

Montana Transportation Commission
June 4, 2026 Minutes
Sleep Inn & Suites
1006 S Haynes Avenue
Miles City, Montana

IN ATTENDANCE

Loran Frazier, Transportation Commission Chair (District 3)
Kody Swartz, Transportation Commissioner (District 1)
Noel Sansaver, Transportation Commissioner (District 4)
Scott Aspenlieder, Transportation Commissioner (District 5)
Chris Dorrington, Director, MDT
Larry Flynn, Deputy Director MDT
Jess Bousliman, Commission Secretary
Dustin Rouse, Chief Engineer, MDT
Liz Franklin, Staff Attorney, MDT
Doug McBroom, Statewide Planning and Modal Operations Administrator, MDT
Dave Gates, Construction Engineer, MDT
Ryan Dahlke, Preconstruction Engineer, MDT
John Schmidt, MDT District One
Jim Wingerter, MDT District 3
Shane Mintz, MDT District 4
Mike Taylor, MDT District 5
Brenden Borges, MDT (online)
Frank Ceane

Online

Geno Liva, MDT District 2
Mitch Buthod, MDT

OPENING – Commissioner Loran Frazier

Commissioner Frazier called the meeting to order with the Pledge of Allegiance. Commissioner Sansaver offered the Invocation. Commissioner Frazier asked for introductions.

Approval of Minutes

The minutes for the Commission Meeting of April 21, 2026 were presented for approval.

Commissioner Aspenlieder moved to approve the minutes for the Commission Meeting of April 21, 2026. Commissioner Sansaver seconded the motion. All Commissioners voted aye.

The motion passed unanimously.

***Agenda Item 1: Construction Project on State Highway System
Tronstad Meadows Subdivision – Kalispell***

Doug McBroom presented the Construction Project on State Highway System – Tronstad Meadows Subdivision, Kalispell to the Commission. Under MCA 60-2-110 “Setting priorities and selecting projects,” the commission shall establish priorities and select and designate segments for construction and reconstruction on the national highway system, the primary highway system, the secondary highway system, the urban highway system, and state highways. This statute exists to ensure the safety of our system, protect transportation investments, and encourage

coordination on public and private infrastructure improvement projects that impact MDT routes.

Tronstad Meadows Subdivision – Kalispell

Elcan & Associates, Inc. is proposing modifications to US-93 (N-5) in Kalispell to address traffic generated by their new facility (the Tronstad Meadows Subdivision). Proposed improvements include the installation of new traffic signals at the intersection of US-93 and Tronstad Road.

MDT headquarters and Missoula District staff have reviewed and concur with the recommended improvements. Elcan & Associates, Inc. will provide 100 percent of project funding and will be required to complete MDT’s design review and approval process to ensure that all work complies with MDT design standards.

When complete, MDT will assume all maintenance and operational responsibilities associated with the proposed improvements.

Staff recommendation:

Staff recommends that the Commission approve these modifications to US-93 pending completion of applicable state and local design review and approval processes.

Commissioner Swartz moved to approve the Construction Project on State Highway System – Tronstad Meadows Subdivision, Kalispell. Commissioner Aspenlieder seconded the motion. All Commissioners voted aye.

The motion passed unanimously.

***Agenda Item 2: Construction Project on State Highway System
Turnrow Subdivision – Bozeman***

Doug McBroom presented the Construction Project on State Highway System – Turnrow Subdivision, Bozeman to the Commission. Under MCA 60-2-110 “Setting priorities and selecting projects,” the commission shall establish priorities and select and designate segments for construction and reconstruction on the national highway system, the primary highway system, the secondary highway system, the urban highway system, and state highways. This statute exists to ensure the safety of our system, protect transportation investments, and encourage coordination on public and private infrastructure improvement projects that impact MDT routes.

Turnrow Subdivision - Bozeman

Virga Venture II, LLC is proposing modifications to East Valley Center Road (U-1211) in Bozeman to address traffic generated by their new development (the Turnrow Subdivision). Proposed improvements include additional turning lanes and a new traffic signal at the intersection of Davis Lane and East Valley Center Road.

MDT headquarters and Butte District staff have reviewed and concur with the recommended improvements. Virga Venture II, LLC will provide 100 percent of project funding and will be required to complete MDT’s design review and approval process to ensure that all work complies with MDT design standards.

When complete, MDT will assume all maintenance and operational responsibilities associated with the proposed improvements.

Staff recommendation:

Staff recommends that the Commission approve these modifications to East Valley Center Road pending completion of applicable state and local design review and approval processes.

Commissioner Sansaver moved to approve the Construction Project on State Highway System – Turnrow Subdivision, Bozeman. Commissioner Swartz seconded the motion. All Commissioners voted aye.

The motion passed unanimously.

**Agenda Item 3: Interstate Maintenance Program
Additions to IM Program (5 New Projects)**

Doug McBroom presented the Interstate Maintenance Program – Additions to IM Program (5 New Projects) to the Commission. The Interstate Maintenance (IM) Program finances highway projects to rehabilitate, restore, resurface, and reconstruct routes on the Interstate System. Montana’s Transportation Commission allocates IM funds to MDT Districts based on system performance.

At this time, MDT is proposing to add five new projects to the IM program – one in District 1, one in District 3, and three in District 4. The projects on the attached list meet the criteria set forth for IM-funded projects. If approved, it would be MDT’s intention to let these projects individually.

Staff recommendation:

Staff recommends that the Commission approve the addition of these IM projects to the highway program.

Commissioner Aspenlieder asked if the Baker Interchange included the bridge or just surface work. Doug McBroom said that does not include the Interchange and is just the Interstate rehab; it includes the area where we have subgrade issues and is similar to what we had by Maverick.

Commissioner Aspenlieder moved to approve the Interstate Maintenance Program – Additions to IM Program (5 New Projects). Commissioner Sansaver seconded the motion. All Commissioners voted aye.

The motion passed unanimously.

**Agenda Item 4: National Highway System Program
Additions to NH Program (14 New Projects)**

Doug McBroom presented the National Highway System Program – Additions to NH Program (14 New Projects) to the Commission. The National Highway System (NH) Program finances highway projects to rehabilitate, restore, resurface, and reconstruct Non-Interstate routes on the National Highway System. Montana’s Transportation Commission allocates NH funds to MDT Districts based on system performance.

