



Tier I Site Assessment

Main CSJ: 2635-04-034

Form Prepared By: Sally S. Amaye

Date of Evaluation: October 8, 2019

Proposed Letting Date: January 2023

District(s): Amarillo

County(ies): Potter

Roadway Name: State Loop 335

Limits From: SW 9th Avenue

Limits To: FM 1719

Project is classified as a Categorical Exclusion

Project not assigned to TxDOT under the NEPA Assignment MOU

Project Description: The Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT) is proposing to widen State Loop (SL) 335 from Southwest (SW) 9th Avenue to Farm-to-Market (FM) 1719 in Potter County, Texas, located northwest of the City of Amarillo. The proposed ultimate project configuration would improve the existing two-lane roadway to a four lane, controlled-access freeway with frontage roads, ramps, bridges over intersecting cross streets, and four mainlanes that do not preclude the accommodation of six mainlanes. Phased construction leading to the ultimate project configuration is anticipated as funding becomes available with an interim configuration of four lanes minimum.

The environmental review, consultation, and other actions required by applicable Federal environmental laws for this project are being, or have been, carried-out by TxDOT pursuant to 23 U.S.C. 327 and a Memorandum of Understanding dated December 16, 2014, and executed by FHWA and TxDOT.

1. No Is the project limited to a maintenance activity exempt from coordination?
<http://txdot.gov/inside-txdot/division/environmental/maintenance-program.html>
2. No Has the project previously completed coordination with TPWD?
3. Yes Is the project within range of a state threatened or endangered species or SGCN and suitable habitat is present?

*Explain:

The proposed project is within range of and has suitable habitat for the following species:

- Woodhouse's toad
- western burrowing owl
- black-tailed prairie dog
- thirteen-lined ground squirrel
- prairie vole
- cave myotis bat
- American badger
- swift fox
- western rattlesnake
- western hognose snake
- Texas horned lizard
- massasauga
- western box turtle



However, only the following species may be impacted by the project:

- Woodhouse's toad
- western burrowing owl
- thirteen-lined ground squirrel
- prairie vole
- American badger
- swift fox
- western rattlesnake
- western hognose snake
- Texas horned lizard
- massasauga
- western box turtle

All SGCN were analyzed but only those that may be impacted are included in the species impact table.

Date TPWD County List Accessed: April 25, 2019

Date that the NDD was accessed: March 25, 2019

What agency performed the NDD search? TPWD

NDD Search Results for EOIDs and Tracked Managed Areas

EOID Number	Common Name	Scientific Name	Listing Status	Buffer Zone
9278	black-tailed prairie dog	<i>Cynomys ludovicianus</i>	SGCN	10 Mile
1194	prairie dog town	N/A	N/A	1.5 Mile
5252	prairie dog town	N/A	N/A	1.5 Mile
57	prairie dog town	N/A	N/A	10 Mile
3743	prairie dog town	N/A	N/A	10 Mile
5253	prairie dog town	N/A	N/A	10 Mile
6413	prairie dog town	N/A	N/A	10 Mile
7674	prairie dog town	N/A	N/A	10 Mile
5375	swift fox	<i>Vulpes velox</i>	SGCN	10 Mile

No Does the BMP PA eliminate the requirement to coordinate for all species?

Comments:

BMPs PA does not eliminate the requirement to coordinate for all species.

Specific BMPs do not exist for the following species that are within range, have suitable habitat within project area, and may be impacted:

- Woodhouse's Toad
- thirteen-lined ground squirrel
- prairie vole
- American badger
- western rattlesnake
- western hognose snake
- massasauga
- western box turtle



Since there are no specific BMPs in the PA for the species listed above, it is recommended that water quality BMPs, amphibian and aquatic reptile BMPs, fossorial mammal BMPs, general BMP, terrestrial reptile BMPs are implemented.

BMPs do exist for the following species:

western burrowing owl (Bird BMPs)
 swift fox (BMP- contractors will be advised of potential occurrence in the project area, and to avoid harming the species if encountered, and to avoid unnecessary impacts to dens)
 Texas horned lizard (BMP- 1) avoid harvester ant mounds in the selection of Project Specific Locations (PSLs) where feasible; 2) Terrestrial Reptile BMPs)

BMPs will be added to the project EPIC sheet for all SGCN species listed above.

