# Guidance

## Historical Studies Review Procedures

This guidance document provides instructions regarding reviewing and processing project activities in accordance with TxDOT's Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act Programmatic Agreement and other federal and state preservation laws.

*TxDOT Environmental Affairs Division*
*Effective Date: January 2020*
*422.02.GUI*
*Version 2*

## Table of Contents

# 1.0 Introduction

This guidance document provides Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT) district environmental staff with coordination and review procedures for meeting requirements under federal and state historic preservation laws. The majority of the guidance document discusses how to coordinate TxDOT projects under TxDOT's Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act (NHPA) Programmatic Agreement (Section 106 PA). The PA facilitates and expedites cultural resources review of common project types when funded by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). Under the Section 106 PA, certain types of TxDOT's common projects are divided into three appendices. These appendices list various "undertakings" (aka projects) and assign them into three categories:

- **No potential** to cause effects on historic properties (Appendix 3)
- **Minimal potential** to cause effects on historic properties (Appendix 4)
- **All other** project types

Because proposed projects can affect archeological and non-archeological resources differently, both the Cultural Resources Management (CRM) Archeology Branch and the Historical Studies Branch (HIST) have specific project types listed separately in the first two categories. For example, an in-kind bridge replacement would be considered a "no potential to cause effects" under archeological historic properties, but could be considered a "minimal potential or potential to cause effects" under non-archeological resources.

**Note that the procedures in Sections 3.0–6.0 below only apply to Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)-funded projects. See Section 8.0 for non-federally funded project procedures.**

Note also that the companion guidance document, "Projects that Do Not Require Review or Coordination for Non-Archeological Historic Property Compliance," is available in the online Historic Resources Toolkit located on TxDOT.gov.

# 2.0 Area of Potential Effect

The Project's Area of Potential Effect (APE) is the area of possible direct and indirect (visual, auditory, vibratory, etc.) effects as defined by the Section 106 regulations and applies to projects with federal triggers only. Under the Section 106 PA, TxDOT standardized the APEs for most of its projects. The project area used for determining the APE shall include temporary and permanent easements. Driveway license agreements for tie-ins to existing driveways are not included in the APE.

The standard APE is as follows:

1. No new ROW = APE is existing ROW
2. New ROW along existing road alignment = APE is 150 feet on either side of the current and proposed new ROW
3. New alignment = APE is 300 feet on either side of the proposed new ROW

Note that in some cases, especially for vertical changes, the APE may differ based on unique project components and/or in consultation with the Texas Historical Commission (THC).

## 3.0 PA Appendix 3—No Potential to Affect Historic Properties

The following activities, when funded by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) do not require review or consultation regarding project effects on non-archeological historic properties.[1] TxDOT's risk analysis, internal policies, and Section 110 of the NHPA inventories shall reinforce any necessary exceptions for specific historic properties. Per the Section 106 PA, the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) or the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) may review project files.

- Installation, repair, or replacement of fencing, signage, traffic signals, railroad warning devices, safety end treatments,[2] cameras, and intelligent highway system equipment;
- Repair or in-kind replacement of lighting, signals, and non-native stone curbs and gutters;[3]
- Maintenance, repair, or replacement of non-brick roadway surfacing, including crack seal, overlay, milling, grooving, resurfacing, and restriping;[4]
- Installation of landscaping within current right-of-way (ROW);
- Relocation or new construction of turn lanes and entrance/exit ramps between existing main lanes and existing frontage roads within current ROW;
- Design changes for projects that have completed all applicable review and consultation where the new project elements comprise only one or more of the activities listed in this subsection; and/or
- Certain bridge projects, as detailed in Section 4.0.

TxDOT district staff shall review project descriptions and other project information as necessary to evaluate whether a project is a type with "no potential to cause effects" on historic properties. The department delegate has authority to approve a finding that the project is a type with "no potential to cause effects" on historic properties. The department delegate shall retain documentation, which is the project description in ECOS and the Work Plan Development process, which establishes the basis of any such findings. Project types listed in Appendix 3 shall not be further reviewed under Section 106 of the NHPA.

**Please note** that the list of the project types that can be cleared by the department delegate is different under this agreement versus the previous PA. If a project does not fit the categories listed above, the department delegate shall determine if it is an Appendix 4 project.

Refer also to the "List of Projects that Do Not Require Review or Coordination for Non-Archeological Historic Property Compliance," available in the online Historic Resources Toolkit.

## 4.0 PA Appendix 4—Minimal Potential to Affect Historic Properties

The following project types, when funded by FHWA, require the department delegate to contact the appropriate TxDOT historian to discuss the project and ensure there are no sensitive property types in the APE (see 2.0 for information on APE). Sensitive property types (per the Section 106 PA) are courthouse

[1] Refer to ENV guidance on Expedited (c)(22) Categorical Exclusions (CEs) for what projects might be eligible for that process.

