MDT
Montana Department of Transportation
2701 Prospect Avenue
PO Box 201001
Helena MT 59620-1001
Timothy W. Reardon, Director
Brian Schweitzer, Governor

October 19, 2012

Gene Kaufman, Operations Engineer
Federal Highway Administration
585 Shepard Way
Helena, MT 59601-9785

Subject: Categorical Exclusion Re-Evaluation
STPHS 292-1(6)7
2003-Safety Impvt – S Whitefish
UPN 5878000

Dear Gene Kaufman:

Environmental Services has reviewed the above proposed project's impacts and has determined that this proposed project still qualifies as a Categorical Exclusion (CE) under the provisions of 23 CFR 771.129(c). The original CE was signed June 8, 2007 and is attached. This proposed action also continues to qualify as a categorical exclusion under the provisions of ARM 18.2.261 (Sections 75-1-103 and 75-1-201, M.C.A.).

The Scope-of-Work for the proposed project has been reviewed and has not changed. As a result of this review, we have reviewed the project reports and found that in accordance with 23 CFR 771.117(a), this action will neither individually or cumulatively, have any significant environmental impacts.

In accordance with the Federal Highway Administration's concurrence letter of April 15, 1999, this notification documents that this proposed action is still properly classified as a CE under the provisions of 23 CFR 771.117(d).

If you have any questions, please phone Susan Kilcrease at 406.523.5842. She will be pleased to assist you.

Sincerely,

Heidy Bruner

Heidy Bruner, P.E.
Engineering Section Supervisor
Environmental Services

Copy (w/o attach.):	Ed Toavs, P.E.	Missoula District Administrator
	Paul Ferry, P.E.	Highway Engineer
	Kent Barnes, P.E.	Bridge Engineer
	Tom S. Martin, P.E.	Environmental Services Bureau Chief
	Suzy Price	Contract Plans Bureau Chief
	Nicole Pallister	Fiscal Programming Section Supervisor
	Tom Erving	Fiscal Programming Section
	Robert Stapley	Right-of-Way Bureau Chief
	Susan Kilcrease	Environmental Services Bureau
	File	Environmental Services Bureau
	Montana Legislative Branch Environmental Quality Council (EQC)	

HB:smk \\astro\envir\PROJECTS\MISSOULA\5878\5878ENCEEX01.DOCX

serving you with pride

Montana Department of Transportation
2701 Prospect Avenue
PO Box 201001
Helena MT 59620-1001

Jim Lynch, Director
Brian Schweitzer, Governor

RECEIVED

JUN 06 2007
FHWA
MONTANA DIVISION

June 5, 2007

RECEIVED
JUN 11 2007
ENVIRONMENTAL

Michael Duman
Assistant Division Administrator
Federal Highway Administration
585 Shepard Way
Helena, MT 59601-9785

Subject: STPHS 292-1(6)7
2003-SAFETY IMPVT-S WHITEFISH
CN 5878000

This is to request approval of this proposed project as a Categorical Exclusion (CE) under the provisions of 23 CFR 771.117(d), and the Programmatic Agreement as signed by the MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION (MDT) and the FHWA on April 12, 2001. A Copy of its Preliminary Field Review Report (1/24/06) is attached. This proposed action also qualifies as a CE under ARM 18.2.261 (Sections **75-1-103** and **75-1-201, MCA**).

The following form provides the documentation required to demonstrate that all of the conditions are satisfied to qualify for a Programmatic Categorical Exclusion Approval (PCE) as initially agreed by the (former) MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS (MDOH) and the FHWA on December 6, 1989. (Note: An " X " in the "N/A" column is "Not Applicable" to, while one in the "UNK" column is "Unknown" at the present time for this proposed project.)

NOTE: A response in a box will require additional documentation for a Categorical Exclusion request in accordance with 23 CFR 771.117(d).

	YES	NO	N/A	UNK
1. This proposed project would have (a) significant environmental impact(s) as-defined under 23 CFR 771.117(a).	☐	☒	☐	☐
2. This proposed project involves (an) unusual circumstance(s) as described under 23 CFR 771.117(b).	☐	☒	☐	☐
3. This proposed project involves one (or more) of the following situations where:				
A. Right-of-Way, easements, and/or construction permits would be required.	☒	☐	☐	☐
1. The context or degree of the Right-of-Way action would have (a) substantial social, economic, or environmental effect(s).	☐	☒	☐	☐
2. There is a high rate of residential growth in this proposed project's area.	☐	☒	☐	☐
3. There is a high rate of commercial growth in this proposed project's area.	☐	☒	☐	☐
4. Work would be on and/or within approximately 1.6 kilometers (1± mile) of an Indian Reservation.	☐	☒	☐	☐

