



Montana Fish, Wildlife & Parks

1400 South 19th Ave
Bozeman, MT 59718

February 16, 2007

To: Governor's Office, Mike Volesky, State Capitol, Room 204, PO Box 200801, Helena, MT 59620-0801
Environmental Quality Council, State Capitol, Room 106, PO Box 201704, Helena, MT 59620-1704
Dept. of Environmental Quality, Metcalf Building, PO Box 200901, Helena, MT 59620-0901
Dept. of Natural Resources & Conservation, PO Box 201601, Helena, MT 59620-1601
Montana Fish, Wildlife & Parks:
 Director's Office Parks Division Lands Section FWP Commissioners
 Fisheries Division Legal Unit Wildlife Division Design & Construction
MT Historical Society, State Historic Preservation Office, PO Box 201202, Helena, MT 59620-1202
MT State Parks Association, PO Box 699, Billings, MT 59103
MT State Library, 1515 E. Sixth Ave., PO Box 201800, Helena, MT 59620
James Jensen, Montana Environmental Information Center, PO Box 1184, Helena, MT 59624
Janet Ellis, Montana Audubon Council, PO Box 595, Helena, MT 59624
George Ochenski, PO Box 689, Helena, MT 59624
Jerry DiMarco, PO Box 1571, Bozeman, MT 59771
Montana Wildlife Federation, PO Box 1175, Helena, MT 59624
Wayne Hurst, PO Box 728, Libby, MT 59923
Gallatin County Commissioners, Courthouse-311 West Main, Bozeman, MT 59715
Montana Department of Transportation, Attention: Ross Gammon, 907 North Rouse, Bozeman MT 59715
Sherman Webb, PO Box 370, Manhattan, MT 59741-0370
Ted Vermillion, 2845 Amsterdam Rd., Belgrade, MT 59714
Peter Rothing, 3108 Linney Rd., Bozeman, MT 59718
Gail & Mike Torgerson, 2660 Amsterdam Rd., Belgrade, MT 59714

Ladies and Gentlemen:

The enclosed Environmental Assessment (EA) has been prepared for the proposed initial development of Erwin Bridge Fishing Access Site (FAS). The proposed development includes an access ramp, parking area, latrine, barriers, trail, and signing.

The draft EA is available for review from FWP at the address provided above or viewed on FWP's Internet website: <http://www.fwp.mt.gov/publicnotices>.

Montana Fish, Wildlife & Parks invites you to comment on the attached proposal. Public comment will be accepted until 5:00 p.m. on March 16, 2007. Comments should be sent to the following:

Montana Fish, Wildlife & Parks
Attn: Tom Greason
1400 South 19th Avenue
Bozeman, MT 59718

Or emailed to: tgreason@mt.gov

Sincerely,

Patrick Flowers
Region Three Supervisor
Attachment

**Draft
Environmental Assessment**

**Erwin Bridge Fishing Access Site
Enhancement**

January 9, 2007



***Montana Fish,
Wildlife & Parks***

**Carter Ferry Fishing Access Site Enhancement
Draft Environmental Assessment
MEPA, NEPA, MCA 23-1-110 CHECKLIST**

PART I. PROPOSED ACTION DESCRIPTION

1. Type of Proposed Action:

Development	<u> X </u>
Renovation	<u> </u>
Maintenance	<u> </u>
Land Acquisition	<u> </u>
Equipment Acquisition	<u> </u>
Other (Describe)	<u> </u>

2. Agency authority for the proposed action: The 1977 Montana Legislature enacted statute 87-1-605 MCA, which directs Montana Fish, Wildlife & Parks (FWP) to acquire, develop, and operate a system of fishing accesses. The legislature established a funding account to ensure that this function would be accomplished. Sections 12-8-213, 23-1-105, 23-1-106, 15-1-122, 61-3-321, and 87-1-303, MCA, authorize the collection fees and charges for the use of state park system units and fishing access sites, and contain rule-making authority for their use, occupancy and protection. See Appendix 1 for HB 495 qualification.

2. Name of Project:

Erwin Bridge Fishing Access Site Enhancement

3. Name, Address, and Phone Number of Project Sponsor:

Allan Kuser	Tom Greason
Fishing Access Site Coordinator	Maintenance Supervisor
Montana FWP, HQ	Montana FWP, Region 3
PO Box 200701	1400 South 19 th
Helena, MT 59620	Bozeman, MT 59718
406-444-7885	406-994-6987

4. If Applicable:

Estimated Construction/Commencement Date: Spring 2007

Estimated Completion Date: Summer 2007

Current Status of Project Design (% complete): 100%

5. **Location Affected by Proposed Action (county, range, and township)**
 Erwin Bridge FAS is located on the Gallatin River at river mile 24 on the left hand side as you float down stream. The site is four miles west of Belgrade on Amsterdam Road (Route 347). The site is located in NW ¼ Sec 9 Township 1 South, Range 4 East, Gallatin County, Montana. The site is 71.7 acres.




