Montana Department of Transportation
Environmental Services Bureau
Categorical Exclusion (CE) Documentation

PO Box 201001
2701 Prospect Avenue
Helena, MT 59620
(406) 444-7203

Control Number 6296000 Date 2019-08-27

Part 1 - Project Summary

Project Name Bitterroot River - W of Missoula

Project Number BR 9032(65) **Control Number** 6296000

Part 2 - Environmental Classification

2.a. Status of Categorical Exclusion (CE): ◉ Draft ○ Final ○ Re-Evaluation

Explain Outstanding and/or pending information:

See Part 7 for a explanation of outstanding and/or pending information.

Date Aug 27, 2019

2.b. Applicable laws and funding mechanisms:

☒ NEPA - FHWA (23 CFR 771.117)

☐ NEPA - Other (Other Federal Agency and CFR Citation)

☒ MEPA - MDT (ARM 18.2.261)

☐ MEPA- Other (Other State Agency and ARM Citation)

(If additional NEPA and/or MEPA rules are triggered, cite applicable rules and discuss additional requirements in Part 7 below.)

2.c. Classification of FHWA NEPA CE: ○ N/A ○ Listed CE(c) ◉ Listed CE(d) ○ Not listed CE

CE(d) Number and Title: 23 CFR 771.117(d)(13) - Actions described in (c)(26), (c)(27), and (c)(28) of 23 CFR 771.117 that do not meet the constraints in paragraph 23 CFR 771.117(e)

2.d. Is FHWA concurrence on the CE being requested. ◉ Yes ○ No

Part 3 - Project Information

3.a. Project Description (i.e., reconstruct, rural/urban, bridge replacement, rehab, new through lane). Include milestone document reference.

Missoula County, in cooperation with the Montana Department of Transportation (MDT), is proposing to construct a new two-lane bridge (one travel lane in each direction) across the Bitterroot River at the western terminus of South Avenue to connect with River Pines Road immediately west of the river. The proposed project involves replacing Maclay Bridge with the new South Avenue Bridge at a location approximately 0.4 mile upstream of the existing bridge. Maclay Bridge, also known as the North Avenue Bridge, is a single-lane structure that connects North Avenue on the east side of the river to River Pines Road on the west side of river. Replacing Maclay Bridge has long been a priority to Missoula County due to its deficient load capacity and sub-standard design features.

The project limits extend between the intersection of South Avenue and Hanson Drive to the east and the intersection of River Pines Road and Blue Heron Road to the west. Additional project components include right-of-way acquisition, utility relocation, a culvert extension on Big Flat Ditch, grading, drainage, signing, pavement markings, and approximately 0.3 mile of new roadway approaches connecting to the new bridge on the east and west sides of the Bitterroot River. A shared-use path is proposed on the north side of South Avenue from Hanson Drive to Blue Heron Road. Approximately 620 feet (0.1 mi.) of River Pines Road would be realigned to a new T-intersection tying into the proposed project. Under the proposed project, Maclay Bridge would be removed and the riverbanks restored.

In 2013, the Maclay Bridge Planning Study concluded and the study recommended the South 1 Alignment (3E.1) as the preferred alignment. The South 1 Alignment included extending the westernmost limits of South Avenue with a new bridge crossing the Bitterroot River and connecting to River Pines Road on the west side of the river. On April 18, 2013, the Missoula County Board of County Commissioners voted unanimously to pursue federal funding through the Off-System Bridge Program for the replacement of Maclay Bridge with a new bridge on the South 1 Alignment as identified by the Maclay Bridge Planning

Montana Department of Transportation
Environmental Services Bureau
Categorical Exclusion (CE) Documentation

PO Box 201001
2701 Prospect Avenue
Helena, MT 59620
(406) 444-7203

Control Number 6296000 Date 2019-08-27

Study. The Missoula County Commission further reaffirmed their commitment to the development and management of the South Avenue Bridge Project by passing Resolution #2015-046 on April 22, 2015. A draft Preliminary Field Review (PFR) Report was published on September 23, 2010 by MDT; however, the PFR was never approved and finalized. While past Commissions have supported development of the project, the current County Commission has not taken a formal position on the proposed project.

◉ Yes ○ No Horizontal alignment shift?

Describe: The proposed project involves constructing a new bridge on a new alignment. The new bridge approaches, bridge structure, and the reconfiguration of River Pines Road will require a horizontal alignment shift.

◉ Yes ○ No Vertical alignment shift?

Describe: The vertical profile of the new bridge was set to provide adequate freeboard over the design flood event, provide clearance for boaters during normal flows, and to match the existing road grades to the extent possible.

◉ Yes ○ No Does the project result in capacity expansion of a roadway by addition of one or more through lanes?

Describe: The proposed project results in capacity expansion on the new bridge only because the new bridge will include a single travel lane in each direction, replacing the single lane Maclay Bridge.

If the project results in capacity expansion of a roadway by addition of one or more through lanes, FHWA signature is required.

3.b. Project Location Description (include beginning and ending RPs; Section, Township, Range, County, town/nearest town.

The proposed South Avenue Bridge Project is located at the existing western terminus of South Avenue West within Missoula County. Montana. The Project is located outside of the city limits of Missoula, approximately 2.8 miles west of Reserve Street. The project is located in Sections 26, 27, 34 and 35 of Township 13 North, Range 20 West, Montana Principle Meridian, and is centered at approximately 46.8491° North latitude and 114.1043° West longitude. The eastern portion of the project area (east of the Bitterroot River) is within the Missoula Urban Area boundary.

3.c. Have the local officials (city and/or county) been consulted on the project? Explain below.

Yes. As described in 3.a. above, Missoula County has been involved with project development since the early 1990s when Missoula County led development of a draft Environmental Assessment (EA) examining options to replace Maclay Bridge. Two Missoula County staff were a part of the advisory planning team involved in the 2013 Maclay Bridge Panning Study. At the conclusion of the 2013 planning study, Missoula County led the effort to retain a consultant to assist in preliminary engineering and environmental services. Missoula County has been certified by MDT to administer the federal-aid project directly under the Local Agency Guidelines, or LAG, process.

3.d. Are relevant local planning documents available?

◉ Yes ○ No ○ N/A

If yes, see below, select one of the following:

☒ A copy of the plan is on file. The proposed project is consistent with the plan.

☐ A copy of the plan is on file. The proposed project is not consistent with the plan. Additional documentation is attached.

3.e. Right-of-Way

◉ Yes ○ No Will acquisition of right-of-way be required?

◉ Yes ○ No Will construction permits or temporary easements be required?

Part 4 - Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4) Issues
(See Storm Water Management Plan and Environmental Manual Chapter 46)

◉ Yes ○ No ○ TBD Is the project within a regulated MS4 Area?

Yes (Area) Missoula

A Low Impact Development (LID) Practice analysis will be conducted an documented in the file. Coordination with local MS4 coordinator will occur and be documented.

Montana Department of Transportation
Environmental Services Bureau
Categorical Exclusion (CE) Documentation

PO Box 201001
2701 Prospect Avenue
Helena, MT 59620
(406) 444-7203

Control Number 6296000 Date 2019-08-27

Part 5 - Permits and Approvals (Environmental Manual Chapter 29)

Yes	No	TBD		Permit or Approval		Describe	
☒	☐	☐		US Army Corps of Engineers	☒ CWA Sec 404	☐ Section 10	Nationwide Permit 14 is anticipated
			☐	Exempt Activity			
			☐	Non-Notification Nationwide			
			☒	Notification Nationwide Type		Pre-Construction Notification required for activities within the Bitterroot River	
			☐	Individual Permit *(If individual permit is required, the PA threshold is exceeded, FHWA must concur with PE finding for federally funded project*			
☒	☐	☐		CW 401 Certification Authority	☒ DEQ	☐ EPA	☐ Tribal Govt
☐	☒	☐		Individual 401 Certification			
☐	☒	☐		Tribal Permit for Aquatic Resources	☐ ALCO	☐ ALPO	
☒	☐	☐		Stream Protection Act - SPA 124			

Notes (Provide additional explanation as needed.) The Missoula MS4 Area boundary does not include any portion of the project area on the west side of the Bitterroot River. However, because the proposed project is partially located within the MS4 Area, an LID Practice Analysis will be conducted and documented in the project file in coordination with the Missoula County MS4 coordinator.

