

## **8.0 CULTURAL RESOURCES**

This chapter describes the historical, architectural and archaeological properties found within the proposed project's area of potential effect (APE) and anticipated effects to these cultural resources resulting from the No-Build and each of the Build Alternatives (Alternatives A, B, C and D), as required by Minnesota Statute Chapter 138 and Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (as amended). Minnesota statutes require that state departments and agencies consider impacts on properties listed on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), the State Register of Historic Places and the State Historic Site Network in their project planning. The Minnesota Field Archaeology Act requires investigations on non-federal public land where archaeological sites are known or suspected to be located. Section 106 requires federal agencies to consider the effects of their actions on historic properties. Under Section 106 federal actions include: 1) a project, activity, or program carried out by or on behalf of a federal agency; 2) a project wholly or partially carried out with federal financial assistance; 3) a project requiring a federal permit, license or approval; or 4) a project subject to state or local regulation administered pursuant to a delegation or approval by a federal agency.

Minnesota Chapter 4410.3900 states that when a joint federal and state environmental document is being prepared, governmental agencies shall, to the fullest extent, avoid duplication between Minnesota Statutes and federal requirements. Therefore, for the purposes of this DEIS, the federal Section 106 process, described below, is being conducted to meet requirements set forth by Minnesota Statute Chapter 138 and the Field Archaeology Act. Section 106 includes a review process whereby the federal agency consults with the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), the Tribal Historic Preservation Office (THPO) on tribal land, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) if appropriate, tribes with historic ties to the area, other interested parties, and the public to identify, evaluate, assess effects, and mitigate adverse impacts on any historic properties affected by their undertaking.

As discussed in Section 6.8.3, Section 4(f) legislation also provides protection for historic sites that are eligible for inclusion or are on the National Register of Historic Places. This chapter includes a discussion of Section 4(f) impacts as they relate to historic sites.

Identification of significant cultural resources and potential effects to those resources has been and continues to be coordinated with the Minnesota SHPO. Consultation has also occurred with Native American tribes and will continue throughout the EIS process.

Potential effects to cultural resources can include direct impacts caused by the proposed project, including demolition and construction activities; however, it can also include indirect impacts such as visual and noise. All possible impacts have been considered in determining effects to cultural resources.

## 8.1 CULTURAL RESOURCE STUDIES

A number of cultural resource studies were conducted to identify cultural resources within each of the four Build Alternative's APE. Cultural resource studies completed as part of the I-94/TH 10 Interregional Connection project include:

- *Phase I and II Historic Resources Identification and Evaluation – Mississippi River Regional Connectors A, B, C and D, Benton, Sherburne, Stearns and Wright Counties* (Mn/DOT, November 1, 1998).
  - This study includes information on historic structures.
- *Mississippi River Crossing Project: Archaeological Survey between Elk River and St. Cloud, Stearns, Sherburne, and Wright Counties, Minnesota* (Mn/DOT, February 1999).
  - This study includes information on archaeological sites.
- *Phase II Archaeological Investigations at Sites 21SN130, 21SN132, 21SN 133 and 21WR117 in Stearns and Wright Counties, Minnesota* (Mn/DOT, February 2002).
  - This study includes information on archaeological sites.
- *Cultural Resources Survey and Evaluation of Portions of the Mississippi River Crossing Project in Stearns, Wright and Sherburne Counties, Minnesota* (Mn/DOT, October 2002).
  - This study includes information on historic structures and archaeological sites.

The 1998 and 1999 studies were initiated at the beginning of the scoping process for this project. Slight revisions to the original (i.e., 1999) four corridors (Alternatives A, B, C and D), and follow-up work recommended as part of the 1999 study, resulted in the need for additional cultural resource studies, resulting in the two 2002 studies. The following sections include a summary of the reports findings. The above reports, as well as Mn/DOT recommendations, were forwarded to the Minnesota SHPO for review and concurrence (see October 17, 2000 and May 6, 2003 letters in Appendix A). The Minnesota SHPO reviewed the above reports and agrees with the findings of the reports (see March 5, 2001 and June 19, 2003 letters in Appendix A.)

