



November 5, 2013

Kevin L. McLaury
Division Administrator
Federal Highway Administration
585 Shepard Way, Suite 2
Helena, MT 59601-9785

RECEIVED
NOV 14 2013
RECEIVED
ENVIRONMENTAL
NOV 13 2013
FHWA
MONTANA DIVISION

Attention: Gene Kaufman

Subject: Programmatic Categorical Exclusion (PCE) Concurrence Request
SF 129 – Guardrail N. Polson
HSIP 52-1(38)14
CN 8070000

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 is attached. In the following form, "N/A" indicates not applicable; "UNK" indicates unknown.

NOTE: A response in a large box will require additional documentation for a Categorical Exclusion request in accordance with 23 CFR 771.117(d).

	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>	<u>N/A</u>	<u>UNK</u>
1. This proposed project would have (a) significant environmental impact(s) as defined under 23 CFR 771.117(a).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. This proposed project involves (an) unusual circumstance(s) as described under 23 CFR 771.117(b).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. This proposed project involves one (or more) of the following situations where:				
A. Right-of-Way, easements, and/or construction permits would be required.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>	<u>N/A</u>	<u>UNK</u>
1. The context or degree of the Right-of-Way action would have (a) substantial social, economic, or environmental effect(s).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 proposed the project area.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The use of such <i>Section 6(f)</i> sites would be documented and compensated with the appropriate agencies. (<i>e.g.</i> : MDFWP, local entities, etc.).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Are there any sites either on, or eligible for the National Register of Historic Places with concurrence in determination of eligibility or effect under <i>Section 106</i> of the <i>National Historic Preservation Act</i> (16 USC 470, <i>et seq.</i>) by the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), which would be affected by this proposed project.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
H. Permanent desirable vegetation with an approved seeding mixture would be established on exposed areas.	<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>
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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Federally listed Threatened or Endangered (T/E) Species:				
A. There are recorded occurrences and/or critical habitat in this proposed project’s vicinity.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

YES NO N/A UNK

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

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

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

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

Susan Kilcrease, Date: 11/5/2013
Susan Kilcrease - Missoula District Project Development Engineer
MDT Environmental Services Bureau

Concur Heidy Bruner, Date: 11/8/13
Heidy Bruner, P.E. - Engineering Section Supervisor
MDT Environmental Services Bureau

Concur [Signature], Date: 11/14/13
Federal Highway Administration

MDT attempts to provide accommodation for any known disability that may interfere with a person participating in any service, program or activity of the Dept. Alternative accessible formats of this information will be provided upon request. For further information, call 406-444-7228 or TTY (800-335-7592), or call Montana Relay at 711.

Attachment: Preliminary Field Review Report (6/25/2013)

- | | | |
|---------------------|----------------------------|---------------------------------------|
| Copy (w/o attach.): | Ed Toavs | Missoula District Administrator |
| | Paul Ferry, P.E. | Highways Engineer |
| | Tom S. Martin, P.E. | Environmental Services Bureau Chief |
| | Heidy Bruner, P.E. | Environmental Services Bureau |
| | Suzy Price | Contract Plans Bureau Chief |
| | Lisa Hurley | Fiscal Programming Section Supervisor |
| | Tom Erving | Fiscal Programming Section |
| | Robert Stapley | Right-of-Way Bureau Chief |
| | Susan Kilcrease | Environmental Services Bureau |
| | File | Environmental Services Bureau |
| | Montana Legislative Branch | Environmental Quality Council (EQC) |



Memorandum

To: Paul R. Ferry, P.E.
Highways Engineer
From: Shane Stack, P.E.
Missoula District Preconstruction Engineer
Date: June 25, 2013
Subject: HSIP 52-1(38)14
SF 129 – Guardrail N. Polson
UPN 8070000
Work Type 310 – Roadway & Roadside Safety Improvements

Please approve the attached Preliminary Field Review Report.

