FHWA-WA-EIS-10-01-F

SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV Program

SR 520 Pontoon Construction Project | Final Environmental Impact Statement

ABSTRACT

The Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) maintains four floating bridges in Washington that are built on large concrete pontoons. One of these bridges, the State Route (SR) 520 Evergreen Point Bridge, has been damaged by past windstorms and is vulnerable to catastrophic failure. The Evergreen Point Bridge is a critical component of the Puget Sound region's transportation infrastructure, and the consequences of bridge failure would be severe for the region's mobility and economy. Having new pontoons available for an emergency bridge replacement would allow WSDOT to quickly restore mobility in the SR 520 corridor across Lake Washington. WSDOT has identified the availability of new pontoons as the most time-critical element of replacing the Evergreen Point Bridge in the event of a catastrophic failure. Therefore, WSDOT proposes to expedite the construction of pontoons by building a new casting basin facility large enough to accommodate the construction of multiple pontoons at one time, thereby having pontoons ready should a bridge replacement be necessary. The Final Environmental Impact Statement evaluates a No Build Alternative and two build alternatives, located in Grays Harbor County, Washington, for their potential effects on the natural and built environments. WSDOT has identified a Preferred Alternative: the Aberdeen Log Yard Alternative. Direct, indirect, and cumulative effects as a result of the construction and operation of the project are considered. No decision will be made on the proposed action until January 10, 2011. For information about the project contact Margaret Kucharski, WSDOT Environmental Lead, 600 Stewart Street, Suite 520, Seattle, Washington 98101, (206) 770-3500.

SUBMITTED PURSUANT TO: National Environmental Policy Act, 42 USC 4332(2)(c)
State Environmental Policy Act, 43.21C RCW and 197-11 WAC

SUBMITTED BY: U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration
Washington State Department of Transportation

12/1/10 — Daniel M. Mathis

Date of Approval — **Daniel M. Mathis, P.E.**, Division Administrator, Washington Division, Federal Highway Administration

12/1/2010 — Megan White

Date of Approval — **Megan White, P.E.**, Director, Environmental Services, Washington State Department of Transportation

Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Information

Materials can be provided in alternate formats: large print, Braille, cassette tape, or on computer disk or people with disabilities by calling the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) Office of Equal Opportunity (OEO) at (360) 705-7097. Persons who are deaf or hard of hearing may contact WSDOT OEO through the Washington Relay Service at 7-1-1.

Title VI Information

The Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) ensures full compliance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 by prohibiting discrimination against any person on the basis of race, color, national origin, or sex in the provision of benefits and services resulting from its federally assisted programs and activities. For questions regarding WSDOT's Title VI Program, you may contact WSDOT's Title VI Coordinator at (360) 705-7098 or (509) 324-6018.

SEPA Fact Sheet

Project Title

SR 520 Bridge Replacement and HOV Program: SR 520 Pontoon Construction Project

Project Description

The State Route (SR) 520 Pontoon Construction Project proposes to build a casting basin facility that can accommodate the construction of multiple pontoons at one time. The project would expedite the construction of replacement pontoons for the SR 520 Evergreen Point Bridge. The pontoons would be stored in the event they are needed for catastrophic failure response or until they can be incorporated into the planned bridge replacement.

The Evergreen Point Bridge is a critical component of the Puget Sound region's transportation infrastructure. Should the bridge fail as a result of a catastrophic event, the economic and regional mobility consequences would be severe. Having pontoons constructed, stored, and ready for quick deployment would reduce closure time of the Evergreen Point Bridge by up to 3.5 years. This project could also provide the Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT) long-term access to the proposed facility to build pontoons for future WSDOT floating bridge repairs or replacement, when the need arises.

This Final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) evaluates two build alternatives and one No Build Alternative. The Aberdeen Log Yard Alternative has been identified as FHWA's and WSDOT's Preferred Alternative.

Each build alternative includes constructing a new casting basin facility along the northern shore of Grays Harbor, Washington, and potentially using the existing Concrete Technology Corporation, Inc. (CTC) graving dock (referred to hereafter as casting basin) facility and surrounding properties in Tacoma, Washington. The two Grays Harbor waterfront sites being evaluated for the new casting basin facility are the Anderson & Middleton property in Hoquiam, Washington, and the Aberdeen Log Yard property in Aberdeen, Washington. During construction of the new casting basin facility at Grays Harbor, the existing CTC facility, which has a limited operations area, could be used to build up to three large and up to ten small pontoons.

