



May 14, 2013

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

RECEIVED
MAY 28 2013
ENVIRONMENTAL

Attention: Alan Woodmansey

Subject: Programmatic Categorical Exclusion (PCE) Concurrence Request
HSIP 41-1(20)24
SF 099 SE of Helmville
CN: 7180000

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 Preliminary Field Review Report, dated January 16, 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
B. Would this proposed project result in a "jeopardy" opinion (under 50 CFR 402) from the Fish & Wildlife Service on any Federally listed T/E Species?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

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

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

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

Eric Thunstrom, Date: 5/14/13
Eric Thunstrom
Great Falls District Project Development Engineer
MDT Environmental Services Bureau

Concur Heidy Bruner, Date: 5/15/13
Heidy Bruner, P.E.
Engineering Section Supervisor
MDT Environmental Services Bureau

Concur [Signature], Date: 24 May 2013
Federal Highway Administration

Attachment: Preliminary Field Review Report

electronic copies without attachment (unless otherwise noted):

- | | |
|----------------------|--|
| Dave Hand | 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
May 14, 2013

HSIP 41-1(20)24
SF 099 SE of Helmville
CN: 7180000

Paul Ferry, P.E.	Highways Engineer
Mark Goodman, P.E.	Hydraulics Engineer
Robert Stapley	Right-of-Way Bureau Chief
Roy Peterson, P.E.	Traffic and Safety Engineer
Gabe Priebe, P.E.	Traffic Project 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
Eric Thunstrom	Environmental Services Bureau Project Development Engineer
Montana Legislative Branch Environmental Quality Council (EQC) (with attachment)	

copies with attachment
File

Environmental Services Bureau

Preliminary Field Review Report

HSIP 41-1(20)24, SF 099 SE of Helmville

Project Manager: Gabe Priebe

Page 1 of 5

Introduction

A Preliminary Field Review (PFR) was conducted Thursday, December 6, 2012 on site with the following attendance:

Steve Prinzing, MDT Great Falls District – Engineering Services Supervisor
Harry Barnett, MDT Great Falls District – Area Maintenance Superintendent
Theodore Winderl, MDT Great Falls District – Lincoln Area Maintenance Supervisor
Patricia Burke, MDT Helena – Safety Engineering
Jim Cornell, MDT Helena – Traffic Signing
Gabe Priebe, MDT Helena – Traffic Project Engineer
Sandie Stiffler, MDT Helena – Traffic Safety

Proposed Scope of Work

The proposed project has been nominated to provide roadside safety enhancements by installing guardrail on the outside of a curve and advanced curve warning signing along a section of State Primary Route 41/MT 141. During the PFR it was noted that over half the crashes involved vehicles leaving the roadway on the inside of the curve; therefore cost-effective measures including guardrail and possible slope flattening will also be implemented on the inside of the curve where appropriate.

Purpose and Need

The intent of the project is to address single vehicle run-off-the road crashes on the curve within the project limits. The purpose of this project is to prevent crashes by warning drivers of the approaching curve with advanced curve warning signing as well as to reduce the severity of the crashes by stopping and redirecting vehicles before they leave the roadway.

Project Location and Limits

The project is located in Powell County on State Primary Route 41/MT 141 southeast of Helmville beginning at RP 24.3 and extending to RP 24.6. The functional classification of this highway is rural minor arterial. According to the Montana Road Log, this section of roadway was built in 1965 and last improved under project number F 41-1(4) in 1979.

Work Zone Safety and Mobility

At this time, Level 3 construction zone impacts are anticipated for this project as defined in the Work Zone Safety and Mobility (WZSM) guidance. Due to the short construction duration, we expect a small degree of public impact. The plans package will include a Transportation Management Plan (TMP) consisting mainly of a Traffic Control Plan (TCP). A limited Public Information (PI) component to address public notification will also be included. These issues are discussed in more detail under the Traffic Control and Public Involvement sections.

Physical Characteristics

The existing terrain within the project limits is rolling, in a rural setting. There are two approaches located within the length of the project.

A speed of 55 mph would be appropriate by current MDT standards for rolling terrain on a minor rural arterial.

The TIS Road Log shows one typical section throughout that consists of two 12' travel lanes and 2' paved shoulders.

The existing surfacing consists of 3.7 in. Bituminous Plant Mix with 13.0 in. base course.

There are no bridges on this project.

Preliminary Field Review Report

HSIP 41-1(20)24, SF 099 SE of Helmville

Project Manager: Gabe Priebe

Page 2 of 5

Traffic Data

The traffic data for this location is as follows:

- 2012 (Present) AADT = 730
- 2033 (Letting) AADT = 750
- 2033 (Design) AADT = 1,220
- DHV = 200
- Truck% = 11.8%
- Equivalent Single Axle Load = 59
- Annual Growth Rate = 2.5%

Crash Analysis

The Montana Highway Patrol records show seven crashes along this section of roadway. The main crash trend is single-vehicle run-off-the-road crashes. Five of the crashes were considered addressable by adding guardrail on the west side of the roadway (outside of curve) from RP 24.329 to RP 24.546 and installing new advanced curve warning signing for the curve. All of the addressable crashes involved southbound vehicles losing control on the curve and entering the adjacent roadside ditches (3 east side/2 west side). These crashes resulted in 1 fatal crash (1 fatality) and 1 injury crash (1 possible injury) and 3 property damage only crash. The safety improvements in this area yielded a benefit-to-cost ratio of 2.47, assuming a \$100,607 construction cost for the time period from January 1, 1998 through December 31, 2007.

