MDT
Montana Department of Transportation
2701 Prospect Avenue
PO Box 201001
Helena MT 59620-1001
Michael T. Tooley, Director
Steve Bullock, Governor

December 2, 2013

Brian Hasselbach
Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)
585 Shepard Way, Suite 2
Helena, Montana 59601

Subject: Statewide Programmatic Categorical Exclusion for Pavement Preservation Project
Gold Creek – E & W
IM 90-3(124)163
Control Number: 8139000

Dear Brian Hasselbach:

The MDT Environmental Services Bureau has reviewed the Preliminary Field Review/Scope of Work Report (PFR/SOW) for the subject project. Based on the completed Environmental Checklist for Pavement Preservation Projects (Checklist), we conclude that the Statewide Programmatic Categorical Exclusion for these types of projects would cover this project. For your information, I have attached a copy of the PFR/SOW (including the location map) and the signed Environmental Checklist. Environmental-related Special Provisions are not anticipated at this time.

If you have questions or concerns, please contact Susan Kilcrease at 523.5842 or me at 444.7203. We will be pleased to assist you.

Sincerely,

Heidy Bruner

Heidy Bruner, P.E.
Environmental Services Bureau Engineering Section Supervisor

Attachments: PFR/SOW Report, Environmental Checklist

Enclosure

e-copies w/checklist encl.:
Ed Toavs, Missoula District Administrator
Tom Martin, P.E., Environmental Service Bureau Chief
Heidy Bruner, P.E., ESB Engineering Section Supervisor
Paul Ferry, P.E., Highways Engineer
Kevin Christensen, P.E., Construction Engineer
Suzy Price, Contract Plans Bureau Chief
Lisa Hurley, Fiscal Programming Section Supervisor
Tom Erving, Fiscal Programming Section
Susan Kilcrease, Missoula District Project Development Engineer
Bill Squires, P.E., Project Design Manager
Montana Legislative Branch Environmental Quality Council
File

HB:smk:S:\PROJECTS\MISSOULA\8139000\8139ENCED001PPP.DOC

Environmental Services Bureau
Phone: (406) 444-7228
Fax: (406) 444-7245

Rail, Transit and Planning Division
TTY: (800) 335-7592
Web Page: www.mdt.mt.gov

(FOR PROJECTS WITH NO RIGHT-OF-WAY INVOLVEMENT)

Applicant cannot be authorized to proceed with the proposed work until ALL of the conditions of the checklist have been satisfied.

ENVIRONMENTAL CHECKLIST FOR PAVEMENT PRESERVATION PROJECTS
(CRACK SEALING, SEAL & COVER, THIN OVERLAYS, MILL & FILL, PLANT MIX LEVELING, MILL OGFC, MICRO SURFACING, FOG SEAL)

Project Number: IM 90-3(124)163 **Control No** 8139000 **Project Name:** Gold Creek – E&W

Reference Post (Station): 162.643 **To Reference Post (Station):** 172.619

Applicant's Name: Montana Department of Transportation **Address:** PO Box 201001; Helena, MT 59620-1001

