



Montana Department of Transportation

2701 Prospect Avenue
PO Box 201001
Helena MT 59620-1001

Michael T. Tooley, Director
Steve Bullock, Governor

March 3, 2014

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

Attention: Jeff Patten

Subject: Categorical Exclusion
SF 109-CRV RECON-N OF HARRISON
HSIP 359-2(6)14
Control Number: 7517000



RECEIVED
MAR 10 2014
ENVIRONMENTAL

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 (PFRR) dated November 22, 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 shaded box will require additional documentation for a Categorical Exclusion request in accordance with 23 CFR 771.117(d).

Table with 4 columns: YES, NO, N/A, UNK. Rows include project impact questions and construction permit requirements.

	<u>YES</u>	<u>NO</u>	<u>N/A</u>	<u>UNK</u>
1. The context or degree of the Right-of-Way action would have (a) substantial social, economic, or environmental effect(s).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
2. There is a high rate of residential growth in this proposed project's area.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
3. There is a high rate of commercial growth in this proposed project's area.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 &amp; Water Conservation Fund Act</i> (16 USC 460L, <i>et seq.</i> ) on or adjacent to proposed the 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 checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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 checked="" 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 checked="" 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
4. There is a delineated floodplain in the proposed project area under FEMA's Floodplain Management criteria.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
The water surface at the 100-year flood limit elevation would exceed floodplain management criteria due to an encroachment by the proposed project.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
5. Tribal Water Permit would be required.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
c. South Fork of the Flathead River (headwaters to Hungry Horse Reservoir).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
d. Missouri River (Fort Benton to Charles M. Russell National Wildlife Refuge).	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input 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 type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" 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.

Barry Brosten, Date: 3/3/14  
Barry Brosten - Butte District Project Development Engineer  
MDT Environmental Services Bureau

Concur Heidy Bruner, Date: 3/3/14  
Heidy Bruner, P.E. - Engineering Section Supervisor  
MDT Environmental Services Bureau

Concur Jeffery A Patten, Date: 3/10/14  
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: PFRR

- Copy (w/o attach.):
- |  |                                       |
|--|---------------------------------------|
| Jeff Ebert   | Butte District Administrator          |
| Paul Ferry   | Highway Engineer                      |
| Tom Martin   | Chief, Environmental Services Bureau  |
| Robert Stapley   | Right-of-Way Bureau Chief             |
| Suzy Price   | Contract Plans Bureau Chief           |
| Lisa Hurley  | Fiscal Programming Section Supervisor |
| Tom Erving   | Fiscal Programming Section            |
| Barry Brosten  | Environmental Services                |
| Environmental Services File                                    |                                       |
| Montana Legislative Branch Environmental Quality Council (EQC) |                                       |



**Memorandum**

To: Roy A. Peterson, PE  
 Traffic and Safety Engineer

From: Scott A. Keller, PE  
 MSU Design Engineer

Date: November 22, 2011

Subject: HSIP 359-2(6)14  
 SF 109 – CRV Recon – N. of Harrison  
 UPN 7517000  
 Work Type 310-Roadway & Roadside Safety Improvements

Please approve the attached Preliminary Field Review Report.

Approved Signed by Roy A. Peterson 11-28-2011 Date \_\_\_\_\_  
 Roy A. Peterson, P.E.  
 Traffic & Safety 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:**

- |   |  |
|---|--|
| Jeff Ebert, District Administrator        | Tom Martin, Environmental Services Bureau Chief              |
| Kent Barnes, Bridge Engineer              | Lynn Zanto, Rail, Transit, & Planning Division Administrator |
| Paul Ferry, Highways Engineer             | Jake Goettle, Construction Engineering Services Bureau       |
| Roy Peterson, Traffic and Safety Engineer | Matt Strizich, Materials Engineer                            |
| Robert Stapley, Right-of-Way Bureau Chief |  |

**cc:**

- Dawn Stratton, Fiscal Programming Section
- Scott Keller, Project Design Manager
- Damian Krings, Road Design Engineer