[2] Appendix 3 permits the extending of the culvert to apply the safety end treatments.

[3] Note that sidewalks no longer appear on this list. See FAQs for more information.

[4] "Maintenance" in this instance refers to all work completed within the existing roadbed, as long as vertical changes are less than 5 feet. Restriping may include restriping to add turn lanes, as long as there is no new pavement added to the roadbed.

squares, historic downtown commercial areas, historic residential neighborhoods, farmsteads, historic road corridors (including masonry culverts or brick streets), historic parks or recreation areas, and bridges.[5] These property types are likely previously identified in local, state, or national registers of historic properties and can be found by checking existing records or through public involvement efforts.

These activities require minimal identification efforts to evaluate the undertaking's potential to cause effects on historic properties. The department delegate shall retain documentation that establishes the basis of any such findings. Undertakings that require no further review for sensitive property types shall be found to have no effect on historic properties.

- Routine structural maintenance and repair of bridges, railroad crossings, picnic areas, and rest areas;
- Replacement, upgrade, and repair of safety barriers, ditches, storm drains, and non-bridge-class culverts;
- Maintenance, repair, reconfiguration, or correction of roadway geometrics, including intersection improvements and driveway and street connections;
- Maintenance, repair, installation, or modification of pedestrian and cycling-related features, including Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) ramps, trails, sidewalks, and bicycle and pedestrian lanes;
- Maintenance, repair, relocation, addition, or minor widening of roadway, highway, or freeway features, including turn bays, turn lanes, shoulders, U-turn bays, travel lanes, interchanges, medians, and ramps;
- Maintenance, repair, replacement, or relocation of features at crossings of irrigation canals, including bridges, new vehicle crossings, bank reshaping, pipeline and standpipe components, canal conversion to below-grade siphons, and utilities;
- Installation of new safety or mast lighting; and/or

<u>The following steps are required for Appendix 4 projects:</u>

1. Department delegate shall complete and upload a minimized Project Coordination Request (PCR) for the project. Department delegate should indicate on the PCR that the project type is one that meets Appendix 4 requirements by answering YES to the question on the PCR prior to completing any additional information.
2. If sensitive property types are identified in the project's APE, the department delegate shall complete and upload a full PCR for the project or may consult with the appropriate historian to determine any next steps.
3. Ensure the historian has access to the following in ECOS:
    a. Detailed project description (in Work Plan Development Tool)
    b. Amount of any new ROW, temporary, and permanent easements (in Work Plan Development Tool)
    c. Aerial project location map
    d. Photographs, if necessary for project

*Note that the ENV historian may request additional information*.

[5] See Section 4.0 for specific bridge project guidance.

4. CRM historians shall review the project and supporting documentation to determine if the APE contains sensitive project types:
    1. If yes, then the historian shall request a full Project Coordination Request (PCR) form.
    2. If no, then the historian shall document their findings as appropriate in ECOS.

*If the project activity does not fall under Appendix 3 or 4 projects, a full PCR is required.*

# 5.0 Bridge Projects

## 5.1 PA Appendix 3 Project Types

ENV historians determined that the following bridge activities, when funded by FHWA, are categorized under Appendix 3, projects with "no potential to cause effects" on a historic property, **as long as the bridge is not within or adjacent to a historic district**. All bridge projects listed below shall be documented in ECOS per the Appendix 3 instructions above. Refer also to the "List of Projects that Do Not Require Review or Coordination for Non-Archeological Historic Property Compliance," available in the online Historic Resources Toolkit. Use the questions at the end of this section to determine if a bridge project falls under Appendix 3 or Appendix 4.

- Routine maintenance, replacement, widening, upgrades,[6] or repair of bridges less than 45 years old at the time of project letting, as long as no additional ROW or easements are necessary to complete the project.
- Routine maintenance, replacement, widening, upgrades, or repair of bridges on the Interstate Highway system, as long as no additional ROW or easements are necessary to complete the project, unless the bridge is listed in Appendix A to this Guidance.
- Routine maintenance, replacement, widening, upgrades, or repair of concrete bridge-class culverts or timber stringer bridges, as long as no additional ROW or easements are necessary to complete the project.
- Routine maintenance, replacement, widening, upgrades or repair of concrete or steel bridges constructed after 1945 and part of Program Comment for Common Post-1945 Concrete or Steel Bridges, unless the bridge is listed in Appendix B to this Guidance,

## 5.2 PA Appendix 4 Project Types

ENV historians determined that the following bridge activities, when funded by FHWA, are categorized under Appendix 4, projects with "minimal potential to cause effects" on a historic property. All bridge projects listed below shall be documented in ECOS per the Appendix 4 instructions above:

Bridge projects under Appendix 3 that require **less than** 2 acres of new ROW and/or easements to complete the project.