### 8.1.1 November 1998 Study

This study reviewed the four proposed Build corridors (Alternatives A, B, C and D) to identify and evaluate all standing structures within the APE. For Alternatives A, B (on the north end) and C, which for the most part involve new roadways in rural agricultural areas, the APE was identified as roughly one mile on either side of the center of the proposed 300-foot wide corridor. Where an alignment used existing roads for the most part, as in the case of Alternative D, the APE was narrowed from one mile to take in physical and visual effects to farmsteads along the existing road. For Alternative B, within the City of Clearwater, the APE was drawn to include about two blocks on either side of the existing roadway.

A total of 48 properties were inventoried along the four corridors. Twenty-nine properties were located in rural settings, while 19 were located in the City of Clearwater. Of the 29 rural properties, two were recommended for eligibility: the Franz Hurrle Farmstead (SN-SAT-010) and the Henry Beumer Brick Barn (SN-SAT-009). Both of these properties were identified within the vicinity of Alternative A.

The Franz Hurrle Farmstead (SN-SAT-010) is recommended for eligibility on the NRHP under Criterion A, as this structure is representative of the significant broad historical pattern of farming in Stearns County between 1855 – 1945. The farmstead is approximately 246 acres and comprises 11 buildings including: a brick farmhouse, wood frame barn, and several outbuildings including a brick workshop/tool shed, and wood granary, drive through corn crib, double corn crib, brooder house, garage, privy, machine shed, and wood shed. The farmstead's associated setting/landscape and its related acreage is illustrative of the pre-railroad settlement pattern, while the buildings illustrate a pattern of mixed farming at the site between circa 1886 and 1945. Together they represent a visual record of the farmstead that evolved on this site between 1854 and 1945.

The Henry Beumer Brick Barn (SN-SAT-009) is recommended for eligibility under Criterion C as illustrative of an important and rare type of barn – the brick barn. Except for the damage to the northeast corner of the barn, the original fenestration of the barn has been retained. The level of craftsmanship in the barn's construction is also notable and is evident in the segmental brick door and window arches, the corbelled brick water table, and the cut granite foundation. Only two brick barns are known to exist in Stearns County, and both were probably built by members of the Beumer family. No other brick barns are known to exist in the Minnesota SHPO inventory.

Of the 19 properties identified within the City of Clearwater, none were recommended eligible for listing on the NRHP and there was no Historic District identified within the city.

This report, along with the recommendation that the Franz Hurrle Farmstead and Henry Beumer Brick Barn are eligible for listing on the NRHP, was forwarded to the Minnesota SHPO. The Minnesota SHPO concurred with the findings of the report (see March 5, 2001 letter in Appendix A).

### **8.1.2 February 1999 Study**

This study reviewed the four corridors (Alternatives A, B, C, and D) for known cultural resources and geoarchaeological indications of high potential for archaeological sites. The study included literature and database review, field visits and coring of the four corridors. For each alternative, a 300-foot wide corridor was assumed as the APE. Within each corridor specific alignments were chosen for more in depth review – Corridor A included two separate routes (A East and A West), one alignment in Corridor B/C (different alignments south of the river and same alignment north of the river) and one alignment in Corridor D. Although no known historic properties were recorded within specific alignments, the potential for buried sites on terraces was considered to be high. Thus, a standard Phase I archaeological survey was conducted, along with coring, for each of the alignments. The surveys identified a total of eight pre-contact sites within the alignments APE.

Four archaeological sites were identified in Corridor A along the south side of the river as warranting further investigation. Three of the sites (21SN130, 21SN132 and 21SN133) met the criteria for being potentially eligible for the NRHP. Following is a description of these four sites:

- Site 21SN130 was identified as a lithic scatter that may be eligible for the NRHP; however, additional evaluation is needed before this determination can be made. The extent of surface lithic scatter adjacent to the Mississippi River trench and the number of artifacts recovered during the Phase I suggest a potentially large site area. It is possible that some movement of materials has occurred due to plowing. The site is located on the edge of the river trench; lack of major deposition since the late Pleistocene indicates that deeply buried sites are not expected. In fact, additional work is needed to determine whether any intact deposits remain below the plow zone. Based on the Phase I work, this site can not be recommended ineligible for listing. If Alternative A is chosen as the preferred alternative, additional evaluation is needed to determine subsurface context data from the field and temporal association, if possible.
- Site 21SN132, also identified as a lithic scatter, may be eligible for the NRHP; however, additional evaluation is needed before this determination can be made. The size of the site area from which surface finds were collected, the association with a levee on the T2 terrace, and the amount of the materials recovered indicated that this site is probably more than a limited lithic scatter. It is unknown if any in situ deposits remain below the plow zone. As such, if Alternative A is chosen as the preferred alternative, additional work is recommended to determine if cultural contexts remain.
- Site 21SN133 was recommended eligible for listing on the NRHP under Criteria A and/or D. This site was identified as an artifact scatter located in a pasture on a Mississippi River terrace with intact soils and good preservation. This site was identified as offering important insight into the pre-contact occupation of the Mississippi River Valley in Central Minnesota and is recommended as eligible for the NRHP under Criterion A because it can contribute to the broad patterns of history and Criterion D because it is likely to yield information important in prehistory or history.
- The fourth site (21SN131), which was determined not eligible for further investigation by itself, was identified as a potential extension of site 21SN132, and thus was identified as requiring further study, if site 21SN132 becomes exposed to project impacts.

One additional site was identified within the vicinity of Corridor A along the north side of the river; however, this site was recommended as not warranting further investigation or eligible for listing on the NRHP.

Two sites (21SH0039 and 21SH0040) were identified in Corridor B/C. Neither of these sites was recommended as eligible for the NRHP. One site (21WR117) was identified within Corridor D and was recommended for further evaluation before a determination of eligibility could be made.

### **8.1.3 February 2002 Study**

The purpose of this study was to complete Phase II archaeological investigations at the four pre-contact sites identified in the February 1999 Study as requiring additional review – sites 21SN130, 21SN132, 21SN133, and 21WR117. Sites 21SN130, 21SN132 and 21SN133 are located along Alternative A and Site 21WR117 is located along Alternative D.

The Phase II investigations included pedestrian survey, shovel testing, and unit excavations. However, rescinded landowner permission at three sites and an intensive permission process for the fourth, followed by the end of the field season, resulted in completed investigations at only one site – Site 21SN133 – and only partial investigation at another site – Site 21SN130. Sites 21SN132 and 21WR117 received no testing.

Site 21SN133, which was fully investigated, was recommended as eligible for listing on the NRHP under Criterion D. Due to the limited investigation of site 21SN130, the archaeologists were unable to ascertain the complexity and integrity of the site, and thus, it was recommended that a Phase II investigation be completed for this site if future construction plans include this area. Phase II investigations were also recommended for sites 21SN132 and 21WR117 if the preferred alternative can not avoid these sites.

### **8.1.4 October 2002 Study**

Between the time that the November 1998 and the February 2002 studies were completed, slight design revisions to the original (i.e., 1999) four alignments occurred. Thus, in addition to the archaeology follow-up work identified in the February 2002 study, it was determined by Mn/DOT that there were some new areas where Phase I archaeological and architectural surveys were needed. It was also determined that a historical archaeological assessment had not been completed as part of the original 1999 survey and should be completed. Also, after further review of the recommendations of the February 2002 study, Mn/DOT determined that it was not necessary to complete Phase II investigations for sites 21SN130 and 21SN132 at this time. Thus, the October 2002 study included a Phase II archaeological investigation at site 21WR117, a Phase I pre-contact archaeological survey for areas that had not previously been considered due to slight revisions to the original (i.e., 1999) four alignments, a historical archaeological assessment for Corridors A, B and C, and a Phase I architectural survey for areas that had not previously been investigated. Following is a brief summary of the results of this study.

#### **8.1.4.1 Phase II Archaeological Evaluation of Site 21WR117**

The Phase II evaluation for Site 21WR117, which is located along Alternative D, included pedestrian survey, shovel testing, auger probing, and unit excavations. With only 26 artifacts recovered from an area of roughly 256,200 square feet, the site was determined to be a sparse artifact scatter in a disturbed agricultural context. No artifacts were found below the plow zone. Informal probing and formal testing did not indicate a likelihood for deeply buried cultural deposits and no formal tools were recovered from the site. As there were no diagnostic artifacts found at the site, there is little likelihood of any deeply buried deposits, and there is no indication that subsurface features remain intact below the plow zone, the site was not recommended as meeting the criteria for eligibility for listing on the NRHP and no further work is recommended.

