



RECEIVED

JAN 24 2012

ENVIRONMENTAL

MASTER FILE
COPY

January 19, 2012

Kevin McLaury
Division Administrator
Federal Highway Administration
585 Shepard Way
Helena MT 59601

**Subject: Programmatic Categorical Exclusion (PCE) Concurrence Request
NH 24-3(25)76
Lincoln-East
CN: 4322**

Dear Kevin McLaury:

This submittal requests approval of the above-mentioned proposed project as a Categorical Exclusion under the provisions of 23 CFR 771.117(d) and the Programmatic Agreement as signed by MDT and FHWA on April 12, 2001. This proposed action also qualifies as a Categorical Exclusion under ARM 18.2.261 (MCA 75-1-103 and MCA 75-1-201).

The following form provides documentation required to demonstrate that all of the conditions are satisfied to qualify for a Programmatic Categorical Exclusion. A copy of the Alignment and Grade Review Report, dated August 20, 2010, including a project location map, is attached. In the following form, "N/A" indicates not applicable; "UNK" indicates unknown.

NOTE: A response in a large box will require additional documentation for a Categorical Exclusion request in accordance with 23 CFR 771.117(d).

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>N/A</u>	<u>UNK</u>
1. This proposed project would have (a) significant environmental impact(s) as defined under 23 CFR 771.117(a).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. This proposed project involves (an) unusual circumstance(s) as described under 23 CFR 771.117(b).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. This proposed project involves one (or more) of the following situations where				
A. Right-of-way, easements and/or construction permits would be required.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1. The context or degree of the right-of-way action would have (a) substantial social, economic, or environmental effect(s).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. A high rate of residential growth exists in the area of the proposed project.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. A high rate of commercial growth exists in the area of the proposed project.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Work would be on and/or within approximately 1.6 kilometers (1± mile) of an Indian Reservation.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>N/A</u>	<u>UNK</u>
5. Parks, recreational, or other properties acquired/improved under Section 6(f) of the 1965 National Land & Water Conservation Fund Act (16 USC 460L, <i>et seq.</i>) are on or adjacent to the proposed project area.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The use of such Section 6(f) sites would be documented and compensated with the appropriate agencies (MDFWP, local entities, etc.).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Sites either on, or eligible for the National Register of Historic Places with concurrence in determination of eligibility or effect under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (16 USC 470, <i>et seq.</i>) by the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) would be affected by this proposed project.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. Parks, recreation sites, school grounds, wildlife refuges, historic sites, historic bridges, or irrigation that might be considered under Section 4(f) of the 1966 US Department Of Transportation Act (49 USC 303) are on or adjacent to the project area.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a. The proposed project would not impact the site(s), so a 4(f) evaluation is not necessary.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. A de minimis finding has been secured for this project.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Nationwide Programmatic Section 4(f) Evaluation forms for those sites are attached.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. This proposed project requires a full Section 4(f) Evaluation.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
B. The activity would involve work in a streambed, wetland, and/or other water body (ies) considered as "waters of the United States" or similar (e.g., "state waters").	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1. Conditions set forth in Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act (33 USC 403) and/or Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (33 USC 1251-1376) codified at 33 CFR 320-330 would be met.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Impacts in wetlands, including but not limited to those referenced under Executive Order (EO) #11990, and proposed mitigation would be coordinated with the US Army Corps of Engineers and other Resource Agencies (Federal, State, and Tribal) as required for permitting.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. A 124SPA would be obtained from the MDFWP.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. A delineated floodplain exists in the proposed project area under FEMA's Floodplain Management criteria.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The water surface at the 100-year flood limit elevation would exceed floodplain management criteria due to an encroachment by the proposed project.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. A Tribal Water Permit would be required.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Work would be required in, across, and/or adjacent to a river that is a component of, or proposed for inclusion in Montana's Wild and/or Scenic Rivers system as published by the US Department of Agriculture, or the US Department of the Interior.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>N/A</u>	<u>UNK</u>
The designated National Wild and/or Scenic River systems in Montana are:				
a. Middle Fork of the Flathead River (headwaters to South Fork confluence).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. North Fork of the Flathead River (Canadian Border to Middle Fork confluence).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. South Fork of the Flathead River (headwaters to Hungry Horse Reservoir).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Missouri River (Fort Benton to Charles M. Russell National Wildlife Refuge).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
In accordance with Section 7 of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (16 USC 1271 – 1287), this work would be coordinated and documented with either the Flathead National Forest (Flathead River), or US Bureau of Land Management (Missouri River).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
C. This is a "Type I" action as defined under 23 CFR 772.5(h), which typically consists of highway construction on a new location or the physical alteration of an existing route which substantially changes its horizontal or vertical alignments or increases the number of through-traffic lanes.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1. If yes, are there potential noise impacts?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. A Noise Analysis would be completed.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. There would be compliance with the provisions of both 23 CFR 772 for FHWA's Noise Impact analyses and MDT's Noise Policy.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
D. Substantial changes in access control would be associated with the proposed project.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
If yes, would they result in extensive economic and/or social impacts on the affected locations?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
E. The use of a temporary road, detour, or ramp closure having the following conditions when the action(s) associated with such facilities:				
1. Provisions would be made for access by local traffic, and be posted for same.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Adverse effects to through-traffic dependant businesses would be avoided or minimized.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. Interference to local events would be minimized to all possible extent.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Substantial controversy associated with this pending action would be avoided.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
F. Hazardous wastes /substances, as defined by the US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and/or the Montana Department of Environmental Quality (MDEQ), and/or (a) listed "Superfund" (under CERCLA or CECRA) site(s) are currently on and/or adjacent to this proposed project.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>N/A</u>	<u>UNK</u>
All reasonable measures would be taken to avoid and/or minimize substantial impacts from same.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
G. The Stormwater Discharge conditions (ARM 17.30.1101-1117), including temporary erosion control features for construction would be met.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
H. Permanent desirable vegetation with an approved seeding mixture would be established on exposed areas.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
I. Documentation of an invasive species review to comply with both EO #13112 and the County Noxious Weed Control Act (7-22-2152, MCA), including directions as specified by the county(ies) wherein its intended work would be done would be conducted.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
J. There are "Prime" or "Prime if Irrigated" Farmlands designated by the Natural Resources Conservation Service on or adjacent to the proposed project area. If the proposed work would affect Important Farmlands, then an AD 1006 Farmland Conversion Impact Rating form would be completed in accordance with the Farmland Protection Policy Act (7 USC 4201, <i>et seq.</i>).	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
K. Features for the Americans with Disabilities Act (PL 101 336) compliance would be included.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
L. A written Public Involvement Plan would be completed in accordance with MDT's Public Involvement Handbook.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. This proposed project complies with the Clean Air Act's Section 176(c) (42 USC 7521(a), as amended) under the provisions of 40 CFR 81.327 as it is either in a Montana air quality:				
A. "Unclassifiable"/attainment area. This proposed project is not covered under the EPA's September 15, 1997 Final Rule on air quality conformity. and/or	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
B. "Nonattainment" area. However, this type of proposed project is either exempted from the conformity determination requirements (under EPA's September 15, 1997 Final Rule), or a conformity determination would be documented in coordination with the responsible agencies (Metropolitan Planning Organizations, MDEQ Air Quality Division, etc.).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
C. Is this proposed project in a "Class I Air Shed" under 40 CFR 52.1382(c)(3)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Federally listed Threatened or Endangered (T/E) Species:				
A. Recorded occurrences, and/or critical habitat are in the vicinity of the proposed project.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
B. Would this proposed project result in a "jeopardy" opinion (under 50 CFR 402) from the Fish and Wildlife Service on any Federally listed T/E Species?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

