

DRAFT PROJECT PROSPECTUS

Part 3 Project Environmental Classification

Project Classification	
<input type="checkbox"/>	Class 1 DEIS FEIS
<input type="checkbox"/>	Class 2 Categorical Exclusion
<input type="checkbox"/>	Programmatic Categ. Exclusion
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Class 3 EA Revised EA
Key Number:	Jurisdiction:
District:	

Project Name: C3, Section 2: Siletz River Highway to Gleneden Beach Road (MP 120.02 to MP 121.68)	Bridge No. Not Applicable	County: Lincoln	Reg: 2	Area: 4	District:
--	-------------------------------------	---------------------------	------------------	-------------------	-----------

1) Provide a brief description of the Project **Construct one new northbound and southbound travel lane from just south of Gleneden Beach Loop (MP 121.68) to the intersection of US 101/OR 229 (MP 120.02). This is approximately 1.2 miles of widening and would require widening of Millport Slough Bridge replacement of Sijota Creek Bridge. Project includes improvements at Salishan Drive and Gleneden Beach Road.**

2) Estimated Right-of-Way Impacts (Including Easements, Number of Parcels, Acreage, and Improvements) **Anticipated to be within existing right-of-way**

3) Estimated Traffic Volume, Flow Pattern and Safety Impacts (Including Construction Impacts, Detours, etc.) **10,780 AADT (2003); minimal traffic flow pattern, safety, and construction impacts anticipated**

4) Estimated Land Use and Socioeconomic Impact (Including Consistency with Comprehensive Plan) **Consistency pending, 2007. Possible exceptions to Goal 16 and 17 necessary if project impacts Lincoln County designated estuarine resources or coastal shoreland areas.**

5) Estimated Wetlands, Waterways and Water Quality Impacts

This segment of US 101 crosses the Siletz River and Millport Slough. It is adjacent to Siletz Bay and segments of Sijota Creek. All of the water bodies, except Sijota Creek east of the highway, are tidally influenced and either permanently or regularly flooded. There is no apparent above-ground connection between the east and west segments of Sijota Creek. The NWI map identifies the Siletz River as estuarine subtidal unconsolidated bottom subtidal (E1UBL). Siletz Bay, Millport Slough, and Sijota Creek west of the highway are identified as estuarine intertidal unconsolidated shore regularly flooded (E2USN). Large wetland areas are associated with Siletz Bay and the drainage of Sijota Creek east of the highway. Estuarine intertidal emergent regularly flooded (E2EMN) wetlands are present on both sides of Hwy 101 adjacent to the Siletz Bay. The drainage of Sijota Creek east of the highway contains several wetland types immediately adjacent to the highway. These include: palustrine emergent seasonally flooded (PEMC), palustrine scrub-shrub seasonally flooded (PSSC), palustrine forested seasonally flooded (PFOC), palustrine aquatic bed permanently flooded (PABH), and palustrine aquatic bed permanently flooded diked/impounded (PABHh). A review of the Soil Survey of Lincoln County, Oregon (NRCS, 1994 reveals three soil type mapped within the study area: Bandon fine sandy loam, 12 to 50 percent slopes, Coquille silt loam, 0 to 1 percent slopes, and Coquille silt loam, protected, 0 to 7 percent slopes. Coquille silt loam and Coquille silt loam, protected are listed as hydric soils. The Siletz River is a Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) 303D water quality limited stream. State and Federal 404 Permit for impacts to wetlands or waters expected.

6) Estimated Biological & Threatened & Endangered Species Impacts
Lincoln City, Oregon Quadrangle (1984). T8S R11W S3,10

The Oregon Natural Heritage Information Center (ORNHIC) identifies one listed terrestrial wildlife species and four aquatic species as occurring within 2 miles of the project area: Bald eagle (*Haliaeetus leucocephalus*), Federal and State Listed Threatened; Winter steelhead (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*, pop 31), Summer steelhead (*Oncorhynchus mykiss*, pop 30), Oregon Coast ESU, and Chum salmon (*Oncorhynchus keta*, pop 4), Pacific Coast ESU, Coho salmon, Oregon Coast ESU (*Oncorhynchus kisutch* pop 3). The ORNHIC database lists no plant species within the 2 miles of the project area. USFWS identifies no listed or candidate plant species potentially occurring in Lincoln County. Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife StreamNet identifies the Siletz River at this location as rearing and migration habitat for Coho Salmon, summer and winter steelhead, and chum salmon. Millport Slough and Sijota Creek, west of US 101, are identified as rearing and migration habitat for Coho salmon and winter steelhead. Consultation with NMFS expected.

