



July 27, 2011

RECEIVED
AUG - 1 2011
ENVIRONMENTAL

Kevin McLaury
Division Administrator
Federal Highway Administration
585 Shepard Way
Helena MT 59601

**Subject: Programmatic Categorical Exclusion (PCE) Concurrence Request
STPP 3-4(29)103
19 km NW Glcr Co Ln-Snow Fence
Control Number: 4046002**

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 MDT and FHWA on April 12, 2001. This proposed action also qualifies as a Categorical Exclusion under ARM 18.2.261 (MCA 75-1-103 and MCA 75-1-201).

The following form provides documentation required to demonstrate that all of the conditions are satisfied to qualify for a Programmatic Categorical Exclusion. A copy of the Preliminary Field Review Report/Scope of Work Report, dated May 17, 2011, 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"/>
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. A high rate of residential growth exists in the area of the proposed project.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. A high rate of commercial growth exists in the area of the proposed project.	<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"/>

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>N/A</u>	<u>UNK</u>
5. Parks, recreational, or other properties acquired/improved under Section 6(f) of the 1965 National Land & Water Conservation Fund Act (16 USC 460L, <i>et seq.</i>) are on or adjacent to the proposed project area.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The use of such Section 6(f) sites would be documented and compensated with the appropriate agencies (MDFWP, local entities, etc.).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
6. Sites either on, or eligible for the National Register of Historic Places with concurrence in determination of eligibility or effect under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (16 USC 470, <i>et seq.</i>) by the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) would be affected by this proposed project.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7. Parks, recreation sites, school grounds, wildlife refuges, historic sites, historic bridges, or irrigation that might be considered under Section 4(f) of the 1966 US Department Of Transportation Act (49 USC 303) are 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. A de minimis finding has been secured for this project.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. Nationwide Programmatic Section 4(f) Evaluation forms for those sites are attached.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. This proposed project requires a full Section 4(f) 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 water body (ies) considered as "waters of the United States" or similar (e.g., "state waters").	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1. Conditions set forth in Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act (33 USC 403) and/or Section 404 of the Clean Water Act (33 USC 1251-1376) codified at 33 CFR 320-330 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 (EO) #11990, and 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 would be obtained from the MDFWP.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. A delineated floodplain exists 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. A 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 that 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"/>

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>N/A</u>	<u>UNK</u>
The designated National Wild and/or 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 Section 7 of the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act (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"/>
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. Substantial changes in access control would be associated with the 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 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"/>

	<u>Yes</u>	<u>No</u>	<u>N/A</u>	<u>UNK</u>
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"/>
I. Documentation of an invasive species review to comply with both EO #13112 and the County Noxious Weed Control Act (7-22-2152, MCA), including directions as specified by the county(ies) wherein its intended work would be done would be conducted.	<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. If the proposed work would affect Important Farmlands, then an AD 1006 Farmland Conversion Impact Rating form would be completed in accordance with the Farmland Protection Policy Act (7 USC 4201, <i>et seq.</i>).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
K. Features for the Americans with Disabilities Act (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 Clean Air Act's Section 176(c) (42 USC 7521(a), as amended) under the provisions of 40 CFR 81.327 as it is either in a Montana air quality:				
A. "Unclassifiable"/attainment area. This proposed project is not covered under the EPA's September 15, 1997 Final Rule on air quality conformity and/or	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
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 Air Quality Division, 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)(3)?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Federally listed Threatened or Endangered (T/E) Species:				
A. Recorded occurrences, and/or critical habitat are in the vicinity of the proposed project.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
B. Would this proposed project result in a "jeopardy" opinion (under 50 CFR 402) from the Fish and 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. No significant effects on access to adjacent property or to present traffic patterns would occur.

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). The project also complies with the provisions of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 USC 2000d) under FHWA regulations (23 CFR 200).

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


Date: 7/27/2011
Eric Thunstrom
Environmental Services Bureau
Great Falls District Project Development Engineer


Date: 7/27/11
Concur Heidy Bruner, P.E.
Environmental Services Bureau
Engineering Section Supervisor


Date: 29 July 2011
Concur Alan W. [unclear]
Federal Highway Administration

Attachment

electronic copies without attachment:

Tom Martin, P.E.	Environmental Services Bureau Chief
Heidy Bruner, P.E.	Environmental Services Bureau Engineering Section Supervisor
Michael P. Johnson	Great Falls District Administrator
Kent Barnes, P.E.	Bridge Engineer
Paul Ferry, P.E.	Highways Engineer
Rob Stapley	Right-of-Way Bureau Chief
Dawn Stratton	Fiscal Programming Section
Christie McOmber, P.E.	Great Falls District Projects Engineer
Suzy Price	Contract Plans Bureau Chief
Steve Prinzing, P.E.	Great Falls District Engineering Services Supervisor
Stacy Hill, P.E.	Great Falls District Environmental Engineering Specialist
Walt Scott	Right-of-Way Bureau Utilities Section
Montana Legislative Branch Environmental Quality Council (EQC)	

copies with attachment:

File Environmental Services Bureau

MDT attempts to provide accommodation for any known disability that may interfere with a person participating in any service, program or activity of the Department. 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.



Montana Department of Transportation
 PO Box 201001
 Helena, MT 59620-1001

Memorandum

To: Distribution

From: Paul R. Ferry, P.E. Lesly Tribelhorn 5/17/11
 Highways Engineer

Date: May 17, 2011

Subject: STPP 3-4(29)103
 19 KM NW GLCR CO LN-SNOW FENCE
 UPN 4046002
 Work Type – 310 Roadway & Roadside Safety Improvements

Attached is the Preliminary Field Review Report/Scope of Work Report which was approved on 5/17/11. We request that those on the distribution review this report and submit your concurrence within two weeks of the approval date.

Your comments and recommendations are also requested if you do not concur or concur subject to certain conditions. When all personnel on the distribution list have concurred, and the environmental documentation is approved, we will submit this report to the Preconstruction Engineer for approval.

I recommend approval:

Approved _____ Date _____

Distribution:

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

cc:

- | | |
|---|--|
| Dawn Stratton, Fiscal Programming Section | Don White, Blackfeet Tribal Planning Department, PO Box 850, |
| Damian Krings, Road Design Engineer | Browning, MT 59417-0850 |
| Dustin Rouse, Project Design Manager | Glacier County Commissioners, 512 E Main Street, Cut Bank, |
| Highways File | MT 59427 |

e-copies:

- | | |
|---|--|
| Jim Walther, Engineering, Preconstruction Engineer | Jason Sorenson, Engineering Cost Analyst |
| Lesly Tribelhorn, Highways Design Engineer | Jake Goettle, Construction Bureau – VA Engineer |
| Mark Goodman, Hydraulics Engineer | Steve Prinzing, District Preconstruction |
| Kurt Marcoux, District Hydraulics Engineer | Christie McOmer, District Projects Engineer |
| Bonnie Gundrum, Env. Resources Section Supervisor | Stan Kuntz, District Materials Lab |
| Paul Sturm, District Biologist | Matt Ladenburg, Havre Division Maintenance Chief |
| Eric Thunstrom, District Project Development Engineer | Walt Scott, R/W Utilities Section Supervisor |
| Danielle Bolan, Traffic Engineer | David Hoerning, R/W Engineering Manager |
| James Combs, District Traffic Engineer | Greg Pizzini, Acquisition Manager |
| Kraig McLeod, Safety Engineer | Joe Zody, R/W Access Management Section Manager |
| Stephanie Brandenberger, District Bridge Engineer | Paul Johnson, Project Analysis Bureau |
| Matt Strizich, Materials Engineer | Sue Sillick, Research Section Supervisor |
| Daniel Hill, Pavement Analysis Engineer | Alyce Fisher, Fiscal Programming |
| Lee Grosch District Geotechnical Manager | Jerilee Weibel, District R/W Supervisor |
| Ivan Ulberg, District Traffic Project Engineer | Linda Cline, District R/W Design |
| Marty Beatty, Engineering Information Services | Doug Wilmot, District Construction Engineer |
| Paul Grant, Public Involvement Officer | Dennis Ghekiere, District Utilities Agent |
| Jean Riley, Planner | Dawn Stratton, Fiscal Programming |
| | Jim Lynch, Tribal Coordinator |



Montana Department of Transportation
PO Box 201001
Helena, MT 59620-1001

Memorandum

To: Paul R. Ferry, P.E.
Highways Engineer

From: Christie W. McOmber, P.E. 
District Projects Engineer

Date: May 10, 2011

Subject: STPP 3-4(29)103
19 KM NW GLCR CO LN-SNOW FENCE
UPN 4046002
Work Type – 310 Roadway & Roadside Safety Improvements

Please approve the attached Preliminary Field Review Report/Scope of Work Report.

