



June 5, 2012



Kevin L. McLaury
Division Administrator
Federal Highway Administration
585 Shepard Way
Helena, MT 59601-9785

Attention: Gene Kaufman

Subject: Programmatic Categorical Exclusion (PCE) Concurrence Request
PLH PFH-67(2)
Turner Mountain – N & S
CN 7724000

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 the Montana Department of Transportation (MDT) and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) on April 12, 2001. This proposed action also qualifies as a Categorical Exclusion under ARM 18.2.261 (Sections 75-1-103 and 75-1-201, MCA).

The following form provides the documentation required to demonstrate that all of the conditions are satisfied to qualify for a PCE. A copy of the Preliminary Field Review Report 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 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>
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. There is a high rate of residential growth in this proposed project's area.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. There is a high rate of commercial growth in this proposed project's area.	<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"/>
5. There are parks, recreational, or other properties acquired/improved under <i>Section 6(f)</i> of the <i>1965 National Land & Water Conservation Fund Act</i> (16 USC 460L, <i>et seq.</i>) on or adjacent to proposed the project area.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The use of such <i>Section 6(f)</i> sites would be documented and compensated with the appropriate agencies. (<i>e.g.</i> : MDFWP, local entities, etc.).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Are there any sites either on, or eligible for the National Register of Historic Places with concurrence in determination of eligibility or effect under <i>Section 106</i> of the <i>National Historic Preservation Act</i> (16 USC 470, <i>et seq.</i>) by the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), which would be affected by this proposed project.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. There are parks, recreation sites, school grounds, wildlife refuges, historic sites, historic bridges, or irrigation that might be considered under <i>Section 4(f)</i> of the 1966 <i>US DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION Act</i> (49 USC 303) on or adjacent to the project area.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. De minimis finding(s) is/are necessary for this project.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. "Nationwide" Programmatic <i>Section 4(f)</i> Evaluation forms for these sites are attached.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. This proposed project requires a full (<i>i.e.</i> : DRAFT & FINAL) <i>Section 4(f)</i> Evaluation.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
B. The activity would involve work in a streambed, wetland, and/or other waterbody(ies) considered as "waters of the United States" or similar (<i>e.g.</i> , "state waters").	<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>
1. Conditions set forth in <i>Section 10</i> of the <i>Rivers and Harbors Act</i> (33 USC 403) and/or <i>Section 404</i> under 33 CFR Parts 320-330 of the <i>Clean Water Act</i> (33 USC 1251-1376) would be met.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Impacts in wetlands, including but not limited to those referenced under Executive Order (E.O.) #11990, and their 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. A 124SPA Stream Protection Authorization would be obtained from the MDFWP?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. There is a delineated floodplain 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Tribal Water Permit would be required.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Work would be required in, across, and/or adjacent to a river which 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"/>
The designated National Wild & 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 <i>Section 7</i> of the <i>Wild and Scenic Rivers Act</i> (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"/>

	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>	<u>N/A</u>	<u>UNK</u>
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1. If yes, are there potential noise impacts?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. A Noise Analysis would be completed.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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. There would be substantial changes in access control involved with this 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 (e.g. festivals) 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
All reasonable measures would be taken to avoid and/or minimize substantial impacts from same.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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"/>

	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>	<u>N/A</u>	<u>UNK</u>
I. Documentation of an “invasive species” review to comply with both EO #13112 and the <i>County Noxious Weed Control Act</i> (7-22-2152, MCA), including directions as specified by the county(ies) wherein its intended work would be done.	<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.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
If the proposed work would affect Important Farmlands, then a CPA 106 Farmland Conversion Impact Rating form would be completed in accordance with the <i>Farmland Protection Policy Act</i> (7 USC 4201, <i>et seq.</i>).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
K. Features for the <i>Americans with Disabilities Act</i> (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 <i>Clean Air Act’s Section 176(c)</i> (42 USC 7521(a), as amended) under the provisions of 40 CFR 81.327 as it’s either in a Montana air quality:				
A. “Unclassifiable/Attainment” area. This proposed project is <u>not</u> covered under the EPA’s September 15, 1997 Final Rule on air quality conformity.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
and/or				
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’s Air Resources Management Bureau, 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)(2-4) and 40 CFR 81.417? (Northern Cheyenne, Flathead, and Fort Peck Indian Reservations; Glacier and Yellowstone National Parks; Anaconda-Pintlar, Bob Marshall, Cabinet Mountains, Gates of the Mountains, Medicine Lake, Mission Mountain, Red Rock Lakes, Scapegoat, Selway-Bitterroot, and U.L. Bend Wilderness Areas)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Federally listed Threatened or Endangered (T/E) Species:				
A. There are recorded occurrences and/or critical habitat in this proposed project’s vicinity.	<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>
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 & Wildlife Service on any Federally listed T/E Species?

