

Date: April 22, 2026

Subject: **Request for Proposals**  
US-191/MT-64 Int Improvements  
NH 50-2(109)47  
UPN 10533000

To Whom It May Concern:

The Montana Department of Transportation (MDT) is accepting proposals from consulting firms interested in the preparation of the construction plans and specifications for the subject project. One firm will be selected to perform the work specified herein.

Teams may be established as necessary; however, it is expected that the prime consultant will be capable of completing the vast majority of the work, and the proposal must clearly identify the prime for this contract. As a rule, the prime consultant must complete at least 50% of the work for a specific project or assignment unless written exception is given.

Montana professional engineering licensure is required for this work and must be in-hand at the time your proposal is submitted. If this requirement is not met and clearly identified in the proposal, your proposal will be considered non-responsive.

If your firm is interested, please submit a proposal as described herein.

## **SCOPE OF WORK**

The intent of this capital improvement project is to expand the intersection operation of US-191 with MT-64. An intersection control evaluation (ICE) was conducted through the US-191/MT-64 Feasibility Study and recommended the installation of a roundabout. Staff also recommend the addition of a northbound passing lane to the north of the intersection. A BUILD grant application was submitted on February 24, 2026, for \$25 million. If the grant is awarded the project will be designed as described, however, if the grant application is unsuccessful, the passing lane portion of the project will be removed from this scope and added to an existing passing lanes project that is currently under contract. Grant award announcements are scheduled for July 1, 2026.

The consultant will be required to provide comprehensive design services necessary for the project, including (but not limited to) roadway widening, geotechnical analysis and design, surfacing design, traffic analysis and design, signing and striping, utilities, environmental features, and right-of-way. It is anticipated the existing bridge is wide enough to accommodate the proposed improvements and the public involvement for the project will be handled through the US-191/MT-64 Feasibility Study.

The MDT Consultant Design Project Manager has developed a draft Scope of Services document, which is linked below in the Additional Information Section. The provided Scope of Services document accounts for work being done through Scope of Work. The intent is to execute a contract post scope of work with the selected consultant for all work through PS&E. Any unaccounted efforts can be added later by amendment. A scoping meeting will be held with MDT and the successful Consultant on **June 10, 2026**. Minor changes to the Scope of Services document will be considered based on discussion during the scoping meeting. The Consultant will be tasked with developing their cost proposal based on this Scope of Services document (revised as agreed upon at scoping meeting). Contract negotiations, including fully executing a contract, should be complete within 14 weeks of Consultant selection, barring unforeseen circumstances. This timeline is outlined in more detail on Page 4.

By submitting a proposal, it is understood your firm has capacity to complete the work requested including having an internal quality assurance/quality control process achieving industry standard expectations for quality.

As previously mentioned, an ICE was completed on the intersection through the US-191/MT-64 Feasibility Study. The documents for the evaluation are being finalized and will be shared with the consultant once MDT has accepted them. The conclusions and recommendations portion is included with this RFP for insight on how the roundabout was selected as the best alternative. High level conceptual information regarding the intersection can also be found on MDT's website under the Public Involvement tab or at <https://mdt.mt.gov/pubinvolve/us191mt64/>. The draft Scope of Services is attached to the bottom of the RFP. The Conclusion and Recommendations Memo from the ICE is linked below.

[US-191 MT-64-ICE-Conclusions-and-Recommendations.pdf](#)

## **LOCATION**

This project is in Gallatin County on National Highway 50 and State Highway 64. The extents on US Highway 191 begin at RP 47.8± and extend to RP 49.5±. On State Highway 64 the extents begin at RP 0.0± and extend to RP 0.2±.

## **PROJECT SCHEDULE AND DELIVERABLES**

The project schedule will be developed and negotiated prior to executing the contract agreement. At this time, it is anticipated that deliverables will generally follow those described in MDT's Consultant Activity Descriptions (as applicable):

[http://www.mdt.mt.gov/other/webdata/external/cdb/ACTIVITY\\_DESCRIPTIONS/CONSULTANT\\_DESIGN\\_2500\\_MU.PDF](http://www.mdt.mt.gov/other/webdata/external/cdb/ACTIVITY_DESCRIPTIONS/CONSULTANT_DESIGN_2500_MU.PDF)

## **STANDARDS, SPECIFICATIONS, AND POLICIES**

Work is expected to follow MDT's various Manuals, Guides, and Policies. These items may be found on MDT's Design Consulting web page at: <http://www.mdt.mt.gov/business/consulting/>.

## **PROPOSAL SUBMITTAL**

**Submit one (1) electronic version (Adobe® PDF format) of the proposal. Hard copy proposals will not be accepted.**

Submit the electronic version by uploading to the State of Montana File Transfer Service (FTS) site, which can be accessed at this link: <https://transfer.mt.gov>. To upload to FTS, an account must be created unless the person who is uploading already has an account. Uploading instructions can be accessed at <https://transfer.mt.gov/Home/Instructions>. When your proposal has been uploaded, the FTS system will prompt you for an email address to send to. Please send this email of your uploaded proposal to the following individuals:

Sheryl Tangen: [stangen@mt.gov](mailto:stangen@mt.gov)

Kelly Williams: [kwilliams@mt.gov](mailto:kwilliams@mt.gov)

Sam Baker: [sbaker@mt.gov](mailto:sbaker@mt.gov)

**The Department must receive the proposals for this RFP no later than 3:00 PM MST, May 13, 2026.**

Regardless of cause, late proposals will not be accepted and will automatically be disqualified from further consideration. It shall be solely the vendor's responsibility to assure delivery at the specified office by the specified time. Offeror may request the State return late proposals at vendor's expense or the State will dispose of late proposals if requested by the offeror. (See Administrative Rules of Montana (ARM) 2.5.509.). If no request is made, late proposals become the property of the Department. All proposals submitted on time become the property of the Department.

The costs for developing and delivering responses to this solicitation are entirely the responsibility of the offeror. The State is not liable for any expense incurred by the offeror in the preparation and presentation of this submittal.

## **TENTATIVE RFP/SELECTION SCHEDULE**

The anticipated schedule for consultant solicitation and selection for this contract is as follows (subject to change):

April 22, 2026:	RFP released
May 13, 2026:	Proposals due to be submitted to MDT Consultant Design
May 27, 2026:	Proposals reviewed, rated, and ranked by the evaluation committee
June 3, 2026:	Consultant Selection Board meeting to select consultant
June 10, 2026:	Scoping meeting with selected consultant

There are three (3) members on the evaluation committee for this RFP (subject to change):

1. MDT Butte District Project Development Engineer
2. MDT Traffic Operations Engineer
3. MDT Consultant Design Project Manager

## **PROPOSAL CONTENTS**

The proposal must contain the information listed in this section. The proposal is **limited to five (5) pages**, not including the required Appendices. A single cover jacket/title page is allowed if desired and will not count in the page limit. Each page is defined as one side of a letter size sheet (no larger than 8 ½” x 11”), minimum font size of 10. Evaluation of information will begin with the first page immediately following the cover jacket/title page, and every page will be counted, in order, from that point forward, including any table of contents or divider pages the firm wishes to include. Once the page limit is reached, any information included thereafter will be removed and not considered or scored. Please organize your proposal in the same order and numbering format as shown below, which will assist MDT in reviewing your proposal:

### **Questions**

#### **1) Team Qualifications**

Provide a discussion on how the team you propose to use for this project (including subconsultants, if used) is best qualified to respond to the requirements of this project. Discussion should focus on the requirements for this specific project, particularly your team’s expertise and experience, as it relates to the work described in the “Scope of Work” section above. Provide examples of previous related project experience as it relates to these services. Identify professional licensure of staff that satisfy the requirements for this contract. Include an organizational chart of your team for this project. Also briefly discuss your compatibility of systems, software, and equipment (i.e. CADD software, word processing software, etc.), and experience with these systems, software, and equipment. The Department’s standard design software is Autodesk® technology included in the Architecture, Engineering & Construction (AEC) Collection. Describe any special equipment or software you intend to use. Resumes may be considered as supplemental information for scoring this question.

