



I-94 Rehabilitation Project

FHWA-MI-EIS-01-01-F

December 2004

Final Environmental

Impact Statement

and

Section 4(f)

Evaluation



**I-94 REHABILITATION PROJECT
CITY OF DETROIT, WAYNE COUNTY, MICHIGAN**

**FINAL ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT
AND FINAL SECTION 4(f) EVALUATION**

**SUBMITTED PURSUANT TO 42 U.S.C. 4332(2)(C), 49 U.S.C. 303
BY THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION (USDOT),
FEDERAL HIGHWAY ADMINISTRATION (FHWA),**

**AND
THE MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION (MDOT)**

12/21/2004

Date of Approval

James J. Steele
For Federal Highway Administration

The following persons may be contacted for additional information concerning this document:

NAME: Abdelmoez Abdalla
Federal Highway Administration
Michigan Division
Environmental Program Manager
315 West Allegan Street
Federal Building, Room 201
Lansing, MI 48933
PHONE: (517) 702-1820
FAX: (517) 377-1804
E-mail: abdelmoez.abdalla@fhwa.dot.gov

NAME: Margaret Barondess
Michigan Department of Transportation
Section Manager
425 W. Ottawa St.
P.O. Box 30050
Lansing, MI 48909
PHONE: (517) 373-2230
FAX: (517) 335-2731
E-mail: barondessm@michigan.gov

Abstract: This Condensed Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) and Final Section 4(f) Evaluation documents the social, economic, and environmental impacts and mitigation, measures associated with the proposed rehabilitation of a portion of I-94 in Detroit, Wayne County, Michigan. The proposed action would provide transportation improvements to a 6.7-mile portion of I-94 from east of I-96 on the west end to Conner Avenue on the east end. The project would address capacity, safety, pavement, and bridge needs while also enhancing local traffic circulation by separating it from through freeway traffic. This FEIS fulfills the requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act and Federal Highway Administration. Comments on this Final Environmental Impact Statement and Final Sections 4 (f) Evaluation should be submitted to Ms. Margaret Barondess.

This document has been published by authorization of the Director of the State of Michigan's Department of Transportation in keeping with the intent of the *National Environmental Policy Act of 1969* and subsequent implementing regulations and policies including *Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964*, that direct agencies to provide the public and other agencies an opportunity to review and comment on proposed projects and alternates so that potential impacts on the project can be considered and taken into account during the decision-making process. The cost of publishing 200 copies of this document at \$70 per copy is \$14,000, and the document has been printed in accordance with *Michigan Executive Directive 1991-6*.

PREFACE

The National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) of 1969 requires that the social, economic, and natural environmental impacts of any proposed action of the federal government be analyzed for decision-making and public information purposes. There are three classes of action. Class I Actions, which are those that may significantly affect the environment, require the preparation of an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS). Class II Actions (categorical exclusions) are those that do not individually or cumulatively have a significant effect on the environment, and do not require the preparation of an EIS or an Environmental Assessment (EA). Class III Actions are those for which the significance of impacts is not clearly established. Class III Actions require the preparation of an EA to determine the significance of impacts and the appropriate environmental document to be prepared – either an EIS or a Finding of No Significant Impact (FONSI).

This document is a Condensed Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) for the proposed I-94 Rehabilitation Project from east of I-96 to east of Conner Avenue, city of Detroit, Wayne County, Michigan. It presents the Recommended Alternative and relevant analyses and addresses the comments received during the public hearing process. Following the comment period on this FEIS, a Record of Decision (ROD) will allow the project to proceed to design, right-of-way acquisition and construction.

This document also contains a Final Section 4(f) Evaluation for the I-94 Rehabilitation Project. Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act requires that an evaluation be prepared when the proposed action may have an adverse effect on a property eligible for or listed on the National Register of Historic Places. The proposed action has been determined to have an adverse effect on properties that meet the criteria for listing on the National Register of Historic Places. A Memorandum of Agreement under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act is also included in this document.

This document was prepared by the Project Planning Division of the Michigan Department of Transportation (MDOT), in cooperation with the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), and other members of the study team. The study team includes representatives from the following divisions within MDOT: Design, Project Planning, Real Estate, Construction and Technology, and Traffic and Safety. The MDOT Metro Region and the MDOT Detroit Transportation Service Center staff also participated in the project development process. Information contained in this FEIS was also furnished by other federal and state agencies, local units of government, public interest groups, and individual citizens.

