|  |  |
| --- | --- |
|  | **PROGRAMMATIC SECTION 4(f) EVALUATION FORMSection 4(f) Evaluation and Approval for** **Transportation Projects That Have a Net Benefit to a Section 4(f) Property****For NEPA Assignment Program Projects** |
| Project Name:      Project Numbers (Federal and State):      Section 4(f) Resource:       This Section 4(f) properties is a: [ ]  Parks+ property (skip Section III) [ ]  Historic property (complete Section III)Date:      List of Attachments:       |

*This programmatic Section 4(f) form is to be used for certain federally assisted transportation improvement projects on existing or new alignments that will use property of a Section 4(f) park, recreation area, wildlife or waterfowl refuge, or historic property, which in the in the view of the DOT&PF and official(s) with jurisdiction over the Section 4(f) property, the use of the Section 4(f) property will result in a net benefit to the Section 4(f) property.*

*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 Section 4(f) property. Description should include size, location, type of property, ownership and identification of official with jurisdiction over the Section 4(f) property, and existing and/or documented planned activities, features and attributes of the property. If it is a historic property, provide the significance criterion & aspects of historic integrity that qualify the property to be eligible for the National Register of Historic Properties. Include a map depicting the boundaries and major features of the Section 4(f) property in relation to the proposed project*.

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  Applicability Requirements for Historic Properties |  | **YES** | **NO** |
| 1. For historic properties, does the project require the major alteration of the characteristics that qualify the property for the National Register of Historic Places (NRHP) such that the property would no longer retain sufficient integrity to be considered eligible for listing?
 |  | [[ ] ] | [ ]  |
| 1. For archaeological properties, does the project require the disturbance or removal of the archaeological resources that have been determined important for preservation in-place rather than for the information that can be obtained through data recovery?

*The determination of a major alteration or the importance to preserve in-place will be based on consultation consistent with 36 CFR part 800.*  |  | [[ ] ] | [ ]  |
| 1. For historic properties, consistent with 36 CFR part 800, is there agreement among the SHPO and /or THPO, as appropriate, and the DOT&PF on measures to minimize harm when there is a use of Section 4(f) property? Such measures must be incorporated into the project.
 |  | [ ]  | [[ ] ] |
| Describe SHPO/THPO consultation and findings. |  |  |  |
|       |
|  |
| Alternatives and Findings | **N/A** | **YES** | **NO** |
| *This section is used to demonstrate that there are no feasible and prudent alternatives to the use of the Section 4(f) property.**The programmatic evaluation does not apply if a feasible and prudent alternative is identified that is not discussed in this document.* |  |  |  |
| 1. Discuss the impacts of the Do Nothing Alternative.

**Demonstrate** that the action would not address nor correct the transportation need cited as the NEPA purpose and need which necessitated the proposed project. |  |  |  |
|       |
| **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. Describe an alternative that would improve the transportation facility in a manner that addresses the purpose and need without use of the Section 4(f) property.

**Demonstrate** that it is not feasible and prudent to avoid Section 4(f) property by using engineering design or transportation system management techniques, such as minor location shifts, changes in engineering design standards, use of retaining walls and/or other structures, and traffic diversions or other traffic management measures because they would result in:* 1. Substantial adverse community impacts to adjacent homes, businesses, or other improved properties; or
	2. Substantially increased transportation facility or structure cost; or
	3. Unique engineering, traffic, maintenance, or safety problems; or
	4. Substantial adverse social, economic, or environmental impacts; or
	5. A substantial missed opportunity to benefit a Section 4(f) property; or
	6. The improvement would not meet the identified transportation needs;

