



KABATA **KNIK ARM CROSSING** DOT&PF



Indirect and Cumulative Impacts Assessment Methodology Feedback Form

April 25, 2005

Your agency: DOT

Your name: Kim Rice

A. Your level of acceptance of the approach for conducting the Indirect and Cumulative Impacts Assessment (please circle one):

4 - I agree with the approach, including:

- The methods as described
- Which resources to address in the cumulative impacts assessment
- The spatial boundaries for this assessment
- The temporal boundaries for this assessment

Landuse & Socioeconomic impact includes Road system & infrastructure

3 - I agree in principle with the approach, but suggest changes in the resources to consider, the spatial boundaries, and/or the temporal boundaries. My suggested changes are:

Increased maintenance & operating costs & loads
Indirect & Direct Impacts

2 - I don't have an opinion because I need more information, which is:

Had salting, sanding & removal ice on this long bridge been considered? De-icing methods sprays etc.

1 - I believe the methodology is seriously flawed because:

B. Reasonably Foreseeable Future Actions (RFFAs) that should be added include:

<u>Project/Action</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Timeframe</u>	<u>Degree of Certainty</u>
-----------------------	-----------------	------------------	----------------------------

inclusion

I'm not certain @s to the LRTP & the MATSU. But it is reasonable to expect that the corridors will be upgraded Pt Mac Rd, Beema Rd, S. Big Lake Rd & a new connection to Willow which will reduce travel times on the road. Also, have you looked @ connecting the Seward/Glenn Hwy connection (C Street may not take the load). I'm not certain how you are including

LRTP
travel patterns
changes



Indirect and Cumulative Impacts Assessment Methodology Feedback Form

April 25, 2005

Your agency: US Army Garrison - Ft. Richardson

Your name: Allen Lucht

A. Your level of acceptance of the approach for conducting the Indirect and Cumulative Impacts Assessment (please circle one):

4 – I agree with the approach, including:

- The methods as described
- Which resources to address in the cumulative impacts assessment
- The spatial boundaries for this assessment
- The temporal boundaries for this assessment

3 – I agree in principle with the approach, but suggest changes in the resources to consider, the spatial boundaries, and/or the temporal boundaries. My suggested changes are:

Area is too small. One issue repeatedly raised at the Anchorage
public scoping meeting – traffic analysis
throughout ^{heading} south, ^{at} Anchorage and traffic heading
through north skirting Wasilla

2 – I don't have an opinion because I need more information, which is:

1 – I believe the methodology is seriously flawed because:

B. Reasonably Foreseeable Future Actions (RFFAs) that should be added include:

<u>Project/Action</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Timeframe</u>	<u>Degree of Certainty</u>
-----------------------	-----------------	------------------	----------------------------



Indirect and Cumulative Impacts Assessment Methodology Feedback Form

April 25, 2005

Your agency: U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service

Your name: Frances Mann

A. Your level of acceptance of the approach for conducting the Indirect and Cumulative Impacts Assessment (please circle one):

4 - I agree with the approach, including:

- The methods as described
- Which resources to address in the cumulative impacts assessment
- The spatial boundaries for this assessment
- The temporal boundaries for this assessment

3 - I agree in principle with the approach, but suggest changes in the resources to consider, the spatial boundaries, and/or the temporal boundaries. My suggested changes are:

→ I'll come clean and admit I did not read the document that Robin^S and others prepared.

But... at this point, the presentations by Robin^S, John, and Robin R. seem to be heading

2 - I don't have an opinion because I need more information, which is:

in the exact right direction.

Good job!

1 - I believe the methodology is seriously flawed because:

One comment I have is to continue to strive (as you are doing) for reality. In addition to the free enterprise development strategies you are trying to capture, there are ~~other~~ regulations that are

B. Reasonably Foreseeable Future Actions (RFFAs) that should be added include:

Project/Action Location Timeframe Degree of Certainty →

Frances Mann, USF+WS
(Continued)

supposedly in place that actually do not work.
Examples include: the minimum lot size of 40 acres
on agriculture parcels. This seems to be waived
frequently. Also - the 75' setback, in reality, allows
for many actions that degrade waterways.



Indirect and Cumulative Impacts Assessment Methodology Feedback Form
April 25, 2005

Your agency: NPS

Your name: John Dravell

A. Your level of acceptance of the approach for conducting the Indirect and Cumulative Impacts Assessment (please circle one):

- 4 – I agree with the approach, including:
 - The methods as described
 - Which resources to address in the cumulative impacts assessment
 - The spatial boundaries for this assessment
 - The temporal boundaries for this assessment

3 – I agree in principle with the approach, but suggest changes in the resources to consider, the spatial boundaries, and/or the temporal boundaries. My suggested changes are:

2 – I don't have an opinion because I need more information, which is:

1 – I believe the methodology is seriously flawed because:

B. Reasonably Foreseeable Future Actions (RFFAs) that should be added include:

Project/Action Location Timeframe Degree of Certainty

Wildland Fire Management - need to consider



Indirect and Cumulative Impacts Assessment Methodology Feedback Form

April 25, 2005

Your agency: Planning Dept. - MOA

Your name: Fred Carpenter

A. Your level of acceptance of the approach for conducting the Indirect and Cumulative Impacts Assessment (please circle one):

- 4 - I agree with the approach, including:
 - The methods as described
 - Which resources to address in the cumulative impacts assessment
 - The spatial boundaries for this assessment
 - The temporal boundaries for this assessment

3 - I agree in principle with the approach, but suggest changes in the resources to consider, the spatial boundaries, and/or the temporal boundaries. My suggested changes are:

2 - I don't have an opinion because I need more information, which is:

1 - I believe the methodology is seriously flawed because:

B. Reasonably Foreseeable Future Actions (RFFAs) that should be added include:

<u>Project/Action</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Timeframe</u>	<u>Degree of Certainty</u>
-----------------------	-----------------	------------------	----------------------------

I don't have enough information, but will get with Tom Nelson, Planning Director to see what he can add.

