NDOR PQS Project Review Memo
Section 106 - Tier III Project

Control Number 12974A Project Number STP-67-2(109) Review Date 05/19/16

Project Name Talmage North Bridges Project Location Otoe County

Date of Project Description Reviewed 09/25/15

Project Effect Recommendation Adverse Effect ☑ Tier III Project

THPO/Tribal Consultation? ☐ No ☑ Yes	CLG Consultation? ☑ No ☐ Yes
THPO/Tribes(s): Ponca Tribe of NE & Iowa Tribe of KA & NE	CLG:
Date Correspondence Sent: 03/31/16	Date Correspondence Sent:
THPO/Tribal response date: 04/07/16, Ponca: no comment	CLG response date:
THPO/Tribal comment:	CLG comment:
05/19/16, Iowa Tribe: to date, no response; 30 day comment period has expired without receiving comment.	

Other Consulting Parties Identified:

01/22/16, Nebraska City Historical Society indicated that they do not wish to be a consulting party for this undertaking.
04/12/16, ACHP indicated that they would not be participating in consultation.

Area of Potential Effects (APE)

The APE for archeological properties and standing structures was chosen to adequately identify any historic properties that may be potentially altered by this undertaking. The APE for each of the two locations includes the structures themselves, a rectangular area along the roadway in addition to approximately 230 feet from the center of the structure upstream and downstream. The rectangular area along the roadway at structure S067-05206 extends roughly 2020 feet east and 1080 feet west from the center of structure. At structure S067-05312, the rectangular area extends along the roadway approximately 550 feet north and 440 feet south from the center of the structure. These areas are sufficient to encompass all construction areas as well as any adjacent architectural resources which might be subject to visual effects. Definition of a broader indirect APE for secondary or cumulative impacts is not required in this instance.
The detour follows existing public highways with similar functional classification to the project, with no construction activities required. Given the scale and nature of the detour, effects resulting from increases to traffic levels (including auditory, vibratory, and atmospheric effects) would be minor and temporary, and the potential impact on historic properties, if any, would be negligible. Therefore, an assessment of standing structures along the detour is not required. An archeological assessment is not required since there would be no construction activities.

APE considered is consistent with 36 CFR 800.16(d): ☑ Yes

Summary of Archeological Investigations

An archeological evaluation was conducted by Highway Archeology Program Manager Rob Bozell in December of 2014, June of 2015 and January 2016. A review of the Nebraska Cultural Resources Geographic Information System (NCRGIS) archeological resources database indicated there are no previously recorded archeological properties in the APE as defined above. Archeological surveys were completed of the entire APE's for Structures S067-05206 and S067-05312 with negative results.

There are no archeological historic properties present in the APE.

Summary of Above Ground Resource Investigations

Preservation Associate Megan Hilger completed a study of structural and architectural resources in the APE as identified above (see Enclosures 5-6). Bridge structure S067-05312 is not identified as eligible structures in the Nebraska inventories of bridges before 1947 or of those from 1947 to 1965. These inventories were a joint effort between the Nebraska Department of Roads (NDOR) and the Nebraska State Historic Preservation Office (NESHPO) and evaluated the National Register eligibility of all bridges in the state. Bridge structure S067-05312 is not listed in the inventories as eligible for inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places because it does not possess the necessary engineering/design significance to be considered eligible. This bridge is not on the list of structures excluded from the November 2012 Advisory Council on Historic Preservation Program Comment issued for Streamlining Section 106 Review for Actions Affecting Post-1945 Concrete and Steel Bridges. The second bridge, S067-05206/OT05-011 has been previously determined by the NESHPO through the above mentioned surveys to be eligible for the NHRP under Criterion C for Engineering. Applying the criteria of adverse effect found at 36 CFR Part 800.5, physical destruction of the historic bridge would be an adverse effect. There is one structural historic property present in the APE for this project.

Archeological Resources	Above Ground Resources
Are NRHP listed or eligible properties present within the APE? ☑ No ☐ Yes	**Are NRHP listed or eligible properties present within the APE?** ☐ No ☑ Yes
Please list:	**Please list:**
	OT05-011 (S067-05206) NRHP eligible under Criterion C for engineering

Is Temporary Easement Required from ANY Historic Property Listed Above? ☐ No ☐ Yes

Is Permanent Easement Required from ANY Historic Property Listed Above? ☐ No ☐ Yes

Is Right of Way Required from ANY Historic Property Listed Above? ☐ No ☐ Yes

If Yes, describe:

Construction Commitments: ☑ No ☐ Yes

If Yes, detail here:

Project would result in: Adverse Effect

Provide narrative supporting no adverse effect finding or detail efforts to avoid an adverse effect finding:

Bridge (S067 05206) received its most recent biennial/fracture critical inspection in July 2014. The bridge was determined to be both structurally and functionally deficient, as discussed below. Continued use of the bridge for vehicular traffic at either its existing location or an alternate location would require that both of these deficiencies be addressed. The alternatives discussion makes the following observations: 1) There is corrosion and delamination of the underside of the deck (deck concrete separating from the reinforcing bars) from several years of leakage and inadequate floor drains; 2) There are areas of section loss (including holes through some steel members) and corrosion damage to the lower portions of steel truss members and the floor framing system; 3) There has been damage to the portal bracing caused by collisions with traffic; 4) The steel piling is in poor condition due to corrosion from the presence of moisture in the embankment; 5) The river banks are nearly vertical with erosion of the abutment berms and scour along both banks. There are erosion ditches at the southwest and northeast abutment corners.
Overall, this structure rated low and deficient, therefore it is deemed structurally inadequate to handle future traffic demand and was determined to be structurally deficient. In addition, the existing steel truss bridge structure is designed for an H15-44 truck, and newer trucks are longer and heavier than an H15-44 truck.
The alternatives that meet the five priorities for bridge treatment required under the Historic Bridge Management Plan are discussed in the enclosed Technical Report.