The proposed project would not induce significant land use changes, nor promote unplanned growth. No significant effects on access to adjacent property or to present traffic patterns would occur.

This proposed project would not create disproportionately high and/or adverse impacts on the health or environment of minority and/or low-income populations (EO #12898). The project also complies with the provisions of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 USC 2000d) under FHWA regulations (23 CFR 200).

In accordance with the provisions of 23 CFR 771.117(a), this pending action would not cause significant individual, secondary, or cumulative environmental impacts. FHWA concurrence that this proposed project is properly classified as a Categorical Exclusion is requested.



Date: 1/19/2012

Eric Thunstrom
Environmental Services Bureau
Great Falls District Project Development Engineer



Date: 1/23/2012

Concur
Heidi Bruner, P.E.
Environmental Services Bureau
Engineering Section Supervisor

TOM MARTIN FOR



Date: 23 JAN 2012

Concur
Federal Highway Administration

Attachment

electronic copies without attachment:

Tom Martin, P.E.	Environmental Services Bureau Chief
Heidi Bruner, P.E.	Environmental Services Bureau Engineering Section Supervisor
Michael P. Johnson	Great Falls District Administrator
Kent Barnes, P.E.	Bridge Engineer
Paul Ferry, P.E.	Highways Engineer
Mark Goodman, P.E.	Hydraulics Engineer
Rob Stapley	Right-of-Way Bureau Chief
Damian Krings, P.E.	Road Design Engineer
Robert Snyder, P.E.	Road Design Area Engineer
Eric Thunstrom	Environmental Services Bureau Project Development Engineer
Nicole Pallister	Fiscal Programming Section Supervisor
Tom Erving	Fiscal Programming
Steve Prinzing, P.E.	Great Falls District Engineering Services Supervisor
Suzy Price	Contract Plans Bureau Chief
Tim Tilton	Contract Section Supervisor
Vacant	Great Falls District Environmental Engineering Specialist
Montana Legislative Branch Environmental Quality Council (EQC)	

copies with attachment:

File Environmental Services Bureau

MDT attempts to provide accommodation for any known disability that may interfere with a person participating in any service, program or activity of the Department. Alternative accessible formats of this information will be provided upon request. For further information, call 406.444.7228 or TTY (800.335.7592) or call Montana Relay at 711.



Memorandum

To: Paul R. Ferry, P.E.
 Highways Engineer

From: Damian Krings, P.E. *DMK*
 Road Design Engineer

Date: August 20, 2010

Subject: Lincoln - East
 NH 24-3(25)76
 UPN 4322
 Project Work Type – 140 Reconstruction w/o Added Capacity

Please Approve the Alignment and Grade Review for this project.

Approved Lesly Tribelhorn for Paul Ferry Date 8/25/10
 Paul Ferry, P.E.
 Highways Engineer

We are requesting comments from the below distribution. If no comments are received within two weeks of the release date we will assume concurrence.

