



RECEIVED
APR 15 2013
ENVIRONMENTAL

April 5, 2013

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
STPS 240-1(9)7
South of Chinook S
CN: 7924000

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 March 6, 2013, 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"/>

	YES	NO	N/A	UNK
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 1965 <i>National Land & Water Conservation Fund Act</i> (16 USC 460L, <i>et seq.</i>) on or adjacent to 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"/>

- | | <u>YES</u> | <u>NO</u> | <u>N/A</u> | <u>UNK</u> |
|--|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| 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"/> |
| 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: 4/5/13
Eric Thunstrom
Great Falls District Project Development Engineer
MDT Environmental Services Bureau

Concur Heidy Bruner, Date: 4/8/13
Heidy Bruner, P.E.
Engineering Section Supervisor
MDT Environmental Services Bureau

Concur [Signature], Date: 12 APR 2013
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

Kevin L. McLaury
Page 7 of 7
April 5, 2013

STPS 240-1(9)7
South of Chinook S
CN: 7924000

Paul Ferry, P.E.	Highways Engineer
Mark Goodman, P.E.	Hydraulics Engineer
Robert Stapley	Right-of-Way Bureau Chief
Christie McOmber, P.E.	Great Falls District Projects Engineer
Suzy Price	Contract Plans Bureau Chief
Tim Tilton	Contract Section Supervisor
Lisa Hurley	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: Paul R. Ferry, PE *Signed by Lesly Tribelhorn - 03/06/2103*
 Highways Engineer

Date: March 06, 2013

Subject: STPS 240-1(9)7
 South of Chinook S
 UPN 7924000
 Work Type 180 – Resurfacing–Asphalt (Thin Lift ≤ 0.20 ft.) (including Safety Improvements)

Attached is the Preliminary Field Review Report/Scope of Work Report which was approved on *March 6, 2013*. 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:

- | | |
|--|--|
| Doug Wilmot, Acting 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 | Alan Woodmansey, FHWA-Operations Engineer |
| | Jon Swartz, Maintenance Administrator |

cc:

- | | |
|--|---|
| Robert Snyder, Road Design Area Engineer | Dawn Stratton, Fiscal Programming Section |
| | 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 McOmer, District Projects Engineer |
| Kurt Marcoux, District Hydraulics Engineer | Stan Kuntz, G.F. District Materials Lab |
| Jon Axline, Acting Env. Resources Section Supervisor | Matt Ladenburg, Great Falls District Maintenance Chief |
| Paul Sturm, District Biologist | Jerilee Weibel, District R/W Supervisor |
| Eric Thunstrom, Project Development Engineer | Phillip Inman, Utilities Engineering Manager |
| Danielle Bolan, Traffic Operations Engineer | David Hoerning, R/W Engineering Manager |
| Ivan Ulberg, Traffic Design Engineer | Greg Pizzini, Acquisition Manager |
| Gabe Priebe, District Traffic Project Engineer | Joe Zody, R/W Access Management Section Manager |
| Kraig McLeod, Safety Engineer | Matt Strizich, Materials Engineer |
| Stephanie Brandenberger, Bridge Area Eng, G.F. District | Daniel Hill, Pavement Analysis Engineer |
| Michael Grover, Engineering Cost Analyst | Lee Grosch, District Geotechnical Manager |
| Marty Beatty, Engineering Information Services | Bryce Larsen, Supervisor, Photogrammetry & Survey |
| Paul Grant, Public Involvement Officer | Paul Johnson, Project Analysis Bureau |

Sue Sillick, Research Section Supervisor
Alyce Fisher, Fiscal Programming Section
Doug Wilmot, G.F. District Construction Engineer
James Combs, District Traffic Engineer
Linda Cline, District R/W Design

Jean Riley, Planner
Dawn Stratton, Fiscal Programming Section
Brendan Scott, District Utility Agent

Preliminary Field Review/Scope of Work Report

STPS 240-1(9)7

South of Chinook S

Project Manager: Christie McOmber, PE

Page 1 of 10

Introduction

This report was derived from information taken from the Preliminary Field Review conducted on February 14, 2013, with the following individuals in attendance:

Steve Prinzing	District Preconstruction Engineer	Great Falls
Jeania Cereck	District Design Supervisor	Great Falls
Beth Doran	Engineering Project Manager	Havre
James Combs	Traffic Engineer	Great Falls
Sam Wurz	Maintenance Superintendent	Havre
Rich Hibl	Construction Operations Engineer	Great Falls
Matt Ladenburg	Maintenance Chief	Havre
Amr Ibrahim	Road Designer	Great Falls

