



October 20, 2014

Montana Department of Transportation

2701 Prospect Avenue
PO Box 201001
Helena MT 59620-1001

Michael T. Tooley, Director
Steve Bullock, Governor

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

Subject: Statewide Programmatic Categorical Exclusion for Pavement Preservation Project
Tarkio - East
IM 90-1(217)64
Control Number: 8770000

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, P.E.
Environmental Services Bureau Engineering Section Supervisor

Attachments: PFR/SOW Report, Environmental Checklist

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
Joshua Dold, P.E., Project Design Manager
Montana Legislative Branch Environmental Quality Council
File

HB:smk:S\PROJECTS\MISSOULA\8770000\8770000ENPPP_FHWA.doc

(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 90-1(217)64 **Control No** 8770000 **Project Name:** Tarkio – East
Reference Post (Station): 64.0 **To Reference Post (Station):** 74.4
Applicant's Name: Montana Department of Transportation **Address:** PO Box 201001; Helena, MT 59620-1001
Type of Proposed Pavement Preservation Activity: Work Type 183 – Resurfacing – Microsurfacing

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)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
2a. Are there any listed or candidate threatened or endangered species in the vicinity of the proposed activity?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> The Clark Fork River is occupied by bull trout and is designated as bull trout critical habitat.
2b. Will the proposed action adversely affect listed or candidate threatened or endangered species, or adversely modify critical habitat?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> The project as proposed will not impact the Clark Fork River, therefore it will not adversely affect bull trout or adversely modify bull trout 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.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
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.)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A
3b. Is the proposed project within an MS4 Permit Area? (See http://deq.mt.gov/wqinfo/MPDES/StormWater/ms4.mcp). (Billings, Great Falls, and Missoula Urbanized areas, and Butte, Bozeman, and Helena)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
4. Does the proposed project have impacts to wetlands, streams, or other water bodies? If 'No', go to question 5.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
4a. If the answer to question 4 is 'Yes', is a Clean Water Act Section 404 permit authorization required?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> N/A
4b. If the answer to question 3 or 4 is 'Yes', is a Stream Protection Act 124SPA consultation required?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/> 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)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
6. Is the proposed activity on and/or within approximately 1 mile of an Indian Reservation? If answer is 'No', go to question 7.	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
6a. Are any Tribal water permits required?	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 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.mcp) (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)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	

Checklist prepared by:
Joshua S. Dold Project Design Engineer 10/14/2014
Applicant Title Date

Approved by:
 ENVIRONMENTAL ENGINEERING 10/20/14
Environmental Services SECTION SUPERVISOR Click here to enter a date.
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.



Memorandum

To: Distribution

From: Paul Ferry, P.E.
 Highways Engineer

Date: October 14, 2014

Subject: **IM 90-1(217)64**
Tarkio - East
UPN 8770000
Work Type – 183 – Resurfacing – Microsurfacing

Attached is the Preliminary Field Review Report/Scope of Work Report which was approved on **10/15/14**. 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 | 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 | Jon Swartz, Maintenance Administrator |

cc:

- | | |
|--|---|
| Joshua Dold, Project Design Manager, Missoula District Master file | Dawn Stratton, Fiscal Programming Section |
| | Damian Krings, Road Design Engineer |

e-copies:

- | | |
|--|---|
| Jim Walther, Engineering, Preconstruction Engineer | Jake Goettle, Construction Bureau – VA Engineer |
| Lesly Tribelhorn, Highways Design Engineer | Shane Stack, District Preconstruction |
| Mark Goodman, Hydraulics Engineer | Ben Nunnallee, District Projects Engineer |
| KC Yahvah, District Hydraulics Engineer | Mike Dodge, District Materials Lab |
| Bill Semmens, Env. Resources Section Supervisor | Steve Felix, Dist. Maintenance Chief (Missoula) |
| Joe Weigand, District Biologist | Maureen Walsh, District Right of Way Supervisor |
| Susan Kilcrease, District Project Development Engineer | Phillip Inman, Utilities Engineering Manager |
| Danielle Bolan, Traffic Operations Engineer | David Hoerning, Lands Section Supervisor |
| Ivan Ulberg, Traffic Design Engineer | Greg Pizzini, Acquisition Section Supervisor |
| Gabe Priebe, District Traffic Project Engineer | Joe Zody, R/W Access Management Section Manager |
| Kraig McLeod, Safety Engineer | Matt Strizich, Materials Engineer |
| Chris Hardan, Bridge Area Engineer, Missoula District | Jim Davies, Pavement Analysis Engineer |
| vacant, Engineering Cost Analyst | Jeff Jackson, Geotechnical Engineer |
| Matt Wagner, Engineering Information Services | Bret Boundy, District Geotechnical Manager |
| Paul Grant, Public Involvement Officer | Bryce Larsen, Supervisor, Photogrammetry & Survey |
| Sue Sillick, Research Section Supervisor | Paul Johnson, Project Analysis Bureau |
| Suzy Price, Contract Plans Bureau Chief | Jean Riley, Planner |
| Alyce Fisher, Fiscal Programming Section | Duane Williams, Motor Carrier Services Division Administrator |
| Bob Vosen, District Construction Engineer | Angela Zanin, Bicycle/Pedestrian Coordinator |
| Dean Jones, Asst. District Construction Engineer | Glen Cameron, District Traffic Engineer (Missoula) |
| Ray Sacks, Construction Bureau | Patricia Hogan, District Utility Engineering (Missoula) |
| Matt Maze, ADA Coordinator | Suzan Foley, R/W Design Supervisor |
| | Ralph Jones, Photogrammetry-Survey |



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

Memorandum

To: Paul Ferry, P.E.
Highways Engineer

From: Damian Krings, P.E. **DK**
Road Design Engineer

Date: October 14, 2014

Subject: **IM 90-1(217)64**
Tarkio - East
UPN 8770000
Work Type – 183 – Resurfacing – Microsurfacing

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

Approved Lesly Tribelhorn Date October 15, 2014
For 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

Preliminary Field Review/Scope of Work Report

IM 90-1(217)64: Tarkio-East [8770000]

Project Manager: Joshua Dold

Page 1 of 9

Introduction

An on-site preliminary field review was conducted on August 19, 2014, with the following people in attendance:

Ben Nunnallee – Missoula District Projects Engineer
Bill Squires – MDT Project Design Engineer
Donny Pfeifer – Missoula District Design Supervisor
Darin Reynolds – MDT Surfacing Design
Joshua Dold – MDT Road Design
Tanya Gates – Missoula District Road Design

Proposed Scope of Work

The proposed project has been nominated to provide microsurfacing (including scratch course) and crack seal treatment to preserve the asphalt pavement and to extend the service life of the roadway. Replacement of the pavement markings will be included with this project. Helena Road Design, Missoula district will design this project. **This project will be developed in English units.**

Purpose and Need

The purpose of this project is to prolong and preserve the existing pavement to extend the service life of the existing asphalt surfacing.

Project Location and Limits

The project is located in Mineral County on Interstate 90 beginning at reference post 64.0 and extending to reference post 74.4. This segment is located in Township 15 N, Range 25 W, section 36; Township 15 N, Range 24 W, sections 31, 32, 33, 34 and 35; Township 14 N, Range 24 W, sections 1 and 2; Township 14 N, Range 23 W, sections 5 and 6; Township 15 N, Range 23 W, sections 32, 33 and 34.

The project begins approximately 2.2 miles east/south of the Tarkio Loop Road Interchange (Town of Tarkio) and ends 0.6 miles west/north of Alberton Interchange. I-90 is designated as a west-east facility, but it runs north-south in sections of the project area. Directions in this report are relative to cardinal direction, not roadway direction. The length of the project is 10.4 miles. The functional classification is Principal Arterial – Interstate. The project as-builts are as follows:

- I-IG-90-1(67)64 U-5 year 1982 (Eastbound)
- I-IG-90-1(27)65 year 1966 (Westbound)
- I-90-1(28)72 year 1964 (Westbound)
- IM 90-1(118)64 year 1997 (Modified original as-built plans, overlay)

The project beginning station is English Station 273+69.00 EB & WB (from as-built project I-IG-90-1(67)64 U-5). The project ending station is English Station 859+68.50 EB and 860+21.2 WB (from as-built project I-IG-90-1(67)64 U-5).