JH



Indirect and Cumulative Impacts Assessment Methodology Feedback Form

April 25, 2005

Your agency: U.S. Army Garrison - AK, Fort Richardson

Your name: Kevin Gardner

A. Your level of acceptance of the approach for conducting the Indirect and Cumulative Impacts Assessment (please circle one):

4 – I agree with the approach, including:

- The methods as described
- Which resources to address in the cumulative impacts assessment
- The spatial boundaries for this assessment
- The temporal boundaries for this assessment

③ I agree in principle with the approach, but suggest changes in the resources to consider, the spatial boundaries, and/or the temporal boundaries. My suggested changes are:

Scope should expand somewhat to address state-wide impacts, north-south.

2 – I don't have an opinion because I need more information, which is:

1 – I believe the methodology is seriously flawed because:

B. Reasonably Foreseeable Future Actions (RFFAs) that should be added include:

Project/Action Location Timeframe Degree of Certainty



Indirect and Cumulative Impacts Assessment Methodology Feedback Form

April 25, 2005

Your agency: DNR / OHMP

Your name: Matthew LaCroix

A. Your level of acceptance of the approach for conducting the Indirect and Cumulative Impacts Assessment (please circle one):

4 – I agree with the approach, including:

- The methods as described
- Which resources to address in the cumulative impacts assessment
- The spatial boundaries for this assessment
- The temporal boundaries for this assessment

3 – I agree in principle with the approach, but suggest changes in the resources to consider, the spatial boundaries, and/or the temporal boundaries. My suggested changes are:

I think that the team has made a good start. The additional resources will improve the assessment.

2 – I don't have an opinion because I need more information, which is:

1 – I believe the methodology is seriously flawed because:

B. Reasonably Foreseeable Future Actions (RFFAs) that should be added include:

<u>Project/Action</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Timeframe</u>	<u>Degree of Certainty</u>
-----------------------	-----------------	------------------	----------------------------



Indirect and Cumulative Impacts Assessment Methodology Feedback Form
 April 25, 2005

Your agency: ALASKAN COMMAND

Your name: STEVE RIBUFFO

A. Your level of acceptance of the approach for conducting the Indirect and Cumulative Impacts Assessment (please circle one):

4 – I agree with the approach, including:

- The methods as described
- Which resources to address in the cumulative impacts assessment
- The spatial boundaries for this assessment
- The temporal boundaries for this assessment

3 – I agree in principle with the approach, but suggest changes in the resources to consider, the spatial boundaries, and/or the temporal boundaries. My suggested changes are:

2 – I don't have an opinion because I need more information, which is:

1 – I believe the methodology is seriously flawed because:

B. Reasonably Foreseeable Future Actions (RFFAs) that should be added include:

<u>Project/Action</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Timeframe</u>	<u>Degree of Certainty</u>
C-17 Operational in AK	Elmendorf	2008	High
F-22 Operational in AK	Elmendorf	2007/2008	High



Indirect and Cumulative Impacts Assessment Methodology Feedback Form

April 25, 2005

Your agency: NMFS

Your name: Larry PeHz

A. Your level of acceptance of the approach for conducting the Indirect and Cumulative Impacts Assessment (please circle one):

- 4 – I agree with the approach, including:
- The methods as described
 - Which resources to address in the cumulative impacts assessment
 - The spatial boundaries for this assessment
 - The temporal boundaries for this assessment

3 – I agree in principle with the approach, but suggest changes in the resources to consider, the spatial boundaries, and/or the temporal boundaries. My suggested changes are:

2 – I don't have an opinion because I need more information, which is:

1 – I believe the methodology is seriously flawed because:

B. Reasonably Foreseeable Future Actions (RFFAs) that should be added include:

Project/Action Location Timeframe Degree of Certainty

can't think of any



Indirect and Cumulative Impacts Assessment Methodology Feedback Form

April 25, 2005

Your agency: DNR-OHMP-VANC

Your name: Mart Somerville

A. Your level of acceptance of the approach for conducting the Indirect and Cumulative Impacts Assessment (please circle one):

4 – I agree with the approach, including:

- The methods as described
- Which resources to address in the cumulative impacts assessment
- The spatial boundaries for this assessment
- The temporal boundaries for this assessment

- Add water quantity, water quality issues

3 – I agree in principle with the approach, but suggest changes in the resources to consider, the spatial boundaries, and/or the temporal boundaries. My suggested changes are:

Add water quantity to analysis - must assume a limited resource.

2 – I don't have an opinion because I need more information, which is:

1 – I believe the methodology is seriously flawed because:

B. Reasonably Foreseeable Future Actions (RFFAs) that should be added include:

<u>Project/Action</u>	<u>Location</u>	<u>Timeframe</u>	<u>Degree of Certainty</u>
Increase Aquaculture	Matsu	next 10-20 yrs	100%