



August 10, 2011

RECEIVED

AUG 11 2011

ENVIRONMENTAL

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

Attention: Alan Woodmansey

Subject: Categorical Exclusion
STPS 298-1(13)25
S of McLeod Slide Repr/MT11-1
CN 7731 000



This is to request approval of this proposed project as a Categorical Exclusion (CE) under the provisions of 23 CFR 771.117(d), and the Programmatic Agreement as signed by the Montana Department of Transportation (MDT) and the FHWA on April 12, 2001. A copy of its Preliminary Field Review Report (July 27, 2011) is attached. This proposed action also qualifies as a CE 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 Programmatic Categorical Exclusion Approval (PCE) as initially agreed by the (former) MONTANA DEPARTMENT OF HIGHWAYS (MDOH) and the FHWA on December 6, 1989. (Note: An "X" in the "N/A" column is "Not Applicable" to, while one in the "UNK" column is "Unknown" at the present time for this proposed project.)

NOTE: A response in a 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 <u>23 CFR 771.117(a)</u> .	<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 <u>23 CFR 771.117(b)</u> .	<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"/>

	YES	NO	N/A	UNK
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 proposed 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 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 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 <u>33 CFR Parts 320-330</u> of the <i>Clean Water Act</i> (33 USC 1251-1376) would be met.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. Impacts in wetlands, including but not limited to those referenced under Executive Order (E.O.) #11990, and their proposed mitigation would be coordinated with the US Army Corps of Engineers and other Resource Agencies (Federal, State and Tribal) as required for permitting	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. A 124SPA Stream Protection Authorization would be obtained from the MDFWP?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. There is a delineated floodplain in the proposed project area under FEMA's Floodplain Management criteria.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 <u>23 CFR 772.5(h)</u> , 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 <u>23 CFR 772</u> 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 <i>CERCLA</i> or <i>CECRA</i>) 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 Montana Pollutant Discharge Elimination System's conditions (<u>ARM 16.20.1314</u>), including temporary erosion control features for construction would be met.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
H. Permanent desirable vegetation with an approved seeding mixture would be established on exposed areas.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>	<u>N/A</u>	<u>UNK</u>
I. Documentation of an “invasive species” review to comply with both EO #13112 and the <i>County Noxious Weed Control Act</i> (7-22-21, 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 an AD-1006 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 <u>40 CFR 81.327</u> 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 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” (Indian Reservations) under <u>40 CFR 52.1382(c)(3)</u> ?	<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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
B. Would this proposed project result in a “jeopardy” opinion (under <u>50 CFR 402</u>) 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: 8/10/2011
Eric Thunstrom -Project Development Engineer
MDT Environmental Services Bureau

Concur Heidy Bruner, Date: 8/10/11
Heidy Bruner, P.E. - Engineering Section Supervisor
Environmental Services Bureau

Concur Alan Woodmansey, Date: 10 AUG 2011
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 (July 27, 2011)

e-copy (w/o attach.): Stefan Streeter, P.E. Billings District Administrator
Paul R. Ferry, P.E. Highway Engineer
Tom S. Martin, P.E. Chief, Environmental Services Bureau
Heidy Bruner, P.E. Environmental Services Bureau
Suzy Price Contract Plans Bureau Chief
Dawn Stratton Fiscal Programming Section
Alyce Fisher Fiscal Programming Section
Robert Stapley Right-of-Way Bureau Chief
Alan Woodmansey, P.E. FHWA Operations Engineer
Tom Gocksch, P.E. Environmental Services
Montana Legislative Branch Environmental Quality Council (EQC)



Memorandum

To: Paul Ferry, PE
Highways Engineer

From: Damian Krings, PE
Road Design Engineer

Date: July 27, 2011

Subject: **STPS 298-1(13)25**
S of McLeod Slide Repr/MT11-1
UPN 7731000
Project Work Type Number 140 – Reconstruction without added capacity

Please approve the attached Preliminary Field Review Report.

