Draft
Environmental Assessment

MISSOURI HEADWATERS
LEGACY TRAIL AND BRIDGE/APPROACH PROJECT

October 2006

Montana Fish, Wildlife & Parks

Missouri Headwaters Legacy Trail and Bridge/Approach Project
Draft Environmental Assessment
MEPA, NEPA, MCA 23-1-110 CHECKLIST

PART I. PROPOSED ACTION DESCRIPTION

1. **Type of proposed state action**: Montana Fish, Wildlife & Parks (MFWP) proposes to construct a ¼ mile pedestrian/bicycle trail in Missouri Headwaters State Park, and to collaboratively oversee the installation of a pedestrian/bicycle bridge at Milwaukee FAS. These two projects will be the final segments in the six-mile Legacy Trail that will run from Three Forks to the Headquarters at Missouri Headwaters State Park.

2. **Agency authority for the proposed action:** The 1977 Montana Legislature enacted statute 87-1-605, which directs Montana Fish, Wildlife & Parks (MFWP) to acquire, develop and operate a system of fishing accesses. The legislature established an earmarked funding account to ensure that this fishing access site function would be established. The opportunity for public involvement regarding the proposed project is provided under MCA 23-1-110. Montana statute 23-1-102 (4) gives FWP "jurisdiction, custody, and control of all state parks, recreational areas, public camping grounds, historical sites, and monuments". Section 23-2-101 MCA allows MFWP to plan and develop outdoor recreational resources in the state and expend funds, including Federal Funds.

The Transportation Equity Act of the 21st Century (TEA21) established the Recreational Trails Program (RTP), which provides for the transfer of federal gas taxes paid on non-highway recreational fuel used in off-highway vehicles to the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). Montana Fish, Wildlife & Parks (FWP) administers the RTP funds at the state level, while the FHWA provides program oversight at the federal level. RTP grant applicants (sponsors) can include federal, state, county or municipal agencies, private associations and clubs. RTP grants to sponsors may not exceed 80% of the total of an individual project. The State Trails Advisory Committee (STAC) advises FWP on RTP Program expenditures.

3. **Name of project:** Missouri Headwaters Legacy Trail and Bridge/Approach Project

4. **Name, address and phone number of project sponsor (if other than the agency):** Montana Fish, Wildlife, and Parks is the project sponsor**.**

5. **If applicable:**
Estimated Construction/Commencement Date: Spring 2007
Estimated Completion Date: Summer 2007
Current Status of Project Design (% complete): 50

6. **Location affected by proposed action (county, range and township**): The bridge site is in Gallatin County, T2N, R2E, N½ Section 30. The bridge site is on the Milwaukee FAS, and can be reached by driving 1.5 miles east on U.S. Hwy 10 after the Three Forks turn-off. The trail site is located on the southern end of Missouri Headwaters State Park.



Figure 1. Approximate location of the proposed project within Montana.

7. Project size -- estimate the number of acres that would be directly affected that are currently:

	Acres		Acres
(a) Developed:		(d) Floodplain	___
Residential	0		
Industrial	0	(e) Productive:	
		Irrigated cropland	0
(b) Open Space/Woodlands/Recreation	4	Dry cropland	0
		Forestry	0
(c) Wetlands/Riparian Areas	.5	Rangeland	0
		Other	0

8. Listing of any other Local, State or Federal agency that has overlapping or additional jurisdiction.

(a) Permits: permits will be filed at least 2 months prior to project start.

Agency Name	Permit
US Corps of Engineers	Section 404
US Corps of Engineers	Section 10
Montana Dept of Fish, Wildlife & Parks	SPA 124
Gallatin County	Floodplain
Montana Department of Environmental Quality	318

(b) Funding:

Agency Name	Funding Amount
National Parks Service Grant	$30,000
Federal Recreation Trails Grant	$15,000
(Funds administered through MFWP)	
Donations	
Monetary Donations	$15,000
Donated Bridge Materal Value	$34,000
In-kind Volunteer Labor: 80 to 100 hours@a value of $11/hr	$1,100
Total	$95,100

(c) Other Overlapping or Additional Jurisdictional Responsibilities:

Agency Name	Type of Responsibility
State Historic Preservation Office	Cultural Site Protection

9. Narrative summary of the proposed action or project including the benefits and purpose of the proposed action:



Figure 2. Site map of Milwaukee FAS. The thick black arrow shows where the proposed bridge would span the river.

The Missouri Headwaters Legacy Trail Project is the result of a 6-year cooperative effort between the Town of Three Forks and MFWP. The Legacy Trail, when completed, will link Missouri Headwaters State Park to the Community of Three Forks with six miles of trail, passing through Milwaukee FAS and crossing the Madison River. Two sections of trail are already completed; the section from the west side of the Madison River to Three Forks was completed in 2004, and the section from the Milwaukee Bridge FAS to the edge of Missouri Headwaters State Park was completed in 2005. The two remaining uncompleted components of the trail, which this EA addresses, is the bridge across the Madison River and a quarter-mile of trail within Missouri Headwaters State Park. This section of trail would continue the existing trail that leads from Milwaukee FAS and currently ends at the Park boundary. The completed trail with the added section would culminate at Park Headquarters.

The proposed bridge and associated approaches across the Madison would be located adjacent to the existing railroad bridge on state property at Milwaukee FAS (see Figures 2 and 3). As Figure 2 shows, the FAS consists of two parcels on either side of the river, so both bridge abutments would be placed within the FAS. The proposed bridge, which like the rest of the trail would only be open to pedestrians and bicyclists, would be 140' long and 7' wide, constructed with steel girders, with four-foot high steel safety railings and metal grating on the bridge deck. The grating surface will meet ADA standards for wheelchair accessibility, and will also eliminate the build-up of snow and other material. The materials and labor required for the construction and installation of the bridge will be provided by donations and volunteers from the Three Forks community. Two new sections of paved trail will link the bridge with the existing trail segments on both sides of the river; 220 lf on the east side and 80 lf on the west. In order for both of these new approaches to the bridge to have ADA-approved grades, a 1000 SF retaining wall will be constructed on the east side of the FAS to 663 CY of fill that will support the trail in order to minimize the area taken up by the approach. The ground elevation is higher on the west side of the bridge, so only 152 CY of fill is required on that side and a retaining wall will not be used.

