



RECEIVED
DEC 16 2013
ENVIRONMENTAL

December 2, 2013

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

Attention: Gene Kaufman

Subject: Programmatic Categorical Exclusion (PCE) Concurrence Request
Frenchtown E & W
IM 90-2(123)84
CN 7522000

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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. There is a high rate of residential growth in this proposed project's area.	<input 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 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 proposed the project area.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
b. De minimis finding(s) is/are necessary for this project.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 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.	<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 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"/>
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"/>

- | | <u>YES</u> | <u>NO</u> | <u>N/A</u> | <u>UNK</u> |
|--|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------------------|--------------------------|
| 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 type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" 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.

Susan Kilcrease, Date: 12/2/13
Susan Kilcrease - Missoula District Project Development Engineer
MDT Environmental Services Bureau

Heidy Bruner, Date: 12/9/13
Concur Heidy Bruner, P.E. - Engineering Section Supervisor
MDT Environmental Services Bureau

Sp. Harbman, Date: 12/16/13
Concur 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 (April 5, 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) | |

Preliminary Field Review Report

UPN 7522000, IM 90-29(123)84, Frenchtown E&W
Project Manager: Ben Nunnallee, P.E.

Page 2 of 9

ramp closures, wide load detours, and public notification will also be included in the plan package. 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 on rolling terrain.

This section of the Interstate was originally constructed in 1972 under the project I 90-2(35)85. In 1996, a PCCP rehabilitation was applied to the roadway under project IM 90-2(93)84. In 2010, under project IM 0002(804) the interchange crossroad structures over the interstate were rehabilitated by re-decking and the bridge ends were milled and filled.

The original typical sections from 1972 were the same for the EB and WB lanes. They consisted of 4.0' inside shoulders, two 12.0' travel lanes, and 10.0' outside shoulders. The shoulders were 0.2' thick of Type 3 PMS, while the travel lanes were 8.0" of PCCP. Underneath the shoulders was 1.0' of Type A leveling course material, and below the PCCP was a 0.4' thick cement treated base layer. The next underlying layer was 0.6' of Type A Grade 5 crushed base course followed by 1.0' of special subgrade treatment layer.

The Huson and Frenchtown interchange ramps constructed in 1972 consisted of the following layers: 0.35' Type 3 PMS, 0.20' CTS, 0.50' Grade 5 CBC and 1.0' of Grade 2 CBC.

The rehabilitation surfacing in 1996 for EB and WB consisted of the 8" PCCP full slab or patch replacement in various locations under project IM 90-2(93)84. The remaining PCCP was ground and crack sealed. The inside and outside shoulders received a 0.15' cold mill followed by 0.15' hot recycled asphalt overlay and chip sealed. The ramps at Huson and Frenchtown during this rehabilitation project received a 0.15' PMS overlay and chip seal.

The rehabilitation of the structures in 2010 at R.P. 85.189 Huson and R.P. 89.753 Frenchtown were re-decked with a grade raise of 1.5" and 0.30' taper mill and fill of PMS under project IM 0002 (804). The deck on the Grade Separation structure at Loiselle, RP 93.397, EB only was epoxy injected. The deck and the approach slabs were replaced at a length of 30' including a 10' transition slab.

Today the roadway consists of a divided open median of varying width, 12' driving lanes, 10' outside shoulders and 4' inside shoulders. The eastbound and westbound lanes have the same horizontal and vertical alignment throughout the project. The Huson and Frenchtown interchange ramps consist of a 14' traffic lane, a 6' outside shoulder and a 4' inside shoulder.

The Pavement Management System generated the following performance indices and subsequent recommendations for the survey year of 2012:

TREATMENT YEAR 2013 and 2015

BEG MP	END MP	RIDE	RUT	ACI	MCI	CONST. TREAT. REC.
84.1 RT	94.414 RT	57.4 (poor)	56.3 (fair)			2013 PCC Major Rehabilitation 2015 PCC Major Rehabilitation
84.1 LT	94.414 LT	62.6 (fair)	61.5 (good)			2013 PCC Major Rehabilitation 2015 PCC Major Rehabilitation

Preliminary Field Review Report

UPN 7522000, IM 90-29(123)84, Frenchtown E&W
Project Manager: Ben Nunnallee, P.E.

Page 4 of 9

86.641	I00090086+06411	Sep Houle Creek Rd (east)	1971	41.5 X 78	Functionally Obsolete
89.753	S00263014+01031	Int Frenchtown I-90	1971/2010	30.83 X 224.5	Not Deficient
93.397	I00090093+03971	Sep Loiselle Rd (east)	1971	41.5 X 78	Functionally Obsolete
93.397	I00090093+03972	Sep Loiselle Rd (west)	1971	41.5 X 78	Functionally Obsolete

Traffic Data

2012 ADT = 8,990 Present
2015 ADT = 9,430 Letting Year
2030 ADT = 12,960 Design Year
DHV = 1,720
Com. Trucks = 18.1%
ESAL = 967 (Daily-Flexible Pavement)
AGR = 1.6%

Crash Analysis

Safety Management completed a crash analysis on I-90 from RP 84.2 to RP 94.4 for January 1, 2007 through December 31, 2011.

- Total Number of Crashes: 163
 - Fatal Crashes: 2 (2 Fatalities)
 - Number of Injury Crashes: 54
 - Incapacitating Crashes: 11 (17 Injuries)
 - Non-Incap. Crashes: 30 (41 Injuries)
 - Other Injury Crashes: 13 (21 Injuries)
 - Non-Injury Crashes: 107
- Total Number of Commercial Crashes: 16 (5 Injuries)

Safety Management included the following summary remarks about the crashes along this segment of Interstate 90.