#### **2) Project Approach**

Transportation work has many challenging aspects, and the development and delivery of a successful project that addresses and mitigates specific project challenges is of utmost interest to MDT. Discuss the challenges you foresee as they relate to this project and its requirements, your strategy for addressing these challenges, and your specific experience in implementing the strategies identified. Describe your quality assurance/quality control

process. Include a discussion on your ability to successfully deliver this project, and your overall plan for delivering this project in a timely manner.

#### **Appendix A: Resumes**

Include brief resumes for the key personnel to be assigned to the contract. **Resumes are limited to one (1) page per person.**

#### **Appendix B: Cover Page Form**

Include a completed version of MDT's standard cover page form, available at the following location:

<http://www.mdt.mt.gov/other/webdata/external/cdb/MDT-CDB-002-Proposal-SOQ-Cover-Sheet.pdf>

Information presented in the cover page form will not be considered in proposal scoring.

#### **Appendix C: References**

Submit references that includes a minimum of five (5) separate contracts from the past three (3) years. If applicable, you may submit multiple contracts for a single client. Each contract must pertain to work similar to the proposed scope of services. Include client name, a currently employed primary contact person, an alternative contact person, corresponding valid phone numbers and emails for both contacts, a range of contract value, and a brief description of the work performed. If MDT needs to use these references for the Past Performance Score (as described in the "Evaluation of Proposals" section below) and is unable to contact the required number of references after a reasonable effort, the firm will receive a zero for the missing reference(s).

### **EVALUATION OF PROPOSALS**

All proposals will be evaluated in accordance with the following factors:

- 1) Team Qualifications (50 points possible)**
- 2) Project Approach (100 points possible)**
- 3) Record of past performance (30 points possible)**
  - a) If two (2) or more MDT evaluations specific to the discipline for this contract are available for the consultant, the average score of these evaluations will be used. Evaluations for Project Management & Overall Performance will also be included.
  - b) If fewer than two (2) MDT evaluations specific to the discipline for this contract are available for the consultant, but there are two (2) or more MDT evaluations are available for other work disciplines, the consultant's current overall past performance score from MDT evaluations will be used.
  - c) If there is only one (1) MDT evaluation available for the consultant, the record of past performance score will be an average of the MDT evaluation and one (1) reference check from the references provided in the unbound attachment.
  - d) If no MDT evaluations are available, the average score of two (2) reference checks from the references provided in the unbound attachment will be used for this score.

Regardless of partnership/teaming relationships, the past performance of the prime consultant will be the past performance scored that will be used for this score.

All Proposals will be evaluated using the following basic scoring methodology:

- Outstanding/Exceptional response: 90-100% of the available points
- Good response: 70-90% of the available points
- Average response: 50-70% of the available points
- Poor response: 30-50% of the available points
- Qualifications not clearly met: 0-30% of the available points

Following the review, evaluation, and rating of all proposals, the final results will be presented to the Consultant Selection Board (Board) at the MDT Headquarters Building. At this time, the Board will select the most qualified firm(s) to perform the work. The Board may consider any proposal scoring within 2% of the highest-scoring proposal as equally qualified and take into account its knowledge of the firms' workload, past performance, and familiarity with the project area and local entities in selecting the most-qualified consultant. In the event that a firm cannot be identified as the most qualified through an evaluation of these proposals, MDT reserves the right to narrow down the list of responding firms to an appropriate short list. Short-listed firms will either be asked to provide a supplemental proposal or asked to be interviewed or provide a presentation. Scores from the proposals, supplement project proposals (if used), and interviews (if used) will be carried forward to determine final consultant score. Consultant selection is finalized by MDT at the Consultant Selection Board meeting.

### **INDIRECT COST RATE REQUIREMENTS**

Proof of the firm's Indirect Cost Rate (overhead rate) is ***not required*** with this proposal submittal. However, an Indirect Cost Rate may be required prior to executing a contract according to MDT's Indirect Cost Rate Requirements:

All submitted indirect cost rates must be calculated in accordance with 23 CFR 172 for the cost principles of 48 CFR part 31 and include the required items identified in the MDT Indirect Cost Rate Policy located in Appendix A of the Consultant Services Manual on the MDT Internet website.

[http://www.mdt.mt.gov/other/webdata/external/cdb/consultant\\_manual/consultant-design-manual\\_combined.pdf](http://www.mdt.mt.gov/other/webdata/external/cdb/consultant_manual/consultant-design-manual_combined.pdf)

***Do not show any actual numerical financial information such as the overhead rate or personnel rates within your proposal. Specific cost information of the firm or team should not be part of the proposal.***

### **AGREEMENT REQUIREMENTS**

Contract agreements will generally be administered on a cost-plus fixed fee basis. The contracts will have negotiated cost ceilings. If a consulting firm is selected for a specific project and a contract agreement is successfully negotiated, certain financial information will be required as part of the contract agreement. As described in the Indirect Cost Rate Requirements section above, all Consultants and subconsultants must provide the Department with an Indirect Cost Rate (as applicable) audited (when applicable) in accordance with 23 CFR 172 for the cost principles of 48 CFR Part 31 and based on the firm's latest completed fiscal year's costs. Personnel rates, profit, and direct expenses must be clearly outlined and provided to the Department. The standard MDT agreement can be found at the following address:

<http://www.mdt.mt.gov/other/webdata/external/cdb/forms/pdf/General-Terms-and-Conditions.pdf>

***Do not submit actual numerical financial information within this proposal.***

### **STATE OPTION TO AWARD**

While the State has every intention to award a contract resulting from this RFP, issuance of the RFP in no way constitutes a commitment by the State to award and execute a contract. Upon a determination such actions would be in its best interest, the State, in its sole discretion, reserves the right to:

- Cancel or terminate this RFP (18-4-307, MCA);
- Reject any or all proposals received in response to this RFP (ARM 2.5.602);
- Waive any undesirable, inconsequential, or inconsistent provisions of this RFP that would not have significant impact on any proposal (ARM 2.5.505);
- Not award a contract, if it is in the State's best interest not to proceed with contract execution (ARM 2.5.602); or
- If awarded, terminate any contract if the State determines adequate funds are not available (18-4-313, MCA).

### **SINGLE POINT OF CONTACT**

From the date this solicitation is issued until the consultant selection is finalized by MDT at the Consultant Selection Board meeting, offerors are not allowed to communicate with any state staff or officials regarding this solicitation, except at the direction of the Consultant Design Engineer. If unauthorized contact is made and the Consultant Design Engineer determines the context of the contact gives the firm an unfair advantage, the firm will be disqualified from the solicitation. Contact information for the single point of contact is as follows:

**Kelly Williams**  
Consultant Design Engineer  
Montana Department of Transportation  
(406) 444-7964 (Direct Line)  
[kwilliams@mt.gov](mailto:kwilliams@mt.gov)

### **DBE GOALS**

There are no DBE goals for this work, but firms are strongly encouraged to utilize DBE firms if applicable. A Montana certified DBE list is available and can be found on the MDT web page, <http://www.mdt.mt.gov/business/contracting/civil/dbe.shtml>.

