

Agenda
Environmental coordination meeting
January 14, 2016
Missoula County, MDT, HDR & FHWA

Purpose: To facilitate the coordination of schedules and activities for environmental compliance.

Introductions

LAG Process

Transition from planning study to MEPA/NEPA document

Coordination

Scheduling

- Expected documents and review time for MDT and FHWA
- The following items are included in 300 section of the Scope (environmental document)
 - Level of Environmental Document form
 - Cultural Resource Inventory Report-draft & final-[HRA]
 - Categorical Exclusion-draft & final
 - Section 4(f) Evaluations-draft & final [4 properties]
 - Biological Assessment-draft & final
 - Wetland and stream delineation & reporting-draft & final
 - Noise Analysis Report and ISA

Technical Design Committee

Preliminary Agency Consultation Meeting

Loose ends / concerns



MISSOULA COUNTY
SOUTH AVENUE BRIDGE
ENVIRONMENTAL MEETING

Thursday, January 14th, 2016
HDR Engineering
1:00 - 3:00pm

NAME	AFFILIATION	ADDRESS	E-MAIL
Jon Schick	HDR	-	jon.schick@hdrinc.com
HEIDY BRUNER	MDT		hbruner@mt.gov
Susan Killecrease	MDT		skillecrease@mt.gov
BRIAN HASSELBACH	FHWA		BRIAN.HASSELBACH@DOT.GOV
Chris Kelly	HDR		-
ERIK DICKSON	MISSOULA COUNTY		edickson@co.missoula.mt.us
GENE KAUFMAN	FHWA		gene.kaufman@dot.gov
DESTIN HROSE	HDR		
Shane Stack	MDT		sstack@mt.gov
Vince 1220	HDR		Vincent.1220@hdrinc.com
Terry Voeller	MDT		tvoeller@mt.gov



Meeting Notes

Subject: South Avenue Bridge Environmental Discussion

Date: Thursday, January 14, 2016

Location: HDR Missoula

Attendees: Greg Robertson (Missoula County), Erik Dickson (Missoula County), Terry Voeller (MDT), Susan Kilcrease (MDT), Heidi Bruner (MDT), Shane Stack (MDT), Joe Weigand (MDT), Gene Kaufman (FHWA), Brian Hasselbeck (FHWA), Dan Harmon (HDR), Jon Schick (HDR), Vince Izzo (HDR), Dustin Hirose (HDR), Chris Kelly (HDR), Bob Schweitzer (Public), Fred Stewart (Public)

Introductions/Sign-in

Status Updates:

- HDR provided an overview of the project area and reviewed conceptual assumptions used to develop scope of services
- HDR provided an overall project schedule, similar to that shown in the September Public Informational Meeting.
- HDR reported the public kick-off was conducted on September 22, 2015.
- HDR reported that the next public meeting is planned to be held mid-March 2016.
- HDR reported the last formal public meeting is planned to be held October 2016

PowerPoint Presentation:

- Right-of-Entry:
 - HDR provided an overview of their right-of-entry request process and the results were described and displayed.
 - The project team has conducted aerial survey to avoid crossing property lines where access was denied.
- Hydraulics & Hydrology Evaluation:
 - DJ&A has conducted bathymetric in river using a boat
 - The LIDAR survey had some shadows (areas without digital points in the survey file), which is being currently addressed and fixed.
- HDR reported that the Field Survey is complete.
- Geotechnical:

- HDR reported that there was limited access for the drilling operation; the project team proceeded with drillings on both ends of the span, close to where each abutment will likely be. Tetra Tech drilled on River Pines and at end of South Avenue.
- Public Involvement/Stakeholder Coordination:
 - 12 Stakeholder/Neighborhood Meetings have been scoped but HDR will conduct more meetings if necessary, as Missoula County deems appropriate
 - Responses to Public Comments received to-date and from the first Public Informational Meeting are planned to be completed and distributed soon.
 - Dan Harmon from HDR will schedule a Resource Agency Meeting. MDT has offered to assist in coordinating the meetings, and will provide suggested information for the use in coordinating with the agencies.

NEPA/MEPA Documentation and Process:

Cultural Resources:

- HDR has received a draft copy of the Cultural Resources report from Historical Research Associates. The report will soon be finalized.

