# STATE OF ALASKA

## DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND PUBLIC FACILITIES

Design and Engineering Services – Southeast Region Preconstruction – Special Projects SARAH PALIN, GOVERNOR

PO Box 112506 6860 GLACIER HIGHWAY JUNEAU, ALASKA 99811-2506

PHONE: FAX: (907) 465-1774 (907) 465-2016

October 9, 2008

RE: Coordination Plan Gravina Access Project

Dear Participating Agency representative and other interested parties:

On behalf of the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Alaska Department of Transportation & Public Facilities (DOT&PF), I am providing your agency with the attached Gravina Access Project Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) Coordination Plan. Section 6002 of The Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU) requires the development of a Coordination Plan by the lead agencies for communicating and implementing the environmental review process.

The purpose of the Coordination Plan is to clearly identify the roles, responsibilities, opportunities, procedures, and schedule that will be used to coordinate the environmental review and decision-making processes. The plan supports timely and collaborative involvement with the public, tribal governments, and federal, state, and local governmental agencies at key milestones; it also identifies key milestones in the environmental review process. Please note the following agency coordination points that will occur in the next few months:

- Opportunity for Participating Agencies to Comment on the Range of Alternatives to be screened
- Scoping Summary Report Provided to Agencies, Tribes, and Public
- Collaborate on Impact Assessment on Methodologies with Participating Agencies
- Agency Review/Comment on Reasonable Alternatives to be evaluated in the SEIS

Updates to the Coordination Plan will be provided to you as the project progresses.

Thank you for your continued participation in the Gravina Access Project. For more information, please feel free to contact me or visit the project website at www.gravina-access.com.

Sincerely,

Reuben Yost

Special Projects Manager

Enclosures: Coordination Plan with Schedule

cc:

Mike Vanderhoof, FHWA

Mark Dalton, HDR Jim Lowell, DOT&PF

#### Distribution List:

Steve Brockman, Acting Field Supervisor, USDOI - Fish and Wildlife Service

Paul Slenkamp, Resource Manager, Alaska Mental Health Trust Land Office, ADNR

Nicole Hayes, US Army Corps of Engineers

Karl R. Amylon, City Manager, City of Ketchikan

Dan Bockhorst, Borough Manager, Ketchikan Gateway Borough

Michael Cirillo, Regional Administrator, FAA

Jennifer Curtis, US Environmental Protection Agency

Jim Helfinstine, Chief, US Coast Guard

Jack Oien, Roads Program Manager, US Forest Service – Alaska Region

John Kurland, Director for Habitat Conservation, US Department of Commerce

Randy Bates, Division Director, ADNR

Jim Rypkema, Alaska Department of Environmental Conservation

Mark Minnillo, Alaska Department of Fish and Game

Judith Bittner, State Historic Preservation Officer, ADNR

Charles Denny, Mayor, City of Saxman

Norman Arriola, President, Ketchikan Indian Community

William Martin, President, Central Council Tlingit and Haida

Indian Tribes of Alaska

Chris NcNeil, Sealaska Corporation

Frank Jones, President, Cape Fox Corporation

Karl Cook Jr., Mayor, Metlakatla Indian Community

Lee Wallace, President, Organized Village of Saxman

## Gravina Island Access Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement

### Coordination Plan





#### **Prepared for:**

Alaska Department of Transportation Federal Highway Administration

> FHWA-AK-EIS-03-01-F DOT&PF Project 67698 Federal Project ACHP-0922(5)

### **Table of Contents**

1.0 Coordination Plan Description and Requirements	
2.0 Project Background and Description	2
2.1 Project Background	2
2.2 SEIS Process	
3.0 AGENCY Roles and Responsibilities	
3.1 Lead Agency and Joint Lead Agency Roles and Responsibilities	2
3.1.1 Lead Federal Agency Role and Responsibilities	
3.1.2 Joint Lead Agency Role and Responsibilities	5
3.2 Participating and Cooperating Agency Roles and Responsibilities	
4.0 Coordination WITH AGENCIES, TRIBAL Governments, AND THE P	UBLIC 10
4.1 Agency Coordination	10
4.2 Tribal Coordination	12
4.3 Public Coordination	
5.0 Project Schedule	13
<u>List of Tables</u>	
Table 1 Potential Cooperating and Participating Agencies	
Table 2 Coordination Points throughout Environmental Review Process	14

APPENDIX A. Project Schedule

#### 1.0 COORDINATION PLAN DESCRIPTION AND REQUIREMENTS

The Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and Alaska Department of Transportation & Public Facilities (DOT&PF) have initiated a Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) for the Gravina Access Project. The Project or "proposed action" is to improve access to Gravina Island from Revillagigedo Island in Ketchikan, Alaska.

On August 10, 2005, President Bush signed the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (SAFETEA-LU) into law. SAFETEA-LU authorized the Federal surface transportation programs for highways, highway safety, and transit for the 5-year period 2005-2009.

SAFETEA-LU also established a new environmental review process, or project development process inclusive of the permitting phase, to be followed for transportation projects developed under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969. SAFETEA-LU supplements existing practices, but does not supersede any previous guidance or regulations promulgated under NEPA. The new environmental review process is intended to promote efficient project management by lead agencies and enhance opportunities for coordination with the public, tribal governments, and other federal, state, and local governmental agencies during the project development process.

Section 6002 of SAFETEA-LU prescribes changes to existing FHWA procedures for implementing the NEPA process, as amended, and for implementing the regulations of the Council on Environmental Quality (CEQ), 40 CFR parts 1500 through 1508. All Environmental Impact Statements (EIS) for which the Notice of Intent (NOI) was published in the *Federal Register* after August 10, 2005, must follow these new SAFETEA-LU requirements. The FHWA issued Final Guidance for the SAFETEA-LU Environmental Review Process on November 15, 2006 (Section 6002 Guidance).

Section 6002 Guidance requires the development of a "Coordination Plan" by the lead agency as the cornerstone for communicating and implementing the environmental review process. The purpose of the Coordination Plan is to clearly identify roles, responsibilities, opportunities, procedures, and schedule that will be used to coordinate the environmental review and decision-making processes. The Coordination Plan supports timely and collaborative involvement with the public, tribal governments, other federal, state, and local governmental agencies at key milestones. The Coordination Plan identifies key milestones as Coordination Points in the environmental review process. The Coordination Points indicate a timeframe where information will be made available for review by the involved entities.

Section 6002 Guidance for the Coordination Plan focuses on the different elements of the environmental review process and provides information on:

- Project initiation.
- Roles and responsibilities of the lead agency, joint lead agency, and participating and cooperating agencies.
- Development of project purpose and need.

- Analysis of alternatives.
- Identification and design of the preferred alternative.
- Opportunities for involvement by the public, tribal governments, other federal, state, and local governmental agencies.

In addition, Section 6002 Guidance establishes maximum deadlines for the public and agencies to submit comments; establishes a 180-day statute of limitations (SOL) on claims against FHWA and other federal agencies for certain environmental and other approval actions, including NEPA documents and permits; and provides for a formal issue resolution process.

The Gravina Access Project SEIS Coordination Plan has been prepared pursuant to 23 USC 139 and will be distributed for public, tribal government, and other federal, state, and local governmental agencies for review as part of scoping and project development. Updates to this Coordination Plan will be provided as the project progresses.

#### 2.0 PROJECT BACKGROUND AND DESCRIPTION

#### 2.1 Project Background

The FHWA, in cooperation with DOT&PF, identified a need to improve access between Revillagigedo Island and Gravina Island in Southeast Alaska. The Gravina Access Project was one of 17 high priority projects funded in the state by the Transportation Equity Act for the 21st Century.