Proposed Scope of Work

- a. This project is nominated as a preventative maintenance overlay. The intent is to overlay the existing driving lanes and shoulders with 0.15' of Plant Bituminous Surfacing, and apply a seal and cover to the full width of the mainline.
- b. The existing horizontal and vertical alignment will be used throughout this project.
- c. Guardrail will be upgraded within the project limits

Purpose and Need

The purpose of this project is to extend the existing pavement life, provide a safer, smoother riding surface and provide additional strength. Guardrail will be upgraded to reduce snow drifting and enhance safety.

Project Location and Limits

- a. The proposed project is located on S-240 in Blaine County, beginning at RP 6.8±, Sec. 25, T32N, R19E, approximately 5.7 miles south of Chinook City Limits, and extending south for approximately 6.4 miles to RP 13.2±, Sec. 23, T31N, R19E.
- b. The Functional Classification of S-240 is a Major Collector. The proposed project will be designed to the Geometric Design Criteria for Rural Collector Road (Secondary System).
- c. The plans for the project will be designed in stationing. The route post for this project increases north to south as will the new stationing.
- d. As-built plans were used to determine the reference posts. The Reference Posts have been verified using a distance meter.
- e. The project crosses one bridge at RP 12.4, over Bean Creek.

Preliminary Field Review/Scope of Work Report

STPS 240-1(9)7

South of Chinook S

Project Manager: Christie McOmber, PE

Page 2 of 10

- f. The following table identifies original as-built project location and year built according to the Road Log:

Table 1: Original As-Built Projects

Original As-Built Project ID	From		To		Year Built
	Station	RP	Station	RP	
*S-340(8)	351+00.0	6.847	580+75.5	11.221	1965
**S-340(3)	750+59.0	11.221	369+09.0	18.446	1957
**RS 240-1(2)11	750+59.0	11.221	0+00.0	25.486	1984

*S-340(8), original As-built stations increase north to south.

**S-340(3) & RS 240-1(2)11, original As-built stations increase south to north.

Equations:

580+75.5 on I S-340(8) = 750+59.0 on S-340(3).

580+75.5 on I S-340(8) = 750+59.0 on RS 240-1(2)11.

- g. The following table identifies improvement as-built project location and year built:

Table 2: Improvement As-Built Projects

Improvement As-Built Project ID	From RP	To RP	Year Built
*RTS 240-1(3)1	1.127	11.221	1997
RS 240-1(2)11	11.221	13.265	1984
STPS 240-1(4)13	13.265	25.486	2000

*RTS 240-1(3)1 is an overlay improvement project.

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 limited 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

- a. This project traverses a rural area with rolling terrain surrounded mainly by farm land.
- b. Existing Horizontal Alignment
The radii of the five horizontal curves within the project limits are 2865.0', 5730.0', 11460.0', 5730.0', and reverse curve of 1146.0'. All the curves meet the minimum radius of 760' for Rural Collector Roads with a 50 mph design speed.
- c. Existing Vertical Alignment
 - i. Most of the grades vary between 0.00% and 6.00% and do not exceed the maximum grade of 7.00% allowed for Rural Collector Roads with a 50 mph design speed in rolling terrain.
 - ii. There is one location where the grade exceeds the Geometric Design Criteria maximum grade of 7% for rolling terrain on Rural Collector Roads. The maximum grade of approximately 7.8% is located from RP 8.91 to RP 9.01.
- d. Existing Cut / Fill Slopes

Preliminary Field Review/Scope of Work Report

STPS 240-1(9)7

South of Chinook S

Project Manager: Christie McOmer, PE

The existing cut and fill slopes vary throughout the proposed project limits. According to the original as-built plans, the fill sections varied from 5:1 to 2:1 slopes depending on fill depth. The cut sections also were varied depending on cut depth.

e. Existing surfacing:

Table 3: Original As-Built Projects surfacing

From RP.	To RP.	Existing Surfacing	As-Built Project ID
6.847	±7.415	0.20' Comp. PL. Mix Bit. Surf. (CRSE) 0.15' Comp. Top Surf. 0.50' Comp. Cr. Base Surf. 0.90' Comp. Select Surf.	S-340(8)
±7.415	±9.555	0.20' Comp. PL. Mix Bit. Surf. (CRSE) 0.15' Comp. Top Surf. 0.50' Comp. Cr. Base Surf. 0.50' Comp. Select Surf.	S-340(8)
±9.555	11.221	0.20' Comp. PL. Mix Bit. Surf. (CRSE) 0.15' Comp. Top Surf. 0.50' Comp. Cr. Base Surf. 0.50' Comp. Select Surf.	S-340(8)
11.221	13.265	*0.2' Two applications of bituminous surface treatment (Double shot) 0.25' Cr. Top Surf. 0.50' Cr. Base Course	*RS 240-1(2)11

*RS 240-1(2)11, the project was designed to accommodate a 0.20' future overlay.

Table 4: Improvement As-Built Projects surfacing

From RP.	To RP.	Existing Surfacing	As-Built Project ID
6.847	11.221	2" overlay 25' to 27' wide average	RTS 240-1(3)1
11.221	13.265	0.2' Two applications of bituminous surface treatment (Double shot) 0.25' Cr. Top Surf. 0.50' Cr. Base Course	RS 240-1(2)11

f. Typical Sections:

According to as-built data and the road log, the existing surfacing, lane, and shoulder widths are as follows:

Table 5: Existing Typical Sections

RP.		Total Width(ft.)	Lane Width(ft.)	Shoulder Width(ft.)
From	To			
6.847	11.221	28	12	2
11.221	13.265	26	12	1

- i. Slight variations were encountered in the field visit. Measurements at RP 7.3, 11.2, and 11.7 showed top widths of 25.3 ft., 26.0 ft., and 26.3 ft. respectively.

Preliminary Field Review/Scope of Work Report

STPS 240-1(9)7

South of Chinook S

Project Manager: Christie McOmer, PE

Page 4 of 10

The total bottom widths of the plant mix are 27.5 ft., 28 ft., and 27.8 ft. respectively.

- ii. Shoulder cracks were present, parallel to the road centerline, along the entire project as were transverse cracks throughout.
- iii. The reverse curves around RP 12.0 were analyzed due to the crashes at this site. The superelevations were inconsistent between RT and LT lanes. During the field review measurements were taken as follows:
 - RP 11.9, 5.5% on the LT and 8.0% on the RT
 - RP 12.2, 6.7% on the LT and 8.3% on the RT
 - RP 12.3, 6.9% on the LT and 8.7% on the RT

g. Bridges

The project crosses one bridge at RP 12.4, over Bean Creek. The bridge is a 26.0' x 39.50' timber structure with bituminous surfacing. The existing bituminous thickness varies between 1" and 2". The actual roadway width between the face of rail is 24.0'. The existing guard rail height is approximately 19" to the bolt hole and the posts are wooden posts. The end treatments of the guardrail are outdated and flared. On the south west corner of the bridge, it was noted that there is a small area of the deck exposed. The transvers cracks located at the end of the bridge were already crack sealed. The bridge was built in 1957.

h. PVMS Data

The survey-year 2012 and run-year 2013 indices for the roadway are listed in the PVMS database as following:

From RP 6.81 to RP 11.16

Recommended Treatment for:

2013 – C_AC Crack Seal & Cover

2015 – C_AC Crack Seal & Cover

Table 6: PVMS Indices from RP 6.81 to RP 11.16

PVMS INDICES	
Ride	75.6 (Fair)
Rut	80.2 (Good)
Alligator Cracking	97.0 (Good)
Miscellaneous Cracking	93.0 (Good)

From RP 11.16 to RP 25.36

Recommended Treatment for:

2013 – Do Nothing

2015 – C_AC Thin Overlay

Table 7: PVMS Indices from RP 11.16 to RP 25.36

PVMS INDICES	
Ride	73.4 (Fair)
Rut	74.9 (Good)
Alligator Cracking	99.5 (Good)
Miscellaneous Cracking	97.6 (Good)

Preliminary Field Review/Scope of Work Report

STPS 240-1(9)7

South of Chinook S

Project Manager: Christie McOmber, PE

Page 5 of 10

i. Guardrail:

There are two sections of guardrail located within the project limits. Both of the guardrail sections have W-beam rail. The first guardrail section is located at RP 7.2 which is in a high drifting area with steep embankments. The majority of guardrail posts are concrete and the height from the pavement to the centerline of the w-beam varies between 17" and 18". The second guardrail section is located around the bridge. All guardrail posts are wooden and the height from the pavement to the centerline is approximately 19".