At this time, MDT is proposing to add 14 new projects to the NH program – one in District 1, four in District 3, eight in District 4, and one in District 5. The projects on the attached list meet the criteria set forth for NH-funded projects. If approved, it would be MDT’s intention to let these projects individually.

MDT is requesting Commission approval to add 14 new projects (listed on Attachment A) to the National Highway System Program. The proposed projects are consistent with the goals and objectives identified in the Performance

Programming (Px3) Process – as well as the policy direction established in TranPlanMT. Specifically, roadway system performance and traveler safety will be enhanced with the addition of these projects to the program.

Staff recommendation:

Staff recommends that the Commission approve the addition of these NH projects to the highway program.

Commissioner Frazier asked if there was any reason District 2 was left out of this addition. I’m assuming their funding is all there and we’re balancing the program. Doug McBroom said that is correct.

Commissioner Sansaver moved to approve the National Highway System Program – Additions to NH Program (14 New Projects). Commissioner Swartz seconded the motion. All Commissioners voted aye.

The motion passed unanimously.

**Agenda Item 5: *Primary System Program*
 *Additions to STPP Program (16 New Projects)***

Doug McBroom presented the Primary System Program – Additions to STPP Program (16 New Projects) to the Commission. The Surface Transportation Program – Primary (STPP) finances highway projects to rehabilitate, restore, resurface, and reconstruct routes on the state’s Primary Highway System. Montana’s Transportation Commission allocates STPP funds to MDT Districts based on system performance.

MDT is requesting Commission approval to add 16 new projects to the Primary System Program. The proposed projects are consistent with the goals and objectives identified in the Performance Programming (Px3) Process – as well as the policy direction established in TranPlanMT. Specifically, roadway system performance and traveler safety will be enhanced with the addition of these projects to the program.

Staff recommendation:

Staff recommends that the Commission approve the addition of these STPP projects to the highway program.

Commissioner Aspenlieder moved to approve the Primary System Program – Additions to STPP Program (16 New Projects). Commissioner Sansaver seconded the motion. All Commissioners voted aye

The motion passed unanimously.

**Agenda Item 6: *Secondary Roads Program*
 *Additions to STPS Program (7 New Projects)***

Doug McBroom presented the Secondary Roads Program – Additions to STPS Program (7 New Projects) to the Commission. The Surface Transportation Program – Secondary (STPS) finances highway projects on the state-designated Secondary Highway System. Secondary Roads are those routes that have been selected by the Montana Transportation Commission to be placed on the Secondary Highway System. Secondary Roads Program funding is distributed by formula and is utilized to resurface, rehabilitate and reconstruct roadways and bridges on the Secondary System. Capital construction priorities are established by the Counties and

pavement preservation projects are selected by MDT (per the guidance in MCA 60-3-206).

MDT is requesting Commission approval to add 7 new projects (listed on Attachment A) to the Secondary Roads Program. The proposed projects are consistent with the goals and objectives identified in the Performance Programming (Px3) Process – as well as the policy direction established in TranPlanMT. Specifically, roadway system performance and traveler safety will be enhanced with the addition of these projects to the program.

Staff recommendation:

Staff recommends that the Commission approve the addition of these STPS projects to the highway program.

Commissioner Sansaver moved to approve the Secondary Roads Program – Additions to STPS Program (7 New Projects). Commissioner Swartz seconded the motion. All Commissioners voted aye

The motion passed unanimously.

**Agenda Item 7: *Urban Pavement Preservation Program
Additions to UPP Program (8 New Projects)***

Doug McBroom presented the Urban Pavement Preservation Program – Additions to UPP Program (8 New Projects) to the Commission. The Urban Pavement Preservation (UPP) program provides funding for pavement preservation work on urban routes throughout the state. MDT Districts work with local governments to advance nominations that align with system needs (as identified by local pavement management systems).

MDT is requesting Commission approval to add 8 new projects (listed on Attachment A) to the Urban Pavement Preservation Program. The proposed projects are consistent with the goals and objectives identified in the Performance Programming (Px3) Process – as well as the policy direction established in TranPlanMT. Specifically, roadway system performance and traveler safety will be enhanced with the addition of these projects to the program.

Staff recommendation:

Staff recommends that the Commission approve the addition of these UPP projects to the highway program.

Commissioner Aspenlieder moved to approve the Urban Preservation Program – Additions to UPP Program (8 New Projects). Commissioner Sansaver seconded the motion. All Commissioners voted aye

The motion passed unanimously.

**Agenda Item 8: *Bridge Program Projects
Additions to Bridge Program (1 New Project)***

Doug McBroom presented the Bridge Program Projects - Additions to Bridge Program (1 New Project) to the Commission. MDT’s Bridge Bureau reviews bridge conditions statewide and provides recommendations for construction projects to be added to the Bridge Program.

MDT is requesting Commission approval to add one new project to the Bridge Program. The proposed project is consistent with the goals and objectives identified in the Performance Programming (Px3) Process - as well as the policy direction established in TranPlanMT. Specifically, roadway system performance and traveler safety will be enhanced with the addition of this project to the Bridge Program.

Staff recommendation:

Staff recommends that the Commission approve the addition of this project to the Bridge Program.

Commissioner Swartz moved to approve the Bridge Program Projects – Additions to Bridge Program (1 New Project). Commissioner Aspenlieder seconded the motion. All Commissioners voted aye.

The motion passed unanimously.

**Agenda Item 9: *Tentative Construction Plan (TCP) Projects
Candidate Projects for Redistribution Funding
in FFY 2026***

Doug McBroom presented the Tentative Construction Plan (TCP) Projects – Candidate Projects for Redistribution Funding in FFY 2026 to the Commission. Under MCA 60-2-110 “Setting priorities and selecting projects,” the commission shall establish priorities and select and designate segments for construction and reconstruction on the national highway system, the primary highway system, the secondary highway system, the urban highway system, and state highways. This statute exists to ensure the safety of our system, protect transportation investments, and encourage coordination on infrastructure improvement projects that impact MDT routes.

Last year, during the Tentative Construction Plan (TCP) meetings, the Transportation Commission approved a list of projects that would be eligible to move forward into FFY 2026 – if sufficient Redistribution funds became available at the end of the federal fiscal year. In recent conversations with the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), it has been determined that this year’s Redistribution amount could be higher than expected. Thus, MDT is requesting Commission approval to add to the list of candidate projects eligible to receive Redistribution funds in FFY 2026.

