Planning and Environmental Linkages
Questionnaire and Checklist

The Planning and Environmental Linkage (PEL) process, a specific product of implementing SAFETEA-LU, seeks to develop subarea and corridor studies that can be used more directly to inform the NEPA process. Effective, conceptual-level transportation planning studies that follow the PEL process provide opportunities both to identify important issues of concern early and to build the agency, stakeholder, and public understanding necessary to successfully address them. Such early, integrated planning is not driven solely by regulatory requirements and the quest for more efficient and effective processes, although those are desirable results. Transportation and environmental professionals—as well as those in metropolitan planning organizations, state and federal resource agencies, and nongovernmental organizations—are finding that early collaboration helps achieve broader transportation and environmental stewardship goals through better decisions regarding programs, planning, and projects.

This document has been developed by the Arizona Department of Transportation (ADOT) to provide guidance, particularly to transportation planners and environmental planners, regarding how to most effectively link the transportation planning and NEPA processes. By considering the questions and issues raised in this questionnaire, transportation planners will become more aware of potential gaps in their subarea or corridor studies, better understand the needs of future users of the studies, and be reminded of the benefits of wider and/or deeper collaboration with agencies, the public, and other stakeholders. Environmental planners who fill out the checklist will assume a new role in the transportation planning process: becoming an advocate for early awareness of environmental issues before the NEPA process begins.

This questionnaire and checklist will be used to effectively influence the scope, content, and process employed for ADOT transportation planning studies that focus on specific transportation corridors or on transportation network subareas (versus statewide transportation studies). Completion of this questionnaire and checklist will support the PEL process and serve dual objectives:

1. provide guidance to transportation planners on the level of detail needed to ensure that information collected and decisions made during the transportation planning study can be used during the NEPA process for a proposed transportation project
2. provide the future NEPA study team with documentation on the outcomes of the transportation planning process, including the history of decisions made and the level of detailed analysis undertaken

When conducting a transportation planning study that links to the future NEPA process, major issues include:

1. identifying the appropriate level of environmental analysis for the study
2. identifying the appropriate level of agency, stakeholder, and public involvement
3. defining unique study concurrence points for seeking agreement from relevant resource agencies, stakeholders, and members of the public

---

1 Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users (Public Law 109-59)
2 National Environmental Policy Act of 1969
• developing a process to ensure that the study will be recognized as valid within the NEPA process
• identifying when to involve resource agencies in the study, and to what extent they influence decision making
• identifying how to persuade U.S. Department of Transportation (USDOT) reviewers to accept the use of these studies in the NEPA process

These issues should be considered throughout the transportation planning study process. Users of this *ADOT Planning and Environmental Linkages Questionnaire and Checklist* should review the entire document at the beginning of the study to familiarize themselves with whatever local and general issues may be operative. The questionnaire is provided in two parts: one to be completed by transportation planners at the beginning of the study and one to be completed at the end. The checklist (Part 3) should be used by environmental planners throughout the study and should be finalized at the end of the study.

Upon completion of the transportation planning study, this document should be included as an appendix to the study’s final report to document how the study meets the requirements of 23 Code of Federal Regulations § 450.212 or § 450.318 (Subpart B: Statewide Transportation Planning and Programming or Subpart C: Metropolitan Transportation Planning and Programming, respectively).

The flowchart on the following page outlines the major inputs, decision points, and outcomes that occur during implementation of a transportation planning study using the PEL process.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PEL Launch</th>
<th>Transportation Planners</th>
<th>Both</th>
<th>Environmental Planners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Review Part 1 and Part 2 of questionnaire</td>
<td>Become familiar with local and general issues</td>
<td>Review checklist</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Complete Part 1 of questionnaire</td>
<td>Modify study scope to include or deepen analysis of specific resources or environmental issues</td>
<td>Advocate inclusion of resources and issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis and Comment</td>
<td>Define, clarify, analyze, and screen modes, corridors, and alternatives (including no-action alternative)</td>
<td>Become familiar with local and general issues</td>
<td>Seek resource agency assistance in changing study scope</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involve relevant stakeholders, agencies, and public in comments and reviews to ensure later acceptability and defensibility in NEPA</td>
<td>Modify study scope to include or deepen analysis of specific resources or environmental issues</td>
<td>Continue to advocate addressing collection and analysis of data pertinent to effective application in NEPA process</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PEL Completion</td>
<td>Complete Part 2 of questionnaire</td>
<td>Include questionnaire and checklist in appendix to study</td>
<td>Complete checklist (Part 3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Document relevant findings for use in later NEPA documents</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Beginning of NEPA Process**

