

Montana Department of Transportation

PO Box 201001 Helena, MT 59620-1001

## Memorandum

То:	James A. Combs, PE 🗦 📮 Highways Engineer		
From:	Steve Heidner, PE District Projects Engineer		
Date:	August 28, 2019		
Subject:	NH-HSIP 57-6(23)260 Brockway – West UPN 9728000 Work Type 140 - Reconstruction – without added capacity		
Please appro	ve the attached Preliminary Field Review Report.	Data	9/5/19
Approved	Jamos A. Combo	_ Date	5/5/15
	James A. Combs		
	nighways 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 (electronic only): Shane Mintz, Glendive District Administrator Stephanie Brandenberger, Bridge Engineer James A. Combs, Highways Engineer Gabe Priebe, Traffic and Safety Engineer Robert Stapley, Right-of-Way Bureau Chief Tom Martin, Environmental Services Bureau Chief

Steve Heidner, EPS Project Manager, Glendive

Lynn Zanto, Rail, Transit, & Planning Division Administrator Darin Reynolds, VA Engineer Jeff Jackson, Geotechnical and Pavement Bureau Chief Jon Swartz, Maintenance Division Administrator

Highways Master file

District

CC:

e-copies: Located at the end of this document

## Introduction

An office and field review were held on August 13, 2019. The following were in attendance:

Jim Frank, DPE – Glendive \* Shane Mintz, DA – Glendive \* Steve Heidner, DPDE – Glendive Jay Fleming, DCOE – Glendive Shane Jarvis, Road Design – Glendive Marc Wotring, Hydraulics – Helena Nick Jaynes, Geotech – Helena Megan Cail, DPM – Helena Paul Jensen, Maintenance – Glasgow Carson Buffington, Maintenance – Wolf Point Larry Sickerson, Environmental – Helena Tyson Dutton, Road Design - Glendive Paul Jensen, Maintenance – Glasgow Grant Rodway, Environmental – Helena Layne Oliver, Road Design – Helena Greg Zeihen, Surfacing – Helena Wayne French, Maintenance – Flowing Wells

\* Office Only

## Proposed Scope of Work

The proposed scope of work for this project is to completely reconstruct this NHS non-interstate Principal Arterial roadway on a new horizontal and vertical alignment that meets all current design standards including 6 ft shoulders.

## This project will be designed in 3D model workspace as agreed during the review.

### **Needs and Objectives**

The purpose of this project is to reconstruct this narrow, outdated section of MT-200 to meet the current design criteria for an NH route and to provide a safer, smoother roadway and reduce maintenance costs.

### Public Summary

The Brockway – West project includes the complete reconstruction of approximately 6.8 miles of Montana Highway 200 (MT-200) west of Brockway in McCone County. The project begins approximately 7 miles west of the Brockway in McCone County at reference post 260.2 and extends east for 6.8 miles ending at reference post 267.0. The roadway will be reconstructed to current design standards, including 6 ft. wide shoulders, centerline and shoulder rumble strips, new drainage structures, signing and pavement markings. The primary purpose of the project is to bring this section of MT-200 up to current standards, resulting in a much safer roadway and reduced maintenance costs.

## **Project Location and Limits**

- County: McCone; T. 18 N., R. 45, 46, 47 E.
- Route Number: N57/ MT 200
- Functional Classification: NHS non-interstate Principal Arterial
- Begin: RP 260.2, as-built station 2494±00 on F 247D
- End: RP 267.0, as-built station 2857±64 on F 247D
  - = as-built station 15+00.0; begin NH 57-6(7)267 F
- Project Length: 6.8 miles
- As-built projects:

The roadway within the project limits was originally constructed under the following project:

- RP 260.2 to 267.0 F 247D; 1937
- The end of this project ties into the following project completed in 2000:
  - NH 57-6(7)267 F; Brockway East
- In 2010, the timber bridge at Beauty Creek was replaced with a culvert under:
  - RP 261.68 NH 0002(699)
- Secondary 253 ends at a "T" intersection from the south to the east of this project at RP 267.478.
- Direction of the Project: Both RP's and stationing proceed from west to east.