Distribution:

Mick Johnson, District Administrator	Lynn Zanto, Rail, Transit, & Planning Division Administrator
Kent Barnes, Bridge Engineer	Jake Goettle, Construction Engineering Services Bureau
Tom Martin, Environmental Services Bureau Chief	Matt Strizich, Materials Engineer
Duane Williams, Traffic and Safety Engineer	Paul Ferry, Highways Engineer
Robert Stapley, Right-of-Way Bureau Chief	

cc:

Dave Jensen, Fiscal Programming Section Supervisor	Eric Griffin, Public Works Director
Dustin Rouse Project Design Manager, GTF District	Lewis and Clark County
Damian Krings, Road Design Engineer	3402 Cooney Drive
Highways file	Helena, MT 59601
Michael McHugh, County Planning	Amber Kamps, District Ranger
Lewis and Clark County	Lincoln Ranger District
316 N. Park	1569 Highway 200
Helena, MT 59624	Lincoln, MT 59639

e-copies:

Jim Walther, Engineering, Preconstruction Engineer	Jason Sorenson, Engineering Cost Analyst
Lesly Tribelhorn, Highways Design Engineer	Jake Goettle, Construction Bureau – VA Engineer
Mark Goodman, Hydraulics Engineer	Stephen Prinzing, District Preconstruction
Kurt Marcoux, District Hydraulics Engineer	Christie McOmer, District Projects Engineer
Bonnie Gundrum, Env. Resources Section Supervisor	Stan Kuntz, District Materials Lab
Paul Sturm, District Biologist	Dave Hand, District Maintenance Chief
Eric Thunstrom, District Project Development Engineer	Walt Scott, R/W Utilities Section Supervisor
Danielle Bolan, Traffic Engineer	David Hoerning, R/W Engineering Manager
Ivan Ulberg, District Traffic Project Engineer	Greg Pizzini, Acquisition Manager
Pierre Jomini, Safety Management Engineer	Joe Zody, R/W Access Management Section Manager
Matt Strizich, Materials Engineer	Paul Johnson, Project Analysis Bureau Chief
Jon Watson, Pavement Engineer	Sue Sillick, Research Section Supervisor
Lee Grosch, District Geotechnical Manager	Mark Keeffe, Bicycle/Pedestrian Coordinator

Alignment and Grade Report

NH 24-3(25)76 Lincoln - East
Project Manager: Dustin Rouse, PE

Page 2 of 15

Bryce Larsen, Supervisor, Photogrammetry & Survey
Marty Beatty, Engineering Information Services
Stephanie Brandenberger, Bridge Area Engineer, Great
Falls District
Jean Riley, Planner

Becky Duke, Traffic Data Collection Section Supervisor (WIM)
Jon Swartz, Maintenance Division Operations Manager (RWIS)
Paul Grant, Public Involvement Officer

Alignment and Grade Report

Introduction

An alignment and grade review was held at the Lincoln Ranger Station for this project with the following personnel in attendance:

Name	Agency
James S. Dunbar	Great Falls Road Design - Helena
Dustin Rouse	Great Falls Road Design - Helena
Amanda Brown	Helena Right-of-Way
Eric Thunstrum	Environmental – Helena
Paul Strum	Environmental - Helena
Gretchen Hedrick	Hydraulics – Helena
John Sharkey	Geotech – Helena
Jerilee Weibel	Great Falls District Right-of-way
Doug Wilmot	Great Falls District
James Combs	Great Falls District
Ted Manderle	Great Falls District Maintenance
Michael P. Johnson	Great Falls District
Steve Prinzing	Great Falls District
Chris Hardan	Bridge - Helena

Scope of Work

The proposed scope of work for this project is to reconstruct the roadway. The project will modify the horizontal and vertical alignments to meet current design guidelines. The District requested an alignment that provided as much passing sight distance as practicable given the terrain and adjacent environmentally sensitive features. Work includes major grading, placing new base course, new plant mix surfacing, installing new drainage structures, stock passes, and wildlife crossings. Pulverization of the existing roadway is being evaluated at locations where the proposed vertical alignment closely matches existing. A new 139-ft, 5-span, flat-slab bridge with 2:1 spill-through abutments is proposed for the Alice Creek crossing.

The Roadway Width Decision Team selected a 36-foot finished top width for this project. The 36-foot width was selected over narrower width options because of the higher than average accident rate and severity rate. The land adjacent to the project has numerous environmentally sensitive features. We did not select the 40-foot width listed in the Route Segment Plan because of the additional environmental impacts associated with the wider finished top. We believe the increased top width of 36-ft, improved alignment, increased passing locations, the addition of rumble strips, and flatter side slopes will result in a substantial reduction in the rate and severity of crashes. We feel the extra cost to provide a 40-foot top would be better utilized in the improvement of other roadways.

Project Location and Limits

- a. The project is located in Lewis & Clark County.
- b. The nearest town is Lincoln.
- c. The project is not located within an Indian reservation.
- d. The project is located on NHS route number N-24.
- e. The project is functionally classified as a rural principal arterial.
- f. The project begins approximately 3.8 miles east of Lincoln.
- g. The project begins at reference point 75.76 and ends at 83.16.

Alignment and Grade Report

- h. The project length is 7.4 miles.
- i. The direction of the proposed project is from west to east with reference posts.
- j. The east end of the project is located approximately 0.2 miles east of the intersection with S-279.
- k. The as-built project numbers are:

Project	Date	Reference Posts
FAP 267D(1)	1939	R.P. 70.559 to 76.326.
FAP 267E(1)	1939	R.P. 76.326 to 82.008
FAP 267A(1)	1939	R.P. 82.008 to 89.892
F267(7)	1957	R.P. 82.008 to 86.130
F267(10)	1960	R.P. 65.453 to 82.008
F267(13)	1964	R.P. 82.008 to 89.892
FR 24-3(3)76 U1	1981	R.P. 75.760 to 83.155
BRF 24-3(12)78	1988	R.P. 77.608 to 78.006
STPHS 0002(388)	2000	R.P. 77.200 to 77.600

Work Zone Safety and Mobility

Although the project segment from RP 81 to EOP RP 83.16 is located within the Rogers Pass High Crash Severity Corridor, this project does not meet the additional criteria to be designated as a Significant Project. At this time, this project is considered a Level 2 Corridor project and Level 2 construction zone impacts are anticipated for this project as defined in the Work Zone Safety and Mobility (WZSM) guidance. The plans package will include a Transportation Management Plan (TMP) consisting mainly of a Traffic Control Plan (TCP).