Figure 1: Blue fish delineates location of Erwin Bridge FAS.

6. Project Size: Estimate the number of acres that would be directly affected that are currently:

- | | |
|---|---|
| (a) Developed: | (d) Floodplain..... |
| Residential <u>0</u> acres | <u>5</u> acres |
| Industrial <u>0</u> acres | (e) Productive: |
| (b) Open Space/Woodlands/
Recreation..... <u>5</u> acres | irrigated cropland <u>0</u> acres |
| (c) Wetlands/Riparian
Areas..... <u>5</u> acres | dry cropland <u>0</u> acres |
| | forestry <u>0</u> acres |
| | rangeland <u>0</u> acres |
| | other <u>0</u> acres |

7. Map/site plan:




Figure 2: Topographic map depicting approximate boundaries (red shaded polygons; 71.7 acres) of FWP Erwin Bridge FAS.

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

- (a) Permits:
- | <u>Agency Name</u> | <u>Permit</u> | <u>Date Filed/#</u> |
|--------------------|-------------------|---------------------|
| Gallatin County | Floodplain Permit | |
- (b) Funding:
- | <u>Agency Name</u> | <u>Funding Amount</u> |
|--------------------|-----------------------|
| FWP | \$30,000 |
- (c) Other Overlapping or Additional Jurisdictional Responsibilities:
- | <u>Agency Name</u> | <u>Type of Responsibility</u> |
|--|---|
| Montana Department of Transportation (MDT) | Construct off ramp from Amsterdam Road to new parking lot at Erwin Bridge FAS |

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

Erwin Bridge Fishing Access Site Description and Background

Erwin Bridge FAS is located on the Gallatin River at river mile 24 on the left hand side as you float down stream. The site is 4 miles west of Belgrade on Amsterdam Road (Route 347). This FAS is one of seven FWP FASs on the Gallatin River. Cameron Bridge (river mile 27) is the next FAS upstream and Four Corners (river mile 16) is the next FAS downstream. At the site, there is a small pullout (about 2 parking spots) off Amsterdam Road on the southwest corner of the bridge crossing the Gallatin River. Egress and ingress to the site has become increasingly dangerous due to increased traffic on Amsterdam Road. The site borders the Gallatin River on the east side and private property on the south and west sides. The vegetation is predominately a cottonwood forest with typical understory. The location and habitat provide many opportunities for fishing, hiking, bird watching, and wildlife viewing. Hunting is permitted at the site, but limited to shotgun and archery.

The Gallatin River from the confluence to river mile 25 has a High Fisheries Resource Value based on sport fisheries, species presence, and habitat. In 2003, an angler survey identified river mile 12.1 to 68.6 of the Gallatin River as the 10th most fished body of water in Montana. The regional rank was four and there were 48,735 days fished with 1,038 trips on this section. Game fish opportunities at the FAS include brown trout, mountain whitefish, and rainbow trout. Other fish species present at this site are brook trout, longnose dace, longnose sucker, mottled sculpin, mountain sucker, and white sucker. The Montana Natural Heritage Program did not locate any species of concern within one mile of the FAS.

Erwin Bridge FAS has been owned by FWP since the 1980's. Previously there was a short access road and parking area at the site. The parking area was hidden from view of Amsterdam Road. This privacy led to illicit activity and vandalism at the site. Due to

these problems, approximately ten years ago the road and parking area were blocked and revegetated. Since that, time access (small pullout) has been minimal and development has not occurred. In addition, the area around the site has seen an increase in population. For example, a new housing development with approximately 4,000 residences has been completed about one mile east of the site on Amsterdam Road. A visible entrance, parking area, and latrine are needed at the site to accommodate usage, prevent accidents, and deter illicit activity.

In the spring of 2007, Montana Department of Transportation has plans to repave Amsterdam road and add guardrails on the section where Erwin Bridge FAS is located. Installing new guardrails will block the current pullout to the FAS. MDT proposed to mitigate this obstruction by constructing a new 24-foot wide paved approach to the FAS about 0.25 miles to the west of the current pullout.

