



Reevaluation Consultation Checklist (RCC)

Original Environmental Decision Date: 8/13/1998

Let Date: October 2016

RCC Date: 6/21/2016

Project Number:

RCC Prepared by: Callie Barnes

RCC Reviewed by: Julia Ragsdale

Project Name: Grand Parkway I-2

Project Limits From: I-10 E Near Belvieu

Project Limits To: SH 146 in Baytown

Control Section Job Number (CSJ): 3187-01-005 is the original control CSJ. 3187-01-009 (from BS 146 West to SH 146) is the CSJ where the Reevaluation is occurring. Other child CSJs associated with the control CSJ (entire project) are as follows: 3187-01-008, 011 and 3187-02-006, 009, 010, 011 and 3510-10-016.

District(s): Houston

County(ies): Galveston, Harris

Check this box if the project is being reclassified without a reevaluation.

No **Has the project design concept or scope changed since the original environmental decision and subsequent reevaluations?**

Project Description:

The originally cleared GP I-2 project was proposed as a four-lane at-grade arterial for the interim design with a preservation of ROW which would accommodate the future ultimate 6-lane freeway with frontage roads and overpasses. The preferred alternative follows an alignment which utilizes existing lanes and the Fred Hartman Memorial Bridge between the SH 225/SH 146 intersection and Missouri Street, approximately 198 meters (650 feet) west of Goose Creek. From Missouri Street, Segment I-2 would improve SH 146, Spur 55, and part of Fisher Road to a controlled access facility. It would then turn north across undeveloped land to intersect with I-10 E. Segment i-2 would be constructed as a four-lane, at grade arterial in a 91 to 122-meter (300-400 foot) ROW.

See Figure Attached. The current concept is the same as what was proposed in the original environmental clearance (1998 ROD) - the ultimate 6-lane schematics in the FEIS showed the main lanes on two bridges over the railroad, and the frontage roads were shown at-grade. However, in the October 2012 Reevaluation the originally cleared area at the RR crossing was revised, and the frontage roads were proposed to be below-grade (below the railroad) and the main lanes would be over the railroad. This design change reduced the ROW requirement in the area of the railroad by approximately 1.8 acres. Since the October 2012 Reevaluation, it has been determined to revert back to the original design as proposed in the FEIS and cleared in the ROD; thus resulting in (since the October 2012) an additional 1.72 acres of ROW. As stated previously, this 1.72 acres was originally cleared in the 1998 ROD.

Project Phasing Plan and Portions Completed (if warranted):

A construction contract for the area from I-10(E) to FM 1405, known as Segment I-2A was awarded in 2003 and the road opened to traffic in March 2008. A construction contract for the area from FM1405 to SH 146B in Baytown, including a second bridge over Cedar Bayou, was awarded in July 2013. Construction for this portion is on-going.

Portion of Project Currently Being Advanced:

Segment I-2B, from north of Fisher Road east to SH 146 near the Fred Hartman Bridge is a portion of the design-build contract TxDOT is proposing for Segments H & I-1 and I-2B from US 59(N) to US 90 to I-10(E) to SH 146 thru Montgomery, Harris, Liberty, Chambers and back into Harris County. This contract is scheduled to be awarded in July 2016, construction will begin in early 2017.

Date(s) of Prior Reevaluations:

2012



Reevaluation Consultation Checklist (RCC)

Who is the lead agency responsible for the approval of the entire project?

- FHWA (Not Assigned to TxDOT) State
 TxDOT (Assigned by FHWA) FTA
 Other federal agency

I. Project Funding and Planning Consistency

Yes **Is the project still consistent with the current, approved, financially constrained MTP, STIP/ TIP?**

What are the project funding sources?

Select all applicable funding sources, holding the Ctrl Key to select multiple sources. To exit the menu, press the Tab Key.

Federal
State
Local

II. Environmental Classification

Select the project's environmental classification: Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS)

Yes **Have major steps to advance the action occurred within three years after the approval of the FEIS, SEIS, or the last major approval or grant? Major steps include authority to undertake final design, authority to acquire a significant portion of the right-of-way, or approval of the plans, specifications, and estimates.**

III. Project Information

1. Proposed Action

No **Have substantial changes occurred to the project design concept and/or scope since the original environmental decision or subsequent reevaluations?**

2. Project Limits

No **Has there been a change to the project limits from what was described in the original environmental decision or subsequent reevaluations?**

3. Right of Way

Yes **Have the ROW requirements changed since the original environmental decision or subsequent reevaluations?**

Yes **Would the changes require the acquisition of any new ROW not covered by the previous decision?**

What was the amount of ROW originally required (in acres): 586.000



Reevaluation Consultation Checklist (RCC)

How much did ROW change since the previous decision? (in acres): 1.720

If the required acreage is reduced, enter a negative number.