### **NONDISCRIMINATION COMPLIANCE**

Consultants will be subject to Federal and Montana nondiscrimination laws and regulations (see attached notice titled "MDT NONDISCRIMINATION AND DISABILITY ACCOMMODATION NOTICE").

If you have any questions, please contact me at (406) 444-7964, or by email at [kwilliams@mt.gov](mailto:kwilliams@mt.gov). I look forward to receiving your proposal.

Sincerely,

*Kelly M. Williams*

Kelly Williams, P.E.  
Consultant Design Engineer

Attachments:

MDT Nondiscrimination and Disability Accommodation Notice  
10533000 Draft Scope of Services

e-copies:

Mary Erchul, ACEC Executive Director-MT Chapter  
Dustin Rouse, MDT Chief Engineer  
Ryan Dahlke, MDT Preconstruction Engineer  
Dave Holien, MDT Highways Engineer  
Erika Wimmer, MDT Civil Rights Bureau Chief

Jason Senn, MDT Consultant Plans Engineer  
Roy Peterson, MDT TA Engineer  
MDT Consultant Design Bureau file  
Geno Liva, Butte District Administrator-MDT

## **MDT NONDISCRIMINATION AND DISABILITY ACCOMMODATION NOTICE**

Montana Department of Transportation (“MDT”) is committed to conducting all of its business in an environment free from discrimination, harassment, and retaliation. In accordance with State and Federal law MDT prohibits any and all discrimination and protections are all inclusive (hereafter “protected classes”) by its employees or anyone with whom MDT does business:

Federal protected classes

Race, color, religion, national origin, sex, age, disability, and genetic information.

State protected classes

Race; color; national origin; familial or marital status; pregnancy, childbirth, or medical conditions related to pregnancy or childbirth; creed; social origin or condition; genetic information; sex, sexual orientation, gender identification or expression; ancestry; age; mental or physical disability; political or religious affiliations or ideas; military service or veteran status; vaccination status or possession of immunity passport.

For the duration of this contract/agreement, the PARTY agrees as follows:

**(1) Compliance with Regulations:** The PARTY (hereinafter includes consultant) will comply with all Acts and Regulations of the United States and the State of Montana relative to Non-Discrimination in Federally and State-assisted programs of the U.S. Department of Transportation and the State of Montana, as they may be amended from time to time, which are herein incorporated by reference and made a part of this contract.

**(2) Non-discrimination:**

- a. The PARTY, with regard to the work performed by it during the contract, will not discriminate, directly or indirectly, on the grounds of any of the protected classes in the selection and retention of subcontractors, including procurements of materials and leases of equipment, employment, and all other activities being performed under this contract/agreement.
- b. PARTY will provide notice to its employees and the members of the public that it serves that will include the following:
  - i. Statement that PARTY does not discriminate on the grounds of any protected classes.
  - ii. Statement that PARTY will provide employees and members of the public that it serves with reasonable accommodations for any known disability, upon request, pursuant to the Americans with Disabilities Act as Amended (ADA).

- iii. Contact information for PARTY's representative tasked with handling non-discrimination complaints and providing reasonable accommodations under the ADA.
- iv. Information on how to request information in alternative accessible formats.
- c. In accordance with Mont. Code Ann. § 49-3-207, PARTY will include a provision, in all of its hiring/subcontracting notices, that all hiring/subcontracting will be on the basis of merit and qualifications and that PARTY does not discriminate on the grounds of any protected class.

**(3) Participation by Disadvantaged Business Enterprises (DBEs):**

- a. If the PARTY receives federal financial assistance as part of this contract/agreement, the PARTY must comply with applicable federal and state laws regarding the DBEs, including but not limited to 49 CFR Part 26.
- b. By signing this agreement the PARTY assures that:  
*The contractor, sub recipient or subcontractor shall not discriminate on the basis of race, color, national origin, or sex in the performance of this contract. The contractor shall carry out applicable requirements of 49 CFR part 26 in the award and administration of DOT-assisted contracts. Failure by the contractor to carry out these requirements is a material breach of this contract, which may result in the termination of this contract or such other remedy as the recipient deems appropriate.*
- c. PARTY must include the above assurance in each contract/agreement the PARTY enters.

**(4) Solicitation for Subcontracts, Including Procurement of Materials and Equipment:**

In all solicitations, either by competitive bidding, or negotiation, made by the PARTY for work to be performed under a subcontract, including procurements of materials, or leases of equipment, each potential subcontractor or supplier will be notified by the PARTY of the PARTY's obligation under this contract/agreement and all Acts and Regulations of the United States and the State of Montana related to Non-Discrimination.

**(5) Information and Reports:** The PARTY will provide all information and reports required by the Acts, Regulations, and directives issued pursuant thereto and will permit access to its books, records, accounts, other sources of information and its facilities as may be determined by MDT or relevant US DOT Administration to be pertinent to ascertain compliance with such Acts, Regulations, and instructions. Where any information required of a contractor is in the exclusive possession of another who fails or refuses to furnish the information, the PARTY will so certify to MDT or relevant US DOT Administration, as appropriate, and will set forth what efforts it has made to obtain the information.

**(6) Sanctions for Noncompliance:** In the event of a PARTY's noncompliance with the Non-discrimination provisions of this contract/agreement, MDT will impose such sanctions as it

or the relevant US DOT Administration may determine to be appropriate, including, but not limited to:

- a. Withholding payments to the PARTY under the contract/agreement until the PARTY complies; and/or
- b. Cancelling, terminating, or suspending the contract/agreement, in whole or in part.

**(7) Pertinent Non-Discrimination Authorities:**

During the performance of this contract/agreement, the PARTY, for itself, its assignees, and successor in interest, agrees to comply with the following non-discrimination statutes and authorities; including but not limited to:

*Federal*

- Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 (42 U.S.C. § 2000d *et seq.*, 78 stat. 252), (prohibits discrimination on the basis of race, color, national origin); and 49 CFR Part 21;
- The Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act of 1970, (42 U.S.C. § 4601 *et seq.*), (prohibits unfair treatment of persons displaced or whose property has been acquired because of Federal or Federal-aid programs and projects);
- Sections 162 and 301(g) of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1973, (Public Law No. 93-87, 87 Stat. 250, codified at 23 U.S.C. § 324), (prohibits discrimination on the basis of sex);
- Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, (29 U.S.C. § 794 *et seq.*), (prohibits discrimination on the basis of disability); and 49 CFR Part 27;
- The Age Discrimination Act of 1975, (42 U.S.C. § 6101 *et seq.*), (prohibits discrimination on the basis of age);
- Section 520 of the Airport and Airways Improvement Act of 1982, (49 U.S.C. § 47123), (prohibits discrimination based on race, creed, color, national origin, or sex);
- The Civil Rights Restoration Act of 1987, (Public Law No. 100-259), (broadened the scope, coverage, and applicability of Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, The Age Discrimination Act of 1975, and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, by expanding the definition of the terms “programs or activities” to include all of the programs or activities of the Federal-aid recipients, sub-recipients, and contractors, whether such programs or activities are Federally funded or not);
- Titles II and III of the Americans with Disabilities Act, (42 U.S.C. §§ 12131 through 12189), which prohibits discrimination on the basis of disability in the operation of public entities, public and private transportation systems, places of public accommodation, and

certain testing entities as implemented by Department of Transportation regulations at 49 CFR parts 37 and 38;

- Title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, as amended, which prohibits discrimination on the basis of sex in education programs or activities (20 U.S.C. § 1681 *et seq.*).