Physical Characteristics

- a. The general terrain of the area is mountainous although the roadway is considered rolling.
- b. The project is considered rural.
- c. The design speed is 60 mph.
- d. RP 70.559± to RP 89.892±

In 1939, the existing gravel roadway bed from RP 70.559± to RP 89.892± was constructed under as-built projects FAP 267-D(1), FAP 267-E(1), and FAP 267-A(1). The base was composed of 0.43' to 0.80' of compacted base course. The surfacing was composed of 0.17' of compacted crushed top surfacing. The surfacing width varied from 27' to 27.9' with no shoulders. Fill slopes were constructed 4:1 for fills 3' or less and 1.5:1 for fills over 3'. Cut slopes were constructed 4:1 with a 10:1 ditch and 1:1 backslope.

- e. RP 82.008± to RP 86.130±

In 1957, the roadway was improved with under as-built project F 267(7). A lift of crush base course was applied to a depth of 0.60' followed by a 0.15' lift of compacted Type A crushed top surfacing. Horizontal and vertical alignments were not modified under this project.

- f. RP 65.453± to RP 82.008±

In 1960, the roadway was improved under as-built project F 267(10). The existing compacted gravel surfacing was left in place. A lift of crush base course was applied to a depth of 0.35' followed by a 0.15' lift of compacted Type A

Alignment and Grade Report

crushed top surfacing. Compacted plant mix bituminous surfacing was applied in two lifts to a depth of 0.25'. Cut and fill slopes were not modified on this project. Horizontal and vertical alignments were not modified under this project

g. RP 82.008± to RP 89.892±

In 1964, the roadway was further improved under as-built project F 267(13). The existing surface was left in place and had an average depth of 0.90'. A 76 0.25' lift of bituminous treated top surfacing was applied followed by a 0.25' lift of Type 3 plant mix bituminous surfacing. Cut and fill slopes were not modified on this project. Horizontal and vertical alignments were not modified under this project.

h. RP 75.760± to RP 83.155±

In 1981, the roadway was improved under project FR 24-3(3)76, Rogers Pass – East & West (West Section). The existing roadway was overlaid with 0.25' of plant mix bituminous surfacing, applied in two lifts to a finished top width of approximately 26'. Cut and fill slopes were not modified on this project. Horizontal and vertical alignments were not modified under this project.

i. Landers Fork Bridge (RP 77.608± to RP 78.006±)

In 1988, the Landers Fork bridge was replaced under project BRF 24-3(12)78. The shoulder widening for this project is summarized in the table below.

R.P.	Shoulder LT	Shoulder RT	Fin. Width	Note
77.608	0'	0'	26'	PTW
77.608-77.699	0' to 8'	0'	26' to 34'	Connect PTW
77.699-77.757	8'	0'	34'	Widen LT
77.757-77.847	8'	0' to 8'	34' to 40'	Widen LT & RT
77.847-77.867	8'	8'	40'	Widen LT & RT
77.867-77.896	8'	8'	40'	Bridge
77.896-77.910	8'	8'	40'	Widen LT & RT
77.910-77.920	8'	8'	46'	6' Turnout LT
77.920-78.006	8' to 0'	8' to 0'	40' to 26.3'	Connect PTW
78.006	0'	0'	26.3'	PTW

In the areas where the existing surfacing was left in place (RP 77.608 to 77.847 and RP 77.915 to 78.006), a 0.15' lift of crushed top surfacing was applied followed by a 0.25' overlay of plant mix bituminous surfacing, applied in two lifts. In areas where existing surfacing was removed and replaced or widened, the base is composed of 0.85' of select surfacing, and 0.50' of crushed base course. The surfacing is composed of 0.15' of crushed top surfacing, and 0.25' of plant mix bituminous surfacing, applied in two lifts. The fill slopes varied from 6:1 to 2:1. The cut slopes were constructed at 6:1 with a 20:1 ditch and variable backslope. Horizontal alignment was not modified under this project. The

Alignment and Grade Report

vertical alignment east of the bridge was modified slightly from a 0.00% to – 0.20% grade for the connection to the PTW. This bridge will not be modified under this project.

j. RP 77.200± to RP 77.600±

In 2000, guardrail and slope flattening safety improvements took place under project STPHS 0002(388). Approximately 0.3’ of shoulder gravel was added to facilitate the installation of guardrail. Riprap was also added for bank stabilization.

k. Project Connections

This project will have tapered connections to the PTW. The properties of the PTW at the beginning and end of this project are as follows:

R.P.	Surf. Width	Surface Depth	Road Width	Base Depth
75.760± (Beg.)	28’	0.25’	30’	1.5’
83.155± (End)	28’	0.8’	35’	0.83’

l. PVMS Indices

The recommended treatment in the Pavement Analysis Section’s 2009 Pavement Conditions/2010 & 2012 Pavement Treatment Report is AC Crack Seal & Cover. The indices and condition levels for the 2009 survey year are given in the following tables:

PVMS INDICES	
Ride	76.5(fair)
Rut	65.1(good)
Alligator Cracking	92.8(good)
Miscellaneous Cracking	91.6(good)