Part 6 - Social, Economic and Environment Considerations

The following sections describe resources that may be present and the potential impacts (direct, indirect, permanent and temporary) that may result from the proposed project. If a resource may be adversely impacted by the project, cumulative impacts, including growth impacts, will need to be identified and discussed. Describe potential mitigation measures that will be employed. Attach additional pages or supplemental information if necessary.

6.1. Access

6.1.a. Permanent Access Control Changes

○ Yes ◉ No Will this action result in the creation or modification of an access control resolution for a particular roadway.

6.1.b. Temporary Access or Changes in Access Control

◉ Yes ○ No Will the following conditions be met: The proposed project will not involve major traffic disruptions because the following provisions will be made for access by local traffic and be posted. Through-traffic dependent businesses would not be adversely affected. Interference to local events such as festivals or parades would be avoided or minimized. The temporary road, detour or ramp closure will not substantially change the environmental consequences of the action. There will not be substantial controversy associated with the use of temporary road, detour, or ramp closure.

6.2 Air Quality (Environmental Manual Chapter 42)

6.2.a. Criteria Pollutants

◉ Yes ○ No Is the project subject to conformity?

○ Yes ◉ No Is the project exempt from conformity?

The project is located in a Nonattainment/Maintenance Area.

Nonattainment/Maintenance Area Missoula CO and PM-10

◉ Yes ○ No ○ N/A Is the project included in a conforming plan?

This project is included in the STIP, TIP, or LRIP adopted on the following date:
No addition analysis is necessary.

Date June 8, 2018

6.2.b. Is this project exempt from Mobile Source Air Toxins (MSAT'S) analysis?

Montana Department of Transportation
Environmental Services Bureau
Categorical Exclusion (CE) Documentation

PO Box 201001
2701 Prospect Avenue
Helena, MT 59620
(406) 444-7203

Control Number 6296000 Date 2019-08-27

- (●) Yes. Rationale is documented in the ISA.
- ( ) No. The project has low potential for MSAT effects. Rationale is documented in the ISA.
- ( ) No. The project has high potential for MSAT effects. MDT will conduct and document an MSAT analysis.

In accordance with MDT Standard Specification 107.11.3, the contractor would be required to adhere to applicable air quality rules and regulations, which may required the use of dust suppression and emission control measures to minimize short-term construction-related impacts.

6.3 Aquatic Resources

☐ Due to the nature and scope of the project, no impacts to aquatic resources are expected. Adequate supporting information is included in Part 3. No detailed analysis is necessary.

6.3.a. Wetlands

(●) Yes ( ) No ( ) TBD Are wetlands present on or adjacent to the project site?

All practicable means to avoid and minimize impacts will be employed. All unavoidable impacts will be mitigated in accordance with applicable requirements (e.g., US Army Corps, Tribal, and/or EO 11990).

Available Wetland Mitigation Site(s) or mitigation strategy, as needed: (Discussion)

No wetland impacts are anticipated and, therefore, no wetland mitigation is required. Bridge abutments and associated rip rap would be located outside the active river channel above OHWM (i.e., landward of wetland boundaries) and would therefore avoid impacting mapped wetlands.

The wetland field investigation was limited to public rights-of-way and parcels where legal access was granted, including survey of the Bitterroot River below the legal OHWM in the vicinity of the proposed bridge alignment as well as existing Maclay Bridge. Additional wetland survey will be necessary once legal access is provided, and prior to construction, following acquisition of project right-of-way. Based on site characteristics and review of existing databases, the potential for additional wetlands within the project area is low and wetland impacts are not anticipated.

6.3.b. Streams

(●) Yes ( ) No ( ) TBD Are stream(s) present on or adjacent to the project site.

All practicable means to avoid and minimize impacts will be employed. All unavoidable impacts will be mitigated in accordance with applicable requirements (e.g., US Army Corps).

Available Stream Site(s) or mitigation strategy, as needed: (Discussion)

Minimal impact on the Bitterroot River is anticipated for pier construction. Abutments are setback outside of the OHWM. The proposed project would have no direct impact on O'Brien Creek. Stream mitigation per the USACE MT Stream Mitigation Procedure is not anticipated.

PROPOSED MITIGATION: Several mitigation measures/construction parameters will be implemented to avoid impact on O'Brien Creek:
• Per FWP recommendation, the proposed bridge alignment has been located to include an approximate 100-foot buffer between the O'Brien Creek confluence and the proposed bridge alignment.
• Segments of River Pines Road will be obliterated and restored with new riparian buffer area between O'Brien Creek and the proposed project to minimize potential water quality impacts due to roadway runoff.
• A minimum 50-ft. no-disturbance buffer will be established along the north edge of O'Brien Creek, with the exception of where the road shoulder currently lies within this distance.
• No existing woody vegetation along O'Brien Creek shall be removed.
Design storm water facilities to prevent to the extent practicable return flow potential to O'Brien Creek and Big Flat Ditch.

6.3.c Other Regulated Aquatic Resources (Irrigation features, lakes, etc.)

(●) Yes ( ) No ( ) TBD Are other aquatic resources present on or adjacent to the project site.

All practicable means to avoid and minimize impacts will be employed. All unavoidable impacts will be mitigated in accordance with applicable requirements (e.g., US Army Corps).

Available Other Aquatic Resource Site(s) or mitigation strategy, as needed: (Discussion)

A minor impact on Big Flat Ditch would occur where a portion of the existing ditch would be modified and the existing culvert extended to the north to accommodate the reconfiguration of River Pines Road. No mitigation for impacts on other regulated

Montana Department of Transportation
Environmental Services Bureau
Categorical Exclusion (CE) Documentation

PO Box 201001
2701 Prospect Avenue
Helena, MT 59620
(406) 444-7203

Control Number 6296000 Date 2019-08-27

aquatic resources is required.

Additional Discussion (Explanation): Impacts on aquatic resources and water quality are determined to be not significant and no long-term impacts are anticipated. Impacts would be primarily short-term and limited to the period during construction.

The contractor will be required to adhere to the terms and conditions of MDT Standard Specification Section 208 for Water Pollution Control and Aquatic Resource Preservation.

6.4 Biological Resources

6.4.a. Threatened and Endangered Species Act

☐ Due to the nature and scope of the project, no impacts to protected resources would be expected. Adequate supporting information is included in Part 3. No detailed analysis is necessary.

◉ Yes ○ No Are there any recorded occurrences of T&E Species and/or critical habitat in the proposed project's vicinity?

Explain (List): The Federally listed endangered, threatened, proposed, and candidate species to be considered for the proposed project include: the threatened Canada Lynx, bull trout, yellow-billed cuckoo, red knot, water howellia and grizzly bear. The wolverine is proposed for listing and whitebark pine is a candidate species. Potential impacts on bull trout, bull trout critical habitat, and yellow-billed cuckoo were analyzed in detail in the Biological Assessment.

In regard to federally listed threatened and endangered species, the proposed project:

○ Will have no effect.

◉ May affect.

PA threshold exceeded, FHWA must concur with the CE finding for a federally funded project.

◉ Consultation with the USFWS will be coordinated and documented.

○ Consultation with the USFWS is completed.

The Biological Assessment rendered the following effect determinations:
• The proposed project may affect, likely to adversely affect bull trout;
• The proposed project may affect, likely to adversely affect bull trout critical habitat; and
• The proposed project may affect, not likely to adversely affect yellow-billed cuckoo.

The Preliminary Biological Assessment included a No Effect determination for the Canada lynx or Canada lynx critical habitat, grizzly bear, red knot, and water howellia, and is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of whitebark pine or wolverine. No further analysis on these species is necessary.

The proposed project will require formal consultation with USFWS based upon the effect determination rendered for bull trout and bull trout critical habitat. Formal consultation will include continued coordination between the USFWS, Missoula County and MDT as design progresses to minimize impacts and incorporate mitigation measures into the design. Consultation will conclude with the issuance of a biological opinion.

