

Comment	Commenter	Agency	Topic 1	Topic 2	Venue	Date
The project would need to be in a conforming transportation improvement plan and transportation plan with respect to the regional emissions analysis. The project would also have to complete a project level conformity analysis.	Christine Reichgott	EPA	Air Quality	Environmental Consequences Analysis	Letter + Attachments	6/16/2005
For each alternative, disclose all locations at which emissions would increase near sensitive receptors, give an assessment or accounting of all factors that could influence the degree of adverse impact on the population, and at receptor locations, conduct a hotspot analysis for air toxics and particulate matter. Construction mitigation measure should be included.	Christine Reichgott	EPA	Air Quality	Mitigation	Letter + Attachments	6/16/2005
Attached to 6-16-05 EPA letter: 1.) Mitigation Measures to Reduce Emissions During Construction; 2.) Contact list for Alaska Native Tribes within Cook Inlet.	Christine Reichgott	EPA	Air Quality	Tribal Interests and Coordination	Letter + Attachments	6/16/2005
EPA recommends that the EIS disclose whether vehicular air toxics emissions would result from project construction and operations, discuss the cancer and non-cancer health effects associated with air toxics and diesel particulate matter, and identify sensitive receptor populations and individuals that are likely to be exposed to these emissions.	Christine Reichgott	EPA	Air Quality		Letter + Attachments	6/16/2005
It is important to identify any sensitive receptor locations with respect to construction, operations, and maintenance of the project. Diesel emissions could be significant, thus the project could potentially be a portfolio project under the West Coast Collaborative to decrease diesel emissions.	Wayne Elson	EPA- Air Program	Air Quality		Email	6/28/2005
The farthest south alignment possible would be best for belugas.	Brad Smith	NOAA Fisheries	Alternatives	Beluga	Meeting	4/14/2005
A causeway could be a problem, if built in sensitive habitat.	Barbara Mahoney	NOAA Fisheries Protected Species	Alternatives	Beluga	Meeting	7/7/2004
What is the economic window? Is one alternative more expensive than the other? How long until it evens out?	Brad Smith	NOAA Fisheries	Alternatives	Economic Impacts	Meeting	8/19/2005
2:1 (embankment) looks good	Mark Sommerville	ADNR	Alternatives	Environmental Consequences Analysis	Meeting	8/19/2005
COE would like the longest bridge possible	Skip Joy	COE	Alternatives	Environmental Consequences Analysis	Meeting	8/26/2005
Financially, less fill is better, but we like to see the smallest footprint too. Velocities have impacts.	Skip Joy	COE	Alternatives	Environmental Consequences Analysis	Meeting	8/26/2005
2:1 embankment and abutment preferred as long as it doesn't result in high current velocity, although doesn't seem likely in this case	Skip Joy	COE	Alternatives	Environmental Consequences Analysis	Meeting	8/26/2005
Satisfied with the Southern Alignment as long as it does not push the design towards more fill.	Steve Duncan	EPA	Alternatives	Environmental Consequences Analysis	Meeting	9/27/2005
The decision on embankments and abutments should be based on fisheries and beluga studies.	Heather Dean	EPA	Alternatives	Environmental Consequences Analysis	Meeting	8/26/2005
Defer slope decision to fisheries	Heather Dean	EPA	Alternatives	Environmental Consequences Analysis	Meeting	8/26/2005
2:1 embankment preferred based on analysis of fish and the longer pier supported bridge is preferred from biological standpoint.	Phil Brna	USFWS	Alternatives	Environmental Consequences Analysis	Meeting	8/19/2005
Maybe something about the environment should be included in the technical criteria. Perhaps minimize impacts, minimize fill, or fully mitigate environmental impacts?	Phil Brna	USFWS	Alternatives	Environmental Consequences Analysis	Agency Scoping Mtg	5/11/2005

Comment	Commenter	Agency	Topic 1	Topic 2	Venue	Date
A commuter rail and the Knik Arm ferry would impact travel demand and/or land use in the MSB and MOA.	Lance Wilbur; Jon Spring; Tom Nelson; Craig Lyon	MOA-Traffic Department	Alternatives	Land Use	Meeting	6/15/2004
The highway connection to the Crossing on the MSB side should not bisect Port MacKenzie in a manner that impacts port operations.	Murph O'Brien	MSB	Alternatives	Land Use	letter	5/12/2005
Alaskan Command is willing to participate in development of screening criteria.	Steve Ribuffo	Alaskan Command	Alternatives	Military	Meeting	1/26/2005
We have no comments on the screening criteria.	Steve Ribuffo	ALCOM	Alternatives	Military	Letter	5/12/2005
There is a lot of expansion going on, so we don't want to restrict military access. But we are still listening to proposals.	Bobby Stone	ALCOM	Alternatives	Military	Agency Scoping Mtg	3/29/2005
The military will review all proposals across military land. We haven't cancelled out anything yet, but we must protect our mission.	Bobby Stone	ALCOM	Alternatives	Military	Agency Scoping Mtg	3/29/2005
Some alternatives might not be permissible.	Matt LaCroix	ADNR	Alternatives	Permits	Meeting	2/17/2005
Once the alignments are known, BLM needs permit (ROW) applications.	Rodney Huffman	BLM	Alternatives	Permits	Meeting	2/18/2005
Port and rail access concerns with the Below the Bluff corridor.	Tom Nelson	MOA	Alternatives	Port of Anchorage	Meeting	9/27/2005
The concept that goes east of the port does not give us a problem. The blue area is problematic. Everything you show connects to the AC couplet. Have you checked on connecting to Gambell/Ingra?	Kevin Bruce	POA	Alternatives	Port of Anchorage	Agency Scoping Mtg	3/29/2005
Do you anticipate sport fishermen in the area, or people using a pull off for sight seeing?	Gregg Schmidt	3CES/CEVP-EAFB	Alternatives	Preliminary Engineering	Agency Scoping Mtg	3/29/2005
Spur dikes won't work with the sediment accumulation in Knik Arm.	Mark Sommerville	ADNR	Alternatives	Preliminary Engineering	Meeting	8/23/2005
Concerning bridge length options: Any estimates on maintenance and cost?	Don Perrin	ADNR	Alternatives	Preliminary Engineering	Meeting	8/19/2005
The project should be designed to accommodate a future separate bridge by preserving option for rail approaches to gain elevation to access an eventual rail crossing.	Bruce Carr	ARRC	Alternatives	Preliminary Engineering	Letter	5/12/2005
The Crossing Project should consider how the railroad would tie into the rail span across and Knik Arm and how it would impact the Port of Anchorage.	Bruce Carr	ARRC	Alternatives	Preliminary Engineering	Letter	5/12/2005
The project should consider the MSB's desires for Port MacKenzie development and future rail access from the MSB side.	Bruce Carr	ARRC	Alternatives	Preliminary Engineering	Letter	5/12/2005
The project should consider future right-of-way designations by identifying and preserving railroad ROW on the Anchorage and Port MacKenzie sides including the studied road/rail corridor to Willow.	Bruce Carr	ARRC	Alternatives	Preliminary Engineering	Letter	5/12/2005
The project must consider impacts on ARRC operations and the Anchorage rail yard to ensure that the ARRC can maintain maximum flexibility for future operation needs.	Bruce Carr	ARRC	Alternatives	Preliminary Engineering	Letter	5/12/2005
If an Ingra/Gambell Street extension is proposed, the project must consider impacts, including the placement of support structures and on/off ramps, to the ARRC yard.	Bruce Carr	ARRC	Alternatives	Preliminary Engineering	Letter	5/12/2005
The project should identify any mitigate additional impacts, including at-grade crossings, traffic congestion, and fixed immovable objects like pier structures, on ARRC operations.	Bruce Carr	ARRC	Alternatives	Preliminary Engineering	Letter	5/12/2005
The project should consider how the Crossing will tie into the Port of Anchorage Expansion project.	Bruce Carr	ARRC	Alternatives	Preliminary Engineering	Letter	5/12/2005
Connections from the Crossing to transportation arterial (approach corridors) to existing highways/streets should be examined.	Bruce Carr	ARRC	Alternatives	Preliminary Engineering	Letter	5/12/2005
How wide will the roads be for the project?	Rodney Huffman	BLM	Alternatives	Preliminary Engineering	Meeting	2/18/2005
The COE thinks that the spur dike option could be dropped from consideration.	Skip Joy	COE	Alternatives	Preliminary Engineering	Meeting	8/26/2005
You should keep an option with an intermediate bridge length.	Steve Duncan	EPA	Alternatives	Preliminary Engineering	Meeting	9/27/2005
It would be useful to have one alternative through the military land. We would also like a viable alternative to Ingra/Gambell (upon construction, not at year 2020).	Tom Nelson	MOA	Alternatives	Preliminary Engineering	Meeting	9/27/2005

Comment	Commenter	Agency	Topic 1	Topic 2	Venue	Date
We at MOA are not convinced you can't tie into Ingra/Gambell before the highway-to-highway project is complete. The issue of travel also needs to consider the type of trips, like truck/tanker traffic in downtown. We would rather see tying into Ingra/Gambell now than later.	Tom Nelson	MOA	Alternatives	Preliminary Engineering	Meeting	9/27/2005
Interested in seeing metrics for fill on only one side	Larry Peltz	NOAA Fisheries	Alternatives	Preliminary Engineering	Meeting	8/19/2005
Volumetric comparisons on intertidal fill would be helpful	Mark Sommerville	USFWS	Alternatives	Preliminary Engineering	Meeting	8/19/2005
Are Elemdorf alternatives still being considered?	Phil Brna	USFWS	Alternatives	Preliminary Engineering	Meeting	8/19/2005
MOA requests a role in determining the preferred alternative. The role should be shared with the Mat-Su Borough and the ADOT&PF.	Lance Wilbur, Tom Nelson	MOA	Alternatives	Public and Agency Involvement	Letter	8/12/2005
Without information on Crossing alternatives, agencies have to assume the worst case scenario options. Agencies might need only one more field season of work.	Brian Lance	NOAA Fisheries Fisheries-Habitat Conservation	Alternatives	Public and Agency Involvement	Meeting	8/26/2004
USCG needs report with the following information: Locations for Knik Arm Ferry and operation schedule; safe zone limits for normal port operations; navigation openings for commercial traffic (like Anderson's tugs); pier protection, design in case of debris, barge, boat impact; location and associated bathymetry and currents; factors considered to determine bridge location	Jim Helfinstine	USCG	Alternatives	Public and Agency Involvement	Meeting	6/3/2004
I don't think you need to talk negatively about the other alternatives (for a crossing) in order to support your P&N for a bridge. By very careful how you give written presentations because we need the support of the public to run ferries and railroads.	Bruce Carr	ARRC	Alternatives	Purpose and Need	Agency Scoping Mtg	5/11/2005
There are other seemingly reasonable and feasible alternatives that we think merit further consideration. One is the rail bridge that provides for freight and commuter rail only, with potential for future additions such as roadway, pedestrian/bikeway, etc. This would meet the intent to develop the transportation system between the Mat-Su Borough and the Municipality of Anchorage (MOA) and the stated project needs, while having the potential to foster and facilitate more compact trans-oriented development.	Christine B. Reichgott	EPA	Alternatives	Purpose and Need	Letter	10/13/2005
It is premature to develop screening criteria without the Purpose and Need Statement completed.	Christine Reichgott	EPA	Alternatives	Purpose and Need	Letter + Attachments	6/16/2005
Would the project as currently proposed, without a connection to the Parks Highway, meet the FHWA requirements for independent utility? Explain why the Houston connection was needed in 1984 but not today.	Christine Reichgott	EPA	Alternatives	Purpose and Need	Letter + Attachments	6/16/2005
The purpose and need background includes a paragraph addressing travel time and commuting costs between the Mat-Su Borough and Anchorage. The MOA 2025 LRTP is recommending improvements to the transportation system between Mat-Su and Anchorage that will reduce travel time and costs and should be considered as part of the analysis of alternatives for the Knik Arm Crossing.	Lance Wilbur, Tom Nelson	MOA	Alternatives	Purpose and Need	Letter	8/12/2005
The project should determine how the ARRC yard would be impacted if the Crossing connects to an Ingra/Gambell Street extension.	Bruce Carr	ARRC	Alternatives	Traffic	Letter	5/12/2005
Light rail and commuter rail are not the same thing. You could remove Light Rail (by definition electric) to be more accurate. The new travel time is down to 54 minutes. The north corridor will go to Willow, not Wasilla.	Bruce Carr	ARRC	Alternatives	Traffic	Agency Scoping Mtg	5/11/2005
All of the proposed alignments segments would impact wetlands or waters of the U.S.	Irvin Joy	COE	Alternatives	Wetlands	Letter	5/31/2005
The project must work hard to be sure that the selected alternative and bridge design avoids and minimizes losses to wetlands and waters of the U.S., wherever practicable, and that the resulting bridge offers advantages to the community that warrant any unavoidable environmental losses.	Irvin Joy	COE	Alternatives	Wetlands	Letter	5/20/2005
The EIS should discuss in detail how planning efforts and alternative selection conform to Section 404(b)(1) guidelines sequencing and criteria (how impacts to wetlands and other aquatic sites have been avoided to the maximum extent practicable). Discuss alternatives that would avoid wetlands before proceeding to minimization/mitigation measures.	Christine Reichgott	EPA	Alternatives	Wetlands	Letter + Attachments	6/16/2005

Comment	Commenter	Agency	Topic 1	Topic 2	Venue	Date
I'm satisfied to see the Elmendorf corridor in red.	Greg Schmidt	3CES/CEVP-EAFB	Alternatives		Agency Scoping Mtg	3/29/2005
We see security concerns. The perpendicular alignment appears outside the study area north of Six Mile Creek. There is a munitions area; you would be going into a clear zone. This is a non-starter.	Greg Schmidt	3CES/CEVP-EAFB	Alternatives		Agency Scoping Mtg	3/29/2005
Communication towers for the Air Force that are located on Fort Richardson would have to be moved for some options.	Greg Schmidt	3CES/CEVP-EAFB	Alternatives		Agency Scoping Mtg	3/29/2005
The alignment of the bridge is a concern. It should not be aligned with the north south runway. From the air, it could be mistaken for a runway and cause problems. If power line crossing the water have a bend, there could be substantial magnetic interference with communications antennas.	Greg Schmidt	3CES/CEVP-EAFB	Alternatives		Agency Scoping Mtg	3/29/2005
Since the 1980's there has been considerable development on base. There is really no room to fit something like this.	Greg Schmidt	3CES/CEVP-EAFB	Alternatives		Agency Scoping Mtg	3/29/2005
Could the project skirt EAFB?	Jim Frechione	ADEC	Alternatives		Meeting	3/11/2005
Is the Air Force okay with having the bridge access across their land?	Jim Frechione	ADEC	Alternatives		Meeting	3/11/2005
Are there evaluation criteria other than cost? Expensive is not the only criteria for dismissing alternatives.	Mel Langdon	ADEC	Alternatives		Meeting	2/25/2005
Will there be a south alignment (south of the Ports)?	Mel Langdon	ADEC	Alternatives		Meeting	2/25/2005
Will the preferred alternative be in the draft EIS?	Mel Langdon	ADEC	Alternatives		Meeting	2/25/2005
Suggests making the lines clear on the maps, lines indicating alignments versus fill, in the DEIS.	Mark Fink	ADF&G	Alternatives		Meeting	9/27/2005
Why are three of the bridge designs (truss, cable-stayed and suspension) not reasonable?	Mark Fink	ADF&G	Alternatives		Agency Scoping Mtg	5/11/2005
Will the EIS look at other alternatives than a bridge? If so, will other alternatives be studied with the same level of consideration?	Judy Bittner	ADNR - SHPO	Alternatives		Meeting	1/26/2005
If a corridor is put in on military land it would have to follow certain security measures (no stopping or leaving the corridor). These would be sufficient for an emergency.	Jamie Spell	ALCOM	Alternatives		Agency Scoping Mtg	5/11/2005
Is the Below the Bluff alternative wide enough for rail?	Barb Hotchkin	ARRC	Alternatives		Meeting	9/27/2005
Recommend the issue of rail on the Below the Bluff alternative be discussed with Bruce Carr at ARRC. The alignment of the piers on a viaduct across railroad property should also be discussed.	Barb Hotchkin	ARRC	Alternatives		Meeting	9/27/2005
The project should determine what agencies are looking into connecting roads to the Crossing (approach corridors).	Bruce Carr	ARRC	Alternatives		Letter	5/12/2005
The project should consider the new rail spur being built around the back of the Port of Anchorage area when studying approach corridors.	Bruce Carr	ARRC	Alternatives		Letter	5/12/2005
The approach corridors are not mentioned in the Port of Anchorage Expansion scope.	Bruce Carr	ARRC	Alternatives		Letter	5/12/2005
The technical screening criteria should say "supports military mission" instead of "does not conflict with military missions and operations".	Bruce Carr	ARRC	Alternatives		Agency Scoping Mtg	5/11/2005
The original plan was for a combination of vehicular and rail bridge but it was too expensive.	Bruce Carr	ARRC	Alternatives		Agency Scoping Mtg	5/11/2005
The ARRC would like a connection across Knik Arm, but understand it will not be a bridge.	Bruce Carr	ARRC	Alternatives		Meeting	1/26/2005
If you put the bridge lower (south in the Arm) it is a shorter span to cross.	Rodney Huffman	BLM	Alternatives		Agency Scoping Mtg	5/11/2005
I will be interested to see how environmental justice fits into the NEPA process. The yellow area seems to be what is left, and that is the one Government Hill residents do not want. It will be a challenge.	Rodney Huffman	BLM	Alternatives		Agency Scoping Mtg	3/29/2005
How would the access roads tie into existing infrastructure?	Rodney Huffman	BLM	Alternatives		Meeting	2/18/2005
Other BLM departments could be involved after alignments are known.	Rodney Huffman	BLM	Alternatives		Meeting	2/18/2005
BLM would like a map of the probable alignment.	Rodney Huffman	BLM	Alternatives		Meeting	2/18/2005
There is a marked bias/preference for a bridge for a causeway likely because of cost.	Irvin Joy	COE	Alternatives		Letter	5/31/2005

Comment	Commenter	Agency	Topic 1	Topic 2	Venue	Date
More than one bridge approach design (not just causeway) should be considered. If the one design is found to have unacceptable environmental impacts it could be disastrous for the project.	Irvin Joy	COE	Alternatives		Letter	5/31/2005
The interaction with the ARRC demonstrates a willingness to look at other alternatives besides a strictly vehicular bridge.	Irvin Joy	COE	Alternatives		Letter	5/31/2005
There is a lack of alternatives, both in design, and location. Other approach alternatives should be considered, especially those which minimize fill amounts.	Irvin Joy	COE	Alternatives		Letter	5/20/2005
Do tunnels have high maintenance costs? Bridge maintenance costs are high. How do they compare?	Irvin Joy	COE	Alternatives		Agency Scoping Mtg	5/11/2005
Different alignments have not been discussed, are we only looking at one line now?	Irvin Joy	COE	Alternatives		Agency Scoping Mtg	5/11/2005
It would be helpful to have alternatives considered and rejected in the document. What is the capacity level for this project? Does it have room to grow?	Matt LaCroix	DNR OHMP	Alternatives		Agency Scoping Mtg	3/29/2005
DNR OPMP recommend the EIS identify how each build alternatives avoids or minimizes impacts to the intertidal zone of the Knik Arm.	Don Perrin	DNR OPMP	Alternatives		Agency Scoping Mtg	5/9/2005
At the last meeting a tunnel was mentioned. Is that still on the table?	Judy Bittner	DNR SHPO	Alternatives		Agency Scoping Mtg	3/29/2005
Another alternative that seems reasonable and feasible, suggested by non-governmental organizations, is the use of more ferries, commuter rail, transit, and additional augmentations to the existing infrastructure and public transportation systems.	Christine B. Reichgott	EPA	Alternatives		Letter	10/13/2005
All reasonable and feasible alternatives should be explored and evaluated. If alternatives are eliminated from detailed study, rationale should be given for their elimination and that information should be included in the draft EIS.	Christine B. Reichgott	EPA	Alternatives		Letter	10/13/2005
There might need to be more conversations about using scoping comments to develop screening criteria.	Elaine Somers	EPA	Alternatives		Agency Scoping Mtg	7/14/2005
Explain why the ferry alternative is not currently being included since it was presented as a viable alternative in 1984	Christine Reichgott	EPA	Alternatives		Letter + Attachments	6/16/2005
The Glenn/Parks Highway proposal (from the 1984 EIS) should receive similar treatment in the EIS.	Christine Reichgott	EPA	Alternatives		Letter + Attachments	6/16/2005
Display, in comparative tabular form with supporting discussion in the text, how each alternative addresses the stated needs and screening criteria.	Christine Reichgott	EPA	Alternatives		Letter + Attachments	6/16/2005
It is not clear that conclusions reached in the screening of alternative are supported by analysis.	Christine Reichgott	EPA	Alternatives		Letter + Attachments	6/16/2005
What is the Anchorage terminus?	Heather Dean	EPA	Alternatives		Agency Scoping Mtg	5/11/2005
Technical Screening Criteria No. 1: The MOA is pleased to see that the project now includes the connections to Anchorage's network. MOA trusts that the analysis will follow FHWA guidelines to allow "environmental issues can be treated on a sufficiently broad scope to ensure that the project will function properly without requiring additional improvements elsewhere."	Lance Wilbur, Tom Nelson	MOA	Alternatives		Letter	8/12/2005
Technical Screening Criteria No. 4: It is important to define "compatible" in regard to this criteria.	Lance Wilbur, Tom Nelson	MOA	Alternatives		Letter	8/12/2005
Technical Screening Criteria No. 5: Clarify that it includes port operations at both the Port of Anchorage and Port MacKenzie.	Lance Wilbur, Tom Nelson	MOA	Alternatives		Letter	8/12/2005
Who screens the alternatives?	Lance Wilbur, Tom Nelson	MOA	Alternatives		Letter	8/12/2005
Are the criteria weighted or all considered equal?	Lance Wilbur, Tom Nelson	MOA	Alternatives		Letter	8/12/2005
Mat-Su Approaches: MOA is concerned that the corridor access will connect to narrow existing routes. Point MacKenzie Road or any future access to the Knik Arm Crossing should be developed as a limited access corridor or at a minimum reserve right of way for one. The Mat-Su Borough should be encouraged to reserve right-of-way for future expansion of this route.	Lance Wilbur, Tom Nelson	MOA	Alternatives		Letter	8/12/2005

Comment	Commenter	Agency	Topic 1	Topic 2	Venue	Date
Below the Bluff Corridor: The MOA has concerns with introducing additional traffic into an already congested and heavily developed industrial corridor. Any changes in the area that compromise the efficiency, safety, and function of the Port of Anchorage and Alaska Railroad Corporation Intermodal operations will be very difficult to support.	Lance Wilbur, Tom Nelson	MOA	Alternatives		Letter	8/12/2005
Above the Bluff Corridor: the MOA is concerned with any impacts to the Government Hill community	Lance Wilbur, Tom Nelson	MOA	Alternatives		Letter	8/12/2005
West Bluff Drive Corridor Variant: this variant is unacceptable to the MOA because the traffic from the Knik Arm Crossing should not be directed through Government Hill to the downtown area via the A/C couplet.	Lance Wilbur, Tom Nelson	MOA	Alternatives		Letter	8/12/2005
Erickson Street Corridor Variant: this variant is unacceptable to the MOA because the traffic from the Knik Arm Crossing should not be directed through Government Hill to the downtown area via the A/C couplet.	Lance Wilbur, Tom Nelson	MOA	Alternatives		Letter	8/12/2005
Elmendorf Corridor Variant: this variant is unacceptable to the MOA because the traffic from the Knik Arm Crossing should not be directed through Government Hill to the downtown area via the A/C couplet.	Lance Wilbur, Tom Nelson	MOA	Alternatives		Letter	8/12/2005
Ingra/Gambell Corridor Variant: this variant is acceptable to the MOA as it will connect to the proposed Glenn Highway Seward Highway connection outlined in the 2025 LRTP. Supports the data showing most Mat Su Commuters are headed to Midtown. This makes the most sense from the regional transportation perspective but carries huge impacts to the neighborhoods.	Lance Wilbur, Tom Nelson	MOA	Alternatives		Letter	8/12/2005
Post Road/Reeve Boulevard Corridor: MOA has reservations about this corridor in that it connects to the Glenn Highway in the most congested part of the corridor. Future improvements to the segment of the Glenn Highway between 5/6th Avenue and McCarey Street are planned; any selection of this corridor should include funds to address the future connection of the Knik Arm Crossing to the Glenn Highway at Reeve Boulevard.	Lance Wilbur, Tom Nelson	MOA	Alternatives		Letter	8/12/2005
Boniface Parkway Corridor: This corridor would compliment proposed north/south and east/west network improvements included in the 2025 LRTP. The improvements call for access management on Boniface Parkway, connecting Boniface to Abbott Loop Extension in a route parallel to Tudor Road and eventually fully connecting east to west at Raspberry Road.	Lance Wilbur, Tom Nelson	MOA	Alternatives		Letter	8/12/2005
Muldoon Road Corridor: This corridor would exacerbate transportation problems experienced in east Anchorage by adding to the already congested Glenn Highway corridor. Anchorage bound traffic destined for employment centers in downtown, midtown, the Airport and U-Med district would need the planned improvements on the Glenn Highway especially Glenn Highway/Seward Highway connection or current practice of using neighborhood streets to bypass congestion would continue to severely compromise livability in east Anchorage neighborhoods. This corridor is also too far east to be an efficient corridor.	Lance Wilbur, Tom Nelson	MOA	Alternatives		Letter	8/12/2005
Hiland Road Corridor: The corridor would create additional out-of-direction travel for Anchorage-bound travelers and raise the vehicle miles traveled on the system. It would create more traffic on the already congested Glenn Highway corridor, a corridor where travel is expected to double by 2025. More direct, shorter routes are preferred. Like the Muldoon Road Corridor, this corridor is too far east to be an efficient corridor.	Lance Wilbur, Tom Nelson	MOA	Alternatives		Letter	8/12/2005
Additional detail of each of the corridors will be needed in the EIS. Will they be designed for all modes - public transportation, bicycle, pedestrian, automobile, trucks?	Lance Wilbur, Tom Nelson	MOA	Alternatives		Letter	8/12/2005
Will the intersection improvements at the connections points be included (we think they should be)?	Lance Wilbur, Tom Nelson	MOA	Alternatives		Letter	8/12/2005
What are the expected/forecasted traffic projections on each corridor?	Lance Wilbur, Tom Nelson	MOA	Alternatives		Letter	8/12/2005
How will the connection at that point in the system impact the overall network?	Lance Wilbur, Tom Nelson	MOA	Alternatives		Letter	8/12/2005
What additional improvements would the connection cause on other portions of the network?	Lance Wilbur, Tom Nelson	MOA	Alternatives		Letter	8/12/2005

