

Memorandum

Date: 10/7/2016
To: Wade Salyards, MDT
Copy to: File
From: Kathy Harris
RE: Swan River - Bridge St (Bigfork) UPN 9020000 STPM 9015 (126)
Summary of Resource Agency Meeting on October 6, 2016

Introduction

A Resource Agency meeting for the above-mentioned project was held on October 6, 2016 at Kalispell MDT and Helena MDT Planning Offices with a phone conference connection. The purpose of the meeting was to give an overview of the feasibility study, to discuss the E-Scan and to confirm if potential environmental issues had been addressed.

The following MDT, Agency and KLJ staff attended the meeting:

Name	Company	Location	Contact
Denise Martin	DEQ	telephone	444-6578 dmartin@mt.gov
Kevin Wilkinson	DEQ	telephone	444-6545 kwilkinson@mt.gov
Leo Rosenthal	FWP	Kalispell	751-4546 lrosenthal@mt.gov
Mark Mussman	Flathead Co., Plang.	Kalispell	751-8200 mmussman@flathead.mt.gov
Susan Kilcrease	MDT-Missoula	Kalispell	523-5842 skilcrease@mt.gov
Wade Salyards	MDT-Consultant Design	Kalispell	444-0451 wsalyards@mt.gov
Joe Weigand	MDT- Environmental	Kalispell	444-9205 joweigand@mt.gov
Pam Holmquist	Flathead County	Kalispell	758.5508 pholmquist@flathead.mt.gov
Brian Goodman	MDT- Environmental	Helena	444-7632 bgoodman@mt.gov
Kathy Harris	KLJ	Kalispell	441-5784 Kathy.harris@kljeng.com
Jennifer Davis	KLJ	Helena	447-3347 Jennifer.davis@kljeng.com
Vicki Crnich	MDT-Planning	Helena	444-7653 vcrnich@mt.gov
Shane Stack	MDT - Missoula	telephone	523-5830 sstack@mt.gov



Chris Hardan	MDT - Bridge	telephone	444-9221 chardan@mt.gov
Invited but did not attend:			
Mike McGrath	USFWS	Provided advance comments which were discussed at meeting	
David Fronczak	EPA		fronczak.david@epa.gov
Deb Thomas	EPA		Thomas.debrah@Epa.gov
Robert Cole	USCOE		Robert.h.cole@usace.army.mil
Renee Lemon	FWP	444-3738	rlimon@mt.gov
Mark Deleray	FWP	751-4550	mdeleray@mt.gov
Bruce Rich	FWP	444-3183	brich@mt.gov
Chip Weber	USFS		
Dan Lozar	CSKT	676-2600	dlozar@cskt.org or djplozar@gmail.com
Kathy Olsen	DNRC	752-27-06	kolsen@mt.gov
Mindy McMcCarthy	DEQ	444-0917	
Deanna Adams	PacifiCorp		Deanna.adams@pacificorp.com

1) Welcome and Introductions

- a) Wade Salyards opened the meeting with self-introductions.

2) Overview of Feasibility Study

- a) Kathy Harris provided an overview of the feasibility study and existing bridge conditions. This study is not yet an MDT project. All options would retain the single-span bridge and the vertical type abutments.

3) E-Scan. A draft environmental scan (E-Scan) was provided to attendees in advance. Comments were requested and identification of any issues that had not been identified or other comments/concerns.

The following items were discussed, with underline added to state general consensus:

a) T&E Species and Fish:

i) **Bull trout** in Swan River/Flathead Lake:

- o The bridge is in a unique stretch of Swan River as fish move in and out from Flathead Lake within the proximity of the bridge. There is bull trout habitat above the dam. Bull trout occur in the area. Some seasonal use is anticipated.
- o Flathead Lake is considered critical habitat.
- o The bridge area is not part of a migratory corridor or a spawning or rearing habitat.

- Discussed if bridge should be treated as Flathead Lake or Swan River for habitat. Consensus was that anticipated construction operations would have minimal effect to bull trout.
 - ii) **Bald Eagle** - Overall consensus that bald eagles would not be effected by anticipated construction operations.
 - (1) Eagles typically require a ½ mile buffer
 - (2) Nearest nest is approximately 2 miles from project site.
 - (3) USFWS had provided comments to determine if nests are documented within 2-mile radius of the site. FWP and MDT concurred that the ½ mile buffer seemed applicable, in accordance with the *Montana Bald Eagle Management Guidelines*.
 - iii) **Western Slope Cutthroat trout** occur in Flathead Lake and should be (additionally) noted in the E-scan. Similar to bull trout, the site may have these fish but it is not key habitat for spawning or migration therefore no timing restrictions due to eggs or migration are requested. Leo noted that it may be possible to relax work windows restrictions for this bridge project.
 - iv) **Overall wildlife comments**
 - (1) No timing restrictions anticipated for aquatic species
 - (2) If this feasibility study proceeds to an MDT project, MDT will prepare a Biological Resource Report and/or Biological Assessment and follow their standard processes.
- b) **Hazardous contamination in the study area:**
- i) The site adjoins a superfund site and requires coordination with DEQ. PacifiCorp participates in the Voluntary Cleanup and Redevelopment Act (VCRA).
 - ii) Soil and/or water contamination possible on the south side of the existing bridge.
 - iii) Brian noted that pre-construction sampling would likely need to occur around the abutments.
 - iv) Coordination would need to occur with DEQ and PacifiCorp regarding any sampling.
 - v) DEQ noted that if any work occurs in the contaminated sediment area, consultation with DEQ will need to occur
 - vi) Additional sampling was completed this spring (2016) at locations shown in Appendix A of the E-scan through the VCRA program.
 - vii) PacifiCorp filed an EA this spring that was deficient/incomplete. New version to be submitted to DEQ any day. MDT and KLJ requested a copy of new draft EA (need to email Kevin Wilkinson).
 - viii) Brian noted that MDT typically negotiates advance agreements for encountering contaminated materials with the responsible party, often prior to construction. This project may require unique approach as Flathead County is the project owner. It is uncertain how PacifiCorp may approach a formal agreement. Negotiations will proceed on a case-by case basis.

- c) **Lead-based paint is on the current bridge.** Any project will need special provisions for encountering lead-based paint. Agencies requested that:
 - i) work be completed away from the river when possible, to minimize materials dropping into the river
 - ii) bridge should be removed in one piece (not demolished or de-constructed in-place), if possible.
 - iii) Encapsulate bridge during removal, if possible.
- d) **Old Concrete - Asbestos.** A remote possibility exists of encountering asbestos at bridge abutments (does not typically happen with bridge concrete). Brian stated in his experience no asbestos has been noted in bridge concrete.
- e) **Water Quality-stormwater runoff.** The current wooden deck allows stormwater to discharge into the river. The options being considered would plan to capture stormwater and carry it to existing facilities to deter runoff directly discharging into the river.
- f) **Recreation** - No project impacts are anticipated to recreational uses at Sliter Park.
- g) **Floodplain discussions** concerned the bridge opening. Most of the bridge options considered would provide a thicker girder than the existing-thereby reducing the bridge opening. Flathead County and FWP noted that the concerns are primarily toward maintaining freeboard. The county passed updated regulations (in 2016) which require 2-foot of freeboard above the floodplain. Freeboard for recreational users (kayaks, paddleboarders) was discussed but, due to existing, high clearance, is not considered a key issue.