Approved Lesly Tribelhorn, for Date July 27, 2011
Paul Ferry
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:

Stefan Streeter, 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	Jon Swartz, Maintenance Administrator
Robert Stapley, Right-of-Way Bureau Chief	

cc:

Dawn Stratton, Fiscal Programming Section
Damian Krings, Road Design Engineer
Master Highways file

e-copies:

Jim Walther, Engineering, Preconstruction Engineer	Jake Goettle, Construction Bureau – VA Engineer
Lesly Tribelhorn, Highways Design Engineer	Gary Neville, District Preconstruction Manager
Mark Goodman, Hydraulics Engineer	Rod Nelson, District Projects Engineer
Dave Leitheiser, District Hydraulics Engineer	Brent McCann, District R/W Field Supervisor
Bonnie Gundrum, Env. Resources Section Supervisor	Jonell Gillaspie, District R/W Design
Bill Semmens, District Biologist	Ron Cebuhar, District Field R/W Agent
Tom Gocksch, District Project Development Engineer	Bill Henning, District Materials Lab
Danielle Bolan, Traffic Engineer	Walt Scott, R/W Utilities Section Supervisor
Leroy Wosoba, Safety Traffic Project Engineer	David Hoerning, R/W Engineering Manager
Kraig McLeod, Safety Engineer	Greg Pizzini, Acquisition Manager
Jeff Olsen, Bridge Area Engineer	Joe Zody, R/W Access Management Section Manager
Matt Strizich, Materials Engineer	Paul Johnson, Project Analysis Bureau
Dan Hill, Pavement Analysis Engineer	Sue Sillick, Research Section Supervisor
Cameron Kloberdanz, District Geotechnical Manager	Dawn Stratton, Fiscal Programming
Bryce Larsen, Supervisor, Photogrammetry & Survey	Alyce Fisher, Fiscal Programming
Marty Beatty, Engineering Information Services	Randy Roth, District Maintenance Chief
Paul Grant, Public Involvement Officer	Wayne Noem, Secondary Roads Engineer
Jean Riley, Planner	

Preliminary Field Review Report

S of McLeod Slide Repr/MT11-1; UPN 7731000
Project Manager: Ryan Dahlke

Page 2 of 5

Introduction

This project was reviewed as part of a District-wide flood damage analysis field trip on June 20-22, 2011. The following personnel attended the review:

Ryan Dahlke	Highways	Helena
Cameron Kloberdanz	Geotechnical	Helena
Dave Leitheiser	Hydraulics	Helena
Bill Semmens	Environmental	Helena
Aaron Eschler	District Design	Billings
Randy Roth	Maintenance	Billings
Jay Federer	Maintenance	Big Timber

Proposed Scope of Work

The proposed project was nominated to repair the facility that was damaged during the recent flooding and heavy rainfall. The existing roadway embankment on the left has slid, resulting in a large head scarp just off the left shoulder, a severely settled roadway (with faulted pavement), and deformed guardrail. It is proposed that the roadway be shifted slightly to the right and the grade lowered. This treatment was selected in order to not only repair the facility, but to stabilize it to prevent eminent future failure. Due to a large irrigation canal near the toe of the left side embankment, simple slope flattening is not a reasonable or cost-effective treatment.

Purpose and Need

The purpose of this project is to provide repairs to the facility that was damaged during the recent flooding and heavy rainfall. The intent of the project is to re-establish the roadway to the pre-damaged condition and stabilize the facility as necessary.

Project Location and Limits

The project begins at approximately RP 24.6. This begin location is about 25 miles south of Big Timber on S-298 in Sweet Grass County. The project extends 0.2 miles south to approximately RP 24.8. The project's last major reconstruction that altered the lines and grades was in 1963 under as-built plan S-28(8). The surfacing was then reconstructed in 1970 under as-built plan S-28(9). The limits of the project are approximately from as-built station 35+00 to 50+00 (as-builts S-28(8)). Both sets of plans have stationing running south to north, while the mile posts run north to south. New project stationing will run north to south in order to coincide with the direction of the mile posts.

Work Zone Safety and Mobility

At this time, Level 2 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). A limited Transportation Operations (TO) component and a limited Public Information (PI) component to address delays and detours 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 lines and grades for this section of roadway was established in 1963. The surfacing was reconstructed to a 28' finished top width. Field measurements on the date of the review showed an existing 24' finished top width. This is likely attributed to numerous Maintenance overlays placed since 1970. The surfacing is of an unknown composition concerning pavement and gravel thicknesses. Slopes vary widely due to the extreme topographic relief. The project lies in a rural section of roadway that is considered mountainous.

Traffic Data

Traffic Data is not available at this time, and likely will not be needed since the intent of the project is to repair the facility to safe operating condition. If it is determined at a later date that traffic data is required, it will be obtained at that time.

Crash Analysis

A crash analysis was not performed due to the intent of the project. We are requesting via this report that the Traffic Safety Section investigate if there are crash clusters or other crash data worth noting within the project limits. If it is determined at a later date that a full crash analysis is required, it will be obtained at that time.