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

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). It also complies with the provisions of *Title VI* of the *Civil Rights Act* of 1964 (42 USC 2000d) under the FHWA’s regulations (23 CFR 200).

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

Susan Kilcrease, Date: 6/5/2012
Susan Kilcrease - Missoula District Project Development Engineer
MDT Environmental Services Bureau

Concur Heidy Bruner, Date: 6/8/12
Heidy Bruner, P.E. - Engineering Section Supervisor
MDT Environmental Services Bureau

Concur Paul Anselbach, Date: 6/12/12
Federal Highway Administration

MDT attempts to provide accommodation for any known disability that may interfere with a person participating in any service, program or activity of the Dept. 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.

Attachment: Preliminary Field Review Report (4/3/2012)

- | | | |
|---------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Copy (w/o attach.): | Ed Toavs | Missoula District Administrator |
| | Tom S. Martin, P.E. | Environmental Services Bureau Chief |
| | Heidy Bruner, P.E. | Environmental Services Bureau |
| | Suzy Price | Contract Plans Bureau Chief |
| | Nicole Pallister | Fiscal Programming Section Supervisor |
| | Tom Erving | Fiscal Programming Section |
| | Robert Stapley | Right-of-Way Bureau Chief |
| | Susan Kilcrease | Environmental Services Bureau |
| | George Fekaris | Western Federal Lands, Vancouver, WA |
| | File | Environmental Services Bureau |
| | Montana Legislative Branch | Environmental Quality Council (EQC) |



Memorandum

To: Paul Ferry, P.E.
 Highways Engineer

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

Date: April 3, 2012

Subject: PLH PFH-67(2)
 Turner Mountain – N&S
 UPN 7724000
 Work Type 160 – Minor Rehabilitation

Please approve the attached Preliminary Field Review Report.

Approved Lesly Tribelhorn Date 4/3/12
for Paul Ferry, P.E.
 Highways Engineer

We are requesting comments from those on the distribution list. We will assume their concurrence if we receive no comments within two weeks of the approval date.

Distribution:

- | | |
|---|--|
| Ed Toavs, District Administrator | Tom Martin, Environmental Services Bureau Chief |
| Kent Barnes, Bridge Engineer | Lynn Zanto, Rail, Transit, & Planning Division Administrator |
| Paul Ferry, Highways Engineer | Jake Goettle, Construction Engineering Services Bureau |
| Roy Peterson, Traffic and Safety Engineer | Matt Strizich, Materials Engineer |
| Robert Stapley, Right-of-Way Bureau Chief | Jon Swartz, Maintenance Administrator |

cc:

- Dawn Stratton, Fiscal Programming Section
- Bill Squires, Project Design Manager
- Damian Krings, Road Design Engineer

e-copies:

- | | |
|--|---|
| Jim Walther, Engineering, Preconstruction Engineer | Jake Goettle, Construction Bureau – VA Engineer |
| Lesly Tribelhorn, Highways Design Engineer | Shane Stack, District Preconstruction |
| Mark Goodman, Hydraulics Engineer | Ben Nunnallee, District Projects Engineer |
| KC Yahvah, District Hydraulics Engineer | Darin Reynolds, District Materials Lab |
| Bonnie Gundrum, Env. Resources Section Supervisor | Bob Vosen, District Maintenance Chief |
| Pat Basting, District Biologist | Jean Crow, District Right of Way Supervisor |
| Susan Kilcrease, District Project Development Engineer | Phillip Inman, Utilities Engineering Manager |
| Danielle Bolan, Traffic Engineer | David Hoerning, R/W Engineering Manager |
| Ivan Ulberg, District Traffic Project Engineer | Greg Pizzini, Acquisition Manager |
| Kraig McLeod, Safety Engineer | Joe Zody, R/W Access Management Section Manager |
| Nigel Mends, Bridge Area Engineer, Missoula District | Paul Johnson, Project Analysis Bureau |
| Matt Strizich, Materials Engineer | Sue Sillick, Research Section Supervisor |
| Daniel Hill, Pavement Analysis Engineer | Wayne Noem, Secondary Roads Engineer |
| Bret Boundy, District Geotechnical Manager | Alyce Fisher, Fiscal Programming |
| Bryce Larsen, Supervisor, Photogrammetry & Survey | |
| Marty Beatty, Engineering Information Services | |
| Paul Grant, Public Involvement Officer | |
| Jean Riley, Planner | |
| Dawn Stratton, Fiscal Programming | |
| Scott Bunton, Engineering Cost Analyst | |

