



Montana Department of Transportation

2701 Prospect Avenue
PO Box 201001
Helena MT 59620-1001

Timothy W. Reardon, Director

Brian Schweitzer, Governor

RECEIVED

AUG 22 2012

ENVIRONMENTAL
RECEIVED

AUG 21 2012

FHWA
MONTANA DIVISION

August 15, 2012

MASTER FILE
COPY

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

Attention: Jeff Patten

Subject: Categorical Exclusion
SF 110-RUMBLE STRIPS N-11
HSIP 11-1(70)1
Control Number: 7760000

This is to request approval of this proposed project as a Categorical Exclusion (CE) under the provisions of 23 CFR 771.117(d), and the Programmatic Agreement as signed by the Montana Department of Transportation (MDT) and the FHWA on April 12, 2001. A Copy of its Preliminary Field Review Report (PFRR) dated June 11, 2012 is attached. This proposed action also qualifies as a CE 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 Programmatic Categorical Exclusion Approval (PCE) as initially agreed by the (former) MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS (MDOH) and the FHWA on December 6, 1989. (Note: An "X" in the "N/A" column is "Not Applicable" to, while one in the "UNK" column is "Unknown" at the present time for this proposed project.)

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

Table with 4 columns: YES, NO, N/A, UNK. Contains 3 main rows of questions regarding environmental impact, unusual circumstances, and right-of-way requirements.

	<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 checked="" 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 checked="" 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 <i>1966 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 checked="" 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 checked="" 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 <u>33 CFR Parts 320-330</u> of the <i>Clean Water Act</i> (33 USC 1251-1376) would be met.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 checked="" 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. 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. 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 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. The designated National Wild & Scenic River systems in Montana are:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
a. Middle Fork of the Flathead River (headwaters to South Fork confluence).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. South Fork of the Flathead River (headwaters to Hungry Horse Reservoir).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Missouri River (Fort Benton to Charles M. Russell National Wildlife Refuge).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" 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 <u>23 CFR 772.5(h)</u> , 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 <u>23 CFR 772</u> for FHWA's Noise Impact analyses and MDT's Noise Policy.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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(<i>e.g.</i> : 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 <i>CERCLA</i> or <i>CECRA</i>) 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 Montana Pollutant Discharge Elimination System's conditions (<u>ARM 16.20.1314</u>), including temporary erosion control features for construction would be met.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
H. Permanent desirable vegetation with an approved seeding mixture would be established on exposed areas.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	YES	NO	N/A	UNK
I. Documentation of an “invasive species” review to comply with both EO #13112 and the <i>County Noxious Weed Control Act</i> (7-22-21, MCA), including directions as specified by the county(ies) wherein its intended work would be done.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 an AD-1006 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 checked="" 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 checked="" 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 checked="" 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 <u>40 CFR 81.327</u> 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 Quality Division, etc.).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
C. Is this proposed project in a “Class I Air Shed” (Indian Reservations) under <u>40 CFR 52.1382(c)(3)</u> ?	<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"/>
B. Would this proposed project result in a “jeopardy” opinion (under <u>50 CFR 402</u>) from the Fish & Wildlife Service on any Federally listed T/E Species?	<input checked="" 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. 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.

Barry Brosten, Date: 8/15/12
Barry Brosten - Butte District Project Development Engineer
MDT Environmental Services Bureau

Concur Heidy Bruner, Date: 8/17/12
Heidy Bruner, P.E. - Engineering Section Supervisor
MDT Environmental Services Bureau

Concur Jeffery G. Patten, Date: 8-22-12
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: PFRR

Copy (w/o attach.):

Jeff Ebert	Butte District Administrator
Paul Ferry	Highway Engineer
Tom Martin	Chief, Environmental Services Bureau
Robert Stapley	Right-of-Way Bureau Chief
Suzy Price	Contract Plans Bureau Chief
Nicole Pallister	Fiscal Programming Section Supervisor
Tom Erving	Fiscal Programming Section
Roy Peterson	Traffic and Safety Engineer
Barry Brosten	Environmental Services
Environmental Services File	
Montana Legislative Branch Environmental Quality Council (EQC)	



Montana Department of Transportation
PO Box 201001
Helena, MT 59620-1001

Memorandum

To: Roy A. Peterson, P.E.
Traffic & Safety Engineer

From: Kraig C. McLeod, P.E. **KCM**
Safety Engineer

Date: June 11, 2012

Subject: HSIP 11-1(70)1
SF 110-Rumble Strips N-11
UPN 7760000
Work Type Code 310 - Roadway & Roadside Safety Improvements

Please approve the attached Preliminary Field Review Report/Scope of Work Report.

