

# South Avenue Bridge

BCC Meeting

Tuesday, March 12, 2019





# 01 Project Overview

# Project History and Overview

- 80s-90s: Need to replace Maclay Bridge identified – Maclay Bridge Site Selection Study Environmental Assessment developed (1994)
- 2002: Missoula County nominated bridge replacement project to receive funding from the MDT Off-System Bridge Program
- 2010: Missoula County entered into agreement with MDT to conduct a pre-National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)/Montana Environmental Policy Act (MEPA) planning study
- 2013: Maclay Bridge Planning Study completed
  - Evaluated a range of alternatives including major and minor rehabilitation options and “Do Nothing” option
- 2013: Missoula BCC voted to pursue federal funding to replace Maclay Bridge with new bridge on the South 1 Alignment (BCC 2013-052)

## Project History and Overview (cont'd)

- 2014: Project Specific Agreement executed between County and MDT for preliminary engineering of Bitterroot River-W of Missoula (South Ave Bridge) project
- 2015: Missoula BCC reaffirms commitment to replacing Maclay Bridge with a new structure at South Ave (BCC 2015-046)
- April 2015: Missoula County enters into agreement with HDR for professional engineering services
- Sept 22, 2015: Public Open House #1
- Jan 14, 2016: HDR conducted environmental review process meeting with MDT and FHWA.
- Aug 16, 2016: Public Open House #2
- Dec 22, 2016: Missoula County & HDR submitted Draft Environmental Document to MDT

## Project History and Overview (cont'd)

- Aug 2, 2017: MDT & FHWA returned comments on Draft Environmental Document
- Oct 27, 2017: FHWA/MDT/Missoula County/HDR Environmental Review Meeting
- July 26, 2018: Contract amended for HDR to conduct Maclay Bridge rehabilitation alternative analysis, yellow-billed cuckoo survey
- Aug 30, 2018: Missoula County & HDR submitted Draft Maclay Bridge Preservation Alternatives Analysis to MDT
- Sept 2018: MDT returned comments on Draft Maclay Bridge Preservation Alternatives Analysis
- Oct 8, 2018: Missoula County & HDR re-submitted revised Environmental Document to MDT
- January 2019: Missoula County & HDR submitted revised Maclay Bridge Preservation Alternatives Analysis to MDT
- As of Today: Awaiting MDT's review of Environmental Document





# 02 BCC Questions

1. How might HDR facilitate the process moving forward to accomplish the following:

a) Abandon the current Categorical Exclusion (CE) approach based on significance of impacts and new information;

1. How might HDR facilitate the process moving forward to accomplish the following:

b) Amend the 10/23/14 project specific agreement with MDT to elevate the level of federal National Environmental Policy Act/Montana Environmental Policy Act (NEPA/MEPA) analysis to include at least three options: no build, Maclay Bridge rehabilitation, and South Avenue Bridge. Section 4(a) of this agreement allows for modification and amendment, which would avoid triggering termination of the current project/payback of planning funds and, instead, broaden the scope and array of options for the current project; and



1. How might HDR facilitate the process moving forward to accomplish the following:

c) Expand the current analysis to an Environmental Analysis (EA) or Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and include a robust Maclay Bridge rehabilitation option based on select design exceptions. HDR's existing environmental documentation could be modified and folded into an expanded analysis.

2. What would have been the additional review and process if HDR had been required to follow the NEPA environmental review process rather than the selected categorical exclusion process?

**3.** Did you incorporate the two studies sent forth by Maclay Bridge Alliance (MBA) on traffic and structural safety in your consideration of a rehab-in-place option? If not, as your initial report predates these studies, could you review them and make a new determination based in part on your assessment of the value, merit and conclusions of those studies?

4. Your report calls for changes to the approaches as part of a rehab option according to the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) guidelines. As these are guidelines, not requirements, and we are considering a historic structure, could you look again at a rehab option and estimate costs without changing the approaches?

**5. Has HDR fully examined Bridge rehabilitation documents such as “Best Practices and Lessons Learned on the Preservation and Rehabilitation of Historic Bridges, 7/2012, prepared for AASHTO, or other similar documents?**

6. A Categorical Exclusion (CE) was deemed not sufficient for the two-lane Nixon structure in Gallatin county. How does this situation compare with ours?