If an adverse effect, detail mitigation:

An MOA was signed on 05/13/16. I. NDOR shall record the bridge to include the following stipulations:
a. Digital photographs of the bridge prior to any demolition activity at the site. Photographs shall be numbered and labeled according to NRHP standards and include at a minimum the following images:
i. Images of the structural components that define the significant character defining features of the bridge as identified in the Historic Bridge Inventory including, but not limited to the deck, truss system, floor beams and cross bracing.
ii. Images of the setting and surrounding area including landscape and highway to put the bridge into a geographical context.
iii. Images of the traveling surface of the bridge itself.
b. A site plan including the highway, the bridge, and its proximity to Lorton.
c. A photo key to identify the location of digital images.
d. A narrative description of the bridge documenting the current condition.
e. An index and copies of pertinent documents identifying the evolution of the project including the historic bridge inventory form, the alternatives analysis, the structural deficiency report, and any and all appropriate correspondence and supporting documentation.
II. An electronic copy of the final report shall be submitted to NDOR and Nebraska SHPO

Section 4(f)

Does a Significant archeological site located within the APE of this project warrant preservation in place? ☑ No ☐ Yes

If yes, archeological site number:

Stacy L. Stupka

Digitally signed by Stacy Stupka-Burda
DN: cn=Stacy Stupka-Burda, o=NDOR, ou=Planning & Project Development, email=stacy.stupka-burda@nebraska.gov, c=US
Date: 2016.05.19 11:14:44 -05'00'

05/19/16

NDOR PQS Review — Date

This undertaking has been reviewed under the programmatic agreement entitled Programmatic Agreement Among the Federal Highway Administration, the Nebraska State Historic Preservation Officer, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation and the Nebraska Department of Roads to Satisfy the Requirements of Section 106 for the Federal Aid Highway Program in the State of Nebraska (July 2015) and meets the requirements to be considered a Tier III Project. Tier III projects result in a project effect recommendation of no adverse effect or adverse effect.

Preserving America's Heritage

April 12, 2016

Mr. Scott H. Stapp
Federal Highway Administration
Nebraska Division
100 Centennial Mall North, Room 220
Lincoln, NE 68508-3803

Ref: *Proposed Talmage North Bridges Project*
Otoe County, Nebraska
Project Number STP-67-2(109), CN 12947A

Dear Mr. Stapp:

The Advisory Council on Historic Preservation (ACHP) has received your notification and supporting documentation regarding the adverse effects of the referenced undertaking on a property or properties listed or eligible for listing in the National Register of Historic Places. Based upon the information provided, we have concluded that Appendix A, *Criteria for Council Involvement in Reviewing Individual Section 106 Cases*, of our regulations, "Protection of Historic Properties" (36 CFR Part 800), does not apply to this undertaking. Accordingly, we do not believe that our participation in the consultation to resolve adverse effects is needed. However, if we receive a request for participation from the State Historic Preservation Officer (SHPO), Tribal Historic Preservation Officer (THPO), affected Indian tribe, a consulting party, or other party, we may reconsider this decision. Additionally, should circumstances change, and it is determined that our participation is needed to conclude the consultation process, please notify us.

Pursuant to 36 CFR §800.6(b)(1)(iv), you will need to file the final Memorandum of Agreement (MOA), developed in consultation with the Nebraska State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO), and any other consulting parties, and related documentation with the ACHP at the conclusion of the consultation process. The filing of the MOA, and supporting documentation with the ACHP is required in order to complete the requirements of Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act.

Thank you for providing us with the notification of adverse effect. If you have any questions or require further assistance, please contact Ms. MaryAnn Naber at 202-517-0218 or via e-mail at mnaber@achp.gov.

Sincerely,

LaShavio Johnson

LaShavio Johnson
Historic Preservation Technician
Office of Federal Agency Programs

ADVISORY COUNCIL ON HISTORIC PRESERVATION
401 F Street NW, Suite 308 • Washington, DC 20001-2637
Phone: 202-517-0200 • Fax: 202-517-6381 • achp@achp.gov • www.achp.gov

U.S. Department of Transportation
Federal Highway Administration

NEBRASKA DIVISION

100 Centennial Mall North
Room 220
Lincoln, NE 68508
(402)742-8460

March 31, 2016

Nebraska State Historic Preservation Office

MAR 31 2016

RECEIVED
NSHS

L. Robert Puschendorf
Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer
Nebraska State Historical Society
P.O. Box 82554
Lincoln, NE 68508

HP# 1603-174-01
County OT
STR. X ARCHEO.
Resp. ____ Date ____

Dear Mr. Puschendorf:

Project STP-67-2(109), CN 12974A
Talmage North Bridges
Otoe County
Cultural Resources Evaluation

Please review this document on historic resources for the subject project as required under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 as amended and implementing regulations at 36 CFR Part 800. The Iowa Tribe of Kansas and Nebraska and the Ponca Tribe of Nebraska are also consulting parties for this undertaking. The Nebraska City Historical Society has declined to participate in this consultation.

An evaluation of the potential for cultural resources, both archeology and standing structures, is included below [and in enclosures].

Project Description
This project would reconstruct structures located over the North Fork of the Little Nemaha River and one of its tributaries on N-67 in Otoe County, at mile markers (MM) 52.06, 0.4 miles west of the east junction of N-67 and N-128, MM 53.12, 0.46 miles north of the west junction of N-67 and N-128, Construction may begin approximately 200 feet ahead of or beyond the actual project limits to accommodate transitioning the pavement.
The existing approach roadway on these segments of N-67 consists of the following typical sections beyond the limits of the bridge structures:

- MM 52.06: This segment consists of two 11-foot wide asphalt lanes and earth shoulders; 2-foot wide left and 3-foot wide right. The clear roadway width at this structure is 22.3 feet.
- MM 53.12: This segment consists of two 11-foot wide asphalt lanes and 2-foot wide earth shoulders. The clear roadway width at this structure is 24 feet

The improvements on this project consist of removing and reconstructing Structure Numbers S067 05206 and S067 05312. The adjacent pavement, for approximately 300 feet beyond the ends of the bridges, would be removed and reconstructed as necessary to accommodate the bridge construction. Additional roadside grading, including some ditch grading/reshaping, would

be required. Guardrail would be removed and replaced at all structures, with surfacing underneath.

