**NATIONWIDE PROGRAMMATIC SECTION 4(f) EVALUATION**

**MINOR INVOLVEMENTS WITH HISTORIC BRIDGES**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Date:** | **xx/xx/xxxx** |
| **Project #** | **xxxxx** |
| **PCN:** | **xxxxx** |
| **Project Name:** | **xxxxx** |
| **Location:** | **xxxxx** |

**NOTE:** *Any response in a shaded box will require additional information, and MAY result in an individual evaluation/statement. Consult the “Nationwide” Section 4(f) Evaluation procedures.*

**USE:** The historic bridges covered by this programmatic Section 4(f) evaluation are unique because they are historic, yet also part of either a Federal-aid highway system or a state or local highway system that has continued to evolve over the years. Even though these structures are on or eligible for inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places, they must perform as an integral part of a modern transportation system. When they do not or cannot, they must be rehabilitated or replaced in order to assure public safety while maintaining system continuity and integrity. For the purpose of this programmatic Section 4(f) evaluation, a proposed action will "use" a bridge that is on or eligible for inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places 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 (NHPA) of 1966, as amended (FHWA), is not subject to Section 4(f).

**APPLICABILITY YES NO**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. | Will the bridge be replaced or rehabilitated with Federal funds? |  |  |
| 2. | Will the project require the use of a historic bridge structure that is on or is eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places? |  |  |
| 3. | Is the bridge a National Historic Landmark? |  |  |
| 4. | Has agreement among the FHWA, State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO) or Tribal Historic Preservation Officer (THPO), and the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) been reached through procedures pursuant to Section 106 of the NHPA? |  |  |

**ALTERNATIVES AND FINDINGS YES NO**

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 1. | The **“Do-Nothing” Alternative** has been evaluated, and is notconsidered to be feasible and prudent for the following reasons: |  |   |
| 1. **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 cope with the situation.
2. **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.
 |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 2. | **Building on New Location without Using the Old Bridge.** An alternative has been evaluated to construct a bridge on a new location or parallel to the old bridge (allowing for a one-way couplet), and is not considered to be feasible and prudent for the following reasons:  |  |  |
| 1. **Terrain-** The present bridge structure has already been located at the only feasible and prudent site, i.e., a gap in the land form, the narrowest point of the river canyon, etc. 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.
2. **Adverse Social, Economic, or Environmental Effects-** Building a new bridge away from the present site would result in social, economic, or environmental impact of extraordinary magnitude. 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.
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. 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.
4. **Preservation of Old Bridge-** 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 US Coast Guard requires removal or demolition of the old bridge.
 |

|  |  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| 3. | **Rehabilitation Without Affecting the Historic Integrity of the Bridge.** An alternative has been evaluated to rehabilitate the historic bridge and is not considered to be feasible and prudent for the following reasons: |  |  |
| 1. The bridge is structurally deficient so that it cannot be rehabilitated to meet minimum acceptable load requirements without affecting the historic integrity of the bridge.
2. 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 the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials geometric standards should be exercised as permitted in 23 CFR Part 625 during the analysis of this alternative. |

**MEASURES TO MINIMIZE HARM YES NO**

|  |
| --- |
| This Nationwide Programmatic Section 4(f) Evaluation and approval may be used only for projects where the FHWA Division Representative, in accordance with this evaluation, ensures that the proposed action includes all possible planning to minimize harm. This has occurred when:*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. | Is this bridge being rehabilitated under this proposed project? |  |  |
| *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 FHWA 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.* |
| 2. | Is this bridge being rehabilitated or demolished to the point where historic integrity is affected under this proposed project? |  |  |
| 3. | Are adequate records being made of the existing structure? |  |  |
| *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.* |
| 4. | Is the existing structure being made available for alternative use with a responsible party to maintain and preserve the bridge? |  |  |
| *For bridges that are adversely affected, agreement among the SHPO or THPO, ACHP, and FHWA 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.* |
| 5. | If the bridge is being adversely affected, has agreement been reached through the Section 106 process of the NHPA on these Measures to Minimize Harm (which will be incorporated into the proposed project) with the following: |
| SHPO/THPOACHPFHWA Division Representative |  |  |
|  |  |
|  |  |

**APPROVAL PROCEDURE** **YES NO**

|  |
| --- |
| This programmatic Section 4(f) approval applies only after the FHWA Division Representative has: |
| 1. | Determined that the project meets the applicability criteria set forth above; |  |  |
| 2. | Determined that all of the alternatives set forth in the Findings section have been fully evaluated; |  |  |
| 3. | Determined that the findings in this document there are no feasible and prudent alternatives to the use of the historic bridge is clearly applicable; |  |  |
| 4. | Determined that the project complies with the Measures to Minimize Harm section of this document; |  |  |
| 5. | Assured that the measures to minimize harm will be incorporated into the project; and |  |  |
| 6. | Documented the project file that the programmatic Section 4(f) evaluation applies to the project on which it is to be used. |  |  |

**SUMMARY AND APPROVAL**

The proposed action meets all criteria regarding the required Alternatives, Findings, and Measures to Minimize Harm, which will be incorporated into this proposed project. This proposed project therefore complies with the December 23, 1986 Programmatic Section 4(f) Evaluation by the U.S. Department of Transportation’s Federal Highway Administration. This approval is made Pursuant to Section 4(f) of the Department of Transportation Act of 1966, 49 U.S.C. 303, Section 18(a) of the Federal-Aid Highway Act of 1968, 23 U.S.C. 138, and 23 CFR 774.

**Approved: Date:**

FHWA Representative