7. A similar one-lane structure was rehabbed in the Swan, how does ours differ functionally, irrespective of the approaches?

**8. Has HDR fully examined other state's bridge rehabilitation programs?**

**9. Clarify the 4(f) evaluation process.**

# Section 4(f)

- Refers to Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act of 1966
- Enacted to protect publically owned parks, recreation areas, wildlife and waterfowl refuges, and public and private historic sites of local, state, and national significance.
- Federally-funded transportation projects cannot impact Section 4(f)-protected properties unless there are no feasible and prudent avoidance alternatives and all possible planning to minimize harm has occurred; or
- FHWA makes a *de minimis* impact determination
- Types of Section 4(f) Documentation
  - *De Minimis* determination
  - Programmatic Section 4(f) Evaluation – Currently 5 nationwide Programmatic Section 4(f) Evaluation available
  - Full Section 4(f) Evaluation – For projects that do not meet *de minimis* criteria or do not meet conditions for applicability of a Programmatic Section 4(f) evaluation

## Section 4(f) (cont'd)

- Section 4(f) applies to this project: The proposed project being advanced by Missoula County involves removal of the NRHP-listed Maclay Bridge
- Programmatic Section 4(f) Evaluation applicable to this project: Programmatic Section 4(f) Evaluation and Approval for FHWA Projects that Necessitate the Use of Historic Bridges
  - This programmatic evaluation sets forth the basis for approval that there are no feasible and prudent alternatives to the use of certain historic bridge structures to be replaced or rehabilitated with Federal funds and that the projects include all possible planning to minimize harm resulting from the use
  - Routinely used by MDT for projects removing historic bridges
- Section 4(f) regulation require an evaluation of alternatives to demonstrate that alternatives to removing Maclay Bridge are not feasible and prudent (49 USC § 303(c))

## Section 4(f) (cont'd)

- Feasible and Prudent Avoidance Alternatives (defined in 23 CFR 774.17)
  - (1) A feasible and prudent avoidance alternative avoids using Section 4(f) property and does not cause other severe problems of a magnitude that substantially outweighs the importance of protecting the Section 4(f) property. In assessing the importance of protecting the Section 4(f) property, it is appropriate to consider the relative value of the resource to the preservation purpose of the statute.
  - (2) An alternative is not feasible if it cannot be built as a matter of sound engineering judgment.
  - (3) An alternative is not prudent if:
    - (i) It compromises the project to a degree that it is unreasonable to proceed with the project in light of its stated purpose and need;
    - (ii) It results in unacceptable safety or operational problems;
    - (iii) After reasonable mitigation, it still causes: Severe social, economic, or environmental impacts; Severe disruption to established communities; Severe disproportionate impacts to minority or low income populations; or Severe impacts to environmental resources protected under other Federal statutes;
    - (iv) It results in additional construction, maintenance, or operational costs of an extraordinary magnitude;
    - (v) It causes other unique problems or unusual factors; or
    - (vi) It involves multiple factors in paragraphs (3)(i) through (3)(v) of this definition, that while individually minor, cumulatively cause unique problems or impacts of extraordinary magnitude.



## Section 4(f) (cont'd) – Rehabilitation Alternatives

- To meet this requirement, the *Maclay Bridge Preservation Options Analysis* was developed
  - Evaluated rehabilitation options presented by Maclay Bridge Alliance that meet the project Purpose and Need
  - Included bridge structure and bridge approaches, and cost estimates

**Table 4: Summary of Evaluation Options**

	MBA Option 2	MBA Option 3	Preservation Option A (includes new South Avenue Bridge)
Approximate acreage needed for new right of way?	4.9 acres	6.5 acres	5.4 acres (for new bridge approaches and realignment of River Pines Rd)
Approximate number of residential relocations?	5	6	0
Substantial structural modifications to Maclay Bridge needed?	Yes	Yes	No
Estimated Cost (2018 dollars)	\$12.6M	\$14.1M	\$12.8M (minimum)

- Cost estimates for Options 2 and 3 exclude costs associated with residential relocations
- The *Maclay Bridge Preservation Options Analysis* currently under review by MDT and FHWA

HDR