Scope details include:

- Grading beyond the hinge point would be required for the following work:
  - Bridge removal and reconstruction
  - Bridge approach construction and/or replacement
  - Contractor access bridges and/or access crossing with pipes
  - Existing roadway removal and replacement (with widening) as needed for bridge replacement, approximately 300 feet beyond the end of the bridges.
  - Earth shoulder construction
  - Foreslope and ditch grading, this would include some minor grading at Lorton as well as the 300 feet beyond the ends of the bridges.
  - Guardrail removal and replacement which would include grading
  - Temporary surfacing

- The culverts at Station 1546.60 and 1546.78 would be removed and replaced. The culvert near Lorton at Station 1560.12 would be removed and replaced with 2 – 24-inch culvert pipes. Wetland impacts are anticipated.
- Three drives would be relocated as a result of the bridge work and new drive pipes placed. This would require additional foreslope grading as well as ditch grading.
- Drop pipes would be added at the NE & SW corner of structure S067 05206 and at the NE corner of structure S067 05312.
- The bridge (Structure Number S067 05206) located over the North Fork of the Little Nemaha River would be removed and replaced with a new bridge. There would be some existing vertical profile adjustments which would extend the reconstructed roadway limits approximately 300 feet east and west of the bridge. Approach slabs and grade beam on pile would be added. The bridge would be overlaid with 3-inch asphaltic concrete with membrane upon completion. Erosion control curbs and flumes would be added to each of the bridge corners. A temporary access bridge and/or contractor crossing would be necessary. The existing guardrail would be removed and replaced and surfacing added. This bridge would be built on alignment with the use of a detour.
- The bridge (Structure Number S067 05312) located over a tributary of the North Fork of the Little Nemaha River would be removed and replaced with a new bridge. There would be no vertical profile adjustments at this location. Approach slabs and grade beam on pile would be added. The bridge would be overlaid with 3-inch asphaltic concrete with membrane upon completion. Erosion control curbs and flumes would be added to each of the bridge corners. A temporary access crossing and/or contractor crossing would be necessary. The existing guardrail would be removed and replaced and surfacing added. This bridge would be built on alignment using phased construction.
- Surfacing would be placed under the guardrail.
- Areas disturbed during construction would be stabilized utilizing methods of erosion control as defined with the Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). Although the total area of disturbance may be less than one acre, a SWPPP would be needed.
- Pavement removal and replacement adjacent to the structures would be necessary, approximately 300 feet beyond the end of bridges.

- The reconstructed roadway segments would be widened.
- Foreslopes within the segments of reconstruction would meet minimum design standards for New and Reconstruction projects.
- Permanent pavement markings would be applied to all new surfacing.
- Additional property rights would be required to build this project.
- Access to adjacent properties would be maintained during construction but may be limited at times due to phasing requirements.
- This project would be constructed with the use of both a detour and under traffic with lane closures controlled with approved temporary traffic control.

The project bridge locations and the location of the detour are depicted in Enclosure 1.

Area of Potential Effects (APE)

The APE for archeological properties and standing structures was chosen to adequately identify any historic properties that may be potentially altered by this undertaking. The APE for each of the two locations includes the structures themselves, a rectangular area along the roadway in addition to approximately 230 feet from the center of the structure upstream and downstream. The rectangular area along the roadway at structure S067-05206 extends roughly 2020 feet east and 1080 feet west from the center of structure (Enclosures 2 and 3). At structure S067-05312, the rectangular area extends along the roadway approximately 550 feet north and 440 feet south from the center of the structure (Enclosures 2 and 3). These areas are sufficient to encompass all construction areas as well as any adjacent architectural resources which might be subject to visual effects. Definition of a broader *indirect* APE for secondary or cumulative impacts is not required in this instance.

The detour follows existing public highways with similar functional classification to the project, with no construction activities required. Given the scale and nature of the detour, effects resulting from increases to traffic levels (including auditory, vibratory, and atmospheric effects) would be minor and temporary, and the potential impact on historic properties, if any, would be negligible. Therefore, an assessment of standing structures along the detour is not required. An archeological assessment is not required since there would be no construction activities.

APE maps are depicted in Enclosure 3.

Archeological Evaluation

An archeological evaluation was conducted by Highway Archeology Program Manager Rob Bozell in December of 2014, June of 2015, and January 2016. A review of the Nebraska Cultural Resources Geographic Information System (NCRGIS) archeological resources database indicated there are no previously recorded archeological properties in the APE as defined above. Archeological surveys were completed of the entire APEs for Structures S067-05206 and S067-05312 with negative results (Enclosures 3 and 4).

There are no archeological historic properties in the APE.

Standing Structures

Preservation Associate Megan Hilger completed a study of structural and architectural resources in the APE as identified above (see Enclosures 5 and 6). Bridge structure S067-05312 is not identified as an eligible structure in the Nebraska inventories of bridges before 1947 or of those

from 1947 to 1965. These inventories were a joint effort between the Nebraska Department of Roads (NDOR) and the Nebraska State Historic Preservation Office (NESHPO) and evaluated the National Register eligibility of all bridges in the state. Bridge structure S067-05312 is not listed in the inventories as eligible for inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places because it does not possess the necessary engineering/design significance to be considered eligible. This bridge is not on the list of structures excluded from the November 2012 Advisory Council on Historic Preservation Program Comment issued for Streamlining Section 106 Review for Actions Affecting Post-1945 Concrete and Steel Bridges.

The second bridge, S067-05206/OT05-011 has been previously determined by the NESHPO through the above mentioned surveys to be eligible for the National Register of Historic Places under Criterion C for Engineering. Applying the criteria of adverse effect found at 36 CFR Part 800.5, physical destruction of the historic bridge would be an adverse effect.

There is one structural historic property present in the APE for this project.

Historic bridges are protected under Section 106 of the NHPA and are subject to Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Section 4(f) requirements. Priorities for review parameters regarding Section 106 of the NHPA evaluation of historic bridges in Nebraska were established under the *Programmatic Agreement Among the Federal Highway Administration, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation and the Nebraska State Historic Preservation Officer for the Highway Bridge Replacement and Rehabilitation Program* (PA) in 1991. While that PA has expired, it is still used for evaluation of historic bridges; it required the development of the *Nebraska Historic Bridge Inventory* and *Historic Bridge Management Plan* (FraserDesign and Hess, Roise and Company 1991). The PA, inventory, and management plan helped to establish a firm foundation for the consideration of historic bridges in Nebraska and established priorities for the treatment of historic bridges. The bridge inventory is updated periodically, in accordance with the PA, and was most recently updated in 2007 (Mead and Hunt 2007).

