Subject: BH-IM 0002(721)
D2 Scour Protection
CN 5466000

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. Copies of the Preliminary Field Review Report and location map (5/12/04) are 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 (MDH) 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).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>YES</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>UNK</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. This proposed project would have (a) significant environmental impact(s) as-defined under 23 CFR 771.117(a).</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. This proposed project involves (an) unusual circumstance(s) as described under 23 CFR 771.117(b).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. This proposed project involves one (or more) of the following situations where:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. Right-of-Way, easements, and/or construction permits would be required.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. The context or degree of the Right-of-Way action would have (a) substantial social, economic, or environmental effect(s).</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. There is a high rate of residential growth in this proposed project's area.</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. There is a high rate of commercial growth in this proposed project's area.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Work would be on and/or within approximately 1.6 kilometers (1± mile) of an Indian Reservation.</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Environmental Services Bureau
Phone: (406) 444-7228
Fax: (406) 444-7245
An Equal Opportunity Employer
5. There are parks, recreational, or other properties acquired/improved under Section 6(f) of the 1965 National Land & Water Conservation Fund Act (16 USC 460L, et seq.) on or adjacent to the proposed project area. The use of such Section 6(f) sites would be documented and compensated with the appropriate agencies. (e.g.: MDFWP, local entities, etc.).

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 Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (16 USC 470, et seq.) by the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), which would be affected by this proposed project.

7. There are 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) on or adjacent to the project area.
   a. "Nationwide" Programmatic Section 4(f) Evaluation forms for these sites are attached.
   b. This proposed project requires a full (i.e.: DRAFT & FINAL) Section 4(f) Evaluation.

B. The activity would involve work in a streambed, wetland, and/or other waterbody(ies) considered as "waters of the United States" or similar (e.g.: "state waters").

1. Conditions set forth in Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act (33 USC 403) and/or Section 404 under 33 CFR Parts 320-330 of the Clean Water Act (33 USC 1251-1376) would be met.

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.

3. A 124SPA Stream Protection permit would be obtained from the MDFWP?

4. There is a delineated floodplain in the proposed project area under FEMA’s Floodplain Management criteria. The water surface at the 100-year flood limit elevation would exceed floodplain management criteria due to an encroachment by the proposed project.

5. Tribal Water Permit would be required.

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.
The designated National Wild & Scenic River systems in Montana are:

a. Middle Fork of the Flathead River (headwaters to South Fork confluence).

b. North Fork of the Flathead River (Canadian Border to Middle Fork confluence).

c. South Fork of the Flathead River (headwaters to Hungry Horse Reservoir).

d. Missouri River (Fort Benton to Charles M. Russell National Wildlife Refuge).

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).

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.

1. If yes, are there potential noise impacts?

   YES   NO   N/A   UNK
   ☐     ☐   ☐    ☐

2. A Noise Analysis would be completed.

   YES   NO   N/A   UNK
   ☐     ☐   ☐    ☐

3. There would be compliance with the provisions of both 23 CFR 772 for FHWA’s Noise Impact analyses and MDT’s Noise Policy.

   YES   NO   N/A   UNK
   ☐     ☐   ☐    ☐

D. There would be substantial changes in access control involved with this proposed project.

If yes, would they result in extensive economic and/or social impacts on the affected locations?

YES   NO   N/A   UNK
☐     ☐   ☐    ☐

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.

   YES   NO   N/A   UNK
   ☐     ☐   ☐    ☐

2. Adverse effects to through-traffic dependant businesses would be avoided or minimized.

   YES   NO   N/A   UNK
   ☐     ☐   ☐    ☐

3. Interference to local events (e.g.: festivals) would be minimized to all possible extent.

   YES   NO   N/A   UNK
   ☐     ☐   ☐    ☐

4. Substantial controversy associated with this pending action would be avoided.

   YES   NO   N/A   UNK
   ☐     ☐   ☐    ☐

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.

YES   NO   N/A   UNK
☐     ☐   ☐    ☐
All reasonable measures would be taken to avoid and/or minimize substantial impacts from same.

G. The Montana Pollutant Discharge Elimination System's conditions (ARM 16.20.1314), including temporary erosion control features for construction would be met.

H. Permanent desirable vegetation with an approved seeding mixture would be established on exposed areas.

I. Documentation of an "invasive species" review to comply with both EO #13112 and the County Noxious Weed Control Act (7-22-21, MCA), including directions as specified by the county(ies) wherein its intended work would be done.

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, et seq.).

K. Features for the Americans with Disabilities Act (PL 101-336) compliance would be included.

L. A written Public Involvement Plan, would be completed in accordance with MDT's Public Involvement Handbook.

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's 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

   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.).