Comment	Commenter	Agency	Topic 1	Topic 2	Venue	Date
When would the connections come on line?	Lance Wilbur, Tom Nelson	MOA	Alternatives		Letter	8/12/2005
Would this be before or after the Glenn Highway/Seward Highway connection?	Lance Wilbur, Tom Nelson	MOA	Alternatives		Letter	8/12/2005
What mitigation could be offered for affected neighborhoods, etc.?	Lance Wilbur, Tom Nelson	MOA	Alternatives		Letter	8/12/2005
A cost estimate should be prepared for the alternatives prior to completion of the EIS by an entity with no ties to the Knik Arm Bridge and Toll Authority, and its EIS preparation team.	Lance Wilbur, Tom Nelson	MOA	Alternatives		Letter	8/12/2005
Financial feasibility is not a good reason to question the viability of the ferry, since many operation and maintenance of other transportation systems in Alaska are subsidized.	Murph O'Brien	MSB	Alternatives		Letter	5/31/2005
Recent studies by the MSB have shown that the planned Knik Arm Ferry may break even in operating costs	Murph O'Brien	MSB	Alternatives		Letter	5/31/2005
Since a travel demand for the Knik Arm Crossing has not been finalized, it is premature to state that a ferry would not meet that need	Murph O'Brien	MSB	Alternatives		Letter	5/31/2005
A fleet of ferry vessels may be able to meet the purpose and need for the Knik Arm Crossing	Murph O'Brien	MSB	Alternatives		Letter	5/31/2005
Ferry efficiency must be determined after the travel demand model has been developed	Murph O'Brien	MSB	Alternatives		Letter	5/31/2005
Projected growth in the Matanuska-Susitna Borough should be known before it is determined that a ferry will not meet the needs of the population	Murph O'Brien	MSB	Alternatives		Letter	5/31/2005
Careful study of emergency scenarios must be completed before it is determined that a ferry would not meet the needs of a population during an emergency	Murph O'Brien	MSB	Alternatives		Letter	5/31/2005
The MSB's Knik Arm Ferry will have other attributes that should be considered, including the ability to: Provide emergency response for marine related emergencies; Provide alternative emergency transport; Support bridge construction; Support economic development at Port MacKenzie and the Borough; Accommodates projected growth in a way that additional public infrastructure can be financially supported.	Murph O'Brien	MSB	Alternatives		Letter	5/31/2005
Construction costs and operation and maintenance costs are not good reasons to question the viability of a bridge with heavy rail	Murph O'Brien	MSB	Alternatives		Letter	5/31/2005
The time, fuel, and equipment usage savings of a bridge with heavy rail should be considered	Murph O'Brien	MSB	Alternatives		Letter	5/31/2005
A cost benefit analysis, including construction and maintenance costs, should be completed before a bridge with heavy rail is omitted	Murph O'Brien	MSB	Alternatives		Letter	5/31/2005
Another benefit to a bridge with rail is that it could accommodate commuter rail	Murph O'Brien	MSB	Alternatives		Letter	5/31/2005
A bridge with rail could provide alternative emergency transport	Murph O'Brien	MSB	Alternatives		Letter	5/31/2005
A cost benefit analysis, including construction and maintenance costs, should be completed before a bridge is selected as the preferred alternative	Murph O'Brien	MSB	Alternatives		Letter	5/31/2005
Expected tolls, daily traffic, and local government contributions (bonds) should be determined to establish the financial feasibility of the bridge	Murph O'Brien	MSB	Alternatives		Letter	5/31/2005
Costs associated with construction and maintenance of highway infrastructure associated with the bridge should be determined	Murph O'Brien	MSB	Alternatives		Letter	5/31/2005
What is the timeframe for us to comment on the criteria for reasonableness?	Murph O'Brien	MSB	Alternatives		Agency Scoping Mtg	5/11/2005
Are we narrowing alternatives on May 11?	Murph O'Brien	MSB	Alternatives		Agency Scoping Mtg	4/25/2005
MSB would like it to be as far north as possible. We need to have a conversation about how it connects to the port's planned infrastructure. We want to protect the utility of the port.	Murph O'Brien	MSB	Alternatives		Agency Scoping Mtg	3/29/2005
Asked for a cost estimate, corridor, and where traffic would go. He mentioned that if traffic didn't travel through the Palmer/Wasilla area they would lose business. Said that the bridge will influence more people to develop in the area around Port MacKenzie, and then they will go to Houston more often than Palmer/Wasilla.	Ken Hudson	MSB	Alternatives		Meeting	2/16/2005
The ferry is an interim measure until the Crossing is completed.	Murph O'Brien	MSB	Alternatives		Meeting	6/16/2004
Disappointed that more than one crossing alternative was not kept.	Barbara Mahoney	NMFS	Alternatives		Meeting	9/27/2005

Comment	Commenter	Agency	Topic 1	Topic 2	Venue	Date
Will there be fill beyond a zero foot tide?	Brad Smith	NOAA Fisheries	Alternatives		Meeting	4/14/2005
Is the area by the old Native hospital being considered (for an alignment)?	Barbara Mahoney	NOAA Fisheries	Alternatives		Meeting	2/24/2005
What are alignment possibilities?	Dan Vos	NOAA Fisheries	Alternatives		Meeting	2/24/2005
NMFS reviewed the draft screening criteria and has to comments.	Lawrence Peltz	NOAA Fisheries	Alternatives		Email	6/3/2005
Have you looked at other projects in upper Cook Inlet that use riprap? How do you factor those into cost of design?	Brad Smith	NOAA Fisheries	Alternatives		Agency Scoping Mtg	3/29/2005
In terms of scoping, what are we considering?	Brad Smith	NOAA Fisheries	Alternatives		Agency Scoping Mtg	3/29/2005
It seems like you are jumping ahead. Has something like the Bay Bridge been considered?	Brad Smith	NOAA Fisheries	Alternatives		Agency Scoping Mtg	3/29/2005
Are we considering a Knik Arm Crossing or a bridge? How much do we assume?	Brad Smith	NOAA Fisheries	Alternatives		Agency Scoping Mtg	3/29/2005
You are missing some alternatives, such as improving existing infrastructure (adding a fourth lane to the highway).	Danny Barnett	USAF, Elmendorf	Alternatives		Agency Scoping Mtg	5/11/2005
A tunnel may be a viable alternative.	Greg Schmidt	USAF, Elmendorf	Alternatives		Meeting	1/26/2005
Concerns about the potential for including tidal generators in conjunction with the project.	Steve Duncan	USEPA	Alternatives		Letter	9/15/2004
Tidal power associated with the Crossing should be addressed.	Steve Duncan	USEPA	Alternatives		Meeting	9/15/2004
In regards to belugas, we would like the project as far south as possible. The goal is to stay out of prime beluga habitat. Long term we would like to keep out of the Arm so would like an even steeper skew.	Brad Smith	NOAA Fisheries	Beluga	Coastal Zone	Agency Scoping Mtg	3/29/2005
Beluga seek out areas of low velocity for prey.	Matt LeCroix	ADF&G	Beluga	Fisheries	Agency Scoping Meeting	4/25/2005
In the winter (before glacial loading), belugas feed lower down the Arm and into Cook Inlet. It is probably easier because it is clear. In the summer, they are feeding up in the Arm. It would be surprising if they were visually limited because they use echolocation. Fish move to the clear water to find their food, and the belugas follow them.	Matt LaCroix	ADNR-OHMP	Beluga	Fisheries	Meeting	8/26/2004
There has been much discussion about the direct impacts to beluga whales and fisheries from bridge construction. These issues are important and we look forward to seeing the analyses in the draft EIS.	Christine B. Reichgott	EPA	Beluga	Fisheries	Letter	10/13/2005
The EPA is concerned about potential impacts on the depleted population of beluga whales, fisheries, and salmon and eulachon, and their prey base.	Christine Reichgott	EPA	Beluga	Fisheries	Letter + Attachments	6/16/2005
We have seen a few belugas hanging around Port MacKenzie, but we can't speculate that they are there to intercept salmon.	Dale Funk	LGL	Beluga	Fisheries	Meeting	8/19/2005
	Murph O'Brien	MSB	Beluga	Fisheries	Letter	9/23/2005
Whales will be at the mouths of the rivers with the best salmon runs. Perhaps rivers outside of the area should be stocked so that belugas go to these locations instead of the project area.	Brad Smith	NOAA Fisheries	Beluga	Fisheries	Meeting	2/24/2005
Whales feed on smelt runs in Turnagain Arm in the spring.	Dan Vos	NOAA Fisheries	Beluga	Fisheries	Meeting	2/24/2005
The goal is to take care of the species, not harass them. Belugas use Knik Arm as an estuary and for recruitment, and to feed on salmon runs. Knik Arm also provides escape from killer whale predation. If summer feeding is disrupted, the belugas might not gain enough weight to make it through the winter. The key is to let the whales in and out of the Arm.	Dan Vos	NOAA Fisheries	Beluga	Fisheries	Meeting	2/24/2005
Studies/information which may be of interest to this project include: · The Tesoro Pipeline to the Port of Anchorage—sediment sampling for organisms may have been conducted. · Corps of Engineers work at Red Dog—some people reported ice hitting dock piles may cause noise which drives whales away. (NOAA Fisheries was not sure this was a fact, however.) · Gunderboom's pile driving sound deadening in the Gulf of Mexico.	Barbara Mahoney	NOAA Fisheries Protected Species	Beluga	Fisheries	Meeting	7/7/2004
The best approach will be to assume that there will be an impact of belugas, and focus on how to avoid impacts.	Larry Peltz	NOAA Fisheries	Beluga	Mitigation	Meeting	4/14/2005

Comment	Commenter	Agency	Topic 1	Topic 2	Venue	Date
Mitigation sounds like something that NOAA Fisheries and KABATA could discuss. Mitigation is part of the engineering of a project.	Brad Smith	NOAA Fisheries	Beluga	Mitigation	Meeting	4/14/2005
If KABATA thinks of a mitigation measure, NOAA Fisheries will consider it.	Dan Vos	NOAA Fisheries	Beluga	Mitigation	Meeting	2/24/2005
NOAA Fisheries is willing to look at mitigation, although "mitigation" measures are unknown. Avoidance is known. NOAA Fisheries' goal is to protect whales but not be restrictive to projects.	Dan Vos	NOAA Fisheries	Beluga	Mitigation	Meeting	2/24/2005
If a gas pipeline is associated with the bridge, the potential impacts of a spill (on belugas) and mitigation measures should be studied in the NEPA document.	Brad Smith	NOAA Fisheries Protected Species	Beluga	Mitigation	Meeting	7/7/2004
For sound attenuation, distance from the belugas makes a difference. Along with tide and season.	Tim Markowitz	LGL	Beluga	Noise	Meeting	8/19/2005
Concerned about noise from construction when belugas are to the south near Six Mile Creek	Brad Smith	NOAA Fisheries	Beluga	Noise	Meeting	8/19/2005
Noise is the biggest issue for belugas, along with affected habitat in the approaches, and passages. Upper Knik Arm is the quietest of the areas studied, and that is where most of the belugas are. NOAA Fisheries is not up to date on the state of the art noise work being done.	Brad Smith	NOAA Fisheries	Beluga	Noise	Meeting	4/14/2005
Interested in acoustic work associated with pile driving.	Brad Smith	NOAA Fisheries Protected Species	Beluga	Noise	Meeting	7/7/2004
A pile supported structure would likely not be a problem. The construction impacts would be more important than direct impacts. Fewer piles would be better to allow for beluga movement. However, the noise from driving larger piles could impact whales more than driving smaller piles.	Barbara Mahoney	NOAA Fisheries Protected Species	Beluga	Noise	Meeting	7/7/2004
The public is always concerned about monitoring, but not the mitigation in the Letter of Authorization (LOA). The level of detail is important.	Brad Smith	NOAA Fisheries	Beluga	Permits	Meeting	4/14/2005
It will be necessary for Ken Holingstad to review the document early.	Brad Smith	NOAA Fisheries	Beluga	Permits	Meeting	4/14/2005
NOAA Fisheries is still struggling with becoming a cooperating agency; they do not need to be cooperating to participate in the scoping process. They will probably not become a cooperating agency. Ken Holingstad (NOAA Fisheries staff) thinks it best that the EIS contain a section that describes the small take authorization.	Brad Smith	NOAA Fisheries	Beluga	Permits	Meeting	4/14/2005
If everything went well it would take 8-12 months for the regulations to be issued (August or December of 2006).	Jeanne Hanson	NOAA Fisheries	Beluga	Permits	Meeting	4/14/2005
KABATA should apply for regulations. NOAA Fisheries would write the regulations so that the POA could operate under the same regulations.	Brad Smith	NOAA Fisheries	Beluga	Permits	Meeting	4/14/2005
Integrating permits with the POA could be problematic.	Larry Peltz	NOAA Fisheries	Beluga	Permits	Meeting	4/14/2005
It takes about 120 days to process permits. It would be appropriate for the POA to seek an Incidental Harassment Authorization soon. The only linkage between the POA and KABATA is geographic area.	Brad Smith	NOAA Fisheries	Beluga	Permits	Meeting	4/14/2005
KABATA should consider jointly pursuing small take authorization permits with the EIS process. Those authorizations have obligations for monitoring, and NOAA Fisheries encourages KABATA to seek those out.	Brad Smith	NOAA Fisheries	Beluga	Permits	Meeting	4/14/2005
If KABATA applies for a permit it will set a precedent for the POA.	Jeanne Hanson	NOAA Fisheries	Beluga	Port of Anchorage	Meeting	4/14/2005
The POA and KABATA could apply for a joint permit to harass belugas during construction. There is no downside for KABATA in applying separately.	Brad Smith	NOAA Fisheries	Beluga	Port of Anchorage	Meeting	4/14/2005
Construction and operation will affect beluga whales. The MMPA can authorize incidental harassment of belugas, It will trigger NEPA within NMFS (NOAA Fisheries ). The scope of the EIS would need environmental documentation for this permit. If intent is to seek regulations for similar work, that brings up scope which should also address POA expansion.	Brad Smith	NOAA Fisheries	Beluga	Port of Anchorage	Agency Scoping Mtg	3/29/2005
NOAA Fisheries thinks long term affects to belugas weighs heavier than short term impacts.	Brad Smith	NOAA Fisheries	Beluga	Preliminary Engineering	Meeting	8/20/2005
Construction from both sides at once would not be good for belugas. The channel should not be blocked.	Barbara Mahoney	NOAA Fisheries	Beluga	Preliminary Engineering	Meeting	2/24/2005

Comment	Commenter	Agency	Topic 1	Topic 2	Venue	Date
There are typically no whales in Knik Arm in June. From winter up to mid-May is a good window for construction.	Barbara Mahoney	NOAA Fisheries	Beluga	Preliminary Engineering	Meeting	2/24/2005
There may be better times to construct when whales don't utilize the Arm as much.	Dan Vos	NOAA Fisheries	Beluga	Preliminary Engineering	Meeting	2/24/2005
If you construct the bridge from both sides of the Arm, the belugas would be forced out of the shallows where they take refuge from killer whales.	Barbara Mahoney	NOAA Fisheries	Beluga	Preliminary Engineering	Meeting	2/24/2005
The beluga report should be posted on the KABATA website so that NOAA Fisheries can direct the public there for information.	Barbara Mahoney	NOAA Fisheries	Beluga	Public and Agency Involvement	Meeting	2/24/2005
We are proposing to initiate a formal review of the status of the Cook Inlet stock of beluga whales under the Endangered Species Act. In the event this stock is listed as threatened or endangered, a Section 7 consultation would be necessary.	James Balsiger	NOAA Fisheries	Beluga	Threatened and Endangered Species	Letter	4/27/2005
There is always the chance that a petition to list the beluga under the Endangered Species Act could arise. If the beluga were listed, NOAA Fisheries would be required to specify critical habitat for belugas. If the bridge were proposed in critical habitat, it could be a problem. However, if the beluga were listed, it would not mean that the bridge could not be built.	Brad Smith	NOAA Fisheries Protected Species	Beluga	Threatened and Endangered Species	Meeting	7/7/2004
If the species were to be listed as threatened or endangered under the Endangered Species Act, critical habitat would need to be designated. "Principle constituent elements" such as food resources would help define the area. As of November 2, 2004, KABATA's beluga whale study appears to be providing the level of study needed in case beluga whales were to be listed.	Brad Smith, Barbara Mahoney	NOAA Fisheries Fisheries-Protected Species	Beluga	Threatened and Endangered Species	Meeting	11/2/2004
Beluga points of interest to look at include: weir information, timing of runs, migration, and area management reports.	Dave Rutz	ADF&G	Beluga		Meeting	2/15/2005
When belugas are in the study area varies with tide and season. When they are in the arm, they go as far south as Six Mile Creek.	Tim Markowitz	LGL	Beluga		Meeting	8/19/2005
Belugas use the shallow areas close to shore. They tend to hug the coastline on both sides when entering Knik Arm. We see some mid-channel diving but they end to stay along shore when transiting. They ride the tides.	Tim Markowitz	LGL	Beluga		Meeting	8/19/2005
During the fall, belugas circulate Birchwood to Six Mile.	Tim Markowitz	LGL	Beluga		Meeting	8/19/2005
	Murph O'Brien	MSB	Beluga		Letter	9/23/2005
Even though there has been no harvest of beluga whales since 1998 there has been no real increase in beluga numbers.	Brad Smith	NOAA Fisheries	Beluga		Meeting	8/21/2005
NMFS is under court order regarding beluga whales. Adverse modifications standard and critical habitat will be part of evaluation on effects on upper Knik Arm.	Brad Smith	NOAA Fisheries	Beluga		Meeting	8/19/2005
What are belugas eating in the winter?	Brad Smith	NOAA Fisheries	Beluga		Meeting	4/14/2005
Belugas hold over south of Cairn Point.	Jeanne Hanson	NOAA Fisheries	Beluga		Meeting	4/14/2005
NOAA Fisheries has not heard back from the Cook Inlet Keeper about NOAA's beluga conservation plan.	Brad Smith	NOAA Fisheries	Beluga		Meeting	4/14/2005
Beluga conservation would be benefited by more studies.	Brad Smith	NOAA Fisheries	Beluga		Meeting	4/14/2005
NOAA Fisheries is interested in behavior, feeding, and demographics of belugas.	Brad Smith	NOAA Fisheries	Beluga		Meeting	4/14/2005
NOAA Fisheries is still accepting comments on the plan, which will affect how state oil and gas leasing is conducted.	Brad Smith	NOAA Fisheries	Beluga		Meeting	4/14/2005
NOAA Fisheries has a beluga conservation plan on the web, which includes recommendations for the construction projects in Knik Arm. NOAA Fisheries hopes to have a sanctuary in Knik Arm, with preservation in the upper Arm, and conservation lower. NOAA Fisheries is not against construction of the bridge.	Brad Smith	NOAA Fisheries	Beluga		Meeting	4/14/2005
NOAA Fisheries strongly recommends an Incidental Harassment Authorization (IHA). It takes 1/2 year minimum to obtain an IHA.	Barbara Mahoney, Brad Smith, Dan Vos	NOAA Fisheries	Beluga		Meeting	2/24/2005
The Conservation Plan will be out as a draft in March. KABATA can review and comment on the document and whether it will work for the project.	Barbara Mahoney	NOAA Fisheries	Beluga		Meeting	2/24/2005

Comment	Commenter	Agency	Topic 1	Topic 2	Venue	Date
There is a nationwide study right now that shows that for whales 180 dp is the threshold between harassment and injury.	Barbara Mahoney	NOAA Fisheries	Beluga		Meeting	2/24/2005
NOAA Fisheries may have to be sued in order to list belugas as threatened or endangered.	Dan Vos	NOAA Fisheries	Beluga		Meeting	2/24/2005
A status review will determine whether belugas are listed as threatened or endangered under the Endangered Species Act.	Barbara Mahoney	NOAA Fisheries	Beluga		Meeting	2/24/2005
The number that will be allowable under the Incidental Harassment Authorization will be low because the base population is so low (336 individuals).	Dan Vos	NOAA Fisheries	Beluga		Meeting	2/24/2005
Belugas have different behaviors depending on the noise source. They might hang around port construction, but avoid small boats. If the noise from the bridge construction is low enough, belugas may not be impacted. The project can be done.	Dan Vos	NOAA Fisheries	Beluga		Meeting	2/24/2005
An incidental harassment permit can be obtained for the project.	Barbara Mahoney	NOAA Fisheries	Beluga		Meeting	2/24/2005
The propagation model (acoustic) may not give a strict buffer distance between the construction and beluga whales, it is just a base. The distance could change if NOAA Fisheries determine belugas are changing their behavior during POA construction.	Dan Vos	NOAA Fisheries	Beluga		Meeting	2/24/2005
The POA did not do any studies. Marine mammal observers will be monitoring Knik Arm during construction, and they would stop work if belugas came near construction. The Port will be doing an acoustic propagation model to determine the distance within which is harmful to belugas.	Barbara Mahoney	NOAA Fisheries	Beluga		Meeting	2/24/2005
Fish and beluga use the tidal current and the shallows for passage, so that should be left free for migration.	Barbara Mahoney	NOAA Fisheries	Beluga		Meeting	2/24/2005
A years worth of (beluga) data is needed, and will help KABATA with scheduling construction. KABATA could cut out observers in unused locations.	Dan Vos	NOAA Fisheries	Beluga		Meeting	2/24/2005
There is no sense in concentrating efforts (observers) up high (north) if it is icy and there is no water. The KABATA study is "doing it right".	Dan Vos	NOAA Fisheries	Beluga		Meeting	2/24/2005
It is a good idea to place beluga observers at open water areas of Knik Arm, but it is important to note that belugas use thick ice areas and are not restricted (in movement) by ice.	Dan Vos	NOAA Fisheries	Beluga		Meeting	2/24/2005
In the winter belugas use Knik and Turnagain Arms less, but they still make trips up occasionally.	Dan Vos	NOAA Fisheries	Beluga		Meeting	2/24/2005
In the winter belugas spend 95% of their time below the surface compared to in the summer when they spend 95% of their time above the surface.	Barbara Mahoney	NOAA Fisheries	Beluga		Meeting	2/24/2005
There will always be questions about data collection and methods used. The project should look at other studies done for comparison, but generally the data (NOAA Fisheries and KABATA) follow each other.	Dan Vos	NOAA Fisheries	Beluga		Meeting	2/24/2005
NOAA Fisheries completes aerial surveys in early June. The KABATA study should avoid using boats in the area at that time to limit disturbances.	Dan Vos	NOAA Fisheries	Beluga		Meeting	2/24/2005
Ice is very variable depending on tide and location, and may be difficult to correlate with beluga sightings.	Dan Vos	NOAA Fisheries	Beluga		Meeting	2/24/2005
The National Ice Center is a good source of sea ice information in Knik Arm.	Dan Vos	NOAA Fisheries	Beluga		Meeting	2/24/2005
The satellite data has shown winter runs of belugas up Knik Arm.	Dan Vos	NOAA Fisheries	Beluga		Meeting	2/24/2005
The Vancouver lab is doing whale acoustic research. Will LGL use a land based recorder?	Dan Vos	NOAA Fisheries	Beluga		Meeting	2/24/2005
The coho run is probably food source for the (summer/fall) data set.	Dan Vos	NOAA Fisheries	Beluga		Meeting	2/24/2005
NOAA Fisheries observed the same daily/tidal beluga whale movement/migration as KABATA's study.	Dan Vos	NOAA Fisheries	Beluga		Meeting	2/24/2005
The final beluga report should not include the grid beyond the reasonable visual distance of the observers.	Dan Vos	NOAA Fisheries	Beluga		Meeting	2/24/2005
Monitoring beluga acoustics has been difficult for everyone because the source level is unknown.	Dan Vos	NOAA Fisheries	Beluga		Meeting	2/24/2005
Has KABATA done any aerial surveys along with the beluga work?	Dan Vos	NOAA Fisheries	Beluga		Meeting	2/24/2005
We would like to see the beluga study go past July 2005. A lot of action happens between July & Oct. The observers need to check belugas around Six Mile Creek. Aerial data suggests significant use in that area.	Brad Smith	NOAA Fisheries	Beluga		Agency Scoping Mtg	3/29/2005

Comment	Commenter	Agency	Topic 1	Topic 2	Venue	Date
Beluga study request: Interested in beluga group size, where crossing Arm, whether there is a tidal association with whale movement, whether patterns in movement exist.	Brad Smith	NOAA Fisheries Protected Species	Beluga		Meeting	7/7/2004
Beluga study request: More interested in what is going on in the upper arm than the mouth of the Susitna. It may be difficult to determine beluga numbers at the mouth since it is hard to find a good (high) observation point in Susitna.	Brad Smith	NOAA Fisheries Protected Species	Beluga		Meeting	7/7/2004
Beluga study request: An aerial survey would not be as good as on the ground observers.	Brad Smith	NOAA Fisheries Protected Species	Beluga		Meeting	7/7/2004
Beluga study request: Sufficient number of observers need to be used in order to determine beluga activities (loafing, feeding, transiting)	Brad Smith	NOAA Fisheries Protected Species	Beluga		Meeting	7/7/2004
Beluga study request: Interested in characterizing and recording belugas activities.	Brad Smith	NOAA Fisheries Protected Species	Beluga		Meeting	7/7/2004
Beluga study request: Interested in collecting a photographic record to identify individual beluga.	Brad Smith	NOAA Fisheries Protected Species	Beluga		Meeting	7/7/2004
Beluga study request: Interested in how the KABATA work may compliment the Port of Anchorage work.	Brad Smith	NOAA Fisheries Protected Species	Beluga		Meeting	7/7/2004
NOAA Fisheries has designated "highly valuable" (type 2 habitat) and highly sensitive" (type 1 habitat) for belugas in Knik Arm. The habitat exists from Cairn Point to the head of the arm. Type 1 habitat, at the mouth of some rivers, would likely limit vessel traffic, outfall discharges, and construction activities.	Brad Smith	NOAA Fisheries Protected Species	Beluga		Meeting	7/7/2004
Cook Inlet beluga whales are "depleted" under the Marine Mammal Protection Act. They will be the focus.	Brad Smith	NOAA Fisheries NMFS	Beluga		Meeting	1/26/2005
NOAA Fisheries is currently writing a beluga harvest conservation plan. Some of the upper Cook Inlet modeling could possibly be of use for the NEPA analysis.	Brad Smith	NOAA Fisheries NMFS	Beluga		Meeting	1/26/2005
It is likely the upper portion of the Knik beluga concentration will have some unintentional "take" under the Marine Mammal Protection Act. You may want to include in the NEPA process.	Brad Smith	NOAA Fisheries NMFS	Beluga		Meeting	1/26/2005
Having fill in the intertidal zone is a big problem.	Matt LaCroix	ADNR-OHMP	Coastal Zone	Hydrology & Hydraulics	Meeting	8/26/2004
Under the old ACMP, existing plans will be obsolete. If the revision does not get done on time, existing district plans will stand. Existing statewide standards will be updated in June 2005.	Amanda Henry	ADNR	Coastal Zone	Land Use	Meeting	2/17/2005
ADF&G is excited to see some alignments out of the tidelands. If there is a corridor through the military land and there is a security issue, will the military close access?	Mark Fink	ADF&G	Coastal Zone	Military	Agency Scoping Mtg	5/11/2005
Mel works outside of the Coastal Zone Management Program.	Mel Langdon	ADEC	Coastal Zone		Meeting	2/25/2005
Each community must re-write ACMP plans. To be finished 7/1/05 with implementation 6 months later.	Thede Tobish	MOA Planning Dept	Coastal Zone		Meeting	1/26/2005
New coastal zone mapping is under way. Some modeling of resource data will be available for KABATA use.	Thede Tobish	MOA Planning Dept	Coastal Zone		Meeting	1/26/2005
The project falls within the MSB's Coastal Management Zone. The connection to land at Port MacKenzie falls within the Port MacKenzie Area Meriting Special Attention which was established to facilitate the development of the port and its associated transportation system.	Murph O'Brien	MSB	Coastal Zone		letter	5/12/2005
We believe that a comparative analysis of the secondary and cumulative effects of the rail bridge vs. a roadway bridge alternative would be informative and worthwhile.	Christine B. Reichgott	EPA	Cumulative and Secondary Impacts	Alternatives	Letter	10/13/2005
There is concern over access for recreational boaters. We don't want them to have to find their way through a gauntlet.	Brad Smith	NOAA Fisheries	Cumulative and Secondary Impacts	Coastal Zone	Meeting	8/19/2005
Port MacKenzie could serve as a key port if the natural gas pipeline is developed.	Murph O'Brien	MSB	Cumulative and Secondary Impacts	Cumulative and Secondary Impacts	Meeting	6/16/2004

