

## CHECKLIST ENVIRONMENTAL ASSESSMENT

<b>Project Name:</b>	<b>MRL (NIMROD) BRIDGE #91 REHABILITATION</b>
<b>Proposed Implementation Date:</b>	<b>July 2017 – November 2017</b>
<b>Proponent:</b>	<b>Montana Rail Link</b>
<b>Location:</b>	<b>SE4NW4, Section 17, T11N – R15W</b>
<b>County:</b>	<b>Granite</b>

### I. TYPE AND PURPOSE OF ACTION

Montana Rail Link (MRL) is proposing to rehabilitate an existing railroad bridge (#91) crossing the Clark Fork River approximately 30 miles upstream of Missoula, Montana. Work is planned to be conducted under seasonal low flow conditions during the summer-fall of 2017. The existing bridge consists of 4 -75' steel spans with an overall length of approximately 312' that is supported by 5 concrete abutments/piers. Existing bridge pier 4 would be encased with 115 cubic yards of reinforced concrete and the bearings would be rehabilitated. In order to perform work under dry conditions, a temporary diversion of the river towards the eastern side of the bridge (between piers 2 & 3) is proposed. The temporary diversion would involve installation of approximately 375 lineal feet of concrete "Ecology Blocks" from the west bank of the river. Temporary access roads would be installed from the west side of the bridge to access the work area. The purpose of the proposed project is to rehabilitate the aging bridge before it's capability to safely support trains is compromised.

DNRC has received an application from MRL for a temporary Land Use License (LUL) for proposed bridge rehabilitation activities to be conducted in the area below the low water mark (estimated at 0.6 acres) of the Clark Fork River.

Montana Code (MCA 70-16-201) provides for state ownership from the low water mark to the low water mark on navigable water bodies. Based on historical evidence and case law, the Clark Fork River is commercially navigable from Deer Lodge, Montana (south boundary of town near south boundary of NW1/4 of Sec 4, T7N-R9W) to the Idaho state line. Therefore, the state claims ownership of the riverbed below the low water mark between these two points.

### II. PROJECT DEVELOPMENT

#### 1. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT, AGENCIES, GROUPS OR INDIVIDUALS CONTACTED:

*Provide a brief chronology of the scoping and ongoing involvement for this project. List number of individuals contacted, number of responses received, and newspapers in which notices were placed and for how long. Briefly summarize issues received from the public.*

Adjacent landowners and permitting agencies (listed below) were contacted regarding the project. As part of the floodplain permitting process the proposal was advertised in the Granite County newspaper (Philipsburg Mail).

#### 2. OTHER GOVERNMENTAL AGENCIES WITH JURISDICTION, LIST OF PERMITS NEEDED:

*Examples: cost-share agreement with U.S. Forest Service, 124 Permit, 3A Authorization, Air Quality Major Open Burning Permit.*

Granite County Conservation District- 310 Permit – the permit has been issued with a modification to insure adequate depth for fish passage in overflow channel per recommendations of Brad Liermann FWP Fisheries Biologist.

Granite County Planning Department – Floodplain Permit - Linda Bouck indicated the proposal has gone through the floodplain permitting review process and the permit will be issued as soon as all other permits have been issued.

Montana DEQ- 318 Short term exemption from water quality standards permit was issued as a part of the 310 permit process. According to Mike Rahl (MRL Project Manager for this proposal) a Storm Water Discharge Permit was not required.

US Army Corps of Engineers – A 404 Permit has been issued.

Since the upper Clark Fork River Basin is a superfund site, testing was done on soil materials adjacent to the proposed overflow channel. Tests indicated that these soils did not exceed hazardous substance thresholds for potential introduction of sediment to the Clark Fork River.

---

### 3. ALTERNATIVE DEVELOPMENT:

*Describe alternatives considered and, if applicable, provide brief description of how the alternatives were developed. List alternatives that were considered but eliminated from further analysis and why.*

Three alternatives consisting of: 1) No Action; 2) Bridge Rehabilitation; and 3) Bridge Replacement were considered. Alternative 1 does not meet the project purpose and need to rehabilitate the aging bridge before it's capability to safely support trains is compromised and would result in an unsafe condition. Alternative 3 is not considered to be cost effective by MRL.