Preliminary Field Review Report

UPN 7724000, Turner Mountain N&S, PLH PFH-67(2)

Project Manager: William M. Squires, P.E

Page 1 of 8

Introduction

An onsite field review was held on August 30, 2011. The following personnel attended:

Ben Nunnallee, District Projects Engineer, Missoula District
Sandy Dorsett, Engineering and Design Manager, Missoula District
Steve McEvoy, Pavement Civil Engineering Specialist, Helena
Jacquelyn Smith, Road Designer, Missoula District

A second onsite field review was held on October 6, 2011. The following personnel attended:

Wayne Noem, Secondary Roads Engineer, Helena
Paul Stantus, U.S. Forest Service Technical Services Staff Officer, Libby
Zia Kazimi, Statewide & Urban Planning Supervisor, Helena
Jacquelyn Smith, Road Designer, Missoula District

Proposed Scope of Work

The proposed project has been nominated to rehabilitate the surfacing section and to extend the service life of the roadway. Following is the proposed scope for the different segments along Pipe Creek Road.

Reference Post (RP) 12.0 to RP 17.1

- Pulverize and overlay providing a 24 ft. top width. Reshape roadway typical to current standards to the extent practical while following the existing horizontal and vertical alignments.
- Seal & cover treatment applied to full width. Use Type 1 cover material.
- Minor grading work to prevent drainage onto the roadway.
- Shoulder and centerline pavement markings will be included.
- Signing will be evaluated and replacement will be determined on a case by case basis.
- Guardrail installation will be determined on a case by case basis.

RP 17.1 to RP 18.8

- Pulverize and overlay providing a 22 ft. top width. Reshape roadway typical to current standards to the extent practical while following the existing horizontal and vertical alignments.
- Seal & cover treatment applied to full width. Use Type 1 cover material.
- Minor grading work to prevent drainage onto the roadway.
- Shoulder and centerline pavement markings will be included.
- Signing will be evaluated and replacement will be determined on a case by case basis.
- Install guardrail over the large culvert at RP 18.7±. For the remainder of this section guardrail installation will be determined on a case by case basis.

RP 18.8 to RP 19.0

- Overlay providing a 20 ft. top width.
- Seal & cover treatment applied to full width. Use Type 1 cover material.
- Minor grading work to prevent drainage onto the roadway.
- Shoulder pavement markings will be included; the centerline will not be striped.
- Signing will be evaluated and replacement will be determined on a case by case basis. Delineators will not be installed in this section.
- Guardrail will not be installed in this section.

RP 19.0 to RP 20.1

- Seal & cover treatment applied to full width. Use Type 1 cover material.
- Shoulder pavement markings will be included; the centerline will not be striped.
- Signing will be evaluated and replacement will be determined on a case by case basis. Delineators will not be installed in this section.
- Guardrail will not be installed in this section.

Preliminary Field Review Report

UPN 7724000, Turner Mountain N&S, PLH PFH-67(2)

Project Manager: William M. Squires, P.E

Page 2 of 8

Purpose and Need

The purpose of this project is to rehabilitate the existing surfacing section to extend the service life of the existing roadway with a new paved surface. This section of roadway is due for rehabilitation before it deteriorates to the point that total reconstruction would be required.