Figure 3. View of the proposed bridge site at Milwaukee FAS. Photo by Sue Dalbey



Figure 4. Engineer's conceptual drawing of the proposed pedestrian/bicycle bridge. The actual bridge design includes chain link fabric on the railings and grated decking. Milwaukee FAS can be seen across the river.

Figure 5. View of the western bridge abutment location. A section of completed trail leading to Three Forks can be seen under the I-90 bridge. Photo by Sue Dalbey

The location of the proposed new section of trail can be seen in Figures 6 and 7. The new trail, which would join the existing trail at the park boundary, would jog to the left for 80ft (briefly following the old county road). and then head north along the old railroad grade until ending at Park headquarters. While the old railroad grade has been largely re-vegetated, the ground is already bermed and level, making it ideal for a trail bed, and minimal work will be needed to transform it into a bike/pedestrian trail. The trail will transition from asphalt to a one-inch minus road-mix at the Park boundary. This type of trail bed material, besides being cost effective, is more primitive and would be more consistent with existing trails in the Park.

This project has widespread support, including the City of Three Forks, Gallatin County Commissioners, MFWP, MDT, Lewis and Clark Heritage Trail Foundation, Sierra Club, and of many area residents who have volunteered money, materials, their professional knowledge and skills to this project, especially in the design and eventual construction of the bridge.

Figure 6. Location of proposed section of trail.



Figure 7. Aerial view of proposed section of trail within Missouri Headwaters State Park. The junction with the existing trail is seen at bottom.

The Missouri Headwaters Legacy Trail benefits the local community by providing a safe pedestrian corridor between town and Missouri Headwaters State Park. The trail leads users through scenic areas and to points of historical and natural significance in and around the State Park area. Missouri Headwaters State Park, one of the more significant sites along the Lewis and Clark Trail, is a principle destination for Lewis and Clark enthusiasts, and these people are often looking for alternative ways to access areas of interest other than by modern vehicle. The completed trail will be a regular source of pleasure for area residents and will be an attraction to tourists.

PART II. ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

1. Description and analysis of reasonable alternatives (including the no action alternative) to the proposed action whenever alternatives are reasonably available and prudent to consider and a discussion of how the alternatives would be implemented:

Alternative A: No Action

The ultimate goal of the Legacy Trail Project was to construct a pedestrian trail connecting the City of Three Forks to Missouri Headwaters State Park. Trails have already been completed to both sides of the Madison River through cooperative efforts including the City of Three Forks, Gallatin County Commissioners, MFWP, MDT, Lewis and Clark Heritage Trail Foundation, and Sierra Club. If the proposed bridge is not completed, the trail would not serve its original purpose of linking Three Forks to the

Park. If the additional trail section is not completed, the trail would end at the boundary of the Park in the middle of the field, instead of at Park headquarters, where users could access other trails, hike, picnic, see interpretive displays, etc. Users could still enter the Park, but they would be forced to walk or bike along the road, which is unsafe. If the bridge is not installed, users would have to use the main highway to cross the river and return to completed portions of the trail or attempt to cross on the railroad bridge, which would be extremely unsafe. The whole intent of the creation of the trail was to provide a safe route for pedestrians and bicyclists to travel to and from the Park.

Alternative B:

In the Preferred Alternative, a 140' x 7' pedestrian/bicycle bridge will be erected on Milwaukee FAS that will link completed sections of trail on both sides of the river, completing a six-mile trail from Three Forks to Missouri Headwaters State Park. An additional quarter-mile of trail will also be added from the current end of the trail at the Park boundary to Park headquarters. Users will then be able to safely access the Park from town without having to use Hwy 10 or the railroad bridge (which is unsafe) for any portion of the journey. Grants that MFWP has received will allow this project to proceed without using limited capitol funds. The only section of trail that MFWP is responsible for maintaining is the short section within the Park itself, and MFWP is not responsible for any maintenance of the bridge. This proposal represents an excellent opportunity to complete an unfinished project in a satisfactory manner that will provide a lot of benefits to the community.

Alternative C:

In Alternative C, the bridge would have still been constructed, but would have been smaller and used cheaper materials. This idea was eventually abandoned because a bridge less than 7 feet wide would not have allowed sufficient passing room for users, and since many of the materials for the bridge will be donated, the reduction in cash cost of the smaller bridge would not have been significant enough to justify constructing a bridge that would have been less serviceable than the preferred one.

Alternative D:

In Alternative D, the pedestrian bridge would not be constructed at all. Instead, a new section of trail would have been added to the eastern section. The new trail would turn south at its current terminus at the river, continue along the bank, and then end at the Hwy 10 bridge. Users would cross on the bridge and travel on Hwy 10 until they reached the western section of completed trail. This idea was not pursued because planners were concerned about the safety of users on the Hwy 10 bridge and road, and because the new section of trail would have negatively impacted wetlands on the site.

Alternative E.

A proposal was made to construct a pedestrian bridge that would hang from the existing railroad bridge. Such a design would be relatively inexpensive, and would have required very little ground disturbance, but the railroad was not amenable to the idea and the plan was dropped

2. **Evaluation and listing of mitigation, stipulation, or other control measures enforceable by the agency or another government agency:**

   There are permit stipulations of mitigation or other controls associated with the proposed bridge construction as listed on page 3 #8 part A. The Headwaters Trail segment does not involve any permits or granting of a license on which stipulations would be placed.

PART III. NARRATIVE EVALUATION AND COMMENT

The proposed projects and larger trail system of which they are a part, fit objectives stated in the Montana State Park Vision Statement that "The future (State Park) system will provide a greater diversity of park types, such as recreational waterways, rail-trails, and historical routes." The project also meets objectives of the Gallatin County Trail Plan and the State Outdoor Recreation Plan.

The proposed project will not have adverse affects on any listed threatened or endangered plant or animal species, or cause any significant adverse affects on air, water or soil resources. The human environment will be positively affected by providing an additional source of healthy recreation for area residents, and by boosting tourism by a small degree. The proposed bridge and connecting trails project will neither individually, nor cumulatively, have any significant adverse effects to the human or physical environment, and will increase the safety Legacy Trail users.

PART IV. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

1. **Describe the level of public involvement for this project if any, and, given the complexity and the seriousness of the environmental issues associated with the proposed action, is the level of public involvement appropriate under the circumstances?**
   The public will be notified by way of one statewide press release, and legal notices in the *Bozeman Chronicle* and the *Helena Independent Record* and by public notice on the Fish, Wildlife & Parks web page: **http://fwp.mt.gov/publicnotices**. Individual notices will be sent to the region's standard EA distribution list and to those that have requested one.