At this time, MDT is advancing a list of additional candidate projects for Redistribution funds in FFY 2026.

MDT is requesting Commission approval to add 4 projects to the list of candidate projects eligible to receive Redistribution funds in FFY 2026. Final selection of projects will occur after Redistribution funding levels are set by FHWA (typically in early September). Selected projects will be consistent with the goals and objectives identified in the Performance Programming (Px3) Process – as well as the policy direction established in TranPlanMT.

Staff recommendation:

Staff recommends that the Commission approve the addition of these projects to the list of candidate projects eligible to receive Redistribution funds in FFY 2026.

Commissioner Aspenlieder asked why we are putting TA projects in the redistribution list. Doug McBroom said if you recall back at the TCP, we had

asterisks and that is how we recognize those redistribution candidates and there were some TA projects in that process. So, a couple of the projects that were identified were lag projects that just didn't develop. These are replacing those options. This doesn't necessarily say we're going to select these as redistribution; we have to determine how much redistribution FHWA is granting us. The other key thing with TA funds is they come from the apportionment pot of money so we're often limited in the type of projects we can use redistribution money for simply because of apportionment limits which are different than obligation limits. So, it's basically not the actual money balance but the account that all these buckets of funding fall into. So, these just give us an option to maximize the amount of redistribution we can take if we're short on apportionment in different categories. Going up a level, this gives us optionality – by giving approval you are saying we could chose these in order to fully obligate a basket of projects according to the criteria.

Commissioner Sansaver moved to approve the Tentative Construction Plan (TCP) Projects – Candidate Projects for Redistribution Funding in FFY 2026. Commissioner Swartz seconded the motion. All Commissioners voted aye.

The motion passed unanimously.

Agenda Item 10: Local Construction Project on State Highway System – Contract Labor City of Glendive

Doug McBroom presented the Local Construction Project on State Highway System – Contract Labor, City of Glendive to the Commission. Under MCA 60-2-111 “letting of contracts on state and federal aid highways,” all projects for construction or reconstruction of highways and streets located on highway systems and state highways, including those portions in cities and towns, must be let by the Transportation Commission. This statute exists to ensure the safety of our system, protect transportation investments, and encourage better coordination between state and local infrastructure improvements. MDT staff reaches out to local governments to solicit local projects on state systems to ensure compliance with this statute.

Some background: This is a project in Glendive that has already been planned and let. We didn't find out about it until it hit the paper. This is a project on the urban system and we're coming through basically to ask your permission to have the project completed by the City of Glendive.

The City of Glendive has planned to design and build a transportation improvement project on the state highway system. The project will be funded locally and will utilize contract labor. The project is designed with input and concurrence from MDT staff to the extent practicable.

When complete, the local government will assume all maintenance responsibilities associated with new project elements. Thus, MDT will not incur additional liability or maintenance costs as a result of the proposed projects.

On behalf of the local government, as required by MCA 60-2-111, staff requests that the Transportation Commission delegate its authority to let, award, and administer a contract for the project listed below. The project is also illustrated on the attached map: City of Glendive.

Staff Recommendation:

Contract Staff recommends that the Commission approve this modification to the state highway system and requests that the Commission delegate its authority to let, award, and administer the contract for this project to the City of Glendive - pending completion of applicable state and local design review and approval processes.

Commissioner Sansaver said so they are coming to us at the last minute – is that like begging for forgiveness rather than asking for permission. Doug McBroom said yes, that is exactly what it is. Commissioner Sansaver said I assume the City of Glendive has moved forward with something without the blessings of the Commission, is that correct? Doug McBroom said that is correct. Commissioner Sansaver asked if they had talked to them. Doug McBroom said we have been engaged in discussions with the City of Glendive extensively. The District Administrator can give you more information on that. Commissioner Sansaver said we talked about it yesterday while driving the route. I think there should be some type of standard we have; is this going to become something that goes on and on. I understand it was the Public Works Director of the City of Glendive, and he should be informed that should this happen again the project will not go through. We will not listen to another project that hasn't been predetermined and authorized by this Commission.

Commissioner Aspenlieder said I'm in the same camp as Commissioner Sansaver. This project has been in the works for two years with Glendive. How did this happen? It is certainly not your fault, but you meet regularly with them so how did this not come up? On top of that Interstate Engineering is doing this work and they are very familiar with the State of Montana MDT and certainly should know better and certainly should have raised the flag on this. What happened? Shane Mintz, District 4 Administrator, said first of all you're right, the city has done a bunch of utility work on Douglas in the last three years. They've been out there doing utility work which doesn't require permission from MDT. Quite a bit of this project isn't even on the urban system, and I don't know what percentage is. Interstate Engineering called to argue that most of it is off the project but there is about a block and a half that is clearly on Douglas Street and clearly, according to my staff, was more than maintenance. It was replacing curb, gutter and some sidewalk. There was definitely more work outside of this project. The City of Glendive hasn't done a project besides maintenance on the urban system since their previous administration in 2017. I'm not trying to make excuses, but they had a completely different administration, a different Mayor, Operations Manager, and Public Works Director. Having said that, our Planning Division sends letters every year notifying them. We touch on this every year. It slipped through the cracks on their part that they got this far in the process.

Commissioner Aspenlieder said I would request a formalization in the form of a letter from the Commission to both the City of Glendive and to Interstate Engineering who should know better. That is inexcusable in my mind. They are the consultants who work with us on our own stuff. I suggest that staff draft a letter and have it signed by the Chair and send it to Interstate Engineering and the City of Glendive formalizing what Commissioner Sansaver said.

Commissioner Frazier said I believe that policy has been in place for a couple of decades. Part of the reason for that policy was to encourage coordination between MDT and the city to protect limited resources. We are putting a large number of dollars into a transportation corridor to support transportation commercial activity and to ensure that we're not stepping on each other's toes or building something that is going to impede or deteriorate our investment.

Commissioner Aspenlieder said I think it's important enough that this will not happen again. The Commission will not consider this under these circumstances again.

Commissioner Sansaver said this isn't pomp and circumstance by the Commission, this is protocol for the State of Montana and protocol must be followed. Even though it is in my district, I will support this project to move forward but I would stand first to say this will not happen again without the approval and blessing of the State of Montana.

Commissioner Aspenlieder moved to draft a letter to the City and Interstate Engineering to be signed by Chairman Frazier, reminding the City of the MCA and Commission Policy. Commissioner Sansaver seconded the motion. All Commissioners voted aye.