Traffic Data

There are no major traffic breaks within the project. The following engineering study evaluation from RP 6.8 to RP 13.2 was determined using weigh-in-motion (WIM) sites and reflects a five-year average:

- 2012 (Current) AADT = 230
- 2014 (Letting Year) AADT = 230
- 2034 (Design Year) AADT = 290
- DHV = 40
- Percent of Trucks = 10.9 %
- EAL = 13
- Basis of Projected Traffic Growth = 1.1 %

Crash Analysis

The following engineering study evaluation on State Secondary Route 240 from RP 6.8 to RP 13.2 was taken from January 1, 2002 to June 30, 2012:

- a. Total Recorded Crashes = 4
- b. Type of crashes included:
 - Three of the four crashes were single vehicle run-off-the-road (SVROR) and occurred between RP 11.5 and RP 12.2.
 - Two of the three crashes resulted in a roll over, one of which resulted in a non-incapacitating injury.
 - The third SVROR crash resulted in a vehicle striking a fixed object.
 - Two of the three SVROR crashes occurred during dark conditions.
 - The fourth crash involved a wild animal during dark conditions at approximately RP 10.0.

Major Design Features

- a. **Design Speed.** The design speed for Rural Collector Roads is 50 mph for rolling terrain. The posted speed limit is 70 mph/65 mph trucks.
- b. **Horizontal Alignment.** The horizontal alignments will be perpetuated with this pavement preservation project.
- c. **Vertical Alignment.** The vertical alignments will be perpetuated with this pavement preservation project.
- d. **Typical Sections and Surfacing.**
 - I. The proposed typical section will receive 0.15' overlay on the driving lane and the shoulders throughout the project to complete a 24' finish top width. The plant mix at the project connections will be milled. No other milling or isolation lift was recommended for the remainder of the project. A leveling course will be added to correct irregularities in the surface.

Preliminary Field Review/Scope of Work Report

STPS 240-1(9)7

South of Chinook S

Project Manager: Christie McOmber, PE

Page 6 of 10

- II. The reverse curve superelevations, at RP 11.9, will be improved during construction to eliminate the inconsistency of the supers between RT and LT lanes. Additional plant mix quantities will be provided during the design phase.
 - III. The existing two 12' travel lanes will be maintained throughout the entire project. Seal and cover the full width, followed by new striping, will complete the treatment for this roadway
 - IV. No slope flattening will be required for 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. One culvert, 36" x 44', is located within the project limits at approximately RP 8.340.
 - g. **Bridges.** The structure will receive a thin layer of 0.1' overlay. The guardrail requires an upgrade with this project. New Box beam guardrail will be placed with metal posts. All the existing guardrail and concrete posts will be salvaged to MDT maintenance.
 - h. **Traffic.** New pavement markings will be required. Delineation was recently upgraded and appears to be in useable condition. New guardrail delineation is required due to the new guardrail installation. Signing will not be upgraded with this project, but the MDT Maintenance crews will update them as necessary.
 - i. **Pedestrian/Bicycle/ADA.** No pedestrian/bicycle/ADA improvements are needed for this project. No sidewalks exist on this route.
 - j. **Miscellaneous Features.**

Fencing:

All existing fencing will not be replaced with this project.

Rumble Strips:

According to MDT current practice, rumble strips will not be included on this project due to the lack of shoulders.

Guardrail:

The guardrail at RP 7.2 requires an upgrade. It is not required to address length of need on an overlay project; however, since this is the only known section in the project area that is non-standard, we will adjust the length to meet the length of need. All the existing guardrail and concrete posts will be salvaged to MDT Maintenance. Box beam guardrail will be used for the new guardrail. Guardrail widening will be provided throughout the guardrail sections. The proposed widening will be constructed as follows:

- 0.7' of plan mix will be placed from the edge of the travel way to the face of the rail.
- 0.75' of crushed aggregate course will be placed to cover the rail width.
- 2.0' of crushed aggregate course will be placed behind the rail posts.

Cold Milling:

Cold mill the beginning and end connections.

- k. **Context Sensitive Design Issues.** There are no Context Sensitive Design issues on this project.