*State*

- Mont. Code Ann. § 49-3-205 Governmental services;
- Mont. Code Ann. § 49-3-206 Distribution of governmental funds;
- Mont. Code Ann. § 49-3-207 Nondiscrimination provision in all public contracts.

**(8) Incorporation of Provisions:** The PARTY will include the provisions of paragraphs one through seven in every subcontract, including procurements of materials and leases of equipment, unless exempt by the Acts, the Regulations and/or directives cited therein. The PARTY will take action with respect to any subcontract or procurement as MDT or the relevant US DOT Administration may direct as a means of enforcing such provisions including sanctions for noncompliance. Provided, that if the PARTY becomes involved in, or is threatened with litigation by a subcontractor, or supplier because of such direction, the PARTY may request MDT to enter into any litigation to protect the interests of MDT. In addition, the PARTY may request the United States to enter into the litigation to protect the interests of the United States.

## Contents

ACTIVITY 100 Interactive Project Evaluation .....	1
ACTIVITY 101 Public Involvement .....	2
ACTIVITY 106 Preliminary Geotech and Surfacing .....	2
ACTIVITY 108 Control Survey .....	2
ACTIVITY 110 Preliminary Right of Way .....	3
ACTIVITY 111 Environmental Engineering Existing Conditions Report.....	3
ACTIVITY 112 Preliminary Traffic Report .....	4
ACTIVITY 113 Preliminary Utility Conflicts/S.U.E. ....	5
ACTIVITY 170 Preliminary Hydraulics Report.....	6
ACTIVITY 177 Cultural Resource Management.....	6
ACTIVITY 178 Request Environmental Information .....	6
ACTIVITY 181 Hazardous Materials/Substances and Water Quality – ISA .....	7
ACTIVITY 182 Biological Resource Report/Preliminary Biological Assessment .....	7
ACTIVITY 109 Wildlife Accommodation Recommendation Memo (WARM).....	8
ACTIVITY 121 Engineering Survey .....	8
ACTIVITY 120 Cadastral Survey .....	8
ACTIVITY 122 Alignment & Grade Traffic Plans .....	9
ACTIVITY 118 Roadway Alignment Plan.....	9
ACTIVITY 116 Preliminary Environmental Document or Categorical Exclusion/Section 4(f) Evaluation....	10
ACTIVITY 124 Finalize Alignment & Grade .....	10
ACTIVITY 183 Site Investigation for Hazardous Materials .....	10
ACTIVITY 127 Place Existing RW & Section Lines .....	11
ACTIVITY 128 Prepare Scope of Work.....	11

## **Introduction**

The following scope of services is for engineering services for the US-191/MT-64 Int Improvements project.

This scope of services document outlines the activities, tasks, deliverables, and assumptions that are expected to be needed to complete all work through Scope of Work Report (ACT 128).

## **General Project Assumptions**

1. This project will be designed using Autodesk software included in the Architecture, Engineering & Construction Collection.
2. Plans will follow MDT plan format and MDT sample plans will be used for reference. Plans will be submitted in PDF and Autodesk formats.
3. Source documents for any electronic deliverable (WORD, EXCEL, PDF, Autodesk, etc.) will be provided upon request as part of the project scope if not specified otherwise.
4. MDT design standards and Standard Drawings will be utilized.
5. Project will use MDT Standard Specifications for Road and Bridge Construction (latest edition) with no Montana Public Works use or reference. The selected Consultant will provide project-specific Special Provisions.
6. The consultant will copy MDT on any correspondence with regulatory agencies, State, Federal, Tribal, and/or public entities.
7. The number of meetings and anticipated staff attending for a given activity have not been determined in this scope. The selected consultant will need to provide this information as needed.

The scope of services that follows is described according to MDT's Consultant Design Activity Descriptions,

[http://www.mdt.mt.gov/other/webdata/external/cdb/ACTIVITY\\_DESCRIPTIONS/CONSULTANT\\_DESIGN\\_2500\\_MU.PDF](http://www.mdt.mt.gov/other/webdata/external/cdb/ACTIVITY_DESCRIPTIONS/CONSULTANT_DESIGN_2500_MU.PDF). Assumptions and deliverables for individual tasks are included under each activity. For full description of the activities, see the link above.

## **Scope of Services**

### **SURVEY PHASE ACTIVITIES**

#### **ACTIVITY 100 Interactive Project Evaluation**

##### **ASSUMPTIONS:**

1. Selected Consultant will attend scoping meeting with 2 people virtually. No site visit is scoped.
2. To be determined # of monthly invoices and progress reports will be prepared.
3. A Preliminary Field Review Report will need to be completed.

##### **TASKS:**

1. Prepare scoping meeting minutes.
2. Develop cost proposal.
3. Determine if "Right of Entry" forms are required for site investigations on private land.

##### **DELIVERABLES:**

1. Scoping Meeting Minutes.

2. Update and finalize scope of services, create fee proposal, and schedule.
3. Include Consultant's standard QA/QC process for proposed work.

### **ACTIVITY 101 Public Involvement**

#### **ASSUMPTIONS:**

1. The public involvement for this project will be handled through the US-191/MT-64 Feasibility Study.

#### **Tasks:**

1. Coordinate with Big Sky PR.

#### **DELIVERABLES:**

1. Supporting documents for public outreach.

### **ACTIVITY 106 Preliminary Geotech and Surfacing**

#### **ASSUMPTIONS:**

1. None

#### **TASKS:**

1. Field Investigation of the existing surface.
2. Investigate and report on culvert conditions.
3. Perform a preliminary subsurface investigation.
4. Preliminary geotechnical office review and field reconnaissance.
5. Prepare preliminary surfacing typical sections.

#### **DELIVERABLES:**

1. Completed MDT review activity 440 checklist.
2. Preliminary Geotechnical and Surfacing Design Report to include the following, as applicable:
  - a. Core Evaluation Report.
  - b. Culvert Inspection Report.
  - c. Preliminary Geotechnical Evaluation Report.
  - d. Preliminary Surfacing Recommendations (minimum of 3 with economic analysis).

### **ACTIVITY 108 Control Survey**

#### **ASSUMPTIONS:**

1. Control should be set from the US-191/MT-64 Feasibility Study. MDT is currently waiting for the control submittal for review and will share the approved data with the successful consultant.

#### **TASKS:**

1. Reach out to MDT for control information when ready to perform the engineering survey.

#### **DELIVERABLES:**

1. None

## **ACTIVITY 110 Preliminary Right of Way**

### **ASSUMPTIONS:**

1. Preliminary right-of-way will need to address the length of the project.
2. A cadastral survey will need to be completed for this project.

### **TASKS:**

1. Perform Ownership Study.
2. Create right-of-way cost estimate.
3. Prepare preliminary areas of acquisition.
4. Initiate retracement survey.
5. Obtain permission to enter from landowners (retained by consultant).

### **DELIVERABLES:**

1. Completed MDT review activity 870 checklist.
2. PE Report through electronic PDF file.
  - a. Ownership Study
  - b. R/W Cost Estimate
  - c. Preliminary Areas of Acquisition.

## **ACTIVITY 111 Environmental Engineering Existing Conditions Report**

### **ASSUMPTIONS:**

1. Conduct analyses and document findings for Environmental Engineering Section responsibilities related to applicable regulations; resources present in the project area; potential impacts; and necessary avoidance, minimization, and mitigation if known prior to preliminary plan distribution.
2. This is an iterative process including the submittal of a Draft Environmental Engineering Existing Conditions Report to MDT in electronic format for review and comment. The Consultant will incorporate proposed revisions in the Final Environmental Engineering Existing Conditions Report. The intent of this report is to inform the design team of environmental considerations in the project area prior to Alignment and Grade so that avoidance and minimization can be considered early in plan development.
3. Receive MDT approval prior to contacting any regulatory agencies, State, Federal, Tribal, and/or public entities. Submit the draft versions of all agency correspondence to MDT for review and approval.
4. The preparer's signature is required on the document.

