|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | **Programmatic Section 4(f) Evaluation Form**  **for**  **Use of Historic Bridges**  **For NEPA Assignment Program Projects \_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_\_** | | | | |
| Project Name:  Project Numbers (Federal and State):  Bridge Name & Number:  Date:  List of Attachments: | | | | |
| *Use this programmatic Section 4(f) form when a project will “use” a bridge that is on or eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) and when the action will impair the historic integrity of the bridge either by rehabilitation or demolition. Rehabilitation that does not impair the historic integrity of the bridge as determined by procedures implementing the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 (as amended) is not subject to Section 4(f).*  *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.  Refer to 4/14/2022, “Section 4(f) Historic Bridge Programmatic Reference Information” document for guidance on filling out this form. | | | | | |
| **I. Project Description** | |  |  |  |
|  | | | | |

**II. Section 4(f) Property Description**

*Describe the historic bridge that is on or eligible for inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP). Include type of bridge, 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 location of the bridge in relation to the proposed project.*

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **III. Applicability** |  | **YES** | **NO** |
| 1. The proposed action will replace or rehabilitate a bridge with federal funds. |  |  | [] |
| 1. The project will require the use of a historic bridge structure which is on or is eligible for listing on the NRHP. |  |  | [] |
| 1. The historic bridge is a National Historic Landmark. |  | [] |  |
| 1. Will the project impair the historic integrity of the bridge either by demolition or rehabilitation? |  |  | [] |
| 1. Has the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP, if appropriate) concurred in writing with the assessment of impacts (i.e., finding of effect) and the proposed mitigation? Attach documentation. |  |  | [] |

| **IV. Alternatives and Findings** |  | **YES** | **NO** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| *Support the following project alternatives with evaluations that clearly discuss potential impacts and demonstrate each finding. Include maps and diagrams.* |  |  |  |
| 1. Discuss the impacts of the Do Nothing Alternative.   **Demonstrate:**   1. Maintenance: That the do nothing alternative does not correct the situation that causes the bridge to be considered structurally deficient or deteriorated, and normal maintenance is not considered adequate to address the deficiencies; and 2. Safety: That the do nothing alternative does not correct the situation that causes the bridge to be considered deficient, and the bridge poses serious and unacceptable safety hazards to the traveling public or places intolerable restriction on transport and travel. |  |  |  |
| **Discussion:** | | | |
| **Finding**:The Do Nothing Alternative has been evaluated and has been determined for reasons of maintenance and safety not to be feasible and prudent. |  |  | [] |
| 1. Discuss building a new structure at a different location without using the historic bridge or affecting the historic integrity of the old bridge.   **Demonstrate:**   1. Terrain: That the present bridge structure has already been located at the only feasible and prudent site (i.e., a gap in the landform, the narrowest point of the river canyon, etc.), and to build a new bridge at another site will result in extraordinary bridge and approach engineering and construction difficulty or costs, or extraordinary disruption to established traffic patterns; or 2. Adverse Social, Economic, or Environmental Effects: That building a new bridge away from the present site would result in social, economic, or environmental impact of extraordinary magnitude, and such impacts as extensive severing of productive farmlands, displacement of a significant number of families or businesses, serious disruption of established travel patterns, and access and damage to wetlands may individually or cumulatively weigh heavily against relocation to a new site; or 3. Engineering and Economy: Where difficulty associated with the new location is less extreme than those encountered above, a new site would not be feasible and prudent where cost and engineering difficulties reach extraordinary magnitude, and factors supporting this conclusion include significantly increased roadway and structure costs, serious foundation problems, or extreme difficulty in reaching the new site with construction equipment; additional design and safety factors to be considered include an ability to achieve minimum design standards or to meet requirements of various permitting agencies such as those involved with navigation, pollution, and the environment; and 4. Preservation of Old Bridge: That it is not feasible and prudent to preserve the existing bridge, even if a new bridge were to be built at a new location. This could occur when the historic bridge is beyond rehabilitation for transportation or an alternative use, when no responsible party can be located to maintain and preserve the bridge, or when a permitting authority, such as the Coast Guard, requires removal or demolition of the old bridge. |  |  |  |
| **Discussion:** | | | |
| **Finding:** Constructing a bridge on a new location or parallel to the historic bridge has been evaluated and is not considered feasible and prudent. |  |  | [] |
| 1. Discuss rehabilitating the historic bridge without affecting the historic integrity of the structure, as determined by the Section 106 procedures implementing the NRHP and fully discuss the resulting impacts.   **Demonstrate:**   1. That the bridge is so structurally deficient that it cannot be rehabilitated to meet minimum acceptable load requirements without affecting the historic integrity of the bridge; or 2. That the bridge is seriously deficient geometrically and cannot be widened to meet the minimum required capacity of the highway system on which it is located without affecting the historic integrity of the bridge. Flexibility in the application of American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) geometric standards should be exercised, as permitted in 23 CFR Part 625, during the analysis of this alternative. |  |  |  |
| **Discussion:** | | | |
| **Finding:** Rehabilitation without affecting the historic integrity of the bridge has been evaluated and is not considered feasible or prudent. |  |  | [] |