The motion passed unanimously.

Commissioner Sansaver moved to approve the Local Construction Project on State Highway System – Contract Labor, City of Glendive. Commissioner Aspenlieder seconded the motion. All Commissioners Voted aye

The motions passed unanimously.

Public Comment

Commissioner Frazier asked if there was any public comment or elected official online that wished to comment at this time.

Frank Ceane, Glendive Public Work Director

Frank Ceane said it was our understanding at the beginning of the project that it was just a repair and not a full reconstruct but it didn't make sense to go through and pave over the top of what we did with the road being in the condition it was so we decided to do full-width paving and I guess that is what brought it to your attention. That was a misunderstanding on our part and we apologize for that. After going through this, we will not make that mistake again.

Commissioner Aspenlieder said your Engineer knows better and that is a conversation I suggest you have with Interstate Engineering. They know the protocol and have been working with the State of Montana for a long, long time. They know better than this. Frank Ceane said they will be having that conversation.

Commissioner Sansaver said I echo that as well. I made a rather harsh comment earlier – you have the District Administrator right at your fingertips in Glendive and it's my district as well. It's embarrassing that you come to us not having the Commission's blessing and not following the protocol, it's hard to approve. Now if we have somebody else come to us without going through the proper protocol, it's going to be hard not to approve their project now that we've approved this. Frank Ceane said I fully understand and I know it's put you in a hard position. We apologize for that and it was a lack of oversight on my part, and everybody involved. We definitely know now and it is a pleasure for us to be here and hopefully we will not be back here with the same situation. Thank you.

Agenda Item 11: Certificates of Completion March & April 2026

Dave Gates presented the Certificates of Completion for March & April 2026 to the Commission for review and approval. Certificates of Completion serve as official

documentation of the Department’s final acceptance of a project. These certificates confirm that the contract has been completed in full compliance with all approved plans, specifications, and special provisions, as authorized by the Transportation Commission.

Upon acceptance of a Certificate of Completion by the Commission, the Department will notify the Contractor and its designated Escrow Agent to authorize the release of bid documents held in Escrow. This acceptance also initiates financial closeout procedures, including preparation of the final voucher for federal reimbursement, reconciliation of state funding, and completion of audit and records retention requirements in accordance with MDT specifications and federal regulations.

Staff Recommendation:

Staff recommends approving the Certificates of Completion for March and April 2026 as presented.

Commissioner Aspenlieder moved to approve the Certificates of Completion for March & April 2026. Commissioner Sansaver seconded the motion. All Commissioners voted aye.

The motion passed.

Agenda Item 12: *Director’s Discussion*

Director Chris Dorrington

Montana Infrastructure Coalition Summit

We went to the Montana Infrastructure Coalition Summit a couple of weeks ago in Billings. The Infrastructure Coalition is reinvigorated just this year. This is the second Summit ever and it was well attended. They did a good job and put together a pretty darn good Summit. Their interest is to express the state of infrastructure across transportation. A lot of it was focused on transportation both local and within our responsible charge. It was a good Summit and the take-away is infrastructure is important but also the need to invest in it.

Earmarked Projects

We have two earmarked projects that are still moving through our Congressional Delegation. They are advancing and I’m happy they are. We had submitted several earmarked nominations for projects. That’s a new thing for the State. We have two in the works and there is no guarantee but through authorization and through appropriation work, they are still in the works. Shane Mintz said one is Alzada East and West. Mike Taylor said the other is Exposition Drive.

Authorization Fund

They passed out of Committee. PA250 is a reauthorization bill draft that treats us well and is very encouraging and eliminates a couple of things that we are not oppose to – carbon reduction program and protect. There are a couple of real benefits in that bill primarily that formula funds are preserved so the formula method for rural states like us still gets a good portion of the federal funds. New revenue source proposed on EV’s and the proposal that it may not follow the traditional formula funding allocation. It went to the full House for a vote, and we’re very interested in what the Senate does. They are very much behind and hasn’t indicated much. The House is moving quickly and we’re happy about that.

The trouble for the reauthorization bill is you get into the summer with the 4th of July and then you have August Recess. Going into the fall right before elections Congress members are usually in their state working on elections instead of bills. What we need is an authorization bill by the end of September. We don't anticipate at this time we will get it and will probably get a Continuing Resolution but hopefully it will be limited to one, but we need a lot of work done on the Senate side in order to get there. It's good news but with a slight caution.

System's Impact

That process has advanced a tremendous amount of work in the last six months. We have quite a bit of work to do but we've set a strong foundation for improving that and then we'll be training internally and externally in order to get people up to speed and get us consistent and timely.

2027 Session

We have submitted some policy initiatives to the Governor's office for review and approval as well as Executive Planning Process which is our budgetary requests. Those will go in tomorrow. We have a handful of requests even though we know it's going to be a very tight financial session.

Speed Studies

Director Dorrington said with the interest in technology and the complexity of speed everybody is asking for speed studies and interest in speed. It's difficult and the Commission has asked why the data seems stagnant and we're three years away from the request, why can't we go faster. We have taken a look at technologies in order to, in my view, remove perceptions and increase the visualization of the speed data so we can make quicker decisions on what we should or should not study. We can share the reason why Brenden is spending so much time on speed reviews on the things we need to and not the things that people perceive we should. That is the objective today.

Brenden Borges, MDT

Brenden Borges gave a presentation on some new technologies regarding speed to the Commission. Brenden said there are a ton of different vendors out there and this technology is emerging. The more I dug into it the more I realized there are probably 10-15 vendors doing big data analytics specifically in speeds. The two vendors we tried are Iteris and Street Vision that we sampled in detail so far. Our Maintenance people are running with Iteris. This is our traffic signal operations – traffic signals and having actual hardware on traffic signals actively taking counts and then integrating that into a UI Traffic signals that we can use. As a side thing they have a speed study or speeds capability as well.

I tested Iteris and Street Vision which is a different vendor that does specifically speed studies and then some safety and behavioral analysis. I'm working with the data set on Street Vision from November 2024 to current. For Iteris from April 2023 to present. That is the bounds from a speed study perspective on data I'm working with.

How does it work? Iteris is kind of a layered data eco system. So, you have the ground hardware and then you have connected view which is the second part of it. Those two are integrated together in one UI.