## 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).

## **Physical Characteristics**

a. As-Builts:

This roadway was originally constructed in 1937 with Federal Aid Project F 247D. The road was initially graveled until it was surfaced with additional gravel and compacted road mix bituminous surfacing around 1947 with projects F 247(15) and F 247D(2). The Montana Road Log does not record any improvements since its original paving in 1947 and 1955. It's likely there have been additional overlays and/or chip seals performed by Maintenance, but there are no as-builts and the Road Log doesn't provide this information.

b. Pavement width and number of lanes:

The pavement width is a 24.0 ft. finished top, which includes two 12 ft. driving lanes and no shoulders.

c. Surface types and thicknesses:

The roadway was constructed with 2.0 in. compacted road mix bituminous surfacing with seal and cover on top of 2.0 in. of comp. top cushion on top of 4.0 in. of comp. base course (SBBC) on top of the oil mat in place on top of an average 3.0 in. comp. base in place. The Road Log indicates some variation in the thicknesses and do not likely include all the overlays that have occurred since its original construction and surfacing in 1947 and 1955. A soil survey will be performed, which will yield actual material thicknesses present.

PvMS Index Numbers & Recommended Treatments for 2019 and 2021:

Section	Ride	Rut	ACI	MCI	Constr'19	Maint'19	Constr'21	Maint'21
RP 248.64-262.33	43.9	64.7	97.3	89.4	Minor	Reactive	Minor	Reactive
					Rehab	Maintenance	Rehab	Maintenance
RP 262.33-267.50	39.4	66.2	93.5	83.9	Minor	Reactive	Minor	Reactive
					Rehab	Maintenance	Rehab	Maintenance

d. Terrain:

The existing terrain is rural rolling pasture and farmland.

e. Existing horizontal and vertical alignments:

The existing horizontal alignment consists of a single 11,460 ft radius curve at PI Sta. 2656+24.9 with as-built back and ahead bearings of S 84°33' E and N 89°07' E.

The existing vertical alignment between stations 2494+00 and  $2857\pm64$  consists of 13 crest and 17 sag vertical curves. Eight crest and 10 sag curves do not meet minimum stopping sight distance criteria for a 60-mph design speed. The steepest grade is 7.00%. There are 8 grades that exceed the 4% maximum, ranging from 4.2% to 7.00%.

f. Existing fill and cut slopes:

According to the 1937 as-built plans, the existing slopes on the project were constructed as follows:

- Fill Slopes: 3:1 for fill heights of 3 ft or less. 1.5:1 for fill heights over 3 ft.
- Cut Slopes: 3:1 ditch in-slope for ±6.25 ft with a variable width 10:1 ditch bottom.
- g. Existing Bridges:

There are no existing bridges.

## Traffic Data

RP 260.2 to RP 267.0	
2019 AADT	540 – Present
2025 AADT	600 – Letting Year
2045 AADT	840 – Design Year
DHV	120
Т	14.5%
EAL	47
AGR	1.7%

## Crash Analysis

The following is the executive summary provided by the Safety Management Section:

## Summary:

As requested, a safety analysis was completed on a portion of MT 200 (C000057E), N-57 from reference post 260.200 to reference post 267.000 for the 10-year period from January 1, 2009 through December 31, 2018. The project was evaluated using the safety performance functions (SPF's) and Level of Service of Safety (LOSS) models developed for rural, flat and rolling 2-lane undivided highways. As these are roadway departure models, non-intersection/non-interchange related crashes are utilized for this analysis.

Montana Highway Patrol records show five total crashes along this section of roadway for the dates January 1, 2009 through December 31, 2018. The crashes involved a road departure overturning crash, two wild animal vehicle collisions (2 deer), two left-turn same direction passing maneuver collisions at intersections/driveway approaches and one domestic animal vehicle collision (cow). It is worth noting that one of the wild animal vehicle collisions involved a secondary road departure collision with a driveway approach. Within this section of roadway there has been one suspected serious injury crash (A), two suspected minor injury (B) crashes and two no apparent injury (property-damage-only) crashes.

Montana Highway Patrol records show two additional crashes along this section of roadway for the dates January 1, 2019 through June 30, 2019. Both crashes were road departure overturning crashes. The severity of the additional crashes resulted in a suspected serious injury crash (A) and a no apparent injury (property-damage-only) crash.

For the SPF – Total Model, this section of roadway is performing at a LOSS II rating. This LOSS boundary indicates a low to moderate potential for crash reduction.

For the SPF – Severity Model, this section of roadway is performing at a LOSS II rating. This LOSS boundary indicates a low to moderate potential for crash reduction.