## 5.3 Guidance for Determining Appropriate Level of Review for Bridge Projects

When the TxDOT District identifies a highway/vehicular bridge in the project area and proposes work on the bridge to include:

[6] "Upgrades" include rail/guardrail repair and replacement

a. Routine maintenance, such as asphalt overlays, cleaning deck drains and vegetation, sealing concrete, installing rip rap and other scour protection, and cleaning the bridge
b. Widening
c. Upgrades, including rail/guardrail repair and replacement
d. Repair
e. Replacement

Answer the following questions to determine the appropriate clearance for non-archeological historic properties for the project:

1. Does TxDOT or the project sponsor require any new right-of-way (ROW) or easements to construct the project?
   a. If yes, is the new ROW less than two acres?
      - If no, then the project does not fall under Appendix 3 or Appendix 4. Complete a full Project Coordination Request (PCR).
      - If yes, then continue to the next question.
   b. If no, then continue to the next question.
2. Is the bridge within or adjacent to a National Register of Historic Places-listed or -eligible historic district?
   a. If yes, then the project does not fall under Appendix 3 or Appendix 4. Complete a full PCR.
   b. If no, then continue to the next question.
3. Is the bridge less than 45 years old at the time of the project letting?
   a. If yes, and no new ROW is necessary, then the project falls under Appendix 3.
   b. If yes, and less than 2 acres of new ROW is necessary, then the project falls under Appendix 4. Complete a modified PCR.
   c. If no, then continue to the next question.
4. Is the bridge on the interstate system?
   a. If yes, is the bridge listed in Appendix A of this Guidance?
      - If yes, then the project does not fall under Appendix 3 or Appendix 4. Complete a full PCR.
      - If no, and no new ROW is necessary, then the project falls under the List of Projects that Do Not Require Review or Coordination for Non-Archeological Historic Property Compliance (Appendix 3).
      - If no, and less than 2 acres of new ROW is necessary, then the project falls under Appendix 4. Complete a modified PCR. If no and more than 2 acres of ROW is necessary, then continue to the next question.
   b. If no, then continue to the next question.
5. Is the bridge a concrete bridge-class culvert or a timber stringer bridge?

a. If yes, and no new ROW is necessary, then the project falls under the List of Projects that Do Not Require Review or Coordination for Non-Archeological Historic Property Compliance (Appendix 3).

b. If yes, and less than 2 acres of new ROW is necessary, then the project falls under Appendix 4. Create a modified PCR

c. If no, then continue to the next question.

6. Is the bridge a concrete or steel bridge constructed after 1945?

   a. If yes, is the bridge one of the bridges listed in Appendix B of this Guidance?

      - If yes, the project does not fall under Appendix 3 or Appendix 4. Complete a full PCR.
      - If no, and no new ROW is necessary, then the project falls under the List of Projects that Do Not Require Review or Coordination for Non-Archeological Historic Property Compliance (Appendix 3).
      - If no, and less than 2 acres of new ROW is necessary, then the project falls under Appendix 4. Create a modified PCR

   b. If no, then continue to the next question.

7. Is the bridge identified as a historic bridge on TxDOT's NRHP Listed and Eligible Bridges of Texas Map? (The map is available online in the Historic Resources Toolkit)

   a. If yes, the project does not fall under Appendix 3 or Appendix 4. Complete a full PCR.

   b. If no, is the project considered to be routine maintenance, such as asphalt overlays, cleaning deck drains and vegetation, sealing concrete, installing rip rap and other scour protection, and cleaning the bridge?

      - If yes, and no new ROW is necessary, then the project falls under the List of Projects that Do Not Require Review or Coordination for Non-Archeological Historic Property Compliance (Appendix 3)..
      - If yes, and less than 2 acres of new ROW is necessary, then the project falls under Appendix 4. Complete a modified PCR.

   c. If no, and the project is not considered to be routine maintenance, then the project does not fall under Appendix 3 or Appendix 4. Complete a full PCR and the following consultation letter:

      - Contact the County Historical Commission (CHC) to determine if there is any local historic significance to the bridge or crossing. HIST can provide templates for this letter.
      - Copy the Historic Bridge Foundation on your letter to the CHC.
      - Upload any responses to the consultation letters to ECOS prior to completing a PCR.