7) Estimated Archaeology and Historical Impacts. **No cultural sites (archaeological or historic) listed at Oregon SHPO. This is a potentially sensitive area and few archaeological surveys have been conducted on this stretch of US 101. No structures appear to be more than 50 years old.**

8) Estimated Park, Visual Impacts and 4(f) Impacts **Potential impacts to Siletz Bay National Wildlife Refuge (a Section 4(f) and 6(f) resource)**

9) Estimated Air, Noise and Energy Impacts **Due to new travel lanes, a noise analysis is required. Noise receptors include approximately two residences, businesses, and Siletz Bay National Wildlife Refuge. The project is compatible with the Statewide Air Quality Report.**

10) Estimated Hazardous Materials Impacts **None**

11) Preliminary Identification of Potential Areas of Critical Concern and Controversial Issues **Based on the environmental review no areas of critical concern or potentially controversial issues have been identified.**

12) Documentation Requirements **Potential Documentation (depending on final project footprint): Wetland Delineation; Ordinary High Water Delineation; State and Federal 404 Permit for impacts to wetlands or waters; Section 4(f) and 6(f) impacts; noise analysis. Consultation with the National Marine Fisheries Service may be required. An archaeological survey report documenting the findings of an archaeological survey will be required.**

Prepared By: Larry Weymouth, CH2M HILL	FHWA or State Official Approval:
Date: August 2007 Revised: <input type="checkbox"/>	Phone Number: 541.768.3321
Date:	Phone Number:

**REGION ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST
ATTACHMENT TO PART 3 (PROJECT ENVIRONMENTAL CLASSIFICATION)**

Project: C3, Section 2: Siletz River Highway to Gleneden Beach Road (MP 120.02 to MP 121.68)

Key No:

Instructions:

This checklist should be completed and attached to the Part 3. It will provide information to assist in appropriately classifying projects. A "Yes" answer indicates areas of concern, a "No" answer indicates no concerns, and UNK indicates that you didn't check into that area. The primary intent of the checklist is to ensure these items have been considered, and where appropriate, researched. When something of potential impact is found, explain in the appropriate section of the Part 3. If you have any questions, please call (503) 986-3477. The receptionist will transfer you to the appropriate resource person for assistance.

1. Prepared By: Larry Weymouth, CH2M HILL
2. Phone Number: 541.768.3321
3. Date: August 2007
4. Applicable Bridge Number: Not Applicable
5. A brief description of the project: Construct one new northbound and southbound travel lane from just south of Gleneden Beach Loop (MP 121.68) to the intersection of US 101/OR 229 (MP 120.02). This is approximately 1.2 miles of widening and would require Millport Slough Bridge to be widened.

Air Quality

- | | | | |
|-----|----|-----|---|
| Yes | No | Unk | 6 Is project in an air quality non-attainment area? NO |
| Yes | No | Unk | 7 CO NO |
| Yes | No | Unk | 8 Ozone NO |
| Yes | No | Unk | 9 PM10 NO |
| | | | Is project missing from: |
| Yes | No | Unk | 10 STIP YES |
| Yes | No | Unk | 11 RTP Not Applicable |
| Yes | No | Unk | 12 MTIP Not Applicable |
| | | | 13 Comment (Questions 10,11,12): There is no US Census Urbanized Area or MPO within Lincoln County |
| Yes | No | Unk | 14 Does the project involve adding lanes, signalization, channelization, and/or alignment changes? |
| | | | 15 Comment (Question 14): Construct one new northbound and southbound travel lanes from Gleneden Beach Loop to US 101/OR 229 intersection (1.66 miles), and intersection improvements at Gleneden Beach Loop and Salishan Drive. |

Archaeology

- | | | | |
|-----|----|-----|---|
| Yes | No | Unk | 18 Are archaeologically sensitive areas potentially affected (confluence of rivers, headlands, coves, overlooks, etc.)? |
| | | | 19 Comment (Question 18): YES, the section crosses two creeks and spans high ground near shoreline |
| Yes | No | Unk | 20 Does local city/county Comprehensive Plan indicate potential Goal 5 resources? |
| | | | 21 Comment (Question 20): NO |
| Yes | No | Unk | 22 Does contact with local BLM or USFS archaeologist indicate any problems? |
| | | | 23 Comment (Question 22): USFS archaeologist identifies no sites |
| Yes | No | Unk | 24 Extent and cause of previous ground disturbance (minor, major), not counting farmed land? YES, construction of US 101 |
| Yes | No | Unk | 25 Does project entail new ground disturbances? YES |
| | | | 26 Comment (Question 25): |
| | | | The State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) has known archeological sites cataloged. NO sites cataloged |
| Yes | No | Unk | 27 Consulted with the SHPO archeologist? SHPO files researched |
| | | | 28 Comment (Question 27): No previous archaeological survey has been conducted along this section of US 101 |