What are connected vehicles? Vehicle-to-vehicle is kind of the emergent thing where you have two different vehicles that can communicate with each other on the road. You can think of that as where autonomous vehicles are progressing towards ...it's kind of emerging not widespread. You have vehicles to entry structures which is blue tooth enabled on our traffic signals. That would be your hardware that can actually type vehicles. Vehicle-to-network, which is the big one, this is your navigation apps, and your OEM. So, the actual vehicle is connected to the network itself and not a navigation app like insurance just your physical hardware on your car. Iteris uses the ground hardware and E2 together.

Connected Vehicles – the cream of the crop of data is OEM vehicles. If you have a newer car, your car can take software updates or recall information and is connected to the network. The car manufacturer is taking your data and selling it to third parties. For the most part most people don't know that but in most connected vehicles your data analytics are being tracked and sold to third part aggregators. You can opt out of it as well. That is the highest quality we visited, specially tailored to that car. So, your computer in your car knows very specifically how fast it's going, then they take that data and connect it.

Second is your navigation Apps and your location enabled Apps. That is your Google maps and any other car App that uses your location as well. You give it permission. It can take your speeds and do PS traces and commercial fleet trucking data as well. Street Vision uses a different system and uses mobile telematics platform that is for insurance. Most insurance companies as most people are aware, if you opt in give, you a discount if you're driving safe. On the back end they track your data and then they could sell it to third party aggregators. That's how we have that sort of data. The kind of issue is there might be inherent bias in the data. I checked it to see how accurate both systems are and it's kind of frightening how accurate the hard data in both systems is.

The data set we're working with for connected vehicles and obviously not all vehicles on a roadway are using navigation apps or are connected. Street Vision actuated roughly five percent of the traffic stream and Iteris is roughly 15% and more than likely both are going to increase over time. You don't really notice it as much on high volume, but 20,000 ADT vehicles 5% or 15% is more than enough in one day to be statistically significant. So, on urban or high-volume roads you don't notice the difference very much but on the more low volume roads that data set matters a little bit more.

What is the output? You see on Street Vision is more of a point system so it's going to be a hexagonal display – think of it as speed spot, so each point in space. Iteris is more corridor wide, so you can review east west corridor. It doesn't give you specific spots, but it gives you an aggregated over a corridor.

What are the case-uses for this? Before and after studies, right now if we're doing speed studies to change the speed limits, you want to know what the effects of that are. So right now, I send my guys out at an allocated time in the summer to find out. Because we have so many new requests, we don't really get an opportunity to actually do performance measures on our speed limit changes. This is a great use for it because I can know instantly that if that sign gets installed if there is immediate compliance to that and then look over the course of a year to find out. So instead of having to send my guys out there to see if what we're doing is correct, I can evaluate it as it's happening in real time. We can determine the effectiveness of our transition changes as well in any area. We can tailor them specifically to each community as well to see if the transition changes, we're instituting are actually being effective in doing what we're trying to do. If I send my guys out and there's a rainstorm or construction, I can't take data that week, we have to chalk it up to a loss essentially. This gives me the capability so I don't have to worry about that

because I can take the data in any week where there are clear skies and then I have the data. So, it gives me the flexibility we're looking for.

Second would be the intelligent interims. Right now we're doing interim speed studies and making educated guesses for the most part of what we think the speed limit would be. We take the data then go confirm whether that's true or not which can sometimes run higher with locals which we don't want. If we lower the speed limit and find out it's not warranted, then the local government gets upset. This gives us the ability so we're not making those decisions in the dark anymore because we know specifically what the speed data is for the interim where we're making an informed decision on those interim speed studies.

Inter-agency cooperation. We can give real-time data to any local authority that could request it. So, these systems go beyond state routes, this tells you data on local routes and city and county routes as well. For example, say there is a school zone on a city route, and we have access to that, can we find out if there's a speeding problem through that school zone. We can notify the local government and tell them where to allocate their resources efficiently. Maybe a different school zone has high compliance, and one does not. Either way we can help them out and in general increase the cooperation with our local governments.

Director Dorrington said one of the things we really struggle with is behavior modification. We spend money on safety initiatives, so we know how many tickets we write but we don't really know whether there is a lasting impact. We also know by corridor we can send enforcement to this section of Interstate but with these tools you can actually say definitively here are our highest priority speeding areas and then watch high visible enforcement be employed and see what that does. We can do it with 24-48 hours of awareness not next year looking at a data set.

Commissioner Aspenlieder said to that point and understanding we're in the early discussion stages of this, do you envision this being a new line of communication with MHP? Here's what we're doing and here's what we're seeing and pumping that information back out to MHP? Director Dorrington said that would be the objective. Then also we can have one of the data aggregators, whoever we select, open the link. They would be our partner, here are your top 15 zones, with them being the point of contact, then working in that triangle to try and improve that.

Commissioner Sansaver asked how much credence we lend to the local community. We run into this all the time, especially on the west side of Big Fork Lake, they want the speed limit to be slowed down. I'm probably the biggest supporter of local communities and their input. You can take all the data you want off computers and machines but it's not going to convince the local mentality, human nature. How do we get them to input that into their minds that would satisfy them? I've heard so many years on my time on the Commission that our speed data shows that if you slow down it is going to create more accidents. That doesn't make sense for human nature. How do we get that through to the community that slowing down would have a worse effect than speeding up? How do we get that mind set through to them?

Brenden said part of the answer to that question is we get a lot of local government feedback that we didn't collect data at the right time, during the summer or during school zone time. That is the limitation of taking hard physical data, we're there for a snapshot, one week and that's it. We might not look at that corridor for another five years. This gives us the ability to tell them how their traffic is progressing through time every week for years. Big Fork is a good example, in talking with the locals they state that it's often times the tourists pushing the speeds higher, but when you apply the data analytics you find that's not the case. Commissioner Frazier said it's usually the locals.

Director Dorrington said your question is a good one. What I think these tools will do when a local official tells us they have a high speed on this corridor, Brenden can share his screen and work with a visualization to say here is what we see over this period of time, here is what we see during a special event, here is what we see on the weekend or tourist season and show them in real time instead of generating a report from hard data collection and getting back to them in six months. Instead, we know almost immediately what a statistically relevant sample shows.

