

Texas Department of Transportation
Environmental Affairs Division

**Standards of Uniformity for
Programmatic Categorical Exclusions**

[Most recent revisions 12/31/2010](#)

List of Sections

Chapter 1. Questions and Answers About SOUs

Chapter 2. Documentation Format, No Added Capacity

PCE Determination Form

Chapter 3. Documentation Format, Added Capacity

PCE Determination Form

Chapter 4. Transportation Planning Consistency and Fiscal Constraint

Chapter 5. Socioeconomic Resources, No Added Capacity

Chapter 6. Socioeconomic Resources, Added Capacity

Chapter 7. Historical Studies

Section 1. Project Coordination Request

Section 2. NEPA Language

Section 3. Windshield Survey of Non-Archeological Historic-Age Resource Review Checklist

Section 4. Non-Archeological Historic-Age Resource Research Designs Review Checklist

Section 5. Non-Archeological Historic-Age Resource Reconnaissance Survey Reports Review Checklist

Section 6. Non-Archeological Historic-Age Resource Intensive Survey Reports Review Checklist

Section 7. Discussion of Effects on Non-Archeological Historic Resources as Components of HRSRs and NEPA Documents Review Checklist

Chapter 8. Archeological Resources

Section 1. Standards of Uniformity for Archeological Resources

Section 2. Standards of Uniformity for Coordination Requests Regarding Archeological Resources

Section 3. Certification Standards for Projects that Do Not Require Project-Specific Review

Section 4. Background Study

Section 5. Individual Antiquities Permit Applications

Section 6. Review Standards for Archeological Survey Reports, Individual Permit

Section 7. Review Standards for Impact Evaluations

Chapter 9. Water Resources

Chapter 10. Traffic Noise

Chapter 11. Hazardous Materials Initial Site Assessment

Chapter 12. Biological Resources

Chapter 13. Air Quality

Chapter 14. Public Involvement

Chapter 15. Tolling

List of Revisions

*Texas Department of Transportation
Environmental Affairs Division*

**Standards of Uniformity for
Programmatic Categorical Exclusions**

Chapter 1.

**Questions and Answers
About SOUs**

Chapter 1. Questions and Answers About SOUs

1. What is a Standard of Uniformity (SOU)?

An SOU defines the state and/or federal minimum requirements for each element of a work product. Its purpose is to speed approval and avoid or minimize repetition or unnecessary revisions of work. (In this context, “work products” also include supporting items in project files.)

An SOU offers the user an established approach to the work product, to satisfy legal, scientific and other matters relevant to the environmental review and public involvement process. Alternative solutions to an SOU may be used, but cannot be guaranteed in advance to be acceptable, even if they are free of errors.

2. What are the goals of the SOUs?

- Getting producers and reviewers on the same page
- Defining performance standards for various environmental and public involvement tasks
- Defining standards for documentation/disclosure
- Developing project information and coordination early for successful outcomes
- Reducing preventable do-overs
- Increasing consultant, district, and ENV accountability
- Providing a baseline for the related Quality Assurance (QA)/Quality Control (QC) and subsequent environmental compliance reviews of SOU use.

3. Can ENV guarantee that the SOU will always work?

No. An SOU cannot prevent errors of fact or method. Also, ENV will modify these SOUs to reflect lessons learned as they are put to use and to address problems identified during the QA/QC process and environmental compliance reviews. Over time, SOUs will be modified to adapt to new or changing expectations from resource agencies, FHWA, and the public.

4. Who will be trained to use SOUs?

ENV, district staff, and Regional Environmental Center personnel have been trained on the use of SOUs. Updated training may be necessary at a later date. Training will expand later to include consultants, Regional Mobility Authorities (RMAs), local governments, and developers, as needed.

5. Will ENV develop SOUs beyond those needed for PCEs?

Yes. ENV plans to develop Standards of Uniformity for the development of environmental assessments, environmental impact statements, section 4(f) evaluations and re-evaluations. Some of the SOUs apply to all types of NEPA classification and regulatory issues.

Chapter 1. Questions and Answers About SOUs

6. Does ENV intend to review how well the SOUs are working?

Yes. Project reviews will be conducted on a certain percentage of work products. ENV will meet periodically with the resource/regulatory agencies and FHWA to gauge how well the SOUs are working and make necessary adjustments as they are identified. ENV conducted a customer service survey in July 2009 for Districts and RECs, which included SOU quality. The results of this survey informed the latest revisions of the SOUs.

*Texas Department of Transportation
Environmental Affairs Division*

**Standards of Uniformity for
Programmatic Categorical Exclusions**

Chapter 2.

Documentation Format, No Added Capacity

Chapter 2. Documentation Format, No Added Capacity

This Standard of Uniformity (SOU) establishes the appropriate format and content of documentation for Programmatic Categorical Exclusions(s) (PCE) related to projects with no added capacity. This format is based on pages 3-12 of [TxDOT's Environmental Manual](#).

The PCE document is composed of:

- 1) Cover Sheet
- 2) Proposed Action
- 3) Surrounding Area
- 4) Specific Areas of Environmental Concern
- 5) Permits/Commitments
- 6) Public Involvement
- 7) Exhibits / Figures / Coordination
- 8) PCE Determination

1. Cover Sheet

- A. Title (Programmatic Categorical Exclusion)
- B. Roadway/Limits
- C. County
- D. CSJ
- E. Federal Highway Administration & Texas Department of Transportation
- F. Month/Year

2. Proposed Action

- A. Describe what the existing facility looks like. For a roadway this includes, at a minimum: the number of lanes (and dimensions), shoulders (with dimensions), medians (type and dimensions), drainage (open-ditch or underground storm sewer), right of way width, and any other information necessary to compare the difference between the existing and proposed facilities.

The existing and proposed average daily traffic and posted speed limits should be included. If the project is a site-based facility (e.g., safety rest area), the site size and elements should be described.

Example: *The CR X bridge at Y Creek is an eight-span, multiple beam timber stringer bridge. The structure has an overall bridge length of 106 feet and an overall deck width of 27.7 feet. The bridge was constructed in 1970. CR X is a two-lane roadway with 12-foot lanes and no shoulders in an existing right of way of 70 feet.*

Chapter 2. Documentation Format, No Added Capacity

- B. Describe what is planned. Discuss how the existing facility will change (what type of bridge is proposed, how many spans, how the typical section will change, etc.) to provide a clear picture of the project.

Example: The proposed action would replace and widen the bridge with a single 40-foot pre-stressed concrete main span structure to provide for a deck width of 30.3 feet consisting of a 28-foot wide roadway with two 12-foot travel lanes, 2 foot wide shoulders and guard railing. The proposed structure would be 80 feet long.

- C. Describe the project funding and planning information. See the [Standards of Uniformity for Transportation Planning Consistency](#) and Fiscal Constraint for more on what to include.

- D. Describe why the project is planned (need and purpose). For most PCEs, this is necessary to justify either safety, maintenance, structural, or operational deficiencies.

Example: The proposed project is needed to replace a bridge that is classified as functionally inadequate and structurally deficient. A bridge inspection report completed August 3, 2005, found that the 1940 bridge had moderate scaling and minor cracking of the concrete deck and minor to moderate impact damage to one stringer, a compression truss diagonal, a tension truss diagonal, and a few other members. Additionally, the timber wingwall extensions had moderate to severe decay. Because of these deficiencies, the TxDOT Bridge Inspection Manual requires that the bridge be closed if it has not been replaced within two years (by August 2005).

For more guidance on need and purpose, see the [FHWA web site](#).

NOTE: The FHWA guidance refers to "purpose and need." TxDOT now calls this "need and purpose."

- E. Bicycle and Pedestrian Accommodations. With this stronger emphasis on multimodal transportation facilities, TxDOT is committed to proactively plan, design and construct facilities that will safely accommodate bicyclists and pedestrians where appropriate. As the need and purpose of a project is defined during the NEPA process, it is critical that bicycle and pedestrian accommodations be discussed, taking into consideration both existing and anticipated bicycle and pedestrian facility systems and needs. The district should include discussion in the project description of proposed bicycle and pedestrian facilities within the NEPA document. If no bicycle or pedestrian facilities are planned, the document should state that and explain why.

For all urban sections, regardless of the type of improvement, the following guidance is provided:

- i. For construction projects within existing right-of-way, and when the scope of work is limited within the roadway typical section, the project plans should:

Chapter 2. Documentation Format, No Added Capacity

- A. remove barriers to accommodate pedestrians according to Texas Accessibility Standards and Americans with Disabilities Act Accessibility Guidelines (TAS/ADAAG) and TxDOT's PED standard and
- B. restripe the existing roadway typical section to provide a 14' wide curb lane for bicyclists, when practical.
- ii. For construction projects within existing right-of-way, but where the scope of work involves pavement widening, the project plans should:
 - A. widen the pavement to provide either a 14-foot wide curb lane or a 5-foot bicycle lane;
 - B. include the work necessary to ensure all existing ADA curb ramps comply with current standards; and
 - C. reconstruct or add sidewalks and crosswalks to ensure a continuous ADA-compliant pedestrian route.
- iii. For full reconstruction or new construction projects in urban areas where new right-of-way is acquired, the project plans should provide the desired geometric values shown in the [Roadway Design Manual](#) for each facility type. The inclusion of bicycle and pedestrian facilities should be included in the project plans as appropriate.

When restriping existing pavement to achieve a 14-foot wide shared use lane, the minimum lane widths and curb offsets for the appropriate roadway classification defined in TxDOT's [Roadway Design Manual](#) should be maintained. Local city and Metropolitan Planning Organization bicycle and pedestrian plans should also be considered.

- F. Address any alternatives related to the project. Typically, for a non-added capacity PCE, alternatives relate to design or right-of-way.

Example: Two designs were considered. One was to construct the project with a 14-foot center left-turn lane. The second was to construct the project with channelized left turns at X Boulevard and Y Street. To maximize access to adjacent businesses, the center left-turn lane alternative was chosen.

Example: Ten acres of additional right of way is necessary for this project. Consideration was given to acquiring all of the additional right of way on the north side, all of the additional right-of-way on the south side, or dividing the additional right-of-way on both side.

- G. Address existing and proposed right of way. At a minimum:
 - i. Describe the existing right of way (feet).
 - ii. Describe the proposed right of way needed in acres, including the number of parcels (if available).

Chapter 2. Documentation Format, No Added Capacity

- iii. Explain where the proposed right of way will occur (which side of the roadway, where in the project area). State that there are no residential/commercial displacements.
- iv. Describe, by location and acreage, any temporary and permanent easements needed. Describe the purpose of the easement(s) (e.g., utilities).
- v. Show this information in typical sections and schematics.

Note: If advance acquisition of right of way has occurred for PCE projects, the acquisitions may be considered "at-risk" by FHWA. See the [FHWA requirement dated December 6, 2007 from FHWA and the TxDOT Administration memo dated January 4, 2008](#) (Crossroads access required).

3. Surrounding Area

- A. What is the land use in the project area? At a minimum, describe the setting of the project -- urban, rural, etc. Describe land uses such as homes, businesses, schools, or parks to provide an accurate "picture" of the project area.

Example: The project is located in a rural area, with primarily undeveloped land. There are scattered farmsteads.

- B. What is the natural setting of the project area? At a minimum, describe the type of vegetation, any water courses, and any resources that will help provide a picture of the project area (using other SOUs, such as [Biology](#), [Water](#), etc.).

Example: The project is located in the watershed of the San Jacinto-Brazos Coastal Basin. In its upper reaches, Mustang Bayou is generally an intermittent stream. Mustang Bayou flows south through the project limits and continues to flow south-southeast into New Bayou in southeastern Brazoria County.

4. Specific Areas of Environmental Concern

- A. Socioeconomics
- B. Section 4(f) Resources
- C. Historic Properties
- D. Archeological Resources
- E. Vegetation
- F. Water Quality
- G. Soils/Farmland
- H. Noise
- I. Hazardous Materials

Chapter 2. Documentation Format, No Added Capacity

- J. Visual (not usually an issue)
- K. Floodplains
- L. Species
- M. Wild and Scenic Rivers (probably not an issue)
- N. Air Quality (probably not an issue)

5. Permits/Commitments

6. Public Involvement

Include the results of any public involvement held. See the [Standards of Uniformity for Public Involvement](#) for the reporting requirements for various public involvement types.

7. Exhibits / Figures / Coordination

- A. County road map showing project area
- B. Typical section(s) (including dimensions) for both existing and proposed condition
- C. Schematics, project layouts, etc. (scales to be determined by designer)
- D. Photos (including natural resources and potential historic resources)
- E. Surveys – National Wetland Inventory, historic resources, etc.
- F. Natural Diversity Database check
- G. Record of any preliminary coordination

Surveys, technical reports, etc. may be included in the PCE document. Or, the technical reports, etc. may be appended by reference in the PCE document. If this option is chosen, keep these reports and studies in the project file.

8. PCE Determination

Example language: *The proposed action meets the criteria for a Programmatic Categorical Exclusion (PCE) as defined in the [Programmatic Agreement for the Review and Approval of NEPA Categorically Excluded Transportation Projects](#) (PA), executed by the Texas Division of the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT) on October 26, 2004, or received an exception from FHWA to process the proposed action as a PCE.*

Complete the [PCE Determination Form](#).

Chapter 2. Documentation Format, No Added Capacity

PCE Determination Form

Note: If an issue is "Not Applicable," write "N/A" in the "No" column.

YES	NO	Description of Item Sufficiency
1		There are no more than 30 acres, or 5 acres per linear mile, of new right of way.
2		There are no commercial or residential displacements.
3		There are no "takes" of Section 4(f) properties.
4		ENV or SHPO has determined that the project poses "no adverse effects" to properties eligible for or listed in the National Register of Historic Places.
5		The proposed action is not subject to an individual Section 404 and/or Section 10 permit issued by the U. S. Army Corps of Engineers.
6		The proposed action is not subject to a Section 9 permit issued by the U.S. Coast Guard (USCG). Further, any required USCG advanced approval and/or lighting exemption concurrence is/was received before letting.
7		The action does not lead to any determination other than "no effect" or "may effect, but not likely to adversely affect" for federally listed resources, under regulations implementing the Endangered Species Act. This includes any species and any designated critical habitat. Essential fish habitat meets the equivalent level of effect as applicable under the laws and regulations governing that program.
8		The action does not necessitate construction in or adjacent to a component included or proposed for inclusion in the National System of Wild and Scenic Rivers .
9		The action does not involve known hazardous materials impacts anticipated to adversely affect construction activities, and does not involve the acquisition of known unresolved contaminated sites where TxDOT could reasonably expect to assume liability for corrective action upon acquisition.
10		The action is consistent with the Coastal Zone Management Plan.
11		The action conforms to all applicable laws, regulations, implementation plans, or other applicable federal and state air quality requirements pursuant to the federal and Texas Clean Air Acts.

No significant social, economic, and/or environmental impacts associated with this project have been discovered. Therefore, the proposed action is certified/approved as a Programmatic Categorical Exclusion.

Certified/Approved

Date

*Texas Department of Transportation
Environmental Affairs Division*

**Standards of Uniformity for
Programmatic Categorical Exclusions**

Chapter 3.

Documentation Format, Added Capacity

Chapter 3. Documentation Format, Added Capacity

This Standard of Uniformity (SOU) establishes the appropriate format and content of documentation for a Programmatic Categorical Exclusion (PCE) related to a project in which additional capacity (travel lanes) is planned in a rural attainment area. (Please see footnotes on Page 7 of the [Programmatic Agreement](#) for the definition of “rural area.”) This format is based on pages 3-12 of [TxDOT’s Environmental Manual](#).

The PCE document is composed of:

1. Cover Sheet
2. Proposed Action
3. Surrounding Area
4. Specific Areas of Environmental Concern
5. Permits/Commitments
6. Public Involvement
7. Exhibits / Figures / Coordination
8. PCE Determination (Conclusion)

1. Cover Sheet

- A. Title (Programmatic Categorical Exclusion)
- B. Roadway/Limits
- C. County
- D. CSJ
- E. Federal Highway Administration & Texas Department of Transportation
- F. Month/Year

2. Proposed Action

- A. Describe what the existing facility looks like and what the proposed facility will look like. At a minimum, this includes the number of lanes (and dimensions), shoulders (with dimensions), medians (type and dimensions), drainage (open-ditch or underground storm sewer), right of way width, and any other information necessary to compare the difference between the existing and proposed facilities. If the project is a roadway, the existing and proposed average daily traffic should be described. Other details describing the facility, such as existing and proposed posted speed limits, may also be provided.

Example: FM 3083 in DeWitt County is currently a two-lane roadway with two 12-foot lanes and 4-foot shoulders. The posted speed limit is 45 miles per hour. Existing traffic volume is 3,000 vehicles per day and is anticipated to be 20,000 vehicles per day proposed in 2020.

The proposed action would provide two additional travel lanes to FM 3083 and widen the shoulders to 10 feet. The right of way width is 100 feet.

Chapter 3. Documentation Format, Added Capacity

- B. Describe the project funding and planning information. See the [Standards of Uniformity for Air Quality](#) for text.
- C. Discuss need and purpose. The need must be different from the purpose.

The need may be considered the “why” -- the problem or unsatisfactory conditions that currently exist or are expected to exist. The purpose may be thought of as the “what” -- the essential purpose(s) the project is expected to address to correct the unsatisfactory condition(s). For most PCEs the purpose is to satisfy safety needs, relieve congestion, or resolve operational deficiencies. Data must be presented to support stated needs for added capacity projects.

Example: The need for the project is based on the City of X’s development plans. A large retail center is planned in the project area. This center will increase traffic in the project area by 50 percent, from 1200 vehicles per day in 2008 to 2400 vehicles per day in 2020. This will cause substantial congestion. The additional travel lanes will increase smooth travel flow and decrease congestion.

See the FHWA’s web site for the agency’s [Guidance on Need and Purpose](#).

NOTE: The FHWA guidance refers to “purpose and need.” TxDOT now calls this “need and purpose.”

- D. Bicycle and Pedestrian Accommodations. With this stronger emphasis for multimodal transportation facilities, TxDOT is committed to proactively plan, design and construct facilities to safely accommodate bicyclists and pedestrians on appropriate facilities. It is critical that bicycle and pedestrian accommodations be considered and discussed as the need and purpose of a project is defined during the NEPA process, taking into consideration existing and anticipated bicycle and pedestrian facility systems and needs. In the NEPA document, the district should include a discussion in the project description of proposed bicycle and pedestrian facilities. If no bicycle or pedestrian facilities are planned, the document should state why no such facilities are planned.

For all urban sections, regardless of the type of improvement, the following guidance is provided:

- i. For construction projects within existing right-of-way and when the scope of work is limited to within the roadway typical section, the project plans should:
- remove barriers to accommodate pedestrians according to Texas Accessibility Standards and Americans with Disabilities Act Accessibility Guidelines (TAS/ADAAG) and TxDOT’s PED standard, and;
 - accommodate for bicyclists by restriping the existing roadway typical section to provide a 14’ wide curb lane when practical.
- ii. For construction projects within existing right-of-way but when the scope of work involves pavement widening, the project plans should:

Chapter 3. Documentation Format, Added Capacity

- accommodate bicyclists by widening the pavement to either provide a 14-foot wide curb lane or a 5-foot bicycle lane;
- Include necessary work to ensure all existing ADA curb ramps comply with current standards; and
- reconstruct or add sidewalks and crosswalks to ensure a continuous ADA compliant pedestrian route.

iii. For full reconstruction or new construction projects in urban areas, where new right-of-way is acquired, the project plans should provide the desired geometric values shown in the Roadway Design Manual for each facility type. The inclusion of bicycle and pedestrian facilities should be included in the project plans as appropriate.

When restriping existing pavement to achieve a 14-foot wide shared use lane, the minimum lane widths and curb offsets for the appropriate roadway classification defined in TxDOT's Roadway Design Manual should be maintained. Local city and Metropolitan Planning Organization bicycle and pedestrian plans should also be considered.

E. Discuss logical termini and independent utility.

- i. Logical termini. Additional travel lanes should be proposed only between rational endpoints. A rational endpoint is typically a state or federal system roadway, although local thoroughfares may be substituted when/if state or federal roadways are not appropriate.

County limits, county lines, or water bodies are NOT logical termini, regardless of whether or not the termini match the construction limits.

Example of logical termini = SH 92 from CR 403 to FM 1488

NOT logical termini = SH 92 from 1.2 miles East of CR 403 to 1.6 miles West of FM 1488.

(In the second case, identify study area limits that extend to a state or federal roadway.)

Example: *The construction limits for the project stretch from 1.2 miles east of SH 92 to 1.6 miles west of FM 1488. However, in order to provide an adequate evaluation of social, economic, and environmental impacts, construction study limits were established. These limits extend from CR 785 to SH 88.*

For more information, see the FHWA's [guidance on determining logical termini](#) and/or [TxDOT's Environmental Manual](#).

- ii. Independent Utility. Additional travel lanes should be a reasonable expenditure and should "stand alone," not requiring additional transportation improvements to complete. The project must be able to function on its own without further construction of an adjoining segment.

Chapter 3. Documentation Format, Added Capacity

Example: *SH 6 is planned to expand from four 12-foot lanes to six 12-foot lanes between SH 288 and IH 45. This typical section will match the six-lane section of SH 6 at IH 45. These limits address the congestion on SH 6 resulting from recent development.*

For guidance on independent utility, see [TxDOT's Environmental Manual](#).

- F. Discuss alternatives. A PCE *may* have alternatives that were considered; if so, describe them clearly. For added capacity PCEs, this is likely limited to any design alternatives considered.

Example: *Two designs were considered. One was to construct the project with a 14-foot center left-turn lane. The second was to construct the project with channelized left turns at X Boulevard and Y Street. To maximize access to adjacent businesses, the center left-turn lane alternative was chosen.*

- G. Discuss right of way. There should be no additional right of way required for the project.. This includes right of way acquired in advance whether by purchase, donation, or any hardship acquisition.

- ii. Describe existing right of way (feet).
- iii. Describe, by location and acreage, any temporary easements needed.
- iv. Describe the purpose of the easement(s) (e.g., utilities).
- v. Show this information in typical sections and schematics.

NOTE: You do not have to follow the above list (A-F) in the precise order given.

3. Surrounding Area

- A. What is the land use in the project area? At a minimum, describe land uses such as homes, businesses, schools, and/or parks to provide an accurate "picture" of the project area.

Example: *The project is located in a rural area, with primarily undeveloped land. There are scattered farmsteads.*

- B. What is the natural setting of the project area? At a minimum, describe the type of vegetation, any water courses, and any resources that will help provide a complete picture of the project area (using other SOUs, such as [Biology](#), [Water](#), etc.).

Example: *The project is located in the watershed of the San Jacinto-Brazos Coastal Basin. In its upper reaches, Mustang Bayou is generally an intermittent stream. Mustang Bayou flows south through the project limits and continues to*

Chapter 3. Documentation Format, Added Capacity

flow south-southeast into New Bayou in southeastern Brazoria County.

4. Specific Areas of Environmental Concern

- A. Socioeconomics
- B. Section 4(f) Resources
- C. Historic Properties
- D. Archeological Resources
- E. Vegetation
- F. Water Quality
- G. Soils/Farmland
- H. Noise
- I. Hazardous Materials
- J. Visual (not usually an issue)
- K. Floodplains
- L. Species
- M. Wild and Scenic Rivers (probably not an issue)
- N. Air Quality (probably not an issue)
- O. Indirect/Cumulative Impacts -- These should be addressed for added capacity projects. At a minimum, this includes a limited analysis of indirect/cumulative impacts. See TxDOT's [Indirect/Cumulative Impact Guidance](#) and the [SOU on Indirect and Cumulative Impacts](#) (Crossroads access required) for more information.

NOTE: It is not necessary to use the list above (A-O) in the precise order given. These are merely resources/issues to address. You may choose to group some.

5. Permits/Commitments (examples below)

- A. Section 404
- B. Section 106 commitments

6. Public Involvement

At a minimum, a Notice Affording an Opportunity for a Public Hearing (NAOPH) must be published. See the [Standards of Uniformity on Public Involvement](#) for information. The Regional Environmental Center must approve the draft PCE document prior to publication of the NAOPH. Include the results of the NAOPH and/or Public Hearing in the project file. Final approval/certification of the project will not be done until after public involvement.

7. Exhibits / Figures / Coordination

- A. County road map showing project area

Chapter 3. Documentation Format, Added Capacity

- B. Typical section (showing dimensions) for both existing and proposed condition
- C. Schematic, project layouts, etc. (scale to be determined by designer)
- D. Photos (including natural resources and potential historic resources)
- E. Surveys – National Wetland Inventory, historic resources, etc.
- F. Natural Diversity Database check
- G. Record of any preliminary coordination

Surveys, technical reports, etc. may be included in the PCE document. Or, they may be included by reference in the PCE document. If this is chosen, keep these reports and studies in the project file.

8. Programmatic Categorical Exclusion Determination

Example language: *The proposed action meets the criteria for a Programmatic Categorical Exclusion (PCE) as defined in the [Programmatic Agreement for the Review and Approval of NEPA Categorically Excluded Transportation Projects \(PA\)](#), executed by the Texas Division of the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) and the Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT) on October 26, 2004; or it has received an exception from FHWA to process the proposed action as a PCE.*

Complete the [PCE Determination Form](#).

Chapter 3. Documentation Format, Added Capacity

PCE Determination Form

Note: If an issue is "Not Applicable," write "NA" in the "No" column.

Yes	No	Description of Item Sufficiency
1		The proposed action is not located within an MPO area boundary and is not located within a non-attainment boundary for air quality standards.
2		There is no additional right of way required, and right of way was not obtained through early acquisition, hardship, donation or protection of an individual parcel prior to the approval of the PCE.
3		There are no commercial or residential displacements.
4		There is no "take" of any Section 4(f) properties.
5		ENV or SHPO has determined that the project poses "no adverse effects" to properties eligible for or listed in the National Register of Historic Places.
6		The proposed action is not subject to an individual Section 404 and/or Section 10 permit issued by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.
7		The proposed action is not subject to a Section 9 permit issued by the U.S. Coast Guard (USCG). Further, any required USCG advanced approval and/or lighting exemption concurrence is/was received before letting.
8		The action does not lead to any determination other than "no effect" or "may effect, but not likely to adversely affect" federally listed resources, under regulations implementing the Endangered Species Act. This includes any species and any designated critical habitat. Essential fish habitat meets the equivalent level of effect as applicable under the laws and regulations governing that program.
9		The action does not necessitate construction in or adjacent to a component included in or proposed for inclusion in the National System of Wild and Scenic Rivers .
10		The action does not involve known hazardous materials impacts anticipated to adversely affect construction activities, and does not involve the acquisition of known unresolved contaminated sites where TxDOT could reasonably expect to assume liability for corrective action upon acquisition.
11		The action is consistent with the Coastal Zone Management Plan.
12		The action conforms to all applicable laws, regulations, implementation plans, or other applicable federal and state air quality requirements pursuant to the federal and Texas Clean Air Acts.

Chapter 3. Documentation Format, Added Capacity

No significant social, economic, and/or environmental impacts associated with this project have been discovered. Therefore, the proposed action is certified/approved as a Programmatic Categorical Exclusion.

Name (Printed)

Certified/Approved

Date

*Texas Department of Transportation
Environmental Affairs Division*

**Standards of Uniformity for
Programmatic Categorical Exclusions**

Chapter 4.

**Transportation Planning Consistency
and Fiscal Constraint**

Chapter 4. Transportation Planning Consistency and Fiscal Constraint

Yes	No	N/A	Description of Item Sufficiency	References/Guidance
Consistency Check of the environmental document, the TIP/STIP and the MTP/RTP				
<p>For a PCE transportation project to be certified by a REC, it must come from a FHWA-approved, fiscally constrained Transportation Improvement Program (TIP)/State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP).</p> <p><i>Note: FHWA-approved TIPs are included in an FHWA-approved STIP. The rest of the document only mentions the STIP.</i></p>				
<p>Note for all documents:</p> <p>If the environmental document differs from the STIP and/or the Metropolitan Transportation Plan (MTP)/Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), then the environmental document, the STIP, and/or the MTP/RTP must be revised so all three are consistent (as applicable). If the STIP and/or the MTP/RTP need to be revised, begin coordination with district Transportation Planning and Development staff as soon as possible.</p> <p>Grouped eligible CSJ project categories are contained in the TxDOT STIP, as allowed under 23 CFR 450.216(j), and are not required to be individually identified in a given program year; instead they are grouped by function and/or work type. An internal TxDOT “batch upload” process is completed by the districts and TPP to capture fiscal constraint needs for the STIP. A District Engineer Certification Form has been developed to ensure adequate funds are budgeted for grouped CSJ projects. For these projects, if the District Certification for Grouped CSJ Eligible PCE Project and Funding is signed and complete, then the REC may certify the PCE (once all other PCE requirements have been met).</p> <p>For non-grouped eligible CSJ projects, if the STIP and/or the MTP/RTP must be revised, the PCE cannot be certified by the REC before the STIP and/or the MTP/RTP have been updated.</p>				
<p>Note for added capacity projects:</p> <p>A PCE may not be used for adding through lanes in an air quality nonattainment or maintenance area, as specified in the “Programmatic Agreement for the Review and Approval of Categorical Exclusions Transportation Projects”. For further details see page 7 of the Programmatic Agreement for the Review and Approval of NEPA Categorical Excluded Transportation Projects.</p>				

Chapter 4. Transportation Planning Consistency and Fiscal Constraint

Yes	No	N/A	Description of Item Sufficiency	References/Guidance
1			<div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 10px;"> <p>Is the project grouped CSJ eligible? See Appendix A – Grouped CSJ eligible projects.</p> <pre> graph TD Q1[Is the project grouped CSJ eligible? See Appendix A – Grouped CSJ eligible projects.] -- Yes --> Q2[Is the District Engineer Certification for Grouped CSJ Eligible Project and Funding complete and signed?] Q1 -- No --> A1[Go to item 2.] Q2 -- Yes --> A2[Go to item 4.] Q2 -- No --> A3[Project cannot be certified by REC. District needs to coordinate with TP&D staff for planning activities (e.g., STIP batch upload for fiscal constraint) and/or District Certification.] </pre> </div>	
2			<p>Is the project scope in the document consistent with (1) the project scope in the STIP and (2) if applicable, the project scope in the MTP/RTP for all CSJs?</p> <p>Check all of the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • CSJ number(s), • Roadway, • Limits, • Project description design concept (meaning the type of facility, such as bicycle-pedestrian facility, rest area, freeway, expressway, arterial highway, grade-separated highway, reserved right-of-way rail transit, mixed- 	

Chapter 4. Transportation Planning Consistency and Fiscal Constraint

Yes	No	N/A	Description of Item Sufficiency	References/Guidance
			<p>traffic rail transit, exclusive busway, etc.) and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Project description design scope, as related to number of lanes or length of project, signalization, access control including approximate number and location of interchanges, preferential treatment for high-occupancy vehicles, etc. <p>NOTE: If the project is not staged construction, and if all of the above are consistent, go to item 3.</p> <p>If it is a staged construction project, is at least one phase of the project beyond NEPA listed in the STIP (preliminary engineering, final design, right of way acquisition, utility relocation, or construction for at least one phase of the project)? Or is the project described in the STIP for information purposes?</p> <p>If (1) the project is not consistent on one or more of the bullets above and/or (2) the answer to the question above is no, then contact TP&D staff to determine if the environmental document or the transportation plans need to be updated.</p>	<p>1/28/08 FHWA guidance (requires Crossroads access)</p>
			<p>Is the project cost in the document within reasonable cost consistency of (1) the project cost in the STIP and (2) if applicable, the project cost in the MTP/RTP?</p> <p>(see next page)</p>	

Chapter 4. Transportation Planning Consistency and Fiscal Constraint

Yes	No	N/A	Description of Item Sufficiency	References/Guidance
			<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Determine Reasonable Cost Consistency</u></p> <pre> graph TD Q1[Is the project cost in the document, STIP, or MTP/RTP greater than \$1,500,000?] -- Yes --> Q2[Does the project cost presented in the document exceed what is contained in either the STIP or the MTP/ RTP by more than 50%?] Q1 -- No --> A1[Cost consistency does not apply] Q2 -- No --> A2[Reasonable cost consistency is acceptable.] Q2 -- Yes --> A3[The project does not meet the requirements for reasonable cost consistency. Either the document, STIP, or MTP/RTP need to be revised.] </pre>	
Consistency Language to Appear in the Document				
4			<p>Does the document indicate (1) that the project is included in the STIP and (2) the timeframe of the STIP? For example, in FY2010, the current STIP timeframe is 2008-2011. If applicable*, does the document indicate (1) that the project is in the MTP/RTP and (2) the timeframe of the MTP/RTP (for example: HGAC 2035 RTP)?</p>	<p>*23 CFR 450.324(g) identifies non-regionally significant projects that do not need to be in the MTP and 23 CFR 450.324(d) requires all regionally significant projects, regardless of funding, to be in the MTP.</p> <p>43 TAC 11.51 defines</p>

Chapter 4. Transportation Planning Consistency and Fiscal Constraint

Yes	No	N/A	Description of Item Sufficiency	References/Guidance
				<p>“regionally significant highway” as a highway functionally classified as a minor arterial or higher.</p> <p>43 TAC 11.56(c)(1) – Connection with Regionally Significant Highway</p> <p>43 TAC 15.8(b)(1) contains provisions for projects that will be in the STIP</p>
5			<p>Example language: <i>The proposed project is included in the approved 2008-2011 Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) and the Houston-Galveston 2035 Regional Transportation Plant (RT).</i></p>	
6			<p>If the project includes more than one CSJ, does the document indicate that all project CSJs are included (1) in the STIP and (2) if applicable, in the MTP/RTP? Or, if it is a staged project, does the document identify the phase(s) of the project that is (are) listed in the STIP and mention other phases are outside the time-period of the STIP?</p> <p>Does the project demonstrate how the different CSJs in the planning documents cover the entire project limits and project scope, as described in the environmental document?</p>	
7			<p>Example language: <i>The project is covered under the following CSJs that are listed in both the STIP and the RTP: 0500-01-107 includes the widening of 8 main lanes and the addition of two 2 lane frontage roads from .1 mile north of Causeway to south of Texas City Wye; 0500-04-104 includes the widening of 8 main lanes and the addition of two 2 lane frontage roads from north of Texas City Wye to north of FM 519;</i></p> <p><i>0500-04-105 includes the widening of 8 main lanes and the addition of two 2 lane frontage roads north of FM 519 to north of FM 1764; and 0500-04-103 includes the reconstruction of the IH 45/SH 146/SH 6 interchange.</i></p>	

Chapter 4. Transportation Planning Consistency and Fiscal Constraint

Yes	No	N/A	Description of Item Sufficiency	References/Guidance
8			Does the document include (1) the funding source, (2) the reasonable total project cost, (3) the date of the cost estimate, and (4) estimated date of completion (open to traffic)? Reasonable total project cost includes preliminary engineering, environmental studies, right of way, utilities, construction, and mitigation costs.	Project Cost Memorandum dated June 19, 2009 (Crossroads access required)
9			Example language: <i>The funding for this project is 80 percent federal and 20 percent state. The total project cost is \$1,000,000 as of October 2007.</i> <i>Estimated time of completion is November, 2009.</i>	
10			If the project is <i>not</i> grouped CSJ eligible, does the document include (1) copies of the appropriate pages of the STIP and (2) if applicable, the MTP/RTP as an appendix?	
11			Example language: <i>Copies of the applicable pages of the STIP and the RTP with project listings are included in Appendix ZZZ of this document.</i>	
12			Example language: <i>The project is included in the FY 2008-2011 STIP as a grouped CSJ. The group number is 500000952.</i> or <i>The project is included in the FY 2008-2011 STIP under CSJ YYYY-YY-YYY. A copy of the page of the STIP where the project appears is attached.</i> and <i>The project is Category 1, Rehabilitation and is certified in the current 2009 letting schedule.</i> <i>Funding is 80% Federal funds and 20% state funds. The total project cost is \$1,935,366.03.</i>	(NOTE: TIP pages are found within the STIP at: http://www.txdot.gov/business/government/s/stips.htm)

Chapter 4. Transportation Planning Consistency and Fiscal Constraint

Appendix A- Grouped CSJ Eligible Project List

Proposed CSJ	Grouped Project Category	Definition
5000-00-950	PE – Preliminary Engineering	Preliminary Engineering for any project that is not added capacity in a non-attainment area. Includes activities which do not involve or lead directly to construction, such as planning and technical studies, grants for training, and research programs.
5000-00-951	Right of Way Acquisition	Right of Way acquisition for any project that is not added capacity in a non-attainment area. Includes relocation assistance, hardship acquisition, and protective buying.
5000-00-952 5000-00-957 5000-00-958	Preventive Maintenance and Rehabilitation	Projects to include pavement repair to preserve existing pavement so that it may achieve its designed loading. Includes seal coats, overlays, resurfacing, restoration, and rehabilitation done with existing ROW. Also includes modernization of a highway by reconstruction, adding shoulders, or adding auxiliary lanes (e.g., parking, weaving, turning, climbing, non-added capacity).
5000-00-953	Bridge Replacement and Rehabilitation	Projects to replace and/or rehabilitate functionally obsolete or structurally deficient bridges.
5000-00-954	Railroad Grade Separations	Projects to construct or replace existing highway-railroad grade crossings and to rehabilitate and/or replace deficient railroad underpasses, resulting in no added capacity.
5800-00-950	Safety	Projects to include the construction or replacement/rehabilitation of guard rails, median barriers, crash cushions, pavement markings, skid treatments, medians, lighting improvements, curb ramps, railroad/highway crossing warning devices, fencing, intersection improvements (e.g., turn lanes), signalization projects, and interchange modifications. Also includes projects funded via the Federal Hazard Elimination Program and the Federal Railroad Signal Safety Program.
5000-00-956	Landscaping	Project consisting of typical right-of-way landscape development, establishment, and aesthetic improvements to include any associated erosion control and environmental mitigation activities.
5800-00-915	Intelligent Transportation Systems Deployment	Highway traffic operation improvement projects including the installation of ramp metering control devices, variable message signs, traffic monitoring equipment and projects in the Federal ITS/IVHS programs.
5000-00-916	Bicycle and Pedestrian	Construction or rehabilitation of bicycle and pedestrian lanes, paths and facilities.
5000-00-917	Safety Rest Areas and Truck Weigh Stations	Construction and improvement of rest areas and truck weigh stations.
5000-00-918	Transit Improvements	Projects include the construction and improvement of small passenger shelters and information kiosks. Also includes the construction and improvement of rail storage/maintenance facilities bus transfer facilities where minor amounts of additional land are required and there is not a substantial increase in the number of users.