Approved Lesly Tribelhorn for Date 5/17/11
Paul R. Ferry, P.E.
Highways Engineer

The same report is also being distributed under a separate cover as a Scope of Work Report for comments and approval recommendations.

cc (w/attach.):
Damian Krings, Road Design Engineer
Dustin Rouse, Road Design Area Eng.-GTF

Preliminary Field Review/Scope of Work Report

STPP 3-4(29)103, 19 KM NW GLCR CO LN-SNOW FENCE

Project Manager: Christie McOmber

Page 2 of 6

Introduction

The site was reviewed in the late winter of 2010 with the following personnel in attendance:

Steve Prinzing District Precon. Eng.

MDT – Great Falls

Dustin Rouse Road Design

MDT – Helena

Proposed Scope of Work

The proposed project has been nominated as a split from the original reconstruction project 19 km NW of Glacier County Line – NW, UPN 4046 to install snow fencing where major drifting occurred in winter 2010. Drifting was noted beginning at RP 103.1 with the most severe drifts at 103.4. Major drifting was also noted between RP 104.1 and 104.2.

The project will be designed in the Great Falls District Office.

In light of the expediency of this project, this report is being released as a combined PFR/SOW Report.

Purpose and Need

The intent of the project is to utilize Wyoming Snow Fence to mitigate drifting snow on US 89 south of Browning. This project should reduce the potential for crashes caused by snow drifting and reduced visibility and will reduce the cost of mechanical snow removal.

Project Location and Limits

- a. The proposed project is located in Glacier County on the Blackfeet Indian Reservation adjacent to U.S. 89, Route P-3.
- b. This segment of P-3 is on the primary highway system and is classified as a rural minor arterial.
- c. The proposed project begins 13.66 miles northwest of the Glacier County Line and extends approximately 1.55 miles.
- d. The project begins at reference post 102.91, **metric Station 286+00** and ends at reference post 104.46, **metric Station 311+00**.
- e. The project was originally constructed under STPP 3-4(8)101, 19 km NW of Glacier County Line – NW, UPN 4046 in 2009.
- f. The project will utilize the as-built metric stationing in order to facilitate R/W easements and speed the design process. Coordinates will be used to locate the fences. The project will be designed in metric but dual units may be shown on the final design plans.

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. All work will take place off the highway and a limited Public Information (PI) component will be the extent of the involvement.

Physical Characteristics

19 km N of Glacier County Line North was a major rehabilitation project that was completed in 2009. The scope included a 9 m deep cut between Stations 286+00 and 299+00 and a 6 m fill between 299+00 and 307+00.

- a. The up-wind terrain consists of miles of rolling to level grazing land broken by occasional coulees.
- b. Slopes on the up-wind (south) side of P-3 general begin as 3:1 fills and transition to 3:1 and 2:1 cuts that catch into an existing hill, leaving a ‘hump’ south of the highway from

Preliminary Field Review/Scope of Work Report

STPP 3-4(29)103, 19 KM NW GLCR CO LN-SNOW FENCE

Project Manager: Christie McOmber

Page 3 of 6

the begin of project to Station 291+40. The highway is below grade with 1.5:1 and 2:1 backslopes through Station 298+60. From there to Station 305+20, the roadway is above the surrounding terrain with 4:1 fill slopes on the south side. Between 306+20 and 308+00, 2:1 fill slopes catch to an upsloping terrain. These mixtures of slopes, in combination with poorly vegetated plains and high winds, lead to drifting and blowing snow throughout the project limits.

Traffic Data

- a. Traffic data is not applicable to this project.

Crash Analysis

- a. Crash History was not requested as there has not been significant time following the rehabilitation project. Snow fence can reduce crashes due to blowing and drifting snow.

Major Design Features

- a. **Design Speed** is not applicable for this scope of project.
- b. **Horizontal Alignment.** The existing horizontal alignment of the highway will not be modified with this project. P-3 includes an 1170 m curve at station 287+56.30 and a 1750 m curve at station 293+07.68.
- c. **Vertical Alignment.** The existing vertical alignment of the project will not be modified. According to as-builts, the project begins on a grade of 6.005% that transitions to a 1420 m vertical curve (PI 300+66.10) beginning at station 293+56.1 and ending at station 307+76.1. This grade was granted a design exception in 2001.
- d. **Typical Sections and Surfacing** is not applicable for this scope of project.
- e. **Geotechnical Considerations.** No geotechnical considerations are necessary due to the scope of the project.
- f. **Hydraulics.** Culverts were upgraded on the recent construction project.
- g. **Bridges.** There are no bridges within the project limits.
- h. **Traffic** is not applicable for this scope of project.
- i. **Pedestrian/Bicycle/ADA** is not applicable for this scope of project.
- j. **Miscellaneous Features.** This project will provide snow fencing along the south side of P-3 (US 89) for a distance of approximately 1.55 miles. Due to the direction of the wind, snow fence will be placed oblique to the roadway. Sufficient space will be provided beyond the snow fence to store the predicted snow throughout the season. Easements will be needed for installation and maintenance.
- k. **Context Sensitive Design Issues.** No context sensitive design issues are noted. However, due to the proximity of wetlands, updated wetland boundaries may be needed.