Biology

- | | | | |
|-----|----|-----|---|
| | | | USGS Quad Name, Township, Range, Section (Questions 31-34): |
| | | | 31 : Lincoln City, Oregon (1984) |
| | | | 32 : T8S |
| | | | 33 : R11W |
| | | | 34 : S3, 10 |
| Yes | No | Unk | 35 Does contact with local ODFW (District Fish/Game/Habitat/Non-game) biologists indicate any problems? YES |
| | | | 36 Name of ODFW biologist and comments: See Attachment C3.2 |
| Yes | No | Unk | 37 Is there any local knowledge of T&E or sensitive (candidate) species in area? Unknown |
| | | | 38 Comment (Question 37): |
| Yes | No | Unk | 39 Are any aquatic T&E species present? Unknown |
| | | | 40 Comment (Question 39): |
| Yes | No | Unk | 41 Does contact with local BLM or USFS biologists indicate any problems? YES |
| | | | 42 Name of BLM or USFS biologist and comments: See Attachment C3.2 |
| | | | 43 What are the results from a Natural Heritage Database check? See Attachment C3.2 |
| Yes | No | Unk | 44 Is stream on ODFW Rivers Information System database? YES |
| | | | 45 Comment (Question 44): See Attachment C5.2 |
| | | | 46 Confirmed ODFW preferred in-water work period(s) for project area? (List if applicable): July 1 to September 15 |

**REGION ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST
ATTACHMENT TO PART 3 (PROJECT ENVIRONMENTAL CLASSIFICATION)**

Project: C5, Section 2: Siletz River Highway to Gleneden Beach Road (MP 120.02 to MP 121.68)

Key No:

Instructions:

This checklist should be completed and attached to the Part 3. It will provide information to assist in appropriately classifying projects. A "Yes" answer indicates areas of concern, a "No" answer indicates no concerns, and UNK indicates that you didn't check into that area. The primary intent of the checklist is to ensure these items have been considered, and where appropriate, researched. When something of potential impact is found, explain in the appropriate section of the Part 3. If you have any questions, please call (503) 986-3477. The receptionist will transfer you to the appropriate resource person for assistance.

1. Prepared By: _____
2. Phone Number: _____
3. Date: _____
4. Applicable Bridge Number: _____
5. A brief description of the project: _____

47 List any streams impacted by project: **Millport Slough, Siletz River**

Yes No Unk 48 Is the creek or river classified as Essential Salmonid Habitat by the Oregon Division of State Lands?

Energy:

Yes No Unk 51 Does project affect energy use due to traffic patterns or volumes, or involve speed zone changes? **NO**
52 Comment (Question 51):

Geology:

Yes No Unk 55 Discussions with Region Geologist indicate any major concerns? **NO**
56 Comment (Question 55):

Yes No Unk 57 Drilling / exploration anticipated? **NO**
58 Comment (Question 57):

Hazardous Materials:

Yes No Unk 59 Does contact with local DEQ office indicate any concerns? **NO**
60 Comment (Question 59):

Yes No Unk 61 Does contact with State Fire Marshal's office indicate any concerns? **NO**
62 Comment (Question 61):

Yes No Unk 63 Does contact with local fire department indicate any concerns? **NO**
64 Comment (Question 63):

Yes No Unk 65 Does contact with PUC indicate any highway spills/incidents? **NO**
66 Comment (Question 65):

Yes No Unk 67 R/W acquisition impacts gas stations / repair shops / industrial sites / landfills, etc.? **NO**
68 Comment (Question 67):

Yes No Unk 69 Ground disturbances anticipated (excavation / drilling, etc.) near known or potential hazmat sites? **NO**
70 Comment (Question 69):

Results of check of DEQ lists for each of the following:

Yes No Unk 71 UST **NO**

Yes No Unk 72 Release Incident **NO**

Yes No Unk 73 RCRA **NO**

Yes No Unk 74 Solid Waste **NO**

Yes No Unk 75 TSD **NO**

Yes No Unk 76 Leaking UST **NO**

Yes No Unk 77 Confirmed release **NO**

Yes No Unk 78 Other **NO**

79 List any occurrence on the above items:

Historical:

Yes No Unk 82 Does any city/county comp plan list any buildings/items in the project area as Goal 5 resources? **NO**
83 Comment (Question 82):

Yes No Unk 84 Any impacted sites nominated/listed as eligible for National Register? **NO**
85 Comment (Question 84):

Yes No Unk 86 Does contact with city/county Historical Society indicate potential resources? **NO**
87 Comment (Question 86):

Yes No Unk 88 Any buildings in the project area thought to be 50 years or older? **NO**

**REGION ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST
ATTACHMENT TO PART 3 (PROJECT ENVIRONMENTAL CLASSIFICATION)**

Project: C5, Section 2: Siletz River Highway to Gleneden Beach Road (MP 120.02 to MP 121.68)

Key No:

Instructions:

This checklist should be completed and attached to the Part 3. It will provide information to assist in appropriately classifying projects. A "Yes" answer indicates areas of concern, a "No" answer indicates no concerns, and UNK indicates that you didn't check into that area. The primary intent of the checklist is to ensure these items have been considered, and where appropriate, researched. When something of potential impact is found, explain in the appropriate section of the Part 3. If you have any questions, please call (503) 986-3477. The receptionist will transfer you to the appropriate resource person for assistance.