Proposed Action, Purpose, and Benefits of the Action

FWP proposes to enhance the Erwin Bridge FAS according to the site plan that is attached as Appendix 2. Development will include

1. Construction of a parking lot with 10 single vehicle parking spaces
2. Installation of a precast vault latrine
3. Construction of a 5-foot wide gravel trail from parking lot to river
4. Install signs and barriers

The current pullout does not provide enough parking for the usage at the site. Usage has increased due to an increase in the surrounding population. In addition, the current pullout area is not safe for egress and ingress due to the increased traffic on Amsterdam Road, again due to the increase in the surrounding population. MDT will be blocking off the current pullout area and mitigating this loss with a new paved approach to the west. This approach will be visible and well marked to prevent any safety hazards. MDT will also install a culvert below the access road if necessary. This new approach will allow for locating a parking area at the site that is visible to Amsterdam Road. FWP is confident that this visibility will deter illicit activity. The parking area will be blocked off with barrier rocks to prevent off-road use at the site.

Installation of the vault latrine, trail, barriers, and signs will allow for site protection. The latrine will protect the site from waste problems. The trail will minimize disturbance of the vegetation at the site. Barriers will prevent off-road use. Signs will identify the rules at the site. The FAS will only be open during daylight hours, and no fires will be permitted.

Maintenance and Operation of the Site

Montana Fish, Wildlife & Parks will assume responsibility for routine maintenance of the site including vault latrine cleaning and stocking, vault toilet pumping, sign installation and maintenance, road maintenance, litter and refuse pick up, mowing and brushing, fence maintenance, and general site upkeep. Many of these duties will be performed by a caretaker.

There are noxious weeds (spotted knapweed) present at the FAS. FWP will follow the Region 3 Weed Management plan. Herbicides would be used as well as bio-control and mowing.

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 comparison of the alternatives with the proposed action/preferred alternative:**

Alternative A: No Action

Do not develop the Erwin Bridge FAS. The site will remain in its current undeveloped state. The current pullout will be blocked during MDT's repaving of Amsterdam Road. After this change, access to the site will only be available by walk in recreationists.

Alternative B: Proposed Action

Development of Erwin Bridge FAS will include constructing a parking lot with 10 single vehicle parking spaces, installing a precast vault latrine, constructing a 5-foot wide gravel trail from parking lot to river, and installing signs and barriers. This development will accommodate current usage, increase safety at the site, allow for site protection, and work in conjunction with Montana Department of Transportations repaving plan for Amsterdam Road.

Alternative C: Develop the parking area and install the vault latrine

Development at Erwin Bridge FAS would be the same as the previous alternative, except the trail would not be built. This alternative has been added in case funding is not enough to cover the projects listed in Alternative B.

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

There is no mitigation, stipulations, or other controls associated with this action. Therefore, no evaluation is necessary. This analysis did not reveal any significant impacts to the human or physical environment. Therefore, an environmental Impact Statement is not required.

PART III. NARRATIVE EVALUATION AND COMMENT

The proposed project will minimally impact the physical environment. Best Management Practices (see Appendix 4) will be utilized to minimize impacts to the land and water (i.e., soil stability, surface runoff, erosion, and drainage patterns) during design and construction of the parking area. The proposed project will minimally impact the diversity and abundance of game and nongame species in the area. The development is occurring in an area that already receives recreational use. Posted regulation signs and enforcement activities will help prevent activities that adversely impact wildlife and their habitat.

The proposed project will minimally affect the human environment. Noise will increase during construction and due to better access to the site. MDT will design the access road to minimize traffic hazards associated with ingress and egress from the site. The proposed project will not alter public services, taxes, or utilities. The proposed project will provide benefits for tourism in this area through improved services, amenities, and better management of the area. Cultural resources will not be impacted by the proposed project. The parking area will be highly visible from Amsterdam Road to prevent vandalism and illicit behavior.

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 in the following ways to comment on the EA for the Erwin Bridge Fishing Access Site Enhancement

1. Legal notices will be published in the *Bozeman Chronicle* and the *Helena Independent Record*.
2. Legal notice and the draft EA will be posted on the Montana Fish, Wildlife, & Parks web page: <http://fwp.mt.gov/publicnotices>
3. Direct notice will be given to adjacent landowners.

This level of public involvement is appropriate for a project of this scale.

- 2. Duration of comment period, if any.**

The public comment period will be 30 days. Comments may be emailed to tgreason@mt.gov, or written comments may be sent to the following address:

Tom Greason
Maintenance Supervisor
Montana FWP, Region 3
1400 South 19th
Bozeman, MT 59718
406-994-6987

PART V. EA PREPARATION

- 1. Based on the significance criteria evaluated in this EA, is an EIS required?
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 impacts to the physical and human environment under MEPA, this environmental review revealed no significant negative impacts from the proposed action: therefore, an EIS is not necessary and an environmental assessment is the appropriate level of analysis.