   C. Is this proposed project in a "Class I Air Shed" (Indian Reservations) under 40 CFR 52.1382(c)(3)?

5. Federally listed Threatened or Endangered (T/E) Species:

   A. There are recorded occurrences, and/or critical habitat in this proposed project's vicinity.

   B. Would this proposed project result in a "jeopardy" opinion (under 50 CFR 402) from the Fish & Wildlife Service on any Federally listed T/E Species?
The proposed project would not induce significant land use changes, nor promote unplanned growth. There would be no significant effects on access to adjacent property, nor to present traffic patterns.

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

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

 signatures and dates are present, indicating review and approval by various officials.

Attachments

cc: Jeffrey M. Ebert, P.E. - District Administrator-Butte
    Paul R. Ferry, P.E. - Highway Engineer
    Kent M. Barnes, P.E. - Bridge Engineer
    John H. Horton - MDT Right-of-Way Bureau Chief
    Suzy Althof - MDT Contract Plans Section Supervisor
    David W. Jensen, Supervisor - MDT Fiscal Programming Section
    Jean A. Riley, P.E., Chief - Environmental Services Bureau
    Tom Gocksch P.E. - Environmental Services Bureau
    Deb Wambach - Environmental Services Bureau
    P.O. Environmental Quality Council

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.
Memorandum

To: Kent M. Barnes, P.E.
   Bridge Engineer

Thru: Robert W. Modrow, P.E.
   Bridge Design Engineer

From: Bryan L. Miller, P.E.
   Bridge Area Engineer – Butte District

Date: May 12, 2004

Subject: BH-IM 0002(721)
   D2-Scour Protection
   Control No. 5466
   Work Type: 232 Minor Bridge Rehabilitation

We request that you approve the attached Preliminary Field Review Report.

Approved Kent Barnes 5/12/04
   Bridge Engineer Date

Delivered to Engineering Information Services Section

We are requesting comments from the individuals on the following distribution list. We will assume concurrence if no comments are received within two weeks from the approved date.

Distribution:
J. M. Ebert-Butte  J. A. Walther-Preconst  Jean Riley-Environmental
P. Ferry-Highway  Road Design  Mark Goodman-Hydraulics
Mark Wissinger-Const  Materials Bureau  S. Straehl-Planning
B. F. Juvan-EISS  D. Williams-Traffic & Safety  P. A. Jomini-Safety
Bryce Larsen-Photo/Surv  R. Jackson-Geotech  Walt Scott-Utilities
M. J. Murphy-Bridge  Bridge File  Darrin Grenfill – FHWA

Introduction
An on site review was held on April 28, 2004. The following people were present.
Bryan Miller, MDT-Bridge  Joe Olsen, MDT-Butte District
Russell Brewer, MDT-Hydraulics  Deborah Wambach, MDT-Environmental
Rick Johnson, MDT-Construction

Betty Sykes Mayor of Twin Bridges and Sam Novich Maintenance Supervisor for Twin Bridges met the review team at the Beaverhead River site.
Project Modification
Another scour mitigation site has been identified and added to the original programmed project. The site is located 3.2km west of Three Forks at structure P00013093+05931 that crosses the Jefferson River in Gallatin County.

Proposed Scope of Work
The project was nominated for scour mitigation. The proposed scope of work is limited to scour mitigation around bridge abutments and piers. The bridges on S205 and P13 have non-standard rail with blunt ends that will not be addressed as part of this project.

Project Location and Limits
The project is located in the Butte District in Gallatin and Madison County at 7 different sites. The construction limits will be limited along and within the channels for scour mitigation. Actual length and construction limits will be determined after survey.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>Feature Crossed</th>
<th>Approximate Location</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Legal Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S002059013+00791</td>
<td>Baker Creek</td>
<td>3.2 km SE of Manhattan</td>
<td>Gallatin</td>
<td>T2N, R1E, Section 13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S0020599514+05181</td>
<td>Gallatin River</td>
<td>6.4 km SE of Manhattan</td>
<td>Gallatin</td>
<td>T1N, R4E, Section 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I10092562+04251</td>
<td>Gallatin River</td>
<td>6.4 km SE of Manhattan</td>
<td>Gallatin</td>
<td>T1N, R4E, Section 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I10092592+04252</td>
<td>Gallatin River</td>
<td>6.4 km SE of Manhattan</td>
<td>Gallatin</td>
<td>T1N, R4E, Section 19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P00050032+07581</td>
<td>West Gallatin River</td>
<td>27.4 km SE of Big Sky</td>
<td>Gallatin</td>
<td>T9S, R4E, Section 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P00050027+05411</td>
<td>Beaverhead River</td>
<td>Twin Bridges</td>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>T3S, R6W, Section 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P00013093+06931</td>
<td>Jefferson River</td>
<td>3.2km West of Three Forks</td>
<td>Gallatin</td>
<td>T1N, R3E, Section 27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>Year Built</th>
<th>DWG #</th>
<th>Rdwy Width m</th>
<th>Abutment Foundation</th>
<th>Pier Foundation</th>
<th>Sufficiency Rating</th>
<th>Structure Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S00205013+00791</td>
<td>1921</td>
<td>1219</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>Spread Footings</td>
<td></td>
<td>79.9</td>
<td>Not Deficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S00205014+05181</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>2572</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>Spread Footings</td>
<td>Spread Footings</td>
<td>88.5</td>
<td>Not Deficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I10090929+04251</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>6846</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>Spread Footings</td>
<td>Spread Footings</td>
<td>96.5</td>
<td>Not Deficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I10090929+04252</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>6845</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>Spread Footings</td>
<td>Spread Footings</td>
<td>96.5</td>
<td>Not Deficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P00050032+07581</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>11864</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>Spread Footings</td>
<td>Spread Footings</td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td>Not Deficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P00049027+05411</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>2750</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>Spread Footings</td>
<td>B2 is Spread/B3 is piles</td>
<td>52.1</td>
<td>Not Deficient</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P00013093+06931</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>2782</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>Timber Piles</td>
<td>Spread Footings</td>
<td>96.5</td>
<td>Not Deficient</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