BRR/BA:

- HDR reported the ESA consultation is underway.

Noise Analysis:

- HDR reported on the noise analysis plan and locations for noise sampling. The work is weather dependent, and Jon Schick from HDR will collect field data as soon as weather permits.

Environmental Document:

Section 4(f) Evaluation:

The MDT programmatic agreement on canals is for the Section 106 process and does not apply to the Section 4(f) evaluation. The canals will need to be evaluated under 4(f).

Other Resources/Analyses:

LAG Manual:

- The group in attendance discussed review times; Susan Kilcrease from MDT requested folks to mention any specific review requirements so they can be included in the schedule, specifically any source documents needed that haven't been identified.
- MDT indicated they want a good mix of everyone's involvement. MDT does not want to be overly burdensome, but MDT and FHWA indicated they are the final signatories.
- FHWA indicated their environmental review and documentation requirements are fulfilled by MDT's requirements.

Transition:

- MDT clarified that this project is part of the process of transitioning from the 2013 Maclay Bridge Planning Study to the formal MEPA/NEPA process and documentation.

Technical Design Committee:

- HDR and Missoula County will work together to get the date set for the final development of the TDC. It is intended to get the TDC in place as soon as possible.

Agency Coordination & Environmental Document:

- HDR reported a Draft submittal is planned in August 2016.
- MDT/FHWA questions how does this fit into AGR and scope of work for design – are there additional schedule conflicts? - The project alignment and grade submittal is currently scheduled for March 2016, at the same timeframe as the second public meeting.
- There was discussion on MDT's standard Scope of Work Document and the timing of the Environmental document:
 - MDT's process includes a Scope of Work Report as the first step in final design, which is why the environmental document should be completed and approved prior to a signed scope of work document. The LAG process may be different.
 - The group agreed that final design work cannot be moved-on prior to the NEPA documentation being completed (20-50% design, usually 30%); MDT cautioned that if the project Team moves forward and NEPA isn't approved,

then there is risk for re-design. The NEPA documentation needs to be aligned with the final design concept.

- The entire group agreed that completing enough design to complete NEPA document is necessary.
- A project Scope of Work document is included in HDR's scope of services and will follow completion of the Environmental document.
- A question was raised to Terry Voeller from MDT whether the project will be in MDT's new project management system? Yes. Terry indicated he wanted a better idea of the planned project schedule before he entered the project into the system. Terry indicated he will explain to the MDT EPS staff the need for this to be customized.
- The question was raised regarding MDT's reviews, and what timelines will be expected for each report? Heidi Bruner from MDT indicated reviews will take between 2 to 4 weeks for each deliverable. The group agreed that the timing will work for Missoula County and HDR.
- MDT noted that for visualizations for the Resource Agency meetings that MDT will provide assistance and show HDR what MDT typically provides for agency coordination (MDT has long-standing relationships, know what agencies will want). MDT will provide Missoula County and HDR the assistance for the agency meetings, and will provide input on questions that the agencies typically ask. HDR will work through Erik Dickson with Missoula County for communications with MDT on this item.
- FHWA requested that since the project is transitioning from planning to NEPA: In NEPA doc, they requested that the project team provide background on development of planning study, key conclusions, and other details that springboard into the NEPA analysis. FHWA recommended that, in order to bring closure to the earlier Environmental Assessment conducted in approximately 1994, the environmental document for the current project include acknowledgement of previous Environmental Assessment to provide closure on the earlier document.
- MDT questioned whether FHWA has any concerns with the direction MDT and Missoula County are taking on this project? MDT indicated they in no way want to lose Federal funding for the project.
 - FHWA indicated that the schedule dovetails well with FHWA's process and the planned scope of services is laid out appropriately.
 - FHWA indicated that quite a bit of work has been done which is good. They indicated that the environmental documentation being completed after

necessary reports are done, and final design needs to occur after approval of the environmental document.

Questions/Discussion:

- HDR questioned MDT's preference for the format of the survey – grid or ground coordinates? MDT indicated they have no preferences (road work typically uses grid coordinates and bridge work typically uses ground coordinates). Terry deferred to Missoula County on their preferences. See it as a guideline, not anticipated to meet MDT survey requirements. MDT's preference is to use ground coordinates for the entire design delivery.