Co-Lead Agencies

Federal Highway Administration (FHWA):

FHWA, Washington State Division
711 South Capitol Way, Suite 501
Olympia, WA 98501

Washington State Department of Transportation (WSDOT):

WSDOT, Environmental Services Office
P.O. Box 47331
Olympia, WA 98504

FHWA is the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) lead agency with WSDOT as its co-lead agency. WSDOT is the project proponent and the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) lead agency.

Responsible NEPA Official

Daniel Mathis, P.E., Division Administrator, FHWA Washington Division

Responsible SEPA Official

Megan White, P.E., Director, WSDOT Environmental Services Office

Document Cost and Availability

Executive Summary hard copies and the Final EIS on DVD are available at no charge. Printed copies of the Final EIS and appendices are available for purchase. All of these can be obtained at the SR 520 Program Office, 600 Stewart Street, Suite 520, Seattle, WA 98101. The price for the Final EIS hard copy is $57.00, and this cost does not exceed the cost of printing.

Printed copies of the Final EIS and related attachments are accessible at the city halls in Hoquiam and Aberdeen, Washington; other locations in the affected communities (see Attachment A2, Distribution List, at the end of this document); and the following libraries:

- Aberdeen Timberland Library
- Grays Harbor College Library
- Hoquiam Timberland Library
- Montesano Timberland Library
- Seattle Public Library - Central Branch
- Tacoma Main Library
- University of Washington Suzzallo-Allen Library
- Washington State Library

Contact Information

For information about the project contact the following:

Margaret Kucharski
WSDOT Environmental Lead
SR 520 Pontoon Construction Project
600 Stewart Street, Suite 520
Seattle, WA 98101

Access the Final EIS online at www.wsdot.wa.gov/projects/sr520/pontoons/. To listen to a recording of the latest project information or to submit a question, please call the project hotline at 1-888-520-6397.

Anticipated Permits and Approvals

Anticipated permits and approvals required for the project— and from which agency the project would obtain them—are listed below.

Federal

U.S. Army Corps of Engineers

- Clean Water Act, Section 404 Permit
- Rivers and Harbors Act, Section 10 Permit

U.S. Coast Guard

- Private Aids to Navigation Permit

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

- Endangered Species Act, Section 7 Consultation

National Oceanic and Atmospheric Association, National Marine Fisheries Service

- Endangered Species Act, Section 7 Consultation

Washington State Department of Archaeology and Historic Preservation

- National Historic Preservation Act, Section 106 Consultation

State and Regional

Washington State Department of Ecology

- Clean Water Act, Section 401 Certification
- Coastal Zone Management Consistency Certificate
- National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System General Sand and Gravel Permit
- National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Construction Stormwater General Permit

Washington State Department of Fish and Wildlife

- Hydraulic Project Approval

Washington State Department of Natural Resources

- Dredge Disposal Site Use Authorization

Local Jurisdiction

Grays Harbor County

- Shoreline Substantial Development Permit

Jurisdiction to be determined with Preferred Alternative decision:

- Street Use Permit
- Noise Variance
- Shoreline Substantial Development Permit/Variance/Conditional Use
- Critical Areas Compliance
- Building Permit

Authors and Principal Preparers

The List of Preparers is included as Attachment A1 at the end of the Final EIS.

Final EIS Date of Issue

December 10, 2010

Anticipated Record of Decision Date of Issue

January 2011

Contents

Note: The Executive Summary is being published and distributed as a stand-alone document.

Chapter 1 Introduction to the Project.....1-1
What is the SR 520 Pontoon Construction Project?.....1-1
What is the purpose of the project?.....1-1
Why is the project needed now, and what would happen if pontoons were not built? 1-2
Why would WSDOT build a new pontoon construction facility?.....1-3
What is a casting basin? 1-4
Where would WSDOT build the pontoons?.....1-5
When would WSDOT begin construction, and how long would the project last?.....1-6
What is the design-build process for the project? 1-6
What would happen to the casting basin facility when the project is completed? 1-7
How would WSDOT use the pontoons if the Evergreen Point Bridge did not fail?.....1-8
Why did WSDOT prepare this Final EIS, and how is it different from the Draft EIS? 1-8
How has WSDOT involved the public in the environmental process? 1-9
How has WSDOT included agencies and tribes in the environmental process?.....1-10
What future public involvement opportunities is WSDOT planning for the project?.....1-12