Comment	Commenter	Agency	Topic 1	Topic 2	Venue	Date
The assumptions used in the modeling efforts do not seem reasonable in this case, because construction of a bridge would likely stimulate economic activity and growth that would not otherwise occur, and would also likely accelerate the pace of growth within the planning horizon. Thus, the amount of growth would not likely be the same with and without the bridge; we would expect to see significant differences in the amount of growth as well as in the location of growth. We recommend revising these assumptions for the modeling work.	Christine B. Reichgott	EPA	Cumulative and Secondary Impacts	Economic Impacts	Letter	10/13/2005
Concerns about bridge affecting hydrodynamics in the Knik Arm and causing the deepwater trench to increase in size (migrate north)	Skip Joy	COE	Cumulative and Secondary Impacts	Environmental Consequences Analysis	Meeting	8/26/2005
Concerned about secondary impacts due to hydrologic changes caused by bridge approaches	Skip Joy	COE	Cumulative and Secondary Impacts	Environmental Consequences Analysis	Meeting	8/26/2005
We have additional comments regarding some key issues already listed for inclusion in the EIS, (e.g. cumulative and secondary effects, aquatic resources), and we also recommend there be some additions to the list (e.g. ecological connectivity, farmlands, global climate change).	Christine B. Reichgott	EPA	Cumulative and Secondary Impacts	Environmental Consequences Analysis	Letter	10/13/2005
As recommended by Wheeler, et al., (2005), "More thorough consideration of highway impacts, and, ultimately, better land use decisions may be facilitated by conceptualizing highway development in three stages: initial highway construction, highway presence, and eventual landscape urbanization." The latter clearly presents "...the greatest threat to stream habitat and biota, as stream ecosystems are sensitive to even low levels (<10%) of watershed urban development."	Christine B. Reichgott	EPA	Cumulative and Secondary Impacts	Environmental Consequences Analysis	Letter	10/13/2005
The EIS (and thus the modeling methodologies) should analyze and disclose induced travel and growth that would potentially occur, and the potential environmental effects upon air quality, water quality and quantity, terrestrial and aquatic habitats, ecological connectivity and ecosystem processes, communities, cultural/historical resources of that growth in travel and development.	Christine Reichgott	EPA	Cumulative and Secondary Impacts	Environmental Consequences Analysis	Letter + Attachments	6/16/2005
What will the indirect effects of the project be? Do the impacts go outside of the study area, and how will Wasilla be impacted? What is the timeframe for examining indirect and cumulative impacts?	Dan Vos	NOAA Fisheries	Cumulative and Secondary Impacts	Environmental Consequences Analysis	Meeting	2/24/2005
The issue is not so much the relative short term of construction, but long term unknown effects.	Phil Brna	USFWS	Cumulative and Secondary Impacts	Environmental Consequences Analysis	Meeting	8/19/2005
			Cumulative and Secondary Impacts	Environmental Consequences Analysis		
Said that the Chinook salmon fishery at the Little Susitna River is at saturation. With increased access that the bridge will supply, there will be the need for limits and restrictions on fishing. Once the crossing is in place, it will be a quick trip to the Little Su fishery, which is the biggest coho salmon producer in North Cook Inlet and West Cook Inlet. The harvest of coho is about 25,000 fish, while the Chinook salmon harvest is between 2,000 and 3,000 fish. The fishery is fairly saturated at this point.	Dave Rutz	ADF&G	Cumulative and Secondary Impacts	Fisheries	Meeting	2/15/2005
Add baseline information for watershed functions and geomorphology to the list of resource components to analyze in the indirect and cumulative impacts.	Larry Dugan	ADEC	Cumulative and Secondary Impacts	Geology	Agency Scoping Meeting	4/25/2005
Concerns with the likelihood of Anchorage International Airport (Ted Stevens AIA) moving to the valley and plans for Port MacKenzie development.	David Post, AICP	ADOT&PF	Cumulative and Secondary Impacts	Land Use	Meeting	6/14/2004
Does this project cover residential and commercial area population growth in the MSB? Where does that growth occur? Economic growth requires access to Port MacKenzie for both goods and people.	Judy Bittner	DNR SHPO	Cumulative and Secondary Impacts	Land Use	Agency Scoping Mtg	3/29/2005

Comment	Commenter	Agency	Topic 1	Topic 2	Venue	Date
Concerns about secondary impacts associated with induced/displaced development.	Steve Duncan	USEPA	Cumulative and Secondary Impacts	Land Use	Letter	9/15/2004
Need to consider and address the projections and consequences of induced development.	Steve Duncan	USEPA	Cumulative and Secondary Impacts	Land Use	Meeting	9/15/2004
Navigational impacts to the waterways should be added as a resource component to consider in the indirect and cumulative impacts analysis.	Jim Helfinstine	USCG	Cumulative and Secondary Impacts	Marine Transportation	Agency Scoping Mtg	4/25/2005
Secondary and cumulative effects analysis should explore alternative future scenarios where proactive mitigation measures and no control, minimal control, and moderate control are portrayed. Report on the differing impacts to ecosystem components.	Christine Reichgott	EPA	Cumulative and Secondary Impacts	Mitigation	Letter + Attachments	6/16/2005
Cumulative impacts associated with the project are the most significant and difficult issue which must be addressed in the EIS. The EIS should discuss the potential to mitigate cumulative impacts through some type of cooperative land use or watershed planning effort in the MSB. Potential for mitigation banking should be investigated.	Denny R. Lassuy	USFWS	Cumulative and Secondary Impacts	Mitigation	Letter	5/10/2005
How will this increased capacity (of people) affect your evaluation of indirect and cumulative impacts? What about time frame?	Brad Smith	NOAA Fisheries	Cumulative and Secondary Impacts	Project Timeline	Agency Scoping Mtg	3/29/2005
The EIS should consider how the overloaded and dysfunctional transportation system in Ship Creek would be impacted by the Crossing.	Bruce Carr	ARRC	Cumulative and Secondary Impacts	Traffic	Letter	5/12/2005
The EIS should consider how the constricted and congested area at the base of Government Hill and into the Port of Anchorage would be impacted by the Crossing.	Bruce Carr	ARRC	Cumulative and Secondary Impacts	Traffic	Letter	5/12/2005
We need to consider impacts from all of these connections.	Irvin Joy	COE	Cumulative and Secondary Impacts	Traffic	Agency Scoping Mtg	5/11/2005
The effects of highway impacts and land use (initial highway construction, highway presence, and eventual landscape urbanization) will carry into the marine environment of Knik Arm as well. It is therefore important to analyze for all the associated impacts of urbanization, such as, terrestrial and aquatic habitat loss, fragmentation, and alteration and the suite of physical, chemical, and biological impacts associated with these changes. For example, the quality, quantity, and timing of runoff from roadways; culvert blockages; the types and efficacy of mitigation measures that would or could be applied; and the ultimate effects on key species and resources of concern, e.g. fisheries, beluga whales, drinking water supplies, and so on.	Christine B. Reichgott	EPA	Cumulative and Secondary Impacts	Wildlife	Letter	10/13/2005
Back to Mr. Carr's statement, this project affects all areas north and south of Knik Arm, not just MOA & MSB. It will also affect the Kenai Peninsula.	Bobby Stone	ALCOM	Cumulative and Secondary Impacts		Agency Scoping Mtg	3/29/2005
The project should consider a rail bridge across Knik Arm when conducting technical studies including but not limited to hydraulic studies, location and soil conditions.	Bruce Carr	ARRC	Cumulative and Secondary Impacts		Letter	5/12/2005
The Crossing may have business impacts on the ARRC. ARRC may be at a competitive disadvantage to trucking due to a shorter highway connection to the Parks Highway.	Bruce Carr	ARRC	Cumulative and Secondary Impacts		Letter	5/12/2005
The MSB is currently leasing out gravel rights in the Port MacKenzie area. The Crossing may become a major gravel truck generator in Anchorage, thereby negatively impacting ARRC's gravel business. If trucks replace railroad gravel shipping, there would be more gravel trucks traveling through Anchorage, significantly impacting downtown Anchorage traffic and affecting local freight, goods, and services distribution. Increased gravel trucks would also impact Anchorage neighborhoods located near gravel companies.	Bruce Carr	ARRC	Cumulative and Secondary Impacts		Letter	5/12/2005

Comment	Commenter	Agency	Topic 1	Topic 2	Venue	Date
The EIS should consider how the Crossing will impact Government Hill traffic and businesses.	Bruce Carr	ARRC	Cumulative and Secondary Impacts		Letter	5/12/2005
Continue to be concerned about long-range affects of the proposed project. While gratified that some studies have been extended several months, cannot help but feel that we are rushing to decision without long-range knowledge of the impacts of this project on the delicate environment of upper Cook Inlet.	Irvin Joy	COE	Cumulative and Secondary Impacts		Letter	8/9/2005
Associated development on the north side must be considered in the indirect and secondary impacts assessment.	Irvin Joy	COE	Cumulative and Secondary Impacts		Letter	5/20/2005
APE (Area of Potential Effect) direct & indirect impacts on both sides of bridge and beyond Point MacKenzie. How will it be addressed and at what level?	Judy Bittner	DNR SHPO	Cumulative and Secondary Impacts		Agency Scoping Mtg	3/29/2005
While we have not yet had the opportunity to collectively address the significant project impacts from secondary development and growth, we have been pleased with the proactive approach that FHWA has taken to engage in discussions about alternative future analysis. We continue to urge that this alternative futures work be done, and we highly commend FHWA for agreeing to do this. We understand that this work will be completed for inclusion in the Final EIS.	Christine B. Reichgott	EPA	Cumulative and Secondary Impacts		Letter	10/13/2005
For the secondary and cumulative effects analysis, it will be important to disclose the assumptions used in the modeling efforts. For example, we understand that the growth forecasts used for the Plan Builder model, which were generated by the Institute for Social and Economic Research (ISER), assume the building of a Knik Arm Bridge. The assumption then used in Plan Builder is that the amount of future growth is the same with or without the bridge—the only difference is in how that growth is distributed.	Christine B. Reichgott	EPA	Cumulative and Secondary Impacts		Letter	10/13/2005
The EIS and its cumulative and secondary impacts must address the affect of Anchorage's housing, commercial and industrial land market in the short and long term. The Knik Arm Crossing may conflict with many of the current goals of Anchorage 2020 and will obviously require large investments in transportation infrastructure to connect to the Anchorage primary road network.	Lance Wilbur, Tom Nelson	MOA	Cumulative and Secondary Impacts		Letter	8/12/2005
This is a complex project aside from the bridge because of issues with access, roads, air quality, property values, and cumulative and secondary impacts on the MOA.	Thede Tobish	MOA Planning Dept	Cumulative and Secondary Impacts		Meeting	1/26/2005
The greatest impacts to the Mat-Su Valley traffic will come from the development of the Port MacKenzie area. Port MacKenzie development would reduce trucks on Anchorage streets and the Glenn Highway.	Lance Wilbur; Jon Spring; Tom Nelson; Craig Lyon	MOA-Traffic Department	Cumulative and Secondary Impacts		Meeting	6/15/2004
The Knik Arm Crossing when constructed will result in a significant shift in population resulting in new community development in the Point MacKenzie Community Council area and the southern portions of the Big Lake and Knik Fairview Community Councils areas. This shift will result in the need for the borough to fund and provide significant transportation and non-transportation public infrastructure including but not limited to schools, fire and emergency services, land fill, and libraries. These secondary impacts need to be assessed accurately so that a reasonable program can be established to fund them.	Murph O'Brien	MSB	Cumulative and Secondary Impacts		Letter	8/24/2005
The Cargo Airport Expansion may not be a reasonably foreseeable project because the land reservation may no longer exist. It is located in the middle of the State Point MacKenzie Agricultural Project. This project needs additional discussion.	Murph O'Brien	MSB	Cumulative and Secondary Impacts		letter	5/12/2005
The MacKenzie Airport for small airplanes should be referred to as the Mat-Su Airpark. It will be outside the Port District.	Murph O'Brien	MSB	Cumulative and Secondary Impacts		letter	5/12/2005
The Ag covenants listed on Mat-Su Agricultural Lands should be called State Point MacKenzie Agricultural Project, since it is not MSB owned lands.	Murph O'Brien	MSB	Cumulative and Secondary Impacts		letter	5/12/2005

Comment	Commenter	Agency	Topic 1	Topic 2	Venue	Date
Fish Creek Agricultural Development should be called Fish Creek (West Mat-Su) Multi-Use Development. This project involves several activities including timber, recreation, and settlement.	Murph O'Brien	MSB	Cumulative and Secondary Impacts		letter	5/12/2005
State Capitol in Wasilla should be called State Capitol in Mat-Su.	Murph O'Brien	MSB	Cumulative and Secondary Impacts		letter	5/12/2005
LRTP: Connection between the Knik Arm Crossing and the Parks Highway should be changed to yes (from no).	Murph O'Brien	MSB	Cumulative and Secondary Impacts		letter	5/12/2005
Implementation of the planning and zoning in Point MacKenzie area by 2015 should be clarified to read: Implementation of the planning and zoning in Point MacKenzie area outside the Port MacKenzie Port District, since the Port District is currently a special use District with zoning.	Murph O'Brien	MSB	Cumulative and Secondary Impacts		letter	5/12/2005
The indirect and cumulative effects plan process appears to be an effective means of identifying cumulative and secondary impacts.	Murph O'Brien	MSB	Cumulative and Secondary Impacts		letter	5/12/2005
Who makes the determination for future "reasonably foreseeable future action (RFFAs)?"	Jim Helfinstine	USCG	Cumulative and Secondary Impacts		Agency Scoping Meeting	4/25/2005
USCG is interested in direct, secondary, and cumulative impacts of construction and structure.	Jim Helfinstine	USCG	Cumulative and Secondary Impacts		Meeting	1/26/2005
The EIS should identify and describe potential direct and indirect project effects on freshwater aquatic habitats, including wetlands, streams, and lakes, especially in the Matanuska-Susitna Borough.	Denny R. Lassuy	USFWS	Cumulative and Secondary Impacts		Letter	5/10/2005
Cumulative effects, especially in the Mat-Su Borough are a big issue that must be addressed.	Phil Brna	USFWS	Cumulative and Secondary Impacts		Meeting	1/26/2005
Indirect and cumulative impacts are an issue.	Phil Brna	USFWS	Cumulative and Secondary Impacts		Meeting	1/26/2005
USFWS will work with the applicant for early identification of issues and to avoid and minimize effects.	Phil Brna	USFWS	Cumulative and Secondary Impacts		Meeting	1/26/2005
USFWS is interested in impacts of the three projects occurring in Knik Arm (POA, Port Mac, and the Knik Arm Crossing)	Phil Brna	USFWS- Ecological Services	Cumulative and Secondary Impacts		Meeting	8/26/2004
We recommend that the social and economic impacts of losing these farmlands be examined carefully, and the effects to overall regional sustainability be considered. The analysis of secondary impacts from growth and development should include a discussion of the consequences of losing farmlands in close proximity to a high population center and the increasing dependence upon long range transportation and distant sources of food to sustain the metropolitan community.	Christine B. Reichgott	EPA	Economic Impacts	Cumulative and Secondary Impacts	Letter	10/13/2005
A major concern as part of the secondary impact analysis of the alternatives brought forward is a financial analysis of the impact of the Knik Arm Crossing will have on other Borough transportation projects.	Murph O'Brien	MSB	Economic Impacts	Cumulative and Secondary Impacts	Letter	9/23/2005
Funds for the Knik Arm Crossing and other earmark projects are deductive from Alaska's Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP). This face greatly impacts the availability of federal funding for desparately needed projects within the Borough's Core Area such as the Trunk Road Realignment, the Seward Meridian Reconstruction and Extension, The Palmer Wasilla Highway Expansion and the Alternative Parks Highway Corridor.	Murph O'Brien	MSB	Economic Impacts	Cumulative and Secondary Impacts	Letter	9/23/2005

Comment	Commenter	Agency	Topic 1	Topic 2	Venue	Date
			Economic Impacts	Cumulative and Secondary Impacts		
The EIS must include analysis of the potential impacts of shifting funds from the Statewide Transportation Improvement program to the Knik Arm Crossing on Anchorage and the Mat-Su Borough and/or statewide communities and significantly delaying planned, priority projects within the MOA and the Mat-Su Borough. Mechanisms for equitable cost reimbursement or sharing, and competition for infrastructure funding (roads, State funds, etc.) should be evaluated.	Lance Wilbur, Tom Nelson	MOA	Economic Impacts	Environmental Consequences Analysis	Letter	8/12/2005
The opportunity costs of the Knik Arm Crossing along with all the technical, socio-economic, and environmental information developed in the EIS process will provide the basis for the public to make an informed decision about this important project.	Murph O'Brien	MSB	Economic Impacts	Public and Agency Involvement	Letter	9/23/2005
Development and investment in Chugiak-Eagle River, redevelopment in the Anchorage Bowl, and Turnagain Arm development are important to the economic health of Anchorage and should be fully considered in the socio-economic evaluation of the EIS.	Lance Wilbur, Tom Nelson	MOA	Economic Impacts	Purpose and Need	Letter	8/12/2005
Development in the Port MacKenzie area into an urban type environment encourages sprawl, slows growth in Anchorage, Eagle River-Chugiak, Palmer and Wasilla. Shifting development away from existing supporting public infrastructure and public services. The implications of this new type of development on Anchorage's and the Mat-Su Borough's resources, infrastructure and funding must be carefully analyzed in the EIS.	Lance Wilbur, Tom Nelson	MOA	Economic Impacts	Purpose and Need	Letter	8/12/2005
The MOA requests that the EIS include an analysis of the potential impact on the financial feasibility of implementing the LRTP if funds are drawn away from Anchorage and other statewide transportation needs to build the bridge and access roads.	Lance Wilbur, Tom Nelson	MOA	Economic Impacts	Purpose and Need	Letter	8/12/2005
Continual statewide operations and maintenance funding shortfalls constrain maintenance of existing infrastructure. It seems that year after year the state divides the maintenance pot by a growing number of lane miles. We want to express our concern for potential impacts to ADOT&PF's ability to provide maintenance to state routes in Anchorage and Mat-Su if funds are drained off for operation and maintenance of the bridge and access road. We understand that revenue from a toll can serve as resources to bridge maintenance and operations. ADOT&PF experience with the Whittier Tunnel might serve as a source to inform the Knik Arm EIS with the estimate O&M costs during the EIS, the actual after construction, the current level of maintenance and the cost recovery from tolls.	Lance Wilbur, Tom Nelson	MOA	Economic Impacts	Purpose and Need	Letter	8/12/2005
An effort should be completed to address the cost of commuting to jobs in Anchorage.	Lance Wilbur, Tom Nelson	MOA	Economic Impacts		Letter	8/12/2005
The EIS must address the full cost consequences of regional growth, infrastructure costs for the Mat-Su development resulting from the increased accessibility created by the bridge crossing.	Lance Wilbur, Tom Nelson	MOA	Economic Impacts		Letter	8/12/2005
The opportunity costs of the Knik Arm Crossing need to be explained thoroughly in the DEIS so the public can be informed of the financial impacts of the Knik Arm Crossing Project.	Murph O'Brien	MSB	Economic Impacts		Letter	9/23/2005
Is the toll for the bridge going to cover operations and maintenance and construction?	Murph O'Brien	MSB	Economic Impacts		Agency Scoping Mtg	5/11/2005
What will the toll be?	Barbara Mahoney	NOAA Fisheries	Economic Impacts		Meeting	2/24/2005
What is a reasonable cost (for a crossing and operations and maintenance)? The public needs to understand that.	Allan Lucht	US Army	Economic Impacts		Agency Scoping Mtg	5/11/2005
The EIS should describe aquatic habitats and the environmental consequences from the proposed alternatives in terms of aerial (acreage) or linear extent to be impacted and by the functions they provide.	Christine Reichgott	EPA	Environmental Consequences Analysis	Alternatives	Letter + Attachments	6/16/2005
We wish to stress the importance of fully evaluating the aquatic resources that will be impacted directly, indirectly, and cumulatively as a result of the proposed project.	Christine B. Reichgott	EPA	Environmental Consequences Analysis	Cumulative and Secondary Impacts	Letter	10/13/2005

Comment	Commenter	Agency	Topic 1	Topic 2	Venue	Date
We continue to advocate that the three projects, Knik Arm Crossing, Port of Anchorage and Port MacKenzie in the Mat-Su Borough (proposed and/or under development in Knik Arm), combine resources and share information to the maximum extent possible to provide a more comprehensive picture of the dynamics and environmental status, including aquatic resources, in that portion of the Knik Arm watershed that would be impacted by these projects.	Christine B. Reichgott	EPA	Environmental Consequences Analysis	Cumulative and Secondary Impacts	Letter	10/13/2005
As we heard in the meeting, the 46,000 (or more) average daily traffic count that would be generated as a consequence of the proposed project would come primarily as a result of the growth and development that would be stimulated by the project as proposed. The costs and environmental impacts that would occur as a result of the expected growth and development, especially if that development occurs in an unplanned manner, would far exceed the costs and impacts of just the project footprint.	Christine B. Reichgott	EPA	Environmental Consequences Analysis	Cumulative and Secondary Impacts	Letter	10/13/2005
The addition of the 14-mile Upper Pt. MacKenzie Road Corridor as part of the proposed project provides additional transportation benefits to the project, but also introduces additional project impacts. The impacts normally associated with new roadway projects would apply and should be addressed in the EIS.	Christine B. Reichgott	EPA	Environmental Consequences Analysis	Cumulative and Secondary Impacts	Letter	10/13/2005
I think it would be worthwhile to look at the effects of global warming.	Elaine Somers	EPA	Environmental Consequences Analysis	Cumulative and Secondary Impacts	Meeting	9/27/2005
A basic understanding of all aspects of the ecosystem, including the chemical, physical, and biological characteristics of Knik Arm, are needed to reasonably predict and avoid significant direct impacts to the belugas and fisheries and to direct a course of action to mitigate secondary and cumulative effects of the project.	Christine Reichgott	EPA	Environmental Consequences Analysis	Cumulative and Secondary Impacts	Letter + Attachments	6/16/2005
Indirect impacts may be as important as direct impacts to address.	Heather Dean	USEPA	Environmental Consequences Analysis	Cumulative and Secondary Impacts	Meeting	9/15/2004
We recommend conducting community impact assessments (in depth analysis of the direct, indirect and cumulative impacts) for communities that would potentially be most affected by the proposed project (Government Hill, Native Alaska Tribes).	Christine Reichgott	EPA	Environmental Consequences Analysis	Economic Impacts	Letter + Attachments	6/16/2005
The USFWS cautions against making broad conclusions about biological resources and project impacts without adequate scientific data. If these types of conclusions are postulated, the Service recommends that current fish studies be expanded to provide scientific evidence to support them.	Denny R. Lassuy	USFWS	Environmental Consequences Analysis	Fisheries	Letter	5/10/2005
The COE recommends exploring a three dimensional model of Knik Arm to better investigate the impacts of the bridge on the local environment. The proposed mathematical model is adequate for theoretical design considerations, but lacks the tools to give specific information needed to evaluate the long term impacts of the proposed designs.	Irvin Joy	COE	Environmental Consequences Analysis	Hydrology & Hydraulics	Letter	5/20/2005
Climate change is occurring and well documented in Alaska, manifested by shrinking sea ice, melting glaciers, and the thawing trend in permafrost (Syun Akasofu, director of the Arctic Research Center, Anchorage Daily News, 8/14/05). These phenomena are relevant to this project in that hydrology in the area could change in ways that affect structure and design	Christine B. Reichgott	EPA	Environmental Consequences Analysis	Hydrology & Hydraulics	Letter	10/13/2005
			Environmental Consequences Analysis	Hydrology & Hydraulics		
Because it is assumed the distance between the two banks at Cairn Point caused the submarine trench, COE is concerned the bridge will have an impact of increasing the trench.	Skip Joy	COE	Environmental Consequences Analysis	Preliminary Engineering	Meeting	8/26/2005
Modeling and velocity is going to play into the decision. Friction is an important factor. Financially, less fill is better, but we would like to see the smallest footprint too. Current velocities have impacts.	Skip Joy	COE	Environmental Consequences Analysis	Preliminary Engineering	Meeting	8/26/2005

Comment	Commenter	Agency	Topic 1	Topic 2	Venue	Date
We recommend exploring and taking into consideration the melting of the Knik Glacier and potential release of Inner and Upper Lake George behind the ice dam of Knik Glacier. The trend and rate of glacial melt for Anchorage-area glaciers could be noted and applied to the project timeframe/lifespan to determine if melt out and release could occur within this timeframe. If it appears possible or likely that the ice dam could be breached, there should be some assessment of what the potential consequences might be with respect to the proposed project.	Christine B. Reichgott	EPA	Environmental Consequences Analysis	Preliminary Engineering	Letter	10/13/2005
At the IDT meeting, held on September 27, 2005, you referenced an agreement between Headquarters FHWA and EPA, which states that FHWA will not examine project specific effects on global warming. We want to be clear that our suggestion is to consider the effects of global warming on the proposed project—not the project’s effect on global warming. We would be interested in looking at the agreement though and would appreciate your assistance in locating it. We have inquired at the FHWA and EPA Headquarters offices and searched the FHWA website for such an agreement, but have not found one.	Christine B. Reichgott	EPA	Environmental Consequences Analysis	Preliminary Engineering	Letter	10/13/2005
We have concerns about the amount of fill in the (Southern Alignment) area, as well as construction time and erosion.	Barbara Mahoney	NMFS	Environmental Consequences Analysis	Preliminary Engineering	Meeting	9/27/2005
For the biology, the less you change the environment the better. A shorter bridge is cheaper for the project, but the longer bridge is better for the biology.	Larry Peltz	NOAA Fisheries	Environmental Consequences Analysis	Preliminary Engineering	Meeting	8/19/2005
			Environmental Consequences Analysis	Preliminary Engineering		
			Environmental Consequences Analysis	Preliminary Engineering		
The EIS should disclose endangered, threatened, sensitive species and habitats, and the alternative presented should reflect all possible measures to avoid and minimize disturbance or harm to them.	Christine Reichgott	EPA	Environmental Consequences Analysis	Threatened and Endangered Species	Letter + Attachments	6/16/2005
Mark Sommerville also came up with 400 acres of sediment accumulation.	Phil Brna	USFWS	Environmental Consequences Analysis	Water Quality	Meeting	8/19/2005
Fill also affects the flow channel and wetlands.	Steve Duncan	EPA	Environmental Consequences Analysis	Wetlands	Meeting	9/27/2005
Concerned about bridge affecting hydrodynamics in the Knik Arm resulting in sedimentation and/or erosion affecting other wetlands in the Knik Arm	Heather Dean	EPA	Environmental Consequences Analysis	Wetlands	Meeting	8/26/2005
Induced growth impacts from a road seems to be a direct impact.	Steve Duncan	EPA	Environmental Consequences Analysis		Meeting	9/27/2005
Competing societal needs include environmental protection as well as other needs identified by the affected public, agencies, and tribes during scoping and throughout the NEPA process.	Christine Reichgott	EPA	Environmental Consequences Analysis		Letter + Attachments	6/16/2005
Impacts to Anchorage and Chugiak-Eagle River transportation systems and the ability to fully implement short-term priorities in long-range planning documents must be clearly evaluated.	Lance Wilbur, Tom Nelson	MOA	Environmental Consequences Analysis		Letter	8/12/2005
The potential impacts to the MSB in the Knik Arm Crossing project area are significant and should be identified and addressed during the process.	Murph O'Brien	MSB	Environmental Consequences Analysis		letter	5/12/2005

