

### 3.4 Housing and Relocation

This section provides an examination of effects related to potential relocation of households. No business relocations are anticipated with any of the alternatives. Economic effects are discussed in Section 3.5.

#### 3.4.1 Affected Environment

According to the 2010 U.S. Census, there were 395 housing units in Cooper Landing, of which 234 were vacant (Table 3.4-1). Of the 234 vacant housing units, 207 were used seasonally and are generally not available for long-term rentals. The total number of housing units increased by 41 percent from 1990 to 2010, and occupied units increased by 59 percent during the same time frame. However, the number of housing units that are vacant because of seasonal use continues to exceed the number of occupied houses (Table 3.4-1).

**Table 3.4-1. Cooper Landing housing characteristics**

	<b>2010</b>	<b>2000</b>	<b>1990</b>
<b>Total Housing Units</b>	<b>395</b>	<b>372</b>	<b>299</b>
Occupied housing (households)	161	162	101
Vacant housing	234	217	180
Vacant due to seasonal use	207	184	--
Owner-occupied housing	117	119	78
Median value of owned homes	\$239,200	\$213,500	\$105,800
Renter-occupied housing	44	43	23
Median rent paid	\$690	\$775	\$263
Total households	161	162	101
Average household size (persons)	1.80	2.14	2.40
Family households	89	96	70
Average family household size (persons)	2.28	2.74	--
Non-family households	72	66	31
Population living in households	289	347	--
Population living in group quarters	0	22	0
<b>Housing Structure Types</b>			
Single family (detached)	321	303	254
Single family (attached)	0	12	0
Duplex	0	17	4
3 or 4 units	7	6	2
5 to 9 units	0	0	0
10 to 19 units	0	0	0
20+ units	0	8	0
Trailers/mobile homes	8	18	19
Boats/other types	0	8	2

Source: USCB (2010a, 2010b).

Note: Census figures estimated, based on sample: 14.9% of Cooper Landing households in 1990; 14.8% in 2000.

Between 1990 and 2010, the median value of homes more than doubled from \$105,800 to \$239,200. Rental rates also more than doubled during this time from \$263 per month to \$690 per month.

### **3.4.2 Environmental Consequences**

This section discusses impacts to residential and commercial properties in the project area and relocations that would result from implementation of the alternatives. An estimate of the number of households to be displaced and a discussion of comparable replacement property are included. Because the project would result in relatively few displacements, information on race, ethnicity, and income levels is not included in this analysis to protect the privacy of those affected. See Sections 3.3 (Social Environment) and 3.5 (Economic Environment) for general information on social and economic impacts. Information on relocations and acquisitions is provided in the *Updated Conceptual Stage Relocation Study*, Appendix B of this Final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS).

#### **3.4.2.1 No Build Alternative**

##### **Direct and Indirect Impacts**

No direct or indirect relocation impacts would be expected as a result of the No Build Alternative.

#### **3.4.2.2 Issues Applicable to the Build Alternatives**

Privately owned properties would be affected through implementation of the build alternatives due to right-of-way acquisition requirements. Table 3.4-2 details the affected parcels by ownership type for the build alternatives. Federal, State, and Kenai Peninsula Borough land ownership effects, along with other details on private and Native corporation lands, are discussed in Section 3.1, Land Ownership, and Section 3.2, Land Use Plans and Policies. No business relocations are anticipated with any of the alternatives.

**Table 3.4-2. Ownership and right-of-way acquisition by alternative**

<b>Ownership and Acquisition Type</b>	<b>Cooper Creek</b>	<b>G South</b>	<b>Juneau Creek</b>	<b>Juneau Creek Variant</b>
<b>Private</b>	<b>38</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>4</b>
Full Parcel	16	0	0	0
Part of Parcel	22	4	4	4
<b>Native Corp. (CIRI)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1</b>
Full Parcel	0	0	0	0
Part of Parcel	0	0	0	1

#### **3.4.2.3 Cooper Creek Alternative**

The Cooper Creek Alternative would generally follow the existing Sterling Highway alignment, widening the right-of-way in many areas and affecting adjacent properties. The alignment would deviate at the west end of the Cooper Landing Bridge, and involve constructing 3.5 miles of new highway south of Cooper Landing between approximately Milepost (MP) 47.9 and MP 51.3.