	YES	NO	N/A	UNK
5. There are parks, recreational, or other properties acquired/improved under *Section 6(f)* of the *1965 National Land & Water Conservation Fund Act* (**16 USC 460L**, *et seq.*) on or adjacent to proposed the project area.	☐	☒	☐	☐
The use of such *Section 6(f)* sites would be documented and compensated with the appropriate agencies. (*e.g.*: MDFWP, local entities, etc.).	☐	☐	☒	☐
6. Are there any sites either on, or eligible for the National Register of Historic Places with concurrence in determination of eligibility or effect under *Section 106* of the *National Historic Preservation Act* (**16 USC 470**, *et seq.*) by the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), which would be affected by this proposed project.	☐	☒	☐	☐
7. There are parks, recreation sites, school grounds, wildlife refuges, historic sites, historic bridges, or irrigation that might be considered under *Section 4(f)* of the 1966 *US DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION Act* (**49 USC 303**) on or adjacent to the project area.	☐	☒	☐	☐
a. "Nationwide" Programmatic *Section 4(f)* Evaluation forms for these sites are attached.	☐	☐	☒	☐
b. This proposed project requires a full (*i.e.*: DRAFT & FINAL) *Section 4(f)* Evaluation.	☐	☒	☐	☐
B. The activity would involve work in a streambed, wetland, and/or other waterbody(ies) considered as "waters of the United States" or similar (*e.g.*: "state waters").	☐	☒	☐	☐
1. Conditions set forth in *Section 10* of the *Rivers and Harbors Act* (**33 USC 403**) and/or *Section 404* under 33 CFR Parts 320-330 of the *Clean Water Act* (33 USC 1251-1376) would be met.	☐	☐	☒	☐
2. Impacts in wetlands, including but not limited to those referenced under Executive Order (E.O.) #11990, and their proposed mitigation would be coordinated with the US Army Corps of Engineers and other Resource Agencies (Federal, State and Tribal) as required for permitting	☐	☐	☒	☐
3. A 124SPA Stream Protection Authorization would be obtained from the MDFWP?	☐	☒	☐	☐
4. There is a delineated floodplain in the proposed project area under FEMA's Floodplain Management criteria.	☐	☒	☐	☐
The water surface at the 100-year flood limit elevation would exceed floodplain management criteria due to an encroachment by the proposed project.	☐	☐	☒	☐
5. Tribal Water Permit would be required.	☐	☒	☐	☐
6. Work would be required in, across, and/or adjacent to a river which is a component of, or proposed for inclusion in Montana's Wild and/or Scenic Rivers system as published by the US Department of Agriculture, or the US Department of the Interior.	☐	☒	☐	☐

	YES	NO	N/A	UNK
The designated National Wild & Scenic River systems in Montana are:				
a. Middle Fork of the Flathead River (headwaters to South Fork confluence).	☐	☐	☒	☐
b. North Fork of the Flathead River (Canadian Border to Middle Fork confluence).	☐	☐	☒	☐
c. South Fork of the Flathead River (headwaters to Hungry Horse Reservoir).	☐	☐	☒	☐
d. Missouri River (Fort Benton to Charles M. Russell National Wildlife Refuge).	☐	☐	☒	☐
In accordance with *Section 7* of the *Wild and Scenic Rivers Act* (**16 USC 1271 – 1287**), this work would be coordinated and documented with either the Flathead National Forest (Flathead River), or US Bureau of Land Management (Missouri River).	☐	☐	☒	☐
C. This is a "Type I" action as defined under 23 CFR 772.5(h), which typically consists of highway construction on a new location or the physical alteration of an existing route which substantially changes its horizontal or vertical alignments or increases the number of through-traffic lanes.	☐	☒	☐	☐
1. If yes, are there potential noise impacts?	☐	☐	☒	☐
2. A Noise Analysis would be completed.	☐	☐	☒	☐
3. There would be compliance with the provisions of both 23 CFR 772 for FHWA's Noise Impact analyses and MDT's Noise Policy.	☒	☐	☐	☐
D. There would be substantial changes in access control involved with this proposed project.	☐	☒	☐	☐
If yes, would they result in extensive economic and/or social impacts on the affected locations?	☐	☐	☒	☐
E. The use of a temporary road, detour, or ramp closure having the following conditions when the action(s) associated with such facilities:				
1. Provisions would be made for access by local traffic, and be posted for same.	☒	☐	☐	☐
2. Adverse effects to through-traffic dependant businesses would be avoided or minimized.	☒	☐	☐	☐
3. Interference to local events(*e.g.*: festivals) would be minimized to all possible extent.	☒	☐	☐	☐
4. Substantial controversy associated with this pending action would be avoided.	☒	☐	☐	☐
F. Hazardous wastes /substances, as defined by the US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and/or the Montana Department of Environmental Quality (MDEQ), and/or (a) listed "Superfund" (under *CERCLA* or *CECRA*) site(s) are currently on and/or adjacent to this proposed project.	☐	☒	☐	☐