STATEMENT OF DISCLOSURE

Parsons Brinckerhoff, Inc. (Parsons Brinckerhoff) has no interest, financial or otherwise, in the preparation of the I-94 Rehabilitation Project Environmental Impact Statement and Record of Decision other than compensation for the services performed and the general enhancement of Parsons Brinckerhoff's professional reputation. The team of professionals which Parsons Brinckerhoff assembled to conduct field studies and analyses was selected based solely upon their qualifications. To the best of Parsons Brinckerhoff's knowledge, no person or firm contributing to the preparation of this document has any interest in the findings or outcome of the process.

1.0	SUMMARY	1-1
1.1	Introduction.....	1-1
1.2	Description of Project Area.....	1-2
1.2.1	Validation of Project Limits.....	1-2
1.3	Purpose and Need for the Proposed Project.....	1-4
1.4	Alternatives.....	1-5
1.4.1	No-Build Alternative	1-5
1.4.2	Enhanced No-Build Alternative.....	1-6
1.4.3	DEIS Build Alternative	1-6
1.4.4	Modifications to DEIS Build Alternative.....	1-7
1.4.5	Comparison of Practical Alternatives and Selection of the Recommended Alternative.....	1-7
1.4.6	Description of the Recommended Alternative.....	1-7
1.5	Social, Economic, and Environmental Impacts	1-8
1.5.1	Social Environment	1-8
1.5.1.1	Acquisition Impacts.....	1-8
1.5.1.2	Displacement Impacts	1-8
1.5.1.3	Community Facilities and Services	1-9
1.5.1.4	Non-Motorized (Pedestrian and Bicycle) Mobility	1-10
1.5.2	Environmental Justice.....	1-10
1.5.3	Economic Development	1-12
1.5.4	Land Use.....	1-13
1.5.5	Aesthetics and Visual Resources.....	1-14
1.5.6	Air Quality.....	1-15
1.5.7	Noise.....	1-16
1.5.8	Vibration.....	1-18
1.5.9	Contaminated Sites.....	1-18
1.5.10	Drainage and Water Quality	1-19
1.5.11	Wetlands and Floodplains.....	1-19
1.5.12	Vegetation and Wildlife.....	1-19
1.5.13	Archaeological Resources.....	1-19
1.5.14	Cultural Resources	1-20
1.5.15	Energy.....	1-22
1.5.16	Utilities.....	1-22
1.5.17	Construction Impacts	1-22
1.5.18	Indirect Impacts.....	1-23
1.5.19	Cumulative Impacts.....	1-24
1.6	Public Participation and Agency Coordination	1-25
1.7	Re-Evaluation.....	1-27
2.0	PURPOSE OF, AND NEED FOR, THE PROPOSED ACTION	2-1
2.1	Purpose of the Proposed Action.....	2-1
2.2	Project Background	2-2
2.2.1	Truck Volumes at Border Crossings.....	2-4
2.2.2	Regional Transportation Planning.....	2-5

2.2.3	Continuing Economic Development.....	2-5
2.2.4	Other Interstate and Freeway Projects.....	2-6
2.2.5	Other Transportation Planning and Projects	2-7
2.3	Description of the Project Limits.....	2-8
2.3.1	Validation of Project Limits.....	2-10
2.3.2	Logical Termini.....	2-10
2.3.3	Independent Utility.....	2-11
2.3.4	Other Improvements	2-11
2.4	Description of the Recommended Alternative	2-12
2.5	Need for the Proposed Action	2-12
2.5.1	Sufficiency Rating.....	2-13
2.5.2	Bridge Conditions	2-13
2.5.3	Traffic Congestion	2-13
2.5.4	Local Traffic.....	2-14
2.5.5	Safety.....	2-14
2.5.6	Transit, Pedestrians, and Bicyclists.....	2-14
2.5.7	Economic Setting	2-15
2.5.8	I-94 System Connectivity and Continuity.....	2-15
2.6	Project Goals and Objectives.....	2-16
2.6.1	MDOT’s Long Range Plan.....	2-16
2.6.2	Corridors of Highest Significance	2-17
2.7	Summary.....	2-18
3.0	PROJECT PLANNING PROCESS.....	3-1
3.1	Project Background	3-1
3.1.1	Interagency Coordination Committee and SEMCOG Goals.....	3-1
3.1.2	Objectives Shared by the ICC and SEMCOG	3-2
3.2	Public Participation Program.....	3-2
3.3	Process for Selecting Alternatives for Further Evaluation.....	3-3
3.4	Other Projects	3-4
3.5	Consistency with Regional Planning.....	3-4
4.0	ALTERNATIVES.....	4-1
4.1	Alternatives Considered and Dismissed in the DEIS.....	4-1
4.2	No-Build Alternative.....	4-1
4.3	Enhanced No-Build Alternative.....	4-1
4.4	DEIS Build Alternative.....	4-2
4.5	Development of Modifications to the DEIS Build Alternative.....	4-3
4.6	Description of the Recommended Alternative and Refinements.....	4-4