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

Allan Kuser
FWP FAS Coordinator
1420 East Sixth Ave
Helena, MT 59601
(406) 444-7885

Tom Greason
Maintenance Supervisor
1400 South 19th
Bozeman, MT 59718
(406) 994-6987

Sally Schrank
Independent Contractor
1416 Winne Ave
Helena, MT 59601
(406) 443-3585

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

Montana Fish, Wildlife & Parks
Parks Division, Region 3
Wildlife Division, Region 3
Fisheries Division, Region 3
Lands Section
Design and Construction Bureau

Montana Department of Commerce—Tourism
PO Box 200533
1424 9th Ave.
Helena, MT 59620-0533

Montana Natural Heritage Program—Natural Resources Information System
PO Box 201800
1515 East Sixth Avenue
Helena, MT 59620-1800

State Historic Preservation Office
Montana Historical Society
1410 8th Avenue
Helena, MT 59620

PART VI. MEPA CHECKLIST

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

A. PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT

1. <u>LAND RESOURCES</u> 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				
e. Exposure of people or property to earthquakes, landslides, ground failure, or other natural hazard?		X				
f. Other		X				

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

- 1a. The proposed project will not alter geologic substructure, and will minimally impact soil stability. The parking area will be located in the 100-year flood plain area. Erosion is expected to be minor. Surface runoff should be minimal due to the low slope (0-2%) and the soil types (i.e., bandy-riverwash-bonebasin complex and rivra, moist-ryell-bonebasin loam). Best Management Practices (see Appendix 4) will be utilized to minimize these impacts during design and construction of the proposed project.
- 1b. The parking area, trail, and latrine will cause over-covering of soil. These areas will be confined with barriers to minimize disturbance and to confine vehicle traffic.

PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT

2. <u>AIR</u> 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			2a.
b. Creation of objectionable odors?			X			2b.
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)		NA				
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 amounts of dust will be temporarily created during construction. Best Management Practices (see Appendix 4) will be utilized to minimize the dust during construction.
- 2b. Vault latrines can create foul odors; but regular latrine maintenance will help to minimize offensive odors. Current design of vault toilets minimizes odors by using a black, passively—heated vent pipe to increase airflow through the structure and remove objectionable odors. Not having a latrine would likely result in sanitation problems that could potentially lead to health and safety issues.

PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT

3. <u>WATER</u>	IMPACT				Can Impact Be Mitigated	Comment Index
	Unknown	None	Minor	Potentially Significant		
Will the proposed action result in:						
a. Discharge into surface water or any alteration of surface water quality including but not limited to temperature, dissolved oxygen or turbidity?		X				
b. Changes in drainage patterns or the rate and amount of surface runoff?			X			3b.
c. Alteration of the course or magnitude of flood water or other flows?		X				
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				
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				
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)		NA				
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)		NA				
n. Other:		X				

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

3b. To help minimize changes in drainage pattern caused by construction, the parking area will be located on an area with low slope (0-2%). Culverts will be used if necessary by MDT during construction of the approach to the site. The proposed plan may increase surface runoff, due to changes in vegetative cover. A vegetative buffer will be left to trap sediments.

PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT

4. <u>VEGETATION</u> 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			See 4a.
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		Yes	4e.
f. For P-R/D-J, will the project affect wetlands, or prime and unique farmland?		NA				
g. Other:		X				

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

- 4a. Approximately 1 acre of understory will be disturbed to construct the parking area. The location of the parking area at the site was chosen to limit the removal of large cottonwood trees and to allow for visibility from Amsterdam Road.

- 4c. The Montana Natural Heritage Program (MNHP; written communication dated December 11, 2006) found no records of unique, rare, threatened, or endangered plant species within one mile of the site.

- 4e. Spotted knapweed is present at the FAS. Development and increased public usage of the FAS will likely increase weeds at the FAS. FWP will follow the Region 3 Weed Management plan to minimize or eradicate the problem.

PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT

5. <u>FISH/WILDLIFE</u> 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				
b. Changes in the diversity or abundance of game animals or bird species?			X			5b.
c. Changes in the diversity or abundance of nongame species?			X			See 5b.
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				
h. <u>For P-R/D-J</u> , 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)		NA				
i. <u>For P-R/D-J</u> , will the project introduce or export any species not presently or historically occurring in the receiving location? (Also see 5d)		NA				
j. Other:		X				

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

5b. The proposed project will minimally impact the diversity and abundance of game and nongame species in the area. The development is occurring in an area that already receives recreational use.