Approved **Roy A. Peterson** Date **June 13, 2012**
Roy A. Peterson, P.E.
Traffic & Safety Engineer

The same report is also being distributed under a separate cover as a Scope of Work Report for comments and approval recommendations.

cc (w/attach.):
Damian Krings, Road Design Engineer
Traffic & Safety File

Preliminary Field Review/Scope of Work Report

SF 110-Rumble Strips N-11

Project Manager : Patricia W. Burke, P.E

Page 2 of 7

Introduction

The preliminary field review was conducted on Thursday, April 5, 2012 with the following individuals in attendance:

Patricia Burke	Safety Project Engineer - Helena
Rob Bukvich	Utility Agent - Bozeman
Joe Walsh	District Projects Engineer - Butte

Proposed Scope of Work

The proposed project has been nominated to install shoulder rumble strips along the N-11 Corridor between Gardiner and Livingston.

Purpose and Need

The purpose and need of this project is to pro-actively address run off the road crashes along the N-11 Corridor by installing shoulder rumble strips.

Project Location and Limits

This project is located in Park County between Gardiner and Livingston. The north-south route (US Hwy 89) connects Interstate 90 to Gardiner and the north entrance of Yellowstone National Park.

The project will encompass the majority of N-11 (C000011) between RP 1.2 (+/-) and 49.7 (+/-) (north end of Gardiner Urban Limits and south end of Livingston Urban Limits). Following the PFR review, it was recommended that rumble strips end closer to RP 49.5 prior to the outer urban limits of Livingston where numerous residences are in close proximity to the roadway. In addition, approximately 13.5 miles of guardrail along this corridor may not require rumble strips per detailed drawing 401-02 (as the shoulder width may be less than six (6) feet adjacent to the guardrail).

The project stationing follows conventional stationing and the attached project map identifies the general limits for installation of shoulder rumble strips.

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 solely of a Traffic Control Plan (TCP). A Transportation Operations (TO) component and a Public Information (PI) component are not necessary for this level of construction zone.

Physical Characteristics

The corridor is in rural terrain with some rolling hills and parallels the Yellowstone River through the valley. The majority of the existing roadway was reconstructed between 1961 and 1976 with improvements completed between 2001 and 2010. The roadway is part of the National Highway System.

Pavement section depths vary along the project. The minimum pavement section is 3 inches asphalt and 9 inches base course at both the north and south ends of the project. The rural portion of the roadway has widths that vary between 31 and 34 feet wide. A few wider sections exist for turn lanes along the corridor.

Preliminary Field Review/Scope of Work Report

SF 110-Rumble Strips N-11

Project Manager : Patricia W. Burke, P.E

Page 3 of 7

One larger bridge exists over the Yellowstone River at RP 20.4 and several small bridges exist along the corridor crossing water drainages. No bridges will be impacted by this project.

A large buffalo guard (modified cattle guard) exists at RP 13.25 and will also not be impacted by this project.

Shoulder rumble strips do exist near the Paradise KOA turnoff. These were installed when a left turn bay was built at this location.

Traffic Data

2012 AADT = 2,370

2013 AADT = 2,410

2033 AADT = 3,110

DHV = 480

T=3.0%

EAL = 31

AGR = 1.3%

Crash Analysis

A safety review was completed for N-11 between RP 1.2 and 49.7 between January 1, 2007 and December 31, 2011. 253 crashes with identified. The crash and severity rates are as follows:

	Statewide Average for Rural State NINHS (06-10)	Study Area
All Vehicles CRASH RATE:	1.04	1.35
All Vehicles SEVERITY INDEX:	2.09	1.95
All Vehicles SEVERITY RATE:	2.18	2.63

The main crash trend identified was wild animal - vehicle collisions. One hundred nineteen of the 253 reported crashes involved wild animals. The second crash trend identified was single vehicle run off-the-road crashes. Seventy-six of the 253 reported crashes were cited as single vehicles running off the roadway.

The following is a summary of the crashes within the study area:

- 35 crashes resulted in an overturn.
- 14 crashes resulted in hitting guardrail.
- 4 crashes resulted in hitting an embankment.
- 4 crashes resulted in hitting a fence.
- 49 crashes involved two or more vehicles.
- 1 crash involved a bicycle.
- 1 crash involved a pedestrian.
- 6 crashes involved commercial vehicles
- 7 crashes involved domestic animals.

Montana Highway Patrol records show 253 crashes between January 1, 2007 and December 31, 2011. This includes two fatal crashes, sixty one injury crashes and one hundred-ninety property damage only crashes. The recommended safety improvements for sleep-related crashes on this corridor yielded a benefit-to-cost ratio of 3.83, for the time period January 1, 2001 to December

Preliminary Field Review/Scope of Work Report

SF 110-Rumble Strips N-11

Project Manager : Patricia W. Burke, P.E

Page 4 of 7

31, 2010. These improvements include installing shoulder rumble strips, a proven FHWA safety countermeasure, along the N-11 Corridor between Gardiner and Livingston.

Variations from Average Occurrence:

- 81.4% of the reported crashes occurred on Dry Road Conditions vs. 66.5% for the Statewide Average on NINHS Routes.
- 44.3% of the reported crashes occurred during Dark – Not Lighted Conditions vs. 35.3% for the Statewide Average on NINHS Routes.

It is anticipated that the proposed shoulder rumble strips will address a portion of the single vehicle run off the road crashes.

