



Montana Department of Transportation

2701 Prospect Avenue
PO Box 201001
Helena MT 59620-1001

Michael T. Tooley, Director
Steve Bullock, Governor

May 9, 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
STPHS-HSIP 3-1(36)10
SF 119-GR NW of Sun River
CN: 7826000

RECEIVED
MAY 31 2013
FHWA
MONTANA DIVISION

RECEIVED

MAY 28 2013

ENVIRONMENTAL

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 June 18, 2012, 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>	<u>N/A</u>	<u>UNK</u>
1. The context or degree of the Right-of-Way action would have (a) substantial social, economic, or environmental effect(s).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. There is a high rate of residential growth in this proposed project's area.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. There is a high rate of commercial growth in this proposed project's area.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. Work would be on and/or within approximately 1.6 kilometers (1± mile) of an Indian Reservation.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. There are parks, recreational, or other properties acquired/improved under <i>Section 6(f)</i> of the <i>1965 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 <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 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. 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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. The designated National Wild & Scenic River systems in Montana are:	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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"/>

Kevin L. McLaury
Page 7 of 7
May 9, 2013

STPHS-HSIP 3-1(36)10
SF 119-GR NW of Sun River
CN: 7826000

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



Memorandum

To: Roy A. Peterson, PE
Traffic and Safety Engineer

From: Ivan B. Ulberg, PE IBU
Traffic Project Engineer

Date: June 18, 2012

Subject: STPHS-HSIP 3-1(36)10
SF 119 – GR NW of Sun River
UPN 7826 000
Work Type 310 – Roadway & Roadside Safety Improvements

Please approve the attached Preliminary Field Review Report.

Approved R A Peterson Date 6/18/12
Roy A. Peterson, PE
Traffic and Safety Engineer

We are requesting comments from those on the distribution list. We will assume their concurrence if we receive no comments within two weeks of the approval date.

Distribution:

Mick Johnson, District Administrator	Tom Martin, Environmental Services Bureau Chief
Kent Barnes, Bridge Engineer	Lynn Zanto, Rail, Transit, & Planning Division Administrator
Paul Ferry, Highways Engineer	Jake Goettle, Construction Engineering Services Bureau
Robert Stapley, Right-of-Way Bureau Chief	Matt Strizich, Materials Engineer
	Jon Swartz, Maintenance Administrator

cc:

Dawn Stratton, Fiscal Programming Section	Traffic and Safety File
Ivan Ulberg, Project Design Manager	

e-copies:

Jim Walther, Engineering, Preconstruction Engineer	Jake Goettle, Construction Bureau – VA Engineer
Lesly Tribelhorn, Highways Design Engineer	Steve Prinzing, District Preconstruction
Mark Goodman, Hydraulics Engineer	Christie McOmber, District Projects Engineer
Kurt Marcoux, District Hydraulics Engineer	Scott Bunton, Engineering Cost Analysis
Bonnie Gundrum, Env. Resources Section Supervisor	Tony Strainer, District Maintenance Chief
Paul Sturm, District Biologist	JeriLee Weibel, District Right of Way Supervisor
Eric Thunstrom, District Project Development Engineer	Phillip Inman, Utilities Engineering Manager
Danielle Bolan, Traffic Engineer	David Hoerning, R/W Engineering Manager
Stephanie Brandenberger, Bridge Area Engineer	Greg Pizzini, Acquisition Manager
Kraig McLeod, Safety Engineer	Joe Zody, R/W Access Management Section Manager
James Combs, District Traffic Engineer	Paul Johnson, Project Analysis Bureau
Matt Strizich, Materials Engineer	Sue Sillick, Research Section Supervisor
Daniel Hill, Pavement Analysis Engineer	Alyce Fisher, Fiscal Programming
Bryce Larsen, Supervisor, Photogrammetry & Survey	Mark Keefe, Bicycle/Pedestrian Coordinator
Marty Beatty, Engineering Information Services	Wayne Noem, Secondary Roads Engineer
Paul Grant, Public Involvement Officer	
Jean Riley, Planner	

Preliminary Field Review Report

STPHS-HSIP 3-1(36)10, SF 119-GR NW of Sun River

Project Manager: Ivan B. Ulberg

Page 1 of 5

Introduction

A Preliminary Field Review was conducted Thursday, May 3rd, 2012 in the Great Falls District Conference room followed by an on-site visit, with the following in attendance:

Steve Prinzing, MDT Great Falls District – Preconstruction Engineer
James Combs, MDT Great Falls District – Traffic Engineer
Ivan Ulberg, MDT Helena – Traffic Project Engineer
Jim Cornell, MDT Helena – Traffic Sign Design Supervisor
Allen Levens, MDT Helena – Traffic Electrical

Proposed Scope of Work

The proposed project has been nominated to provide a roadway safety enhancement by installing box beam guardrail at five locations within the study area. Box beam guardrail has been proposed due to the high potential for blowing and drifting snow in the area.