### **TASKS:**

1. Consult with the design team to discuss the purpose of and need for the project and the nature and scope of the project work. Use this information in conjunction with filed work and literature review to evaluate which resource areas need to be investigated and which analyses may be triggered. Based on the nature and scope of the work, the following social and economic analyses may be triggered:
  - a. Economic Impacts
  - b. Environmental Justice
  - c. Induced Growth
  - d. Social Impacts

- e. Visual Quality/Aesthetics  
As applicable, document analyses for the project file. The level of effort associated with each resource area should be commensurate with the project scope, the resources present, and the potential for impact.
2. Consult with agencies with jurisdiction over or interest in the proposed project. Perform a field and/or literature review to identify resources in the project area, including the following:
  - a. Low income and/or minority populations
  - b. Prime farmland and/or farmland of statewide importance
  - c. Historical resources that may be protected by Section 4(f)
  - d. Park and recreational lands that may be protected by Section 4(f)
  - e. Wildlife and waterfowl refuges that may be protected by Section 4(f)
  - f. Parks, recreational areas, or other properties acquired and/or improved with LWCF funds or with similar encumbrances
  - g. Surface water resources including irrigation, streams, wetlands, springs, etc.
  - h. Drinking water sources
  - i. Stormwater management facilities
  - j. Low Impact Development Practice features
  - k. Wild and Scenic Rivers
3. Consult with the design team to discuss the nature and scope of the work in the context of various regulatory authorities to determine if the following analyses will be necessary:
  - a. DEQ and/or local MS4 Permit requirements including need for Low Impact Development (LID) practices analysis.
  - b. Potential trigger for permitting from the US Army Corps (CWA Section 404 and/or Section 10), ability to comply with Nationwide and Regional Conditions, “practicable” avoidance and minimization measures, and availability of mitigation if necessary.
  - c. Potential trigger for 401 Certification and which agency will have Authority. If DEQ has authority, note that permit fees will need to be calculated.
  - d. Potential trigger for Tribal permitting.
  - e. Potential need for incorporation of Permanent Erosion and Sediment Control Measures (PESC) Manual.
  - f. Potential trigger for Underground Injection Control (UIC) program requirements.

**DELIVERABLES:**

1. Draft Environmental Engineering Existing Conditions Report (electronic WORD format).
2. Final Environmental Engineering Existing Conditions Report (electronic PDF of signed document, and electronic WORD version of final document).

**ACTIVITY 112 Preliminary Traffic Report****ASSUMPTIONS:**

1. None

**TASKS:**

1. Request Traffic and Crash data from Consultant Design Project Engineer.
2. Prepare a traffic report outlining recommendations associated with the traffic operational/safety needs within the project limits. The traffic study typically includes the following:
  - a. Traffic volumes.
  - b. Capacity analysis and Level of Service.
  - c. Traffic control features.
  - d. Major access management features.
  - e. Special operational needs.
  - f. Analyssi of crash data and dominant trends.
  - g. Analysis of pedestrian/bicycle/school crossing needs.
  - h. Provide traffic recommendations.
  - i. Traffic control analysis.
  - j. Prepare conceptual layouts as scoped.

**DELIVERABLES:**

1. Completed MDT review activity 430 checklist.
2. Preliminary Traffic Report.
3. Submit raw traffic data.

**ACTIVITY 113 Preliminary Utility Conflicts/S.U.E.****ASSUMPTIONS:**

1. No utility survey has been completed.
2. Engage and inform the impacted utility companies early in the project development to enable them to budget and plan for potential conflict mitigations and avoid additional impacts with their future utility projects. Reduce design changes due to utility conflicts by incorporating the design avoidance from the beginning of project development.

**TASKS:**

1. Set up and conduct initial Utility Informational office meeting with MDT and all utility companies believed to have facilities within the vicinity of the project. Invite the MDT Project Manager, a representative from the MDT Utilities Section, and the MDT District Utility Engineering Specialist to attend the meeting.
2. Complete SUE Phase I investigation.
3. Show SUE Phase I information on preliminary plans. Integrate existing facility data from the SUE Phase I investigation with all design activities including: hydraulic, geotechnical, traffic, road alignment, structural, and environmental. Identify crossings and locations where higher quality level data (e.g., test holes) may be needed to further assess and refine designs.
4. Set up and conduct individual Utility Coordination office meetings with MDT and each utility company. Invite the MDT Project Manager and a representative from the MDT Utilities Section to attend these meetings. These meetings serve as a design aid to the consultant by creating the forum for the utility to inform the consultant on limitations and clearances with utility facilities in order to make the best engineering decision regarding mitigating any utility conflicts (i.e. design around, different design, utility relocation, protect in place, etc.).

**DELIVERABLES:**

1. Utility Coordination Meeting Minutes.

2. SUE Phase I Plans (PDF copy).

### **ACTIVITY 170 Preliminary Hydraulics Report**

#### **ASSUMPTIONS:**

1. Preparation of the preliminary Hydraulics Report includes sufficient information to establish proposed alignment and grade.

#### **TASKS:**

1. Perform location hydraulic study (354).
2. Perform a preliminary hydraulic evaluation (356).

#### **DELIVERABLES:**

1. Completed MDT review activity 350 checklist.
2. Preliminary Hydraulic Report.
3. Preliminary Road Plans.

### **ACTIVITY 177 Cultural Resource Management**

#### **ASSUMPTIONS:**

1. None

#### **TASKS:**

1. Perform inventory to determine whether historic properties exist.
2. Evaluate significance of identified sites.
3. Prepare Draft Cultural Resource Inventory Report in accordance with the latest edition of the MDT Cultural Resource Manual detailing survey methods, results including site identification, and evaluation of National Register eligibility.
4. Incorporate MDT comments to prepare final cultural Resource Inventory Report.

#### **DELIVERABLES:**

1. Draft Cultural Resource Inventory Report.
2. Final Cultural Resource Inventory Report.

### **ACTIVITY 178 Request Environmental Information**

#### **ASSUMPTIONS:**

1. There will be environmental impacts on the project.
2. Refer to 6002 SAFETEA-LU for participating agency coordination of the environmental impact statements.
3. Online resources can be used rather than letters to request information from impacted agencies.
4. Receive MDT approval prior to contacting any regulatory agencies, State, Federal, Tribal, and/or public entities. Submit the draft versions of all agency correspondence to MDT for review and approval.

**TASKS:**

1. Reach out to impacted agencies to request information that cannot be readily obtained on their websites.

**DELIVERABLES:**

1. None

**ACTIVITY 181 Hazardous Materials/Substances and Water Quality – ISA****ASSUMPTIONS:**

1. Identify potential hazardous materials/substances and water quality contamination issues on the project and determine if Preliminary Site Investigation (PSI) is necessary.
2. This may be an iterative process with MDT to finalize the Initial Site Assessment Report.
3. Receive MDT approval prior to contacting any regulatory agencies, State, Federal, Tribal, and/or public entities. Submit the draft versions of all correspondence to MDT for review and approval.