4.7	Potential for Project Staging Associated with the Recommended Alternative	4-5
4.8	Cost of the Recommended Alternative	4-7
5.0	AFFECTED ENVIRONMENT AND SOCIAL, ECONOMIC, AND ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACTS.....	5-1
5.1	Social Environment.....	5-1
5.1.1	Existing Social Environment.....	5-1
5.1.1.1	Population.....	5-1
5.1.1.2	Housing	5-5
5.1.1.3	Community Facilities and Services	5-5
5.1.1.4	Non-Motorized (Pedestrian and Bicycle) Mobility	5-7
5.1.1.5	Neighborhood/Community Character and Cohesion.....	5-8
5.1.2	Impacts to the Social Environment	5-20
5.1.2.1	Acquisition and Displacement Impacts	5-20
5.1.2.2	Impacts to Community Facilities and Services.....	5-21
5.1.2.3	Non-Motorized (Pedestrian and Bicycle) Mobility	5-24
5.1.3	Mitigation of Recommended Alternative Impacts to the Social Environment.....	5-25
5.1.3.1	Mitigation of Acquisitions and Displacements.....	5-25
5.1.3.2	Mitigation of Other Impacts to the Social Environment.....	5-25
5.1.4	Environmental Justice.....	5-25
5.1.4.1	Determination of Effects on Minority and Low Income Populations.....	5-29
5.1.4.2	Impacts on Minority and Low Income Populations.....	5-30
5.1.4.3	Offsetting Benefits, Mitigation, and Reduction of Impacts Summary	5-31
5.2	Economic Environment.....	5-34
5.2.1	Economic Development	5-34
5.2.2	Impacts to the Economy	5-34
5.2.2.1	Recommended Alternative	5-34
5.2.3	Mitigation of Recommended Alternative Impacts to Economic Conditions	5-37
5.3	Land Use	5-38
5.3.1	Existing Land Use Conditions	5-38
5.3.2	Impacts to Land Use.....	5-39
5.4	Aesthetics and Visual Resources.....	5-39
5.4.1	Existing Conditions.....	5-39
5.4.2	Impacts to Aesthetics and Visual Resources.....	5-40
5.4.2.1	Reconstructed Interchanges.....	5-40
5.4.2.2	Proposed Right-of-Way Cross-Section.....	5-40
5.4.2.3	Impacts to Landscape Units.....	5-40
5.4.3	Mitigation of Impacts to Aesthetics and Visual Resources	5-41
5.5	Air Quality.....	5-42
5.5.1	Relevant Pollutants.....	5-42
5.5.2	National and State Ambient Air Quality Standards.....	5-42
5.5.3	Air Quality Regulations and Planning.....	5-45
5.5.3.1	Clean Air Act Amendments (CAAA) of 1990	5-45
5.5.3.2	The Non-Attainment Status of the Project Area.....	5-45
5.5.4	Impact Assessment.....	5-45
5.5.4.1	Existing Conditions	5-48
5.5.5	Impacts	5-48