-For R.P. 75.76 to 82.417 (PvMS Recommends AC Crack Seal & Cover)-

PVMS INDICES	
Ride	82.9(good)
Rut	79.5(good)
Alligator Cracking	99.1(good)
Miscellaneous Cracking	90.5(good)

-For R.P. 82.417 to 91.3(PvMS Recommends AC Crack Seal)-

m. Horizontal Alignment

The horizontal alignment has 4 simple curves and 2 reverse spiral curve spiral curves with 15.02’ of normal crown between them. This is in the area of Landers Fork where the existing bridge will be used and the roadway is in close proximity to the River.

n. Vertical Alignment

The existing vertical alignment has 7 substandard vertical curves and 9 curves do not meet passing sight distance criteria. Two grades exceed MDT’s geometric

Alignment and Grade Report

design standard maximum gradient of 4 percent. The maximum grade on the existing alignment is -5.23 percent. In addition, there are four locations on the existing alignment where angle points were substituted for vertical curves at slight grade changes.

o. Bridges

There are three existing bridges that fall within the limits of this project; they are summarized in the table below:

Structure Number	Feature Crossed	Width (ft)	Length (ft)	Year Built	Structure Status
P00024076+07001	Stockpass	30	12	1940	Not Applicable
P00024077+08071	Landers Fork	39.3	155	1988	Not Deficient
P00024082+08931	Alice Creek	24	76	1939	Structurally Obsolete and Eligible for Replacement

p. Fill Slopes

Fill slopes vary from 6:1 to 2:1 on the project. Cut slopes have 10 feet of 6:1 and 10 feet of 20:1 with backslopes varying from 5:1 to 1:1.

Horizontal Alignment

The proposed alignment primarily follows the existing horizontal alignment due to terrain and environmental constraints. The alignment shifts 12.0' north in the area of Bouma's post and pole yards to allow a vertical grade raise without significant impact to Bouma's yard. The shift also eliminates an impact to Flesher Lake in this area.

The project has 4 simple curves with radii ranging from 5700 to 6000 with standard supers. There are 2 spiral curves with radii ranging from 1450 to 2850 with standard supers and spiral lengths.

Vertical Alignment

The vertical alignment has been designed to meet stopping sight distance for a 60 mph design speed throughout. Five vertical curves have been re-designed to provide passing sight distance. There are four remaining vertical curves that will remain no-passing zones. Two of these curves are within horizontal curves.

The existing vertical alignment will be utilized from 10+00 to 82+00. The VPI at 92+00 will be eliminated to lengthen passing sight distance. This will result in larger rock cuts left, but borrow is needed on the project. The vertical curve at 146+00 will be lengthened to improve stopping sight distance and to provide an additional borrow source; however, this location will be designated no-passing. The VPI at 168+00 will be eliminated to maintain passing sight distance and to improve safety in the area of the Aspen Grove approach. This approach location will also be designated as no-passing. The VPI at 184+00 will be eliminated to provide passing sight distance. The vertical curve at 217+00 will be lengthened to improve stopping sight distance and improve safety at the approach at Sta. 209+77 left. This area will also be designated no passing. The VPI and curve at 293+00 will be manipulated to the extent possible while avoiding impact to

Alignment and Grade Report

the large transmission line. The VPI at 311+00 will be eliminated to provide passing sight distance and to improve Bouma's approach. The VPI at 360+50 will be modified to provide passing sight distance once the approved wildlife crossing location is determined and the bridge design for the slab option is complete.

The maximum grade on the project is now 4.35% at 217+00. Standards call for a 7% maximum for mountainous and 4% for rolling. A design exception may be necessary at this location to match existing terrain.

The existing bridge at Landers Fork is a grade control (Sta. 114+810). The roadway elevation will be maintained at all creek crossings (Hardscrabble creek @ 325+67 and 331+13), as no overtopping has been identified on this project. There is an overhead crossing @ 340+83 that we will go under before raising the grade for the wildlife crossing at 360+50. The proposed grade at the Alice Creek crossing will closely match existing due to the proximity of the S-279 intersection.

Surfacing and Typical Section

Preliminary surfacing recommendations are shown below:

Surfacing Section No. 1 – Pulverization (RP 79.0 – 80.5)

0.30' Plant Mix Surfacing

0.65' Crushed Aggregate Course

0.95' Design R-Value = 5

Mill and remove 0.75' existing PMS. Then pulverize and blend remaining 0.25' existing PMS with 0.25' new CAC to a depth of 0.50'. Place remaining 0.40' CAC.

Surfacing Section No. 2 – Pulverization (RP 75.8 – 79.0 and RP 80.5 – 83.0)

0.30' Plant Mix Surfacing

0.30' Crushed Aggregate Course

0.60' Design R-Value = 16

Mill and remove 0.70' of existing PMS. Blend remaining 0.30' existing PMS with 0.30 CAC.

Surfacing Section No. 3 – Reconstruction/Widening (A&G Design BOP – EOP)

0.30' Plant Mix Surfacing

0.90' Crushed Aggregate Course

1.20' Design R-Value = 16

Surfacing sections are designed for 111 daily ESAL's. Listed subgrade soil R-values were used to determine surfacing thicknesses. Soil classes are not listed, as R-values for particular soil types range considerably. R-values used in the AASHTO method are based upon an 85th percentile statistical analysis.

Plant mix grade and PG binder were determined as per Materials Bureau Policy dated January 4, 2006. Recommended PG Binder is 64-34. Recommended PMS is Grade S, with ¾" maximum nominal aggregate size.