Chapter 4. Transportation Planning Consistency and Fiscal Constraint

Appendix B: District Engineer Certification

District Engineer Certification for Grouped CSJ Eligible Project and Funding
<p>Project name:</p> <p>Project CSJ:</p> <p>Applicable Grouped CSJ category number</p> <p>The attached project is grouped CSJ eligible under the grouped CSJ category listed above.</p> <p>Fiscal Constraint Statement:</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The project is listed in the most recent funded portion of Project Development Plan (PDP) and is included in the current STIP with sufficient funds (e.g. project was included in a previous “batch-upload” or has been forwarded to TPP for a pending “batch-upload” and sufficient funds are available for the project).</p> <p>or</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The project is listed in the most current funded portion of the PDP and the let date is within the time-period of the current fiscal year plus 3 years (e.g. current fiscal year is 2010 and project is scheduled to let by August 31, 2013).</p> <p>To aid in REC review provide verification that the project is funded: for example 1) provide a P6 screen shot showing let date and either PDP/WWWTB field that identifies it is funded, or UTP field that shows construction funding. or 2) attach a copy of the PDP page that demonstrates the project is funded.</p> <p>Note: if one of the above two fiscal constraint statements does not apply to the grouped CSJ eligible project, the REC will not be able to certify it.</p> <p>By signing below, I certify to the accuracy of the above statements related to this project.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">District Engineer Name</p> <hr/> <p>District Engineer Signature</p>

23 CFR 450.216(j) Projects that are not considered to be of appropriate scale for individual identification in a given program year may be grouped by function, work type, and/or geographic area using the applicable classifications under 23 CFR 771.117(c) and (d) and/or 40 CFR part 93. In nonattainment and maintenance areas, project classifications must be consistent with the “exempt project” classifications contained in the EPA's transportation conformity regulation (40 CFR 93). In addition, projects proposed for funding under title 23 U.S.C. Chapter 2 that are not regionally significant may be grouped in one line item or identified individually in the STIP.

John Barton distributed 1/28/08 FHWA guidance on consistency between projects and plans anticipates that a subsequent phase (beyond NEPA) of the project seeking final environmental action would be included in the TIP/STIP. In those instances where no subsequent phase (e.g., preliminary engineering, right of way acquisition or construction) of the project, or portion of the project (e.g., staged construction) is anticipated to occur within the time-frame of the TIP/STIP, the guidance calls for the project to be described in the TIP/STIP for informational purposes.

*Texas Department of Transportation
Environmental Affairs Division*

**Standards of Uniformity for
Programmatic Categorical Exclusions**

Chapter 5.

Socioeconomic Resources, No Added Capacity

Chapter 5. Socioeconomic Resources, No Added Capacity

Yes	No	N/A	Description of Item Sufficiency	References/Guidance
Community Impacts				
1			The document describes the characteristics of the project area population. Either census data or the results of a windshield survey are presented.	Community Impact Assessment – A Quick Reference for Transportation TxDOT Interim Guidance for Project Level Environmental Justice (EJ) Analysis
2			The document identifies any changes in neighborhood or community cohesion resulting from the proposed action.	T6640.8a Community Impact Assessment – A Quick Reference for Transportation
3			The document discusses any changes in access and travel patterns (e.g., vehicular, commuter, bicycle, pedestrian). Changes in travel patterns may result from cutting off streets, introducing a median, increasing automobile dependency, improving pedestrian facilities, altering or changing access to public transportation, etc.	T6640.8a Community Impact Assessment – A Quick Reference for Transportation
Environmental Justice				
4			The document includes a definition of EO 12898. The following definition may be used: <i>Executive Order (EO) 12898 “Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations” requires each Federal agency to “make achieving environmental justice part of its mission by identifying and addressing, as appropriate, disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of its programs, policies, and activities on minority populations and low-income populations.” FHWA has identified three fundamental principles of environmental</i>	FHWA’s Western Resource Center Interim Guidance for Environmental Justice

Chapter 5. Socioeconomic Resources, No Added Capacity

Yes	No	N/A	Description of Item Sufficiency	References/Guidance
			<p><i>justice:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>To avoid, minimize, or mitigate disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects, including social and economic effects, on minority populations and low-income populations;</i> 2. <i>To ensure the full and fair participation by all potentially affected communities in the transportation decision-making process; and</i> 3. <i>To prevent the denial of, reduction in, or significant delay in the receipt of benefits by minority populations and low-income populations.</i> 	
5			<p>The document includes a definition of “disproportionate impacts.” The following definition may be used:</p> <p><i>Disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects are defined by FHWA as adverse effects that:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>are predominately borne by a minority population and/or a low-income population; or</i> 2. <i>will be suffered by the minority population and/or low-income population and are appreciably more severe or greater in magnitude than the adverse effects that will be suffered by the non-minority population and/or non-low-income population.</i> 	<p>FHWA’s Western Resource Center Interim Guidance for Environmental Justice</p>
6			<p>The document includes the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services’ current poverty guideline for a family of four. The current poverty guideline may be accessed at the HHS web site.</p>	<p>FHWA’s Western Resource Center Interim Guidance for Environmental Justice</p>
7			<p>If an Environmental Justice population is present, the analysis considers the impacts</p>	<p>FHWA’s Western Resource Center Interim</p>

Chapter 5. Socioeconomic Resources, No Added Capacity

Yes	No	N/A	Description of Item Sufficiency	References/Guidance
			of each alternative (including No-Build) on EJ populations.	Guidance for Environmental Justice
Limited English Proficiency				
8			The document includes a definition of EO 13166. The following definition may be used: <i>EO 13166 "Improving Access to Services for Persons with Limited English Proficiency" requires agencies to examine the services they provide, identify any need for services to those with limited English proficiency (LEP), and develop and implement a system to provide those services so that LEP persons can have meaningful access to them.</i>	
9			The document identifies any indicators of LEP populations observed in the field, such as signage in languages other than English.	LEP Policy Guidance for DOT Recipients See also Limited English Proficiency: A Federal Interagency Website
10			The document describes any efforts undertaken so far to include the LEP population in the project development process.	
11			The document includes a commitment to make specific efforts to include the LEP population in future public involvement activities.	

*Texas Department of Transportation
Environmental Affairs Division*

**Standards of Uniformity for
Programmatic Categorical Exclusions**

Chapter 6.

Socioeconomic Resources, Added Capacity

Chapter 6. Socioeconomic Resources, Added Capacity

Yes	No	N/A	Description of Item Sufficiency	References/Guidance
Community Impacts				
1			The document describes characteristics of the neighborhood population. Census data that has been utilized is presented at the lowest level available which, for race and ethnicity, is the block level.	Community Impact Assessment – A Quick Reference for Transportation (also known as the “Purple Book”) TxDOT Interim Guidance for Project Level Environmental Justice (EJ) Analysis
2			Income and language characteristics may also be presented at the block group level.	
3			Census data is presented for each block/block group/census tract. It is not aggregated across the project area.	
4			Census data is compared to the next larger level (e.g., block-to-block group).	
5			The document identifies any changes in neighborhood or community cohesion resulting from the proposed action.	T6640.8a Community Impact Assessment – A Quick Reference for Transportation
6			<p>The document discusses any changes in access and travel patterns (e.g., vehicular, commuter, bicycle, pedestrian).</p> <p>Changes in travel patterns may result from cutting off streets, introducing a median, increasing automobile dependency, improving pedestrian facilities, altering or changing access to public transportation, etc.</p>	
Environmental Justice				
7			<p>The document includes a definition of EO 12898. The following definition may be used:</p> <p><i>Executive Order (EO) 12898, “Federal Actions to Address Environmental Justice in Minority Populations and Low-Income Populations,” requires each federal agency to “make achieving environmental justice part of its mission by identifying and addressing, as appropriate,</i></p>	FHWA’s Western Resource Center Interim Guidance for Environmental Justice

Chapter 6. Socioeconomic Resources, Added Capacity

Yes	No	N/A	Description of Item Sufficiency	References/Guidance
			<p><i>disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects of its programs, policies, and activities on minority populations and low-income populations.”</i></p> <p><i>FHWA has identified three fundamental principles of environmental justice:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>1. To avoid, minimize, or mitigate disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects, including social and economic effects, on minority populations and low-income populations;</i> <i>2. To ensure the full and fair participation by all potentially affected communities in the transportation decision-making process; and</i> <i>3. To prevent the denial of, reduction in, or significant delay in the receipt of benefits by minority populations and low-income populations.</i> 	
8			<p>The document includes a definition of “disproportionate impacts.” The following definition may be used:</p> <p><i>Disproportionately high and adverse human health or environmental effects are defined by FHWA as adverse effects that:</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <i>1. are predominately borne by a minority population and/or a low-income population; or</i> <i>2. will be suffered by the minority population and/or low-income population and are appreciably more severe or greater in magnitude than the adverse effects that will be suffered by the nonminority population and/or non-low-income population.</i> 	<p>FHWA’s Western Resource Center Interim Guidance for Environmental Justice</p>
9			<p>The document includes the U.S.</p>	<p>FHWA’s Western</p>

Chapter 6. Socioeconomic Resources, Added Capacity

Yes	No	N/A	Description of Item Sufficiency	References/Guidance
			Department of Health and Human Services' current poverty guideline for a family of four. The current poverty guideline may be accessed at the HHS web site .	Resource Center Interim Guidance for Environmental Justice
10			The document clearly indicates whether any potential Environmental Justice populations/communities exist in the project area. If not, no further discussion is needed, other than a statement of no impact.	Community Impact Assessment – A Quick Reference for Transportation FHWA's Western Resource Center Interim Guidance for Environmental Justice
11			If an Environmental Justice population is present, the analysis considers the impacts of each alternative (including No-Build) on EJ populations.	FHWA's Western Resource Center Interim Guidance for Environmental Justice
Limited English Proficiency				
12			The document includes a definition of EO 13166. The following definition may be used: <i>EO 13166 "Improving Access to Services for Persons with Limited English Proficiency" requires agencies to examine the services they provide, identify any need for services to those with limited English proficiency (LEP), and develop and implement a system to provide those services so that LEP persons can have meaningful access to them.</i>	
13			The document identifies any indicators of LEP populations observed in the field, such as signage in languages other than English.	LEP Policy Guidance for DOT Recipients
14			The document describes any efforts undertaken so far to include LEP population in the project development process.	Limited English Proficiency: A Federal Interagency Website
15			The document includes a commitment to make specific efforts to include the LEP population in future public involvement	

Chapter 6. Socioeconomic Resources, Added Capacity

Yes	No	N/A	Description of Item Sufficiency	References/Guidance
			activities.	
Land Use				
16			The document describes existing land use for the project area and the surrounding area influenced by the project. This should include acreage estimates of existing land uses in the study area.	T6640.8a
17			The document describes direct land use changes by acreage. This should include a discussion of the current uses and zoning for land that will be acquired for right of way.	
Indirect Impacts (needed for added capacity projects)**				
18			The document describes any potential foreseeable, induced development. The document discusses whether growth is planned or unplanned, when possible. An acreage estimate should be provided for potential induced growth. The methods described in NCHRP Report 25-25 (Task 22) are recommended, especially for projects with an economic development purpose, or where economic development is described as a benefit of the project.	T6640.8a
Cumulative Impacts (needed for added capacity projects)**				
19			The document includes an acreage estimate for land use changes resulting from the combined direct and indirect effects of the project, plus any identified reasonably foreseeable future actions.	

* General Note: The document may discuss issues briefly, but it should still provide sufficient information to support the CE classification.

** Indirect and Cumulative Impacts analysis likely should focus on land use effects. There may be cases where community impacts or environmental justice impacts require discussion as well, but this should be rare for a CE document.

*Texas Department of Transportation
Environmental Affairs Division*

**Standards of Uniformity for
Programmatic Categorical Exclusions**

Chapter 7.

Historical Studies

Chapter 7. Historical Studies.

The District submits Section 1, Part 1 of the Project Coordination Request (PCR) only. Subsequent forms (Sections 3-7) should only be used based on consultation with the appropriate TxDOT Historian.

Chapter 7. Historical Studies. Section 1. Project Coordination Request

District/County _____ Highway _____ CSJ _____
Contractor _____ Submittal Date _____

Section 1. Project Coordination Request

The District completes Part 1 for submission to ENV. If appropriate, the qualified contractor will fill out Part 2. This Standard of Uniformity (SOU) will be reviewed by ENV's Historical Studies (HIST) staff; HIST will return it to the District if the information does not comply with the standards. The District will then either (1) address any information insufficiencies or (2) initiate the steps necessary to address ENV HIST's recommendations. Once any additional issues have been addressed, the District will resubmit this form for review.

Note: Part 1 includes information that is minimally required to properly facilitate the review process. Please submit all relevant documentation at one time.

PART 1: Information Required to Process Historic Resources Coordination and Consultation		Comments*
<i>[To be completed with all appropriate documentation attached by District personnel. Quality Control must be performed by District personnel if completed by a consultant]</i>		
1	District provided: <input type="checkbox"/> Active CSJ (or equivalent if the project is not a construction project) against which environmental work can be charged.	
2	District indicated the targeted expected: <input type="checkbox"/> Letter of Authority (LOA) date <input type="checkbox"/> Anticipated letting date.	
3	District provided: <input type="checkbox"/> "Historic-age" date (let date minus 45 years)	
4	District identified: <input type="checkbox"/> Proposed additional ROW (estimated in acres) <input type="checkbox"/> Any easements (estimated in acres)	
5	District provided aerial map(s) or equivalent of the project area. Map includes: <input type="checkbox"/> Current ROW <input type="checkbox"/> Proposed ROW <input type="checkbox"/> Area of Potential Effects (APE) <input type="checkbox"/> Known historic resources <input type="checkbox"/> Major streets names	

Chapter 7. Historical Studies. Section 1. Project Coordination Request

District/County _____ Highway _____ CSJ _____
Contractor _____ Submittal Date _____

<p>PART 1: Information Required to Process Historic Resources Coordination and Consultation <i>[To be completed with all appropriate documentation attached by District personnel. Quality Control must be performed by District personnel if completed by a consultant]</i></p>	<p>Comments*</p>
<p>6 As determined in consultation with ENV HIST, the District provided:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> The project description <input type="checkbox"/> Preliminary plans showing: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> The existing ROW boundaries <input type="checkbox"/> Proposed right of way boundaries <input type="checkbox"/> Property parcel boundaries <input type="checkbox"/> Temporary easements <input type="checkbox"/> Permanent easements 	
<p>7 District provided:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Typical roadway sections <input type="checkbox"/> Proposed roadway sections 	
<p>8 District provided:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> The results of the Texas Historic Sites Atlas search, identifying NHL, NRHP, RTHL, and OTHM resources located within one-quarter mile of the project area. Markers to be relocated must also be identified. <input type="checkbox"/> The results of the search are listed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> in table format <input type="checkbox"/> sites are identified on aerial map(s) or equivalent 	
<p>9 For Bridge Projects <u>or projects with historic-age bridges in the project area</u>, the District provided:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> The Bridge Inventory Number <input type="checkbox"/> The reported results of Historic Bridge Inventory Search (available from ENV HIST) <input type="checkbox"/> The results of the search are listed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> in table format <input type="checkbox"/> ALL bridges are identified on aerial map(s) or equivalent <input type="checkbox"/> As appropriate and in consultation with ENV HIST, the District provides copy of CHC consultation letter and results of consultation. 	

Chapter 7. Historical Studies. Section 1. Project Coordination Request

District/County _____ Highway _____ CSJ _____
Contractor _____ Submittal Date _____

<p>PART 1: Information Required to Process Historic Resources Coordination and Consultation <i>[To be completed with all appropriate documentation attached by District personnel. Quality Control must be performed by District personnel if completed by a consultant]</i></p>	<p>Comments*</p>
<p>10 The District consulted with ENV HIST to determine: <input type="checkbox"/> If rest area(s) have been evaluated for inclusion in the NRHP. <input type="checkbox"/> The results of the search are: <input type="checkbox"/> listed in table format <input type="checkbox"/> sites are identified on aerial map(s) or _____ equivalent.</p>	
<p>11 When right of entry (ROE) is required, as determined in consultation with ENV HIST, the District sends out ENV HIST ROE forms to affected land owners. District provided: <input type="checkbox"/> Dated ROE letters sent out to ENV HIST for time tracking purposes.</p>	
<p>12 If applicable, the District appropriately identified: <input type="checkbox"/> Consulting parties (as stipulated by federal and state historic preservation law) <input type="checkbox"/> Individuals, local governments and known historic preservation groups are listed with contact information.</p>	
<p>13 District provided: <input type="checkbox"/> Representative photographs of the project area, including: <input type="checkbox"/> adjacent buildings <input type="checkbox"/> road features <input type="checkbox"/> areas of construction.</p>	
<p>14 Additional Comments:</p>	

**A District's response and/or comments should reflect known data about the project and identify any data limits that would prevent the District from providing the requested information.*

Chapter 7. Historical Studies. Section 1. Project Coordination Request

District/County _____ Highway _____ CSJ _____
Contractor _____ Submittal Date _____

PART 2: Additional Project Information that can be Provided by a Qualified TxDOT Consultant		Comments*
<i>[A professionally qualified Historian or Architectural Historian must provide the following information; however, Quality Assessment and Quality Control must be performed by District personnel if completed by a consultant]</i>		
1	<input type="checkbox"/> Period of Historical Significance (if known)	
2	Research repositories used or will be used: <input type="checkbox"/> State Archives <input type="checkbox"/> CSJ log books <input type="checkbox"/> Local repositories <input type="checkbox"/> Other sources	
3	<input type="checkbox"/> Potential historic resources in the APE and study area (e.g. modern commercial, mid-20 th century residential, etc.)	
4	<input type="checkbox"/> Literature review appropriate to the study area	
5	<input type="checkbox"/> A succinct summary of the literature review results with: <input type="checkbox"/> clear descriptions of identification, evaluation, and documentation tasks required, and a description of <input type="checkbox"/> potential areas of significance appropriate to the survey area)	
6	Additional documentation: <input type="checkbox"/> Methodology <input type="checkbox"/> Historic context <input type="checkbox"/> Bibliography	

PART 2: QUALIFIED HISTORIAN CERTIFICATION
As a Secretary of Interior's Standards qualified historian, I certify that the provided information contains no factual errors affecting the finding(s). Qualified Historian Name: _____ Date: _____
PARTS 1 & 2: DISTRICT PERSONNEL CERTIFICATION
I reviewed all submitted documents for quality control and assessment. District Personnel Name: _____ Date: _____

Chapter 7. Historical Studies. Section 1. Project Coordination Request

District/County _____ Highway _____ CSJ _____
Contractor _____ Submittal Date _____

PART 3: ENV HIST Determinations		Yes
Additional actions required by the District. SOU to be resubmitted with requested information <i>[DO NOT WRITE on this page; for ENV HIST STAFF ONLY]</i>		
1	Project information is insufficient to determine level of Historic Resource Review and Consultation (see attached comments indicating why information is insufficient).	<input type="checkbox"/>
2	Project information is sufficient to recommend that a Reconnaissance Survey be performed.** ENV HIST staff will consult with the District to (1) specify survey needs and (2) develop a scope of work and a timeline for receiving contract deliverables.	<input type="checkbox"/>
3	Project information is sufficient to recommend that an Intensive Survey be performed.** ENV HIST staff will consult with the District to (1) specify survey needs and (2) develop a scope of work and a timeline for receiving contract deliverables.	<input type="checkbox"/>
4	Additional Comments: 	

** All work must meet appropriate Standards of Uniformity. Please consult ENV HIST if assistance is required through an ENV Scientific Services Contract.

PART 4: ENV HIST Certification	
<i>[TO BE FILLED OUT BY ENV HIST STAFF; TO BE INCLUDED WITH DISTRICT'S SUBMISSION TO THE REC]</i>	
1	ENV HIST staff determined that the project information is sufficient to record Section 106 actions on HIST screen in ETS. The appropriate NEPA language has been submitted to the District and recorded in ETS.
2	ENV HIST Reviewer Name: _____ Date: _____

Chapter 7. Historical Studies. Section 2. NEPA Language

Section 2. NEPA Language

Part 1. Instructions

This section of the SOU contains standard language for documenting the results of historic resources studies. The standard language includes an introductory statement that applies to both archeological studies and historical studies. This paragraph should precede the discipline-specific statements and needs to only be included once in the document. In other words, the introductory statement does not need to precede both the individual ARCH and HIST paragraphs.

Introductory Paragraph for Cultural Resources:

Cultural Resources

Cultural resources are structures, buildings, archeological sites, districts (a collection of related structures, buildings, and/or archeological sites), cemeteries and objects. Both federal and state laws require consideration of cultural resources during project planning. At the federal level, NEPA and the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) of 1966, among others, apply to transportation projects such as this one. In addition, state laws such as the Antiquities Code of Texas apply to these projects. Compliance with these laws often requires consultation with the Texas Historical Commission/Texas State Historic Preservation Officer and/or federally-recognized tribes to determine the project's effects on cultural resources. Review and coordination of this project followed approved procedures for compliance with federal and state laws.

Part 2. Instructions

After including the introductory paragraph for all cultural resources, add appropriate statements for both archeological and historic resources (see the [SOU for Archeological Studies](#) for the archeological resource language). For historic resources, choose one of the following two paragraphs.

- *Statement A is used when ENV HIST staff has determined the project activities have no potential to affect historic properties.*
- *Statement B is used when the project requires individual coordination through ENV HIST. Please note that Statement B requires additional information to be added, based on information provided by ENV Historians. Statement B provides prompts to indicate where information needs to be selected and added.*

A. No Potential to Affect Historic Properties

Use the following introduction paragraph for Historical Resources:

A review of the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), the list of State Archeological Landmarks (SAL), and the list of Recorded Texas Historic Landmarks (RTHL) indicated that no historically significant resources have been previously documented within the area of potential effects (APE). It has been determined through consultation with the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) that the APE for the proposed project is the current right-of-way. A site visit revealed that there are no

Chapter 7. Historical Studies. Section 2. NEPA Language

historic-age resources (built prior to **[insert date of letting minus 45 years]***), located within the Project APE.

Use the following conclusion paragraph for Historical Resources:

Pursuant to Stipulation V “Undertakings with No Potential to Affect Historic Resources” of the First Amended Programmatic Agreement Regarding the Implementation of Transportation Undertakings (PA-TU) between the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), the Texas State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, and the Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT) and the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), TxDOT historians determined that the proposed action has no potential to affect historic properties and that individual project coordination with SHPO is not required.

B. Individual Coordination with ENV HIST Required

Use the appropriate conclusion paragraph for Historic Resources:

There are three possible scenarios:

- 1. Negative Survey*
- 2. No Historic Properties Present*
- 3. Historic Properties Present but not Affected*

ENV HIST should be consulted to determine which scenario is appropriate.

Scenario One - Negative Survey: No previously recorded historic properties are present and no historic-age properties were identified within the Project APE.

A review of the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), the list of State Archeological Landmarks (SAL), and the list of Recorded Texas Historic Landmarks (RTHL) indicated that no historically significant resources have been previously documented within the area of potential effects (APE). It has been determined through consultation with the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) that the APE for the proposed project is **[Insert the correct APE per the PA-TU]**. A site visit revealed that there are no historic-age resources (built prior to **[insert date of letting minus 45 years]***), located within the Project APE.

Pursuant to **[Stipulation V “Undertakings with No Potential to Affect Historic Resources”]** or **[Stipulation VI “Undertakings with the Potential to Affect Historic Resources”]** of the First Amended Programmatic Agreement Regarding the Implementation of Transportation Undertakings (PA-TU) between the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), the Texas State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, and the Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT) and the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), TxDOT historians determined that no historic-age properties are present and that individual project coordination with SHPO is not required.

Chapter 7. Historical Studies. Section 2. NEPA Language

* Note that the **bolded italicized text** in brackets [] indicates language that must be customized by the District depending on the facts of the specific project for which the NEPA language is being written.

- If the proposed project would require TxDOT to relocate a marker, coordination with THC for marker relocation is required. Therefore, the District needs to report the status of the THC marker coordination in the last sentence of the Disclosure Statement paragraph of the NEPA language.

* Note that in order to be a Stipulation V, the project activities have to be identified within Appendix 3 as activities that do not have the potential to affect listed or eligible properties.

Scenario Two – No Historic Properties Present: TxDOT historian has determined that no NRHP listed and no NRHP eligible properties are located within the Project APE.

A review of the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), the list of State Archeological Landmarks (SAL), and the list of Recorded Texas Historic Landmarks (RTHL) indicated that no historically significant resources have been previously documented within the area of potential effects (APE). It has been determined through consultation with the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) that the APE for the proposed project is **[choose correct APE per PA-TU]**. A site visit revealed that there are **[insert number of historic-age resources]** historic-age resources (built prior to **[insert date of letting minus 45 years]**), located within Project APE. TxDOT historians have determined that none of the historic-age resources are NRHP eligible.

Pursuant to **[Stipulation V “Undertakings with No Potential to Affect Historic Resources”]** or **[Stipulation VI “Undertakings with the Potential to Affect Historic Resources”]** of the First Amended Programmatic Agreement Regarding the Implementation of Transportation Undertakings (PA-TU) between the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), the Texas State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, and the Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT) and the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU).

* Note that the **bolded italicized text** in brackets [] indicates language that must be customized by the District depending on the facts of the specific project for which the NEPA language is being written.

* Note that in order to be a Stipulation V, the project activities have to be identified within Appendix 3 as activities that do not have the potential to affect listed or eligible properties.

Scenario Three – Historic Properties Present, but not Affected: TxDOT historian has determined that NRHP listed and/or NRHP eligible properties located within the Project APE will not be adversely affected by project activities.

A determination by ENV Historians that project activities would have no adverse effect to historic properties located within the project APE is dependent on the following components. These components include:

- Evidence of efforts to identify and evaluate historic properties located within a proposed project area of potential effects;

Chapter 7. Historical Studies. Section 2. NEPA Language

- *Documentation that project planners and engineers considered project effects on properties listed or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places and; through appropriate consultation sought ways to avoid, minimize or mitigate any adverse effects on historic properties;*
- *Findings of determination of effects to historic properties, with the appropriate documentation showing that Section 106 consultation is completed.*

Use the following conclusion paragraphs for Historic Resources:

A review of the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), the list of State Archeological Landmarks (SAL), and the list of Recorded Texas Historic Landmarks (RTHL) indicated that no historically significant resources have been previously documented within the area of potential effects (APE). It has been determined through consultation with the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) that the APE for the proposed project is ***[choose correct APE per PA-TU]***. A site visit revealed that there are ***[insert number of historic-age resources]*** historic-age resources (built prior to ***[insert date of letting minus 45 years]***), located within Project APE. TxDOT historians have determined there are ***[insert number]*** of historic-age resources that are determined NRHP eligible.

- ❖ *Include a list of all NRHP historic properties with location information, and descriptive summary of each resource by type*
- ❖ *Describe any consultation efforts with Section 106 consultation parties*
- ❖ *For each NRHP property provide determination statements of NRHP eligibility and significance*
- ❖ *For each NRHP property document how project planners and engineers have considered efforts to minimize and avoid adverse effects. AND the results of the application of Adverse Effects Criteria*

Pursuant to Stipulation VI “Undertakings with the Potential to Affect Historic Resources” of the First Amended Programmatic Agreement Regarding the Implementation of Transportation Undertakings (PA-TU) between the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA), the Texas State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation, and the Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT) and the Memorandum of Understanding (MOU), TxDOT Historians have determined that the proposed action will not adversely affect historic properties and that the proposed undertaking would have no reasonably foreseeable adverse effects that may occur later in time, be farther removed in distance, or be cumulative. Therefore, individual project coordination with SHPO is not required.

** Note that the **bolded italicized text in brackets []** indicates language that must be customized by the District depending on the facts of the specific project for which the NEPA language is being written.*

Chapter 7. Historical Studies. Section 3. Windshield Survey of Non-Archeological Historic-Age Resource Review Checklist

Section 3. Windshield Survey of Non-Archeological Historic-Age Resource Review Checklist

District/County _____ Highway _____ CSJ _____
Contractor _____ Submittal Date _____ Reviewed by _____

Historic-age Resource Survey Reports (HRSR) for non-archeological historic-age resources will be reviewed for compliance with the following checklist in addition to the Texas Historical Commission reporting standards and the *Archeology and Preservation: Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines*. Windshield Survey of Non-Archeological Historic-Age Resources is applicable for **Constraints Analysis** and **No Potential to Effect** reporting. ENV can make preliminary determinations of eligibility and/or identify probable constraints. Reports with all **YES** responses will be automatically accepted. One or more **No** response may result in acceptance pending specified revisions or clarifications or in rejection depending on the nature of the issue.

A. Format Criteria	ENV-HIST Comments
1 <input type="checkbox"/> Report cover and title page included, with: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> highway and project limits <input type="checkbox"/> district(s) <input type="checkbox"/> counties <input type="checkbox"/> CSJ(s) <input type="checkbox"/> identification of professional historian and consulting firm <input type="checkbox"/> contract number and type (e.g. RMA, TTA, District ENV, ENV-PM, ENV HIST) 	
2 <input type="checkbox"/> Report includes a project area map based on aerial photographs, or if aerials are not available, then a map based on a USGS 7.5' Quadrangle.	
3 <input type="checkbox"/> Report identifies the anticipated NEPA Document Project Type (i.e., CE, BCE PSE, EA, or EIS)	
4 Report includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> project type <input type="checkbox"/> description <input type="checkbox"/> impacts <input type="checkbox"/> acreage of proposed new right-of-way (ROW) in project area 	
5 <input type="checkbox"/> Report includes a table which identifies any direct impacts anticipated at potential or designated historic	

Chapter 7. Historical Studies. Section 3. Windshield Survey of Non-Archeological Historic-Age Resource Review Checklist

	resources/districts.	
6	<input type="checkbox"/> Photographs of potential or designated historic resources/districts that abut the project corridor.	
7	<input type="checkbox"/> Report includes a map indicating the location of potential or designated historic resources/districts and where new ROW may be required if necessary.	
8	<input type="checkbox"/> Report identifies what additional survey work may be needed to complete determinations and National Register eligibility or conduct determinations of project effects to historic resources/districts.	
	B. Identification Criteria	ENV-HIST Comments
9	<input type="checkbox"/> Report documents the survey methodology to identify potential or designated historic sites. The methodology shall describe: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> the project study limits <input type="checkbox"/> the APE <input type="checkbox"/> the historic-age period 	
10	<input type="checkbox"/> Report includes discussion of previously designated historic properties within the ROW or abutting the project area (Study Area). Explicit reference should be made that the following were reviewed: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> THC Historic Sites Atlas and online survey files, <input type="checkbox"/> The National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), <input type="checkbox"/> The list of State Archeological Landmarks (SAL), and <input type="checkbox"/> The list of Recorded Texas Historic Landmarks (RTHL). 	
	C. Documentation Criteria	ENV-HIST Comments
11	<input type="checkbox"/> Report evaluates resources 45 years or older at the time of the project letting. <input type="checkbox"/> The report evaluates historic-age resource's eligibility for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), providing analysis appropriate to the Recommended level of significance of the resource. <input type="checkbox"/> For resources recommended as NRHP-eligible and for those of marginal significance recommended as not NRHP-eligible, the report must justify significance within appropriate context and NRHP criteria.	