Environmental planners review completed PEL questionnaire and checklist and confirm that study recommendations and analyses can support the anticipated NEPA process(es) and document type(s), including, if applicable, incorporation into the content of a Notice of Intent.
# Questionnaire for Transportation Planners – Part 1

This part of the questionnaire should be completed by transportation planners at the beginning of the transportation planning study. Please note that planners should also review the second part of the questionnaire to understand what additional issues will need to be considered and documented as the study progresses.

## Project identification

What is the name of the study? What cities and region does it cover? What major streets are covered? For corridor studies, what are the intended termini?

Who is the study sponsor?

Briefly describe the study and its purpose.

Who are the primary study team members (include name, title, organization name, and contact information)?

Does the team include advisory groups such as a technical advisory committee, steering committee, or other? If so, include roster(s) as attachment(s).

Have previous transportation planning studies been conducted for this region? If so, provide a brief chronology, including the years the studies were completed. Provide contact names and locations of the studies and study websites.

What current or near-future planning (or other) studies in the vicinity are underway or will be undertaken? What is the relationship of this study to those studies? Provide contact names and locations of the studies and study websites.

## Study objectives

What are your desired outcomes for this study? (Mark all that apply.)

- [ ] Stakeholder identification
- [ ] Stakeholder roles/responsibilities definition
- [ ] Travel study area definition
- [ ] Performance measures development
- [ ] Development of purpose and need goals and other objectives
- [ ] Alternative evaluation and screening
- [ ] Alternative travel modes definition
- [ ] Scheduling of infrastructure improvements over short-, mid-, and long-range time frames
- [ ] Environmental impacts
- [ ] Mitigation identification
- [ ] Don't know
- [ ] Other ________________________________

Have system improvements and additions that address your transportation need been identified in a fiscally constrained regional transportation plan?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Establishment of organizational relationships</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is a partnering agreement in place? If so, who are signatories (for example, affected agencies, stakeholders, organizations)? Attach the partnering agreement(s).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What are the key coordination points in the decision-making process?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning assumptions and analytical methods</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is the time horizon of the study sufficiently long to consider long-term (20 years or more from completion of the study) effects of potential scenarios?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What method will be used for forecasting traffic volumes (for example, traffic modeling or growth projections)? What are the sources of data being used? Has USDOT validated their use?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Will the study use FHWA’s Guide on the Consistent Application of Traffic Analysis Tools and Methods&lt;sup&gt;6&lt;/sup&gt;? If not, why not? How will traffic volumes from the travel demand model be incorporated, if necessary, into finer-scale applications such as a corridor study?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do the travel demand models base their projections on differentiations between vehicles?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data, information, and tools</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Is there a centralized database or website that all State resource agencies may use to share resource data during the study?</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>5</sup> For an explanation of purpose and need in environmental documents, please see the Federal Highway Administration’s (FHWA’s) “NEPA and Transportation Decisionmaking: The Importance of Purpose and Need in Environmental Documents,” [Purpose and Need](http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/environment/792476.htm). This website provides links to five additional resources and guidance from FHWA that should be helpful in understanding the relationship between goals and objectives in transportation planning studies and purpose and need statements of NEPA documents.

<sup>6</sup> FHWA November 2011 publication: [Traffic Analysis Tools and Methods](http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/trafficanalysis/traffic_analysis.htm)
**Questionnaire for Transportation Planners – Part 2**

This part of the questionnaire should be completed by transportation planners at the end of the transportation planning study. This completed document should become an appendix to the study’s final report to document how the study meets the requirements of 23 Code of Federal Regulations § 450.212 or § 450.318.