## 6.0 Local-Government-Sponsored Projects

For FHWA-funded projects that have a local government sponsor, **TxDOT** shall coordinate the Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act review through the Section 106 PA. If a project has FHWA funds and the local government is a sponsor, the following tasks shall be completed:

1. Local government completes the Work Plan Development process (or similar) and provides it to the District for review.[7]
2. The District makes a determination of the appropriate appendix for the project based on the information provided by the local government.
3. The appropriate documentation for Appendix 3, Appendix 4, or other project types must follow this guidance document. The local government may complete the appropriate PCRs or further historical studies technical documents for the project. All technical documents for an FHWA-funded project shall meet TxDOT's published Documentation Standards and shall be conducted by a TxDOT-approved Principal Investigator.

For non-FHWA-funded projects that have a local government sponsor, the local government shall coordinate any necessary historic preservation reviews with the appropriate federal and state agencies. The local government shall provide evidence of this coordination to TxDOT for the project file.

## 7.0 Re-coordination of Projects with HIST

Certain circumstances require the District to contact the ENV historians to determine if a project is still in compliance with the Section 106 determination. The following process **must** be followed when changes are made to:

1. Funding source (federal to state, or state to federal funds)
2. Letting date[8]
3. Amount of ROW, temporary, or permanent easements[9]
4. Scope of work changes
5. Project location expanding or contracting[10]

Assign the district's CRM historian a "Historical Studies SME Consultation" Activity in ECOS with a description of the proposed changes, including appropriate maps and photographs. The historian shall:

1. Review the changes to ensure that previous Areas of Potential Effect (APEs) and documentation methods remain sound.
2. Request a new PCR that covers the changes, as appropriate.
3. Document findings for re-coordination within the Historical Studies SME Consultation Activity (if no PCR necessary) or on the Obtain Historical Studies Section 106/Antiquities Code of Texas (ACT) Approval (if PCR or revised Section 106 findings are necessary).

[7] The process of completing a Project Work Plan for a local government sponsored project may vary from this procedure laid out in this guidance.

[8] Notify CRM HIST if the letting date changes by at least 5 years AFTER HIST clearance but BEFORE overall NEPA clearance. Once NEPA clearance is issued, HIST is less concerned with the letting date change.

[9] Changes in ROW may affect the Area of Potential Effect (APE) for the project.

[10] Changes in project location (expanding or contracting) may affect the APE for the project.

# 8.0 Antiquities Code of Texas Documentation

For projects that are TxDOT funded (with state money) but do not have any FHWA funds, TxDOT must consider the effects of the projects under the Antiquities Code of Texas (ACT). If TxDOT/FHWA is not the main federal sponsor for the project, this section also applies to the project review. The majority of reviews under the ACT will be for archeological resources. The Historical Studies branch shall review projects for the presence or absence of known and designated historic properties. The following steps detail how to coordinate any **non-FHWA funded projects** (using other federal funds or state, local, or private funds) for ACT compliance for work in state ROW. [11]District environmental staff shall complete the following steps.

1. Answer the following questions:

    1. Does the department delegate anticipate any non-FHWA federal funds, or any federal approvals, permits, licenses, or properties necessary for the project?

        a. If yes, then contact your historian to discuss next steps.

        b. If no, then move to question 2.

    2. Are there previously recorded historic properties or county courthouses within the project location? (Check the following historic resources maps (Texas Historic Sites Atlas, Texas Historic Districts and Properties and NRHP Listed and Eligible Bridges of Texas Map)):

        a. If yes, then contact your historian to discuss next steps.

        b. If no, then move to question 3.

    3. Is the project on the “List of Projects that Do Not Require Review or Coordination for Non-Archeological Historic Property Compliance”?

        a. If yes, then he department delegate shall retain documentation, which is the project description in ECOS and the Work Plan Development process, which establishes the basis of any such findings.

        b. If no, then move to Step 2.

    2. The District shall complete a PCR and assign a review of the Activity to the appropriate ENV historian, answering “yes” for the first question on the PCR.

3. The District shall ensure the historian has access to the following in ECOS:

- Detailed project description (in Work Plan Development Tool)
- Amount of any new ROW, temporary, and permanent easements (in Work Plan Development Tool)
- Aerial project location map
- Photographs, of the project, if necessary

4. The historian shall review maps to confirm the presence or absence of State Antiquities Landmark-designated properties within the existing or proposed ROW or easements for the project.

    a. The historian shall document their findings as appropriate in ECOS.

[11] Refer to ENV guidance on Expedited (c)(22) Categorical Exclusions (CEs) for what projects might be eligible for that process.

# 9.0 Frequently Asked Questions

1. **Does the Section 106 PA apply to non-federal projects?**

   **No**, the Section 106 PA **only** applies to those projects that require **FHWA** approval, funding or permitting. The PA **does not apply** to state-funded projects or any other federally funded or permitted projects. This is why knowledge of the type of funding or type of permits necessary to complete a project is important to Historical Studies.