2. **Duration of comment period, if any.**
   A 30-day comment period is proposed. This level of public involvement is appropriate for this scale of project.

   The comment period will run from Oct 2-Oct 31, 2006. Comments can be sent to:
   MRWP Region 3 Offices
   1400 South 19th Ave
   Bozeman, MT 59717-5496

PART V. EA PREPARATION

1. Based on the significance criteria evaluated in this EA, is an EIS required? (YES/NO)? If an EIS is not required, explain why the EA is the appropriate level of analysis for this proposed action.

Based on an evaluation of the primary, secondary, and cumulative impacts to the physical and human environment under the Montana Environmental Protection Act (MEPA), this environmental review found no significant impacts from the proposed bridge and trail project at Milwaukee FAS and Missouri Headwaters State Park. In determining the significance of the impacts, FWP assessed the severity, duration, geographic extent, and frequency of the impact, the probability that the impact would occur or reasonable assurance that the impact would not occur, growth-inducing or growth inhibiting aspects of the impact, the importance to the state and to society of the environmental resource or value affected, and precedent that would be set as a result of the proposed action that would commit FWP to future actions; and potential conflicts with local, federal, or state laws. Therefore, an EA is the appropriate level of review and an EIS is not required.

2. Name, title, address and phone number of the person(s) responsible for preparing the EA:

Ray Heagney
Area State Parks Manager
1400 South 19th
Bozeman, MT 59718
(406)994-6934

Linnaea Schroeer-Smith
Independent Contractor
1027 9th Ave
Helena, MT 59601
(406)495-9620

3. List of agencies consulted during preparation of the EA:

Montana Fish, Wildlife & Parks
- Parks Division
- Wildlife Division
- Fisheries Division
- Design & Construction Bureau
- Lands Division

Montana State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO)
Montana Department of Commerce – Tourism
Montana Natural Heritage Program – Natural Resources Information System (NRIS)

PART VI. ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW CHECKLIST

3. Evaluation of the impacts of the Proposed Action including secondary and cumulative impacts on the Physical and Human Environment.

A. PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT

1. LAND RESOURCES Will the proposed action result in:	IMPACT *				Can Impact Be Mitigated *	Comment Index
	Unknown *	None	Minor *	Potentially Significant		
a. **Soil instability or changes in geologic substructure?		X				1a.
b. Disruption, displacement, erosion, compaction, moisture loss, or over-covering of soil, which would reduce productivity or fertility?			X			1b.
c. **Destruction, covering or modification of any unique geologic or physical features?		X				
d. Changes in siltation, deposition or erosion patterns that may modify the channel of a river or stream or the bed or shore of a lake?			X			1d.
e. Exposure of people or property to earthquakes, landslides, ground failure, or other natural hazard?		X				
f. Other:						

Narrative Description and Evaluation of the Cumulative and Secondary Effects on Land Resources (attach additional pages of narrative if needed):

1a. Geologic substructure along the river is not expected to be altered by the installation of bridge abutments and short trail sections. Abutments will be set on footings and built of concrete. Banks along the river at this location are stable with adequate vegetation; therefore, landslides or other ground failures are not anticipated. Best Management Practices (BMP's) will be used throughout this project.

1b. Installation of the abutments will cause soils to be disrupted and compacted. As the sites of both abutments have been previously disturbed by vehicular use, previous trail construction, and high visitation, this will be a minor effect to the area. In addition, disturbed areas will be re-seeded with grasses and/or willows to expedite vegetative regrowth and stabilize soils.

1d. Though the abutments will be placed above the typical high water line, these structures will not dissipate water energy if water levels rise to the abutments in the case of a flood event. Rip-rap around the bridge abutments would be used to help stabilize soils and dissipate water energy. Small volumes of soil would still be dislodged in the case of a flood, resulting in minor erosion, siltation, and deposition. This is considered to be a minor effect to the area because this stretch of the Madison River is already highly altered by three bridges in the immediate vicinity—the I-90 overpass, the Burlington Northern Railroad Bridge, and the Hwy 10 bridge.

* Include a narrative explanation under Part III describing the scope and level of impact. If the impact is unknown, explain why the unknown impact has not or cannot be evaluated.

** Include a narrative description addressing the items identified in 12.8.604-1a (ARM).

*** Determine whether the described impact may result and respond on the checklist. Describe any minor or potentially significant impacts.

**** Include a discussion about the issue in the EA narrative and include documentation if it will be useful.

2. AIR Will the proposed action result in:	IMPACT *				Can Impact Be Mitigated *	Comment Index
	Unknown *	None	Minor *	Potentially Significant		
a. **Emission of air pollutants or deterioration of ambient air quality? (Also see 13 (c).)			X positive			2a.
b. Creation of objectionable odors?		X				
c. Alteration of air movement, moisture, or temperature patterns or any change in climate, either locally or regionally?		X				
d. Adverse effects on vegetation, including crops, due to increased emissions of pollutants?		X				
e. ***For P-R/D-J projects, will the project result in any discharge, which will conflict with federal or state air quality regs? (Also see 2a.)						
f. Other:		X				

Narrative Description and Evaluation of the Cumulative and Secondary Effects on Air Resources (attach additional pages of narrative if needed):

2a. Minor and temporary dust and vehicle emissions will be created by heavy equipment during construction. The completed trail system will promote walking, bicycling, and other forms of non-motorized transportation which has a minor positive effect on local air quality by reducing vehicle emissions.

* Include a narrative explanation under Part III describing the scope and level of impact. If the impact is unknown, explain why the unknown impact has not or cannot be evaluated.

** Include a narrative description addressing the items identified in 12.8.604-1a (ARM).

*** Determine whether the described impact may result and respond on the checklist. Describe any minor or potentially significant impacts.