### Purpose and need for this study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How did the study process define and clarify corridor-level or subarea-level goals (if applicable) that influenced modal infrastructure improvements and/or the range of reasonable alternatives?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>What were the key steps and coordination points in the decision-making process? Who were the decision-makers and who else participated in those key steps?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How should this study information be presented in future NEPA document(s), if applicable? Are relevant findings documented in a format and at a level of detail that will facilitate reference to and/or inclusion in subsequent NEPA document(s)?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Were the study’s findings and recommendations documented in such a way as to facilitate an FHWA or Federal Transit Administration decision regarding acceptability for application in the NEPA process? Does the study have logical points where decisions were made and where concurrence from resource or regulatory agencies, stakeholders, and the public was sought? If so, provide a list of those points.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Establishment of organizational relationships – tribes and agencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tribe or agency</th>
<th>Date(s) contacted</th>
<th>Describe level of participation</th>
<th>Describe the agency’s primary concerns and the steps needed to coordinate with the agency during NEPA scoping.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Tribal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(name of tribe)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(name of tribe)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Federal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureau of Indian Affairs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureau of Land Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureau of Reclamation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal Highway Administration</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National Park Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Army Corps of Engineers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

7 For an explanation of the types of documents needed under the NEPA process and the nature of the content of those documents, please see “NEPA Documentation: Improving the Quality of Environmental Documents,” [Documentation](#).

8 Users may add rows to this table to accommodate additional tribes and agencies. Unused rows may be deleted.

9 If the transportation planning study final report does not adequately document interactions (for example, meeting minutes, resolutions, letters) with the relevant agencies, append such information to the end of this questionnaire and checklist.
### Establishment of organizational relationships – tribes and agencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tribe or agency</th>
<th>Date(s) contacted</th>
<th>Describe level of participation</th>
<th>Describe the agency’s primary concerns and the steps needed to coordinate with the agency during NEPA scoping.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Department of Agriculture Forest Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Environmental Protection Agency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Department of Defense</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>State</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona Department of Environmental Quality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona Department of Public Safety</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona Game and Fish Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona State Land Department</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>County</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(name of county and department)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(name of county and department)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(name of municipality and department)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(name of municipality and department)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Transportation agencies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(name of agency)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(name of agency)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Establishment of organizational relationships – stakeholders and members of the public

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public and stakeholders</th>
<th>Date(s) contacted</th>
<th>Describe level of participation</th>
<th>Describe the primary concerns expressed by members of the public and stakeholders.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Members of the public</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stakeholders</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (for example, Audubon Society, Center for Biological Diversity, citizen groups, homeowners associations, Sierra Club, private mining or energy interests, railroad companies)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10 Users may add rows to this table to accommodate additional stakeholders.

### Planning assumptions and analytical methods

**Did the study provide regional development and growth assumptions and analyses? If so, what were the sources of the demographic and employment trends and forecasts?**

**What were the future-year policy and/or data assumptions used in the transportation planning process related to land use, economic development, transportation costs, and network expansion?**

**Were the planning assumptions and the corridor vision/purpose and need statement consistent with each other and with the long-range transportation plan? Are the assumptions still valid?**

### Data, information, and tools

**Are the relevant data used in the study available in a compatible format that is readily usable? Are they available through a centralized web portal?**

**Are the completeness and quality of the data consistent with the quality (not scale or detail) of inputs needed for a NEPA project-level analysis?**

**Are the data used in the study regularly updated and augmented? If regularly updated, provide schedule and accessibility information.**

11 For an explanation of the types of information needed to evaluate impacts in environmental documents, please see FHWA’s “NEPA and Transportation Decisionmaking: Impacts,”<Analysis of Impacts>. This website provides links to six additional resources and guidance that should be helpful in understanding the types of impacts that need to be assessed, their context, and their intensity.
Have the environmental data been mapped at scales that facilitate comparison of effects across different resources and at sufficient resolution to guide initial NEPA issue definition? If not, what data collection and/or manipulation would likely be needed for application to the NEPA scoping process?