Alignment and Grade Report

Surface Design recommends the District review soil survey information to confirm R-values prior to construction. Areas of concern and possible borrow areas should have additional soil samples submitted for R-value testing.

The MDT Roadway Width Determination Committee approved using a 36' top with no Future Widening for this project. Standard slopes and supers are currently proposed, although some areas may need design exceptions for fill and cut slopes, which are not identified at this time. A Type B, GVW scale widening, left and right of Sta. 375+00 will be included with this project.

Grading

The project will be constructed with unclassified excavation. Borrow will be needed.

Geotech is in the process of drilling the project and their recommendations will follow this report. The project is primarily located on good A-1-a material. Based on this information Road Design will select locations to flatten backslopes for additional borrow material. Some embankment foundation treatment will likely be needed for the pond left of Sta. 300+00 and for the proposed wildlife crossing location.

Maintenance warned us of a frost heave area at R.P. 76.5 (Sta. 50+00) and at Sta. 165+00. Geotech will investigate whether sub excavation or special borrow will be needed in these areas. Geotech recommendations will be incorporated once they are received.

These are also areas where drifting snow is a problem. Road Design will verify adequate snow storage is provided in our ditches at these locations.

Hydraulics warned us of several areas where we are filling in existing roadside borrow ditches. Road Design will perpetuate ditches as needed to ensure positive drainage and conveyance capacity.

Sliver fill locations will be evaluated prior to PIH to determine if a barn roof typical would be justified to reduce borrow.

Hydraulics

The three named drainages that cross MT Highway 200 within the project limits are as follows:

Landers Fork – not deficient (pier scour mitigation completed in Aug. 2003)

The scuppers on Landers Fork Bridge currently allow water to discharge from the bridge deck directly into Landers Fork Creek. Environmental has requested that the hydraulics section evaluate ways to drain the bridge deck safely while eliminating the direct discharge of bridge deck runoff directly into the creek below, with the reason being for water quality and bull trout mitigation purposes. Hydraulics will need to evaluate the necessity for bridge deck drains based on spread width and notify the Bridge section of our findings. A potential solution may be to re-route the drain discharge location to a bench. This environmental issue will need to be addressed during the design phase of this project.

Approximately 1200-ft downstream of Landers Fork Bridge (to the south of the alignment), the PTW is adjacent to approximately 450-ft of the Landers Fork channel. The Landers Fork

Alignment and Grade Report

channel is a tributary of the Blackfoot River. **Because of potential floodplain impacts, as well as other potential environmental sensitivities, such as impacts on Bull Trout, encroachment on the Landers Fork channel should be avoided.**

Hardscrabble Creek – double 36” RCP

According to the 4/19/04 LHSR the double 36” RCP’s at the Hardscrabble Creek crossing are undersized and frequently blocked by debris. Also, during the 3/3/09 PFR, Dave Hand of Great Falls MDT Maintenance noted that the outlets of the double RCP’s have settled and separated as the result of scour under the outlets. According to the 11/19/04 pipe report, the RCP’s were 5% full of sediment and both ends were in poor condition. Hydraulics will specify a culvert size at this crossing as part of the Hydraulic Recommendation report. A larger culvert at Hardscrabble creek may eliminate the need for the Hardscrabble overflow pipe at Sta. 331+13.

Alice Creek – structurally obsolete and eligible for replacement

Hydraulics recommends a 64-foot bottom width bridge with a bridge centerline at 385+37 that meets MDT’s hydraulic design criteria. The recommended abutments are 2:1 spill-through. The 64-foot bottom width opening is the shortest that would not encroach into the active channel, and would maintain the hydraulic capacity, as well as meet the maximum roadway grade increase of 0.4-ft and the minimum grizzly bear clearance of 6.0-ft. The proposed structure will improve on the existing bridge in the following ways: the proposed bridge spans the active channel; provides greater cross sectional area for water to flow under the bridge; decreases backwater at the design event; and increases the overtopping event. The overtopping elevation of 4957.29-feet at the berm to the west of the bridge will remain the same.

Floodplains

Potential floodplain impacts on this project are located downstream of the Grosfield Irrigation Ditch, which crosses the roadway at two locations near the beginning of the project. Potential floodplain impacts are located downstream of the most easterly irrigation pipe. The Grosfield ditch is delineated as an approximate 100-year flood boundary, which extends to the upstream boundary of the PTW, but does not cross the highway.

It should be noted that preliminary FIRM panel #30049C1510E shows that portions of Landers Fork River near this project are located in Zone D, which the map legend defines as “areas in which flood hazards are undetermined, but possible.” Coordination with the Lewis and Clark Floodplain Manager will be required to determine if a floodplain permit will be required.

Minor Drainage

Hydraulics noted procedural memo dated August 25, 2009 for pipes in large fills since we have several pipes with in excess of 15’ of cover. These location will be difficult to trench. Hydraulics is requested to determine if these pipes can be extended. Hydraulics will use the corrosive soils report to verify if the pipes can be extended. We also need to look at service life. It was noticed many of the RCP pipes seemed to be in very poor condition.

There is a 24” RCP in poor condition in a large fill at Sta. 296+47 (RP 81.2). This pipe’s inlet left is quite often covered with silt and is a continuing maintenance problem to keep clean. The pipe condition report lists this pipe as 100% full of sediment. The pipe is necessary because it

Alignment and Grade Report

serves as an equalizer between existing ponds on the left and right of the alignment. In addition, the left end of the pipe has extensive salt damage, and the rest of the pipe is underwater. The pipe is to be replaced and raised to better match the inlet elevation.