Major Design Features

- a. **Design Speed.** The design speed for this Rural Minor Arterial is 45 mph. The posted speed limits within the project are 60 mph for cars and 55 mph for trucks).
- b. **Horizontal Alignment.** The proposed scope is to shift the centerline slightly to the right (west), and will be designed to meet the appropriate design criteria.
- c. **Vertical Alignment.** The proposed scope is to lower the grade through the re-aligned section in order to reduce fill heights, grading quantities, impacts, and cost, and will be designed to meet the appropriate design criteria.
- d. **Typical Sections and Surfacing.** The finished top width will be 26 feet, consisting of (2) 12-foot travel lanes and 1 foot shoulders. The Surfacing Section will provide a recommendation for thicknesses. Surfacing inslopes as well as cut and fill slopes will meet the applicable design criteria. It is expected that the slope on the left will be flattened enough to be able to eliminate the guardrail.
- e. **Geotechnical Considerations.** There is a massive slide immediately adjacent and to the north of the embankment that has failed. The road actually traverses through the toe berm of this massive slide and has had continued movement. Because this area has historic problems and because continued movement of the toe berm is eminent, no significant work is planned through this toe berm area. There is, however, a small cut slope that has sloughed on the right that will be repaired with the project. The slide that happened recently as a result of the heavy rainfall and flooding will be the primary focus of this project. It will be dependent on how far we can reasonably shift the road and lower the grade, but ideally we will flatten the fill slopes of this failed embankment to 3:1 or flatter.
- f. **Hydraulics.** There is an existing 48" SSPP for the small drainage coming in from the right. This culvert is in good condition and will be extended as needed based on the shift in the roadway. Potentially, a manhole structure will be placed and buried at the current inlet to facilitate a bend in the extension. This bend is required to properly align the culvert with the drainage.
- g. **Bridges.** There are no bridges within the project limits.
- h. **Traffic.** No alterations to traffic elements are proposed. New delineation and upgraded signs may be installed.
- i. **Pedestrian/Bicycle/ADA.** No changes to the existing pedestrian/bicycle/ADA features are proposed. No dedicated pedestrian/bicycle facilities exist.
- j. **Miscellaneous Features.** Fencing will be included as needed. The existing guardrail will likely be eliminated as a result of the flatter slopes.
- k. **Context Sensitive Design Issues.** No context sensitive design elements are proposed.

Other Projects

There are no other projects in the area.

Location Hydraulics Study Report

A Location Hydraulics Study Report is not needed. Recommendations will be provided by the Hydraulics Section as needed.

Design Exceptions

Design exceptions are not anticipated.

Preliminary Field Review Report

S of McLeod Slide Repr/MT11-1; UPN 7731000
Project Manager: Ryan Dahlke

Page 4 of 5

Right-of-Way

The existing right-of-way is generally 100' on the west side and 110' on the east side. Adjacent property is privately held, being owned by the Lion Head Ranch. The project work is in the NE corner of section 23, T.3S., R.12E. New R/W will be required.

Access Control

No changes to the access control are proposed.

Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) Features

There are no ITS solutions proposed.

Experimental Features

No experimental features have been identified.

Utilities/Railroads

There is an overhead power line running along the right-of-way fence on the west side. One or two of these poles may be in conflict with the proposed construction. No railroad tracks/property were identified at the review.

Survey

District Survey staff is performing a conventional topo survey utilizing local coordinates. A cadastral survey will also be performed for the acquisition of right-of-way.

Public Involvement

Public involvement for the project will consist of a notice of an ER project on MDT's web page.

Environmental Considerations

A Categorical Exclusion is anticipated for this project. No wetlands were identified at the review, with no other significant environmental issues. 404 and SPA 124 permits will not be required.

Energy Savings/Eco-Friendly Considerations

No energy savings or eco-friendly considerations have been identified.

Traffic Control

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. Traffic will be maintained on the roadway and construction will take place under traffic.

Project Management

This project will be designed by Helena Headquarters staff with Ryan Dahlke as the Project Manager. This project is not under full FHWA oversight.

Preliminary Cost Estimate

	Estimated cost	Inflation (INF) (from PPMS)	TOTAL costs w/INF + IDC (from PPMS)
Total CN	\$ 400,000	\$ 52,554	\$ 496,180
CE (10%)	\$ 40,000	\$ 5,255	\$ 49,617
TOTAL CN+CE	\$ 440,000	\$ 57,809	\$ 545,797

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 9.64% as of FY 2012.

Preliminary Field Review Report

S of McLeod Slide Repr/MT11-1; UPN 7731000
Project Manager: Ryan Dahlke

Page 5 of 5

Ready Date

A Ready Date has not yet been established. As this is an emergency repair, the project will be designed as quickly as possible. PPMS currently shows this project to have a December 2011 tentative letting date. An expedited project schedule will be utilized.

Site Map