For the purposes of licensing, DNRC will evaluate and compare the environmental effects of (No Action) and the proposed action (Action) alternatives. This analysis also incorporates, by reference, information contained in the Joint Application for Proposed Work in Montana's Streams, Wetlands, Floodplains and Other Water Bodies and associated reference sheets 1-4 and the Wetlands and Stream Delineation Report performed by HDR Engineering.

<b>III. IMPACTS ON THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT</b>
---

- |  |
|--|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <i>RESOURCES potentially impacted are listed on the form, followed by common issues that would be considered.</i></li><li>• <i>Explain POTENTIAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATIONS following each resource heading.</i></li><li>• <i>Enter "NONE" if no impacts are identified or the resource is not present.</i></li></ul> |
|--|

---

### 4. GEOLOGY AND SOIL QUALITY, STABILITY AND MOISTURE:

*Consider the presence of fragile, compactable or unstable soils. Identify unusual geologic features. Specify any special reclamation considerations. Identify direct, indirect, and cumulative effects to soils.*

Existing Conditions: Soils within the floodplain are mixtures of stratified alluvial sands, silts and gravels that are erosive if disturbed and not revegetated. No above average erosion is noted at the site. No unique geology was identified in the project area. Testing was completed on the soil materials adjacent to the proposed overflow channel. Tests indicated soils did not exceed hazardous substance thresholds for potential introduction of sediment to the Clark Fork River.

No Action: No change in effects to soils. The concrete piers of the existing bridge are degraded from years of erosion, ice and debris. The bridge would continue to degrade and would become a safety concern for continued rail traffic if not repaired and stabilized.

Action: Potential soil related environmental impacts identified are streambed and ground disturbance, temporary removal of vegetation during construction, and temporary excavation of a diversion channel within the floodplain. The DNRC affected area or scope of work authorized by the Land Use License is limited to the channel bottom lands below the low water mark. For this analysis we also considered proposed operations on the adjacent channel banks that may impact the channel bottom. There would be a short term disturbance of the channel during installation and removal of the diversions within the main river channel. Pier 4 would be repaired while the site is dewatered. All operations are planned to minimize soil disturbance, conserve and restore soils, install erosion control measures, and promote prompt revegetation of disturbed soils. There would be short term direct impacts and moderate in-direct or cumulative effects that would subside quickly and long-term ground profile would be similar to existing conditions.

---

## 5. WATER QUALITY, QUANTITY AND DISTRIBUTION:

*Identify important surface or groundwater resources. Consider the potential for violation of ambient water quality standards, drinking water maximum contaminant levels, or degradation of water quality. Identify direct, indirect, and cumulative effects to water resources.*

Existing Conditions: The existing bridge is constructed with 4- 75" steel spans supported by 5 concrete abutment/piers. The river channel sediments move and shift with changing flow dynamics and geomorphology of the Clark Fork River and over the 108 years since bridge construction in 1909, there has been some sediment aggradation between piers 2 and 3. The west bank is armored with rip-rap and the banks are stable with minor evidence of scour or erosion near the MRL bridge piers. Floodplain map number is 30039C0150C.

No Action: No changes are expected in stream channel morphology or water quality compared to existing conditions. Without repairs, the continued degradation of the Railroad Bridge and potential loss of the bridge could result in channel erosion and impacts to water quality.

Action: The proposed construction and repair actions include the following summary operations 7/1/2017- 11/30/2017: Access from the west bank to construct a temporary diversion channel for about 220 x 75ft. with diversion blocks to support working on dewatered site to reconstruct pier 4 and repair of the other railroad bridge support piers as needed. Existing bridge pier 4 would be encased with 115 cubic yards of reinforced concrete that would increase the area of pier 4, but is not expected to substantially change flow paths or river geomorphology. Temporary placement of 400 cubic yards of clean rock fill would occur below the ordinary high water mark for construction access. At completion of repairs, the temporary diversion channel would be backfilled to match the existing channel and temporary fill removed and riverbank access points would be stabilized where disturbed. Hazardous materials would not be stored and construction equipment would not be refueled within 50 feet of the waterways located within the project area. All fluids would be properly stored to prevent spills from entering the river. Additionally, spill kits would be available onsite to respond to a spill if one does occur, and construction crews would be properly trained in their use.

This analysis also incorporates by reference all information and mitigations contained in the Joint Application for Proposed Work in Montana's Streams, Wetlands, Floodplains and Other Water Bodies, Granite County 310 permit, Montana DEQ 318 short term turbidity permit and 401 Water Quality Certification and the US Army Corps Of Engineers 404 authorization.

