

Project Information	
Project Name: Enter project name. ADOT Project Number: Enter number Approval MOU: <input type="checkbox"/> 23 U.S.C. 326 <input type="checkbox"/> 23 U.S.C. 327	Federal-aid Number: Enter number NEPA Class of Action: Project Administration: <input type="checkbox"/> ADOT <input type="checkbox"/> LPA

According to Title 23 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 774.17, a property afforded protection under Section 4(f) is defined as “publicly owned land of a public park, recreation area, or wildlife and waterfowl refuge of national, state, or local significance, or land of a historic site of national, state, or local significance.”

Section 4(f) requirements stipulate that the USDOT agencies may not approve the use of a Section 4(f) property unless there is no feasible and prudent alternative to the use of that land, and the proposed action includes all possible planning to minimize harm to the property resulting from such use, OR it is determined that the use of the property, including any measures to minimize harm committed to by the applicant, will have a *de minimis* impact on the property.

The Programmatic Section 4(f) Evaluation and Approval for FHWA Projects that Necessitate the Use of Historic Bridges can be used when there is a Section 106 Adverse Effect finding for rehabilitation or replacement of a bridge on or eligible for listing on the *National Register*.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION:

(Provide a concise description of the proposed action.)

PROJECT PURPOSE AND NEED(s):

(Include the project’s purpose and need(s) as included in the project’s NEPA documentation)

IDENTIFICATION OF SECTION 4(f) PROPERTY:

(List the property and provide a description of the property)

**Nationwide/Programmatic Section 4(f) Evaluation
for Projects that Necessitate the Use of Historic Bridges Form**

APPLICABILITY DETERMINATION:

1. The bridge will be replaced or rehabilitated with federal funds. YES
2. The project requires the use of a historic bridge structure which is eligible for listing or listed on the *National Register of Historic Places* (including contributing elements to a historic district). YES
3. The bridge has not been determined to be a National Historic Landmark (NHL) (If the bridge is a NHL, this programmatic Section 4(f) evaluation does not apply). YES
4. ADOT has determined that the facts of the project match those set forth in the sections of this document labeled Alternatives/Findings and Measures to Minimize Harm. YES
5. A Memorandum of Agreement (MOA)/Programmatic Agreement (PA) has been executed pursuant to 36 CFR 800.6. YES

OR

Agreement has been reached among consulting parties to utilize Attachment 6 of the Statewide Section 106 PA to resolve adverse effects on the bridge.

ALTERNATIVES CONSIDERED/FINDINGS:

1. Verify that the **Do Nothing Alternative** has been examined, and document why it has been determined to ignore the basic transportation need and not be feasible and prudent (Indicate all that apply. A minimum of one must be selected for this programmatic Section 4(f) evaluation to be applicable):

- Maintenance** – The Do Nothing Alternative does not correct the situation that causes the bridge to be considered structurally deficient or deteriorated. These deficiencies can lead to sudden collapse and potential injury or loss of life. Normal maintenance is not considered adequate to address the situation.

Explain (Provide the facts that support this conclusion):

- Safety** – The Do Nothing Alternative does not correct the situation that causes the bridge to be considered deficient. Because of these deficiencies, the bridge poses serious and unacceptable safety hazards to the traveling public or places intolerable restriction on transport and travel.

Explain (Provide the facts that support this conclusion):

**Nationwide/Programmatic Section 4(f) Evaluation
for Projects that Necessitate the Use of Historic Bridges Form**

2. Investigations must be conducted to **construct a bridge on a new location/alignment or parallel to the old bridge** to determine if the alternative would be feasible and prudent. Document below why building on new location/alignment without using the old bridge is not feasible and prudent. *(Indicate all that apply. A minimum of one must be selected for this programmatic Section 4(f) evaluation to be applicable):*

- Terrain** – A new bridge at another site will result in extraordinary bridge and approach engineering and construction difficulty, or cost, or extraordinary disruption to established traffic patterns.
- Adverse Social, Economic, or Environmental Effects** – A new bridge away from the present site would result in social or environmental impact of extraordinary magnitude.
- Engineering and Economy** – Cost and engineering difficulties reach extraordinary magnitude. 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 considered include minimum design standards or requirements of various permits such as involved with navigation, pollution, and the environment.
- Preservation of Old Bridge** – It is not feasible and prudent to preserve the existing bridge at the existing location or a new location. This could occur when the bridge is beyond rehabilitation for transportation or an (non-motorized) alternative use, or when no responsible party can be located to maintain and preserve the bridge through the Bridge Marketing Plan, or when a permitting authority requires removal or demolition of the old bridge. (Note: Moving a historic bridge to a new location with rehabilitation may constitute a no use.)

Explain (For each checkbox above, provide thorough and specific evidence/explanation that supports checking the box):

3. Investigations must be conducted to determine if **rehabilitation of the existing** bridge, without affecting the historic integrity of the bridge, would be feasible and prudent. Document below why the rehabilitation alternative is not feasible and prudent. *(Indicate all that apply. A minimum of one must be selected for this programmatic Section 4(f) evaluation to be applicable):*

- Structurally Deficient** – 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.
- Geometrically Deficient** – The bridge is seriously deficient geometrically and cannot be widened (horizontally and/or vertically) to meet the minimum required capacity of the highway system on which it is located without affecting the historic integrity of the bridge.

MEASURES TO MINIMIZE HARM:

1. Verify that the project includes all possible planning to minimize harm. *(Indicate all that apply. A minimum of one must be selected for this programmatic Section 4(f) evaluation to be applicable):*

**Nationwide/Programmatic Section 4(f) Evaluation
for Projects that Necessitate the Use of Historic Bridges Form**

- For bridges that are to be **rehabilitated**, the historic integrity of the bridge will be preserved, to the greatest extent possible, consistent with unavoidable transportation needs, safety, and load requirements.
- For bridges that are to be **rehabilitated** to the point that the historic integrity is affected or that are to be **replaced**, adequate records will be made of the bridge through Historic American Engineering Record (HAER) standards, or other suitable means developed through consultation.
- For bridges that are to be **replaced**, the existing bridge will be made available for alternative use, provided a responsible party agrees to maintain and preserve the bridge.

Explain (For each checkbox above, provide thorough and specific evidence/explanation that supports checking the box):

2. Verify that the measures to minimize harm from the Section 106 MOA/PA have been incorporated into the project or are included as environmental commitments. YES

SUMMARY AND APPROVAL:

ADOT has:

1. Determined that; the project meets the applicability criteria set forth in Applicability section; all of the alternatives set forth in the Findings section have been fully evaluated; the use of the findings in this document that there are no feasible and prudent alternatives to the use of the historic bridge is clearly applicable; the project complies with the Measures to Minimize Harm section of this document.
2. Assures that implementation of the measures to minimize harm is completed.
3. Documented in the project file that this programmatic Section 4(f) evaluation applies to the project.

Programmatic Section 4(f) Approval:

<hr/>	Date: _____
Cultural Resources Manager : Kris Powell	

<hr/>	Date: _____
Approved By: Select a name	

**Nationwide/Programmatic Section 4(f) Evaluation
for Projects that Necessitate the Use of Historic Bridges Form**

Approval Authority

The environmental review, consultation, and other actions required by Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act are being carried out by ADOT pursuant to 23 U.S.C. **326** and a Memorandum of Understanding(s) executed by FHWA and ADOT on January ~~34, 2018~~2021.

The environmental review, consultation, and other actions required by Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act are being carried out by ADOT pursuant to 23 U.S.C. **327** and a Memorandum of Understanding(s) executed by FHWA and ADOT on April 16, 2019.