Examine the Checklist for Environmental Planners, at the back of this document, for more detail about potential impacts that could be mapped. Below is an abbreviated list of resources that could occur in the study area and may be knowable at this time and at the study’s various analytical scales:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource or issue</th>
<th>Is the resource or issue present in the area?</th>
<th>Would any future transportation policies or projects involve the issue? Would there be impacts on the resource?</th>
<th>Resource or issue</th>
<th>Is the resource or issue present in the area?</th>
<th>Would any future transportation policies or projects involve the issue? Would there be impacts on the resource?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sensitive biological resources</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife corridors</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetland areas</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riparian areas</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100-year floodplain</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prime or unique farmland or farmland of statewide or local importance</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual resources</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designated scenic road/byway</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeological resources</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical resources</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12 Section 4(f) of the U.S. Department of Transportation Act of 1966 (49 U.S. Code § 303, as amended); see <Section 4(f)>.
Did the study incorporate models of, for example, species/habitat locations (predictive range maps), future land use, population dynamics, stormwater runoff, or travel demand? What models were used? Did the study adequately document what models were used, who was responsible for their use, and how they were used (with respect to, for example, calibration, replicability, contingencies, and exogenous factors)?

In scoping, conducting, and documenting the planning study, participants have come across documents and leads from agency staff and other sources that the environmental planners may be able to use in conducting their studies. List any applicable memoranda of understanding, cost-share arrangements, programmatic agreements, or technical studies that are underway but whose findings are not yet published, etc.

Development of alternatives

Were resource agencies, stakeholders, and members of the public engaged in the process of identifying, evaluating, and screening out modes, corridors, a range of alternatives, or a preferred alternative (if one was identified—the latter two refer to corridor plans)? If so, how? Did these groups review the recommendation of a preferred mode(s), corridor(s), range of alternatives (including the no-build alternative), or an alternative? Were the participation and inputs of these groups at a level acceptable for use in purpose and need statements or alternatives development sections in NEPA documents? If not, why not?

Describe the process of outreach to resource agencies, the public, and other stakeholders. Describe the documentation of this process and of the responses to their comments. Is this documentation adequate in breadth and detail for use in NEPA documents?

If the study was a corridor study, describe the range of alternatives considered (if any), screening process, and screening criteria. Include what types of alternatives were considered (including the no-build alternative) and how the screening criteria were selected. Was a preferred alternative selected as best addressing the identified transportation issue? Are alternatives' locations and design features specified?

Also regarding whether the study was a corridor study, for alternatives that were screened out, summarize the reasons for their rejection. Are defensible, credible rationale articulated for their being screened out? Did the study team take into account legal standards needed in the NEPA process for such decisions? Did the study team have adequate information for screening out the alternatives?

What issues, if any, remain unresolved with the public, stakeholders, and/or resource agencies?

---

13 Section 6(f) of the Land and Water Conservation Fund Act

14 refers to Title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act and 1994 Executive Order 12898 on environmental justice

15 under FHWA’s Noise Abatement Criterion B: picnic areas, recreation areas, playgrounds, active sports areas, parks, residences, motels, hotels, schools, churches, libraries, and hospitals

16 For an explanation of the development of alternatives in environmental documents, please see FHWA’s “NEPA and Transportation Decisionmaking: Development and Evaluation of Alternatives,”<Alternatives>.

Formally joining PEL with the NEPA process

Lead federal agencies proposing a project that will undergo the NEPA process will want to most effectively leverage the transportation planning study’s efforts and results. How could a Notice of Intent (for an environmental impact statement) refer to the study’s findings with respect to preliminary purpose and need and/or the range of alternatives to be studied?

Could a Notice of Intent in the NEPA process clearly state that the lead federal agency or agencies will use analyses from prior, specific planning studies that are referenced in the transportation planning study final report? Does the report provide the name and source of the planning studies and explain where the studies are publicly available? If not, how could such relevant information come to the environmental planners’ attention and be made available to them in a timely way?