**TASKS:**

1. Perform Initial Site Assessment (ISA Checklist). May include review of transmits, plans (if available), As-Builts, photo log and on-site review (if warranted).
2. Review historic land uses including but not limited to State and Federal Superfund list, MDEQ Underground Tank Program files, etc.
3. Consult with appropriate environmental regulatory agencies to determine if hazardous materials/substances or water quality issues are present.
4. Determine necessity for Preliminary Site Investigation.
5. Prepare the draft ISA form as required.
6. Prepare final ISA form incorporating MDT comments.

**DELIVERABLES:**

1. Draft ISA form.
2. Final ISA form.

**ACTIVITY 182 Biological Resource Report/Preliminary Biological Assessment****ASSUMPTIONS:**

1. The BRR will encompass the entire project.
2. Receive MDT approval prior to contacting any regulatory agencies, State, Federal, Tribal, and/or public entities. Submit the draft versions of all correspondence to MDT for review and approval.
3. The preparer's signature is required on the document.

**TASKS:**

1. Prepare draft BRR/PBA
2. Incorporate comments received and prepare final BRR/PBA.

**DELIVERABLES:**

1. Draft Biological Resource Report/Preliminary Biological Assessment (electronic Word format).
2. Final Biological Resource Report/Preliminary Biological Assessment (electronic PDF format).

## **ACTIVITY 109 Wildlife Accommodation Recommendation Memo (WARM)**

### **ASSUMPTIONS:**

1. *This activity will only be completed if it is determined it is necessary through activity 182. If it is necessary, the rest of the assumptions, tasks, and deliverables apply.*
2. Receive MDT approval prior to contacting any regulatory agencies, State, Federal, Tribal, and/or public entities. Submit the draft versions of all correspondence to MDT for review and approval.
3. The preparer's signature is required on the document and all memos submitted under this activity.

### **TASKS:**

1. Prepare a draft of the WARM (see Consultant Design Activity Description).
2. Incorporate comments received on the draft WARM and prepare the final WARM (see Consultant Design Activity Description).

### **DELIVERABLES:**

1. Draft Wildlife Accommodation Recommendations Memo (WARM) (electronic Word format).
2. Final Wildlife Accommodation Recommendations Memo (WARM) (electronic Word and PDF format).

## **ACTIVITY 121 Engineering Survey**

### **ASSUMPTIONS:**

1. If photogrammetry used, refer to MDT's Consultant Design Activity Descriptions for tasks and deliverables.

### **TASKS:**

1. Complete topographic survey of DTM and non-DTM features.
2. Survey conventional cross sections.
3. Complete the hydraulics surveys.
4. Complete special or additional engineering surveys.

### **DELIVERABLES:**

1. Completed MDT review activity 323 checklist.
2. Provide original field notes if applicable.
3. Electronic survey files including but not limited to ASCII coordinate listings with features and descriptions, data collection files, etc.
4. Survey mapping files.
5. Engineering Survey files conforming to MDT standards in Autodesk format.

## **ACTIVITY 120 Cadastral Survey**

### **ASSUMPTIONS:**

1. A cadastral survey will be necessary for right-of-way purposes.

**TASK:**

1. Complete the cadastral survey.
2. Create and file a Certificate of Survey.
3. Create and file any necessary corner recordation's.

**DELIVERABLES:**

1. Completed MDT review activity 322 checklist.
2. Provide original field notes for the survey.
3. Survey computations.
4. ASCII coordinate listings and descriptions.
5. Copies of data used to evaluate cadastral survey.
6. Electronic and paper copies of preliminary Certificate of Survey and corner recordation's.
7. Calibration baseline reports.
8. Upon Survey Unit approval, provide electronic and paper copies of recorded Certificates of Survey and corner recordation(s).

**ACTIVITY 122 Alignment & Grade Traffic Plans****ASSUMPTIONS:**

1. Preliminary geometric details will be needed.

**TASK:**

1. Prepare preliminary geometrics.
2. Prepare intersection grades.
3. Prepare existing road sign inventory.
4. Identify preliminary R/W needs for signing structures.
5. Establish preliminary signing needs.

**DELIVERABLES:**

1. Completed MDT review activity 432 checklist.
2. Geometric details.
3. Signing Inventory
4. Preliminary Right of Way needs for signing structures.

**ACTIVITY 118 Roadway Alignment Plan****ASSUMPTIONS:**

1. Design exceptions are not anticipated.

**Task:**

1. Preliminary Alignment and Grade
2. Establish Major Control
3. Preliminary Plan Preparation
4. Prepare the WZSM worksheets.

**DELIVERABLES:**

1. Provide PDF package of plans, special provisions, and cost estimate to the Consultant Design Bureau for distribution (if different from the compliance review).

2. Submit project files through MDT's file transfer system (PDF files, DWG files, cost estimate, specials, etc.). All files must follow MDT file naming standards.
3. Completed AGR Plan Review checklist.

### **ACTIVITY 116 Preliminary Environmental Document or Categorical Exclusion/Section 4(f) Evaluation**

#### **ASSUMPTIONS:**

1. Receive MDT approval prior to contacting any regulatory agencies, State, Federal, Tribal, and/or public entities. Submit the draft versions of all correspondence to MDT for review and approval.

#### **TASKS:**

1. Complete Final Environmental Engineering Analysis Report
2. Develop Preliminary Environmental Document or Categorical Exclusion.
3. Section 4(f) Evaluation if any property is identified through Activity 111.

#### **DELIVERABLES:**

1. Final Cooperating Agency request letters (if applicable).
2. Final Environmental Engineering Analysis Report.
3. Preliminary versions of the Environmental Document (CE, EA, or DEIS) and all supporting documentation. Submit Microsoft WORD file.
4. Preliminary versions of Section 4(f) Evaluation. Submit Microsoft WORD file.
5. Final Versions of Section 4(f) Evaluation. Submit Microsoft WORD file.

### **ACTIVITY 124 Finalize Alignment & Grade**

#### **ASSUMPTIONS:**

1. Plan review will be conducted with shared PDF commenting and final archive of comments will be shared with the Consultant as PDF files.
2. Consultant will attend the AGR Meeting. We will discuss whether virtual or an office review is appropriate along with a field review. This will include a meeting with project stakeholders (MDT, Big Sky personnel, and others) to review the AGR submittal. Two members of the Consultant team will attend the meeting with optional staff virtually.
3. Design exceptions are not anticipated.

#### **TASKS:**

1. Prepare the Alignment and Grade Review Report.

#### **DELIVERABLES:**

1. Completed MDT review activity 264 checklist.
2. Alignment and Grade Review Report (electronic WORD format) with cost estimate (PDF).
3. Include Deliverables for Act 700 (refer to Activity 700 for description).

### **ACTIVITY 183 Site Investigation for Hazardous Materials**

#### **ASSUMPTIONS:**

1. This will be required due to the bridge expansion.

2. Permits will be necessary.

**TASKS:**

1. Preliminary site investigation.
2. Perform asbestos inspections.
3. Prepare special provisions.
4. Permits as needed.

**DELIVERABLES:**

1. Preliminary Site Investigation (PSI) report or Asbestos Inspection report, including description of impacts to highway right-of-way and construction project, and recommendations for avoidance or minimization of impacts. A Detailed Site Investigation (DSI) report or asbestos abatement may be necessary, dependent upon the finding of the PSI and asbestos inspection report.
2. Special provisions to be included in contract plans.
3. Any applicable permits.

**ACTIVITY 127 Place Existing RW & Section Lines****ASSUMPTIONS:**

1. Right-of-way will be needed on the project.

**TASKS:**

1. Finalize R/W and Cadastral Retracement Survey(s).
2. Secure recorded full size existing R/W and Cadastral Retracement Survey(s), complete full-size set of C.O.S.'s and Subdivision Plats, existing highway R/W Plans with deeds and other documentation, existing public road documentation, copies of GLO Plats, and copies of Corner Recordation's.
3. Prepare R/W files to include existing highway and intersecting public road R/W, ownership dots and property lines, section lines, 1/16 section lines, property controlling corner cells, and existing access control.

