|  |  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
|  | | | | |
| Bridge Name: <Enter Bridge Name> | | | | |
| Bridge Location: <Enter Bridge Location> | | | | |
| County: <Enter Name of County> | | | | |
| District: <Enter Name of District> | | | | |
| Control Section Job Number (CSJ): <Enter CSJ Number> | | | | |
| Highway/Facility: <Enter Highway/Facility> | | | | |
| Bridge Type: <Enter Bridge Type> | | | | |
| NB #: <Enter NB Number> | | | | |
| The environmental review, consultation and other actions required by applicable Federal environmental laws for this project are being, or have been, carried out by TxDOT pursuant to 23 U.S.C. 327 and a Memorandum of Understanding dated July 17, 2025, and executed by FHWA and TxDOT. | | | | |
| I. Description of Section 4(f) Property, Project Scope, and Need and Purpose Statement | | | | |
| <Enter the project's Need and Purpose Statement and a brief description of the project scope> | | | | |
|  | | | | |
| II. Determination of Applicability | | | | |
| *All must result in a Yes answer for this checklist to be used.* | | | | |
| Yes | No |  | |
|  |  | The project requires the use of a bridge defined as historic per Section 106 regulations. (36 CFR 800) | |
|  |  | The historic bridge is not a designated National Historic Landmark (NHL). | |
|  |  | The project results in: | | |
|  |  | Section 4(f) use of a historic bridge, AND | | |
|  |  | Additional impacts to protected Section 4(f) properties are limited to *de minimis* or exception categories as specified in the Scope of Work. | | |
|  | | | | |
| III. Identify additional Section 4(f) properties in the project area | | | | |
| *Either exception, de minimis, or another programmatic* | | | | |
| <List additional Section 4(f) properties here> | | | | |
| **Comments:** <Enter comments on additional Section 4(f) properties> | | | | |
|  | | | | |
| IV. Alternatives Considered/Findings | | | | |
| **No Build** *(Indicate all that apply.)* | | | |
|  | **Structural Deficiencies**  The No Build alternative does not correct the situation that causes the bridge to be considered structurally deficient or significantly deteriorated. These deficiencies can lead to eventual structural failure/collapse. Normal maintenance is not considered adequate to address these deficiencies. | | |
|  | **Functional/Geometric Deficiencies**  The No Build alternative does not correct the situation that causes the bridge to be considered functionally/geometrically deficient. These deficiencies can lead to safety hazards to the traveling public or place unacceptable restrictions on transport and travel. | | |
|  | **Justification** *(Summary describing constraints posed by terrain; adverse social, economic, or environmental effects, engineering and economic considerations, and preservation standards)*  <Enter Justification Summary here> | | |
|  | **Recommendation (Mandatory)**  TxDOT determined this alternative <meets/fails> the Section 4(f) prudent and feasible standard and <is/is not> recommended. | | |
|  | | | | |
| **Alternative: Build on New Location (conversion to one-way pair/parallel construction with monument)** | | | |
|  | **Structural Deficiencies**  The New Location alternative does not correct the situation that causes the bridge to be considered structurally deficient or significantly deteriorated. These deficiencies can lead to eventual structural failure/collapse. Normal maintenance is not considered adequate to address these deficiencies. | | |
|  | **Functional/Geometric Deficiencies**  The New Location alternative does not correct the situation that causes the bridge to be considered functionally/geometrically deficient. These deficiencies can lead to safety hazards to the traveling public or place unacceptable restrictions on transport and travel. | | |
|  | **Justification** *(Summary describing constraints posed by terrain; adverse social, economic, or environmental effects, engineering and economic considerations, and preservation standards)*  <Enter Justification Summary here> | | |
|  | **Recommendation (Mandatory)**  TxDOT determined this alternative <meets/fails> the Section 4(f) prudent and feasible standard and <is/is not> recommended. | | |
|  | | | | |
| **Alternative: Rehabilitation of Historic Bridge (two-way vehicular/pedestrian in situ or relocated)** | | | |
