

Office Copy
THOMAS L. JUDGE
GOVERNOR



STATE OF MONTANA
DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS

HELENA, MONTANA 59601

January 7, 1975

H. J. ANDERSON
DIRECTOR OF HIGHWAYS

IN REPLY REFER TO:

F 117 (13)
Park St. - Livingston

RECEIVED
JAN 8 1975
ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY
COUNCIL

Environmental Quality Council
Capitol Station
Helena, Montana 59601

Gentlemen:

Attached, for your information, are two (2) copies of the Agency Impact Determination for the above project, as approved by the Federal Highway Administration.

Very truly yours,

H. J. ANDERSON
DIRECTOR OF HIGHWAYS

By *Stephen C. Kologi*
Stephen C. Kologi, P. E., Chief
Preconstruction Bureau

32-SCK:mg
Enclosures

cc: K. F. Skoog

GEORGE VUCANOVICH, CHAIRMAN
HELENA

Wm. M. KESSNER, VICE CHAIRMAN
BLACK EAGLE

W. R. CURNEY
BUTTE

E. L. BACHELLER
BILLINGS

JAY LA LONDE
SIDNEY

MONTANA DEPARTMENT
OF HIGHWAYS

STATE OF MONTANA
DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS

December 23, 1974

F 117 (13)
Part St.-Livingston

U. S. Department of Transportation
Federal Highway Administration
Helena, Montana 59601

Gentlemen:

This Agency Impact Determination is being submitted for your approval on Federal Aid Project F 117 (13), Park Street-Livingston.

At present there are three alternative designs being considered for construction of this project. These alternatives are:

1. a 4-lane on Park Street,
2. a one-way couplet on Park and Calender Streets, and
3. a 2-lane, 2-way on Park Street.

Further discussions on the alternative designs will be covered under Item #4.

At this time, the only alternative the people and the city of Livingston seem to be interested in is #3, which is the reconstruction of Park Street as a 2-lane. The attached documentation will verify this; therefore, the evaluation of the environmental public involvement impacts will be based only on Alternative #3. If another alternative is to be designed, the appropriate addendum or new environmental statement or negative declaration will be submitted as required.

1. LOCATION AND DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED IMPROVEMENTS AND ITS SURROUNDING AREA.

This project is located in the city of Livingston. It begins at the southwest end of Park Street at the junction of old U.S. 10 and U.S. 89 and extends northeasterly to end near the city limits. The highway connects to Interstate 90 about 2+ miles from either end of the project.

On the northwest side of the project are the Division Shops for Burlington Northern along with several other businesses. The southeast side of Park Street, it is all businesses except for a few homes near the project beginning. The area involved along Park Street is classified mainly as a commercial-industrial area.

The proposed improvement will closely align with the existing highway through town. The roadway width will also be similar having two driving lanes and two parking lanes for a total width of 44 feet. The proposed work will include grading, storm sewers, appropriate surfacing, striping, signing, utility moves, lighting, traffic signals, sidewalks, curb and gutter, and topsoil and seeding where necessary.

As presently planned, this 2-lane alternate would be a reconstruction of an existing facility to present standards. The existing roadway is rather dilapidated and requires considerable maintenance. Much of Park Street does not have storm sewer facilities and so water decay and frost upheaval require continual maintenance and repair. With installation of storm sewers, much of Park Street would already be disrupted and therefore it will be about as economical to reconstruct the entire street as part of it. Some minor grade changes may also be required in order to make use of the storm sewers.

2. PROBABLE IMPACT

The project should provide a safer and more efficient facility: not by shortening the roadway length, but rather by improving or installing some traffic signals, safer cross walks for school children, better signing, and appropriate lighting.

The various public facilities as well as businesses should benefit due to the safer traffic conditions and pedestrian crossings. Signalizing where Park Street intersects with 5th Street and with B Street may be required and possibly at 2nd Street, as it is approaching minimum warrants.

The new construction along with curb and gutter and sidewalks should enhance public parking and general traffic flow. The new storm sewers should help preserve the street and reduce maintenance. The construction of this project is expected to cost roughly \$875,000.

Economically this project should have minimal, if any, effect on the area except possibly during construction. During construction some inconveniences to the businesses may occur even though detours and stage type construction will be considered. However, the construction should aid the employment in the area which in turn will benefit the businesses. Thus, the effects should be minor.