#### 8.1.4.2 Phase I Archaeological Survey

The Phase I pre-contact archaeological survey included the investigation of areas associated with Alternative B (including several sub-alternatives in the I-94/TH 24 interchange area) that had not been previously investigated, including the area just west of the existing I-94/TH 24 interchange and the area approximately 2.5 miles west of the existing interchange. The survey resulted in the identification of one historic archaeological site, Site 21WR136, located west of the existing I-94/TH 24 interchange, and two pre-contact archaeological sites, Sites 21SN139 and 21SN140, located approximately 2.5 miles west of the existing I-94/TH 24 interchange. Two small areas were considered to have high potential for archaeology.

The results of the Phase I survey indicated that Site 21WR136 which appears to have a clear association with the mid-nineteenth century town of Fremont City is recommended as potentially eligible for listing on the NRHP. Site 21WR136 is identified as an artifact scatter and structural ruin that is believed to be associated with the mid-nineteenth century town of Fremont City. Nearly all of the 169 artifacts recovered from the site date to this period of time and historical data and oral history support this conclusion. This site is an early intact town site containing intact features and artifact deposits. However, the boundaries of this site have not been clearly established. It is thought that further investigation of the site could yield data pertaining to the development and settlement of the town of Fremont City, and provide information about the specific settlers who made Fremont City their home in the mid-nineteenth century. An additional Phase I survey within the APE and possibly a Phase II evaluation were recommended if Alternative B would result in impacts to this site.

Pre-contact Sites 21SN139 and 21SN140 are not recommended as eligible for listing on the NRHP. These two sites are represented by single artifact finds from a plowed field. Although three separate surface collection attempts were made, no other artifacts were found to help identify site limits or site functions. It is assumed that because no other artifacts were discovered, these sites lack identifiable features, and possess poor integrity. These sites do not meet the integrity qualifications under the NRHP criteria. No additional investigation at these two sites is recommended.

Two small areas within the archaeological APE for Alternative B were not surveyed because access to these parcels was denied by the property owner. The first parcel is located northwest of the existing I-94/TH 24 interchange in the vicinity of the Clearwater River. This parcel encompasses a mostly level, terraced area on the south shore of the Clearwater River. The second parcel is located northeast of I-94, where CSAH 44 and CSAH 75 intersect. This parcel is located in an undisturbed wood lot and a barren meadowy area that seemed to investigators to contain the highest potential for buried resources. Both of these areas are considered to have a somewhat high potential for archaeological deposits and should be investigated further if any construction activities associated with Alternative B would impact these areas.

#### 8.1.4.3 Historical Archaeological Assessment

A historical archaeological assessment was conducted for Alternatives A, B and C. Alternative D was not surveyed for historical archaeology as Mn/DOT CRU determined there was no potential historical archaeology along this corridor. The APE for the assessment

included a 200-foot wide corridor along each of the alternative's alignments and associated intersections. The assessment identified 14 potential historical archaeological sites. Of these 14 sites, five sites were selected for additional research. Of the five sites, four were recommended as not eligible for the NRHP because documentary research indicated that further investigation would not likely yield significant data. As discussed above in Section 8.1.4.2, Site 21WR136, which is located along Alternative B and is associated with the historic town of Fremont City, was recommended as potentially eligible for the NRHP. Additional fieldwork and investigation of Site 21WR136 is recommended if construction work is proposed in this area.

Three of the fourteen potential historical archaeological sites (one of which is located along Alternative A, and two which are located along Alternative B) were identified as potentially eligible for the NRHP, but were not reviewed further since it was believed that these three sites would be avoided during construction. One of the three potential historical archaeological sites (identified as Site A1 on Figure 8.1) was identified along Alternative A, north of the river, south of CR 60, and just west of the north-south section line between sections 32 and 33. This site is located adjacent to a farmyard which is bounded by a row of large deciduous trees and a driveway. It is unknown whether the farmyard contains significant intact historic deposits. Two potential historical archaeological sites were identified along Alternative B (identified as Sites B1 and B5 on Figure 8.1). The first site, B1, is located west of I-94 and northwest of TH 24 in a farmyard which is currently bounded by a row of large deciduous trees (see Figure 8.1). It is unknown whether the farmyard contains significant intact historic deposits. The second site, B5, is located east of CSAH 8 in a farmyard that is bounded by a row of large deciduous trees and lilac bushes (see Figure 8.1). The existing TH 24 alignment runs northeast of this potential site. If avoidance of any of the three sites is not possible, additional research was recommended by the archaeological assessment.