A map is attached at the end of this report.

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)

Preliminary Field Review/Scope of Work Report

IM 90-1(217)64: Tarkio-East [8770000]

Project Manager: Joshua Dold

Page 2 of 9

component to address interchange ramp closures and wide load 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 physical characteristics for this four-lane (2-E.B. lanes & 2-W.B. lanes) Interstate facility are described below:

1. Current typical sections and surfacing information is provided below:

Westbound:

Station	Station	Top Width
FROM	TO	(ft)
273+69.00	707+85.70	41.0
707+85.70	750+50.00	40.0
750+50.00	860+23.10	41.0

Eastbound:

Station	Station	Top Width
FROM	TO	(ft)
273+69.00	707+83.80	38.0
707+83.80	750+50.00	40.0
750+50.00	859+68.50	38.0

According to the 2014 Montana Road Log, the existing pavement cross section consists of 0.35' to 0.55' of plant mix surfacing atop 1.30' of crushed base course.

1. The Fish Creek and Cyr interchanges are within the project limits at RP 66.87 and RP 70.09, respectively. There are two scenic turnouts within the project: One located south of the eastbound lanes at RP 72.0± and one located north of the westbound lanes at RP 73.5±.

The segment was constructed under several projects. The interstate was constructed along the existing highway corridor from the early 1960's to the early 1980's. The projects included I 90-1(17), I 90-1(67), I 90-1(27), I 90-1(28) and I 90-1(60).

IR 90-1(100)64, 2 MI. E. of Tarkio – E. was completed in 1985. It included cold milling in areas with excessive pavement distress, placing a plant mix surface overlay and placing an open graded friction course. Other work included raising guardrail and clearing vegetation from the clear zone.

IM 90-1(118)64, Tarkio – East [1768] was completed in 1998. The driving lanes were cold milled 0.21' and the shoulders and closed median sections were milled 0.06'. The trench was filled with 0.15' of 50% Hot Recycled Plant Mix. A 0.20' Polymer Modified Grade D asphalt overlay was then placed full width, followed by a chip seal consisting of CRS 2 Latex Modified Seal and Grade 4A cover material. The project also included bituminous curb removal, rumble strips, guardrail upgrade and slope flattening.

IM 90-1(149)64, Tarkio – East [5065] was completed in 2005. The EB and WB lanes of I-90 were chip sealed full width. The Fish Creek Interchange ramps and crossroad and the scenic

Preliminary Field Review/Scope of Work Report

IM 90-1(217)64: Tarkio-East [8770000]

Project Manager: Joshua Dold

Page 3 of 9

turnout south of the eastbound lanes at RP 71.2 were chip sealed. They were chip sealed using grade 4A cover material and CRS-2P seal oil.

One project was developed and constructed within the limits of Tarkio – East. BR 9031(13), Clark Fork – 7 Km E of Tarkio [4545] proposed to construct a split-diamond interchange, with the eastbound on- and off-ramps at RP 65.1± and the westbound on- and off-ramps at RP 66.0±. The letting date was June, 2011.

Existing Roadside Geometrics: The horizontal and vertical alignments will be perpetuated for this project. The project is in the Clark Fork River valley, in a rural area with level to rolling terrain. Adjacent land is mostly forest with rural home sites.

The horizontal alignment meets 70 mph design criteria, except for three curves. Each has a radius of 1637.02'. They are located at RP 64.4, RP 65.8 and RP 66.1.

The vertical alignment meets the 70 mph design criteria for stopping sight distance.

Two grades are steeper than 3% maximum grade: +3.17% at RP 65.5± and +3.63% at RP 72.4±.