	YES	NO	N/A	UNK
All reasonable measures would be taken to avoid and/or minimize substantial impacts from same.	☐	☐	☒	☐
G. The Montana Pollutant Discharge Elimination System's conditions (ARM 16.20.1314), including temporary erosion control features for construction would be met.	☒	☐	☐	☐
H. Permanent desirable vegetation with an approved seeding mixture would be established on exposed areas.	☒	☐	☐	☐
I. Documentation of an "invasive species" review to comply with both EO #13112 and the *County Noxious Weed Control Act* (7-22-21, MCA), including directions as specified by the county(ies) wherein its intended work would be done.	☒	☐	☐	☐
J. There are "Prime" or "Prime if Irrigated" Farmlands designated by the Natural Resources Conservation Service on or adjacent to the proposed project area.	☒	☐	☐	☐
If the proposed work would affect Important Farmlands, then an AD-1006 Farmland Conversion Impact Rating form would be completed in accordance with the *Farmland Protection Policy Act* (**7 USC 4201**, *et seq.*).	☒	☐	☐	☐
K. Features for the *Americans with Disabilities Act* (PL 101-336) compliance would be included.	☐	☐	☒	☐
L. A written Public Involvement Plan, would be completed in accordance with MDT's Public Involvement Handbook.	☒	☐	☐	☐
4. This proposed project complies with the *Clean Air Act's Section 176(c)* (**42 USC 7521(a)**, as amended) under the provisions of 40 CFR 81.327 as it's either in a Montana air quality:				
A. "Unclassifiable"/attainment area. This proposed project is not covered under the EPA's September 15, 1997 Final Rule on air quality conformity.	☒	☐	☐	☐
and/or				
B. "Nonattainment" area. However, this type of proposed project is either exempted from the conformity determination requirements (under EPA's September 15, 1997 Final Rule), or a conformity determination would be documented in coordination with the responsible agencies: (Metropolitan Planning Organizations, MDEQ's Air Quality Division, etc.).	☐	☐	☒	☐
C. Is this proposed project in a "Class I Air Shed" (Indian Reservations) under 40 CFR 52.1382(c)(3)?	☐	☒	☐	☐
5. Federally listed Threatened or Endangered (T/E) Species:				
A. There are recorded occurrences, and/or critical habitat in this proposed project's vicinity.	☐	☒	☐	☐
B. Would this proposed project result in a "jeopardy" opinion (under 50 CFR 402) from the Fish & Wildlife Service on any Federally listed T/E Species?	☐	☒	☐	☐

The proposed project would not induce significant land use changes, nor promote unplanned growth. There would be no significant effects on access to adjacent property, nor to present traffic patterns.

This proposed project would not create disproportionately high and/or adverse impacts on the health or environment of minority and/or low-income populations (EO #12898). It also complies with the provisions of *Title VI* of the *Civil Rights Act* of 1964 (**42 USC 2000d**) under the FHWA's regulations (23 CFR 200).

In accordance with the provisions of 23 CFR 771.117(a), this pending action would not cause any significant individual, secondary, or cumulative environmental impacts. Therefore, the FHWA's concurrence is requested that this proposed project is properly classified as a Categorical Exclusion.

_____, Date: 6/5/07
Thomas G. Gocksch P.E.
Project Development Engineer
MDT Environmental Services Bureau

Concur _____, Date: 6/05/07
Tom Hansen, P.E. - Engineering Section Supervisor
Environmental Services Bureau

Concur _____, Date: 6/8/07
Federal Highway Administration

TLH:tgg S:\PROJECTS\MISSOULA\5878\5878ENCED001.DOC

Attachments

cc: Dwane Kailey, P.E. – District Administrator – Missoula District
Paul R. Ferry, P.E. - Highway Engineer
John H. Horton - MDT Right-of-Way Bureau Chief
Suzy Price - MDT Contract Plans Section Supervisor
David W. Jensen, Supervisor - MDT Fiscal Programming Section
Dan Smith, Acting Chief - Environmental Services Bureau
Tom Gocksch P.E. – Environmental Services Bureau
Susan Kilcrease – Missoula District Office
Flathead County
Environmental Quality Council

MDT attempts to provide accommodation for any known disability that may interfere with a person participating in any service, program or activity of the Dept. Alternative accessible formats of this information will be provided upon request. For further information, call 406-444-7228 or TTY (800-335-7592), or call Montana Relay at 711.