Brenden said I think the locals will really appreciate this. Again, part of the process they get so upset about is how long it takes to get results back to them. So instead of taking a year to get results, I can have a five minutes conversation with them and tell them exactly what the speeds are and where they are. In general, I think they will be happy. I can foresee in the future a lot of local city governments working with us specifically on this because if they want to do a speed study and don't want to do our process, they can hire a consultant to do it and just ask the state for our speeds immediately.

I did a couple of examples. This is on the I-15 where we extended the 65 mph zone out from the Capital Interchange down to Saddle Drive because of the MCA statute. Let's use both tools to see what happened (showing graphs). Iteris – the signs went up on May 1st around noon on Friday and immediately the moment we installed the 65-mph speed limit we got a deviation on traffic speeds. As the signs went up people changed their behavior immediately. The 50th percentile was 70 mph and the moment the signs went up the 50th percentile went down to 67 mph – a three mile per hour reduction in running speeds. I watched it happen live and it was really cool. Street Vision gave me essentially the same thing. It told me there was a net reduction of three miles per hour. So both software gave me nearly identical information. The nice thing about Street Vision is it gives me an Instagram.

This is the hexagonal display of another example. Think of it as a 3D representation of a straight-line diagram with the actual satellite imagery overlaid on it. This allows us to really understand what's happening. In Augusta, which the Commission ruled on a couple of months ago, we standardized the transition zones 25-45-55 mph instead of 70-55-45-35-25 mph. This is a lower volume road of 900 ADT and it's in a rural area. So, what happened? We go to a two-to-five mph decrease in the 50th percentile. We got a 23% drop in excessive speeding which I consider to be 15 mph over the limit. So, when we changed the transitions this tool allows MDT to see the actual net effects of doing the transition change and we saw net safety benefits.

There are some limitations. I only have data back as far as 2024. For Street Vision the directionality is still being ironed out. These are emerging companies and we're working closely in their development with both. We should have the pace – give me that metric to digest and both are working on it. We measure the pace and find out what the pace is any time of day now. I can see how the pace changes over time instead of just a fixed static number.

Commissioner Swartz asked him to go back to Augusta. You said a 23% drop in excessive speed, can you show the metric of 15 mph over the limit. If you drop it to the actual speed limit, I would suspect that number of excessive speed would increase and the percentage would drop. Is that correct? Brenden said yes. You can see as you come into Augusta you have speeds of about 70 mph and then you check each point and it will tell you the speed specifically and instead of 18 stations, I have 200 stations to pick from. It will show you any area to see the transitions and how people are reacting in real time. The limitation in this one is directionality which is obviously very important – how do people transition into the community versus out of the community. We need directionality to identify them.

I-90 was posted at 65 mph, which the Commission wanted and we did a speed study and got some results. This is a sneak peek for the next Commission meeting. In the 65 mph zone the 85th percentile is about 75 mph, the 50th is 69 mph. The table shows you the net difference – how much excessively over the speed limit you are going.

This is Street Vision and it told me that the 85th is 75.8%. The 50th again I'm working with them so they will actually give me a hard number which is not hard to do. What I found was compared to hard data, we were only off the 85th percentile by point three mph which is as accurate as you can possibly get. That is the difference between my counters out on one week versus the next week because traffic flow varies.

Director Dorrington said each hexagon is a statistically representative sample of total traffic, so you could have 1,300 vehicle samples in each hexagon of total traffic which ADT errors around 10-12 thousand. Brendon said yes. This one says between 1,000-1,500 traversals which is basically 1,000-1,500 vehicles. So, their minimum is lower than ours, which is 100 vehicles and their minimum before they will even give you data is 500 so their thresholds are even higher than what we have. You want that 500 or higher. I found is that it shows that 80% of people are going above the 65-mph speed limit.

The kind of limitation or hard issue is you have to tailor around these on and off ramps because it will pick up that data. Then we have to be very selective about it but either way it gets washed out in the sea of through traffic. I'm specifically working on them to get the 50-percentile hammered out.

This is Iteris and it will show me the 15th switch which tells you what our 15th slowest people are going. Our median is the 50th and then the 85th percentile. This graphic shows you what it output from June 15th to June 22nd. I did the specific four days. Iteris gave me the same statistic – 80% are going over 66 mph, the 85th was only off by 28 and the 50th off by 29. Iteris can show you very specific days and it can exclude the grand data.

Work Zones: US 12 – Iteris gave me live. This was done on May 4th when we had construction outside our office in Helena. It starts on May 4th at 7 am. What happened to traffic? It cratered down to 20 mph. This was super interesting – the speed limit is 35 mph but there was a lane closure. The speed shown here was kind of arbitrary because it's a congestion-dominated work zone so running speeds are only 20 mph and the speed limit is 15 mph higher. You can see as the cones go up the traffic slows down. The cones went away at night and then back up the next morning and that is when you see that jump. The spike occurs after 5 pm when the cones went away. The speeds go back up and normalize after that. This work zone was moving eastward away from the segment I was looking at and as it moved eastward it naturally increased because the work zone is no longer affecting that area.

The limitation of Street Vision and why I need the directionality, you see there was no single lane closure on the westbound traffic but there was on the east bound traffic. I found it was aggregating the two together even though they shouldn't be so that is a limitation. Iteris told me the 85th was 29 mph at 1 pm and Street Vision gave me 34 mph but that's because it's aggregating the two directions of travel.

I traveled through the work zone at 5:15 pm. It's a bridge rehab project and has a single lane closure on the Interstate, it's in a rural area. I found with preconstruction the 85th was 86 mph, looking at the 35-mph work zone during construction the speeds are 68 mph on average. With the 19-mph reduction, we had some compliance, but you still have a problem. As a side note, we have a construction project on US 89 & 200 at the interchange outside of Livingston. There is a 35-mph

zone on the Interstate as well. I checked last night and the running speeds were 55 mph. There is a bit of problem in our work zones and speeding on Interstates.

This is kind of the data output that Iteris can show me. If you look down here, on the speeding map it will show the entire state – all state and city routes. I told it to find me the percentage of vehicles speeding over 10 mph, give me 20% of all those vehicles which is a large chunk of vehicles. I highlighted the areas that met that metric. In Columbia Falls, around the bridge area and the transition leaving Columbia Falls, there is some compliance issues with the transition specifically. I took data out here and let's see how it compares to the hard data at each specific point.