A snowmobile/ATV trail exists on the north side of the road through much of this project. MDT has a Memorandum of Understanding that allows trail riders to utilize the bottom of the ditches along the north side of the road. Currently snowmobiles and ATV's go up and over the approach near the existing approach culverts. Road design will put an approach detail in the plans, which will show the trail going up and around the approach, away from the approach culverts. The detail will possibly include end protection for the approach culverts, such as an end section on the approach culvert and/or covering the end section with drain aggregate. Road design will evaluate possible end treatments for the approach culverts in terms of safety, constructability, and maintenance issues.

There is a 6'S x 4'R RCB located approximately 920-ft to the west of Landers Fork bridge which does not appear to convey any drainage. According to Dave Hand, he has never seen water running through the culvert. Hydraulics is requested to determine if this culvert is needed.

The pipes at Sta's 216+07 and 218+43 are on the crest of a hill and seem to serve no purpose. Maintenance has never seen water in them. These pipes will be removed with this project.

Irrigation

Hydraulics and Right-of-way were asked if we could eliminate the irrigation pipes at 261+97, 270+57 and 270+83 as these pipes seem to move irrigation from one side of Sieben land to the other and then back for no reason. Ted Manderle with Maintenance stated in their lifetime he had never seen water in them. These pipes are above ground in the ditch and are hazards. Right-of-way stated the landowner, John Baucus, has agreed to sign a waiver to remove these pipes.

Finally, a land owner on site advised us the pipe at 24+36 conveys an irrigation ditch he needs and is planning to start using soon.

Bridge

There is a 12' X 28' Timber stockpass at Sta. 61+02 which will be replaced as part of this project with an 84" stockpass. This stockpass was originally designed to have a skew, although on field inspection, the skew will not be necessary, the inlet will need excavation to flatten the stockpass entrance area. A new skewed 24" culvert will be added to handle the drainage we were originally trying to intercept at this location.

The existing 40.0' X 153.5' concrete bridge over Landers Fork, at Sta. 115+00, will be left in place. Environmental would like to plug the deck scuppers, or re-route to a bench if possible. Hydraulics and Bridge are requested to evaluate this request and provide recommendations. Guardrail will be replaced on the roadway in this area.

The 25.98' X 75.98' timber structure over Alice Creek, Sta. 385+30, will be replaced with a new 139-ft, 5-span, flat-slab bridge with 2:1 spill-through abutments at Sta. 385+37. The proposed detour will need to be on the north side of the roadway.

A new 30.0' X 36.0' wide prefabricated, post tensioned flat slab concrete bridge, or a 12'R x 18'7"S SSPPA are proposed at Sta. 360+50, for use as a wildlife crossing. This area includes

Alignment and Grade Report

wildlife fence from Hardscrabble Creek to Alice Creek to encourage animals to use the crossing. The District recommends rapid construction technology for the wildlife crossing to avoid construction of an additional detour. Geotech was interested in investigating the use of geosynthetically confined soil wall that could be used under the wildlife crossing. This may reduce construction time and would eliminate differential settlement at the bridge ends

Traffic

Traffic evaluated requests for left turn bays at Copper Creek, Dump Road, and Aspen Grove Campground. Traffic recommends no left turn bays at these locations.

Traffic recommended realignment of the Copper Creek and Dump Road approaches so that they are directly across from each other. Mainline sight distance improvement at this location is also recommended.

Traffic also recommends installing a no-passing zones for 500' on both sides of these intersections.

A land owner on site at Sta. 58+75 right would like that area designated as a no-passing zone as he has difficulty getting on the road in this area. Removing the guardrail on the stock pass should increase his sight distance and help with this. He stated he will get in touch with James Combs in the District.

Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) Features

An RWIS camera site should be added at the GVW scale widening (Sta. 375+00). This can be hooked to power from the existing maintenance shed located in this area, so solar power won't be needed for this one

Design Exceptions

Design exceptions are anticipated for fill slopes in the area of Flesher Lake and for the 4.35% grade at 217+00.

Right-of-Way

Hydraulics and Right-of-way were asked if we could eliminate the irrigation pipes at 261+97, 270+57 and 270+83 as these pipes seem to move irrigation from one side of Sieben land to the other and then back for no reason. Ted Manderle with Maintenance stated in their lifetime he had never seen water in them. These pipes are above ground in the ditch and are hazards. Right-of-way stated the landowner, John Baucus, has agreed to sign a waiver to remove these pipes. Right-of-way is in the process of completing a new irrigation narrative for this project.

Mick stated the Sieben land needs sheep fence for their operation. There are no existing cross fences in many of these areas to tie into. Mick said Sieben uses sheep herders to keep them confined and the fence can stop at their property line without a cross fence tie.

There are numerous large trees from Sta. 37+00 to 47+00 left. The landowners were concerned with losing them. Road Design will add these trees to the cross sections to avoid or minimize any impact to the extent possible.

The approach at Sta. 209+77 left is in a poor location due to sight distance. The vertical curve at

Alignment and Grade Report

Sta. 217+00 will be modified to help the situation. The approach could move back in stationing to 207 or 208 to improve sight distance.

The private approach at Sta. 230+71 should be removed as it is the old Hogum Creek Road approach, which has been re-aligned to Sta. 237+40 right, and is no longer used.

Utilities/Railroads

A large transmission line crossing at 295+71 may be impacted by this project. Road Design will try to not impact this line. The existing survey only picked up the above ground poles and telephone pedestals. The field needs to have the underground utilities located and surveyed for our plans.