Chapter 2 Project Alternatives.....2-1
What alternatives does WSDOT evaluate in this Final EIS? 2-1
What is the Aberdeen Log Yard Alternative (Preferred Alternative)?.....2-4
What is the Anderson & Middleton Alternative?.....2-17
What is the CTC facility option?.....2-20
What is the No Build Alternative? 2-20
What are the primary differences between the build alternatives?.....2-21
Why was Aberdeen Log Yard selected as the Preferred Alternative?.....2-22
Did all alternatives receive the same level of analysis? 2-24
What is the environmentally preferable alternative?.....2-25
How did WSDOT choose potential sites to evaluate?.....2-26
How did WSDOT screen and select potential sites for analysis?.....2-27
Why is WSDOT analyzing the casting basin method for building pontoons?.....2-33
What other construction methods did WSDOT review?.....2-33
How long would it take WSDOT to build the new facility and pontoons?.....2-35
How would WSDOT maintain the casting basin after pontoons for this project are built? 2-35

Chapter 3 The Environment **3-1**
What topics did WSDOT include in the environmental effects analysis? 3-1
What types of direct effects did WSDOT evaluate? 3-2
What are indirect effects, and how did WSDOT evaluate them? 3-3
What are cumulative effects, and how did WSDOT evaluate them? 3-3
Why did WSDOT consider indirect and cumulative effects in this EIS? 3-4
How did WSDOT identify other past, current, and reasonably foreseeable actions? 3-5

3.1 Ecosystems **3.1-1**

Wetlands **3.1-2**
Has any new information been developed since the Draft EIS? 3.1-2
What regulatory programs govern activities in and around wetlands? 3.1-3
How did WSDOT identify and classify wetlands? 3.1-3
What are the existing wetlands in the study area? 3.1-5
How did WSDOT evaluate direct effects on wetlands? 3.1-7
How would construction of the casting basin directly affect wetlands? 3.1-9
How would pontoon-building operations directly affect wetlands? 3.1-9
How would pontoon moorage directly affect wetlands? 3.1-10
How would the build alternatives compare in their effects on wetlands? 3.1-10
What indirect effects would the project have on wetlands? 3.1-10
How would wetlands be affected if the project were not built? 3.1-12
What would the cumulative effect on wetlands likely be? 3.1-12

Fish and Aquatic Resources **3.1-15**
Has any new information been developed since the Draft EIS? 3.1-15
What regulatory programs protect fish and aquatic resources? 3.1-15
What fish and aquatic resources exist in the study area? 3.1-16
What is the condition of freshwater habitat in the study area? 3.1-20
What is the condition of shoreline and intertidal habitat in the study area? 3.1-22
Are the project sites within any federally adjudicated tribal fishing areas? 3.1-25
What has led to the condition of fish and aquatic resources in the study area? 3.1-26
How did WSDOT evaluate direct effects on fish and aquatic resources? 3.1-27
How would construction of the casting basin directly affect fish and aquatic resources? 3.1-27
How would pontoon-building operations directly affect fish and aquatic resources? 3.1-33
How would pontoon moorage directly affect fish and aquatic resources? 3.1-35
How would the project affect tribal fishing? 3.1-37
How would the build alternatives compare in their effects on fish and aquatic resources? 3.1-38
What indirect effects would the project have on fish and aquatic resources? 3.1-39
How would fish and aquatic resources be affected if the project were not built? 3.1-40
What would the cumulative effect on fish and aquatic resources likely be? 3.1-40
What is the Endangered Species Act consultation process? 3.1-41
Why is consultation under the Endangered Species Act required? 3.1-43
What are the results of the Endangered Species Act consultation? 3.1-43

Wildlife **3.1-44**
Has any new information been developed since the Draft EIS? 3.1-44
What regulatory programs protect wildlife? 3.1-44
What wildlife species live in and/or use the study area? 3.1-44
What are the habitat characteristics of the CTC site? 3.1-51
What are the habitat characteristics of the Grays Harbor area and build alternative sites? 3.1-52
How did WSDOT evaluate direct effects on wildlife? 3.1-53
How would construction of the casting basin directly affect wildlife and their habitat? 3.1-55
How would pontoon-building operations directly affect wildlife and their habitat? 3.1-58
How would pontoon moorage directly affect wildlife? 3.1-60
How would the build alternatives compare in their effects on wildlife? 3.1-62
What indirect effects would the project have on wildlife? 3.1-62
How would wildlife be affected if the project were not built? 3.1-64
What would the cumulative effect on wildlife likely be? 3.1-64

3.2 Geology and Soils **3.2-1**
Has any new information has been developed since the Draft EIS? 3.2-1
What are the geologic and soils characteristics in the study area? 3.2-1
How did WSDOT evaluate the direct effects on geology and soils? 3.2-10
How would construction of the casting basin directly affect geology and soils? 3.2-10
How would pontoon-building operations directly affect geology and soils? 3.2-14
How would pontoon moorage directly affect geology and soils? 3.2-15
How would the Grays Harbor build alternatives compare in their direct effects on geology and soils? 3.2-15
What indirect effects would the project have on geology and soils? 3.2-15
How would geology and soils be affected if the project were not built? 3.2-17
What would the cumulative effect on geology and soils likely be? 3.2-17