#### 8.1.4.4 Phase I and II Architectural Surveys

A Phase I architectural history survey was conducted for areas that had not been previously reviewed. For Alternative B and its sub-alternatives, these previously uninvestigated areas include a larger area around the existing I-94/TH 24 interchange, and the areas north and south of the existing interchange where local interchanges were being proposed. Modifications to the I-94 interchange at Alternative C also required that a larger area be looked at. The APE for these areas was drawn to include roughly a half-mile on all sides of the proposed construction limits. Alternatives A and D did not require further investigation.

The Phase I survey identified 74 new and one previously identified property (SN-LYN-001). Of these 75 properties, 18 properties were inventoried and 57 properties, including SN-LYN-001, did not meet minimum age and integrity requirements for NRHP consideration. As a result of the Phase I survey, a Phase II evaluation was undertaken at one farmstead (SN-LYN-007), which is located in the vicinity of the northern local interchange proposed as part of Sub-Alternatives B3-1 or B4-1. The evaluation resulted in two recommendations regarding eligibility of the Weyrauch farmstead (SNL-YN-007) for listing on the NRHP. The individual farmhouse, as well as the entire farmstead, was recommended as eligible for the NRHP.

The cream brick house on the Weyrauch farmstead (SNL-YN-007) embodies the distinctive characteristics of a significant vernacular house type in Minnesota. The house presents an

aesthetic based on simple geometry, a familiar house type, and the expression of economic success and expected permanence of occupation. The material integrity of the brick farmhouse is excellent and its original form, materials, and craftsmanship are readily apparent. The functional changes made by the Voigt family during the 1940s do not substantially alter the aesthetic presentation or historic appearance of the house and are quite typical of the type of alterations made to farmhouses over time. The setting for the house retains important historic elements, such as a row of maple trees marking the boundary of the house yard and other vegetation in the west yard facing the farmyard. The dwelling retains its original relationship to other farmstead buildings of the same era. The Weyrauch cream brick farmhouse embodies the distinctive characteristics of a significant vernacular house type in Minnesota and therefore is recommended eligible for listing on the NRHP under Criterion A.

The entire Weyrauch farmstead (SNL-YN-007) represents diversified livestock and crop farms of the 1880 to 1950 period. Overall the Weyrauch farmstead has the setting, appearance, and feeling of a farm used over a long period of time. A portion of the farmstead conveys how the Weyrauch property appeared during the period from circa 1890 to circa 1940, and can be considered representative of a successful farmer in eastern Stearns County. The farmstead is an example of an identifiable type of agricultural resource and conveys the materials, construction methods, and vernacular aesthetic prevalent during the decades flanking the turn of the twentieth century in rural Stearns County. The farmstead retains nearly all of the physical features that were present during its period of significance, including landscape, layout and buildings. It consequently serves as a representative example of a diversified farm adapted over time to modern farming practices. Due to its representative history and buildings, and high degree of material integrity, this farm is recommended eligible for listing on the NRHP under Criterion A.

## 8.2 ENVIRONMENTAL CONSEQUENCES

Based on the results of the cultural resources studies, the following sections describe the anticipated impacts to the listed or eligible cultural resources for each of the alternatives.

### 8.2.1 No-Build Alternative

The No-Build Alternative would not directly or indirectly affect any NRHP listed or eligible properties/resources along the corridor.

### 8.2.2 Alternative A

Figure 8.1 shows the location of cultural resources in the vicinity of Alternative A. Three eligible or potentially eligible pre-contact archaeological sites (Sites 21SN133, 21SN130, and 21SN132) are within the vicinity of the proposed alignment. If Alternative A is chosen as the preferred alternative, additional evaluation of Sites 21SN130 and 21SN132 would be needed to determine whether or not these sites are eligible for the NRHP. If eligible and within the project limits, an assessment of effects and appropriate mitigation for these sites would be considered. Site 21SN133 has been determined eligible. It is recommended that Site 21SN133 be avoided; however, if avoidance is not prudent or feasible, mitigation in the form of data recovery is recommended.