2. PvMS Index Numbers & Recommended Treatment for 2014:

<u>Section</u>	<u>Ride</u>	<u>Rut</u>	<u>ACI</u>	<u>MCI</u>	<u>Construction</u>	<u>Maintenance</u>
RP 64.0 to RP 74.4-E.B.	82.4	57.8	98.3	98.9	C AC Minor Rehab Rut	M Maintenance Rut Fill
RP 64.0 to RP 74.4-W.B.	82.1	60.0	99.0	98.6	Do Nothing	Do Nothing

The eastbound lanes of Interstate 90 in the project area was constructed in 1982 under project I-IG-90-1(67)64 U-5 as a four-lane divided facility, with 2-12 foot travel lanes, 10 foot outside shoulder and 4 foot inside shoulder, for a total width of 38 feet. The westbound lanes typical section consists of 2-12 foot travel lanes, 10 foot outside shoulder and 7 foot inside shoulder, for a total width of 41 feet.

The westbound lanes were originally constructed in 1964 and 1966 under projects I-90-1(28)72 and I-IG-90-1(27)65. Most of the project has open median at least 70' wide (Φto Φ). The segment from RP 71.66 to 72.43 has a paved flush median 12' wide, with concrete barrier rail separating the two roadways. This typical section for eastbound and westbound consists of 4-12 foot travel lanes, 2-10 foot outside shoulders and 2-6 foot inside shoulders for a total width of 80 feet.

No pedestrian facilities currently exist within the project limits.

The following bridges are within the project limits:

Bridge ID	Location	Feature Crossed	Const	Sufficiency
			Year	Rating
I00090065+04971	10 M W ALBERTON	SEP COUNTY ROAD	1981	91.7
I00090065+04972	10 M W ALBERTON	SEP COUNTY ROAD	1965	46.2
I00090066+02791	9 M W ALBERTON	CLARK FORK	1981	85.7
I00090066+02792	9 M W ALBERTON	CLARK FORK	1965	50.3
I00090066+04211	9 M W ALBERTON	MONTANA RAIL LINK	1981	96.7

Preliminary Field Review/Scope of Work Report

IM 90-1(217)64: Tarkio-East [8770000]

Project Manager: Joshua Dold

Page 4 of 9

I0009066+04212	9 M W ALBERTON	MONTANA RAIL LINK	1965	64.5
L31170003+05001	4 M E TARKIO	INT FISH CREEK I-90	1965	88.6
I00090069+00411	6 M W ALBERTON	LOCAL, MONTANA RAIL LINK	1981	92.7
I00090069+00412	6 M W ALBERTON	LOCAL, MONTANA RAIL LINK	1964	97.7
I00090070+00901	5 M W ALBERTON	INT CYR, CLARK FORK	1981	98.0
I00090070+00902	5 M W ALBERTON	INT CYR, CLARK FORK	1965	47.0

Traffic Data

Traffic data is not required on this microsurfacing project. 2012 traffic data by sections report from reference post 64.0 to 70.2 for I-90 shows an AADT of 7,290, with 1,598 commercial vehicles. From reference post 70.2 to 74.4 for I-90 shows an AADT of 7,010, with 1,598 commercial vehicles.

Crash Analysis

Accident history is not required on this microsurfacing project.

Major Design Features

This project will be developed in accordance with the latest Guidelines for Pavement Preservation Projects. The plans will be developed in English units. The project is considered to be preventative maintenance by means of scheduled treatment.

a. **Design Speed**

The geometric design criteria for Principal Arterial - Interstate indicate that the design speed should be 70 mph based on the level terrain. The existing posted speed limit is 75 mph (65 mph for trucks). Design speed is not an applicable design criterion for preventative maintenance type projects.

b. **Horizontal Alignment.**

The horizontal alignment will be perpetuated with this project.

c. **Vertical Alignment.**

The vertical alignment will be perpetuated with this project.

d. **Typical Sections and Surfacing.**

The proposed typical section and surfacing is as follows:

- The microsurfacing will be placed:
 - Across the eastbound and westbound ramps and the crossroad of the Fish Creek Interchange. On the crossroad of the Fish Creek Interchange, the microsurfacing should extend to the cattle guards located on the north and south of the interchange.
 - Across the eastbound and westbound ramps of the Cyr Interchange.
 - Across the eastbound and westbound ramps and parking areas of the Scenic Turnouts located south of the eastbound lanes at RP 72.0 and north of the westbound lanes at RP 73.5.
- The microsurfacing will be constructed to 2.0' beyond each fog line consisting of two 12' lanes and 2' onto the shoulders (each direction). The scratch course will be placed in the EB and WB driving lanes only (12' each direction). There will be three passes of microsurfacing on the project.
 - The first pass, scratch course will fill ruts and cover any potential turnouts. The application rate for scratch course will be approximately

Preliminary Field Review/Scope of Work Report

IM 90-1(217)64: Tarkio-East [8770000]

Project Manager: Joshua Dold

Page 5 of 9

- 29.7 lbs/yd².
- The second pass will consist of tack oil. The application rate for undiluted tack oil will be approximately 0.025 gal/yd².
- The third pass will be a wearing course placed on top of the tack oil. The application rate for the wearing course will be approximately 31.2 lbs/yd².
- There will be a ½” taper grind approximately 100’ long for tie in-depths at bridge ends and project connections.
- A ride improvement special provision will be required to ensure the proposed work will have a ride index equal to or better than existing.

The shoulders will be fog sealed full width for the entire project limits. I-90 eastbound and westbound will be crack sealed with this project.

New rumble strips will be installed to replace the existing ones which have been filled in by previous pavement treatments and are no longer as effective as they were when new. The inside lane will be continuous and the outside lane will be intermittent. The new rumble strips will receive a fog seal.

There are no proposed changes to the typical sections as this is a microsurfacing project.

e. **Geotechnical Considerations.**

No Geotechnical considerations are anticipated on this project.

f. **Hydraulics.**

No Hydraulic considerations are anticipated on this project.

g. **Bridges.**

The bridges on this project are being rehabilitated in project I-90 BR Decks MP 40-70, NHPB 90-1(202)40, CN 8087000, therefore no bridge work will be performed on this project. The estimated letting date of this project is beyond FFY 2019.

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.

i. **Pedestrian/Bicycle/ADA.**

Interstate 90 is a controlled access facility therefore no pedestrian or bicycle facilities accommodations will be made. There are existing rumble strips within the paved shoulders (inside and outside) adjacent to the through lanes. The outside paved shoulders are wide enough to accommodate both the rumble strips and still provide room for bicyclists. After the microsurfacing is complete, the paved shoulders will be the same as their existing configuration.

j. **Miscellaneous Features.**

There are existing rumble strips on the inside and outside shoulders that will be remilled with this project. The inside lane will be continuous rumble strips and the outside lane will be intermittent rumble strips.

Preliminary Field Review/Scope of Work Report

IM 90-1(217)64: Tarkio-East [8770000]

Project Manager: Joshua Dold

Page 6 of 9

Existing guardrail BCT end treatments will be updated with this project. There are 12 BCT arrival end treatments on EB lanes and 11 BCT arrival end treatments on WB lanes, for a total of 23 guardrail end treatments that need updating.

k. Context Sensitive Design Issues.

The intent of this project is to increase the service life of the pavement and do minor repairs and upgrades as needed to reduce maintenance costs and improve safety. The majority of the work will occur on the paved roadway surface. Therefore, no significant changes will occur to the context of the area the roadway passes through once construction is completed.

Other Projects

Another resurfacing project, **Tarkio – West, IM 90-1(213)59, CN 8729000**, connects to the beginning of Tarkio-East at reference post 64.0. Tarkio-West currently has a letting date of January 2016. Tarkio-East will not be tied to Tarkio-West.

A bridge rehabilitation project, **I-90 BR Decks MP 40-70, NHPB 90-1(202)40, CN 8087000**, will rehabilitate several structures from reference post 40-70. The project is currently not fundable until beyond FFY 2019, so there appears to be little potential for tying to Tarkio – East for contract.