Using MDT pattern recognition tools, there have been no observed crash patterns along this section of roadway during the study period. The pattern recognition tools identify areas with 5 or more crashes with a cumulative probability of 95% or greater within the study period time frame.

## Crash Clusters and Safety Projects:

There have been no crash clusters and/or upcoming safety projects within this section of roadway during the study period.

## Recommendations:

There are no recommendations based on this crash analysis and the scope of this project.

## **Major Design Features**

a. **Design Speed.** The design speed for this NHS non-interstate principal arterial in rolling terrain is 60 mph. The posted speed on this roadway is 70 mph and 65 mph at night for passenger vehicles. For trucks the posted speed is currently 60 mph and 55 mph at night but will change on October 1, 2019 to be 65 mph day and night; car speed limits will remain unchanged.

- b. Horizontal Alignment. The horizontal alignment will be designed to meet current design standards and likely be offset to one side or the other of the PTW to facilitate construction under traffic. The beginning of this project will tie into the end of the Wes of Brockway West, [UPN 9727000] project and remove any connection used to get back to the PTW from an offset alignment, if required. The exact location and stationing of the end of that project has not yet been determined; the tie-in points will be coordinated during the design process. The end of this project will tie into the beginning of the Brockway East project completed in 2000 at the offset alignment that was used heading east; the ±1,200 ft long connection that is currently in place from the Brockway East project will be removed with this project. The following offsets were discussed at the PFR (stations are as-built project stations):
  - Sta. 2494±00, RP 260.2: Begin project offset to the south (RT) of the existing PTW.
  - Sta. 2544±00, RP 261.0: South side of PTW is preferred at this site.
  - Sta. 2566±00, RP 261.6: South side of PTW is still preferred at this site, but a transition to PTW or slightly north should occur ahead.
  - Sta. 2585±00, RP 261.8: Minimize impacts to wetlands at this site. The wetlands are more significant and should be avoided to the extent possible on the south side (RT). Alignment should be shifted slightly north of existing PTW to accomplish this.
  - Sta. 2650±00, RP 263.0: Beginning of a short curve to the LT. Consider using this curve to achieve the desired additional offset ahead for constructability. There are power poles to the north and phone lines, but the offset to the poles increases past the curve ahead.
  - Sta. 2775±00, RP 264.5: Beauty Creek Rd. to south. North side of PTW is preferred.
  - Sta. 2857±64, RP 267.0: End project north (LT) of the existing PTW. Tie into the beginning of the Brockway – East project.

The actual offset location and distances will be selected through the design process to best fit the terrain, facilitate drainage structure construction and minimize impacts to utilities and natural resources to the extent practicable.

- c. **Vertical Alignment**. The maximum grade for a 60-mph design speed is 4%. With many of the grades being greater than 4% the vertical alignment design will flatten them as much as practical to meet the current design standard of 4% and balance earthwork.
- d. **Typical Sections and Surfacing**. The typical section will include two 12 ft driving lanes, and two 6 ft shoulders for a finished 36 ft top width, which matches the Route Segment Plan.

The surfacing design thickness and asphalt cement percentage will be provided by the Surfacing Design Section. Surfacing will likely be 3/4" grade S with PG 64-28. The two projects to the west of this project that are currently under design are utilizing an inverted pavement design concept, which includes placement of a lift of CTB followed by a lift of CAC prior to paving. All options for surfacing design will be considered and one will be selected through the design process.

The slopes will be designed to the current design criteria of for non-interstate principal arterials in level/rolling terrain:

Fill Slopes	Back Slopes
0 - 10  ft = 6:1	0 - 5 ft = 5:1
10 – 20 ft = 4:1	5 – 10 ft = 4:1
20 – 30 ft = 3:1	10 – 15 ft = 3:1
> 30 ft = 2:1*	15 – 20 ft = 2:1*
	> 20 ft = 1.5:1*

\* Slopes steeper than 3:1 are typically not recommended in the Glendive District. The Geotechnical Section will evaluate slopes and determine what is a suitable maximum slope criterion for this project.

Twenty-foot-wide snow ditches will be included on the north side of the roadway through the cuts. Based on past observations of snow ditch performance by members of the design team,

the wider snow ditches will be carried through the entire cut section to minimize the drifting increase potential as a result of narrowing the ditch up in a shallower area that is more prone to filling up with snow sooner than the deeper sections. Standard 10-ft. wide ditches will be used on the south side of the road throughout the project.

