



Montana Department of Transportation

2701 Prospect Avenue
PO Box 201001
Helena MT 59620-1001

Michael T. Tooley, Director
Steve Bullock, Governor

September 4, 2013

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

Attention: Jeff Patten

Subject: Programmatic Categorical Exclusion (PCE) Concurrence Request
STPS 330-1(16)14
Smith River Scour Repair
CN: 7993000

RECEIVED
SEP 17 2013
ENVIRONMENTAL

RECEIVED
SEP 10 2013
FHWA
MONTANA DIVISION

MASTER FILE COPY

Dear Kevin McLaury:

This submittal requests approval of the above-mentioned proposed project as a Categorical Exclusion under the provisions of 23 CFR 771.117(d) and the Programmatic Agreement as signed by the Montana Department of Transportation (MDT) and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) on April 12, 2001. This proposed action also qualifies as a Categorical Exclusion under ARM 18.2.261 (Sections 75-1-103 and 75-1-201, MCA).

The following form provides the documentation required to demonstrate that all of the conditions are satisfied to qualify for a PCE. A copy of the Preliminary Field Review Report, dated January 8, 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).

Table with 4 columns: YES, NO, N/A, UNK. Contains 3 main rows and 1 sub-row (A) regarding Right-of-Way, easements, and/or construction permits.

	<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"). Smith River	<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. 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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. No wetland impacts are anticipated.	<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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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. The MPDES special provision will be included in the contract bid package.	<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"/>

YES NO N/A UNK

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: 9/4/13
Eric Thunstrom
Great Falls District Project Development Engineer
MDT Environmental Services Bureau

Concur Heidy Bruner, Date: 9/5/13
Heidy Bruner, P.E.
Engineering Section Supervisor
MDT Environmental Services Bureau

Concur Jeffrey G. Patten, Date: 9/17/13
Federal Highway Administration

Attachments: Preliminary Field Review Report, Project location map

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
September 4, 2013

STPS 330-1(16)14
Smith River Scour Repair
CN: 7993000

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
Eric Thunstrom	Environmental Services Bureau Project Development Engineer
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: Paul Ferry, PE
 Highways Engineer

From: Christie McOmber, PE
 Projects Engineer *CWM*

Date: January 8, 2013

Subject: STPS 330-1(16)14
 SMITH RIVER SCOUR REPAIR
 UPN 7993000
 Project Work Type 310: Roadway and Roadside Safety Improvement

Please approve the attached Preliminary Field Review Report.

Approved Paul R. Ferry Date 1/10/13
 Paul Ferry, P.E.
 Highway 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:

- | | |
|--|--|
| 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, Project Design Man., Great Falls District | Dawn Stratton, Fiscal Programming Section |
| Damian Krings, Road Design Engineer | |
| Cascade County Commissioners | |
| 325 2 nd Ave North | |
| Great Falls MT 59401 | |

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 McOmber, District Projects Engineer |
| Kurt Marcoux, District Hydraulics Engineer | Stan Kuntz, G.F. District Materials Lab |
| Jon Axline, Acting Resources Section Supervisor | Tony Strainer, 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 |
| 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 | Jean Riley, Planner |
| Alyce Fisher, Fiscal Programming Section | Dawn Stratton, Fiscal Programming Section |

Preliminary Field Review Report

STPS 330-1(17)14 SMITH RIVER SCOUR

Project Manager: Christie McOmber, P.E.

Doug Wilmot, G.F. District Construction Engineer
James Combs, District Traffic Engineer
Linda Cline, District R/W Design

Michael Murphy, Eng. Manager, Bridge Management System
Duane Williams, Motor Carrier Services Division Administrator
Brendan Scott, District Utility Agent

Preliminary Field Review Report

STPS 330-1(16)14 ~ SMITH RIVER SCOUR REPAIR
Project Manager: Christie McOmer, P.E.

