



Montana Department of Transportation

2701 Prospect Avenue  
PO Box 201001  
Helena, MT 59620-1001

Timothy W. Reardon, Director  
Brian Schweitzer, Governor

RECEIVED

OCT 1 - 2012

ENVIRONMENTAL

September 18, 2012

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

MASTER FILE  
COPY

Attention: Alan Woodmansey

Subject: Programmatic Categorical Exclusion (PCE) Concurrence Request  
HSIP 358-1(15)7  
SF 099 N of Valier  
CN: 7217000

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/Scope of Work Report, dated September 30, 2011, and a project location map are 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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. <b>Blackfoot Indian Reservation</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 &amp; 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 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>
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 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 (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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. A 124SPA Stream Protection Authorization would be obtained from the MDFWP?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. There is a delineated floodplain in the proposed project area under FEMA's Floodplain Management criteria.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
<b>An Aquatic Lands Protection Ordinance 90-A Permit will likely be required.</b>				
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"/>

	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>	<u>N/A</u>	<u>UNK</u>
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"/>
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 <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"/>

	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>	<u>N/A</u>	<u>UNK</u>
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 <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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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"/>

- |  | <u>YES</u>                          | <u>NO</u>                           | <u>N/A</u>               | <u>UNK</u>               |
|--|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 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 Candidate, 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 50 CFR 402) from the Fish & 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. 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.

Eric Thunstrom, Date: 9/18/12  
Eric Thunstrom  
Great Falls District Project Development Engineer  
MDT/Environmental Services Bureau

Heidy Bruner, Date: 9/18/12  
Concur Heidy Bruner, P.E. - Engineering Section Supervisor  
MDT Environmental Services Bureau

Sam W. [Signature], Date: 28 SEP 2012  
Concur Federal Highway Administration

Attachment:

electronic copies without attachment (unless otherwise noted):

Michael P. Johnson	Great Falls District Administrator
Tom Martin, P.E.	Environmental Services Bureau Chief
Heidy Bruner, P.E.	Environmental Services Bureau Engineering Section Supervisor
Kent Barnes, P.E.	Bridge Engineer
Paul Ferry, P.E.	Highways Engineer
Mark Goodman, P.E.	Hydraulics Engineer
Steve Prinzing, P.E.	Great Falls District Preconstruction Engineer
Robert Stapley	Right-of-Way Bureau Chief
James Combs, P.E.	Great Falls District Traffic Engineer
Suzy Price	Contract Plans Bureau Chief
Tim Tilton	Contract Section Supervisor
Nicole Pallister	Fiscal Programming Section Supervisor
Tom Erving	Fiscal Programming Section
Tim Holley	Great Falls District Environmental Engineering Specialist
Montana Legislative Branch Environmental Quality Council (EQC)	(with attachment)

copies with attachment

File	Environmental Services Bureau
------	-------------------------------



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

**Memorandum**

To: Distribution

From: Roy Peterson, PE *Signed by Roy Peterson 10/3/2011*  
 Traffic & Safety Bureau Chief

Date: September 30, 2011

Subject: HSIP 358-1(15)7  
 SF 099 N of Valier  
 UPN: 7217000  
 Work Type: 310 - Roadway & Roadside Safety Improvements

Attached is the Preliminary Field Review Report/Scope of Work Report which was approved on \_\_\_\_\_. We request that those on the distribution review this report and submit your concurrence within two weeks of the approval date.

Your comments and recommendations are also requested if you do not concur or concur subject to certain conditions. When all personnel on the distribution list have concurred, and the environmental documentation is approved, we will submit this report to the Preconstruction Engineer for approval.

I recommend approval:  
 Approved \_\_\_\_\_ Date \_\_\_\_\_

**Distribution:**

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| Michael Johnson, 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                        |
| Alan Woodmansey, FHWA - Operations Engineer |  |

**cc:**

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| Dawn Stratton, Fiscal Programming Section | Robert Snyder, Road Design Area Engineer |
| Damian Krings, Road Design Engineer       |  |