3.3 Hazardous Materials **3.3-1**
Has any new information been developed since the Draft EIS? 3.3-1
What are the regulations that govern the management of hazardous materials? 3.3-1
How did WSDOT evaluate project effects related to hazardous materials? 3.3-1
Are there any hazardous materials in or immediately adjacent to the study area? 3.3-3
How would construction of the casting basin directly increase risks related to hazardous materials? 3.3-10
How would pontoon-building operations directly increase risks related to hazardous materials? 3.3-13
How would pontoon moorage directly affect hazardous materials? 3.3-14
How would the Grays Harbor build alternatives compare in their direct effects related to hazardous materials? 3.3-14
What indirect effects would the project have related to hazardous materials? 3.3-15
How would hazardous materials be affected if the project were not built? 3.3-17
What would the cumulative effect related to hazardous materials likely be? 3.3-17

3.4 Water Resources **3.4-1**
Has any new information been developed since the Draft EIS? 3.4-1
What laws and regulations protect water resources? 3.4-1

What are the water resources in the study area now? 3.4-2
How did WSDOT evaluate direct effects on water resources? 3.4-6
How would WSDOT treat project stormwater for water quality? 3.4-7
How would construction of the casting basin directly affect water resources? 3.4-9
How would pontoon-building operations directly affect water resources? 3.4-10
How would pontoon moorage directly affect water resources? 3.4-11
How would the Grays Harbor build alternatives compare in their direct effects on water resources? 3.4-11
What indirect effects would the project have on water resources? 3.4-11
How would water resources be affected if the project were not built? 3.4-13
What would the cumulative effect on water resources likely be? 3.4-13

3.5 Air Quality 3.5-1
Has any new information has been developed since the Draft EIS? 3.5-1
What laws and regulations protect air quality? 3.5-1
What is the air quality in the study area? 3.5-1
How did WSDOT evaluate direct effects on air quality? 3.5-4
What air pollutants would the project generate? 3.5-5
How would construction of the casting basin directly affect air quality? 3.5-6
How would pontoon-building operations directly affect air quality? 3.5-8
Would the project meet conformity requirements? 3.5-9
How would pontoon moorage directly affect air quality? 3.5-10
How would the Grays Harbor build alternatives compare in their direct effects on air quality? 3.5-11
What indirect effects would the project have on air quality? 3.5-11
How would air quality be affected if the project were not built? 3.5-12
What would the cumulative effect on air quality likely be? 3.5-12
How would the project affect greenhouse gases? 3.5-13

3.6 Energy and Climate Change 3.6-1
Has any new information been developed since the Draft EIS? 3.6-1
What energy conditions are in the study area? 3.6-1
How did WSDOT evaluate the direct effects on energy? 3.6-3
How would construction of the casting basin directly affect energy use? 3.6-4
How would pontoon-building operations directly affect energy use? 3.6-5
How would pontoon moorage directly affect energy use? 3.6-6
How would the Grays Harbor build alternatives compare in their direct effects on energy? 3.6-6
What indirect effects would the project have on energy? 3.6-6
How would energy use be affected if the project were not built? 3.6-7
What would the cumulative effect on energy use likely be? 3.6-7
What is climate change, and what are greenhouse gas emissions? 3.6-7
How did WSDOT calculate greenhouse gas emissions for project construction and operation? 3.6-8
What effect would the project have on greenhouse gas emissions? 3.6-9
Did the project consider future conditions related to climate change? 3.6-10

3.7 Cultural Resources 3.7-1
Has any new information has been developed since the Draft EIS? 3.7-1

What regulations apply to cultural resources? 3.7-1
What cultural resources are in the study area? 3.7-2
How did WSDOT evaluate direct effects on cultural resources? 3.7-14
How would construction of the casting basin facility directly affect cultural resources? 3.7-15
How would pontoon-building operations directly affect cultural resources? 3.7-18
What effects would pontoon moorage have on cultural resources? 3.7-18
Would the project affect historic properties? 3.7-18
How would the Grays Harbor build alternatives compare in their direct effects on cultural resources? 3.7-19
What indirect effects would the project have on cultural resources? 3.7-19
What would happen to cultural resources if the project were not built? 3.7-19
What would the cumulative effect on cultural resources likely be? 3.7-20
What is the Section 106 consultation process? 3.7-20
Why is consultation under Section 106 required? 3.7-21
What are the results of the Section 106 consultation? 3.7-21