Comment	Commenter	Agency	Topic 1	Topic 2	Venue	Date
Action should be taken to conduct adequate public outreach and participation in accordance Environmental 12898 on Environmental Justice (EJ). Information gathered should be factored into decision making and should be disclosed in the EIS. Related to EJ, in the EIS: describe efforts to inform communities about potential impacts and ensure "meaningful public participation" by the potentially affected communities; identify low income and minority groups in the impact area; disclose what was heard from the community (perceived and real); determine whether these impacts will disproportionately impact low income or minority communities; describe how comments have been incorporated into project decisions: <u>propose mitigation for impacts.</u>	Christine Reichgott	EPA	Environmental Justice	Environmental Justice	Letter + Attachments	6/16/2005
OHMP wants to see the data from the studies.	Mark Somerville	ADNR	Fisheries	Beluga	Meeting	2/17/2005
OHMP is concerned with interference with fish and beluga migration. There is no way to predict how they will be affected by the project. OHMP needs the data early so they can study and understand it.	Matt LaCroix	ADNR	Fisheries	Beluga	Meeting	2/17/2005
It is hard to get good data from beach seines. Maybe the project could use beluga geography to locate fish.	Matt LaCroix	ADNR-OHMP	Fisheries	Beluga	Meeting	8/26/2004
Is velocity a concern for both fish and beluga?	Michael Rylko	EPA	Fisheries	Beluga	Agency Scoping Meeting	4/25/2005
Fisheries study station 11, north of the Port of Anchorage, has beluga activity. There are questions about why they are there, what they are doing, and possible prey species.	Brian Lance	NOAA Fisheries Fisheries-Habitat Conservation	Fisheries	Beluga	Meeting	8/26/2004
The project may increase (fishing) pressure on the Little Susitna River. Will those impacts be studied in the document?	Dan Vos	NOAA Fisheries	Fisheries	Cumulative and Secondary Impacts	Meeting	2/24/2005
Fisheries must look at cumulative impacts. POA construction is eliminating wetland and this project will also impact the area. At some point the tidelands are gone and that doesn't work anymore.	Larry Peltz	NOAA Fisheries	Fisheries	Cumulative and Secondary Impacts	Agency Scoping Mtg	3/29/2005
In addition to increases in water velocity through the bridge abutments constriction, changes in both vertical and horizontal currents and flow patterns could be expected. Such changes will likely affect resident and transient fishes by altering local current dynamics and current velocity. DNR OHMP recommend the EIS analyze the potential extent of these impacts.	Don Perrin	DNR OPMP	Fisheries	Environmental Consequences Analysis	Agency Scoping Mtg	5/9/2005
Any potential impacts to essential fish habitat must be analyzed and disclosed, and should include a description of measures proposed to avoid, mitigate, or offset the impacts of proposed activities on the essential fish habitat.	Christine Reichgott	EPA	Fisheries	Environmental Consequences Analysis	Letter + Attachments	6/16/2005
Near the dock there is a habitat shift, not a gain. We would like to see numbers.	Larry Peltz	NOAA Fisheries	Fisheries	Environmental Consequences Analysis	Meeting	8/19/2005
The key is to have benches so that fish can move past structures and into the shallows. It will be important to get the structure to stay in place in the strong currents.	Larry Peltz	NOAA Fisheries	Fisheries	Hydrology & Hydraulics	Meeting	4/14/2005
When we started looking ( <b>the study</b> ), we were concerned about the effects on fish, but it looks like that is not the case from these studies. It looks like the effects on Government Hill are more important.	Phil Brna	USFWS	Fisheries	Land Use	Meeting	8/25/2005
The Corps of Engineers (COE) has done fish benches for creating tidelands around breakwaters.	Jeanne Hanson	NOAA Fisheries	Fisheries	Mitigation	Meeting	4/14/2005
If tidelands are impacted KABATA should try to recreate something that would be there without the bridge. They should not narrow the passage more than the narrowest spot in the Arm.	Larry Peltz	NOAA Fisheries	Fisheries	Mitigation	Meeting	4/14/2005
NOAA Fisheries will go over early drafts of documents until they go to mitigation.	Larry Peltz and Jeanne Hanson	NOAA Fisheries	Fisheries	Mitigation	Meeting	4/14/2005
What about using hydroacoustics to survey fish?	Phil Brna	USFWS- Ecological Services	Fisheries	Noise	Meeting	8/26/2004

Comment	Commenter	Agency	Topic 1	Topic 2	Venue	Date
Accessing a bridge may require a road along intertidal lands between Cairn Point and the bridge approach ramps. This road would cross the mouth of Sixmile Creek. Sixmile Creek is specified as being important for the spawning, rearing, or migration of anadromous fishes pursuant to AS 41.14.870(a). A Fish Habitat Permit will be required for this crossing.	Don Perrin	DNR OPMP	Fisheries	Permits	Agency Scoping Mtg	5/9/2005
Jack Colonell gave a good explanation as to why the distal embankments should not pose a barrier to the passage of small fish.	Larry Peltz	NOAA Fisheries	Fisheries	Preliminary Engineering	Meeting	8/19/2005
The project team should ask NOAA Fisheries if they need anything. NOAA Fisheries and USFWS should be consulted regarding alternative designs.	Larry Peltz	NOAA Fisheries	Fisheries	Preliminary Engineering	Meeting	4/14/2005
Based on fish, either the perpendicular or the skewed bridge alignment would work.	Phil Brna	USFWS	Fisheries	Preliminary Engineering	Meeting	8/19/2005
You should still look at bridge designs with pilings and no fill out into Knik Arm.	Francis Mann	USFWS	Fisheries	Preliminary Engineering	Agency Scoping Meeting	4/25/2005
Did the fisheries study record/note water clarity.	Matt LaCroix	ADNR-OHMP	Fisheries	Water Quality	Meeting	8/26/2004
It is important to realize that there are a variety of habitat types associated with water clarity, and it is risky to assume that what you find in one location and one water type is representative of all of Knik Arm. The upper and lower parts and the east and west side of the Arm have different characteristics and habitats. Rivers affect the clarity of the water, and the habitat, such as the Palmer Slough which is clear. The habitats being surveyed are the least hospitable for fish and birds. We can't use single data points to extrapolate other specific areas. Some places are more hospitable with less tidal action and ice scouring.	Matt LaCroix	ADNR-OHMP	Fisheries	Water Quality	Meeting	8/26/2004
There are areas of clear, green water in Cook Inlet. Is the use of those areas different than in other locations.	Phil Brna	USFWS- Ecological Services	Fisheries	Water Quality	Meeting	8/26/2004
Project impacts to USFWS trust resources, including anadromous fish, migratory birds, and wetlands, should be avoided or minimized to the greatest practicable extent through proper consideration and selection of alternatives and designs.	Denny R. Lassuy	USFWS	Fisheries	Wetlands	Letter	5/10/2005
I am not sure whether either option shown will recreate what is going on in Knik Arm now. It may work for adult fish, but not juveniles. What happens if the calculations are incorrect? Fill is essentially permanent. Who will monitor and report on impacts? the concept needs to be shown at a real scale to properly evaluate	Matt LeCroix	ADF&G	Fisheries		Agency Scoping Meeting	4/25/2005
Cook Inlet Aquaculture Association stocked Eklutna River for years with primarily sockeye and chum salmon. ADF&G has been stocking Eklutna River with coho and Chinook salmon for the last three years, and they may start stocking more types of salmon in the future. The natural runs of Chinook salmon in the Matanuska drainage are around 800 fish. Most runs for individual streams in the area are about 100 Chinook. The Knik River has about 200-300 Chinook.	Dave Rutz	ADF&G	Fisheries		Meeting	2/15/2005
Has the project team consulted existing studies from British Columbia or Washington involving causeways and juvenile migration?	Dave Rutz	ADF&G	Fisheries		Meeting	2/15/2005
Mentioned that the biggest fisheries issues would be those affecting Ship Creek (hatchery fed), the wild runs at Six Mile River, Chinook salmon at Eagle River, and the fishery at Eklutna.	Matt Miller	ADF&G	Fisheries		Meeting	2/15/2005
The educational (tribal) fisheries in the area are important to the local tribes.	Dave Rutz	ADF&G	Fisheries		Meeting	2/15/2005
Asked about juvenile sampling at Point MacKenzie.	Dave Rutz	ADF&G	Fisheries		Meeting	2/15/2005
There has not been much of a problem with adult salmon returns. There is a need to determine the timing of when the bulk of juveniles are coming through the Arm.	Dave Rutz	ADF&G	Fisheries		Meeting	2/15/2005
Mainly concerned with the spring out-migration of smolt (out to ocean) in May and the adult migration in to spawn starting in late June and July. The bridge seems to be far enough south that it would not impact the commercial fisheries.	Jeff Regnart	ADF&G Sport Fish	Fisheries		Telephone	8/17/2004
Knik Arm salmon are also important for commercial and subsistence/educational harvests.	Matt LaCroix	ADNR-OHMP	Fisheries		Email	9/7/2004
In 1999, the Board of Fisheries agreed to the development of a management plan for coho salmon in Upper Cook Inlet. This was requested by the Governor after three consecutive years of dramatically reduced returns. While there have been higher returns in subsequent years, the stocks are not considered stable.	Matt LaCroix	ADNR-OHMP	Fisheries		Email	9/7/2004

Comment	Commenter	Agency	Topic 1	Topic 2	Venue	Date
Seek out the latest data on these stocks and talk to ADF&G fisheries staff for the best insight into stock status and health of runs in Knik Arm.	Matt LaCroix	ADNR-OHMP	Fisheries		Email	9/7/2004
Interested in whether tow nets had been incorporated into the fisheries fieldwork.	Scott Maclean	ADNR-OHMP	Fisheries		Meeting	8/26/2004
Interested in whether stomach analysis on saffron cod and Bering cisco was being completed for the fisheries study.	Matt LaCroix	ADNR-OHMP	Fisheries		Meeting	8/26/2004
ADF&G would be best to speak with regarding commercial fishing. There are set net sites for a “cultural and educational fishery” on the north side of Knik Lake that are regulated by ADF&G Commercial Fish Division. This is an important fishery to the people in Knik. It is a historical fishery now used for education and subsistence. Both the Eklutna and Knik Tribes have educational fisheries. It is a small scale fishery and not sufficient for subsistence.	Matt LaCroix	ADNR-OHMP	Fisheries		Telephone	8/13/2004
One of the most important fisheries in the area is Fish Creek. However, this year (2004) has not been a great run.	Matt LaCroix	ADNR-OHMP	Fisheries		Telephone	8/13/2004
There are annual commercial and sport fish management reports. There are at least 35 streams on the west side of the Arm. Streams on both sides (importantly: Matanuska and its tributaries, Knik R., Eklutna R., Eagle R., and Ship Cr.) of the Arm see incredible amount of fishing pressure.	Matt LaCroix	ADNR-OHMP	Fisheries		Telephone	8/13/2004
That Rabbit Slough is a very important local fishery, but the monetary value was unknown.	Matt LaCroix	ADNR-OHMP	Fisheries		Telephone	8/13/2004
Talk with Dave Rutz at ADF&G Sport Fish about the fisheries in the Mat-Su.	Matt LaCroix	ADNR-OHMP	Fisheries		Telephone	8/13/2004
Salmon are using the intertidal areas in Knik Arm. The wide area provides a “highway” for fish to move up and down the Arm at any tide. It allows the salmon to avoid beluga whale and seal predation. If the salmon were pushed out by construction in the intertidal, it would cause problems. There are reports of beluga whales feeding on salmon right at the Port Mac dock. It is probably because the fish have been pushed into deeper water.	Matt LaCroix	ADNR-OHMP	Fisheries		Telephone	8/13/2004
How much time juvenile salmon are in the Arm. The data have not been conclusive. The estuary rearing habitat is important. If the juveniles are forced out into deeper water, they could be preyed upon by larger marine fish.	Matt LaCroix	ADNR-OHMP	Fisheries		Telephone	8/13/2004
ADF&G sport fish is very interested in marine forage fish (stickleback, eulachon, capline, etc) numbers because they are prey for salmon and halibut.	Matt LaCroix	ADNR-OHMP	Fisheries		Telephone	8/13/2004
We request information based on two key questions : 1) What is the residence time of juvenile salmon within Knik Arm and how do they maintain that residency with such extreme current velocities? 2) Are salmon and other species of fish utilizing the mid-channel portions of Knik Arm as well as the near shore?	Don Perrin	DNR OPMP	Fisheries		Agency Scoping Mtg	5/9/2005
There is a need to acknowledge the fisheries resources of the native communities, as well as traditional knowledge from Knik.	Ken Hudson	MSB	Fisheries		Meeting	2/16/2005
Regarding recreation of the shoreline, the closer you can come to what exists in Knik Arm, the better it will work.	Larry Peltz	NMFS	Fisheries		Agency Scoping Meeting	4/25/2005
The beach seining research has not shown what is present at higher tides.	Larry Peltz	NOAA Fisheries	Fisheries		Meeting	4/14/2005
The project team should go to NOAA Fisheries' website and look at their guidelines for writing EFH consultation reports.	Jeanne Hanson	NOAA Fisheries	Fisheries		Meeting	4/14/2005
The location of the crossing does not matter for fisheries.	Larry Peltz	NOAA Fisheries	Fisheries		Meeting	4/14/2005
There is a missing piece of information; NOAA Fisheries wonders if juvenile salmon are using the mid-channel.	Larry Peltz	NOAA Fisheries	Fisheries		Meeting	4/14/2005
NOAA Fisheries does not have any suggestions of how to do things better. They are doing the right thing.	Larry Peltz	NOAA Fisheries	Fisheries		Meeting	4/14/2005
The project team should put an EFH assessment in the document. It can be a separate section or incorporated throughout the document.	Jeanne Hanson	NOAA Fisheries	Fisheries		Meeting	4/14/2005
More fill will produce greater impacts to the environment.	Larry Peltz	NOAA Fisheries	Fisheries		Meeting	4/14/2005
KABATA's fisheries work looks good so far. The main problem is that this project looks at a big picture with a lot of holes in it. Building the bridge should not have an impact on the fish, unless the tidelands were filled. If the bridge were totally pile supported, there will be no Essential Fish Habitat (EFH) problems.	Larry Peltz	NOAA Fisheries	Fisheries		Meeting	4/14/2005

Comment	Commenter	Agency	Topic 1	Topic 2	Venue	Date
Fisheries Study Request: POA, Port MacKenzie, and KABATA are all planning projects in the Arm and that NOAA Fisheries is interested in a study effort that answers agency questions, and pools resources (money) or are at least not redundant.	Brian Lance	NOAA Fisheries Habitat Conservation	Fisheries		Telephone	7/14/2004
Fisheries Study Request: Interested in determining whether the ports and KABATA are interested in working together.	Brian Lance	NOAA Fisheries Habitat Conservation	Fisheries		Telephone	7/14/2004
Fisheries Study Request: Interested in bringing together agencies' fisheries scientist (NOAA Fisheries, ADF&G, USF&W, OHMP) to determine their questions.	Brian Lance	NOAA Fisheries Habitat Conservation	Fisheries		Telephone	7/14/2004
Fisheries Study Request: Interested in calling the Ports and KABATA together with NOAA Fisheries to discuss how to move forward.	Brian Lance	NOAA Fisheries - Habitat Conservation	Fisheries		Telephone	7/14/2004
Fisheries study request: Sample offshore using a surface tow net (see Moulton 1997)	Brian Lance	NOAA Fisheries Fisheries-Habitat Conservation	Fisheries		Email	9/17/2004
Fisheries study request: To locate fish offshore, supplement net sampling using hydroacoustic techniques (following Moulton 1997 techniques)	Brian Lance	NOAA Fisheries Fisheries-Habitat Conservation	Fisheries		Email	9/17/2004
Fisheries study request: Closely examine the Ship Creek estuary	Brian Lance	NOAA Fisheries Fisheries-Habitat Conservation	Fisheries		Email	9/17/2004
Fisheries study request: Sample fish once a month during ice free months until freeze up in fall 2005	Brian Lance	NOAA Fisheries Fisheries-Habitat Conservation	Fisheries		Email	9/17/2004
Fisheries study request: Consider using radio tagging for tracking the seasonal presence of certain species	Brian Lance	NOAA Fisheries Fisheries-Habitat Conservation	Fisheries		Email	9/17/2004
Fisheries study request: Sample in the intertidal area for benthic invertebrates	Brian Lance	NOAA Fisheries Fisheries-Habitat Conservation	Fisheries		Email	9/17/2004
Fisheries study request: Attempt sampling for pelagic invertebrates in nearshore and offshore areas	Brian Lance	NOAA Fisheries Fisheries-Habitat Conservation	Fisheries		Email	9/17/2004
Fisheries study request: Conducted stomach analysis for all species captured.	Brian Lance	NOAA Fisheries Fisheries-Habitat Conservation	Fisheries		Email	9/17/2004
Has Larry Moulton's paper which focuses on the head of Cook Inlet/south end of Knik Arm been reviewed for this project. According to the paper, lots of fish were caught with a surface tow net in June, July, and September of 1993.	Brian Lance	NOAA Fisheries Fisheries-Habitat Conservation	Fisheries		Meeting	8/26/2004
Interested in whether KABATA could expand research into the rest of the ice free months.	Brian Lance	NOAA Fisheries Fisheries-Habitat Conservation	Fisheries		Meeting	8/26/2004
There needs to be comprehensive data for the area. KABATA's research in July and Aug is a good start, but a temporal expansion through the ice free months and refined water column sampling is needed.	Brian Lance	NOAA Fisheries Fisheries-Habitat Conservation	Fisheries		Meeting	8/26/2004
NMFS is not asking KABATA to do fish study tows around the Port of Anchorage. Other projects can fill in the data gaps. However, the methods need to be correlated.	Brian Lance	NOAA Fisheries Fisheries-Habitat Conservation	Fisheries		Meeting	8/26/2004
Essential Fish Habitat will trigger federal agency action.	Brad Smith	NOAA Fisheries NMFS	Fisheries		Meeting	1/26/2005

Comment	Commenter	Agency	Topic 1	Topic 2	Venue	Date
Fisheries study request: Determine what species are in Knik Arm, when they are in the Arm, and where they are located.	Steve Duncan	USEPA	Fisheries		Letter	9/15/2004
Fisheries study request: Gather information on other fish and non-fish species in the Arm in addition to information gathered on beluga whales and anadromous fish.	Steve Duncan	USEPA	Fisheries		Letter	9/15/2004
Fisheries study request: Need a minimum of one year of data.	Steve Duncan	USEPA	Fisheries		Meeting	9/15/2004
Interested in why juvenile salmon spend time in the shallows in the fill near the dock at Port MacKenzie. Is it because they can't go around the dock or do they like the habitat?	Phil Brna	USFWS	Fisheries		Meeting	8/19/2005
We are concerned that fish study methodologies may not adequately evaluate density and diversity of invertebrates or the importance of other food sources.	Denny R. Lassuy	USFWS	Fisheries		Letter	5/10/2005
While it may be that littoral habitat may not function as a refuge for juveniles from predators because of turbid water, it does seem likely that littoral habitat provides refuge for juvenile salmon from strong tidal currents.	Denny R. Lassuy	USFWS	Fisheries		Letter	5/10/2005
The USFWS is concerned about the effects of this and other projects on movement and migration of both juvenile and adult anadromous fish in Knik Arm. Of particular concern to USFWS is placement of fill in intertidal and subtidal areas of Knik Arm because of the potential effects on movement and migration of juvenile and adult anadromous fish. We believe that a pile supported crossing, rather than one which includes intertidal or subtidal fill, is likely to avoid and minimize impacts to anadromous fish to the greatest practicable extent.	Denny R. Lassuy	USFWS	Fisheries		Letter	5/10/2005
Do these options work (recreating tidelands)? We need to survey the literature and determine if they will work.	Francis Mann	USFWS	Fisheries		Agency Scoping Meeting	4/25/2005
Fisheries study request: Continue gathering current fisheries data over the winter months of 2004/2005 and into the spring and summer of 2005.	Ann Rappoport	USFWS	Fisheries		Letter	9/17/2004
Fisheries study request: Determine the entry timing of juvenile salmon into Knik Arm.	Ann Rappoport	USFWS	Fisheries		Letter	9/17/2004
Fisheries study request: Determine the duration of residence timing (of salmon) within Knik Arm.	Ann Rappoport	USFWS	Fisheries		Letter	9/17/2004
Fisheries study request: Determine the size and growth of juvenile salmon during early marine residence.	Ann Rappoport	USFWS	Fisheries		Letter	9/17/2004
Fisheries study request: Determine the distribution, by habitat type and area, and feeding intensity of juvenile salmon in Knik Arm.	Ann Rappoport	USFWS	Fisheries		Letter	9/17/2004
Fisheries study request: Determine the availability of prey for juvenile salmon.	Ann Rappoport	USFWS	Fisheries		Letter	9/17/2004
Fisheries study request: Use methods similar to what Moulton (1997) used	Ann Rappoport	USFWS	Fisheries		Letter	9/17/2004
How will the data collected during the fisheries study be correlated considering in 1983 sampling took place in the spring/early summer and sampling in 2004 has taken place in July, Aug, and will occur in September.	Phil Brna	USFWS- Ecological Services	Fisheries		Meeting	8/26/2004
Interested in the possibility of winter sampling and what would be found.	Phil Brna	USFWS- Ecological Services	Fisheries		Meeting	8/26/2004
How will the fisheries study data from different months and different years be compared	Phil Brna	USFWS- Ecological Services	Fisheries		Meeting	8/26/2004
The MOA has a geotechnical advisory division that should be included early on in the process.	Thede Tobish	MOA Planning Dept	Geology	Public and Agency Involvement	Meeting	1/26/2005
Asked if seismic related problems would affect the bottom of Knik Arm or the bluffs.	Matt LaCroix	ADNR	Geology		Meeting	2/17/2005
There are some gravel sources on EAFB.	Rodney Huffman	BLM	Geology		Meeting	2/18/2005
There are no specific reason for not including the DFSP-A parcel in planning the Knik Arm Crossing project, other than any contaminated soils that did not meet construction specifications would need to be transported offsite for proper treatment/disposal. This would require additional logistics and cost, but would not be prohibitive to the project moving forward.	Jim Frechionne	ADEC- Contaminated Sites Program	Hazardous Waste Sites	Alternatives	Telephone	10/22/2004

Comment	Commenter	Agency	Topic 1	Topic 2	Venue	Date
Do not believe than an approach to the bridge at the toe of the bluff below LF04 (contaminated site) would be prohibited due to contamination. Main concern was the potential for negative public perception due to erosion of landfill materials out of the bluff face.	Jon Scudder	Elmendorf AFB	Hazardous Waste Sites	Alternatives	Meeting - Field Visit	8/10/2004
There is a landfill on the bluff. A Record of Decision has been signed which directs how to manage the landfill cleanup.	Greg Schmidt	Elmendorf AFB	Hazardous Waste Sites	Land Use	Meeting	1/26/2005
WP14, a former sludge disposal site, is being remediate along with LF04 as part of EAFB's Operable Unit 6. Groundwater from these sites is not currently impacting the toe of the bluff.	Jon Scudder	Elmendorf AFB	Hazardous Waste Sites	Water Quality	Meeting - Field Visit	8/10/2004
Kevin Oats at EPA in Alabama should be contacted.	Louis Howard	ADEC	Hazardous Waste Sites		Meeting	3/11/2005
EPA should be coordination with regarding the landfill.	Jim Frechione	ADEC	Hazardous Waste Sites		Meeting	3/11/2005
A waste management plan is needed.	Louis Howard	ADEC	Hazardous Waste Sites		Meeting	3/11/2005
For the railroad project, the railroad put together methods that would be employed to deal with contamination during construction. The bridge project should consider doing this.	John Haverson	ADEC	Hazardous Waste Sites		Meeting	3/11/2005
ADEC will provide additional data on the contaminated sites as the project moves forward.	Jim Frechione	ADEC	Hazardous Waste Sites		Meeting	3/11/2005
There is an area wide petroleum hydrocarbon contamination flume all over the tank farm area.	Jim Frechione	ADEC	Hazardous Waste Sites		Meeting	3/11/2005
The tank farms in the area include Chevron, Flint Hills, and Tesoro. They would probably not be impacted by the project.	Gloria Beckley	ADEC	Hazardous Waste Sites		Meeting	3/11/2005
The Railroad is putting tracks through the Defense Fuels Support area (contaminated site).	Louis Howard	ADEC	Hazardous Waste Sites		Meeting	3/11/2005
The landfill has both inert items, explosives, and the potential for contamination and UXOs.	John Haverson	ADEC	Hazardous Waste Sites		Meeting	3/11/2005
How will the project deal with the landfill on the bluff. Moving or covering the landfill would be difficult.	John Haverson	ADEC	Hazardous Waste Sites		Meeting	3/11/2005
The COE is the only entity dealing with ordinances now, but they may be able to fast track this issue.	John Haverson	ADEC	Hazardous Waste Sites		Meeting	3/11/2005
The COE will take longer to clean up the UXOs than another entity.	Jim Frechione	ADEC	Hazardous Waste Sites		Meeting	3/11/2005
There could be unexploded ordinances (UXO) in the Port MacKenzie area and in Knik Arm. The firing range was on the Anchorage side, and ammunition was fired at the Port MacKenzie side.	John Haverson	ADEC	Hazardous Waste Sites		Meeting	3/11/2005
The Susitna Gunnery created a contaminated site on the Mat-Su side that extends through the Port MacKenzie area. Teresa Thomas is the COE contact. COE people in Huntsville are creating a draft map.	John Haverson	ADEC	Hazardous Waste Sites		Meeting	3/11/2005
Circulation and Knik Arm water quality will be important to look at in the report.	Mel Langdon	ADEC	Hazardous Waste Sites		Meeting	2/25/2005
Is the contaminated sites research a synopsis of existing data?	Mel Langdon	ADEC	Hazardous Waste Sites		Meeting	2/25/2005
EPA would prefer to see projects build on contaminated sites rather than disturbing clean, pristine land. It is more efficient to actually use those sites if possible, or clean them up.	Elaine Somers	EPA	Hazardous Waste Sites		Agency Scoping Mtg	5/11/2005
Will the project avoid CERCLA sites?	Elaine Somers	EPA	Hazardous Waste Sites		Agency Scoping Mtg	5/11/2005
Soil contamination on military lands along the south approach will need to be addressed.	Heather Dean	USEPA	Hazardous Waste Sites		Meeting	9/15/2004
Be careful not to allow attention to Section 106 review to cause analysts to give insufficient consideration to other kinds of cultural resources (i.e. those not defined in the National Historic Preservation Act). These properties need to be addressed under NEPA.	Christine Reichgott	EPA	Historic & Archaeological Resources	Environmental Consequences Analysis	Letter + Attachments	6/16/2005

Comment	Commenter	Agency	Topic 1	Topic 2	Venue	Date
DNR SHPO is tasked to work with federal agencies for impacts to cultural resources.	Judy Bittner	ADNR - SHPO	Historic & Archaeological Resources	Public and Agency Involvement	Meeting	1/26/2005
Typically the lead federal agency coordinates with SHPO on Section 106 consultation, but Judy is comfortable working directly with the state agency.	Judy Bittner	ADNR - SHPO	Historic & Archaeological Resources	Public and Agency Involvement	Meeting	1/26/2005
DNR SHPO has no input on purpose and need. We are more interested in alternatives.	Judy Bittner	ADNR - SHPO	Historic & Archaeological Resources	Purpose and Need	Meeting	1/26/2005
There will be SHPO issues on the east side of the project area.	Amanda Henry	ADNR	Historic & Archaeological Resources		Meeting	2/17/2005
It is critical that the SHPO has a good map of the project.	Judy Bittner	ADNR - SHPO	Historic & Archaeological Resources		Meeting	1/26/2005
DNR SHPO needs information to address many issues including: identification of cultural resources, eligibility for National Registry, and adverse impacts.	Judy Bittner	ADNR - SHPO	Historic & Archaeological Resources		Meeting	1/26/2005
Will section 106 be part of the process?	Judy Bittner	ADNR - SHPO	Historic & Archaeological Resources		Meeting	1/26/2005
The initial Section 106 consultation is needed in writing.	Judy Bittner	ADNR - SHPO	Historic & Archaeological Resources		Meeting	1/26/2005
Road access (Government Hill and Port) will need to be studied this summer.	Judy Bittner	ADNR - SHPO	Historic & Archaeological Resources		Meeting	1/26/2005
Road in Mat-Su Borough was built without archaeological surveys.	Judy Bittner	ADNR - SHPO	Historic & Archaeological Resources		Meeting	1/26/2005
Documents that are sent to the SHPO should be sent by hard copy, not via electronic versions. Follow-up communications can be by email.	Judy Bittner	ADNR - SHPO	Historic & Archaeological Resources		Meeting	1/26/2005
Do not think that the Cherry Hill area was inventoried by Section 106 standards	Judy Bittner	ADNR-SHPO	Historic & Archaeological Resources		Meeting	7/13/2005
The housing at Elmendorf may be a part of the Capehart and Wherry Era (1949-1962) Army Family Housing. If so, it would fall under a nationwide programmatic agreement. The team would have to do a context study and a type study to determine whether the housing falls under that agreement. The structures could be taken down because the nationwide agreement has mitigated adverse effects already. The team should check with the Air Force to see if it has determined whether the housing falls under the agreement.	Judy Bittner	ADNR-SHPO	Historic & Archaeological Resources		Meeting	4/29/2005
SRB&A should review information that has been collected already. There is much existing information from the Elephant Cage (Circularly Arrayed Antenna Display) on Elmendorf Air Force Base south. There may be some "hot spots" such as birch trees, but she wouldn't expect to find much physical evidence. SRB&A should work with the Eklutna Tribe to determine sites.	Judy Bittner	ADNR-SHPO	Historic & Archaeological Resources		Meeting	4/29/2005
For Section 106, SRB&A should look at where the crossing would be constructed and at the road to and from the bridge. Secondary development would not be covered under the Section 106 process; it would need to be covered under the NEPA process.	Judy Bittner	ADNR-SHPO	Historic & Archaeological Resources		Meeting	4/29/2005