Project Location and Limits

- Route: S-567 (Pipe Creek Road)
- County: Lincoln County
- Begin Project: RP 12.0, approximately 0.1 mile north of the Noisy Creek Road intersection
English as-built station 372+97.56 on County Construction
- End Project: RP 20.1, just past the intersection with the road to Turner Mountain Ski Area
English as-built station 800+65.56 on County Construction
- Project Length: 8.1 miles
- Location: Township 32 N, Range 31 W
Sections 3, 4, 5, 10
Township 33 N, Range 31 W
Section 16, 17, 21, 28, 33 & 34

S-567 is not on the National Highway System and is functionally classified as a Rural Collector.

The stationing will be continued from project UPN 4789, 11 km North of Libby - North.

See attached location map.

Work Zone Safety and Mobility

At this time, Level 3 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). A limited Transportation Operations (TO) component and a limited Public Information (PI) component to address public notification will be included. These issues are discussed in more detail under the Traffic Control and Public Involvement sections.

Physical Characteristics

The existing terrain within the project limits is mountainous in a rural setting. The area is heavily forested on both sides of the road.

The existing road was originally built as a logging road with a gravel surface. The road was then improved by the Forest Service with bituminous surface treatments, asphalt and chip seals. The paved width is generally 20 feet, but it widely varies along intermittent sections. Below is a summary of the widths measured during the August field review.

<i>Location</i>	<i>Width (ft.)</i>
18.4	21.5
19.0	19.2
19.3	14.7
21.3	20.9
22.0	16.4
24.5	20.4

The road side slopes are steep throughout the project length.

Preliminary Field Review Report

UPN 7724000, Turner Mountain N&S, PLH PFH-67(2)

Project Manager: William M. Squires, P.E

Page 3 of 8

Core sample indicate that the existing pavement ranges in thickness from 0.125 ft to 0.66 ft and the gravel thickness ranges from 0.0 ft. to 0.58 ft.

The U.S. Forest Service has applied an overlay to most of the roadway from RP 19.0 to RP 24.2. The overlay appears to be in good condition.

From the Bridge Management System there are no structures located within the project limits.

Following is alignment information provided from the Libby North Corridor Study. The following information goes up to RP 20, where the Corridor Study ended.

The horizontal curve at RP 19.1 has a radius with a nominal design speed of 37 mph, compared to the 45 mph design speed indicated for a rural collector in mountainous terrain. A series of horizontal curves from RP 19.5 to 19.9 have nominal design speeds ranging from 20 mph to 25 mph.

Stopping sight distance (SSD) at a 45 mph design speed is not provided for a series of horizontal curves from RP 19.1 to RP 19.9. The majority of these curves provide SSD at a 37 mph design speed, however, there are three curves that provide SSD at a 25 mph design speed.

There are 16 vertical curves that do not provide 45-mph SSD. These substandard curves offer SSD at design speeds of 17 to 23 mph.

Below is a table summarizing the 2010 Pavement Management System's Pavement Condition Report.

<i>Reference Post</i>	<i>Ride Index</i>	<i>Rut Index</i>	<i>ACI</i>	<i>MCI</i>	<i>Construction Recommendation</i>	
					<i>2011</i>	<i>2013</i>
6.69 to 20.1	24.7 Poor	57.8 Fair	80.7 Good	96.3 Good	Major Rehabilitation	Major Rehabilitation

Traffic Data

2012 AADT = 170 (Present)
2013 AADT = 170 (Letting Year)
2033 AADT = 210 (Design Year)
DHV = 30
Com Trucks = 5.9%
Growth Rate = 1.0% (Annual)
ESAL's = 4

Crash Analysis

A crash analysis was completed for the ten-year period from July 1, 2001 through June 30, 2011 from RP 12.0 to 24.2. There were 15 total crashes. There were no fatal injury crashes, and three injury crashes, none of which involved incapacitating injuries. There were no crashes involving trucks.

The crash rate was 2.37, the severity index was 1.53, and the severity rate was 3.63. The statewide averages for rural secondary system are 1.40, 2.25, and 3.17, respectively.

The Safety Management Section had the following remarks: The main crash trend was single vehicle, off road crashes (9). Of these crashes, five involved vehicles hitting a tree and four involved vehicles overturning.

Preliminary Field Review Report

UPN 7724000, Turner Mountain N&S, PLH PFH-67(2)

Project Manager: William M. Squires, P.E

Page 4 of 8

Ten of the crashes were dispersed through the study area with no particular concentrations observed. There were five multi-vehicle collisions during the study period resulting in a vehicle crossing the centerline while negotiating a curve and striking a vehicle in the opposing lane.