- e. **Geotechnical Considerations**. The geotechnical section will complete a full geotechnical investigation and provide recommendations in a geotechnical report.
- f. **Hydraulics**. Hydraulics will complete a Location Hydraulics Study Report, which will address the location and magnitude of crossings that will need to be addressed with the project, along with any site-specific survey requests.
- g. Bridges. There are no existing bridges within the project limits as nominated.
- h. **Traffic.** The Traffic Section will provide the design for signing, delineation, and pavement markings including words and symbols, if necessary.
- i. **Pedestrian/Bicycle/ADA**. There are currently no ADA or pedestrian concerns on this project, and none are anticipated. This route has been identified as an existing bicycle route by the Adventure Cycling Association. The 6 ft shoulders will improve safety for bicyclists who use this route.

#### j. Miscellaneous Features.

#### Guardrail:

Slopes will be designed to eliminate the need for guardrail as much is practical. Wherever guardrail is warranted box beam guardrail will be used to mitigate snow drifting potential.

Salvage:

There were no items identified on this project that Maintenance wants salvaged.

#### Rumble Strips:

Rumble strips will be included. This route has been identified as an existing bicycle route by the Adventure Cycling Association. Shoulder and centerline rumble strips will be included in accordance with the Rumble Strip Guidance Memo.

Fencing:

Fencing along the project will be replaced and is a right of way negotiated item. Wildlife friendly fence will be encouraged whenever possible.

### Approaches:

Approaches will be reconstructed to fit site conditions and be perpetuated near their existing locations to the extent practicable. Some adjustments or consolidation of farm field approach locations may be required to gain more favorable approach grades and line up approaches across from one other wherever possible. The public and private approaches will be paved to the right of way. The farm field approaches will be gravel surfaced to the right of way and receive a 12 ft plant mix strip.

#### Mailboxes and Mailbox Turnouts:

Existing mailboxes in use will be replaced with this project. Mailbox turnouts will not be required with the inclusion of 6 ft shoulders.

- k. **Context Sensitive Design Issues**. No context sensitive design issues were identified at the preliminary field review.
- I. **Permanent Erosion and Sediment Control (PESC) Features**. The surrounding soil appears to consist of silty clays and is generally held intact with vegetative cover. Based on these characteristics, it is assumed that significant erosion events are minimal where vegetation is established depending on the storm event. The climate is considered arid and

weather conditions are typical of eastern Montana. No unique erosion and sediment control design features have been identified at this time.

# **Other Projects**

There a total of 5 projects currently programmed and at various stages of project development along MT 200 between RP 230.1 and 267.0. This project is the third project in sequence. The four other projects besides this project are listed below:

- 1. Jct. Sec. 462 East & West [UPN 8707000], NH 57-5(46)230
  - RP 230.1 239.3
  - Scheduled for Letting in November 2021
- 2. Little Dry Creek East [UPN 9108000], NH 57-5(49)239
  - o RP 239.3 246.8
  - Scheduled for Letting in November 2020
- 3. Flowing Wells East & West [UPN 9726000], NH 57-5(55)247
  - RP 246.8 253.5
  - To be let after the Jct. Sec. 462 East & West project
- 4. West of Brockway West [UPN 9727000], NH 57-6(21)254
  - o RP 253.5 260.2
  - To be let after the Flowing Wells East & West project

This project will remove the end of project connection that will likely be constructed with the West of Brockway – West project.

#### Location Hydraulics Study Report

The Location Hydraulics Study Report will be prepared by the Hydraulics Section.

#### **Design Exceptions**

No design exceptions are anticipated at this time.

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

New right of way will be required for this reconstruction project. Existing right of way will be retraced, and new right of way acquisition will be conducted for this project. The acquisition of new right-of-way will be a uniform 80 ft or 10.0 ft beyond the construction limits, whichever is greater in accordance with the MDT Right of Way Manual.

The MDT Right of Way Design and Acquisition Sections will provide right of way design plans, deeds, appraisals and conduct the right of way negotiations and acquisition. Wildlife friendly fence will be encouraged wherever possible during the negotiations.

#### Access Control

Changes to the current level of access control are not anticipated with this reconstruction project.

#### **Utilities/Railroads**

Underground telephone and overhead power lines are present along the project. The extent of the utility impacts will not be known until survey is acquired and the design progresses. The design will try to avoid the existing utilities to the extent practical.

Railroad is not adjacent to this project.