Chapter 7. Historical Studies. Section 3. Windshield Survey of Non-Archeological Historic-Age Resource Review Checklist

12	<input type="checkbox"/> A Historic-Age Resources Project Inventory Table. The table shall contain the following fields: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> property address or UTMs <input type="checkbox"/> a basic property type description <input type="checkbox"/> approximate date of construction within 5 year increments <input type="checkbox"/> a direct impact assessment 	
13	<input type="checkbox"/> Report includes maps based on aerial photos of the study area detailing: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> The APE <input type="checkbox"/> Existing ROW and proposed new ROW boundary(ies) <input type="checkbox"/> Major street names, and other directional landmarks clearly indicated <input type="checkbox"/> Historic-age and historic resources indicated <input type="checkbox"/> Section 4(f) property(ies) indicated <input type="checkbox"/> Locations for each historic property's resource labeled with appropriate ID numbers running as consecutively as possible from left to right <input type="checkbox"/> Site maps detailing the inter-relationship of resources such as outbuildings and landscape features associated with a property recommended NRHP-eligible property by the reconnaissance survey. Outbuildings and landscape features should be reported as subsets of the main ID number for a property, for example, a residence and associated garage could be labeled Resource Nos. 100a and 100b. The site map may label resources on an individual aerial or inset of an overall aerial. 	
14	<input type="checkbox"/> Report includes photographic documentation for each historic-age resource sufficient in number and perspective to satisfy ENV documentation requirements and enable ENV to make a determination if a higher level of survey is required or if a potentially eligible historic district exists. Photographs must be 3.5" x 5" color representations printed on matte finish photographic paper or 3.5" x 5" color representations printed on matte white, premium or photo quality laser or inkjet paper. Photographs must be original prints or electronic presentations of at least 1200 x 1600 pixel resolution quality: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> must include a single oblique view that incorporates both the primary façade and a side elevation at a minimum for each primary and auxiliary resource and 	

Chapter 7. Historical Studies. Section 3. Windshield Survey of Non-Archeological Historic-Age Resource Review Checklist

	<p>landscape feature associated with a property recommended NRHP-eligible by the reconnaissance survey, with the subject filling the frame.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> must be well focused and clearly depict architectural and other details relevant to an evaluation of the resource's character-defining features, as well as documenting the historic property's relationship to the proposed road project. <input type="checkbox"/> must be attached to separately labeled pages that clearly identify project name, project ID number, address or UTM of resource, direction of the photograph, style and/or form of the resource, NRHP criteria eligibility, resource integrity issues, and any limitations when photographing the resource. (Style and form must accurately describe the resource) <input type="checkbox"/> Additional photographs of the inter-relationship of resources may be necessary if historic outbuildings or significant landscape features are associated with the property. <input type="checkbox"/> These photographs must document representative streetscapes for each block or significant area within a historic district. 	
Approval		
15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Report contains no factual errors affecting the finding(s), satisfactory completion of field work, or acceptance of the report by Texas Historical Commission or other consulting parties and is therefore approved for acceptance. (Reviewer comments required if No.) 	
16	<p>Additional Comments:</p>	

Chapter 7. Historical Studies. Section 4. Non-Archeological Historic-Age Resource Research Designs Review Checklist

Section 4. Non-Archeological Historic-Age Resource Research Designs Review Checklist

District/County _____ Highway _____ CSJ _____

Contractor _____ Submittal Date _____ Reviewed by _____

Historic-age Resource Research Designs (HRRD) for non-archeological historic-age resources will be reviewed for compliance with the following checklist in addition to the Texas Historical Commission reporting standards and the *Archeology and Preservation: Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines*. Reports with all **YES** responses will be automatically accepted. One or more **No** response may result in acceptance pending specified revisions or clarifications or in rejection depending on the nature of the issue.

A. Format Criteria	ENV-HIST Comments
<p>1</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Research design cover and title page included, with: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> highway and project limits <input type="checkbox"/> district(s) <input type="checkbox"/> counties <input type="checkbox"/> CSJ(s) <input type="checkbox"/> identification of professional historian and consulting firm <input type="checkbox"/> contract number and type (e.g. RMA, TTA, District ENV, ENV-PM, ENV HIST) 	
<p>2</p> <input type="checkbox"/> The research design includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Project Type <input type="checkbox"/> Project Description <input type="checkbox"/> Project Impacts <input type="checkbox"/> Acreage of proposed new right-of-way (ROW) in project area. 	
<p>3</p> <input type="checkbox"/> The research design includes a list of consulting partners including prime contractor and/or subcontractors, Certified Local Governments (CLG) and local preservation contacts including County Historical Commissions	
<p>4</p> <input type="checkbox"/> The research design includes a project area map on aerial photographs or, if aerials are not available, then a map based on a USGS 7.5' Quadrangle or equivalent.	
<p>5</p> <input type="checkbox"/> The research design includes a bibliography for the information provided in the research design and sources used for creating the historic context during the literature	

Chapter 7. Historical Studies. Section 4. Non-Archeological Historic-Age Resource Research Designs Review Checklist

	review.	
	B. Define Project and Project Issues	ENV-HIST Comments
6	<input type="checkbox"/> The research design defines and justifies: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> the Area of Potential Effects (APE) <input type="checkbox"/> the study area (referring to project plans and/or to proposed direct impacts for this class of project) 	
7	<input type="checkbox"/> The research design includes discussion of previously designated historic properties within the study area of the proposed project to develop an appropriate analysis of the historical context. Including: Explicit reference to review of THC survey files and Historic Sites Atlas, the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), the list of State Archeological Landmarks (SAL), and the list of Recorded Texas Historic Landmarks (RTHL) must be included.	
8	<input type="checkbox"/> The research design includes survey methodology that describes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> the APE <input type="checkbox"/> the study limits of the survey area <input type="checkbox"/> the historic-age cut off date <input type="checkbox"/> the historic period of significance. 	
9	<input type="checkbox"/> The research design includes a literature review appropriate to the study area, its historic-age resources, and historic period of significance that provides for the appropriate to the identification and evaluation of non-archeological historic-age resources specific to the survey area. The research design must provide a succinct summary of the literature review results, clear descriptions of identification, evaluation and documentation tasks required and a description of potential areas of significance appropriate to the survey area.	
	C. Documentation Criteria	ENV-HIST Comments
10	<input type="checkbox"/> The research design includes maps based on aerial photographs of the study area. Maps show: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> the APE <input type="checkbox"/> existing ROW <input type="checkbox"/> proposed new ROW <input type="checkbox"/> major street names and other directional landmarks clearly indicated on the map. <input type="checkbox"/> the location of each Official State Historical Marker 	

Chapter 7. Historical Studies. Section 4. Non-Archeological Historic-Age Resource Research Designs Review Checklist

	(OSHM) in the study area must be indicated on the map.	
Approval		
11	<input type="checkbox"/> Report contains no factual errors affecting the finding(s), satisfactory completion of field work, or acceptance of the report by Texas Historical Commission or other consulting parties and is therefore approved for acceptance. (Reviewer comments required if No.)	
COMMENTS:		

Chapter 7. Historical Studies. Section 5. Non-Archeological Historic-Age Resource Reconnaissance Survey Reports Review Checklist

Section 5. Non-Archeological Historic-Age Resource Reconnaissance Survey Reports Review Checklist

District/County _____ Highway _____ CSJ _____
Contractor _____ Submittal Date _____ Reviewed by _____

Historic-age Resource Survey Reports (HRSR) for non-archeological historic-age resources will be reviewed for compliance with the following checklist in addition to the Texas Historical Commission reporting standards and the *Archeology and Preservation: Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines*. Reports with all **Yes** responses will be automatically accepted. One or more **No** response may result in acceptance pending specified revisions or clarifications or in rejection depending on the nature of the issue.

Historic resource studies shall be performed and documented at sufficient levels to satisfy the SHPO/Texas Historical Commission (hereafter THC) requirements for determining the presence of and documenting historically significant properties in the project Area of Potential Effects (APE) in accordance with 36 CFR 60 and 43 TAC 2.4-2.51. All reports shall include the names and tasks performed of all technical experts associated with the project.

A. Format Criteria		ENV-HIST Comments
1	<input type="checkbox"/> Report cover and title page included, with: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> highway and project limits <input type="checkbox"/> district(s) <input type="checkbox"/> counties <input type="checkbox"/> CSJ(s) <input type="checkbox"/> identification of professional historian and consulting firm. 	
2	<input type="checkbox"/> Report includes a project area map based on aerial photographs or, if aerials are not available, then a map based on a USGS 7.5' Quadrangle.	
3	Report includes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> project type <input type="checkbox"/> description <input type="checkbox"/> impacts <input type="checkbox"/> acreage of proposed new right-of-way (ROW) in project area. 	
B. Identification Criteria		ENV-HIST Comments
4	<input type="checkbox"/> Report defines the Area of Potential Effects (APE), referring to project plans and/or to proposed direct impacts for this	

Chapter 7. Historical Studies. Section 5. Non-Archeological Historic-Age Resource Reconnaissance Survey Reports Review Checklist

	class of project.	
5	<input type="checkbox"/> Report includes discussion of previously designated historic properties within 1300' of the project area to foster development of appropriate contextual analysis. Explicit reference to review of THC survey files and Historic Sites Atlas, the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), the list of State Archeological Landmarks (SAL), and the list of Recorded Texas Historic Landmarks (RTHL) must be included.	
6	<input type="checkbox"/> Report includes survey methodology that describes: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> the APE <input type="checkbox"/> the study limits of the survey area <input type="checkbox"/> the historic-age period 	
7	<input type="checkbox"/> Report includes a literature review appropriate to the study area and its historic-age resources that resulted in development of a research design appropriate to the identification and evaluation of non-archeological historic-age resources specific to the survey area. The research design should be approved by ENV prior to fieldwork. The research design must provide a succinct summary of the literature review results, clear descriptions of identification, evaluation and documentation tasks required and a description of potential areas of significance appropriate to the survey area.	
	C. Documentation Criteria	ENV-HIST Comments
8	<input type="checkbox"/> Report includes photographic documentation for each historic-age resource sufficient in number and perspective to satisfy ENV documentation requirements, except under circumstances beyond the Technical Expert's control (NOTE: such circumstances require comprehensive verbal characterizations of historic-age resource features). Photographs must: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> include a single oblique view incorporating both the primary façade and a side elevation at a minimum for each resource, with the subject filling the frame. <input type="checkbox"/> include multiple views of elevations and architectural details when the resource is listed on or is potentially eligible for the NRHP. <input type="checkbox"/> include multiple views of the property when it has more than one historic-age resource. <input type="checkbox"/> be well focused and clearly depict architectural and 	

**Chapter 7. Historical Studies. Section 5. Non-Archeological Historic-Age Resource
Reconnaissance Survey Reports Review Checklist**

	<p>other details relevant to an evaluation of the resource's character-defining features.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> document a historic property's relationship to the proposed road project. <input type="checkbox"/> be 3.5" x 5" color representations printed on matte finish photographic paper or 3.5" x 5" color representations printed on matte white, premium or photo quality laser or inkjet paper. <input type="checkbox"/> be original prints or electronic presentations of at least 1200 x 1600 pixel resolution qualities. <input type="checkbox"/> be attached to separately labeled pages that clearly identify project name, project ID number, address or UTM of resource, direction of the photograph, style and/or form of the resource, NRHP criteria eligibility, resource integrity issues, and any limitations when photographing the resource. (Style and form must accurately describe the resource) 	
9	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Report includes inventory of all historic-age resources, provided in a table form that details: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> their ID numbers <input type="checkbox"/> locations/addresses <input type="checkbox"/> property type and subtype classifications <input type="checkbox"/> stylistic influences or form <input type="checkbox"/> construction dates <input type="checkbox"/> integrity issues <input type="checkbox"/> preliminary eligibility recommendations referenced to applicable NRHP criteria. 	
10	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Report includes brief overview of the results of the reconnaissance survey, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> an outline of the purpose and methodology of the project, <input type="checkbox"/> a background history of study area presenting historic contexts relevant to the time period associated with the historic-age resources in which to evaluate significance of resources for NRHP eligibility, <input type="checkbox"/> brief description of property types developed from observations on patterns of settlement, development trends, resource distribution, and analysis of survey data <input type="checkbox"/> NRHP registration requirements with integrity analysis of resources in study area. 	

Chapter 7. Historical Studies. Section 5. Non-Archeological Historic-Age Resource Reconnaissance Survey Reports Review Checklist

<input type="checkbox"/> preliminary assessments of effects on historic properties as required in Section E with the appropriate NEPA or federal regulatory language.		
11	<input type="checkbox"/> Report includes maps based on aerial photos of the study area with: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> The APE, existing ROW and proposed new ROW, major street names and other directional landmarks must be clearly indicated on the map. <input type="checkbox"/> The location of each Official State Historical Marker (OSHM) in the study area must be indicated on the map. <input type="checkbox"/> Locations for each historic-age resource must be labeled with appropriate project ID numbers running as consecutively as possible from left to right. <input type="checkbox"/> Outbuildings and landscape features should be reported as subsets of the main project ID number for a property, for example, a residence and associated garage could be labeled Resource Nos. 100a and 100b. If an eligible or potentially eligible historic property has multiple resources, the map will have an inset aerial of the site, with the labeled resources, on the overall map or a separate map to give the reviewer a site plan. 	
12	<input type="checkbox"/> Report includes documentation appropriate to the level of survey for all historic-age features of a historic property. Report also includes appropriate archival and bibliographic references for historic properties, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> oral histories <input type="checkbox"/> historical maps <input type="checkbox"/> deed or tax record research <input type="checkbox"/> other archival research <input type="checkbox"/> title search <input type="checkbox"/> other detailed historic research directly related to the specific location of the site. <input type="checkbox"/> Report also includes appropriate public involvement by contacting local interested parties in order to determine local interest in historic resources in the project area. (Reviewer comments required if No.)	
	D. Evaluation Criteria (requires coordination with ENV staff/technical expert)	ENV-HIST Comments
13	<input type="checkbox"/> Report explicitly evaluates each historic-age resource's	

**Chapter 7. Historical Studies. Section 5. Non-Archeological Historic-Age Resource
Reconnaissance Survey Reports Review Checklist**

	<p>eligibility for inclusion in the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP), providing analysis appropriate to the recommended level of significance of the resource. For resources recommended as NRHP-eligible and for those of marginal significance recommended as not NRHP-eligible, the report must:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> justify significance within appropriate context and NRHP criteria <input type="checkbox"/> discuss all seven aspects of integrity 	
14	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Report provides recommendations for historic-age resources requiring additional intensive survey efforts in order to finalize determinations of NRHP eligibility in accordance with 36 CFR 60.</p>	
15	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Report recommends proposed changes to the research design arising from the results of the reconnaissance survey, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> contextual issues, <input type="checkbox"/> comparative property information needs <input type="checkbox"/> data gaps and other items necessary to finalize the evaluation and documentation phases of the project in accordance with the <i>SOI Standards</i>. <p>Intensive survey results must be integrated with reconnaissance survey results into a single HRSR upon their availability. (Reviewer comments required if NO. TxDOT reserves the right to deviate from recommendations for additional work.)</p> 	
E. Effects Criteria		ENV-HIST Comments
16	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Report characterizes potential direct, indirect, and cumulative effects and provides appropriate supplemental visual documentation for all historic properties in accordance with 36 CFR 60, noting presence or absence of character-defining features in proposed new ROW zones subject to Section 4(f) regulations.</p>	
Approval		
17	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Report contains no factual errors affecting the finding(s), satisfactory completion of field work, or acceptance of the report by Texas Historical Commission or other consulting parties and is therefore approved for acceptance. (Reviewer comments required if No.)</p>	
18	Additional Comments:	

Chapter 7. Historical Studies. Section 6. Non-Archeological Historic-Age Resource Intensive Survey Reports Review Checklist

Section 6. Non-Archeological Historic-Age Resource Intensive Survey Reports Review Checklist

District/County _____ Highway _____ CSJ _____
Contractor _____ Submittal Date _____ Reviewed by _____

Historic-Age Resource Survey Reports (HRSR) for non-archeological historic-age resources will be reviewed for compliance with the following checklist in addition to the Texas Historical Commission reporting standards and the *Archeology and Preservation: Secretary of the Interior's Standards and Guidelines*. Reports with all **Yes** responses will be automatically accepted. One or more **No** response(s) may result in acceptance pending specified revisions or clarifications or in rejection depending on the nature of the issue.

Historic resource studies shall be performed and documented at sufficient levels to satisfy the State Historic Preservation Office/Texas Historical Commission (SHPO/THC) requirements for determining the presence of and documenting historically significant properties in the project Area of Potential Effects (APE) in accordance with 36 CFR 60 and 43 TAC 2.4-2.51. All reports shall include the names and tasks performed of all technical experts associated with the project.

A. Format Criteria	ENV-HIST Comments
1 <input type="checkbox"/> Findings for reconnaissance surveys must be integrated into the intensive survey findings to provide a single HRSR.	
B. Identification Criteria	ENV-HIST Comments
2 <input type="checkbox"/> Report includes a methodological statement based on a research design appropriate to the identification and evaluation of non-archeological historic-age resources specific to the survey area. The research design must be approved by ENV prior to fieldwork. The research design must provide a succinct summary of the literature review results, clear descriptions of identification, evaluation and documentation tasks required and a description of potential areas of significance appropriate to the survey area.	
C. Documentation Criteria	ENV-HIST Comments
3 <input type="checkbox"/> Report includes photographic documentation for each historic-age resource sufficient in number and perspective to satisfy ENV documentation requirements. Photographs must be 3.5" x 5" color representations printed on matte finish photographic paper or 3.5" x 5" color representations printed on matte white, premium or photo quality laser or inkjet paper. Photographs must be original prints or electronic presentations of at least 1200 x 1600 pixel	

Chapter 7. Historical Studies. *Section 6. Non-Archeological Historic-Age Resource Intensive Survey Reports Review Checklist*

<p>resolution quality:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><input type="checkbox"/> must include a single oblique view that incorporates both the primary façade and a side elevation at a minimum for each primary and auxiliary resource and landscape feature associated with a property recommended NRHP-eligible by the reconnaissance survey, with the subject filling the frame.<input type="checkbox"/> must be well focused and clearly depict architectural and other details relevant to an evaluation of the resource’s character-defining features, as well as documenting the historic property’s relationship to the proposed road project.<input type="checkbox"/> must be attached to separately labeled pages that clearly identify project name, project ID number, address or UTM of resource, direction of the photograph, style and/or form of the resource, NRHP criteria eligibility, resource integrity issues, and any limitations when photographing the resource. (Style and form must accurately describe the resource.)<input type="checkbox"/> Additional photographs are required if the historic integrity of the resource is compromised by architectural alterations including, but not limited to, replacement of historic doors and windows, attachment of synthetic siding, loss of ornamental detailing or unsympathetic additions.<input type="checkbox"/> Additional photographs of the inter-relationship of resources are required if historic outbuildings or significant landscape features are associated with the property.<input type="checkbox"/> Additional photographs of the inter-relationship of resources are required if potential or designated historic districts are identified within the APE. These photographs must document representative streetscapes for each block or significant area within the historic district.<input type="checkbox"/> Additional photographs of the inter-relationship of resources are required if modern development impacts the historic integrity of the landscape or demonstrates that the historic resource was moved from its original location into the APE.<input type="checkbox"/> Additional photographs are required to document the resource’s setting, including the presence or absence of character-defining features in a proposed zone of taking subject to Section 4(f) regulations.	
--	--

Chapter 7. Historical Studies. Section 6. Non-Archeological Historic-Age Resource Intensive Survey Reports Review Checklist

<p><input type="checkbox"/> Report includes maps based on aerial photos of the study area detailing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> the APE <input type="checkbox"/> existing ROW <input type="checkbox"/> proposed new ROW <input type="checkbox"/> major street names and other directional landmarks clearly indicated <input type="checkbox"/> locations for each historic property's resource labeled with appropriate ID numbers running as consecutively as possible from left to right. Site maps detailing the inter-relationship of resources such as outbuildings and landscape features associated with a property recommended NRHP- eligible property by the reconnaissance survey. Outbuildings and landscape features should be reported as subsets of the main ID number for a property, for example, a residence and associated garage could be labeled Resource Nos. 100a and 100b. The site map may label resources on an individual aerial or inset of an overall aerial. 	
<p><input type="checkbox"/> Report details the results of the intensive survey, including the findings of the intensive survey and recommendations for NRHP eligibility of all resources. The survey report must have sufficient detail and clarity to provide ENV with a basis for obtaining SHPO concurrence for determinations of NRHP eligibility without requiring submission of additional documentation. At a minimum, the survey report must include the following information:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> an outline of the purpose and methodology of the project, <input type="checkbox"/> a background history of study area presenting historic contexts relevant to the time period associated with the historic-age resources in which to evaluate significance of resources for NRHP eligibility, and <input type="checkbox"/> brief description of property types developed from observations on patterns of settlement, development trends, resource distribution, and analysis of survey data <input type="checkbox"/> NRHP registration requirements with integrity analysis of resources in study area. <input type="checkbox"/> an inventory of resources with proposed determinations of NRHP eligibility for all resources, evaluated against NRHP criteria for significance and integrity in accordance with 36 CFR 60. 	

4

Chapter 7. Historical Studies. Section 6. Non-Archeological Historic-Age Resource Intensive Survey Reports Review Checklist

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> assessments of effects on historic properties as required in Section E with the appropriate NEPA or federal regulatory language. <input type="checkbox"/> detailed information on potential historic districts, including inventories, maps, photos, background history and justification of significance. <input type="checkbox"/> project area maps, survey forms, photographs, site plans. <input type="checkbox"/> appropriate graphics including historic photographs and illustrations, aerials and plat maps that amplify the arguments presented for evaluation purposes. <input type="checkbox"/> appropriate archival and bibliographic references for historic properties, including oral histories, historical maps, deed or tax record research, other archival research, title search, other detailed historic research directly related to the specific location of the site. <input type="checkbox"/> if applicable, appropriate research related to results obtained through public involvement tasks. (Reviewer comments required if No.) 	
	D. Evaluation Criteria (requires coordination with ENV staff/technical expert)	ENV-HIST Comments
5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Report explicitly evaluates each resource's NRHP eligibility, providing analysis appropriate to the recommended level of significance of the resource. For resources recommended as NRHP-eligible and for those of marginal significance recommended as not NRHP-eligible, the report must: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> justify significance within appropriate context and NRHP criteria <input type="checkbox"/> discuss all seven aspects of integrity 	
6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Report integrates intensive survey results with reconnaissance survey results into a single HRSR, including a revised inventory with finalized NRHP recommendations. (Reviewer comments required if No. TxDOT reserves the right to deviate from recommendations for additional work.) 	
	E. Effects Criteria	ENV-HIST Comments
7	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Report characterizes potential indirect, direct, and cumulative effects and provides appropriate supplemental visual documentation for all historic properties in accordance with 36 CFR 60, noting presence or absence of character-defining features in proposed new ROW zones 	

**Chapter 7. Historical Studies. Section 6. Non-Archeological Historic-Age Resource Intensive Survey
Reports Review Checklist**

	subject to Section 4(f) regulations.	
	Approval	
8	<input type="checkbox"/> Report contains no factual errors affecting the finding(s), satisfactory completion of field work, or acceptance of the report by Texas Historical Commission or other consulting parties and is therefore approved for acceptance. (Reviewer comments required if No.)	
9	Additional Comments:	

Chapter 7. Historical Studies. *Section 7. Discussion of Effects on Non-Archeological Historic Resources as Components of HRSRs and NEPA Documents Review Checklist*

**Section 7. Discussion of Effects on Non-Archeological
Historic Resources as Components of HRSRs and NEPA Documents
Review Checklist**

District/County _____ Highway _____ CSJ _____
Contractor _____ Submittal Date _____ Reviewed by _____

Historic-age Resource Survey Reports (HRSR) for non-archeological historic resources and the relevant sections of NEPA documents will be reviewed for compliance with the following checklist in addition to the Texas Historical Commission reporting standards and the Archeology and Preservation: Secretary of the Interior’s Standards and Guidelines. These standards of submission (SOS) operate in concurrence with all other Tx-DOT ENV SOSs and do not supersede requirements set for by those SOSs. Reports with all Yes responses will be automatically accepted. One or more No response may result in acceptance pending specified revisions or clarifications or in rejection depending on the nature of the issue. Reviewer comments are required if No.

Determinations of Effect

A. Format Criteria		ENV-HIST Comments
1	<input type="checkbox"/> Findings for effect must be integrated into survey findings in addition to being incorporated into the NEPA document/HRSR.	
B. Identification Criteria		ENV-HIST Comments
2	<input type="checkbox"/> The NEPA document/HRSR identifies and justifies the presence of historic properties in the APE appropriate to the project scope according to the PA-TU. <input type="checkbox"/> Each historic property discussion shall thoroughly describe all character defining elements that qualify it for inclusion in the NRHP.	
3	<input type="checkbox"/> Generally, historic properties subject to indirect effects shall be documented at the reconnaissance survey level at a minimum. Those subject to direct effects shall be documented at the intensive level at a minimum.	
4	<input type="checkbox"/> The NEPA document /HRSR characterizes potential effects and provides appropriate supplemental visual documentation for all historic properties in accordance with 36 CFR 60 and 36 CFR 800.9, including introduction of visual, atmospheric or audible elements that diminish the integrity of the historic property’s character defining features.	

Chapter 7. Historical Studies. *Section 7. Discussion of Effects on Non-Archeological Historic Resources as Components of HRSRs and NEPA Documents Review Checklist*

C. Documentation Criteria	ENV-HIST Comments
<p><input type="checkbox"/> The NEPA document/HRSR includes photographic documentation for each historic-age resource sufficient in number and perspective to satisfy ENV documentation requirements. Photographs must be 3.5" x 5" color representations printed on matte finish photographic paper or 3.5" x 5" color representations printed on matte white, premium or photo quality laser or inkjet paper. Photographs must be original prints or electronic presentations of at least 1200 x 1600 pixel resolution quality:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> must include a single oblique view that incorporates both the primary façade and a side elevation at a minimum for each primary and auxiliary resource and landscape feature associated with a property recommended NRHP-eligible by the reconnaissance survey, with the subject filling the frame. <input type="checkbox"/> must be well focused and clearly depict architectural and other details relevant to an evaluation of the resource's character-defining features <input type="checkbox"/> documents the historic property's relationship to the proposed road project. <input type="checkbox"/> must be attached to separately labeled pages that clearly identify: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> project name <input type="checkbox"/> project ID number <input type="checkbox"/> address or UTM of resource <input type="checkbox"/> direction of the photograph <input type="checkbox"/> style and/or form of the resource (style and form must accurately describe the resource) <input type="checkbox"/> NRHP criteria eligibility <input type="checkbox"/> resource integrity issues <input type="checkbox"/> any limitations when photographing the resource (style and form must accurately describe the resource) <input type="checkbox"/> Additional photographs are required if the historic integrity of the resource is compromised by architectural alterations including, but not limited to: replacement of historic doors and windows, attachment of synthetic siding, loss of ornamental detailing or unsympathetic additions. <input type="checkbox"/> Additional photographs of the inter-relationship of resources are required if historic outbuildings or 	

5

Chapter 7. Historical Studies. *Section 7. Discussion of Effects on Non-Archeological Historic Resources as Components of HRSRs and NEPA Documents Review Checklist*

<p>significant landscape features are associated with the property.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Additional photographs are required to show the inter-relationship of resources to the project area. <input type="checkbox"/> Additional photographs of the inter-relationship of resources are required if modern development impacts the historic integrity of the landscape. <input type="checkbox"/> Additional photographs are required to document the resource's setting, including the presence or absence of character-defining features in a proposed zone of taking subject to Section 4(f) regulations. 	
<p><input type="checkbox"/> The NEPA document/HRSR includes maps based on aerial photos of the study area detailing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> The APE, existing ROW and proposed new ROW, boundary(ies) and resources of Section 4(f) property(ies) with major street names, and other directional landmarks clearly indicated on the map. <input type="checkbox"/> Locations for each historic property's resource labeled with appropriate ID numbers running as consecutively as possible from left to right. <input type="checkbox"/> Site maps detailing the inter-relationship of resources such as outbuildings and landscape features associated with a property recommended NRHP-eligible property. Outbuildings and landscape features should be reported as subsets of the main ID number for a property, for example, a residence and associated garage could be labeled Resource Nos. 100a and 100b. The site map may label resources on an individual aerial or inset of an overall aerial. <input type="checkbox"/> Legal parcel boundaries. 	
<p><input type="checkbox"/> The NEPA document/HRSR has appropriate graphics including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> historic photographs and illustrations <input type="checkbox"/> aerials and plat maps that amplify the arguments presented for effects analysis. <input type="checkbox"/> designated proposed ROW limits, edge of pavement and other roadway features in relationship to historic property. <input type="checkbox"/> justification of boundaries of a historic property for NRHP guidelines with resources. 	

6

7

Chapter 7. Historical Studies. *Section 7. Discussion of Effects on Non-Archeological Historic Resources as Components of HRSRs and NEPA Documents Review Checklist*

D. Evaluation Criteria	ENV-HIST Comments
<p>8 <input type="checkbox"/> The NEPA document/HRSR explicitly evaluates each resource's contributing or noncontributing status as a component of the historic property. This shall include a discussion of all seven aspects of integrity.</p>	
E. Effects Criteria (requires coordination with ENV staff/technical expert)	ENV-HIST Comments
<p>9 <input type="checkbox"/> The NEPA document/HRSR shall characterize direct impacts to the historic property, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> permanent acquisition of land from a historic property's tract by purchase <input type="checkbox"/> permanent or temporary use of land from a historic property by easement <input type="checkbox"/> relocation of features of the historic property (such as buildings, outbuildings, objects, fencing, landscaping elements) <input type="checkbox"/> demolition of features of the historic property (as above) <input type="checkbox"/> documentation of any feature of a historic property (such as awnings, signs, canopies attached to historic buildings) that lies within TxDOT ROW and must be removed to comply with unobstructed ROW regulations or may be subject to accidental impact during construction <input type="checkbox"/> development of appropriate EPIC language to protect property during construction 	
<p>10 <input type="checkbox"/> The NEPA document/HRSR shall characterize indirect impacts to the historic property, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> changes in setting, feeling or association brought about by relocation of pavement edge within TxDOT ROW <input type="checkbox"/> changes in the utility of a property by rendering it inaccessible, unusable or unsalable (for example, dividing a farm into non-productive components or precluding commercial usage of a property by eliminating parking) <input type="checkbox"/> changes in the functionality of a property wrought by impacting its character-defining features through constructive use (for example, introducing substantive increases of noise to a cemetery or other place of reflection and respite) 	

Chapter 7. Historical Studies. *Section 7. Discussion of Effects on Non-Archeological Historic Resources as Components of HRSRs and NEPA Documents Review Checklist*

	<input type="checkbox"/> discussion of such impacts shall rely on the standards used in determining environmental impacts through NEPA process	
11	<input type="checkbox"/> The NEPA document/HRSR shall characterize foreseeable cumulative impacts to the historic property by discussing the following points. Discussion of such impacts shall rely on the standards used in determining environmental impacts through NEPA process, including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> changes in the long term economic viability that could impact its preservation <input type="checkbox"/> long-term impacts through ongoing development of transportation undertakings that could compromise the historic property in particular or the property type as a whole (such as change of hydraulics or ongoing loss of historic bridges) <input type="checkbox"/> Development plans in the immediate area (for example, reviewing filed plats) 	
12	<input type="checkbox"/> The NEPA document/HRSR shall characterize all impacts to the historic property for purposes of providing alternatives analyses required by Section 4(f) regulations and supply supporting graphic documentation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Defining zones of impact and characterizing potential to avoid or minimize harm to character defining elements. 	
F. Approval		
13	<input type="checkbox"/> The NEPA document/HRSR contains no factual errors affecting the finding(s), satisfactory completion of field work, or acceptance of the report by Texas Historical Commission or other consulting parties and is therefore approved for acceptance.	
14	Additional Comments: 	

*Texas Department of Transportation
Environmental Affairs Division*

**Standards of Uniformity for
Programmatic Categorical Exclusions**

Chapter 8.

Archeological Resources

Chapter 8. Archeological Resources. Section 1. Standards of Uniformity for Archeological Resources

Section 1. Standards of Uniformity for Archeological Resources

Purpose of these standards

The [*Programmatic Agreement for the Review and Approval of NEPA Categorically Excluded Transportation Projects between the Federal Highway Administration Texas Division and the Texas Department of Transportation \(PA-CE\)*](#) states that a project classified as a PCE may have no adverse effect on archeological historic properties (PA-CE Section C.3), unless the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) approves an exception in writing.

To make a determination about the effect of a project, some kind of analysis must be undertaken and the results documented. This SOU provides instructions to evaluate and report a project's potential effects on archeological historic properties. It also provides sample language to use in the NEPA decision document.

Roles of ENV, District, Regional Environmental Center and Others

The District or other project sponsor develops the project description. ENV is usually responsible for evaluating project effects and coordinating the results of studies; this includes consulting with federally-recognized tribes and other parties.

The one exception occurs when the project has, by definition, no potential to cause effects to an archeological historic property (see the [*Certification Standards for Projects that Do Not Require Project-Specific Review*](#)).

After concluding all required coordination, ENV sends copies of its reports and consultation letters directly to the District. The District reports the results in the PCE document and archives supporting documentation in the project file. The [Regional Environmental Center](#) (requires Crossroads access) certifies that the results satisfy applicable criteria for a PCE.

How to use the standards

This SOU describes the activities to be undertaken, the sequence in which they are to be performed, and the manner in which they are to be reported, to determine a project's effects on archeological historic properties. In effect, this SOU also provides a guide to the rest of the applicable archeology [SOU's for permits and reports](#). A project determined to have "no effect" or "no adverse effect" on archeological historic properties may be classified as a PCE.

Suggested language for such situations is provided in the [*Suggested Language for the Cultural Resources Section of PCE Documents*](#) section. In this section, *italicized* text gives directions for completing the statement; [bracketed] text identifies information to include. For this information and copies of relevant documentation, see the appropriate [ETS record\(s\)](#). Follow the directions given in the applicable SOU for the format of the PCE document to determine what supporting documentation, such as preliminary coordination letters, must be included as part of the PCE document.

ENV has determined that the suggested language provides adequate documentation of a project's effects. A District may deviate from the suggested text at their discretion and as individual situations warrant; however, such deviation increases the risk that the District and REC will not agree on the adequate level of documentation.

Chapter 8. Archeological Resources. Section 1. Standards of Uniformity for Archeological Resources

Timing of work

To be approved as a PCE, a project must have no adverse effects. This condition must be established before the District submits it to the REC. Therefore, ENV must obtain project information in a timely fashion so all review and coordination can be complete prior to the District's submission.

The District must provide project information to ENV more than 23 weeks prior to submitting the PCE document to the [Regional Environmental Center](#) for certification (see the [Standards of Uniformity for Coordination Requests Regarding Archeological Resources](#)). This requirement is based upon typical review and consultation timelines. After completing the required investigations and coordination, ENV will provide the results to the District, so they may be incorporated into the NEPA document.

This schedule assumes that the investigations do not identify a site requiring evaluation or field work beyond the survey level. Any additional field investigation beyond survey will take another six months or more to complete and coordinate with other groups, such as federally-recognized tribes.

Statutes, regulations, and other applicable guidelines

The [PA-CE \(Section C.3\)](#) specifies that a project cannot be classified as a BCE or PCE if it has an adverse effect on any historic property. Thus, a project can not ordinarily be classified as a BCE or PCE if it would have an adverse effect on a historic property, unless FHWA approves an exception in writing.

[Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act](#) requires federal agencies to consider the effects of their undertakings on historic properties. See the following link:

http://frwebgate.access.gpo.gov/cgi-bin/getdoc.cgi?dbname=browse_usc&docid=Cite:+16USC470f.

