



**WHITEFISH**  
U.S. HIGHWAY 93

# US HIGHWAY 93 WHITEFISH URBAN AND WEST PROJECTS

## Environmental Re-evaluation Summary of Environmental Impacts

ENVIRONMENTAL ELEMENT	NO-BUILD	FEIS PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE	CURRENT PROPOSED ACTION
<b>Traffic</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Decrease in circulation.</li> <li>Increase in delays and congestion.</li> <li>Increase in safety problems.</li> <li>No parking spaces lost.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improved circulation, traffic operations and safety.</li> <li>Reduced delay and congestion.</li> <li>Increased out-of-direction travel time on one-way streets.</li> <li>Increased traffic on Baker Ave.</li> <li>Approximately 115 parking spaces would be lost.</li> <li>Restrictive access control would cause some minor street intersections to be limited to right-turns only.</li> <li>Motorists would experience some detours and delays during construction.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic operation, safety, parking, access, and construction detours and delay impacts are similar to those discussed in FEIS.</li> <li>Urban – Further reduced delay and congestion, but capacity and geometric needs not completely addressed.</li> <li>West – Improved safety and capacity with additional turn lanes and access reconfiguration.</li> </ul>
<b>Land Use</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Worsening congestion would slow business development.</li> <li>Development would be more likely to occur in agricultural areas.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Urban - Baker Avenue would experience increased commercial development.</li> <li>West - Denser and more coordinated development would be encouraged.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Similar to the FEIS, but does not comply with newly adopted (April 2006) Whitefish Downtown Business District Master Plan on Second Street.</li> </ul>
<b>Farmland</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No impacts</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No impacts</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No impacts</li> </ul>
<b>Social</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Travel times will continue to increase.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There might be some influence on the geographic distribution of future settlement wherever the highway substantially changes the quality of access into areas with development potential.</li> <li>There would be impacts to low intensity commercial and residential uses along Baker.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Similar to the FEIS, but intersection and street widths, and pedestrian crossing distances would increase in the urban project area.</li> </ul>
<b>Relocation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No impacts</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Urban - Approximately 0.17 ha (0.4 ac) of right-of-way acquired.</li> <li>West - Approximately 6.52 ha (16.1 ac) of right-of-way acquired</li> <li>No residential or business acquisitions were identified at the level of detail analyzed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Urban – Additional right-of-way would be acquired and there would be commercial and residential relocations.</li> <li>West - Approximately 22 ha (54 ac) of right-of-way acquired; 2 commercial relocations and 18 residential relocations.</li> </ul>
<b>Economic</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Worsening congestion would limit economic viability.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There would be business growth along commercial strips from highway improvements.</li> <li>Commercial opportunities on Baker Ave would improve.</li> <li>A better downtown driving environment would enhance shopping opportunities.</li> <li>One-way streets could have a negative economic impact.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Similar to FEIS.</li> <li>Two businesses would be acquired in the urban project area. Increased intersection and street widths on Second Street would further divide downtown business north and south of Second Street and would conflict with business-related guiding principles of the Downtown Master Plan.</li> </ul>
<b>Pedestrian and Bicyclists</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increased congestion decreases safety and function.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improved pedestrian/bicyclist facilities.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Similar to FEIS, but pedestrians and bicyclists would experience wider intersections and increased crossing distances on Second Street.</li> <li>Additional facilities would further improve connectivity, especially at under crossings and bridges.</li> </ul>
<b>Air Quality</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Re-entrained road dust and smoke produced by residential wood burning were the likely largest PM<sub>10</sub> emission sources.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Emissions would be higher in the Whitefish Nonattainment Area.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Similar to the FEIS, but a reduction in traffic congestion would decrease vehicle emissions downtown.</li> </ul>
<b>Noise</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Existing noise levels along US 93 approach or exceed FHWA NAC. Truck noise would continue to increase downtown.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No receptors are expected to receive a noticeable increase in noise.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Similar to FEIS preferred alternative.</li> </ul>
<b>Water Resources and Quality</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No new impervious surfaces.</li> <li>No new river encroachment.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Urban - increased impurities in storm water runoff due to 0.62 ha (1.52 ac) of new impervious surface.</li> <li>West - Increased impurities in storm water runoff due to 3 ha (7.9 ac) of new impervious surface.</li> <li>Urban - There would be 32 m<sup>3</sup> (41 yd<sup>3</sup>) of new river encroachment.</li> <li>West - There would be 14 m<sup>3</sup> (18 yd<sup>3</sup>) of new river encroachment.</li> <li>There would be a new bridge over the Whitefish River.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Urban – There would be increased impurities in storm water runoff due new impervious surface</li> <li>West – Increased impurities in storm water runoff due to 5.77 ha (14.26 ac) of new impervious surface.</li> <li>The areas of river encroachment would be similar to the areas discussed in the FEIS.</li> <li>Removal of culverts at the Spokane bridge would improve water quality.</li> </ul>