Approved _____ Date _____
Paul R. Ferry, P.E.
Highways 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:

- Ed Toavs, District Administrator
Kent Barnes, Bridge Engineer
Paul Ferry, Highways Engineer
Roy Peterson, Traffic and Safety Engineer
Robert Stapley, Right-of-Way Bureau Chief
Tom Martin, Environmental Services Bureau Chief
Lynn Zanto, Rail, Transit, & Planning Division Administrator
Jake Goettle, Construction Engineering Services Bureau
Matt Strizich, Materials Engineer

cc:

- Ben Nunnallee, Project Design Manager
Bill Squires, District Road Design Area Engineer
Dawn Stratton, Fiscal Programming Section

e-copies:

- Jim Walther, Engineering, Preconstruction Engineer
Lesly Tribelhorn, Highways Design Engineer
Mark Goodman, Hydraulics Engineer
K.C. Yahvah, District Hydraulics Engineer
Bill Semmens, Env. Resources Section Supervisor
Pat Basting, District Biologist
Susan Kilcrease, District Project Development Engineer
Danielle Bolan, Traffic Operations Engineer
Ivan Ulberg, Traffic Design Engineer
Gabe Priebe, District Traffic Project Engineer
Kraig McLeod, Safety Engineer
Chris Hardan, District Bridge Area Engineer
Michael Grover, Engineering Cost Analyst
Marty Beatty, Engineering Information Services
Paul Grant, Public Involvement Officer
Sue Sillick, Research Section Supervisor
Alyce Fisher, Fiscal Programming Section
Mark Keeffe, Bicycle/Pedestrian Coordinator
Alice Flesch, ADA Coordinator
Bob Vosen, District Construction Engineer
Dean Jones, Asst. District Construction Engineer
Jake Goettle, Construction Bureau – VA Engineer
Shane Stack, District Preconstruction Engineer
Ben Nunnallee, District Projects Engineer
Darin Reynolds, District Materials Supervisor
Gary Engman, Dist. Maintenance Chief (Kalispell)
Maureen Walsh, District Right of Way Supervisor
Phillip Inman, Utilities Engineering Manager
David Hoerning, R/W Engineering Manager
Greg Pizzini, Acquisition Manager
Joe Zody, R/W Access Management Section Manager
Matt Strizich, Materials Engineer
Daniel Hill, Pavement Analysis Engineer
Bret Boundy, District Geotechnical Manager
Bryce Larsen, Supervisor, Photogrammetry & Survey
Paul Johnson, Project Analysis Bureau
Jean Riley, Planner
Dawn Stratton, Fiscal Programming Section
James Freyholtz, District Traffic Engineer (Kalispell)
Ray Sacks, Construction Bureau
Suzan Foley, R/W Design Supervisor
Breta Palmer, District Utility Engineering (Kalispell)

Preliminary Field Review Report

UPN 807000, HSIP 52-1(38)14, SF 129 – Guardrail N. Polson
Project Manager: Ben Nunnallee

Page 1 of 6

Introduction

An on-site field review was held on June 19th, 2013. The following people attended:

Ben Nunnallee – Missoula District Projects Engineer - Missoula
Troy Johnson – Missoula District Road Design - Missoula
Nicole Arrington – Traffic Safety Management - Helena
James Freyholtz – Traffic Engineer – Kalispell
Dave Rauser – Maintenance Superintendent - Kalispell

Proposed Scope of Work

The project is located on MT 35 (P-52) approximately halfway between Polson and Woods Bay. The proposed scope of work on this project is to improve the safety of the roadway by installing two segments of box-beam guardrail along the west side of the roadway.

Purpose and Need

The purpose of this project is to improve the safety of the existing roadway by addressing a previously identified crash trend at this location.

Project Location and Limits

- Route: MT-35 (P-52) is on the State Primary Highway System and is functionally classified as a Minor Arterial. See the attached location map.
- County: Lake County
- Begin Project: North of Polson at R.P. 14.3±
English As-Built Station 756+04.88
Township 24 North, Range 19 West, Section 21
- End Project: South of Woods Bay at R.P. 15.2±
English As-built Station 803+43.84
Township 24 North, Range 19 West, Section 9
- Project Length: 0.9 miles
- The project is located on the Flathead Indian Reservation

Both stationing and reference post markings run from the south to north on this project.

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. This route is on the Level 2 Corridor list, but due to the simple nature of this small project, minimal impact to traffic, and short construction timeframe, we feel that Level 3 is more appropriate. The plans package will include a Transportation Management Plan (TMP) consisting 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 project is located in a rural setting, with the existing terrain being designated as rolling.