and* 1. 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 after taking into account measures to minimize harm and mitigate for adverse uses, and enhance the functions and value 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 address or correct the problems cited as the NEPA purpose and need, which necessitated the proposed project; 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 community cohesion, jeopardize the continued existence of any endangered or threatened species or resulting in the destruction or adverse modification of their designated critical habitat, substantial damage to wetlands or other sensitive natural areas, or greater impacts to other Section 4(f) properties; or
	3. Would substantially increase costs or cause substantial 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, or the environment); and
	4. Would result in such problems, impacts, costs, or difficulties that would be truly unusual or unique, or of extraordinary magnitude when compared with the proposed use of Section 4(f) property after taking into account proposed measures to minimize harm, mitigation for adverse use, and the enhancement of the Section 4(f) property’s functions and value.
 |  |  |  |
| **Discussion:**  |  |  |  |
|       |  |  |  |
| **Finding:** Build Alternatives on new location have been evaluated and are not considered feasible and prudent. |  | [ ]  | [[ ] ] |

| Minimization of Harm |  | **YES** | **NO** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. Does the proposed action include all possible planning to minimize harm, include appropriate mitigation measures, and has the official with jurisdiction agreed in writing to these measures?
 |  | [ ]  | [[ ] ] |
| 1. Discuss minimization and mitigation measures:
 |  |  |  |
|       |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Coordination and Public Involvement  | **N/A** | **YES** | **NO** |
| 1. Has the proposed project been coordinated with the federal, state, and/or local officials having jurisdiction over the Section 4(f) property?
 |  | [ ]  | [[ ] ] |
| 1. Summarize coordination.
 |  |  |  |
|       |
| 1. In the case of non-federal Section 4(f) property, the official with jurisdiction has been asked to identify any federal encumbrances [e.g. lands from a site purchased or improved with funds under the *Land and Water Conservation Fund Act (LWCF)*, the *Federal Aid in Fish Restoration Act* (Dingell-Johnson Act), the *Federal Aid in Wildlife Act* (Pittman-Robertson Act) or similar laws or lands are otherwise encumbered with a Federal interest].

If applicable, discuss any encumbrances and include a copy of the correspondence (e.g. letter, e-mail, phone log) from the official with jurisdiction of the Section 4(f) property and any appropriate officials regarding federal encumbrances (e.g. Alaska Department of Natural Resources Grants Administrator for the LWCF). | [ ]  | [ ]  | [[ ] ] |
|  |  |  |
|       |
| 1. As the official with jurisdiction over the Section 4(f) property I have reviewed and concur with the assessment of impacts; the proposed measures to minimize harm; and the mitigation necessary to preserve, rehabilitate and enhance those features and values of the Section 4(f) property; and that such measures will result in a net benefit to the Section 4(f) property.
 |  | [ ]  | [[ ] ] |
|  |       |       |  |
|  | [Printed Name and Signature] Official with Jurisdiction over the Section 4(f) ResourceTitle and Agency/Division:       |  | Date |  |
| 1. The project includes public involvement activities that are consistent with the specific requirements of 23 CFR 771.111, early coordination, public involvement and project development. For a project where one or more public meetings or hearings are held, information on the proposed use of the Section 4(f) property shall be communicated at the public meeting(s) or hearing(s).
 |  | [ ]  | [[ ] ] |
| Summarize public involvement. |  |  |
|       |

|  Determination and Approval |
| --- |
| All applicable coordination and consultations have occurred during the development of this Section 4(f) Evaluation, and DOT&PF has determined that the project complies with April 19, 2005, “Section 4(f) Evaluation and Approval for Transportation Projects That Have a Net Benefit to a Section 4(f) Property” (2005 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 conclude that the alternative recommended is the only feasible and prudent alternative) result in a clear net benefit to the Section 4(f) property.
4. The project complies with the Mitigation and Measures to Minimize Harm section of the 2005 Programmatic, and
5. The coordination and public involvement efforts required by the 2005 Programmatic have been successfully completed and necessary written agreements have been obtained.
 |
| 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. |
| Approved by: |       |  |       |  |
|  | [Printed Name and Signature] NEPA Program Manager |  | Date |  |
| *Distribute copies of the approved Programmatic 4(f) Evaluation to the federal, state, and/or local officials having jurisdiction over the Section 4(f) property.* |