Additional Survey

The HYD-1 Survey for Landers Fork Bridge is still needed. District survey is requested to contact Road Design prior to conducting the survey.

Environmental Considerations

The appropriate environmental documentation will be provided in order to comply with NEPA regulations

Paul Sturm, District Biologist, stated there will be a timing restriction from July 15th to September 1st for in stream work on Alice Creek. Riprap installation will be considered in-stream, but pile driving and removal may not.

The District, Road Design, and Environmental evaluated potential wildlife crossing locations and selected 360+50 as a logical crossing based on wildlife hits, roadway profile, adjacent terrain, and vegetative cover. Paul was concerned about the crossing being located in a wet area. Road Design will design a dry bench in the crossing with a small ditch. It appears as though we could outfall this ditch about 300' back on the left at Sta. 357+50 and 50' back on the right at Sta. 360+00.

Paul requested we use wildlife fence from Bouma's property to Alice Creek to ensure use of the wildlife crossing. Paul was concerned with using sheep fence for such long stretches along the Sieben property as it could disrupt smaller animal patterns.

The biological resource comments for this project were as follows:

T&E Species

Bull Trout (listed threatened) are present in Alice Creek, Landers Fork, and the Blackfoot River. Timing restrictions on in-stream work may apply from July 15th to early September 1st to minimize impact to bull trout.

Additional T&E species potentially located in the project area include grizzly bear, Canada lynx, gray wolf, and the bald eagle. Coordination will be completed with MT FWP and USFWS to determine a complete list of species, effects on these species, and the need for any conservation measures.

Wildlife

The US Forest Service has designated a corridor between Lincoln and Roger's Pass as a key linkage area for wildlife movement between the Glacier Park/Bob Marshall Wilderness areas and the National Forest lands to the south. The entire project is within this corridor. FHWA requested that early coordination be completed with resource agencies to gain their comments on this issue. Resource agencies may request that MDT consider incorporating wildlife-crossing features at key crossing areas. There may also be a request to minimize the width of vegetation clearing, roadway width, or snowmobile trail expansions throughout or at key locations to preserve conditions more conducive to wildlife crossing.

Wetlands

Two higher quality shallow marsh wetlands ponds and shrub wetlands are located adjacent to the roadway between mileposts 81 and 82. Measures should be considered to avoid/minimize wetland losses in these areas. Environmental will provide new delineated wetland limits to Road Design.

Streams/Fisheries

At approximate RP 77.5, the PTW is sandwiched between the river and a hill to the north. To minimize impact to the river, resource agencies will likely request that the riverbank remain undisturbed and that all necessary widening be accomplished to the north, away from the river.

An SPA permit will be needed for bridge replacement work in Alice Creek. An SPA permit at Landers Fork is not needed if no work is planned near the water.

Alice Creek has substantial fisheries resource value. Resource agencies will likely request that provisions be made for adequate fish passage.

Experimental Features

Mick requested we employ rapid construction technology for the wildlife crossing to avoid construction of an additional detour. Geotech was interested in investigating the use of geosynthetically reinforced soil (geo-confined soil) wall that could be used under the wildlife crossing. This may reduce construction time and would eliminate differential settlement at the bridge ends.

Note geo-confined soil walls are considered an FHWA Every Day Counts Technology. Meaning FHWA recently identified some technologies to aggressively promote implementation across the country. Finally, rapid construction technology for bridge construction may not be considered experimental, but some methods may be new to MDT.

Traffic Control

Traffic will be maintained through the project in accordance with the MUTCD. Detours will be needed in at least 3 locations and they all should be located on the north side of the road. The wildlife crossing may also need a detour if some sort of single lane rapid technology process can't be designed for placement of this structure.

Public Involvement

A limited PI component will be included in the project outlining strategies for public notification. Possible strategies appropriate for this project would be:

Alignment and Grade Report

Radio public service announcements, newspaper ads, Montana Travel Info, and variable message boards.

Based on the presently anticipated scope of work, a Level B public involvement plan is appropriate. The proposed plan includes:

Level B (Expanded)

1. News release explaining the project and including a department point of contact.
2. Personal contacts with local government officials, interest groups.
3. Personal contacts with adjacent landowners explaining final design.
4. Construction notification and information during construction.
5. Public information meeting to present basic concepts/information and seek input.

A public meeting was held at the Lincoln Public School on December 7, 2009. Comments were supportive of the project. Concerns were raised regarding tree impact. Improvements to the atv/snowmobile trail were encouraged. A request for an improved crossing at the stockpass for atv's was requested. Rumble strips were encouraged provided bicyclists were provided sufficient shoulder width.

Cost Estimate

	Estimated cost	Inflation (INF) (from PPMS)	TOTAL costs w/INF + IDC (from PPMS)
Road Work	5,872,000		
New Structure BR Funded	480,000		
Detour	120,000		
Traffic Control	450,000		
Subtotal	6,922,000		
Mobilization (10%)	692,000		
Subtotal	7,614,000		
Contingencies (15%)	1,142,000		
Total CN	\$ 8,756,000	\$1,387,000	\$11,622,000
CE (10%)	\$876,000	\$137,000	\$1,144,000
TOTAL CN+CE	\$9,632,000	\$1,524,000	\$12,766,000

Note: Inflation is calculated in PPMS to the letting date plus one year to estimate mid-point of construction. If there is no letting date, the project is assumed to be inside the current TCP and is given a maximum of 5 years until letting. IDC is calculated at 13.35% as of FY 2011.

Ready Date

The ready date is September 1, 2012 and the planned finish date is on schedule to meet this date. The target letting date is January 25, 2013.