F00012A: PIN 600012A US 395/NSC - Freya St to Farwell Rd - SB Additional Lanes
Project Version: 1. F00012A US 395/NSC - Freya to Fairview SB Grading and Structures (State)
Environmental Document: 1

PART 1 - PROJECT DESCRIPTION

Statement of Deficiencies/Needs: This project is included in the Eastern Region 20-year financially constrained mobility strategy. The region does not have a high capacity north-south transportation corridor for the efficient movement of freights, goods and people to meet the future transportation demands. The current traffic congestion on both state routes and local routes moving in a north south direction have contributed to non-attainment for carbon monoxide levels within the urban growth boundaries.

Statement of Purpose: This project constructs three southbound lanes and five bridges between Freya Street and Farwell Road. When complete this

PART 2 - ENVIRONMENTAL CLASSIFICATION

NEPA Re-evaluation of EIS
SEPA Adoption of NEPA

Original EIS Title: North Spokane Corridor Phase I, Final Supplemental

Rod Date: Tuesday, November 21, 2000

Federal Doc ID Number: FHWA-WA-EIS-95-4-DS

SIGNATURES

Williams, Tammie 01/30/2009
Regional Environmental Manager Date

Vance, Melanie 01/30/2009
Regional Environmental Contact Date

Vance, Melanie 01/30/2009
Completed by Date
TelephoneNumber: 509.324.6131
Fax:
Endangered Species Act

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anticipated USFWS Consultation Type:</th>
<th>Anticipated NOAA Consultation Type:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Effect</td>
<td>No Effect</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Part 2C. National Historic Preservation Act: Section 106

Exempt per 2000 Programmatic Agreement: ☐ Yes ☐ No
Exempt per 2007 Programmatic Agreement: ☐ Yes ☐ No

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Highways and bridge activities presumed to have minimal potential to cause effects:</th>
<th>Highways and bridge activities presumed to have minimal potential to cause effects, with</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>☐ Yes ☐ No</td>
<td>☐ Yes ☐ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>☐ Yes ☐ No</td>
<td>☐ Yes ☐ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>☐ Yes ☐ No</td>
<td>☐ Yes ☐ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>☐ Yes ☐ No</td>
<td>☐ Yes ☐ No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PART 3 - PERMITS & APPROVALS

JARPA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Corps of Engineers</th>
<th>Permit Type:</th>
<th>Nationwide #:</th>
<th>Individual Permit #:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes ☐ No</td>
<td>☐ Section 404 ☐ Section 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes ☐ No</td>
<td>Coast Guard Bridge Permit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes ☐ No</td>
<td>Coastal Zone Management Certification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes ☐ No</td>
<td>Short-Term Water Quality Modification</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes ☐ No</td>
<td>Water Quality Certification — Section 401</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes ☐ No</td>
<td>Shoreline Permit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes ☐ No</td>
<td>Hydraulic Project Approval</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes ☐ No</td>
<td>DNR Use Authorization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other State/Federal

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Water Use Permit</th>
<th>Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) Baseline General for Construction</th>
<th>Temporary Erosion Sediment Control Plan (TESC)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes ☐ No</td>
<td>☐ Yes ☐ No</td>
<td>☐ Yes ☐ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes ☐ No</td>
<td>State Waste Discharge Permit</td>
<td>☐ Yes ☐ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes ☐ No</td>
<td>Tribal Permit(s) (ARPA, other)</td>
<td>☐ Yes ☐ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes ☐ No</td>
<td>Forest Practices Approval</td>
<td>☐ Yes ☐ No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes ☐ No</td>
<td>Section 4(f)/6(f): Wildlife Refuges, Recreation Areas, Historic Properties</td>
<td>☐ Yes ☐ No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Local/Other

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Critical Area Ordinance (CAO) Permit</th>
<th>Flood Plain Development Permit</th>
<th>General HPA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes ☐ No</td>
<td>Yes ☐ No</td>
<td>Yes ☐ No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

List of Other Permits (0)
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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stream Name (if known)</th>
<th>Fisheries WA Stream No.</th>
<th>Latitude/Longitude ID.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. Identify stream crossing structures by type

| N/A |
---|---|

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: 0

Total sq ft of new impervious surface: 1,350,360

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.