Major Design Features

- a. **Design Speed.** The geometric design criteria for Rural Collector Roads (Secondary System) indicate that the design speed should be 45 mph, based on mountainous terrain. The posted speed limit is 45 mph.
- b. **Horizontal Alignment.** No changes to the horizontal alignment are proposed.
- c. **Vertical Alignment.** No changes to the vertical alignment are proposed.
- d. **Typical Sections and Surfacing.** Following is a table summarizing the pavement widths that will be constructed with this project.

<i>Reference Posts</i>	<i>Width (ft)</i>
12.0 to 17.1	24
17.1 to 18.8	22
18.8 to 19.0	20
19.0 to 20.1	Match Existing

The surfacing will match that of **11 km North of Libby – North [4789]**. Surfacing Design recommends a 0.25' plant mix overlay composed of Grade S ½" aggregate and PG 58-28 binder. Cover material will be Type 1, with CRS-2P seal oil.

The existing plant mix will be pulverized to a depth of 0.30'. Approximately 370 tons per mile of crushed aggregate will be added as a leveling course prior to the 0.25' plant mix overlay.

- e. **Geotechnical Considerations.** There will be no geotechnical considerations.
- f. **Hydraulics.** There will be no Hydraulics involvement.
- g. **Bridges.** There are no bridges on this segment of S-567.
- h. **Traffic.** The roadway will receive new pavement markings for the entire length of the project. The centerline will only be delineated from RP 12.0 to 18.8. Traffic Engineering will provide the quantities, details and specifications for interim paint and final epoxy. Six-inch shoulder stripes will be specified, as recommended in the corridor study.

The existing roadway signing will be evaluated and updated as needed with this project. Traffic Engineering will provide the necessary plans, quantities, details and specifications for pavement markings and signing items.

- i. **Pedestrian/Bicycle/ADA.** There are no dedicated pedestrian or bicycle facilities. This route is included on the bicycle route map and shows that the shoulders are < 4 ft. with a section of the roadway having grades 5-7%. Due to the nature of this project, new accommodations will not be added.
- j. **Miscellaneous Features.** Guardrail will be installed over the large culvert at RP 18.7±. Other areas of guardrail will be installed on a case by case basis between RP 12.0 and 18.8.

Preliminary Field Review Report

UPN 7724000, Turner Mountain N&S, PLH PFH-67(2)

Project Manager: William M. Squires, P.E

Page 5 of 8

- k. **Context Sensitive Design Issues.** One of the major goals of the Libby North (Hwy 567/Pipe Creek Rd) Corridor Study was to develop a project scope that was sensitive to the existing conditions, identified corridor issues, financial feasibility, potential environmental impacts and public acceptance. Overall, the proposed scope will exhibit context sensitive design elements.

Other Projects

This project will be tied with 11 km North of Libby – N, UPN 4789, from RP 6.8 – 12.0 and SF109-Sing, RS, Libby Area, UPN 7492000 for contract letting.

Location Hydraulics Study Report

A Location Hydraulics Study Report is not needed on this project.

Design Exceptions

Design exception criteria are applicable only to the minor rehab sections: RP 12.0 to 18.8 (pulverize/overlay) and RP 18.8 to 19.0(overlay), in accordance with the *Guidelines for Nomination and Development of Pavement Projects*. None of the horizontal curves will require design exception approval for radius or stopping sight distance because they all have design speeds that are no more than 15 mph below the proposed 45 mph design speed (i.e. a design speed ≥ 30 mph).

A design exception could be indicated on one vertical curve (a 20 mph sag at RP 15.2) because it provides SSD at a design speed more than 20 mph below the proposed 45 mph design speed (i.e. a design speed less than 25 mph). We reviewed the crash history and determined that there was one crash (at RP 15. 57) in the vicinity of the sag. However, the crash occurred in daylight, so a sag vertical curve would not affect the stopping sight distance. Therefore, a design exception is not required because neither crash clusters nor trends associated with the substandard element were identified.

Design exceptions will be pursued for lack of clear zone width, which would be 14' feet on 4:1 inslopes on tangent sections. The northbound (east) roadside is generally characterized by shallow, narrow v-ditches with steep backslopes with variable tree cover. By visual inspection, we roughly estimate adequate clear zone is not provided along 70% to 80% of the minor rehab sections.