#### **Maintenance Items**

Maintenance asked that snow ditches be included on the north side of the road to mitigate snow drifting potential. Other than that, and the requested salvage items, no other maintenance issues were discussed.

#### Intelligent Transportation Systems (ITS) Features

No ITS features are currently being considered for this project.

# Experimental Features

No experimental features are currently being considered for this project.

# <u>Survey</u>

This project will be surveyed via. aerial photogrammetry; the following types of surveys will be required:

- Photogrammetry Survey (to be flown fall of 2019)
- Engineering pickup survey (utilities, hydraulics, voids, etc.)
  <u>Note</u>: A Phase I SUE survey is not anticipated, since the utilities will be located and surveyed during engineering survey. The need for a Phase II SUE will be determined during design development.
- Cadastral Survey
- Soil Survey

## Public Involvement

The project Level of Impact (LOI) has been determined to be Substantial and level of public involvement C, as defined by MDT's Public Involvement Plan. The Highway Commission designated this project as a substantial impact project.

Specific strategies identified in the project-specific Public Involvement Plan (as described in the Engineering Project Communication Process Guide) include:

Level C (Moderate or Substantial Impact)

- 1. News release explaining the project and including a department point of contact.
- 2. Project information, including public summary, posted to MDT website (GIS map).
- 3. Personal contacts with local and tribal government officials, interest groups, and other organizations.
- 4. Personal contacts with adjacent landowners at the time of right of entry and at major project milestones (PFR, AGR, PIH).
- 5. A right-of-way public information meeting to present the final proposed right-of-way plans.
- 6. Electronic phase/milestone updates for stakeholders and other entities requesting updates. Contact list maintained on project specific electronic database.
- 7. Notification of initial project selection to all parties on electronic notification list.
- 8. Construction notification and information during construction.

Any kind of opposition to the project is not anticipated based on experience in this area; the locals are very happy that work is finally getting done on this route and they are generally very cooperative during right-of-way negotiations. For the public involvement and outreach efforts, Big Sky Public Relations has been hired to assist MDT through the design and construction phases with a custom-tailored plan suited to not only this project's PI, but all five of the projects currently in design at different stages of development. The outreach efforts will be coordinated with each of the five projects by combining into one corridor wide public campaign spanning multiple years. We anticipate a series of open houses, likely in Circle and Jordan, but possibly at the Flowing Wells Rest Area as well in late summer/early fall of 2019 as the kickoff. The PI firm will also be responsible for setting up a corridor website to keep people informed during the development and construction of all five projects on this corridor until it's completely rebuilt, which is expected to be completed within the next 10 years or less. We anticipate a construction phase public involvement as well, but the details will be determined as we get closer to construction.

# **Environmental Considerations**

The initial review did not identify any significant environmental effects, issues or cumulative effects from the proposed work. A Categorical Exclusion will likely provide a sufficient level of documentation for the proposed project in accordance with the guidelines of 23 CFR 771.117. However, the level of documentation may be revised pending information obtained from on-site reviews and changes in the proposed alignment during the survey phase of the project's development.

A biological resource review (BRR) will be conducted. The effect of the project on any threatened or endangered species, including sage grouse will be assessed. Wetlands will need to be delineated prior to the AGR in order to determine the impacts and make all reasonable efforts to minimize them.

A cultural resource survey will be needed as there will be right of way acquisition required. REV 8/21/2019 A 404 permit and the associated special provision will be required. The need for a SPA 124 notification will be evaluated as the design progresses and will be included if needed. Environmental related special provisions will be provided by the Environmental Section.

This area commonly has antelope present and it will be important that the use of the most recent wildlife friendly right-of-way fence (WFF) designs be encouraged during right-of-way negotiations to facilitate the migratory and seasonal needs of the antelope. WFF would also benefit the local whitetail and mule deer herds by improving or ensuring habitat connectivity across the landscape, particularly for their young of the year.

### **Energy Savings/Eco-Friendly Considerations**

No specific energy savings or eco-friendly considerations have been identified. However, this route continues to see an increase in truck traffic, especially as more segments of the route are improved. By flattening grades to current design criteria, this will greatly improve truck movement efficiency and have a major impact on fuel efficiency for these trucks.

#### **Traffic Control**

A traffic control plan will be developed as the design of the project progresses. Traffic will be maintained during construction activities throughout the project. Appropriate traffic control devices and signing will be used throughout the project in accordance with the *Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD)*.