Major Design Features

- Design Speed.** The posted speed limit is 70 mph/65 mph (vehicles/trucks) during daylight hours and 60 mph/55 mph (vehicles/trucks) during the night-time hours. The design speed will be 70 mph. Through the town of Emigrant, the speed limit is lowered to 55 mph.
- Horizontal Alignment.** No changes to the horizontal alignment will be completed with this project.
- Vertical Alignment.** No changes to the vertical alignment will be completed with this project.
- Typical Sections and Surfacing.** The typical section and surfacing will not be impacted by this project.
- Geotechnical Considerations.** No geotechnical considerations are anticipated.
- Hydraulics.** No hydraulic work will be completed with this project.
- Bridges.** No bridges will be impacted by this project. Rumble strips will begin and terminate at each bridge approach.
- Traffic.** No changes to the traffic geometrics will be completed with this project.
- Pedestrian/Bicycle/ADA.** The majority of this route has four (4) foot shoulders or wider which meets MDT minimums for rumble strips. There are small sections where the shoulder is less than four feet (approximately 3.5 feet). These locations will require consideration whether to implement a modified rumble strip or modified placement within the shoulder to minimize potential impacts to bicycle use yet still provide some level of safety to the errant vehicle leaving the travel way. No impacts to pedestrian and ADA facilities will be completed with this project.
- Miscellaneous Features.** No impacts to any miscellaneous features are anticipated with this project.
- Context Sensitive Design Issues.** Consideration to homes in close proximity to the roadway will be taken into account when determining suitable locations for placement of rumble strips.

Other Projects

There are three active projects within the project limits. UPN 7577 is a resurfacing project from RP 0.0 to 24.0. It currently has a let date of March 2013.

UPN 4755 is a bridge removal and culvert replacement at the Cedar Creek crossing approximately 16 km (10 miles) north of Gardiner. It currently has a let date of November 2013.

UPN 3885 is an approach realignment of S-540 as it ties in with N-11 at approximately RP 19.9. Placement of rumble strips on N-11 will need to be coordinated with this new approach location.

Preliminary Field Review/Scope of Work Report

SF 110-Rumble Strips N-11

Project Manager : Patricia W. Burke, P.E

Page 5 of 7

The Ready Date is listed as May 2012 in OPX2.

Location Hydraulics Study Report

A Location Hydraulics Study Report is not needed for the scope of this project.

Design Exceptions

No design exceptions are anticipated with this project.

Right-of-Way

Right of way will not be needed for this project.

Access Control

Access control will not be modified with this project.

Utilities/Railroads

No utilities or railroads will be impacted by this project.

Cold-In-Place Recycle (for mill & overlay projects only)

This is not applicable to the scope of the project.

Maintenance Items

No maintenance issues or tasks were identified during the PFR.

Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) Features

ITS solutions will not be included in this project.

Survey

No survey is required for this project.

Public Involvement

This project will require minimal public involvement due to the nature of the improvements. A Level 'A' Program is recommended due to improvements being limited to within the existing roadway section. A news release explaining the project and including a department point of contact is proposed for the project.

Environmental Considerations

No significant environmental impacts or issues were identified. We anticipate a categorical exclusion will provide the appropriate level of environmental evaluation and documentation.

Energy Savings/Eco-Friendly Considerations

Due to its limited scope, no energy savings or eco-friendly considerations are recommended for this project.

Experimental Features

Due to its limited scope, no experimental features are recommended for this project.

Traffic Control

Minimal traffic control operations are anticipated for this project due to the limited scope. However, it is recommended that construction be limited to the spring or fall season to minimize impacts to the travelling public with this route being a major route to Yellowstone National Park.

Preliminary Field Review/Scope of Work Report

SF 110-Rumble Strips N-11

Project Manager : Patricia W. Burke, P.E

Page 6 of 7

The plans package will include a Transportation Management Plan (TMP) consisting solely of a Traffic Control Plan (TCP). A Transportation Operations (TO) component and a Public Information (PI) component are not necessary for this level of construction zone.

Project Management

The Safety Engineering Section will be responsible for the plans and Patricia W. Burke will be the Project Design Manager.

Preliminary Cost Estimate

	Estimated cost	Inflation (INF) (from PPMS)	TOTAL costs w/INF + IDC (from PPMS)
Rumble Strips (Shoulder)	71,230.44		
Traffic Control	7,900.00		
Subtotal	79,130.44		
Mobilization (10%)	7,913.04		
Subtotal	87,043.48		
Contingencies(15%)	13,056.52		
Total CN	\$ 100,100.00	\$ 13,151.00	\$ 124,168.00
CE (20%)	\$ 20,000.00	\$ 2,627.00	\$ 24,808.00
TOTAL CN+CE	\$ 120,100.00	\$ 15,778.00	\$ 148,976.00

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 proposed ready date and letting date will be determined after all over-rides are complete.

Site Map

The project site map is attached.

Preliminary Field Review/Scope of Work Report

SF 110-Rumble Strips N-11

Project Manager : Patricia W. Burke, P.E

Page 7 of 7