Type of Proposed Pavement Preservation Activity: Seal and Cover

IMPACTS ON THE PHYSICAL ENVIRONMENT (TO BE COMPLETED BY APPLICANT)				
Impact Questions		[Y/N] There are Potential Impacts; or Item Requires Documentation, Evaluation, Mitigation Measures, and/or (a) Permit(s).		
		Yes	No	Comment (Use attachments if necessary)
1.	Does the proposed action require work in, across, and/or adjacent to a listed or proposed Wild or Scenic River? (See http://www.rivers.gov/wildriverslist.html)	☐	☒	
2a.	Are there any listed or candidate threatened or endangered species in the vicinity of the proposed activity?	☐	☒	☐
2b.	Will the proposed action adversely affect listed or candidate threatened or endangered species, or adversely modify critical habitat?	☐	☒	☐
3.	Will the proposed action have potential to affect water quality? If 'Yes', an environment-related permit or authorization may be required. If 'No', go to question 4.	☐	☒	
3a.	If the answer to question 3 is yes, is a Clean Water Act Section 402 permit (i.e., MPDES or NPDES permit)required? (Need for an MPDES or NPDES is generally triggered by a disturbance area equal to or greater than one acre.)	☐	☐	☒ N/A
3b.	Is the proposed project within an MS4 Permit Area? (See http://deq.mt.gov/wqinfo/MPDES/StormWater/ms4.mcpx). (Billings, Great Falls, and Missoula Urbanized areas, and Butte, Bozeman, and Helena)	☐	☒	
4.	Does the proposed project have impacts to wetlands , streams, or other water bodies? If 'No', go to question 5.	☐	☒	
4a.	If the answer to question 4 is 'Yes', is a Clean Water Act Section 404 permit authorization required?	☐	☐	☒ N/A
4b.	If the answer to question 3 or 4 is 'Yes', is a Stream Protection Act 124SPA consultation required?	☐	☐	☒ N/A
5.	Are solid wastes, hazardous materials or petroleum products likely to be encountered? (For example, project occurs in or adjacent to Superfund sites, known spill areas, underground storage tanks, or abandoned mines.) (See http://nris.mt.gov/deq/remsitequery/portal.aspx)	☐	☒	
6.	Is the proposed activity on and/or within approximately 1 mile of an Indian Reservation? If answer is 'No', go to question 7.	☐	☒	
6a.	Are any Tribal water permits required?	☐	☐	☒ N/A
7.	Is the proposed project in a "Class I Air Shed" or a nonattainment area? (See http://deq.mt.gov/AirQuality/Planning/AirNonattainment.mcpx) (Class I Air Sheds include the Northern Cheyenne, Flathead, and Fort Peck 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)	☐	☒	

Checklist prepared by:

William Squires, PE	Project Design Engineer	11/8/2013
Applicant	**Title**	**Date**

Approved by: Cindy Brunner — ENVIRONMENTAL ENGINEERING SECTION SUPERVISOR — 12/3/13

Environmental Services		Click here to enter a date.
Environmental Services	**Title**	**Date**

(When any of the above questions are checked "Yes")

The Applicant is **not** authorized to proceed with the proposed work until the checklist has been reviewed and approved, as necessary, and any requested conditions of approval have been incorporated.

A. Complete the checklist items 1 through 7, indicating "Yes" or "No" for each item. Include comments, explanations, information sources, and a description of the magnitude/importance of potential impacts in the right hand column. Attach additional and supporting information as needed. The checklist preparer, by signing, certifies the accuracy of the information provided.

B. When "Yes" is indicated on any item, the checklist preparer must explain why and provide the appropriate documentation, evaluation, permit, and/or mitigation measures required to satisfy environmental concerns for the project. Use attachments if necessary. **Any proposed mitigation measures will become a condition of approval.**

C. If the applicant checks "Yes" for any one item, the checklist and MDT's mitigation proposal, documentation, evaluation and/or permit shall be submitted to MDT Environmental Services Bureau. Electronic format is preferred. Contact Number 444-7228.

D. When the applicant checks a "Yes" item, MDT cannot be authorized to proceed with the proposed work until Environmental Services Bureau reviews the information and signs the checklist.

E. MDT will obtain all necessary permits or authorizations from other entities with jurisdiction prior to beginning the Pavement Preservation Activity.

F. The links above are provided as a starting point for potential sources of information for completing the checklist. The Applicant is encouraged to consult Environmental Services Bureau and/or other information sources.

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

Memorandum

To: Distribution

From: Paul Ferry, P.E. *Initialed by Lesly Tribelhorn for Paul Ferry*
Highways Engineer

Date: 11/12/13

Subject: IM 90-3(124)163
Gold Creek – E&W
8139000
Work Type 183 Resurfacing – Seal & Cover