3.8 Economics 3.8-1
Has any new information been developed since the Draft EIS? 3.8-1
What are the economic conditions in the study area? 3.8-1
How did WSDOT evaluate direct effects on the economy? 3.8-4
How would construction of the casting basin facility directly affect the economy? 3.8-5
How would pontoon-building operations directly affect the economy? 3.8-7
What direct effects would pontoon moorage have on the economy? 3.8-9
How would the Grays Harbor build alternatives compare in their direct effects on the economy? 3.8-9
What indirect effects would the project have on the economy? 3.8-10
How would the economy be affected if the project were not built? 3.8-11
What would the cumulative effect on the economy likely be? 3.8-11

3.9 Navigable Waterways 3.9-1
Has any new information been developed since the Draft EIS? 3.9-1
What regulations define and manage the use of navigable waterways? 3.9-1
What are the navigable waterways and their use in the study area? 3.9-1
How did WSDOT evaluate the project effects on navigable waterways? 3.9-4
How would construction of the casting basin directly affect navigable waterways? 3.9-5
How would pontoon-building operations directly affect navigable waterways? 3.9-5
How would pontoon moorage directly affect navigable waterways? 3.9-6
How would the build alternatives compare in their direct effects on navigable waterways? 3.9-6
What indirect effects would the project have on navigation? 3.9-7
How would navigable waterways be affected if the project were not built? 3.9-7
What is the cumulative effect on navigation likely to be? 3.9-8

3.10 Noise 3.10-1
Has any new information been developed since the Draft EIS? 3.10-1
What laws and regulations govern noise levels? 3.10-1
How are noise levels characterized? 3.10-2
What are the noise levels in the study area now? 3.10-2

How did WSDOT evaluate direct effects on noise levels? 3.10-5
How would construction of the casting basin directly affect noise levels? 3.10-6
How would pontoon-building operations directly affect noise levels? 3.10-14
How would pontoon moorage directly affect noise levels? 3.10-18
How would the build alternatives differ in their direct effects on noise levels? 3.10-19
What indirect noise effects would the project have? 3.10-19
How would noise levels be affected if the project were not built? 3.10-21
What would the cumulative noise effects likely be? 3.10-21

3.11 Public Services and Utilities 3.11-1
Has any new information been developed since the Draft EIS? 3.11-1
What are the public services and utilities in the study area? 3.11-1
How did WSDOT evaluate direct project effects on public services and utilities? 3.11-5
How would construction of the casting basin directly affect public services and utilities? 3.11-5
How would pontoon-building operations directly affect public services and utilities? 3.11-5
How would pontoon moorage directly affect public services and utilities? 3.11-6
How would the build alternatives compare in their direct effects on public services and utilities? 3.11-6
What indirect effects would the project have on public services and utilities? 3.11-6
How would public services and utilities be affected if the project were not built? 3.11-7
What would the cumulative effect on public services and utilities likely be? 3.11-7

3.12 Land Use 3.12-1
Has any new information been developed since the Draft EIS? 3.12-1
What are the land uses in the study area? 3.12-1
What state-owned aquatic lands are in the study area? 3.12-4
What are the planned future land uses and zoning in the study area? 3.12-4
How did WSDOT evaluate direct effects on land use? 3.12-9
How would construction of the casting basin directly affect land use? 3.12-9
How would pontoon-building operations directly affect land use? 3.12-9
How would pontoon moorage directly affect land use? 3.12-10
How would the project directly affect state-owned aquatic lands? 3.12-10
How would the build alternatives compare in their direct effects on land use? 3.12-11
Are the build alternatives consistent with the applicable land use plans and development regulations? 3.12-11
What indirect effects would the project have on land use? 3.12-12
How would land use be affected if the project were not built? 3.12-12
What would the cumulative effect on land use likely be? 3.12-13

3.13 Social Elements 3.13-1
Has any new information been developed since the Draft EIS? 3.13-1
What are the laws and regulations that apply to the social elements analysis? 3.13-1
What social elements are in the study area? 3.13-2
How did WSDOT evaluate direct effects on social elements? 3.13-11
How would construction of the casting basin directly affect social elements? 3.13-12
How would pontoon-building operations directly affect social elements? 3.13-16

How would pontoon moorage directly affect social elements? 3.13-17
How would the Grays Harbor build alternatives compare in their direct effects on social elements? 3.13-17
How would the project affect low-income and/or minority populations? 3.13-17
What indirect effects would the project have on social elements? 3.13-20
How would social elements be affected if the project were not built? 3.13-21
What would the cumulative effect on social elements likely be? 3.13-21