5f. The Montana Natural Heritage Program (MNHP; written communication dated December 11, 2006) found no records of unique, rare, threatened, or endangered species within one mile of the site.

B. HUMAN ENVIRONMENT

6. <u>NOISE/ELECTRICAL EFFECTS</u> 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		Yes	6a.
b. Exposure of people to severe or nuisance noise levels?		X				
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 Land Resources (Attach additional pages of narrative if needed):

6a. An increase in existing noise levels will occur with increased public access to the FAS, due to vehicle traffic and recreationists at the FAS. FWP will follow the guidelines of the good neighbor policy for public recreation lands (MCA 23-1-126.) to have “no impact upon adjoining private and public lands by preventing impact on those adjoining lands from noxious weeds, trespass, litter, noise and light pollution, streambank erosion and loss of privacy.”

HUMAN ENVIRONMENT

7. <u>LAND USE</u> 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				7a.
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				
d. Adverse effects on or relocation of residences?		X				
e. Other: _____		X				

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

7a. The proposed project will not alter land use in the area. All construction will be occurring at an established Fishing Access Site.

HUMAN ENVIRONMENT

8. <u>RISK/HEALTH HAZARDS</u> 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		Yes	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)		NA				
e. Other:		X				

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

8a. The FWP Region 3 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. Weeds would also be controlled using mechanical or biological means in certain areas to reduce the risk of chemical spills or water contamination.

HUMAN ENVIRONMENT

9. <u>COMMUNITY IMPACT</u> 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				
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 Land Resources (Attach additional pages of narrative if needed):

9e. The proposed plan will establish a new approach to the FAS. The current pullout has become increasingly dangerous with the increase in traffic on Amsterdam Road. The new approach will be constructed by MDT and will decrease safety hazards associated with ingress and egress at the FAS.

HUMAN ENVIRONMENT

10. PUBLIC SERVICES/TAXES/UTILITIES	IMPACT				Can Impact Be Mitigated	Comment Index
	Unknown	None	Minor	Potentially Significant		
Will the proposed action result in:						
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			10a.
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 used of any energy source?		X				
e. Define projected revenue sources						10e.
f. Define projected maintenance costs.						10f
g. Other: _____						

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

10a. There have been problems associated with illegal activity at this site. These problems occurred when there was a parking area that was not visible from the road. Approximately 10 years ago, FWP closed the parking area to end the problems. The new parking area would be highly visible from Amsterdam Road. This visibility should deter illicit behavior. Thus, FWP is confident that the problems that occurred in the past will not resurface.

10e. No revenue will be created from this project

10f. It will cost approximately \$2,000 per year for FWP to operate the site, enforce regulations, and maintain parking area, fences, toilet, signs, weeds, and grounds.

HUMAN ENVIRONMENT

11. <u>AESTHETICS/RECREATION</u> 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				
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)			X			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)		NA				
e. Other:		NA				

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

11c. The project takes advantages of MDT's Amsterdam Road improvement and mitigation to improve access and parking at the FAS while addressing some previous security and current safety concerns. It appears to improve both the quality and quantity of opportunities and settings. Please see Appendix 3, Tourism Report.

HUMAN ENVIRONMENT

12. <u>CULTURAL/HISTORICAL RESOURCES</u> 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				12a.
b. Physical change that would affect unique cultural values?		X				
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)		NA				
e. Other:						

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

12a. The State Historic Preservation Office concurred with FWP on July 20, 2006 that the proposed project would not impact any cultural resources. Please see attached SHPO consultation in Appendix 4.

HUMAN ENVIRONMENT

13. <u>SUMMARY EVALUATION OF SIGNIFICANCE</u>	IMPACT				Can Impact Be Mitigated	Comment Index
	Unknown	None	Minor	Potentially Significant		
Will the proposed action, considered as a whole:						
a. Have impacts that are individually limited, but cumulatively considerable? (A project or program may result in impacts on two or more separate resources which create a significant effect when considered together or in total.)		X				
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				
f. For P-R/D-J, is the project expected to have organized opposition or generate substantial public controversy? (Also see 13e)		NA				
g. For P-R/D-J, list any federal or state permits required.		NA				

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

APPENDIX 1
HB495
PROJECT QUALIFICATION CHECKLIST

Date December 18, 2006

Person Reviewing Sally Schrank

Project Location: Erwin Bridge FAS is located on the Gallatin River at river mile 24 on the left hand side as you float down stream. The site is four miles west of Belgrade on Amsterdam Road (Route 347). The site is located in NW ¼ Sec 9 Township 1 South, Range 4 East, Gallatin County, Montana. The site is 71.7 acres.