The roadway was constructed with project FAS 102(10) and was completed in 1948. The As-Builts for this project shows that the two-lane highway had 12.5' wide lanes with no shoulders. The typical section consisted of a ½" cover course, 2 ½" top course, a 6" base course, followed by a 6" borrow course. Station 190+00.0 to 952+06.3 was overlaid in 1991 under project RTF 52-194)7. The overlay consisted of a 0.3' plant mix layer and 0.15' seal layer. This section of roadway was also chip sealed in 2000 under

Preliminary Field Review Report

UPN 807000, HSIP 52-1(38)14, SF 129 – Guardrail N. Polson

Project Manager: Ben Nunnallee

Page 2 of 6

project STPP 52-1(16)4. The latest TIS Roadlog shows that the roadway has two 12' lanes with a 5.1 inch surface depth and 8 inch base depth.

The Pavement Management System generated the following performance indices for the survey year 2012 and treatment recommendations for the years 2013 and 2015.

TREATMENT YEARS 2013 & 2015

BEG RP	END RP	RIDE	RUT	ACI	MCI	CONST. TREAT. REC.
10.345	18.000	75.1 (fair)	52.2 (fair)	99.4 (good)	99.3 (good)	2013 – Minor Rehab Rut 2015 - Minor Rehab Rut

Using Figure 12-4 in the MDT Road Design Manual, and given the rural setting and rolling terrain the design speed is 55 mph. Both of the horizontal curves on the project meet the minimum radius, but neither one meets current superelevation rates based on 55 mph. As-built superelevations and radii were used in conjunction with the table on Page 9.3(3) of the Road Design Manual to create the summary:

P.I. Station	Radius (ft)	As-Built Super	Interpolated Design Speed (mph)
756+63.10	1146	7	50+/-
773+26.30	1146	7	50+/-

There are 3 vertical curves within the project, all of which meet the minimum length required for SSD on vertical curves.

According to As-Built, the typical sections of the roadway have 4:1 surfacing inslopes, and fill slopes varying from 1 ½:1 to 3:1.

Traffic Data

2013 ADT = 2,750 Present
2014 ADT = 2,770 Letting Year
2034 ADT = 3,390 Design Year
DHV = 540
Com Trucks = 5.1%
ESAL = 84
AGR = 1.0%

Crash Analysis

Safety Management completed a crash analysis for MT-35 (P-52) south of Bigfork from R.P. 14.0 to R.P. 16.0. The Montana Highway Patrol has recorded a total of 14 crashes from January 1, 2006 through December 31, 2012. The main crash trend is a single vehicle run-off-the-road (SVROR) crash (11 out of 14) with four of the crashes resulting in the vehicle overturning.

- Fatal Crashes: 0
- Total Injury Crashes: 7
- Property Damage Only Crashes: 7

To address these crashes, the Safety Engineering Section recommended using guardrail installation. Three of the eight SVROR crashes between January 1, 2006 and December 31, 2010 were considered addressable by the improvements proposed with this project. The Crash Analysis did not state how many of the three additional SVROR crashes between January 1, 2011 and December 31, 2012 were considered

Preliminary Field Review Report

addressable. The recommended safety improvement yields a benefit-to-cost ratio of 2.77 assuming a \$434,470 project cost.

Major Design Features

- a. **Design Speed.** The geometric design criteria for Rural Minor Arterials (Non-NHS-Primary) indicate that the design speed should be 55 mph based on the rolling terrain. The posted speed limit through the length of the project is 50 mph.
- b. **Horizontal Alignment.** The existing horizontal alignment will not be changed with this guardrail safety project.
- c. **Vertical Alignment.** The existing vertical alignment will not be changed with this guardrail safety project.
- d. **Typical Sections and Surfacing.** The existing roadway typical sections will not be changed with this project.
- e. **Geotechnical Considerations.** There are no special geotechnical considerations for this guardrail safety project. There will be guardrail end section widening.
- f. **Hydraulics.** There are no hydraulics concerns with this project.
- g. **Bridges.** There are no bridges on this project.
- h. **Traffic.** The existing pavement markings and traffic layout will not be altered with this project.
- i. **Pedestrian/Bicycle/ADA.** There are no dedicated pedestrian or bicycle facilities on this project, and due to the scope of work there will be no new accommodations.
- j. **Miscellaneous Features.** Box-beam guardrail will be placed in two segments on the left side of the road. The first section will start at southern Sunset Point loop approach and extend north to the other Sunset Point loop approach. The second section of guardrail starts at Osprey Point Lane extending north to the next private approach.
- k. **Context Sensitive Design Issues.** There are no context sensitive design issues identified for this guardrail safety project.