**** Include a discussion about the issue in the EA narrative and include documentation if it will be useful.

3. WATER Will the proposed action result in:	IMPACT *				Can Impact Be Mitigated*	Comment Index
	Unknown *	None	Minor *	Potentially Significant		
a. *Discharge into surface water or any alteration of surface water quality including but not limited to temperature, dissolved oxygen or turbidity?			X		yes	3a.
b. Changes in drainage patterns or the rate and amount of surface runoff?			X		yes	3b.
c. Alteration of the course or magnitude of floodwater or other flows?			X			3c.
d. Changes in the amount of surface water in any water body or creation of a new water body?		X				
e. Exposure of people or property to water related hazards such as flooding?			X			3e.
f. Changes in the quality of groundwater?		X				
g. Changes in the quantity of groundwater?		X				
h. Increase in risk of contamination of surface or groundwater?			X			3h.
i. Effects on any existing water right or reservation?		X				
j. Effects on other water users as a result of any alteration in surface or groundwater quality?		X				
k. Effects on other users as a result of any alteration in surface or groundwater quantity?		X				
l. ****For P-R/D-J, will the project affect a designated floodplain? (Also see 3c.)						
m. ***For P-R/D-J, will the project result in any discharge that will affect federal or state water quality regulations? (Also see 3a.)						
n. Other:		X				

Narrative Description and Evaluation of the Cumulative and Secondary Effects on Water Resources (attach additional pages of narrative if needed):

3a. Construction of the bridge abutments will occur during low water periods and would be above the water line, but minor and temporary turbidity may occur. The state requires the use of standard erosion control devices such as silt fencing to limit erosion and resulting turbidity.

3b. Approximately 300 linear feet of 7'-wide trail will be paved to connect the bridge to the existing trails, and soils will be elevated to meet the bridge deck on the east side, which will slightly change the drainage patterns of the site. The effects can be mitigated through proper design of the trail and supporting structures. Reseeding disturbed areas will also reduce the amount and rate of runoff.

* Include a narrative explanation under Part III describing the scope and level of impact. If the impact is unknown, explain why the unknown impact has not or cannot be evaluated.

** Include a narrative description addressing the items identified in 12.8.604-1a (ARM).

*** Determine whether the described impact may result and respond on the checklist. Describe any minor or potentially significant impacts.

**** Include a discussion about the issue in the EA narrative and include documentation if it will be useful.

3c. Hydraulic modeling was performed to determine the effect of the proposed pedestrian bridge on the Madison River floodplain and Base Flood Elevation (BFE). Van Mullem Engineering PLLC used the 2004 Revised Three Forks Floodplain Study for comparison. The Madison River is prone to ice jams at this site and the Three Forks Study showed the highest BFE was found with ice jam flooding during the winter period. The Madison River also has flood control levees. These levees were found to be ineffective for protection against a 100-year flood. However, the greatest BFE for the site, which is inside the levees, occurs from the ice jam flood with the levees in place. This is the condition that was modeled with the proposed bridge. The low girder elevation for the proposed bridge is 4069.2 (NAVD 1988). This is 1.1 feet higher than the BFE at this at this site of 4068.1. The proposed bridge has a clear span of 138 feet and spans the entire river channel at the site. However, there will be some obstruction of the floodplain, especially on the right abutment, by the abutment and bridge approach ramp.

3e. The construction of a bridge and the promotion of the trail system would attract people to the site. People may access the bridge during a flood to view the event or during the usual course of using the trial, exposing themselves to risk. The design of the bridge, including using chain link fabric on the railing and designing the decking elevation above the 100-yr flood level help to limit the risk of accidents.

3h. A small risk of surface water contamination is present temporarily during construction due to the use of heavy machinery near the river. Equipment will be operated by professionals and the project will adhere to all state standards. All concrete will be contained within forms, fill material will be clean, and all federal and state water quality regulations will be followed. The oversight of the bridge construction will be provided by Gene Townsend, Mayor of Three Forks and Greg Benjamin, P.E. of Stahly Engineering. Because the construction will be taking place on the Milwaukee FAS, Scott Blossom of FWP Design & Construction will serve in a collaborative function during the bridge abutment and bridge installation to assure that construction impacts in the FAS do not minimize the site's function. FWP Design & Construction staff will provide oversight for trail construction within Missouri Headwaters State Park.

* Include a narrative explanation under Part III describing the scope and level of impact. If the impact is unknown, explain why the unknown impact has not or cannot be evaluated.

** Include a narrative description addressing the items identified in 12.8.604-1a (ARM).

*** Determine whether the described impact may result and respond on the checklist. Describe any minor or potentially significant impacts.

**** Include a discussion about the issue in the EA narrative and include documentation if it will be useful.

4. VEGETATION Will the proposed action result in?	IMPACT *				Can Impact Be Mitigated *	Comment Index
	Unknown *	None	Minor *	Potentially Significant		
a. Changes in the diversity, productivity or abundance of plant species (including trees, shrubs, grass, crops, and aquatic plants)?			X			4a.
b. Alteration of a plant community?			X			4b.
c. Adverse effects on any unique, rare, threatened, or endangered species?		X				4c.
d. Reduction in acreage or productivity of any agricultural land?		X				
e. Establishment or spread of noxious weeds?		X				4e.
f. ****For P-R/D-J, will the project affect wetlands, or prime and unique farmland?						
g. Other:		X				

Narrative Description and Evaluation of the Cumulative and Secondary Effects on Vegetation (attach additional pages of narrative if needed):

4a. The majority of the area affected by bridge construction is devoid of vegetation or heavily impacted by existing use. The area over which the trail would be constructed is an old roadbed and sparsely vegetated with grasses and forbs. That vegetation would be killed with an herbicide prior to construction of the trail. The plant species that have colonized the old roadbed are extremely abundant in the area, and many are weed species, so their loss is not considered potentially significant.

4b. Please see Comment 4a.

4c. A search of the Montana Natural Heritage Database yielded two plant Species of Concern in the search area, Ute Ladies Tresses (*Spiranthes diluvialis*) and Annual Indian Paintbrush (*Castilleja exilis*). Neither of these species is known to occur in the proposed construction zones. Please see Appendix 2 for a complete discussion of Species of Concern in the Milwaukee FAS/Missouri Headwaters State Park area.

4e. Noxious weeds such as spotted knapweed have been observed on the Milwaukee FAS site and on the site of the proposed new section of trail in Missouri Headwaters State Park, but are at relatively low densities. MFWP currently operates noxious weed control programs in accordance with the Region 3 Weed Management Plan and the Gallatin County Weed Board at both locations and will continue to do so regardless of the outcome of this project.

* Include a narrative explanation under Part III describing the scope and level of impact. If the impact is unknown, explain why the unknown impact has not or cannot be evaluated.

** Include a narrative description addressing the items identified in 12.8.604-1a (ARM).

*** Determine whether the described impact may result and respond on the checklist. Describe any minor or potentially significant impacts.