Total ROW required (in acres): 587.720

Describe:

The addition of 1.72 acres is a change since the previous environmental decision - 2012 Reevaluation; however, it is not a change from the original 1998 ROD.

No **Would any additional ROW be required from a significant publicly owned park, recreation area, wildlife or waterfowl refuge, or historic site?**

4. Easements

No **Have the requirements for temporary or permanent easements changed since the original environmental decision or subsequent reevaluations?**

5. Displacements

No **Will changes, if any, result in residential or nonresidential displacements that were not covered by the original environmental decision or subsequent reevaluations?**

6. Access

No **Will changes, if any, to the project design result in a temporary or permanent adverse change of access to any residential or nonresidential properties that were not covered in the original environmental decision or subsequent reevaluations?**

7. Traffic

No **Have there been substantial changes to the projected ADT from what was described in the original environmental decision or subsequent reevaluations?**

8. Laws and Regulations

No **Have there been any changes to laws or regulations that would result in the need for any updated analyses since the original environmental decision or subsequent reevaluations?**

9. Land Use and Population

No **Have there been any substantial changes in land use or population within the project area since the original environmental decision or subsequent reevaluations?**

IV. Required Action

Project Name: Grand Parkway I-2



Reevaluation Consultation Checklist (RCC)

Control Section Job Number (CSJ): 3187-01-005 is the original control CSJ. 3187-01-009 (from BS 146 West to SH 146) is the CSJ where the Reevaluation is occurring. Other child CSJs associated with the control CSJ (entire project) are as follows: 3187-01-008, 011 and 3187-02-006, 009, 010, 011 and 3510-10-016.

Responses to the previous questions indicate there are potential changes that may affect the previous environmental decision. Further evaluation is required. Complete the reevaluation and Sections V-XII.

V. Environmental Setting and Affected Environment

Indicate whether there have been changes in the affected environment since the environmental decision. Changes in the affected environment could result from changes in design, in the environmental setting, or laws and regulations.

Only select NA if a resource was not addressed in the original environmental documentation and does not need to be addressed as a result of the changes.

If Yes is selected, describe the changes in the field provided.

Changed?	Resource/Setting	Comments
<u>No</u>	Environmental Justice	
<u>No</u>	Socio-economics	
<u>No</u>	Farmlands	
<u>No</u>	Threatened/Endangered Species	
<u>No</u>	Vegetation	
<u>No</u>	Water Quality	
<u>No</u>	Wetlands/Waters of the U.S. (including any changes in permitting)	
<u>No</u>	Floodplains	
<u>No</u>	Air Quality	
<u>No</u>	Noise Impacts	
<u>Yes</u>	Hazardous Materials	The additional 1.72 acres was previously covered in the 1998 ROD; therefore, no additional investigations are needed in the 1.72 acres.
<u>No</u>	Archeological Resources	
<u>No</u>	Historic Resources	
<u>No</u>	Section 4(f)/6(f)	
<u>No</u>	Visual Resources/Aesthetics	
<u>No</u>	Indirect and Cumulative Impacts	
<u>Yes</u>	Others	Need to conduct a MAPO for affected property owners.



VI. Resource Agency Coordination

Check the box in the NA Column if no additional coordination was required.

If additional coordination was required, describe it, and enter the dates the original and additional coordination were completed. List documentation of additional coordination in Section XI below.

NA	Agency	Previous Coordination Completed	Additional Completed
	Texas Historical Commission		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Archeology		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Historical Structures		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Texas Parks and Wildlife Department		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Texas Commission on Environmental Quality		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	U.S. Coast Guard		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service		
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	FHWA (Conformity Determination)		
<input type="checkbox"/>	Other: A MAPO is required. <i>Describe:</i> MAPO is required. Meetings are being scheduled with two affected property owners that own the 1.72 acres.	PH was held Jan. 26, 1995. ROD issued 1998.	MAPO is required. Meetings are being scheduled with two affected property owners that own the 1.72 acres.

VII. Additional Studies

If applicable, describe any additional environmental studies that were conducted. Select NA if changes to the project did not result in a need for new studies. Indicate whether studies have been conducted or remain to be completed. Describe additional studies, and list them in Section XI below.

NA Were additional studies needed?

VIII. MTP/TIP Consistency

No Is the project located outside the MPO area?

Yes Is the project listed in the current, approved, financially constrained MTP and TIP?

What is the ETC? Early 2017

Yes Is the current ETC consistent with the ETC indicated in the initial environmental document or last reevaluation?