|  | **Structural Deficiencies**  The Rehabilitation alternative does not correct the situation that causes the bridge to be considered structurally deficient or significantly deteriorated. These deficiencies can lead to eventual structural failure/collapse. Normal maintenance is not considered adequate to address these deficiencies. | | |
|  | **Functional/Geometric Deficiencies**  The Rehabilitation alternative does not correct the situation that causes the bridge to be considered functionally/geometrically deficient. These deficiencies can lead to safety hazards to the traveling public or place unacceptable restrictions on transport and travel. | | |
|  | **Justification** *(Summary describing constraints posed by terrain; adverse social, economic, or environmental effects, engineering and economic considerations, and preservation standards)*  <Enter Justification Summary here> | | |
|  | **Recommendation (Mandatory)**  TxDOT determined this alternative <meets/fails>the Section 4(f) prudent and feasible standard and <is/is not> recommended. | | |
|  | | | | |
| **Alternative: Replacement on Current Alignment** | | | |
|  | **Structural Deficiencies**  The Replacement alternative corrects the situation that causes the bridge to be considered structurally deficient or significantly deteriorated. | | |
|  | **Functional/Geometric Deficiencies**  The Replacement alternative corrects the situation that causes the bridge to be considered functionally/geometrically deficient. | | |
|  | **Justification** *(Summary describing constraints posed by terrain; adverse social, economic, or environmental effects, engineering and economic considerations, and preservation standards)*  <Enter Justification Summary here> | | |
|  | **Recommendation (Mandatory)**  TxDOT determined this alternative <meets/fails>the Section 4(f) prudent and feasible standard and <is/is not> recommended**.** | | |
|  | | | | |
| V. Measures to Minimize Harm | | | | |
| *Indicate all that apply, but a minimum of one must be selected. Verify that the project includes all possible planning to minimize harm.* | | | | |
|  | Measures taken to preserve historic integrity per preservation standards | | |
|  | Measures taken to market historic bridge for alternative use | | |
|  | Alternative design measures taken to address deficiencies that complies with codes | | |
|  | Other measures taken to address deficiencies that complies with codes | | |
|  | | | | |
| VI. Mitigation Commitment | | | | |
| *Describe mitigation agreed to in consultation with SHPO and other consulting parties.* | | | | |
|  | Programmatic | | <Describe mitigation> | |
|  | Customized | | <Describe mitigation> | |
|  | | | | |
| VII. Summary and Approval | | | | |
| The environmental review, consultation, and other actions required by applicable Federal environmental laws for this project are being, or have been, carried out by TxDOT pursuant to 23 U.S.C. 327 and a Memorandum of Understanding dated 12-9-19 and executed by FHWA and TxDOT.  The proposed project meets all the applicability criteria set forth by the Federal Highway Administration’s (FHWA) guidance for Programmatic Bridge Section 4(f) Evaluation. TxDOT fully evaluated all alternatives set forth in the subject programmatic and the findings made are clearly applicable to this project. There are **no feasible and prudent alternatives** to the use of the historic bridge.  The project includes all possible planning to minimize harm. The Texas Department of Transportation (TxDOT) will include the measures to minimize harm as environmental commitments in the applicable National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) document and Environmental Compliance Oversight System (ECOS) for the proposed project. | | | | |
| The following **MUST** be attached to this checklist to ensure proper documentation of the Historic Bridge Programmatic Section 4(f): | | | | |
|  | 1. Concurrence letter with the Official with Jurisdiction | | | |
|  | 2. Proof of Historic Bridge Marketing | | | |
|  | 3. Historic Bridge Team Report | | | |
|  | 4. Detour Map | | | |
|  | 5. Photographs of the bridge detailing conditions cited in alternatives analyses | | | |
|  | 6. Comparative alternatives analysis chart | | | |