**e-copies:**

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| Jim Walther, Engineering, Preconstruction Engineer   | Jake Goettle, Construction Bureau – VA Engineer |
| Lesly Tribelhorn, Highways Design Engineer           | Dustin Rouse, District Preconstruction          |
| Mark Goodman, Hydraulics Engineer                    | Joe Walsh, District Projects Engineer           |
| Walt Ludlow, District Hydraulics Engineer            | Casey Ballard, District Materials Lab           |
| Bonnie Gundrum, Env. Resources Section Supervisor    | Steven Giard, R/W Utilities Section             |
| Deb Wambach, District Biologist                      | David Hoerning, R/W Engineering Manager         |
| Barry Brosten, District Project Development Engineer | Greg Pizzini, Acquisition Manager               |
| Danielle Bolan, Traffic Engineer                     | Joe Zody, R/W Access Management Section Manager |
| Lee Alt, District Traffic Engineer                   | Paul Johnson, Project Analysis Bureau           |
| Kraig McLeod, Safety Engineer                        | Sue Sillick, Research Section Supervisor        |
| Nathan Haddick, Bridge Area Engineer                 | Wayne Noem, Secondary Roads Engineer            |
| Matt Strizich, Materials Engineer                    | Ray Stocks, Bozeman Division Maintenance Chief  |
| Daniel Hill, Pavement Analysis Engineer              | Larry Brooke, Harrison Maintenance Section      |
| Pat McCann, District Geotechnical Manager            | Alyce Fisher, Fiscal Programming                |
| Bryce Larsen, Supervisor, Photogrammetry & Survey    | Scott Bunton, Engineering Cost Analyst          |
| Marty Beatty, Engineering Information Services       | Gino Liva, District Construction                |
| Paul Grant, Public Involvement Officer               |   |
| Jean Riley, Planner                                  |   |
| Dawn Stratton, Fiscal Programming                    |   |

## Preliminary Field Review Report

HSIP 359-2(6)14; SF 109 – CRV Recon – N. of Harrison

Project Manager: Scott A. Keller

Page 1 of 5

### Introduction

The field review for the subject project was held Wednesday, October 12, 2011 with the following personnel in attendance:

Joe Walsh	Butte District Preconstruction	MDT-Butte
Geno Liva	Butte District Construction	MDT - Butte
Pat McCann	Geotechnical Section	MDT - Helena
Dave Cunningham	Geotechnical Section	MDT - Helena
Deb Wambach	Environmental Services Bureau	MDT - Helena
Jonathan Floyd	Traffic & Safety Bureau	MDT - Helena
Scott Keller	MSU Design	MDT - Bozeman
Jim Nallick	MSU Design	MDT - Bozeman
Rod Payne	MSU Design	MDT - Bozeman

### Proposed Scope of Work

This project was originally nominated through the Highway Safety Improvement Program to reconstruct the curve along a section of Secondary 359 in Madison County. At the field review, the committee recommended slope flattening as the preferred option to address a pattern of single vehicle run off the road crashes. Roy Peterson and Kraig McLeod also agreed with the revised slope flattening scope of work during a conference call on October 20, 2011.

### Purpose and Need

The pattern of addressable crashes along this section of roadway is single vehicle run off the road. The purpose of this project is to reduce the number and severity of these crashers by providing embankment slope flattening to allow for potential recovery of errant vehicles.

### Project Location and Limits

This project is located on Secondary 359 from RP 13.9 to 14.5 in Madison County approximately 2 miles north of Harrison. Secondary 359 is classified as a rural collector road. The attached Project Site Map depicts the location of the proposed improvements.

### 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. The plans package will include a Transportation Management Plan (TMP) consisting mainly of a Traffic Control Plan (TCP). A Transportation Operations (TO) component or a Public Information (PI) component will not be included.