The purpose of this project is to improve surface transportation between Revillagigedo Island, home of the City of Ketchikan and the City of Saxman, and Gravina Island, the location of the Ketchikan International Airport and adjoining lands that offer recreation and development potential. Currently, a small ferry provides the only regular access to Gravina Island with a terminal at Ketchikan International Airport. Access to the remainder of Gravina Island is available by watercraft and the Lewis Reef Road. The recent opening of the Gravina Island Highway now provides access to some private lands and the Ketchikan Gateway Borough's developable lands north and south of the airport reserve, and to the Bostwick Lake Road and the Alaska Department of Natural Resources and the U.S. Forest Service's timber lands.

The FHWA, in cooperation with DOT&PF, evaluated six bridge alternatives, three ferry alternatives, and the No Action Alternative in the Gravina Access Project EIS. The Final EIS, which was distributed to the public and federal and state agencies on July 30, 2004, identified Alternative F1 as FHWA's and DOT&PF's Preferred Alternative. Alternative F1 would cross Tongass Narrows via Pennock Island with two bridges: a 200-foot bridge over the East Channel and a 120-foot bridge West Channel. FHWA issued a Record of Decision on September 15, 2004, that identified Alternative F1 as the Selected Alternative. More information can be found at the project website: www.gravina-access.com.

Alternative F1 included a 3.4-mile road segment, known as the Gravina Island Highway, which would connect the bridge over West Channel with the Airport Access Road and Lewis Reef Road. Of the nine build alternatives considered in the EIS, only two, Alternatives F1 and F3,

included the Gravina Island Highway. Lewis Reef Road was part of all nine build alternatives evaluated in the EIS with the purpose of providing access to the Ketchikan Gateway Borough's Lewis Reef development area.

The DOT&PF has moved forward with the first phase of the Gravina Access Project: construction of the Gravina Island Highway. The work includes the site grading, placing embankment, constructing bridges over Government Creek and Gravina Creek, installing drainage structures, and other improvements. Construction of the Gravina Island Highway is expected to be complete in fall of 2008.

On September 21, 2007, Alaska Governor Sarah Palin stated that funding for the development of Alternative F1 was \$329 million short of the required amount and "it's clear that Congress has little interest in spending any more money on a bridge between Ketchikan and Gravina Island." The governor directed the DOT&PF to look for the most fiscally responsible alternative for access to the airport and Gravina Island instead of proceeding further with Alternative F1 (Gravina Access Project Redirected 07-192).

FHWA informed the DOT&PF in October 2007 that if it were to select a different alternative that does not include the Gravina Island Highway, all or part of the monies expended on construction of the highway may be declared ineligible for federal participation. Not all of the reasonable alternatives in the Final EIS included the Gravina Island Highway, which DOT&PF began constructing in 2006. So, DOT&PF is now preparing a Supplemental EIS to consider all reasonable alternatives with the inclusion of the Gravina Island Highway. The No Action Alternative will also be considered. The SEIS will result in a new Record of Decision issued by the FHWA.

#### 2.2 SEIS Process

According to FHWA's Environmental Impact and Related Procedures (23 CFR Part 771), an EIS shall be supplemented whenever FHWA determines that changes to the proposed action would result in significant environmental impacts that were not evaluated in the EIS, or new information or circumstances relevant to environmental concerns and bearings on the proposed action or its impacts would result in significant environmental impacts not evaluated in the EIS. In the case of the Gravina Access Project, the changes requiring the preparation of an SEIS are the uncertainty of funding levels and the consideration of construction of the Gravina Island Highway for all reasonable alternatives. The SEIS will review and update information presented in the FEIS and supplement the environmental analyses of the alternatives to incorporate the Gravina Island Highway. The SEIS may consider new alternatives if the results of scoping or new cost criteria (as per Governor Palin's September 21, 2007, directive) present reasons to do so. The FHWA and DOT&PF are lead agencies for the Gravina Access Project SEIS.

#### 3.0 AGENCY ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES

The roles and responsibilities specified in Section 6002 Guidance are an important component of the regulatory and governmental obligations for the lead and participating agencies (defined below) to work cooperatively to improve the environmental review process. Section 6002 Guidance outlines specific roles and responsibilities for each entity and requires the Coordination

Plan document the methodology in which interaction is conducted with the public, tribal governments, and other federal and state agencies.

#### 3.1 Lead Agency and Joint Lead Agency Roles and Responsibilities

#### 3.1.1 Lead Federal Agency Role and Responsibilities

Section 6002 requires FHWA take the role of the lead federal agency for all highway projects that receive federal funds or require FHWA approval. FHWA has the responsibility and decision making authority for the proposed federal action. As the lead agency, FHWA oversees the NEPA process, consults with other agencies, maintains the government-to-government relationships with potentially affected tribal governments, and is ultimately responsible for the scope and content of the SEIS. Because DOT&PF is the direct recipient of the federal funds, it must serve as a joint lead agency (see Section 3.1.3). FHWA provides guidance to the joint lead agency during the development of the environmental analysis and SEIS document. FHWA must ensure the joint lead agency implements mitigation measures appropriate to the scope and scale of impacts.

Key responsibilities of FHWA as the lead federal agency include:

- Review and approve the Coordination Plan.
- Consult with DOT&PF and approve invitations to participating and cooperating agencies.
- Invite federal agencies and tribal governments to become participating and/or cooperating agencies, as appropriate. Table 1 provides a list of agencies that participated in the development of the draft and final EIS and which have been invited to participate in the SEIS. Table 1 reflects the responses provided to date by the agencies.
- Conduct government-to-government consultation with tribal governments as described in Federal Executive Order 13175 "Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments."
- Oversee, manage, and facilitate the environmental review process to ensure efficiency and compliance with NEPA, SAFETEA-LU, and other applicable laws and regulations.
- Furnish guidance in the preparation of environmental documents.
- Enforce schedules and establish deadlines for comments during the environmental review process in accordance with SAFETEA-LU and CEQ requirements.
- Provide information to the participating and cooperating agencies as early as practicable in the environmental review process regarding potentially affected resources located within the project area.
- Collaborate with DOT&PF in scoping and public involvement processes.
- Work cooperatively with participating and cooperating agencies to identify and resolve issues that may delay the project or result in a denial of a required permit for the project.
- Take actions as necessary and proper within the authority of the lead agency to facilitate the expeditious resolution of the environmental review process for the project.

- Provide opportunity for involvement by the public, tribal government, and participating and cooperating agencies in reviewing the purpose and need for the project and the range of alternatives.
- Collaborate with participating and cooperating agencies on the methodologies and level of detail for alternative analysis and evaluation of impacts to address changes or new information not addressed in the previous EIS.
- Conduct appropriate and required consultation and coordination processes for NEPA, and other applicable laws, Executive Orders, regulations, and policies pertaining to the public, tribal governments, and other federal, state, and local governmental agencies.
- Make final decisions regarding purpose and need, range of alternatives, methodologies for analyses of alternatives, screening methodologies for alternatives, identification of reasonable alternatives for detailed study in the SEIS, and selection of the preferred alternative, in consultation with DOT&PF, and after considering input from the public, tribal entities, and participating/cooperating agencies.
- Facilitate dispute resolution process.
- Review requests from DOT&PF to develop the preferred alternative to a higher level of detail.
- Review and approve environmental documents in accordance with NEPA, SAFETEA-LU, and other applicable laws and regulations.
- Ensure the project sponsor, DOT&PF, complies with all design and mitigation commitments.

#### 3.1.2 Joint Lead Agency Role and Responsibilities

DOT&PF is the direct recipient of federal funds for this project and will therefore serve as the joint lead agency. As the joint lead agency, DOT&PF will collaborate with FHWA on all public and agency coordination for the Gravina Access Project SEIS.