No Has a revised CO and MSAT analysis been conducted?

What is the total project cost? \$108,000,000

Yes Is the project located in a non-attainment area?



Reevaluation Consultation Checklist (RCC)

No **Would any changes to the project result in an inconsistency with the fiscally constrained MTP and TIP?**

Note: Estimated Time of Completion (ETC) is the fiscally constrained MTP/LRTP ultimate proposed project versus an interim and/or intermediate phase of an ultimate proposed project.

No **Will a revised conformity determination be required?**

Note: Shifts, earlier or later not within, in AQ analysis years can cause revisions to conformity.

IX. EPICS

Indicate the status of required any permits and/or commitments, and describe any changes in the related requirements. List any required documentation in Section XI below. Selecting some options will trigger the appearance of a description field. If a field appears after making a selection, a description is required.

Select the applicable finding from the dropdown field below:

All mitigation and/or commitments from the original approval remain the same.

X. Public Involvement

If additional public involvement is required, list summaries or required documentation in Section XI below. If no additional public involvement was required, select NA.

No **Is there substantial controversy on environmental grounds?**

Yes **Was additional public involvement completed for this reevaluation?**

Previously Completed Public Involvement Activities:

Meeting with Affected Property Owners

Yes **Does any additional public involvement remain to be completed?**

Public Involvement Activities yet to be completed:

Meeting with Affected Property Owners

XI. Attachments and References

Attachments:

List any studies, permits, coordination, etc. attached to this checklist. If there are no associated attachments, enter NA into the field.

Figure 1 attached shows the additional 1.72 acres needed at the RR ROW.

References:

List any studies, permits, coordination, etc. incorporated into the RCC by reference. Include the names and locations of electronic files. If there are no associated references, enter NA into the field.

N/A

XII. Conclusion and Recommendation

Project Name: Grand Parkway I-2



Reevaluation Consultation Checklist (RCC)

Control Section Job Number (CSJ): 3187-01-005 is the original control CSJ. 3187-01-009 (from BS 146 West to SH 146) is the CSJ where the Reevaluation is occurring. Other child CSJs associated with the control CSJ (entire project) are as follows: 3187-01-008, 011 and 3187-02-006, 009, 010, 011 and 3510-10-016.

Reevaluation Preparer's Recommendation

The environmental decision has been reevaluated as required by 23 CFR 771.129 and/or 43 TAC §2.85 and it has been determined that no substantial changes have occurred to the social, economic or environmental impacts of the proposed action that would substantially impact the quality of the human or natural environment. Therefore, the original environmental decision remains valid. It is recommended that the project be advanced to the next phase of project development.

Callie Barnes

Reevaluation Preparer Name

Environmental Specialist

Title

Callie Barnes

Reevaluation Preparer Signature

Digitally signed by Callie Barnes
DN: cn=Callie Barnes, o=TXDOT - Houston District, ou=APD,
email=Callie.barnes@txdot.gov, c=US
Date: 2016.06.21 11:55:34 -05'00'

July 7, 2016

Date

Reevaluation Reviewer's Recommendation

The environmental decision has been reevaluated as required by 23 CFR 771.129 and/or 43 TAC §2.85 and it has been determined that no substantial changes have occurred to the social, economic or environmental impacts of the proposed action that would substantially impact the quality of the human or natural environment. Therefore, the original environmental decision remains valid. It is recommended that the project be advanced to the next phase of project development.

Comments (Optional):

Julia Ragsdale

Reevaluation Reviewer Name

Project Delivery Manager

Title

Julia Ragsdale

Reevaluation Reviewer Signature

Digitally signed by Julia Ragsdale
DN: cn=Julia Ragsdale, o=TXDOT, ou=ENV,
email=JULIA.RAGSDALE@TXDOT.GOV, c=US
Date: 2016.07.07 13:14:48 -05'00'

July 7, 2016

Date



Department Delegate's Decision

The environmental decision has been reevaluated as required by 23 CFR 771.129 and/or 43 TAC §2.85 and it has been determined that no substantial changes have occurred to the social, economic or environmental impacts of the proposed action that would substantially impact the quality of the human or natural environment. Therefore, the original environmental decision remains valid. It is recommended that the project be advanced to the next phase of project development.

Comments (Optional):

Jenise Walton

Department Delegate Name

PD Deputy Section Director

Title

Jenise Walton

Department Delegate Signature

Digitally signed by Jenise Walton
DN: cn=Jenise Walton, o=TXDOT, ou=ENV Division,
email=JENISE.WALTON@TXDOT.GOV, c=US
Date: 2016.07.07 13:17:16 -05'00'

July 7, 2016

Date