The *Nebraska Historic Bridge Inventory* and *Historic Bridge Management Plan* (FraserDesign and Hess, Roise and Company 1991) includes the following priorities for treatment of historic bridges:

1. The preferred treatment for a historic bridge is to have it continue to carry vehicular traffic at its original site with minimal modification.
2. If it is not feasible to keep the bridge at its original site, every effort should be made to find an appropriate site to which it could be relocated for vehicular use.
3. If it is determined that the bridge can no longer carry vehicular traffic, or could do so only at the expense of its historic integrity, the next best solution is to retain it for nonvehicular use at its original site with minimal modification. Priority should be given to transit-related uses, such as serving bicycle and pedestrian traffic.
4. If the bridge can no longer carry vehicular traffic, no "as is" use is feasible, and cannot be left in place, adaptive use possibilities should be explored, with preference to reuses that retain the bridge at its original site. Necessary modifications should not damage or obscure the original bridge structure. If no suitable in situ adaptive use can be found, the bridge can be closed to vehicular traffic and left in place as a "moldering ruin".

5. If the bridge cannot remain on its original site and cannot be moved, it shall be documented to the standards of the Historic American Engineering Record before demolition, disassembly or modifications that will destroy its historic integrity. If possible, the structure should be disassembled carefully and stored until a new location for it can be found or significant components should be incorporated into any new bridge at the site or salvaged for educational purposes.

Alternatives Evaluation

To consider the priorities identified in the Historic Bridge Management Plan referenced above, NDOR is responsible for identifying and evaluating treatments/alternatives for the historic bridge. This alternatives discussion, relevant to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended and Section 4(f) of the U.S. Department of Transportation Act of 1966 is attached to this document for your reference.

Bridge (S067 05206) received its most recent biennial/fracture critical inspection in July 2014. The bridge was determined to be both structurally and functionally deficient, as discussed below. Continued use of the bridge for vehicular traffic at either its existing location or an alternate location would require that both of these deficiencies be addressed. The alternatives discussion makes the following observations: 1) There is corrosion and delamination of the underside of the deck (deck concrete separating from the reinforcing bars) from several years of leakage and inadequate floor drains; 2) There are areas of section loss (including holes through some steel members) and corrosion damage to the lower portions of steel truss members and the floor framing system; 3) There has been damage to the portal bracing caused by collisions with traffic; 4) The steel piling is in poor condition due to corrosion from the presence of moisture in the embankment; 5) The river banks are nearly vertical with erosion of the abutment berms and scour along both banks. There are erosion ditches at the southwest and northeast abutment corners.

Overall, this structure rated low and deficient, therefore it is deemed structurally inadequate to handle future traffic demand and was determined to be structurally deficient. In addition, the existing steel truss bridge structure is designed for an H15-44 truck, and newer trucks are longer and heavier than an H15-44 truck.

The alternatives that meet the five priorities for bridge treatment required under the Historic Bridge Management Plan are discussed in the enclosed Technical Report.

Public Input

On June 11, 2015, from 4 p.m. to 6 p.m., NDOR held an open house public information meeting at the Talmage Community Center, located at 404 Main Street in Talmage, Nebraska. This meeting was announced via NDOR standard public involvement methods contained within the NDOR Public Involvement Procedure (2015b).

Thirty-five members of the public signed the public information meeting sign-in sheet. Eight formal comments were submitted via public comment form. Additional public sentiment was orally conveyed to meeting staffers and appropriately documented. No citizens expressed concern related to the historic bridge or its preservation.

A Programmatic Section 4(f) Evaluation was then completed by NDOR and submitted to FHWA in which five alternatives were given consideration. These alternatives included: No Build; Restoration and Rehabilitation; New Alignment; Relocation; and Replacement. The

evaluation concluded there was no feasible and prudent alternative to the preferred alternative of replacing the existing bridge with a new bridge (see attached alternatives discussion).

Recommended Section 106 Effects
Based on the alternatives analysis and lack of public opposition, FHWA recommends that the only viable alternative for the bridge is demolition. Therefore, the proposed undertaking would have an adverse effect to historic properties and FHWA recommends a project effect finding of adverse effect. FHWA has notified the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation of this adverse effect.

The FHWA respectfully requests NESHPO concurrence with the above NRHP-eligibility recommendations and Section 106 determination of effects. Upon receipt of your concurrence, FHWA will generate a Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) to identify the recordation standards for this bridge. In addition, FHWA will issue a decision that there is no feasible and prudent alternative to the use the Section 4(f) property, that all possible planning to minimize harm to the Section 4(f) property has occurred, and that this use falls under the *Programmatic Section 4(f) Evaluation and Approval of FHWA Projects that Necessitate the Use of Historic Bridges*.

If you have any questions regarding this information, do not hesitate to contact me at your convenience.

Sincerely yours,

Scott H. Stapp

Scott H. Stapp
Environmental Protection Specialist

Enclosures

CONCUR:

L. Dolberg for BP 3-31-2016

L. Robert Puschendorf, Deputy State Historic Preservation Officer Date

U.S. Department of Transportation
Federal Highway Administration

NEBRASKA DIVISION

100 Centennial Mall North
Room 220
Lincoln, NE 68508
(402)742-8460

March 31, 2016

Mr. Shannon Wright
Tribal Historic Preservation Officer
Ponca Tribe of Nebraska
P.O. Box 288
Niobrara, NE 68760

Dear Mr. Wright:

Project STP-67-2(109), CN 12974A
Talmage North Bridges
Otoe County
Cultural Resources Evaluation

Please review this document on historic resources for the subject project as required under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 as amended and implementing regulations at 36 CFR Part 800. The Iowa Tribe of Kansas and Nebraska and the Nebraska State Historic Preservation Office (NESHPO) are also consulting parties for this undertaking. The Nebraska City Historical Society has declined to participate in this consultation.

An evaluation of the potential for cultural resources, both archeology and standing structures, is included below [and in enclosures].

Project Description
This project would reconstruct structures located over the North Fork of the Little Nemaha River and one of its tributaries on N-67 in Otoe County, at mile markers (MM) 52.06, 0.4 miles west of the east junction of N-67 and N-128, MM 53.12, 0.46 miles north of the west junction of N-67 and N-128, Construction may begin approximately 200 feet ahead of or beyond the actual project limits to accommodate transitioning the pavement.
The existing approach roadway on these segments of N-67 consists of the following typical sections beyond the limits of the bridge structures:

- MM 52.06: This segment consists of two 11-foot wide asphalt lanes and earth shoulders; 2-foot wide left and 3-foot wide right. The clear roadway width at this structure is 22.3 feet.
- MM 53.12: This segment consists of two 11-foot wide asphalt lanes and 2-foot wide earth shoulders. The clear roadway width at this structure is 24 feet

The improvements on this project consist of removing and reconstructing Structure Numbers S067 05206 and S067 05312. The adjacent pavement, for approximately 300 feet beyond the ends of the bridges, would be removed and reconstructed as necessary to accommodate the bridge construction. Additional roadside grading, including some ditch grading/reshaping, would

be required. Guardrail would be removed and replaced at all structures, with surfacing underneath.