Page 1 of 6

Introduction

This report was derived from information taken from the Preliminary Field Review conducted on January 07, 2013, with the following individuals in attendance:

Doug Wilmot	Acting District Administrator	MDT	Great Falls
Rich Hibel	Construction Operations Engr.	MDT	Great Falls
Steve Prinzing	District Preconstruction Engineer	MDT	Great Falls
Jeania Cereck	District Design Supervisor	MDT	Great Falls
James Combs	Traffic Engineer	MDT	Great Falls
Gerry Brown	CES Bureau	MDT	Lewistown
Kurt Marcoux	District Hydraulics Engineer	MDT	Helena
John Sharkey	Geotechnical Specialist	MDT	Helena
Paul Sturm	District Biologist	MDT	Helena
Eric Thunstrom	Environmental Services Bureau	MDT	Helena
Bob Cloninger	Maintenance Superintendent	MDT	Great Falls
John Haugrose	Maintenance Section Person	MDT	Great Falls
Andy Bohl	Maintenance Crew Leader	MDT	Great Falls

Proposed Scope of Work

This project is proposed to provide riprap and scour protection along the bank of the Smith River adjacent to S-330 between RP 14.3 and 14.6 along the northeasterly side of the highway.

Purpose and Need

The scour has been moving closer to the highway since the previous flood event and has now worked into the highway embankment causing concerns for safety and road stability.

Project Location and Limits

The project is in Cascade County in section T17N, R2E, U.S. Govt. Lot 3, Section 1. The project is 15 miles south of Ulm north of the Deep Creek School on Secondary 330, locally know as Milligan Road. The as built project, STPS 330-1(11)12 was built in metric with stationing running from south to north, opposite of the mileposts.

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

Physical Characteristics

The project was built under STPS 330-1(11)12 in 1999-2000. The PTW is a two lane highway in level rural terrain. Slopes on the easterly side of the PTW are 6:1 fills. Work will take place on the easterly side of the highway, within the Smith River.

Traffic Data

Traffic Data is not applicable due to the scope of the project.

Crash Analysis

Crash Data is not applicable due to the scope of the project.

Preliminary Field Review Report

STPS 330-1(16)14 ~ SMITH RIVER SCOUR REPAIR
Project Manager: Christie McOmber, P.E.

Page 2 of 6

Major Design Features

- a. **Design Speed.** A design speed will not be established due to the scope of the project. The existing PTW was designed to 50 mph. The posted speed limit is 70 mph.
- b. **Horizontal Alignment.** The existing PTW in the project area is partially on an 879' spiral curve. The curve is signed with a 50 mph advisory speed. No changes to the PTW alignment are planned.
- c. **Vertical Alignment.** The existing PTW is on a +.0363% grade. No changes are proposed.
- d. **Typical Sections and Surfacing.** No changes are proposed to the roadway surface. The existing side slope was built at a 6:1. The riprap proposed will be designed outside the roadway clearzone which is approximately 12 feet based on the existing PTW design speed of 50 mph and an anticipated ADT less than 750.
- e. **Geotechnical Considerations.** The Geotechnical Section is asked to review the stability of the slopes or materials in the area.
- f. **Hydraulics.** A Location Hydraulics Study Report will be prepared. Only approach culverts exist within the project limits. A Level I Scour Analysis for the bridge was completed in 1997 as part of the roadway reconstruction project STPS 330-1(11)12 in 1999-2000. The bridge pier has spread footings with no piling. Calculated pier scour extended below the top of the pier footing and was estimated to be two feet above the bottom of the footing. Since the stream alignment has changed significantly, a scour analysis will be completed for the bridge as part of the project.
- g. **Bridges.** There is a bridge at the northern end of the project limits. It is 141.5' long with a center pier and prestressed concrete beams. The bridge rail and approach sections were upgraded with the as-built project. The riprap adjacent to the structure may need to be repaired. A bridge scour analysis will be completed as noted in the above Hydraulics section.
- h. **Traffic.** No traffic involvement will be necessary due to the scope of the project.
- i. **Pedestrian/Bicycle/ADA.** No issues will be addressed with this project.
- j. **Miscellaneous Features.** The scope of the project is to address erosion and scour from the Smith River on the east side of the PTW. Aerial photographs show the channel is moving closer to the highway and has now impacted the toe of the highway fill.



Year 2005 compared to 2011



Preliminary Field Review Report

STPS 330-1(16)14 ~ SMITH RIVER SCOUR REPAIR
Project Manager: Christie McOmber, P.E.

Page 3 of 6



Looking South from Bridge

The existing fence has also eroded into the river. It was determined to not replace the existing fence.

