



Montana Department of Transportation

2701 Prospect Avenue
PO Box 201001
Helena MT 59620-1001

Timothy W. Reardon, Director
Brian Schweitzer, Governor

November 27, 2012

RECEIVED

DEC -3 2012

ENVIRONMENTAL

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 226-1(7)3
SF 109-Wdn Shdlrs, Chrvns-S226
CN: 7503000

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, 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).

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 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 1965 <i>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 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 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.	<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 Candidate, Threatened or Endangered (T/E) Species:				

- | | <u>YES</u> | <u>NO</u> | <u>N/A</u> | <u>UNK</u> |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| A. There are recorded occurrences and/or critical habitat in this proposed project's vicinity. | <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? | <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: 11/27/12
Eric Thunstrom
Great Falls District Project Development Engineer
MDT Environmental Services Bureau

Concur Heidy Bruner, Date: 11/28/12
Heidy Bruner, P.E.
Engineering Section Supervisor
MDT Environmental Services Bureau

Concur [Signature], Date: 30 NOV 12
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

Kevin L. McLaury
Page 7 of 7
November 27, 2012

HSIP 226-1(7)3
SF 109-Wdn Shdlrs, Chrvns-S226
CN: 7503000

Roy Peterson, P.E.	Traffic and Safety Engineer
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

HSB:ejt: S:\PROJECTS\GREAT-FALLS\7000-7999\7503\EDOC\7503000\ENCED001.doc

Preliminary Field Review Report

HSIP 226-1(7)3

SF109-Wdn Shdlrs, Chrvns-S226

Project Manager: James A Combs, PE

Page 1 of 6

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 is eligible for High Risk Rural Road funding. The project has been nominated to widen the outside shoulder, flatten slopes, upgrade advanced curve warning signs, and place chevrons along a single curve. The District will also review options for correcting the superelevation through the curve and realigning the County Road approach.

The project schedule and ready date will be developed through the overrides process in OPX2. The plans for the proposed project will be in English stationing. The project begins at RP 2.5± and continues south to RP 3.1±.

Purpose and Need

The intent of this project is to address single-vehicle run-off-the-road overturning crashes.

Project Location and Limits

The project is located in Cascade County on Secondary 226, commonly known as Eden Road, beginning at RP 2.5± and proceeding south approximately 0.6 miles ending at RP 3.1±. The functional classification of S-226 is a Rural Collector Road.

Project ID	From		To		Year Built
	Station	RP	Station	RP	
<u>As-Built</u>					
NRS 329-B	0+00.0	0.0	128+30.0	5.0	1936
<u>Improvement Projects</u>					
RS 329(6) – Overlay	0+00.0	0.0	128+30.0	5.0	1975
RTS 226-1(4) – Overlay		0.0		15.2	1993
HSIP 226-1(6)1 – Signing	0+00.0	0.6	780+43.56	15.2	2008

Work Zone Safety and Mobility

At this time, Level 2 construction zone impacts are anticipated for this project as defined in the Work Zone Safety and Mobility (WZSM) guidance. The plans package will include a Transportation Management Plan (TMP) consisting mainly of a Traffic Control Plan (TCP). These issues are discussed in more detail under the Traffic Control and Public Involvement sections.

Physical Characteristics

The P.T.W. traverses a rural area with rolling terrain.

Preliminary Field Review Report

HSIP 226-1(7)3

SF109-Wdn Shdlrs, Chrvns-S226

Project Manager: James A Combs, PE

Page 2 of 6

Project History:

- A. NRS 329-B constructed S-226 between RP's 0.0 and 5.0 in 1936 with 0.4' gravel surface.
- B. As-builts have not been found for the project that paved S-226 in 1939.
- C. RS 329(6) was an overlay and widen project on S-226 between RP's 0.0 and 5.0. The project widened the roadway approximately 5.5' creating a 26' finished surface. The overlay consisted of 0.25' of plant mix.
- D. RTS 226-1(4) was an overlay project constructed in 1993 between RP's 0.0 and 15.2. The roadlog shows this project as the most recent improvement project. The project consisted of a 23' finished surface with 2-11.5' travel lanes, 4:1 surfacing inslopes, and a 0.15' plant mix overlay.
- E. HSIP 226-1(6)1, UPN: 6062000, was a signing project constructed in 2008 between RP 0.6 and 15.2 addressing a crash trend of single-vehicle run-of-the-road crashes.

Traffic Data

2011 AADT	=	250 Present
2013 AADT	=	260 Letting Year
2033 AADT	=	480 Design Year
DHV	=	70
Com Trks	=	5.0%
ESAL	=	5
AGR	=	3.1%

Crash Analysis

- A. The crash analysis for State Secondary route 226, from RP 2.5 to RP 3.1, was taken for the dates of January 1, 2001 through December 31, 2010.
- B. The study area crash rate, severity index, and severity rate are 18.83, 4.00, and 75.32 respectively. In comparison to statewide averages for rural Secondary routes the crash rate, severity index, and severity rate are all higher. Please bear in mind that the study area has a short segment length and the crash rates and indices will be skewed. 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 nine crashes along this section of roadway.
 1. The main crash trend is single-vehicle run-off-the-road overturning crashes.
 2. Five of the crashes occurred along the curve from RP 2.5 to RP 2.7, resulting in 2 fatal crashes with 2 fatalities and 5 injuries (2 incapacitating, 2 non-incapacitating, and 1 possible), 1 injury crash (1 non-incapacitating) and 2 property damage only crashes.
 3. Two of the remaining crashes were also single-vehicle run-off-the-road overturning crashes both resulting in injury.
 4. The remaining crashes were a wild-animal vehicle collision and a rear-end collision at the intersection of Custer Lane and S-226.
- D. The Safety Engineering Section recommendation was to widen shoulders to 4' and add both advanced curve warning signing and chevrons on the outside of the curve. The safety improvements in this area yielded a benefit-to-cost ratio of 4.83, assuming a \$100,000 construction cost for the time period from January 1, 2004 through December 31, 2008.