Scope details include:

- Grading beyond the hinge point would be required for the following work:
    - Bridge removal and reconstruction
    - Bridge approach construction and/or replacement
    - Contractor access bridges and/or access crossing with pipes
    - Existing roadway removal and replacement (with widening) as needed for bridge replacement, approximately 300 feet beyond the end of the bridges.
    - Earth shoulder construction
    - Foreslope and ditch grading, this would include some minor grading at Lorton as well as the 300 feet beyond the ends of the bridges.
    - Guardrail removal and replacement which would include grading
    - Temporary surfacing

- The culverts at Station 1546.60 and 1546.78 would be removed and replaced. The culvert near Lorton at Station 1560.12 would be removed and replaced with 2 – 24-inch culvert pipes. Wetland impacts are anticipated.
- Three drives would be relocated as a result of the bridge work and new drive pipes placed. This would require additional foreslope grading as well as ditch grading.
- Drop pipes would be added at the NE & SW corner of structure S067 05206 and at the NE corner of structure S067 05312.
- The bridge (Structure Number S067 05206) located over the North Fork of the Little Nemaha River would be removed and replaced with a new bridge. There would be some existing vertical profile adjustments which would extend the reconstructed roadway limits approximately 300 feet east and west of the bridge. Approach slabs and grade beam on pile would be added. The bridge would be overlaid with 3-inch asphaltic concrete with membrane upon completion. Erosion control curbs and flumes would be added to each of the bridge corners. A temporary access bridge and/or contractor crossing would be necessary. The existing guardrail would be removed and replaced and surfacing added. This bridge would be built on alignment with the use of a detour.
- The bridge (Structure Number S067 05312) located over a tributary of the North Fork of the Little Nemaha River would be removed and replaced with a new bridge. There would be no vertical profile adjustments at this location. Approach slabs and grade beam on pile would be added. The bridge would be overlaid with 3-inch asphaltic concrete with membrane upon completion. Erosion control curbs and flumes would be added to each of the bridge corners. A temporary access crossing and/or contractor crossing would be necessary. The existing guardrail would be removed and replaced and surfacing added. This bridge would be built on alignment using phased construction.
- Surfacing would be placed under the guardrail.
- Areas disturbed during construction would be stabilized utilizing methods of erosion control as defined with the Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). Although the total area of disturbance may be less than one acre, a SWPPP would be needed.
- Pavement removal and replacement adjacent to the structures would be necessary, approximately 300 feet beyond the end of bridges.

- The reconstructed roadway segments would be widened.
- Foreslopes within the segments of reconstruction would meet minimum design standards for New and Reconstruction projects.
- Permanent pavement markings would be applied to all new surfacing.
- Additional property rights would be required to build this project.
- Access to adjacent properties would be maintained during construction but may be limited at times due to phasing requirements.
- This project would be constructed with the use of both a detour and under traffic with lane closures controlled with approved temporary traffic control.

The project bridge locations and the location of the detour are depicted in Enclosure 1.

Area of Potential Effects (APE)

The APE for archeological properties and standing structures was chosen to adequately identify any historic properties that may be potentially altered by this undertaking. The APE for each of the two locations includes the structures themselves, a rectangular area along the roadway in addition to approximately 230 feet from the center of the structure upstream and downstream. The rectangular area along the roadway at structure S067-05206 extends roughly 2020 feet east and 1080 feet west from the center of structure (Enclosures 2 and 3). At structure S067-05312, the rectangular area extends along the roadway approximately 550 feet north and 440 feet south from the center of the structure (Enclosures 2 and 3). These areas are sufficient to encompass all construction areas as well as any adjacent architectural resources which might be subject to visual effects. Definition of a broader *indirect* APE for secondary or cumulative impacts is not required in this instance.

The detour follows existing public highways with similar functional classification to the project, with no construction activities required. Given the scale and nature of the detour, effects resulting from increases to traffic levels (including auditory, vibratory, and atmospheric effects) would be minor and temporary, and the potential impact on historic properties, if any, would be negligible. Therefore, an assessment of standing structures along the detour is not required. An archeological assessment is not required since there would be no construction activities.

APE maps are depicted in Enclosure 3.

Archeological Evaluation

An archeological evaluation was conducted by Highway Archeology Program Manager Rob Bozell in December of 2014, June of 2015, and January 2016. A review of the Nebraska Cultural Resources Geographic Information System (NCRGIS) archeological resources database indicated there are no previously recorded archeological properties in the APE as defined above. Archeological surveys were completed of the entire APEs for Structures S067-05206 and S067-05312 with negative results (Enclosures 3 and 4).

There are no archeological historic properties in the APE.

Standing Structures

Preservation Associate Megan Hilger completed a study of structural and architectural resources in the APE as identified above (see Enclosures 5 and 6). Bridge structure S067-05312 is not identified as an eligible structure in the Nebraska inventories of bridges before 1947 or of those

from 1947 to 1965. These inventories were a joint effort between the Nebraska Department of Roads (NDOR) and the Nebraska State Historic Preservation Office (NESHPO) and evaluated the National Register eligibility of all bridges in the state. Bridge structure S067-05312 is not listed in the inventories as eligible for inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places because it does not possess the necessary engineering/design significance to be considered eligible. This bridge is not on the list of structures excluded from the November 2012 Advisory Council on Historic Preservation Program Comment issued for Streamlining Section 106 Review for Actions Affecting Post-1945 Concrete and Steel Bridges.

The second bridge, S067-05206/OT05-011 has been previously determined by the NESHPO through the above mentioned surveys to be eligible for the National Register of Historic Places under Criterion C for Engineering. Applying the criteria of adverse effect found at 36 CFR Part 800.5, physical destruction of the historic bridge would be an adverse effect.

There is one structural historic property present in the APE for this project.

Historic bridges are protected under Section 106 of the NHPA and are subject to Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Section 4(f) requirements. Priorities for review parameters regarding Section 106 of the NHPA evaluation of historic bridges in Nebraska were established under the *Programmatic Agreement Among the Federal Highway Administration, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation and the Nebraska State Historic Preservation Officer for the Highway Bridge Replacement and Rehabilitation Program* (PA) in 1991. While that PA has expired, it is still used for evaluation of historic bridges; it required the development of the *Nebraska Historic Bridge Inventory* and *Historic Bridge Management Plan* (FraserDesign and Hess, Roise and Company 1991). The PA, inventory, and management plan helped to establish a firm foundation for the consideration of historic bridges in Nebraska and established priorities for the treatment of historic bridges. The bridge inventory is updated periodically, in accordance with the PA, and was most recently updated in 2007 (Mead and Hunt 2007).