### **Direct and Indirect Impacts**

Right-of-way acquisition for the Cooper Creek Alternative would affect 38 privately owned parcels, 16 of which would be total acquisitions. The 22 partial acquisitions would require small slivers or portions of parcels that would not impact residential structures or preclude access.

According to 2015 Kenai Peninsula Borough tax assessment information, the 16 total acquisitions include:

- Seven residential parcels with structural improvements to the properties (requiring relocation)
- One property with a residence owned by the Kenai Lake Baptist Church (requiring relocation)
- Six vacant residential parcels
- Two residential accessory building parcels

The total assessed property values of the full acquisitions range from approximately \$140,000 to \$315,000. None of the total acquisitions would require relocation of businesses, farms, or non-profit organizations. None of the partial acquisitions would require the relocation of any residences, businesses, farms, or non-profit organizations.

According to the 2010 U.S. Census data, the average household size in Cooper Landing is 1.8 people. Using average household size for each of the 8 relocated residences, approximately 14 people could be expected to be displaced under the Cooper Creek Alternative.

There are limited numbers of residential properties available for sale in Cooper Landing, and available housing may not be adequate to accommodate the relocations at the time of displacement. According to local real estate listings from research conducted in November 2013, three comparable residences in the \$200,000 to \$350,000 price range were available in Cooper Landing (Table 3.4-3). Of the eight displaced residences, five residences have an assessed value within this price range; comparable housing for the three residences valued at less than \$200,000 is not currently available within Cooper Landing.

**Table 3.4-3. Cooper Landing residences for sale in \$200,000–\$350,000 price range, November 2013**

Style	Single Family House	Price Range <sup>a</sup>
1 Bedroom	1	\$219,000
2 Bedrooms	0	-
3 Bedrooms	2	\$289,000 - \$325,000
4 Bedrooms	0	-

<sup>a</sup> No residences less than \$200,000 were available at the time of research.

A search of local listings conducted in January 2016 identified two residential listings in the Cooper Landing area in total (Table 3.4-4). None of the eight displaced residences have an assessed value within the range of available properties. One residence is accessible only by boat or floatplane and is unlikely to be considered comparable. Federal Highway

Administration regulations found at 49 CFR § 24.301(g) provide for relocations and transportation expenses for displaced persons for up to 50 miles away. Availability of comparable housing within 50 miles of Cooper Landing would include Moose Pass and the larger communities of Seward, Sterling, and Soldotna, where sufficient replacement housing exists (see Appendix B). Because Cooper Landing is a unique destination community, however, these other locations may not be deemed comparable or reasonably accessible to a person’s place of work.

**Table 3.4-4. Cooper Landing residences for sale (January 2016)**

Style	Single-family house	Price range
1 Bedroom	0	-
2 Bedrooms	1	\$89,500 <sup>a</sup>
3 Bedrooms	1	\$489,000
4 Bedrooms	0	-

<sup>a</sup> Not road accessible – located on an island on Skilak Lake.

No indirect relocation impacts are expected as a result of the Cooper Creek Alternative.

**Construction Impacts**

Relocation impacts would occur during the right-of-way acquisition phase of the project prior to construction; no relocation impacts are anticipated during the construction phase.

**Mitigation**

Adversely affected and appropriately qualified property owners would be assured fair compensation, as provided by the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Act of 1970, as amended, and the Alaska Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Practices, Alaska Statutes (AS) 34.60.010 et seq. Relocation resources would be made available to all relocated residents and businesses without discrimination. “Housing of last resort” options would be implemented if adequate comparable housing were not available on the market.

The Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970 and the Uniform Relocation Act Amendments of 1987 provide uniform and equitable treatment for persons displaced from their homes, businesses, or farms by Federal and Federally assisted programs, and establish uniform and equitable land acquisition policies for Federal and Federally assisted programs. Whenever a Federal agency’s acquisition of real property for a program or project results in displacement of someone, the agency is required to reimburse the displaced persons and provide relocation planning, assistance coordination, and advisory services. Residents displaced by a Federal program generally are relocated to existing housing in the community. Businesses generally are relocated to similar business settings. The cost of relocating is covered as part of the relocation process. Without discrimination, all owners of acquired property are compensated for their loss of property at fair market value, and all displaced persons are moved at no expense to them in accordance with the law.

Regulations found at 49 CFR § 24.404 provide for what is called “Housing of Last Resort,” which requires that comparable decent, safe, and sanitary replacement housing within a person’s

financial means be made available before that person may be displaced. These measures could apply if comparable housing were not available on the housing market. The agency may provide the necessary housing in a number of ways, such as:

- Providing replacement housing payments or rental assistance in excess of normal limits set in the law
- Purchasing an existing comparable residential dwelling and making it available to the affected party in exchange for the impacted dwelling
- Moving and rehabilitating a dwelling and making it available to the affected party in exchange for the impacted property
- Purchasing, rehabilitating, or reconstructing an existing dwelling to make it comparable to the impacted property
- Purchasing land and constructing a new replacement dwelling comparable to the impacted dwelling when comparable housing is not otherwise available
- Purchasing an existing dwelling, removing barriers, or rehabilitating the structure to accommodate a handicapped displaced person when a suitable comparable replacement dwelling is not available
- Providing a direct loan that would enable the affected party to construct or contract for the construction of a decent, safe, and sanitary replacement dwelling

#### **3.4.2.4 G South Alternative**

The G South Alternative would include approximately 5.6 miles of new alignment north of the existing Sterling Highway, between approximately MP 46.3 and MP 55.6. The affected properties by ownership type are described in Table 3.4-2.

##### **Direct and Indirect Impacts**

The G South Alternative would not require relocation of any residences or commercial properties. Right-of-way for this alternative would require partial acquisition of four private properties.

No indirect relocation impacts are expected as a result of the G South Alternative.

##### **Construction Impacts**

No relocation impacts would occur during the construction phase of this alternative.

##### **Mitigation**

The G South Alternative would not require relocation of any residences or commercial properties, and therefore no mitigation is required.

#### **3.4.2.5 Juneau Creek and Juneau Creek Variant Alternatives**

The Juneau Creek Alternative (preferred alternative) and Juneau Creek Variant Alternative would provide approximately 10 and 9 miles of new roadway alignment, respectively, from MP 46.3 to the vicinity of Sportsman's Landing in the MP 55–56 area. The affected properties by ownership type are described in Table 3.4-2 for these two build alternatives.

### **Direct and Indirect Impacts**

The Juneau Creek and Juneau Creek Variant alternatives would not require relocation of any residences or commercial properties. The right-of-way for these alternatives would require partial acquisitions of four privately owned properties. In addition, for the Juneau Creek Variant Alternative only, the right-of-way would require partial acquisition of one parcel owned by Cook Inlet Regional, Inc. (CIRI), a Native corporation formed under the Alaska Native Claims Settlement Act (see Section 3.1.1 in Land Ownership). The Juneau Creek Variant Alternative would require approximately 12.3 acres of this 42-acre parcel, known as CIRI Tract A. See Sections 3.1.2.2 and 3.1.2.6. The Juneau Creek Alternative would avoid impacts to properties owned by Native corporations.

These two alternatives would affect State land management Unit 395, which is slated for transfer to the Kenai Peninsula Borough, ultimately for rural residential settlement. The impacts are nearly identical but the alignments across the Unit 395 differ slightly. See the discussion under Cumulative Impacts in Sections 3.27.4.3 (Reasonably Foreseeable Future Actions), 3.27.7.1 (Land Ownership) and 3.27.7.3 (Social Environment), as well as other subsections of Section 3.27.

### **Construction Impacts**

Neither of these alternatives would have relocation impacts during the construction phase.

### **Mitigation**

The Juneau Creek and Juneau Creek Variant alternatives would not require relocation of any residences or commercial properties, and therefore no housing or business mitigation is required.