4. No NDD and TCAP review indicates adverse impacts to remnant vegetation?
5. No Does the project require a NWP with PCN or IP by USACE?
6. No Does the project include more than 200 linear feet of stream channel for each single and complete crossing of one or more of the following that is not already channelized or otherwise maintained:
7. No Does the project contain known isolated wetlands outside the TxDOT ROW that will be directly impacted by the project?
8. No Would the project impact at least 0.10 acre of riparian vegetation?
9. Yes Does project disturb a habitat type in an area equal to or greater than the area of disturbance indicated in the Threshold Table Programmatic Agreement?

*Explain:

Specifically, the project could potentially disturb up to 2.43 acres of Cliffs, Breaks, and Barrens habitat; up to 24.70 acres of Disturbed Prairie; up to 245.76 acres of Mixed/Arid/Sand Grasslands; and up to 9.46 acres of Western Wetlands, Riparian habitat.

*Attach associated file of EMST output (Mapper Report or other Excel File which includes MOU Type, Ecosystem Name, Common/Vegetation Type Name) in ECOS

Excel File Name:

 SL_335_C-1_Draft_EMST_Table

- 9.1. Yes Is there a discrepancy between actual habitat(s) and EMST mapped habitat(s)?



*Explain:

A field survey determined that there were the following discrepancies in the mapped versus actual vegetation types:

- * 2.43 acres of Rolling Plains: Breaks Canyon instead of 2.49 acres.
- * 0 acre of CRP/Other Improved Grassland instead of 0.08 acre.
- * 0.91 acre of Native Invasive: Deciduous Shrubland instead of 2.45 acres.
- * 23.79 acres of Native Invasive: Mesquite Shrubland instead of 4.09 acres.
- * 0 acre of Native Invasive: Sand Sage Shrubland instead of 15.49 acres.
- * 103.86 acres of Rolling Plains: Mixedgrass Prairie instead of 93.92 acres.
- * 141.90 acres of High Plains: Shortgrass Prairie instead of 128.55 acres.
- * 0 acre of Urban High Intensity instead of 10.30 acres.
- * 0 acre of Urban Low Intensity instead of 57.27 acres.
- * 0.28 acre of High Plains: Floodplain Deciduous Shrubland instead of 0.91 acre.
- * 6.09 acres of High Plains: Floodplain Hardwood Forest instead of 0.01 acre.
- * 0.68 acre of High Plains: Floodplain Herbaceous Vegetation instead of 31.30 acres.
- * 2.41 acres of High Plains: Riparian Herbaceous Vegetation instead of 2.02 acres.

Attach file showing discrepancy between actual and EMST mapped habitat(s).

File Name:

SL_335_C-1_Draft_EMST_Table

Is TPWD Coordination Required?

Yes

Early Coordination

Administrated Coordination - Must be conducted through ENV-NRM

BMPs Implemented or EPICs included (as necessary):

The following would be implemented based on the MOU:

- *western burrowing owl (Bird BMPs);
- *swift fox (BMP- contractors will be advised of potential occurrence in the project area, and to avoid harming the species if encountered, and to avoid unnecessary impacts to dens)
- *Texas horned lizard (BMP- 1) avoid harvester ant mounds in the selection of Project Specific Locations (PSLs) where feasible; 2) Terrestrial Reptile BMPs)

It is recommended that the following would also be implemented: water quality BMPs, amphibian and aquatic reptile BMPs, fossorial mammal BMPs, general BMP, terrestrial reptile BMPs

TxDOT Contact Information

Name:

Phone Number:

E-mail:



Tier I Site Assessment



Suggested Attachments

Aerial Map (with delineated project boundaries)

USFWS T&E List

TPWD T&E List

Species Impact Table

NDD EOID List and Tracked Managed Areas (Required for TPWD Coordination)

EMST Project MOU Summary Table (Required for TPWD Coordination)

TPWD SGCN List

Photos (Required for TPWD Coordination)

Previous TPWD Coordination Documentation (if applicable)