2. **Under the standard Section 106 process, does each step require a separate 30-day review period?**

   **Yes**, but the PA provides a significant streamlining opportunity to complete the review process in-house or to consult with the THC/SHPO in a condensed 20-day review period. Some complex or controversial projects still follow the standard process to accommodate integration of comments of consulting parties, but approximately 95% of project coordination under the PA takes advantage of its significant streamlining opportunities.

3. **What do we do for emergency projects?**

   Contact your historian as soon as you know you have an emergency undertaking. Under the Section 106 PA, TxDOT can proceed with emergency projects with the potential to affect historic properties prior to notifying the THC/SHPO. Emergency projects are those where the governor issued an official disaster declaration. TxDOT must initiate the projects within 30 days of the disaster declaration.

4. **Did sidewalks used to be under Appendix 3?**

   Yes, but sidewalks were also listed under Appendix 4 and require some amount of documentation of historic properties. To eliminate confusion, we moved these project types out of Appendix 3. Sidewalk projects have the potential to affect historic properties, especially if they are on county courthouse squares or within historic commercial or residential districts. While the majority of sidewalk projects will not affect historic properties, the ones that do warrant special consideration, and thus need historian review under Appendix 4. Some sidewalk projects require protection notes for work adjacent to historic buildings. Some projects, especially those on county courthouse squares, require additional review steps with the THC/SHPO, including the potential for permits for work at a State Antiquities Landmark (SAL).

5. **When do we have to contact County Historical Commissions?**

   Historical Studies encourages contacting CHCs, Certified Local Governments (CLGs), or Main Street Communities as appropriate, for any large, complex, or controversial projects. Developing a relationship with CHCs, CLGs, and other local professional preservation staff will assist TxDOT in determining when certain consulting parties prefer to be contacted.

   Districts should contact CHCs when a project proposes to replace, widen, upgrade, or repair a historic-age concrete or masonry bridge. Districts do not have to contact CHCs for routine maintenance on these bridges. Historical Studies has a specific letter template that Districts may

use for contacting CHCs. It is no longer necessary to contact CHCs when the following non-historic bridges[12] are proposed for replacement:

- Bridges constructed between 1945 and 1965
- Metal truss bridges
- Concrete box culverts and bridge-class culverts
- Timber bridges

Historical Studies changed the CHC notification requirement for these bridges because large-scale, statewide findings have been made for these bridges. We conducted statewide outreach and public notification on our list of historic bridges constructed between 1945 and 1965 during the summer of 2014. Therefore, the consultation threshold is already met for those bridges. Truss bridges are universally determined to be eligible for the National Register of Historic Places, while concrete box culverts, bridge-class culverts, and timber bridges are typically not eligible for the National Register of Historic Places.

6. **When must we re-coordinate a project with CRM HIST?**

   It is important to contact Historical Studies when the following occurs on a project:

   - Amount of ROW, temporary, or permanent easement(s) increases or decreases
   - Project location is expanded or contracted
   - Scope change
   - Funding sources change (state to federal and federal to state)
   - Letting date change

   Changes in amount of ROW or project location, either increasing or decreasing, will affect the project's Area of Potential Effect (APE). Letting date changes may affect the validity of a historic resources survey and its findings. It is most important to notify Historical Studies about letting date changes **after** HIST clearance, but before overall NEPA clearance. If you are not sure HIST needs to review a letting date change, contact the historians and ask.

   Historical Studies will confirm that the original finding is still valid or will request additional information.

[12] Bridges in these categories that have been determined "historic" appear on the "NRHP Listed and Eligible Bridges of Texas Map, a link for which is on the Historic Resources Toolkit.

## 9.0 Abbreviations and Acronyms

| | |
|---|---|
| ACHP | Advisory Council on Historic Preservation |
| ACT | Antiquities Code of Texas |
| ADA | Americans with Disability Act |
| APE | Area of Potential Effects |
| CHC | County Historical Commission |
| CLG | Certified Local Governments |
| CRM | Cultural Resources Management |
| ECOS | Texas Environmental Compliance Oversight System |
| HIST | Historical Studies Branch, Cultural Resources Management, Environmental Affairs Division |
| NEPA | National Environmental Policy Act |
| NHPA | National Historic Preservation Act |
| PA | Programmatic Agreement |
| PCR | Project Coordination Request |
| ROW | Right-of-Way |
| SHPO | State Historic Preservation Officer (in Texas, the THC) |
| THC | Texas Historical Commission (Texas SHPO) |