PROPOSED MITIGATION: The following conservation measures/construction parameters are anticipated based early coordination with the USFWS (USFWS letter to HDR, Dec. 12, 2016) These measures are subject to change following issuance of a biological opinion.
New Bridge Construction:
• To minimize impact on bull trout, in-water work shall be conducted within the work window of July 1 through September 30.
• Impact pile driving that has not been attenuated for noise occur between July 1 and September 30. This work includes dry land and in-water impact pile driving.
• To minimize the risk of barotraumas and fish mortality from driving piles for construction of the new bridge and any temporary work bridges outside the above time period:
o Use a vibratory hammer to drive piles to such a point when an impact hammer will be required to drive the pile to the point of refusal OR;
o Initiate impact hammer pile-driving of each pile with lower hammer strokes than are

Montana Department of Transportation
Environmental Services Bureau
Categorical Exclusion (CE) Documentation

PO Box 201001
2701 Prospect Avenue
Helena, MT 59620
(406) 444-7203

Control Number 6296000 Date 2019-08-27

Additional information, if needed.

required for the initial six strikes to encourage fish to vacate the surrounding area, and use the National Marine Fisheries Service Calculator Tool to determine how many pile strikes can occur during a day, based on pile type and size, prior to the thresholds being attained. Once the number of strikes has been attained, impact pile driving must be stopped for the day. If driving pile with an impact hammer over consecutive days, do not drive piling between the hours of 9:00 PM and 6:00 AM. OR;

o Use MDT-approved noise reduction methods, such as those offered in Leslie and Schwertner (2013) (e.g., bubble curtain, cofferdams) AND;

o Conduct hydroacoustic monitoring. Through hydroacoustic monitoring, should it be determined that the physical harm thresholds of the peak sound pressure level (SPL) OF 206 dB (re: 1 µPa), or the cumulative sound exposure level (SEL) of 187 dB (re: 1 µPa) for fish > 2 g, or 183 dB (re: 1 µPa) for fish < 2 g have been attained or exceeded, impact pile driving must be stopped for the day, with impact pile driving permitted to commence the next morning.

• In-stream work conducted within the channel should be kept to the minimum amount necessary, preferably during periods of low flow. This includes, but is not limited to, construction and removal of any coffer dams that may be needed for the driving and removal of pilings for any temporary support structures that may be necessary. In-stream construction work should be completed in the shortest amount of time possible.

• Any temporary work or detour bridges necessary at these crossings should clear span the stream channel, if possible. No construction equipment should be allowed to operate within the active channel of any stream unless permitted to do so. If at all possible, schedule instream construction activities such that as many of the necessary construction activities as possible occur “in the dry.”

• Materials excavated from inside any coffer dams or drilled shafts shall not enter any waterbody, and if so, will be removed.

• De-watering activities will require that the effluent be pumped to an upland detention area that will allow for the sediments to separate out and water infiltrate into the groundwater system.

• All disturbed areas should be revegetated with woody plants and native grasses.

• To the extent practicable and to minimize impacts on yellow-billed cuckoo:

o Minimize the frequency and duration of project activities producing loud construction noise during the yellow-billed cuckoo migratory and breeding season (June 1 through July 31) in Montana.

o Adhere to the standard MDT MBTA vegetation removal special provision that requires clearing of trees and shrubs to occur between August 16 and April 15.

o Minimize the removal of yellow-billed cuckoo habitat (riparian woodlands).

o Restore riparian vegetation where possible after construction is complete.

Maclay Bridge Removal:

• Conduct work within specified work window of July 1 through September 30.

• Prevent/minimize allowing pieces of bridge to fall into the water during demolition. If pieces fall into the river, remove without dragging along streambed.

• Following removal of Maclay Bridge, remove channel constriction at west bank and restore.

If there is a finding of “may affect, likely to adversely affect” action may not be processed under paragraphs CE(c)(26), (c)(27), and (c)(28).

6.4.b. Bald and Golden Eagle Protection

☐ Due to the nature and scope of the project, no impacts to protected resources would be expected. Adequate and supporting information is included in Part 3. No detailed analysis is necessary.

◉ Yes ○ No Are there recorded Bald and/or Golden Eagle nests in the proposed project's vicinity?

Explain (List) The nearest known bald eagle nest is located approximately 1.3 miles southeast of the project vicinity.

○ Yes ◉ No The proposed project will have impacts subject to the conditions of the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act.

No additional analysis necessary.

6.4.c. Migratory Bird Treaty Act

Montana Department of Transportation
Environmental Services Bureau
Categorical Exclusion (CE) Documentation

PO Box 201001
2701 Prospect Avenue
Helena, MT 59620
(406) 444-7203

Control Number 6296000 Date 2019-08-27

☐ Due to the nature and scope of the project, no impacts to protected resources would be expected. Adequate and supporting information is included in Part 3. No detailed analysis is necessary.

○ Yes ◉ No The proposed project may have impacts subject to the conditions of the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (MBTA).

No additional analysis necessary.

Additional Discussion on Biological Resources

The proposed project would be implemented in compliance with the MBTA through inclusion of MDT standard MBTA special provisions. Special Provision number 107-25c, Migratory Bird Treaty Act Compliance – Vegetation Removal (Added 9-26-13), will be included in the final construction bid documents to avoid and minimize potential impacts on migratory birds resulting from vegetation removal. This special provision limits cutting of trees or shrubs to non-nesting periods (August 16 through April 15 of any given year). Special provision 107-25a, Migratory Bird Treaty Act Compliance – Structures (Revised 2-18-16) will be included in the final construction bid documents to avoid and minimize potential impacts on migratory birds resulting from removal of Maclay Bridge or work that may directly impact active nests on Maclay Bridge.

Timing in-stream work to occur during low flows and completing work within the Bitterroot River in the shortest practicable timeframe will minimize impacts on fish. A special provision will be included in the construction bid documents instructing the contractor to coordinate with FWP prior to initiating construction to identify constraints relative to known eagle and osprey nest locations.

6.5 Economic Impacts (Environmental Manual Chapter 20)

○ Due to the nature and scope of the project, no effects on the local economy are expected. No detailed analysis necessary.

◉ Due to the nature and scope of the project, minor or temporary effects on the local economy are expected. A detailed analysis is necessary. The following explanation will justify that the impact is not "significant". (Explain below)

○ A detailed economic analysis has been conducted and is documented in the file and/or summarized in Section 7. Analysis does not indicate potential for significant adverse impact.

Explain not "significant"

Potential economic impacts are determined to be not significant because no adverse economic effects were identified. The proposed project would require approximately 5.4 acres of new right-of-way, which is expected to have negligible effect on the tax base due to acquisition of taxable property. The proposed project may result in minor positive economic benefits to the local and regional economy during construction. No mitigation is proposed or necessary.

6.6 Environmental Justice (EJ) (Environmental Manual Chapter 24).

Would the proposed project likely create disproportionately high and/or adverse impact on the health or environment of minority and/or low-income populations as described in Executive Order 12898?

◉ Due to the nature and scope of the project, no disproportionately high and/or adverse EJ impact is expected. No detailed analysis necessary.

○ Due to the nature and scope of the project, minor effects on EJ populations may occur. A detailed analysis is not necessary. The following explanation will justify that the impact is not "disproportionately high and/or adverse". (Explain below.)

○ An EJ analysis has been conducted and is documented in the file and/or summarized in Section 7. Analysis does not indicate potential for significant adverse impact.

6.7 Farmland Protection Policy Act (FPPA) (Environmental Manual Chapter 33)

☐ Due to the nature and scope or the project, no impacts to farmland resources are expected. Adequate supporting information is includes in Part 3. No detailed analysis is necessary.

○ Yes ◉ No Is the project within existing ROW acquired on or before 8/4/84 or located within an area of existing development?

○ Yes ◉ No Is the project specifically for the purposes of national defense?

6.7.a. Will farmland (as defined in 7 CFR 658.2) be directly or indirectly converted as a result of the project?

Montana Department of Transportation
Environmental Services Bureau
Categorical Exclusion (CE) Documentation

PO Box 201001
2701 Prospect Avenue
Helena, MT 59620
(406) 444-7203

Control Number 6296000 Date 2019-08-27

○ No. Project is not subject to FPPA. No additional analysis or discussion required.