**** Include a discussion about the issue in the EA narrative and include documentation if it will be useful.

** 5. FISH/WILDLIFE Will the proposed action result in:	IMPACT *				Can Impact Be Mitigated *	Comment Index
	Unknown *	None	Minor *	Potentially Significant		
a. Deterioration of critical fish or wildlife habitat?		X				5a.
b. Changes in the diversity or abundance of game animals or bird species?		X				
c. Changes in the diversity or abundance of nongame species?		X				
d. Introduction of new species into an area?		X				
e. Creation of a barrier to the migration or movement of animals?		X				
f. Adverse effects on any unique, rare, threatened, or endangered species?			X			5f.
g. Increase in conditions that stress wildlife populations or limit abundance (including harassment, legal or illegal harvest or other human activity)?			X			5g.
h. ****For P-R/D-J, will the project be performed in any area in which T&E species are present, and will the project affect any T&E species or their habitat? (Also see 5f.)						
i. ***For P-R/D-J, will the project introduce or export any species not presently or historically occurring in the receiving location? (Also see 5d.)						
j. Other:		X				

Narrative Description and Evaluation of the Cumulative and Secondary Effects on Fish and Wildlife (attach additional pages of narrative if needed):

5a. The proposed projects would not cause deterioration of critical fish or wildlife habitat, due to the previously disturbed state of the sites and the small acreage that would be affected.

5f. A search of the Montana Natural Heritage Program Database did not yield any documented observations of endangered or threatened animal species in the project area. Please see Appendix 2 for a complete discussion of species of concern within the Milwaukee FAS/Missouri Headwaters State Park area.

5g. Recreational use of the trail may cause a small increase in stress to resident wildlife populations. This effect has been kept to a minimum by prohibiting motorized use of the trail. Wildlife in the area is already fairly accustomed to human presence and has likely adapted to that presence.

* Include a narrative explanation under Part III describing the scope and level of impact. If the impact is unknown, explain why the unknown impact has not or cannot be evaluated.

** Include a narrative description addressing the items identified in 12.8.604-1a (ARM).

*** Determine whether the described impact may result and respond on the checklist. Describe any minor or potentially significant impacts.

**** Include a discussion about the issue in the EA narrative and include documentation if it will be useful.

B. HUMAN ENVIRONMENT

6. NOISE/ELECTRICAL EFFECTS Will the proposed action result in:	IMPACT *				Can Impact Be Mitigated *	Comment Index
	Unknown *	None	Minor *	Potentially Significant		
a. Increases in existing noise levels?			X			6a.
b. Exposure of people to severe or nuisance noise levels?			X			6b.
c. Creation of electrostatic or electromagnetic effects that could be detrimental to human health or property?		X				
d. Interference with radio or television reception and operation?		X				
e. Other:		X				

Narrative Description and Evaluation of the Cumulative and Secondary Effects on Noise/Electrical Effects (attach additional pages of narrative if needed):

6a. There would be a temporary increase in noise levels at Milwaukee FAS during construction of the bridge abutments and sections of connecting trail, and during installation of the bridge. There would also be a temporary increase in noise in the south end of Missouri Headwaters State Park, but it would not be excessive and would end after completion.

6b. All sections of the Legacy trail, including the new bridge and sections of trail, will be a regular source of noise from pedestrians and bicyclists. However, the noise level is expected to remain very low, and it is unlikely that any homeowners would be negatively affected.

* Include a narrative explanation under Part III describing the scope and level of impact. If the impact is unknown, explain why the unknown impact has not or cannot be evaluated.

** Include a narrative description addressing the items identified in 12.8.604-1a (ARM).

*** Determine whether the described impact may result and respond on the checklist. Describe any minor or potentially significant impacts.

**** Include a discussion about the issue in the EA narrative and include documentation if it will be useful.

7. **LAND USE** **Will the proposed action result in:**	**IMPACT** *				**Can Impact Be Mitigated** *	**Comment Index**
	Unknown *	**None**	**Minor** *	**Potentially Significant**		
a. Alteration of or interference with the productivity or profitability of the existing land use of an area?		X				
b. Conflicted with a designated natural area or area of unusual scientific or educational importance?		X				
c. Conflict with any existing land use whose presence would constrain or potentially prohibit the proposed action?			X positive			7c.
d. Adverse effects on or relocation of residences?		X				
e. Other:		X				

Narrative Description and Evaluation of the Cumulative and Secondary Effects on Land Use (attach additional pages of narrative if needed):

7c. The projects are consistent with Gallatin County's Trail Plan and the State Comprehensive Outdoor Recreation Plan.

* Include a narrative explanation under Part III describing the scope and level of impact. If the impact is unknown, explain why the unknown impact has not or cannot be evaluated.

** Include a narrative description addressing the items identified in 12.8.604-1a (ARM).

*** Determine whether the described impact may result and respond on the checklist. Describe any minor or potentially significant impacts.

**** Include a discussion about the issue in the EA narrative and include documentation if it will be useful.

8. RISK/HEALTH HAZARDS Will the proposed action result in:	IMPACT *				Can Impact Be Mitigated *	Comment Index
	Unknown *	None	Minor *	Potentially Significant		
a. Risk of an explosion or release of hazardous substances (including, but not limited to oil, pesticides, chemicals, or radiation) in the event of an accident or other forms of disruption?		X				8a.
b. Affect an existing emergency response or emergency evacuation plan, or create a need for a new plan?		X				
c. Creation of any human health hazard or potential hazard?		X				
d. ***For P-R/D-J, will any chemical toxicants be used? (Also see 8a)						
e. Other:		X				

Narrative Description and Evaluation of the Cumulative and Secondary Effects on Risk/Health Hazards (attach additional pages of narrative if needed):

8a. Montana FWP already control weeds at Milwaukee FAS and Missouri Headwaters State Park, and will continue to do so after the projects have been completed. The MFWP Region 2 Weed Management Plan calls for an integrated method of managing weeds, including the use of herbicides. The use of herbicides would be in compliance with application guidelines and conducted by people trained in safe handling techniques to limit the possibility of a spill. Weeds would also be controlled using mechanical or biological methods in certain areas to reduce the risk of a chemical spill or water contamination.

* Include a narrative explanation under Part III describing the scope and level of impact. If the impact is unknown, explain why the unknown impact has not or cannot be evaluated.

** Include a narrative description addressing the items identified in 12.8.604-1a (ARM).

*** Determine whether the described impact may result and respond on the checklist. Describe any minor or potentially significant impacts.