Key responsibilities of the DOT&PF as the joint lead agency include:

- Develop the Coordination Plan.
- Provide recommendations to FHWA for participating and cooperating agencies. See Table 1
- Invite state and local agencies to become participating and/or cooperating agencies, as appropriate.
- Provide information to the participating and/or cooperating agencies as early as practicable in the environmental review process regarding potentially affected resources located within the project area.
- Conduct baseline engineering and environmental inventories and assessments.
- Prepare draft purpose and need statement and range of alternatives information.

- Provide opportunity for involvement by the public, tribal government, and participating and/or cooperating agencies in reviewing the purpose and need for the project and the range of alternatives.
- Collaborate with participating and/or cooperating agencies on the methodologies and level of detail for alternative analysis and evaluation of impacts to address on changes or new information not addressed in the previous EIS.
- Work cooperatively with participating and/or cooperating agencies to identify and resolve issues that may delay the project or result in a denial of a required permit for the project.
- Prepare engineering drawings in accordance with alternatives development.
- Conduct cost and impact assessments.
- Prepare environmental documents for FHWA review and approval.
- Present recommendations to FHWA on the preferred alternative, including level of design detail.

#### 3.2 Participating and Cooperating Agency Roles and Responsibilities

To enhance interagency coordination and ensure issues of concern are identified, SAFETEA-LU created a new category of involvement in the environmental review process termed "participating agency." The intent of the new category is to encourage governmental agencies at any level with an interest in the proposed project to be active participants in the NEPA evaluation, especially at key decision points in the process.

Section 6002 Guidance requires the lead agencies to invite all federal, state, tribal, regional, and local government agencies with an interest in the project to be participating agencies. Nongovernmental organizations and private entities cannot serve as participating agencies.

The key responsibilities of the participating agencies include:

- Identify, as early as practicable, any issues of concern regarding the project's potential environmental impacts that may substantially delay the project or result in a denial of a required permit for the project.
- Provide meaningful and timely input on the purpose and need and on the determination of the range of alternatives. This also includes the methodologies and level of detail for the analysis of alternatives.
- Participate in appropriate coordination meetings, workshops, scoping meetings, and field review meetings.
- Work cooperatively and participate in issue resolution processes.

Invitations to become a participating agency for a project are made by the lead agencies by mail. A federal agency must decline in writing if it does not intend to participate. The written response must be sent to the lead federal agency and state the reason for declining the invitation. The federal agency must specifically state in its response that it:

- has no jurisdiction or authority with respect to the project,
- has no expertise or information relevant to the project, and
- does not intend to submit comments on the project.

If the invited federal agency's response does not state the agency's position in these terms, or if no agency response is provided within 30 days, then the federal agency will be treated as a participating agency.

A tribal government, state or local agency must respond affirmatively to the invitation to be designated as a participating agency. If the tribal government, state, or local agency fails to respond within 30 days or declines the invitation, regardless of the reasons for declining, the agency should not be considered a participating agency.

Agencies that choose not to accept participating or cooperating agency status will be supplied with project information at major milestones. Agencies are invited to be participating and cooperating agencies during scoping to ensure that issues are identified early and incorporated into the environmental review process. An agency may request participating or cooperating agency status at any time, usually because they learn that they have an interest or compliance requirements. The lead agencies will consider any requests and will revisit issues, if appropriate, to ensure efficient project delivery.

The roles and responsibilities of cooperating and participating agencies are similar, but cooperating agencies have a higher degree of authority, responsibility, and involvement in the environmental review process. SAFETEA-LU does not change the traditional CEQ concept of "cooperating agencies." In accordance with CEQ (40 CFR 1508.5), cooperating agencies are agencies that have jurisdiction by law or special expertise with respect to potential environmental impact to be addressed in the project. Federal and state agencies, tribal entities, and regional and local governmental agencies that meet these requirements, by agreement with the lead agency, may become cooperating agencies.

Cooperating agencies have the same responsibilities as participating agencies. In addition, cooperating agencies are given the opportunity to provide timely, coordinated review and comment on the pre-Draft and pre-Final SEIS, environmental documents, and technical reports to reflect their views and concerns. In addition, CEQ regulations permit a cooperating agency to adopt, without recirculating, the EIS of a lead agency when, after an independent review of the statement, the cooperating agency concludes that its comments and suggestions have been satisfied. By Section 6002 definition, cooperating agencies serve as participating agencies, in addition to their traditional CEQ roles as cooperating agencies.

A list of potential cooperating and participating agencies, along with their jurisdiction or potential interest in the Gravina Access Project, is provided in Table 1: Potential Cooperating and Participating Agencies. The agencies were invited in July 2008. Table 1 reflects how the agencies responded. Identification of cooperating and participating agencies will be updated in the Coordination Plan as the project progresses.

**Table 1: Potential Cooperating and Participating Agencies** 

<b>Cooperating Agency</b>	Jurisdiction/Project Interest	Invitation
N 134	NACCO: 111 C C : 1 N : N 1	Response
National Marine	NMFS is responsible for enforcing the Marine Mammal	No response to
Fisheries Service	Protection Act (MMPA) and the Magnuson Stevens	invitation – treat
(NMFS)	Fishery and Conservation and Management Act under	as Participating
	which essential fish habitat (EFH) is managed. NMFS	Agency
	also administers the Endangered Species Act for marine	
II C A C C	species.	A 1
U.S. Army Corps of	USACE is responsible for issuing permits under Section	Accepted
Engineers (USACE)	404(b)(1) of the Clean Water Act for impacts to	
	wetlands or waters of the United States, and under	
	Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899 for	
H.C.C. I.C. I	areas subject to the ebb and flow of the tide.	N
U.S. Coast Guard	USCG is responsible for approval of the location and	No response to
(USCG)	plans of bridges and causeways constructed across	invitation – treat
	navigable waters of the United States under Section 9 of	as Participating
77.6.77	the Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899.	Agency
U.S. Environmental	EPA is responsible for reviewing, rating, and publicly	Declined as
Protection Agency	commenting on the environmental impacts of major	Cooperating
(EPA)	federal actions, including actions that are the subject of	Agency, accepted
	EISs under Section 309 of the Clean Air Act. USEPA	participation as a
	also has a strong role in the Clean Water Act Section	Participating
	404 process.	Agency
U.S. Fish and Wildlife	USFWS administers the Endangered Species Act for	Declined as
Service (USFWS)	non-marine species, manages migratory bird	Cooperating
,	populations, restores nationally significant fisheries, and	Agency, accepted
	conserves and restores wildlife habitat such as wetlands.	participation as a
	Migratory birds and wetlands are located in the project	Participating
	area. USFWS may have special expertise regarding the	Agency
	project area environment.	
Participating Agency	Jurisdiction/Project Interest	Invitation
Federal		Response
U.S. Department of	USDA Forest Service provides leadership in a	Declined
Agriculture (USDA)	partnership effort to help people conserve, maintain, and	20011100
Forest Service	improve our natural resources and environment.	
Federal Aviation	FAA administers activities at airports and in airspace,	Accepted
Administration (FAA)	and is responsible for safe and efficient air travel	1 1000pied
1.23111111011411011 (1.11.1)	throughout the U.S.	
State		I
Alaska Department of	ADEC is responsible for issuing Water Quality	No response - not
Environmental	Certifications under Section 401 of the Clean Water	participating
Conservation (ADEC)	Act, implementing and permitting under the 1970	
	Federal Clean Air Act, and managing the cleanup of	
	contaminated soil and groundwater in Alaska. The	
	project will require a 401 certification.	
L		1