1. Prepared By: _____
2. Phone Number: _____
3. Date: _____
4. Applicable Bridge Number: _____
5. A brief description of the project: _____

89 Comment (Question 88):

Yes No Unk 90 Any apparent / unique / suspect structures of possible historical interest? **NO**

91 Comment (Question 90):

Yes No Unk 92 Historic district / trails / bridges? **NO**

93 Comment (Question 92):

Yes No Unk 94 Was the SHPO historic database consulted? **YES, no properties listed**

95 Comment (Question 94):

Land Use / Planning:

Yes No Unk 98 Project identified in local transportation improvement plan? **YES**

99 Comment (Question 98): **Pending, 2007**

Yes No Unk 100 Does contact with local jurisdiction planning department indicate any concerns? **NO**

101 Comment (Question 100):

Yes No Unk 102 Is project outside of UGB? **YES**

103 Comment (Question 102):

Yes No Unk 104 Does project cross or touch UGB? **NO**

105 Comment (Question 104):

Yes No Unk 106 Does Coastal Zone Management Act apply? **YES**

107 Comment (Question 106):

Yes No Unk 108 Is there Forest or EFU zoning on or impacted by the project? **NO**

109 Comment (Question 108):

Yes No Unk 110 Are there other protected resources (i.e. estuary, wetlands, greenways, etc.)? **YES**

111 If Yes, list: **Siletz Bay National Wildlife Refuge**

Yes No Unk 112 Does contact with local NRCS indicate "High Value" farmland concerns? **NO**

113 Comment (Question 112):

Yes No Unk 114 Farmland Conversion Impact Rating applicable? **NO**

115 Comment (Question 114):

116 List Comprehensive Plan designations being impacted: **R-1 (Residential) M-W (Marine Waterway)**

117 List zoning designations being impacted: **R-1 (Residential) M-W (Marine Waterway), R-1 PD (Planned Development)**

Region Planner's opinion that the project conforms with (If not, explain):

Yes No Unk 118 Transportation Planning Rule **YES**

119 Comment (Question 118):

Yes No Unk 120 Statewide Planning Goals **Unknown**

121 Comment (Question 120): **Possible Goal Exception to Goal 16 and 17**

Yes No Unk 122 Comprehensive Plan (county / city or both) **YES**

123 Comment (Question 122): **Pending, 2007**

Noise:

Yes No Unk 126 Any shift in horizontal or vertical alignment? If so, amount of shift: **Unknown**

127 Horizontal: **Likely with two new travel lanes proposed**

128 Vertical: **Possible**

Yes No Unk 129 Does project increase the number of through travel lanes? (See Project Components screen)

130 Number of existing lanes: **2 to 4**

131 Number of proposed lanes: **4**

Yes No Unk 132 Is this a new roadway located on a new alignment? **NO**

**REGION ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST
ATTACHMENT TO PART 3 (PROJECT ENVIRONMENTAL CLASSIFICATION)**

Project: C5, Section 2: Siletz River Highway to Gleneden Beach Road (MP 120.02 to MP 121.68)

Key No:

Instructions:

This checklist should be completed and attached to the Part 3. It will provide information to assist in appropriately classifying projects. A "Yes" answer indicates areas of concern, a "No" answer indicates no concerns, and UNK indicates that you didn't check into that area. The primary intent of the checklist is to ensure these items have been considered, and where appropriate, researched. When something of potential impact is found, explain in the appropriate section of the Part 3. If you have any questions, please call (503) 986-3477. The receptionist will transfer you to the appropriate resource person for assistance.