The *Nebraska Historic Bridge Inventory* and *Historic Bridge Management Plan* (FraserDesign and Hess, Roise and Company 1991) includes the following priorities for treatment of historic bridges:

1. The preferred treatment for a historic bridge is to have it continue to carry vehicular traffic at its original site with minimal modification.
2. If it is not feasible to keep the bridge at its original site, every effort should be made to find an appropriate site to which it could be relocated for vehicular use.
3. If it is determined that the bridge can no longer carry vehicular traffic, or could do so only at the expense of its historic integrity, the next best solution is to retain it for nonvehicular use at its original site with minimal modification. Priority should be given to transit-related uses, such as serving bicycle and pedestrian traffic.
4. If the bridge can no longer carry vehicular traffic, no "as is" use is feasible, and cannot be left in place, adaptive use possibilities should be explored, with preference to reuses that retain the bridge at its original site. Necessary modifications should not damage or obscure the original bridge structure. If no suitable in situ adaptive use can be found, the bridge can be closed to vehicular traffic and left in place as a "moldering ruin".

5. If the bridge cannot remain on its original site and cannot be moved, it shall be documented to the standards of the Historic American Engineering Record before demolition, disassembly or modifications that will destroy its historic integrity. If possible, the structure should be disassembled carefully and stored until a new location for it can be found or significant components should be incorporated into any new bridge at the site or salvaged for educational purposes.

Alternatives Evaluation

To consider the priorities identified in the Historic Bridge Management Plan referenced above, NDOR is responsible for identifying and evaluating treatments/alternatives for the historic bridge. This alternatives discussion, relevant to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended and Section 4(f) of the U.S. Department of Transportation Act of 1966 is attached to this document for your reference.

Bridge (S067 05206) received its most recent biennial/fracture critical inspection in July 2014. The bridge was determined to be both structurally and functionally deficient, as discussed below. Continued use of the bridge for vehicular traffic at either its existing location or an alternate location would require that both of these deficiencies be addressed. The alternatives discussion makes the following observations: 1) There is corrosion and delamination of the underside of the deck (deck concrete separating from the reinforcing bars) from several years of leakage and inadequate floor drains; 2) There are areas of section loss (including holes through some steel members) and corrosion damage to the lower portions of steel truss members and the floor framing system; 3) There has been damage to the portal bracing caused by collisions with traffic; 4) The steel piling is in poor condition due to corrosion from the presence of moisture in the embankment; 5) The river banks are nearly vertical with erosion of the abutment berms and scour along both banks. There are erosion ditches at the southwest and northeast abutment corners.

Overall, this structure rated low and deficient, therefore it is deemed structurally inadequate to handle future traffic demand and was determined to be structurally deficient. In addition, the existing steel truss bridge structure is designed for an H15-44 truck, and newer trucks are longer and heavier than an H15-44 truck.

The alternatives that meet the five priorities for bridge treatment required under the Historic Bridge Management Plan are discussed in the enclosed Technical Report.

Public Input

On June 11, 2015, from 4 p.m. to 6 p.m., NDOR held an open house public information meeting at the Talmage Community Center, located at 404 Main Street in Talmage, Nebraska. This meeting was announced via NDOR standard public involvement methods contained within the NDOR Public Involvement Procedure (2015b).

Thirty-five members of the public signed the public information meeting sign-in sheet. Eight formal comments were submitted via public comment form. Additional public sentiment was orally conveyed to meeting staffers and appropriately documented. No citizens expressed concern related to the historic bridge or its preservation.

A Programmatic Section 4(f) Evaluation was then completed by NDOR and submitted to FHWA in which five alternatives were given consideration. These alternatives included: No Build; Restoration and Rehabilitation; New Alignment; Relocation; and Replacement. The

evaluation concluded there was no feasible and prudent alternative to the preferred alternative of replacing the existing bridge with a new bridge (see attached alternatives discussion).

Recommended Section 106 Effects

Based on the alternatives analysis and lack of public opposition, FHWA recommends that the only viable alternative for the bridge is demolition. Therefore, the proposed undertaking would have an adverse effect to historic properties and FHWA recommends a project effect finding of adverse effect. FHWA has notified the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation of this adverse effect.

The FHWA is providing this documentation for your review and comment and requests that the Ponca Tribe of Nebraska notify FHWA of any objections within 30 days of receipt of this letter.

If you have any questions regarding this information, do not hesitate to contact me at your convenience.

Sincerely yours,

Scott H. Stapp
Environmental Protection Specialist

Enclosures

From:	Sue.Petracek@dot.gov on behalf of Nebraska.FHWA@dot.gov
To:	scott.stapp@dot.gov; melissa.maiefski@dot.gov; Stupka-Burda, Stacy; Barber, Jon; Dittmer, Dillon; Marshall, Anthony
Subject:	FW: Section 106 review - Project STP-67-2(109), CN 12974A, Talmage North Bridges
Date:	Thursday, April 07, 2016 11:32:56 AM

Ponca THPO response.

From: Shannon Wright [mailto:swright@poncatribe-ne.org]
Sent: Thursday, April 07, 2016 10:33 AM
To: FHWA, Nebraska (FHWA)
Subject: RE: Section 106 review - Project STP-67-2(109), CN 12974A, Talmage North Bridges

Good Morning,
I have gone over all the documents that have been sent for this project and I do not have a comment at this time. As long as there are no major ground disturbances in areas that have not been previously disturbed.

Thank you,
Mr. Shannon Wright
THPO
Ponca Tribe Of Nebraska
Office: 402-857-3519
Cell: 402-750-8121
swright@poncatribe-ne.org

From: Sue.Petracek@dot.gov [mailto:Sue.Petracek@dot.gov] **On Behalf Of** Nebraska.FHWA@dot.gov
Sent: Thursday, March 31, 2016 2:03 PM
To: Shannon Wright
Cc: stacy.stupka-burda@nebraska.gov; Jon.Barber@nebraska.gov; dillon.dittmer@nebraska.gov; ryan.walkowiak@nebraska.gov; melissa.maiefski@dot.gov; scott.stapp@dot.gov
Subject: Section 106 review - Project STP-67-2(109), CN 12974A, Talmage North Bridges

Please see attachments.