◉ Yes. A farmland impact analysis was conducted in accordance with the most current NRCS procedures and is documented in the file. Analysis does not indicate potential for significant adverse impact.

○ Yes. A farmland impact analysis will be conducted in accordance with the most current NRCS procedures and will be documented in the file. Analysis will not indicate potential for significant adverse impact or else the level of environmental documentation will be re-evaluated.

6.8 Floodplains

All stream crossing would be designed in accordance with Executive Order (EO) 111988 amended and 23 CFR 650 Subpart A and in coordination with the appropriate regulatory agencies. Projects within a designated 100-year floodplain will have a floodplain development permit prior to the start of construction. MDT Hydraulics will secure and document the permit for the permanent facility. In accordance with Standard Specification 107.11.2.H, the contractor is required to secure applicable floodplain permits for temporary facilities.

☐ Due to the nature and scope of the project, no impacts to floodplains are expected. Adequate supporting information is included in Part 3.a above. No detailed analysis is necessary.

◉ Yes ○ No Does a delineated floodplain exist in the project area under FEMA's Floodplain Management Criteria?

◉ Yes ○ No Does the project involve work encroaching on a regulatory floodway such that the water surface at the 100-year flood limit elevation would exceed floodplain management criteria.

PA threshold exceeded, FHWA must concur with the CE finding for a federally funded project.

○ Yes ◉ No Is the floodplain encroachment something other than a functionally dependent use (e.g., bridge, wetlands)? ***(If yes, action may not be processed under paragraphs CE(c)(26), (c)(27), and (c)(28).)***

○ Yes ◉ No Is the action something that facilitates open space use (e.g., recreational trails, bicycle and pedestrian paths? ***(If no, action may not be processed under paragraphs CE(c)(26), (c)(27), and (c)(28).)***

Additional Information if needed

Impacts on the 100-year floodplain are determined to be not significant. The proposed bridge design provides an improvement over the existing conditions associated with Maclay Bridge, including span and pier configurations appropriately designed to account for flood conditions and scour, and a 2-ft freeboard as required to convey ice flows, the 100-year flood, and any debris associated with such a flood. By removing Maclay Bridge, restoring the channel width at this location, and constructing a new bridge with hydraulic design considerations, the proposed project would provide a beneficial effect on floodplains in the project area.

It is estimated that the proposed project would increase the water surface elevation of the 100-year flood event by 0.03 feet upstream of the proposed structure over existing conditions, assuming removal of Maclay Bridge. This result is not anticipated to impact flooding conditions. Because the proposed project is anticipated to result in an increase of more than 0.00 feet to the Base Flood Elevation of the Floodway, the DNRC must approve the project pursuant to 76-5-203 MCA. The proposed project will require a floodplain permit from Missoula County. A CLOMR will be submitted to DNRC and FEMA during the floodplain permit application process followed by a LOMR to officially amend the boundaries of flood zones and elevations on the FIRM once construction has been completed.

6.9. Hazardous Materials and Substances (Environmental Manual Chapter 44.).

☐ Due to the nature and scope of the project, no impacts to hazardous materials and substances are expected. Adequate supporting information is included in Part 3. No detailed analysis is necessary.

○ Yes ◉ No The project occurs in an area where local permitting is required for ground disturbance activities in a Superfund Site.

◉ Yes ○ No Hazardous materials, hazardous substances, and/or petroleum products are currently on and/or adjacent to the proposed project.

A preliminary Site Investigation will be conducted and documented in the file. Appropriate special conditions will be included in the contract.

Describe: The existing Maclay Bridge may contain asbestos and/or lead-based paint. See additional information below.

Montana Department of Transportation
Environmental Services Bureau
Categorical Exclusion (CE) Documentation

PO Box 201001
2701 Prospect Avenue
Helena, MT 59620
(406) 444-7203

Control Number 6296000 Date 2019-08-27

Additional information if needed

An asbestos and lead inspection of Maclay Bridge would be conducted prior to bridge demolition. If lead is present, a Lead-Based Paint Removal and Disposal special provision would be included in the contract bid documents. Abatement provisions may be necessary pending results from the asbestos and lead inspection of the bridge.

Potential impacts from hazardous materials and substances as a result of the proposed project have been determined as not significant. The contractor will handle and dispose of all hazardous materials in accordance with applicable local, state, and federal regulations.

Should evidence of hazardous materials and/or underground storage tanks be discovered during construction, in accordance with MDT Standard Specifications 107.23 and 107.24, the contractor would be required to immediately stop work in the area until the significance of the site is determined and appropriate measures implemented.

6.10. Historic and Archaeological Resources (Environmental Manual Chapter 30.)

☐ Due to the nature and scope of the project, no impacts to historic and archaeological resources are expected. Adequate supporting information is included in Part 3. No detailed analysis is necessary.

◉ Yes ○ No Are any historic, archaeological or cultural resources on or eligible for listing on the National Register present within the project's Area of Potential Effect?

Historic Resources

Smithsonian #	Name	Eligible?	Date of Concurrence in Eligibility	Effect Determination	Date of Effect Determination
24MO0519	Maclay House	Yes	Mar 30, 2016	No Effect	Oct 31, 2016
24MO0587	Big Flat Ditch	Yes	Aug 23, 2006	No Adverse Effect	Oct 31, 2016
24MO0521	Maclay Bridge	Listed on NR	Dec 20, 2016	Adverse Effect	Oct 31, 2016

Add Row | Delete Last Row

◉ Yes ○ No Is there confirmed potential for adverse effect on cultural/historic resources?

PA threshold exceeded, FHWA must concur with the CE finding for a federally funded project.

If adverse effect, action may not be processed under paragraphs CE(c)(26), (c)(27), and (c)(28). Also, PA threshold exceeded, FHWA must concur with the CE finding for a federally funded project. An MOU is on file describing agreed upon mitigation measures, as necessary. (If there is a "use of a Section 4(f) property, document it in Section 6.16 below.)

Provide additional information below, if needed or reference Section 7. Include specific information related to each resource by Smithsonian Number. Cut and paste from existing reports.

The proposed project would have No Effect to the NRHP-eligible Maclay House (24MO0519). The Maclay House is located approximately 200 feet west of the proposed project limits, which terminates near the intersection of River Pines Road and Blue Heron Lane. The proposed project would have No Adverse Effect to the NRHP-eligible Big Flat Ditch (24MO0587). The proposed project would involve the extension of the existing siphon that carries the Big Flat Ditch under River Pines Road to accommodate a change in the roadway alignment. The existing ditch alignment would be perpetuated as would its historic function and there would be no diminution in the amount of water it carries. No mitigation is currently proposed or required for the effect on the Big Flat Ditch.

The proposed project would have an Adverse Effect to the NRHP-listed Maclay Bridge (24MO0521) due to the removal of the historic structure. The adverse effect to Maclay Bridge would be mitigated through the terms and stipulations as specified by MDT's Historic Roads and Bridges Programmatic Agreement. Maclay Bridge has been documented according to the National Park Service's Historic American Engineering Record (HAER) standards. Additionally, Maclay Bridge will be offered for adoption according to Stipulation 3(C)(E) of the PA. If a second party owner is identified to take ownership of and relocate Maclay Bridge, the cost of demolition will be made available to the third party as reimbursement for relocating the bridge.

Montana Department of Transportation
Environmental Services Bureau
Categorical Exclusion (CE) Documentation

PO Box 201001
2701 Prospect Avenue
Helena, MT 59620
(406) 444-7203

Control Number 6296000 Date 2019-08-27

The adverse effect to Maclay Bridge has been identified as not significant. Maclay Bridge is a part of the county road system that has continued to evolve over the years. Although listed on the NRHP and unique because it's historic, Maclay Bridge must perform as an integral part of a modern transportation system. When historic bridges do not or cannot, they must be rehabilitated or replaced in order to assure public safety while maintaining system continuity and integrity. Rehabilitation has been identified as not feasible or prudent because this option would compromise the project to a degree that it is unreasonable to proceed with the project in light of its stated purpose and need. It has been concluded that Maclay Bridge must be replaced.

Should evidence of historic or pre-historic sites be discovered during construction, in accordance with MDT Standard Specifications 107.11, the contractor would be required to immediately stop work in the area until the significance of the site is determined and appropriate measures implemented.