1. Prepared By: _____
2. Phone Number: _____
3. Date: _____
4. Applicable Bridge Number: _____
5. A brief description of the project: _____

- 133 Comment (Question 132):
- Yes No Unk 134 Any known noise problems / complaints? **NO**
- 135 Comment (Question 134):
- Yes No Unk 136 Will this project result in the removal of topographical features which currently shield receptors? **NO**
- 137 Comment (Question 136):

Approximate number of buildings / activity areas within 61 meters (200 feet) of proposed right of way line:

- 138 Commercial: **10 (Salishan Commercial Area)**
- 139 Industrial: **0**
- 140 Public: **0**
- 141 Residences: **5**
- 142 Schools: **0**
- 143 Churches: **0**
- 144 Parks: **2 (Siletz Bay National Wildlife Refuge and Salishan Golf Course)**

Section 4(f) Potential:

- Yes No Unk 147 Parks, wildlife refuges, historic buildings, recreational areas, etc., impacted? **YES**
- 148 If yes, explain: **Potential impacts to Siletz Bay National Wildlife Refuge**

Section 6(f) Potential:

- Yes No Unk 151 Land & Water Conservation Funds used to acquire parks, or make improvements, etc.? **YES**
- 152 If yes, explain: **Potential impacts to Siletz Bay National Wildlife Refuge**

Socioeconomics:

- Yes No Unk 153 Do building displacements appear key to economy / neighborhood? **NO**
- 154 Comment (Question 153):
- 155 Number of building displacements? **0**

General use of adjacent land:

- Yes No Unk 156 Residential **YES (south end)**
- Yes No Unk 157 Commercial **YES (south end)**
- Yes No Unk 158 Farm/Range **NO**
- Yes No Unk 159 Public **YES (wildlife refuge)**
- Yes No Unk 160 Other **NO**
- 161 If other, explain:
- 162 Estimate of number of people living adjacent to project: **15**
- 163 Estimate of number of people working adjacent to project: **30**
- Yes No Unk 164 Divide or disrupt an established community, or affect neighborhood character or stability? **NO**
- 165 Comment (Question 164):
- Yes No Unk 166 Affect minority, elderly, handicapped, low income, transit-dependent, or other specific interest group? **NO**
- 167 Comment (Question 166):

Visual:

- Yes No Unk 170 Designated State or Federal Scenic Highway? **YES**
- 171 Comment (Question 170):
- Yes No Unk 172 Oregon Forest Practices Act restrictions apply? **NO**
- 173 Comment (Question 172):

**REGION ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST
ATTACHMENT TO PART 3 (PROJECT ENVIRONMENTAL CLASSIFICATION)**

Project: C5, Section 2: Siletz River Highway to Gleneden Beach Road (MP 120.02 to MP 121.68)

Key No:

Instructions:

This checklist should be completed and attached to the Part 3. It will provide information to assist in appropriately classifying projects. A "Yes" answer indicates areas of concern, a "No" answer indicates no concerns, and UNK indicates that you didn't check into that area. The primary intent of the checklist is to ensure these items have been considered, and where appropriate, researched. When something of potential impact is found, explain in the appropriate section of the Part 3. If you have any questions, please call (503) 986-3477. The receptionist will transfer you to the appropriate resource person for assistance.

1. Prepared By: _____
2. Phone Number: _____
3. Date: _____
4. Applicable Bridge Number: _____
5. A brief description of the project: _____

- | | | | |
|-----|----|-----|---|
| Yes | No | Unk | 174 Major cut / fills? Unknown |
| | | | 175 Comment (Question 174): |
| Yes | No | Unk | 176 Bridges or large retaining walls anticipated? YES |
| | | | 177 Comment (Question 176): Millport Slough Bridge |
| Yes | No | Unk | 178 Any rivers on the Oregon Scenic Waterway listing? NO |
| | | | 179 Comment (Question 178): |
| Yes | No | Unk | 180 Any rivers on the Federal Wild and Scenic River Listings? NO |
| | | | 181 Comment (Question 180): |

Water Ways / Water Quality:

- | | | | |
|-----|----|-----|--|
| Yes | No | Unk | 184 Does city / county comp plan list any water resources as Goal 5 resources? NO |
| | | | 185 Comment (Question 184): |
| Yes | No | Unk | 186 Within FEMA 100-year flood plain? YES |
| | | | 187 Comment (Question 186): FIRM Flood Insurance Rate Map, Lincoln County, OR. Panel 75 of 475. September 3, 1980 |
| Yes | No | Unk | 188 Within FEMA regulated floodway? YES |
| | | | 189 Comment (Question 188): Lincoln County regulates all areas within the 100-year flood boundary (LCC 1.1395(2)) |
| Yes | No | Unk | 190 Water quality limited stream impacted? YES |
| | | | 191 Comment (Question 190): |
| Yes | No | Unk | 192 Any active wells impacted? Unknown |
| | | | 193 Comment (Question 192): |
| | | | 194 Select range of ADT: 10,780 AADT (2003) |
| | | | 195 Comment (Question 196): |
| Yes | No | Unk | 196 Navigable waterway(s)? NO |
| | | | 197 Comment (Question 196): See Attachment C3.2 |
| Yes | No | Unk | 198 New impervious surface area >= 1,000 sq. meters? YES |
| | | | 199 Comment (Question 198): |
| Yes | No | Unk | 200 Any irrigation districts impacted? Unknown |
| | | | 201 Comment (Question 200): |
| Yes | No | Unk | 202 Are there T&E aquatic species in the receiving water? YES |
| | | | 203 Comment (Question 202): |
| Yes | No | Unk | 204 Existing storm drain system? Unknown |
| | | | 205 Comment (Question 204): |