### Preliminary Construction Cost Estimate

			TOTAL costs
	Estimated cost	Inflation (INF)	w/INF + IDC
		(from PPMS)	(from PPMS)
NHCN	\$9,300,000	\$1,006,044	\$11,378,903
HSIP CN	\$1,600,000	\$173,082	\$1,957,659
TOTAL CN	\$10,900,000	\$1,179,126	\$13,336,562
<b>CE</b> (10%)	\$1,100,000	\$118,994	\$1,345,891
Project TOTAL from all of the	funding types above:		
Project TOTAL CN+CE	\$12,000,000	\$1,298,120	\$14,682,453

The estimate above includes \$400,000 for traffic control, 20% allowance for contingency, and 10% for mobilization.

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 10.41% for FY 2020.

#### **Preliminary Engineering**

The project is currently programmed with \$1,050,887 for preliminary engineering. At this time, it is anticipated that the project will not require a modification to the current federal aid agreement for PE. The need for a modification will be monitored as the project schedule and manhour estimates have been set through the overrides process.

#### **Project and Risk Management**

Steve Heidner of the Glendive District Office will be the Project Design Manager. This project is not a project of division interest to FHWA.

The risk to this project is its cost. This project will take time to develop and funding and completion of design will determine when it can be let.

# Ready Date

No ready date has been established at this time. The project will have overrides completed in EPS and then a ready date will be requested, and set based on a planned finish date and where this project might fit in the TCP. The estimated let date in PPMS is November 2023. The current estimated PE phase end date in PPMS is December 2025. Based on the target letting date alone right now, a modification to the PE End Date isn't needed. This will need to be re-evaluated once an actual let date is established in the TCP.

## Site Map

The project site map is attached.





#### e-copies:

Dustin Rouse, Preconstruction Engineer Damian Krings, Acting Highways Design Engineer Dave Hedstrom, Hydraulics Engineer Bill Weber, Supervisor, Photogrammetry & Survey Stanton Brelin, Traffic Operations Engineer Ivan Ulberg, Traffic Design Engineer Patricia Burke, Safety Engineer Chad Richards, Engineering Cost Analyst John Pirre, Engineering Information Services Vacant, Public Involvement Officer Sue Sillick, Research Section Supervisor Lisa Hurley, Fiscal Programming Section

David Phillips, Engineering Division

Jeff Nehring, Engineering Division

Sheila Ludlow, Bicycle/Pedestrian Coordinator

Tom Martin, Environmental Services Bureau Chief

Joe Radonich, Remediation and Assessment

Darin Reynolds, Construction Bureau – VA Engineer Nathan Haddick, Bridge Design Engineer

James Frank, Preconstruction Engineer Jaronn Boysun, Materials Supervisor Patty Patterson, Right of Way Supervisor Clay Blackwell, Construction Engineer Marc Wotring, Hydraulics Engineer LeRoy Wosoba, Traffic Project Engineer Larry Sickerson, Biologist Steve Heidner, Projects Engineer Troy Hafele, District Utility Agent Vacant, Utilities Engineering Manager David Hoerning, Lands Section Supervisor Jerilee Weibel, Acquisition Section Supervisor Joe Zody, R/W Access Management Section Manager Jim Davies. Materials Bureau Chief DJ Berg, Pavement Analysis Engineer Miles Yerger, Surfacing Design Supervisor Scot Helm, Geotechnical Operations Manager Paul Johnson, Project Analysis Bureau Jean Riley, Planner Tom Gocksch, ESB, Engineering Section Supervisor Dawn Stratton, Fiscal Programming Section Amanda Jackson, Eng. Manager, Bridge Management System William Squires, Acting Road Design Engineer Becky Duke, Traffic Data Collection Section Supervisor (WIM) Doug McBroom, Maintenance Division Operations Mgr (RWIS) Bill Semmens, Environmental Resources Section Supervisor Jon Axline, Historian Darcy Goodson, Reclamation Specialist

Carson Buffington, Maintenance Chief Thomas Christensen, Right of Way Design Supervisor Jay Fleming, Construction Ops Engineer Scott Walter, Bridge Area Engineer Bob Evans, Geotechnical Specialist Pat McCann, Geotechnical Engineer Grant Rodway, Project Development Engineer Linda Switzer, District MCS Captain Miles Yerger, Surfacing Design Vacant, Constructability Reviewer