

## US 2 - Badrock Canyon <br> Corridor Planning Study <br> Informational Meeting

Tuesday,<br>April 10, 2012<br>U.S. Forest Service<br>Hungry Horse Ranger District Office<br>10 Hungry Horse Drive<br>Hungry Horse, MT



## Welcome \& Introductions



## Purpose of Meeting



- Summarize MDT's Previous Efforts in Corridor
- Provide Overview of Corridor Planning Study Process
- Present Key Findings
© Draft Existing and Projected Conditions Report
© Draft Environmental Scan Report
- Present Draft Preliminary Improvement Options
- Solicit Input


## MDT's Previous Efforts




2011: Phase I - Informational Meeting

## Corridor Planning Process



- Involves conducting a review of safety, operational, and geometric conditions and environmental resources to identify needs and constraints.
- This process allows MDT to:
© Identify realistic strategies given funding or other constraints
- Identify fatal flaws before initiation of formal environmental process for any future project forwarded from study
© Eliminate alignments and/or improvement options from further evaluation


## Goals and Purpose

Corridor Planning Study


O Engage constituents early
O Identify needs and objectives
O Identify constraints
O Identify short-range and long-range improvements

- Develop planning-level cost estimates
- Develop information and data to be forwarded into the environmental process if a project moves forward from the study


## Study Area




# Key Findings <br> Existing and Projected Conditions Report 



## Existing Physical Features



- South Fork Flathead River Bridge
© Functionally obsolete and structurally deficient
- Utilities
© Gas, fiber optics, and power transmission lines

- Pedestrian \& Bicycle Facilities
- No dedicated facilities in corridor
- Physical Constraints
© US 2 is located between Flathead River and rock outcroppings


DロWL HKM

## Existing Physical Features



## Existing Geometric Features



O Horizontal Alignment
© Nine (9) horizontal curves do not meet current MDT design standards

O Vertical Alignment
© Six (6) vertical curves do not meet current MDT design standards

## Existing Geometric Features



## Crash Statistics



| Statewide <br> Average for Rural <br> Principal <br> Arterials <br> (NINHS) <br> $(2006-2010)$ | US 2 Corridor <br> RP 140.0-142.4 <br> (NINHS) <br> $(2006-2010)$ | Comparison of <br> US 2 Corridor <br> to Statewide <br> Average <br> (NINHS) |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Crash Rate <br> (All Vehicles) | 1.04 | 2.56 | $\mathbf{2 . 4 6}$ times <br> higher |
| Severity Index <br> (All Vehicles) | 2.09 | 2.68 | $\mathbf{1 . 2 8}$ times <br> higher |
| Severity Rate <br> (All Vehicles) | 2.18 | 6.86 | $\mathbf{3 . 1 5}$ times <br> higher |

## Crash Statistics



## 2010 Traffic Volumes






## Operations



Acceptable operations for a principal arterial facility in rolling terrain is LOS B


| Analysis Period | 2011 |  |  | 2035 |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | AM <br> Peak <br> Hour | Median OffPeak Hour | PM <br> Peak <br> Hour | AM <br> Peak <br> Hour | Median OffPeak Hour | PM <br> Peak <br> Hour |
|  | LOS | LOS | LOS | LOS | LOS | LOS |
| Peak Season | D | D | D | D | D | E |
| Annual Average | C | C | D | C | C | D |

 <br> \section*{\title{
Key Findings <br> \section*{\title{
Key Findings Environmental Scan Environmental Scan <br> <br> <br> Report
}} <br> <br> <br> Report
}}


## Land Ownership



## Floodplains



## Wildlife Issues



O Critical Habitat

O Wildlife Movement Areas

- Animal-Vehicle Conflicts



## Recreational Resources



## Cultural and Archaeological Resources



## Needs and Objectives



- Need 1: Improve the safety and operation of the US 2 roadway facility within the study area for all users, where practicable.
© Objectives: roadway elements; South Fork Flathead River Bridge; guardrail; signing; drainage; operations; non-motorized usage

- Need 2: Minimize adverse impacts from improvements to the environmental, historic, cultural, scenic and recreational characteristics of the corridor.
○ Objectives: Flathead River; fisheries; historic, cultural, and archaeological resources; scenic resources; recreational sites; wild animals.

- Other issues to be considered:
- Utilities, construction feasibility, funding



# Draft Preliminary Improvement Options 

- Alignments
- Lane Configurations
- Spot Improvements


## Alignment Option 1 Existing Alignment



## Alignment Option 2 Optimized Existing Alignment



## Alignment Option 3 Optimized Existing Alignment with Tunnel



## Alignment Option 4 North of US 2 - Partial Canyon Bypass



## Alignment Option 5 North of US 2 - Full Canyon Bypass



## Alignment Option 6 South of US 2




## Improvements for Alignments 1 \& 2



## US 2



Typical Section 1: Standard Two-Lane


US 2


Typical Section 2: Standard Two-Lane with Center Turn Lane

US 2


Typical Section 3: Standard Four-Lane

US 2


Typical Section 4: Standard Four-Lane with Center Median


Typical Section 6: Two-Lane Cantilever with Center Turn Lane



Typical Section 7: Four-Lane Cantilever


Typical Section 8: Four-Lane Cantilever with Median


Typical Section 5:
Two-Lane Cantilever



Typical Section 9: Two-Lane Elevated Structure


Typical Section 12: Four-Lane Elevated Structure / Cantilever Combination


Typical Section 11: Four-Lane Elevated Structure with Median


Typical Section 10: Four-Lane Elevated Structure

## US 2



Typical Section 1: Standard Two-Lane

## US 2



Typical Section 3: Standard Four-Lane


Figures illustrate planning concepts (not engineering designs)
US 2


## US 2

SHOULDER TRAVEL LANE TRAVEL LANE SHOULDER


Typical Section 1: Standard Two-Lane

## US 2



Typical Section 3: Standard Four-Lane


Figures illustrate planning concepts (not engineering designs)

## US 2

SHOULDER TRAVEL LANE LEFT-TURN LANE TRAVEL LANE SHOULDER

Typical Section 2: Standard Two-Lane with Center Turn Lane

US 2


Typical Section 4: Standard Four-Lane with Center Median

## Next Steps - Phase II



## Please Submit Comments!



- Mail comments to:

Sheila Ludlow, MDT Project Manager Montana Department of Transportation
2701 Prospect Avenue
PO Box 201001
Helena, MT 59620-1001


- Questions:

Sarah Nicolai, DOWL HKM Project Manager 406.442.0370
snicolai@dowlhkm.com

## Visit the website at:

http://www.mdt.mt.gov/pubinvolve/badrock/default.shtml