### Physical Characteristics

This section of roadway was constructed in 1962 under project number S-167(6) which consists of two 12-foot travel lanes and no shoulders. The asphalt surfacing is approximately 2.4 inches over a 12.0 inch crushed base. The project site is located in a rural area with level terrain. From RP 13.9 to RP 14.5 the existing roadway contains two horizontal curves with radii of 1432.5 feet and 716.3 feet. A railroad crossing is located between the horizontal curves at RP 14.253. The maximum vertical gradient within this project is 4.75%. As-builts indicate fill slopes consist of a 5:1 slope to approximately 10 feet beyond the edge of pavement, breaking to a 2 ½: 1 or steeper fill slope to the catch point. Cut slopes consist of a 5:1 slope to a V-ditch located 15 feet beyond the edge of pavement.

## Preliminary Field Review Report

### Traffic Data

The traffic data for this project is summarized as follows:

2011 AADT = 480 (Present)  
2015 AADT = 540 (Letting Year)  
2035 AADT = 920 (Design Year)  
DHV = 140  
T = 6.8%  
EAL = 27  
AGR = 2.7%

### Crash Analysis

Eight west bound single vehicle, run off the road accidents were reported between January 1, 2003 and December 31, 2010 on the curve near MP 14.4. Seven of these accidents were correctable by the recommended improvements. Of these crashes there were 6 injuries, 2 incapacitating, and 2 accidents were property damage only. No fatalities were reported.

### Major Design Features

The following sections summarize the pertinent design features on the project.

- a. **Design Speed.** The design speed for rural collectors in rolling terrain is 50 miles per hour (mph). The posted speed limit for this section of Secondary 359 is 70 mph. An advisory speed limit of 50 mph is located in advance of the curve at RP 14.4 in both the westbound and eastbound direction.
- b. **Horizontal Alignment.** No modifications to the existing horizontal alignment are proposed with this project.
- c. **Vertical Alignment.** No modifications to the existing vertical alignment are proposed with this project.
- d. **Typical Sections and Surfacing.** The existing roadway consists of asphalt surfacing with a top width of 24 feet which includes two 12-foot travel lanes and no shoulders. Proposed modifications include slope flattening to provide 6:1 slopes to the north and 4:1 slopes to the south of the existing roadway. It is anticipated that slope flattening could be achieved within the existing Right-of-Way.
- e. **Geotechnical Considerations.** Fill material for slope flattening could be obtained from an area northwest of the railroad crossing near MP 14.1. Joe Walsh will verify the ownership of this potential borrow area as it appears this material may be located within MDT Right-of-Way. The Geotechnical Section will investigate this material to determine suitability for slope flattening.
- f. **Hydraulics.** No hydraulic involvement is currently anticipated. An existing 72" RCP culvert crosses the roadway east of the Railroad and will be used as is.
- g. **Bridges.** No bridge involvement is necessary for this project.
- h. **Traffic.** Existing advisory speed limit signs of 50 mph are located in advance of the curve at RP 14.4 in both the westbound and eastbound direction. Chevron signs will be added to the outside of this curve with HSIP STWD(001), SF089 Butte District Safety Improvements, UPN 668300 project within the next few months.
- i. **Pedestrian/Bicycle/ADA.** No modifications to pedestrian, bicycle or ADA will be made with this project.
- j. **Miscellaneous Features.** A railroad crossing exists near RP 14.25. Slope flattening will not occur within 50 feet of this crossing. The side slopes will also be flattened on an existing approach on the north side of the roadway near RP 14.33 to eliminate a potentially unsafe slope in the clear zone that could launch an errant vehicle. No other miscellaneous features have been identified.
- k. **Context Sensitive Design Issues.** No context sensitive design issues have been identified.

## **Preliminary Field Review Report**

HSIP 359-2(6)14; SF 109 – CRV Recon – N. of Harrison  
Project Manager: Scott A. Keller

Page 3 of 5

### **Other Projects**

HSIP STWD(001), SF089 Butte District Safety Improvements, UPN 668300 project includes the installation of Chevron signs on the outside of the curve from RP 14.0 to RP 14.5 on Secondary 359. It is anticipated that Maintenance will install these signs within the next few months.

