

*Texas Department of Transportation
Environmental Affairs Division*

**Standards of Uniformity for
Technical Reports**

**Review Standards for
Archeological Impact Evaluations**

Review Standards for Archeological Impact Evaluations

CSJ _____ Hwy _____ Contract/WA# _____

Contractor _____ QC Reviewer _____

Author/Affiliation _____ ENV Reviewer _____

Page	Section	Sentence	Criteria	Issues: Not Applicable / None / Editorial or minor / Substantive / Critical	How addressed (or why not addressed)	New Page	QC check
			Project Description				
1			Report includes Hwy/limits, Counties, CSJ(s), and District(s)				
2			Report includes a map of the area investigated on a USGS 7.5' Quadrangle or equivalent if 7.5' Quad unavailable. Map is included as a separate attachment.				
3			The project description clearly identifies the project type and any associated elements.				
4			The area of potential effects (APE) is defined to encompass the limits of the existing right of way; proposed, new project right of way; permanent and temporary easements; utility relocations; and project-specific locations designated by TxDOT. The APE is defined in three dimensions, including the project limits, width, acreage, and depth of impacts. The description of the APE identifies the maximum depth of impacts from the project, referring to project plans or to typical impacts for this class of project. Note: the APE encompasses the entirety of the project area, regardless of the extent of prior archeological investigations, the particular locations subject to field investigations, or the portion of a project added through a design change.				
5			The project description notes whether the project includes any new right of way, easements (temporary or permanent), or project-specific locations; describes the location of any such features; and quantifies their area				
6			Clearly reproducible layouts are attached; layouts show the existing and proposed right of way boundaries and easements.				
7			Clearly reproducible profiles are attached.				
8			Clearly reproducible typical sections are attached.				
			Background Information				
9			Report includes description of topography, soils, and geology.				

Review Standards for Archeological Impact Evaluations

			Report references soil survey maps and geological maps for the entire area surveyed or indicates that none are published for the area surveyed.				
10			Report includes estimate of surface visibility, description of land use, and general description of vegetation in and adjacent to the area surveyed.				
11			Report includes discussion of previous work and sites within one kilometer of the area surveyed with explicit reference to review of TARL files, THC or Historic Sites Atlas maps, and explicitly indicates trinomials of sites or absence of sites within one kilometer. The study also includes a map of unevaluated archeological sites, ineligible properties, and historic properties in and adjacent to the APE.				
12			Report includes discussion of how the project setting, as detailed in criteria 9-11, affect the likelihood of intact, buried deposits being present.				
			Methods				
13			Report documents methods used, including whether any subsurface probes were excavated to characterize the potential integrity of the deposits within the APE. Report discloses any variability in methods used within the project's APE.				
			Results				
14			Report documents conditions that affect the integrity of the deposits within the area surveyed and describes how these conditions would affect the integrity of archeological sites, regardless of whether any sites were identified within the APE. As applicable, report states that no conditions exist to compromise integrity. Evaluation of potential site integrity explicitly considers the aspects of integrity presented in 36 CFR 60.4. Typically, the integrity of archeological sites is characterized by their integrity of location, design, materials, and association.				
15			Report explicitly documents whether any newly-recorded archeological sites occur within or adjacent to the APE.				
16			Within the constraints of an Impact Evaluation, report explicitly evaluates each site's eligibility for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) or for designation as a State Archeological Landmark (SAL), or explicitly states that additional work is necessary to make a determination.				
17			Evaluation of each site in the APE refers to conditions affecting the integrity of the site constituents, including the possibility that no conditions compromise integrity. Evaluation of site integrity explicitly considers the aspects of integrity presented in 36 CFR				

Review Standards for Archeological Impact Evaluations

			60.4. Typically, the integrity of archeological sites is characterized by their integrity of location, design, materials, and association.				
18			The report supports its conclusions with attached photographs, survey forms, and field note copies.				
19			Finding or findings explicitly refer(s) to relevant sections of 36 CFR 800, 36 CFR 60, and 13 TAC 26.				
20			Recommendations for further work are explicitly expressed and justified, including the necessary level of effort and locations within the APE that require such work. If portions of the APE were inaccessible, the report makes explicit recommendations regarding the need for further work in those areas based on the results of the background research, field results in adjacent areas, and observations on the inaccessible areas made from adjacent, accessible areas, (Reviewer comments required if "Critical." TxDOT reserves the right to deviate from reported recommendations for additional work.)				
			ENV Reviewer Conclusions/Additional Issues				
21			Report contains no factual errors or omissions affecting the finding(s). (Reviewer comments required if "Critical")				
22			Report violates no regulatory requirement(s). (Reviewer comments required if "Critical").				
			Additional Comments				
23							
24							
25							
26							
27							
28							

Review Standards for Archeological Impact Evaluations

Signature of QC Officer _____

Printed Name _____ **Date** _____

ENV Staff Reviewer Signature _____ **Date** _____

Version History

2.0 - Revised format to comment-response matrix

3.0 - Clarified the area of potential effects (APE) definition (item 4); noted that easements included both permanent and temporary easements (item 5); required disclosure of any variability in methods within the APE (item 13); included requirement that report doesn't violate any regulatory requirement not otherwise specified (item 22); made additional format changes.