5.6	Noise	5-52
5.6.1	Sound Descriptors and Human Perception to Changes in Noise Levels	5-52
5.6.2	Noise Impact Criteria and Abatement Guidelines	5-53
5.6.3	Methodology for Predicting Noise Levels	5-53
5.6.3.1	Factors Affecting Traffic Noise Levels	5-55
5.6.4	Existing Noise Conditions	5-55
5.6.5	Modeled Noise Impact	5-59
5.6.6	Noise Mitigation Measures.....	5-67
5.6.6.1	Evaluation of Alternative Abatement Measures	5-67
5.6.6.2	MDOT Noise Barrier Policy.....	5-67
5.6.6.3	Specific Abatement Requirements for Type I Projects.....	5-68
5.6.6.4	Noise Abatement Findings	5-69
5.7	Vibration	5-69
5.7.1	Existing Conditions.....	5-69
5.7.2	Impacts	5-69
5.7.3	Mitigation	5-71
5.8	Contaminated Sites	5-71
5.8.1	Existing Conditions.....	5-72
5.8.2	Mitigation	5-73
5.9	Water Quality	5-74
5.9.1	Existing Conditions.....	5-74
5.9.2	Potential Impacts	5-74
5.9.3	Water Quality Mitigation.....	5-76
5.10	Natural Resources	5-78
5.10.1	Wetlands and Floodplains.....	5-78
5.10.2	Wild and Scenic Rivers and Natural Areas	5-78
5.10.3	Vegetation and Wildlife.....	5-78
5.10.4	Threatened and Endangered Species	5-78
5.10.5	Geological Resources	5-78
5.10.6	Soils	5-78
5.11	Cultural Resources	5-79
5.11.1	Archaeological Resources.....	5-79
5.11.2	Historic Resources	5-79
5.11.2.1	Existing Historic Resources Affected.....	5-79
5.11.2.2	Impacts to Historic Resources	5-79
5.11.3	Woodbridge Neighborhood Historic District	5-82
5.11.4	I-94/M-10 Interchange.....	5-82
5.11.5	United Sound Systems Recording Studio.....	5-83
5.11.6	Square D/Detroit Fuse and Manufacturing Company Building.....	5-83
5.11.7	Mitigation of Impacts to Historic Resources	5-83
5.12	Energy	5-84
5.13	Utilities	5-84
5.14	Construction Impacts	5-84
5.14.1	Traffic Flow.....	5-85
5.14.1.1	I-94 Traffic	5-85
5.14.1.2	Mitigation	5-85

5.14.2	Emergency Services	5-85
5.14.3	Air Quality.....	5-85
5.14.4	Erosion Control and Water Quality.....	5-85
5.14.5	Noise.....	5-85
5.15	Indirect (Secondary) and Cumulative Impacts.....	5-86
5.15.1	Study Area Boundaries and Definitions.....	5-86
5.15.2	Indirect Effects.....	5-86
5.15.3	Cumulative Effects.....	5-89
5.15.4	Summary and Conclusions	5-97
5.16	Relationship of Local Short-Term Uses Versus Long-Term Productivity	5-97
5.17	Irreversible and Irretrievable Commitment of Resources.....	5-98
6.0	FINAL SECTION 4(F) EVALUATIONS FOR THE WOODBRIDGE NEIGHBORHOOD HISTORIC DISTRICT, I-94/M-10 INTERCHANGE, Square D/Detroit Fuse & Manufacturing Building, AND THE UNITED SOUND SYSTEMS RECORDING STUDIOS.....	6-1
6.1	Proposed Action and Need for the Project	6-2
6.2	Section 4(f) Properties	6-3
6.2.1	The Woodbridge Neighborhood Historic District.....	6-3
6.2.2	I-94/M-10 Interchange.....	6-3
6.2.3	United Sound Systems Recording Studios.....	6-4
6.3	Impacts to Section 4(f) Properties	6-5
6.3.1	Impacts to Woodbridge Neighborhood Historic District	6-5
6.3.2	Impacts to the I-94/M-10 Interchange	6-6
6.3.3	Impacts to United Sound Systems Recording Studios.....	6-7
6.3.4	Impacts to the Square D/Detroit Fuse and Manufacturing Company Building.....	6-7
6.4	Avoidance Alternatives.....	6-7
6.4.1	Woodbridge Neighborhood Avoidance Alternatives	6-7
6.4.2	I-94/M-10 Interchange Avoidance Alternatives	6-8
6.4.3	United Sound System Recording Studios Avoidance Alternatives	6-9
6.4.4	Square D/Detroit Fuse and Manufacturing Company Building Avoidance Alternatives	6-10
6.5	Measures to Minimize Harm	6-10
6.5.1	Woodbridge Neighborhood District Measures to Minimize Harm	6-10
6.5.2	I-94/M-10 Interchange Measures to Minimize Harm.....	6-11
6.5.3	United Sound Systems Recording Studios Measures to Minimize Harm	6-11
6.5.4	Square D/Detroit Fuse and Manufacturing Company Building Measures to Minimize Harm.....	6-11
6.6	Coordination.....	6-12
6.6.1	Woodbridge Neighborhood District Coordination	6-12
6.6.2	I-94/M-10 Interchange Coordination.....	6-13

