



February 21, 2013

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

Attention: Alan Woodmansey

Subject: Programmatic Categorical Exclusion (PCE) Concurrence Request
NH 10-2(37)31
Carter N Turn Lanes
CN: 7965000

RECEIVED
MAR -5 2013
ENVIRONMENTAL
RECEIVED
MAR 04 2013
FHWA
MONTANA DIVISION
MASTER FILE
COPY

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 Scoping Meeting Minutes and a project location map (plan sheet title page) 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.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. There are parks, recreational, or other properties acquired/improved under <i>Section 6(f)</i> of the <i>1965 National Land & Water Conservation Fund Act</i> (16 USC 460L, <i>et seq.</i>) on or adjacent to proposed the project area.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The use of such <i>Section 6(f)</i> sites would be documented and compensated with the appropriate agencies. (<i>e.g.</i> : MDFWP, local entities, etc.).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Are there any sites either on, or eligible for the National Register of Historic Places with concurrence in determination of eligibility or effect under <i>Section 106</i> of the <i>National Historic Preservation Act</i> (16 USC 470, <i>et seq.</i>) by the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), which would be affected by this proposed project.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. There are parks, recreation sites, school grounds, wildlife refuges, historic sites, historic bridges, or irrigation that might be considered under <i>Section 4(f)</i> of the <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 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 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 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 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"/>
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

YES NO N/A UNK

B. Would this proposed project result in a "jeopardy" opinion (under 50 CFR 402) from the Fish & Wildlife Service on any Federally listed T/E Species?

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

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

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

Eric Thunstrom, Date: 2/21/13
Eric Thunstrom
Great Falls District Project Development Engineer
MDT Environmental Services Bureau

Heidy Bruner, Date: 2/22/13
Concur Heidy Bruner, P.E.
Engineering Section Supervisor
MDT Environmental Services Bureau

[Signature], Date: 4 MAR 2013
Concur Federal Highway Administration

Attachment:

electronic copies without attachment (unless otherwise noted):

- | | |
|----------------------|--|
| Doug Wilmot, P.E. | Acting Great Falls District Administrator |
| Steve Prinzing, P.E. | Great Falls District Preconstruction Engineer |
| 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 |
| Robert Stapley | Right-of-Way Bureau Chief |
| Bryan Miller, P.E. | Acting Consultant Design Engineer |
| Fred Bente, P.E. | Consultant Project Engineer |
| 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

Scoping Meeting Minutes

Carter Turn Lanes (UPN 7965) NH 10-2(37)31

Kershaw Turn Lanes (UPN 7964) NH 10-2(35)37

Page 1 of 4

A scoping meeting for the Carter and Kershaw Turn Lanes was held at MDT Great Falls District headquarters on October 25, 2012, with the following in attendance:

Mick Johnson	Great Falls District Administrator
Steve Prinzing	Great Falls District Engineering Services Supervisor
Doug Wilmot	Great Falls District Construction Engineer
James Combs	Great Falls District Traffic Engineer
Fred Bente	Consultant Project Engineer
Will Tangen	Consultant Plans Designer
Chris Ward	TD&H Engineering Project Manager

The consulting firm of TD&H has been selected to complete the design for these projects.

Carter Turn Lanes

TD&H previously produced a set of plans for the Carter site for the developer of the grain elevator project, EGT, LLC ("April 2012 plans") working with MDT through the Systems Impact Process. The plans were advertised for bid, but the low bid exceed the amount of funds available to finance construction. The plans were developed in AutoCAD.

Fred Bente distributed an email from Darcy O'Dell in Traffic Geometrics with review comments of the April 2012 plans. The comments and a response by TD&H are attached.

It was agreed that the survey should be reprocessed in GEOPAK and the design regenerated in MicroStation to MDT CADD standards so it will be compatible with the letting system and in a familiar format for reviewers. A little extra effort up front should make things run faster in the end.

The length of the acceleration lane and tapers were set to avoid a Weigh in Motion site that is just off the east end of the project. It was agreed that the project should avoid impacting the WIM site.

According to the Route Segment Plan, 8 foot shoulders would be required. The existing shoulders are 4 feet. The April 2012 plans use 4 foot shoulders. Steve Prinzing commented that there are no projects to widen the roadway in the foreseeable future, even in the 20 year plan. Steve said a Width Exception would be required, and said he could provide an example write up. The width exception would not have been required in the Systems Impact Process.

The typical section in the April 2012 plans reduced the inslope width to 4 feet from the 10 foot standard listed in the Geometric Design Tables. A sketch of the reduced inslope width is attached. The attendees thought that a design exception will not be needed as long as the reduction is documented in the reports. Consultant Design will check whether this reduction will require a design exception.

The narrower shoulder and reduced inslope width were incorporated in the design to eliminate the need for right of way acquisition and eliminate major impacts to utilities on the west side of the highway.

The topographic survey was completed in state plane coordinates, but there may be some aspects that do not conform to MDT standards, such as ties to benchmarks and setting control points. Chris Ward thought that this could be improved to MDT standards without affecting the topog. TD&H will look into what it will take to bring the survey up to MDT standards and provide a summary.

Scoping Meeting Minutes

Carter Turn Lanes (UPN 7965) NH 10-2(37)31
Kershaw Turn Lanes (UPN 7964) NH 10-2(35)37

Page 2 of 4

The schedule for this project can be compressed due to the design work and review that has been completed. Attendees thought the geometrics are probably final as shown in the April 2012 plans. The schedule should include a combined Alignment and Grade and Scope of Work report. There would be one full in person Plan-in-Hand and PIH stage, followed by a mail in final plan review.

Fred Bente said he had discussed the project with Environmental and it is likely that MDT Environmental would do the cultural/biological permitting and prepare the E-doc.