# Appendix A

Interstate Bridges that Must Undergo Section 106 Consultation Due to Historical Significance:

| Interstate Number | District | Resource Name | Year Construction Completed | NRHP Listed/Eligible |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| I-40 | AMA | NBI: 252420027513001 | 1932 | Listed |
| I-20 | BWD | NBI: 230680031405018 | 1934 | Eligible |
| I-20 | BWD | NBI: 230680031405020 | 1934 | Eligible |
| I-20 | FTW | NBI: 021840031401006 | 1934 | Listed |
| I-35 | LAR | NBI: 221420001708030 | 1929 | Eligible |
| I-10 | ODA | NBI: 061860014003021 | 1933 | Eligible |
| I-10 | SAT | NBI: 150150002502011 | 1933 | Listed |
| I-10 | SJT | NBI: 071340014201035 | 1938 | Listed |

# Appendix B

Post-1945 Historic Bridges that Must Undergo Section 106 Consultation Due to Historical Significance

| County | Bridge Number | Facility | Bridge Type | Year Built |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Bee | 160130073805012 | FM 2441 over Medio Creek | I-beam cantilevered with suspended span | 1946 |
| Bexar | 150150B24750003 | Nogalitos St ML over San Pedro Creek | Prestressed concrete girder multiple/I-beam | 1959 |
| Bexar | 150150B07510004 | W Commerce St over RRs, Medina, Comal, Etc. | Prestressed concrete girder-multiple/I-beam | 1959 |
| Bexar | 150150B21985011 | W Martin St over Alazan Creek | Continuous prestressed concrete slab-full depth | 1964 |
| Bosque | 090180051903001 | SH 174 over Steele Creek | I-beam cantilevered with suspended span | 1948 |
| Bosque | 090180042201025 | FM 927 over Bosque River | Prestressed concrete girder-multiple/cantilevered | 1962 |
| Brazoria | 120200AA0862004 | CR 210 over Austin Bayou | Tee beam | 1959 |
| Brazos | 170210031505051 | SH 105 over Brazos River | Continuous plate girder | 1954 |
| Brazos | 170210223601001 | FM 2038 over Bowman Creek | Prestressed concrete girder | 1957 |
| Calhoun | 130290017910061 | SH 35 over Lavaca Bay | Continuous plate girder | 1961 |
| Cameron | 210310063002003 | FM 106 Lift over Arroyo Colorado | Vertical lift | 1953 |
| Coke | 070410040701057 | SH 70 NB over US 277 SB | Prestressed concrete girder-multiple/I-beam | 1959 |
| Colorado | 130450026608043 | BU 71 F over Colorado River | Parker through truss | 1949 |
| Dallas | 180570K01415002 | Cedar Hill Rd over Ten Mile Creek | Box girder-multiple | 1950 |
| Dallas | 180570915100009 | Inwood Rd over Freeman Branch | Variable depth rigid frame concrete slab | 1953 |
| Dallas | 180570009510123 | Big Town Blvd over US 80 | Prestressed concrete girder-multiple/I-beam | 1959 |
| Dallas | 180570058101038 | Loop 12 over Lawther Drive | Prestressed concrete girder-multiple/I-beam | 1959 |
| Dallas | 180570009201048 | S.H. 310 over T&NO RR | Continuous I-beam | 1953 |
| Dallas | 180570009201327 | US 175 SB over Metropolitan | Variable depth rigid frame concrete tee beam | 1956 |

| County | Bridge Number | Facility | Bridge Type | Year Built |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Dallas | 180570009201076 | US 175 NB over Metropolitan | Variable depth rigid frame concrete tee beam | 1956 |
| Dallas | 180570009201075 | US 175 WB over Pennsylvania Ave | Variable depth rigid frame concrete slab | 1956 |
| Dallas | 180570009201326 | US 175 SB over Pennsylvania Ave | Variable depth rigid frame concrete slab | 1956 |
| Dallas | 180570009201325 | SB US 175 over Hatcher St | Variable depth rigid frame concrete slab | 1956 |
| Dallas | 180570009201054 | NB US 175 over Hatcher St | Variable depth rigid frame concrete slab | 1956 |
| Dallas | 180570009201074 | MLK JR Blvd over US 175 | Variable depth rigid frame concrete tee beam | 1956 |
| Dallas | 1805709H7350001 | Santa Fe Ave over Ervay St | Variable depth rigid frame concrete slab | 1950 |
| Dallas | 180570K01740001 | Joe Wilson Rd over Bentle Branch | Box girder-multiple | 1950 |
| DeWitt | 130620234601001 | FM 884 over Smith Creek | Prestressed concrete girder-multiple/I-beam | 1958 |
| El Paso | 240720000212079 | SH 20 EB over US 62 | Continuous I-beam | 1949 |
| Goliad | 160890288501001 | FM 2441 over Sarco Creek | Prestressed concrete box girder-multiple | 1955 |
| Grayson | 010920C02620001 | W Pecan St over Post Oak Creek | Continuous I-beam | 1949 |
| Grayson | 010920AA0109002 | Craft Rd over Draw | Half-through Camelback truss | 1950 |
| Hall | 250970031102006 | SH 70 over Mulberry Creek | Continuous I-beam | 1949 |
| Hamilton | 090980025101054 | US 281 over Leon River | Prestressed concrete girder-multiple/I-beam | 1958 |
| Hamilton | 090980012001011 | SH 22 over Pecan Creek | I-beam cantilevered with suspended span | 1948 |
| Hamilton | 090980012001012 | SH 22 over Leon River | Steel I-beam | 1948 |
| Hamilton | 090980018303051 | SH 36 over Pecan Creek | Continuous I-beam | 1948 |
| Harris | 121020B53960647 | Reseda Rd over HCFCD Ditch | Box girder-multiple | 1965 |
| Harris | 121020B57009003 | San Felipe Rd over Bering Ditch | Prestressed concrete box girder-multiple | 1962 |
| Harris | 121020B44185016 | Ped Crossing over Memorial Dr | Prestressed concrete box girder-single, spread | 1955 |
| Harris | 121020002710063 | US 90A SB over Buffalo Bayou & St | Continuous plate girder | 1956 |
| Harris | 121020002710062 | US 90A NB over Buffalo Bayou & St | Continuous plate girder | 1956 |