ADFG Office of Habitat Management and Permitting (OHMP)	OHMP is charged with protecting Alaska's fish and wildlife resources and their habitats.	No response - not participating
Alaska Department of Natural Resources (ADNR) The Trust Land Office	The Trust Land Office manages Mental Health Trust land to generate income, which is used by the Alaska Mental Health Trust Authority to improve the lives and circumstance of Trust beneficiaries.	The Division of Forestry accepted on behalf of The Trust Land Office. They will act jointly as a participating agency.
ADNR Division of Coastal and Ocean Management	The Division of Coastal and Ocean Management administers the Alaska Coastal Management Program, which provides stewardship for Alaska's rich and diverse coastal resources to ensure a healthy and vibrant Alaskan coast that efficiently sustains long-term economic and environmental productivity.	No response - not participating
ADNR State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO)	SHPO is consulted during the process for Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act and Executive Order (EO) 13175: Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments. This project must comply with Section 106 and EO 13175.	No response - not participating
Local		
Ketchikan Gateway Borough	The Borough is the planning authority for the project area. It has engaged in plans to promote development on Gravina Island for over 20 years.	Accepted
City of Ketchikan	The City of Ketchikan is the largest city and population center for the Ketchikan Gateway Borough. The City relies on access to Ketchikan International Airport on Gravina Island to support the local economy.	Accepted
City of Saxman	The City of Saxman is just south of the City of Ketchikan, and the second largest population center in the borough.	No response - not participating
Tribal Governments		
Organized Village of Saxman	Federally recognized tribal membership corporation located in Saxman, Alaska, with an interest in cultural, archaeological, and historic properties in the project area.	No response - not participating
Ketchikan Indian Corporation (IRA)	Federally recognized tribal membership corporation located in Ketchikan, Alaska, with an interest in cultural, archaeological, and historic properties in the project area.	No response - not participating
Metlakatla Indian Community	Incorporated tribe located on Annette Islands Reserve, a federal Indian reservation, with an interest in cultural, archaeological, and historic properties in the project area.	No response - not participating
Central Council Tlingit & Haida Indian Tribes of Alaska (CCTHITA)	Regional Native non-profit Tribal Government representing approximately 26,000 Tlingit and Haida Indians worldwide. CCTHITA is a sovereign entity and	No response - not participating

	has a government to government relationship with the United States. CCTHITA is located in Juneau, Alaska, and has an interest in cultural, archaeological, and historic properties in the project area.	
Hydaburg Cooperative	The Hydaburg Cooperative Association is a federally	No response - not
Association	recognized tribal membership corporation located on	participating
	Prince of Wales Island in Hydaburg, Alaska.	
Craig Community	The Craig Community Association is a federally	No response - not
Association	recognized tribal membership corporation located on	participating
	Prince of Wales Island in Craig, Alaska.	
Klawock Cooperative	The Klawock Cooperative Association is a federally	No response - not
Association	recognized tribal membership corporation located on	participating
	Prince of Wales Island in Klawock, Alaska.	
Organized Village of	The Organized Village of Kasaan is a federally	No response - not
Kasaan	recognized tribal membership corporation located on	participating
	Prince of Wales Island in Kasaan, Alaska	

## 4.0 COORDINATION WITH AGENCIES, TRIBAL GOVERNMENTS, AND THE PUBLIC

Section 6002 Guidance states the Coordination Plan should identify key coordination points and which persons, organizations, or agencies should be included for each of those coordination points. The plan should also explain how the coordination is conducted and the timeframes for input by those persons, organizations, or agencies involved.

Table 2 identifies key coordination points for the Gravina Access Project SEIS, along with timing and methodologies for those coordination points.

Section 6002 Guidance establishes maximum deadlines for the public and agencies to submit comments, including:

- Maximum 60 days Draft SEIS comment period (minimum 45 days).
- Maximum 30 days for other key coordination points (including purpose and need, range of alternatives, etc.).

Longer time periods may be set if agreed to by lead agencies and all participating agencies. Conversely, shorter time periods will be implemented commensurate with the volume and complexity of materials to be reviewed. No reduction of any time period will occur for public comment stipulated by federal law or regulation.

At the end of comment periods, agencies, tribal governments, or individuals that have not provided comments or requested an extension of the deadline will be assumed to have no comments on the material distributed and to be in agreement with the analysis completed to date, and the SEIS process will move forward.

#### 4.1 Agency Coordination

The majority of agencies consulted during the previous project studies were invited to be participating or cooperating agencies under Section 6002 Guidance (see Section 3.2).. Agency

coordination was initiated during the scoping process and focuses on identifying issues, identifying what additional studies are needed and method of analysis, review and discussion on the purpose and need, and review of the range of alternatives. These topics were discussed in one-on-one scoping meetings with individual agencies when possible, and through correspondence when meetings could not be arranged. The agencies were provided a 30-day comment period following the scoping meeting or written notice.

Following is a list of tools that will be used to coordinate with participating, cooperating, and other federal, state, and local governmental agencies during development of the SEIS.

#### **Communications**

The lead agencies will communicate with cooperating and participating agencies through email, phone, fax, mail, and scoping meetings. Written communications have included the invitation letter from the lead agencies to participate either as a "participating or cooperating" agency and to provide scoping comments, and notice of the agency scoping meeting.

#### Agency Scoping Meetings

The agency scoping meetings were conducted as one on one agency meetings. This provided an opportunity to efficiently and effectively meet with the agencies, as the agencies commenting on the project are located in Anchorage, Juneau, and Ketchikan. Scoping meetings covered the following coordination points: 1) Identify Issues and Concerns, 2) Purpose and Need Statement, 3) Initial Collaboration on Methodologies and Level of Detail for Analysis of Alternatives, 4) Preliminary Identification of the Range of Alternatives, and 5) Screening Process to Identify Reasonable Alternatives.

#### **Coordination Packet**

At project scoping initiation, the lead agencies sent coordination packets to the cooperating and participating agencies. The packet included the following project information:

- Project history
- Draft study area and map
- Known issues
- Draft purpose and need statement
- Initial range of alternatives
- Preliminary screening criteria
- Draft coordination plan

#### Agency Comment and Response Database

The lead agencies are responsible for maintaining a comment database to track all comments made in scoping, on the Draft SEIS, and on the Final SEIS. All agency comments will be responded to and taken into consideration at each project phase. The record of response will be included in the database and made available to agencies.

#### Scoping Summary Report

The Scoping Summary Report will summarize the scoping and project development activities undertaken by the lead agencies. In addition to summarizing input provided by the public, tribal governments, and federal, state, and local governmental agencies, the Scoping Summary Report will describe the process used to develop the range of alternatives, establish screening criteria, and identify reasonable alternatives for the proposed project, including those alternatives that

will be carried forward for further evaluation in the Draft SEIS and those that are eliminated from further consideration.

#### Pre-Draft SEIS and Pre-Final SEIS Review

Cooperating agencies have the additional opportunity of reviewing a pre-Draft SEIS and pre-Final SEIS to provide comments. Documents will be circulated to cooperating agencies with a 30-days comment period deadline.

#### Draft SEIS and Final SEIS Review

Notice of the Draft SEIS availability for public, agency, and tribal government review will be published in the Federal Register. Copies of the Draft SEIS will be circulated to cooperating and participating agencies for their review. Comments will be requested. All agency comments will be responded to, and responses will be provided in the Final SEIS.

Notice of the Final SEIS availability for public, agency, and tribal government review will be published in the Federal Register. The Final SEIS will respond to all comments on the Draft SEIS. Copies of the Final SEIS will be circulated to cooperating and participating agencies for their review. The responses to comments on the Final SEIS will be provided in the Record of Decision, anticipated to be made in the spring of 2010.

