



DRAFT ENVIRONMENTAL IMPAGT STATEMENT - STATUS





301 US 301 Project Development



The National Environmental Policy Act of 1970 requires the preparation of an environmental analysis for federal actions or undertakings using federal funds.

NEPA Requirements:

NEPA requires the federal government to use all practicable means to create and maintain conditions under which man and nature can exist in productive harmony. NEPA requires federal agencies to incorporate environmental considerations in their planning and decision-making through a systematic interdisciplinary approach. Specifically, all federal agencies are to prepare detailed statements (Environmental Impact Statements) assessing the environmental impact of and alternatives to major federal actions significantly affecting the environment. NEPA-related hearings or public meetings are required. The lead agencies must also consider all comments from the public and other parties received during the formal comment period. NEPA requires federal agencies to lend appropriate support to initiatives and programs designed to anticipate and prevent a decline in the quality of the environment.

What is an EIS?

An Environmental Impact Statement is an assessment of the environmental impacts of various alternatives to a project. An EIS is required by the federal government under NEPA for certain federal actions that could have a significant impact on the natural, socioeconomic, or cultural environment.

An EIS is a full disclosure document that details the process through which a transportation project was developed and includes the following important sections:

Defining purpose and need is the first step in the NEPA process. It provides an explanation for why a project is being pursued.

The design and details for each build alternative and the no-build are described.

The affected environment includes description of potential areas that would be impacted as a result of the project; this includes the socioeconomic, natural, and cultural environment.

• Environmental Consequences

How each alternative would impact the socioeconomic, natural and cultural environment is described.

Comments and Coordination

All formal comments made during the public comment period (held after the DEIS is submitted) are included along with agency comments made in response to each public comment. A description of all agency coordination occurring throughout is also included.

The EIS Process

The EIS process is completed in the following steps:

Notice of Intent (NOI) \longrightarrow Draft EIS \longrightarrow Final EIS \longrightarrow Record of Decision (ROD)

- The NOI is published in the Federal Register by the lead Federal agency and signals the initiation of the process. The NOI for the US 301 EIS was issued on February 3, 2005 in the Federal Register.
- Scoping is an open process involving the public and other Federal, state and local agencies, commences immediately to identify the major and important issues for consideration during the study.
- Public involvement and agency coordination continues throughout the entire process.
- The draft EIS (DEIS) provides a detailed description of the proposal, purpose and need, reasonable alternatives, affected environment and environmental effects.
- Following a formal comment period the final EIS (FEIS) is issued. The FEIS addresses the comments on the DEIS and identifies the selected alternative.
- Once the FEIS is published, a minimum 30-day waiting period is required before a Record of Decision (ROD) can be issued. A ROD notifies the public of the alternative that the agency has selected to proceed with and the reasons for that decision.

US 301 Draft Environmental Impact Statement

The US 301 EIS

The DEIS was completed and made available to resource agencies and the public on November 17, 2006. Following the Federal requirements as described under NEPA, the DEIS includes as an evaluation of all the engineering and environmental analysis performed to date on the project.

Chapter I - describes the project purpose and need.

Chapter II - describes the project parpose and need.

Chapter III - describes the environmental resources and consequences (including socio-economic environment, cultural resources, and natural environment).

Chapter IV - includes formal comments and agency coordination.

Chapter V - outlines the recommended preferred alternative.

Kev Findings:

Impacts for the US 301 project are evaluated in Chapter III of the DEIS. Impacts include analysis of:

The Yellow Alternative would impact the most properties (377 total- including full and partial acquisitions and total relocations for residences, businesses and other properties). The Brown North Option and Brown South Option would impact the least properties (100 each). Both Brown Options would impact the Summit Airport and their FAA approved expansion plans. (FAA designated reliever airport, 85 employees, 100 based aircraft, State Police helicopter operations) - FAA likely to oppose Brown Alternatives

The Yellow Alternative is the only alternative that would impact historic properties. The impacts on architectural resources (buildings, structures), objects, archaeological sites, cultural landscapes, and districts, as defined by the National Register of Historic Places are presented in detail on Display Board No. 10.

A comparison of the No-Build Alternative to the build alternatives shows that CO concentrations generally remain the same. There are slight increases or decreases in CO concentrations that can be attributed to shifts in the roadway alignments and altered traffic patterns on existing and proposed roadways. Air Quality analysis and potential impacts are presented in detail on Display Board No. 8.