| County | Bridge Number | Facility | Bridge Type | Year Built |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Harris | 121020B44185009 | Waugh Dr over Memorial Dr | Post-tensioned concrete slab | 1955 |
| Hays | 141060028503003 | RM 12 over Blanco River | Prestressed concrete girder-multiple/I-beam | 1959 |
| Hidalgo | 211090G00090001 | SB US 281 over Rio Grande River | Other prestressed concrete | 1965 |
| Hill | 091100001405083 | US 81 over Island Creek | Continuous I-beam | 1948 |
| Hill | 091100051902005 | SH 174 over Brazos River | Continuous truss-deck | 1950 |
| Jack | 021200039107056 | FM 4 over Keechi Creek | Prestressed concrete girder-multiple/I-beam | 1958 |
| Johnson | 021270159904015 | FM 916 over Nolan River | Prestressed concrete girder-multiple/I-beam | 1959 |
| Kaufman | 181300009504108 | CR 217 over US 80 ML | Rigid frame | 1958 |
| Kaufman | 181300009504109 | FR Crossover over US 80 ML | Rigid frame | 1958 |
| Lampasas | 231410103201016 | FM 580 over Lampasas River | I-beam cantilevered with suspended span | 1965 |
| Lavaca | 131430044601007 | US 90A over Navidad River | Steel I-beam | 1949 |
| Leon | 171450064301027 | FM 39 over BNSF RR | Prestressed concrete girder-multiple/I-beam | 1958 |
| Marion | 191550056903017 | SH 43 over Big Cypress Bayou | Plate girder | 1965 |
| Maverick | 221590B00290001 | Garrison St over Rio Grande River | Continuous I-beam | 1954 |
| McCulloch | 231600007101065 | US 87 NB over Brady Creek | Variable depth continuous concrete slab | 1960 |
| McCulloch | 231600007101072 | US 87 SB over Brady Creek | Variable depth continuous concrete slab | 1960 |
| McLennan | 091610004901141 | Spur 484 SB over US 77 BUS NB | Continuous plate girder | 1958 |
| McLennan | 091610004901124 | US 77 BUS NB over SP 484 SB CONN | Continuous I-beam | 1958 |
| McLennan | 091610005515001 | US 77 (BUS) SB over US 84 FR | Continuous I-beam | 1955 |
| McLennan | 091610005515380 | US 84 over US 77 BUS | Continuous I-beam | 1955 |
| McLennan | 091610005515006 | US 77 (BUS) NB over US 84 FR | Continuous I-beam | 1955 |
| Menard | 071640039605025 | US 190 over Dry Creek | Prestressed concrete girder-multiple/I-beam | 1958 |
| Nolan | 081770026401043 | E First St over BUS 70 | I-beam | 1954 |