6.11. Induced Growth Analysis - Impacts to Planned Growth and Land Use **(Induced Growth Guidance)**

○ Yes ◉ No Is this project exempt from screening due to the nature and scope of the project?

○ Yes ◉ No Does the project have an economic development purpose?

○ Yes ◉ No Does the project substantially improve accessibility?

No Detailed Analysis Necessary - Explain No Improvement to Accessibility

The MDT publication "Assessing the Extent and Determinants of Induced Growth" was reviewed and the proposed project does not involve any of the listed factors that would substantially improve accessibility. Specifically, the project components that may substantially improve accessibility are listed below along with a brief description of relevance to the proposed project.

• New roadway: The project includes constructing a new bridge carrying South Avenue across the Bitterroot River; however, change in access would be minor. The new bridge and associated approaches would replace similar functioning infrastructure on North Avenue with a negligible effect on the area's transportation network. Traffic currently using North Avenue to cross Maclay Bridge to access areas west of the river would shift to South Avenue to cross the proposed South Avenue Bridge to access the same areas. The proposed project would construct approximately 0.3 mile of new roadway approaches connecting to the structure on the east and west sides of the Bitterroot River and realign approximately 0.1 mile of River Pines Road to tie into the project.

• Adding travel lanes to an existing roadway: The project does not involve added capacity by adding travel lanes to an existing roadway that would substantially improve accessibility. The proposed project does include adding a single lane to the proposed bridge to connect to the existing two-way, two-lane roadways on either side of the project to allow for simultaneous two-way travel. The added capacity of one lane is limited to only the bridge and is necessary to meet the purpose and need for the proposed project. Current and projected traffic volumes on Maclay Bridge substantially exceed the recommended capacity of a one-lane structure. AASHTO standards specify single-lane bridges are appropriate on roads with AADT volumes less than 100 vehicles per day. Maclay Bridge has a current AADT of 1,998 and a projected AADT of approximately 1,500 in 2045. Moreover, Maclay Bridge is categorized by the MDT Bridge Management System as functionally obsolete due to the single-lane width of the bridge being sub-standard for the current traffic volumes.

• New interchange/intersection: The project does not involve construction of a new interchange but does involve a proposed stop-controlled T-intersection. Approximately 620 feet of River Pines Road would be realigned to a new T-intersection tying into the proposed project. Land use changes are not anticipated as a result of the proposed project.

• Modification to an existing interchange/intersection that provides access to previously inaccessible land: The project does not involve modification to an existing interchange/intersection that provides access to previously inaccessible land. Land use changes are not anticipated as a result of the proposed project.

• Project reduces travel time from the project area to a population/employment center or regional destination by five minutes or more: The proposed project does not immediately connect to a population/employment center or regional destination.

• Changes in access control, such as removing the limited access designation of a roadway: The proposed project does not involve changes in access control.

Additional information, if needed.

The Environmental Engineering Analyses Report included an assessment of potential indirect land use effects resulting from the proposed project. Through that assessment it was determined that a detailed induced growth analysis is not necessary and no further screening is required. The proposed project is not anticipated to indirectly contribute to further growth and development of the Target Range area or the nearby Big Flat area. Future growth in the project area vicinity will continue to be guided by the existing land use and zoning plans currently adopted by Missoula County.

Montana Department of Transportation
Environmental Services Bureau
Categorical Exclusion (CE) Documentation

PO Box 201001
2701 Prospect Avenue
Helena, MT 59620
(406) 444-7203

Control Number 6296000 Date 2019-08-27

6.12 Noise (Environmental Manual Chapter 43)

(•) Yes ( ) No Is this a Type I action as defined in 23 CFR 772?

If yes, PA threshold exceeded, FHWA must concur with the CE finding for a federally funded project.

Compliance with provisions of 23 CFT 772 and MDT's Noise Policy will be ensured and documented in the file. Noise abatement will be examined for reasonableness and feasibility. A final decision of the installation of the abatement measure(s) will be made upon completion of the project's final design and the public involvement process. At any point in the design process, if new or different information is identified that could impact the significance assessment associated with the noise impact, an amended NEPA/MEPA analysis could be required. If significant impacts were identified, an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process may need to be initiated or the project design may need to be modified. (Explain below)

A detailed noise analysis was conducted for the proposed project to evaluate the potential noise impacts associated with the operation of a new bridge on South Avenue. Noise levels were predicted for two scenarios: the 2015 existing conditions and the 2035 build scenario (the proposed project). Twenty-six noise-sensitive receptors were identified within a 500-foot distance extending from either side of the proposed project and future noise levels were predicted for these locations and compared to the 2015 existing condition to determine if increases in noise levels at any of the receptors results in impacts as defined by the federal Noise Abatement Criteria (NAC).

The 2035 design year alternative noise level is on average 4 dB(A) greater than the noise level predicted for the existing year (2015) alternative, with a maximum 10 dB(A) increase in noise level for residences located on the east side of the Bitterroot River near Hanson Drive. The predicted noise level increase, however, does not result in a noise impact at any of the receptor locations as defined by MDT Noise Policy.

Operation of the proposed project would indirectly increase traffic noise east of the project area along South Avenue and Clements Road due to the traffic pattern change. Although not modeled as part of the noise analysis because it is outside of the immediate project area, vehicular volumes and corresponding traffic noise would increase on South Avenue west Clements Road, and particularly west of Humble Road over existing conditions following construction of the new bridge. Changes in noise can be generally quantified for areas not specifically modeled. A general rule of thumb is that a doubling of traffic results in a 3 dB increase. Based on traffic data from the Maclay Bridge Planning Study comparing 2010 AADT and the projected 2040 South 1 Alternative AADT, the traffic increase on South Avenue between Humble Road and Pleasant Avenue would result in an approximate 4.6 dB increase and traffic noise between Pleasant Avenue and Clements Road would increase approximately 2.9 dB. Similarly, traffic noise levels in the vicinity of Maclay Bridge are anticipated to decrease as a result of the bridge removal and removal of through traffic. The removal of the bridge would reduce noise levels on North Avenue near Clements Road by approximately 2.0 dB in this area and in the vicinity of the bridge.

Increases in traffic noise do not result in a traffic noise impact as defined by the 2017 MDT Noise Policy and do not trigger consideration of noise abatement. As a result, the anticipated increases in traffic noise are determined to be not significant.

PROPOSED MITIGATION FOR CONSTRUCTION NOISE: In accordance with MDT Standard Specification 107.11.4, the contractor would be required to comply with applicable local noise ordinances, laws and regulations. Special provision 107-10, Noise Impact, will be included in the final contract that would minimize construction noise by prohibiting construction activities between the hours of 10 p.m. and 6 a.m. without express written approval from the project manager. Noise-related complaints would be investigated and resolved as appropriate. Any adverse noise impacts would be short-term and limited to the period of construction.

6.13. Public Involvement

(•) Yes ( ) No A public involvement plan would be completed in accordance with MDT's Public Involvement Handbook.

Explain

Development of the 2013 Maclay Bridge Planning Study included 4 public meetings and additional stakeholder and agency outreach. More recently, during development of the proposed project, two public meetings were held regarding the proposed project: Meeting #1 was on September 22, 2015 and Meeting #2 was on August 16, 2016. The Missoula County Commissioners elected to hold a public hearing on November 16, 2016 to provide another opportunity for public comment. The meeting included a project status update to the Commission by the design

Montana Department of Transportation
Environmental Services Bureau
Categorical Exclusion (CE) Documentation

PO Box 201001
2701 Prospect Avenue
Helena, MT 59620
(406) 444-7203

Control Number 6296000 Date 2019-08-27

team. Public testimony was heard both against and in favor for the proposed project. A third and final public meeting is anticipated following completion of the environmental process.

6.14 Recreational Resources

☒ Due to the nature and scope of the project, no impacts to publicly-owned recreation resources are expected. Adequate supporting information is included in Part 3. No detailed analysis is necessary.

6.15 Right-of-Way (ROW)

◉ Yes ○ No Will acquisition of ROW be required?

◉ Yes ○ No Will construction permits or temporary easement be required?