Other Projects

The construction timeframe for this project has not yet been established, however, there are many other projects also under development in Flathead and Lake Counties. As the Letting dates near for this project and others, we will evaluate the potential to tie this project in order to save costs.

This project is within the limits of the UPN 7654000, Blue Bay – N&S project which will chip seal the highway from RP 3.6 – 18.0. That project is scheduled for letting January 25, 2014. There is a possibility that this guardrail safety project could be ready in time to tie with the chip seal project.

Location Hydraulics Study Report

A Location Hydraulics Study Report will not be needed for this project.

Design Exceptions

The design exception process does not apply for safety improvement projects. Any proposed design elements that do not comply with the MDT design criteria will be described in the Scope of Work Report.

Right-of-Way

There will be no right-of-way involvement on this project. All proposed work will stay within the existing right-of-way.

Access Control

This section of highway is not an access control facility.

Preliminary Field Review Report

UPN 807000, HSIP 52-1(38)14, SF 129 – Guardrail N. Polson
Project Manager: Ben Nunnallee

Page 4 of 6

Utilities/Railroads

A utility survey will be requested for this project.

At this time it is unknown whether or not there will be any utility involvement with this project.

There will be no railroad involvement on this project.

Maintenance Items

Maintenance will not be participating on this project and at this time has no issues with the project.

Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) Features

Implementation of ITS solutions will not be included with this guardrail safety project.

Experimental Features

There are no experimental features identified for this guardrail safety project.

Survey

A utility locate and topographic survey will be requested for this project. The topographic survey will be limited to just the locations of the four guardrail end sections.

Public Involvement

A Level 'A' public involvement plan is appropriate for this project. A news release explaining the project and including a department point of contact will be distributed to the local media.

Environmental Considerations

No significant environmental impacts or issues were identified for this project. A Categorical Exclusion is anticipated.

Energy Savings/Eco-Friendly Considerations

No energy savings/eco-friendly considerations will be implemented on this safety improvement project.

Traffic Control

Traffic will be maintained through the construction of the project with appropriate signing, flagging, pilot cars etc. in accordance with the MUTCD (Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices). The work zone may require single lane closures during construction operations. A minimum of one lane will remain open for traffic at all times during the construction of this project. Possible stipulations governing the time of year, the days of the week during which construction activities may take place, time of day, and maximum length of roadway that may be under construction at a time may be specified in the contract in order to minimize public impact.

The Traffic Management Plan (TMP) consisting of a Traffic Control Plan (TCP) is appropriate for this project. Due to the relatively simple nature of the work, the TCP will consist of only special provisions.

Project Management

The Missoula District Design Crew will be responsible for developing the plans. Ben Nunnallee will manage the design of this project. See contact information below:

Ben Nunnallee, P.E.
Montana Department of Transportation
2100 West Broadway, PO Box 7039
Missoula, MT 59807-7039
(406) 523-5846
E-mail: bnunnallee@mt.gov

Preliminary Field Review Report

UPN 807000, HSIP 52-1(38)14, SF 129 – Guardrail N. Polson

Project Manager: Ben Nunnallee

Page 5 of 6

Preliminary Cost Estimate

The nomination cost estimate (without IDC & Inflation) that was originally programmed for this project was \$427,500 (CN=\$378,200 and CE=\$49,300). The total nomination cost estimate including IDC and Inflation was \$533,000. A more detailed cost estimate will be developed once the project has been surveyed and preliminarily designed.

Ready Date

At this point in time the Ready Date has not been established. It will be set once the project has gone through the override process in OPX2. According to the Project Nomination Report, the anticipated letting date is October 2014.

Site Map

The project site map is attached.

Preliminary Field Review Report

UPN 807000, HSIP 52-1(38)14, SF 129 – Guardrail N. Polson

Project Manager: Ben Nunnallee