Installing exclusively box beam rail may not be possible at all locations due to the need for approach rail “IRT” end sections. MDT does not have an approved design for box beam rail that allows installation along a radius to wrap around an approach. MDT does have a transition section designed to match up w-beam and box beam. This will be used as necessary to limit the amount of w-beam installed on this project.

Purpose and Need

The identified crash trend along this section of highway is single-vehicle, run-off-road crashes. The purpose of this project is 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 Cascade County on P-3 (US 89), starting approximately 1 mile north of Sun River and running to the northwest. This segment covers a length of 4.0 miles, from RP 10.0 to RP 14.0. While there are numerous driveways intersecting the roadway within the project limits, there are no major breaks. The functional classification of this highway is “rural, minor arterial”. This is a north/south route by designation – in this area, it runs more east/west. For the purposes of this report, directions will be in reference to the route running north/south, rather than the actual physical conditions in the area. All distances of rail are from the initial cost estimates provided by Safety Engineering. Actual lengths of rail will be determined as design progresses.

Five individual guardrail locations are included within the broader project limits. Locations 2-5 do not have any guardrail at this time, and each location is similar in that the roadway spans a large drainage feature, creating non-recoverable fill slopes on either side of the roadway.

Location 1, RP 11.0 – Mill Creek Coulee: Add terminal sections to all four existing runs of rail. The existing guardrail is W-Beam, and there is no mention of replacing the existing guardrail on the structure with box beam. Therefore, a transition will be made from w-beam to box-beam, and then a box beam terminal section will be installed for each end of the existing rail. There is a creek bank on the southeast end of the bridge, and a non-recoverable area on the southwest end. These areas will be evaluated, and additional rail may be necessary.

Location 2, RP 11.5 – NW of Deerfoot county road approach: New guardrail installation, both sides of road. On the east, begin guardrail just west of Deerfoot and extend to the north until the roadside transitions from a deep slope to a cut section, ~1225 ft. On the west, begin guardrail after private approach opposite Deerfoot, and extent to the north until the roadside transitions from a deep slope to a cut section, ~ 1225 feet.

Preliminary Field Review Report

STPHS-HSIP 3-1(36)10, SF 119-GR NW of Sun River

Project Manager: Ivan B. Ulberg

Page 2 of 5

Location 3, RP 12.3 – Residence with corrals on east side: New guardrail installation on the both sides of the roadway, beginning just north of the approach at ~RP 12.3 and extending ~855' on the east side and ~555' on the west side. An IRT may be necessary in this location at the private approach on the south end of the installation, east side. If so, right-of-way may be required to complete the installation.

Location 4, RP 12.7: New guardrail installation on both sides of the roadway, beginning just north of the farm field approach at RP 12.7 and extending ~500 feet on both sides of the roadway. It appears that the guardrail should begin before the approach on the west side, and will also terminate earlier, as it appears that the drainage feature crosses at an angle in this section.

Location 5, RP 12.9: New guardrail installation on both sides of the roadway, beginning north of the private road approach on the west and the farm field approach on the east side of the roadway, ~ 660' of rail on the east side and ~500' on the west side.

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. Work will take place on the shoulder of the roadway. Lane reductions and possible short-term one-way traffic may be necessary.

The plans package will include a Transportation Management Plan (TMP) consisting mainly of a Traffic Control Plan (TCP). These issues are discussed in more detail under the Traffic Control and Public Involvement sections.

Physical Characteristics

This section of P-3 runs through rural, rolling terrain. According to the MDT Road Log, this section of roadway was fully re-constructed in 1940, under project FAP 65 B 2, and improved in 1987, under project RTF-HES 3-1(8)8. Surfacing thickness is reported to be 5.5" of PMS over 8.0" of compacted gravel base. Within the limits, the highway is made up of two 12' lanes with 2' shoulders along both sides. There is one existing run of guardrail that extends along both sides of the road between approximately RP 10.96 and RP 11.17.