#### **4.2** Tribal Coordination

The approach to coordination with the tribal governments within the project area is similar to the approach used with the federal, state, and local governmental agencies. However, the lead federal agency recognizes the sovereignty of the tribal government and will coordinate communication and outreach efforts under Executive Order (EO) 13175 Consultation and Coordination with Indian Tribal Governments. EO 13175 uses Indian tribe to describe an Indian or Alaska Native tribe, band, nation, pueblo, village, or community that the Secretary of the Interior acknowledges to exist as an Indian tribe pursuant to the Federally Recognized Indian Tribe List Act of 1994, 25 U.S.C. 479a. A recent Omnibus Act expanded the definition to include native corporations. EO 13175 outlines how each federal agency must ensure that it operates with a government-to-government relationship with the Indian tribe and also directs agencies to consult with the Indian tribe before taking action that affects tribal lands, resources, and members.

The FHWA invited the tribal governments listed in Table 1 to become participating agencies for the project.

The FHWA initiated contact and will attempt to establish an ongoing relationship with tribal governments. The ongoing relationship is the foundation of government-to-government consultation and coordination, and will be maintained throughout the life of the project. In addition to this special relationship, consultation with the tribal government will be conducted as part of the National Historic Preservation Act Section 106 process. In order to provide ongoing project information, DOT&PF, as project co-lead, met with potentially affected tribal entities during scoping.

Section 106 requires federal agencies to take into account the effects of their undertakings on historic and cultural properties. The Section 106 process must also be conducted in accordance with EO 13175. FHWA will coordinate with the tribal governments in the project area and the

State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) to determine the potential impacts, area of potential effect, and mitigation requirements for impacts on cultural, historic, and archaeological resources. Tribal governments will assist in identifying religious and cultural significance of historic properties that may be affected. Section 106 consultation will occur in parallel with coordination under NEPA.

The tools for agency coordination described in section 4.1 also will be used to coordinate with tribal governments during development of the SEIS.

#### 4.3 Public Coordination

The public involvement process is governed by 23 USC 128 and 40 CFR 1500 to 1508. Both Federal and state regulations require public involvement in the environmental review process. It is the policy of FHWA, and by extension of DOT&PF, to "proactively support public involvement at all stages of planning and project development." This policy includes:

- early and continuous involvement;
- reasonable public availability of technical and other information;
- collaborative input on alternatives, evaluation criteria, and mitigation needs;
- open public meetings where matters related to Federal-aid highway and transit programs are being considered; and
- open access to the decision-making process.

SAFETEA-LU requires that the public be given opportunity to comment specifically on purpose and need and the range of alternatives. In addition, NEPA requires that the public be invited to comment during scoping and on the Draft SEIS. At the time the Draft SEIS is made available, an open house will be held to present the document. A formal public hearing will be held immediately following the open house to allow the public to provide comments to FHWA and DOT&PF.

In addition to ongoing outreach and feedback, key coordination points during scoping at which public input will be solicited include: 1) Identify Issues and Concerns, 2) Purpose and Need Statement, 3) Identification of the Range of Alternatives, and 4) Screening of Alternatives to Identify Reasonable Alternatives.

#### 5.0 PROJECT SCHEDULE

The project schedule is provided in Appendix A and includes key coordination points. Updates to this schedule will be provided as the project progresses.

Process
Review
onmental
Envir
oughout
ints thr
ion Poi
Coordinat
<b>Table 2:</b> (

	Public	<ul> <li>June 2008 –NOI published in Federal     Register.</li> <li>August 19, 2008 - Scoping comments due</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>July - August 2008 – Comment period (30 days).</li> <li>August 2008 – Develop comment database.</li> </ul>		<ul> <li>July 2008 – Publish notices in local print media and community flyers for public and tribal scoping meeting.</li> <li>July 2008 – Public and tribal scoping meeting.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>July – August 2008 – 30-day comment period.</li> <li>September 2008 – Update comment</li> </ul>	database.	August – November 2008 – Scoping Summary Report.
	tring) Tribes	<ul> <li>June 2008 – NOI published in Federal Register.</li> <li>August 19, 2008 - Scoping comments due</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>April – July 2008 – One-on-one meetings/contacts.</li> <li>July 2008 – Government-to-government consultation letters, including invitation to participate, request for scoping comments, and Section 106 consultation.</li> <li>June 2008 – Coordination packet (project</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>history, study area and map, known issues, draft purpose and need statement, initial alternatives, preliminary screening criteria, draft Coordination Plan) goes out with government-to-government Letter.</li> <li>April – July 2008 – Communications (emails, letters, comment forms, etc) soliciting input and communicating pertinent project information.</li> <li>July - August 2008 – Comment period (30 days).</li> <li>August 2008 – Develop comment database.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>April – July 2008 – Continue one-on-one meetings/contacts.</li> <li>April – June 2008 – Communications (emails, letters, comment forms, etc) soliciting input and communicating pertinent project information.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>July 2008 – Public and tribal scoping meeting.</li> <li>July – August 2008 – 30-day comment period.</li> <li>September 2008 – Update comment database.</li> </ul>		August – November 2008 – Scoping Summary Report.
::::::::::::::::::::::::::::::::::::::	Agencies (Cooperating & Participating)	<ul> <li>May 2008 – Phone calls and emails alerting agencies regarding a pending agency scoping meetings.</li> <li>June 2008 – NOI published in Federal Register.</li> <li>August 19, 2008 - Scoping comments due</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>April – July 2008 – One-on-one meetings/contacts.</li> <li>July 2008 – Invitation letters for participating and cooperating agencies and request for scoping comments.</li> <li>July – August 2008 – Coordination packet (project history, study area and map, known</li> </ul>	issues, draft purpose and need statement, initial alternatives, preliminary screening criteria, draft Coordination Plan) goes out with invitation letter.  April – July 2008 – Communications (emails, letters, comment forms, etc) soliciting input and communicating pertinent project information.  July - August 2008 – Comment period (30 days).  August 2008 – Develop comment database.	<ul> <li>April – July 2008 – Continue one-on-one meetings/contacts.</li> <li>April – June 2008 – Communications (emails, letters, comment forms, etc) soliciting input and communicating pertinent project information.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>July – August 2008 – 30-day comment period.</li> <li>September 2008 – Update comment database.</li> <li>October 2008 – Comment on Range of Alternatives to be screened</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>January 2009 – Comment on analysis methodologies</li> <li>January 2009 – Comment on Reasonable Alternatives</li> </ul>	August – November 2008 – Scoping Summary Report.
	Description	Publication of NOI in the Federal Register-Inform agencies, tribes and general public on the initiation of an SEIS and the scope of the project.	<ul> <li>Identify and discuss:</li> <li>The proposed action.</li> <li>Issues and concerns regarding potential environmental or socioeconomic impacts.</li> <li>Why SEIS is being prepared.</li> <li>What has changed since publication of ROD?</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Identify the project purpose.</li> <li>Confirm the need for the proposed action.</li> <li>Provide supporting information for how the proposed action could addresses the problem(s), issues, and concerns identified.</li> </ul>	Determine how alternatives should be analyzed and to what level of detail the analysis should be developed such that the agencies, tribal governments, and public understand the magnitude of impacts and can reasonably compare alternatives.	Identify the range of alternatives that could potentially satisfy the purpose and need. Includes No Action, activities that maximize the existing system, and reasonable and feasible bridge and ferry alternatives.	Develop screening criteria and determine the range of reasonable alternatives.	Scoping Summary Report:  Summary of scoping activities Final purpose and need statement Significant issues and concerns Method of analysis and level of detail Alternatives for screening Screening of alternatives Identify reasonable alternatives for study in SEIS
		Notice of Intent (NOI) Publication	Identify Issues and Concerns	Purpose and Need Statement	Collaboration on Methodologies and Level of Detail for Analysis of Alternatives	Identification of the Range of Alternatives	Screening of Alternatives to Identify Reasonable Alternatives	Conclusion of Scoping Activities—Scoping Summary Report
Favingamental	Review Phase			səifivitəA gniqoəS bnı	s noitsitini təəj	orq		