Also, since this project is not expected to involve any new or additional right-of-way, no change in taxes, land values or other economic responses to the project are expected. In addition, this project is all or mostly within the city limits and therefore, any additional strip development per se will be minimal.

There are no public parks, recreational areas, or historical sites on this project. We foresee no impact on fisheries.

Since the project is confined to a highly developed urban area, the only wildlife likely to be affected are songbirds. Maximum conservation of this resource would require saving as many trees as possible along the project. This is also desirable from an aesthetic viewpoint.

Examination of the aerial photos of the alternates show that Calender Street has considerably more trees along it than Park Street.

3. PROBABLE ADVERSE ENVIRONMENTAL EFFECTS WHICH CANNOT BE AVOIDED.

Although air pollution is expected to be increased during construction, some abatement of this will be provided by requirements in the standard specifications and special provisions. Watering and similar means will be done to alleviate the dust problems associated with highway construction.

The Department of Health and Environment Sciences has reviewed the subject project. They stated, "We find there should be no adverse effects on air quality from the construction of this project. We know of nothing existing or planned that would adversely affect the project in air quality considerations. We assume the usual precautions will be taken during construction to protect the environment from excessive dust and that any clearing and grubbing will be done according to current specifications." This response to the "Letter of Intent" is attached.

We concur with this assessment that the project should not significantly affect the areas air quality. This project, by promoting better traffic flow may even improve air quality.

The only water pollution caused by this project would be storm sewer effluent. A settling basin is being considered for the storm sewer outfall to reduce pollution to any waterways. The Yellowstone River is near Livingston and would be the logical termini for the storm sewer outfall. No waterways are crossed by this project. Erosion control measures will be employed as needed on this project.

Future noise pollution may be a problem factor on this project. Using the NCHRP Report 117 method, it was found the future L10 noise level is about 77+ dBA. Although this exceeds the 75 dBA allowable, the difference would hardly be discernable and the projection is based on the amount of noise created by present day vehicles. Vehicles of the future may create less noise than present day vehicles.

Some noise abatement measures would be considered except (with only about 60-foot of existing right-of-way and businesses next to property lines on both sides) no feasible method of abatement would be practical for the benefits received. Also, Interstate 90 already acts as a truck bypass around the city of Livingston.

In addition, this project would basically be a reconstruction of an existing facility and be in compliance with PPM 90-2, Section 4(a).

4. ALTERNATES

There are three(3) construction alternatives for the improving of the route of transportation. Only two alternatives were mentioned in the Letter of Intent and from the response correspondence, it appears that the alternative involving only 2-lane construction is the only acceptable one. On March 28, 1974, a Public Involvement Meeting for the subject project was held in Livingston. The majority of those present favored the two-lane construction. The meeting resume is dated April 2, 1974 and a copy is attached.

Following is a discussion of the three construction alternatives along with the "no-build" alternate:

ALTERNATIVE #1

This design would call for a 4-lane along Park Street. It would perhaps handle the traffic volumes better especially if left turn bays could be installed. In turn, this construction would require an extra 40 feet of right-of-way which would dislocate most of the businesses along the northwest side of Park Street including Burlington Northern's Depot, office and warehouse. This right-of-way would cost about \$1,125,000 plus the cost of relocation. Some relocation problems would be encountered because of the type and number of businesses being displaced. Livingston has a population of about 7000 and there is hardly adequate room or sufficient facilities to handle the large displacement requirements within the central business district. Thus, this alternative could reduce the viability of the central business district and have substantial adverse socio-economic effects on Livingston.

Near the intersection of Park Street and B Street, there is an underpass connection to Park Street. By the widening to the north of Park Street, this access would be eliminated for an at-grade connection.

At present, Main Street goes easterly and passes under the railroad trackage. It angles northeast for about one block. It then curves sharply right (refer to attached sketch map) to form a street intersection with Park Street opposite "B" Street. Since the distance between the trackage and Park Street is only about 110+ feet now, it hardly leaves room for the underpass and parallel street if another 40 feet is required for the widening of Park Street.

A number of additional utility problems would be encountered along with updating some of the city facilities. Some storm sewer would be required.