Click here to report this email as spam.

This message has been scanned for malware by SurfControl plc. www.surfcontrol.com

U.S. Department of Transportation
Federal Highway Administration

NEBRASKA DIVISION

100 Centennial Mall North
Room 220
Lincoln, NE 68508
(402)742-8460

March 31, 2016

Mr. Lance Foster
Tribal Historic Preservation Officer
Iowa Tribe of Kansas and Nebraska
3345 B Thrasher Rd.
White Cloud, KS 66094

Dear Mr. Foster:

Project STP-67-2(109), CN 12974A
Talmage North Bridges
Otoe County
Cultural Resources Evaluation

Please review this document on historic resources for the subject project as required under Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966 as amended and implementing regulations at 36 CFR Part 800. The Ponca Tribe of Nebraska and the Nebraska State Historic Preservation Office (NESHPO) are also consulting parties for this undertaking. The Nebraska City Historical Society has declined to participate in this consultation.

An evaluation of the potential for cultural resources, both archeology and standing structures, is included below [and in enclosures].

Project Description
This project would reconstruct structures located over the North Fork of the Little Nemaha River and one of its tributaries on N-67 in Otoe County, at mile markers (MM) 52.06, 0.4 miles west of the east junction of N-67 and N-128, MM 53.12, 0.46 miles north of the west junction of N-67 and N-128, Construction may begin approximately 200 feet ahead of or beyond the actual project limits to accommodate transitioning the pavement.
The existing approach roadway on these segments of N-67 consists of the following typical sections beyond the limits of the bridge structures:

- MM 52.06: This segment consists of two 11-foot wide asphalt lanes and earth shoulders; 2-foot wide left and 3-foot wide right. The clear roadway width at this structure is 22.3 feet.
- MM 53.12: This segment consists of two 11-foot wide asphalt lanes and 2-foot wide earth shoulders. The clear roadway width at this structure is 24 feet

The improvements on this project consist of removing and reconstructing Structure Numbers S067 05206 and S067 05312. The adjacent pavement, for approximately 300 feet beyond the ends of the bridges, would be removed and reconstructed as necessary to accommodate the bridge construction. Additional roadside grading, including some ditch grading/reshaping, would

be required. Guardrail would be removed and replaced at all structures, with surfacing underneath.

Scope details include:

- Grading beyond the hinge point would be required for the following work:
  - Bridge removal and reconstruction
  - Bridge approach construction and/or replacement
  - Contractor access bridges and/or access crossing with pipes
  - Existing roadway removal and replacement (with widening) as needed for bridge replacement, approximately 300 feet beyond the end of the bridges.
  - Earth shoulder construction
  - Foreslope and ditch grading, this would include some minor grading at Lorton as well as the 300 feet beyond the ends of the bridges.
  - Guardrail removal and replacement which would include grading
  - Temporary surfacing

- The culverts at Station 1546.60 and 1546.78 would be removed and replaced. The culvert near Lorton at Station 1560.12 would be removed and replaced with 2 – 24-inch culvert pipes. Wetland impacts are anticipated.
- Three drives would be relocated as a result of the bridge work and new drive pipes placed. This would require additional foreslope grading as well as ditch grading.
- Drop pipes would be added at the NE & SW corner of structure S067 05206 and at the NE corner of structure S067 05312.
- The bridge (Structure Number S067 05206) located over the North Fork of the Little Nemaha River would be removed and replaced with a new bridge. There would be some existing vertical profile adjustments which would extend the reconstructed roadway limits approximately 300 feet east and west of the bridge. Approach slabs and grade beam on pile would be added. The bridge would be overlaid with 3-inch asphaltic concrete with membrane upon completion. Erosion control curbs and flumes would be added to each of the bridge corners. A temporary access bridge and/or contractor crossing would be necessary. The existing guardrail would be removed and replaced and surfacing added. This bridge would be built on alignment with the use of a detour.
- The bridge (Structure Number S067 05312) located over a tributary of the North Fork of the Little Nemaha River would be removed and replaced with a new bridge. There would be no vertical profile adjustments at this location. Approach slabs and grade beam on pile would be added. The bridge would be overlaid with 3-inch asphaltic concrete with membrane upon completion. Erosion control curbs and flumes would be added to each of the bridge corners. A temporary access crossing and/or contractor crossing would be necessary. The existing guardrail would be removed and replaced and surfacing added. This bridge would be built on alignment using phased construction.
- Surfacing would be placed under the guardrail.
- Areas disturbed during construction would be stabilized utilizing methods of erosion control as defined with the Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP). Although the total area of disturbance may be less than one acre, a SWPPP would be needed.
- Pavement removal and replacement adjacent to the structures would be necessary, approximately 300 feet beyond the end of bridges.

- The reconstructed roadway segments would be widened.
- Foreslopes within the segments of reconstruction would meet minimum design standards for New and Reconstruction projects.
- Permanent pavement markings would be applied to all new surfacing.
- Additional property rights would be required to build this project.
- Access to adjacent properties would be maintained during construction but may be limited at times due to phasing requirements.
- This project would be constructed with the use of both a detour and under traffic with lane closures controlled with approved temporary traffic control.

The project bridge locations and the location of the detour are depicted in Enclosure 1.

Area of Potential Effects (APE)

The APE for archeological properties and standing structures was chosen to adequately identify any historic properties that may be potentially altered by this undertaking. The APE for each of the two locations includes the structures themselves, a rectangular area along the roadway in addition to approximately 230 feet from the center of the structure upstream and downstream. The rectangular area along the roadway at structure S067-05206 extends roughly 2020 feet east and 1080 feet west from the center of structure (Enclosures 2 and 3). At structure S067-05312, the rectangular area extends along the roadway approximately 550 feet north and 440 feet south from the center of the structure (Enclosures 2 and 3). These areas are sufficient to encompass all construction areas as well as any adjacent architectural resources which might be subject to visual effects. Definition of a broader *indirect* APE for secondary or cumulative impacts is not required in this instance.

The detour follows existing public highways with similar functional classification to the project, with no construction activities required. Given the scale and nature of the detour, effects resulting from increases to traffic levels (including auditory, vibratory, and atmospheric effects) would be minor and temporary, and the potential impact on historic properties, if any, would be negligible. Therefore, an assessment of standing structures along the detour is not required. An archeological assessment is not required since there would be no construction activities.

