|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **PROGRAMMATIC SECTION 4(f) EVALUATION FORM**  **For Projects with Minor Involvements with Historic Sites**  **For NEPA Assignment Program Projects** |
| Project Name:  Project Numbers (Federal and State):  AHRS Site Number and Name:  Date:  List of Attachments: |

*This programmatic Section 4(f) form is to be used for projects which improve existing highways and use minor amounts of land (including non-historic improvements thereon) from historic sites that are adjacent to existing highways.*

*If any of your responses are contained within [brackets], do not continue filling out the form. Consult with the DOT&PF NEPA Program Manager for the appropriate action.*

The environmental review, consultation, and other actions required by applicable federal environmental laws for this project are being, or have been, carried out by DOT&PF pursuant to 23 U.S.C. 327 and a Memorandum of Understanding dated April 13, 2023, and executed by FHWA and DOT&PF.

| Project Description |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
| Section 4(f) Property Description *Describe the historic site that is on or eligible for inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). Include type of historic property, the significance criteria and aspects of historic integrity that qualify the property to be eligible, and location of the historic site. Include a map depicting the boundaries and features of the Section 4(f) property in relation to the proposed project. For historic properties, the boundary should be identified - during the Section 106 process.* | | | |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Applicability *Note: These items are applicability requirements and may not capture all of the consultation/coordination efforts completed under Section 106. These can be elaborated in more detail in Section VI of this form.* | **N/A** | **YES** | **NO** |
| 1. The proposed project involves construction of a highway on new location (If yes, this programmatic Section 4(f) evaluation may not be applied). |  | [] |  |
| 1. The proposed project is designed to improve the operational characteristics, safety, and/or physical condition of the existing facilities on essentially the same alignment. |  |  | [] |
| 1. Does the proposed action meet one of the following criteria? *If yes, select applicable project scope from the following list and describe project*. |  |  | [] |
| Resurfacing, restoration, rehabilitation, or reconstruction |  |  |  |
| Safety improvements (such as shoulder widening, and the correction of substandard curves and intersections) |  |  |  |
| Traffic operation improvements (such as signalization, channelization, and turning or climbing lanes) |  |  |  |
| Bicycle and pedestrian facilities |  |  |  |
| Bridge replacement on essentially the same alignment (Note: this form cannot be used for the replacement of historic bridges) |  |  |  |
| Construction of additional lanes |  |  |  |
| 1. The historic site involved is located adjacent to the existing highway. |  |  | [] |
| 1. The project requires the removal or alteration of historic buildings, structures or objects on the historic site. |  | [] |  |
| 1. The project requires the disturbance or removal of archaeological resources that are important to preserve in place rather than to recover for archaeological research. The determination of the importance to preserve in place will be based on consultation with the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO)/Tribal Historic Preservation Officer (THPO), federally recognized Tribes (as appropriate), and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) (if participating). *Attach documentation of consultation*. |  | [] |  |
| 1. The impact on the historic site resulting from the use of the land is considered “minor”. The word minor is narrowly defined as having either “no effect” or “no adverse effect” on the qualities that qualified the site for listing or eligibility for listing on the NRHP. The ACHP must not object to the determination of “no adverse effect”. |  |  | [] |
| 1. The SHPO/THPO agrees, in writing, with the assessment of the impacts of the proposed project on the historic site and the proposed mitigation for the historic site. |  |  | [] |
| 1. Does the project require the preparation of an environmental impact statement? |  | [] |  |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Alternatives and Findings | **N/A** | **YES** | **NO** |
| *Support the following project alternatives with evaluations that clearly discuss potential impacts and demonstrate each of the following findings. Include maps and diagrams.* |  |  |  |
| 1. Discuss the impacts of the Do Nothing Alternative.   **Demonstrate:** That the Do Nothing Alternative:   * 1. Would not correct existing or projected capacity deficiencies; or   2. Would not correct existing safety hazards; or   3. Would not correct existing deteriorated conditions and maintenance problems; and   4. That not providing such correction would constitute a cost or community impact of extraordinary magnitude, or would result in truly unusual or unique problems when compared with the proposed use of the Section 4(f) property |  |  |  |
| **Discussion:** | | | |
| **Finding:** A Do Nothing Alternative that does not use the Section 4(f) property has been evaluated and is not considered feasible and prudent. |  |  | [] |
| 1. Identify a highway improvement (i.e. design option within the preferred alternative) that does not use adjacent Section 4(f) property and discuss its impacts.   **Demonstrate** that roadway design measures or transportation system management techniques (including, but not limited to, minor alignment shifts, changes in geometric design standards, use of retaining walls and/or other structures, and traffic diversions or other traffic management measures) would result in:   * 1. Substantial adverse community impacts to adjacent homes, businesses, or other improved properties; or   2. Substantially increased roadway or structure cost; or   3. Unique engineering, traffic, maintenance, or safety problems; or   4. Substantial adverse social, economic, or environmental impacts; or   5. The improvement would not meet the identified transportation needs; and   6. The impacts, costs, or problems would be truly unusual or unique, or of extraordinary magnitude when compared with the proposed use of the Section 4(f) property. |  |  |  |
| **Discussion:** | | | |
| **Finding:** A highway improvement that does not use the Section 4(f) property has been evaluated and is not considered feasible and prudent. |  |  | [] |
| 1. Identify a Build Alternative on new location that does not use the Section 4(f) property and fully discuss the resulting impacts.   **Demonstrate**that the new location:   1. Would not solve existing transportation, safety, or maintenance problems; or 2. Would result in substantial adverse social, economic, or environmental impacts (including such impacts as extensive severing of productive farmlands, displacement of a substantial number of families or businesses, serious disruption of established travel patterns, substantial damage to wetlands or other sensitive natural areas, or greater impacts to other Section 4(f) lands); or 3. Would substantially increase costs or engineering difficulties (such as an inability to achieve minimum design standards, or to meet the requirements of various permitting agencies such as those involved with navigation, pollution, and the environment); and 4. That such problems, impacts, costs, or difficulties would be truly unusual or unique, or of extraordinary magnitude when compared with the proposed use of Section 4(f) property. |  |  |  |
| **Discussion:** | | | |
| **Finding:** Build Alternatives on new location have been evaluated and are not considered feasible or prudent. |  |  | [] |