**WHITEFISH**  
U.S. HIGHWAY 93

# US HIGHWAY 93 WHITEFISH URBAN AND WEST PROJECTS

## Environmental Re-evaluation Summary of Environmental Impacts

ENVIRONMENTAL ELEMENT	NO-BUILD	FEIS PREFERRED ALTERNATIVE	CURRENT PROPOSED ACTION
<b>Wetlands</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No impacts.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>0.04 ha (0.10 ac) of wetland impacts were identified at the level of detail analyzed.</li> </ul>	<p>There would be new wetland impacts in the west project area that were not identified in the FEIS.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Urban – A greater number of wetlands would be impacted than discussed in the FEIS.</li> <li>West - 1.346 ha (3.326 ac) of wetlands would be impacted.</li> <li>There would be a total of 1.4 ha (3.5 ac) of wetland impacts.</li> </ul>
<b>Fisheries and Wildlife</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No impacts.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Impacts to fish and wildlife are expected to be minor due to the lack of important habitat features in the project area and due to the current urbanization of the project area.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Similar to FEIS preferred alternative.</li> <li>Minor increase in wildlife habitat converted.</li> <li>Removal of culverts on Spokane would improve fish and wildlife passage.</li> </ul>
<b>Floodplains</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No impacts.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Minor new encroachments at bridges.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Similar to FEIS.</li> <li>Removal of culverts on Spokane would reduce the existing encroachment areas.</li> </ul>
<b>Threatened and Endangered Species</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No impacts.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No adverse indirect, direct, or cumulative impacts were anticipated to bald eagles and their nests, or to peregrine falcons as a result of the proposed project.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Listed threatened and endangered species have changed since the FEIS was written.</li> <li>The proposed action will have no effect on the gray wolf and Canada lynx.</li> <li>A may affect, not likely to adversely affect determination is rendered with regard to grizzly bear and bald eagle.</li> <li>A may effect, likely to adversely affect determination is rendered with regard to bull trout.</li> </ul>
<b>Cultural Resources</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increased traffic congestion and noise along Baker, Spokane, and 2<sup>nd</sup> St would have a negative affect on cultural resources.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The project would affect visual characteristics of the setting of eligible properties.</li> <li>All construction would be confined to the existing right-of-way and no trees would be removed, therefore no direct or indirect impacts would occur.</li> <li>The addition of sidewalks where none currently exist along West Second Street would constitute an Adverse Effect to the setting of the historic neighborhood.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Urban - Additional analysis is needed in the urban portion of the project in order to minimize potential impacts, investigate potential avoidance alternatives, and develop mitigation measures.</li> <li>West - A portion of six historic properties would be acquired. One historic property would be temporarily impacted during construction. Although portions of properties along Second Street and US 93 west of State Park Road would be incorporated into MDT's right-of-way, MDT determined and SHPO concurred there would be <b>NO ADVERSE EFFECT</b> to the setting of the historic properties.</li> </ul>
<b>Parks and Recreation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increased noise and traffic congestion at parks.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There would be minor indirect impacts related to access and visual criteria.</li> <li>There would be no purchase or direct conversion of use of parks and recreation properties.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>There would be new temporary impacts during construction at Kay Beller Park and Grouse Mountain Park.</li> <li>There would be new permanent, beneficial changes to the under crossing at the Whitefish Lake Golf Club.</li> <li>A portion of the road to the Skyles Lake Fishing Access Site would be improved and permanently incorporated into MDT right-of-way.</li> </ul>
<b>Hazardous Materials</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Sites with potential hazardous materials would continue to exist in the project area, but would not be disturbed by construction of this project.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Potential concerns with 2 sites were identified at the level of detail analyzed.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Urban – A greater number of sites were identified as having documented or potential hazardous material contamination issues than the FEIS.</li> <li>West - A total of 5 additional sites in the west segment were identified as having documented or potential hazardous material contamination issues.</li> </ul>
<b>Visual Resources</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No impacts.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Urban - Traffic would be split between two major streets</li> <li>Special design concepts would be an improvement in Urban and West.</li> <li>West - There would be expanded roadway fill and clear zones, and new cut and fill sections</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Similar to the FEIS, but displacement of four buildings and wider intersections in the Whitefish Urban project area would result in a loss of some of the visual character in the downtown area.</li> </ul>
<b>Energy</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>No energy impacts to construct and greater energy would be lost to traffic congestion.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Construction operations consume energy.</li> <li>Decreased vehicular fuel consumption due to better traffic flow.</li> <li>Greater roadway surface requires more maintenance.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Similar to FEIS preferred alternative.</li> <li>Further reductions in congestion would result in greater reductions in fuel consumption.</li> </ul>
<b>Implementation</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Not applicable.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Traffic would be delayed during construction. A temporary rerouting of vehicles on to city side streets will increase trip times.</li> <li>Construction improvements would have positive short-term impacts on the local economy and would cause a small short-term increase in the local population.</li> <li>Construction improvements would expose persons living or working near the project area to noise and dust inconveniences.</li> <li>Construction in an urban area including utility relocation is time consuming.</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Similar to FEIS preferred alternative.</li> </ul>