**** Include a discussion about the issue in the EA narrative and include documentation if it will be useful.

9. COMMUNITY IMPACT Will the proposed action result in:	IMPACT *				Can Impact Be Mitigated *	Comment Index
	Unknown *	None	Minor *	Potentially Significant		
a. Alteration of the location, distribution, density, or growth rate of the human population of an area?		X				
b. Alteration of the social structure of a community?		X				
c. Alteration of the level or distribution of employment or community or personal income?		X				
d. Changes in industrial or commercial activity?			X			9d.
e. Increased traffic hazards or effects on existing transportation facilities or patterns of movement of people and goods?			X			9e.
f. Other:		X				

Narrative Description and Evaluation of the Cumulative and Secondary Effects on Community Impact (attach additional pages of narrative if needed):

9d. Construction of the bridge would cause a minor and temporary increase in industrial activity in the Milwaukee FAS area.

9e. Construction of the bridge and trail would cause a minor and temporary increase in traffic hazards due to transportation of bridge materials and workers.

* Include a narrative explanation under Part III describing the scope and level of impact. If the impact is unknown, explain why the unknown impact has not or cannot be evaluated.

** Include a narrative description addressing the items identified in 12.8.604-1a (ARM).

*** Determine whether the described impact may result and respond on the checklist. Describe any minor or potentially significant impacts.

**** Include a discussion about the issue in the EA narrative and include documentation if it will be useful.

10. PUBLIC SERVICES/TAXES/UTILITIES Will the proposed action result in:	IMPACT *				Can Impact Be Mitigated *	Comment Index
	Unknown *	None	Minor *	Potentially Significant		
a. Will the proposed action have an effect upon or result in a need for new or altered governmental services in any of the following areas: fire or police protection, schools, parks/recreational facilities, roads or other public maintenance, water supply, sewer or septic systems, solid waste disposal, health, or other governmental services? If any, specify:		X				
b. Will the proposed action have an effect upon the local or state tax base and revenues?		X				
c. Will the proposed action result in a need for new facilities or substantial alterations of any of the following utilities: electric power, natural gas, other fuel supply or distribution systems, or communications?		X				
d. Will the proposed action result in increased use of any energy source?		X				
e. **Define projected revenue sources						10e.
f. **Define projected maintenance costs.						10f.
g. Other:		X				

Narrative Description and Evaluation of the Cumulative and Secondary Effects on Public Services/Taxes/Utilities (attach additional pages of narrative if needed):

10e.

Revenue Source	Funding Amount
National Parks Service Grant	$30,000
Federal Recreation Trails Grant (Funds administered through MFWP)	$15,000

Donations	
Monetary Donations	$15,000
Donated Bridge Material Value	$34,000
In-kind Volunteer Labor: 80 to 100 hours@a value of $11/hr	$1,100
Total	$95,100

10f. The City of Three Forks is responsible for maintenance of the Legacy Trail and will also be responsible for maintenance of the pedestrian bridge. The only additional maintenance costs of this project to FWP will be for upkeep of the new trail section within the park and some additional weed control along the new trail. It is estimated that those costs will be approximately $200/yr.

* Include a narrative explanation under Part III describing the scope and level of impact. If the impact is unknown, explain why the unknown impact has not or cannot be evaluated.

** Include a narrative description addressing the items identified in 12.8.604-1a (ARM).

*** Determine whether the described impact may result and respond on the checklist. Describe any minor or potentially significant impacts.

**** Include a discussion about the issue in the EA narrative and include documentation if it will be useful.

** 11. AESTHETICS/RECREATION Will the proposed action result in:	IMPACT *				Can Impact Be Mitigated *	Comment Index
	Unknown *	None	Minor *	Potentially Significant		
a. Alteration of any scenic vista or creation of an aesthetically offensive site or effect that is open to public view?			X			11a.
b. Alteration of the aesthetic character of a community or neighborhood?		X				
c. **Alteration of the quality or quantity of recreational/tourism opportunities and settings? (Attach Tourism Report.)						11c.
d. ***For P-R/D-J, will any designated or proposed wild or scenic rivers, trails or wilderness areas be impacted? (Also see 11a, 11c.)						
e. Other:		X				

Narrative Description and Evaluation of the Cumulative and Secondary Effects on Aesthetics/Recreation (attach additional pages of narrative if needed):

11a. The addition of one more bridge to an area with three already existing bridges would have a minor effect on the scenic vista.

11c. Please see Tourism Report in Attachment A.

* Include a narrative explanation under Part III describing the scope and level of impact. If the impact is unknown, explain why the unknown impact has not or cannot be evaluated.

** Include a narrative description addressing the items identified in 12.8.604-1a (ARM).

*** Determine whether the described impact may result and respond on the checklist. Describe any minor or potentially significant impacts.

**** Include a discussion about the issue in the EA narrative and include documentation if it will be useful.

12. CULTURAL/HISTORICAL RESOURCES Will the proposed action result in:	IMPACT *				Can Impact Be Mitigated *	Comment Index
	Unknown *	None	Minor *	Potentially Significant		
a. **Destruction or alteration of any site, structure or object of prehistoric historic, or paleontological importance?		X				
b. Physical change that would affect unique cultural values?		X				12b.
c. Effects on existing religious or sacred uses of a site or area?		X				
d. ****For P-R/D-J, will the project affect historic or cultural resources? Attach SHPO letter of clearance. (Also see 12.a.)						
e. Other:		X				

Narrative Description and Evaluation of the Cumulative and Secondary Effects on Cultural/Historical Resources (attach additional pages of narrative if needed):

12b. The Gallatin Valley Railroad (24GA1395) was eligible for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) in 1988. A Section 106 Determination of Effect was conducted and resulted in a finding of "No Adverse Effect". This determination has reviewed by SHPO and they concurred on July 27, 2004.

* Include a narrative explanation under Part III describing the scope and level of impact. If the impact is unknown, explain why the unknown impact has not or cannot be evaluated.

** Include a narrative description addressing the items identified in 12.8.604-1a (ARM).

*** Determine whether the described impact may result and respond on the checklist. Describe any minor or potentially significant impacts.