There has been one additional crash since December 2007 within the study area. The crash involved a northbound vehicle losing control on the curve and overturning in the west side ditch, resulting in a non-incapacitating injury.

Major Design Features

- a. **Design Speed.** The design speed for this section of roadway based on its functional classification of rural minor arterial in rolling terrain is 55 miles per hour (mph). The posted speed limit is 70 mph.
- b. **Horizontal Alignment.** The horizontal alignment consists of one horizontal curve. No changes will occur to the horizontal alignment.
- c. **Vertical Alignment.** The existing vertical alignment will not be changed with the project.
- d. **Typical Sections and Surfacing.** The existing roadway section will not change.
- e. **Geotechnical Considerations.** No geotechnical involvement is anticipated.
- f. **Hydraulics.** No hydraulic-related involvement is anticipated. An irrigation crossing structure is located close to the edge of travel way on the inside of the curve at RP 24.32.
- g. **Bridges.** There are no bridges within project limits.
- h. **Traffic.** Traffic will be the lead for this project. Advanced curve warning signs will be installed in advance of the curve in both directions. A section of guardrail will be installed on the west side of the roadway from RP 24.3 to RP 24.6 between the approaches. Additionally, guardrail will be installed on the east side of the roadway north of RP 24.3 to address an existing irrigation structure within the clear zone. Fill slopes will also be evaluated on the inside of the curve north of the structure to determine if extending the guardrail or slope flattening is feasible and cost effective. More specific information will be provided following

Preliminary Field Review Report

HSIP 41-1(20)24, SF 099 SE of Helmville

Project Manager: Gabe Priebe

Page 3 of 5

survey at Scope of Work.

- i. **Pedestrian/Bicycle/ADA.** There are no pedestrian, bicycle or ADA specific features included in this project.
- j. **Context Sensitive Design Issues.** There are no apparent context sensitive design issues.

Other Projects

No other projects are currently under construction that will affect this project. This project may be tied for construction with a nearby safety project depending upon project schedules; a possible candidate is SF 119-Signing E of MT 141.

Location Hydraulics Study Report

A Location Hydraulics Study Report is not required for this project.

Design Exceptions

No design exceptions are anticipated for this project.

Right-of-Way

There will be no right-of-way involvement on this project.

Access Control

No changes to access control are proposed.

Utilities/Railroads

There are no railroads affected by this project. Underground utilities, including a fiber optic line, run within the right-of-way at various points; however, installing guardrail is not expected to interfere with them. A 'one-call' will be conducted in conjunction with the survey and will be required again prior to placing guardrail posts and any slope flattening.

Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) Features

No ITS features will be used on this project.

Experimental Features

No experimental features will be used on this project.

Survey

A topographical survey will be required for project area slated for guardrail installation and potential slope flattening as well as centerline and edge of pavement locations for signing placement. A soil survey is not needed. Determining horizontal utility locations via 'one-call' within the guardrail and slope flattening areas will be included in the survey request.

Public Involvement

The project will include a 'Level A' standard of public involvement. This includes a news release explaining the project and a Department point of contact.

Environmental Considerations

A Categorical Exclusion is anticipated on this project.

Energy Savings/Eco-Friendly Considerations

No energy savings/eco-friendly considerations are proposed.

Preliminary Field Review Report

HSIP 41-1(20)24, SF 099 SE of Helmville

Project Manager: Gabe Priebe

Page 4 of 5

Traffic Control

The final traffic control plan (TCP) will be discussed at the plan-in-hand with district personnel in attendance. The TCP will include a sequencing special provision that will provide a safe route for the travelling public at all times. All signing and/or flagging operations will be in accordance with the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices.

The guardrail installation can be completed under traffic by closing a portion of the adjacent lane and alternating one-way traffic through the construction area by use of flaggers and/or temporary traffic signals.

Project Management

Gabe Priebe will be the Project Design Engineer. This project does not require full FHWA oversight.

Preliminary Cost Estimate

The estimate below is based on information provided by the Safety Engineering office. This estimate will be refined as design progresses.

	Estimated cost	Inflation (INF) (from PPMS)	TOTAL costs w/INF + IDC (from PPMS)
Guardrail and Signing	\$58,182		
Traffic Control (10%)	\$5,818		
Subtotal	\$64,000		
Mobilization (25%)	\$16,000		
Subtotal	\$80,000		
Contingencies (10%)	\$8,000		
Total CN	<u>\$88,000</u>	<u>\$2,572</u>	<u>\$100,607</u>
CE (15%)	<u>\$13,200</u>	<u>\$385</u>	<u>\$15,090</u>
TOTAL CN+CE	<u>\$101,200</u>	<u>\$2,957</u>	<u>\$115,697</u>

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.

Ready Date

A ready date will be set once the project is sent for overrides. A letting date will be established before the SOW.

Site Map

The project site map is attached.

Preliminary Field Review Report

HSIP 41-1(20)24, SF 099 SE of Helmville
Project Manager: Gabe Priebe