Description of Proposed Work: FWP proposes to enhance the Erwin Bridge FAS. Development will include:

1. Construction of a parking lot with 10 single vehicle parking spaces
2. Installation of a precast vault latrine
3. Construction of a 5-foot wide gravel trail from parking lot to river
4. Installation of signs and barriers.

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: The 5-foot wide gravel trail will be built over undisturbed land.

B. New building construction (buildings <100 sf and vault latrines exempt)?

Comments:

C. Any excavation of 20 c.y. or greater?

Comments: The construction of the parking area will cause an excavation of greater than 20 c.y.

D. New parking lots built over undisturbed land or expansion of existing lot that increases parking capacity by 25% or more?

Comments: A new parking lot will be constructed with 10 single vehicle parking spaces.

E. Any new shoreline alteration that exceeds a double wide boat ramp or handicapped fishing station?

Comments:

F. Any new construction into lakes, reservoirs, or streams?

Comments:

G. Any new construction in an area with National Registry quality cultural artifacts (as determined by State Historical Preservation Office)?

Comments:

H. Any new above ground utility lines?

Comments:

I. Any increase or decrease in campsites of 25% or more of an existing number of campsites?


Comments:

J. Proposed project significantly changes the existing features or use pattern; including effects of a series of individual projects?

Comments:

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 Site Plan



APPENDIX 3
TOURISM REPORT
MONTANA ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT (MEPA)/HB495

The Montana Department of Fish, Wildlife & 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, 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: Erwin Bridge Fishing Access Site Enhancement

Project Description: Erwin Bridge FAS is located on the Gallatin River at river mile 24 on the left hand side as you float down stream. The site is four miles west of Belgrade on Amsterdam Road (Route 347). The site is located in NW ¼ Sec 9 Township 1 South, Range 4 East, Gallatin County, Montana. The site is 71.7 acres. Development of Erwin Bridge FAS will include constructing a parking lot with 10 single vehicle parking spaces, installing a precast vault latrine, constructing a 5-foot wide gravel trail from parking lot to river, and installing signs and barriers. This development will accommodate current usage, increase safety at the site, protect the site from degradation, and work in conjunction with Montana Department of Transportations repaving plan for Amsterdam Road.

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

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

The project takes advantages of MDT's Amsterdam Road improvement and mitigation to improve access and parking at the FAS while addressing some previous security and current safety concerns. It appears to improve both the quality and quantity of opportunities and settings.

Signature Victor Bjornberg, Tourism Development Coordinator, Travel Montana, MT
Dept of Commerce

Date: 12-21-06

APPENDIX 4 SHPO CONSULTATION



2006071103
**Montana Fish,
Wildlife & Parks**

RECEIVED

JUL 24 2006

CONCUR
MONTANA SHPO

DESIGN & CONSTRUCTION
DEPT. OF FISH, WILDLIFE & PARKS

1420 East Sixth Avenue
P.O. Box 200701
Helena, Montana 59620-0701

DATE 20 Jul 06 SIGNED [Signature]

Dr. Mark Baumler SHPO
State Historical Preservation Office
P.O. Box 201202
1410 8th Avenue
Helena, Montana 59620-1202

RECEIVED
JUL 11 2006

BY: SJPa

Josef
FWP - Fish
(FAS) Report - Erwin
Bridge Fishing Access
Gall. Co

RE: Erwin Bridge Fishing Access Site Improvements

July 7, 2006

Dear Dr. Baumler:

The Montana Department of Fish, Wildlife and Parks (FWP) is proposing improvements to the Erwin Bridge Fishing Access Site (FAS). The property is located at approximately T1S, R4E S9 near Amsterdam, Montana in Gallatin County. Enclosed please find the report prepared by GCM Services, Inc. entitled *A Class III Cultural Resource Inventory of a Proposed Parking Area at the Erwin Bridge Fishing Access Site, Gallatin County, Montana*.

The report indicates the location and recordation of a ~~historic~~ isolate, a possible abandoned section of county road. No other cultural sites or artifacts were discovered. FWP believes that the report prepared by Garren Meyer of GCM Services, Inc. for FWP is adequate and we agree with his methods. We agree with the consultant's recommendation that the ~~historic~~ isolate is not eligible and that, due to the low likelihood of adverse impacts to cultural resources, the project should be allowed to proceed as proposed.