[36 CFR 800](#) defines the terms "adverse effect" (36 CFR 800.5(a)(1)) and "historic properties" (36 CFR 800.16(l)). See the following link: <http://ecfr.gpoaccess.gov/cgi/t/text/text-idx?c=ecfr&sid=45b0db2aef5536422feb88bb67207aa9&rqn=div5&view=text&node=36:3.0.6.1.1&idno=36>

The [First Amended Programmatic Agreement among the Federal Highway Administration, the Texas Department of Transportation, the Texas State Historic Preservation Officer, and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation Regarding the Implementation of Transportation Undertakings \(PA-TU\)](#) specifies TxDOT's procedures for evaluating project effects and completing associated consultation on behalf of FHWA.

The Antiquities Code requires Texas Historical Commission (THC) to review all ground-disturbing projects that occur on non-federal public lands. The THC evaluates the effects of those projects on archeological sites, including cemeteries. Rules for implementing the Antiquities Code can be found in Title 13 Texas Administrative Code (TAC) Part 2 Chapter 26. For the statute, use the following link:

<http://www.statutes.legis.state.tx.us/SOTWDocs/NR/pdf/NR.191.52811.45565.pdf>

To read the rules, click this link:

[http://info.sos.state.tx.us/pls/pub/readtac\\$ext.ViewTAC?tac_view=4&ti=13&pt=2&ch=26&rl=Y](http://info.sos.state.tx.us/pls/pub/readtac$ext.ViewTAC?tac_view=4&ti=13&pt=2&ch=26&rl=Y)

Chapter 8. Archeological Resources. Section 1. Standards of Uniformity for Archeological Resources

[TxDOT's Memorandum of Understanding \(MOU\) with the Texas Historical Commission](#) (43 TAC 2.24) specifies TxDOT's procedures for compliance with the [Antiquities Code](#). It describes procedures consistent with the process detailed in the [PA-TU](#). See the following link:
[http://info.sos.state.tx.us/pls/pub/readtac\\$ext.TacPage?sl=R&app=9&p_dir=&p_rloc=&p_tloc=&p_ploc=&pg=1&p_tac=&ti=43&pt=1&ch=2&rl=24](http://info.sos.state.tx.us/pls/pub/readtac$ext.TacPage?sl=R&app=9&p_dir=&p_rloc=&p_tloc=&p_ploc=&pg=1&p_tac=&ti=43&pt=1&ch=2&rl=24)

Chapter 8. Archeological Resources. Section 1. Standards of Uniformity for Archeological Resources

District/County _____ Highway _____ CSJ _____
Contractor _____ Submittal Date _____ Reviewed by _____

YES	NO	N/A	Description of Item Sufficiency	References/Guidance
Initiating Archeological Review and Coordination				
1			<p>Step 1. The District determines whether the project can be classified as a project that does not require project-specific review. (See Certification Standards for Projects that Do Not Require Project-Specific Review).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If “yes,” complete the SOU entitled Certification Standards for Projects that Do Not Require Project-Specific Review and submit to ENV-ARCH. Send a copy of the signed certification to ENV for input to ETS and archive the original form in the project file. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ The District documents this finding in the PCE document. ○ The next section of this SOU provides suggested language for the PCE document. If you are following this suggested language, use the introductory paragraph and statement A from the standard language section; no further work is required. • If “no” go to step 2. 	<p>The First Amended Programmatic Agreement among the Federal Highway Administration, the Texas Department of Transportation, the Texas State Historic Preservation Officer, and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation Regarding the Implementation of Transportation Undertakings (PA-TU)</p> <p>Memorandum of Understanding between TxDOT and the Texas Historical Commission (MOU) (13 TAC 26.14(e)(1) and 43 TAC 2.24(e)(1))</p> <p>Certification Standards for Projects that Do Not Require Project-Specific Review</p>
2			<p>Step 2. The District provides project information to ENV in accordance with the Standards of Uniformity for Coordination Requests Regarding Archeological Resources.</p> <p>ENV receives the same project information that is reported in the PCE document and project file. ENV also receives information about any changes to the project design and uses that to</p>	<p>Standards of Uniformity for Coordination Requests Regarding Archeological Resources</p>

Chapter 8. Archeological Resources. Section 1. Standards of Uniformity for Archeological Resources

YES	NO	N/A	Description of Item Sufficiency	References/Guidance
			<p>determine if additional review and coordination are necessary. Go to Step 3.</p>	
3			<p>Step 3. ENV recommends an appropriate level of effort for archeological investigations. This recommendation may include a background study (see the Standards of Uniformity for Background Study) or survey (applicable standards include the Standards for Individual Antiquities Permit Applications; the Review Standards for Archeological Survey Reports, Individual Permit; and the Review Standards for Impact Evaluations), for example.</p> <p>In coordination with the District, ENV performs the work in-house or contracts with a consultant under its scientific services contracts, or the District obtains the services through a sub-consultant working under an engineering contract. ENV initiates any other required coordination and consultation.</p> <p>One of the following four results will occur:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) A background study or field investigation is performed and consultation is completed. <p style="padding-left: 40px;">If ENV concludes that the project will have no effect or no adverse effect, go to Step 4.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> b) If further field investigation is required, repeat this step. c) If field investigations cannot be completed due to denial of right-of-entry, go to Step 4. d) If ENV concludes that the project will have an adverse effect, go to Step 7. 	<p>PA-TU Standards of Uniformity for Background Study, Archeological Resources Standards for Individual Antiquities Permit Applications Review Standards for Archeological Survey Reports, Individual Permit Review Standards for Impact Evaluations</p>
4			<p>Step 4. Technical review documents and consultation letters identify the horizontal dimensions and depth of impacts</p>	<p>36 CFR 800.4(a)(1) PA-TU, Stipulation IX.D.1.a.</p>

Chapter 8. Archeological Resources. Section 1. Standards of Uniformity for Archeological Resources

YES	NO	N/A	Description of Item Sufficiency	References/Guidance
			<p>resulting from the project (the area of potential effects or APE). The District should compare these documents and letters to the most recent project description.</p> <p>The District confirms the following statement:</p> <p><i>Considered cumulatively, the three-dimensional space (APE) evaluated by the various technical review documents and consultation letters completely encompasses all accessible portions of the project area and depth of impacts disclosed in the most recent project description.</i></p> <p>If ENV has concluded that the project will have no effect or no adverse effect, go to Step 5.</p> <p>If field investigations could not be completed because right-of-entry was denied, go to Step 6.</p>	<p>MOU, 43 TAC 2.24(c)(3)(A).</p>
Documentation of ENV Findings and Recommendations				
5			<p>Step 5. As documented through review and coordination, the project will not have an adverse effect.</p> <p>ETS and the project file contain comprehensive documentation of the completion of review and consultation.</p> <p>The District reports the results of all studies and coordination in the PCE document, showing that the project will not have an adverse effect. The next section of this SOU provides suggested language for the PCE document. If you are following this suggested language, use the introductory paragraph and statement B.</p>	
6			<p>Step 6. Studies and coordination could not be completed due to denial of right-of-entry to private property. As documented through review and coordination for all areas that could be accessed, the project will not have an adverse effect.</p>	<p>PA-TU, Stipulation IX.B.3.</p>

Chapter 8. Archeological Resources. Section 1. Standards of Uniformity for Archeological Resources

YES	NO	N/A	Description of Item Sufficiency	References/Guidance
			<p>ETS and the project file contain comprehensive documentation of the completion of review and consultation.</p> <p>The District reports (1) the results of any studies and coordination, (2) the denial of right-of-entry, and (3) its commitment to complete investigations when access to those parcels is obtained in the PCE document.</p> <p>The next section of this SOU provides suggested language for the PCE document. If you are following the suggested language, use the introductory paragraph and statement C.</p>	
7			<p>Step 7. The project can not be classified as a standard PCE. The District must either (1) follow the Standard Operating Procedure entitled Request for FHWA Exceptions, (2) produce an appropriate, higher level of NEPA documentation, or (3) redesign the project to avoid adverse effects.</p> <p>Based on this decision, ENV will provide project-specific language for a revised or different document.</p>	<p>The Programmatic Agreement for the Review and Approval of NEPA Categorically Excluded Transportation Projects between the Federal Highway Administration Texas Division and the Texas Department of Transportation</p> <p>Request for FHWA Exceptions SOP</p>

Chapter 8. Archeological Resources. Section 1. Standards of Uniformity for Archeological Resources

Suggested Language for the Cultural Resources Section of PCE Documents

Instructions (part one): *This section contains suggested language for documenting the results of cultural resources studies. It includes an introductory statement that applies to results for both Archeological Studies and [Historical Studies](#). This introductory paragraph should precede the discipline-specific statements; it only needs to be included once in the document. In other words, the introductory statement does not have to precede both the individual ARCH and HIST paragraphs.*

This italicized text provides directions for producing the archeology section of the PCE document. [Bracketed] text is information that must be input by the document preparer.

Introductory Paragraph for Cultural Resources:

Cultural Resources

Cultural resources are structures, buildings, archeological sites, districts (a collection of related structures, buildings, and/or archeological sites), cemeteries, and objects. Both federal and state laws require consideration of cultural resources during project planning. At the federal level, NEPA and the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) of 1966, among others, apply to transportation projects such as this one. In addition, state laws such as the Antiquities Code of Texas apply to these projects. Compliance with these laws often requires consultation with the Texas Historical Commission/Texas State Historic Preservation Officer and/or federally-recognized tribes to determine the project's effects on cultural resources. Review and coordination of this project followed approved procedures for compliance with federal and state laws.

Instructions (part two): *After including the above introductory paragraph for all cultural resources, add appropriate statements for both archeological and non-archeological resources (see the appropriate [SOU from the Historical Studies Branch](#) for the non-archeological resource language). For archeological resources, choose one of the following:*

Statement A *is used when the project does not require project-specific review (see the [Certification Standards for Projects that Do Not Require Project-Specific Review](#)).*

Statement B *is used when the project does require a project-specific review, and review and consultation have been completed. Please note that Statement B requires additional information from ETS to be included. Statement B provides [bracketed] prompts where information needs to be selected and added.*

Statement C *is used when field investigations could not be completed because property owners denied right-of-entry to their property, preventing archeologists from conducting necessary field work in those areas. Statement C also requires additional information from ETS to be included, and provides [bracketed] prompts where information needs to be selected and added. Additional supporting documentation for these statements, such as preliminary coordination results, should be included and referenced as required by the SOU for the appropriate NEPA document format.*

Chapter 8. Archeological Resources. Section 1. Standards of Uniformity for Archeological Resources

Statement A. No Project-Specific Review Required

ARCH paragraph. Archeological Resources. Existing agreements for compliance with applicable cultural resource laws define this project as a type that has no potential to adversely affect archeological resources. No consultation with the Texas Historical Commission/Texas State Historic Preservation Officer or other groups was required.

Statement B. Project Review Completed

ARCH paragraph. This paragraph should be assembled from the individual sentences as indicated. The heading and sentences have been presented as a list for ease of reference.

Heading: Archeological Resources.

First sentence: Based on the archeological study, no further investigation is warranted.

Second sentence: [Add brief discussion of the results of this work. Example: The background study found that the project area had been extensively disturbed, precluding the possibility of it containing any intact archeological deposits. Another example: A field investigation found no archeological sites within the project area.]

Third sentence: Consultation with federally-recognized Native American tribes with a demonstrated historic interest in the area [Check ETS and select one of the following two options: (1) was initiated on [DATE] or (2) was not required for this project].

Fourth sentence (contingent on tribal consultation being required): [Report the results of any tribal consultation; see record of consultation in ETS. If appropriate, state: No objections or expressions of concern were received within the comment period].

Fifth and sixth sentences. Choose one of the following two sets of sentences:

(1) If the project was processed on TxDOT-ENV's weekly list of projects that did not warrant THC/TSHPO review select the following text:

TxDOT archeologists completed their review of this project on [DATE] and determined that the project will have no effect or no adverse effect on archeological resources that would be afforded further consideration under cultural resource laws. No consultation with the Texas Historical Commission/Texas State Historic Preservation Officer was required. *The date for completion of coordination can be obtained from the ENV-A coordination row End Date in ETS.*

(2) If, on the other hand, the project was the subject of an individual consultation letter with THC/TSHPO, use the following text and determine from the scanned letter in ETS which finding applies:

TxDOT and the THC/TSHPO consulted on the project impacts. The THC/TSHPO concurred that the project will

[Refer to the consultation letter conclusions and select one of the following two options to complete this sixth sentence (note that the indentation is intended to make the following

Chapter 8. Archeological Resources. Section 1. Standards of Uniformity for Archeological Resources

text easier to read and is not to be taken as a suggestion for the format of the PCE document):

(2a) not affect archeological resources that would be afforded further consideration under cultural resource laws

or

(2b) not adversely affect archeological resources that would be afforded further consideration under cultural resource laws]

In either case, conclude this sixth sentence by adding the date for completion of processing or consultation and a reference to appropriate attachments: [DATE] The date for completion of coordination can also be obtained from the THC-A coordination row End Date in ETS.

Concluding sentence: In the event that unanticipated archeological deposits are encountered during construction, work in the immediate area will cease, and TxDOT archeological staff will be contacted to initiate post-review discovery procedures.

Statement C. Project Review Not Completed Due to Denial of Right-of-Entry

ARCH paragraph. This paragraph should be assembled from the individual sentences as indicated. The heading and sentences have been presented as a list for ease of reference.

Heading: Archeological Resources.

First sentence: Evaluation of project effects on archeological resources could not be completed because right-of-entry was denied to some properties, preventing archeologists from conducting the necessary field work.

Second sentence: [Add a brief discussion of the results of any work that has been completed, using information from existing consultation letters, memos, reports, and ETS. Example: A background study found that only some areas warranted survey. Another example: A field investigation of the portions of the project area to which archeologists could obtain access found no archeological sites.]

Third sentence: Consultation with federally-recognized Native American tribes with a demonstrated historic interest in the area [Check ETS and select one of the following two options: (1) was initiated on [DATE] or (2) was not required for this project].

Fourth sentence (contingent on tribal consultation being required): [Report the results of any tribal consultation; see record of consultation in ETS. If appropriate, state: No objections or expressions of concern were received within the comment period].

Fifth, sixth, and seventh sentences: Work conducted up to this point has identified no archeological resources that would be afforded further consideration under cultural resource laws and that the project would adversely affect. Once access to the areas requiring field investigations has been obtained, TxDOT will complete all required investigations and consultation. In the event that unanticipated archeological deposits are encountered during

Chapter 8. Archeological Resources. *Section 1. Standards of Uniformity for Archeological Resources*

construction, work in the immediate area will cease, and TxDOT archeological staff will be contacted to initiate post-review discovery procedures.

Chapter 8. Archeological Resources. *Section 2. Standards of Uniformity for Coordination Requests Regarding Archeological Resources*

Section 2. Standards of Uniformity for Coordination Requests Regarding Archeological Resources

Purpose of these standards

All projects with the potential to affect archeological sites must be passed through ENV-ARCH for review and/or processing. This SOU specifies the information ENV-ARCH requires to determine the level of effort necessary in evaluating project effects, and to begin required coordination with other parties, such as federally-recognized tribes.

Projects that meet the criteria for having “no potential to cause effects” (such as maintenance projects and some projects with a minor amount of ground disturbance) do not have to be sent to ENV-ARCH for review. These projects can be certified using the [Certification Standards for Projects that Do Not Require Project-Specific Review](#).

Role of ENV, District, Regional Environmental Center and others

The District should use this form to ensure that all necessary and available information is supplied with the coordination request. The District can also use this form to determine what information should be supplied to a consultant providing archeological services under a District contract.

ENV-ARCH will review all requests and proceed with investigations and coordination to the extent practical with the available information.

How to use the standards

District project submittals for coordination or initiation of fieldwork by ENV-ARCH staff should include the information on the following table. Some of this information may not be available, depending on when coordination is initiated during project planning. The District should submit as much information as it has available, as early as possible.

ENV may undertake coordination efforts to the extent practical with the available information, but these efforts may not be complete until all the requested information has been provided. Also, if the project changes, additional coordination will be required.

Timing of work

Send project information to ENV more than 23 weeks prior to submitting the PCE document to the Regional Environmental Center for certification. Submitting information to ENV earlier is always recommended – even if the information is incomplete – because the outcome of archeological investigations cannot be predicted in advance. Completion of a survey and coordination of the results can take a full 23 weeks, even if the survey results find that no additional investigations are required.

Chapter 8. Archeological Resources. *Section 2. Standards of Uniformity for Coordination Requests Regarding Archeological Resources*

This time is required for developing a work authorization, scheduling and implementing fieldwork, producing and reviewing a draft report, and coordinating the report with appropriate parties. For example, most projects require consultation with federally-recognized tribes regarding the findings of archeological evaluations. Tribes are afforded 45 days to respond once information has been sent to them. Providing project information more than 23 weeks in advance of draft environmental document production allows time for survey and coordination results to be included in the draft environmental document.

If a project requires fieldwork beyond survey, 23 weeks will not be sufficient time to complete all required investigations and coordination. Initial field surveys can disclose the presence of resources that require extensive additional evaluation. The discovery of archeological materials within the project area may also require multiple rounds of tribal consultation. Submitting project information early allows more time for handling such occurrences when they arise, while also minimizing the effects on the overall project schedule as much as possible.

Integrating the results with NEPA documentation

This SOU does not directly produce results to be reported in a NEPA document. It will produce a packet of information for ENV to begin review and coordination. Since ENV does not review the PCE document, submission of this information is critical for the completion of review and coordination. ENV will use the information to determine the appropriate type of investigation. An investigation is conducted using a corresponding SOU (e.g., [SOU for Background Study](#) or the [SOU for Archeological Survey Reports, Individual Permit](#)). These other SOUs are available from the staff of [ENV's Archeological Studies Branch](#). Based on the results of the investigation, ENV will produce results to be reported in the PCE document. [The Standards of Uniformity for Archeological Resources](#) also provides appropriate language for the PCE document.

Regulations and other applicable guidelines

ENV is responsible for completing project evaluations and conducting coordination as specified in the [First Amended Programmatic Agreement among the Federal Highway Administration, the Texas Department of Transportation, the Texas State Historic Preservation Officer, and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation Regarding the Implementation of Transportation Undertakings \(PA-TU\)](#). See the following link: <ftp://ftp.dot.state.tx.us/pub/txdot-info/library/pubs/bus/env/programmatic.pdf>

The [Memorandum of Understanding between TxDOT and the Texas Historical Commission \(MOU\) \(13 TAC 26.14\(d\)\(1\)\(D\) and 43 TAC 2.24\(d\)\(1\)\(D\)\)](#) also requires ENV to coordinate with the [Texas Historical Commission](#) regarding its projects. The PA-TU, Stipulation VIII, and the MOU identify the type of project information to be documented. For [43 TAC 2.24](#), go to: [http://info.sos.state.tx.us/pls/pub/readtac\\$ext.TacPage?sl=R&app=9&p_dir=&p_rloc=&p_tloc=&p_ploc=&pg=1&p_tac=&ti=43&pt=1&ch=2&rl=24](http://info.sos.state.tx.us/pls/pub/readtac$ext.TacPage?sl=R&app=9&p_dir=&p_rloc=&p_tloc=&p_ploc=&pg=1&p_tac=&ti=43&pt=1&ch=2&rl=24)

Chapter 8. Archeological Resources. Section 2. Standards of Uniformity for Coordination Requests
Regarding Archeological Resources

District/County _____ Highway _____ CSJ _____

Contractor _____ Submittal Date _____ Reviewed by _____

YES	NO	N/A	Description of Item Sufficiency	References/Guidance
Administrative Requirements				
1			The District has provided Segment ID, CSJ, and an active function code (or equivalent if the project is not a construction project) against which work can be charged.	
2			Project information is submitted more than 23 weeks prior to submission of the PCE document to the REC for certification.	
Project Description				
3			Submittal includes a map of the project area on a USGS 7.5' quadrangle, or equivalent if a 7.5' quadrangle is unavailable.	Memorandum of Understanding between TxDOT and the Texas Historical Commission (MOU) (13 TAC 26.14(f)(2)(D)(iii) and 43 TAC 2.24(f)(2)(D)(iii))
4			The project description identifies any culvert replacements or construction, bridge-class culvert replacements, bridge replacements, bridge approach work, storm sewer installations, and utility relocations associated with the project.	First Amended Programmatic Agreement among the Federal Highway Administration, the Texas Department of Transportation, the Texas State Historic Preservation Officer, and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation Regarding the Implementation of Transportation Undertakings (PA-TU) , Stipulation VIII(A). MOU (13 TAC 26.14(j)(3)(A) and 43 TAC 2.24(j)(3)(A))
5			The project description identifies (1) the project limits, (2) right-of-way (ROW) width, and (3) acreage of existing ROW,	PA-TU , Stipulation VIII(A)

Chapter 8. Archeological Resources. Section 2. Standards of Uniformity for Coordination Requests Regarding Archeological Resources

YES	NO	N/A	Description of Item Sufficiency	References/Guidance
			new ROW, and easements. The project description also identifies the maximum depth of impacts from the project, referring either to project plans or to typical impacts for this class of project.	
6			The description (1) notes whether the project includes any new ROW, easements, or project-specific locations, (2) describes the location of any such features, and (3) quantifies their area.	PA-TU , Stipulation VIII(A) 13 TAC 26.14(j)(3)(A) and 43 TAC 2.24(j)(3)(A)
7			Clearly reproducible layouts are attached, including bridge and culvert layouts. These layouts show the existing and proposed ROW boundaries and easements.	PA-TU , Stipulation VIII(A) and (H)
8			Clearly reproducible profiles are attached.	PA-TU , Stipulation VIII(A) and (H)
9			Clearly reproducible typical sections are attached.	PA-TU , Stipulation VIII(A) and (H)
Information Required for Field Investigations				
10			Right of entry forms, signed by the owners of parcels from which new right of way or easements shall be acquired, are attached.	TxDOT Form 2140 (others may be used by the District in consultation with ENV)
11			When artifacts are to be collected, right of entry forms are accompanied by an explicit transfer of ownership of any recovered artifacts from private property owners to the State. NOTE: This criterion may be waived for survey-level investigations where artifact collection will not be conducted but is required for all test excavation and data recovery projects.	Requirement to permanently curate: PA-TU , Stipulation II(F) and MOU (13 TAC 26.14(f)(6)(B) and 43 TAC 2.24(f)(6)(B)) Transfer of Ownership form available from ENV.
Conclusion (for use by ENV Staff)				
12			Project submittal approved for coordination or further investigation.	

ENV ARCH Reviewer Name _____ Date _____

Chapter 8. Archeological Resources. *Section 3. Certification Standards for Projects that Do Not Require Project-Specific Review*

Section 3. Certification Standards for Projects that Do Not Require Project-Specific Review

Purpose of these standards

Some projects, by definition, require no review by ENV or the Texas State Historic Preservation Officer (TSHPO)/Texas Historical Commission (THC). The standards identify the projects of this type and describe the documentation required to certify them as such projects.

Role of ENV, District, and others

The District should use the following checklist to determine whether the project conforms to a type that does not require project-specific review by ENV or TSHPO/THC. Once completed, an authorized D/D/O staff member shall sign the checklist. ENV may also use and sign this checklist, as appropriate, for projects that have been sent to ENV for review.

How to use the standards

Certification of the project's status as a project that does not require review should be done by completing the following checklist. The checklist identifies the project elements and required supporting documentation. A copy of the completed checklist and documentation should be kept on file with other project information, as it may be subject to audit. Once completed, an authorized D/D/O staff member projects shall sign the checklist, certifying that the project description meets the criteria on the list. Any changes to the project description should be followed by verification that the project still conforms to a type listed on the checklist and that existing documentation is adequate. If not, the certification should be completed again with the revised project description, or the project should be sent to ENV for review.

Timing of work

A project can be certified as a type that does not require review once the project description has been finalized. The certification must occur prior to approval of the NEPA document, because the certification must be reported in that document. Any changes to the project description that occur following certification must be followed by verification that the project still conforms to a type listed on the checklist and that existing documentation is adequate.

Integrating the results with NEPA documentation

The Standards of Uniformity for the Archeology Section of a PCE Document contains standard language to use in cases where the project does not require review. PCE documents should employ the standard introductory paragraph for cultural resources and statement A for archeology from that SOU. Other forms of NEPA documentation should use a similar statement.

Chapter 8. Archeological Resources. *Section 3. Certification Standards for Projects that Do Not Require Project-Specific Review*

Regulations and other applicable guidelines

Appendix 3 of the First Amended Programmatic Agreement among the Federal Highway Administration, the Texas Department of Transportation, the Texas State Historic Preservation Officer, and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation Regarding the Implementation of Transportation Undertakings (PA-TU) identifies those projects that do not require project specific review by ENV or by the TSHPO. The Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) between the Texas Historical Commission and TxDOT also identifies those projects that do not require project specific review by ENV or by the THC (13 TAC 26.14(e)(1) and 43 TAC 2.24(e)(1)). The PA-TU and MOU contain identical lists. For 43 TAC 2.24 see:

[http://info.sos.state.tx.us/pls/pub/readtac\\$ext.TacPage?sl=R&app=9&p_dir=&p_rloc=&p_tloc=&p_ploc=&pg=1&p_tac=&ti=43&pt=1&ch=2&rl=24](http://info.sos.state.tx.us/pls/pub/readtac$ext.TacPage?sl=R&app=9&p_dir=&p_rloc=&p_tloc=&p_ploc=&pg=1&p_tac=&ti=43&pt=1&ch=2&rl=24)

Certification Standards for Projects that Do Not Require Project-Specific Review

Project name and description (attach project location map and include in project file or maintenance log): _____

#	Criterion (indicate whether a particular criterion applies by checking one of the following three columns)	Yes	No	N/A
Project Classified as Routine Maintenance				
1	Project entails routine roadway maintenance (such as vegetation control, traffic control, and routine painting and striping) that does not have the potential to affect State Archeological Landmarks or historic properties.			
Project Is Not Routine Maintenance But Contains Only Elements from the Following List (Check All That Apply)				
2	(A) installation, repair, or replacement of fencing, signage, traffic signals, railroad warning devices, safety end treatments, cameras and intelligent highway system equipment;			
	(B) earthmoving projects involving less than 100 cubic yards of excavation below the original grade;			
	(C) routine structural maintenance and repair of non-historic bridges, highways, railroad crossings, picnic areas, and rest areas;			
	(D) in-kind repair, replacement of non-historic lighting, signals, curbs and gutters, and sidewalks;			
	(E) crack seal, overlay, milling, grooving, resurfacing, and restriping;			
	(F) replacement, upgrade, and repair of safety barriers, ditches, storm drains, and culverts constructed after the depression-era period (i.e. after 1939) except in association with historic bridges;			
	(G) intersection improvements that require no additional right of way;			
	(H) placement of riprap to prevent erosion of waterway banks and bridge piers provided no ground disturbance is required;			
	(I) all maintenance work between a highway and an adjacent frontage road;			
	(J) installation of noise barriers or alterations to existing publicly owned buildings less than 50 years old, to provide for noise reduction except in potential or listed National Register districts;			
	(K) driveway and street connections;			
	(L) all work within interchanges and within medians of divided highways except where graves are present;			
	(M) all work between the flowlines of the ditches and channels and above the original line and grade;			
	(N) ditch and channel maintenance provided removal of fill is above the original line and grade;			
	(O) repairs needed as a result of an event, natural or man-made, which causes damage to a designated state highway, resulting in an imminent threat to life or property of the traveling public or which substantially disrupts or may disrupt the orderly flow of traffic and commerce; or			
	(P) FOR ARCHEOLOGY ONLY: sidewalk construction or modification—including ADA ramps—except (i) sidewalk installations where the depth of impacts exceeds one foot or (ii) projects within the historic districts of Goliad, Rio Grande City, Roma, San Antonio, San Elizario, and San Ygnacio or (iii) projects within the city limits of Anahuac, San Patricio, and Socorro.			
Other Project Elements				
3	The project contains only elements listed under criteria 1 or 2.			
Supporting Documentation				
4	Documentation included in the project files or maintenance log support the conclusion that this project contains only elements listed under criterion 1 or 2.			

The undersigned certifies that the project meets the criteria above. Therefore, the project qualifies as an Undertaking with No Potential to Affect Historic Properties under Stipulation V and Appendix 3 of the First Amended Programmatic Agreement Among the Federal Highway Administration, the Texas Department of Transportation, the Texas State Historic Preservation Officer, and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation Regarding the Implementation of Transportation Undertakings. It also qualifies as a project that does not have potential to affect State Archeological Landmarks under 43 TAC 2.24(e).

Certified by:

 Signature Date

 Name, Title

Chapter 8. Archeological Resources. Section 4. Background Study

Section 4. Background Study

Purpose of these standards

For purposes of regulatory compliance regarding archeological sites, many projects can be evaluated with only a background study and do not require a field investigation or greater level of effort. Background studies are limited to a review of existing literature, maps, and other documentation. Depending on the results of the study, a background study may be sufficient for evaluating a project's effects. A background study may also result in a recommendation for further investigations, including fieldwork.

Role of ENV, District, and others

The following checklist or standards of uniformity (SOU) should be used by ENV staff and archeological consultants to develop such studies. Districts may use criteria 1 through 14 on the form as the basis for a scope of work. The Districts shall incorporate the results of the background study into their NEPA documents when the study results in a determination that no further work is required.

How to use the standards

As is the case for any project documentation, coordination of a background study depends on the extent to which the submission adheres to the required criteria. A study with all "Yes" responses will be automatically accepted. One or more "No" responses may result in acceptance pending specified revisions or clarifications, or may be rejected depending on the nature and relative importance of the error or omission. A background study that identifies sites within the project area may be accepted pending outcome of consultation with Texas Historical Commission, federally-recognized tribes, and other consulting parties. A background study shall include the elements listed on the following checklist.

Timing of work

For cases where ENV will perform the required review, project information must be submitted more than six months prior to approval of the NEPA document (see the SOU for Coordination Requests Regarding Archeological Resources), because the study results must be reported in that document. A background study itself generally does not take very long to complete, but it may lead to a determination that a field investigation is warranted. Field investigations may require six months to complete. This time is required for developing a work authorization, scheduling and implementing fieldwork, producing and reviewing a draft report, and coordinating the report with appropriate parties.

Integrating the results with NEPA documentation

The background study often produces information that can form the basis for a corresponding NEPA section. When the background study results in a determination that further investigations are needed, that additional work must be completed before any results can be reported in a

Chapter 8. Archeological Resources. Section 4. Background Study

NEPA document. A background study, however, may often result in the determination that no further work is required. In such cases, the results and conclusions of the study should be summarized briefly in the NEPA document. The following two paragraphs provide guidance for PCE documents and for other types of NEPA document when the investigations conclude with the background study.

For PCE documents, see the SOU for the Archeology Section of a PCE Document. The PCE document should employ the standard introductory paragraph for cultural resources and statement B for archeology from that SOU. Statement B requires that a summary of the results of the background study to be included in the document. The results may frequently be summarized using the following statement: "The study found that the project area had been extensively disturbed, precluding the possibility of it containing intact archeological deposits." This finding often applies in cases where the project is confined to existing right-of-way. In some, rarer cases, the project area may not be extensively disturbed, and other factors such as the lack of suitable landforms for human occupation may provide the basis for the determination that no field investigation was warranted. The background study should be consulted for the appropriate finding. In addition to the findings, the date that this study was processed internally at ENV or coordinated with the Texas State Historic Preservation Officer/Texas Historical Commission should also be noted in the NEPA document.

For other types of NEPA document, the results may also frequently be summarized using the following statement: "The study found that the project area had been extensively disturbed, precluding the possibility of it containing intact archeological deposits." This finding often applies in cases where the project is confined to existing right-of-way. In some, rarer cases, the project area may not be extensively disturbed, and other factors such as the lack of suitable landforms for human occupation may provide the basis for the determination that no field investigation was warranted. The background study should be consulted for the appropriate finding. In addition to the findings, the date that this study was processed internally at ENV or coordinated with the Texas State Historic Preservation Officer/Texas Historical Commission should also be noted in the NEPA document. Additional information, such as a description of the sources of information used to make this determination and a brief overview of the utilized information, should be included in EA or EIS documents. This information supports the reported results.

Regulations and other applicable guidelines

Requirements for the contents of a background study derive from the First Amended Programmatic Agreement among the Federal Highway Administration, the Texas Department of Transportation, the Texas State Historic Preservation Officer, and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation Regarding the Implementation of Transportation Undertakings (PA-TU), Stipulation VIII and 43 TAC 2.24 (j) (3)

For 43 TAC 2.24 see:

[http://info.sos.state.tx.us/pls/pub/readtac\\$ext.TacPage?sl=R&app=9&p_dir=&p_rloc=&p_tloc=&p_ploc=&pg=1&p_tac=&ti=43&pt=1&ch=2&rl=24](http://info.sos.state.tx.us/pls/pub/readtac$ext.TacPage?sl=R&app=9&p_dir=&p_rloc=&p_tloc=&p_ploc=&pg=1&p_tac=&ti=43&pt=1&ch=2&rl=24)

Standards of Uniformity for Background Study

CSJ _____ Hwy/County/Dist _____

Author/Affiliation _____ Reviewed by _____

#	Criterion	Meets criterion? Yes / No / N/A
Administrative Requirements (for Studies Produced under District Contracts; To Be Verified by District)		
i	District has provided Segment ID, CSJ, and function code (or equivalent if the project is not a construction project) against which the time for review and coordination can be charged.	
ii	Project information is submitted more than six months prior to NEPA draft document completion.	
Project Description		
1	Submission includes a map of the project area on a USGS 7.5' quadrangle or equivalent if a 7.5' quadrangle is unavailable.	
2	The project description clearly identifies the project type and any associated elements.	
3	The project description identifies the area of potential effects (APE) 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.	
4	The project description notes whether the project includes any new right of way, easements, or project-specific locations; describes the location of any such features; and quantifies their area	
5	Clearly reproducible layouts are attached when available; layouts show the existing and proposed right of way boundaries and easements.	
6	Clearly reproducible profiles are attached when available	
7	Clearly reproducible typical sections are attached when available.	
Background Information		
8	Study includes description of relevant natural conditions that could affect the visibility and preservation of archeological deposits, including topography, soils, and geology. The study references soil survey maps and geological maps for the entire area of the background study or indicates that none are published for the area surveyed.	
9	Study includes discussion of previous work/sites within one kilometer of the project area 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.	
10	Study contains a description of existing disturbances in the project area. For those existing disturbances that could affect the integrity of historic properties, the description shall include the type of existing disturbances and the extent of those disturbances. This discussion focuses on the effects of the disturbances on the integrity of location, design, materials, and association unless a discussion of other aspects of integrity is justified as appropriate.	
Identification of Areas that Require Field Investigation		
11	The study describes how geologic conditions, previous disturbances, and other factors could affect the integrity of archeological deposits. 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.	
12	For areas with the potential for intact archeological deposits, the study accounts for the locations of previously-identified archeological sites, the results of previous archeological investigations in the area of the construction project, and settlement patterns and likely locations for unrecorded prehistoric and historic archeological sites (including historic cemeteries). For these areas, the study also makes use of other sources of information such as historic maps, in addition to the THC Archeological Sites Atlas or TARL files, as a basis for drawing conclusions.	
Recommendations and Justification		
13	Recommendations regarding project effects and the need for further work are explicitly expressed, indicating the portions of the project area where additional work is necessary to identify the project's effect on archeological historic properties, sites that warrant formal designation as State Archeological Landmarks, or cemeteries. For areas where additional work is recommended, an appropriate level of effort is recommended. (TxDOT reserves the right to deviate from recommendations for additional work.)	
14	Study includes an explicit justification of the level of effort used to identify and evaluate historic properties and make recommendations. For a background study, this justification either explains why no fieldwork is necessary or explains why fieldwork should be conducted.	