List how the study’s proposed transportation system would support adopted land use plans and growth objectives.

What modifications are needed in the goals and objectives as defined in the transportation study process to increase their efficient and timely application in the NEPA process?

Jurisdictional delineations of waters of the United States frequently change. Housing and commercial developments can alter landscapes dramatically and can be constructed quickly. Noise and air quality regulations can change relatively rapidly. Resource agencies frequently alter habitat delineations to protect sensitive species. Will the study data’s currency, relevance, and quality still be acceptable to agencies, stakeholders, and members of the public for use in the NEPA process? If not, what will be done to rectify this problem? Who will be responsible for any needed updating?

Other issues

Are there any other issues a future NEPA study team should be aware of (mark all that apply)? In the space below the check boxes, explain the nature and location of any issue(s) checked.

- Public and/or stakeholders have expressed specific concerns
- Utility problems
- Access or right-of-way issues
- Encroachments into right-of-way
- Need to engage—and be perceived as engaging—specific landowners, citizens, citizen groups, or other stakeholders
- Contact information for stakeholders
- Special or unique resources in the area
- Federal regulations that are undergoing initial promulgation or revision
- Other ________________________________

---

18 While Notices of Intent are required by some federal agencies for environmental assessments, they are optional for FHWA. Please see “3.3.2 Using the Notice of Intent to Link Planning and NEPA,” in Guidance on Using Corridor and Subarea Planning to Inform NEPA (Federal Highway Administration, April 5, 2011), <Notice of Intent>.
### Concurrency

By signature, we concur that the transportation planning document meets or exceeds the following criteria in terms of acceptability for application in NEPA projects:

- [ ] Public involvement (outreach and level of participation)
- [ ] Stakeholder involvement (outreach and level of participation)
- [ ] Resource agencies' involvement and participation
- [ ] Documentation of the above efforts
- [ ] Applicability of the general findings and conclusions for use, by reference, in NEPA documents

Approved by: _________________________________ Date: ______________

**JENNIFER TOTH**  
State Engineer  
Arizona Department of Transportation

Approved by: _________________________________ Date: ______________

**SCOTT OMER**  
Director  
Multimodal Planning Division, Arizona Department of Transportation

Approved by: _________________________________ Date: ______________

**KARLA PETTY**  
Division Administrator  
Federal Highway Administration
Checklist for Environmental Planners – Part 3

By completing this checklist, environmental planners will be able to systematically evaluate the transportation planning study with regard to environmental resources and issues. It provides a framework for future NEPA studies by identifying those resources and issues that have already been evaluated, and those that have not. The role of environmental planners during the study’s various stages is laid out in the flowchart on page 3. This role includes timely advocacy for resources and issues that will later be integral to NEPA processes.