Comment	Commenter	Agency	Topic 1	Topic 2	Venue	Date
For Section 106, a ground survey and subsurface sampling would be needed.	Judy Bittner	ADNR-SHPO	Historic & Archaeological Resources		Meeting	4/29/2005
The team should plan a meeting in the Mat-Su Borough with historical societies to present what the team is doing and what is known; to determine sites that might not be listed; and to determine what issues might need to be addressed by the project team and the Borough. The purpose of the meeting would be to educate the historical societies and to gather information on potential sites. Section 106 calls for consultation and outreach on the indirect and cumulative impacts of a project.	Judy Bittner	ADNR-SHPO	Historic & Archaeological Resources		Meeting	4/29/2005
There could be follow-up meetings based on the response. She said that a meeting in Anchorage may need to be held. Groups to invite could include Government Hill Community Council, Anchorage Historical Society, (ARRC), Municipality of Anchorage, Anchorage Historical Properties, Cook Inlet Historical Society, Knik-Wasilla Historical Society, and Palmer Historical Society	Judy Bittner	ADNR-SHPO	Historic & Archaeological Resources		Meeting	4/29/2005
Information collected can be pulled together into booklets with photographs and graphics to give back to the citizens as mitigation.	Stefanie Ludwig	ADNR-SHPO	Historic & Archaeological Resources		Meeting	4/29/2005
The Iditarod Trail is a National Historic Trail under BLM jurisdiction (SHPO involvement).	Rodney Huffman	BLM	Historic & Archaeological Resources		Meeting	1/26/2005
FHWA should ensure that all impacts to cultural and historical resources are considered in an orderly and systematic manner in full consideration of concerned parties.	Christine Reichgott	EPA	Historic & Archaeological Resources		Letter + Attachments	6/16/2005
The locations of historical and archeological sites located within the MSB land and others not yet known could potentially be affected by growth and development that are stimulated by the project. Consultation, impact assessment, and proactive mitigation measures should be developed to protect known and unknown cultural resources from direct and indirect impacts.	Christine Reichgott	EPA	Historic & Archaeological Resources		Letter + Attachments	6/16/2005
NO ROD should be completed until the requirements of Section 106 have been completed. If a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) is required for adverse affects, the ROD should not be issued until the MOA is completed.	Christine Reichgott	EPA	Historic & Archaeological Resources		Letter + Attachments	6/16/2005
Look at the Alaska Railroad Corporation's (ARRC) records for other historic sites that might not be listed in the typical locations.	Judy Bittner	SHPO	Historic & Archaeological Resources		Meeting	4/29/2005
Much has changed in Government Hill so it may not be an historic district. Look at the integrity of the area to determine if it is. There is a mix of houses built at different times on the streets.	Judy Bittner	SHPO	Historic & Archaeological Resources		Meeting	4/29/2005
Military housing that may be impacted by the project may be a part of the Capehart and Wherry Era (1949 to 1962) Army Family Housing. If so, it would fall under a nationwide programmatic agreement. The team would have to do a context study and a type study to determine whether the housing falls under that agreement. The structures could be taken down because the nationwide agreement has mitigated adverse effects already. The team should check with the Air Force to see if it has determined whether the housing falls under the agreement.	Judy Bittner	SHPO	Historic & Archaeological Resources		Meeting	4/29/2005
Review information that has been collected on cultural and historical sites. There is much existing information around the Elephant Cage (Circularly Arrayed Antenna Display) on Elmendorf Air Force Base south. There may be some "hot spots" such as birch trees, but don't expect to find much physical evidence. Work with the Eklutna Tribe to determine sites.	Judy Bittner	SHPO	Historic & Archaeological Resources		Meeting	4/29/2005
For Section 106, look at where the project would be constructed and at the road to and from the proposed bridge. A ground survey and subsurface sampling will be needed.	Judy Bittner	SHPO	Historic & Archaeological Resources		Meeting	4/29/2005

Comment	Commenter	Agency	Topic 1	Topic 2	Venue	Date
Secondary development would not be covered under the Section 106 process; it would need to be covered under the NEPA process.	Judy Bittner	SHPO	Historic & Archaeological Resources		Meeting	4/29/2005
The team should plan a meeting in the Mat-Su Borough with historical societies to present what the team is doing and what is known; to determine sites that might not be listed; and to determine what issues might need to be addressed by the project team and the Borough. The purpose of the meeting would be to educate the historical societies and to gather information on potential sites. There could be follow-up meetings based on the response. Section 106 calls for consultation and outreach on the indirect and cumulative impacts of a project.	Judy Bittner	SHPO	Historic & Archaeological Resources		Meeting	4/29/2005
A meeting regarding impacts to cultural and historical sites in Anchorage and the MSB may need to be held. Groups to invite could include Government Hill Community Council, Anchorage Historical Society, (ARRC), Municipality of Anchorage, Anchorage Historical Properties, Cook Inlet Historical Society, Knik-Wasilla Historical Society, and Palmer Historical Society.	Judy Bittner	SHPO	Historic & Archaeological Resources		Meeting	4/29/2005
Surveying for cultural and historical site that could be impacted by cumulative and/or indirect effects should be done at a reconnaissance level, working with the archaeologist in the SHPO office to identify high probability areas. The first cut could be identification of general development sites and general resource locations. This can begin with discussion with the SHPO Office and with DOT&PF about where to go to do field work in order to test or ground-truth high and low probability areas. This approach would start with development of a method and then involve some surveying to ground-truth the method.	Judy Bittner	SHPO	Historic & Archaeological Resources		Meeting	4/13/2005
In the past, a pile supported bridge was presented. Can this still be considered?	Francis Mann	USFWS	Hydrology & Hydraulics	Alternatives	Agency Scoping Mtg	3/29/2005
Fill in Knik Arm could cause a change in circulation patterns and unnatural deposition in the Arm. The intertidal habitat should not be lost. Marine related projects in Knik Arm should minimize fill in the intertidal areas.	Matt LaCroix	ADNR-OHMP	Hydrology & Hydraulics	Coastal Zone	Telephone	8/13/2004
Knik Arm has significant salmon runs. Filling in the intertidal zone is a fatal flaw.	Matt LaCroix	DNR OHMP	Hydrology & Hydraulics	Coastal Zone	Agency Scoping Mtg	3/29/2005
Sometime breaches work and sometimes they don't. We've been envisioning something wider than a breach. We have over 100 populations of anadromous fish. Blocking the intertidal zone is not an option.	Matt LaCroix	DNR OHMP	Hydrology & Hydraulics	Coastal Zone	Agency Scoping Mtg	3/29/2005
The MOA has concerns about increasing siltation adjacent to the POA and the increasing dredging costs to the Corps of Engineers. The potential for bridge structures upstream of the Port to exacerbate this problem must be thoroughly evaluated in the EIS. This evaluation must include engineering, geologic and economic evaluation potential with increased siltation.	Lance Wilbur, Tom Nelson	MOA	Hydrology & Hydraulics	Environmental Consequences Analysis	Letter	8/12/2005
If there is a causeway it will create slack water on either side which will fill in with sediment. It does not matter whether they use sheet pile or not, because the area will be filled in either way. From a fisheries standpoint it does not make a difference.	Larry Peltz	NOAA Fisheries	Hydrology & Hydraulics	Fisheries	Meeting	4/14/2005
The COE is concerned about this model. We will examine this issue in great detail, all the alternatives along with permitting for the least environmental damage. The COE hydraulic folks will have a better model for this (physical model)	Irvin Joy	COE	Hydrology & Hydraulics	Permits	Agency Scoping Mtg	3/29/2005
Is sedimentation of the Port of Anchorage a concern.	Don Perrin	ADNR	Hydrology & Hydraulics	Port of Anchorage	Meeting	2/17/2005
The bridge could impact tidal flow and sediment transport. We don't know much about it, but we have already seen sediment buildup on the Mat-Su side because of the Port MacKenzie. The dock is causing habitat to be filled in permanently. ADNR-OHMP is interested in the offsite impacts. There needs to be a sediment transport and distribution study.	Matt LaCroix	ADNR-OHMP	Hydrology & Hydraulics	Preliminary Engineering	Meeting	8/26/2004
Are downstream siltation patterns being considered for all bridge designs?	Tom Nelson	MOA	Hydrology & Hydraulics	Preliminary Engineering	Meeting	9/27/2005
Concerns about the potential changes to currents and flow in the Arm related to the Crossing.	Steve Duncan	USEPA	Hydrology & Hydraulics	Preliminary Engineering	Letter	9/15/2004

Comment	Commenter	Agency	Topic 1	Topic 2	Venue	Date
Concerns about the potential changes in sedimentation patterns in the Arm.	Steve Duncan	USEPA	Hydrology & Hydraulics	Preliminary Engineering	Letter	9/15/2004
We are concerned about trends in the math models that have been run on the proposed project suggest that velocities in the reach affected by the proposed intertidal fill will be reduced, resulting in a reduced tidal response in the upstream estuary, including the possible conversion of wetlands to open water. Also, the math models used so far do not adequately address many of the issues including potential changes in flows within the Arm in general, how the system maintains its energy balance between static head and velocity with the adjacent flow fields, and how the bridge and especially the causeways will interact with existing facilities including Port MacKenzie. We therefore recommend that an appropriate 3-D physical model be developed.	Christine B. Reichgott	EPA	Hydrology & Hydraulics	Wetlands	Letter	10/13/2005
The hydrology study needs to be a predictor of change to show causeway and shoreline sedimentation, changes in water velocity and sediment over time and how that will impact fish.	Larry Peltz	NOAA Fisheries	Hydrology & Hydraulics	Wildlife	Agency Scoping Mtg	3/29/2005
Sedimentation will depend on how closely the piles are spaced.	Mel Langdon	ADEC	Hydrology & Hydraulics		Meeting	2/25/2005
ADEC needs to know if dredging is required as maintenance for the bridge.	Mel Langdon	ADEC	Hydrology & Hydraulics		Meeting	2/25/2005
We will want to see ecological connectivity addressed, like the interactions between subsurface and surface hydrology	Elaine Somers	EPA	Hydrology & Hydraulics		Agency Scoping Meeting	4/25/2005
The COE will regulate floodplain management on Base (including preventing erosion).	Jack Puff	MOA Floodplains	Hydrology & Hydraulics		Meeting	2/22/2005
There are currently no floodplain restrictions in Port MacKenzie.	Jack Puff	MOA Floodplains	Hydrology & Hydraulics		Meeting	2/22/2005
Involvement below elevation 19 feet would require filling out a floodplain application. If activity is proposed for area below 19 feet, hydrologists would need to report what they think would happen to the base flood elevation (BFE) based on the project. Jack does not expect a rise in the BFE in floodplains of Knik Arm.	Jack Puff	MOA Floodplains	Hydrology & Hydraulics		Meeting	2/22/2005
Ship Creek is tidal up to the dam (Zone A), but the tidal influence has not been studied.	Jack Puff	MOA Floodplains	Hydrology & Hydraulics		Meeting	2/22/2005
If the project is above the floodplain, there will be no influence on the tide level, thus it would not be regulated.	Jack Puff	MOA Floodplains	Hydrology & Hydraulics		Meeting	2/22/2005
What are the effects of siltation.	Ken Hudson	MSB	Hydrology & Hydraulics		Meeting	2/16/2005
KABATA should talk to the COE about hydrology studies.	Jeanne Hanson	NOAA Fisheries	Hydrology & Hydraulics		Meeting	4/14/2005
Do you have tidal datum for the Arm?	Brad Smith	NOAA Fisheries	Hydrology & Hydraulics		Meeting	4/14/2005
Breaches will not work in Knik Arm.	Brad Smith	NOAA Fisheries	Hydrology & Hydraulics		Meeting	4/14/2005
It seems necessary to pursue three dimensional modeling in Vicksburg to determine the hydrological impacts of the project related to fill and embankments.	Steve Duncan	USEPA	Hydrology & Hydraulics		Meeting	9/15/2004
The USGS has expertise in hydraulic modeling that may be of use in reviewing the draft Environmental Impact Statement.	Leslie Bartels	USGS	Hydrology & Hydraulics		Letter	4/11/2005
It is the MOA's opinion that the Ted Stevens Anchorage International Airport will not be relocated to the MSB.	Lance Wilbur; Jon Spring; Tom Nelson; Craig Lyon	MOA-Traffic Department	Joint Development	Cumulative and Secondary Impacts	Meeting	6/15/2004
Collaboration is needed between the railroad and the POA and Port MacKenzie regarding their expansion plans.	Bruce Carr	ARRC	Joint Development	Land Use	Meeting	1/26/2005
The project should accommodate, and not interfere with, already existing residences and development.	Judy Bittner	ARRC	Joint Development	Land Use	Meeting	1/26/2005

Comment	Commenter	Agency	Topic 1	Topic 2	Venue	Date
The MSB just completed a study of the 800' road rail corridor. The current 200' corridor for the Railroad creates a conflict because it limits expansion.	Bruce Carr	ARRC	Joint Development	Preliminary Engineering	Agency Scoping Mtg	5/11/2005
Said that the bridge will have to be high enough to allow passage of ships. Port MacKenzie has reserved use of Port MacKenzie for cruise ships and hotels. That will likely be popular, as the bus ride into Anchorage would be significantly shorter with the bridge connection than from other ports around Alaska. He said that the Port plan is designated for the future, so they want to accommodate for larger boats maneuvering in the area, and don't want to have to downsize later because of the bridge.	Ken Hudson	MSB	Joint Development		Meeting	2/16/2005
Knik Arm Crossing Project, Port of Anchorage Expansion, and Port MacKenzie improvements should combine resources and share data to provide a more comprehensive picture of dynamics and environmental status	Steve Duncan	USEPA	Joint Development		Letter	9/15/2004
The Port MacKenzie master plan wants the bridge as far north of Port MacKenzie as possible so the controlled access facility does not bisect the MSB port. That leaves greater utilization opportunities for port land.	Murph O'Brien	MSB	Land Use	Coastal Zone	Agency Scoping Mtg	3/29/2005
FHWA is not responsible for land use planning and decisions, but the agency is taking a leadership role for analyzing and disclosing the effects of its proposed project	Christine B. Reichgott	EPA	Land Use	Cumulative and Secondary Impacts	Letter	10/13/2005
Because farmlands are located adjacent to the proposed 14-mile Upper Pt. MacKenzie Road corridor, and because these uplands would likely be deemed suitable for development, the threat to Mat-Su Borough farmlands from induced growth and development would be high.	Christine B. Reichgott	EPA	Land Use	Economic Impacts	Letter	10/13/2005
Widening the ROW would not be an issue on patented lands where BLM owns the mineral state (subsurface), unless the subsurface materials are used as fill materials.	Rodney Huffman	BLM	Land Use	Geology	Meeting	2/18/2005
The defense fuels have already been moved, and the new tanks are close to the Inlet.	Jim Frechione	ADEC	Land Use	Hazardous Waste Sites	Meeting	3/11/2005
KABATA could not develop in the Ship Creek area, there is not enough space. In order to make room, all of the tanks would have to be moved.	Gloria Beckley	ADEC	Land Use	Hazardous Waste Sites	Meeting	3/11/2005
BLM's only concern is if the existing infrastructure needs to be built up, they might need ROW. That would be under military jurisdiction. An exclusive license in perpetuity would be given to the bridge.	Rodney Huffman	BLM	Land Use	Military	Meeting	2/18/2005
No crossing alternative should be implemented until land use planning, zoning and necessary community services are in place. This should be a major component of mitigation for the proposed project.	Christine Reichgott	EPA	Land Use	Mitigation	Letter + Attachments	6/16/2005
There are constraints on space around Ship Creek because the POA and the railroad yard are in tight quarters.	Jim Frechione	ADEC	Land Use	Port of Anchorage	Meeting	3/11/2005
The state owns the tidelands, and DOT&PF owns the roads going to the POA	Rodney Huffman	BLM	Land Use	Port of Anchorage	Meeting	2/18/2005
Were would the project require temporary access onto State lands. KABATA needs to tell DNR where temporary access would be needed versus where the project would need an easement.	Marcie Menefee	ADNR	Land Use	Preliminary Engineering	Meeting	2/17/2005
I was called on the telephone survey and all the questions seemed to focus on the residential development on MSB, and the bridge opening up for commuting.	Judy Bittner	DNR SHPO	Land Use	Purpose and Need	Agency Scoping Mtg	3/29/2005
Growth is occurring now. Most developers are building on smaller lots with community water supplies.	Murph O'Brien	MSB	Land Use	Water Quality	Agency Scoping Meeting	4/25/2005
Why will the project follow the shoreline?	Jim Frechione	ADEC	Land Use		Meeting	3/11/2005
There are buried pipes associated with the tank farms.	Jim Frechione	ADEC	Land Use		Meeting	3/11/2005
The MSB owns the tidelands on the MSB side.	Matt LaCroix	ADNR	Land Use		Meeting	2/17/2005
Another concern is the Cherry Hill Property. J.L. Properties just signed a new 25 year lease.	Bobby Stone	ALCOM	Land Use		Agency Scoping Mtg	3/29/2005
The project must coordinate with ARRC regarding project impacts on ARRC's leased parcels in Government Hill and its 600-acre Anchorage Terminal Reserve in the Ship Creek area	Bruce Carr	ARRC	Land Use		Letter	5/12/2005

Comment	Commenter	Agency	Topic 1	Topic 2	Venue	Date
BLM is the manager for the Iditarod Trail, but if development is on private lands, they will not have a say.	Rodney Huffman	BLM	Land Use		Meeting	2/18/2005
Will there be any temporary use areas on the MSB side?	Rodney Huffman	BLM	Land Use		Meeting	2/18/2005
BLM probably does not own any land over by Point MacKenzie.	Natalie Cooper and Rodney Huffman	BLM	Land Use		Meeting	2/18/2005
BLM will look over the entire project area, and determine where they would be involved. They will determine land status in the scoping area for the scoping meeting.	Natalie Cooper	BLM	Land Use		Meeting	2/18/2005
If the ROW corridor was widened, BLM would like to use the bridge's EIS.	Rodney Huffman	BLM	Land Use		Meeting	2/18/2005
BLM completes their own NEPA documentation before issuing ROWs. This would only affect the bridge approaches, DOT&PF would issue ROWs on the connector roads.	Rodney Huffman	BLM	Land Use		Meeting	2/18/2005
I think there are consequences of the loss of farmland even though the farmlands are not prime and unique. The distance of sources of fresh produce should be addressed.	Elaine Somers	EPA	Land Use		Meeting	9/27/2005
Could the bridge go over to Fire Island, then continue on to Port MacKenzie?	Jack Puff	MOA Floodplains	Land Use		Meeting	2/22/2005
Regional planning programs include the Mat-Su Borough. The MOA will likely have similar Land Use and ACMP issues.	Thede Tobish	MOA Planning Dept	Land Use		Meeting	1/26/2005
The MSB is interested in the results of the land use and transportation implementation plan relative to land use requirements and infrastructure needs relative to the MSB side.	Murph O'Brien	MSB	Land Use		letter	5/12/2005
We are interested in where and how the crossing will intersect the Port District. The Transportation system on the Mat-Su side is limited, so we want to see the concepts.	Murph O'Brien	MSB	Land Use		Agency Scoping Meeting	4/25/2005
Do you need a recreational plan for DOT? We would discourage a boat launch in the area.	Brad Smith	NOAA Fisheries	Land Use		Agency Scoping Mtg	3/29/2005
The National Park Service has the Rivers and Trails Program which may be impacted.	Phil Brna	USFWS	Land Use		Meeting	1/26/2005
USCG needs data to make decisions on clearance stipulations, design and construction considerations.	Jim Helfinstine	USCG	Marine Transportation	Preliminary Engineering	Meeting	6/3/2004
The project team is saying that the ferry is being taken as the "No Build Alternative." The bridge needs to be self supporting. The MSB has concerns about how the project team is presenting the ferry. There is a different P&N for the ferry, so be sensitive to the fact that the ferry is an existing project. To say that something that has to be subsidized is unreasonable is contradictory to everything in Alaska.	Murph O'Brien	MSB	Marine Transportation	Purpose and Need	Agency Scoping Mtg	5/11/2005
Did you assume that passenger cars could use the ferry?	Marcie Menefee	ADNR	Marine Transportation	Traffic	Agency Scoping Mtg	5/11/2005
How will the bridge effect navigation?	Jim Frechione	ADEC	Marine Transportation		Meeting	3/11/2005
We see the ferry as the initial phase of the Knik Arm Crossing. We don't see the ferry going away after the bridge is put in place.	Murph O'Brien	MSB	Marine Transportation		Agency Scoping Mtg	5/11/2005
The tribes would be interested in future information about navigation through the Arm. NOAA Fisheries has worked with the tribes on the their conservation plan, and they want to keep boats out of upper Knik Arm. KABATA is doing the right thing by talking to tribes.	Brad Smith	NOAA Fisheries	Marine Transportation		Meeting	4/14/2005
The USCG will provide information on navigation issues.	Jim Helfinstine	USCG	Marine Transportation		Meeting	1/26/2005
Navigation issues, limited mainly to barges should be considered. (However, EPA follows Coast Guard's directives.)	Steve Duncan	USEPA	Marine Transportation		Meeting	9/15/2004
Which one of the (bridge) designs falls out of reasonable design based on military concerns?	Don Perrin	ADNR	Military	Alternatives	Agency Scoping Mtg	5/11/2005
Alaskan Command's participation will be to protect the viability of the military bases.	Steve Ribuffo	Alaskan Command	Military	Alternatives	Meeting	1/26/2005
We would like to see more details regarding the military alternatives being deemed unreasonable because of a national security issue.	Tom Nelson	MOA	Military	Alternatives	Meeting	9/27/2005
Can the military get rid of the elephant cage?	Don Perrin	ADNR	Military	Land Use	Meeting	2/17/2005

Comment	Commenter	Agency	Topic 1	Topic 2	Venue	Date
Several projects affect Fort Richardson and Elmendorf. Encroachment is always an issue for the military as needs for industrial facilities such as power plants surface. If this project helps relieve some of that pressure, it could be a good thing.	Rodney Huffman	BLM	Military	Land Use	Agency Scoping Mtg	3/29/2005
BLM is responsible for issuing right-of-way (ROW) on military lands (EAFB), and BLM will grant access based on the military's will.	Rodney Huffman	BLM	Military	Land Use	Meeting	2/18/2005
On some military lands BLM issues rights-of-way.	Rodney Huffman	BLM	Military	Land Use	Meeting	1/26/2005
How about access from the north around six mile creek area? There would be a lot less environmental impact that way. There is also a railroad corridor in this area.	Irvin Joy	COE	Military	Land Use	Agency Scoping Mtg	3/29/2005
Elmendorf is a munitions storage site.	Greg Schmidt	Elmendorf AFB	Military	Land Use	Meeting	1/26/2005
Electromagnetic levels should be added to the resource components.	Greg Schmidt	3CES/CEVP-EAFB	Military	Noise	Agency Scoping Meeting	4/25/2005
The confluence of military and general aviation can affect residential areas with significant noise.	Greg Schmidt	3CES/CEVP-EAFB	Military	Noise	Agency Scoping Mtg	3/29/2005
There are many activities occurring on Base. We need to know, geographically, where bridge components are planned. We need an integration of where things will come on and go off Base.	Greg Schmidt	USAF, Elmendorf	Military	Preliminary Engineering	Meeting	1/26/2005
The northern most bridge alignment appears to coincide with Elmendorf east west runway. It could be mistaken for a runway and this is a serious concern.			Military	Preliminary Engineering	Meeting	9/27/2005
The military is planning for direct access from Fort Richardson and Elmendorf to the POA for deployment of the Stryker Brigade. This access project fits into POA expansion plans. \$2 million has been requested for an EIS study. The Knik Arm Crossing must be integrated into this military access project, although the bridge will play no role in deployment.	Allan Lucht	US Army	Military	Purpose and Need	Meeting	1/26/2005
You don't want to create a perching and feeding area for birds on the bridge. A bridge could create a "bird strike" hazard for military aircraft.	Greg Schmidt	3CES/CEVP-EAFB	Military	Wildlife	Agency Scoping Mtg	3/29/2005
Would a security restrictive corridor block wildlife movement?	Phil Brna	USFWS	Military	Wildlife	Agency Scoping Mtg	5/11/2005
There is also munitions storage and a landfill with a 3 mile area of concern.	Greg Schmidt	3CES/CEVP-EAFB	Military		Agency Scoping Mtg	3/29/2005
At this point it is hard to tell if base closures are planned. The closure plan will come out in six months.	Steve Ribuffo	Alaskan Command	Military		Meeting	1/26/2005
The military access Stryker road is going in right through that area.	Bobby Stone	ALCOM	Military		Agency Scoping Mtg	3/29/2005
An ammo storage area is not on map. Also, the north Merrill Field's flight path needs to be added. Fort Rich flight path would be affected by a north route.	Bobby Stone	ALCOM	Military		Agency Scoping Mtg	3/29/2005
BLM works closely with Allen Richman's group.	Rodney Huffman	BLM	Military		Meeting	2/18/2005
The 62,000 acre base is already bisected by the Glenn Highway so it restricts access to training areas and the air corridor.	Kevin Gardner	Fort Richardson	Military		Agency Scoping Mtg	3/29/2005
Military lands are not within the MOA jurisdiction.	Jack Puff	MOA Floodplains	Military		Meeting	2/22/2005
The Alaska Command is involved in supporting war effort needs such as munitions and fuel storage and movement.	Greg Schmidt	USAF, Elmendorf	Military		Meeting	1/26/2005
Identify effects to natural resources, cultural, archaeological, Section 106, noise, and wetlands, and mitigation measures need to be developed.	Greg Schmidt	USAF, Elmendorf	Military		Meeting	1/26/2005
A potential means to mitigate for the proposed project's secondary and cumulative effects would be to analyze alternative future land use/build out scenarios using high, medium, and low or no Smart Growth and Low Impact Development controls. The environmental, economic (such as for infrastructure development of compact vs. dispersed development), and social costs of the modeled scenarios could be calculated and proactively conveyed via outreach to the public, local land use planners, and elected officials. With knowledge of the costs and consequences of these alternative future land use decisions, the public and decision makers could then select the type of future they wish to promote or create.	Christine B. Reichgott	EPA	Mitigation	Cumulative and Secondary Impacts	Letter	10/13/2005
There are areas we would like to be unattractive to birds for flight safety.	Steve Ribuffo	Alaskan Command	Mitigation	Wildlife	Agency Scoping Mtg	4/25/2005