**e-copies:**

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| Jim Walther, Engineering, Preconstruction Engineer      | Jake Goettle, Construction Bureau – VA Engineer   |
| Lesly Tribelhorn, Highways Design Engineer              | Steve Prinzing, District Preconstruction Engineer |
| Mark Goodman, Hydraulics Engineer                       | Christie McOmber, District Projects Engineer      |
| Kurt Marcoux, District Hydraulics Engineer              | Stan Kuntz, G.F. District Materials Lab           |
| Bonnie Gundrum, Env. Resources Section Supervisor       | Matt Landenberg, Havre District Maintenance Chief |
| Paul Sturm, District Biologist                          | Steven Giard, R/W Utilities Section               |
| Eric Thunstrom, Project Development Engineer            | David Hoerning, R/W Engineering Manager           |
| Danielle Bolan, Traffic Engineer                        | Greg Pizzini, Acquisition Manager                 |
| Ivan Ulberg, G.F. District Traffic Project Engineer     | Joe Zody, R/W Access Management Section Manager   |
| Kraig McLeod, Safety Engineer                           | Paul Johnson, Project Analysis Bureau             |
| Stephanie Brandenberger, Bridge Area Eng, G.F. District | Sue Sillick, Research Section Supervisor          |
| Matt Strizich, Materials Engineer                       | Wayne Noem, Secondary Roads Engineer              |
| Daniel Hill, Pavement Analysis Engineer                 | Tim Reardon, Tribal Coordination                  |
| Lee Grosch, District Geotechnical Manager               | Alyce Fisher, Fiscal Programming                  |
| Bryce Larsen, Supervisor, Photogrammetry & Survey       | Linda Cline, District R/W Design                  |
| Marty Beatty, Engineering Information Services          | Dennis Ghekiere, District Utility Agent           |
| Paul Grant, Public Involvement Officer                  | Doug Wilmot, G.F. District Construction Engineer  |
| Jean Riley, Planner                                     | Jerilee Weibel, District R/W Supervisor           |
| Dawn Stratton, Fiscal Programming                       | James Combs, District Traffic Engineer            |
| Scott Bunton, Engineering Cost Analyst                  |   |

## Preliminary Field Review/Scope of Work Report

HSIP 358-1(15)7  
 SF 099 N of Valier  
 Project Manager: James A Combs, PE

### Introduction

This report was developed from information taken from the Preliminary Field Review conducted on September 14, 2011 with the following personnel in attendance:

Steve Prinzing	District Preconstruction Engineer	Great Falls
Christie McOmber	District Projects Engineer	Great Falls
Jim Combs	District Traffic Engineer	Great Falls
Jeania Cereck	District Road Design Supervisor	Great Falls
Laci Bogden	District Road Design	Great Falls
Jim Cornell	Traffic and Signing	Helena
Jonathan Floyd	Safety Engineer	Helena
Gerry Brown	Constructability Reviewer	Lewistown

### Proposed Scope of Work

This project has been nominated for the installation of fencing and cattle guards on MDT right of way that will be maintained by MDT. The intent of the project is to reduce domestic animal crashes. Some areas along the project have existing fence.

The plans for the proposed project will be in English stationing. The project starts at RP 7.0± and continues north approximately 10.0 miles ending at RP 17.0±.

### Purpose and Need

To address vehicle collisions with domestic animals fencing, cattle guards, and gates will be installed as necessary.

### Project Location and Limits

The project is located in Pondera County on S-358 beginning at RP 7.0± and proceeding north for approximately 10.0 miles to RP 17.0±. RP 7.4± through RP 17.0± is located within the Blackfeet Indian Reservation. The functional classification of S-358 is a Rural Collector Road.

The project crosses two bridges, one at RP 7.4 over Birch Creek and one at RP 16.8 over the Two Medicine River.

Project ID	From		To		Year Built
	Station	RP	Station	RP	
<b><u>As-Builts</u></b>					
S 193(1)		0.0		7.1	1960
ERS 57(4)	378+50.0	7.1	424+00.0	7.8	1967
S 193(6)	424+00.0	7.8	511+82.4	9.8	1967
S 193(9)	511+82.4	9.8	690+68.7	13.2	1967
S-SR-193(3)	715+57.6	13.2	919+67.0	16.9	1973
S 193(10)	919+67.0	16.9	1430+00.0	17.7	1968
<b><u>Improvement Projects</u></b>					
STPHS 358-1(10)7 – Overlay & Guardrail		7.4		17.5	2010
STPS 358-1(12)16 – Slide Repair		16.4		16.7	2010

Equations:

## Preliminary Field Review/Scope of Work Report

HSIP 358-1(15)7

SF 099 N of Valier

Project Manager: James A Combs, PE

Page 2 of 6

ERS 57(5) 414+81.2 BK=422+69.9 AH  
ER 57(4) 931+42.8 BK=935+64.4 AH  
S 193(6) 506+13.6 BK=490+71.2 AH  
S 193(9) 690+68.7 BK=715+57.6 AH  
S 193(13) 849+17.6 BK=854+82.3 AH

### 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 proposed project involves placing fencing and cattle guards off the roadway and should not involve traffic control plans to a high extent. No detours are planned and two-way traffic should not be interrupted during construction.