The southbound (west) roadside generally consists of low to moderately high fill slopes steeper than 3:1, with varying densities of tree and brush cover. Again, we roughly estimate adequate clear zone is not provided along 70% to 80% of the minor rehab sections.

Right-of-Way

The road is primarily Forest Service land; however, there are a few sections of private property. Portions of the roadway are located within a Forest Service easement.

There will be no right-of-way acquisitions or construction easements.

Access Control

This is not an access control facility. No changes to the access control are proposed.

Utilities/Railroads

There will be no railroad or utility involvement.

Maintenance Items

REV 3/16/2012

Preliminary Field Review Report

UPN 7724000, Turner Mountain N&S, PLH PFH-67(2)

Project Manager: William M. Squires, P.E

Page 6 of 8

No maintenance issues were brought up at the field review. MDT does not maintain this route. Lincoln County is responsible for the snowplowing and the USFS performs all other maintenance activities.

Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) Features

No ITS features have been identified to be included with this project.

Experimental Features

There will be no experimental features included on this project.

Survey

A survey has already been completed under the 11km North of Libby – N, UPN 4789. No additional survey will be needed.

Public Involvement

A Level A public involvement plan is appropriate for this project. A news release explaining the project and including a department point of contact will be distributed to the local media.

Environmental Considerations

Based on the proposed scope of work for this project a Categorical Exclusion is anticipated.

The scope of this project was developed specifically to minimize environmental impacts.

A Grizzly Bear distribution zone is located west of Pipe Creek Road up to RP 21, past that the western part becomes a Grizzly Bear recovery zone. The proposed work has been developed to minimize impacts to the Grizzly Bear.

Energy Savings/Eco-Friendly Considerations

No energy savings considerations have been proposed. The project scope and design have been selected to minimize impacts to the sensitive environment along the Pipe Creek Road Corridor.

Traffic Control

Traffic will be maintained through the construction of the project with appropriate signing, flagging, pilot cars, etc., in accordance with the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices. The work zone will require single lane closures during construction operations. A minimum of one lane will remain open for traffic at all times during construction of this project. Possible stipulations governing the time of year, the days of the week during which construction activities may take place, time of day and maximum length of roadway that may be under construction at a time may be specified in the contract in order to minimize public impact.

A Transportation Management Plan (TMP) consisting of a Traffic Control Plan (TCP) and a Transportation Operations (TO) component are appropriate for this project. Due to the relatively simple nature of the work, the TCP and TO components will consist only of special provisions.

Project Management

Helena Road Design – Missoula Crew will be responsible for developing the plans. Bill Squires is the Project Manager. See contact information below:

William M. Squires, P.E.
Missoula Area Engineer
Highways Bureau – Road Design Section
(406) 444-6228
bsquires@mt.gov

Preliminary Field Review Report

UPN 7724000, Turner Mountain N&S, PLH PFH-67(2)

Project Manager: William M. Squires, P.E

Page 7 of 8

Preliminary Cost Estimate

This project was programmed with an estimated CN cost of \$3,242,000 and a CE cost of \$324,000, both without IDC or inflation.

	Estimated cost	Inflation (INF) (from PPMS)	TOTAL costs w/INF + IDC (from PPMS)
Road Work	1,479,500		
Traffic Control	136,500		
Subtotal	1,616,000		
Mobilization (10 %)	162,000		
Subtotal	1,778,000		
Contingencies (5%)	89,000		
Total CN	<u>\$1,867,000</u>	<u>\$17,821</u>	<u>\$ 2,066,518</u>
CE (10%)	<u>\$187,000</u>	<u>\$1,785</u>	<u>\$ 206,984</u>
TOTAL CN+CE	<u>\$2,054,000</u>	<u>\$ 19,606</u>	<u>\$ 2,273,502</u>

Note: Inflation is calculated in PPMS to the letting date. 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 9.64% as of FY 2012.

Ready Date

The ready date is April 26th. The project is being developed on a “fast-track” schedule so that it can be tied for contract to 11 km North of Libby – N, UPN 4789, scheduled for letting on July 26, 2012.

Preliminary Field Review Report

UPN 7724000, Turner Mountain N&S, PLH PFH-67(2)
Project Manager: William M. Squires, P.E

Site Map