**** Include a discussion about the issue in the EA narrative and include documentation if it will be useful.

SIGNIFICANCE CRITERIA

13. SUMMARY EVALUATION OF SIGNIFICANCE Will the proposed action, considered as a whole:	IMPACT *				Can Impact Be Mitigated *	Comment Index
	Unknown *	None	Minor *	Potentially Significant		
a. Have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (A project or program may result in impacts on two or more separate resources that create a significant effect when considered together or in total.)			X positive			13a.
b. Involve potential risks or adverse effects, which are uncertain but extremely hazardous if they were to occur?		X				
c. Potentially conflict with the substantive requirements of any local, state, or federal law, regulation, standard or formal plan?		X				
d. Establish a precedent or likelihood that future actions with significant environmental impacts will be proposed?		X				
e. Generate substantial debate or controversy about the nature of the impacts that would be created?			X positive			13e.
f. ***For P-R/D-J, is the project expected to have organized opposition or generate substantial public controversy? (Also see 13e.)						
g. ****For P-R/D-J, list any federal or state permits required.						

Narrative Description and Evaluation of the Cumulative and Secondary Effects on Significance Criteria (attach additional pages of narrative if needed):

13a. Taken individually, the two proposed projects have few effects, but as they are the final two links in a six-mile long trail system, the projects will have a considerable affect on the usefulness and recreational potential of the trail.

13e. The entire trail project has received a considerable amount of public support. Several area groups have been involved since the project's inception and numerous area residents have volunteered their time, expertise, and materials for the project.

* Include a narrative explanation under Part III describing the scope and level of impact. If the impact is unknown, explain why the unknown impact has not or cannot be evaluated.

** Include a narrative description addressing the items identified in 12.8.604-1a (ARM).

*** Determine whether the described impact may result and respond on the checklist. Describe any minor or potentially significant impacts.

**** Include a discussion about the issue in the EA narrative and include documentation if it will be useful.

APPENDIX 1
HB495
PROJECT QUALIFICATION CHECKLIST

Date Aug 24, 2006 **Person Reviewing** Linnaea Schroeer-Smith

Project Location: Milwaukee FAS and Missouri Headwaters State Park

Description of Proposed Work: Montana Fish, Wildlife & Parks proposes to construct a ¼ mile pedestrian/bicycle trail in Missouri Headwaters State Park, and to collaboratively oversee the installation of a pedestrian/bicycle bridge at Milwaukee FAS. These two projects will be the final segments in the six-mile Legacy Trail that will run from Three Forks to the Headquarters at Missouri Headwaters State Park.

The following checklist is intended to be a guide for determining whether a proposed development or improvement is of enough significance to fall under HB 495 rules. (Please check _ all that apply and comment as necessary.)

[ ] A. New roadway or trail built over undisturbed land?
Comments: None. The trail section in Missouri Headwaters would be situated on the old railroad bed. The roadbed has been partially re-vegetated but is still bermed and level.

[ ] B. New building construction (buildings <100 sf and vault latrines exempt)?
Comments: None

[X]C. Any excavation of 20 c.y. or greater?
Comments: Construction of the bridge abutments and other work would likely require excavation of 20 c.y. or greater. Please see Comment 1a on page 11.

[ ] D. New parking lots built over undisturbed land or expansion of existing lot that increases parking capacity by 25% or more?
Comments: None

[ ] E. Any new shoreline alteration that exceeds a double wide boat ramp or handicapped fishing station?
Comments: None.

[X]F. Any new construction into lakes, reservoirs, or streams?
Comments: The abutments for the pedestrian bridge would not extend past the shoreline during normal water levels, but could do so during flood events.

[ ] G. **Any new construction in an area with National Registry quality cultural artifacts (as determined by State Historical Preservation Office)?**
Comments: No construction will take place until SHPO clearance has been obtained.

[ ] H. **Any new above ground utility lines?**
Comments: None

[ ] I. **Any increase or decrease in campsites of 25% or more of an existing number of campsites?**
Comments: None.

[ ] J. **Proposed project significantly changes the existing features or use pattern; including effects of a series of individual projects?**
Comments: None

If any of the above are checked, HB 495 rules apply to this proposed work and should be documented on the MEPA/HB495 CHECKLIST. Refer to MEPA/HB495 Cross Reference Summary for further assistance.

APPENDIX 2

Sensitive Plants and Animals in the Milwaukee FAS and Missouri Headwaters State Park area.

A search of the Montana Natural Heritage Program (MNHP) element occurrence database (nhp.nris.state.mt.us/eoportal) indicates no known occurrences of federally listed threatened, endangered, or proposed threatened or endangered plant or animal species in the proposed project site.

Species of Concern Terms and Definitions

Montana Species of Concern. The term **"Species of Concern"** includes taxa that are at-risk or potentially at-risk due to rarity, restricted distribution, habitat loss, and/or other factors. The term also encompasses species that have a special designation by organizations or land management agencies in Montana, including: Bureau of Land Management Special Status and Watch species; U.S. Forest Service Sensitive and Watch species; U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Threatened, Endangered and Candidate species.

Status Ranks (Global and State)

The international network of Natural Heritage Programs employs a standardized ranking system to denote global (**G** -- range-wide) and state status (**S**) (NatureServe 2003). Species are assigned numeric ranks ranging from 1 (critically imperiled) to 5 (demonstrably secure), reflecting the relative degree to which they are “at-risk”. Rank definitions are given below. A number of factors are considered in assigning ranks -- the number, size and distribution of known “occurrences” or populations, population trends (if known), habitat sensitivity, and threat. Factors in a species’ life history that make it especially vulnerable are also considered (e.g., dependence on a specific pollinator).

Status Ranks

Code	Definition
G1 S1	At high risk because of extremely limited and/or rapidly declining numbers, range, and/or habitat, making it highly vulnerable to global extinction or extirpation in the state.
G2 S2	At risk because of very limited and/or declining numbers, range, and/or habitat, making it vulnerable to global extinction or extirpation in the state.
G3 S3	Potentially at risk because of limited and/or declining numbers, range, and/or habitat, even though it may be abundant in some areas.
G4 S4	Uncommon but not rare (although it may be rare in parts of its range), and usually widespread. Apparently not vulnerable in most of its range, but possibly cause for long-term concern.
G5 S5	Common, widespread, and abundant (although it may be rare in parts of its range). Not vulnerable in most of its range.

1. *Castilleja exilis (*Annual Indian Paintbrush)

State: **S2**
Global: **G5**

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service:
U.S. Forest Service:
U.S. Bureau of Land Management:

A small population of this species occurs in Missouri Headwaters State Park, approximately 0.2 miles from the site of the proposed trail. Construction of the trail would likely help protect this species by encouraging visitors to use the trail instead of walking freely through vegetated areas.