**DELIVERABLES:**

1. Recorded copy of Existing R/W and Cadastral Retracement Survey(s) (including survey coordinate list and descriptions) (electronic).
2. Complete Set of C.O.S.'s and Subdivision Plats (electronic).
3. Existing Railroad & Highway R/W Plans (electronic) with Deeds and Other Documentation.
4. Existing Public Road Documentation (including intersecting roads to project roadway).
5. Copies of GLO Plats (electronic).
6. Copies of Corner Recordation's.
7. R/W Strip Map.
8. Completed MDT review activity 871 checklist.

**ACTIVITY 128 Prepare Scope of Work****ASSUMPTIONS:**

1. Design exceptions are not anticipated.

**TASK:**

1. Write Scope of Work Report.
2. Prepare cost estimate.

**DELIVERABLES:**

1. Completed MDT review activity 266 checklist.
2. Scope of Work Report (electronic WORD format) with cost estimate (PDF).



April 21, 2026

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

Reference: US-191/MT-64 Intersection Control Evaluation – Conclusions and Recommendations – Project 22338

Dear Joe:

This memorandum summarizes the findings from the intersection control evaluation (ICE) conducted at the intersection of US-191 and MT-64. This includes the traffic volumes assessment, sensitivity analysis, Tier 1 and Tier 2 operational evaluations, and intersection control recommendations.

### **Executive Summary**

Existing and future traffic conditions were evaluated to assess projected growth in the Big Sky area and identify potential impacts to operations at the US-191/MT-64 intersection and along the MT-64 corridor. Existing conditions operational results show that the corridor currently accommodates peak travel demand with manageable delay, although operations are highly sensitive to seasonal variation and directional imbalance. Long-range traffic projections indicate that corridor volumes are expected to more than double as residential and lodging development along MT-64 continues to build out. These increases will place increased strain on both corridor throughput and intersection performance.

Sensitivity analysis using deterministic and microsimulation methods confirms that MT-64 functions as a capacity-constrained corridor where limited cross-section, closely spaced intersections, and directional commuter patterns interact to govern performance. Queue spillback between intersections occurs even under existing volumes during peak periods, particularly near Little Coyote Road, and becomes the dominant driver of future operational degradation. As a result, intersection operations cannot be evaluated in isolation without accounting for upstream and downstream constraints. Maintaining existing corridor geometrics for all evaluative tiers provides a conservative and realistic understanding of how intersection improvements would function if implemented independently of corridor widening.

The Tier 1 analysis focused on the US-191/MT-64 intersection and evaluated a no build signalized alternative, a build signalized alternative, a continuous flow intersection (CFI), a median U-turn (MUT) configuration, and a multilane roundabout using 10-year and 20-year future traffic volumes. A description of the lane configuration and traffic control considered for each alternative is provided below:

- Multilane roundabout
  - Hybrid configuration with two circulating lanes on the south and east sides and one circulating lane on the north and west sides
  - Southbound and eastbound right-turn slip lanes
  - Two eastbound and northbound entry lanes
- Signalized intersection
  - Dual eastbound left-turn lanes
  - Southbound right-turn lane
  - Northbound left-turn lane
- CFI
  - Dual eastbound left-turn lanes which cross over westbound traffic (northbound left-turning vehicles) on MT-64, west of the US-191/MT-64 intersection
  - Southbound right-turn lane
  - Northbound left-turn lane
- MUT
  - Dual eastbound left-turn lanes
  - Southbound right-turn lane
  - Signalized U-turn location adjacent to developments north of the US-191/MT-64 intersection

This analysis demonstrated that the MUT alternative is not well suited to this location due to geometric constraints near the Gallatin River bridge, increased travel time due to extensive diversion of route for northbound left-turning vehicles, and insufficient gaps for northbound left-turns to cross southbound approach volumes under future volumes. The signalized, CFI, and roundabout alternatives exhibited improved operational performance and were selected to advance to Tier 2 analysis.

Tier 2 analysis expanded upon the Tier 1 findings by evaluating the remaining alternatives within a corridor context and applying a multi-criteria design framework that considered operational performance, safety, constructability, right-of-way impacts, long-term adaptability, and consistency with the surrounding transportation system. Microsimulation results illustrate that as traffic volumes

increase, the ability of an alternative to process peak directional demand without being impacted by spillback from downstream intersections becomes increasingly critical. The evaluation confirms that intersection control form alone cannot resolve corridor-wide limitations but can meaningfully influence resiliency and operational stability.

## **Tier 2 Design Matrix**

Building upon the framework established in the Tier 1 analysis, the Tier 2 evaluation provides a more detailed assessment of each design alternative using the established design decision criteria. This analysis focuses specifically on targeted improvements that will enhance safety, operational efficiency, and multimodal functionality at the US-191/MT-64 intersection. The goal is to determine the most effective intersection control strategies to accommodate projected traffic growth while aligning with community goals and engineering standards. The design decision matrix is included on page six.

### *Safety Performance*

A safety analysis was performed for the above alternatives using the Safety Performance for Intersection Control Evaluation (SPICE) Tool, Version 1.4. The crash prediction methodology evaluates factors such as number of lanes and signal phasing for signalized intersections but does not have the capability to evaluate roundabout configurations with a varying number of lanes throughout the roundabout. However, SPICE analysis does show that a two-lane roundabout is predicted to have a lower crash frequency than a signalized intersection, for both total crashes and fatal/injury crashes.

The methodology also does not provide crash prediction rates for CFIs but does provide a rate for a displaced left-turn (DLT) intersection, which is similar. The crash frequency prediction for a DLT at US-191/MT-64 was lower than for a signalized intersection but higher than a two-lane roundabout.

The roundabout alternative is projected to offer the most safety benefits due to reduced conflict points and lower operating speeds. While the CFI at US-191/MT-64 also improves safety by eliminating 90-degree left turns, roundabouts generally result in fewer severe crashes compared to intersections with any form of signalized control.

### *Operational Performance*

The multilane roundabout alternative at the US-191/MT-64 intersection is projected to provide the best operational performance, maintaining LOS A during the PM peak hour under the Future (10-Year), Future (14-Year), and Future (20-Year) volume scenarios with minimal to moderate queueing. During the AM peak hour, the roundabout is projected to operate with the lowest delay and shortest queues compared to the signalized and CFI alternatives. Under Future (20-Year) AM peak hour volumes, the roundabout is projected to operate at LOS F with queues of up to 172 vehicles in the southbound right-turn lane. However, this condition is a result of corridor constraints and upstream queueing from the Little Coyote Road/MT-64 intersection that extends east to the US-191/MT-64 intersection. Until improvements are implemented at the Little Coyote Road/MT-64 intersection to mitigate these extensive westbound AM peak hour queues, queue management through signal timing adjustments at Little Coyote Road would be expected to improve operations at the US-191/MT-64 intersection.

The CFI alternative is projected to provide the next best operational performance under future traffic volumes. Details on the operational results for the three alternatives and future volume scenarios are included in the design decision matrix.

### *Initial Construction Cost*

A roundabout at the US-191/MT-64 intersection would require full reconstruction and realignment, with increased costs due to terrain and footprint. Installation of a CFI would result in comparatively moderate costs due to additional median footprint and signal infrastructure. Also, the additional auxiliary lanes proposed for the traditional signalized intersection alternative would require further pavement expansion, contributing to overall project costs.

