Wild and Scenic Rivers Technical Report

State Highway 82 / Entrance to Aspen Environmental Reevaluation

February 20, 2007

Colorado Department of Transportation, Region 3 and

Federal Highway Administration, Colorado Division

Prepared by:

HDR Engineering, Inc.

Contents

1.0	AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT	
1.1	Methodology	1
1.2	Regulatory Overview	1
1.3	Description of the Existing Condition	1
2.0	ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES	1
2.1	Methodology	1
2.2	Preferred Alternative	2
3.0	MITIGATION MEASURES	2
4.0	SUMMARY OF IMPACTS AND MITIGATION	2
5.0	AGENCY COORDINATION	2
6.0	References	2
7.0	LIST OF PREPARERS	2

1.0 Affected Environment

This report provides a reevaluation of wild and scenic rivers resources analysis presented in the 1997 State Highway 82 Entrance to Aspen Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) for the Preferred Alternative selected in the Record of Decision (ROD) issued in August 1998.

1.1 Methodology

The list of designated Wild and Scenic River resources was reviewed for designated Wild and Scenic Rivers in Colorado (National Park Service (NPS), no date). The U.S. Forest Service (USFS) was contacted to determine if the Roaring Fork River had been evaluated as eligible for designation as a wild, scenic or recreation river segment. Additionally, the land and resource management plan for the White River National Forest was reviewed to determine if the USFS had evaluated or proposed the Roaring Fork River as eligible for a wild, scenic or recreation designation (USFS 2002).

1.2 Regulatory Overview

There have been no new or changed regulatory requirements regarding Wild and Scenic Rivers since the publication of the 1997 FEIS.

1.3 Description of the Existing Condition

Since the 1997 FEIS, there have been no changes in Wild and Scenic Rivers designations for the Roaring Fork River. The Roaring Fork River is not designated as a Wild and Scenic River (NPS, no date). As part of the EIS that supported the revised 2002 Land and Resource Management Plan prepared for the White River National Forest, the USFS studied all rivers within the forest for eligibility as designated Wild and Scenic Rivers. Five river and stream segments were recommended as eligible; the Roaring Fork River was not included in that list.

2.0 Environmental Consequences

2.1 Methodology

No Wild and Scenic Rivers are present in the project corridor and no changes have been made in the Preferred Alternative since the FEIS and ROD. No additional impact analysis was necessary.

February 20, 2007 Wild and Scenic Rivers 1

2.2 Preferred Alternative

No Wild and Scenic Rivers are present in the project corridor. Therefore, there will be no impacts to these resources from the Preferred Alternative selected in the ROD.

3.0 Mitigation Measures

No mitigation measures are necessary because there will be no impacts to Wild and Scenic Rivers from construction, operation or maintenance of the Preferred Alternative.

4.0 Summary of Impacts and Mitigation

Table 4-1
Summary of Impacts and Mitigation Measures

Topic	FEIS Impact	Reevaluation Impact	Mitigation Measures
Wild & Scenic Rivers	No impact	No change	No mitigation measures

5.0 Agency Coordination

The US Forest Service was contacted for information related to the reevaluation of wild and scenic rivers.

6.0 References

National Park Service (NPS). No Date. Wild and Scenic Rivers by State. Accessible on http://www.nps.gov/rivers/wildriverslist.html accessed on June 28, 2006.

Sandate, Matt. 2006. Personal communication between Matt Sandate, USFS and Laura Lutz-Zimmerman, HDR Engineering on June 28, 2006 regarding the status of the Roaring Fork River as a Wild and Scenic River.

United States Department of Agriculture, Forest Service (USFS). 2002. Land and Resource Management Plan. Available at: http://www.fs.fed.us/r2/whiteriver/projects/forest_plan/index.shtml accessed on June 28, 2006

7.0 List of Preparers

Laura R. Lutz-Zimmerman, Environmental Scientist, HDR Engineering, Inc.