Where is the study located?
The study area includes the portion of I-90 from Big Timber to Columbus in addition to the segment of I-94 from Billings to Miles City. Existing rest area locations assessed within these boundaries include the eastbound (EB) and westbound (WB) Greycliff, Custer, Hysham, and Hathaway rest area locations. The study area, existing rest area locations, and proposed rest area locations are illustrated in the figure below.

How do I stay involved in this study?
Public participation is an important part of the study process. You are welcome to review the Public Review Draft Document and submit comments.

Project Team
Montana Department of Transportation:
- Lynn Zanto
- Paul Johnson
- Stefan Streeter
- Paul Johnson
- Jean Riley
- Rod Nelson
DOWL HKM:
- Sarah Nicolai
- Jessica Salo
- Phil Odegard

Purpose of Tonight’s Meeting
The project team will describe the study process, discuss the study findings, and present the study recommendations regarding rehabilitation of existing rest area sites. Additionally, the project team will discuss the proposed Fort Keogh rest area. We will be requesting public feedback on the study recommendations.

Document Viewing Locations
Copies of the Public Review Draft I-94 Rest Area Corridor Study are available at the following locations:
- Miles City Public Library (One South 10th St.)
- Miles Community College Library (2715 Dickinson Street)
- MDT Glendive District Office (503 N River Ave)
- MDT Helena Headquarters Office (2701 Prospect Ave)
- Call MDT Glendive District at (406) 345-8200 for a CD

Submit Comments
Comments may be submitted during the public meeting. Additionally, written comments may be submitted as follows:
- Mail to Sheila Ludlow, MDT, PO Box 201001, Helena, MT 59620-1001
- Email to sludlow@mt.gov
- Submit comments online at www.mdt.mt.gov/pubinvolve/i94restarea

Please indicate comments are for the I-94 Rest Area Corridor Study.

Comments received by September 25, 2009 will be considered in the final study report.
Your input is important!
## Summary of Existing Rest Areas Assessment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Greycliff</th>
<th>Custer</th>
<th>Hysham</th>
<th>Hathaway</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size of Building Facility</strong></td>
<td>Existing buildings are undersized to meet current and future demand. Five additional women’s stalls and two additional men’s stalls would be needed at each site in 2027.</td>
<td>Existing buildings are adequate to meet current and future demand.</td>
<td>Existing buildings are adequate to meet current and future demand.</td>
<td>An additional women’s stall would be needed at each site in order to meet future demand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Size of Parking Facility</strong></td>
<td>Existing parking areas are undersized to meet current and future demand. Thirteen to 15 additional truck parking spots and 42 additional auto parking spots would be needed at each site in 2027.</td>
<td>Existing parking areas are undersized to meet future demand. One additional truck parking spot and three to seven additional auto parking spots would be needed at each site in 2027.</td>
<td>Existing parking areas are undersized to meet future demand. Four additional truck parking spots and eight to nine additional auto parking spots would be needed at each site in 2027.</td>
<td>Existing parking areas are undersized to meet future demand. Two additional truck parking spots and 10 to 12 additional auto parking spots would be needed at each site in 2027.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spacing</strong></td>
<td>Spacing is appropriate.</td>
<td>Spacing is appropriate.</td>
<td>The Hathaway rest area is excessively close (approximately 25 miles) to the nearest rest area to the west (Custer).</td>
<td>Spacing is appropriate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Water Facilities</strong></td>
<td>Wells have adequate capacity to meet projected 2027 demand.</td>
<td>Wells have adequate capacity to meet projected 2027 demand.</td>
<td>Wells do not have adequate capacity to meet projected 2027 demand.</td>
<td>There are current supply issues at the Hathaway site. Because the disinfection process wastes some water, irrigation is not possible at certain periods during the summer.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sewer Facilities</strong></td>
<td>Existing septic tanks and drainfields are undersized to meet current and 2027 demand.</td>
<td>Existing drainfields are undersized to meet 2027 demand.</td>
<td>Existing septic tanks and drainfields are undersized to meet 2027 demand.</td>
<td>Existing septic tanks are undersized to meet 2027 demand.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Power Facilities</strong></td>
<td>Approximately one additional acre needed to meet 2027 demand for parking.</td>
<td>Approximately two additional acres would be needed to meet 2027 demand for the combined wastewater system.</td>
<td>No additional right-of-way would be needed.</td>
<td>No additional right-of-way would be needed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Right-of-Way</strong></td>
<td>Consider major rehabilitation of EB and WB sites, including new building facilities, new parking areas and amenities, new drainfield, and new advanced wastewater treatment systems. Consider construction of single combined wastewater system at WB site.</td>
<td>Rehabilitate existing EB and WB sites; consider new advanced wastewater treatment systems; convert sites to year round use.</td>
<td>Convert existing rest area to truck parking location; demolish existing facilities and install vault toilets.</td>
<td>Rehabilitate existing water system; consider new advanced wastewater treatment systems; convert sites to year round use.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recommendation</strong></td>
<td>Improvements are needed in the near term to address rest area’s failure to meet current demand.</td>
<td>Improvements should be targeted over the 20-year planning horizon as funding becomes available.</td>
<td>Near-term conversion could be accomplished at a relatively low cost and would provide immediate savings in maintenance and operation time and costs.</td>
<td>Improvements to the water supply system are needed in the near term. Other improvements at the site could be targeted over the 20-year planning horizon as funding becomes available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Urgency of Rehabilitation</strong></td>
<td>$3.5 million***</td>
<td>$4 million***</td>
<td>$800,000</td>
<td>$700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Ranking Score</strong></td>
<td>102</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Approximate Cost</strong> (Multi-Phase)</td>
<td>$200,000****</td>
<td>$200,000****</td>
<td>$1.1 million</td>
<td>$1.1 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Dark orange cells indicate failure to meet current demand or spacing guidelines; light orange cells indicate failure to meet future demand.

*More stringent water quality rules may apply in the future.
**Total possible score is 136. A higher total score indicates a better candidate for rehabilitation due to a more suitable site and a greater need for improvements.
***Assumes use of prefabricated building facility. Rehabilitation using site-built facility would cost approximately $6 million.
****Assumes conversion to truck parking location. Rehabilitation of Hysham rest area would cost approximately $1 million.

### Fort Keogh Proposal

The Hathaway rest area is currently spaced approximately one hour of driving time from the nearest rest areas to the east on I-94 and on US 12. Construction of the Fort Keogh rest area near Miles City would reduce the distance from Hathaway to the next rest area to the east to only 25 miles. This distance is excessively close and would represent an unnecessary allocation of MDT resources. If the Hathaway rest area is rehabilitated as recommended in the study, there would be no need to construct the new Fort Keogh rest area from a spacing perspective. Further, a new rest area would require acquisition of right-of-way for an entirely new site, as well as construction of entirely new facilities. In contrast, the rehabilitation recommended at Hathaway could utilize existing right-of-way, the existing building facility, existing entrance and exit ramps, and most of the existing parking areas, sidewalks, and amenities at the site. For these reasons, construction of a new rest area at Keogh is not recommended.