Attached is the Preliminary Field Review Report/Scope of Work Report which was approved on 11/12/13. 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:
Ed Toavs, District Administrator, Missoula Dist.
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:
William M. Squires, Area Engineer, Road Design
Dawn Stratton, Fiscal Programming Section
Damian Krings, Road Design Engineer

e-copies:
Jim Walther, Engineering, Preconstruction Engineer
Lesly Tribelhorn, Highways Design Engineer
Mark Goodman, Hydraulics Engineer
KC Yahvah, District Hydraulics Engineer, Missoula Dist.
Bill Semmens, Env. Resources Section Supervisor
Pat Basting, District Biologist, Missoula District
Susan Kilcrease, District Project Development Engineer
Danielle Bolan, Traffic Operations Engineer
Ivan Ulberg, Traffic Design Engineer
Kraig McLeod, Safety Engineer
Chris Hardan, Bridge Area Engineer, Missoula District
Michael Grover, Engineering Cost Analyst
Marty Beatty, Engineering Information Services
Sue Sillick, Research Section Supervisor
Jake Goettle, Construction Bureau – VA Engineer
Shane Stack, Missoula District Preconstruction
Ben Nunnallee, Missoula District Projects Engineer
Mike Dodge, District Materials Lab
Jack May, Missoula District Maintenance Chief
Suzan Foley, District Right of Way Design/Plans Supervisor
Phillip Inman, Utilities Engineering Manager
David Hoerning, R/W Engineering Manager
Greg Pizzini, Acquisition Manager
Matt Strizich, Materials Engineer
Daniel Hill, Pavement Analysis Engineer
Jeff Jackson, Geotechnical Engineer
Bret Boundy, Missoula District Geotechnical Manager
Paul Grant, Public Involvement Officer
Jean Riley, Planner

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

Memorandum

To: Paul Ferry, P.E.
Highways Engineer

From: Damian Krings, P.E. DMK
Road Design Engineer

Date: November 8, 2013

Subject: IM 90-3(124)163
Gold Creek – E&W
8139000
Work Type 183 Resurfacing – Seal & Cover

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

Approved Lesly Tribelhorn for Date 11/12/13
Paul 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

Introduction

A preliminary field review was held on August 16, 2012. MDT staff attending included:

William Squires, PE, Missoula Area Engineer, Road Design - Helena
Steve McEvoy, CE Specialist, Surfacing Design Unit – Helena*
Ben Nunnallee, PE, District Projects Engineer - Missoula
Dan Hanni, Civil Engineer Specialist, Traffic Safety Engineering Section - Helena
Chris Hardan, PE, Bridge Area Engineer, Missoula District – Helena

Proposed Scope of Work

A seal and cover (Type I) is proposed for this project, in accordance with Pavement Management recommendations and the field review. Pavement markings will be included, and signing will be upgraded as needed.

Purpose and Need

The project purpose is to preserve the asphalt pavement and extend the life of the roadway.

Project Location and Limits

The project is located in Powell County, beginning at Reference Post (RP) 162.643 and extending southeasterly to RP 172.619. The total project length is 9.976 miles. The project begins in Section 21 of Township 10 North, Range 11 West, 3.63 miles west of Gold Creek Interchange, and ends in Section 14 of Township 9 North, Range 10 West, 2.38 miles east of Phosphate Interchange. See attached map.

The limits of the project coincide with the limits of as-built project IM 90-3(98)163, Gold Creek – East & West [6192], a seal and cover project constructed in 2008.

Interstate Highway 90 (I-90) is functionally classified as principal arterial (freeway) and is on the NH system.

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) and a limited Public Involvement Plan (news release). These issues are discussed in more detail under the Traffic Control and Public Involvement sections.

Physical Characteristics

The existing highway is in the Clark Fork River Valley and has level to gently rolling terrain. Land use on both sides of the Interstate consists of farms, frontage road, and the Clark Fork River.

The road was originally built under two projects. The first was I 90-3(3)157, Drummond-Gold Creek in 1960, and the second was I 90-3(23)166, Gold Creek-East in 1973. The road received an overlay in 1984 under IR 90-3(58)162, Gold Creek East & West. The most recent project has been IM 90-3(98)163, Gold Creek – East & West, a seal and cover project constructed in 2008.

I 90-3(3)157, Drummond-Gold Creek was built with 0.35' of plant mix surfacing, 0.25' of top surfacing, and 2.0' of base course. It was originally constructed 40' wide in each direction with 5:1 surfacing inslopes.

Gold Creek-East was constructed with 0.35' of plant mix surfacing, 0.20' of top surfacing, and 1.6' of base course. Shoulders were tapered from full depth to 0.20' at the edge of pavement. The project was originally constructed 38' wide in each direction with 6:1 surfacing inslopes. Approximately 3480'of the Gold Creek-East project has an 80' wide top; this includes a 14' wide flush median.