This is the hard data we took. We took one station throughout the whole thing. This is the existing conditions, and you see we have a problem with the 35-mph zone and a problem with the 45 mph. So, I asked for the 50th percentile of vehicles going over 55 mph. As you know going to West Glacier is a 55-mph zone. I found that 90% of people were going above the speed limit. So, this shows some compliance issues in the 55-mph zone. This is my comparison of the hard data. At these points I took speed spot data. For Iteris I picked the exact date I was out there and took data. So, this is not an arbitrary time period, this is the specific day we took hard data. I was one mile per hour off each station and that was consistent throughout the entire area. That is how accurate the software is. Commissioner Sanders asked if it was usually high or low. Branden said it depends on the area.

For Street Vision of the same area, I asked how many people were driving over 55 mph. It's in the high 70% and goes up to 90% of the people not complying. The 85th percentile is in the low 60's. You can see the traffic goes down to zero here where there is a major traffic signal. That obviously aggregates and pushes speeds down. So that is how traffic signals affect free flow speeds. Some traffic signals, depending on the timing of it, affect it very little.

Commissioner Sansaver asked if they had done any study close to roundabouts. Branden said I have not, but I would like to do that next. Commissioner Sansaver said I'd love to see that. Commissioner Aspenlieder said if you look at Shiloh Road in Billings, our traffic unit is spending significant time there all the way up to Rimrock with high density crash volume at King and Shiloh and Grand and Shiloh. It would be interesting to see that. Our own internal team is looking at the data, trying to figure it out with enforcement action. It would be interesting to correlate that. We have a lot of data in Billings also.

Commissioner Sanders asked if he could address the crash data around schools and how you can overlay. Branden said we imported our crash data into these systems and they can integrate them together essentially. For example, you know how we have the crash heat diagrams that show where the crashes are occurring, I can do the same thing with the speed overlaid on it as well. Commissioner Aspenlieder said it is getting stupid enough in Billings that we have some on the Council that want to spend two million dollars to put speed tables on Shiloh and to slow it from 45 mph down to 25 mph which is absurd. There is a whole host of conversations in Billings around Shiloh Road dealing with this roundabout issue. Brandon said in live action you can take the link on Shiloh Road that is the worst and zoom into it and look at speeds, look at braking, look at hard acceleration and then put crash history right on top of it and show visually what exactly is happening.

Can you imagine if you tap your phone while you're driving and it notifies us so you can aggregate that together? So, you can see where people are looking at their phones a lot. You have distracted driving and as a result you have a high crash rate in the area as well. So those two can be overlaid immediately.

Iteris, the average 50th analyzed the 25-mph zone and asked what recommendation I would come up with if I just use this data. So, my hard data was 29.5 mph and Iteris gave me 28.5 mph so my recommendation regardless of what data source I used is still 30 mph using the closest 50th percentile. So, what Iteris shows and what this graphic shows is the percent of vehicles going over 25 mph is in the high 70s. Roadway context shows this area has heavy enforcement as well and we're still not getting compliance with the roadway. So is the roadway supporting a 25 mph, is that the context that should be used in this regard and I make the argument that this road should be 30 mph. It fits the roadway. If heavy enforcement is not getting compliance that speaks to a different issue.

This is through Columbia Falls – at Nucleus Avenue and 6th you have a traffic signal, and you see that 6th and Nucleus are affecting traffic flow. At 4th there is a traffic signal, but it is not affecting traffic, so I asked the question because I was curious. On 4th the signal favors the mainline heavily and it doesn't get recalled as often, thus it stays green for US 2 more often than not, so you get more free-flow data. So not all traffic signals essentially have a net effect of decreasing and suppressing free-flow data that we would normally assume.

Commissioner Sanders asked about Great Falls on 10th Avenue South. You want to keep 10th Avenue South green longer than the side streets, but what that does is encourage that higher speed limit because they know they don't have to slow down as much because the light is going to stay greener longer. That is really interesting. Branden said this is really easy for the average person to digest as well. This is what speeds are doing in your local community for you to understand. Again, our speed data is useful for all of us to understand but for people out in the public it is very hard to try and explain this to them, but this is a beautiful tool to help them see this. It shows things I didn't think about. My assumption would be that 4th Avenue would have an effect on free-flow speed, and this blew up my assumption, so I had to change my way of thinking.

This is Toston – which went from 70 mph to 75 mph on the four-lane between Helena and Bozeman. What happens when you raise the speed limit five miles per hour? My assumption was that speeds would increase about three or four miles per hour because you raised the limit. That is not what happened. You got a net increase in the 85th by 1.3 mph and that was it. So, increasing the speed limit had a very negligible effect on running speeds in that section, which I would have not assumed. That leans more to the fact that people drive the speed they feel comfortable at and even if they could go faster if they want to, they chose not to go faster. So, the posted speed what not impeding people from driving faster. Again, I wouldn't have known that, and this only took me an hour to figure out, and I immediately knew the net effect of the 5 mph increase. Commissioner Frazier said so it's a piece of sheet metal on a stick. Commissioner Sanders said I'd be curious if the average 85th percentile didn't change, did it bring up the people driving slower so that the speed differential got narrower. Branden said that is a good question. That is why we're working on getting that pace metric specifically. If it narrowed the pace, then you could make the argument that increasing the speed limit was a net safety benefit for the roadway.

Street Vision showed the net increase was 6.5% and the net was 1.1 mph. So, it was nearly identical for both software. In practicality this had very little effect on running speeds at 1.0 mph versus 5 mph increase. I have talked with the local government who was looking at doing a speed study on the Toston Bridge area because their perception was that speeds were too fast and didn't feel safe at 75 mph. So, there was a negligible difference at the Toston Bridge. So, do we really need to do a speed study out there?

Commissioner Sansaver asked about truck traffic. Brandon said they are working on that. So many software use truck commercial fleet data and they are working on tools to separate that out and give us the capability of analyzing specifically truck speeds which is very important.

Commissioner Sansaver asked how long we had been using this. Brandon said one month. Commissioner Sansaver said the people who live in the area say you need to slow down and now we have some hard data to show them what is actually happening. Brandon said a good tool to use is a mismatch between speed data and the speed limits – what if there were areas where no one is going even near the speed limit because there is some geometric constraint preventing them from getting to the speed limit. So, there is a mismatch between the speed limit and what people are driving. We don't look at it until someone complains about it and this gives us the tools to shift the window from being reactive to proactive. We can look at areas where no one has talked about or looked at or thought about and we can actually address that is there currently.

I'm really excited about this and thanks to the Director for giving me the tools to analyze this. I came in skeptical, but I'm blown away by what this can do.