Checklist for environmental planners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource or issue</th>
<th>Is the resource or issue present in the area?</th>
<th>Are impacts to the resource or issue involvement possible?</th>
<th>Are the impacts mitigable?</th>
<th>Discuss the level of review and method of review for this resource or issue and provide the name and location of any study or other information cited in the planning document where it is described in detail. Describe how the planning data may need to be supplemented during NEPA.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Natural environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitive biological resources</td>
<td>Yes  No  Unknown  Not applicable</td>
<td>Yes  No  Unknown  Not applicable</td>
<td>Yes  No  Unknown  Not applicable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife corridors</td>
<td>Yes  No  Unknown  Not applicable</td>
<td>Yes  No  Unknown  Not applicable</td>
<td>Yes  No  Unknown  Not applicable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invasive species</td>
<td>Yes  No  Unknown  Not applicable</td>
<td>Yes  No  Unknown  Not applicable</td>
<td>Yes  No  Unknown  Not applicable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetland areas</td>
<td>Yes  No  Unknown  Not applicable</td>
<td>Yes  No  Unknown  Not applicable</td>
<td>Yes  No  Unknown  Not applicable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riparian areas</td>
<td>Yes  No  Unknown  Not applicable</td>
<td>Yes  No  Unknown  Not applicable</td>
<td>Yes  No  Unknown  Not applicable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100-year floodplain</td>
<td>Yes  No  Unknown  Not applicable</td>
<td>Yes  No  Unknown  Not applicable</td>
<td>Yes  No  Unknown  Not applicable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean Water Act Sections 404/401 waters of the United States</td>
<td>Yes  No  Unknown  Not applicable</td>
<td>Yes  No  Unknown  Not applicable</td>
<td>Yes  No  Unknown  Not applicable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prime or unique farmland</td>
<td>Yes  No  Unknown  Not applicable</td>
<td>Yes  No  Unknown  Not applicable</td>
<td>Yes  No  Unknown  Not applicable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farmland of statewide or local importance</td>
<td>Yes  No  Unknown  Not applicable</td>
<td>Yes  No  Unknown  Not applicable</td>
<td>Yes  No  Unknown  Not applicable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Checklist for environmental planners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource or issue</th>
<th>Is the resource or issue present in the area?</th>
<th>Are impacts to the resource or issue involvement possible?</th>
<th>Are the impacts mitigable?</th>
<th>Discuss the level of review and method of review for this resource or issue and provide the name and location of any study or other information cited in the planning document where it is described in detail. Describe how the planning data may need to be supplemented during NEPA.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sole-source aquifers</td>
<td>□ Yes □ No □ Unknown □ Not applicable</td>
<td>□ Yes □ No □ Unknown □ Not applicable</td>
<td>□ Yes □ No □ Unknown □ Not applicable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wild and scenic rivers</td>
<td>□ Yes □ No □ Unknown □ Not applicable</td>
<td>□ Yes □ No □ Unknown □ Not applicable</td>
<td>□ Yes □ No □ Unknown □ Not applicable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visual resources</td>
<td>□ Yes □ No □ Unknown □ Not applicable</td>
<td>□ Yes □ No □ Unknown □ Not applicable</td>
<td>□ Yes □ No □ Unknown □ Not applicable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designated scenic road/byway</td>
<td>□ Yes □ No □ Unknown □ Not applicable</td>
<td>□ Yes □ No □ Unknown □ Not applicable</td>
<td>□ Yes □ No □ Unknown □ Not applicable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cultural resources</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archaeological resources</td>
<td>□ Yes □ No □ Unknown □ Not applicable</td>
<td>□ Yes □ No □ Unknown □ Not applicable</td>
<td>□ Yes □ No □ Unknown □ Not applicable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Historical resources</td>
<td>□ Yes □ No □ Unknown □ Not applicable</td>
<td>□ Yes □ No □ Unknown □ Not applicable</td>
<td>□ Yes □ No □ Unknown □ Not applicable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section 4(f) and Section 6(f) resources</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 4(f) wildlife and/or waterfowl refuge</td>
<td>□ Yes □ No □ Unknown □ Not applicable</td>
<td>□ Yes □ No □ Unknown □ Not applicable</td>
<td>□ Yes □ No □ Unknown □ Not applicable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 4(f) historic site</td>
<td>□ Yes □ No □ Unknown □ Not applicable</td>
<td>□ Yes □ No □ Unknown □ Not applicable</td>
<td>□ Yes □ No □ Unknown □ Not applicable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 4(f) recreational site</td>
<td>□ Yes □ No □ Unknown □ Not applicable</td>
<td>□ Yes □ No □ Unknown □ Not applicable</td>
<td>□ Yes □ No □ Unknown □ Not applicable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 4(f) park</td>
<td>□ Yes □ No □ Unknown □ Not applicable</td>
<td>□ Yes □ No □ Unknown □ Not applicable</td>
<td>□ Yes □ No □ Unknown □ Not applicable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section 6(f) resource</td>
<td>□ Yes □ No □ Unknown □ Not applicable</td>
<td>□ Yes □ No □ Unknown □ Not applicable</td>
<td>□ Yes □ No □ Unknown □ Not applicable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Checklist for environmental planners