Standards of Uniformity for Background Study

ENV Reviewer Conclusions		
15	Study contains no factual errors affecting the finding(s). (Reviewer comments required if “No”)	
16	Study approved for acceptance	

ENV Staff Reviewer Signature

Date

Provide any comments below:

Chapter 8. Archeological Resources. Section 5. Individual Antiquities Permit Applications

Section 5. Individual Antiquities Permit Applications

Purpose of these standards

Some projects will require field investigations in order to evaluate or mitigate their effects on archeological sites. All field investigations performed by consultants working on behalf of TxDOT must be conducted under a permit issued by the Texas Historical Commission (THC). Review and transmittal of the permit to THC by ENV will be facilitated by following these standards.

Role of ENV, District, and others

The following checklist or standards of uniformity (SOU) should be used by all consultants preparing a permit to conduct fieldwork for a project with TxDOT involvement. ENV staff will evaluate the permit using these criteria. (Under the terms of TxDOT's Memorandum of Understanding with the Texas Historical Commission, ENV staff does not need individual permits to conduct their own surveys and test excavations.) Districts may also use criteria 1 through 27 on the form as the basis for a scope of work for a survey permit; note that it should be used in conjunction with the Standards of Uniformity for Archeological Survey Reports.

How to use the standards

The following list contains the elements for inclusion in all permit applications other than annual permits for survey. The duration of the permit must include time needed to produce a final report that meets THC standards. The duration can be extended only once by THC staff, although an additional extension can be granted by the Antiquities Advisory Board. ENV recommends that the archeological consultant contact ENV in advance to coordinate on the terms of the scope of work, particularly in the case of testing and data recovery permit applications. Although TxDOT will review and approve applications, the THC has final approval authority for all permits. Adherence to these standards will facilitate THC approval.

Timing of work

For projects that require a survey, project information must be submitted by the District to ENV more than six months prior to approval of the NEPA document (see the SOU for Coordination Requests Regarding Archeological Resources), because the study results must be reported in that document. All necessary work may require six months to complete. This time is required for developing a work authorization, scheduling and implementing fieldwork, producing and reviewing a draft report, and coordinating the report with appropriate parties. Be aware that a survey may identify a site that requires additional field work in order to evaluate the site.

If field investigations beyond survey are necessary this work will require more than an additional six months to complete. Typically, a test excavation, conducted in order to evaluate an archeological site, requires eight months for a consultant to complete. These eight months only include time to acquire a permit, conduct field work, and complete an interim report. This time frame does not include the amount of time required to negotiate and develop the work authorization for the consultant. Additional time will also be required for consultation with groups

Chapter 8. Archeological Resources. Section 5. Individual Antiquities Permit Applications

such as federally-recognized tribes and the Texas Historical Commission/Texas State Historic Preservation Officer. Data recovery excavations, conducted to mitigate the effects of a project on an archeological site, often take much more time to complete, although projects can usually proceed to construction once field work has been finished.

Integrating the results with NEPA documentation

This SOU does not produce results to be reported in a NEPA document. The SOU will primarily be used to guide field methods and to commit the investigating firm to producing complete documentation of their work. Investigations are completed using the corresponding SOU (e.g., the SOU for Archeological Survey Reports). The other technical SOUs for archeology include directions for integrating the results into a NEPA document.

Regulations and other applicable guidelines

The Natural Resources Code Title 9 Chapter 191.054 grants the THC authority to issue permits for field investigations. See the following link: <http://tlo2.tlc.state.tx.us/statutes/nr.toc.htm>

Procedures for acquiring a permit can be found in 13 TAC 26.17. For 13 TAC 26.17 see: [http://info.sos.state.tx.us/pls/pub/readtac\\$ext.TacPage?sl=R&app=9&p_dir=&p_rloc=&p_tloc=&p_ploc=&pg=1&p_tac=&ti=13&pt=2&ch=26&rl=17](http://info.sos.state.tx.us/pls/pub/readtac$ext.TacPage?sl=R&app=9&p_dir=&p_rloc=&p_tloc=&p_ploc=&pg=1&p_tac=&ti=13&pt=2&ch=26&rl=17)

Requirements for the contents of a permit application derive from 13 TAC 26.21(c); the reporting requirements of the PA-TU, Stipulation VIII; and 43 TAC 2.24 (j) (3)

For 13 TAC 26.21 see:

[http://info.sos.state.tx.us/pls/pub/readtac\\$ext.TacPage?sl=R&app=9&p_dir=&p_rloc=&p_tloc=&p_ploc=&pg=1&p_tac=&ti=13&pt=2&ch=26&rl=21](http://info.sos.state.tx.us/pls/pub/readtac$ext.TacPage?sl=R&app=9&p_dir=&p_rloc=&p_tloc=&p_ploc=&pg=1&p_tac=&ti=13&pt=2&ch=26&rl=21)

For 43 TAC 2.24 see:

[http://info.sos.state.tx.us/pls/pub/readtac\\$ext.TacPage?sl=R&app=9&p_dir=&p_rloc=&p_tloc=&p_ploc=&pg=1&p_tac=&ti=43&pt=1&ch=2&rl=24](http://info.sos.state.tx.us/pls/pub/readtac$ext.TacPage?sl=R&app=9&p_dir=&p_rloc=&p_tloc=&p_ploc=&pg=1&p_tac=&ti=43&pt=1&ch=2&rl=24)

Standards of Uniformity for Individual Antiquities Permit Applications

CSJ _____ Hwy/County/Dist _____

Consultant _____ Reviewed by _____

#	Criterion	Meets criterion? Yes / No / N/A
Administrative Requirements (for Permits Produced under District Contracts; To Be Verified by District)		
i	District has provided Segment ID, CSJ, and function code (or equivalent if the project is not a construction project) against which the time for review and coordination can be charged.	
ii	Project information is submitted more than six months prior to approval of NEPA document.	
Project Description		
1	Submission includes a map of the project area on a USGS 7.5' quadrangle or equivalent if a 7.5' quadrangle is unavailable.	
2	The project description clearly identifies the project type and any associated elements.	
3	The project description identifies the area of potential effects (APE) 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.	
4	The project description notes whether the project includes any new right of way, easements, or project-specific locations; describes the location of any such features; and quantifies their area	
5	Clearly reproducible layouts are attached; layouts show the existing and proposed right of way boundaries and easements.	
6	Clearly reproducible profiles are attached.	
7	Clearly reproducible typical sections are attached.	
Background Information		
8	The permit scope of work includes description of the project area's topography, soils, and geology. The scope of work references soil survey maps and geological maps for the entire area to be surveyed or indicates that none are published for the area to be surveyed.	
9	The permit scope of work includes discussion of previous work and sites within one kilometer of the project area with explicit reference to review of TARL files, THC Archeological Sites Atlas maps, and other utilized sources. The scope of work explicitly indicates the trinomials of sites or the absence of sites within one kilometer.	
10	The permit scope of work includes a description of existing disturbances in the project area that affect identification, evaluation, or data recovery efforts. Determine these disturbances from soils maps, Digital Ortho Quads, available photographs, and other materials provided by the project sponsor.	
Research Design		
11	Based on the background information, the scope of work summarizes expectations for location, type, and integrity of archeological finds within the APE. Typically, the integrity of archeological sites is characterized by their integrity of location, design, materials, and association.	
12	The scope of work identifies the type of work to be undertaken, conforming to one of the categories of archeological investigation listed in 13 TAC 26.20 and defined in 13 TAC 26.5.	
13	The scope of work includes a clear statement of the methods that will be employed during all phases of work, following guidance on the preparation of appropriate research designs in 13 TAC 26.21(d).	
14	The scope of work defines the areas to be investigated, whether 100 percent of the area of potential effects shall be investigated or some subset thereof.	
15	For investigations where artifact collection is proposed, the scope of work clearly states whether the land on which the work is conducted is "privately owned" or "publicly owned" or contains both privately and publicly owned land. The scope of work identifies the land owners, including public and private owners.	
16	The scope of work explicitly details the sampling intensity. Sampling intensity comprises such factors as transect spacing, sample intervals along a transect, unit density, unit sizes, screen size, and sediment sample volumes.	
17	The scope of work explicitly justifies these methods with reference to details of the project background information and/or appropriate middle-level theory, demonstrating the adequacy of the methods. For testing and data recovery projects, this justification should explain how the methods will provide data that could address important questions of prehistory or history and identifies such questions.	
18	The scope of work states that the methods will comply with applicable standards as defined or referenced in 13 TAC 26.20 and THC policy (such as THC's policy on survey-level historic sites background documentation) or that the resulting report will provide explicit, plausible justification for deviation from these standards.	

Standards of Uniformity for Individual Antiquities Permit Applications

19	The scope of work specifies an artifact collection policy. The application specifies that artifacts will not be collected from private land without explicit written transfer of ownership to the State. No eligibility testing and data recovery projects can be undertaken on private land without explicit written transfer of ownership or artifacts to the State.	
20	The scope of work specifies a curation plan, including the intended curation facility and a commitment to prepare collections for curation according to the curation facility's standards for collection preparation.	
Reporting Requirements		
21	The scope of work specifies that the resulting report will meet the reporting standards of 13 TAC 26.24, including satisfaction of the Council of Texas Archeologists (CTA) reporting guidelines.	
22	The scope of work specifies that the resulting report will include a discussion of the results of the field investigations.	
23	For survey, testing, and monitoring projects, the scope of work notes that the report's discussion will include a list of sites identified, the ownership of the land on which the sites lie, each sites' recommended eligibility for inclusion in the National Register and formal designation as a State Archeological Landmark, and the appropriate criteria under which the sites were evaluated. The scope of work notes that site forms will be submitted to TARL and that trinomials will be obtained. The scope of work notes that the report will also include recommendations for further work or no further work with appropriate justifications based on the requirements of 13 TAC 26.20 and defined in 13 TAC 26.5.	
24	For data recovery projects, the scope of work notes that the report's discussion will address how the project results contribute to an understanding of important issues of prehistory or history. The scope of work also specifies a public outreach program for such projects.	
25	The scope of work specifies that the report will indicate which excavations units were placed on public land and private land, and identify artifacts collected from public land and private land.	
26	The scope of work specifies that four copies of the draft report will be submitted for review by TxDOT and THC.	
27	The scope of work specifies that at least 25 paper copies of the final report (24 bound copies and one unbound copy) and two electronic copies (CD's with the electronic document in tagged PDF format) will be submitted to TxDOT. Twenty of these paper copies (19 bound copies and one unbound copy) and one of the CD's will go to the THC.	

 ENV Staff Reviewer Signature

 Date

Comments:

Chapter 8. Archeological Resources. *Section 6. Review Standards for Archeological Survey Reports, Individual Permit*

Section 6. Review Standards for Archeological Survey Reports, Individual Permit

Purpose of these standards

Archeological surveys are frequently conducted to evaluate a project's effects of archeological historic properties. Several different sources provide requirements for the content of survey reports. The checklist form compiles these requirements for use by those qualified archeologists who prepare such reports.

Role of ENV, District, and others

The following form will be used to evaluate both consultant and ENV staff reports. Districts may also use it as the basis of a scope of work for an archeological subcontractor under a district engineering contract. In cases where the District wants to use this form as the basis for a scope of work, please note that it should be used in conjunction with the Standards for Individual Antiquities Permits, Individual Permit.

How to use the standards

Reports shall be evaluated based on the following criteria. These criteria mainly elicit the information required in a Full Report, as described in the Council of Texas Archeologist's reporting guidelines and referenced in 13 TAC 26.24. Reports with all "Yes" responses will be automatically accepted. One or more "No" responses may result in acceptance pending specified revisions or clarifications or may be rejected depending on the nature and relative importance of the error or omission. Reports for surveys resulting in identification of sites may be accepted pending outcome of consultation with Texas Historical Commission, federally-recognized tribes, and other consulting parties.

Timing of work

For projects that require a survey, project information must be submitted by the District to ENV more than six months prior to completion of the draft NEPA document (see the SOU for Coordination Requests Regarding Archeological Resources). Field investigations may require six months to complete. This time is required for developing a work authorization, scheduling and implementing fieldwork, producing and reviewing a draft report, and coordinating the report with appropriate parties.

Be aware that a survey may identify a site that requires additional field work in order to evaluate the site. Any such project will require more than six months for completion of the additional field work. Additional time will also be required for consultation with groups such as federally-recognized tribes.

Chapter 8. Archeological Resources. *Section 6. Review Standards for Archeological Survey Reports, Individual Permit*

Integrating the results with NEPA documentation

Survey reports often produce information that can form the basis for a corresponding NEPA section. The field study may result in the determination that no further work is required. In such cases, the results and conclusions of the report may be summarized briefly. The date that this study was processed internally or was coordinated with the Texas State Historic Preservation Officer/Texas Historical Commission should be noted in the NEPA document. When the study results in a determination that further investigations are needed, the additional work must be completed before any results can be reported in a NEPA document. See the Standards of Uniformity for the Archeology Section of a PCE Document. The NEPA document should employ the standard introductory paragraph for cultural resources and statement B for archeology from that SOU.

Regulations and other applicable guidelines

Requirements for the contents of a survey report derive from the PA-TU, Stipulation VIII; 43 TAC 2.24 (j) (3); and 13 TAC 26.24.

For 43 TAC 2.24 see:

[http://info.sos.state.tx.us/pls/pub/readtac\\$ext.TacPage?sl=R&app=9&p_dir=&p_rloc=&p_tloc=&p_ploc=&pg=1&p_tac=&ti=43&pt=1&ch=2&rl=24](http://info.sos.state.tx.us/pls/pub/readtac$ext.TacPage?sl=R&app=9&p_dir=&p_rloc=&p_tloc=&p_ploc=&pg=1&p_tac=&ti=43&pt=1&ch=2&rl=24)

Review Standards for Archeological Survey Reports, Individual Permit

CSJ _____ Hwy/County/Dist _____

Permit # _____ Author/Affiliation _____ Reviewed by _____

#	Criterion	Meets criterion? Yes / No / N/A
Front Matter		
1	Report includes Hwy/limits, Counties, CSJ(s), District(s), Antiquities Permit #, Principal Investigator's name, investigative firm's name, and date of publication. This information is provided on cover and title page of draft and final reports or on first page of interim reports.	
2	Abstract included in draft and final reports unless the investigation does not identify sites within the area of potential effects (APE). It contains a description of findings, list of sites recorded, identification of which artifacts were curated, and location of curation facility. (Abstract form and, when appropriate, curation form must always accompany final reports.)	
3	Management summary included in draft and final reports, which describes the context in which the work was performed and identifies the investigation's sponsor, the purpose of the investigation, the identity of the institution conducting the investigation, the personnel involved in the investigation and their roles, the person-hours invested in the project, and the dates of fieldwork. It should also include a brief summary of the scope of work, a summary of the results, and the recommendations.	
Introduction and Project Description		
4	Introduction included in draft and final reports, unless the investigation does not identify sites within the APE. The introduction describes the context in which the work was performed and identifies the investigation's sponsor, the purpose of the investigation, the identity of the institution conducting the investigation, the personnel involved in the investigation and their roles, the person-hours invested in each project phase, and the dates of fieldwork. It provides a brief summary of the methods and any difficulties encountered in completing the project that affect the results, the curation facility, and the organization and content of the succeeding sections.	
5	Report includes a map of the area surveyed on a USGS 7.5' Quadrangle or equivalent if 7.5' Quad unavailable. (In final report, the map of the area surveyed cannot include site locations. Maps with site locations must be included as separate enclosure.)	
6	The project description clearly identifies the project type and any associated elements.	
7	The project description identifies the APE 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.	
8	The project description notes whether the project includes any new right of way, easements, or project-specific locations; describes the location of any such features; and quantifies their area.	
9	Clearly reproducible layouts are attached; layouts show the existing and proposed right of way boundaries and easements.	
10	Clearly reproducible profiles are attached.	
11	Clearly reproducible typical sections are attached.	
Background Information		
12	Report includes description of topography, soils, and geology. Report references soil survey maps and geological maps for the entire area surveyed or indicates that none are published for the area surveyed.	
13	Report includes estimate of surface visibility, description of land use, and general description of vegetation in and adjacent to the area surveyed.	
14	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.	
15	Report includes discussion of how the project setting, as detailed in criteria 12-14, affect the likelihood of intact, buried deposits being present.	
Methods		
16	Report documents methods used. For intensive surveys, report documents compliance with THC/CTA survey standards (as referenced in 13 TAC 26.20 and THC policy) or provides explicit, plausible justification for deviation from THC/CTA standards. Documentation of compliance with THC/CTA standards will take the form of an explicit description of the number and kind of transects surveyed and the number and kinds of units excavated. Justification of deviations shall refer to project setting conditions that affect the likelihood of archeological deposits with sufficient integrity to address important questions of history or prehistory being present.	

Review Standards for Archeological Survey Reports, Individual Permit

17	Report documents compliance with THC/CTA standards for site definition (as referenced in 13 TAC 26.20) or provides explicit, plausible justification for deviation from THC/CTA standards. Documentation of compliance with THC/CTA standards will take the form of an explicit description of the number and kinds of units excavated. All sites have site trinomials assigned by Texas Archeological Research Laboratory.	
18	Report documents locations of excavated units, and explicitly indicates which excavated units are on public and private land.	
19	Report explicitly states whether land surveyed is public, private or both and delineates boundaries on map.	
20	Report explicitly documents which portions of the APE were investigated and which portions were not investigated. Report also explicitly documents and justifies any variability in methods if the methods vary across the APE.	
	Results	
21	Report documents cultural materials recovered and observed and explicitly indicates which were recovered/observed on public and private land. If no cultural materials were recovered/observed, the report explicitly notes their absence.	
22	For historic sites, the report notes the beginning and end dates of diagnostic artifacts. The report identifies artifact types and distinguishes explicitly between modern trash and historically relevant materials (materials greater than 50 years in age).	
23	Report provides explicit quantification of observed artifacts and indicates whether collections were made. The report indicates in the abstract and concluding chapter the repository where materials will be curated.	
24	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.	
25	For Intensive Surveys: 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). Report notes whether or not a project will adversely affect eligible sites.	
26	For Intensive Surveys: For historic sites, the report includes two of the following elements of historic background to meet THC requirements for assessing site age and eligibility: Oral history, deed or tax record research, other archival research, title search, other detailed historic research directly related to the specific location of the site. (Reviewer comments required if "No")	
27	Evaluation of each site in the APE refers to relevant background information presented in the report.	
28	Evaluation of each site in the APE incorporates data collected in the field regarding site constituents.	
29	Evaluation of each site in the APE refers to data requirements needed to be eligible for inclusion in the NRHP or for designation as a SAL.	
30	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 60.4. Typically, the integrity of archeological sites is characterized by their integrity of location, design, materials, and association.	
31	The report supports its conclusions with attached photographs, survey forms, and field note copies.	
32	Finding or findings explicitly refer(s) to relevant sections of 36 CFR 800, 36 CFR 60, and 13 TAC 26.	
33	Recommendations for further work are explicitly expressed and justified. 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 "No." TxDOT reserves the right to deviate from reported recommendations for additional work.)	
34	Report provides a references section that contains all work cited.	
	Reviewer Conclusions	
35	Report contains no factual errors affecting the finding(s). (Reviewer comments required if "No")	
36	Report approved for acceptance	

 ENV Staff Reviewer Signature

 Date

 Comments:

Section 7. Review Standards for Impact Evaluations

Purpose of these standards

Impact evaluations are a type of report defined only in TxDOT's Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the Texas Historical Commission (THC) (43 TAC 2.24(c)(9)). Impact evaluations are not defined in the rules of practice and procedure for compliance with the Antiquities Code of Texas (13 TAC 26). An impact evaluation has two uses. An impact evaluation may serve as the sufficient level of documentation in cases where the project setting has been so extensively disturbed as to preclude the possibility of the project's area of potential effects (APE) containing archeological historic properties or archeological sites that would warrant formal designation as State Archeological Landmarks. An impact evaluation may also focus a subsequent survey on the particular portions of the project's APE with sufficient integrity to potentially contain archeological historic properties or sites that would warrant formal designation as State Archeological Landmarks. In the latter case, the impact evaluation identifies areas where right-of-entry will be required and the appropriate level of effort in the areas to be surveyed. Because an impact evaluation can be conducted fairly easily, it can greatly reduce project costs and speed the completion of archeological investigations. This document identifies the appropriate use and contents of an impact evaluation.

Role of ENV, District, and others

Because they are not defined in 13 TAC 26, consultants working under a District contract may not submit impact evaluations for coordination with the THC. Only ENV staff or consultants working directly under contract to ENV may produce reports of this type.

How to use the standards

These reports will be evaluated using the attached criteria. Reports with all "Yes" responses to the following criteria will be automatically accepted. One or more "No" responses may result in acceptance pending specified revisions or clarifications or may be rejected depending on the nature and salience of the error or omission.

Timing of work

For projects that may only require an impact evaluation, project information must be submitted by the District to ENV more than six months prior to completion of the draft NEPA document (see the SOU for Coordination Requests Regarding Archeological Resources). Field investigations may require six months to complete. This time is required for developing a work authorization, scheduling and implementing fieldwork, producing and reviewing a draft report, and coordinating the report with appropriate parties.

Be aware that an impact evaluation may result in a determination that additional investigations are required. Any such project will likely require more than six months for completion of the additional field work. However, as noted, the use of an impact evaluation can focus right-of-entry requests to those areas where access is necessary to complete a survey. It can also identify the appropriate level of effort to be conducted during the subsequent survey. For large

Chapter 8. Archeological Resources. Section 7. Review Standards for Impact Evaluations

projects, an impact evaluation is a useful tool for reducing the workload for District and ENV staff and speeding the archeological investigations to completion.

Integrating the results with NEPA documentation

Impact evaluation reports often produce information that can form the basis for a corresponding NEPA section. The field study may result in the determination that no further work is required. In such cases, the results and conclusions of the report may be summarized briefly. The date that this study was processed internally or was coordinated with the Texas State Historic Preservation Officer/Texas Historical Commission should be noted in the NEPA document. When the study results in a determination that further investigations are needed, the additional work must be completed before any results can be reported in a NEPA document. See the Standards of Uniformity for the Archeology Section of the appropriate NEPA document.

Regulations and other applicable guidelines

The Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) with the Texas Historical Commission (THC) (43 TAC 2.24(c)(9) defines impact evaluations. The use of impact evaluations is described in 43 TAC 2.24(f)(1)(A). The contents of an impact evaluation are identified in 43 TAC 2.24(j)(3). For 43 TAC 2.24 see:

[http://info.sos.state.tx.us/pls/pub/readtac\\$ext.TacPage?sl=R&app=9&p_dir=&p_rloc=&p_tloc=&p_ploc=&pg=1&p_tac=&ti=43&pt=1&ch=2&rl=24](http://info.sos.state.tx.us/pls/pub/readtac$ext.TacPage?sl=R&app=9&p_dir=&p_rloc=&p_tloc=&p_ploc=&pg=1&p_tac=&ti=43&pt=1&ch=2&rl=24)

Review Standards for Impact Evaluations

(Contractor QC Officers should complete bold numbered items and submit signed form with each impact evaluation)

CSJ _____ Hwy _____

Contract/WA# _____ Contractor _____

QC Reviewer _____

Author/Affiliation _____ ENV Reviewer _____

#	Criterion	Meets criterion? Yes / No / N/A
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 project description identifies the area of potential effects (APE) 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.	
5	The project description notes whether the project includes any new right of way, easements, 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. 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	
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 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.	

Review Standards for Impact Evaluations

(Contractor QC Officers should complete bold numbered items and submit signed form with each impact evaluation)

20	Recommendations for further work are explicitly expressed and justified, including the necessary of 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 “No.” TxDOT reserves the right to deviate from reported recommendations for additional work.)	
	ENV Reviewer Conclusions	
21	Report contains no factual errors affecting the finding(s). (Reviewer comments required if “No”)	
22	Report approved for acceptance	

Signature of QC Officer _____

Printed Name _____ **Date** _____

ENV Staff Reviewer Signature _____ Date _____

ENV Reviewer Comments: _____

*Texas Department of Transportation
Environmental Affairs Division*

**Standards of Uniformity for
Programmatic Categorical Exclusions**

**Chapter 9.
Water Resources**

Chapter 9. Water Resources

If any one of the regulations listed below applies to a project, the project may not be processed as a PCE unless prior approval from FHWA has been obtained.

- **Section 404 of the Clean Water Act: Waters of the U.S.** – Individual Permit or Nationwide Permit (NWP) 23
- **Section 9 Rivers and Harbors Act (USCG)**
- **Section 10 Rivers and Harbors Act (USACE)** – Individual Permits
- **Wild and Scenic Rivers** (Only applicable to the Rio Grande from the New Mexico/EI Paso boundary to the Terrell/Val Verde County Line)

A document is not guaranteed compliance with the SOU simply because it includes the template language below. The language must also be technically correct and consistent with the other information presented in the document. For example, if the document states that wetlands are not present and references the wetland delineation forms, the wetland delineation forms should not suggest that wetlands are present. Similarly, if the document includes the template statement that the project is not in a floodplain, but the project IS in a floodplain, the document would NOT comply with the SOU.

Yes	No	N/A	Description of Item Sufficiency	References/Guidance
Section 404 of the Clean Water Act: Waters of the U.S. NWPs				
1			<p>Does the document include one of the following statements?</p> <p><i>This project would not result in the placement of temporary or permanent dredge or fill material into [potentially] jurisdictional Waters of the U.S., including wetlands or other special aquatic sites; therefore a Section 404 permit would not be required.</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;">OR</p> <p><i>The placement of temporary or permanent dredge or fill material into [potentially] jurisdictional Waters of the U.S. would be authorized under NWP [insert number] [with or without] a Pre-Construction Notification (PCN).</i></p>	<p>33 USC 1344 33 CFR 320-331 23 CFR 771</p> <p>Regional Conditions Regulatory Guidance Letters</p>
2			<p>Describe why the area was determined to be (potentially) jurisdictional or non-jurisdictional. Include the following information:</p> <p><i>The USACE issued a jurisdictional determination on [date].</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;">OR</p> <p><i>An analysis of [USGS topographic maps, FEMA maps, field reconnaissance/wetland delineation, jurisdiction established through prior work within the water, previous decisions made by the USACE</i></p>	

Chapter 9. Water Resources

Yes	No	N/A	Description of Item Sufficiency		References/Guidance				
			under similar circumstances, etc.] <i>reveals [no] potentially jurisdictional waters of the U.S. that would be impacted by the proposed project.</i>						
3			If discharge of fill or dredge material within jurisdictional or potentially jurisdictional waters or wetlands is undetermined, describe why this is the case; focus on the expected impacts and possible permitting requirements.						
4			If jurisdictional or potentially jurisdictional waters or wetlands are present but will not be impacted by the project, describe them and discuss how impacts will be avoided.						
5			If the project will result in fill within jurisdictional or potentially jurisdictional waters:						
6			A.	Include a map identifying all jurisdictional waters and/or wetlands, impacted jurisdictional waters and/or wetlands, and project limits. If wetlands are present, include wetland delineation form(s) and indicate observation points on the map. The wetland delineations and data forms must adhere to the requirements of the appropriate regional supplemental to the 1987 USACE wetland delineation manual .					
7			B.	Denote the impacts and expected permitting requirements in the table below. If quantifying the impacts in this table is overly cumbersome (e.g., when the impacts are the result of dozens of SETs), a verbal summary of the same information may be provided.					
Provide acres and/or linear feet as appropriate									
8	Name of Water Body or other location indicator	Existing Structure	Proposed Work or Structure	Permanent Fill		Temporary Fill		NWP (indicate number)	PCN (Y/N)
				Open Waters (acres and linear feet)	Wetlands or other Special Aquatic Sites (acres)	Open Waters (acres and linear feet)	Wetlands or other Special Aquatic Sites (acres)		
9			C.	Describe how the activity(ies) meet(s) the description(s) of the chosen NWP(s). See the example text below for the most common NWPs: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> NWP 3(a): <i>The maintenance activity at [indicate stream name or station number if there is more than one regulated area] would result in [indicate change in footprint] acres of permanent fill within waters of the U.S. This increase is due to [indicate an allowable reason,</i> 					

Chapter 9. Water Resources

Yes	No	N/A	Description of Item Sufficiency	References/Guidance
				<p>e.g. changes in materials, construction techniques, or safety standards]. <i>The purpose of the project is not to add capacity or relocate a bridge. Therefore the activity would be authorized under paragraph (a) of NWP 3.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ NWP 13: <i>The bank stabilization at [indicate stream name or station number, if there is more than one regulated area] would not involve the placement of material in excess of the minimum necessary for erosion protection and does not involve stream channelization. Therefore the activity would be authorized under NWP 13.</i> ▪ NWP 14: <i>The purpose of the proposed activity is to [construct, expand, modify or improve] the linear transportation facility at [indicate stream name or station number, if there is more than one regulated area]. Appropriate measures would be taken to maintain normal downstream flows and minimize flooding. Temporary fills would consist of materials and be placed in a manner that would not be eroded by expected high flows. Temporary fills would be removed in their entirety and the affected area returned to pre-construction elevations, and revegetated as appropriate." If the project involves stream modification, indicate "Stream channel modifications, including bank stabilization, would be limited to the minimum necessary to construct or protect the structure and the immediate vicinity of the project.</i>
10			D.	<p>State that: <i>The activity would comply with all general and regional conditions applicable to NWP [indicate number].</i></p>
11			E.	<p>Indicate why a PCN is/is not required:</p> <p><i>A Preconstruction Notification (PCN) for NWP [indicate number] at [indicate name of water body or station number] would not be required because [discuss the acreage or linear foot PCN trigger for the relevant NWP, as appropriate]. There is no potential to affect listed species or designated critical habitat, and there are no historic properties listed or eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places.</i></p> <p>For more information, refer to the USACE General Conditions.</p> <p style="text-align: center;">OR</p> <p><i>A Preconstruction Notification (PCN) is required at [indicate name of water body or station number] because [indicate which PCN trigger(s)] [is/are] met.</i></p>

Chapter 9. Water Resources

Yes	No	N/A	Description of Item Sufficiency	References/Guidance
				If verification has been issued for this project, include the date and permit number.
12			F.	<p>If more than one area of the project would require a NWP, add:</p> <p><i>The activities at [indicate name of water bodies or station numbers] have been identified as single and complete* projects as defined in the Nationwide Permits because [insert reason] and will therefore be permitted separately.</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;">OR</p> <p><i>The activities at [indicate name of water bodies or station numbers] have been determined to not be single and complete* projects as defined in the Nationwide Permits, because [insert reason] and would therefore be permitted together.</i></p> <p>*Single and complete - For linear projects, a “single and complete project” is all crossings of a single water of the United States (i.e., a single waterbody) at a specific location. For linear projects crossing a single waterbody several times at separate and distant locations, each crossing is considered a single and complete project. However, individual channels in a braided stream or river, or individual arms of a large, irregularly shaped wetland or lake, etc., are not separate waterbodies, and crossings of such features cannot be considered separately.</p>
13			G.	<p>If compensatory mitigation is triggered by the NWP General Conditions, Regional Conditions for Texas, or is requested at the discretion of the USACE, describe how the impacts would be mitigated (avoidance, minimization, bank credits, onsite mitigation, etc.). If use of a mitigation bank is proposed, include the bank name and indicate the quality of wetlands being impacted, amount of impacts, and proposed credits if known. If the project requires third party mitigation, coordination with Texas Parks and Wildlife Department (TPWD) is required to provide TPWD an opportunity to offer mitigation options before pursuing the third party mitigation options.</p>
14			H.	<p>Are all technical reports in support of a wetland determination or delineation, either produced by TxDOT or TxDOT consultants, identified in either a table or a separate reference page, and is the following example reference format utilized?</p> <p>Author, date, title, number of pages.</p> <p>Example: <i>Ace Environmental. 2008. Wetland Delineation, S.H. 64 at Little Coon Creek, Smith County, Texas. 45 pp.</i></p>
Section 401 of the Clean Water Act: Water Quality Certification				

Chapter 9. Water Resources

Yes	No	N/A	Description of Item Sufficiency	References/Guidance
15			<p>Does the document include one of the following statements?</p> <p><i>This project would not require a USACE Section 404 Permit; therefore Section 401 Certification would not be required.</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;">OR</p> <p><i>The 401 Certification requirements for NWP [indicate number] would be met by implementing approved [indicate applicable BMP categories: erosion controls, sediment controls, and/or post-construction TSS controls] BMPs from TCEQ's 401 Water Quality Certification Conditions for Nationwide Permits.</i></p>	<p>33 USC 1341 30 TAC 279 23 CFR 771</p>
Executive Order 11990, Wetlands				
16			<p>Does the document include one of the following statements?</p> <p><i>Executive Order 11990 on wetlands does not apply because no wetlands will be impacted.</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;">OR</p> <p><i>If wetlands [jurisdictional or non-jurisdictional] would be impacted, indicate "Alternatives were reviewed as required by Executive Order 11990 on wetlands, and no practicable alternatives to [describe wetland impacts] were identified."</i></p>	<p>Executive Order 11990 DOT Order 5660.1 A 23 CFR 771 and 777</p>
Rivers and Harbors Act of 1899, Section 10				
17			<p>Does the document include one of the following statements?</p> <p><i>This project does not involve work in or over a navigable water of the U.S., therefore Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act does not apply.</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;">OR</p> <p><i>This project includes [describe work] in or over a navigable water of the U.S. under Section 10 of the Rivers and Harbors Act. The Section 10 activity will be covered under NWP [insert permit</i></p>	<p>33 USC 401, et.seq 23 CFR 650, Subparts D & H 33 CFR 114-115</p>

Chapter 9. Water Resources

Yes	No	N/A	Description of Item Sufficiency	References/Guidance
			number] [with/without] a PCN.	
Section 303(d) of the Clean Water Act (Please reference the current EPA approved 303(d) list.)				
18			<p>Does the document include one of the following statements?</p> <p><i>Runoff from this project would not discharge directly into a Section 303 (d) listed threatened or impaired water, or into a stream within 5 miles upstream of a Section 303(d) listed threatened or impaired water. The [insert year of the most recent EPA approved list] 303(d) list was utilized in this assessment.</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;">OR</p> <p><i>Runoff from this project would discharge ["directly into" or "within 5 stream miles upstream of"] segment(s) [insert segment number(s)] of [insert stream name(s)], which [is/are] listed as threatened/impaired for [insert constituent(s) of concern] on the [insert year of the most recent EPA-approved list] 303(d) list. [If the project may potentially contribute the constituent of concern, describe the BMPs that would be used] to control the constituent of concern at this location. This project is not expected to contribute the constituent of concern to the impaired water body.</i></p> <p>Note: A stream segment number is only required for listed impaired streams. If a non-listed stream does not have a segment number, the nearest downstream segment number may be inserted into ETS. TCEQ 303(d) coordination is not required for PCEs.</p>	<p>Memorandum of Understanding between TxDOT and TCEQ</p> <p>43 TAC 2.23</p> <p>30 TAC 7.119</p> <p>33 USC 1251-1377</p> <p>TWC 26.023</p> <p>30 TAC 307</p> <p>23 CFR 771</p>
Section 402 of the Clean Water Act: Texas Pollutant Discharge Elimination System, Construction General Permit				
19			Does the document include one of the following statements?	<p>33 USC 1342</p> <p>40 CFR 122</p>