6.6.3	United Sound Systems Recording Studios Coordination	6-13
6.6.4	Square D/Detroit Fuse and Manufacturing Company Building Coordination	6-13
6.7	Section 4(f) Summary	6-14
6.7.1	No Feasible and Prudent Alternatives	6-14
6.7.2	Planning to Minimize Harm	6-14
6.7.3	Formal Coordination.....	6-14
6.7.4	Coordination Comments	6-15
6.7.5	Conclusion	6-15
7.0	MEASURES TO MITIGATE IMPACTS.....	7-1
7.1	Minimization of Relocation Impacts Resulting from Right-of-Way Acquisition.....	7-1
7.2	Environmental Permits	7-2
7.2.1	State	7-2
7.2.2	Federal.....	7-2
7.3	Soil Erosion and Sedimentation Control	7-2
7.4	Existing Vegetation	7-2
7.5	Threatened and Endangered Species	7-2
7.6	Noise Barriers.....	7-2
7.7	Aesthetics	7-3
7.8	Cultural Resources.....	7-4
7.9	Groundwater Quality	7-5
7.10	Surface Water Quality.....	7-5
7.11	Contaminated Properties	7-6
7.12	Disposal of Surplus or Unsuitable Material	7-6
7.13	Maintenance of Traffic Flow During Construction.....	7-6
7.14	Continuance of Public Utility Service	7-8
7.15	Construction Noise Levels and Vibration Impacts	7-8
7.16	Control of Air Pollution During Construction.....	7-8
7.17	Additional Mitigation or Modifications	7-9
8.0	PUBLIC PARTICIPATION AND AGENCY COORDINATION.....	8-1
8.1	Public Participation	8-1
8.1.1	Citizens Advisory Committee	8-1
8.1.2	Public Information Meetings	8-1
8.1.3	Neighborhood and Organization Meetings.....	8-2
8.1.4	Citizens Impact Survey	8-2
8.1.5	Focus Group Studies.....	8-2

8.1.6	Continuing Public Involvement	8-2
8.2	Agency Coordination	8-3
8.2.1	Interagency Coordination Committee	8-3
8.2.2	Agency and Local Government Meetings	8-3
8.2.3	Context Sensitive Solutions and Historical Workshops	8-3
8.3	Overview of Response to DEIS	8-4
8.4	Agency Letters and Responses.....	8-4
9.0	DISTRIBUTION OF THE FEIS.....	9-1
10.0	LIST OF PREPARERS FOR FEIS	10-1
11.0	REFERENCE LIST	11-1
12.0	GLOSSARY	12-1
13.0	RECOMMENDED ALTERNATIVE CONCEPTUAL DESIGN PLAN.....	13-1
14.0	INDEX.....	14-1

List of Figures

Figure 1-1: I-94 Project Limits 1-3

Figure 2-1: I-94 Project Limits 2-9

Figure 4-1: Recommended Alternative - Typical Section 4-6

Figure 5-1: ICE Year 2000 Census Tract Boundaries Put in New Exhibit 5-2

Figure 5-2: Locations of Community Facilities and Services 5-9

Figure 5-3: Location of Schools 5-12

Figure 5-4: Suburban Mobility Authority for Regional Transportation Service Map..... 5-15