Noise impact analysis in residential areas shows that the Purple Alternative would have the most noise impacts (108). Green South Option would have the least noise impacts (63). Residential noise impacts are presented in detail on Display Board No. 9.

Rare, Threatened and Endangered Species

- All of the Alternatives would have impacts to potentially occupied bog turtle habitat. Refer to Display Board #11.

- The Brown South Option would impact the least amount of ACOE wetlands (18.5 acres). The Yellow Alternative would impact the highest amount of ACOE wetlands (50.5 acres). Potential impacts on Rare, Threatened and Endangered Species are presented in detail on Display Board No. 11.

Waters of the US

- The Yellow Alternative would impact the highest amount of Waters of the US (20,708 linear feet). The Brown South Option would impact the least amount of Waters of the US (14,276 linear feet).

The Brown South Option would impact the most forestland (51.0 acres). The Green North Option would impact the least amount of forestland (34.1 acres).

Hydric Soils
- The Yellow Alternative impacts the most hydric soils (158 acres). The Brown South Option would impact the leas hydric soils (115 acres).

Section Sect								
Part Common		YELLOW	LLOW PURPLE with SPUR		OWN	GREEN with SPUR		
## A COUNTY FINE AND ADDRESS A				NORTH	SOUTH	NORTH	SOUTH	ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCE
## A COUNTY FINE AND ADDRESS A								ATTEDMATIVES IMPACT
MARIX NOVEMBER 2006 Maria Mari		Barrella Carrella Barrel						ALIERNATIVES INFACT
Product Calculate Product Prod								MATRIV
Property Column								
Company Comp						Spur	Spur	NOVEMBER 2006
The state of the	project development					Option 38	Option 38	THO TEMBER 2000
The content of the	/ /							
The content of the	Total Length of Attenuative (miles)	19.4	16.2	17.0	15.9	17.5	17.3	Total Length of Albertative (miles)
The content of the first content of the content o		870.5	921.9	295.9	294.3	297.4	278.3	
Property 1	Potential Mediand/Waters of the US Impacts. Total Area of Butantial ACCE Waterday (acces)	50.5	***	77.5	18.5	36.7	11.1	Published Welland Workers of She LS Impacts Turnel Associat States and Referented ACTNI Wellands (Account)
Property 1	High Quality							High Quality
Property of the Control of the Con	Paluation Forested			5.6	5.4	4.5	4.3	Palustian Forested
Management Man	Paluation Struit-Soute		0		0			Palustian Strub-Souti
Proceedings	Paluation Mond	42		1.6				Patastian Mixed
Property and Texas		30.8						
The content of the	Paluation Emergent		7.6					Patastian Emergent
The content of the								
Page 10	Lew Quality	11.2	62	8.2	1.3	4.0	9.1	Law Coulty
Property of the Control of the Con								
Proceedings			2.8					Paturbian Emergent Balumian Strong-South
The content of the	Paluation Morel							
The second sec	Other Wellands							CELAN WARLANDS
The second content of the second content o	Trop angler quality undetermined to date Number of Mediands beneathed		41	-	ů	å	- 4	Type and/or quality undeterminated to date Number of Welfunds Inspected
The content of the	Number of Medand Crossings		•	10	ï	ï	ï	Number of Welland Crossings
The color of the		7		1	4		7	
March Marc	Waters of the US (non-welland)							Waters of the US (non-welland)*
The content of the	Ditulnes (linear feet)	29,482	15,997	14,227	12,383	15,388	15,805	Ditables (Sinear Seet)
The state of the	Open Wides (sonds, SWM) (Sores)	24	3.2	22	1.1	32	32	Open Wilders (bonds, SYMM) (agres)
Company	DROBLC State-Appearant Lands (Steam's Beet)							DISSEC Sub-Aqueous Lands (Inner Inn)
The state of the s	Recharge Areas (scres)	954	592	636		699	961	Resharae Areas (acres)
The state of the		81						
March Marc		153	167	28	113			
The content of the								Putential Floodylain Impacts - FEMA
		1.5	1.9	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	
March Marc			,					
The content of the		16.1						
The second second part of the	Number of Agricultural Districts within 3 miles of Attenuative	-	7					Number of Agricultural Districts within 3 miles of Attenuative
The second section for the content before the conte	Area (scient)		6.0	9.4	124	- 63	- 63	Ana (acres)
The content of the		3	3	2	2	2	2	
Annual Content of the Content of t	Agricultural Suitsbillty (Land Evaluation Site Assessment Model)							Agricultural Suitability (Land Evaluation Site Assessment Model)
The factors of the page 1 and		212		222		218	213	
	Prime Familiand Solf Area (sores)							Prime Farndand 3nd Area (acres)
The second sec	Ratio of prime familiand to total prime familiand in New Castle County (persent) (16,454 sores total)	0.27	0.56	0.55	0.67	0.59	0.53	Rado of prime familiand to total prime familiand in New Castle County (percent)
The second of	Potential Hazardous Waste Impacts Number of SER Wase							Puterdial Hazardous Waste Impacts Number of EPA Wast
The second sec	Number of Sites identified as potential sources of contamination	i -		í	í	1 1	1	Number of Sites identified as potential sources of contamination
The content of the		-						
The following control The		61	41					
The state of the		0.8	2.3	2	1	2	2	
Proceedings Process		6.8	2.3	1.9		2.0	2.8	
Section 1		26.3			91.0		26.8	Forestland: 2002 Land Use
The state								
We bright		62		1.0	3.7			
	State Forest Lands		-1	-				State Funest Lands
1	State Owned State Forest Properties Secret							State-Owned State Forest Properties (acres)
The contract of the contract o		(1)		67.5	27.0	110	414	
Asset of Adding Ground Asset the Section Asset Sec	Potential Section 4(f) Properties							Putential Section 6(1) Properties
February Control	Number of Publicly-Owned Parks and Recreation Areas*	- 4			0			Number of Publicly-Owned Parks and Recreation Areas*
Sec Codes	Acres of Publicly-Owned Parks and Recreation Areas					-		Acres of Publicly-Owned Parks and Recreation Areas
Managint Canada 0 0 0 0 0 Managing Canada Namada Canada Ca	State Owned		×			-		State Daniel
Number of Federally Owner William and Waterland Refuges.	County Dwned							County Owned
	Municipal Channel Number of Fulfish General Wealths and Waterfood Refuses		- 1	- 1		-		Municipal Owned Number of Publishy Owned Wildlife and Widerfood Kellules
Manuface of Historial Properties* 4 0 0 0 0 0 0 Manuface Historial Properties* 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 Manuface Historial Properties*								Monther of Mattels Respection*

