

e. Based on the above information and project specific activities, is there reasonable potential for the project to generate contaminated soils and/or groundwater? If yes, explain: ○ Yes ◉ No

None

13. Geologically Hazardous Area

Identify conditions and hazards.

None

14. Energy

An energy analysis is generally required for large scale projects.

Is an energy analysis required for this project? ○ Yes ◉ No

If NO, how will climate change be evaluated?
If YES, is a climate change evaluation advised for this project? What are the triggers?

15. Visual Quality

Will the project disturb the roadside? ◉ Yes ○ No

Cuts, fills, clearing and grading, new alignments, structures, utilities, etc. usually impact visual functions and should be analyzed per EPM Chapter 459.
Describe roadside visual disturbances.

There will be a noise wall constructed on the east side of SR 167, between Ellingson Road and 6th Avenue South.

PART 4 - ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS

16. Commitments

a. Environmental

Describe existing environmental commitments that may affect or be impacted by the project:

None

b. Long-term maintenance

Are long-term maintenance commitments necessary for this project? ○ Yes ◉ No

Identify

None