The proposed construction operations at low flows would have minor, if any, effects to the navigable status of the Clark Fork River through this site. There would be short term direct and in-direct effects of increased sediment during installation and removal of the proposed diversion channel that would be expected to quickly subside. Based on implementation of construction Best Management Practices, project mitigations

and all permit requirements as referenced for operations in the floodplain prior to the project approval and construction.

The proposed operations, followed by erosion control and stabilization measures are expected to result in low cumulative effects to water quality. The benefits outweigh the continued degradation of the MRL Railroad Bridge 91 and potential loss of the bridge and erosion associated impacts with no action.

---

## 6. AIR QUALITY:

*What pollutants or particulate would be produced (i.e. particulate matter from road use or harvesting, slash pile burning, prescribed burning, etc)? Identify the Airshed and Impact Zone (if any) according to the Montana/Idaho Airshed Group. Identify direct, indirect, and cumulative effects to air quality.*

Some temporary emission releases would be expected during construction activities; however, air quality would not be expected to be impacted to any measurable degree. During construction the contractor would be required to implement environmental quality controls to mitigate effects on air quality. The contractor would be required to comply with any applicable Federal, State, and local regulations concerning the prevention and control of air pollution. The contractor would be required to use reasonable methods and devices that control, prevent, and minimize emissions or discharges of air contaminants.

---

## 7. VEGETATION COVER, QUANTITY AND QUALITY:

*What changes would the action cause to vegetative communities? Consider rare plants or cover types that would be affected. Identify direct, indirect, and cumulative effects to vegetation.*

Existing Conditions: Existing vegetation within the project area is primarily a complex of native river bottom riparian species including cottonwood and coniferous trees, riparian shrubs, as well as forbs and grasses. Current noxious weed infestations on channel banks are a combination of spotted knapweed, leafy spurge and other noxious weeds. Infestations occur along portions of the project area but are outside the low water mark that is DNRC ownership.

No Action: No changes to existing vegetative conditions would occur.

Action: A minimal amount of disturbance to natural vegetation is proposed under the Action Alternative, primarily to allow for the movement of heavy equipment. River bottom habitats are favorable to rapid revegetation. The following Best Management Practices and Conservation Measures would be implemented under the Action Alternative:

\*For the Action Alternative, the contractor would be responsible for developing and implementing a weed management plan to promote revegetation and control the spread of noxious weeds and require that all equipment would be cleaned and free of weeds, seeds and excess grease before use in the waterway.

\*Disturbed areas would be revegetated with a seed mix that is appropriate for the area to control erosion and provide competition against invasive weed species. Shrub seedlings would be planted along the disturbed channel as required by the Granite County Conservation district 310 permit.

Based on implementation of BMP's and mitigations, there would be low direct, in-direct or cumulative impacts to vegetation, noxious weeds or aquatic invasive species with the proposed actions on DNRC ownership.

---

## 8. TERRESTRIAL, AVIAN AND AQUATIC LIFE AND HABITATS:

*Consider substantial habitat values and use of the area by wildlife, birds or fish. Identify direct, indirect, and cumulative effects to fish and wildlife.*

Existing Conditions: Terrestrial

Limited habitats for terrestrial wildlife exist in the project area. Surrounding uplands and riparian habitats likely support a variety of wildlife species.

No-Action: No disturbance to terrestrial wildlife would occur. No changes to existing habitats would be anticipated. Collectively, no effects to terrestrial wildlife would be anticipated.

Action Alternative: Some short-duration disturbance to terrestrial wildlife could occur. No appreciable changes to existing habitats would be anticipated. Collectively, negligible effects to terrestrial wildlife would be anticipated.

#### Existing Conditions: Fisheries

The Clark Fork River supports a diverse fishery. Species present include bull-trout, westslope cutthroat trout (WCT), mountain whitefish, northern pike minnow, longnose dace, longnose sucker, slimy sculpin, brown trout, rainbow trout, brook trout, and other minor species (MFISH 2016). Both westslope cutthroat trout and bull trout are considered sensitive species by DNRC. Bull trout is a federally threatened species and potential for impacts to this species are discussed in detail in Section 9 below.