Comment	Commenter	Agency	Topic 1	Topic 2	Venue	Date
The EIS should describe the types, location, and estimated effectiveness of Best Management Practices applied to minimize and mitigate impacts to aquatic resources for any project impacts that can not be avoided through siting and design.	Christine Reichgott	EPA	Mitigation		Letter + Attachments	6/16/2005
Disturbed areas should be revegetated using native species and ongoing maintenance should be conducted to prevent the establishment of invasive species in areas disturbed by project activities, in compliance with E.O. 13112.	Christine Reichgott	EPA	Mitigation		Letter + Attachments	6/16/2005
Does the \$400-\$600 million constraint (for the project) include environmental mitigation? The cost of mitigation won't be known until the resources agencies have talked about the impacts.	Elaine Somers	EPA	Mitigation		Agency Scoping Mtg	5/11/2005
On the MSB side, land use and public infrastructure impacts and mitigation measures need to be identified. A strategy for addressing and funding mitigation measures initially and over the next 20 years is needed.	Murph O'Brien	MSB	Mitigation		letter	5/17/2005
Noise would be an issue for Cherry Hill residential areas with red and orange routes.	Greg Schmidt	3CES/CEVP-EAFB	Noise	Alternatives	Agency Scoping Mtg	3/29/2005
There is a fill vs. piling issue because it consolidates noise which can be harmful to belugas.	Brad Smith	NOAA Fisheries	Noise	Beluga	Agency Scoping Mtg	3/29/2005
Really look at the advantages of reducing noise both from construction and over the long term.	Brad Smith	NOAA Fisheries	Noise	Environmental Consequences Analysis	Meeting	8/19/2005
There may be an issue of noise in the Mat-Su with low flying jets.	Greg Schmidt	3CES/CEVP-EAFB	Noise		Meeting	9/27/2005
Could you add recreational and commercial development and their noise levels to the list of resource components?	Steve Ribuffo	Alaskan Command	Noise		Agency Scoping Meeting	4/25/2005
The air quality division of ADEC would require a permit for stationary source (generators or the like) emission – emissions that are calculated at 100 tons per year or greater would require a permit. Permits would be necessary if a rock crusher or asphalt plant is used on the project. A plan must be submitted to the ADEC for dust control during construction.	Cynthia Espinoza	ADEC-Div of Air Quality	Permits	Air Quality	Telephone	8/13/2004
Project alignment is a big deal for her job. Issuing a Best Interest Finding for granting the Right-of-way on State owned land requires a precise line. They won't start the best interest finding process until they know the final alternative. They can begin a Best Interest Finding for a larger corridor and grant a ROW within that corridor once the alignment is determined.	Marcie Menefee	ADNR	Permits	Alternatives	Meeting	2/17/2005
Asked if there will be permit applications for all alternatives.	Mark Somerville	ADNR	Permits	Alternatives	Meeting	2/17/2005
The coastal zone review would be conducted by the FHWA if the FHWA is the applicant. They would make the determination for the state if it is consistent with state and district policies. The OPMP would then be sent the completed review for concurrence. If the KABATA/DOT is the applicant the OPMP would conduct the review. There is a 50-day public comment period. With staffing problems reviews are currently running 90 days behind. Federal projects get assigned faster, but not necessarily processed faster. No comment on timelines. ADNR-OPMP will coordinate with MOA and Mat-Su for district policies. The regulations are currently being re-written and there is no way of knowing what will be required of the state after the regs change.	Cynthia Zuelow	ADNR-OPMP	Permits	Coastal Zone	Telephone	8/12/2004
The MOA would consult with the OPMP and review the Coastal Project Questionnaire and make comments on the project through the Coastal Zone Consistency Review Process. No wetlands permits would be issued through the MOA.	Thede Tobish	MOA-Coastal Zone Management	Permits	Coastal Zone	Telephone	8/12/2004
The coastal zone consistency review is concurrent with the ACMP process. No wetlands management program in place at this time, but would coordinate with the USACE on the 404 Permit. Project would require a Port District Use Permit, and must be consistent with the Areas Meriting Special Attention (AMSA) plan or the AMSA must be amended.	Ken Hudson	MSB	Permits	Coastal Zone	Telephone	8/11/2004
ADEC contaminated sites will not be doing any permitting for the project.	Jim Frechione	ADEC	Permits	Hazardous Waste Sites	Meeting	3/11/2005
The SHPO has 30 days to review and respond to Section 106 conclusions. They can either concur with the findings or reject them. If historic properties are found during the survey, then it needs to be determined if the property is eligible for the National Historic Register.	Stefanie Ludwig	ADNR - SHPO	Permits	Historic & Archaeological Resources	Telephone	8/3/2004

Comment	Commenter	Agency	Topic 1	Topic 2	Venue	Date
Commented that there are no 4(f) lands in the north project area, but are some down by Anchorage. There may be Section 106 issues as well.	Glen Yankus	NPS	Permits	Historic & Archaeological Resources	Meeting	2/15/2005
The area below bluff is tidally influenced. The project would require a floodplain permit for construction in elevations below 20 feet mean sea level. MOA responsibility stops at Elmendorf Air Force Base. Floodplain permits would be coordinated with USACE 404 permit.	Jack Puff	MOA-Watershed Management/Floodplains	Permits	Hydrology & Hydraulics	Telephone	8/12/2004
Matanuska-Susitna Borough (MSB) Code 17.29 requires a Flood Plain Development Permit. At this time, the project area is not within the Borough managed designated flood hazard district; therefore, no permit would be required. However, this could change in the future. The Borough at any time may obviate its responsibility to the State of Alaska, and not require the project to obtain any Borough permits.	Ken Hudson	MSB	Permits	Hydrology & Hydraulics	Telephone	8/11/2004
The project would need a land use permit for temporary use of state land if using for staging areas. The project would need a right-of-way permit for crossing a state tideland. The project would not need a tideland use or lease. The project would need a temporary water use permit if using surface or groundwater. Talk to Kelly Westphall / Water Section regarding specifics on water use permit 269-8646. For specific questions regarding ROW contact Marcee Menefee 269-8563.	Dave Kelly	ADNR- Division of Mining Land & Water	Permits	Land Use	Telephone	8/13/2004
If the road will cross Borough land, the usual process with DOT&PF is: (1) DOT decides on the ROW that they need and have it surveyed and appraised; (2) DOT&PF present an application or a detailed letter to the MSB requesting to buy the land for the appraised value. No platting requirements exist. The request is processed within 2 months.	Steve Cypra	MSB	Permits	Land Use	Telephone	8/12/2004
Dedicated public easement will be required between the tidelands and existing right-of-way to Port MacKenzie Road. Platting division (short plat approval, Title 16) to change the property lines and dedicate a public right-of-way would be needed. Construction Within Public Easement and Rights-of-way Permits would be required for project construction. The project should voluntarily submit of the Acknowledgement of Existing Land Use Regulations (MSB 17.01) for any construction project.	Ken Hudson	MSB	Permits	Land Use	Telephone	8/11/2004
NPS is responsible for 4(f) issues; FHWA writes the 4(f) evaluation, NPS comments on it with input from its sister organizations.	Glen Yankus	NPS	Permits	Land Use	Meeting	2/15/2005
One document can be used for FHWA NEPA compliance and the USCG process. USCG is the expert agency for navigation issues and homeland security.	Jim Helfinstine	USCG	Permits	Marine Transportation	Meeting	1/26/2005
If the project is out of the POA area, BLM would be required to issue some permits. The slope area (80-102) is an executive order area; BLM would likely issue ROW with the Military's "non objection" letter.	Rodney Huffman	BLM	Permits	Military	Meeting	2/18/2005
Permit applications will have to include potential material sources, all of the project impacts, temporary construction impacts, and a staging area. All information is better early than late.	Cynthia Zuelow-Osborne	ADNR	Permits	Preliminary Engineering	Meeting	2/17/2005
Is the project considering design build? It would be difficult to permit based on design build, because that is a conceptual project. KABATA has high expectations for the state to determine impacts when they are listed generally in the NEPA document.	Matt LaCroix	ADNR	Permits	Preliminary Engineering	Meeting	2/17/2005
Asked if the permit application will include location and design.	Mark Somerville	ADNR	Permits	Preliminary Engineering	Meeting	2/17/2005
DNR can merge state permitting with the NEPA process. DNR will develop and discuss a state process timeline/schedule and meet with Dale Paulson.	Don Perrin	ADNR-OPMP	Permits	Project Timeline	Meeting	1/26/2005
The required Coast Guard bridge permit process was not factored into the proposed EIS schedule. The USCG permit procedure can only take place after the USCG receives a completed application.	J.N. Helfinstine	USCG	Permits	Project Timeline	Letter + Attachments	2/2/2005
We appreciate your sharing of information ahead of time, and showing every agency the all of the permits	Cynthia Zuelow-Osborne	ADNR	Permits	Public and Agency Involvement	Meeting	2/17/2005

Comment	Commenter	Agency	Topic 1	Topic 2	Venue	Date
Commented that six months for permitting (between draft and final document) is a very tough schedule.	Marcie Menefee	ADNR	Permits	Public and Agency Involvement	Meeting	2/17/2005
Since there are a number of large EISs occurring on the state we may be able to get additional funding for understaffed agencies like the USCG by going to the congressional delegation. (The ARRC has a \$500 million project with the Ft. Greeley extension.)	Bruce Carr	ARRC	Permits	Public and Agency Involvement	Meeting	1/26/2005
Conditional Use permit for removal or fill from Elmendorf Property (zoned T-Transition) or State Property trigger is 50,000 cubic yards. For activities below bluff it is likely USACE responsibility. MOA usually doesn't do ROW permits for that. For time frames on permitting process call Ron Thompson. No other permits required from her department, but check with Thede Tobish for Wetlands and Jack Puff for Floodplains	Angela Chambers	MOA-Planning Department	Permits	Public and Agency Involvement	Telephone	8/12/2004
The MSB will give permits priority and not hold up process. Turnaround time estimated between 30 and 45 days.	Ken Hudson	MSB-Coastal Zone Management	Permits	Public and Agency Involvement	Telephone	8/11/2004
The USCG will be permitting for the "overall project". The process must be legally defensible.	Jim Helfinstine	USCG	Permits	Public and Agency Involvement	Meeting	1/26/2005
Permit applications and correspondence needs to be routed through Helfinstine's office	Jim Helfinstine	USCG	Permits	Public and Agency Involvement	Meeting	6/3/2004
If no ESA-listed species occur in the project area, then an informal consultation would be appropriate. If there are listed species (not including Bald Eagles, that do not fall under Section 7 Consultation), a formal consultation is required. Timeframes were discussed. Consultation would occur during the NEPA process. For this project consultation handled by Greg Baloug 907-271-2778.	Mary Lynn Nation	USFWS-Endangered Species	Permits	Threatened and Endangered Species	Telephone	8/13/2004
Storm water permits are issued by EPA and enforced by ADEC.	Mel Langdon	ADEC	Permits	Water Quality	Meeting	2/25/2005
The bridge will need a storm water system. The COE permit is issued first, then ADEC will do a plan review, which might take a long time.	Mel Langdon	ADEC	Permits	Water Quality	Meeting	2/25/2005
The 30-day public notice period runs concurrent with the USACE permit public notice process. Theoretically, if no negative comments, then the certification could be issued shortly after the public notice period expires. However, realistically, the 401 Certification would not be issued until the completion of the ACMP review process. Their comment period is 50-days. At best, there would be a 60 day turnaround.	Tim Rumpfelt	ADEC-Div of Water Quality	Permits	Water Quality	Telephone	8/12/2004
Will existing NPDES permits above the bridge structure change with the construction of the bridge?	Mel Langdon	ADEC	Permits		Meeting	2/25/2005
Phasing and early entry authorization for construction will be needed. This is not an easement for Knik Arm, but the Anchorage side has an easement.	Marcie Menefee	ADNR	Permits		Meeting	2/17/2005
Permits thorough submerged lands could take more than six months.	Amanda Henry	ADNR	Permits		Meeting	2/17/2005
Most projects requiring permits perform NEPA then ask for Corps permits	Don Perrin	ADNR	Permits		Meeting	2/17/2005
Did not know what permits would be needed from DNR. It depends on where the bridge hits the shore and whether streams would be impacted.	Mark Somerville	ADNR	Permits		Meeting	2/15/2005
The project would need a temporary water use permit if using surface or groundwater in a significant amount (>500 gallons a day).	Mike Walton	ADNR- Division of Mining Land & Water	Permits		Telephone	8/16/2004
The Office of Habitat Management and Permitting does not have regulatory control of this project.	Mark Somerville	ADNR-OHMP	Permits		Meeting	1/26/2005
The Office of Habitat Management and Permitting will review and comment for the coastal management process.	Mark Somerville	ADNR-OHMP	Permits		Meeting	1/26/2005
The Alaska Coastal Management Program (ACMP) reviews coordination for the State, except for ADEC. There is a different review for state and federal applicants. OPMP's goal is to start a state review during the DEIS and to have permits at the FEIS.	Amanda Henry	ADNR-OPMP	Permits		Meeting	1/26/2005

Comment	Commenter	Agency	Topic 1	Topic 2	Venue	Date
DNR is still determining whether the Large Project Model or the standard ACMP review will be used.	Don Perrin	ADNR-OPMP	Permits		Meeting	1/26/2005
BLM has new ROW regulations coming out next week.	Rodney Huffman	BLM	Permits		Meeting	2/18/2005
In order to issue a "letter of non objection" (which is needed in order to grant permits), BLM must go through an internal NEPA process.	Rodney Huffman	BLM	Permits		Meeting	2/18/2005
BLM must become a cooperating agency (to FHWA) in order to issue permits.	Rodney Huffman	BLM	Permits		Meeting	2/18/2005
Ordinarily stormwater treatment permit and plan handled by public works department and roads must meet municipal specifications. However, because the project is publicly funded, MOA would not have review authority. However, the SWPPP must be prepared in adherence to EPA guidelines, and project review would go through the ADEC Greg Drezwiecki 269-7692.	Greg Soule	MOA-Stormwater	Permits		Telephone	8/16/2004
A MOA Right-of Way permit would be required for municipal ROWs. If state ROW is used, then the MOA would review. A traffic impact analysis would be needed to address safety and circulation. The Port of Anchorage area has mostly private ROWs. It could take approximately 60 days for a ROW permit, if MOA involved early in the scoping process. The MOA Traffic department review plans for traffic flow and any development on public lands (ROW).	Mada Angell	MOA-Traffic Department	Permits		Telephone	8/13/2004
Said that his position is Chief of Code Compliance and he is in charge of floodplains. For permitting, KABATA should look at anything that needs specific permits in the Port MacKenzie Special Land Use District.	Ken Hudson	MSB	Permits		Meeting	2/16/2005
There would probably not be many 6(f) issues (Ship Creek public boat launch? Public/private?)	Glen Yankus	NPS	Permits		Meeting	2/15/2005
Trails on the side of roads could be 4(f), and the project team can talk directly to the MOA but official 4(f) interests are funneled through the NPS.		NPS	Permits		Meeting	2/15/2005
Attached to 2-22-05 USCG letter: 1.) US Coast Guard/FHWA Memorandum of Understanding on Coordinating the Preparation and Processing of Environmental Documents; 2.) Procedures for Projects which Require a Coast Guard Bridge Permit	J.N. Helfinstine	USCG	Permits		Letter + Attachments	2/2/2005
The USCG permitting time frame will wait until the end of the NEPA process. USCG and COE could issue dual public notices.	Jim Helfinstine	USCG	Permits		Meeting	1/26/2005
A recent project provided an Interagency Permit Binder that was very helpful. It included agency contact numbers and all permit applications.	Jim Helfinstine	USCG	Permits		Meeting	1/26/2005
Multiple designs can be applied for at the same time.	Jim Helfinstine	USCG	Permits		Meeting	1/26/2005
The permit will be for the approach and the bridge, lighting, and navigation safety. The COE had permit for Section 404 fills on the bridge approach. The bridge approach is not the USCG's responsibility. MOU in place for USCG to coordinate with the COE.	Jim Helfinstine	USCG	Permits		Meeting	1/26/2005
Impacts to the Port of Anchorage and Government Hill need to be clearly stated in the EIS documentation.	Lance Wilbur, Tom Nelson	MOA	Port of Anchorage	Environmental Consequences Analysis	Letter	8/12/2005
The Port road and Ship Creek area are within floodplains (Zone A).	Jack Puff	MOA Floodplains	Port of Anchorage	Hydrology & Hydraulics	Meeting	9/27/2005
MOA is concerned about fill affecting sedimentation at the POA.	Jack Puff	MOA Floodplains	Port of Anchorage	Hydrology & Hydraulics	Meeting	2/22/2005
The POA expansion is also a big project a lot of us (agency people) are working on. We are looking for opportunities to combine expansion with the Port.	Phil Brna	USFWS	Port of Anchorage	Joint Development	Agency Scoping Mtg	5/11/2005
The railroad has not conceded that you can follow the corridor in the "floating easement" along the tidelands. The Port asserts that you do not have a right to travel the length of the easement, but rather you can cross it.	Kevin Bruce	POA	Port of Anchorage	Land Use	Agency Scoping Mtg	3/29/2005
Has the military given formal notification to stay off military land? Why is it all cross hatched?	Kevin Bruce	POA	Port of Anchorage	Military	Agency Scoping Mtg	3/29/2005
Why do the two ports need to be connected?	Elaine Somers	EPA	Port of Anchorage	Purpose and Need	Agency Scoping Mtg	5/11/2005

Comment	Commenter	Agency	Topic 1	Topic 2	Venue	Date
Short term connectivity is not very important to the POA. Industrial connection to the interior is important. We see less importance in port to port connection; more strengthening of the transportation network to facilitate industrial opportunity because of land availability on Mat-Su side.	Kevin Bruce	POA	Port of Anchorage	Purpose and Need	Agency Scoping Mtg	3/29/2005
From discussions with the POA, there is already an environmental assessment out there so the alignment with POA needs to be coming into focus.	Greg Schmidt	3CES/CEVP-EAFB	Port of Anchorage		Agency Scoping Mtg	3/29/2005
Are you looking at air space use?	Greg Schmidt	3CES/CEVP-EAFB	Port of Anchorage		Agency Scoping Mtg	3/29/2005
The Alaska Railroad area is larger than the POA. About 80-90% of the goods coming into the state are distributed through the port. There is not an efficient distribution system now.	Bruce Carr	ARRC	Port of Anchorage		Agency Scoping Mtg	5/11/2005
The area south of Cairn Point will be filled this summer (by the POA).	Larry Peltz	NOAA Fisheries	Port of Anchorage		Meeting	4/14/2005
The Port of Anchorage (POA) is a secure facility and the tidelands on the Anchorage side are owned by the POA.	Kevin Bruce	POA	Port of Anchorage		Meeting	1/26/2005
The Port Expansion Project environmental assessment should be out by the end of January 2005.	Kevin Bruce	POA	Port of Anchorage		Meeting	1/26/2005
Matt said that he has seen a few preliminary designs, but that the impacts of the projects would depend on the design of the project. This would include project location, construction strategy, as well as long term impacts.	Matt LaCroix	ADNR-OHMP	Preliminary Engineering	Alternatives	Telephone	8/12/2004
The model you have displayed in the back of the room goes through the new railroad operations center.	Barb Hotchkin	ARRC	Preliminary Engineering	Alternatives	Meeting	9/27/2005
It looks like the Southern Alignment needs more piling than the perpendicular or the skewed alignment.	Brian Lance	NMFS	Preliminary Engineering	Alternatives	Meeting	9/27/2005
If you put a commuter rail system it would encourage "smart growth."	Elaine Somers	EPA	Preliminary Engineering	Cumulative and Secondary Impacts	Meeting	9/27/2005
Concerned that the deep water trench will grow if the channel is narrowed with fill.	Mark Sommerville	ADNR	Preliminary Engineering	Environmental Consequences Analysis	Meeting	8/19/2005
Would this design help reduce scour?	Skip Joy	COE	Preliminary Engineering	Environmental Consequences Analysis	Meeting	8/26/2005
COE initially is leaning toward the 2:1 roadway sideslope as long as it doesn't create high velocities. Skip Joy doesn't see that happening here.	Skip Joy	COE	Preliminary Engineering	Environmental Consequences Analysis	Meeting	8/26/2005
EPA agrees with COE regarding dropping the spur dike option.	Heather Dean	EPA	Preliminary Engineering	Environmental Consequences Analysis	Meeting	8/26/2005
The Southern Alignment is a better option because the deeper the water, the sooner a structure (bridge) is needed, so the less fill is used.	Howard Holtan	MOA	Preliminary Engineering	Environmental Consequences Analysis	Meeting	9/27/2005
Concerning siltation along bridge approaches: We would like to see numbers.	Larry Peltz	NOAA Fisheries	Preliminary Engineering	Environmental Consequences Analysis	Meeting	8/19/2005
Concerned about the fill approach versus the piling. Is it based the composition of the bottom material.	Brad Smith	NOAA Fisheries	Preliminary Engineering	Environmental Consequences Analysis	Meeting	8/19/2005
Either the perpendicular or the skewed bridge alignment may not make a big difference in siltation.	Phil Brna	USFWS	Preliminary Engineering	Environmental Consequences Analysis	Meeting	8/19/2005

Comment	Commenter	Agency	Topic 1	Topic 2	Venue	Date
EPA recommends deferring to the agencies concerned with fisheries on determining the best design.	Heather Dean	EPA	Preliminary Engineering	Fisheries	Meeting	8/26/2005
Decisions on the embankments and abutments should be based on fisheries and beluga whales.	Heather Dean	EPS	Preliminary Engineering	Fisheries	Meeting	8/26/2005
There is a big argument with the POA over fill versus pilings. The POA claims that the added cost of pilings is millions of dollars. Doing a project without fill adds an additional 20-30% to a project.	Larry Peltz	NOAA Fisheries	Preliminary Engineering	Hydrology & Hydraulics	Meeting	4/14/2005
The Joint Pipeline Office and oil companies will tell you fill is not forever due to hydrology and ice flows. There are concerns regarding the type of fill and rip rap used. If the rip rap shifts, it can cause structural integrity issues.	Jim Helfinstine	USCG	Preliminary Engineering	Hydrology & Hydraulics	Agency Scoping Meeting	4/25/2005
We recognize the dilemma posed by pile driving and placements vs. fill. We believe that further study, information sharing, interagency discussions, and consultations with subject experts are needed to arrive at a prudent approach with respect to these bridge construction issues.	Christine B. Reichgott	EPA	Preliminary Engineering	Public and Agency Involvement	Letter	10/13/2005
The MOA will likely review and interpret the bridge design.	Theodore Tobish	MOA Planning Dept	Preliminary Engineering	Public and Agency Involvement	Meeting	1/26/2005
Right now the limit to a rail crossing of Knik Arm is expense and funding.	Bruce Carr	ARRC	Preliminary Engineering	Purpose and Need	Meeting	1/26/2005
Interested in stormwater runoff. Will the runoff be drained into the inlet or piped to shore	Mark Sommerville	ADNR	Preliminary Engineering	Water Quality	Meeting	8/22/2005
Preliminary information indicates that pile driving and placements may be environmentally preferable to fill. We recommend that the short and long term impacts of both pile driving and intertidal fill be analyzed, including the full evaluation of the potential impacts on the upstream aquatic resources, system dynamics, and aquatic biota	Christine B. Reichgott	EPA	Preliminary Engineering	Water Quality	Letter	10/13/2005
Does deicing and snow removal factor into the bridge design?	Brad Smith	NOAA Fisheries	Preliminary Engineering	Water Quality	Meeting	8/19/2005
Have the volumes and fill sources for the material sites been identified?	Mel Langdon	ADEC	Preliminary Engineering		Meeting	2/25/2005
Because of impacts to the rail yard in Anchorage, and plans for a rail extension to Port MacKenzie, the ARRC is concerned with the approach (either ends) of the bridge, more than the bridge itself.	Bruce Carr	ARRC	Preliminary Engineering		Meeting	1/26/2005
BLM needs the as-built design following construction.	Rodney Huffman	BLM	Preliminary Engineering		Meeting	2/18/2005
How will the bridge be constructed?	Rodney Huffman	BLM	Preliminary Engineering		Meeting	2/18/2005
What kind of construction area would be needed for the project?	Rodney Huffman	BLM	Preliminary Engineering		Meeting	2/18/2005
COE is interested in the longest possible bridge.	Skip Joy	COE	Preliminary Engineering		Meeting	8/26/2005
Why not look at the option of freight and commuter rail bridge crossing? It would encourage concentrated growth.	Elaine Somers	EPA	Preliminary Engineering		Meeting	9/27/2005
Concerns about the adequacy of engineering data for design, including the physical environment of Knik Arm.	Steve Duncan	USEPA	Preliminary Engineering		Letter	9/15/2004
Due to workload 18 months is an unrealistic timeline for completing this EIS. The EIS timeline should reflect minimum time frames for each step. The project must follow a "critical path" and then other things can go on simultaneously.	Jim Helfinstine	USCG	Project Timeline	Public and Agency Involvement	Meeting	1/26/2005
Based on one on one meetings, have you changed your process or schedule?	Don Perrin	DNR OPMP	Project Timeline		Agency Scoping Mtg	3/29/2005

Comment	Commenter	Agency	Topic 1	Topic 2	Venue	Date
USFWS is interested in their "trust resources," which include migratory birds, bald eagles, anadromous fish, endangered species, and wetlands. Also, they are interested in waterfowl and shorebirds in the area. USFWS would be especially interested in the cumulative impacts of the project.	Phil Brna	USFWS- Ecological Services	Public and Agency Involvement	Cumulative and Secondary Impacts	Telephone	7/28/2004
Concerns about coordination with the Mat-Su Borough with regards to potential impacts on growth and development patterns there.	Steve Duncan	USEPA	Public and Agency Involvement	Joint Development	Letter	9/15/2004
The Regional Transportation Planning Organization (RTPO) would be interested in discussing the Project.	David Post, AICP	ADOT&PF	Public and Agency Involvement	Land Use	Meeting	6/14/2004
On the west side of Cook Inlet, there are some limited BLM lands.	Rodney Huffman	BLM	Public and Agency Involvement	Land Use	Meeting	1/26/2005
In order to adopt your NEPA analysis we are required to enter into a MOU with your Agency. The U.S. Air Force would also like to be a party to the MOU. We would like to meet with the Air Force and Federal Highway Administration to develop the MOU.	Gary Reimer	BLM	Public and Agency Involvement	Military	Letter	5/12/2005
The same people will review the EIS and process the permits, it will be a big burden on time and resources.	Don Perrin	ADNR	Public and Agency Involvement	Permits	Meeting	2/17/2005
Is KABATA consulting with NMFS?	Mel Langdon	ADEC	Public and Agency Involvement		Meeting	2/25/2005
Mel would like to see materials in advance of upcoming meetings.	Mel Langdon	ADEC	Public and Agency Involvement		Meeting	2/25/2005
Wondered if KABATA had been talking to the Cook Inlet Aquaculture Association, the Northern District Setnetter Association and other interested parties.	Dave Rutz	ADF&G	Public and Agency Involvement		Meeting	2/15/2005
Would like the partnering session meeting minutes.	Amanda Henry	ADNR	Public and Agency Involvement		Meeting	2/17/2005
The KAC is not a "large project" as defined by the state because of the project cost. OPMP's coordination isn't needed- that work is done already.	Don Perrin	ADNR	Public and Agency Involvement		Meeting	2/17/2005
How long will the comment period be for the draft document?	Matt LaCroix	ADNR	Public and Agency Involvement		Meeting	2/17/2005
The agencies don't have a file on the bridge project. They need to know what is going on in order to determine their concerns. They need current results to show what has been completed.	Matt LaCroix	ADNR-OHMP	Public and Agency Involvement		Meeting	8/26/2004
ALCOM will be a Cooperating agency for the project.	Carrol Chandler	ALCOM	Public and Agency Involvement		Letter	1/21/2005
Contact for the project is Colonel Steve Ribuffo.	Carrol Chandler	ALCOM	Public and Agency Involvement		Letter	1/21/2005
The COE will be a Cooperating Agency.	William Keller	Army COE	Public and Agency Involvement		Letter	1/24/2005