-				Method of Coordination	
Environmental Review	SEIS Coordination	Docorintion	Saitonioitaed	Agonopo	
Phase	Point		ratiopatii	Agencies	Public
			Agencies (Cooperating & Participating)	I ribai Governments	
	Completion of Draft	Provide a description of significant environmental impacts	July 2009 – Distribute Pre-draft SEIS	<ul> <li>August 2009 – Distribute Draft SEIS.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>August 2009 – Distribute Draft SEIS.</li> </ul>
	SEIS	resulting from the proposed action and its alternatives,	to cooperating agencies.	<ul> <li>August 2009 – Publish Notice of Availability in</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>August 2009 – Publish Notice of Availability in</li> </ul>
		including avoidance, minimization, and preliminary	<ul> <li>August 2009 – Distribute Draft SEIS.</li> </ul>	Federal Register (establish public hearing date	Federal Register (establish public hearing date
		Illingalol Illeasures.	<ul> <li>August 2009 – Publish Notice of Availability</li> </ul>	and initiate comment period) and local print	and initiate comment period) and local print
			in Federal Register (establish public hearing	media.	
			date and initiate comment period) and local	August 2009 – Public nearing/open nouse.	<ul> <li>August 2009 – Public nearing/open nouse.</li> </ul>
			print media.  • August 2000 – Dublic hearing/order bause	August - September 2009 – 45-day comment	August – September 2009 – 45-day comment period
				period:	period:
			<ul> <li>August - September 2009 – 45-day</li> <li>comment period</li> </ul>	September - October 2009 - Continue     communications (emails letters comment	September - October 2009 - Continue     communications (emails, letters, comment
			September - October 2000 - Continue	forms. etc) soliciting input and communicating	forms. etc) soliciting input and communicating
				pertinent project information.	pertinent project information.
luəu			forms, etc) soliciting input and communicating	October 2009 – Update comment database.	October 2009 – Update comment database.
ndole			<ul> <li>Dctober 2009 – Update comment database.</li> </ul>		
Devo	Identification of	Explicitly describes the preferred alternative and the basis	March 2009 - Send written communication	March 2009 – Send written communication	March 2009 – Update the project website with
ţue	Preferred Alternative for	for the decision	with updated project information.	with updated project information.	a public notice.
ouno	Draft SEIS (if applicable)				
PO 9	Completion of the Final	Identify the preferred/recommended alternative and the	<ul> <li>Document and respond to comments.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Document and respond to comments.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>Document and respond to comments.</li> </ul>
EIS	SEIS	basis for the decision, discuss impacts and regulatory	<ul> <li>January 2010  — Distribute Pre-Final SEIS with</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>March 2010 – Distribute Final SEIS.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>March 2010 – Distribute Final SEIS.</li> </ul>
S		compliance issues, and prepare draft permit applications,	draft Corps permit application and draft	<ul> <li>March 2010 – Publish Notice of Availability in</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>March 2010 – Publish Notice of Availability in</li> </ul>
		and present mitgation and commitments.		Federal Register of Final SEIS and local print	Federal Register of Final SEIS and local print
			March 2010 – Distribute Final SEIS.	media.	media.
			March 2010 – Publish Notice of Availability in Endowal Boxistary of Einel CEIC	December 2009 – February 2010 – On-going	December 2009 – February 2010 – On-going
			edetal register of Final Octob	collingation tools:	Collinging to the collinging t
			<ul> <li>December 2009 – February 2010 – On-going communication fools</li> </ul>	• January 2010 – 30-day review period.	<ul> <li>January 2010 – 30-day review period.</li> </ul>
			January 2010 – 30-day review period.		
	Completion of the	Explains the basis for the project decision and summarizes	July 2010 – Publish ROD notice in local print madia	July 2010 – Publish ROD notice in local print media	March 2010 – Publish ROD notice in local print media  Ordinates  Ordinat
	Record of Decision	mitigation measures.	בומקומ.	liedia.	חווונ וויסטומ.
	(ROD)		<ul> <li>August 2010 – Publish Statute of Limitations (SOL) in Federal Register.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>August 2010 – Publish Statute of Limitations (SOL) in Federal Register.</li> </ul>	<ul> <li>August 2010 – Publish Statute of Limitations (SOL) in Federal Register.</li> </ul>
	Completion of the	Prepare draft and final permit applications.	Opportunity for comment on permits provided	Opportunity for comment on permits provided	<ul> <li>Opportunity for comment on permits provided</li> </ul>
stim	Permits, Licenses or	-	by permitting agencies during agency permitting process.	by permitting agencies during agency permitting process.	by permitting agencies during agency permitting process
Per	Apployais alter tile ROD		• TBD – Publish Statute of Limitations (SOL) in	• TBD – Publish Statute of Limitations (SOL) in	• TBD – Publish Statute of Limitations (SOL) in
				Federal Register for Federal permits.	