IR 90-3(58)162, Gold Creek East & West was an overlay project constructed in 1984. Under this project, 0.15' of plant mix surfacing and a ¾" Open Graded Friction Course (OGFC) was placed full width. The overlay reduced the outside shoulder widths from 10.0' to approximately 9.0' and inside shoulder widths were reduced from 6.0' to approximately 5.0'.

In 2002, under project IM 90-3(83)163, Gold Creek – East & West, 0.25' (75 mm) of cold milling on the mainline and 0.08' (25 mm) on the interchange ramps and crossroads at Gold Creek and Phosphate Interchange removed the OGFC applied in 1984. Following full width milling, a 0.36' (110 mm) PMS overlay was placed in two lifts. The first lift was composed of 50% recycled plant mix placed to a depth of 0.16' (50 mm). The top lift was placed to a depth of 0.20' (60 mm). Inside shoulders were narrowed from 5.0' (1.5 m) to 4.0' (1.2 m) and outside shoulders were widened from 9' (2.7 m) to 10' (3.0 m) on this project.

In 2008, under project IM 90-3(98)163, Gold Creek – East & West [6192], a partial-width (travel lanes only) Seal Coal – Type I (grade 4A cover material) with CRS-2P seal oil was performed.

The horizontal alignment meets standards for a design speed of 70 mph. There are two curves with radii of 1910'; all other curves are flatter. The minimum radius curve for a 70 mph design speed is 1820'.

Grades along the project are generally less than 1%; however, the maximum grade on the project is 3.5%, which is greater than the desirable maximum of 3%.

Traffic Data

Current traffic data was not requested for this seal and cover project. The 2012 Traffic by Sections report stated that between R.P. 162.278 and R.P. 174.371, the average AADT was 8,215 and the average number of commercial trucks was 1,769.

Crash Analysis

Four HES clusters have previously identified within the project limits. Three of the four were addressed by the last project or previous projects. The fourth had no addressable trend. An updated crash history was not requested for this seal and cover project.

Major Design Features

This project will be developed in accordance with the Guidelines for Pavement Preservation Projects. The project is considered to be preventative maintenance. The Missoula section of Helena Road Design will perform the preconstruction design activities.

a. **Design Speed.** Design speed is not an applicable design criterion for preventative maintenance projects. The posted speed limit is 75 mph for cars and light trucks, and 65 mph for large trucks.
b. **Horizontal Alignment**. The existing horizontal alignment is adequate for the proposed preventative maintenance resurfacing.
c. **Vertical Alignment**. The existing vertical alignment is adequate for the proposed preventative maintenance resurfacing.
d. **Typical Sections and Surfacing**. There are no proposed changes to the typical sections. The chip-seal will extend 37.3' to cover the entire existing paved surface. The ramps at the Gold Creek and Phosphate interchanges will be chip sealed their full widths.

   Due to the nature of the project, a surfacing design was not requested. We propose a full width Seal Coat with CRS-2P seal oil and Type I cover material, for the entire project. Frontage roads and the Gold Creek rest area are not proposed to be resurfaced on this project. The PvMS 2013 Recommendations (based on 2012 survey) are listed below:

Ref. Post	Ride	Rut	ACI	MCI	Recommendation
162.6 – 172.6 (LT)	87.4	68.4	99.6	99.5	C_AC Crack Seal & Cover
162.6 – 172.6 (RT)	87.4	68.1	99.4	99.8	C_AC Crack Seal & Cover

   Based on the 2012 PvMS data and recommendation, we feel a seal and cover resurfacing is the appropriate treatment for this project. Crack sealing was determined to be unnecessary because almost no cracking was identified on the project.
e. **Geotechnical Considerations**. There are no geotechnical considerations. There will be no geotechnical involvement.
f. **Hydraulics**. There are no hydraulic considerations.
g. **Bridges.** Within the project limits there are four pairs of bridges, a concrete box, and a steel culvert. Their reference points and names are listed below:

   RP 165.421 JR Grade Separation (Concrete Box)
   RP 166.272 Gold Creek Interchange
   RP 168.300 Private Road (Steel Culvert)
   RP 170.005 Railroad Separation
   RP 170.241 Phosphate Interchange
   RP 171.779 County Road Separation