○ Yes ◉ No ○ N/A Will ROW acquisition be considered "minor" per the Programmatic Agreement (PA)? *For purposes of the PA, an acquisition is considered more than minor if it will substantially affect the functionality of the property and/or primary structure on the property.* If no, action may not be processed under paragraphs CE(c)(26), (c)(27), and (c)(28).

PA threshold exceeded, FHWA must concur with the CE finding for a federally funded project.

○ Yes ◉ No ○ N/A Will residential or commercial displacement be required? If yes, action may not be processed under paragraphs CE(c)(26), (c)(27), and (c)(28).

○ Yes ◉ No ○ N/A Will acquisition of land for hardship or protective purposes, or early acquisition be required?

6.16 Section 4(f) of the US Department of Transportation Act (Environmental Manual Chapter 15.)

☐ Due to the nature and scope of the project, no impacts to Section 4(f)-protected resources would be expected. Adequate supporting information is included in Part 3.1 above. No detailed analysis is necessary.

◉ Yes ○ No Are there any parks, recreation areas, wildlife and or waterfowl refuges, or historic sites on or adjacent to the project.

4(f) Resources

Resource	Use?	Type of Use (Permanent, Temporary, Constructive)	Documentation (De Minimis, Programmatic, Full 4(f))	Date of Completion
Maclay Bridge (24MO0521)	Yes	Permanent	Nationwide Programmatic Section 4(f) Evaluation and Approval for FHWA Projects that Necessitate the Use of Historic Bridges	See Attached
Maclay House (24MO0519)	No		NA	NA
Big Flat Ditch (24MO0587)	No		NA	NA

Add Row | Delete Last Row

◉ Yes ○ No ○ TBD Will there be a "use" of Section 4(f) protected sites?

If "yes", PA threshold exceeded, FHWA must concur with the CE finding for a federally funded project.

Work has been coordinated with and documented with the managing agency/agencies. Documentation is available on file.

Additional Information if Needed: The proposed project would have no effect on any publicly owned parks, recreation areas, or wildlife refuges that are protected by Section 4(f). Section 4(f) compliance for the adverse effect to Maclay Bridge will be achieved through use of the Nationwide Programmatic Section 4(f) Evaluation for Historic Bridges. The Programmatic Section 4(f) Evaluation is attached.

Montana Department of Transportation
Environmental Services Bureau
Categorical Exclusion (CE) Documentation

PO Box 201001
2701 Prospect Avenue
Helena, MT 59620
(406) 444-7203

Control Number 6296000 Date 2019-08-27

6.17 Section 6(f) of the National Land and Water Conservation Act (Environmental Manual Chapter 32) or Similar Deed Restriction.

☐ Due to the nature and scope of the project, or the location, no impacts to protected resources would be expected. Adequate supporting information is included in Part 3 above. No detailed analysis is necessary.

○ Yes ◉ No Have any of the parks, recreation areas, or other properties on or adjacent to the project been acquired (in fee or in easement) and/or improved with funds from the Land and Water Conservation Act of 1965, the Federal Aid in Fish Restoration Act, the Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act, or other public-use money that includes deed restrictions or covenants on the property.

No additional analysis necessary.

6.18 Social Impacts (Environmental Manual Chapter 19.)

☐ Due to the nature and scope of the project, no social impacts would be expected. No detailed analysis is necessary.

◉ Due to the nature and scope of the work potential for minor or temporary social impacts are expected. A detailed analysis is not necessary. The following explanation will justify that the impact is not "significant".

○ A detailed social impact analysis has been conducted and is documented in the file and/or in Section7.

Explain not "significant".

The potential social impacts identified as a result of the proposed project have been determined as not significant. The proposed project would not result in disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects on any low income or minority populations and, as such, would be in accordance with Executive Order No. 12898, Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations.

The proposed project has not been identified as inconsistent with the current adopted 2016 county growth policy. The proposed project has not been identified as inconsistent with current zoning regulation because it would have no effect on population growth or exacerbate land use changes in the Target Range area. Because the proposed project involves removal of Maclay Bridge, it is inconsistent with the bridge recommendations identified by the Target Range Neighborhood Plan.

The proposed project is designed to meet the purpose and need of the project by improving safety and mobility for the traveling public. In general, traffic volumes for 2045 in the Target Range area are projected to increase in some locations and decrease in others. Based on the 2045 TDM results, the traffic volumes on South Avenue in the vicinity of the proposed project would generally see a reduction in traffic volumes over future existing conditions following completion of the proposed project. The exception to this is at the location immediately west of the Clements Road intersection on South Avenue (in the vicinity of Target Range School) where there is an increase of approximately 900 vehicles per day (vpd) as compared to the projected 2045 traffic conditions without a new bridge. The location on South Avenue nearest the proposed project between Humble and Pleasant is projected to see a decrease of approximately 400 vpd following completion of the proposed project as compared to 2045 future existing conditions. Changes in travel patterns under the proposed project would result in a more efficient river crossing connecting the major roadway networks on either side of the river and reduce out-of-direction travel as compared to the existing crossing at Maclay Bridge.

The proposed project would improve safety for pedestrians and bicyclists crossing the Bitterroot River by providing a 10-foot shared-use path separated from traffic throughout the project limits. East- and westbound through movements on South Avenue in the vicinity of Target Range School would increase as a result of the proposed project. This predicted minor increase in vpd on what is predicted to be a moderate to low volume two-lane road (2,958 AADT in 2045) does not warrant additional pedestrian safety mitigation per MDT Traffic Control Manual.

The proposed improvements along South Avenue, and in particular, west of Humble Road has potential to change the character of the roadway as it is currently a dead end cul-de-sac. Missoula County is committed to and is actively working with neighborhood representatives to address the

Montana Department of Transportation
Environmental Services Bureau
Categorical Exclusion (CE) Documentation

PO Box 201001
2701 Prospect Avenue
Helena, MT 59620
(406) 444-7203

Control Number 6296000 Date 2019-08-27

potential impacts as a result of shifting traffic from North Avenue onto South Avenue. Preliminary strategies are congruent with the Target Range Neighborhood Plan.

6.19 Tribal Lands/Issues (Environmental Manual Chapter 31.)

○ Yes ◉ No Is the project located within a current American Indian Reservation border?

◉ Yes ○ No Is the project located outside a current American Indian Reservation border, but in an area of interest to the Tribal government?

Tribal Government? CS&K Tribes

Documentation of coordination with the Tribal government is on file for overall project coordination, and any coordination related to aquatic resource permitting, 401 certification, and/or history and cultural resources.

6.20 Vegetation (Environmental Manual Chapter 37)

○ Due to the nature and scope of the project and the site, a seeding special provision is not necessary.

◉ A seeding provision will be included in the contract documents to ensure appropriate re-vegetation of disturbed areas.

In accordance with Standard Specification 201, clearing and grubbing activities would occur only with staked construction limits.

To re-establish permanent vegetation and to reduce the spread and establishment of noxious weeds, disturbed areas within MDT right-of-way and easements would be seeded with desirable plant species, as soon as practicable, as recommended and determined feasible by the MDT Reclamation Specialist. The seeding mixture special provision will be included in the contract documentation.

Re-vegetation plan will conform to the requirements of 23 CFR 650 Subpart B. Post construction, the site would be monitored until final stabilization is met.

Additional information as needed. Document any deviations from standard procedures.

PROPOSED MITIGATION: Restoration through planting of riparian species will occur where practicable in disturbed areas adjacent the Bitterroot River following construction of the proposed project and removal of Maclay Bridge. A section of River Pines Road between O'Brien Creek and the west roadway approach to the bridge will be obliterated due to the alignment being shifted to the north and the existing roadway fill prism will be removed and restored in accordance with Standard Specification 212. Once the Maclay Bridge abutments are removed, existing rip rap will be put back in place and restored by incorporating soil and planting willow cuttings above the OHWM. Measures will be taken to retain the vegetated islands near Maclay Bridge to the extent practicable when removing the existing piles and piers.