Location Hydraulics Study Report

There will be no LHSR for this project as it is a microsurfacing project.

Design Exceptions

The design exception process does not apply to pavement preservation projects. No design exceptions will be required for this project.

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

Evidence of overhead and underground utilities in the project area was noted during the field review. I-90 crosses over the Montana Rail Link at reference post 66.4 and again at reference post 69.0. There will be no utility or railroad involvement as this is a microsurfacing project.

Maintenance Items

I-90 eastbound and westbound will be crack sealed with this project. We will request maintenance to determine an estimate on the length of transverse and longitudinal cracks.

Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) Features

There will be no ITS solutions to be considered as part of the design process.

Survey

It is not anticipated that any survey will be required for this project.

Preliminary Field Review/Scope of Work Report

IM 90-1(217)64: Tarkio-East [8770000]

Project Manager: Joshua Dold

Page 7 of 9

Public Involvement

A limited PI component will be included in the project outlining strategies for public notification. Given the scope of the project, there will be minimal disruption to the public. This project will have level A public involvement, which will include a news release explaining the project and including a department point of contact.

Environmental Considerations

No significant environmental impacts or issues were identified. This project meets the criteria for a statewide programmatic categorical exclusion under the pavement preservation agreement with FHWA. We are submitting a pavement preservation checklist for this project.

As proposed, no CWA 404 permit or SPA 124 notifications are anticipated for this project. The Protection of Aquatic Resources special provision will be included in the bid package for this project.

Energy Savings/Eco-Friendly Considerations

At this time, no savings or considerations have been identified.

Experimental Features

At this time, no experimental features have been identified.

Traffic Control

Traffic will be maintained through the construction of the project with appropriate signing, flagging, pilot cars, etc., in accordance with the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices. The work zone will require single lane closures during construction operations. A minimum of one lane in each direction will remain open for traffic at all times during the construction of this project. Possible stipulations governing the time of year, the days of the week during which construction activities may take place, time of day, and maximum length of roadway that may be under construction at a time may be specified in the contract in order to minimize public impact.

A Transportation Management Plan (TMP) consisting of a Traffic Control Plan (TCP) is appropriate for this project. Due to the relatively simple nature of the work, the TCP will consist of only special provisions.

No crossovers are anticipated unless major bridge rehabilitation work is performed. Limit work requiring interchange ramp closures to off-peak hours or to night time.

Project Management

Helena Road Design, Missoula district will design this project. The project design manager will be Josh Dold. This is not a Project of Division Interest for FHWA.

Preliminary Construction Cost Estimate

The nomination cost estimate (without IDC) that was originally programmed for this project was \$3,724,000 (CN = \$3,385,000 and CE = \$339,000).

Preliminary Field Review/Scope of Work Report

IM 90-1(217)64: Tarkio-East [8770000]

Project Manager: Joshua Dold

Page 8 of 9

PFR Estimate	Estimated Cost	Inflation (INF) (from PPMS)	TOTAL Costs w/INF + IDC (from PPMS)
Road Work	\$1,760,632		
Signing	\$82,368		
Traffic Control	\$142,000		
Subtotal	\$1,985,000		
Mobilization (10%)	\$199,000		
Subtotal	\$2,184,000		
Contingencies (12%)	\$262,000		
Total CN	\$2,446,000	\$ 359,733	\$ 3,061,896
CE (10%)	\$245,000	\$ 35,973	\$ 306,190
TOTAL CN + CE	\$2,691,000	\$ 395,706	\$ 3,368,086

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 9.13% as of FY 2015.

Preliminary Engineering

It is not anticipated the project will require a significant addition or reduction to the nominated PE amount.

Project and Risk Management

There are no current risks to the project cost and schedule. This is a relatively simple design project and there is no active management strategy.

Ready Date

The current scheduled Ready Date in OPX2 is shown as February 1, 2015. The scheduled let date is January 2017.

Site Map

The project site map is attached.