Wetlands

- | | | | |
|-----|----|-----|---|
| Yes | No | Unk | 208 National wetlands inventory maps show any wetlands in the project area? YES |
| | | | 209 Comment (Question 208): See Attachment C3.2 |
| Yes | No | Unk | 210 Soil conservation maps indicate hydric soils in project area? YES |
| | | | 211 Comment (Question 210): See Attachment C3.2 |
| Yes | No | Unk | 212 Local Comprehensive Plan show any wetlands as protected resources? NO |
| | | | 213 Comment (Question 212): |
| Yes | No | Unk | 214 Riparian or wetland vegetation evident from visual inspection? YES |
| | | | 215 Comment (Question 214): Estuarine wetland vegetation; riparian herbaceous shrub vegetation |

Permits: (Note: "Unknown" is not a valid response in this section)

- | | | | |
|-----|----|-----|--|
| Yes | No | Unk | 218 US Corps of Engineers Section 404 YES |
| Yes | No | Unk | 219 DSL Removal and Fill YES |

**REGION ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST
ATTACHMENT TO PART 3 (PROJECT ENVIRONMENTAL CLASSIFICATION)**

Project: C5, Section 2: Siletz River Highway to Gleneden Beach Road (MP 120.02 to MP 121.68)	Key No:
---	----------------

Instructions:

This checklist should be completed and attached to the Part 3. It will provide information to assist in appropriately classifying projects. A "Yes" answer indicates areas of concern, a "No" answer indicates no concerns, and UNK indicates that you didn't check into that area. The primary intent of the checklist is to ensure these items have been considered, and where appropriate, researched. When something of potential impact is found, explain in the appropriate section of the Part 3. If you have any questions, please call (503) 986-3477. The receptionist will transfer you to the appropriate resource person for assistance.

1. Prepared By: _____ 2. Phone Number: _____ 3. Date: _____ 4. Applicable Bridge Number: _____ 5. A brief description of the project: _____

- | | | | |
|-----|----|-----|--|
| Yes | No | Unk | 220 DEQ Indirect Source (Air) NO |
| Yes | No | Unk | 221 PUC (Railroad) NO |
| Yes | No | Unk | 222 DOGAMI NO |
| Yes | No | Unk | 223 Coast Guard NO |
| Yes | No | Unk | 224 Local Jurisdiction National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) NO |
| | | | 225 Other: |

Clearances: (Note: "Unknown" is not a valid response in this section)

- | | | | |
|-----|----|-----|---|
| Yes | No | Unk | 226 State and/or Federal Endangered Species Act YES |
| Yes | No | Unk | 227 State Historic Preservation Office (Historic) NO |
| Yes | No | Unk | 228 State Historic Preservation Office (Archaeological) NO |
| Yes | No | Unk | 229 FHWA Noise NO |
| Yes | No | Unk | 230 Air Conformity NO |
| Yes | No | Unk | 231 DEQ Commercial / Industrial Noise Regulation NO |
| Yes | No | Unk | 232 Hazmat Materials Clearance NO |
| Yes | No | Unk | 233 ODOT Erosion Control Plan YES |

Prepared by:	Phone Number:	Date:
---------------------	----------------------	--------------