We request your concurrence on the adequacy of the enclosed report and the ineligibility of the possible abandoned section of county road. Please feel free to contact Bardell Mangum at (406) 841-4012 or by e-mail at bmangum@mt.gov if you have any questions or concerns regarding the proposed project.

Sincerely,

[Signature]
Bardell Mangum, RLA
Assistant Cultural Resources Coordinator
Design & Construction Bureau

Encl. Report, CRABS Form

cc: Allan Kuser, File 314.1

APPENDIX 5
MONTANA FISH, WILDLIFE & PARKS
BEST MANAGEMENT PRACTICES FOR FISHING ACCESS SITES
10-02-02

I. ROADS

A. Road Planning and location

1. Minimize the number of roads constructed at the FAS through comprehensive road planning and recognizing foreseeable future uses.
2. Use existing roads, unless use of such roads would cause or aggravate an erosion problem.
3. Fit the road to the topography by locating roads on natural benches and following natural contours. Avoid long, steep road grades and narrow canyons.
4. Locate roads on stable geology, including well-drained soils and rock formations that tend to dip into the slope. Avoid slumps and slide-prone areas characterized by steep slopes, highly weathered bedrock, clay beds, concave slopes, hummocky topography, and rock layers that dip parallel to the slope. Avoid wet areas, including seeps, wetlands, wet meadows, and natural drainage channels.
5. Minimize the number of stream crossings.
6. Choose stable stream crossing sites. “Stable” refers to streambanks with erosion-resistant materials and in hydrologically safe spots.

B. Road Design

1. Design roads to the minimum standard necessary to accommodate anticipated use and equipment. The need for higher engineering standards can be alleviated through proper road-use management. “Standard” refers to road width.
2. Design roads to minimize disruption of natural drainage patterns. Vary road grades to reduce concentrated flow in road drainage ditches, culverts, and on fill slopes and road surfaces.

C. Drainage from Road Surface

1. Provide adequate drainage from the surface of all permanent and temporary roads. Use outsloped, insloped or crowned roads, installing proper drainage features. Space road drainage features so peak flow on road surface or in ditches will not exceed their capacity.
 - a. Outsloped roads provide means of dispersing water in a low-energy flow from the road surface. Outsloped roads are appropriate when fill slopes are stable, drainage will not flow directly into stream channels, and transportation safety can be met.
 - b. For in-sloped roads, plan ditch gradients steep enough, generally greater than 2%, but less than 8%, to prevent sediment deposition and ditch erosion. The steeper gradients may be suitable for more stable soils; use the lower gradients for less stable soils.
 - c. Design and install road surface drainage features at adequate spacing to control erosion; steeper

gradients require more frequent drainage features. Properly constructed drain dips can be an economical method of road surface drainage. Construct drain dips deep enough into the subgrade so that traffic will not obliterate them.

2. For ditch relief/culverts, construct stable catch basins at stable angles. Protect the inflow end of crossdrain culverts from plugging and armor if in erodible soil. Skewing ditch relief culverts 20 to 30 degrees toward the inflow from the ditch will improve inlet efficiency.
3. Provide energy dissipators (rock piles, slash, log chunks, etc.) where necessary to reduce erosion at outlet of drainage features. Crossdrains, culverts, water bars, dips, and other drainage structures should not discharge onto erodible soils or fill slopes without outfall protection.
4. Route road drainage through adequate filtration zones, or other sediment-settling structures. Install road drainage features above stream crossings to route discharge into filtration zones before entering a stream.

D. Construction/Reconstruction

1. Stabilize erodible, exposed soils by seeding, compacting, riprapping, benching, mulching, or other suitable means.
2. At the toe of potentially erodible fill slopes, particularly near stream channels, pile slash in a row parallel to the road to trap sediment. When done concurrently with road construction, this is one method to effectively control sediment movement and it provides an economical way of disposing of roadway slash. Limit the height, width, and length of these “slash filter windows” so not to impede wildlife movement. Sediment fabric fences or other methods may be used if effective.
3. Construct cut and fill slopes at stable angles to prevent sloughing and subsequent erosion.
4. Avoid incorporating potentially unstable woody debris in the fill portion of the road prism. Where possible, leave existing rooted trees or shrubs at the toe of the fill slope to stabilize the fill.
5. Place debris, overburden, and other waste materials associated with construction and maintenance activities in a location to avoid entry into streams. Include these waste areas in soil stabilization planning for the road.
6. When using existing roads, reconstruct only to the extent necessary to provide adequate drainage and safety; avoid disturbing stable road surfaces. Consider abandoning existing roads when their use would aggravate erosion.