### Physical Characteristics

The P.T.W. traverses a rural area with rolling terrain used primarily as farm and ranch land.

Project History:

- A. S-358 between RP's 0.0 and 17.7 was constructed in 1960, 1967, 1968, & 1973 under projects S 193(1), ERS 57(4), ER 57(5), S 193(6), S 193(9), S-SR-193(3), and S 193(10) with a finished roadway width of 29.4'±. The roadway consists of two 12' travel lanes and two shoulders averaging 2.7'.
- B. The existing horizontal alignment has one curve with a radius of 716' that does not meet the 760' minimum design radius for a Rural Collector Road with a design speed of 50 mph.
- C. The existing vertical alignment maximum grade of 6.5% is below the design criteria maximum of 7% for a Rural Collector Road with a design speed of 50 mph.
- D. The existing fill slopes on the project vary between 3:1 and 5:1 and the existing cut sections have 5:1 inslopes with a variable backslope.

### Traffic Data

Traffic data is not required for fencing projects.

### Crash Analysis

- A. The crash analysis for State Secondary 358, from RP 7.0 to RP 17.0 was taken for the dates of January 1, 2001 through December 31, 2010. The crash analysis includes only crashes addressable with domestic animal fencing.
- B. The study area crash rate, severity index and severity rate are 1.69, 1.69, and 2.86 respectively. In comparison to statewide averages for rural Secondary routes the crash rate is higher, but the severity index and severity rate are lower. The statewide averages for rural Secondary routes (2006-2010) for crash rate, severity index and severity rate are 1.40, 2.25, and 3.17 respectively.
- C. The Montana Highway Patrol records show a total of 31 crashes along this section of roadway, 16 of which were addressable with this safety project.
  1. 45.2% or 14 of 31 total crashes involved vehicles striking a domestic animal (cow) in the roadway, resulting in 2 non-incapacitating injury crashes and 12 property damage only crashes.
  2. The remaining two addressable crashes, involved a vehicle striking a horse on the roadway (property damage only) and a single-vehicle off-the-road overturning crash resulting from a vehicle swerving to avoid cows in the roadway (incapacitating injury crash).
  3. Of the addressable crashes, 14 also occurred during dark not lit conditions.

## Preliminary Field Review/Scope of Work Report

HSIP 358-1(15)7

SF 099 N of Valier

Project Manager: James A Combs, PE

Page 3 of 6

- D. The Safety Engineering Section recommendation was to install domestic animal fencing from RP 7.0 to RP 17.0. The safety improvements in this area yield a benefit-to-cost ratio of 3.09, assuming a \$600,000 construction cost for the time period from January 1, 1998 through December 31, 2007.

### Major Design Features

- A. **Design Speed.** The design speed of 50 mph was taken from improvement project STPS 358-1(10)7 and the Geometric Design Criteria for Rural Collector Roads. The posted speed limit is 70 mph daytime/65 mph nighttime.
- B. **Horizontal Alignment.** No changes are proposed to the existing horizontal alignment with this project.
- C. **Vertical Alignment.** No changes are proposed to the existing vertical alignment with this project.
- D. **Typical Sections and Surfacing.** The project is designed to install fencing throughout and cattle guards and gates at specified approaches. The roadway width varies from 26' to 28' wide and no new surfacing will be provided with this project.
- E. **Geotechnical Considerations.** No geotechnical issues will be addressed with this project.
- F. **Hydraulics.** No hydraulic issues will be addressed with this project.
- G. **Bridges.** Two bridges exist within the project limits. No bridge issues will be addressed with this project. Bridge guardrail was upgraded on both bridges to three-beam in 2010 with STPS 358-1(10)7.