| Minimization of Harm | **N/A** | **YES** | **NO** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Does the proposed action include all possible planning to minimize harm? Measures to minimize harm consist of those measures necessary to preserve the historic integrity of the site and are agreed to, in accordance with 36 CFR Part 800 by the DOT&PF, the SHPO/THPO, and as appropriate, the ACHP. |  |  | [] |

| Coordination |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Has the proposed project been coordinated with the SHPO/THPO, the ACHP (if required), and interested parties as called for in 36 CFR Part 800?   Summarize coordination: |  |  | [] |
| 1. For historic sites encumbered with Federal interests, has the proposed project been coordinated with the Federal agencies responsible for the encumbrances?   Summarize coordination:    *Note: Before applying this programmatic evaluation to projects requiring an individual bridge permit, the Division Administrator shall coordinate with the U.S. Coast Guard District Commander.* |  |  | [] |

| Determination and Approval | | | | | | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| All applicable coordination and consultations have occurred during the development of this Section 4(f) Evaluation, and this project meets all criteria and findings required for approval under the FHWA, Programmatic Section 4(f) Evaluation approval dated December 23, 1986. | | | | | | | | |
| Recommended Approval by: |  |  | |  | |  | | |
|  | [Printed Name and Signature] Regional Environmental Manager |  | | Date | |  | | |
| Based on the above considerations, there is no feasible and prudent alternative to the use of land from the [name of site] and the proposed action includes all possible planning to minimize harm to the [name of site] resulting from such use. | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | |
| DOT&PF has determined that the project complies with 12/23/86, “Final Nationwide Section 4(f) Evaluation and Approval for Federally Aided Highway Projects With Minor Involvements With Minor Involvements with Historic Sites” (1986 Programmatic) and that:   1. This project meets the applicability criteria prescribed. 2. All of the alternatives set forth have been fully evaluated. 3. The findings in this document, which include that there is no feasible and prudent alternatives to the use of land from or non-historic improvements on the historic site, are clearly applicable to the project. 4. The project complies with the Measures to Minimize Harm section of the 1986 Programmatic, 5. The coordination called for in the 1986 Programmatic has been successfully completed. 6. All measures to minimize harm will be incorporated in the project; and 7. All documentation identifying the basis for the above determinations and assurances are contained in the project file. | | | | | | | | |
|  | | | | | | | | |
| Approved by: |  | |  | |  | |  |
|  | [Printed Name and Signature] NEPA Program Manager | |  | | Date | |  |