2. *Oreoscoptes montanua* (Sage Thrasher)

Natural Heritage Ranks:
State: **S3B**
Global: **G5**

Federal Agency Status:
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service:
U.S. Forest Service:
U.S. Bureau of Land Management: **Sensitive**

This species of concern has not been documented in either of the two project areas, but does occur in the greater Three Forks area. It is unlikely that the proposed projects would affect any occasional, incidental, or potential habitat for this species because all areas have been previously disturbed and do not support climax vegetation.

3. *Spizella breweri* (Brewer's Sparrow).

Natural Heritage Ranks:
State: **S2B**
Global: **G5**

Federal Agency Status:
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service:
U.S. Forest Service:
U.S. Bureau of Land Management: **Sensitive**

This species of concern has not been documented in either of the two project areas, but does occur in the greater Three Forks area. It is unlikely that the proposed projects would affect any occasional, incidental, or potential habitat for this species because all areas have been previously disturbed and do not support climax vegetation.

4. *Dolichonyx oryzivorus* (Bobolink).

Natural Heritage Ranks:
State: **S2B**
Global: **G5**

Federal Agency Status:
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service:
U.S. Forest Service:
U.S. Bureau of Land Management:

This species of concern has not been documented in either of the two project areas, but does occur in the greater Three Forks area. It is unlikely that the proposed projects would

affect any occasional, incidental, or potential habitat for this species because all areas have been previously disturbed and do not support climax vegetation.

5. *Calamospiza melanocorys* (Lark Bunting).

Natural Heritage Ranks:	Federal Agency Status:
State: **S3B**	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service:
Global: **G5**	U.S. Forest Service:
	U.S. Bureau of Land Management:

This species of concern has not been documented in either of the two project areas, but does occur in the greater Three Forks area. It is unlikely that the proposed projects would affect any occasional, incidental, or potential habitat for this species because all areas have been previously disturbed and do not support climax vegetation.

6. *Numenius americanus* (Long-Billed Curlew).

Natural Heritage Ranks:	Federal Agency Status:
State: **S2B**	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service:
Global: **G5**	U.S. Forest Service:
	U.S. Bureau of Land Management: **Sensitive**

This sensitive species of concern has not been documented in either of the two project areas, but does occur in the greater Three Forks area. It is unlikely that the proposed projects would affect any occasional, incidental, or potential habitat for this species because all areas have been previously disturbed and areas affected do not include this species favored habitat.

7. *Spiranthes diluvialis* (Ute Ladies' Tresses).

Natural Heritage Ranks:	Federal Agency Status:
State: **S1**	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service: **LT**
Global: **G2**	U.S. Forest Service:
	U.S. Bureau of Land Management:

A small population of this threatened species occurs approximately 0.25 miles away from the proposed pedestrian bridge project. It is unlikely that the project would affect this species because the distance between the plants and the construction should serve as an adequate buffer. In addition, measures will be taken to ensure that impacts to area wetlands caused by the construction of the bridge abutments will be kept to a minimum.

8. *Stygobromus puteanus* (a cave obligate amphipod).

Natural Heritage Ranks:	Federal Agency Status:
State: **S1S2**	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service:
Global: **G1G2**	U.S. Forest Service:
	U.S. Bureau of Land Management:

These specimens were found in a well approximately 1 mile from both project sites, so would not be affected by the proposed project. Other undocumented populations would not be likely to be affected because no caves, wells, or similar habitats would be disturbed by the projects.

9. *Ammodramus savannarum* (Grasshopper Sparrow).

Natural Heritage Ranks:	Federal Agency Status:
State: **S3B**	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service:
Global: **G5**	U.S. Forest Service:
	U.S. Bureau of Land Management:

This species of concern has not been documented in either of the two project areas, but does occur in the greater Three Forks area. It is unlikely that the proposed projects would affect any occasional, incidental, or potential habitat for this species because all areas have been previously disturbed and do not support climax vegetation.

10. Great Blue Heron Bird Rookery

Natural Heritage Ranks:	Federal Agency Status:
State: **SNR**	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service:
Global: **GNR**	U.S. Forest Service:
	U.S. Bureau of Land Management:

There are two Great Blue Heron rookeries in the larger Three Forks area, but it is unlikely that the proposed projects would affect these communities because the bridge project is located at least ½ mile from the western rookery, and the trail project is situated at least ¼ mile from the river and any existing nests located there.

Interested parties may contact MFWP Region 7 offices for a detailed map of sensitive species Element Occurrences (EOs).

Information courtesy of Montana Natural Heritage Program.

ATTACHMENTS

A. Tourism Report – Department of Commerce

ATTACHMENT A
TOURISM REPORT
MONTANA ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT (MEPA)/HB495

The Montana Department of Fish, Wildlife and Parks has initiated the review process as mandated by HB495 and the Montana Environmental Policy Act in its consideration of the project described below. As part of the review process, input and comments are being solicited. Please complete the project name and project description portions and submit this form to:

Victor Bjornberg, Tourism Development Coordinator
Travel Montana-Department of Commerce
PO Box 200533
1424 9th Ave.
Helena, MT 59620-0533

Project Name: Missouri Headwaters Legacy Trail and Bridge/Approach Project

Project Location: Missouri Headwaters State Park and Milwaukee FAS, Gallatin Co.

Project Description: Montana Fish, Wildlife & Parks proposes to install a pedestrian/bicycle bridge at Milwaukee FAS and construct a ¼ mile trail in Missouri Headwaters State Park. These two components would be the final links in the six-mile Legacy Trail that connects the City of Three Forks to Missouri Headwaters State Park. Currently, the trail ends at the Madison River and resumes on the other side, forcing users onto Hwy 10 for a short distance. The trail then ends at the park boundary. With the additional section, the trail would terminate at the Park headquarters, where visitors could get park information and use park facilities and access additional trails.

1. Would this site development project have an impact on the tourism economy?
   NO **YES** If YES, briefly describe:

The connection of the state park's bike/walking path with the Legacy trail would add to the visitor services provided at Headwaters State Park and in the Three Forks Community. This positive addition should provide benefits to the area's tourism economy as well as the residents well being and enjoyment.

2. Does this impending improvement alter the quality or quantity of recreation/tourism opportunities and settings?
   NO **YES** If YES, briefly describe:

It adds to both the quality and quantity of recreation and tourism opportunities available in this area.

Signature Victor Bjornberg, Tourism Development, Travel Montana
Date August 30, 2006