Other Projects

BR 240-1(6)3 ~ 3 Mile CR-2M S Chinook is a bridge replacement project at RP 2.9 and has an

Preliminary Field Review/Scope of Work Report

STPS 240-1(9)7

South of Chinook S

Project Manager: Christie McOmber, PE

Page 7 of 10

anticipated letting date of January 2014. Approximate project limits are between RP 2.8 and 3.1. This project is located outside of the proposed project limits. A detour will be constructed during bridge replacement phase. The proposed detour top width is 24' with two 11' travel lanes. The detour will be made up of 0.75' of crushed aggregate course. This detour may not hold up to the weight and number of trucks hauling to this project. Coordination with these two projects is necessary.

Location Hydraulics Study Report

No hydraulic issues are anticipated with this project.

Design Exceptions

There is one location where the grade exceeds the Geometric Design Criteria maximum grade of 7% for rolling terrain on Rural Collector Roads. The maximum grade of approximately 7.8% is located from RP 8.91 to RP 9.01. Due to the nomination as a pavement preservation project, the steep grades will not be adjusted.

Right-of-Way

There is no right-of-way involvement for this project. Right of Way limits for this project vary between 50' and 190'.

Access Control

Access control will not be required for this project.

Utilities/Railroads

There will be no railroad or utility involvement with this project. Some known utilities in the vicinity are overhead power and underground gas. A note to locate underground utilities around the guardrail installation areas before construction will be included in the plans.

Cold-In-Place Recycle

Cold-In-Place Recycle (CIR) is not an applicable activity for this project.

Maintenance Items

Maintenance forces have agreed to complete the following tasks prior to contract letting:

- Verify existing traffic signs condition
- Upgrade traffic signs as needed

Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) Features

No ITS solutions will be included with this project.

Survey

No survey will be necessary. Estimated plan quantities will be determined from As-Built plans. Any survey they may be needed as the project progresses will be either performed or requested by the District.

Public Involvement

Due to the limited scope of the project, a Level "A" public involvement plan should suffice. This will include a news release explaining the project and include a department point of contact.

Preliminary Field Review/Scope of Work Report

STPS 240-1(9)7

South of Chinook S

Project Manager: Christie McOmber, PE

Page 8 of 10

Environmental Considerations

Due to the proposed guardrail widening, the appropriate level of environmental documentation will be a Programmatic Categorical Exclusion. Environmental Services will provide the necessary documentation. Environmental Services will prepare a Programmatic Categorical Exclusion in accordance with 23 CFR 771.117(d) for this proposed project.

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. Access to residences within the project will be maintained to the maximum extent possible. The plans package will include a limited Transportation Management Plan (TMP) consisting mainly of a Traffic Control Plan (TCP).

Project Management

Christie W. McOmber, PE., Great Falls District Projects Engineer. This project is not under full FHWA oversight.

Preliminary Cost Estimate

- The project was programmed at \$1,500,000
- The following items were considered in the Preliminary Field Review cost estimate: PMS surfacing, traffic control, upgrade guardrails, and pavement markings. The cost per mile is approximately \$198,636\$/mile.

Preliminary Field Review/Scope of Work Report

STPS 240-1(9)7

South of Chinook S

Project Manager: Christie McOmber, PE

Page 9 of 10

Table 8: Preliminary Cost Estimate

		Estimate Costs	Inflation (INF) (from PPMS)	w/INF + IDC (from PPMS)
Road work		\$938,533		
Traffic Control		\$24,555		
Subtotal		\$963,088		
Mobilization	10%	\$96,309		
Subtotal		\$1,059,397		
Contingencies	20%	\$211,879		
Total CN		\$1,271,276	\$38,557	\$1,454,962
CE	10%	\$127,128	\$3,856	\$145,496
IDC:	11.08%		TOTAL	\$1,600,458
Inflation Factor (ppms)		0.0303297		

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 11.08% as of FY 2013

- A more detailed cost estimate will be determined after the project is designed.

Ready Date

The target ready date for this project is **September 01, 2013** with a letting date of **March 2014**.

Site Map

The project site map is attached.

Preliminary Field Review/Scope of Work Report

STPS 240-1(9)7
South of Chinook S
Project Manager: Christie McOmer, PE
10

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

**FEDERAL AID PROJECT STPS 240-1(10) 7
MILL, OVERLAY, SEAL & COVER
SOUTH OF CHINOOK S
BLAINE COUNTY**

LENGTH 6.4 miles