E. Road Maintenance

1. Grade road surfaces only as often as necessary to maintain a stable running surface and to retain the original surface drainage.
2. Maintain erosion control features through periodic inspection and maintenance, including cleaning dips and crossdrains, repairing ditches, marking culvert inlets to aid in location, and clearing debris from culverts.
3. Avoid cutting the toe of cut slopes when grading roads, pulling ditches, or plowing snow.
4. Avoid using roads during wet periods if such use would likely damage the road drainage features. Consider gates, barricades, or signs to limit use of roads during wet periods.

II. RECREATIONAL FACILITIES (parking areas, campsites, trails, ramps, restrooms)

A. Site Design

1. Design a site that best fits the topography, soil type, and stream character, while minimizing soil disturbance and economically accomplishing recreational objectives. Keep roads and parking lots at least 50 feet from water; if closer, mitigate with vegetative buffers as necessary.
2. Locate foot trails to avoid concentrating runoff and provide breaks in grade as needed. Locate trails and parking areas away from natural drainage systems and divert runoff to stable areas. Limit the grade of trails on unstable, saturated, highly erosive, or easily compacted soils
3. Scale the number of boat ramps, campsites, parking areas, bathroom facilities, etc. to be commensurate with existing and anticipated needs. Facilities should not invite such use that natural features will be degraded.
4. Provide adequate barriers to minimize off-road vehicle use

B. Maintenance: Soil Disturbance and Drainage

1. Maintenance operations minimize soil disturbance around parking lots, swimming areas and campsites, through proper placement and dispersal of such facilities or by reseeding disturbed ground. Drainage from such facilities should be promoted through proper grading.
2. Maintain adequate drainage for ramps by keeping side drains functional or by maintaining drainage of road surface above ramps or by crowning (on natural surfaces).
3. Maintain adequate drainage for trails. Use mitigating measures, such as water bars, wood chips, and grass seeding, to reduce erosion on trails.
4. When roads are abandoned during reconstruction or to implement site-control, they must be reseeded and provided with adequate drainage so that periodic maintenance is not required.

III. RAMPS AND STREAM CROSSINGS

A. Legal Requirements

1. Relevant permits must be obtained prior to building bridges across streams or boat ramps. Such permits include the SPA 124 permit, the COE 404 permit, and the DNRC Floodplain Development Permit.

B. Design Considerations

1. Placement of boat ramp should be such that boats can load and unload with out difficulty and the notch in the bank where the ramp was placed does not encourage bank erosion. Extensions of boat ramps beyond the natural bank can also encourage erosion.
2. Adjust the road grade or provide drainage features (e.g. rubber flaps) to reduce the concentration of road drainage to stream crossings and boat ramps. Direct drainage flow through an adequate filtration zone and away from the ramp or crossing through the use of gravel side-drains, crowning (on natural surfaces) or 30-degree angled grooves on concrete ramps.
3. Avoid unimproved stream crossings on permanent streams. On ephemeral streams, when a culvert or bridge is not feasible, locate drive-throughs on a stable, rocky portion of the stream channel.

4. Unimproved (non-concrete) ramps should only be used when the native soils are sufficiently gravelly or rocky to withstand the use at the site and to resist erosion.

C. Installation of Stream Crossings and Ramps

1. Minimize stream channel disturbances and related sediment problems during construction of road and installation of stream crossing structures. Do not place erodible material into stream channels. Remove stockpiled material from high water zones. Locate temporary construction bypass roads in locations where the stream course will have a minimal disturbance. Time construction activities to protect fisheries and water quality.

2. Where ramps enter the stream channel, they should follow the natural streambed in order to avoid changing stream hydraulics and to optimize use of boat trailers.

3. Use culverts with a minimum diameter of 15 inches for permanent stream crossings and cross drains. Proper sizing of culverts may dictate a larger pipe and should be based on a 50-year flow recurrence interval. Install culverts to conform to the natural streambed and slope on all perennial streams and on intermittent streams that support fish or that provide seasonal fish passage. Place culverts slightly below normal stream grade to avoid culvert outfall barriers. Do not alter stream channels upstream from culverts, unless necessary to protect fill or to prevent culvert blockage. Armor the inlet and/or outlet with rock or other suitable material where needed.

4. Prevent erosion of boat ramps and the affected streambank through proper placement (so as to not catch the stream current) and hardening (rip-rap or erosion resistant woody vegetation).

5. Maintain a 1-foot minimum cover for culverts 18-36 inches in diameter, and a cover of one-third diameter for larger culverts to prevent crushing by traffic.