### **Location Hydraulics Study Report**

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

### **Design Exceptions**

A design exception is being requested for the curve near RP 14.4. This curve has an existing 716.3 foot radius which is less than the minimum radius of 760 feet required for a 50 mph design speed. Since the existing radius is close to the minimum radius required for open-roadway facilities, it is recommended that the existing horizontal alignment be left as is and not reconstructed.

### **Right-of-Way**

No right-of-way will be required for completion of the proposed improvements.

### **Cold-In-Place Recycle**

Not applicable for this project.

### **Access Control**

Access control will not be modified with this project.

### **Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) Features**

No ITS features will be modified with this project.

### **Experimental Features**

No experimental features have been identified for this project.

### **Utilities/Railroads**

No utilities were identified during the field review. A railroad crossing exists near RP 14.25. Slope flattening will not occur within 50 feet of this crossing. It was discussed at the preliminary field review that the railroad only uses this crossing once a year. Existing gates on each side of the roadway require the train to stop and open the gates prior to crossing. The railroad has been providing flaggers when this crossing is in use.

### **Survey**

The survey will be completed by the MSU Design Unit.

### **Public Involvement**

Level A public involvement will be completed for this project. A news release explaining the project including a Department point of contact will be provided.

### **Environmental Considerations**

An intermittent tributary to Little Antelope Creek exists to the south of the roadway outside of the right-of-way. All slope flattening will be completed within the existing right-of-way and will not encroach upon the drainage. An existing 72" RCP culvert crosses the roadway east of the Railroad which carries flow from the drainage. This culvert is in good condition and will be used as is.

Slope flattening should avoid encroachment into the floodprone riparian zone and avoid any impacts to wetland areas along the drainage to the greatest extent practicable. Depending on the limits of the slope flattening, CWA 404 and/or SPA 124 permitting may be required, but is not anticipated at this time. If no

## Preliminary Field Review Report

HSIP 359-2(6)14; SF 109 – CRV Recon – N. of Harrison

Project Manager: Scott A. Keller

Page 4 of 5

permitting is required, the Protection of Aquatic Resources special provision will be included in the bid package. Any affected fencing will be replaced with the existing type. A cultural resource survey will be necessary for this project.

No significant environmental impacts or issues were identified. A categorical exclusion is anticipated for this project.

### Energy Savings/Eco-Friendly Considerations

No energy savings or eco-friendly considerations were identified with this project.

### Traffic Control

Lane closures and/or shifting of traffic may be necessary for completion of the slope flattening. All signing and/or flagging operations will be in accordance with the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices.

A Transportation Management Plan (TMP) consisting of a Traffic Control Plan (TCP) is appropriate for this project.

### Project Management

Plans and special provisions will be developed by the MSU Road Design Unit. The project manager will be Scott Keller (994-1843). This project is not under full FHWA oversight.

### Preliminary Cost Estimate

The preliminary project cost estimate is summarized as follows:

	Estimated cost	Inflation (INF) (from PPMS)	TOTAL costs w/INF + IDC (from PPMS)
Road Work	\$548,460		
Traffic Control (10%)	\$54,846		
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$603,306</b>		
Mobilization (10%)	\$60,330		
<b>Subtotal</b>	<b>\$663,636</b>		
Contingencies (10%)	\$66,364		
<b>Total CN</b>	<b><u>\$730,000</u></b>	<b><u>\$94,151</u></b>	<b><u>\$903,599</u></b>
<b>CE (20.55%)</b>	<b><u>\$150,000</u></b>	<b><u>\$19,346</u></b>	<b><u>\$185,671</u></b>
<b>TOTAL CN+CE</b>	<b><u>\$880,000</u></b>	<b><u>\$113,497</u></b>	<b><u>\$1,089,270</u></b>

Note: IDC is calculated at 9.64% as of FY 2012.

### Ready Date

A ready date will be established after OPX2 over-rides have been completed.

### Site Map

The project site map is attached.

rp:SAK:7517000RDPFR001.docx