Structure Description	Number of Structures	Road Width (feet)	Length (feet)	Year Built	Structure Status
Birch Creek (RP 7.4)	1	30'	286'	1965	Concrete Cast in Place
Two Medicine River (RP 16.8)	1	30'	318'	1968	Concrete Cast in Place

- H. **Traffic.** No traffic issues will be addressed with this project.
- I. **Pedestrian/Bicycle/ADA.** No issues will be addressed with this project.
- J. **Miscellaneous Features.** Fencing, cattle guards, pedestrian passes, and gates will be installed along right-of-way as necessary to address vehicle collisions with domestic animals. Fencing may meander slightly to avoid steep slopes, utilities, etc. MDT will maintain new fences, cattle guards, gates, and possible pedestrian passes at the bridge ends.
- K. **Context Sensitive Design Issues.** S-358 intersects the Lewis & Clark National Historic Trail in 4 locations. A portion of the project is within in the Blackfeet Indian Reservation; therefore, a Project Specific Agreement (PSA) will be required.

### Other Projects

STPS 2-(2)24, (UPN 7682000) Cut Bank South Slide-S 358, is a slide repair project between RP 24.2 and RP 24.5. It is currently under construction and will be completed during the 2011 construction season. The project is outside the project limits of this project.

### Location Hydraulics Study Report

No hydraulic issues will be addressed with this project.

### Design Exceptions

Design exceptions are not required as this is a fencing and cattle guard project.

## Preliminary Field Review/Scope of Work Report

HSIP 358-1(15)7  
SF 099 N of Valier  
Project Manager: James A Combs, PE

Page 4 of 6

### Right-of-Way

Right-of-Way widths vary from 50' to 150' left and 50' to 245' right. Existing right-of-way was purchased under right-of-way projects S 193(4) and S 193(5). No new right-of-way will be required for this project but it is requested that the Right-of-Way Bureau plot existing right-of-way prior to fencing design.

### Access Control

Access control will not be implemented on this project.

### Utilities/Railroads

No utility impacts are anticipated with this project. Underground utilities will be surveyed to avoid conflicts with the fencing.

No railroads are located within the project limits.

### Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) Features

There is a short-term traffic count site at RP 10±; however, the site will not be disturbed with this project. No other ITS features have been located within the project limits. No ITS issues are anticipated with this project.

### Survey

A survey request, 7217000RDREQ001.DOCX, has been developed for this project.

### Public Involvement

Due to the limited scope of the project, a level "A" public involvement plan is appropriate. The plan will include a news release, which will explain the project and include a department point of contact.

### Environmental Considerations

According to overlay project STPS 358-1(10)7, a low priority Superfund site is located along a short section of the project in Township 30 North, Range 6 West, Section 15.

The appropriate documents will be developed by Environmental Services including a Traditional Tribal Cultural Coordination special provision. Existing cultural resources will need to be identified.

Wetlands within the project limits will need to be delineated.

### Energy Savings/Eco-Friendly Considerations

No energy savings/eco-friendly considerations are planned for this project.

### Experimental Features

No experimental features will be addressed with this project.

### Traffic Control

Traffic will be maintained throughout the project during construction with the appropriate signing, flagging, etc. All signing will be in accordance with the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices.

## Preliminary Field Review/Scope of Work Report

HSIP 358-1(15)7

SF 099 N of Valier

Project Manager: James A Combs, PE

Page 5 of 6

### Project Management

James A. Combs, P.E., Great Falls District Traffic Engineer. The project will be designed in the Great Falls District. The project is not under full FHWA oversight.

### Preliminary Cost Estimate

The project was nominated at \$904,000. The preliminary estimate for CN and CE is \$652,050 with a cost of \$65,205 per mile. The following items were considered in the roadwork preliminary cost estimate: new fencing for the entire project including panels, deadman, gates, and cattle guards.

		Estimate Costs	Inflation (INF) (from PPMS)	w/INF + IDC (from PPMS)
Road work		\$405,000		
Traffic Control		\$15,000		
<b>Subtotal</b>		<b>\$420,000</b>		
Mobilization	15%	\$63,000		
<b>Subtotal</b>		<b>\$483,000</b>		
Contingencies	25%	\$120,750		
<b>Total CN</b>		<b>\$603,750</b>	<b>\$102,314</b>	<b>\$774,129</b>
CE	8%	\$48,300	\$8,185	\$61,930
IDC:	9.64%		<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>\$836,059</b>
<b>Inflation Factor (ppms)</b>			0.169464799	

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 target ready date for this project is January 2013 with a letting date of April 2013.

### Site Map

The project site map is attached.

Preliminary Field Review/Scope of Work Report

HSIP 358-1(15)7

SF 099 N of Valier

Project Manager: James A Combs, PE

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

FEDERAL AID PROJECT HSIP 358-1(16)7

CATTLE GUARDS AND FENCE

SF 099 N OF VALIER

PONDERA COUNTY

LENGTH 10.0 MILES