Figure 5-5: Detroit Department of Transportation Service Map 5-16

Figure 5-6: Environmental Justice Study Area of Affect 5-17

Figure 5-7: Recommended Alternative and Potential Impacts 5-22

Figure 5-8: Non-Motorized Mobility for the Recommended Alternative 5-26

Figure 5-9: Renaissance Zone Boundaries 5-35

Figure 5-10: Air Quality Analysis Sites Recommended Alternative..... 5-49

Figure 5-11: Noise Monitoring, Predictor and Barrier Locations..... 5-57

Figure 5-12: Locations of Historic Resources 5-80

Figure 5-13: Cumulative Effects Major Actions 5-92

Figure 5-14: Indirect and Cumulative Analysis Study Area of Affect 5-93

Figure 7-1: Proposed Buffer Zone between the I 94 Service Drive and Hendrie Street 7-11

List of Tables

Table 1-1: Estimated Number of Structure Acquisitions for the Recommended Alternative	1-9
Table 2-1: Chronology of Edsel Ford Expressway Segments	2-3
Table 2-2. Number of Trucks Using the SE Michigan U.S. – Canadian Border Crossings	2-4
Table 3-1: ICC and SEMCOG Goals.....	3-1
Table 4-1: I-94 Rehabilitation Project-Recommended Alternative Cost Estimate (In Millions, 2004 Dollars)	4-7
Table 5-1: 1990 and 2000 Population.....	5-1
Table 5-2: Current and Projected Population.....	5-3
Table 5-3: 1990/2000 Population Characteristics of the Project Area, Detroit, Wayne County and Michigan	5-4
Table 5-4: 1990/2000 Income and Disability in the Project Area	5-5
Table 5-5: Number of Households (1990 and 2000)	5-6
Table 5-6: Housing Characteristics for the Project Area, City of Detroit, Wayne County, and Michigan, 2000	5-6
Table 5-7: Estimated Number of Structure Acquisitions and Displacements for the Recommended Alternative.....	5-21
Table 5-8: 1950 Historical Census Data	5-30
Table 5-9: Recommended Alternative (RA) Impacts and Mitigation to EJ Population	5-33
Table 5-10: 2000 Employment by Industrial Class in the Project Area	5-37
Table 5-11: National and State Ambient Air Quality Standards	5-43
Table 5-12: MOBILE6.2 Vehicle Mix Information	5-47
Table 5-13: Air Quality Analysis Sites.....	5-48
Table 5-14: Predicted Worst-Case One-Hour Carbon Monoxide Concentrations (ppm).....	5-51
Table 5-15: Predicted Worst-Case Eight-Hour Carbon Monoxide Concentrations (ppm).....	5-51
Table 5-16: Noise Abatement Criteria for Highway Projects (1).....	5-53
Table 5-17: Common Noise Levels and Typical Reactions	5-54
Table 5-18: Comparing Measured Existing Noise Levels and TNM2 Predicted Existing Noise Levels during Peak AM, PM Travel Time Periods.....	5-61
Table 5-19: Summary of Baseline Noise Monitoring.....	5-63
Table 5-20: Summary of I-94 TNM2 Noise-Level Predictions.....	5-65
Table 5-21: Summary of Noise Abatement Analysis to Satisfy the MDOT Criteria	5-70
Table 5-22: Contaminated Sites.....	5-73
Table 5-23: Summary of Potential Indirect and Cumulative Effects.....	5-99
Table 8-1: Public Information Meetings (after 2001).....	8-1
Table 8-2: Community Workshops.....	8-4
Table 8-3: Number and Percentage of Total Comments by Method Received	8-104
Table 8-4: DEIS Comments Summary	8-105

List of Appendices

- Appendix A – Traffic Volumes for the 2025 AM and PM Intersection Level of Service
- Appendix B – 1950 Census Tract Data
- Appendix C – Conceptual Stage Relocation Plan and Project Impacts
- Appendix D – Environmental Justice Legislation and Guidance
- Appendix E – Memorandum of Agreement
- Appendix F – State Historic Preservation Office Letters
- Appendix G – Context Sensitive Solutions Workshops and Historic Workshop
- Appendix H – I-94 Project Area Contamination Survey and Air Pollutants
- Appendix I – List of Representative Meetings since the DEIS
- Appendix J – DEIS Comments
- Appendix K – Re-evaluation Letter
- Appendix L - Three Modifications to the DEIS Build Alternative