There is one short horizontal curve approximately halfway between the start and end reference posts. Matching the gently rolling terrain, there are numerous vertical curves. Inside the project limits, both moderate cut and minor fill sections can be found, though the majority of the roadway tends to fall within the latter category. While the most drastic backslopes possess steep grades, likely between 2:1 and 1:1, they are short and well-vegetated; outside of these sections, the backslopes are gentler. The foreslopes are typically 4:1 or flatter.

Traffic Data

The traffic data for this location is as follows:

2013 (Present) AADT = 1490
2033 (Letting) AADT = 1820
2032 (Design) AADT = 1800
DHV = 230
Truck% = 3.9%
Equivalent Single Axle Load = 35
Annual Growth Rate = 1.0%

Crash Analysis

A total of 24 crashes occurred on P-3 from RP 10.0 to RP 14.0 between January 1st, 2006 and December 31st, 2010. All 24 collisions were single-vehicle incidents, with 13 involving domestic or wild animals, seven involving fixed objects and four rollovers. Of these, six are considered addressable though the

Preliminary Field Review Report

STPHS-HSIP 3-1(36)10, SF 119-GR NW of Sun River

Project Manager: Ivan B. Ulberg

Page 3 of 5

installation of box beam guardrail at the five proposed locations along the route. These specific collisions included one fatal crash (resulting in two fatalities) and three resulting in non-incapacitating injury; the two other crashes involved property damage only.

The proposed improvements, based on the five-year period spanning January 1, 2006 through December 31, 2010, yielded a benefit to cost ratio of 3.54 when assuming a construction cost of \$524,000.

Major Design Features

- a. **Design Speed.** The design speed for this section of roadway based on its functional classification of "rural, minor arterial" in level terrain is 55 miles per hour (mph). The posted speed limit is 70 mph with a night-time speed of 65 mph for passenger vehicles; for trucks, the day and night speed limits are 60 mph and 55 mph, respectively.
- b. **Horizontal Alignment.** The horizontal alignment consists of one horizontal curve to the right, with respect to increasing mileposts, located roughly mid-way through the project. No changes will occur to the horizontal alignment.
- c. **Vertical Alignment.** The vertical alignment rolls gently throughout the project, but possesses no sharp grades. No changes will occur to the vertical alignment.
- d. **Typical Sections and Surfacing.** The existing roadway section will not change: its widths and surfacing will remain as is. There is no slope work or alignment modification included in the scope of work.
- e. **Geotechnical Considerations.** No geotechnical involvement is anticipated.
- f. **Hydraulics.** No hydraulic-related involvement is anticipated.
- g. **Bridges.** There are no bridges within project limits.
- h. **Traffic.** Traffic will be the lead for this project. All signing in conflict with the new guardrail will be reset. Sign faces will be upgraded to meet retro-reflectivity standards.
- 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 or in design that will affect this project.

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

Right-of-way may be required if IRT's (intersecting roadway terminal sections) are necessary. A distance of 50 ft from the centerline of the roadway is necessary to install an IRT. Typical right-of-way in this area appears to be less than this 50 ft requirement.

Preliminary Field Review Report

STPHS-HSIP 3-1(36)10, SF 119-GR NW of Sun River

Project Manager: Ivan B. Ulberg

Page 4 of 5

Access Control

No changes to access control are proposed.

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.

Utilities/Railroads

There are no railroads affected by this project. Power transmission lines do run near the roadway at various points; however, installing guardrail is not expected to interfere with them. A 'one-call' will be required prior to placing guardrail posts.

Survey

A topographical survey will be required for project areas slated for guardrail installation. No other surveys, such as a soil survey or an S.U.E., are warranted.

Public Involvement

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

Environmental Considerations

A 'Categorical Exclusion' is anticipated on this project.

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

Ivan Ulberg 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 installation	\$318,820		
Traffic Control (10%)	\$31,900		
Subtotal	\$350,720		
Mobilization (25%)	\$87,680		
Subtotal	\$438,400		
Contingencies (10%)	\$43,840		

Preliminary Field Review Report

STPHS-HSIP 3-1(36)10, SF 119-GR NW of Sun River

Project Manager: Ivan B. Ulberg

Page 5 of 5

Total CN	<u>\$482,240</u>	<u>\$80,432</u>	<u>\$616,913</u>
CE (15%)	<u>\$72,340</u>	<u>\$12,065</u>	<u>\$92,541</u>
TOTAL CN+CE	<u>\$554,580</u>	<u>\$92,497</u>	<u>\$709,454</u>

Ready Date

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

Site Map