The April 2012 plans include a depressed island between the right turn acceleration lane and the through lane. District thought this is okay. Chris Ward stated that the runoff into the island is minimal and no drainage structure had been included.

No surfacing design was done during development of the project to date. The surfacing depth was matched to the existing surfacing section and is also similar to that used on Jct Bootlegger Trail – NE, near Great Falls. Steve Prinzing suggested that an ESAL calc be provided and a surfacing design calc be run based on an R value of 5. This should be conservative for this location. It was agreed that pulverization should not be designed into the project. It will be up to the contractor to handle the existing surfacing. It might be used in the embankment. MDT may do a soil boring to determine if the existing subgrade is over optimum moisture. It would be good to have that information soon and MDT staff can do it now without waiting for getting TD&H under contract.

Mick Johnson noted that the April 2012 plans show RCP culverts. Optional pipe should be used. TD&H will check and see if there is adequate geotechnical data from the grain elevator project to determine if there will be issues with pipe corrosion. If not MDT may want to do those tests on their boring.

No phase I SUE survey should be needed. Utilities were designated by a one-call locate. There is a telephone pedestal at 1521+00 RT that no lines were marked on, but it is well outside the construction limits and may be abandoned. Since there are no indications that the project will affect underground utilities no further investigation should be needed. District Utilities can provide an update if there are any new permits.

The need for a railroad agreement was discussed, since the private approach crosses the railroad tracks. It was agreed that it would be best if the industry builds the portion of the approach, up to the right of way line, first, so that MDT's contractor will not be working in the railroad right of way. Chris Ward reported that the developer's contractor should be building their portion in the next few weeks, so there should be no question that MDT's project will be able to match up to that completed work at the right of way line.

Mick Johnson stated that it is expected that the new elevator will be receiving grain in July 2013. The District believes that a 6 month schedule to letting would be ideal. Chris Ward commented that it should be possible to get the plans regenerated in MicroStation to alignment and grade level in about a three week period.

The meeting reconvened on the project site, without Johnson, Wilmot and Combs. Steve Prinzing noted that drainage needs to be checked closely. The April 2012 plans indicate eliminating a culvert under the farm field approach. The concern is that water would pond or be directed off the right of way differently that it currently does. The railroad crossing signing was noted. It consists of a stop sign with a supplemental regulatory panel (photos attached). The crossing surface is being upgraded by BNSF but it is unknown if the signing is adequate or who is responsible for upgrading if needed.

Scoping Meeting Minutes

Carter Turn Lanes (UPN 7965) NH 10-2(37)31
Kershaw Turn Lanes (UPN 7964) NH 10-2(35)37

Page 3 of 4

Follow up items:

1. District Utilities inform if any new underground utilities added after the fiber optic line.
2. TD&H provide analysis of what's needed to bring survey up to MDT standards.
3. Consultant Design determine if a design exception is needed for inslope width.
4. Steve Prinzing provide an example Width Exception request.
5. TD&H check if adequate info available to analyze culvert corrosion.
6. District do a soil boring.
7. Traffic Safety review and comment on the railroad crossing signing.

Kershaw Turn Lanes

This project is expected to be a geometric twin of the Carter Turn Lanes. No compromises on design standards are expected; except for the 4 foot shoulder is expected to be used and would require the same route segment width exception.

The schedule is longer term than Carter and will follow the design flowchart more closely. The schedule may be slightly expedited. It was agreed to plan for a mail out Alignment and Grade as the geometrics appear to be fairly clear already. A Preliminary Field Review report will need to be prepared as well as a Scope of Work report. An in-person Plan in Hand should be held.

There is no Memorandum of Agreement in place yet with the owner of this elevator like there is at Carter.

There could be Right of Way and utility involvement. TD&H should plan to do right of way and utility plans, with MDT staff doing deed and acquisitions. Fred Bente said he had discussed the project with Environmental and it is likely that MDT Environmental would do the cultural/biological permitting and prepare the E-doc.

Mick Johnson thought that this may be a public approach. It is expected that work will be limited to the MDT right of way, as this is an existing elevator. Mick said there is a turnaround for the WIM testing truck near the project site and this could be moved if necessary.

A Phase I SUE should be considered.

The meeting was reconvened on the project site. The profile grade should be kept similar to existing. The approach grade over the railroad crossing is good. It looks like there would be fill on the northwest side (left), but unlikely to run into the issues with fitting a ditch in the right of way that exist at Carter. Drainage should be maintained as existing on the right.

Geometrics from Carter should work here. There is an additional approach to US 87 west of the grain elevator approach that will probably be within the project limits and may be in the right turn lane. There is a parallel two track road on the right between two approaches. It is not clear if the road is in the right of way or railroad right of way. The road is likely to be affected or eliminated by the widening.

The elevator approach also serves a residence to the west. That residence also has access to the highway via the other approach to the west.

Fiber optic markers we observed on the left but further away than at Carter, and probably well outside the right of way. It was agreed that utilities should be designated based on a one-call and it is assumed that

Scoping Meeting Minutes

Carter Turn Lanes (UPN 7965) NH 10-2(37)31
Kershaw Turn Lanes (UPN 7964) NH 10-2(35)37

Page 4 of 4

that information will be adequate for design. A determination if a Phase I SUE is needed will be made based on the survey and preliminary design. For scoping purposes assume no Phase I SUE.

Plans for the grain elevator site should be obtained from the developer. It is unknown if any modifications to the approach are planned. It was noted that the grade crossing occurs in a switch so the crossing surface would be complicated if the existing wood crossing surface needs to be replaced. However the crossing is assumed to be outside the limits of MDT's project. Grade crossing signing consists of crossbucks.

Follow up items:

1. Get the developer's site plan.

DRAFT