- 92 crashes were single vehicle run-off-the-road crashes not citing wild animals as a first or most harmful event. Two of these crashes resulted in a fatality.
- 63 vehicles overturned
- 36 crashes cited a wild animal as a first or most harmful event
- 21 vehicles struck a fence
- 13 crashes cited guardrail as the first or most harmful event
- 10 crashes cited ditch or embankment as the first or most harmful event

The accident rate for this section was 0.97, the severity index was 2.09, and the severity rate was 2.03. These numbers are all slightly higher than the respective statewide averages of 0.92, 1.86, and 1.70. The commercial vehicle accident rate, severity index, and severity rate are 0.49, 1.50, and 0.74 respectively.

The area from RP 84.6 to 85.4 was identified as a crash cluster area for the 2011/2012 HSIP. The area was reviewed by the Safety Engineering section in 2012 and Project UPN 8059000, SF 129 – Lighting Huson Intch is currently being programmed. The area from RP 82 to 85 was evaluated as part of the HSIP in 2007 for a potential wildlife fencing project. The area from RP 83 to RP 84 was reevaluated in

Preliminary Field Review Report

UPN 7522000, IM 90-29(123)84, Frenchtown E&W
Project Manager: Ben Nunnallee, P.E.

Page 6 of 9

will provide the quantities, details, plans and specification for the striping and signing. These items will be included in the road plans package.

- i. **Pedestrian/Bicycle/ADA.** There are no dedicated pedestrian or bicycle facilities. The outside shoulders are 10 feet wide with rumble strips and can accommodate bicycle traffic. Due to the nature of this rehabilitation project, no new accommodations will be added.
- j. **Miscellaneous Features.** Areas of guardrail will be replaced as needed and terminal sections will also be replaced as needed. The ramps at Huson Interchange have existing cattle guards that will be removed and milled and filled. The existing crossovers at RP 84.5, RP 86.1, RP 89.2, and RP 93.8 will be removed at the end of the project construction. New shoulder rumble strips will be installed.
- k. **Context Sensitive Design Issues.** There are no special context sensitive design issues identified for this resurfacing project.

Other Projects

There is a rehabilitation project UPN 7523000, IM 90-1(196)74, Alberton - E&W located on the section of I-90 to the west of this project. However, it is to be let for construction on May 9, 2013 and the construction will be complete well before this project is constructed. Similarly, the final chip seal construction of the pavement preservation project UPN 7601000, IM 90-2(122)94, Missoula – West which is located on the section of I-90 to the east will be completed in 2013.

There is a reconstruction project UPN 6137000, STPS 574-1(1)0, Huson – East on the adjacent S-574 Frenchtown Frontage Road. It is scheduled for construction in 2015 and will also likely be completed prior to the construction of this project.

There is a safety project UPN 8059000, HSIP 90-2(130)85, SF 129 – Lighting Huson Intch that is currently being programmed to install interchange lighting at the Huson interchange. This new safety project has not yet been identified as to which year it will potentially receive funding for construction. There could be a potential to tie this safety project with Frenchtown – E&W depending on what happens with future funding. A potential tie will be evaluated in the future when funding time frames and project schedules are more certain.

Location Hydraulics Study Report

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

Design Exceptions

There are eight curves that do not meet the superelevation requirements for their given radii at a 60 mph design speed. However, the design speeds that these curves do provide are within the 15 mph allowable speed differential for rehabilitation projects. Therefore, these curves do not require design exceptions.

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

The Interstate is an access controlled facility. This project will not change the existing access control.

Utilities/Railroads

Utilities – There are no utilities that would be impacted by the scope of this project.

Preliminary Field Review Report

UPN 7522000, IM 90-29(123)84, Frenchtown E&W
Project Manager: Ben Nunnallee, P.E.

Page 8 of 9

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

This project is not under full FHWA oversight.

Preliminary Cost Estimate

The nomination cost estimate (without IDC) that was originally programmed for this project is \$14,700,000 (CN = \$13,800,000 and CE = \$900,000). The total nomination cost estimate including IDC was \$19,689,060.

	Estimated cost	Inflation (INF) (from PPMS)	TOTAL costs w/INF + IDC (from PPMS)
Road Work	\$13,200,000		
Bridge Work	\$250,000		
Traffic Control	\$450,000		
Subtotal	\$13,900,000		
Mobilization (8%)	\$1,112,000		
Subtotal	\$15,012,000		
Contingencies (20%)	\$3,002,000		
Total CN	<u>\$18,014,000</u>	<u>\$2,668,448</u>	<u>\$22,974,063</u>
CE (8%)	<u>\$1,441,000</u>	<u>\$213,458</u>	<u>\$1,837,771</u>
TOTAL CN+CE	<u>\$19,455,000</u>	<u>\$2,881,906</u>	<u>\$24,811,834</u>

Note: Inflation is calculated in PPMS to the letting date. If there is no letting date, the project is assumed to be inside the current TCP and is given a maximum of 5 years until letting. IDC is calculated at 11.08% as of FY 2013. The Inflation costs currently shown are based on the 5 year maximum because a Letting Date has not yet been entered into PPMS. The current cost estimate reflects FPR cost per mile estimates for two other nearby and similarly scoped projects on the Interstate.

Ready Date

The Ready Date has not yet been determined for this project. It will be set once the project has gone through the override process in OPX2 and the schedule has been reviewed. The Letting Date has also not been established. It is currently unfunded in the Tentative Construction Plan, however, this project could be needed as a backup project in the future, so we are going to go ahead and start developing the project with that in mind.

Due to the large project cost, there is a potential that the project could be split in the future.

Site Map

The project site map is attached.