Figure 8.1

COLORED

11 X 17

BACK

Based on the current construction limits, Alternative A could impact a potential historical archaeological site (Site A1), which is located just south of CR 60. If Alternative A is chosen as the preferred alternative, additional evaluation of this site would be needed to determine if this site is eligible. If eligible and within the project limits, an assessment of effects and appropriate mitigation would also be considered.

Alternative A would pass through the acreage associated with the historic property of the Franz Hurre Farmstead (SN-SAT-010), which is recommended for eligibility on the NRHP. The proposed alignment would be located approximately 800 feet east of the structures located on the farmstead. The proposed alignment would not only require the acquisition of land from the farmstead, but it would also have a visual impact on the property with the construction of a new roadway through the property. The new river crossing would also have a visual impact to the farmstead. Since the setting is crucial to the eligibility of this property, Alternative A would have an adverse effect to this property. As the proposed project includes direct impacts to this eligible property, it was determined that a Section 4(f) impact would occur. Therefore, a Draft Section 4(f) Evaluation has been completed and is included in Appendix B.

The NRHP-eligible Henry Beumer Brick Barn (SN-SAT-009) is located some distance north of Alternative A. At its nearest point, Alternative A comes within one-half mile southeast of the barn. (The barn is presently about 820 feet from CSAH 75.) Construction of this alternative would result in no direct impacts to the barn. In addition, since the setting of the barn is not integral to the eligibility of the barn, and Alignment A would have no visual effects to the barn, no indirect impacts to this property are anticipated as a result of this alternative.

### **8.2.3 Alternative B**

Figure 8.1 shows the location of cultural resources in the vicinity of Alternative B. Since the cultural resources studies were completed, Alternative B5 has been identified as the preferred sub-alternative to be carried forward for Alternative B. As discussed in Chapter 3, Sub-Alternatives B1, B2, B3-1, B3-2, B3-2a, B4-1, B4-2 and B4-3 have been eliminated from further consideration. As such, several cultural resource properties/sites that were identified in the cultural resources studies as being within the APE for these sub-alternatives are no longer considered to be properties/sites of concern. Following is a description of those properties/sites that are no longer of concern; the sub-alternative(s) these properties/sites had the potential to be impacted by are included in parentheses.

- Site 21WR136 (Sub-Alternative B2)
- The potential pre-contact archaeological site located northeast of I-94, where CSAH 44 and CSAH 75 intersect (Sub-Alternatives B3-1 and B4-1)
- The potential pre-contact archaeological site located northwest of the existing I-94/ TH 24 interchange in the vicinity of the Clearwater River (Sub-Alternatives B4-1, B4-2 and B4-3)
- The potential historical archaeological site; identified as site B5 (Sub-Alternative B2)
- The cream brick house on the Weyrauch farmstead (Sub-Alternatives B3-1 and B4-1)
- The Weyrauch farmstead (Sub-Alternatives B3-1 and B4-1)

The only cultural resource that has the potential to be impacted by Sub-Alternative B5 (also identified as Alternative B throughout the DEIS document) is a potential historical archaeological site, identified as Site B5, located in the vicinity of the proposed CSAH 8 overpass. If this alternative is chosen as the preferred alternative, additional investigation of this site would be needed to determine the sites eligibility and, if applicable, extent of impact. If the site is determined eligible and if the proposed alignment could not avoid impacts to this resource, appropriate mitigation measures would also be addressed.

#### **8.2.4 Alternative C**

Alternative C would not directly or indirectly affect any NRHP listed or eligible properties/resources along the corridor.

#### **8.2.5 Alternative D**

Alternative D would not directly or indirectly affect any NRHP listed or eligible properties/resources along the corridor.

### **8.3 MITIGATION**

As described above, several eligible and potentially eligible properties that could be impacted by the proposed project would require additional research before a determination of effects decision can be made. As agreed to by Mn/DOT and Minnesota SHPO for the approach to cultural resources in the DEIS, further work on these properties need not be completed until the FEIS process when a preferred alternative has been identified. If the properties do not have the potential to be impacted by the preferred alternative, no additional research is recommended. Additional research would be completed, if necessary, for any eligible, or potentially eligible properties that may be impacted by the preferred alternative. The FEIS would document the results of the additional research and avoidance, minimization and mitigation of potential impacts from the preferred alternative.