Other Projects

No other projects will be under construction in the vicinity in this time period.

Location Hydraulics Study Report

An LHSR will not be required.

Design Exceptions

No design exceptions are proposed.

Right-of-Way

Permanent easements for installation and maintenance of the fencing will be obtained. Right of entry for survey requests have been sent out. R/W on the south side of US 89 begins at 65 m and

Preliminary Field Review/Scope of Work Report

STPP 3-4(29)103, 19 KM NW GLCR CO LN-SNOW FENCE

Project Manager: Christie McOmber

Page 4 of 6

transitions to 40 m at Station 289+37. R/W varies between 32 m and 45 m throughout the remainder of the project.

There is a section corner at 300+86 approximately on centerline. Cadastral survey was completed under the previous project. 4 parcels are likely to be affected by the design of the project – all are trust lands. Coordination with BIA will be necessary.

Access Control

No changes are proposed.

Utilities/Railroads

There are no railroads within the project limits. Utility impacts are not expected although the contractor will be required to locate utilities during to construction.

Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) Features

No ITS features will be included.

Survey

Limited survey may be required to locate potential maintenance access roads, new fencing installed with the last project, and approaches that may have been adjusted during construction. A survey request will be sent following receipt of permission to enter forms. No other survey will be necessary.

Public Involvement

Due to the limited scope, public involvement will be limited to a news release and personal contact with the landowner/lessee during the right-of-way phase.

Environmental Considerations

- a. The anticipated level of environmental documentation for the proposed project will be a Programmatic Categorical Exclusion.
- b. There are existing wetlands shown on the plans for UPN 4046 between stations 300+60 and 301+20 on the south side of the highway. Some of these were impacted during construction of the previous project. Remaining wetlands will be delineated but no impact is expected.
- c. Appropriate permits will be prepared for this project by Environmental Services.
- d. Close adherence to guidelines put forth by Environmental Services for the abatement of erosion and water, air and noise pollution will be called for in the project plans.

Energy Savings/Eco-Friendly Considerations

No Energy Savings and Eco-Friendly Considerations have been identified for this project.

Experimental Features

No experimental features are included.

Traffic Control

No traffic control will be necessary. All work will take place off the roadway.

Project Management

Christie McOmber, P.E., Great Falls District Projects Engineer.

This project is not under full FHWA oversight.

Preliminary Field Review/Scope of Work Report

STPP 3-4(29)103, 19 KM NW GLCR CO LN-SNOW FENCE

Project Manager: Christie McOmber

Page 5 of 6

Preliminary Cost Estimate

The project nomination cost was \$605,000. It included approximately 4000 feet of snow fencing.

		Estimate	Inflation (INF)#	w/INF + IDC*
		Costs	(from PPMS)	(from PPMS)
Snow Fencing		\$425,000		
Misc		\$27,019		
Subtotal		\$452,019		
Mobilization	12%	\$54,242		
Subtotal		\$506,261		
Contingencies	15%	\$75,939		
Total CN		\$582,200	\$103,885	\$777,678
CE	10%	\$55,309	\$9,869	\$73,879
	IDC:	13.35%		
	Inflation Factor (ppms)		0.178435	

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 13.35% as of FY 2011. As this project will be let as soon as plans are complete, actual inflation should be minimal.

Ready Date

The intent is to design and construct the project by the fall of 2011 in order to avoid snow drifting issues in the future.

Site Map

The project site map is attached.

Preliminary Field Review/Scope of Work Report

STPP 3-4(29)103, 19 KM NW GLCR CO LN-SNOW FENCE

Project Manager: Christie McOmber

MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
FEDERAL AID PROJECT STPP 3-4(29)103

SNOW FENCING

19 KM NW GLCR CO LN-SNOW FENCE

GLACIER COUNTY &

BLACKFEET INDIAN RESERVATION

LENGTH 2.5 KM (1.55 MILES)

