

FHWA guidelines for Section 4(f) require the identification and consideration of an alternative that completely avoids Section 4(f) resources. Based on the known locations of historic sites, the irrigation canal, cultural resources, and recreation sites, only one alignment examined completely avoids all Section 4(f) resources. The Section 4(f) Evaluation examined this alignment and concluded that it was not prudent because it did not meet the project purpose and need. The avoidance alignment would not improve safety, failed to improve freight mobility, created excessive costs, and would have unacceptable social impacts.

Of the build alternatives, the Selected Alternative affects the fewest Section 4(f) resources. One of the criteria for use of Section 4(f) resources is that the project include all possible planning to minimize harm to the resource. Specific measures to minimize harm to the two historic resources are discussed under the National Historic Preservation Act.

Based on the above, FHWA has determined that there is no feasible and prudent alternative to the use of land from the irrigation canal and a historic home. The Selected Alternative includes all possible planning to minimize harm to the irrigation canal and the historic home from their use.

7.9 Section 6(f) of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act

Two resources in the Study Area are known to have been developed with funding resources under Section 6(f) of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act. Neither site is affected by the Selected Alternative. Comment by the National Park Service on Section 6(f) lands is not required.

8.0 Conclusion

For the reasons outlined above, Alternative 3B is the alternative that best meets the purpose and need of the project, and will have the least impact to the human and natural environment. FHWA will ensure that the commitments outlined above, in the Final EIS, and in the Biological Assessment will be implemented as part of the project design and construction.

Based upon a careful consideration of all social, economic, and environmental impacts contained in the Final EIS; the various technical studies completed; the input from other agencies and the public; and the factors and commitments outlined above, it is the decision of the FHWA to choose the Alternative 3B for the SR 28 Eastside Corridor Project.

RECORD OF DECISION APPROVAL

The Record of Decision for the SR 28 Eastside Corridor Project is hereby approved.

05/17/07
Date

Daniel M. Mathis
Daniel M. Mathis
Division Administrator
Federal Highway Administration