   The junior grade separation and private road structures have a bituminous surfacing and will be resurfaced on this project. The bridges on the project will be treated with a bridge deck crack seal. The bridge approach slabs will be

repaired as needed and then sealed.

h. **Traffic.** The existing pavement marking layout will be used to re-stripe the roadway. Traffic Engineering will provide the quantities, details, and specifications for interim paint and final epoxy. These items will be included in the road plans package. Signing will be upgraded, pending the results of the Preliminary Signing Study.
i. **Pedestrian/Bicycle/ADA**. I-90 is a limited access facility with no bicycle or pedestrian accommodations. No new bicycle or pedestrian features will be added.
j. **Miscellaneous Features**. Because the previous seal and cover project [6192] was partial-width, rumble strips will not be cut-in again on this project.
k. **Context Sensitive Design Issues**. No features considered to be context sensitive are proposed.

Other Projects
We propose to tie this project for contract to IM 90-2(134)106, Missoula – Bonner [8138000].

The project is between two pavement preservation projects currently under contract: IM 90-3(111)150, Drummond - E & W (I-90) [7602000] and NHPB-IM 90-3(114)173, Garrison – Beck Hill [7603000]. If needed, we will include project coordination language in the contract for [8139000].

Location Hydraulics Study Report
No Location Hydraulics Study Report will be prepared for this preventative maintenance project. No impacts to existing drainage patterns or structures are anticipated.

Design Exceptions
The design exception process does not apply to pavement preservation projects. However, the following sub-standard design elements should be noted:

- Maximum grade on the project is 3.5% (exceeds 3% in level terrain)
- 5:1 surfacing inslopes and sideslopes exist in various locations

Right-of-Way
There will be no right of way involvement.

Access Control
This section of roadway is an access controlled facility. There will be no changes to the existing access control.

Utilities/Railroads
There will be no utilities or railroad involvement on this project.

Maintenance Items
No maintenance items were identified during the field review.

Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) Features
No ITS features will be installed, impacted, or modified as part of this preventative maintenance project.

Survey
No survey is required for this project.

Public Involvement

A Level [A] public involvement plan is appropriate. A news release explaining the project and including a department point of contact will be prepared and distributed.

Environmental Considerations

No significant environmental impacts or issues were identified. We reviewed the project and determined it meets the criteria for the Programmatic Agreement as a Categorical Exclusion under the provisions of 23 CFR 771.117(d) as signed by MDT February 18, 2005, and concurred in by the FHWA on March 4, 2005. The Environmental Checklist for Pavement Preservation Projects is attached.

Energy Savings/Eco-Friendly Considerations

None.

Experimental Features

There are no experimental features included in this project.

Traffic Control

Traffic will be maintained through the construction of the project with appropriate signing, flagging, detours, etc., in accordance with the *Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices*. There may be periods of single lane closures during working hours.

A Transportation Management Plan (TMP) consisting of a Traffic Control Plan (TCP) and a limited Public Information (PI) component is appropriate for this project.

Project Management

Project management responsibilities will be handled by Jennifer Nelson of the Missoula crew in Helena Road Design. This project is not under full FHWA oversight.

Preliminary Cost Estimate

	Estimated cost	Inflation (INF) (from PPMS)	TOTAL costs w/INF + IDC (from PPMS)
Road Work	$989,000		
Rehab Structure	90,473		
Remove Structure			
Detour			
Traffic Control			
Subtotal	**$1,079,473**		
Mobilization (7%)	75,563		
Subtotal	**$1,155,036**		
Contingencies (10%)	115,504		
Total CN	**$1,270,540**	**$7,435**	**$1,394,526**
CE (10%)	**$127,054**	**$ 744**	**$ 139,453**
TOTAL CN+CE	**$1,397,594**	**$8,179**	**$1,533,979**

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 9.12% for FY 2014.

Ready Date

The ready date is February 20, 2014. The project is slated for a May 22, 2014 letting. Ready date in Project Management System is March 10, 2014. The project is currently on schedule in OPX2.

Site Map

The project site map is attached.

Project Site Map