### *Operations & Maintenance Costs*

Roundabouts generally offer lower long-term maintenance costs due to the absence of electrical systems and reduced wear from stop-and-go traffic. A roundabout at the US-191/MT-64 intersection would reduce the need for ongoing signal maintenance and simplify seasonal operations, while still maintaining access to the adjacent businesses. The signalized alternative would require regular servicing of signal equipment, coordination systems, and pedestrian infrastructure. The CFI alternative at US-191/MT-64 would introduce a more complex signal network and increase maintenance demands but may offset some costs through improved traffic flow and

reduced congestion-related wear. The CFI may also restrict access to the businesses north of the intersection along US-191.

#### *Environmental, Utility and Right-of-Way Impacts*

A roundabout would have the most right-of-way impact due to projected footprint of a multilane roundabout. Since the intersection is currently signalized, the signalized alternative would only introduce impacts associated with widening the approaches for the proposed auxiliary turn lanes and potential utility relocation. The CFI alternative would have moderate right-of-way and utility relocation needs.

#### *Multi-Modal Considerations*

Roundabouts enhance pedestrian safety through staged crossings and slower vehicle speeds. The CFI may present challenges for pedestrian and bicycle movements due to complex geometry but can be mitigated with refuge islands and coordinated signals. The signalized intersection alternative would provide actuated crossings but may increase pedestrian conflict points with turning vehicles and increase crossing distances due to the introduction of additional turn lanes.

#### *Consistency with Current Plans*

Signalized intersections align with existing infrastructure and driver familiarity. Roundabouts, though less common in Big Sky, are being increasingly adopted regionally and offer long-term benefits. The CFI is a new concept for Montana but aligns with MDT's goals for innovative congestion management.

Decision-Making Criteria	US-191 & MT-64 Intersection Control Alternatives		
	Signalized	Continuous Flow Intersection	Multilane Roundabout
<b>Safety Performance</b>	Higher speed collisions are more likely with a signal than a roundabout, and right-angle collisions are still a possibility. Crashes will continue to increase as total volumes increase.	Eliminates 90-degree left turns and reduces conflict points. May reduce safety for pedestrians due to complexity, increased conflict points, and potentially higher vehicle speeds.	Roundabouts encourage lower speeds and have fewer conflict points compared to a signal. There is an anticipated reduction in intersection-related crashes and crash severity compared to the signal alternative.
<b>Operational Performance</b>	<p>Future (10-year) intersection capacity analysis estimates LOS F during the AM peak hour with a maximum queue of 230 vehicles in the SB right-turn lane. During the PM peak hour, the intersection is projected to operate at LOS C or better.</p> <p>Future (14-Year) analysis projects LOS F and E for the AM and PM peak hours, respectively. During the AM peak hour, both SB lanes are projected to operate with severe delay and maximum queues up to 230 vehicles in the right-turn lane. During the PM peak hour, the EB approach is projected to operate at LOS E with queues over 200 vehicles.</p> <p>Future (20-Year) analysis results are very similar to the Future (14-Year) results. During the PM peak hour, the EB approach is projected to operate at LOS F with queues up to 260 vehicles.</p>	<p>Future (10-year) intersection capacity analysis estimates LOS C or better during both peak hours, with a maximum queue of 34 vehicles on the SB approach during the AM peak hour.</p> <p>Future (14-Year) analysis projects LOS E for the MT-64/US-191 intersection during the AM peak hour, with maximum queues up to 191 vehicles in the SB right-turn lane. The CFI crossover is projected to operate at LOS C during both peak hours with minimal queueing.</p> <p>Future (20-Year) analysis projects LOS F and D for the MT-64/US-191 intersection and CFI crossover, respectively, for the AM peak hour with severe queues. During the PM peak hour, this CFI is projected to operate at LOS C or better at both nodes, with moderate maximum queues.</p>	<p>Future (10-year) intersection capacity analysis estimates LOS A during both peak hours for the intersection, with a maximum queue of 24 vehicles on the EB approach during the PM peak hour.</p> <p>Future (14-Year) analysis projects LOS E during the AM peak hour with queues up to 145 vehicles in the SB right-turn lane. During the PM peak hour, all approaches are projected to operate at LOS A.</p> <p>Future (20-Year) analysis projects LOS F during the AM peak hour with queues up to 172 vehicles in the SB right-turn lane. During the PM peak hour, the intersection is projected to operate at LOS B or better on all approaches with minimal to moderate queues.</p>
<b>Initial Construction Cost</b>	Minimal. Improving the existing signal will require minor widening along MT-64 and signal/striping/signing modifications.	The continuous flow alternative may require roadway widening along the major legs.	The roundabout alternative will require modifications to the entire intersection, some realignment of existing roadways, and transition sections.
<b>Operations &amp; Maintenance Cost</b>	The signal alternative will require ongoing electrical maintenance, power, and signal timing updates. Access to the businesses north of the intersection would remain the same.	Regular maintenance of the signal systems, sensors, and other components is necessary to ensure optimal performance. Access to the businesses north of the intersection may need to be greatly altered.	Intersection lighting will require general maintenance and power, but cost should be less than a signal. Access to the businesses north of the intersection would remain the same.
<b>Environmental, Utility and R/W Impacts</b>	Increased delay will produce higher carbon emissions. R/W impacts for dual eastbound left-turn lanes.	Lower emissions than a traditional signal. More R/W impacts for displaced left turns. Utility relocation is required.	High impacts to land on the west side due to river to the east. R/W impact is greater than a signal, requires sizeable acquisition on several corners. Lower emissions.
<b>Multimodal Accommodations</b>	Signalized crossing on the west leg. Increased conflict points and crossing distances for pedestrians.	Painted crosswalks on all legs and slip-lanes. Refuge islands are proposed.	Yield control crossing on west leg and median refuge. Lower speeds and fewer conflict points for pedestrians with the ability to focus on crossing one direction of traffic at a time.

Figure 1: US-191/MT-64 Design Decision Matrix

Mr. Joe Zody  
April 21, 2026  
Page 7

### **Recommended Improvements**

Based on the results of the Tier 1 and Tier 2 Intersection Control Evaluation, the multilane roundabout alternative is recommended as the preferred intersection control strategy at the US-191/MT-64 intersection based on the Future (10-Year), Future (14-Year), and Future (20-Year) planning horizons. This alternative provides the most balanced solution when considering operational performance, safety, long-term resiliency, and corridor constraints.

The roundabout is projected to maintain LOS A during the PM peak hour across all future scenarios and to provide the lowest overall delay and queuing during the AM peak hour relative to the signalized and CFI alternatives. Projected AM peak hour LOS F conditions under the Future (20-Year) scenario are attributable to upstream corridor constraints and queue spillback from the Little Coyote Road/MT-64 intersection, rather than deficiencies at the US-191/MT-64 intersection. The roundabout demonstrates increased operational stability under constrained corridor conditions and provides notable safety benefits through reduced conflict points and lower operating speeds. While the alternative requires greater initial investment and right-of-way, reduced long-term maintenance needs support its selection. Coordination with corridor-level queue management and future improvements at the Little Coyote Road/MT-64 intersection is recommended to further enhance corridor performance.

If you have any questions about this assessment, or if additional analysis is required, please feel free to contact me at 406.922.4306 or [jstaszczuk@sanbell.com](mailto:jstaszczuk@sanbell.com).

Sincerely,



Joey Staszczuk, PE, PTOE, RSP1  
Associate Principal | Community Transportation Studio Manager

SJW/PJF