Stormwater from all new impervious surfaces will be treated per the Highway Runoff Manual using bioinfiltration and infiltration methods. Highway Runoff Manual flow control standards will also be met.

2. Wetlands

Impacted wetland categories and known acreage

Are wetlands present? ☐ Yes ☐ No

If already known, estimated acres impacted:

If already known, list anticipated wetland mitigation requirements:

If already known, estimate anticipated wetland mitigation acres:

☐ Onsite ☐ Offsite ☐ None

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.

- Spirantes diluvialis (Ute ladies-tresses) - Fed. Threatened
- Howellia aquatilis (water howellia) - Fed. Threatened
- Silene spaldingii (Spalding’s Silene) - Fed. Threatened

c. General fish and wildlife habitat

This is a largely commercial and industrial area mixed with residences near the eastern Spokane City Limit. This setting supports small mammals (rodents, coyotes, etc.), deer, songbirds, and small raptors.

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

None.

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
PART 4 - ENVIRONMENTAL CONSIDERATIONS

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

**Aquifer Recharge Area, Wellhead Protection Area, or Sole Source Aquifer.**
If located within a sole aquifer, is project exempt from EPA approval? ☐ Yes ☐ No

The Spokane Valley Rathdrum Prairie Aquifer is below the project.

5. Air Quality

a. Is project included in Metropolitan Transportation Plan? ☐ Yes ☐ No
MTP adoption date: ☐ Yes ☐ No
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 Maintenance CO PM10 ☐ ☐
Not Applicable ☐ ☐

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

The SFEIS included an updated air quality analysis. It concluded that the project conforms to the CO State Implementation Plan.

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 vehicles / freight more than the 8% standard usage ☐ Yes ☐ No
Completed project allows larger/heavier vehicles and more freight 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 qualitative MSAT. Categorical exclusion/exemption projects are also exempt from MSAT. Provide notes or comments below:
The SFEIS was signed in September 18, 2000 and the ROD issued November 21, 2000. MSAT was not in effect until 2006. This project is therefore exempt from MSAT evaluation.

6. Noise

a. Is this a Type 1 noise project? ☐ Yes ☐ No ☐ Need additional information
If known, estimate total length of mitigation (in miles). 0.53 in miles
Explain/describe mitigation:

The analysis prepared for the SFEIS determined that the only sound barrier along this segment of the NSC which would meet the feasibility and reasonableness criteria is on the east side of the NSC alignment at the north end of this segment (between Farwell Road and Parksmith Drive). This barrier was built when the northbound lanes were constructed.

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.  

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:

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:

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):

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

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  
  - None.

b. Forest/Timber  
  - None.
12. Hazardous and Problem Waste

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.)

Numerous sites previously identified in the SFEIS.

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].

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:

13. Geologically Hazardous Area

Identify conditions and hazards.

None known.

14. Energy

An energy analysis is generally required for large scale projects.

Is an energy analysis required for this project?  

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

The FEIS compared energy consumption conditions for the build and no-build alternatives. Due to the level of congestion on existing north-south urban arterials, the build alternative results in reduced fuel consumption.

15. Visual Quality

Will the project disturb the roadside?  

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.

Land within the project limits has been cleared and used as a staging area for previous NSC projects. Most of the embankment for the southbound lanes has already been built.
Mitigation proposals described in the FSEIS will be implemented. These include planting along the corridor to soften the visual impacts of the new road, as well as to shield the user from views of urban blight.

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

      The NSC (US 395) will become part of the inventory of facilities maintained by WSDOT.