No-Action: No changes to fisheries habitat would occur. If the railroad bridge failed, there may be an increased risk of scour of the river bed and banks that increases sedimentation and degrades water quality that can impact fish habitat. A worst case scenario might involve a bridge failure and train derailment with introduction of hazardous materials into the river.

Action Alternative: The in-stream work would occur outside the typical spring spawning period for westslope cutthroat trout and allows all fish species to seek refuge from the construction sites. The proposed activities are planned to complete operations at low flows. Work areas would be isolated from the main river with the use of ecology blocks and a diversion channel during low flows. Isolation and dewatering of the work area would minimize the effects to water quality so that potential water quality impacts downstream of the project could be minimized.

Periods of short-duration disturbance to sediment and fisheries would occur from the temporary installation and removal of the eco-blocks and a diversion channel as noted in the Water Quality section of this report. Mitigations to control erosion and sediment would be incorporated into a Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan and would be in place during construction. Direct, in-direct and cumulative impacts to fisheries associated with this project are expected to be low and of short duration that are not considered significant.

---

## **9. UNIQUE, ENDANGERED, FRAGILE OR LIMITED ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES:**

*Consider any federally listed threatened or endangered species or habitat identified in the project area. Determine effects to wetlands. Consider Sensitive Species or Species of special concern. Identify direct, indirect, and cumulative effects to these species and their habitat.*

Existing Conditions: Limited habitats for terrestrial wildlife exist in the project area. The project area is more than 1.75 miles from the Nimrod bald eagle nest; this territory has been fairly productive in the past. The aquatic habitats in the project area likely provide bald eagle foraging habitats. Surrounding uplands and riparian habitats likely support a variety of wildlife species, including common species as well as less common species such as great blue herons, Lewis's woodpeckers, and pileated woodpeckers. Proximity to Highway 90, Montana Rail Link railroad, agricultural fields, and numerous other forms of human disturbance likely limits some wildlife use of the vicinity.

No-Action: No disturbance to terrestrial wildlife would occur. No changes to existing habitats would be anticipated. Collectively, no effects to terrestrial wildlife would be anticipated.

Action Alternative: Some short-duration disturbance to terrestrial wildlife could occur. No appreciable changes to existing habitats would be anticipated. Foraging bald eagles could be disturbed by the proposed activities depending on the timing; activities would occur during the summer period at the end of

the nesting season or immediately after the nesting season. No appreciable changes in bald eagle prey species would be anticipated. Collectively, negligible effects to terrestrial threatened, endangered, or sensitive wildlife species would be anticipated.

Bull Trout Existing Conditions: Bull trout is a federally threatened species with critical habitat in the vicinity of the project area. The entire main stem of the Clark Fork River, including the project area is identified by Montana Fish, Wildlife, and Parks (MFWP) and USFWS as nodal habitat (MBTRT 2000). Nodal habitat includes those areas which provide or have the potential to provide a migratory corridor for bull trout. Bull trout presence in this segment of the Clark Fork River is low and limited to foraging and migratory use to connect to headwater streams. No bull trout spawning occurs in this or any reach of the main stem of the upper Clark Fork River. The current railroad bridge structure is not a barrier to fish migration.

Bull Trout- No Action: No immediate changes to the existing fisheries would occur, but there is an increased risk of sediments and water quality impacts if the railroad bridge was to fail.

Bull Trout Action: Potential direct and indirect impacts to bull trout at the project site: are disturbance or temporary displacement of fish in the 200-400 feet of channel diversion and project area, changes of supporting aquatic and/or riparian habitat in the project area, and project actions that cause impact water quality due to excessive sedimentation and/or the introduction of toxic substances. . Periods of short-duration disturbance to sediment and fisheries would occur from the temporary installation and removal of the eco-blocks and a diversion channel as noted in the Water Quality section 5 of this report. Mitigations to control erosion and sediment would be incorporated into "A Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan" and would be in place during construction. Additional mitigation measures include timing restrictions, implementing BMP's to minimize the extent and duration of disturbance and sedimentation, plus safety requirements for maintain clean equipment to avoid toxic introductions of greases or chemicals.

The proposed activity, that would temporarily affect approximately 400 feet of the Clark Fork River and 0.01 acre of adjacent wetland, is authorized by US Army Corps of Engineers (USACOE), NWP 3 Maintenance Permit Found in the Federal Register (76 FR 9174), Reissuance of Nationwide Permits Authorization (NWP)as outlined in USACOE memo NWO-2016-00309-MTM December 15, 2016. The proposed project authorization under this Corps permit is conditional upon compliance with all of the mandatory terms and conditions associated with the US Fish and Wildlife Service Programmatic Biological Opinion, which terms and conditions are incorporated by reference in this DNRC Land Use License.