ALTERNATE #2

This alternative calls for a one-way couplet system utilizing Park Street for the west bound traffic and Calender Street for the east bound traffic. When examining the effects along Calender Street, there are various factors which should be considered. (1). The safety of children is vital and two schools, the Livingston Junior High School and the East Grade School, are both located along Calender Street. The Pioneer Nursing Home is on Calender Street between Yellowstone and Third Street. Although there are some businesses along Calender Street, there are also many blocks of residential homes along with the Fire Department fronting on it. The backing out of driveways could be hazardous. (2). Excessive noise pollution would be evident which would be unavoidable and incurable. With the schools, nursing home and residences, the noise pollution would be higher over the allowable than on Park Street. (3). Economically, the couplet would have an adverse effect on the residential areas. Whereas, heavy traffic flow is good for business and commercial areas, it has the opposite effect on residential value where safety and low noise are essential.

With this couplet, only a small amount of additional right-of-way would be needed in areas where the couplet splits and rejoins. This would be essential to blend the traffic off of and onto the highway. The couplet legs would each have two driving lanes with parking. The couplet would begin at about 6th Street and end at about "N" Street. This alternative was very strongly opposed at the Public Involvement meeting.

ALTERNATE #3

This alternative is the one most preferred by the local people and would have the least adverse impact and would have the lowest initial cost. There should be little, if any, additional right-of-way costs and minimal utility involvement. It would not change any traffic patterns and have the least environmental effects. It would be the reconstruction of an existing facility consisting of two driving lanes with parking for two-way traffic. New storm sewer facilities will be needed along Park Street regardless of the alternative.

It is estimated that the reconstruction of Park Street as a two-lane, two-way will be sufficient to handle the traffic flows for the next 14 years. Then, only a small segment may exceed the theoretic capacity at which time consideration could be given to making provisions for a median turning bay with limited parking or for the removal of parking and conversion to a 4-lane for the critical area.

ALTERNATE #4

This is the "no-build" alternative which would leave present facilities as they exist. Although the present facilities have two-lanes with parking, there is a need for curb and gutter, sidewalks, new surfacing, and storm sewers along much of the roadway through town. There is also a need for some traffic signals for safety reasons. These improvements would not only enhance the businesses, but also provide more enjoyable pedestrian facilities.

The present roadway was built some time ago and is in poor shape. Maintenance cost have increased and will do so more in the future unless the roadway is reconstructed.

5. RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SHORT TERM USE AND LONG TERM PRODUCTIVITY

Since this project is within the city and anticipated to stay within existing right-of-way, there should be no significant change in land use or productivity. No change in area business, ranching, or railroad activity is expected because of this project. Perhaps in future years if the connecting roads to the Interstate are improved, more tourist traffic may be attracted. There is a bridge over the Yellowstone River a short distance east of town which will need to be replaced in the future.

Some short term inconveniences are expected during construction. However, detours and stage type construction should help reduce any adverse economic conditions. The local residents and area ranchers would still do business which is the main support for most merchants.

Traffic oriented businesses will be affected the most during construction. Service stations and motels or hotels may be adversely affected. On the other hand, the constructor's employees will need lodging, food, and gas so that in a smaller city the problems should be balanced out.

6. IRREVERSIBLE AND IRRETRIEVABLE COMMITMENTS OF RESOURCES.

No resources other than money, energy, labor, and road building materials will be irretrievably committed to this project. The right-of-way is already committed for as long as travel over the roadway exists. From Table 1 of the FHWA Notice, dated December 27, 1973, it was calculated that 54,500 gallons of fuel would be consumed for construction of this project.

There does not appear to be any major commitment of resources that would affect the beneficial uses of the environment in the area.

7. BASIS FOR DETERMINATION

The attached "Letter of Intent" was sent to all persons and agencies considered to have an interest in the project. The mailing list is included with the letter. Following the letter are all the comments that were received. Also attached is an autoscreen print of the project.

Based on the foregoing, it is our opinion that the discussed project alternative does not significantly affect the environment and is not a major action. As previously mentioned, if another alternative is decided upon, the appropriate revision or addendum will be submitted as required.

The return of one signed copy of this statement indicating your concurrence will be appreciated.

Very truly yours,

H. J. ANDERSON
DIRECTOR OF HIGHWAYS

By *Robert M. Hudnell*
for S. C. Kologi, P. E., Chief
Preconstruction Bureau

32-SCK:KFS:LPH:dt
Enclosures

cc: J. E. Beckert w/attach.
D. D. Anderson "
R. E. Champion "
S. C. Kologi "
K. F. Skoog "
W. H. Walters "
R. C. Holmes "

I Concur *W.S. Dunbar*
for H. N. Stewart
Federal Highways

Date *1/2/75*