The contractor will be required to wash all equipment prior to transport into the project area as specified in the MDT Supplemental Specification 107.11.5, Noxious Weed Management, to control the spread of noxious weeds. Missoula County will be responsible for developing construction contract special provisions and include coordination with an MDT Botanist, as needed, to determine appropriate revegetation plans. Missoula County will be responsible for post-construction monitoring of the re-vegetated areas to ensure final stabilization is met.

Due to minimization of the project footprint, plans for restoration and enhancement of disturbed riparian areas, and incorporation of vegetation standard and supplemental specifications into the contract bid documents, the proposed project is not anticipated to have a long-term negative impact on riparian habitat along the Bitterroot River.

6.21 Visual Quality/Aesthetics (Environmental Manual Chapter 22)

◉ Yes ○ No Will the project have the potential to impact roadside classification or visual aspects such as aesthetics, light, glare or night sky?

The project area contains a range of natural and human-made features influencing the visual environment. The Bitterroot River is the primary visual resource in the project area. The primary user groups include recreational anglers and floaters directly on the river or its banks, and vehicles or bicyclists traveling along Blue Mountain Road south of the proposed project. To a much smaller degree, some residences are located near the river and have unobstructed

Montana Department of Transportation
Environmental Services Bureau
Categorical Exclusion (CE) Documentation

PO Box 201001
2701 Prospect Avenue
Helena, MT 59620
(406) 444-7203

Control Number 6296000 Date 2019-08-27

Explain

views of the Bitterroot River. Views from the Bitterroot River as seen by anglers and floaters traveling downstream through the project area consist of undeveloped floodplains, as well as frequent and prolonged views of the adjacent Blue Mountain Road and River Pines Road and interspersed residential development.

The views from anglers and floaters and northbound vehicles traveling on Blue Mountain Road would be of a new two-lane bridge structure and associated road approaches, which, when taken in context with the immediate river corridor, is not compatible with the existing views and would contrast with the surrounding environment. The proposed bridge would tie into River Pines Road, which is currently visible from the river corridor in an area with multiple bridges and, when taken in context with the broader river corridor and surrounding built environment, would not be a substantial contrast and the impact is therefore considered not significant.

Additional information as needed. Document any deviations from standard procedures.

A spatial analysis using GIS was conducted to quantify the number of residences whose views could potentially be affected by the proposed project by intersecting the State of Montana Structures Framework dataset with a quarter-mile buffer surrounding the proposed alignment. Based on the spatial analysis, there are 70 single-family dwellings and 14 mobile homes within a quarter-mile radius of the proposed project. The removal of Maclay Bridge and associated spans, piers, and abutments would also affect the visual environment of the Bitterroot River. Using the same GIS method, 72 single-family dwellings were identified within a quarter-mile radius of the existing Maclay Bridge whose views may be potentially affected by removing the structure. Thirteen residences are located within both quarter-mile radii of the proposed project and Maclay Bridge.

River bridges are a common sight (and obstacle) for river users in the Missoula area. Within the project area vicinity, Maclay Bridge is located 0.4 mile downstream; Buckhouse Bridge (Highway US 93) spanning the Bitterroot River is less than four river miles upstream; Kona Bridge (E. Kona Rapids Road) spanning the Clark Fork River is approximately five river miles downstream. Constructing the new South Avenue Bridge and removal of the existing Maclay Bridge will result in changes to the visual environment in the location of these actions. These changes may be perceived as adverse or beneficial depending on the user group.

PROPOSED MITIGATION: A context sensitive design approach is being employed through attention to design quality and soliciting input from the public on bridge aesthetics to mitigate the potential adverse effects to the visual environment. A public meeting held on August 16, 2016 offered an opportunity for the public to provide input on bridge aesthetics. Additional opportunities will exist during final design for project stakeholders and the public to provide input on aesthetics of the proposed project. Bridge features that include girder type, pier shape, and pedestrian rail type will be determined with assistance from public input and the project Technical Design Committee, as necessary. All final decisions will need to ensure cost-effectiveness and practicability. In addition, restoration of disturbed areas adjacent to the Bitterroot River with appropriate species would improve the long-term visual character of the surrounding environment.

6.22 Water Quality *(In accordance with MDT Standard Specifications 107 and 208, the contractor would be required to adhere to applicable water quality rules, regulations, and permit conditions.).*

☐ Due to the nature and scope of the project, no impacts to water quality would be expected. Adequate supporting information is included in Part 3. No detailed analysis is necessary.

6.22.a Groundwater *(Domestic and irrigation well impacted by the project will be mitigated with the landowner)*

◉ Yes ○ No Are Public Water Supply Wells located on or adjacent to the project?

Explain

A single well MISSOULA COUNTY WQD WELL U132035B, GWIC ID: 151188 was identified adjacent to the east bridge approach. This well is identified in the database as a monitoring well and is not a public water supply well. The well is located outside of the project footprint and no impact on the well is anticipated.

Ensure the DEQ setback requirements of a100-foot isolation zone in which no source of pollutant can be located is accounted for in project plans.

6.22.b Underground Injection Control (UIC) Program Under the Safe Drinking Water Act (SDWA)

○ Yes ◉ No ○ N/A ○ TBD Will the project include stormwater drainage wells such as dry wells, bored wells, and infiltration galleries that are regulated as Class V injection wells by EPA under the NPDES program.

Montana Department of Transportation
Environmental Services Bureau
Categorical Exclusion (CE) Documentation

PO Box 201001
2701 Prospect Avenue
Helena, MT 59620
(406) 444-7203

Control Number 6296000 Date 2019-08-27

Explain: The proposed project does not include any stormwater drainage features regulated under the SDWA.

6.22.c Stormwater - Temporary Erosion and Sediment Control
MDT's contractor will be contractually obligated to provide temporary erosion and sediment control in accordance with FHWA rules at 23 CFR 650 Subpart B and applicable stormwater permit requirements at the MPDES and/or NPDES.

6.22.d Stormwater - Permanent Erosion and Sediment Control (PESC) *(If the scope of the project includes a rehabilitation or reconstruction, evaluate need for incorporation of PESC and discussed this with Road Design and Hydraulics.)*

☒ Due to the nature and scope of the project and the site, a PESC analysis is not necessary.

Explain No Analysis: The requirement for PESC has not been identified to date. Consideration of PESC may occur during final design.

6.22.e Stormwater - Local Requirements (Discuss compliance with local stormwater requirements with Road Design and Hydraulics.)

☐ Due to the nature and scope of the project and the site, local stormwater requirements do not apply.

☒ Local stormwater requirement apply that are being coordinated with personnel on the Design Team.

Describe Local Stormwater Requirements: Missoula MS4

Explain: The Missoula MS4 boundary includes the project area east of the Bitterroot River and, as such, the proposed project would be evaluated for the applicability of the requirement to incorporate Low Impact Development (LID) practices to comply with post-construction storm water management controls.

6.23 Wild and Scenic Rivers (Environmental Manual Chapter 35)

○ Yes ◉ No Will the proposed project require work in, across or adjacent to a Wild and Scenic River?

Additional information as needed: No rivers designated as Wild and Scenic exist in the project area.

Part 7 - Additional MDT Discussion/Comments

Montana Department of Transportation
Environmental Services Bureau
Categorical Exclusion (CE) Documentation

PO Box 201001
2701 Prospect Avenue
Helena, MT 59620
(406) 444-7203

Control Number 6296000 Date 2019-08-27

Part 3.d: Several local planning documents are relevant to the proposed project:
Activate Missoula 2014: Missoula LRTP (2017), Missoula County Growth Policy (2016), Maclay Bridge Planning Study (2013), and the Target Range Neighborhood Plan (2009).