- Migratory Fish Passage- The temporary diversion channel is designed to provide fish passage and maintain connectivity in the main river thalweg during the project.
- Ground Water-The proposed project is not expected to alter ground water resources.
- Food base for Bull Trout- The proposed operations would have minimal effect on the food base on the main river and plenty of forage remains on adjacent reaches of the river
- Based on project design and implementation of BMP'S, appropriate conservation/ coordination measures and all USACOE NWP and associated agency permit requirements, the proposed construction activities may affect but is not likely to adversely affect bull trout, or bull trout critical habitat. Potential direct, in-direct and cumulative impacts to fisheries associated with this project are expected to be low and of short duration.

---

## **10. HISTORICAL AND ARCHAEOLOGICAL SITES:**

*Identify and determine direct, indirect, and cumulative effects to historical, archaeological or paleontological resources.*

Railroad Bridge 91 crossing the Clark Fork River is historic, but it is privately owned. As such, the DNRC has no authority to dictate to the private owners how they will manage their property. Issuance of a Land Use License for repairs to this bridge would have No Effect to state-owned heritage properties as defined in the State Antiquities Act.

---

**11. AESTHETICS:**

*Determine if the project is located on a prominent topographic feature, or may be visible from populated or scenic areas. What level of noise, light or visual change would be produced? Identify direct, indirect, and cumulative effects to aesthetics.*

None. The proposed project work is mainly focused on the river bed below the water line. The water diversions would be temporary and removed at the completion of the project. River bank shrub plantings are planned as a part of the proposed erosion control and bank stabilization.

---

**12. DEMANDS ON ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCES OF LAND, WATER, AIR OR ENERGY:**

*Determine the amount of limited resources the project would require. Identify other activities nearby that the project would affect. Identify direct, indirect, and cumulative effects to environmental resources.*

None.

---

**13. OTHER ENVIRONMENTAL DOCUMENTS PERTINENT TO THE AREA:**

*List other studies, plans or projects on this tract. Determine cumulative impacts likely to occur as a result of current private, state or federal actions in the analysis area, and from future proposed state actions in the analysis area that are under MEPA review (scoped) or permitting review by any state agency.*

The Upper Clark Fork River Basin is part of a federal superfund site. The Natural Resources Damage Program within the Montana Department of Justice has and continues to do restoration work including stream and river stabilization and restoration work projects utilizing settlement money from historic mining in the Butte and Anaconda areas.

None.

IV. IMPACTS ON THE HUMAN POPULATION
<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• RESOURCES potentially impacted are listed on the form, followed by common issues that would be considered.</li><li>• Explain POTENTIAL IMPACTS AND MITIGATIONS following each resource heading.</li><li>• Enter "NONE" if no impacts are identified or the resource is not present.</li></ul>



---

**14. HUMAN HEALTH AND SAFETY:**

*Identify any health and safety risks posed by the project.*

No Action: The current railroad bridge poses a future safety hazard which in a worst case may result in a train derailment, obstruction of a navigable river, pollution of the river from transported freight, and a potential public safety hazard.

Action: One of the primary purposes of the proposed project is to extend the usable life of the railroad bridge by completing repairs to avoid structural failure. Repairing the bridge would reduce potential risks to human health and safety.

---

**15. INDUSTRIAL, COMMERCIAL AND AGRICULTURE ACTIVITIES AND PRODUCTION:**

*Identify how the project would add to or alter these activities.*

None. The proposed project would not interfere with the delivery of irrigation water to area users.

---

**16. QUANTITY AND DISTRIBUTION OF EMPLOYMENT:**

*Estimate the number of jobs the project would create, move or eliminate. Identify direct, indirect, and cumulative effects to the employment market.*

No Action: No change

Action: Construction would be expected to occur between July 1, 2017 and November 30, 2017 and would be anticipated to provide a direct short term opportunity for maintaining employment of up to 10 people while construction activities occur, as well as maintaining indirect employment opportunities to provide goods and services in support the project.

---

**17. LOCAL AND STATE TAX BASE AND TAX REVENUES:**

*Estimate tax revenue the project would create or eliminate. Identify direct, indirect, and cumulative effects to taxes and revenue.*

Minor, if any, change in tax base and tax revenues would be anticipated with selection of either alternative.