- k. **Context Sensitive Design Issues.** Revegetation of the area and riprap will consider environmental aspects.

Other Projects

There are no planned projects in the vicinity.

Location Hydraulics Study Report

A Location Hydraulics Study Report will be prepared by the Hydraulics Section.

Design Exceptions

No design exceptions are anticipated at this stage. The need for design exceptions will be further evaluated as the design progresses.

Right-of-Way

Right of way acquisition or permits will be required to facilitate the repairs. The existing r/w on the east side of the highway is 98.4' (30 m) at the bridge end and transitions to 82' (25 m) for the remainder of the project. There is only one landowner within the project limits.

Based on historical documentation, the Smith River is commercially navigable from the mouth of Sheep Creek to its confluence with the Missouri River. However, it is not adjudicated. The DNRC areas will be parceled, but MDT will obtain a legal opinion of ownership based on the adjoining ownership and the way the title was originally taken.

Access Control

There is no formal access control on this project and no changes will be made.

Preliminary Field Review Report

STPS 330-1(16)14 ~ SMITH RIVER SCOUR REPAIR
Project Manager: Christie McOmer, P.E.

Page 4 of 6

Utilities/Railroads

No railroads are in the vicinity. The District Survey crews will be requested to pick up utilities within the survey limits.

Maintenance Items

Maintenance is monitoring the site for movement.

Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) Features

No ITS solutions are planned.

Experimental Features

Any experimental features will be developed as the project progresses.

Survey

A conventional data collector survey is appropriate for this project. A hydraulics survey will be submitted with the survey request.

Public Involvement

Level A public involvement is recommended. This would include a news release explaining the project and including a Department point of contact.

Environmental Considerations

The appropriate environmental evaluation and documentation will be prepared by the Environmental Services Bureau. A Clean Water Act Section 404 permit will likely be required. A Stream Protection Act 124 will also be necessary. Wetlands will be delineated and revegetation recommendations for disturbed areas will be provided. A BRR will be prepared.

Energy Savings/Eco-Friendly Considerations

Appropriate measures will be taken to revegetate disturbed areas. The Smith River between Camp Baker and the Eden Bridge is a permitted river for private floats that are allocated via a lottery system. The bridge at the north end of the project is also popular recreational and swimming hole and the river is renowned for its trout fishing. Considerations will be required to preserve the recreational usage during construction.

Traffic Control

The work will take place off the PTW. A Transportation Management Plan (TMP) consisting of a Traffic Control Plan (TCP), a limited Transportation Operations (TO) component and a limited Public Information (PI) component is appropriate for this project.

Project Management

The Great Falls District will be responsible for the plans. Christie McOmer, P.E. is the Project Design Manager. Kurt Marcoux will be the Hydraulics Manager on this project. This project is not under full FHWA oversight.

Preliminary Field Review Report

STPS 330-1(16)14 ~ SMITH RIVER SCOUR REPAIR
 Project Manager: Christie McOmer, P.E.

Page 5 of 6

Preliminary Cost Estimate

The estimated cost programmed to construct the project is shown below. The estimate includes Riprap, excavation and revegetation.

		Estimate	Inflation (INF)	w/INF + IDC
Smith River Scour Repair		Costs	(from PPMS)	(from PPMS)
Scour Remediation		\$122,273		
Traffic Control		\$5,000		
Subtotal		\$127,273		
Mobilization	10%	\$12,727		
Subtotal		\$140,000		
Contingencies	25%	\$35,000		
Total CN		\$175,000	\$27,825	\$225,298
CE	10%	\$17,500	\$2,782	\$22,530
IDC:	11.08%		TOTAL	\$247,828
Inflation Factor (PPMS)			<i>0.159</i>	

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

The ready date will be established through the override process. Construction while the water level is low is advisable.

Site Map

The project site map is attached.

Preliminary Field Review Report

STPS 330-1(16)14 ~ SMITH RIVER SCOUR REPAIR
Project Manager: Christie McOmer, P.E.

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION

FEDERAL AID PROJECT STPS 330-1(16)14
BANK STABILIZATION AND EROSION REPAIR
SMITH RIVER SCOUR REPAIR

CASCADE COUNTY
LENGTH N/A MILES