3.14 Transportation 3.14-1
Has any new information been developed since the Draft EIS? 3.14-1
What are the current transportation and traffic conditions in the study area? 3.14-1
How did WSDOT evaluate direct effects on transportation? 3.14-6
How would construction of the casting basin directly affect transportation? 3.14-10
How would pontoon-building operations directly affect transportation? 3.14-13
How would pontoon moorage directly affect transportation? 3.14-14
How would the Grays Harbor build alternatives compare in their direct effects on transportation? 3.14-15
What indirect effects would the project have on transportation? 3.14-15
How would transportation be affected if the project were not built? 3.14-16
What would the cumulative effects on transportation likely be? 3.14-17

3.15 Visual Quality and Aesthetics 3.15-1
Has any new information been developed since the Draft EIS? 3.15-1
How did WSDOT evaluate direct effects on visual quality and aesthetics? 3.15-1
What are the visual quality and aesthetic characteristics in the study area? 3.15-2
How would construction of the casting basin directly affect visual quality and aesthetics? 3.15-11
How would pontoon-building operations directly affect visual quality and aesthetics? 3.15-11
How would pontoon moorage directly affect visual quality and aesthetics? 3.15-12
How would the Grays Harbor build alternatives compare in their direct effects on visual quality and aesthetics? 3.15-13
What indirect effects would the project have on visual quality and aesthetics? 3.15-14
How would visual quality and aesthetics be affected if the project were not built? 3.15-15
What would the cumulative effect on visual quality and aesthetics likely be? 3.15-15

3.16 Section 4(f) Resources 3.16-1
Has any new information been developed since the Draft EIS? 3.16-1
What Section 4(f) resources are in the study area? 3.16-1
How did WSDOT evaluate project effects on Section 4(f) resources? 3.16-4
How would the Grays Harbor build alternatives compare in their direct effects on Section 4(f) resources? 3.16-4
What is the use determination for identified Section 4(f) resources? 3.16-4

Chapter 4 Comparison of the Alternatives 4-1
What are the primary differences between the build alternatives? 4-1
How would the alternatives differ in their effects on the environment? 4-2

Chapter 5 Mitigation 5-1

Chapter 6 Other Considerations and Next Steps 6-1

What irreversible and irretrievable commitments of resources would the project involve? 6-1
What would be the relationship between the project's short-term effects and long-term benefits?.....6-2
What is the project schedule?.....6-3
Are there unresolved issues, concerns, and/or controversy? 6-4
What are the next steps for this project? 6-7

Chapter 7 Public and Agency Comments on the Draft EIS.....7-1
What was the Draft EIS review process? 7-1
What did WSDOT learn from the comments received during the public comment period?.....7-2
How did WSDOT respond to the Draft EIS comments?.....7-2

Exhibits

1-1 Casting Basin with Pontoons Conceptual Cross-Section Design 1-4
1-2 Casting Basin Three-Dimensional Overview 1-5
1-3 Proposed Pontoon Construction Facility Sites 1-5
1-4 Proposed SR 520 Pontoon Construction Project Schedule 1-6

2-1 Which Project's EIS Evaluates the Proposed SR 520 Program Actions? 2-3
2-2 Project Vicinity Map 2-5
2-3 Conceptual Layouts for Grays Harbor Build Alternative Sites.....2-7
2-4 Approximate Areas of Casting Basin and Other Project Components.....2-8
2-5 Example of Turning Dolphin Construction.....2-8
2-6 Pontoon Types, Quantity, and Approximate Dimensions 2-11
2-7 Pontoon Configuration to Replace the Existing Evergreen Point Bridge 2-12
2-8 Grays Harbor Proposed Pontoon Moorage Location 2-13
2-9 Conceptual Pontoon Open-Water Anchorage Design.....2-14
2-10 Aerial View of CTC Facility as Used for the Hood Canal Project.....2-20
2-11 Examples of Potential Construction Differences between the Grays Harbor Build Alternatives 2-22
2-12 Candidate Casting Basin Facility Sites 2-28
2-13 Screening Criteria for Casting Basin Facility Construction Site.....2-29
2-14 Casting Basin Facility Sites Considered and Dismissed 2-31

3-1 Current and Reasonably Foreseeable Actions in the Grays Harbor Area 3-6
3-2 Current and Reasonably Foreseeable Actions in the Tacoma Area 3-7
3-3 Locations of Past, Present, and Reasonably Foreseeable Actions in the Grays Harbor Area 3-11
3-4 Locations of Past, Present, and Reasonably Foreseeable Actions in the Tacoma Area 3-12