|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **V. Measures to Minimize Harm** | |  | | **YES** | | **NO** | |
| Have you identified measures to minimize harm on the Section 4(f) property? | |  | |  | | [] | |
| Measures to minimize harm will consist of those measures necessary to preserve the historic integrity of the site and agreed to, in accordance with 36 CFR Part 800, by DOT&PF, SHPO, and as appropriate, the ACHP: | |  | |  | |  | |
| 1. For bridges that are to be rehabilitated, the historic integrity of the bridge is preserved, to the greatest extent possible, consistent with unavoidable transportation needs, safety, and load requirements; | |  | |  | |  | |
| 1. For bridges that are to be rehabilitated to the point that the historic integrity is affected or that are to be moved or demolished, the DOT&PF ensures that, in accordance with the Historic American Engineering Record (HAER) standards, or other suitable means developed through consultation, fully adequate records are made of the bridge; | |  | |  | |  | |
| 1. For bridges that are to be replaced, the existing bridge is made available for an alternative use, provided a responsible party agrees to maintain and preserve the bridge; and | |  | |  | |  | |
| 1. For bridges that are adversely affected, written agreement with SHPO and the ACHP (as appropriate) is reached through the Section 106 process of the NHPA on measures to minimize harm and those measures are incorporated into the project. This programmatic Section 4(f) evaluation does not apply to projects where such an agreement cannot be reached. | |  | |  | |  | |
| Discuss minimization measures and attach relevant documentation: | | | | | | | |
| VI. Coordination  1. Has the proposed project been coordinated with SHPO, the ACHP, Tribal, and other interested parties (including property owners) as called for in 36 CFR Part 800; and has SHPO (and the ACHP if appropriate) concurred in writing with the assessment of the impacts on the proposed project on, and the proposed measures to minimize harm for, the Section 4(f) property? 2. Summarize Section 106 consultation efforts and dates and attach documentation, including concurrence from SHPO. | |  | | **YES** | | **NO** | |
|  | |  | | [] | |
|  | | | | | | | |

|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| **VII. 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 July 5, 1983, “Final Nationwide Section 4(f) Evaluation and Approval for FHWA Projects that Necessitate the Use of Historic Bridges” 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 alternative to the use of the historic bridge, are clearly applicable to the project. 4. The project complies with the Measures to Minimize Harm section of the 1983 Programmatic, and 5. All measures to minimize harm will be implemented. 6. The coordination called for in the 1983 Programmatic has been successfully completed. 7. For bridge replacement projects over navigable waters, DOT&PF has coordinated with the U.S. Coast Guard. 8. Documentation in the project file clearly identifies the basis for the above determinations and assurances. | | | | |
|  | | | | |
| Recommended Approval by: |  | | Date: |  | |
|  | [Printed Name and Signature] Regional Environmental Manager | |  | | | |
| Based on the above considerations, there is no feasible and prudent alternative to the use of land from the      Bridge and the proposed action includes all possible planning to minimize harm to the       Bridge resulting from such use. | | | | | |
| Approved by: | |  | Date: |  | |
|  | | [Printed Name and Signature] NEPA Program Manager |  |  | |