Comment	Commenter	Agency	Topic 1	Topic 2	Venue	Date
Irvin T. (Skip) Joy will be the COE's single point of contact concerning this project	William Keller	Army COE	Public and Agency Involvement		Letter	1/24/2005
We have no scoping issues to raise that would affect BLM managed lands at this time.	Gary Reimer	BLM	Public and Agency Involvement		Letter	5/12/2005
BLM wants to know the public meeting dates, so that they can send people to access public opinion.	Rodney Huffman	BLM	Public and Agency Involvement		Meeting	2/18/2005
BLM has no jurisdiction over fee title.	Rodney Huffman	BLM	Public and Agency Involvement		Meeting	2/18/2005
BLM will be an informal cooperating agency (little "c" cooperating agency).	Rodney Huffman	BLM	Public and Agency Involvement		Meeting	1/26/2005
BLM will check to see if NEPA will satisfy BLM needs.	Rodney Huffman	BLM	Public and Agency Involvement		Meeting	1/26/2005
Interaction with Alaska Railroad at July 14 scoping meeting was quite beneficial to the process.	Irvin Joy	COE	Public and Agency Involvement		Letter	8/9/2005
Can we access the comment matrix database?	Irvin Joy	COE	Public and Agency Involvement		Agency Scoping Mtg	3/29/2005
There is a lot of expectation on state reviewers, and we don't have a lot of staff. We will provide what we can. Spoken comments in meetings are easier than something written.	Matt LaCroix	DNR OHMP	Public and Agency Involvement		Agency Scoping Mtg	3/29/2005
What is the expected workload for State department staff? How many more opportunities for state to submit comments? Usually we submit comments at when the DEIS is available.	Don Perrin	DNR OPMP	Public and Agency Involvement		Agency Scoping Mtg	3/29/2005
The EPA urges that the project work closely with resource agencies, researchers, the MSB, the MOA, tribes and others interested to review existing information, determine additional studies needs, and develop mitigation.	Christine Reichgott	EPA	Public and Agency Involvement		Letter + Attachments	6/16/2005
The MOA will be a formal cooperating agency (big "C"). Will recommend that the Planning Department lead the effort.	Theede Tobish	MOA Planning Dept	Public and Agency Involvement		Meeting	1/26/2005
The Anchorage Comp Plan and the LRTP will not include the Knik Arm Crossing because it is the MOA's opinion that environmental issues will prevent the bridge from being built in the next 10 years or 20 years.	Lance Wilbur; Jon Spring; Tom Nelson; Craig Lyon	MOA-Traffic Department	Public and Agency Involvement		Meeting	6/15/2004
MSB will not be attending the ID Team Meeting on September 27, 2005, due to the short notice of the scoping meeting and previous commitments that can not be changed.	Murph O'Brien	MSB	Public and Agency Involvement		Letter	9/23/2005
The benefit of the Agency Scoping Meetings has been that all cooperating agencies have the opportunity to listen and respond to each other's concerns and issues. This is an important dynamic that will be lost with the proposed individual meeting.	Murph O'Brien	MSB	Public and Agency Involvement		Letter	9/23/2005
MSB requests greater advanced notice be given for future meetings.	Murph O'Brien	MSB	Public and Agency Involvement		Letter	9/23/2005
As a cooperating agency that will receive both the benefits and the impacts of this project, it is important that we have a seat at the table at these meetings (ID Team Meetings).	Murph O'Brien	MSB	Public and Agency Involvement		Letter	9/23/2005

Comment	Commenter	Agency	Topic 1	Topic 2	Venue	Date
The MSB supports the project and appreciates the opportunity to participate.	Murph O'Brien	MSB	Public and Agency Involvement		letter	5/12/2005
Is there still time to provide comments?	Murph O'Brien	MSB	Public and Agency Involvement		Agency Scoping Mtg	3/29/2005
The Municipality of Anchorage will be a Cooperating Agency.	Tom Nelson	Municipality of Anchorage	Public and Agency Involvement		Letter	1/24/2005
Tom Nelson will be the single point of contact for the MOA.	Tom Nelson	Municipality of Anchorage	Public and Agency Involvement		Letter	1/24/2005
We would like to request that NMFS become a cooperating agency for preparation of the NEPA document. This status will allow us to include as part of the action the authorization of small takes under the MMPA. In doing so, we will avoid a duplicative EA or EIS for this related action.	Brad Smith	NMFS	Public and Agency Involvement		Email	8/16/2005
NOAA Fisheries would like a few weeks to digest information. That works better than constant feedback.	Larry Peltz	NOAA Fisheries	Public and Agency Involvement		Meeting	4/14/2005
NOAA Fisheries fisheries will be an informal cooperating agency (little "c" cooperating agency)	Brad Smith	NOAA Fisheries NMFS	Public and Agency Involvement		Meeting	1/26/2005
What is a Cooperating Agency verses an agency that is just cooperating?	Allan Lucht	US Army	Public and Agency Involvement		Meeting	1/26/2005
Mr. Mattson or Mr. Schmidt will represent Elmendorf AFB at future meetings.	Michael Snodgrass	USAF	Public and Agency Involvement		Letter	3/22/2005
USCG will be a Cooperating Agency.	J.N. Helfinstine	USCG	Public and Agency Involvement		Letter + Attachments	2/2/2005
It helps to have access to project information and updates during the entire process.	Jim Helfinstine	USCG	Public and Agency Involvement		Meeting	1/26/2005
The USCG will be a Cooperating Agency. We have MOU with FHWA.	Jim Helfinstine	USCG	Public and Agency Involvement		Meeting	1/26/2005
USCG is interested in flying along during aerial photography or when other field activities are conducted.	Jim Helfinstine	USCG	Public and Agency Involvement		Meeting	6/3/2004
USCG is interested in working closely with the engineers as the project moves forward.	Jim Helfinstine	USCG	Public and Agency Involvement		Meeting	6/3/2004
The EPA has a dual role; we are responsible for reviewing all EISs prepared by other federal agencies and we are also responsible for NEPA compliance under Section 109 of the Clean Air Act. In this project, the EPA is interested in being involved with purpose and need.	Colleen Burgh	USEPA	Public and Agency Involvement		Meeting	1/26/2005
Role of Mat-Su Borough in NEPA process and project development should be considered.	USEPA	USEPA	Public and Agency Involvement		Meeting	9/15/2004
We appreciate the openness and commitment of the project team.	Francis Mann	USFWS	Public and Agency Involvement		Agency Scoping Mtg	4/25/2005

Comment	Commenter	Agency	Topic 1	Topic 2	Venue	Date
The USFWS is unable to participate as a formal Cooperating Agency	Ann Rappoport	USFWS	Public and Agency Involvement		letter	1/27/2005
Phil Brna will be the contact for the USFWS.	Ann Rappoport	USFWS	Public and Agency Involvement		letter	1/27/2005
Most agencies have been involved for a year or so and have a pretty good understanding of the issues. Studies have been discussed, although the agencies have not seen any results or reports.	Phil Brna	USFWS	Public and Agency Involvement		Meeting	1/26/2005
USFWS will be an informal cooperating agency (little "c" cooperating agency).	Phil Brna	USFWS	Public and Agency Involvement		Meeting	1/26/2005
The USFWS will coordinate with other agencies.	Phil Brna	USFWS	Public and Agency Involvement		Meeting	1/26/2005
The U.S. Geological Survey has no jurisdiction regarding this project and will not be a cooperating agency on this project.	Leslie Bartels	USGS	Public and Agency Involvement		Letter	4/11/2005
Since I'm the one who proposed the idea of a tunnel in the first meeting, I will explain why. I lived in the Norfolk area where shipping was an issue. Here it is ice flows. Can a bridge design deal with that?	Greg Schmidt	3CES/CEVP-EAFB	Purpose and Need	Alternatives	Agency Scoping Mtg	3/29/2005
The existing railroad route is a continuous north-south corridor and it provides an emergency evacuation route	Bruce Carr	ARRC	Purpose and Need	Alternatives	Letter	5/12/2005
Regarding the Purpose and Need Statement: The statement should mention the ARRC, its existing transportation infrastructure in Southcentral Alaska, and its role and place in the regional transportation system.	Bruce Carr	ARRC	Purpose and Need	Alternatives	Letter	5/12/2005
Regarding the Purpose and Need Statement: Needs to include the importance of the ARRC to the regional transportation system in order to justify a future rail extension across Knik Arm.	Bruce Carr	ARRC	Purpose and Need	Alternatives	Letter	5/12/2005
Regarding the Purpose and Need Statement: Connectivity in the Matanuska-Susitna Borough needs to be considered in order for the project to meet the purpose and need.	Bruce Carr	ARRC	Purpose and Need	Alternatives	Letter	5/12/2005
Regarding the Purpose and Need Statement: Protection of a future rail crossing across Knik Arm will help meet the need for a redundant overland route for emergency response and evacuation.	Bruce Carr	ARRC	Purpose and Need	Alternatives	Letter	5/12/2005
Regarding the Purpose and Need Statement: Total tonnage increases through the Port of Anchorage should reference years.	Bruce Carr	ARRC	Purpose and Need	Alternatives	Letter	5/12/2005
Regarding the Purpose and Need Statement: Reference to increasing truck traffic in the Port of Anchorage within the next 10-12 years may result in more railroad activity not activity on a Crossing. The Purpose and Need Statement should protect the option of a future rail crossing by acknowledging the critical role rail plays in the movement of freight goods and services.	Bruce Carr	ARRC	Purpose and Need	Alternatives	Letter	5/12/2005
Regarding the Purpose and Need Statement: Further support for a future rail route across Knik Arm is the support by the MSB for rail at Port MacKenzie as documented in the "Matanuska-Susitna Road Rail Corridor Study."	Bruce Carr	ARRC	Purpose and Need	Alternatives	Letter	5/12/2005
Regarding the Purpose and Need Statement: The existing railroad route is a continuous north-south corridor and it provides an emergency evacuation route in addition to the existing highway.	Bruce Carr	ARRC	Purpose and Need	Alternatives	Letter	5/12/2005
Regarding the Purpose and Need Statement: References to tsunamis may not support the project.	Bruce Carr	ARRC	Purpose and Need	Alternatives	Letter	5/12/2005
Regarding the Purpose and Need Statement: The statement could be strengthened by including references and support for all modes of transportation.	Bruce Carr	ARRC	Purpose and Need	Alternatives	Letter	5/12/2005
Some needs could be met without a bridge. We saw some of the same needs for the ferry consideration. Is the ferry superfluous?	Matt LaCroix	DNR OHMP	Purpose and Need	Alternatives	Agency Scoping Mtg	3/29/2005

Comment	Commenter	Agency	Topic 1	Topic 2	Venue	Date
How does the needs statement translate into alternatives? Has it affected alternatives being rejected? Other alternatives could meet some of those needs, like a ferry. How does this fit into the EIS document? There is a lack of current regional transportation infrastructure on MSB side.	Matt LaCroix	DNR OHMP	Purpose and Need	Alternatives	Agency Scoping Mtg	3/29/2005
It is not clear whether or not the purpose and need statement narrows alternatives to slight variations of a bridge project. In recent discussions about the project, some alternatives that would seem to meet purpose and need are no longer being considered.	Christine B. Reichgott	EPA	Purpose and Need	Alternatives	Letter	10/13/2005
A purpose and need statement should be written in such a way that all reasonable and feasible alternatives will be considered and the statement should not unduly constrain the range of alternatives.	Christine B. Reichgott	EPA	Purpose and Need	Alternatives	Letter	10/13/2005
Purpose and Need Screening Criteria No. 1: The MOA feels this is subjective and could be answered in the affirmative for all corridor alternatives presented.	Lance Wilbur, Tom Nelson	MOA	Purpose and Need	Alternatives	Letter	8/12/2005
Purpose and Need Screening Criteria No. 2: If the project not-to-exceed cost is \$600 million, the financial feasibility screening criteria should be tied only to this number. We suggest the phrase "unless other yet to be identified funding sources become available" be deleted. This may also limit corridor alternatives to most undesirable options and insufficient mitigation of impacts.	Lance Wilbur, Tom Nelson	MOA	Purpose and Need	Alternatives	Letter	8/12/2005
Purpose and Need Screening Criteria No. 3: The MOA suggested that the last part of the criteria be eliminated beginning with "unless other yet to be identified funding sources become available." This permits the criteria to strictly address the project's sustainability.	Lance Wilbur, Tom Nelson	MOA	Purpose and Need	Alternatives	Letter	8/12/2005
Purpose and Need Screening Criteria No. 4: It is not clear what would be "efficient". MOA proposed that the "system" should be "efficient". This criterion should refer to the system including the Anchorage Bowl and the Mat-Su Borough between the Knik Arm Crossing and the Parks Highway.	Lance Wilbur, Tom Nelson	MOA	Purpose and Need	Alternatives	Letter	8/12/2005
Purpose and Need Screening Criteria No. 6: This criterion should be divided into two criteria. Number 1 - Would further regional transportation infrastructure in response to locally adopted economic development, land use, and transportation plans. And Number 2 - Would further regional transportation infrastructure as directed by the Alaska State Legislature in Alaska Statutes Chapter 19.75. To not separate them allows the state law to distort the screening by overriding the local planning efforts in all cases and does not lend credibility to local plans.	Lance Wilbur, Tom Nelson	MOA	Purpose and Need	Alternatives	Letter	8/12/2005
I have concerns about how Purpose and Need Screening Criteria #6 about local plans may be applied. At best, AMATS recommended a feasibility study for a Knik Arm Crossing.	Tom Nelson	MOA	Purpose and Need	Alternatives	Agency Scoping Mtg	7/14/2005
Purpose and Need Statement, Footnote 1. The recently signed transportation bill makes a significant percentage of earmark projects deductive from the state's annual apportionment of STIP funding. This has significant short term funding impacts and potential long term funding impacts and heightens the concern of the MSB that this project may be constructed in lieu of other key transportation projects in the Core Area of the borough.	Murph O'Brien	MSB	Purpose and Need	Cumulative and Secondary Impacts	Letter	8/24/2005
Purpose & Need might need to be expanded to more regional to include impacts statewide, Anchorage, and Interior Alaska.	Sasha Forland	ARRC	Purpose and Need	Land Use	Agency Scoping Mtg	3/29/2005
Purpose and Need, Anchorage 2020 Anchorage Bowl Comprehensive Plan - the narrative needs to reflect that some land within the Anchorage Bowl is considered underdeveloped or land that can be revitalized or redeveloped. The EIS analysis should also include potential development along the Turnagain Arm. These omissions in an otherwise detailed analysis skew the conclusions.	Lance Wilbur, Tom Nelson	MOA	Purpose and Need	Land Use	Letter	8/12/2005
On Purpose & Need Statement, the Municipality may test some of the P&N assumptions. There are cheaper ways to accomplish some of these needs. The MOA Long Range Plans have been developed to accommodate growth. MOA does not necessarily accept the idea that we are running out of land here.	Tom Nelson	MOA Planning Dept	Purpose and Need	Land Use	Agency Scoping Mtg	3/29/2005
Will you be breaking number four down further to reflect commercial development and the relocation of the airport?	Brad Smith	NOAA Fisheries	Purpose and Need	Land Use	Agency Scoping Mtg	3/29/2005
Port MacKenzie could become a regional port. Then there would not necessarily be a need for a bridge to Anchorage. Some people might ask if the money would be better spent improving Port MacKenzie into a container port.	Matt LaCroix	DNR OHMP	Purpose and Need	Marine Transportation	Agency Scoping Mtg	3/29/2005

Comment	Commenter	Agency	Topic 1	Topic 2	Venue	Date
The military's "elephant cage" has electromagnetic listening antennas that must not have noise interference. Locating crossing activities below the bluff may mitigate this issue. During construction contractors can use special equipment to mitigate noise issues.	Steve Ribuffo	Alaskan Command	Purpose and Need	Military	Meeting	1/26/2005
The Department of Defense has nothing strategic to gain by a bridge.	Steve Ribuffo	Alaskan Command	Purpose and Need	Military	Meeting	1/26/2005
The Alaskan Command plans to investigate a clarification of "need" in relation to the Stryker Brigade and munitions deployment.	Steve Ribuffo	Alaskan Command	Purpose and Need	Military	Meeting	1/26/2005
We ask that any future alignments being submitted for military review first be screened and determined reasonable and accompanied by your reasonableness analysis.	Steve Ribuffo	ALCOM	Purpose and Need	Military	Letter	5/12/2005
We do not concur that Anchorage's proximity to military installations and an international airport makes it vulnerable to terrorist activities. Recommend verifying this with the Department of Homeland Security.	Steve Ribuffo	ALCOM	Purpose and Need	Military	Letter	5/12/2005
We concur that proximity to the military installations and international airport places Anchorage at risk to man-made hazards such as air transportation accidents.	Steve Ribuffo	ALCOM	Purpose and Need	Military	Letter	5/12/2005
In terms of Emergency Response (in the P&N), the proximity of access roads to EAFB does not increase the potential for terrorist activity.	Jamie Spell	ALCOM	Purpose and Need	Military	Agency Scoping Mtg	5/11/2005
We do not want to imply that the military has a requirement for a bridge, because we do not.	Jamie Spell	ALCOM	Purpose and Need	Military	Agency Scoping Mtg	5/11/2005
You should remove number two (re: Military Operations) from your Needs. Mayor Wuerch has been advised by the military that there is no "need" or "void" for the military, and has been asked to remove it as a "need." There may be a quality of life issue, convenience, but not a need. There is no void for deployment, munitions or necessity.	Bobby Stone	ALCOM	Purpose and Need	Military	Agency Scoping Mtg	3/29/2005
Is one of the needs for the bridge based on military deployment in and out of the POA? Is that a national security interest?	Rodney Huffman	BLM	Purpose and Need	Military	Meeting	2/18/2005
Regarding the Purpose and Need Statement: The military have stated that the bridge plays no part in their deployment plans and that bridge construction could inhibit military deployment. Depending on the final configuration and alignment, the bridge could interfere with the military's mission	Irvin Joy	COE	Purpose and Need	Military	Letter	5/20/2005
COE would not consider number five a purpose or need. It (having funding) can't be driving the project.	Irvin Joy	COE	Purpose and Need	Military	Agency Scoping Mtg	3/29/2005
I heard that number two should not be a need also.	Irvin Joy	COE	Purpose and Need	Military	Agency Scoping Mtg	3/29/2005
Did the POA agree with the P&N stated for them?	Dan Vos	NOAA Fisheries	Purpose and Need	Port of Anchorage	Meeting	2/24/2005
The Borough is generally in favor of the Crossing, however there is concern that a "port to port" Crossing would not address long-term traffic. The Borough views Port MacKenzie as being complementary to the Port of Anchorage.	Murph O'Brien	MSB	Purpose and Need	Public and Agency Involvement	Meeting	6/16/2004
Are the "needs" in order of priority? Need number 3 is more of a need than 2.	Steve Ribuffo	Alaskan Command	Purpose and Need	Traffic	Agency Scoping Meeting	4/25/2005
The current project background and P&N leaves out the Alaska Railroad, the fastest growing freight mover. The P&N as it now stands states that there is a need for intermodal surface transportation connectivity, which includes railroads.	Bruce Carr	ARRC	Purpose and Need	Traffic	Agency Scoping Mtg	5/11/2005
What kind of evacuation is the bridge going to aid? Tsunami evacuation would not make sense by using a bridge.	Elaine Somers	EPA	Purpose and Need	Traffic	Agency Scoping Mtg	5/11/2005
The Muni looks at ways to provide a "better connected network;" multiple routes in and out of an area. Need number four "cook Inlet" is key in regards to regional planning. Regional inadequacy doesn't happen until 30 years out, and if you wait until then to solve the problem, it's too late, because the land is gone. Eventually growth will happen. Only looking at 2010 is not far enough out to provide a good long term plan. Preserving the corridors for that growth is important and difficult. That is where the P&N should focus, because the statewide connectivity will look good in 2020 or 2030.	Lance Wilber	MOA Traffic	Purpose and Need	Traffic	Agency Scoping Mtg	3/29/2005

Comment	Commenter	Agency	Topic 1	Topic 2	Venue	Date
The MSB is concerned that regional connectivity will not be achieved by connecting the two ports. Additional infrastructure is needed on the MSB side. The logical termini for the project may be further out (then just to the Port MacKenzie).	Murph O'Brien	MSB	Purpose and Need	Traffic	Agency Scoping Mtg	5/11/2005
We need information on availability of single family housing land on the Mat-Su side. The statement about "affordable land" needs to be supported.	Don Perrin	ADNR	Purpose and Need		Agency Scoping Mtg	7/14/2005
What will the toll would be? The toll could effect the purpose and need for the bridge.	Don Perrin	ADNR	Purpose and Need		Meeting	2/17/2005
Final Draft Purpose and Need: p.2, 1 Project Background, Paragraph 3: Remove reference to "military bases".	Col. Paul S. Curtis	ALCOM	Purpose and Need		Letter	8/12/2005
Final Draft Purpose and Need: p.3, 1.2 Purpose and Need Statement, Item 3: Remove reference to "military bases".	Col. Paul S. Curtis	ALCOM	Purpose and Need		Letter	8/12/2005
Final Draft Purpose and Need: p.8, 1.2.1 Discussion of the Purpose and Need Statement, Item (Anchorage Metropolitan Area Transportation Solutions (AMATS) Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) Amendment, 2002 paragraph 2): Remove reference to "and the military".	Col. Paul S. Curtis	ALCOM	Purpose and Need		Letter	8/12/2005
Final Draft Purpose and Need: p.8, 1.2.1 Discussion of the Purpose and Need Statement, Item (Regional Transportation Planning Organization Resolution Supporting the Knik Arm Crossing as a Regional Transportation Priority Project, 2003): Add the following after "...Alaskan Command of the U.S. Department of Defense (non voting advisory role only),...".	Col. Paul S. Curtis	ALCOM	Purpose and Need		Letter	8/12/2005
Final Draft Purpose and Need: p.12, 1.2.1 Discussion of the Purpose and Need Statement, Item (3): Remove reference to "military bases".	Col. Paul S. Curtis	ALCOM	Purpose and Need		Letter	8/12/2005
The word "military" appears in one of your "need" statements. That may need to be looked at more closely.	Jamie Spell	ALCOM	Purpose and Need		Agency Scoping Mtg	7/14/2005
Don't preclude a railroad bridge in further studies.	Bruce Carr	ARRC	Purpose and Need		Agency Scoping Mtg	3/29/2005
I would like to stress that purpose & need should talk about surface transportation. Even though (the project) doesn't include railroad now, it could in the future. You should keep that in mind.	Sasha Forland	ARRC	Purpose and Need		Agency Scoping Mtg	3/29/2005
Regarding P&N Screening criteria #3, the Mat-Su now has a new hospital. Also, in bad weather, a bridge can actually be an unsafe place to be. You may want to make that piece stronger.	Rodney Huffman	BLM	Purpose and Need		Agency Scoping Mtg	7/14/2005
Vast improvement in the wording of the Purpose and Need statement.	Irvin Joy	COE	Purpose and Need		Letter	8/9/2005
While the purpose and need statement has been considerably reworded, it is not where it needs to be.	Irvin Joy	COE	Purpose and Need		Letter	5/31/2005
Regarding the purpose and need statement: Relying on the intent of the Alaska Legislature (to support the economic welfare of the State through the development of upper Cook Inlet transportation) should not be a listed need.	Irvin Joy	COE	Purpose and Need		Letter	5/31/2005
Regarding Purpose and Need: The COE questions the real need to build the Crossing to provide connectivity between the Port of Anchorage and Port MacKenzie. Neither port has expressed a need or desire to be connected to the other port.	Irvin Joy	COE	Purpose and Need		Letter	5/31/2005
Regarding the Purpose and Need Statement: The Port of Anchorage and Port MacKenzie do not agree with the stated need regarding efficient surface and freight and goods movement between ports. The ports handle different types of freight and would not need to transfer goods between them. If moving goods across Knik Arm were needed, it's likely that they would be moved over the water (by marine vessel/barge) not by truck as mentioned in the statement.	Irvin Joy	COE	Purpose and Need		Letter	5/20/2005
Regarding the Purpose and Need Statement: In order for the "safety of redundant route" need to be realized, a massive building of infrastructure on the north side of Knik Arm must take place.	Irvin Joy	COE	Purpose and Need		Letter	5/20/2005
Regarding the Purpose and Need Statement: The existing transportation infrastructure appears to be adequate at this time and the proposed location of the bridge would not relieve a significant amount of commuters from the MSB. Residents that move close to the bridge on the MSB side would use the bridge, but those in Wasilla would continue to commute along the Glenn Highway.	Irvin Joy	COE	Purpose and Need		Letter	5/20/2005

Comment	Commenter	Agency	Topic 1	Topic 2	Venue	Date
Regarding the Purpose and Need Statement: Conventional funding for the Knik Arm Crossing cannot be considered under purpose and need. Funding to build a project is part of the solution to a specifically identified problem not the reason for the proposed project.	Irvin Joy	COE	Purpose and Need		Letter	5/20/2005
Regarding the Purpose and Need Statement: If the project is determined needed to be part of a regional supply route to Interior Alaska, opening a highway corridor from Port MacKenzie to connect to the Parks Highway should be considered. If the highway connection is needed to fortify the purpose and need, it should be evaluated as a secondary impact.	Irvin Joy	COE	Purpose and Need		Letter	5/20/2005
If sounds like you're locked down on P&N.	Irvin Joy	COE	Purpose and Need		Agency Scoping Mtg	5/11/2005
I would like serious re-consideration of connectivity as a need.	Irvin Joy	COE	Purpose and Need		Agency Scoping Mtg	3/29/2005
What is the capacity level for this project? How do you construct it today to accommodate 2030? It would be good to tie it into the needs to allow for growth, both commercial and residential.	Matt LaCroix	DNR OHMP	Purpose and Need		Agency Scoping Mtg	3/29/2005
The original intent for the earmarked funds should be presented as the stated purpose and need.	Christine Reichgott	EPA	Purpose and Need		Letter + Attachments	6/16/2005
The basic needs to be met by the project should be stated and justified with adequate information and analysis.	Christine Reichgott	EPA	Purpose and Need		Letter + Attachments	6/16/2005
Competing needs should be acknowledged and assessed with respect to the alternatives.	Christine Reichgott	EPA	Purpose and Need		Letter + Attachments	6/16/2005
Some of the needs stated have been contradicted by those that the needs pertain to, such as the Ports, the Municipality of Anchorage, and the Department of Defense.	Christine Reichgott	EPA	Purpose and Need		Letter + Attachments	6/16/2005
Prior to May 11, we need to have the background information to substantiate the Purpose and Need.	Elaine Somers	EPA	Purpose and Need		Agency Scoping Mtg	4/25/2005
The MOA believes that the Draft Purpose and Need Statement (July 2005) mischaracterized what the cited MOA plans and reports do or don't say about the Knik Arm Crossing.	Lance Wilbur, Tom Nelson	MOA	Purpose and Need		Letter	8/12/2005
Anchorage 2020, in conjunction with the LRTP adequately addresses the demand for growth for the next twenty years and identifies the needed infrastructure to support it without a Knik Arm Crossing. A Knik Arm Crossing is not needed, but will create an opportunity for new and different development than that which has been reflected in the documents being referred.	Lance Wilbur, Tom Nelson	MOA	Purpose and Need		Letter	8/12/2005
At the writing of the AMATS Freight Mobility Study 2001, no Knik Arm Crossing was being considered. The purpose and need background document asserts that recommendations made in the Freight Mobility study support the Knik Arm Crossing. However, the report contains no recommendations regarding the Knik Arm Crossing.	Lance Wilbur, Tom Nelson	MOA	Purpose and Need		Letter	8/12/2005
Regional Port of Anchorage Master Plan, 1999: the second largest non-port of Anchorage land us is intermodal rail at 27.4 acres, however the Knik Arm Crossing is not considering rail on a facility that should be intermodal.	Lance Wilbur, Tom Nelson	MOA	Purpose and Need		Letter	8/12/2005
The recognition of the importance of resouces in the purpose and need that require rail transport require that this EIS should recognize and analyze the future needs of rail on the bridge at some point in the future. To suggest that only trucks would move coal to Port MacKenzie on the existng road corridors concerns the MOA because of potential environmental and community impacts. We also understand that increases in fuel prices will continue to make rail movement of freight i.e., trailers on flat cars more attractive between Anchorage and Fairbanks which also lends support for having rail included in the EIS analysis.	Lance Wilbur, Tom Nelson	MOA	Purpose and Need		Letter	8/12/2005
AMATS LSTP Ammendment (2002) - The referenced amendment merely provided an approval needed to spend federal money on a study of the feasibility of a possible Knik Arm Crossing.	Lance Wilbur, Tom Nelson	MOA	Purpose and Need		Letter	8/12/2005