ATTACHMENT C3.2

36	Name of ODFW biologist and comments:	<p>Bob Buckman/Fish Biologist (5/17/2007): "In addition to ORNHIC and StreamNet identified species, Millport Slough is also important habitat for cutthroat trout, chinook salmon, and Pacific lamprey. Millport Slough and Siletz Bay are very important tidal areas for rearing area for juvenile salmonids. ODFW is doing lots of restoration to improve tidal exchange. Not sure of fish passage at Sijota Creek. Cutthroat trout use is documented in this creek upstream of US 101."</p> <p>Doug Cottam/District Wildlife Biologist (5/18/07): "In general, all wetland areas... are of importance to a variety of wildlife...please note that I would strongly encourage wetland protection. The Hwy 101 projects sites such as[C3 Section 2] are tidally influenced salt marshes and are significant and unique wildlife habitat which need to be protected. Several species of shorebirds will use the tidal mudflats adjacent to the highway. There are quite a few species of waterfowl in the Bay and ducks such as Mallards as well as Canada Geese may nest in the wetlands adjacent to the highway. Wherever there is bridge or culvert replacement/modification/improvements over streams please consider noting all these stream riparian areas have beaver in them which are important to many species of wildlife along the streams including Coho. I would recommend beaver control devices such as beaver deceivers placed in locations where beaver may build dams that would result in road maintenance problems. Non lethal beaver damage prevention is our goal.</p> <p>I believe the T & E species you noted (from the ORNHIC) are accurate with one addition: Brown Pelicans, which are a federally listed endangered species, do exist along the coast especially during late spring/summer and may actually be present near site in Siletz Bay although I have personally not seen them. The USFWS could provide you more information."</p>
42	Name of BLM or USFS biologist and comments:	<p>David Leal/USFWS (5/11/2007): "While the bald eagle may be the only species recorded within 2 miles this is also likely historical murrelet habitat. Any mature trees being removed or where loud noise would occur within the 1 April to September 15 murrelet breeding season within 300 feet of loud project activities would require some level of ESA consultation. Eagles are currently listed under the ESA and those sites within 2 miles are probably nest sites. Besides the obvious nest tree concerns (i.e., avoid removing nest stand habitat) you will also need to look at whether nesting eagles could be harassed by project activities. Loud noise within 0.25 miles and visual activity within 0.5 miles may rise to the level of harassment and will likely require some level of ESA consultation. If the bald eagle gets delisted in June it will still be protected against "disturbance" under the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act, however, the thresholds are less constraining and are either 300 or 600 feet for noise or visual disturbance (This is still being developed so further discussion would be needed regarding final guidance).</p> <p>In addition to the listed species there are many other fish and wildlife resources of concern to ODFW and the USFWS in the Siletz Bay area. Much of this area is also part of the Siletz Bay National Wildlife Refuge and has high fish and wildlife use. If your projects have the potential to affect the adjacent NWR you should contact Roy Lowe or Dave Pitkin at the Oregon Coast National Wildlife Refuge Complex in Newport (the same number you called to reach Laura Todd). I would also like to be kept in that loop. Also if you have further questions regarding OR Silverspot butterflies you can talk to Anne Walker also in our Newport office."</p>
43	What are the results from a Natural Heritage Database check?	<p>ORNHIC identifies one listed terrestrial wildlife species and four aquatic species as occurring within 2 miles of the project area: Bald eagle (<i>Haliaeetus leucocephalus</i>), Federal and State Listed Threatened; Winter steelhead (<i>Oncorhynchus mykiss</i>, pop 31), Summer steelhead (<i>Oncorhynchus mykiss</i>, pop 30), Oregon Coast ESU, and Chum salmon (<i>Oncorhynchus keta</i>, pop 4), Pacific Coast ESU, Coho salmon, Oregon Coast ESU (<i>Oncorhynchus kisutch</i>, pop 3). The ORNHIC database lists no plant species within the 2 miles of the project area.</p>
45	Comment (Question 44):	<p>Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife StreamNet identifies the Siletz River at this location as rearing and migration habitat for coho salmon, summer and winter steelhead, and chum salmon. Millport Slough and Sijota Creek, west of US 101, are identified as rearing and migration habitat for Coho salmon and winter steelhead.</p>
203	Comment (Question 202):	<p>ORNHIC identifies four aquatic species as occurring within 2 miles of the project area: Winter steelhead (<i>Oncorhynchus mykiss</i>, pop 31), Summer steelhead (<i>Oncorhynchus mykiss</i>, pop 30), Oregon Coast ESU, and Chum salmon (<i>Oncorhynchus keta</i>, pop 4), Pacific Coast ESU, Coho salmon, Oregon Coast ESU (<i>Oncorhynchus kisutch</i> pop 3).</p>
209	Comment (Question 208):	<p>Large wetland areas are associated with Siletz Bay and the drainage of Sijota Creek east of the highway. Estuarine intertidal emergent regularly flooded (E2EMN) wetlands are present on both sides of Hwy 101 adjacent to the Siletz Bay. The drainage of Sijota Creek east of the highway contains several wetland types immediately adjacent to the highway. These include: palustrine emergent seasonally flooded (PEMC), palustrine scrub-shrub seasonally flooded (PSSC), palustrine forested seasonally flooded (PFOC), palustrine aquatic bed permanently flooded (PABH), and palustrine aquatic bed permanently flooded diked/impounded (PABHh).</p>
211	Comment (Question 210):	<p>A review of the Soil Survey of Lincoln County, Oregon (NRCS, 1994) reveals three soil type mapped within the study area: Bandon fine sandy loam, 12 to 50 percent slopes, Coquille silt loam, 0 to 1 percent slopes, and Coquille silt loam, protected, 0 to 7 percent slopes. Coquille silt loam and Coquille silt loam, protected are listed as hydric soils.</p>