Page 15 October 2008

# **APPENDIX A Project Schedule**

						GRAVINA ACCESS PROJECT SUPPLEMENTAL ENVIRONMENAL IMPACT STATEMENT PROJECT SCHEDULE	
ID	Task Name	Duration	Start	Finish	Predecessors	essors February March April May June July August Septembe October November December January February March April May June July August Septembe October November December January February March	
1	Project Initiation	574 days	Mon 1/7/08	Wed 3/17/10		Feb Mar Apr May Jun Jul Aug Sep Oct Nov Dec Jan Feb Mar Apr May Jun Jul Aug Sep Oct Nov Dec Jan Feb Mar	Apr
2	Mobilization / Internal kick-off meetings	5 days	Wed 3/26/08	Tue 4/1/08			
3	Notification Letter (DOT to FHWA)	5 days	Wed 4/2/08	Tue 4/8/08	2		
4	Project Management Plan / QC Plan	10 days	Wed 3/26/08	Tue 4/8/08			
5	Public Involvement Plan	3.33 days	Wed 3/26/08	Mon 3/31/08			
6	Internally Update Purpose and Need and Reasonable Alternatives Screening Factors	20 days	Wed 3/26/08	Tue 4/22/08			
7	Coordination Plan (Including schedule)	135 days	Wed 3/26/08	Tue 9/30/08			
8	Prepare Coordination Plan	30 days	Wed 3/26/08	Tue 5/6/08			
9	DOT Review	10 days	Wed 5/7/08	Tue 5/20/08	8		
10	FHWA Review	10 days	Wed 5/21/08	Tue 6/3/08	9		
11	Invite Cooperating and Participating Agencies	36 days	Tue 7/1/08	Tue 8/19/08			
12	Provide to Cooperating/Participating Agencies & Tribal Groups and make available to the p		Tue 9/30/08 Wed 4/2/08	Tue 9/30/08 Mon 5/12/08			
13 14	Project Update Assessment  Identify EIS Update Requirements (new regs, new issues, dated info, new constraints, data	29 days	Tue 4/15/08	Mon 5/12/08 Mon 5/12/08	2		
15	Identify Planning Update Requirements (land use, traffic, local plans, etc.)	20 days	Wed 4/2/08	Tue 4/29/08	2		
16	Identify Figineering / Alternatives Update Requirements	20 days	Tue 4/15/08	Mon 5/12/08	2		
17	Identify Environmental Update Requirements (social, economic, cultural, natural, physical)		Tue 4/15/08	Mon 5/12/08	2		
18	Engineering	574 days	Mon 1/7/08	Wed 3/17/10			
19	Update Design Criteria	5 days	Mon 1/7/08	Fri 1/11/08			<b>Y</b>
20	Develop Draft P&P Sheets	10 days	Mon 1/28/08	Fri 2/8/08			
21	Finalize P&P Sheets	10 days	Mon 2/11/08	Fri 2/22/08	20		
22	Determine Structure Type	20 days	Mon 2/11/08	Fri 3/7/08	20		
23	Determine Structure Limits (Beginning and Ending)	10 days	Mon 3/10/08	Fri 3/21/08	22		
24	Finalize Alignments	55 days	Mon 2/25/08	Fri 5/9/08	21		
25	Develop Roadway Quantities	20 days	Mon 5/12/08	Fri 6/6/08	24		
26	Develop Roadway Estimates	10 days	Mon 6/9/08	Fri 6/20/08	25		
27	Develop Structures Quantities	15 days	Mon 3/24/08	Fri 4/11/08	23		
28	Develop Structures Estimates	10 days	Mon 4/14/08	Fri 4/25/08	27		
29 30	Prepare Draft Report and Submit to DOT  DOT Review of Draft Construction Cost Estimate Report	9 days	Mon 6/23/08 Mon 7/7/08	Thu 7/3/08 Thu 7/24/08			
31	Address DOT Review Comments on Cost Estimate Report	14 days 43 days	Mon 7/28/08	Wed 9/24/08	20		
32	Meeting in Portland on New Alternatives	1 day	Thu 8/14/08	Thu 8/14/08	30		
33	Develop New Alternatives at Pennock and Airport (F3 and C3/4)	25 days	Thu 8/14/08	Wed 9/17/08			
34	Develop Updated Ferry Alternative Estimates	10 days	Thu 8/14/08	Wed 8/27/08			
35	Prepare Alternatives Estimate Matrix	10 days	Thu 9/18/08	Wed 10/1/08	26,28,34		
36	Update Life Cycle Costs	5 days	Thu 10/2/08	Wed 10/8/08	35		
37	QC Reviews	5 days	Thu 10/9/08	Wed 10/15/08	36		
38	Finalize Alternatives Estimate Matrix	3 days	Thu 10/16/08	Mon 10/20/08	37		
39	Draft Construction Cost Estimate Report and Submit to DOT	5 days	Tue 10/21/08	Mon 10/27/08	38		
40	DOT Review of Draft Construction Cost Estimate Report	10 days	Tue 10/28/08	Fri 11/7/08	39		
41	Complete 24 Variable Concepts Matrix	20 days	Mon 11/10/08	Fri 12/5/08	40		
42	Address DOT Review Comments	10 days	Mon 11/10/08	Fri 11/21/08	40		
43	Final Construction Cost Estimate Report	5 days	Mon 11/24/08	Fri 11/28/08	42		
44	Support During SEIS	574 days	Mon 1/7/08	Wed 3/17/10			
45	Initial Public Involvement	45 days	Mon 4/14/08	Sun 6/15/08	5		
46	One-on-One Meetings (Key stakeholders, local govt., key agencies, etc.)	22 days	Thu 5/15/08	Sun 6/15/08 Fri 5/16/08	2		
47	Notice of Intent for Supplemental EIS-Federal Register and local media  Initial PI Activities (kick-off meetings, website, mail list, newsletters, etc.)	3 days 30 days	Wed 5/14/08 Mon 4/14/08	Fri 5/16/08 Fri 5/23/08	5		
	Scoping	217 days	Fri 3/21/08	Fri 1/16/09	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		
50	Agency Scoping	217 days	Fri 3/21/08	Fri 1/16/09			
51	Issues Identification / Study Requirements	40 days	Fri 3/21/08	Thu 5/15/08			
52	Agency Scoping Meetings	4 days	Tue 6/10/08	Fri 6/13/08			
53	Purpose and Need and Alternatives-Opportunity for Input by Participating Agencies	36 days	Tue 7/1/08	Tue 8/19/08	6		
54	30-Day Comment Period (Actual)	36 days	Tue 7/1/08	Tue 8/19/08			
55	Range of Alternatives-Opportunity for Involvement by Participating Agencies	22 days	Wed 10/22/08	Wed 11/19/08	71		
56	Collaborate on Impact Assessment Methodologies and Level of Detail with Participating Ag	e 30 days	Mon 12/8/08	Fri 1/16/09	72		
57	Public and Tribal Scoping	169 days	Mon 3/31/08	Wed 11/19/08			
58	Issues Identification / Study Requirements	30 days	Mon 3/31/08	Fri 5/9/08			
59	Public and Tribal Scoping Meeting(s)	18 days	Tue 7/8/08	Thu 7/31/08	52		
60	Purpose and Need and Alternatives-Opportunity for Public Input	29 days	Thu 7/10/08	Tue 8/19/08	6		
61	30-Day Comment Period	22 days	Mon 7/21/08	Tue 8/19/08			
62	Scoping Summary Report	68 days	Tue 8/19/08	Wed 11/19/08			
63 64	Log Scoping Comments  Prepare Scoping Report	20 days	Tue 8/19/08 Tue 9/16/08	Mon 9/15/08 Tue 9/30/08	63		
65	DOT Review	11 days 5 days	Wed 10/15/08	Tue 10/21/08			
66	Address DOT Review Comments	5 days	Wed 10/15/08	Tue 10/21/08			
67	FHWA Review	10 days	Wed 10/22/08 Wed 10/29/08	Mon 11/10/08			
68	Address FHWA Review Comments	3 days	Tue 11/11/08	Thu 11/13/08			
69	Provide Scoping Summary Report to Agencies, Tribe, and Public	4 days	Fri 11/14/08	Wed 11/19/08			
	Alternatives Screening	124 days	Wed 8/20/08	Fri 2/6/09	61		
71	Confirm / Define Range of Alternatives (Based on Comments Heard During Scoping)	45 days	Wed 8/20/08	Tue 10/21/08			
	ORKING\SEA\d0178918\GAP SEIS Schedule 10-06-08.mpp			<u>I</u>			Page 1 of
C-/DIAMA							TADE 1 Of