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resource or issue</th>
<th>Is the resource or issue present in the area?</th>
<th>Are impacts to the resource or issue involvement possible?</th>
<th>Are the impacts mitigable?</th>
<th>Discuss the level of review and method of review for this resource or issue and provide the name and location of any study or other information cited in the planning document where it is described in detail. Describe how the planning data may need to be supplemented during NEPA.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Human environment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing development</td>
<td>□ Yes □ No □ Unknown □ Not applicable</td>
<td>□ Yes □ No □ Unknown □ Not applicable</td>
<td>□ Yes □ No □ Unknown □ Not applicable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planned development</td>
<td>□ Yes □ No □ Unknown □ Not applicable</td>
<td>□ Yes □ No □ Unknown □ Not applicable</td>
<td>□ Yes □ No □ Unknown □ Not applicable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Displacements</td>
<td>□ Yes □ No □ Unknown □ Not applicable</td>
<td>□ Yes □ No □ Unknown □ Not applicable</td>
<td>□ Yes □ No □ Unknown □ Not applicable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access restriction</td>
<td>□ Yes □ No □ Unknown □ Not applicable</td>
<td>□ Yes □ No □ Unknown □ Not applicable</td>
<td>□ Yes □ No □ Unknown □ Not applicable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood continuity</td>
<td>□ Yes □ No □ Unknown □ Not applicable</td>
<td>□ Yes □ No □ Unknown □ Not applicable</td>
<td>□ Yes □ No □ Unknown □ Not applicable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community cohesion</td>
<td>□ Yes □ No □ Unknown □ Not applicable</td>
<td>□ Yes □ No □ Unknown □ Not applicable</td>
<td>□ Yes □ No □ Unknown □ Not applicable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Title VI/Environmental justice populations</td>
<td>□ Yes □ No □ Unknown □ Not applicable</td>
<td>□ Yes □ No □ Unknown □ Not applicable</td>
<td>□ Yes □ No □ Unknown □ Not applicable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical environment</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>□ Yes □ No □ Unknown □ Not applicable</td>
<td>□ Yes □ No □ Unknown □ Not applicable</td>
<td>□ Yes □ No □ Unknown □ Not applicable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hazardous materials</td>
<td>□ Yes □ No □ Unknown □ Not applicable</td>
<td>□ Yes □ No □ Unknown □ Not applicable</td>
<td>□ Yes □ No □ Unknown □ Not applicable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensitive noise receivers</td>
<td>□ Yes □ No □ Unknown □ Not applicable</td>
<td>□ Yes □ No □ Unknown □ Not applicable</td>
<td>□ Yes □ No □ Unknown □ Not applicable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Air quality</td>
<td>□ Yes □ No □ Unknown □ Not applicable</td>
<td>□ Yes □ No □ Unknown □ Not applicable</td>
<td>□ Yes □ No □ Unknown □ Not applicable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other (list)</td>
<td>□ Yes □ No □ Unknown □ Not applicable</td>
<td>□ Yes □ No □ Unknown □ Not applicable</td>
<td>□ Yes □ No □ Unknown □ Not applicable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Identification of potential environmental mitigation activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Could the transportation planning process be integrated with other planning activities, such as land use or resource management plans? If so, could this integrated planning effort be used to develop a more strategic approach to environmental mitigation measures?</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>With respect to potential environmental mitigation opportunities at the PEL level, who should ADOT consult with among federal, State, and local agencies and tribes and how formally and frequently should such consultation be undertaken?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Off-site and compensatory mitigation areas are often creatively negotiated to advance multiagency objectives or multiple objectives within one agency. Who determined what specific geographic areas or types of areas were appropriate for environmental mitigation activities? How were these determinations made?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>To address potential impacts on the human environment, what mitigation measures or activities were considered and how were they developed and documented?</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Prepared by: _________________________________ Date: ______________

_________________________

Environmental Planning Group, Arizona Department of Transportation