3.1-1 Location of Grass Creek Mitigation Site.....3.1-2
3.1-2 Grays Harbor Build Alternative Sites and Wetland Areas.....3.1-4
3.1-3 Wetlands Areas Shown on Conceptual Layouts of Grays Harbor Build Alternative Sites.....3.1-8
3.1-4 Wetlands Summary of Direct Effects.....3.1-11

3.1-5 Federally Protected Fish Species in Grays Harbor County 3.1-19
3.1-6 Grays Harbor Build Alternative Sites Shoreline and Surface Water Features 3.1-21
3.1-7 Fish and Aquatic Resources Summary of Direct Effects 3.1-38
3.1-8 ESA-Listed Wildlife Species in Grays Harbor County 3.1-47
3.1-9 Additional Federally Protected, State-Listed, and State Priority Species that Might Occur in the Study Area 3.1-48
3.1-10 Wildlife Habitat Summary of Direct Effects 3.1-53

3.2-1 General Subsurface Profiles for the Grays Harbor Build Alternative Sites 3.2-3
3.2-2 Typical Engineering Properties and Hazard Susceptibility of Geologic Units Underlying the Grays Harbor Build Alternative Sites 3.2-4
3.2-3 Potential Seismic Source Zones in the Pacific Northwest 3.2-5
3.2-4 Study Area Fault Zones 3.2-6
3.2-5 Study Area Geologic Hazards and Inundation Limits 3.2-7
3.2-6 Maximum Estimated Export, Import, and Dredging Material Quantities for Grays Harbor Build Alternative Sites 3.2-12
3.2-7 Potential Disposal and Material Site Locations 3.2-13
3.2-8 Geology and Soils Summary of Direct Effects 3.2-16

3.3-1 Locations of Low- to Moderate-Risk Sites in the Grays Harbor Study Area 3.3-5
3.3-2 Summary of Low- to Moderate-Risk Sites in the Grays Harbor Study Area 3.3-6
3.3-3 Hazardous Materials Summary of Direct Effects 3.3-15

3.4-1 Study Area Water Resource Inventory Areas 3.4-3
3.4-2 Proposed Stormwater and Process Water Facilities for the Grays Harbor Build Alternatives 3.4-9
3.4-3 Water Resources Summary of Direct Effects to Fresh and Marine Water 3.4-12

3.5-1 Summary of Ambient Air Quality Standards in the Study Area 3.5-2
3.5-2 Aberdeen Log Yard Alternative (Preferred Alternative) Site Construction and Operation Emissions 3.5-7
3.5-3 Anderson & Middleton Alternative Site Construction and Operation Emissions 3.5-8
3.5-4 CTC Facility Site Operation Emissions 3.5-9
3.5-5 Pontoon Transport Emissions 3.5-11
3.5-6 Air Quality Summary of Direct Effects 3.5-11

3.6-1 Site Construction Onsite Energy Use and Cost 3.6-4
3.6-2 Pontoon Construction Onsite Energy Use and Cost 3.6-5
3.6-3 Energy Summary of Direct Effects 3.6-7
3.6-4 Project Greenhouse Gas Emissions 3.6-10

3.7-1 Cultural Resources Areas of Potential Effects for the Study Area 3.7-4

3.7-2a Properties 45 Years of Age or Older and Identified Historic Properties within the Area of Potential Effects 3.7-6
3.7-2b Properties 45 Years of Age or Older and Identified Historic Properties within the Area of Potential Effects 3.7-7
3.7-2c Properties 45 Years of Age or Older and Identified Historic Properties within the Area of Potential Effects 3.7-8
3.7-2d Properties 45 Years of Age or Older and Identified Historic Properties within the Area of Potential Effects 3.7-9
3.7-2e Area of Potential Effects in the Grass Creek Mitigation Site 3.7-10
3.7-3 Cultural Resources Summary of Direct Effects 3.7-19

3.8-1 Average Annual Employment in Grays Harbor County, 2002 and 2008 ....3.8-3
3.8-2 Unemployment Rates in Grays Harbor County, Washington State, and the United States, 2000 to 2009 ....3.8-4
3.8-3 Estimated Direct, Indirect, and Induced Employment 3.8-5
3.8-4 Economics Summary of Direct Effects 3.8-9

3.9-1 Navigable Waterways in the Grays Harbor Study Area 3.9-2
3.9-2 Grays Harbor Navigation Channel 3.9-3
3.9-3 Navigable Waterways Summary of Direct Effects 3.9-7