Recommended Preferred Alternative

Effects to the natural and built environment, resource and regulatory agency input, and the results of the extensive public involvement process were carefully evaluated by DelDOT in order to develop a Preferred Alternative recommendation. Based on all analysis completed and presented in this Draft Environmental Impact Statement, DelDOT recommends the Green Alternative North Option as the Preferred Alternative for the US 301 project. This alternative would include Armstrong Corner Road (ACR) Area Option 2A and Summit Interchange (SI) Option 3B. Refer to Display Board #17

This recommendation is for a Preferred Alternative only. Final identification of the Selected Alternative cannot occur until after a public hearing is conducted, the Final Environmental Impact Statement has been publicly circulated and the Record of Decision is complete. DelDOT will continue to interact with members of the public and communities, and those directly affected by the Preferred Alternative, along with the environmental resource and regulatory agencies, to refine the Preferred Alternative design and develop strategies to avoid, minimize and mitigate impacts.

Next Steps in NEPA Process:

• DEIS Comment Period: November 17, 2006 through February 3, 2007

The comment period has been extended from the date published in the DEIS (February 1, 2007).

Written and oral comments may be submitted at the public hearing. Written comments may also be submitted on the project website (www.us301.org) or via mail:

US 301 Project Comments Attn: Mr. Robert Kleinburd Environmental Program Manager Federal Highway Administration 300 South New Street Dover, Delaware 19901

US 301 Project Comments Attn: Mr. Mark Tudor Project Director Delaware Department of Transportation 800 Bay Road Dover, Delaware 19903

Identify Preferred Alternative

The FEIS will include updated impact calculations for the Preferred Alternative. The FEIS will also include all public comments received during the comment period and agency responses to the comments.

Prepare Record of Decision (ROD)

Alternative Selected for Design