Director Dorrington said one thing we haven't talked about is that if we deploy this appropriately, we're also reducing the amount of time that Brenden and his team are out at work on the road and in danger stretching tubes across the road, etc. Brenden said the caveat is this doesn't work without cell service, so you can't fully supplement the speed study hard data process. It is purely supplemental to give us more data to work with in certain areas and to still meet our deadlines specifically with the Commission. If we run out of time and data, we still have access to get you data and get a speed study ready.

Commissioner Aspenlieder said this is a big thing for Commissioner Sanders and I'd encourage you to find a time to set up a team call and go through this very same thing with Commissioner Sanders so that he's schooled up with the rest of us. Director Dorrington said we can do that live and he can select routes he has interest in and we can share our screen with him. We've only touched on some things because of time limits; we could spend all day on this. You can show a bunch of other behavioral patterns that are statistically relevant. So if you're tapping, touching, moving your screen we can tell. It's wild that you can look at behavioral patterns live. Brendon said many of you have routes that you are curious about, send them to my way and I can tell you very quickly what's going on there. Another side thing you can do with this is tailor it to whatever you need and have actual hard data on our mountain passes as well. That is a little ways down the line but we're looking into it.

Commissioner Sansaver asked if they could get on the roundabout issues sooner than later. It really promotes to the general public that these are safer. When we have speed zone where they are going 55 mph for a quarter of a mile then all of a sudden you have a roundabout, there is a problem. The public says they are not safer. Brenden said you can show crash severity by increment of time; we can do 36 months of crash severity overlaid with speed at an intersection improvement. We can do that district specific as well so we can give our traffic engineers these tools as well so they can be in their local areas working with local city and county governments. As an example, if in your city commission meeting you could invite someone from MDT to look at a corridor and present the information visually and show them the trends.

Commissioner Aspenlieder said they could talk about that during a work session with city council on Shiloh because we've already dispatched our traffic unit to do targeted interaction. We're talking about noise ordinance; we move from rapid

acceleration coming out of a roundabout and we could show them that on top of the crash data. It's less significant crashes but there is an assumption the crashes have increased because of the roundabouts particularly at Grand and King rather than decreased. That would be incredibly interesting. The other thing I'd say is we just approved in our budget another traffic analyst inside Public Works to start doing some of these things and they are talking about their own software similar to this. We need to look at our networks and see if there is a way, particularly with the Big Eight, which have their own engineering departments, to try and collaborate better through the MPOs using the same software and trying to piggyback licensing with the state so we're congruent in what we're looking at. That would probably be super helpful as well. Commissioner Frazier said that sounds like a topic for another meeting. Director Dorrington said they are going to look at co-licensing with MHP as well. If they had a data analyst, they could do the same prioritization with enforcement.

Commissioner Frazier said this is very interesting and this is a topic we could go all day long on. It's nice to know there are new tools and I think we should look at not just Billings but some of the others and to get our traffic people sharing the same data and speaking the same language. Brenden said I know this has been long and you have the presentation so you can go over the notes to see the full effect of what this software can do. Commissioner Frazier said we could have used this in 1993 in Twin Bridges trying to explain the speed zone and what people were doing.

Commissioner Aspenlieder asked Brenden which software they liked better. Brenden said they are very similar and it would be nice to have both because they do different things that are essentially good. Iteris is really good for directionality and figuring out northbound vs. southbound and eastbound vs westbound. Street Vision displays in a graph and is an actual 3D representation which the public will gravitate towards. They don't like seeing graphs because they are boring, but when they can see a beautiful 3D rendering of speeds, they can see and understand that better. Commissioner Frazier said it is nice to have both, but directionality is important. Brenden said our systems manager operation people use Iteris as well for traffic signals and are familiar with that software.

Director Dorrington asked if it was helpful to see some of the tools the department is working on. As long as we have time on the Agenda in the future would it be helpful? Commissioner Frazier said this was very helpful and all the Commissioners agreed. It helps me in educating others of what we're doing. Commissioner Sansaver said it is helpful in defending what we're doing as well. A lot of times you get crowds of people like on Big Fork Lake that come in demanding changes and in some cases, we approve and others we don't. This is an amazing tool. I like to see us have both software programs as well because it's an arbitrary thing with just one tool but if you have two it isn't arbitrary. You made a good point about talking to the Commission and all the folks you work with and using a lot of language that we understand but the general public does not. If you pull up a graph and show them, it's a visualization of the data and they can see what you're saying. Brenden said also the general public can see they are going a little too fast and need to change their own behavior based on the information we show them. Commissioner Sansaver thanked him for the presentation and said it was very helpful.

Mike Taylor said he would like to recognize and thank Jess Bousliman for all the behind the scene work she did for this meeting in particular but also for all the meetings we have. It really helps us a lot. Commissioner Sansaver thanked Shane Mintz for the outstanding job he did with the tour. You kept it on schedule and on time. District 4 is proud of our Administrator, and we think Shane does an outstanding job. Our District Administrators aren't thanked enough for the work they do, without their work we as Commissioners wouldn't be able to sit here.

Shane Mintz thanked all the Commissioners for coming out and spending the time in Miles City to check out eastern Montana. I appreciate your time.

***Agenda Item 13: Change Orders
March 2026***

Dave Gates presented the Change Orders for March 2026 to the Commission. The monthly Change Order Reports for March 2026 are provided for your review. These reports are informational only and do not require any action by the Commission.

Agenda Item 14: Letting Lists

Ryan Dahlke presented the Letting Lists to the Commission. This is an informational item only. He handed out hard copies of the Letting List through the end of December 2026. One thing I will note is that because we don't know the redistribution amount, those aren't in the October lettings yet. As we get closer, we can populate that. You will see a lot of those redistribution projects in November. Commissioner Frazier said the November letting is stacked up pretty good. Ryan Dahlke said it's not enough, the goal is to have the entire fiscal year showing into November and then as we get closer, we distribute immediately.

Next Commission Meetings

The next Commission Conference Calls were scheduled for June 16, 2026, June 30, 2026, July 7, 2026, and August 18, 2026.

The next Commission Meeting was scheduled for August 27, 2026.

Meeting Adjourned

Commissioner Loren Frazier, Chairman
Montana Transportation Commission

Chris Dorrington, Director
Montana Department of Transportation

Jess Bousliman, Secretary
Montana Transportation Commission