S205 RP 13.079 Baker Creek
The existing bridge is a two span bridge with cast in place concrete beams and concrete deck. The deck has a 150mm asphalt overlay. The bridge has a concrete rail that does not meet current standards and has blunt ends. Pier 2 consists of a pier wall that does not align with the current channel. The pier wall separates the channel. Span 2 has silted in forcing all the flow through span 1. Asbuilt plans show spread footings for the abutment and pier. Scour inspections have indicated the possibility of piles under the pier footing. A scour hole with a depth below the footing exists at the upstream end of Pier 2. Abutment 1 has a scour hole at the footing depth on the northwest corner. Scour mitigation includes stabilization of the footing at abutment 1 and pier 2.

S205 14.518 Gallatin River

The existing bridge is a three span bridge with steel girders and concrete deck. The bridge has a concrete curb and rail that does not meet current standards and has blunt ends. The intermediate piers consist of pier walls with spread footings that do not align with the current channel. A scour hole exists around Pier 3. Scour mitigation includes stabilization of the footings at pier 2 and 3.

I90 292.425 Eastbound & Westbound

The Structures are four span pretressed concrete bridges. The structures received a deck overlay, rail revision and seismic rehab in 1999. The intermediate piers consist of pier walls with spread footings. Scour mitigation includes stabilization of the footings at the intermediate piers.
The Structure is three spans with cast in place concrete beams. The intermediate piers consist of pier walls with spread footings. Scour mitigation includes stabilization of the footings at the intermediate pier 2.

P49 27.541 Beaverhead River

The existing bridge is a three span bridge with rolled steel girders. The intermediate piers consist of pier walls with spread footings. In 1998 project ER 0002(308) was completed adding riprap to pier 3. Scour mitigation includes stabilization of the footings at Pier 2.
The existing bridge is a three span bridge with riveted plate girders. The intermediate piers consist of pier walls with spread footings. Scour mitigation includes stabilization of the footings at Pier 3 and abutment 4.

Traffic and Accident Data
Traffic and accident data will not be requested for this project since the scope of work is limited to scour mitigation.

Major Design Features
1.) Functional Classification: Not applicable for scour mitigation.
2.) Design Speed: Not applicable for scour mitigation.
3.) Horizontal Alignment: Maintain existing alignment.
4.) Vertical Alignment: Maintain existing alignment.
5.) Bridge: Work is limited to scour mitigation at abutments and piers.
6.) Surfacing and Typical Section: Maintain the existing surfacing and typical section.
7.) Grading: Not applicable.
8.) Geotechnical Considerations: Geotechnical involvement is not anticipated.
9.) Hydraulics: Refer to the Location Hydraulic Summary Report

Design Exceptions
The project intent is to address scour. Design exceptions are beyond the scope of this scour mitigation project.

Right-of-Way
Right-of-Way acquisition may be required for work involving bank stabilization and channel shaping but not for pier protection work. Construction Permits may be required for access.

Utilities
No utilities were observed. No utility involvement is anticipated.

Railroad
A Railroad bridge exists between the I90 structures and the S205 structure across the Gallatin River. Railroad involvement is anticipated at this site.

Public Involvement
An informational notice will be published.

Environmental Considerations
All Structures: The conceptual design needs to be submitted to the resource agencies for review and comment. An on-site review, after conceptual plan submittal, will be coordinated with the resource agencies if needed. A CWA 404 permit and SPA 124 permit will be needed for each treatment. The Contractor awarded the project will also have to secure permits for methods, temporary structures and instream activities. Instream equipment traffic must be limited to the greatest extent practicable. Timing restrictions on instream activities may be required as a provision of the SPA 124 permit. A Categorical Exclusion will likely be prepared for this project.