The following paragraphs include additional information on potential impacts, proposed mitigation, and special provisions for select resources:
FARMLAND: A Farmland Conversion Impact Rating for Corridor Type Projects Form (NRCS-CPA-106) was processed for the proposed project in accordance with the FPPA and approved by the NRCS on November 10, 2016. The conversion of 5.27 acres of prime farmland equates to 0.001% of the available farmland in Missoula County. This impact is not significant and no mitigation is required by the NRCS for farmland impacts. A copy of the NRCS correspondence and completed Form NRCS-CPA-106 are included in the project file.
UTILITIES: A contract special provision will be developed requiring the contractors to cooperate with utility owners during construction to minimize interruption to utility services. Notification of service interruptions will be the responsibility of the appropriate utility owners. It is anticipated many of the utilities could be relocated within existing utility agreements, easements, and rights-of-way, and relocations will be performed by the utility companies. Coordination with utility companies to determine utility locations near the proposed bridge site and options to protect in place or relocate will occur during final design.
RIGHT-OF-WAY: The requirement of an estimated 5.37 acres of new right-of-way is determined as not significant. No residential or business relocations would occur under the proposed project. All right-of-way acquisition will be developed in accordance with both the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Act of 1970, and the Uniform Relocation Act Amendments of 1987. In accordance with federal laws and regulations, affected landowners are entitled to fair market value for any land or structures acquired to construct the proposed project.
Specific to Part 6.15 of this CE form, a threshold established in the 2016 Programmatic Agreement between FHWA and MDT is exceeded because the proposed right-of-way acquisition of one parcel (Parcel ID 04219927103390000) exceeds one-quarter of the size of the parcel. The project is proposing acquisition of 0.53 acres of the 1.65 acre property , or approx. 32% of the property. This parcel is vacant with no structures and appears to be a common open parcel associated with the subdivision.
BICYCLES AND PEDESTRIANS: Missoula County intends to provide a connection along South Avenue from the westernmost end of the existing shared-use path at Humble Road to the proposed project. The preliminary concept includes a pedestrian/ bicycle crosswalk across South Avenue at the South Avenue/Humble Road intersection and construction of a paved shared-use facility along the north side of South Avenue to connect to the proposed project. Details of these improvements will be determined cooperatively between the public, County, and MDT during final design. Missoula County will fund the improvement through its general maintenance fund.

Per MDT and FHWA recommendation, Missoula County examined the feasibility of rehabilitation options brought forth by the Maclay Bridge Alliance that meet the project's purpose and need in the report entitled "Maclay Bridge Preservation Options Analysis" (HDR 2019). A primary purpose of the study was to provide analysis to be used by MDT and SHPO to identify whether the structural modifications of the rehabilitation options would affect the NHRP eligibility of Maclay Bridge. MDT provided a Determination of Effect to SHPO (recieved April 30, 2019) on the five rehabilitation options originally proposed by the Maclay Bridge Alliance and the effect to the historic structure. In a letter dated May 14, 2019, SHPO concurred with the determinations that Options 1, 2, 3, and 5 would result in an adverse effect on the Maclay Bridge. Option 4 (constructing a new two-lane concrete or steel beam bridge parallel to the existing Maclay Bridge rehabilitated for bike/pedestrian access only) would have no adverse effect. More information is included in the attached Programmatic Section 4(f) Evaluation.

Additional documentation of correspondences from the Maclay Bridge Alliance to FHWA, MDT, and SHPO need to be compiled and attached to the Environmental Document, and responses provided, as appropriate. A revised No Adverse Effect Determination cover letter from SHPO regarding Big Flat Ditch is necessary and needs to include the de minimis action statement.

SIGNIFICANCE DETERMINATION:
Significance determinations were made based on the criteria specified in 40 CFR 1508.27 and ARM 18.2.238. Based on the environmental analyses conducted for the proposed project and through the information presented above, no significant impacts were identified and, therefore, in accordance with NEPA/MEPA regulations, a Categorical Exclusion is the appropriate level of environmental document for the proposed project. In addition, neither extraordinary circumstances as specified in ARM 18.2.261(5), nor unusual circumstances as specified in 23 CFR 771.117(b)(1)-(4), have been identified.

Montana Department of Transportation
Environmental Services Bureau
Categorical Exclusion (CE) Documentation

PO Box 201001
2701 Prospect Avenue
Helena, MT 59620
(406) 444-7203

Control Number 6296000 Date 2019-08-27

Part 8 - FHWA Comments

Part 9 - FHWA Signature Rationale

(•) Yes ( ) No Is FHWA Concurrence on the CE necessary?

Explain why FHWA concurrence is necessary:

☐ Action is not listed in 23 CFR 771.117.

☐ Action is listed in 23 CFR 771.117, no PA threshold is exceeded, but MDT is requesting FHWA concurrence.

☒ Action is listed in 23 CFR 771.117, but a PA threshold is exceeded as documented below. Actions listed in 23 CFR 771.117 that exceed any of the thresholds below may not be approved by MDT. MDT May certify to FHWA that the action qualified for a CE. FHWA concurrence is required for the CE to be valid.

If "yes" is answered for any item below, FHWA concurrence is required.

Abbreviated Signature Triggers from Programmatic Agreement	Yes/No
9.a. RIGHT-OF-WAY. The action involved acquisition of more than a minor amount of ROW.	Yes
9.b. RIGHT-OF-WAY. The action involved acquisition that results in residential or non-residential displacements.	No
9.c. RIGHT-OF-WAY. The action includes acquisition of land for hardship or protective purposes, or each acquisition pursuant to the Federal acquisition project.	No
9.d. CAPACITY. The action results in capacity expansion of a roadway by addition of one or more through lanes.	Yes
9.e. ACCESS. The action involves the construction of temporary access, or the closure of existing road, bridge, or ramps, that would result in major traffic disruptions.	No
9.f. ACCESS. The action results in changes in access control that affect traffic patterns.	No
9.g. HISTORIC PROPERTIES. The action results in a determination of adverse effect on historic properties pursuant to Section 106 of the NHPA.	Yes
9.h. SECTION 4(f). The action requires the "use" of properties protected by Section 4(f).	Yes
9.i. SECTION 6(f). The action requires the acquisition of lands under the protection of Section 6 (f) or other unique areas or special lands that were acquired in fee or easement with public-use money and have deed restrictions or covenants on the property.	No
9.j. CWA SECTION 404. The action requires an Individual CWA Section 404 permit.	No
9.k. FLOODPLAIN PERMIT. The action requires work encroaching on a regulatory floodway or work affecting the base floodplain (100-year flood) elevations of water course or lake, pursuant to Executive Order (EO) 11988 and 23 CFR 650 Subpart A.	Yes
9.l. WILD AND SCENIC RIVERS. The action requires construction in, across, or adjacent to a river designated as a component of, or proposed for inclusion in, the National System of Wild and Scenic Rivers published by the US Department of the Interior/US Department of Agriculture.	No
9.m. NOISE. The action is defined as a "Type I Project" per 23 CFR 772.5 and MDT's Noise Policy.	Yes
9.n. T&E SPECIES and CRITICAL HABITAT. The action may affect federally listed or candidate endangered species, or proposed or designated critical habitat or projects with impacts subject to the conditions of the Bald and Golden Eagle Protection Act.	Yes
9.o. AIR QUALITY. The action does not conform to the State Implementation Plan (SIP) which is approved or promulgated by the US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) in air quality non-attainment areas.	No

Montana Department of Transportation
Environmental Services Bureau
Categorical Exclusion (CE) Documentation

PO Box 201001
2701 Prospect Avenue
Helena, MT 59620
(406) 444-7203

Control Number 6296000 Date 2019-08-27

9.p STIP. The action is not included in or is inconsistent with the statewide transportation improvement program (STIP), and in applicable urbanized areas, the transportation improvement plan.	No

In accordance with the provisions of 23 CFR 771.117(a), this pending action would not cause any significant environmental impacts. Additionally, this pending action would not involve unusual circumstances as described at 23 CFR 771.117(b) or ARM 18.2.261(2). The proposed project is appropriately fiscally constrained in accordance with 23 CFR 450.104.

Approval Signatures

Local Agency Approving Authority	Date
MDT Environmental Services Project Development Engineer	Date
MDT Environmental Services Engineering Section Supervisor	Date
Federal Highway Administration	Date

(●) Standard Distribution List ( ) Maintenance Distribution List ( ) Custom Distribution List

Distribution List: Lisa Hurley, Fiscal Programming Section Supervisor
Rob Stapley, Right-of-Way Bureau Chief

Jake Goettle, P.E., Engineering Construction Contracting Bureau Chief
Tom Martin, P.E., Environmental Services Bureau Chief
Tom Gocksch, P.E. ESB, Engineering Section Supervisor

Dawn Stratton, Fiscal Programming
Montana Legislative Branch Environmental Quality Council