| County | Bridge Number | Facility | Bridge Type | Year Built |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Nueces | 161780226302004 | SH 361 over Gulf Intra-Coastal W-Way | Continuous plate girder | 1959 |
| Nueces | 161780010106041 | US 181 over CC Ship Channel | Continuous cantilever tied arch steel truss | 1959 |
| Nueces | 161780010106044 | US 181 over BURLESON ST | Prestressed concrete girder-multiple/I-beam | 1958 |
| Nueces | 161780010106043 | US 181 NBFR CONN over US 181 | Prestressed concrete girder-multiple/I-beam | 1958 |
| Nueces | 161780007406050 | US 181 southbound over Belden Street | Prestressed concrete girder-multiple/I-beam | 1959 |
| Nueces | 161780007406171 | US 181 southbound off-ramp over BU 44 D | Prestressed concrete girder-multiple/I-beam | 1959 |
| Nueces | 161780007406170 | US 181 northbound over BU 44 D | Prestressed concrete girder-multiple/I-beam | 1959 |
| Nueces | 161780007406169 | US 181 northbound over BU 44 D | Prestressed concrete girder-multiple/I-beam | 1959 |
| Orange | 201810AA2690006 | E Round over Cow Bayou | Horizontal swing | 1960 |
| Palo Pinto | 021820039108057 | FM 4 over Keechi Creek | Prestressed concrete girder-multiple/I-beam | 1958 |
| Palo Pinto | 021820000710057 | US 180 over Brazos River | Multiple plate girder | 1948 |
| Presidio | 241890AA0107001 | Pinto Canyon Rd over Arroyo Escondido | steel multi-plate arch bridge | 1960 |
| Red River | 011940018901034 | SH 37 over Red River | Continuous plate girder | 1954 |
| Refugio | 161960044704029 | SH 202 over Blanco Creek | I-beam cantilevered with suspended span | 1947 |
| Robertson | 171980020409061 | US 79 / US 190 over Brazos River | Continuous plate girder | 1956 |
| Robertson | 171980026203045 | FM 485 over Brazos River | Continuous plate girder | 1957 |
| Smith | 102120042401030 | Saunders Ave over SH 31 | Rigid frame | 1960 |
| Smith | 102120042401031 | Fleishel Ave over SH 31 | Rigid frame | 1960 |
| Somervell | 022130077801001 | FM 199 over Georges Creek | Prestressed concrete girder-multiple/I-beam | 1958 |
| Somervell | 022130025903046 | US 67 over Brazos River | Continuous truss-through | 1947 |
| Stephens | 232150103101022 | FM 578 over Hubbard Creek | Continuous I-beam | 1949 |
| Tarrant | 022200009405030 | SH183 WBL over Carswell Access Rd | Variable depth concrete flat slab | 1954 |
| Tarrant | 022200009405029 | SH183 EBL over Carswell Access Rd | Variable depth concrete flat slab | 1954 |

| County | Bridge Number | Facility | Bridge Type | Year Built |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Tarrant | 022200106803020 | White Settlement Rd over Spur 341 | Rigid frame | 1953 |
| Travis | 142270015106031 | Loop 111 over MKT RR | Steel I-beam | 1947 |
| Travis | 142270B00022001 | E 7TH ST EB over Tillery St and Austin NWRR | Steel I-beam | 1948 |
| Travis | 142270B00022003 | E 7TH ST WB over Tillery St and Austin NWRR | Steel I-beam | 1948 |
| Travis | 142270B01381001 | Speedway over West Waller Creek | Reinforced concrete closed-spandrel arch | 1946 |
| Travis | 142270B00099013 | E 38th St over Waller Creek | Variable depth concrete tee beam | 1951 |
| Travis | 142270070003004 | SH 71 WB over Pedernales River | Continuous truss-deck | 1949 |
| Val Verde | 222330002209070 | US 90 over Devils Riv/Amistad Resv | Plate girder-cantilever with suspended span, | 1965 |
| Val Verde | 222330002206068 | US 90 over Pecos River | Continuous deck truss | 1957 |
| Washington | 172390018606043 | Old Mill Creek Rd over US 290 | Prestressed concrete girder-multiple/I-beam | 1958 |
| Webb | 222400B00250001 | Convent Ave over Rio Grande River | Prestressed concrete girder-multiple/cantilever | 1956 |
| Young | 032520AA0237001 | CR 237/ Hot Wells over Clear Fork of Brazos R. | T beam | 1954 |

# Appendix C

The following table shows the revision history for this guidance document.

| Revision History | |
|---|---|
| **Effective Date Month, Year** | **Reason for and Description of Change** |
| January 2020 | Version 3 was released.<br>• New ECOS procedures reflected in document;<br>• Clarified funding sources for use of Appendix 3 and Appendix 4 project descriptions;<br>• Updated Appendix B with correct list of bridges. |
| May 2019 | Version 2 was released.<br>• Added new Section 2.0 on Area of Potential Effect, changing section numbers throughout remainder of document;<br>• Updated information on bridge projects;<br>• Clarified and corrected language;<br>• Removal of GIS link that changed;<br>• Updated district decision-making processes for bridges and non-federally funded projects;<br>• Added new appendix on projects that do not require review. |
| June 2016 | Version 1 was released. |