Chapter 9. Water Resources

Yes	No	N/A	Description of Item Sufficiency	References/Guidance
			<p><i>This project would include less than one acre of earth disturbance, and is not part of a larger common plan of development that would disturb one or more acres, therefore TCEQ's Texas Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (TPDES) Construction General Permit (CGP) does not apply.</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;">OR</p> <p><i><u>This project would include one or more acres of earth disturbance, but less than five acres.</u> TxDOT would comply with TCEQ's Texas Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (TPDES) Construction General Permit (CGP). A Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SW3P) would be prepared and implemented, and a construction site notice would be posted on the construction site. A Notice of Intent (NOI) would not be required.</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;">OR</p> <p><i>This project would include five or more acres of earth disturbance. TxDOT would comply with TCEQ's Texas Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (TPDES) Construction General Permit (CGP). A Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SW3P) would be implemented, and a construction site notice would be posted on the construction site. A Notice of Intent (NOI) would be required.</i></p>	<p>30 TAC 205, 216, 281.25 23 CFR 771</p>
Section 402 of the Clean Water Act: Texas Pollutant Discharge Elimination System, Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System (MS4)				
			<p>Does the document include one of the following statements?</p> <p><i><u>This project is not located within the boundaries of a regulated Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System.</u></i></p> <p style="text-align: center;">OR</p> <p><i>This project is located within the boundaries of the [Phase I (indicate city) or Phase II (indicate which Urbanized</i></p>	<p>33 USC 1342 40 CFR 122 30 TAC 205, 216, 281.25 23 CFR 771</p>

Chapter 9. Water Resources

Yes	No	N/A	Description of Item Sufficiency	References/Guidance
			Area)] <i>Municipal Separate Storm Sewer System, and would comply with the applicable MS4 requirements.</i>	
Floodplains				
21			<p>Language: Does the document include one of the following statements?</p> <p><i>The project is not located within a Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) designated 100-year floodplain.</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;">OR</p> <p><i>The project is located within a Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) designated 100-year floodplain, however no work will occur in the floodplain.</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;">OR</p> <p><i>The project is located within a Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) designated 100-year floodplain. The hydraulic design for this project would be in accordance with current FHWA and TxDOT design policies. The facility would permit the conveyance of the 100-year flood, inundation of the roadway being acceptable, without causing significant damage to the facility, stream or other property. The proposed project would not increase the base flood elevation to a level that would violate applicable floodplain regulations and ordinances. Coordination with the local Floodplain Administer will be required. OR Coordination is not required because [insert county or community] does not participate in the NFIP.</i></p>	<p><u>Executive Order 11988</u> Executive Order 12148 DOT Order 5650.2 23 CFR 650, et seq. 44 CFR 59-62, 64-68, 70-73, 75 23 CFR 771</p>

Chapter 9. Water Resources

Trinity River Corridor Development Certificate				
22	This section is required for projects in Dallas, Tarrant, or Denton County.			
23			<p>Does the document include one of the following statements?</p> <p><i>The project is not within the Trinity River Corridor Development Regulatory Zone; therefore, a Corridor Development Certificate (CDC) permit would not be required.</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;">OR</p> <p><i>The project is within the Trinity River Corridor Development Regulatory Zone and a Corridor Development Certificate (CDC) would be required.</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;">OR</p> <p><i>The project is within the Trinity River Corridor Development Regulatory Zone and a Corridor Development Certificate (CDC) would typically be required. TxDOT [has applied /will apply] for an exemption as the project meets the criteria for exemption from the CDC requirement.</i></p>	<p>North Central Texas Council of Governments</p>
Texas Coastal Management Program				
24	This section is required for projects in Orange, Jefferson, Chambers, Harris, Galveston, Brazoria, Matagorda, Jackson, Calhoun, Victoria, Refugio, Aransas, San Patricio, Nueces, Kleberg, Kennedy, Willacy, and/or Cameron counties.			
25			<p>Does the document include one of the following statements?</p> <p><i>This project is located within [indicate county(ies)], but is not within the Texas Coastal Management Program (TCMP) boundary, therefore a consistency determination is not required.</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;">OR</p> <p><i>This project is located within [indicate county (ies)], which [is/are] within the Texas Coastal Management Program (TCMP) boundary. TxDOT has reviewed this proposed action for consistency with the TCMP goals and policies in</i></p>	<p>16 USC 1451-1465 15 CFR 923, 926, 930 23 CFR 650.211 31 TAC 281 23 CFR 771</p>

Chapter 9. Water Resources

			<p><i>accordance with the regulations of the Coastal Coordination Council; it has determined that the proposed action is consistent with the applicable TCMP goals and policies, and would not have a direct and significant adverse effect on the Coastal Natural Resource Area (CNRAs), identified in 31 TAC Chapter 501.31.</i></p>	
26			<p>Note: If the project is within the CMP Boundary, District personnel are required to mark the “CZM” and “Consistent” flags “Y” when filling out the ETS Water screen. Failure to do so will result in a non-compliance report for the Water SOU. TxDOT is required by 31 TAC 305 to “maintain a record of all proposed actions that are subject to the CMP and provide such record to the council on a quarterly basis.” ENV generates a quarterly report from ETS, based on the entries made in the Water review screen. Failure to mark those fields will result in non-compliance with 31 TAC 305.</p>	
			<p>Coastal Barrier Resources Act (CBRA) (Coordination requirements subject to change pending FHWA/USFWS consultation)</p>	
27			<p>This section is only required for projects in Jefferson, Galveston, Brazoria, Matagorda, Calhoun, Aransas, Nueces, Kleberg, Willacy, and/or Cameron Counties (Texas CBRA Maps)</p>	
28			<p>Does the document include one of the following statements?</p> <p><i>This project is located within [indicate county(ies)] but is not located within a designated CBRA map unit. Coordination with the U.S Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) is not <u>required</u>.</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;">OR</p> <p><i>This project is located within [indicate county(ies)] and is within a designated CBRA map unit but is exempt from CBRA regulations according to Section 6 subsection 3 of the CBRA. The purpose of this project is to [replace, reconstruct, maintain, or repair] the existing transportation facility. The project does not add capacity or construct a new transportation facility. Contact ENV-WRM regarding coordination.</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;">OR</p> <p><i>This project is located within [indicate county(ies)] and within a designated CBRA map unit [insert CBRA map unit name and number]. The project will</i></p>	

Chapter 9. Water Resources

			[construct or expand] [roadway name and/or number]. Contact ENV-WRM regarding coordination.	
Edwards Aquifer Recharge and Contributing Zones				
29			<u>This section is required for projects in Kinney, Uvalde, Medina, Bexar, Comal, Hays, Travis, and/or Williamson Counties.</u>	
30			<p>Does the document include one of the following statements?</p> <p><i>This project is not located within the <u>Edwards Aquifer Contributing or Recharge Zones</u>; therefore, the Edwards Aquifer Rules do not apply.</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;">OR</p> <p><i>This project is located within the Edwards Aquifer Contributing Zone and would disturb [insert "less than five" or "five or more"] acres of earth; therefore, a Contributing Zone Plan [would/would not] be submitted to TCEQ.</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;">OR</p> <p><i>This project is located within the Edwards Aquifer Recharge Zone; therefore, a Water Pollution Abatement Plan would be submitted to TCEQ.</i></p>	<p>Texas Water Code 26.401 30 TAC 213 23 CFR 771</p>
International Boundary and Water Commission				
31			This section is required for projects in U.S.-Mexico Border Counties.	
32			<p>Does the document include the following statement?</p> <p><i>This project [would/would not] be located within the floodplain of the Rio Grande; therefore, coordination with the <u>International Boundary Water Commission (IBWC)</u> [would/would not] be required.</i></p>	<p>International Bridge Act of 1972 33 USC 535, et seq. Executive Order 11423 Executive Order 12847 1944 Treaty to Resolve Pending Boundary Differences and Maintain the Rio Grande and Colorado River as the International Boundary between the United States of America and Mexico 23 CFR 771</p>

*Texas Department of Transportation
Environmental Affairs Division*

**Standards of Uniformity for
Programmatic Categorical Exclusions**

Chapter 10.

Traffic Noise

Chapter 10. Traffic Noise

Yes	No	N/A	Description of Item Sufficiency	References/ Guidance
Basic Criteria				
1			<p>Would the project be on a new location; or substantially alter the horizontal or vertical alignment; or increase the number of through-traffic lanes [add capacity]?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ If no, a Traffic Noise Analysis is not required. ➤ If yes, perform a Traffic Noise Analysis in accordance with TxDOT's Noise Guidelines and TNM User's Guide. 	TxDOT's Noise Guidelines and TNM User's Guide .
2			<p>Would the project result in a noise impact?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ If no, noise abatement measures are not considered/required. ➤ If yes, noise abatement measures must be considered. 	
3			<p>Would any noise abatement measure be feasible and reasonable?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ If no, no further action is required. ➤ If yes, propose the noise abatement [noise barrier] for incorporation into the project subject to the completion of the project design, utility evaluation, and polling of adjacent property owners. 	
Documentation				
<p>For the specific format/content necessary when documenting the results of traffic noise analyses, refer to the Examples of Recommended Text developed by TxDOT/ENV.</p>				
4			<p>Would a traffic noise analysis be required?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ If no, include a simple statement to indicate that a traffic noise analysis is not required, and why. ➤ If yes, document in accordance with the appropriate Example of Recommended Text. 	Examples of Recommended Text

*Texas Department of Transportation
Environmental Affairs Division*

**Standards of Uniformity for
Programmatic Categorical Exclusions**

Chapter 11.

**Hazardous Materials
Initial Site Assessment**



Hazardous Materials Initial Site Assessment Standard of Submission

Complete this form for all construction projects to document completion of the Hazardous Materials Initial Site Assessment (ISA). Maintain a copy of the completed ISA with applicable attachments in the project file.

Completion of the ISA complies with the FHWA's policy dealing with hazardous waste contamination discussed in FHWA's *Supplemental Hazardous Waste Guidance* (January 16, 1997) located at <http://www.environment.fhwa.dot.gov/guidebook/vol1/doc7b.pdf>

In addition, completion of the ISA will reduce construction delays due to unexpected hazardous material discoveries and reduce the department's liability associated with the purchase of contaminated right-of-way.

NOTE: Completion of the ISA is not required for projects that consist only of work activities associated with overlay, seal coat, resurfacing, rehabilitation, or restoration done within the existing ROW on an existing road and completely within the footprint of existing base course.

For additional information, refer to TxDOT's online manual: *Hazardous Materials in Project Development*, located at <http://onlinemanuals.txdot.gov/txdotmanuals/haz/index.htm>

Abbreviations and Acronyms

ASTs	above ground storage tanks
ASTM	American Society for Testing and Materials
CERCLIS	Comprehensive Environmental Response Compensation Liability Information System
CSJ	control, section, job
ERNS	Emergency Response Notification System
HWY	highway
MSWLF	municipal solid waste landfills
NA	not applicable
NPL	National Priority List
LPST	leaking petroleum storage tank
RCRA	Resource Compensation Recovery Act
ROW	right-of-way
RPST	registered petroleum storage tank
RRC	Texas Railroad Commission
TBD	To be determined
TCEQ	Texas Commission on Environmental Quality
TSD	treatment storage and disposal facility
UNK	unknown
USGS	United States Geological Survey

TxDOT Hazardous Materials Initial Site Assessment (ISA)

Project Information			
CSJ No:	City:	Zip Code:	County:
HWY:	Limits:		
Section 1: Preliminary Project Design and Right-of-Way Requirements			
NOTE: If the project does not consist of any work activities other than overlay, seal coat, resurfacing, rehabilitation, or restoration done within the existing ROW on an existing road and completely within the footprint of existing base course, no further hazardous materials action is required and the project is eligible for a PCE classification or lower pending review of other environmental conditions.			
Yes/No Obtain information/comments from design and right of way staff. Attach maps and/or details as appropriate.			
	Previous environmental assessments, testing or studies performed by local entities or TxDOT? If yes, any concerns?		
	Existing geotechnical borings/soil cores? If yes, provide location/depth.		
	Proposed borings, columns, piers or drilled shafts? If yes, provide location/depth.		
	Proposed excavations (vertical alignment/profile changes, cuts, trenches and/or storm sewers)? If yes, provide location/depth.		
	Proposed de-watering? If yes, what is anticipated depth to groundwater level?		
	Proposed demolition or structure modification? If yes, provide details.		
	Proposed right-of-way acquisition and easement requirements? If yes, provide location/width.		
	Known encroachments? If yes, provide location and type.		
	Utility and/or pipeline adjustments? If yes, provide location, depth and type.		
	Will utilities require adjustment during construction?		
	Other? <i>(Describe as necessary)</i>		
	Other? <i>(Describe as necessary)</i>		
Section 2: Identification of Potential Hazardous Material Issues			
	2.1 Does the project include any of the following activities (indicate all that apply)?		
	Structure demolition operations or structure modifications.		

	Tunneling exceeding three feet below the surface.	
	Underpass construction.	
	Pipeline and underground utility installation or adjustments.	
	Confined spaces.	
	De-watering.	
	Vertical alignment changes.	
	Purchase of new ROW or easement.	
	Trenching, drilled shafts, cuts or other excavations exceeding three feet in depth.	
<p><i>If the project includes one or more of the activities listed above, complete Section 2.2 below. Use Table 1 in Appendix A to help identify all potential hazardous materials issues for this project.</i></p>		
<p><i>If the project <u>does not</u> include any of the activities listed above, complete a site survey and document the results in Section 6. If the site survey <u>did not</u> identify evidence of any of the environmental concerns listed in Section 6, no further hazardous materials action required and the project is eligible for a PCE classification or lower pending review of other environmental conditions. If the site survey identified evidence of any of the environmental concerns listed in Section 6, complete Section 3 below to determine additional data collection actions.</i></p>		
Yes/ No	2.2 Based on Table 1 Appendix A, what are the <i>potential</i> hazardous materials issues for this project (indicate all that apply)?	
	Lead based paint	
	Asbestos Containing Materials (ACM)	
	Oil & Gas	
	Petroleum Storage Tanks (PST)	
	Leaking Petroleum Storage Tanks (LPST)	
	Pipelines	
	Landfills	
	Non-LPST source of Contaminated Soil	
	Non-LPST source of Contaminated Groundwater	
	Other – (Describe)	
Section 3: Identification of Data Collection Actions		
<p><i>Using the information listed on Table 2, Appendix A and the potential hazardous materials issues indicated above in Section 2.2; determine the data collection actions required to identify actual hazardous material issues that may impact the project.</i></p>		
Required? Yes /No	Based on the potential hazardous materials issues indicated above and the Level 1 data collection information listed on Table 2 Appendix A, what data collection actions are required to identify actual hazardous material issues that may impact the project (indicate all that apply)?	
	Required Level 1 Data Collection Action	Corresponding Section of ISA Form
	Conduct Land Use Review (Existing & Previous)	Section 4
	Review existing project geotechnical boring logs to identify potential environmental concerns	Section 4.6
	Conduct ASTM E1527 Level or Equivalent Regulatory Database Search	Section 5
	Conduct Site Survey	Section 6
	Conduct Interviews	Section 7

	Conduct ASTM E1527-05 Phase 1 ESA	No Corresponding Section (This requires the completion of a separate document. Call ENV for assistance)	
<p><i>Based on the data collection actions indicated above, complete the required corresponding sections of the ISA form below. Use best professional judgment to determine whether to collect other data that is not required (Contact ENV for assistance or guidance). Place an "NA" in non-required sections if not completed.</i></p>			
Section 4: Existing and Previous Land Use Information			
Reviewed? (Yes/No/ Not Available)	Document and attach sources reviewed. Review and assess existing right of way, proposed acquisition and adjacent land use.		
	4.1 USGS 7.5 Minute Topographic Maps Any concerns? If yes, explain:		
	Quad(s):	Date(s):	Map ID:
	4.2 Aerial Photographs Any concerns? If yes, explain:		
	TxDOT:	Date(s):	Aerial ID:
	Soil Conservation Service:	Date(s):	Aerial ID:
	Other:	Date(s):	Map ID:
	4.3 Right-of-way Maps/Files Any concerns? If yes, explain:		
		Date(s):	Map ID:
	4.4 Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps Any concerns? If yes, explain:		
	Do Sanborn Maps cover project limits? Yes/No		
	Year:	Date(s):	Map ID:
	Year:	Date(s):	Map ID:
	Year:	Date(s):	Map ID:
	4.5 TxDOT As-Built Plans Any concerns identified during previous work within the project limits? If yes, explain:		
	4.6 TxDOT Geotechnical Soil Boring Logs Any concerns noted on the boring logs such as unusual odors, visible contamination, trash, waste or debris? If yes explain:		

	4.7 TxDOT Temporary Use Agreements: Any concerns such as monitor wells or treatment systems within the ROW? If yes, explain:
	4.8 Notifications of Contamination to TxDOT: Any concerns regarding contamination of ROW from off-site sources? If yes, explain:
	4.9 Other?

Section 4: Existing and Previous Land Use Information (Continued)

Type? (Circle and Describe)	4.10 Document types of land use on existing and proposed right-of-way. Also indicate type of adjacent land use. Obtain information from land use sources and site surveys.		
Undeveloped to Light Commercial:	undeveloped	agricultural ranch, pasture or cultivated fields	residential
	office buildings	retail	light commercial
Commercial, Repair or Maintenance:	automotive/truck repair	commercial printing facility	dry cleaners
	photo developing laboratory	service (gasoline) stations	other:
Recycling & Disposal Facilities:	auto salvage	landfill	recycling facility
	waste processing	treatment, storage or disposal	other:
Refinery/ Chemical/ Manufacturing:	ASTs	pipelines	other:
Oil & Gas Exploration:	oil/gas/injection wells	pipelines/compressor station	separation tanks
	tank batteries (ASTs)	other:	other:
Railroad:	rails and ballast	track side lubrication/maintenance	loading ramps
	railroad staging areas/spurs	warehouses storage areas	other:
Industrial / Manufacturing:			
Military:			

Other:	
Other:	
4.11 Comments:	
Section 5: Regulatory Agency Databases	
<p><i>Complete or contract for services to complete a database search in accordance with 40 CFR Part 312 Standards and Practices for All Appropriate Inquiry. A complete copy of the database search findings should be attached to this ISA. Attempts to locate "Orphan Sites", sites listed but have no listed addresses, should be made during Site Survey. Include in the table below the regulatory databases searched and indicate whether a database included a potential environmental concern.</i></p>	
Database Name	Environmental Concerns (Yes/ No)
<i>Add additional rows as needed</i>	

Section 6: Project Site Survey			
<i>Document site survey and findings. Describe location, size of concern. Attach site maps and photographs as appropriate.</i>			
Site Survey Date(s):			
Evidence? (Yes/No)	6.1 Specific Concerns Identified		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> underground storage tanks 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> vent pipes, fill pipes, or access ways indicating a fill pipe protruding from the ground 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> aboveground storage tanks 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> electrical and transformer equipment 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> injection wells, cisterns, sumps, dry wells flooring, drains, or walls stained by substances other than water or emitting foul odors 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> vats, 55-gallon drums (labeled/unlabeled), canisters, barrels, bottles, etc. 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> stockpiling, storage, spills, surface dumping of trash, garbage, refuse, rubbish, debris half exposed/buried, etc. 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> damaged or discarded automotive or industrial batteries 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> stained, discolored, barren, exposed or foreign (fill) soil 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> dead, damaged or stressed vegetation 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> oil sheen or films on surface water, seeps, lagoons, ponds, or drainage basins 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> pits, ponds, or lagoons associated with waste treatment or waste disposal 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> changes in drainage patterns from possible fill areas 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> security fencing, protected areas, placards, warning signs 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> dead animals possibly due to contamination 		
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> other concerns (<i>Describe</i>): 		
6.2 Description of Site Survey Evidence: <i>As necessary, provide additional information about the evidence identified; include photographs as an attachment.</i>			
Section 7: Interviews			
Interviewed? (NA/Yes/No)	Attach record of communications.		
	Local Residents including TxDOT Staff		
	Name:	Title:	Date:
	City Fire Departments		
	Name:	Title:	Date:
	City or County Department of Health/Environmental Division		

	Name:	Title:	Date:
City or County Planning Department			
	Name:	Title:	Date:
Local Electric Utility Companies (PCBs)			
	Name:	Title:	Date:
Regional TCEQ			
	Name:	Title:	Date:
District RRC			
	Name:	Title:	Date:
Current or Former Property Owners or Operators: See ASTM Standard Practice E 1528 Transaction Screen for Questions.			
	Name:	Title:	Date:
	Name:	Title:	Date:
	Name:	Title:	Date:

Section 8: Determine Need for Further Investigation

(Yes/No)	
	Is additional review of project design and right-of-way requirements needed? If Yes explain:
	Is additional existing or previous land use research needed? If Yes explain:
	Is additional regulatory agency database or file review needed? If Yes explain:
	Are additional interviews needed? If Yes explain:
	Is additional assessment or investigation needed? If Yes explain:

If the answer is Yes to any of the above questions in Section 8, collect the additional information and attach the information to the ISA. Contact ENV as early as possible for assistance or guidance with these questions.

Section 9: Findings

(Yes/No/TBD)	Answer and Explain as necessary
	Does possible or known contamination exist within the right-of-way?

	Is there possible or known involvement with contamination or hazardous material concerns during construction?
	Is further investigation required during subsequent stages of project development as a result of known or potential contamination/hazardous materials?
	Will special considerations be needed during the right-of-way acquisition process or property management as a result of known or potential contamination/ hazardous materials?
	Will special considerations be needed during plans, specification and estimate (PS&E) development as a result of known or potential contamination/ hazardous materials?
	Will special considerations be needed during maintenance as a result of known or potential contamination/ hazardous materials?
<p><i>If the answer is Yes or TBD to any of the above questions in Section 9, contact ENV as early as possible for assistance. ENV will initiate actions to resolve the hazardous materials issues. Refer to ENV-PPA's online Summary Guidance for Resolving Hazardous Materials Issues - Scheduling Considerations; Internal/ External Coordination and Recommended Practices.</i></p>	
<p>Section 10: NEPA Programmatic Categorical Exclusion Determination (Yes/ No)</p>	
	Will the project involve the acquisition of known unresolved contamination where TxDOT could reasonably expect to assume liability for corrective action upon acquisition?
	Will project activities involve known hazardous materials impacts that could be anticipated to adversely affect construction (e.g. can not resolve before letting or during construction)?
<p><i>If the answer is Yes to either of the above two questions in Section 10, the project is not eligible for a PCE determination.</i></p>	
<p>Section 11: Conclusions <i>(Select the appropriate conclusion from the two listed below)</i></p>	
<p><i>(Conclusions 1 - Delete if not applicable)</i> An analysis of initial site assessment data indicates that there are no identified hazardous materials concerns for this project. The hazardous materials assessment is complete.</p>	
<p><i>(Conclusions 2 - Delete if not applicable)</i> An analysis of the initial site assessment data identified the following hazardous materials concerns for this project (select all that apply):</p>	
	Lead based paint
	Asbestos Containing Materials (ACM)
	Oil & Gas
	Petroleum Storage Tanks (PST)
	Leaking Petroleum Storage Tanks (LPST)
	Pipelines
	Landfills
	Non-LPST source of Contaminated Soil
	Non-LPST source of Contaminated Groundwater
	Other – <i>(Describe)</i>
<p><i>(Conclusion 2 continued- Delete if not applicable)</i> Additional assessment is necessary to determine the impact to the project; scheduling considerations; internal/ external coordination needs and the appropriate actions needed to resolve the hazardous materials issues.</p>	

<p>Refer to ENV-PPA's online Summary Guidance for Resolving Hazardous Materials Issues - Scheduling Considerations; Internal/ External Coordination and Recommended Practices and TxDOT's online manual Hazardous Materials in Project Development for additional information. Contact ENV as early as possible for assistance with resolving the hazardous materials issues.</p>			
<p>Refer to Table 3 in Appendix A for recommended NEPA documentation and EPIC language for hazardous materials management.</p>			
<p>Section 12: Attachments</p>			
<p>Circle</p>	Project Map (Required)	USGS Topographic Maps (Required)	Aerial Photographs
	ROW Maps/Files	Sanborn Fire Insurance Maps	Temporary Use Agreements
	TxDOT As-Built Plans	Notifications	Photographs
	Record of Communications	Other:	Other:
<p>Section 13: Contact/Completed by</p>			
Name:			Tel:
Title:			
Firm (District Section):			
Address:			
Signature:			Date:

Hazardous Materials Initial Site Assessment

Appendix A

Table 1

Project Scoping and Identification of Potential Environmental Issues Hazardous Materials Management for Project Development

Table 1
Project Scoping and Identification of Potential Environmental Issues
Hazardous Materials Management for Project Development

Review Project Requirements and Determine if the Project Includes Any of the Following Activities ^{1,3}	Potential Environmental Issues Based on the Type of Project Activity ²								
	Lead Based Paint	Asbestos Containing Materials	Oil & Gas	PST	LPST	Pipelines	Landfills	Non-LPST Source Contaminated Soil	Non-LPST Source Contaminated Groundwater
Structure demolition operations or structure modifications.	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	No	No	No	No
Tunneling exceeding three feet below the surface.	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Underpass construction.	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Pipeline and underground utility installation or adjustments.	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Confined spaces.	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
De-watering.	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Vertical alignment changes.	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Purchase of new ROW or easement with no structures.	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Purchase of ROW or easement with structures.	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
Trenching, drilled shafts, cuts or other excavations exceeding three feet in depth.	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
<p>Document potential environmental issues in project file⁴. Begin data collection to identify actual environmental issues that will impact the project. Refer to Table 2 <i>Data Collection for Identification of Environmental Issues Impacting the Project</i> for data collection requirements.</p>									

Notes:

1. Projects that include one or more of the listed activities will have a higher potential for hazardous material impacts to project and will require a higher level of scrutiny during the data collection phase.
2. The project scoping stage only identifies potential hazmat issue. Actual project hazmat issues are identified during the project data collection stage outlined in Table 2 Data Collection for Identification of Environmental Issues Impacting the Project.
3. Not required for projects that consist only of work activities associated with overlay, seal coat, resurfacing, rehabilitation, or restoration done within the existing ROW on an existing road and completely within the footprint of existing base course.
4. A copy of the completed TxDOT Initial Site Assessment checklist is acceptable file documentation.

Hazardous Materials Initial Site Assessment

Appendix A

Table 2

Data Collection for Identification of Hazardous Materials Issues That Impact the Project

Table 2
Data Collection for Identification of Hazardous Material Issues That Impact the Project

Data Collection Action ¹ <i>(Read all foot notes on page 3 for complete clarification of data collection actions)</i>		Project Activity and Data Collection Requirements						
		Project requires new ROW or easement with or without structures	Project requires tunneling, trenching, drilled shafts or other excavations exceeding three feet and/ or vertical alignment changes, de-watering, confined spaces	Project has identified potential encroachments or other concerns	Proposed structure demolition or structure modifications	Project requires relocation of utilities	Land parcels purchased for construction of new TxDOT Buildings (i.e. offices, maintenance sections)	For all other projects that do not have one or more of the activities listed in the previous columns
Level 1 Data Collection	Determine Project Design & ROW Requirements	Required	Required	Required	Required	Required	Required	Required
	Conduct Site Survey	Required	Required	Required	Required	Required	Required	Required ⁵
	Conduct Land Use Review (Existing & Previous)	Required	Required	Required	Required	Required	Required	Required ^{6, 10}
	Conduct ASTM E1527 Level or Equivalent Regulatory Database Search	Required ⁸	Required	Required	Required ⁹	Required	Required	Recommended ⁶
	Review existing project geotechnical boring logs to identify potential environmental concerns	Recommended if logs available	Required if logs available	Recommended if logs available	Not Required	Required if logs available	Required if logs available	Recommended if logs available ⁶
	Conduct Interviews	Recommended if other collected data indicates a need	Recommended if other collected data indicates a need	Recommended if other collected data indicates a need	Not Required	Recommended if other collected data indicates a need	Recommended if other collected data indicates a need	Recommended if other collected data indicates a need ⁶
	Conduct ASTM E1527-05 Phase 1 ESA	Optional ⁷	Optional ⁷	Optional ⁷	Optional ⁷	Optional ⁷	Recommended (note ASTM PH 1 includes all Level 1 data collection information)	Optional ^{6,7}
Review Level 1 data to determine project impacts	Required	Required	Required	Required	Required	Required	Required ⁶	
If the review of Level 1 Data indicates potential project impacts, collect Level 2 data If no impact, hazardous material review completed. Document ² for project file Level 1 data findings and conclusions.								

Table 2
Data Collection for Identification of Hazardous Material Issues That Impact the Project

Data Collection Action ¹ <i>(Read all foot notes on page 3 for complete clarification of data collection actions)</i>		Project Activity and Data Collection Requirements						
		Project requires new ROW or easement with or without structures	Project requires tunneling, trenching, drilled shafts or other excavations exceeding three feet and/ or vertical alignment changes, de-watering, confined spaces	Project has identified potential encroachments or other concerns	Proposed structure demolition or structure modifications	Project requires relocation of utilities	Land parcels purchased for construction of new TxDOT Buildings (i.e. offices, maintenance sections)	For all other projects that do not have one or more of the activities listed in the previous columns
Level 2 Data Collection	Conduct Regulatory File Reviews ^{1,11}	Required when available if issue will impact project	Required when available if issue will impact project	Required when available if issue will impact project	Optional	Required when available if issue will impact project	Required when available if issue will impact project	Required when available if issue will impact project
	Conduct Additional Investigation/ testing ^{1,3,11}	Project Dependent. Contact ENV for assistance ⁴	Project Dependent. Contact ENV for assistance ⁴	Project Dependent. Contact ENV for assistance ⁴	Required - Contact ENV for assistance ⁴	Project Dependent. Contact ENV for assistance ⁴	Project Dependent. Contact ENV for assistance ⁴	Project Dependent. Contact ENV for assistance ⁴
	Conduct Project Impact Review using additional investigation/ testing data ¹	Required	Required	Required	Required	Required	Recommended	Required
Review Level 2 data to determine project impacts		Required	Required	Required	Required	Required	Recommended	Required
<p>If the review of Level 2 data indicates project impacts, document for project file Level 1 and 2 data findings and conclusions and contact ENV Pollution Prevention and Abatement staff to begin issue resolution process. Refer to ENV-PPA's online Summary Guidance for Resolving Hazardous Materials Issues - Scheduling Considerations; Internal/ External Coordination and Recommended Practices and TxDOT's online manual Hazardous Materials in Project Development for additional information.</p> <p>If no impact, hazardous material review completed. Document² for project file Level 1 and 2 data findings and conclusions. Refer to</p>								

Table 2 Data Collection for Identification of Hazardous Material Issues That Impact the Project

Notes:

1. The [*Hazardous Materials in Project Development Manual*](#) describes in more detail the data collection procedures.
2. A copy of the completed TxDOT Initial Site Assessment checklist or the ASTM Phase 1 report are suitable forms of Level 1 data collection documentation for the project file.
3. Examples of additional investigation/ testing include Phase 2 site assessment and ACM inspections.
4. District is responsible for initiating contact with ENV.
5. Does not apply for projects that consist only of work activities associated with overlay, seal coat, resurfacing, rehabilitation, or restoration done within the existing ROW on an existing road and completely within the footprint of existing base course.
6. Not necessary for projects that fall within this column that do not include any of the following activities: Structure demolition operations or structure modifications; Tunneling exceeding three feet below the surface; Underpass construction; Pipeline and underground utility installation or adjustments; Confined spaces; De-watering; Vertical alignment changes; Purchase of ROW or easement with or without structures; Trenching; drilled shafts; Cuts or other excavations exceeding three feet in depth.
7. An ASTM E1527-05 Phase 1 ESA may be conducted in lieu of the other listed Level 1 data collection actions. However, an ASTM E1527-05 Phase 1 is more practically used as a documentation tool for an individual parcel of concern where right of entry is obtained.
8. A limited database search is acceptable for undeveloped/agricultural areas where excavations are less than three feet and the project includes no relocations.
9. A limit database search is acceptable for bridge replacement/ modifications in undeveloped/agricultural areas.
10. A historical review (i.e. Sanborn Maps) recommended for ADA/ sidewalk reconstruction, in commercial or city downtown areas.
11. Internal and contracted technical experts will utilize ENV's Standard Operating Procedures for Technical Experts when conducting pollution prevention and abatement services. Contact ENV for assistance.