3.10-1 Grays Harbor Study Area Noise-Monitoring Locations 3.10-4
3.10-2 Sites Representing Noise-Sensitive Properties in the Grays Harbor Study Area 3.10-8
3.10-3 Predicted Maximum Project Construction Noise Levels for the Aberdeen Log Yard (Preferred Alternative) 3.10-9
3.10-4 Predicted Maximum Haul Route Noise Levels during Project Construction for the Aberdeen Log Yard (Preferred Alternative) 3.10-9
3.10-5 Predicted Maximum Cumulative Project Construction Noise Levels for the Aberdeen Log Yard (Preferred Alternative) 3.10-10
3.10-6 Predicted Maximum Project Construction Noise Levels for the Anderson & Middleton Alternative 3.10-12
3.10-7 Predicted Maximum Haul Route Noise Levels during Project Construction for the Anderson & Middleton Alternative 3.10-13
3.10-8 Predicted Maximum Cumulative Project Construction Noise Levels for the Anderson & Middleton Alternative 3.10-14
3.10-9 Predicted Maximum Project Operations Noise Levels for the Aberdeen Log Yard Alternative (Preferred Alternative) 3.10-15
3.10-10 Predicted Maximum Haul Route Noise Levels during Project Operations for the Aberdeen Log Yard Alternative (Preferred Alternative) 3.10-16
3.10-11 Predicted Maximum Cumulative Project Operational Noise Levels for the Aberdeen Log Yard Alternative Site (Preferred Alternative) 3.10-16
3.10-12 Predicted Maximum Project Operations Noise Levels, Anderson & Middleton Alternative 3.10-17

3.10-13 Predicted Maximum Haul Route Noise Levels during Project Operations for Anderson & Middleton Alternative 3.10-18
3.10-14 Predicted Maximum Cumulative Project Operations Noise Levels, for the Anderson & Middleton Alternative 3.10-19
3.10-15 Noise Summary of Direct Effects 3.10-20

3.11-1 Grays Harbor Study Area Public Services and Utilities 3.11-2
3.11-2 Grays Harbor Study Area Public Service Providers 3.11-3
3.11-3 Grays Harbor Study Area Utility Providers 3.11-4
3.11-4 Public Services and Utilities Summary of Direct Effects 3.11-7

3.12-1 Study Area Existing Land Use and Proposed Project Haul Routes 3.12-2
3.12-2 Study Area Existing Zoning 3.12-5
3.12-3 Land Use Summary of Direct Effects 3.12-11

3.13-1 Grays Harbor Study Area Social Elements 3.13-3
3.13-2 Aerial View of the Port of Tacoma Industrial Area 3.13-4
3.13-3 Low-Income Population in the Grays Harbor Study Area 3.13-7
3.13-4 Minority Population in the Grays Harbor Study Area 3.13-8
3.13-5 Social Elements Summary of Direct Effects 3.13-18

3.14-1 Potential Project Haul Routes 3.14-2
3.14-2 Established LOS Ratings for Signalized and Unsignalized Intersections 3.14-3
3.14-3 Aberdeen Log Yard Alternative (Preferred Alternative) Total Truck Trips per Month 3.14-8
3.14-4 Anderson & Middleton Alternative Total Truck Trips per Month 3.14-8
3.14-5 Transportation Summary of Direct Effects 3.14-15

3.15-1 Study Area Viewsheds 3.15-3
3.15-2 Study Area Landscape Units 3.15-4
3.15-3 Grays Harbor Area Landscape Unit Photographs 3.15-7
3.15-4 Visual Quality and Aesthetics Summary of Direct Effects 3.15-13

3.16-1 Study Area Section 4(f) Resources 3.16-2
3.16-2 Section 4(f) Resources Summary of Direct Effects 3.16-4

4-1 Build Alternatives Comparison Table 4-3

5-1 Grass Creek Mitigation Site 5-5

Attachments

A1 List of Preparers

A2 Distribution List

A3 References

A4 Glossary

A5 Acronyms and Abbreviations

A6 Index

Appendices

Note: These are provided electronically on a CD at the end of this document.

A Agency Coordination and Public Involvement Discipline Report

B Description of Alternatives and Construction Techniques Discipline Report

C Ecosystems Discipline Report

D Geology and Soils Technical Memorandum

E Hazardous Materials Technical Memorandum

F Water Resources Discipline Report

G Air Quality Technical Memorandum

H Energy Technical Memorandum

I Cultural Resources Discipline Report

J Economics Technical Memorandum

K Navigable Waterways Technical Memorandum

L Noise Technical Memorandum

M Public Services and Utilities Technical Memorandum

N Land Use Technical Memorandum

O Social Elements Technical Memorandum

P Transportation Technical Memorandum

Q Visual Quality and Aesthetics Technical Memorandum

R Section 4(f) Resources Technical Memorandum

S Indirect and Cumulative Effects Methodology Memorandum

T Draft EIS Comments and Responses Report

U Summary of Effects Technical Memorandum