---

**18. DEMAND FOR GOVERNMENT SERVICES:**

*Estimate increases in traffic and changes to traffic patterns. What changes would be needed to fire protection, police, schools, etc.? Identify direct, indirect, and cumulative effects of this and other projects on government services*

None. Little or no change in demand for government services would be anticipated with selection of either alternative.

---

**19. LOCALLY ADOPTED ENVIRONMENTAL PLANS AND GOALS:**

*List State, County, City, USFS, BLM, Tribal, and other zoning or management plans, and identify how they would affect this project.*

None.

---

**20. ACCESS TO AND QUALITY OF RECREATIONAL AND WILDERNESS ACTIVITIES:**

*Identify any wilderness or recreational areas nearby or access routes through this tract. Determine the effects of the project on recreational potential within the tract. Identify direct, indirect, and cumulative effects to recreational and wilderness activities.*

Recreational Opportunities; Existing Conditions: The Clark Fork River is an important regional recreational resource used for fishing and floating. Fishing is not allowed from the railroad bridge. Recreational opportunities continue to increase in the area as additional parks and fishing access sites are built, open space is conserved, and trails are expanded. A new fishing access site is planned at the Bearmouth I-90 exit upstream of this bridge site. A park is planned by Five Valley's Land Trust near the mouth of Rock Creek. There is an existing MT FWP Park at the Beavertail Hill exit on I-90 that provides access to the Clark Fork River. Anglers can also access the Clark Fork River by a frontage road along segments of the river.

No Action: No change from current conditions.



Action: Project Direct & indirect Impacts: The proposed plan involves a temporary diversion of the river to dewater the site around bridge pier #4. This temporary diversion of the river channel will accentuate an existing bend in the river and has the potential to surprise floaters passing through the area. The DNRC Land Use License would contain a provision requiring that a sign be placed 300-500' upstream of the construction site during the period of temporary diversion. This sign would inform floaters of potential hazards associated with bridge construction activities and the temporary diversion of the river channel. No impact on access to any nearby formal recreational areas is expected to occur.

Potential Cumulative Impacts No permanent impact on any formal recreation access site would occur under the proposed project. No direct effect on access to any designated recreational area would occur as a result of the proposed project. The one summer season repairs would not have a lasting or measurable cumulative effect on fishing, floating or other recreational opportunities.

---

**21. DENSITY AND DISTRIBUTION OF POPULATION AND HOUSING:**

*Estimate population changes and additional housing the project would require. Identify direct, indirect, and cumulative effects to population and housing.*

None

---

**22. SOCIAL STRUCTURES AND MORES:**

*Identify potential disruption of native or traditional lifestyles or communities.*

None

---

**23. CULTURAL UNIQUENESS AND DIVERSITY:**

*How would the action affect any unique quality of the area?*

None. The proposed project involves repair of an existing structure

---

**24. OTHER APPROPRIATE SOCIAL AND ECONOMIC CIRCUMSTANCES:**

*Estimate the return to the trust. Include appropriate economic analysis. Identify potential future uses for the analysis area other than existing management. Identify direct, indirect, and cumulative economic and social effects likely to occur as a result of the proposed action.*

No Action: None

Action: Granting of the proposed Land Use License would return \$150 to the Public Land- Navigable Rivers trust (license fee) and \$50 to the state general fund (application fee)

<b>EA Checklist Prepared By:</b>	<b>Name:</b> Robert H Storer	<b>Date:</b> 2/17/2017
	<b>Title:</b> SWLO Trust Lands Program Manager	

---

**V. FINDING**

---

**25. ALTERNATIVE SELECTED: The Action Alternative-repair of the existing bridge**

---

**26. SIGNIFICANCE OF POTENTIAL IMPACTS:** Implementation of the mitigations contained within this document should prevent any significant impacts to the environment from implementation of the selected alternative.

---

**27. NEED FOR FURTHER ENVIRONMENTAL ANALYSIS:**

EIS

More Detailed EA

No Further Analysis

<b>EA Checklist Approved By:</b>	<b>Name: Jonathan Hansen Title: Missoula Unit Manager</b>
<b>Signature:</b> <i>Jonathan Hansen</i>	<b>Date:</b> <i>February 22, 2017</i>