Hazardous Material Concern	Potential Impacts	Suggested Language for the Environmental Document	Environmental Tracking System Suggested EPIC Language
No Concerns Identified	NA	The project consist only of work activities associated with (<i>select: overlay, seal coat, resurfacing, rehabilitation, or restoration</i>) work done within the existing ROW on an existing road and completely within the footprint of existing base course. Consequently, this project will not involve the acquisition of known unresolved contamination where TxDOT could reasonably expect to assume liability for corrective action upon acquisition. In addition, this project does not involve known hazardous materials impacts that could be anticipated to adversely affect construction (e.g. can not resolve before letting or during construction).	Include on the PS&E EPIC any applicable storage and management requirements for liquid oil products, liquid petroleum products and other chemical liquids as per 40 CFR 112 (a.k.a. SPCC) and/ or the TCEQ Construction General Permit for storm water management.
	NA	Based on the following project activities (<i>list relevant project construction activities</i>) an Initial Site Assessment (ISA) was conducted to identify potential hazardous materials in the project area. The ISA consisted of the following actions (<i>list the ISA actions</i>). An analysis of the ISA data indicates that this project will not involve the acquisition of known unresolved contamination where TxDOT could reasonably expect to assume liability for corrective action upon acquisition. In addition, this project does not involve known hazardous materials impacts that could be anticipated to adversely affect construction (e.g. can not resolve before letting or during construction).	Include on the PS&E EPIC any applicable storage and management requirements for liquid oil products, liquid petroleum products and other chemical liquids as per 40 CFR 112 (a.k.a. SPCC) and/ or the TCEQ Construction General Permit for storm water management.
Asbestos Containing Materials (ACM)	ROW Structures	The proposed project includes the [demolition and/or relocation] of building structures. The buildings may contain asbestos containing materials. Asbestos inspections, specification, notification, license, accreditation, abatement and disposal, as applicable, should comply with federal and state regulations. Asbestos issues should be addressed during the right-of-way process prior to construction.	Pre-Construction - Prior to project letting, an asbestos inspection and subsequent abatement must be conducted on all public buildings purchased for this project. Additionally, the Department of State Health and Human Service (DSHS) shall be notified (10-day notification) prior to ACM abatement and/or the demolition of a bridge structure.
	Bridges	The proposed project includes the (demolition and/or renovation) of (# of bridges to be demolished) bridge(s). The bridge(s) may contain asbestos containing materials (ACM) and shall be inspected to verify the presence or absence of ACM. Prior to the bridge demolition(s), a 10-Day Notification shall be submitted to the Department of State Health and Human Services (DSHS).	Pre-Construction - Prior to the renovation and/or demolition of a bridge structure, an asbestos inspection must be conducted to verify the presence or absence of asbestos containing materials (ACM). Additionally, the Department of State Health and Human Service (DSHS) shall be notified (10-day notification) prior to ACM abatement and/or the demolition of a bridge structure.
	Underground Asbestos Piping (Transite, Coated Pipes)	The proposed project includes the (relocation, disturbance) of pipelines (give location as well as possible) that are suspected to contain asbestos Removal/disturbance of asbestos containing pipelines would be accomplished in accordance with OSHA and applicable Asbestos NESHAP standards, including the use of trained personnel working under the supervision of an asbestos competent person.	Pre-Letting - Develop procedures / specifications to address ACM piping prior to disturbance.
	Enhancement Projects	Due to the age of the public building structure, there is the potential for asbestos-containing materials. However, the proposed project does not include utility work, renovation, dismantling, demolition or disposal of building materials. Therefore, no further coordination or compliance with applicable asbestos regulations is required.	No EPIC produced for this situation.
		The project improvements include [partial] renovation of a public building. [At this time, no asbestos surveys are known to have been performed / Preliminary asbestos surveys have been performed].	No suggested language. Develop EPIC language appropriate for the situation.
	An Asbestos Containing Materials (ACM) and Lead Based Paint (LBP) Survey was performed by [Consultant Name] for the City of	No suggested language. Develop EPIC language appropriate for the	

Hazardous Material Concern	Potential Impacts	Suggested Language for the Environmental Document	Environmental Tracking System Suggested EPIC Language
		<p>[Name]. The document is also available for review through the [X] District of TxDOT. On [date], an asbestos inspection of the existing building was performed by a Texas Department of Health licensed asbestos inspector. [Number (X)] bulk samples of suspected asbestos containing material (ACM) were collected from the building. Polarized Light Microscopy (PLM) analysis revealed that [none of the bulk samples contain greater than 1 % asbestos fibers. The suspected materials consisted of [painted plaster and floor tiles]. The asbestos survey did not include sampling of such materials as [concrete flooring, wooden or metal doors, concrete block walls, or hidden/inaccessible components].</p> <p>[Further testing / no further testing for ACM] appears required. The proposed improvements would comply with applicable federal and state regulations, including the Texas Asbestos Health Protection Act (TAHPA), the National Emissions Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAP), and disposal regulations of the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ) and Environmental Protection Agency (EPA).</p>	situation.
		<p>On [date], a Lead Based Paint (LBP) survey was also performed on the building. The survey was performed by [testing interior and exterior painted surfaces of the building using EPA testing method [insert test method name]. The survey was performed by a Certified Inspector for Lead Hazards and LBP Risk Assessor. A limited number of painted surfaces exhibited XRF readings indicating that the painted surface contains lead. The positive LBP readings were found on the [exterior window headers, door arches, upper trim, windowsill and sash and porch ceiling]. Positive LBP readings were also found on the interior [window stools and stops, wall baseboard, support columns, ceiling, window sash, door and door jamb, cabinet door, door plinth and casing].</p> <p>Applicable regulations do not require hiring a Certified Lead Abatement Contractor for component or paint removal during remodeling. However, the waste materials and construction debris containing LBP are required to be disposed according to current disposal regulations of the TCEQ and EPA.</p>	No suggested language. Develop EPIC language appropriate for the situation.
		<p>Prior to [partial] renovation, the [work area and all immediately surrounding areas / building] would be surveyed by a licensed asbestos inspector. If asbestos is confirmed, then asbestos-related activities and the renovation would need to be performed in accordance with the Texas Asbestos Health Protection Act (TAHPA) and the National Emissions Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants (NESHAP).</p>	No suggested language. Develop EPIC language appropriate for the situation.
		<p>The project's plans, specifications and estimates (PS&E) would disclose areas of asbestos and lead-based paint which could be disturbed. Special provisions would be developed in the PS&E for asbestos-related activities, notifications, required licenses, and monitoring in accordance with NESHAPS and TAHPA.</p>	No suggested language. Develop EPIC language appropriate for the situation.
PST	No Concern to Project	<p>Within the project limits, there are [X] registered petroleum storage tanks (RPST) facilities. [None] of the registered facilities are listed as leaking petroleum storage tanks (LPST) sites. The site survey and research into the historical land use [revealed / did not reveal] any other abandoned and/or active gasoline service stations. [As previously stated, right-of-way acquisition or easements are not required for this project. / No significant excavation is anticipated.] A summary table and map showing the location of the sites is [attached to this documentation / provided in Appendix X].</p>	No EPIC produced for this situation.
	ROW Take	<p>Within the project limits, there are (X) (registered/ abandoned) petroleum storage tanks (RPST) facilities. (None) of the PST facilities are listed as leaking petroleum storage tanks (LPST) sites. (X) of the (RPST/ abandoned) sites will be (will not be) acquired as part of the ROW requirements of the project. District ROW will be</p>	Pre-ROW – It is recommended that the district ROW section be notified of the petroleum storage tanks identified within the areas identified for tanking.

Hazardous Material Concern	Potential Impacts	Suggested Language for the Environmental Document	Environmental Tracking System Suggested EPIC Language
	Unregistered PST	<p>notified of the PST regulatory status and exact location.</p> <p>During the site survey, (X) potential undisclosed Petroleum Storage Tanks (PST) sites were identified immediately adjacent (close proximity) to the proposed project. These sites were not identified on the Texas Commission on Environmental (TCEQ) petroleum storage tank (PST) database nor on the leaking petroleum storage tank (LPST) database. No information is currently known about sites, including if a release has occurred or not.</p>	<p>Pre-PS&E Development – Prior to PS&E development, it is recommended that a more detailed investigation be conducted for the sites identified as undisclosed petroleum storage tanks. The project requirements adjacent to the undisclosed sites should be reviewed for ROW acquisition requirements and any excavations greater than 3 feet (or to estimated groundwater). If a determination cannot be made on the likelihood potential impacts, then a Phase II investigation is recommended.</p>
LPST	No Concern to Project	<p>A review of TCEQ's leaking petroleum storage tank (LPST) on-line database query indicated [X] LPST sites adjacent to the proposed project. According to the priority and status indicated in the list search, only minor soil contamination was indicated in [X] of the [X] adjacent LPST listings. TCEQ issued the final concurrence for [X] of these [X] listings and the cases are closed.</p> <p>[As previously stated, right-of-way acquisition or easements are not required for this project.] [No significant excavation is anticipated. / In this area of the proposed project, only rehabilitation of the existing roadway with no significant lowering of the vertical alignment is required. / The vertical alignment would need to be raised.] Therefore, it is not anticipated that petroleum contamination would be encountered during construction. A summary table and map showing the location of the sites is [attached to this documentation / provided in Appendix X].</p>	<p>No EPIC produced for this situation.</p>
	Potential Impacts	<p>Since [displacements / tank system removal would be required / excavation greater than three feet, storm sewers or utility adjustments would be required], the LPST and RPST files for facilities adjacent or within X feet to the project limits were reviewed by [TxDOT district staff / TxDOT division staff / Consultant Name / Environmental Consultant]. Additionally, the sites were discussed with the [TCEQ project case manager / staff of TCEQ's Region X office.]</p> <p>LPST No. XXXXXX is located near the [X] of the project. The status and priority of the site indicates that groundwater is impacted and quarterly monitoring is in progress. [According to the file review, the static water level in the monitoring wells is approximately X meters (XX feet) below the ground surface. In this area, a stormwater drainage structure would be installed approximately X meters (X feet) below the ground surface. Although contaminated groundwater may exist within the project limits, it is not anticipated that contaminated groundwater or soil would be encountered during construction.]</p>	<p>Advance Planning – Phase II Recommended – A Phase II (Subsurface Investigation) is recommended (for LPST#xxxxx) to assess the potential impacts to the proposed project.</p> <p>Advance Planning – Additional Research (File Search) – It is recommended that a regulatory file search be conducted for the following sites (list the locations). Please assess whether the potential contamination (soil, groundwater, and vapors) from the affected parcels will impact the proposed project</p>
	Known Impacts	<p>Follow above example for LPST potential except replace the second paragraph with the following:</p> <p>LPST No XXXXX is located at (give a good location). Contamination associated with this LPST will impact the proposed project. The (insert the affected improvements) will be installed within an area known to have soil and groundwater contamination. A Soil and Groundwater Management Plan (SGMP) will be prepared to direct the installation of all improvements for this project within the affected zone.</p>	<p>Advance Planning – Preparation of a SGMP – A Soil and Groundwater Management Plan (SGMP) shall be prepared for the installation of improvements affected by LPST XXXXX.</p>

Hazardous Material Concern	Potential Impacts	Suggested Language for the Environmental Document	Environmental Tracking System Suggested EPIC Language
Oil & Gas Wells	Identification of Well(s)	<p>XXX Oil Well(s) and X Gas well(s) were identified within the project study area. The well locations are depicted on (show the well locations on a map).</p> <p>(Assess each well as much as possible. Try to determine the regulatory standing of the well, its depth and size, production rates, possible visual contamination, etc.)</p>	<p>Pre PS&E Development – Prior to PS&E development, it is recommended that each well observed within the project study area be investigated further to determine its possible location within the chosen alignment. If the identified wells will be acquired as part of the project, contact for assistance in this matter.</p>
	Well Acquisition(s)	<p>XXX Oil Well(s) and X Gas well(s) were identified within the project study area and XXX will be acquired as part of the ROW process. The well locations are depicted on (show the well locations on a map).</p> <p>(Assess each well as much as possible. Try to determine the regulatory standing of the well, its depth and size, production rates, possible visual contamination, etc.)</p>	<p>Pre PS&E Development – Prior to PS&E development, it is recommended that each well observed within the project limits be investigated further to determine its possible impact to the project; contact ENV-PPA for assistance in this matter.</p>
Pipelines	Active Pipelines	<p>During the preliminary investigations, multiple pipelines were found to bisect the proposed project. The locations of the pipeline can be found in Section XX (show the locations on a map within the document) of this document. Negotiations will be conducted with the pipeline owners to properly relocate or deepen the affected pipelines.</p>	<p>No EPIC produced for this situation.</p>
		<p>During the preliminary investigations, multiple pipelines were found to bisect the proposed project. The locations of the pipeline can be found in Section XX (show the locations on a map within the document) of this document. Potential environmental impacts (e.g. dead vegetation, soil staining, etc.) were observed in the proposed construction area. Negotiations will be conducted with the pipeline owners to investigate the potentially impacted area from the presence of contamination.</p>	<p>Pre PS&E Development – Known Pipelines - Prior to the completion of the PS&E, all known active pipelines with suspected releases shall be investigated by the current owners and negotiations shall be initiated to facilitate the investigation of the potentially impacted areas. If owners will not or cannot conduct the investigation TxDOT will conduct the investigation and initiate cost recovery actions from the pipeline owner.</p>
	Abandon Pipelines	<p>During the preliminary investigations, abandoned pipelines were found (or have the potential) to bisect the proposed project. The locations of the known pipeline(s) (the area potentially affected by abandoned pipelines) can be found in Section XX (show the locations on a map within the document) of this document. Efforts will be made to locate the owners of the known abandoned pipelines to negotiate for their removal(s). If owners of the pipelines cannot be located, then TxDOT will “hot tap” and remove the abandon pipelines prior to construction or prepare a pipeline removal plan to facilitate their removal.</p>	<p>Pre PS&E Development – Known Pipelines - Prior to the completion of the PS&E, all known abandon pipelines shall be investigated for current owners and negotiations shall be initiated to facilitate their removal. If owners cannot be found for the abandoned pipelines, then TxDOT will assume responsibility for their “hot tap” and removal.</p> <p>Pre PS&E Development – Designated Areas – Prior to the completion of the PS&E, the affected area thought to contain abandon pipelines shall be investigated thoroughly (RRC file searched, field surveys, etc.). Pipeline Removal Plans shall be prepared to facilitate the “hot tap” and removal of any abandoned pipelines discovered during construction. This Pipeline Removal Plan should be</p>

Hazardous Material Concern	Potential Impacts	Suggested Language for the Environmental Document	Environmental Tracking System Suggested EPIC Language
			incorporated into the PS&E to be included in the work performed by the Prime Contractor. Please contact PPA-ENV to complete this function.
Landfills	Identified Landfills	During the preliminary investigation, (multiple) landfill(s) were identified within the search area. (Assess and discuss <u>each</u> Landfill as much as possible. Try to determine the regulatory standing of the landfill, its size and potential impacts to the proposed project to include contamination issues as well.)	Pre-PS&E Development – Needs more Research – Prior to PS&E development, more research/ regulatory file review shall be conducted on (give the landfill identification number (s) or other distinguishing identification). Revised Document – If impacts are likely – Please revise the document to include the following information. Additional research shall be conducted on (give the landfill identification number(s) or other distinguishing identification) to verify the likelihood of the proposed project intersecting waste material (or cells), known groundwater and/or soil contamination.
	Known Impacts	During the preliminary investigation, (multiple) landfill(s) were identified within the search area. Gather sufficient information to compare potential impacts among project alternatives and support selection of the preferred alternative. Try to determine the regulatory standing of the landfill, its size and potential impacts to the proposed project to include contamination issues as well. If impacts to the proposed project are likely, use the following paragraph.) The (give the name of the landfill along with the address or a method of identifying its location) was found to intersect the proposed project. (Give a summary of the issues and potential problems that might be felt by the landfill - volume of waste, soil and/or groundwater contamination, regulatory issues, etc.)	Pre-PS&E Development – Prior to PS&E development, investigations will be conducted to determine the impacts to the proposed project, contact ENV-PPA for assistance in this matter.
Lead Based Paint (LBP)	Bridge Span/Girders (demolition)	(Number of bridges) bridges will be demolished as part of this project, which will include the removal of steel beam(s) that may have the potential to contain Lead Based Paint (LBP). Prior to project letting, the steel coatings on the bridge(s) to be demolished will be analyzed for the presence or absence of LBP. If LBP is discovered, contingencies would be developed to address worker safety, material recycling and proper management of any paint related wastes, as necessary.	Pre-Letting - Prior to project letting, the presence or absence Lead Based Paint (LBP) should be determined through testing or process knowledge. If LBP is confirmed, coordinate w/ BRG and ENV for current procedures/specifications addressing lead based paint.
	Enhancement Projects	On [date], a Lead Based Paint (LBP) survey was also performed on the building. The survey was performed by [testing interior and exterior painted surfaces of the building using a Niton XRF Spectrum Analyzer]. The survey was performed by a Certified Inspector for Lead Hazards and LBP Risk Assessor. A limited number of painted surfaces exhibited XRF readings indicating that the painted surface contains lead. The positive LBP readings were found on the [exterior window headers, door arches, upper trim, windowsill and sash and porch ceiling]. Positive LBP readings were also found on the interior [window stools and stops, wall baseboard, support columns, ceiling, window sash, door and door jamb, cabinet door, door plinth and casing]. Applicable regulations do not require hiring a Certified Lead Abatement Contractor for component or paint removal during	Pre-Letting –When paints applied prior to 1978 might be disturbed, coordinate with the project sponsor conduct a Lead-Based Paint (LBP) inspection. If LBP will be disturbed by the enhancement project, project specifications must consider worker health and safety requirements and proper waste management/ disposal. All LBP that will not be disturbed by the construction that is in good working condition can remain as is and will not require abatement.

Hazardous Material Concern	Potential Impacts	Suggested Language for the Environmental Document	Environmental Tracking System Suggested EPIC Language
		remodeling. However, the waste materials and construction debris containing LBP are required to be disposed according to current disposal regulations of the TCEQ and EPA.	
	Bridge Cleaning and Painting Projects (Cleaning and Painting Steel) Requiring Paint Removal	Paint removal activities would be in accordance with appropriate specifications addressing environmental concerns including containment, waste management, and safety considerations.	Coordinate with designers/BRG to assure proper specifications.
CERCLA	Identified CERCLA Sites	<p>During the preliminary investigation, (multiple) CERCLA Sites(s) were identified within the search area. Gather sufficient information to compare potential impacts among project alternatives and support selection of the preferred alternative. Try to determine the regulatory standing of the site, its size and potential impacts to the proposed project to include contamination issues as well. If impacts to the proposed project are likely, use the following paragraph.)</p> <p>The (give the name and regulatory number of the CERCLA site along with the address or a method of identifying its location) has the potential to impact the proposed project. (Give a summary of the issues and potential problems that might be felt by the CERCLA site – potential impacts, soil and/or groundwater contamination, regulatory issues, etc.)</p>	<p>Pre-PS&E Development – Needs more Research – Prior to PS&E development, more research/ regulatory file review shall be conducted on (give the CERCLA identification number (s) or other distinguishing identification).</p> <p>Revised Document – If impacts are likely – Please revise the document to include the following information. Additional research shall be conducted on (give the CERCLA identification number(s) or other distinguishing identification) to verify the likelihood of the proposed project impacting known contaminated media.</p>

*Texas Department of Transportation
Environmental Affairs Division*

**Standards of Uniformity for
Programmatic Categorical Exclusions**

Chapter 12.

Biological Resources

Chapter 12. Biological Resources

Regulations that must be addressed in the PCE document include:

- The Migratory Bird Treaty Act
- Executive Order 13112 on Invasive Species
- The Executive Memorandum on Beneficial Landscaping
- The Farmland Protection Policy Act
- The Endangered Species Act
- The Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act
- Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act, and
- The Memorandum of Understanding with the Texas Parks and Wildlife Department (TAC43(1)(2)(B)(22.2)) and memoranda of agreements.

This document includes the regulations, suggested language, and triggers for agency coordination.

Federal Level

Yes	No	N/A	Description of Item Sufficiency	References/Guidance
Endangered Species Act of 1973				
1			<p>Are all federally listed species and designated critical habitat addressed with one of the following effect calls?</p> <p>1) no effect 2) may affect, not likely to adversely affect 3) may affect, likely to adversely affect</p> <p><i>Note: Any effect call other than "no effect" requires USFWS consultation. Based on the outcome of the consultation, the project may or may not remain a PCE. If the effect call is "may affect, likely to adversely affect," the project cannot be a PCE.</i></p>	<p>Digest of Federal Resource Laws of Interest to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) USFWS Threatened and Endangered Species List</p>
2			<p>Is there a detailed assessment of the action in relation to each of the federally listed species, and their habitat, to support the effect call?</p> <p><i>(Is habitat present? If so, will it be affected? If species are in or near project action area, how will they be affected?)</i></p>	
3			<p>Are all technical reports and other supporting materials used in support of making effect calls or determining impacts</p>	

Chapter 12. Biological Resources

Yes	No	N/A	Description of Item Sufficiency	References/Guidance
			to natural resources identified in a table or a separate reference page? Format should be "Author, date, title, no. pages." For example: <i>Ace Environmental. 2008. Results of Karst Invertebrate Habitat Assessment Along Highway 1, Travis County, Texas. 45 pp.</i>	
Migratory Bird Treaty Act				
4			<p>Is the Migratory Bird Treaty Act adequately addressed?</p> <p>An adequate statement includes, at a minimum, the following three items:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Acknowledgement of the MTBA. 2. Acknowledgement of the applicability to the project. 3. A statement explaining how the project will comply with the MBTA. 	Migratory Bird Treaty Act
Magnuson-Stevens Fishery Conservation and Management Act (Essential Fish Habitat)				
5			Is Essential Fish Habitat adequately addressed?	Essential Fish Habitat Findings
6			<p>Note that, if the project is located within a county with tidally influenced waters, it must be determined whether or not the project area contains essential fish habitat.</p> <p>If the habitat exists within the project area, then consultation with NMFS is required. Consultation may be completed through the USACE permitting process for non-federally funded projects.</p> <p>If there are no tidally influenced waters in the county where the proposed project is located, there is no requirement to address EFH.</p>	
Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (FWCA)				
7			<p>Is compliance with the FWCA adequately addressed?</p> <p>If the project is authorized under a Section 404 NWP, or if no USACE permit is</p>	Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act (FWCA) memo dated 6/16/2003

Chapter 12. Biological Resources

Yes	No	N/A	Description of Item Sufficiency	References/Guidance
			<p>required, then no coordination under FWCA is required.</p> <p>If the project is authorized under an IP, then coordination under FWCA is required. However, if a section 404 NWP 23 is used, or if an IP is required, the project can not be a PCE.</p>	
Farmland Protection Policy Act				
8			Is the Farmland Protection Policy Act (FPPA) adequately addressed?	Farmland Protection Policy Act
9			<p>A. The project is exempt if any of the following conditions are met:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No federal nexus • No new ROW • Is there is new ROW, the project is located in developed, urbanizing, or zoned urban. 	FHWA/TxDOT FPPA Guidance Memo, Farmland Protection Policy Act, January 16, 2001
10			<p>B. If not exempt, then the following must occur:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New ROW must be scored using either FPPA Form AD-1006 or SCS-CPA 106, depending on project type • If the project scores above 60 on part V of either form, then coordination with NRCS is required. 	FPPA Form AD-1006 Farmland Conversion Impact Rating, for Corridor Type Projects (Form CS-CPA 106)
Executive Order 13112 on Invasive Species				
11			Is Executive Order 13112 on Invasive Species adequately addressed?	Executive Order 13112 of February 3, 1999: Invasive Species
Environmentally and Economically Beneficial Practices on Federal Landscaped Grounds				
12			Is the Executive Memorandum on Beneficial Landscaping adequately addressed?	Memorandum on environmentally beneficial landscaping

Chapter 12. Biological Resources

Species Impact Table				
13			<p>Does the document include a table addressing species that are found on the current federal and state county lists?</p> <p>At minimum, the table should include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. the scientific name b. the common name c. the protection status, e.g., federal and state listed T&E species, federal candidates, state species of concern (state species of concern are not required at present, but are strongly recommended) d. a brief habitat description e. indicate if suitable habitat that is present f. determination of effect/impact g. any EOIDs found in the NDD search h. table organized taxonomically i. the dates of the federal and county lists that were used to construct the table (this information cannot be more than six months old). 	<p>Impact assessment memo</p>

State Level

Yes	No	N/A	Description of Item Sufficiency	References/Guidance
Triggers for Texas Parks and Wildlife Department Coordination				
14			<p>Does the project involve more than 1.0 acre of new ROW within floodplains or creek drainages in rural or undeveloped urban areas?</p> <p>If yes, coordinate with TPWD.</p>	<p>TxDOT/TPWD Memoranda of Understanding -- TAC43(1)(2)(B) 2.22(d)(2)(A)</p>

Chapter 12. Biological Resources

	Yes	No	N/A	Description of Item Sufficiency	References/Guidance
15				Does the project require channel modifications to streams, rivers or water bodies? If yes, coordinate with TPWD.	TxDOT/TPWD Memoranda of Understanding -- TAC43(1)(2)(B) 2.22(d)(2)(B)
16				Does the project include a channel re-alignment requiring the creation of new drainage ways or other excavation impacting more than 1.0 acre of mature woody vegetation? If yes, coordinate with TPWD.	TxDOT/TPWD Memoranda of Understanding -- TAC43(1)(2)(B) 2.22(d)(2)(C)
17				Does the project require any excavation (scraping, clearing, or other surface disturbance) of the existing channel outside of TxDOT's existing ROW, or of the channel inside the ROW which is not routinely maintained and exhibits native vegetation? If yes, coordinate with TPWD.	TxDOT/TPWD Memoranda of Understanding -- TAC43(1)(2)(B) 2.22(d)(2)(D)
18				Might the project affect mature woody vegetation or dense mature brush, including any significant remnant native vegetation (e.g., undisturbed native prairie or bottomland hardwood, etc.)? If yes, coordinate with TPWD.	TxDOT/TPWD Memoranda of Understanding -- TAC43(1)(2)(B) 2.22(d)(2)(E)
19				Is the project within range and in suitable habitat of any state or federally listed threatened or endangered species? If yes, coordinate with TPWD.	TxDOT/TPWD Memoranda of Understanding -- TAC43(1)(2)(B) 2.22(d)(2)(F)
20				Does the project involve mitigation plans or otherwise involve proposals to redress project impacts on fish, wildlife, or plant resources? If yes, coordinate with TPWD.	TxDOT/TPWD Memoranda of Understanding -- TAC43(1)(2)(B) 2.22(d)(2)(G)
21				Does the project have previous environmental clearance, i.e., three years have passed without major action(s) and/or TPWD review, but now meets any of the above listed criteria?	TxDOT/TPWD Memoranda of Understanding -- TAC43(1)(2)(B) 2.22(d)(2)(H)

Chapter 12. Biological Resources

Yes	No	N/A	Description of Item Sufficiency	References/Guidance
			If yes, coordinate with TPWD.	
22			Have three years passed since environmental clearance with major actions (i.e., the TPWD may have or may not have reviewed, but the project meets any of the above listed criteria)? If yes, coordinate with TPWD.	TxDOT/TPWD Memoranda of Understanding -- TAC43(1)(2)(B) 2.22(d)(2)(l)
MOU/MOA Documentation				
23			The following document elements are required per the TxDOT and Texas Parks and Wildlife Department (TPWD) Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) and Memorandum of Agreement (MOA), or by ENV guidance/policy memoranda.	TxDOT/TPWD Memoranda of Understanding -- TAC43(1)(2)(B) 2.22
No New ROW				
24			Include a general description of vegetation types, as described in the TPWD Vegetation Types of Texas (TPWD, 1984). Include any available maps, aerial photos (with dates), photos, etc. to supplement the description.	The Vegetation Types of Texas Memorandum of Agreement with TPWD for Finalization of 1998 MOU Concerning Habitat Descriptions and Mitigation
25			Provide a statement indicating whether the existing vegetation matches the description from the Vegetation Types of Texas, and if there is an unusual difference between vegetation inside and outside the ROW.	
26			Identify any unusual vegetation features and/or special habitat features within the ROW. Unusual vegetation features may include (but are not limited to): unmaintained vegetation, fencerow vegetation, riparian, unusually large trees for the area, or unusual/isolated stands of vegetation. Special habitat features include bottomland hardwoods, caves, cliffs and bluffs, native prairies, ponds, seeps or	

Chapter 12. Biological Resources

Yes	No	N/A	Description of Item Sufficiency	References/Guidance
			springs, snags, water bodies, and bird or bat colonies in structures.	
27			<p>Describe and quantify permanent and temporary impacts to (1) unusual vegetation features and (2) special habitat features.</p> <p>Quantification should include either the areal extent or the number of trees impacted.</p>	
28			<p>Discuss the steps taken to avoid or minimize impacts to unusual vegetation and special habitat features. This discussion should include: balancing decisions made with respect to other natural and environmental issues, community, social and historic issues, and safety and operational design elements.</p>	
29			<p>Describe any habitat that occurs for State or Federally listed threatened or endangered species within or abutting the ROW.</p> <p>ENV also strongly recommends addressing state species of concern in this step.</p> <p>In the description, include the habitat requirements for these species.</p>	
New location				
30			<p>Is the project on new location?</p> <p>If yes, the document must include the all the information above, as well as the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • dominant species for each vegetation strata, including: tree, shrub, vine, and any herbaceous (grass and forb) layers • height of trees (range • diameter at breast height of trees (range and average) 	

Chapter 12. Biological Resources

Yes	No	N/A	Description of Item Sufficiency	References/Guidance
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> percent canopy cover of trees acreage of vegetation types 	
31			Describe the land use within and outside the proposed ROW.	
32			For projects with multiple alternatives, evaluate all alternatives to the same level of detail.	
Existing location with new ROW				
33			Is the project on existing location but requires additional ROW?	
34			The information required for projects on existing location shall be included for existing and new ROW.	
35			The information required for projects on new location shall be included for any unusual vegetation or special habitat features.	
36			<p>Include a statement that clearly addresses mitigation for regulated and non-regulated habitats, regardless of whether or not it is proposed.</p> <p>Specifically, the document must address, at a minimum, the five habitat types listed in the MOA for compensatory mitigation. If no compensatory mitigation is proposed, provide justification.</p>	TxDOT/TPWD Memorandum of Agreement TxDOT/TPWD Memorandum of Understanding TAC43(1)(2)(B)(2.22)(d)(4)(B)
<p>Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) for Sharing and Maintaining Natural Diversity Database Information and TxDOT/TPWD MOU</p> <p>TAC43(1)(2)(B)(22.2) (e)(1 & 2)</p>				
37			Per the TxDOT and Texas Parks and Wildlife Department (TPWD) Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) for Sharing and Maintaining Natural Diversity Database Information, specific criteria and standards for documentation are required. Until these criteria and standards are developed and formally agreed upon by both TxDOT and TPWD, the following minimum document elements are required.	

Chapter 12. Biological Resources

Yes	No	N/A	Description of Item Sufficiency	References/Guidance
38			<p>Perform a search of the Natural Diversity Database that meets all the requirements of the TxDOT/TPWD MOA for Sharing and Maintaining Natural Diversity Database Information, and include the results. Results should include the enumeration of all Element Occurrence Records (EOIDs) and all managed areas within the search radius.</p> <p>Discuss any of the project's potential impacts to the operation of any nearby managed areas.</p>	<p>Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) for Sharing and Maintaining Natural Diversity Database Information and TxDOT/TPWD MOU</p>
39			<p>If the project area is to be surveyed for species or habitat, describe the survey protocols or state that specific USFWS established protocols were utilized.</p>	<p>Refer to guidance provided on Crossroads -- Biological Resources, or contact ENV.</p>
40			<p>Conduct a search of the NDD using a 1.5 mile buffer around the entire project area.</p> <p>A 10-mile search radius is also recommended.</p>	
41			<p>Report the results of the NDD search. Include EOID numbers, common names, scientific names, and listing status for all EO reps.</p> <p>This information can be included in the species impact table discussed above.</p> <p>If a broader search radius was used, identify that search radius and report the results, following the above guidelines.</p>	
42			<p>Include a statement that the NDD was checked using the NDD Mimic. Provide the NDD Mimic version date and the date the search was performed.</p> <p>Include a statement that the NDD cannot be used for presence/absence determinations.</p>	
43			<p>Any included maps SHOULD NOT show the locations of records from the NDD in</p>	

Chapter 12. Biological Resources

Yes	No	N/A	Description of Item Sufficiency	References/Guidance
			the NEPA document.	
TPWD Coordination				
44			<p>The document must be coordinated with TPWD:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • after the District has completed review and revisions of the NEPA document, • prior to submission to the REC, AND • if any of the MOA/MOU triggers have been met. <p>The following procedures apply:</p>	TPWD Coordination Letter Template
45		<p>A. Initiate coordination:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Email a copy of the NEPA document and the completed TPWD Coordination Letter Template to ENV. 		
46			<p>B. Respond to TPWD comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within 90 days of its decision regarding TPWD comments received for the project, the District shall respond in writing to TPWD for all comments, suggestions, and recommendations. • The District shall email a copy of the its reply to ENV. • The District shall upload a copy of its reply to TPWD into ETS. • The District shall include copies of all correspondence with TPWD in the project file. 	TPWD Code, Chapter 12, Subchapter A

*Texas Department of Transportation
Environmental Affairs Division*

**Standards of Uniformity for
Programmatic Categorical Exclusions**

Chapter 13.

Air Quality

Chapter 13. Air Quality

Introduction

This Standard of Uniformity (SOU) has been designed to ensure that all Programmatic Categorical Exclusions (PCEs) using it in development and certification will comply with all air quality-related provisions of the [2004 Programmatic Agreement for the Review and Approval of NEPA Categorically Excluded Transportation Projects between FHWA and TxDOT](#) (Programmatic Agreement).

Specifically, if a PCE is developed in accordance with this SOU, the project (action) will conform to all applicable laws, regulations, implementation plans, or other federal and/or state air quality requirements pursuant to the Federal and Texas Clean Air Acts. Any exceptions to the Programmatic Agreement that affect the use of this SOU should be coordinated through the [Environmental Affairs Division's Air Quality staff](#).