Jefferson River: The old piers need to be removed from the river channel. Removal of the abutments should also be investigated. While riprap armoring may be required around the exposed footing, it is recommended that a "soft-armoring" approach be taken along the eroded bank upstream of the structure. Riprap should be minimized along the downstream side of the structure. No wetlands should be impacted at this site.

Baker Creek: Hard-armoring along the west bent and center pier is likely. The use of Reno mats or other gabion structures may be preferable to limit additional excavation of the channel. Equipment access is limited and some manual labor will likely be included. Minor channel manipulation may be required but a true channel change will not likely be permitted. A thick scrub-shrub wetland dominated by willow, dogwood, alder and sedge surrounds the structure. Some wetland impacts are anticipated but should be minimized to the greatest extent possible.

Gallatin River S-205: Cable-tied blocks and/or riprap is likely at the two instream piers. It is recommended that the abutments not be treated in association with this project, but it is understood that some minimal riprap placement without additional excavation may be placed along the east abutment. No wetlands should be impacted at this site. An unknown entity appears to be using this site as a dumping ground for ungulate carcasses. Maintenance should...
be altered to this situation.

Gallatin River I-90 EB/WB: Cable-tied blocks or a mattress is likely at each of the three instream piers. This should only required minor excavation. No abutment treatments are anticipated at this site. No wetlands should be impacted at this site.

Gallatin River P-50: Large riprap is proposed to fill the hole at the instream pier two. A more sensitive alternative such as grout bags or mattresses should be investigated. No additional excavation is anticipated. No abutment work is proposed. No wetlands, but minimal riparian vegetation occurs along the shoreline. There may be equipment access issues at this location and some manual labor may be required. A water ouzel (American dipper) was nesting behind the bridge rail at the time of the field review. Active swallow nests were also observed on the structure. Disturbance of active nests is not permitted. Removal of inactive nests and installation of a nesting deterrent is permitted between the dates of August 15 and May 1.

Beaverhead River: Excavation around pier two and the placement of riprap is likely. The riprap needs to be placed below the natural channel elevation and covered with natural streambed material or allowed to fill in naturally. Treatment of the minor erosion along the parkway downstream of the structure is not recommended in association with this project. Negligible wetlands may be impacted at this site.

Traffic Control
Traffic should not be disturbed by actual work. Traffic control may be needed to allow the contractor access to the right-of-way. All signing, flagging, etc. will be in accordance with MUTCD.

Survey
Refer to Location Hydraulic Study Report for field survey requirements.

Salvage
The Contractor will dispose of all removed material as part of this project according to all applicable rules and regulations.

Management
The Bridge Bureau will manage the preconstruction phase of this project. A realistic ready date will be established once overrides are complete.
Cost Estimate under BH Funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>Feature Crossed</th>
<th>Approximate Location</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Scour Mitigation Est.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S00205013+00791</td>
<td>Baker Creek</td>
<td>3.2 km SE of Manhattan</td>
<td>Gallatin</td>
<td>$47,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S00205014+05181</td>
<td>Gallatin River</td>
<td>6.4 km SE of Manhattan</td>
<td>Gallatin</td>
<td>$87,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P00050032+07581</td>
<td>West Gallatin River</td>
<td>27.4 km SE of Big Sky</td>
<td>Gallatin</td>
<td>$33,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P00049027+05411</td>
<td>Beaverhead River</td>
<td>Twin Bridges</td>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>$87,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P00013093+06931</td>
<td>Jefferson River</td>
<td>3.2km West of Three Forks</td>
<td>Gallatin</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scour Mitigation $405,500
Traffic Control $60,000
Subtotal $465,500
Mobilization (12%) $55,900
Subtotal $521,400
15% Eng. And 10% Cont. $130,400
Subtotal $651,800
Inflation (3% per year x 3 years) $60,400
Total BH Funds: $712,200

Cost Estimate under IM Funds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>Feature Crossed</th>
<th>Approximate Location</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>Scour Mitigation Est.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I00000292+04251</td>
<td>Gallatin River</td>
<td>6.4 km SE of Manhattan</td>
<td>Gallatin</td>
<td>$65,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I00000292+04252</td>
<td>Gallatin River</td>
<td>6.4 km SE of Manhattan</td>
<td>Gallatin</td>
<td>$65,400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Scour Mitigation $130,800
Traffic Control $40,000
Subtotal $170,800
Mobilization (12%) $20,500
Subtotal $191,300
15% Eng. And 10% Cont. $47,800
Subtotal $239,100
Inflation (3% per year x 3 years) $22,200
Total IM Funds: $261,300

Total Project Cost Estimate $973,500