Purpose and Need Statement

US-101 Widening -- Lincoln City SCL to Lancer St./Seagrove Dr. (MP 118.70 – 123.49)

Description of the Existing Facility:

US-101 (Oregon Coast Highway – State Highway No. 9) is a major north-south highway and part of the National Highway System. The approximate 5-mile segment between the south city limits (SCL) of Lincoln City and Lancer Street/Seagrove Drive in the Lincoln Beach area (MP 118.70 to MP 123.49) is a non-freight route designated as a rural principal arterial and National Scenic Byway. The highway segment consists of two-lane and four-lane sections. At its northerly end, the highway is two lanes until transitioning into a four-lane section near the Siletz River Highway and the Siletz River Bridge. South of the bridge, the highway again becomes a two-lane section until it nears the Salishan resort area, where a short four-lane section exists at a traffic signal. South of the traffic signal, the highway again transitions into a two-lane highway until it reaches the four-lane section in Lincoln Beach. Significant portions of this highway segment are either within or adjacent to the Siletz Bay National Wildlife Refuge. The section contains two-lane bridges over Drift Creek and Millport Slough and a four-lane bridge over the Siletz River. Average annual daily traffic is approximately 14,000 south of Lincoln City to Lincoln Beach.

Purpose of the Project:

The purpose of the proposed project is to provide for the operation of US-101 and key intersections so that travel through the project section can be accomplished efficiently and safely.

Need for the Project:

High travel demand throughout the summer months results in congestion and traffic safety problems that already exceed acceptable conditions. These problems are particularly acute on summer weekends and are forecast to become worse by the end of the planning horizon, 2027.

- Vehicles entering and leaving the highway at Drift Creek Road, OR-229 (Siletz Highway), Immonen Road, Salishan Drive, Gleneden Beach Road North, and Lancer Street/Seagrove Drive affect highway travel speeds that then cause traffic operations and safety problems. High traffic volumes on US-101 provide very few gaps for the left-turn movements at these intersections and increase the likelihood of risky maneuvers by motorists.
- The stop-controlled Gleneden Beach Road intersection currently operates at conditions worse than the acceptable mobility standard (V/C ratio is 0.95; mobility standard is 0.75). The signalized intersection of US-101 at Salishan Drive currently operates at substandard conditions (V/C ratio of 0.74; OHP Mobility Standard of 0.70) due to the heavy turning traffic volume at the intersection. Forecast 2027 V/C is projected to

exceed available capacity for both intersections: V/C projected to be greater than 2.0 for Gleneden Beach Road and 1.04 for Salishan Drive.

- Two areas within the segment have been among the worst 10 percent of all crash locations on state highways: Lancer Street (2006 SPIS List) and OR-229 (2004 SPIS List). The section from Lincoln City SCL to OR-229 experienced 32 crashes during the past 5 years, resulting in a crash rate of 0.99 per million vehicle miles, which is considered high compared to similar highways.
- Highway traffic volumes in 2027 are forecasted to result in conditions that are worse than the highway standard also at the following stop-controlled intersections: Drift Creek Road, Immonen Road, and Lancer Street.
- Forecast vehicle queue lengths in the through lanes in the Salishan area are expected to extend over 1,300 feet from the intersection, creating very undesirable conditions. The distances are equivalent to 53 vehicles in the northbound through lane and 81 vehicles in the southbound through lane. They may block upstream intersections/driveways as far north as Immonen Road and as far south as Gleneden Beach Road, thereby creating gridlock.
- In 2027, analysis shows that highway operations in the section will be affected by bottleneck traffic conditions at each end of the existing four-lane sections. Very undesirable, erratic traffic operations and a high number of crashes are to be expected under such conditions. A highway providing two travel lanes in each direction and addressing turn movements at the intersections would eliminate these conditions.

Goals and Objectives of the Project:

- Identify and evaluate feasible alternatives that address operational, safety, and geometric problems. Feasible alternatives need to be consistent with Oregon Highway Design Manual (HDM) standards and relevant Oregon Highway Plan (OHP) policies.
- Avoid environmental impacts if feasible. If not feasible, minimize the impacts to the natural and built environment.
- Develop improvements that will facilitate operation of the highway at acceptable conditions through the design year.
- Provide a context-sensitive design that recognizes the significant environmental, scenic and other intrinsic values of the highway and communities.
- Incorporate proposed improvements into Lincoln County's Transportation System Plan (TSP) and Comprehensive Plan.
- Engage all interested local, state, and federal agencies and other interested parties in identifying the appropriate solution to the transportation need.