Chapter 13. Air Quality

Yes	No	N/A	Description of Item Sufficiency	References/Guidance
Basic Criteria				
1			Does the document include a section discussing the project's consistency with transportation plans? (NOTE: This section may be part of the air quality section or it may be part of another section of the PCE document.)	
2			Does the document include a section discussing air quality?	
3	If the answer to either of the above two questions is no, the document should not be certified as complete.			
Project Consistency with Transportation Plans and Funding				
4	The PCE may only be certified if the proposed project is consistent with any applicable transportation plans. Transportation plans include: metropolitan planning organization (MPO), long-range metropolitan transportation plan (LRTP or MTP), and Transportation Improvement Program (TIP), or State Transportation Improvement Program (STIP) for areas not within an MPO jurisdiction. All projects located in a nonattainment and/or maintenance area require Transportation Consistency verifications to determine conformity. The representative District is responsible for determining that the project is consistent with the appropriate transportation plans, and should follow the steps outlined in the Transportation Consistency SOU .			
5			<p>National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS) Attainment Area (AA): If the project is within a metropolitan planning area (MPA), does the document disclose that the project is consistent with the local MPO's MTP and TIP (or Appendix D of the TIP, if the proposed letting date is not within the TIP timeframe)? Does the document disclose the date of the latest MTP and TIP?</p> <p>See AA Consistency and Conformity Template Language.</p> <p>Nonattainment Area (NAA) and Maintenance Area (MA): If the project is within a metropolitan planning area (MPA), does the document disclose that the project is consistent with the local MPO's MTP and TIP (or Appendix D of the TIP, if the proposed letting date is not</p>	<p>FHWA: Transportation Planning Requirements and Their Relationship to NEPA Process Completion (1/28/2008)</p> <p>23 CFR 450, Appendix A (explains congressional intent that plans should be the foundation for transportation decisions)</p> <p>23 CFR 450.220 (funding)</p> <p>40 CFR 93.101, 93.107, 93.109</p> <p>23 CFR 771.133 Clarification of</p>

Chapter 13. Air Quality

Yes	No	N/A	Description of Item Sufficiency	References/Guidance
			<p>within the TIP timeframe)? Does it disclose the date of the MTP and TIP and the latest conformity dates for both?</p> <p>See NAA/MA Consistency and Conformity Template Language.</p> <p>Rural NAA (RNAA) or Rural MA (RMA): If the proposed letting date is within the STIP timeframe, does the document disclose that the project is consistent with the STIP?</p> <p>If the letting date is later than the STIP timeframe, does the document disclose that it is consistent with Appendix D of the STIP?</p> <p>See RNAA/RMA Consistency and Conformity Template Language.</p> <p><i>NOTE: Some PCE projects may not warrant specific project-level inclusion in the MTP, but all should be programmed into the TIP/STIP (either individually or as a grouped CSJ).</i></p>	<p>Transportation Conformity Requirements for FHWA/FTA Projects Requiring Environmental Impact Statements, May 20, 2003</p> <p>Internal TxDOT Memo to Administration, District Engineers, Division Directors, Office Directors from John Barton dated September 23, 2008 RE: FHWA Transportation Planning and NEPA Approval Guidance</p>
Ozone, Carbon Monoxide, Particulate Matter and/or Nitrogen Dioxide National Ambient Air Quality Standards (NAAQS) – Transportation Conformity				
6			<p>If the project is in an attainment area (AA), does the document disclose:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the county the project is in, • that it is in attainment of all NAAQS, and • that transportation conformity rules do not apply? <p>See AA Consistency and Conformity Template Language.</p>	
7			<p>For a project in a nonattainment or maintenance area (NAA), does the document disclose:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the county the project is in, • that the county is nonattainment or attainment maintenance, 	

Chapter 13. Air Quality

Yes	No	N/A	Description of Item Sufficiency	References/Guidance
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the nonattainment area or attainment maintenance area the county is in, • nonattainment classification or attainment maintenance classification, • pollutant(s) for which it is nonattainment or attainment maintenance, and • that transportation conformity rules do apply, or for an attainment maintenance area that the conformity rules continue to apply? <p>See Non-Exempt text under NAA Consistency and Conformity Template Language or RNAA Consistency and Conformity Template Language.</p> <p>Note: Projects exempt from a conformity determination, according to 40 CFR 93.126, are listed in Appendix A. See Exempt Project Template Language under NAA Consistency and Conformity Template Language or RNAA Consistency and Conformity Template Language.</p>	
Carbon Monoxide (CO) Traffic Air Quality Analysis (TAQA)				
8			<p>For a non-added capacity project, does the document disclose that a CO TAQA is not required, because (1) it will not increase capacity and current and (2) future CO emissions should not be affected by the project?</p> <p>See TAQA Template Language (no added capacity).</p>	
9			<p>For an added capacity project, does the document disclose that a CO TAQA is not required for projects with Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) less than 140,000?</p> <p>See TAQA Template Language (AADT <140,000).</p>	

Chapter 13. Air Quality

Yes	No	N/A	Description of Item Sufficiency	References/Guidance
			If 140,000 or more AADT, contact ENV Air Quality.	
Lead and/or Sulfur Dioxide NAAQS - Transportation Conformity <u>Does Not</u> Apply to These NAAQS				
10			<p>For a project in a Lead nonattainment area (NAA), does the document disclose:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the county the project is in, • that the county or a portion of it is nonattainment, • that it is nonattainment for lead, and • that transportation conformity rules <u>do not</u> apply? <p>If yes, see Lead NAAQS NA Template Language.</p>	<p>On November 16, 2010, EPA approved Governor Perry's recommendation to make a small portion of Collin County nonattainment for the Lead NAAQS.</p> <p>http://www.epa.gov/leadesignations/ or http://www.epa.gov/leadesignations/2008standards/documents/2010-11-16/FRNoticePart81PbDesignFinal.pdf .</p>
11			Placeholder in the event that any part of Texas is designated nonattainment for the 2010 primary SO2 NAAQS or the pending secondary SO2 NAAQS.	<p>The June 22, 2010 FR published EPA's final decision to lower the SO2 NAAQS. EPA design value data for 2007-2009, indicates that Jefferson County was above the revised SO2 standard. EPA should make final designations by June 2012.</p> <p>http://www.epa.gov/air/sulfurdioxide/actions.html</p>
Mobile Source Air Toxics				
12			<p>If the project is not adding capacity, does the document disclose that it has no meaningful potential MSAT effects?</p> <p>See MSAT Negative Declaration Template Language.</p>	<p>72 FR 8427-8476 February 26, 2007</p> <p>40 CFR 59, 80, 85 & 86: Control of Emissions of Hazardous Air Pollutants From Mobile Sources; 66 FR 17229 – 17272, March 29, 2001</p>

Chapter 13. Air Quality

Yes	No	N/A	Description of Item Sufficiency	References/Guidance
				[[Page 17230]]
13			If the project is adding capacity on an existing rural highway within existing ROW, has the requirement for a qualitative MSAT analysis been reviewed and addressed, particularly if any sensitive receptors are located within 100 and/or 500 meters of the ROW?	See section 8.2 of the Air Quality Guidelines for instructions and template language.
Construction Emissions				
14			<p>Does the document disclose measures taken to minimize construction emissions (MSAT and/or dust)?</p> <p>If the project may generate dust emissions or MSATs, consider including this optional discussion on measures to minimize construction emissions if such measures are taken to reduce emissions. See Construction Emission Template Language.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consider the presence and duration of stay for non-road equipment and the potential for nuisance dust conditions (e.g., is dirt being moved, or rock/concrete crushed?). • Also consider whether construction will be close to neighborhoods or sensitive receptors (e.g., schools, licensed day care facilities, elder care facilities, hospitals) or other areas where the public may congregate (e.g., parks). 	

Chapter 13. Air Quality

Template Language

1. AA Consistency and Conformity Template Language:

Within an MPA

The proposed action is consistent with the (insert local MPO's name) (insert MTP title and date identifier) MTP and the (insert TIP date identifier) TIP. The project is located in (insert county) County, which is in an area in attainment of all NAAQS; therefore, the transportation conformity rules do not apply.

Not within an MPA

The proposed action is consistent with the (insert STIP with date identifier) STIP. The project is located in (insert county) County, which is in an area in attainment of all NAAQS; therefore, the transportation conformity rules do not apply.

2. NAA/MA Consistency and Conformity Template Language:

Non-exempt Projects

This project is located within (insert county name) County, which is part of the (insert area name/identifier) area that has been designated by EPA as a (insert area's classification level, e.g. marginal, moderate, serious, or severe) nonattainment area (or insert attainment maintenance area and delete nonattainment area) for (insert the applicable NAAQS, ozone in Texas for all areas except parts of El Paso); therefore, transportation conformity rules apply.

The proposed action is consistent with the area's financially constrained Metropolitan Transportation Plan (insert local MPO's name) (insert MTP title and date identifier) and the (insert TIP date identifier) TIP. Both the MTP and the TIP were found to conform to the TCEQ State Implementation Plan (SIP) by FHWA on (insert date conformity was determined). Copies of the MTP and TIP pages are included in Appendix (insert Appendix number or identifier). All projects in the (insert name of MPO) TIP that are proposed for federal or state funds were initiated in a manner consistent with federal guidelines in Section 450, of Title 23 CFR and Section 613.200, Subpart B, of Title 49 CFR. Energy, environment, air quality, cost, and mobility considerations are addressed in the programming of the TIP.

Exempt Projects

This project is located within (insert county name) County, which is part of the (insert area name/identifier) area that has been designated by EPA as a (insert area's classification level, e.g. marginal, moderate, serious or severe) nonattainment area (or insert attainment maintenance area and delete nonattainment area) for (insert the applicable NAAQS, ozone in Texas for all areas except parts of El Paso). However, in accordance with federal guidelines in Section 93.126, of Title 40 CFR, the proposed project, (identify the type of exempt project as listed in Appendix A), is exempt from conformity determination.

Chapter 13. Air Quality

The proposed action is consistent with the area's financially constrained Metropolitan Transportation Plan (insert local MPO's name) (insert MTP title and date identifier) and the (insert TIP date identifier) TIP. Copies of the MTP and TIP pages are included in Appendix (insert Appendix number or identifier). All projects in the (insert name of MPO) TIP that are proposed for federal or state funds were initiated in a manner consistent with federal guidelines in Section 450, of Title 23 CFR and Section 613.200, Subpart B, of Title 49 CFR. Energy, environment, air quality, cost, and mobility considerations are addressed in the programming of the TIP.

3. RNAA/RMA Consistency and Conformity Template Language:

Non-exempt Projects

This project is located within (insert county name) County, which is part of the (insert area name/identifier) area that has been designated by EPA as a (insert area's classification level) nonattainment area (or insert attainment maintenance area and delete nonattainment area) for (insert the applicable NAAQS, ozone in Texas for all areas except parts of El Paso). The (insert TxDOT District's name) (insert STIP date identifier) STIP was found to conform to the TCEQ's State Implementation Plan by FHWA on (insert date of conformity determination). Copies of the STIP page(s) are included in Appendix (insert Appendix number or identifier).

The proposed action is consistent with the financially constrained Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (insert date of the STIP). The STIP was found to conform to the TCEQ State Implementation Plan (SIP) by FHWA on (insert date of STIP conformity determination). Copies of the STIP pages are included in Appendix (insert Appendix number or identifier). All projects in the STIP that are proposed for federal or state funds were initiated in a manner consistent with federal guidelines in Section 450, of Title 23 CFR and Section 613.200, Subpart B, of Title 49 CFR. Energy, environment, air quality, cost, and mobility considerations are addressed in the programming of the STIP.

Exempt Projects

This project is located within (insert county name) County, which is part of the (insert area name/identifier) area that has been designated by EPA as a (insert area's classification level) nonattainment area (or insert attainment maintenance area and delete nonattainment area) for (insert the applicable NAAQS, ozone in Texas for all areas except parts of El Paso). However, in accordance with federal guidelines in Section 93.126, of Title 40 CFR, the proposed project, (identify the type of exempt project as listed in Appendix A), is exempt from conformity determination.

The proposed action is consistent with the financially constrained Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (insert date of the STIP). Copies of the STIP pages are included in Appendix (insert Appendix number or identifier). All projects in the STIP that are proposed for federal or state funds were initiated in a manner consistent with federal guidelines in Section 450, of Title 23 CFR and Section 613.200, Subpart B, of Title 49 CFR. Energy, environment, air quality, cost, and mobility considerations are addressed in the programming of the STIP.

Chapter 13. Air Quality

4. TAQA Template Language (no added capacity):

Generally, (identify the type of exempt project such as intersection improvements) are considered exempt from a TAQA because they are intended to enhance traffic safety and improve traffic flow. The proposed action would not add capacity to an existing facility. Current and future emissions should continue to follow existing trends not being affected by this project. Due to the nature of this project, further carbon monoxide analysis was not required.

5. TAQA Template language (AADT <140,000):

Traffic data for the design year (insert year) is (insert estimated AADT) vehicles per day. A prior TxDOT modeling study demonstrated that it is unlikely that a carbon monoxide standard would ever be exceeded as a result of any project with an average annual daily traffic (AADT) below 140,000. The AADT projections for the project are (insert estimated AADT) and do not exceed 140,000 vehicles per day; therefore a Traffic Air Quality Analysis was not required.

6. Lead NAAQS NA Template Language:

This project is located within the portion of Collin County that has been designated by EPA as a nonattainment area for the 2008 Lead National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS), effective December 31, 2010. Transportation conformity is required under CAA section 176(c) (42 U.S.C. 7506(c)) to ensure that federally supported highway and transit project activities are consistent with the purpose of the SIP for transportation-related criteria pollutants. However, in light of the elimination of lead additives from gasoline, transportation conformity does not apply to the Lead NAAQS. (2008 Final Lead NAAQS Rule, preamble page (73 FR 67043), November 12, 2008). Insert here the language for ozone nonattainment along with TIP and MTP consistency and conformity here.

7. MSAT Negative Declaration Template Language:

The purpose of this project is to insert project description. This project will not result in any meaningful changes in traffic volumes, vehicle mix, location of existing roadways, or any other factor that would cause an increase in emissions impacts relative to the no-build alternative. As such, TxDOT/FHWA have determined that this project will generate minimal air quality impacts for Clean Air Act criteria pollutants and has not been linked with any special MSAT concerns. Consequently, this project is exempt from analysis for MSATs.

Moreover, EPA regulations for vehicle engines and fuels will cause overall MSATs to decline significantly over the next 20 years. Even after accounting for a projected 64% increase in VMT, FHWA predicts MSATs will decline in the range of 57 to 87% from a baseline year of 2000 to 2020 based on the current vehicle and fuel regulations in effect. These reductions will reduce the background level of MSATs as well as the possibility of even minor MSAT emission increases from this project.

Chapter 13. Air Quality

8. Construction Emission Template Language:

The language can be modified with project specifics.

Air Quality Construction Emissions

During the construction phase of this project there may be temporary increases in air pollutant emissions from construction activities, equipment, and related vehicles. The primary construction related emissions are particulate matter (fugitive dust) from site preparation and construction and non-road mobile source air toxics (MSAT) from construction equipment and vehicles. The primary MSAT emission related to construction is diesel particulate matter from diesel powered construction equipment and vehicles.

These emissions are temporary in nature (only occurring during actual construction) and it is not possible to reasonably estimate impacts from these emissions due to limitations of the existing models. However, the potential impacts of particulate matter emissions will be minimized by dust control measures such as covering or treating disturbed areas with dust suppression techniques, sprinkling, covering loaded trucks, and other dust abatement controls, as appropriate. The MSAT emissions will be minimized by measures to encourage use of EPA required cleaner diesel fuels, limits on idling, increasing use of cleaner burning diesel engines, and other emission limitation techniques, as appropriate.

However, considering the temporary and transient nature of construction related emissions as well as the mitigation actions to be utilized, it is not anticipated that emissions from construction of this project will have any significant impact on air quality in the area.

References:

The TxDOT air quality resources (including the 2006 Air Quality Guidelines and FHWA MSAT guidance) are located at: ftp://ftp.dot.state.tx.us/pub/txdot-info/library/pubs/env/air/aq_guidelines_0606.pdf

Planning information and the STIP are located at:
<http://www.txdot.gov/business/governments/stips.htm>

Basic information on the NAAQS: <http://www.epa.gov/air/criteria.html>

A table listing Counties that are nonattainment and/or maintenance for a NAAQS and conformity dates, MTP dates and TIP/STIP dates is located at: ftp://ftp.dot.state.tx.us/pub/txdot-info/library/pubs/env/air/trans_plans_conformity.pdf

An official listing of NAAQS nonattainment and/or maintenance counties can also be found at: <http://www.tceq.state.tx.us/implementation/air/sip/siptexas.html#naags>

Laws and Regulations

Federal Clean Air Act

SAFETEA-LU (23 USC), Sections 6001 and 6011

Chapter 13. Air Quality

[23 CFR 450](#)

[23 CFR 500.109](#)

[23 CFR 771](#), U.S. Department of Transportation's regulations on implementing NEPA

[40 CFR 50](#)

[40 CFR 51](#)

[40 CFR 58](#)

40 CFR [59](#), [80](#), [85](#) & [86](#) (MSAT)

[40 CFR 93](#)

[49 CFR 613](#)

[30 TAC 114](#)

[43 TAC 2.1 – 2.20 \(TxDOT's Environmental Regulations\)](#)

[Texas Clean Air Act](#) (2 THSC 382)

Agreements that define requirements (MOUs, MOAs, PAs)

[Memoranda of Understanding between the U.S. Department of Transportation and Environmental Protection Agency on Transportation Conformity, April 25, 2000](#)

[Memoranda of Understanding between TxDOT and Texas Natural Resource Conservation Commission/Texas Commission on Environmental Quality, 43 TAC 2.23](#)

[The Programmatic Agreement for the Review and Approval of NEPA Categorically Excluded Transportation Projects between the Federal Highway Administration \(Texas Division\) and the Texas Department of Transportation](#)

Letters and Memos Spelling Out Requirements

Internal TxDOT Memo to District Engineers from Dianna Noble and James Randall dated November 2, 2004, RE: Importance of Consistent Project Information in Planning, Programming and Environmental Documents to Avoid Delays in Project Approval

[Internal TxDOT Memo to Administration, District Engineers, Division Directors, Office Directors from John Barton dated September 23, 2008](#) RE: FHWA Transportation Planning and NEPA Approval Guidance

Contracts, Work Authorizations, guidance and other documents that lay out expectations by resource agencies and FHWA based on practice and experience

[TxDOT's Environmental Manual](#)

[TxDOT's Guidance on Tolling](#)

[TxDOT's Air Quality Guidelines](#)

[TxDOT's Planning and Air Quality Guidelines for Toll Projects](#)

Chapter 13. Air Quality

TxDOT's Consistency between NEPA and Planning Documents

Federal Highway Administration's [Transportation Conformity Guidance for Qualitative Hot-Spot Analyses in PM2.5 and PM10 Nonattainment and Maintenance Areas, dated March, 2006](#)

Federal Highway Administration's [Transportation Conformity Reference Guide, revised March, 2006](#)

[Federal Highway Administration's Interim Guidance on Air Toxic Analysis in NEPA Documents, dated February 2006](#)

[Federal Highway Administration's Transportation Planning Requirements and Their Relationship to NEPA Process Completion, dated January 2008](#)

Chapter 13. Air Quality

Appendix A – Projects Exempt from Conformity under 40 CFR 93.126

Safety

1. Railroad/highway crossing.
2. Hazard elimination program.
3. Safer non-Federal-aid system roads.
4. Shoulder improvements.
5. Increasing sight distance.
6. Safety improvement program.
7. Traffic control devices and operating assistance other than signalization projects.
8. Railroad/highway crossing warning devices.
9. Guardrails, median barriers, crash cushions.
10. Pavement resurfacing and/or rehabilitation.
11. Pavement marking demonstration.
12. Emergency relief (23 U.S.C. 125).
13. Fencing.
14. Skid treatments.
15. Safety roadside rest areas.
16. Adding medians.
17. Truck climbing lanes outside the urbanized area.
18. Lighting improvements.
19. Widening narrow pavements or reconstructing bridges (no additional travel lanes).
20. Emergency truck pullovers.

Mass Transit

1. Operating assistance to transit agencies.
2. Purchase of support vehicles.
3. Rehabilitation of transit vehicles 1.
4. Purchase of office, shop, and operating equipment for existing facilities.
5. Purchase of operating equipment for vehicles (e.g., radios, fareboxes, lifts, etc.).
6. Construction or renovation of power, signal, and communications systems.
7. Construction of small passenger shelters and information kiosks.
8. Reconstruction or renovation of transit buildings and structures (e.g., rail or bus buildings, storage and maintenance facilities, stations, terminals, and ancillary structures).
9. Rehabilitation or reconstruction of track structures, track, and track bed in existing rights-of-way.
10. Purchase of new buses and rail cars to replace existing vehicles or for minor expansions of the fleet 1.
11. Construction of new bus or rail storage/maintenance facilities categorically excluded in 23 CFR part 771.

Air Quality

1. Continuation of ride-sharing and van-pooling promotion activities at current levels.
2. Bicycle and pedestrian facilities.

Other

1. Specific activities which do not involve or lead directly to construction, such as:
2. Planning and technical studies.
3. Grants for training and research programs.
4. Planning activities conducted pursuant to titles 23 and 49 U.S.C.
5. Federal-aid systems revisions.
6. Engineering to assess social, economic, and environmental effects of the proposed action or alternatives to that action.
7. Noise attenuation.

*Texas Department of Transportation
Environmental Affairs Division*

**Standards of Uniformity for
Programmatic Categorical Exclusions**

Chapter 14.

Public Involvement

Chapter 14. Public Involvement

TxDOT's public involvement regulations are found in [43 TAC Chapter 2](#).

Additional information about the entire range of public involvement, how to notify the public, meeting/hearing formats and how to prepare various comment/response reports is available in the [TxDOT Environmental Manual](#) (Chapter 4, Sections 2 and 5).

YES	NO	N/A	Description of Item Sufficiency	References/Guidance
Meeting with Affected Property Owners				
1			Meetings with Affected Property Owners (MAPO) shall be held where there are detours, a minimal amount of new right of way, or temporary construction easements.	43 TAC 2.6
2			Affected property owners include property owners adjacent to the projects and other affected property owners (business owners, governments, etc.) that may be affected by the project.	
3			At a minimum, affected property owners shall be notified of the meeting(s). All MAPOs should be documented in the project file and summarized in the PCE document/certification. A separate summary of the meeting(s) may also be prepared.	
Public Meetings				
At a minimum, these meetings will be held in the following occurrences:				
4			A public meeting can be held at any time during project development with the general public, public interest, or special interest groups. When developing a Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS), a public meeting must be held. (In the case of a public meeting for an EIS, notices similar to those published for a public hearing must be prepared and published.)	43 TAC 2.7
5			Notification of the meeting shall be done in a manner fitting the anticipated audience, including the time, place, and format of the meeting.	

Chapter 14. Public Involvement

YES	NO	N/A	Description of Item Sufficiency	References/Guidance
6			<p>Summarize the results in the project file, including a comment and response report, and submit the results. Forward a copy of the meeting materials to ENV for review as well.</p> <p>In the case of an Environmental Impact Statement, the results of the meeting(s) must be summarized in the document.</p>	
Opportunity for Public Hearing				
At a minimum, an opportunity for public hearing will be offered in the following manner:				
7			<p>If there is some question about whether or not a public hearing should be held, an opportunity for public hearing may be offered. The opportunity for public hearing consists of notices published in newspapers, as well as notices sent to adjacent property owners.</p>	43 TAC 2.8
8			<p>The opportunity for public hearing is offered for a project that requires the acquisition of substantial amounts of right of way, substantial changes to the layout or function of the connecting roadway/facility, adds capacity, has a measurable adverse impact on abutting real property or otherwise causes a substantial social, economic, or environmental impact.</p>	
9			<p>If no requests for a public hearing are received, document the project file and submit a signed certification to ENV.</p> <p>Note: If a public hearing is planned, an opportunity for public hearing is not required.</p>	
Public Hearing				
At a minimum, a public hearing will be held in the following manner:				
10			<p>A public hearing is held to present project alternatives, and to encourage and solicit public comment. A hearing is held only after location and design studies are</p>	43 TAC 2.9

Chapter 14. Public Involvement

YES	NO	N/A	Description of Item Sufficiency	References/Guidance
			developed and the environmental studies are considered substantially complete. FHWA must determine whether or not the document/certification is technically complete. FHWA will return any documents/certifications to ENV if revisions are needed to the document/certifications.	
11			A public hearing is held in the cases listed in 43 TAC 2.9 . These include, but are not limited to, controversial projects, projects with Environmental Impact Statements, high profile projects, and projects with hearings requested pursuant to the requirements of the Transportation Code §201.604.	
12			The Notices for the Hearing should meet the requirements of 43 TAC 2.9 .	
			All hearing testimony, comments, and response reports and certifications shall comply with 43 TAC 2.9 .	
13			All project hearing-related materials may be referenced in any final document. In the case of a Final Environmental Impact Statement, any such materials must be included in the document.	
Public Involvement under the Texas Parks and Wildlife Code				
14			If a project requires the taking of public lands designated as parklands, recreational areas, scientific areas, wildlife refuges, or historic sites, an opportunity for a public hearing may not be afforded where one might normally be offered. State law (Vernon's Code, Chapter 26.002 of the Parks and Wildlife Code), requires that a public hearing be conducted. (Please note that notification and publication requirements differ from 43 TAC requirements.)	Texas Parks and Wildlife Code Chapter 26: Protection of Public Parks and Recreational Lands

*Texas Department of Transportation
Environmental Affairs Division*

**Standards of Uniformity for
Programmatic Categorical Exclusions**

Chapter 15.

Tolling

Chapter 15. Tolling

This SOU applies to all projects which involve tolling.

YES	NO	N/A	Description of Item Sufficiency	References/Guidance
Early Right-of-Way Acquisition				
1			The document identifies available non-toll facilities and alternate routes (e.g., free main lanes on same facility, frontage roads, and parallel arterials). Maps depicting tolled and non-tolled roadways should be included.	Guidance on Environmental Justice/Title VI Considerations for Toll Roads (March 2005) FHWA and TxDOT Joint Guidance for Project and Network Level Environmental Justice, Regional Network Land Use, and Air Quality Analyses for Toll Roads (April 23, 2009)
2			The document compares travel times and distance between the proposed project and available non-tolled alternatives (including frontage roads).	Guidance on Environmental Justice/Title VI Considerations for Toll Roads (March 2005) FHWA and TxDOT Joint Guidance for Project and Network Level Environmental Justice, Regional Network Land Use, and Air Quality Analyses for Toll Roads (April 23, 2009)
3			The document discusses toll policies regarding transit, HOVs, and motorcycles; use of toll revenues; and mitigation measures. If there is a toll policy, a copy should be included in the environmental document or a website link provided. In some areas, it may also be important to discuss policies related to emergencies or special events (i.e., hurricane evacuations).	Guidance on Environmental Justice/Title VI Considerations for Toll Roads (March 2005) FHWA and TxDOT Joint Guidance for Project and Network Level Environmental Justice, Regional Network Land Use, and Air Quality Analyses for Toll Roads (April 23, 2009)
4			The document identifies all potential impacts to transit service.	Guidance on Environmental Justice/Title VI Considerations for Toll Roads (March 2005)

Chapter 15. Tolling

YES	NO	N/A	Description of Item Sufficiency	References/Guidance
5			The document discusses the anticipated toll rate, or range of rates if tolls are variable.	Guidance on Environmental Justice/Title VI Considerations for Toll Roads (March 2005) FHWA and TxDOT Joint Guidance for Project and Network Level Environmental Justice, Regional Network Land Use, and Air Quality Analyses for Toll Roads (April 23, 2009)
6			The document discusses toll collection methods, associated costs, and the differences between various collection methods for households at various income levels. Cost differences between toll tags purchased with credit/debit cards versus cash should be discussed. The document should address whether toll tags are only available to those with credit cards and bank accounts. If cash accounts are available, the document should reflect where and how cash customers can pay.	Guidance on Environmental Justice/Title VI Considerations for Toll Roads (March 2005) FHWA and TxDOT Joint Guidance for Project and Network Level Environmental Justice, Regional Network Land Use, and Air Quality Analyses for Toll Roads (April 23, 2009)
7			If toll booths are planned, the document should address where they are located in relation to identified low-income and minority areas.	Guidance on Environmental Justice/Title VI Considerations for Toll Roads (March 2005) FHWA and TxDOT Joint Guidance for Project and Network Level Environmental Justice, Regional Network Land Use, and Air Quality Analyses for Toll Roads (April 23, 2009)
8			The document addresses any potential discounts for low-income drivers, or any other program which may provide increased access to the facility for low-income persons.	Guidance on Environmental Justice/Title VI Considerations for Toll Roads (March 2005)

Chapter 15. Tolling

YES	NO	N/A	Description of Item Sufficiency	References/Guidance
			The document identifies potential users of the toll facility. Origin and destination (O&D) studies are one example of an analysis that may be used to identify potential users of the toll road.	Guidance on Environmental Justice/Title VI Considerations for Toll Roads (March 2005) FHWA and TxDOT Joint Guidance for Project and Network Level Environmental Justice, Regional Network Land Use, and Air Quality Analyses for Toll Roads (April 23, 2009)
			The document provides EJ-related demographic data for the toll road user groups (generally by TAZ). Maps may be used to graphically represent this.	Guidance on Environmental Justice/Title VI Considerations for Toll Roads (March 2005) FHWA and TxDOT Joint Guidance for Project and Network Level Environmental Justice, Regional Network Land Use, and Air Quality Analyses for Toll Roads (April 23, 2009)
			The document discloses that inability to use the toll facilities or lack of parallel non-tolled alternatives may result in increased travel times when using non-tolled alternatives.	FHWA and TxDOT Joint Guidance for Project and Network Level Environmental Justice, Regional Network Land Use, and Air Quality Analyses for Toll Roads (April 23, 2009)
			The document illustrates the potential economic impact to individuals using the toll facilities. One method is to multiply the anticipated toll cost to use the proposed facility by an estimate of 500 trips per year (i.e., 250 round trips to work per year). This should be put into context by discussing what percentage of household income this cost represents for a household at the poverty level vs. a house at median household income. If variable toll rates are used, the document	FHWA and TxDOT Joint Guidance for Project and Network Level Environmental Justice, Regional Network Land Use, and Air Quality Analyses for Toll Roads (April 23, 2009)

Chapter 15. Tolling

YES	NO	N/A	Description of Item Sufficiency	References/Guidance
			should provide analyses of the high, low, and mid-range toll rates.	
13			Since the economic impact of tolls will be greater for low-income populations, mitigation measures can be recommended for consideration. If the analysis does find disproportionately high and adverse effects, mitigation measures must be considered. Mitigation measures may be addressed in a region's/ MPO's toll policy.	FHWA and TxDOT Joint Guidance for Project and Network Level Environmental Justice, Regional Network Land Use, and Air Quality Analyses for Toll Roads (April 23, 2009)
14			The document discusses any potential for traffic to be diverted through neighborhoods.	Guidance on Environmental Justice/Title VI Considerations for Toll Roads (March 2005)
15			The document addresses any issues related to air quality and/or noise in neighborhoods.	Guidance on Environmental Justice/Title VI Considerations for Toll Roads (March 2005)
16			The document addresses how the toll facility will affect access to businesses, and the impact to businesses.	Guidance on Environmental Justice/Title VI Considerations for Toll Roads (March 2005)
17			The document addresses the potential for denial of benefits or disproportionate impacts to low-income drivers.	Guidance on Environmental Justice/Title VI Considerations for Toll Roads (March 2005)
18			The document discusses accommodations provided by the tolling authority to allow populations with Limited English Proficiency and the disabled to access the toll facilities.	FHWA and TxDOT Joint Guidance for Project and Network Level Environmental Justice, Regional Network Land Use, and Air Quality Analyses for Toll Roads (April 23, 2009)
19			When travel demand or other models are used in the analysis, the document must include a discussion of the assumptions and limitation association with the model.	FHWA and TxDOT Joint Guidance for Project and Network Level Environmental Justice, Regional Network Land Use, and Air Quality Analyses for Toll Roads

Chapter 15. Tolling

YES	NO	N/A	Description of Item Sufficiency	References/Guidance
				(April 23, 2009)
20			The document discusses whether the project would be part of a network of tolled facilities.	FHWA and TxDOT Joint Guidance for Project and Network Level Environmental Justice, Regional Network Land Use, and Air Quality Analyses for Toll Roads (April 23, 2009)
21			If the project is part of a tolled network, the document must include maps indicating the implementation of the toll network over time. Maps should identify all planned toll projects and discuss the anticipated timeline for implementation of each segment of the network.	FHWA and TxDOT Joint Guidance for Project and Network Level Environmental Justice, Regional Network Land Use, and Air Quality Analyses for Toll Roads (April 23, 2009)
22			If the project is part of a tolled network, the document must estimate the cumulative economic impact to individuals of using the toll network facilities. This should be based on a reasonable estimate of the distance a commuter would travel along toll facilities, multiplied by the toll rate, multiplied by an assumed number of trips per year. This should be discussed in a similar manner to the economic impact estimate done for the individual project.	FHWA and TxDOT Joint Guidance for Project and Network Level Environmental Justice, Regional Network Land Use, and Air Quality Analyses for Toll Roads (April 23, 2009)
23			If the project is part of a tolled network, the anticipated growth of the tolled network should be discussed.	FHWA and TxDOT Joint Guidance for Project and Network Level Environmental Justice, Regional Network Land Use, and Air Quality Analyses for Toll Roads (April 23, 2009)
24			If the project is part of a tolled network, the document must identify potential users of the tolled network.	FHWA and TxDOT Joint Guidance for Project and Network Level Environmental Justice, Regional Network Land Use, and Air Quality

Chapter 15. Tolling

YES	NO	N/A	Description of Item Sufficiency	References/Guidance
				Analyses for Toll Roads (April 23, 2009)
25			If the project is part of a tolled network, the document should discuss a measure of the benefits of implementing the financially constrained metropolitan transportation plan, including the tolled network.	FHWA and TxDOT Joint Guidance for Project and Network Level Environmental Justice, Regional Network Land Use, and Air Quality Analyses for Toll Roads (April 23, 2009)
26			<p>If the project is part of a tolled network, the document should discuss potential impacts on overall land use patterns, focusing on the land use considerations incorporated into the region’s MPO analysis of the overall MTP. This discussion should address:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land use assumptions used in developing the travel demand model and MTP • The basis for the land use assumptions • Land use scenarios considered (if any) and whether there is a preferred growth scenario • The toll network’s consistency with land use plans • Growth patterns anticipated after implementation of the toll network. If the network is facilitating the existing trend, what will the impacts be? 	FHWA and TxDOT Joint Guidance for Project and Network Level Environmental Justice, Regional Network Land Use, and Air Quality Analyses for Toll Roads (April 23, 2009)
27			If the project is part of a tolled network, the document should briefly address air quality as part of the network level analysis, and may reference the project level analysis.	FHWA and TxDOT Joint Guidance for Project and Network Level Environmental Justice, Regional Network Land Use, and Air Quality Analyses for Toll Roads (April 23, 2009)

*Texas Department of Transportation
Environmental Affairs Division*

**Standards of Uniformity for
Programmatic Categorical Exclusions**

List of Revisions

Most recent revisions made: 12/30/2010

List of Revisions

Chapter/ Section	SOU	Date	Placement(s)	Revision(s) Made
1	Questions and Answers	December 27, 2010	Entire chapter	Minor edits only, updated title
2	Documentation Format, No Added Capacity	December 27, 2010	Entire chapter	Minor edits to language, updated links
2	Documentation Format, No Added Capacity	October 14, 2010	Page 2, letter "E"	Added section on Bicycle and Pedestrian Accommodations
3	Documentation Format, Added Capacity	December 27, 2010	Entire chapter	Minor edits to language, updated links
2	Documentation Format, Added Capacity	December 27, 2010	Page 3, letter "E"	Added section on Bicycle and Pedestrian Accommodations
4	Transportation Planning Consistency and Fiscal Constraint	December 27, 2010	Entire chapter	Added notes where Crossroads access was required
5	Socioeconomic Resources, No Added Capacity	December 31, 2010	Entire chapter	Updated footer
5	Socioeconomic Resources, No Added Capacity	December 27, 2010	Entire chapter	Minor edits to language, updated links
6	Socioeconomic Resources, Added Capacity	December 27, 2010	Entire chapter	Minor edits to language, updated links
7	Historical Studies	February 19, 2010	Section 1, page 1	Added table for signature lines
7	Historical Studies	November 5, 2009	Page 1	Added a new page with instructions for completing Historical

List of Revisions

Chapter/ Section	SOU	Date	Placement(s)	Revision(s) Made
				Studies SOU forms.
8	Archeological Resources	October 9, 2009	Entire chapter	Entire chapter revised
9	Water Resources	December 27, 2010	Line 12	Updated language.
9	Water Resources	December 27, 2010	Lines 1-2	Gray, non-numbered line between the two was removed
9	Water Resources	December 27, 2010	Line 21	Updated language.
9	Water Resources	August 31, 2010	Line 12	Changed "permitted under the same NWP" to "permitted separately."
10	Traffic Noise	December 30, 2010	Entire chapter	Minor changes to formatting
11	Hazardous Materials Initial Site Assessment	October 9, 2009	Entire chapter	Entire chapter revised
12	Biological Resources	December 27, 2010	Line 3	Updated language
12	Biological Resources	July 1, 2010	Page 10, lines 45-47	Added section for "TPWD Coordination"
12	Biological Resources	October 19, 2009	Page 5, line 3	Corrected typo: "include" changed to "include"
12	Biological Resources	October 19, 2009	Pages 4-10	Renumbered "State Level" table to continue from "Federal Level"

List of Revisions

Chapter/ Section	SOU	Date	Placement(s)	Revision(s) Made
				table. Removed row 11 ("Does the project require new ROW?...")
13	Air Quality	December 30, 2010	Entire chapter	Entire chapter revised, template language updated
13	Air Quality	October 9, 2009	Entire chapter	Entire chapter revised
13	Air Quality	July 15, 2010	Page 8, #6	Changed last sentence of MSAT Negative Declaration Language. ("These reductions will reduce the background level of MSATs...")
14	Public Involvement	October 9, 2009	Entire chapter	Entire chapter revised
15	Tolling	December 30, 2010	Entire chapter	Updated links, minor changes to formatting
16	Early Right-of-Way Acquisitions	February 1, 2010	Entire chapter	Entire chapter removed
List of Revisions		December 30, 2010		Updated links