Comment	Commenter	Agency	Topic 1	Topic 2	Venue	Date
Regarding Purpose and Need No. 2 - The purpose and need clearly identifies the transportation connectivity and alternate route needed for industrial expansion, that has long been supported by the trucking industry, is well documented, it ignores the importance and potential benefit of rail transport connectivity. The MOA considers the omission of rail on the crossing to be a serious flaw that compromises the regional transportation connectivity, distorts regional freight in favor of more expensive trucks, and compromises the economic and environmental benefits to Anchorage and communities north that would be realized if the freight was on rail instead of on our roads. If the bridge structure is not designed for inclusion of rail, a future, equally costly structure may be required, when an incremental cost today could provide the logical inclusion of rail. The idea of opening potential resources of coal to the north supports inclusion of rail on the structure because bulk commodities such as coal are more efficiently moved on rail. For these reasons, the environmental document should include analysis of the	Lance Wilbur, Tom Nelson	MOA	Purpose and Need		Letter	8/12/2005
Regarding Purpose and Need No. 3 - The MOA acknowledges the benefit of redundancy in the regional transportation system, however are concerned that the cost of this facility may be greater than the benefit. This is especially true in light of the need to find two-thirds of the funding from sources within Alaska and revenue bonds.	Lance Wilbur, Tom Nelson	MOA	Purpose and Need		Letter	8/12/2005
Regarding Purpose and Need No. 3 - The purpose and need advances the argument that housing development in Mat-Su is "good", because buyers may save money (approximately \$69,000) over comparable housing in Anchorage. But the P&N never addresses the full cost of Mat Su development - infrastructure such as roads, sidewalks, parks open space, sewers, water supply, schools, fire and police facilities and protection services, etc.	Lance Wilbur, Tom Nelson	MOA	Purpose and Need		Letter	8/12/2005
I see a big improvement on the purpose and need since the last version. I have concerns about Purpose and Need Screening Criteria #1. There are a whole range of costs that need to be considered. There are a lot of unknown factors pertaining to growth and housing markets that must be fleshed out.	Tom Nelson	MOA	Purpose and Need		Agency Scoping Mtg	7/14/2005
Regarding the Draft purpose and need statement: the supporting documentation continues to provide the reader an unrealistic picture of the existing transportation infrastructure on the Matanuska-Susitna Borough side. The supporting documentation needs to reflect the reality of the existing transportation infrastructure and the need to expend significant funds, whether project funds or from other sources, to provide the basic transportation connections to make the Knik Arm Crossing function effectively and efficiently.	Murph O'Brien	MSB	Purpose and Need		Letter	8/24/2005
Project Background, Page 2, second full paragraph, last sentence. This statement is only true for travel between the MSB and Anchorage. Travel from within Anchorage to its airports, hospitals, the port, etc. may not be disrupted. So to travel within the MSB to Port MacKenzie, its airports and hospital may not be disrupted.	Murph O'Brien	MSB	Purpose and Need		Letter	8/24/2005
Project Background, Page 2, Paragraph 3, final sentence. This sentence does not accurately portray the recent and existing rapid growth within the MSB and substantial increase in travel between the two communities as a result of this growth.	Murph O'Brien	MSB	Purpose and Need		Letter	8/24/2005
Project Background, Page 2, Paragraph 4, last sentence. There continues to be a misrepresentation that the existing Burma Road provides effective and direct access to the Parks Highway by way of South Big Lake Road. Significant improvements need to be made to both Burma Road and South Big Lake Road to provide safe and effective access to the Parks Highway. This sentence needs to be modified to express what the true condition of this connection is or be deleted. It is assumed that Figure 1-1 is the map titled Regional Transportation System. This map is also misleading since it portrays all the routes of the State Highway System in bold red with no differentiation of the functional classification of the existing State Transportation System. Looking at this figure, people unfamiliar with the road system could assume for example that Burma Road is built to the same standards as the Glenn and Parks Highways when it is really nothing more than a poorly constructed gravel road.	Murph O'Brien	MSB	Purpose and Need		Letter	8/24/2005
Purpose and Need Statement, Introductory Paragraph. This sentence needs to be modified to truly make it a statement of the regional importance for this project. Instead of saying ", at the Port MacKenzie District..." it should read "through the Port MacKenzie District".	Murph O'Brien	MSB	Purpose and Need		Letter	8/24/2005

Comment	Commenter	Agency	Topic 1	Topic 2	Venue	Date
Purpose and Need Statement, Footnote 1. An issue is the reality of the financial limitation of \$600 million for the crossing. This financial limitation forces key MSB elements of this project to be funded outside of the scope of the project. There needs to be a commitment to place the appropriate funding priority on these project elements such as the Burma Road/South Big Lake Road Parks Highway Connection and ultimately the Port MacKenzie Willow connection without impacting the funding stream for other key transportation improvements in the MSB such as Palmer Wasilla Highway Upgrade, Glenn Highway Improvements, Parks Highway Alternative corridor, etc.	Murph O'Brien	MSB	Purpose and Need		Letter	8/24/2005
Purpose and Need Statement, Bullet 1. A key issue that needs to be explained is how the bridge alternative better meets the project's purpose and needs over an expanded ferry system.	Murph O'Brien	MSB	Purpose and Need		Letter	8/24/2005
Purpose and Need Statement, Bullet 2. This bullet talks of improving movement of people, freight and goods to and from Anchorage and the MSB and Interior Alaska. Against the project as proposed does not immediately address this need because there is no new Parks Highway Connection proposed in the near term. Traffic will use the existing system that will take travelers or freight northeast through Wasilla to the Parks Highway resulting in little if any travel time savings.	Murph O'Brien	MSB	Purpose and Need		Letter	8/24/2005
Discussion of Purpose and Need Statement, Page 4, line 1 discussion of MSB's Core Area. The Core Area is defined as the area between the Cities of Palmer and Wasilla.	Murph O'Brien	MSB	Purpose and Need		Letter	8/24/2005
Discussion of Purpose and Need Statement, Page 5, last paragraph, line 6, sentence that begins with "Currently". This statement does not account for the Port of Anchorage expansion.	Murph O'Brien	MSB	Purpose and Need		Letter	8/24/2005
Discussion of Purpose and Need Statement, Page 11, last paragraph. It should be noted that near term access needs to Port MacKenzie will be met by the MSB's Cook Inlet Ferry which should be operational in late 2007.	Murph O'Brien	MSB	Purpose and Need		Letter	8/24/2005
Termini on the Mat-Su side needs to be determined, along with completion of the modeling so there is no unintended meaning with the word "vicinity" of Port MacKenzie	Murph O'Brien	MSB	Purpose and Need		Agency Scoping Mtg	7/14/2005
Regarding the Purpose and Need Statement: The MSB's LRTP should be mentioned.	Murph O'Brien	MSB	Purpose and Need		letter	5/12/2005
Regarding the Purpose and Need Statement: Direct connections to the National Highway System do not exist from where the Crossing would make landfall at Port MacKenzie. There is a certain level of highway infrastructure needed on the MSB side that needs to be constructed as part of the Knik Arm Crossing to insure utility of the project.	Murph O'Brien	MSB	Purpose and Need		letter	5/12/2005
Regarding the Purpose and Need Statement: The Port MacKenzie area should be defined. Port MacKenzie is zoned industrial and commercial within the port district and would not be available for residential development.	Murph O'Brien	MSB	Purpose and Need		letter	5/12/2005
Regarding the Purpose and Need Statement: The proposed floatplane/airpark will be outside the Port MacKenzie District.	Murph O'Brien	MSB	Purpose and Need		letter	5/12/2005
Regarding the Purpose and Need Statement: There should be discussion of the MSB's multi-Use Ferry/Rescue Vessel project which will be useful in the support and development and construction of the Crossing Project.	Murph O'Brien	MSB	Purpose and Need		letter	5/12/2005
Regarding the Purpose and Need Statement: The movement of containers from Anchorage to the MSB (beyond Port MacKenzie) will require highway improvements on the MSB side. Tying into the existing road system will not facilitate faster more cost efficient movement of freight.	Murph O'Brien	MSB	Purpose and Need		letter	5/12/2005
Regarding the Purpose and Need Statement: The transportation system on the MSB side will need to be upgraded to facilitate the purpose and need.	Murph O'Brien	MSB	Purpose and Need		letter	5/12/2005
Note that there are more than two escape routes from Anchorage; the Old Glenn Highway is an alternative escape route.	Ken Hudson	MSB	Purpose and Need		Meeting	2/16/2005
Is the goal of emergency evacuation to have two ways to get out of Anchorage or the Valley?	Barbara Mahoney	NOAA Fisheries	Purpose and Need		Meeting	2/24/2005

Comment	Commenter	Agency	Topic 1	Topic 2	Venue	Date
Is a fuel pipeline included on the bridge? If so, impacts to threatened and endangered species found farther south in the Cook Inlet is needed.	Phil Brna	USFWS	Threatened and Endangered Species	Preliminary Engineering	Meeting	9/27/2005
NMFS agrees with FHWA's conclusion that no species listed as threatened or endangered occurs within the project area and that this project would have no effect on listed species.	James Balsiger	NOAA Fisheries	Threatened and Endangered Species		Letter	4/27/2005
There are no areas designated or proposed as critical habitat within the action area of the proposed project.	Gregory Risdahl	USFWS	Threatened and Endangered Species		Letter	4/13/2005
Our records indicate that there are no species listed as threatened or endangered under the Endangered Species Act in the project area.	Gregory Risdahl	USFWS	Threatened and Endangered Species		Letter	4/13/2005
If the approach corridor comes through the Port of Anchorage, port traffic patterns as it relates to business interruptions and impacts at the port should be examined.	Bruce Carr	ARRC	Traffic	Alternatives	Letter	5/12/2005
When you are looking at total cost (for the bridge), you're assuming that infrastructure on the other side will be built.	Danny Barnett	USAF, Elmendorf	Traffic	Alternatives	Agency Scoping Mtg	5/11/2005
The project needs to ensure that Ship Creek port and railroad continue to function.	Bruce Carr	ARRC	Traffic	Joint Development	Meeting	1/26/2005
Port MacKenzie is part of an industrial road network. All the traffic currently travels down Knik Road. Especially with the addition of the bridge, the MSB will have to eventually improve the road system in the area.	Ken Hudson	MSB	Traffic	Joint Development	Meeting	2/16/2005
The railroad will want to look at traffic and land use patterns and the location of piling in the railroad property.	Barb Hotchkin	ARRC	Traffic	Land Use	Meeting	9/27/2005
Is the project independently useful if we don't have infrastructure on the MSB side? Is it a stand along project?	Elaine Somers	EPA	Traffic	Purpose and Need	Agency Scoping Mtg	5/11/2005
The railroad corridor to Willow is about the same cost as this project. Some of their improvements may be in a plan, but how are they going to be funded?	Murph O'Brien	MSB	Traffic	Purpose and Need	Agency Scoping Mtg	5/11/2005
What year are the traffic projections based on?	Mel Langdon	ADEC	Traffic		Meeting	2/25/2005
The project should consider studying traffic impacts in the Ship Creek area in light of future projects like the MSB's ferry and ARRC Intermodal facility.	Bruce Carr	ARRC	Traffic		Letter	5/12/2005
Adding more traffic to the downtown area must not choke back down the Whitney Road. This area is very constrained with the railroad, Ship Creek and the Chugach power plant.	Bruce Carr	ARRC	Traffic		Agency Scoping Mtg	3/29/2005
Traffic is an issue in the Ship Creek area.	Bruce Carr	ARRC	Traffic		Meeting	1/26/2005
This project has an effect on 60% of transportation in Alaska, since the project is in the regional transportation hub.	Bruce Carr	ARRC	Traffic		Meeting	1/26/2005
Would you say the numbers show a demand for a bridge in 5 years?	Irvin Joy	COE	Traffic		Agency Scoping Mtg	5/11/2005
What are the assumptions that went into travel demand?	Elaine Somers	EPA	Traffic		Agency Scoping Mtg	5/11/2005
The traffic on the Knik-Goose Bay Road has increased recently. There are about 300 new homes in the area and traffic jams are common.	Susan Lee	MSB	Traffic		Meeting	2/16/2005
Will there be traffic issues at Port MacKenzie?	Barbara Mahoney	NOAA Fisheries	Traffic		Meeting	2/24/2005
How many people are expected to use the bridge?	Barbara Mahoney	NOAA Fisheries	Traffic		Meeting	2/24/2005
Will the project include roads into Anchorage? How will that process work?	Dan Vos	NOAA Fisheries	Traffic		Meeting	2/24/2005
The crossing cannot dump traffic into the Port of Anchorage area.	Kevin Bruce	POA	Traffic		Meeting	1/26/2005

Comment	Commenter	Agency	Topic 1	Topic 2	Venue	Date
Government to government consultation with federally recognized Indian tribal governments is legally required.	Christine Reichgott	EPA	Tribal Interests and Coordination		Letter + Attachments	6/16/2005
Special efforts must be taken to avoid disproportionate adverse environmental impacts on tribes, and to eliminate barriers to their full participation in the NEPA process and related processes of environmental review.	Christine Reichgott	EPA	Tribal Interests and Coordination		Letter + Attachments	6/16/2005
EPA recommends that FHWA consult with the potentially affected tribes to determine their interests and concerns.	Christine Reichgott	EPA	Tribal Interests and Coordination		Letter + Attachments	6/16/2005
Since the responsibility for government to government consultation with tribes is vested by law in the federal government, we recommend that a lead federal agency not delegate its tribal consultation responsibilities to the State or local governments unless it has a formal agreement to such delegation with the pertinent tribal government or governments permitting such a delegation, as well as a formal agreement with the State or local government as to how such consultation responsibilities will be carried out.	Christine Reichgott	EPA	Tribal Interests and Coordination		Letter + Attachments	6/16/2005
Special attend should be paid to environmental impacts on trust or treaty resources. Close consideration should be given to all types of resources and aspects of the environment that tribes regard as significant in consultation with tribes. Consultation should occur early and throughout the process.	Christine Reichgott	EPA	Tribal Interests and Coordination		Letter + Attachments	6/16/2005
Tribes not currently involved (farther south in Cook Inlet) should be consulted.	Christine Reichgott	EPA	Tribal Interests and Coordination		Letter + Attachments	6/16/2005
Will there be joint use of the bridge for utilities?	Steve Ribuffo	Alaskan Command	Utilities	Military	Meeting	1/26/2005
If the project is intended to support fuel pipelines, then the potential for spills should be assessed, along with the fate of spilled material, and potential effects of those spills on the environment in Cook Inlet.	Denny R. Lassuy	USFWS	Utilities	Water Quality	Letter	5/10/2005
Utilities will have other issues associated with them including the need for spill response (if proposing a pipeline).	Phil Brna	USFWS	Utilities	Water Quality	Meeting	1/26/2005
Because the proposed project would result in significant residential, commercial, and industrial growth in the Mat-Su Borough, we recommend that the EIS include an assessment of drinking water supplies and drinking water quality in the Mat-Su. EPA recommends conducting adequate testing to determine the level and extent of arsenic in existing and potential future drinking water supplies. This information is needed to inform the public and decision makers regarding reasonably foreseeable growth and is an additional factor in comparing alternatives.	Christine Reichgott	EPA	Water Quality	Cumulative and Secondary Impacts	Letter + Attachments	6/16/2005
There is a need for long range planning tools so the area can be developed in a way that best meets the needs of the nation, the state, and the Mat-Su Borough. Identifying, mapping, and providing functional assessments for those aquatic resources within the areas that will be most affected by the proposed project will provide some of those important planning tools	Christine B. Reichgott	EPA	Water Quality	Economic Impacts	Letter	10/13/2005
We are concerned and feel it is important to evaluate the impacts within the entire reach of the sub-watersheds that feed Knik Arm, especially those that will be crossed by the proposed 14 mile road corridor, as opposed to just evaluating the area within the right-of-way of the proposed road corridor.	Christine B. Reichgott	EPA	Water Quality	Environmental Consequences Analysis	Letter	10/13/2005
The upper Cook Inlet system, including the wetlands, streams and lakes, is a very dynamic and important regional system.	Christine B. Reichgott	EPA	Water Quality	Hydrology & Hydraulics	Letter	10/13/2005
Does a water supply issue in the Point MacKenzie area undermine part of your purpose & Need?	Elaine Somers	EPA	Water Quality	Purpose and Need	Agency Scoping Meeting	4/25/2005
To meet the requirements of the Clean Water Act the NEPA document must identify all water bodies likely to be impacted by the project, the nature of the potential impacts, and the specific pollutants likely to impact those waters.	Christine Reichgott	EPA	Water Quality	Water Quality	Letter + Attachments	6/16/2005
Will water supply be added as a GIS layer? What is the aquifer level? Funds should be provided to USGS to look at it.	Larry Dugan	ADEC	Water Quality		Agency Scoping Meeting	4/25/2005

Comment	Commenter	Agency	Topic 1	Topic 2	Venue	Date
ADEC is concerned with water quality during construction and after, storm water runoff, snow removal, and other impacts.	Mel Langdon	ADEC	Water Quality		Meeting	2/25/2005
Fill placed in Knik Arm will not affect water quality, since the water is so silty.	Matt Miller	ADF&G	Water Quality		Meeting	2/15/2005
We have raised the issue of drinking water.	Elaine Somers	EPA	Water Quality		Meeting	9/27/2005
The EIS should identify all waterbodies likely to be impacted and the nature of the impact. 303(d) waterbodies should be discussed related to whether a TMDL has been developed.	Christine Reichgott	EPA	Water Quality		Letter + Attachments	6/16/2005
There have not been any studies done on water quality and runoff from roads in the area.	Jack Puff	MOA Floodplains	Water Quality		Meeting	2/22/2005
Water quality and runoff from roads is an issue.	Jack Puff	MOA Floodplains	Water Quality		Meeting	2/22/2005
Water quantity should be added to the list of resource components to analyze in the indirect and cumulative impacts.	Murph O'Brien	MSB	Water Quality		Agency Scoping Meeting	4/25/2005
Water supply is a factor in the MSB. There is more arsenic showing up in the wells.	Murph O'Brien	MSB	Water Quality		Agency Scoping Meeting	4/25/2005
Air and water quality related issues should not create sizable problems. Wetland related questions are the most important to address.	Marcia Combs	USEPA	Wetlands	Air Quality	Meeting	9/15/2004
We are interested in the secondary impacts to the wetlands in Knik Arm	Skip Joy	COE	Wetlands	Cumulative and Secondary Impacts	Meeting	9/26/2005
We are concerned about sedimentation impacting other important wetlands in Knik Arm and erosion.	Heather Dean	EPA	Wetlands	Environmental Consequences Analysis	Meeting	8/26/2005
Influence of the project on wetland related issues will need to be addressed, including upstream wetlands, changes in tidal estuaries, and drainage.	Steve Duncan	USEPA	Wetlands	Hydrology & Hydraulics	Meeting	9/15/2004
The MSB recently passed wetlands banking. Some of the land is in the project area and is now protected.	Murph O'Brien	MSB	Wetlands	Land Use	Agency Scoping Meeting	4/25/2005
At what point does reality come into scenarios (for land use and development)? For example, could wetlands be developed because it is cheaper land?	Francis Mann	USFWS	Wetlands	Land Use	Agency Scoping Meeting	4/25/2005
EPA's big concern is with wetlands.	Heather Dean	USEPA	Wetlands	Public and Agency Involvement	Meeting	2/16/2005
The wetlands debit-credit document was developed by EPA, FWS, COE and MOA. The method were published in 2000. The fee-in-lieu has fluctuated due to changes in property values. The values get audited every year. Today the value is: REV-1 \$54,785/acre-based on acquisition; REV-2 \$36,523/acre-based on acquisition; REV-3 \$6,939/acre-based on restoration.	Thede Tobish	MOA-Coastal Zone Management	Wetlands	Wetlands	Telephone	9/29/2004
All of the proposed alignments segments would impact wetlands or waters of the U.S.	Irvin Joy	COE	Wetlands		Letter	8/9/2005
I would like to see better identification of wetlands as well as functional assessment.	Steve Duncan	EPA	Wetlands		Meeting	9/27/2005
A better assessment of functions of wetlands outside the direct project footprint is needed.	Steve Duncan	EPA	Wetlands		Meeting	9/27/2005
Concerns about potential impacts on upstream wetlands.	Steve Duncan	USEPA	Wetlands		Letter	9/15/2004
Bill Pearson with the USFWS is working on digitizing wetland inventories. Phil will contact Bill and report to Edrie. The Mat-Su Borough is next on the list.	Phil Brna	USFWS	Wetlands		Meeting	1/26/2005
It would be good to know how birds use the shoreline	Phil Brna	USFWS	Wildlife	Alternatives	Meeting	8/24/2005
Suggested that we talk to Tony Kavalok (ADF&G) about doing a moose movement study. The Mat-Su would be the perfect place to do it, and it would determine where to put moose crossing structures. How to go about the study is unclear, as collaring bulls and cows is very expensive.	Rick Sinnot	ADF&G	Wildlife	Cumulative and Secondary Impacts	Meeting	2/15/2005
Black and brown bears and coyotes would be likely attracted to development and waste (associated with indirect development), so it would be worthwhile to facilitate nuisance management techniques with the project.	Gino del Frate	ADF&G- Wildlife Conservation	Wildlife	Cumulative and Secondary Impacts	Telephone	9/2/2004

Comment	Commenter	Agency	Topic 1	Topic 2	Venue	Date
The Crossing itself won't be the big factor for the moose, but all of the traffic and development will probably lead to many more car related deaths, also a human safety factor. The roads will likely bisect these two great moose wintering habitats, impacting both local moose and those who are migrating. The bad snow years will be especially fatal to moose who seek out roads for easier walking. Mitigation for impacts to moose is recommended such as fences, lights, and wildlife passageways such as over and underpasses.	Gino del Frate	ADF&G- Wildlife Conservation	Wildlife	Cumulative and Secondary Impacts	Telephone	9/2/2004
There are many concerns that road and rail projects in the area will produce the worst moose kills in the state, not at the port or the crossing, but from the feeder roads. The construction and improvement of roads will increase the speed and volume of traffic in the area significantly, an area that hosts some of the largest concentrations of moose in Alaska.	Gino del Frate	ADF&G- Wildlife Conservation	Wildlife	Cumulative and Secondary Impacts	Telephone	9/2/2004
We recommend that the DEIS for this project provide the information for the aquatic resources within the entire reach of those sub-watersheds of Knik Arm that will be crossed by the proposed project corridor. This information would be valuable for alternative futures analyses and for looking at mitigation opportunities.	Christine B. Reichgott	EPA	Wildlife	Cumulative and Secondary Impacts	Letter	10/13/2005
The use of intertidal zones by shorebirds needs to be studied.	Francis Mann	USFWS	Wildlife	Cumulative and Secondary Impacts	Agency Scoping Mtg	3/29/2005
A particularly significant impact, generated by the 14-mile Upper Pt. MacKenzie Road corridor, would be the barrier effect of the roadway, causing habitat fragmentation for terrestrial and aquatic species, as well as the effects on ecological processes, such as hydrology, movement of nutrients, sediment, and so on. As part of the proposal, we recommend (1) incorporating wildlife crossings to accommodate the movement needs of resident species and to increase safety by preventing vehicular-wildlife collisions, such as with moose; and (2) incorporating roadway design that provides for maintaining the integrity of natural ecological processes, particularly hydrological processes and connectivity.	Christine B. Reichgott	EPA	Wildlife	Hydrology & Hydraulics	Letter	10/13/2005
Moose use the beach for movement on the military land. Moose must be kept off the bridge.	Gregg Schmidt	3CES/CEVP-EAFB	Wildlife	Military	Agency Scoping Mtg	3/29/2005
OHMP has to act conservatively if they are given limited information about the project. The agencies need to know how other projects have impacted the natural environment and animal migration.	Matt LaCroix	ADNR	Wildlife	Public and Agency Involvement	Meeting	2/17/2005
There are no endangered species in the project area, although Steller's eider and sea otter's (proposed) are found in the lower Cook Inlet. Although they would not be directly impacted by the project, they may be an issue.	Phil Brna	USFWS	Wildlife	Threatened and Endangered Species	Meeting	1/26/2005
The development of transportation infrastructure will impact moose. MSB had the highest moose kill in the state last year even with low snow cover. Increased traffic will increase that.	Tony Kavalok	ADF&G	Wildlife	Traffic	Agency Scoping Mtg	3/29/2005
USFWS is interested in issues with their "trust resources": migratory birds, anadromous fish, and wetlands.	Phil Brna	USFWS	Wildlife	Wetlands	Meeting	1/26/2005
Raptors like to use the cliffs for nesting on both sides.	Gregg Schmidt	3CES/CEVP-EAFB	Wildlife	Wildlife	Agency Scoping Mtg	3/29/2005
Wildlife corridors and moose habitat must be maintained because of the Sykes Act.	Greg Schmidt	3CES/CEVP-EAFB	Wildlife		Agency Scoping Mtg	7/14/2005
We don't have a lot of information about terrestrial migration through the MSB.	Mark Fink	ADF&G	Wildlife		Meeting	9/27/2005
Wildlife should include bears, not just moose.	Mark Fink	ADF&G	Wildlife		Agency Scoping Mtg	4/25/2005
Fewer concerns exist with wildlife on the Anchorage side, especially if the route goes through Port of Anchorage/Ship Creek/Government Hill. The Anchorage side of the project area is a general wildlife "write-off" area.	Rick Sinnot	ADF&G	Wildlife		Meeting	2/15/2005

Comment	Commenter	Agency	Topic 1	Topic 2	Venue	Date
Moose kills on the road will also be a concern on the Mat-Su side. This is an issue for the moose as well as for public safety. Recent studies showed around 130 moose per square mile in the Point MacKenzie area. The moose tend to move back and forth from the Susitna Flats State Game Refuge to the Palmer Hay Flats. That area is heavily hunted for moose, as well as small game. Trapping occurs in the area also.	Rick Sinnot	ADF&G	Wildlife		Meeting	2/15/2005
Large mammal populations, except for moose, are in very low numbers because the Port MacKenzie area is not good habitat for them. The moose populations however are extremely high in the winter, and high for the rest of the year.	Gino del Frate	ADF&G- Wildlife Conservation	Wildlife		Telephone	9/2/2004
There are shorebirds in the upper intertidal in the Arm. There are more birds than we see or think.	Matt LaCroix	ADNR-OHMP	Wildlife		Telephone	8/13/2004
We primarily hear about moose and bear on the Mat-Su side. Why not on the Anchorage side?	Jamie Spell	ALCOM	Wildlife		Agency Scoping Mtg	7/14/2005
We recommend the EIS specifically address conservation of green space corridors to maintain moose and bear population connectivity, as well as methods to avoid and minimize moose/human encounters, particularly vehicle collisions, in the Point Mackenzie area.	Don Perrin	DNR OPMP	Wildlife		Agency Scoping Mtg	5/9/2005
Harbor seals are seen at the mouths of the Little Susitna and Big Susitna (but rarely in Knik Arm).	Mark Boland	NOAA Fisheries Fisheries-Protected Species	Wildlife		Meeting	8/26/2004
There are amphibians in the area-wood frogs.	Phil Brna	USFWS	Wildlife		Meeting	9/27/2005
Use of intertidal and other habitats where fill or other structures might be placed should be evaluated for use by migratory birds.	Denny R. Lassuy	USFWS	Wildlife		Letter	5/10/2005
The potential for bird strikes with the bridge should be evaluated.	Denny R. Lassuy	USFWS	Wildlife		Letter	5/10/2005
Raptors should be added (resource components). Problems with eagle nest abandonment has occurred in the Valley.	Francis Mann	USFWS	Wildlife		Agency Scoping Meeting	4/25/2005
We keep an eagle database that should be consulted. We may need additional raptor surveys.	Francis Mann	USFWS	Wildlife		Agency Scoping Mtg	3/29/2005
Seasonal bird use on the tidal areas and migration corridors needs to be studied. There could be issues with birds striking the bridge.	Francis Mann	USFWS	Wildlife		Agency Scoping Mtg	3/29/2005
What is known about birds?	Phil Brna	USFWS- Ecological Services	Wildlife		Meeting	8/26/2004