Major Design Features

- A. **Design Speed.** The design speed of 50 mph was taken from 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 of S-226 with this project. The single horizontal curve located within the project limits has a radius of 1,432' which exceeds the minimum radius of 760' for Rural Collector Roads with a 50 mph design speed. The District will review options for realigning the County Road approach or improving the existing approach as the current configuration creates the visual deception for northbound traffic that the roadway is straight.

Preliminary Field Review Report

HSIP 226-1(7)3

SF109-Wdn Shdlrs, Chrvns-S226

Project Manager: James A Combs, PE

Page 3 of 6

- C. **Vertical Alignment.** No changes are proposed to the existing vertical alignment with this project. The existing maximum grade of 2.6% within the project limits is below the maximum grade of 7% allowed for Rural Collector Roads with a 50 mph design speed.
- D. **Typical Sections and Surfacing.** The roadway width is 23' consisting of 2-11.5' travel lanes and no shoulders. A design to widen the shoulder along the outside of the existing curve is being considered. A new typical is also being considered which would correct the superelevation of the curve. The existing southbound travel lane superelevation appears to vary between 7% and 8%; the northbound travel lane superelevation appears to vary between 3% and 4%. The existing side slopes appear to be traversable. Corrective slope flattening will be considered if the existing side slopes do not meet design standards.
- E. **Geotechnical Considerations.** No geotechnical issues are anticipated with this project. Cores of the existing pavement depth may be required.
- F. **Hydraulics.** No hydraulic issues are anticipated with this project.
- G. **Bridges.** There are no bridges on the project. No Bridge issues will be addressed with this project.
- H. **Traffic.** This project was nominated to address an existing safety issue at this location. Proposed solutions include widening the shoulder of the curve, correcting the superelevation through the curve, upgrading advanced curve warning signing, placing chevrons on the outside of the curve, slope flattening, modifying the existing County Road approach and/or realigning the County Road approach. Pavement markings and signing plans will be required for this project.
- I. **Pedestrian/Bicycle/ADA.** No issues will be addressed with this project.
- J. **Miscellaneous Features.** If the County Road approach is realigned approximately 9 mailboxes and fencing will require relocation.
- K. **Context Sensitive Design Issues.** No Context Sensitive Design Issues have been identified at this time.

Other Projects

No other projects have been identified in the area.

Location Hydraulics Study Report

No hydraulics issues are anticipated with this project.

Design Exceptions

Any exceptions to standards will be documented in the Scope of Work report.

Right-of-Way

The existing right-of-way will need to be plotted. According to NRS 329-B, existing right-of-way widths are 60' left and vary between 40'-60' right. Right-of-way acquisition may be necessary.

Access Control

Access control will not be implemented on this project.

Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) Features

No ITS features have been located within the project limits. No ITS issues are anticipated with this project.

Experimental Features

No experimental features are anticipated with this project.

Utilities/Railroads

Underground utilities will be surveyed to determine potential conflicts in the area.

Preliminary Field Review Report

HSIP 226-1(7)3

SF1 09-Wdn Shdlrs, Chrvns-S226

Project Manager: James A Combs, PE

Page 4 of 6

No railroads are located within the project limits.

Survey

A survey request, 7503000RDREQ001.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

No apparent significant environmental issues have been identified. Environmental Services will develop the appropriate documentation. 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.

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. A Traffic Control Plan will be provided.

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 \$158,048. The preliminary estimate for CN and CE is \$118,443 with a cost per mile of \$197,400. The following items were considered in the roadwork preliminary cost estimate: plant mix, cold milling, grading, signing, pavement markings, and new fencing.

		Estimate Costs	Inflation (INF) (from PPMS)	w/INF + IDC (from PPMS)
Road work		\$63,000		
Traffic Control		\$10,000		
Subtotal		\$73,000		
Mobilization	10%	\$7,300		
Subtotal		\$80,300		
Contingencies	25%	\$20,075		
Total CN		\$100,375	\$17,010	\$128,701
CE	18%	\$18,068	\$3,062	\$23,166
IDC:	9.64%		TOTAL	\$151,867
Inflation Factor (ppms)			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.

Preliminary Field Review Report

HSIP 226-1(7)3

SF109-Wdn Shdlrs, Chrvns-S226

Project Manager: James A Combs, PE

Page 5 of 6

Ready Date

The project schedule and ready date will be developed through the overrides process in OPX2.

Site Map

The project site map is attached.

Preliminary Field Review Report

HSIP 226-1(7)3

SF109-Wdn Shdlrs, Chrvns-S226

Project Manager: James A Combs, PE

Page 6 of 6

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

FEDERAL AID PROJECT HSIP 226-1(8)3
WIDENING, SIGNING, & CHEVRONS
SF109-WDN SHDLRS, CHR VNS-S226
CASCADE COUNTY