						GR	AVINA ACCE	SS PROJEC	CT SUPPLEMENTA PROJECT SO		IMENAL IMPACT STAT	EMENT									
ID Task Name	Duration	Start	Finish	Predecessors		arch April	May	June	July August		hbe October Novem		January Feb	ruary March	h April Ma		July August		October November De		y March April
72 Department Establishes Cost Criterion	5 days	Mon 12/1/08	Fri 12/5/08	43	Feb M	ar Apr	May	Jun	Jul Aug	ISep	Oct Nov	LDEC	Jan Feb	Mar	Apr Ma	Jun	Jul Aug	Sep	Oct Nov De	ec Jan Feb	Mar Apr
73 Screen Alternatives (Purpose and Need and Screening Factors)	15 days	Mon 12/8/08	Fri 12/26/08	72																	
74 Identify Reasonable Alternatives	10 days	Mon 12/29/08	Fri 1/9/09	73								Ĭ									
75 Agency Review/Comment Period on the Reasonable Alternatives	20 days	Mon 1/12/09	Fri 2/6/09	74																	
76 Resource Agency Reviews 77 Section 106 and Tribal Consultation	192 days	Thu 5/1/08 Thu 5/1/08	Thu 1/22/09 Thu 1/22/09				Y														
77 Section 106 and 1710al Consultation  78 Gov-Gov	79 days	Thu 5/1/08	Tue 8/19/08																		
79 Letter Preparation	25 days	Thu 5/1/08	Wed 6/4/08			•				1											
80 Submittal	1 day	Thu 6/5/08	Thu 6/5/08	79				<b>†</b>													
81 30-Day Comment Period	22 days	Mon 7/21/08	Tue 8/19/08					ı													
82 Section 106 DOE Letters	38 days	Tue 12/2/08	Thu 1/22/09																		
83 Letter Preparation	15 days	Tue 12/2/08	Mon 12/22/08	106								ĹЪ	•								
84 Submittal	1 day	Tue 12/23/08	Tue 12/23/08	83								T L									
85 30-Day Comment Period	22 days	Wed 12/24/08	Thu 1/22/09	84																	
86 Meeting with SHPO regarding APE for potential archeological reconnaissance of Revilla Island	1 day	Wed 12/24/08	Wed 12/24/08	84																	
87 Tribal Meeting	1 day	Thu 6/19/08	Thu 6/19/08  Tue 7/7/09																		
88 Alaska Coastal Management Consistency 93 Essential Fish Habitat	142 days 58 days	Mon 12/22/08 Mon 12/15/08	Tue 7/7/09 Wed 3/4/09														<b>T</b>				
93 Essential Fish Habitat  97 Section 7 Consultation	45 days	Mon 12/15/08 Mon 1/12/09	Wed 3/4/09 Fri 3/13/09																		
101 Bald Eagle Consultation	57 days	Thu 6/12/08	Fri 8/29/08					ـــــــ													
105 Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement	290 days	Wed 8/20/08	Mon 9/28/09	13					<b>T</b>	<b>Y</b>									<b>.</b>		
106 Conduct Special Assessments/ Coordination [tribal, navigation, airspace, Section 106 4(f)]	75 days	Wed 8/20/08	Mon 12/1/08	53						· -									1		
107 Constructability, Construction Sequencing, and Phasing Assessment	20 days	Mon 1/12/09	Fri 2/6/09	74																	
108 Develop Mitigation Measures	30 days	Mon 2/9/09	Fri 3/20/09	107																	
109 Prepare Pre-Draft SEIS	160 days	Wed 8/20/08	Mon 3/30/09	61						*			4								
110 DOT review of Pre-Draft SEIS	15 days	Tue 3/31/09	Mon 4/20/09	109											<u> </u>						
111 Address DOT Review Comments	10 days	Tue 4/21/09	Mon 5/4/09	110											<u> </u>						
112 FHWA Division Review of Pre-Draft SEIS	20 days	Tue 5/5/09	Mon 6/1/09	111											<u> </u>						
113 Address FHWA Review Comments	5 days	Tue 6/2/09	Mon 6/8/09	112												<u> </u>					
114 Coincidental FHWA Legal and Cooperating Agency review of Pre-Draft SEIS	20 days	Tue 6/9/09	Mon 7/6/09	113													<b></b>				
115 Address FHWA Legal Comments and Respond to Coop Agency Review Comments	5 days	Tue 7/7/09	Mon 7/13/09	114																	
116 Finalize Draft SEIS 117 FHWA Approval of Draft SEIS	10 days 5 days	Tue 7/14/09 Tue 7/28/09	Mon 7/27/09 Mon 8/3/09	115																	
117 FHWA Approval of Draft SEIS  118 Document Distribution	5 days	Tue 8/4/09	Mon 8/10/09	117													<b></b>				
118 Document Distribution  119 NOA of Draft SEIS in Federal Register and Local Media	5 days	Tue 8/4/09	Mon 8/10/09	117													<b>!</b>				
120 45-Day Comment Period	35 days	Tue 8/11/09	Mon 9/28/09	119																	
121 Public Hearing/Open House	1 day	Wed 8/26/09	Wed 8/26/09																		
122 Final Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement	167 days	Thu 8/27/09	Fri 4/16/10																		
123 Comment-Response Database/ Respond to Draft SEIS comments	20 days	Tue 9/29/09	Mon 10/26/09	120															*		<b>~</b>
124 Update Alternatives and Coordination / Consultation, as required	15 days	Thu 8/27/09	Wed 9/16/09	121														h '	terrent to the second		
125 Prepare draft Final SEIS and Draft ROD	20 days	Thu 9/17/09	Wed 10/14/09	124															<u> </u>		
126 Finalize Mitigation measures	10 days	Thu 10/15/09	Wed 10/28/09	125	]																
127 DOT review of draft Final SEIS and Draft ROD	5 days	Thu 10/29/09	Wed 11/4/09	126															<u> </u>		
128 Address DOT Review Comments	5 days	Thu 11/5/09	Wed 11/11/09	127																	
129 FHWA Division review of draft Final SEIS	20 days	Thu 11/12/09	Wed 12/9/09	128																<u> </u>	
130 Address FHWA Review Comments  124 Coincidental FHWA Local Sufficiency/Cooperating Agency review of tre-Final SEIS	5 days	Thu 12/10/09	Wed 12/16/09	129																	
131 Coincidental FHWA Legal Sufficiency/Cooperating Agency review of pre-Final SEIS  132 Address FHWA Legal Review Comments/Respond to Coop Agency Review Comments	20 days 5 days	Thu 12/17/09 Thu 1/14/10	Wed 1/13/10 Wed 1/20/10	130																<u> </u>	
132 Address FHWA Legal Review Comments/Respond to Coop Agency Review Comments  133 Finalize Final SEIS	15 days	Thu 1/14/10	Wed 1/20/10 Wed 2/10/10	131																	
134 FHWA approval of Final SEIS	10 days	Thu 2/11/10	Wed 2/24/10	133																<u> </u>	
135 Document distribution	10 days	Thu 2/25/10	Wed 3/10/10	134																	
136 NOA of Final SEIS in Federal Register and local media (minimum 30 days for ROD approval)	5 days	Thu 3/11/10	Wed 3/17/10	135																	
137 30-Day Document Availability	22 days	Thu 3/18/10	Fri 4/16/10	136																	
138 Record of Decision	67 days	Mon 4/19/10	Tue 7/20/10		1																
139 Comment-Response to SEIS comments/Revise Draft ROD and Submit Substantive Comment Re	e 20 days	Mon 4/19/10	Fri 5/14/10	137	1																
140 DOT review of Draft ROD	10 days	Mon 5/17/10	Fri 5/28/10	139																	
141 Address DOT Review Comments	5 days	Mon 5/31/10	Fri 6/4/10	140																	
142 FHWA Division review of Draft ROD	15 days	Mon 6/7/10	Fri 6/25/10	141																	
143 Address FHWA Review Comments	5 days	Mon 6/28/10	Fri 7/2/10	142																	
144 FHWA approval of ROD and Submit to Federal Register	2 days	Mon 7/5/10	Tue 7/6/10	143																	
145 Local media advertisement  146 Statute of Limitations Netification in Endors Designer (199 days)	10 days	Wed 7/7/10	Tue 7/20/10	144																	
146 Statute of Limitations Notification in Federal Register (180 days)	10 days	Wed 7/7/10	Tue 7/20/10 Thu 6/24/10	144																	
147 Administrative Record Maintenance  148 Management / Progress Meetings	540 days 575 days	Mon 6/2/08 Mon 1/7/08	Thu 6/24/10					L.													<del>.</del>
			Thu 3/18/10			_	<u> </u>								<u> </u>		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·				
149   HDR Internal Quality Control Reviews     150     Coordination Plan	533 days 5 days	Mon 4/28/08 Mon 4/28/08	Tue 5/11/10 Fri 5/2/08																		
150 Coordination Plan  151 Scoping Summary Report	5 days	Mon 10/6/08	Fri 10/10/08																		
152 Draft SEIS	15 days	Thu 3/5/09	Wed 3/25/09								•										
153 Final SEIS	15 days	Thu 10/1/09	Wed 3/23/03 Wed 10/21/09																		
154 ROD	5 days	Wed 5/5/10	Tue 5/11/10																		
					I			<u> </u>		i							<u> </u>		<u> </u>		