



Documented Reevaluation Checklist (DRC)

For detailed instructions on completing this checklist please see *Guidance: Preparing a Documented Reevaluation Using the Documented Reevaluation Checklist (DRC)* available in the TxDOT Environmental Compliance Toolkit.

Original Environmental Decision Date: 3/29/2013

Let Date: 8/1/2030

DRC Prepared by: David C. Wilkins

DRC Reviewed by: Jenise Walton

Project Name: Grand Parkway (SH 99), Segment C

Project Limits From: IH 69/US 59

Project Limits To: SH 288

Control Section Job Number (CSJ): 3510-02-002

District(s): Houston

County(ies): Brazoria, Fort Bend

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

Project Description:

The SH 99, Segment C FEIS was approved on August 8, 2012 and the Record of Decision (ROD) was signed on March 29, 2013. This Reevaluation was conducted to document and account for a design error. During the original analysis Canyon Gate subdivision did not qualify for a noise barrier because the model was conducted incorrectly and included wrap-around walls at both ends of the subdivision that would have been located on property outside of the TxDOT ROW. As a result of this error the Canyon Gate subdivision did not qualify for a noise barrier because the cost was too high. Once the wall extensions were removed and the model was rerun, it was determined a noise barrier was reasonable and feasible. The Canyon Gate subdivision was eligible for a noise barrier and a noise barrier should have been offered in the original FEIS.

The shorter noise barrier, located completely within TxDOT ROW, would provide a noise reduction of at least 5 dB(A) for 20 receptors and meet the noise reduction goal of 7dB(A) or greater for eleven receptors. Using the estimate of \$18 per square foot cost, the estimated cost per benefited receptor was \$24, 581. Based on the calculated noise reduction for receptors and the cost per benefited receptor, the revised barrier is both reasonable and feasible. This barrier would be a Type I barrier.

Project History:

Grand Parkway Segment C, an approximately 26-mile segment in Fort Bend and Brazoria counties, which traverses from US 59 to SH 288. The project's northern terminus is near the intersection of existing Segment D of the Grand Parkway at US 59 in Fort Bend County. The project's southeastern terminus is approximately 26.9 miles southeast of US 59 at SH 288 in Brazoria County. The Preferred Alternative would be a new location, four-lane, controlled-access toll road with intermittent frontage roads within a 300–400-foot ROW. Traversing parts of Fort Bend and Brazoria counties, the proposed new toll road would provide access to US 59 and SH 288 (radial freeway). The proposed Segment C project would involve the construction of direct connector ramps at US 59 and SH 288 to provide fully directional interchanges. The roadway would be designed to accommodate a 70-mph design speed.

Portion of Project Currently Being Advanced:

CSJ: 3510-02-002 from US 59 to Sansbury Boulevard

Date(s) of Prior Reevaluations:

SH 99 Crabb River Road Reevaluation CSJ: 3510-03-006 12/04/2015

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



Documented Reevaluation Checklist (DRC)

- 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?**

Funding Source(s): Federal, State

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 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

No **Have the ROW requirements changed since the original environmental decision or subsequent reevaluations?**

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 (SH 99), Segment C

Control Section Job Number (CSJ): 3510-02-002

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>Yes</u>	Noise Impacts	The proposed project would require the construction of one Type I noise barrier within the TxDOT ROW at Canyon Gate at the Brazos from Sansbury Blvd. to the Middle Bayou Bridge.
<u>No</u>	Hazardous Materials	
<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>No</u>	Others	



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 checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Other:		

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.

Yes Were additional studies needed?

Describe:

A Traffic Noise Analysis and revised Barrier Analysis were required for the Canyon Gate subdivision.

No Are there studies that remain to be completed?

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? 2022

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? \$625,110,107

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



Documented Reevaluation Checklist (DRC)

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:

There are additional mitigation requirements or commitments.

Describe:

The proposed project would require a combined noise workshop/MAPO. The noise workshop would be held to determine the construction of the proposed Type I noise barrier within the TxDOT ROW at Canyon Gate at the Brazos from Sansbury Blvd. to the Middle Bayou Bridge.

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?**

No **Was additional public involvement completed for this reevaluation?**

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

Public Involvement Activities yet to be completed:

Meeting with Affected Property Owners

Comments:

The proposed project would require a combined noise workshop/MAPO. The noise workshop would be held to determine the construction of the proposed noise barrier within the TxDOT ROW at Canyon Gate at the Brazos from Sansbury Blvd. to the Middle Bayou Bridge. The MAPO would be held to explain to the affected property owners the design error and why a noise barrier was not offered under the original FEIS.

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.

NA



Documented Reevaluation Checklist (DRC)

References:

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

Files listed below are references, which have been uploaded into ECOS.

Noise Tab:

Seg C ReEval 2017 TNM 1-19-17.zip

Seg C ReEval Noise Tech Report 1-19-17.pdf

XII. Conclusion and Recommendation

Project Name: Grand Parkway (SH 99), Segment C

Control Section Job Number (CSJ): 3510-02-002

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.

David C. Wilkins

Reevaluation Preparer Name

Environmental Scientist

Title

February 8, 2017

Date

Reevaluation Preparer Signature

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):

Jenise Walton

Reevaluation Reviewer Name

PD Deputy Section Director

Title

March 8, 2017

Date

Reevaluation Reviewer Signature



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):

Doug Booher

Department Delegate Name

Deputy Director

Title

March 9, 2017

Date

Department Delegate Signature