APE maps are depicted in Enclosure 3.

Archeological Evaluation

An archeological evaluation was conducted by Highway Archeology Program Manager Rob Bozell in December of 2014, June of 2015, and January 2016. A review of the Nebraska Cultural Resources Geographic Information System (NCRGIS) archeological resources database indicated there are no previously recorded archeological properties in the APE as defined above. Archeological surveys were completed of the entire APEs for Structures S067-05206 and S067-05312 with negative results (Enclosures 3 and 4).

There are no archeological historic properties in the APE.

Standing Structures

Preservation Associate Megan Hilger completed a study of structural and architectural resources in the APE as identified above (see Enclosures 5 and 6). Bridge structure S067-05312 is not identified as an eligible structure in the Nebraska inventories of bridges before 1947 or of those

from 1947 to 1965. These inventories were a joint effort between the Nebraska Department of Roads (NDOR) and the Nebraska State Historic Preservation Office (NESHPO) and evaluated the National Register eligibility of all bridges in the state. Bridge structure S067-05312 is not listed in the inventories as eligible for inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places because it does not possess the necessary engineering/design significance to be considered eligible. This bridge is not on the list of structures excluded from the November 2012 Advisory Council on Historic Preservation Program Comment issued for Streamlining Section 106 Review for Actions Affecting Post-1945 Concrete and Steel Bridges.

The second bridge, S067-05206/OT05-011 has been previously determined by the NESHPO through the above mentioned surveys to be eligible for the National Register of Historic Places under Criterion C for Engineering. Applying the criteria of adverse effect found at 36 CFR Part 800.5, physical destruction of the historic bridge would be an adverse effect.

There is one structural historic property present in the APE for this project.

Historic bridges are protected under Section 106 of the NHPA and are subject to Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) Section 4(f) requirements. Priorities for review parameters regarding Section 106 of the NHPA evaluation of historic bridges in Nebraska were established under the *Programmatic Agreement Among the Federal Highway Administration, the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation and the Nebraska State Historic Preservation Officer for the Highway Bridge Replacement and Rehabilitation Program* (PA) in 1991. While that PA has expired, it is still used for evaluation of historic bridges; it required the development of the *Nebraska Historic Bridge Inventory* and *Historic Bridge Management Plan* (FraserDesign and Hess, Roise and Company 1991). The PA, inventory, and management plan helped to establish a firm foundation for the consideration of historic bridges in Nebraska and established priorities for the treatment of historic bridges. The bridge inventory is updated periodically, in accordance with the PA, and was most recently updated in 2007 (Mead and Hunt 2007).

The *Nebraska Historic Bridge Inventory* and *Historic Bridge Management Plan* (FraserDesign and Hess, Roise and Company 1991) includes the following priorities for treatment of historic bridges:

1. The preferred treatment for a historic bridge is to have it continue to carry vehicular traffic at its original site with minimal modification.
2. If it is not feasible to keep the bridge at its original site, every effort should be made to find an appropriate site to which it could be relocated for vehicular use.
3. If it is determined that the bridge can no longer carry vehicular traffic, or could do so only at the expense of its historic integrity, the next best solution is to retain it for nonvehicular use at its original site with minimal modification. Priority should be given to transit-related uses, such as serving bicycle and pedestrian traffic.
4. If the bridge can no longer carry vehicular traffic, no "as is" use is feasible, and cannot be left in place, adaptive use possibilities should be explored, with preference to reuses that retain the bridge at its original site. Necessary modifications should not damage or obscure the original bridge structure. If no suitable in situ adaptive use can be found, the bridge can be closed to vehicular traffic and left in place as a "moldering ruin".

5. If the bridge cannot remain on its original site and cannot be moved, it shall be documented to the standards of the Historic American Engineering Record before demolition, disassembly or modifications that will destroy its historic integrity. If possible, the structure should be disassembled carefully and stored until a new location for it can be found or significant components should be incorporated into any new bridge at the site or salvaged for educational purposes.

Alternatives Evaluation

To consider the priorities identified in the Historic Bridge Management Plan referenced above, NDOR is responsible for identifying and evaluating treatments/alternatives for the historic bridge. This alternatives discussion, relevant to Section 106 of the National Historic Preservation Act of 1966, as amended and Section 4(f) of the U.S. Department of Transportation Act of 1966 is attached to this document for your reference.

Bridge (S067 05206) received its most recent biennial/fracture critical inspection in July 2014. The bridge was determined to be both structurally and functionally deficient, as discussed below. Continued use of the bridge for vehicular traffic at either its existing location or an alternate location would require that both of these deficiencies be addressed. The alternatives discussion makes the following observations: 1) There is corrosion and delamination of the underside of the deck (deck concrete separating from the reinforcing bars) from several years of leakage and inadequate floor drains; 2) There are areas of section loss (including holes through some steel members) and corrosion damage to the lower portions of steel truss members and the floor framing system; 3) There has been damage to the portal bracing caused by collisions with traffic; 4) The steel piling is in poor condition due to corrosion from the presence of moisture in the embankment; 5) The river banks are nearly vertical with erosion of the abutment berms and scour along both banks. There are erosion ditches at the southwest and northeast abutment corners.

Overall, this structure rated low and deficient, therefore it is deemed structurally inadequate to handle future traffic demand and was determined to be structurally deficient. In addition, the existing steel truss bridge structure is designed for an H15-44 truck, and newer trucks are longer and heavier than an H15-44 truck.

The alternatives that meet the five priorities for bridge treatment required under the Historic Bridge Management Plan are discussed in the enclosed Technical Report.

Public Input

On June 11, 2015, from 4 p.m. to 6 p.m., NDOR held an open house public information meeting at the Talmage Community Center, located at 404 Main Street in Talmage, Nebraska. This meeting was announced via NDOR standard public involvement methods contained within the NDOR Public Involvement Procedure (2015b).

Thirty-five members of the public signed the public information meeting sign-in sheet. Eight formal comments were submitted via public comment form. Additional public sentiment was orally conveyed to meeting staffers and appropriately documented. No citizens expressed concern related to the historic bridge or its preservation.

A Programmatic Section 4(f) Evaluation was then completed by NDOR and submitted to FHWA in which five alternatives were given consideration. These alternatives included: No Build; Restoration and Rehabilitation; New Alignment; Relocation; and Replacement. The

evaluation concluded there was no feasible and prudent alternative to the preferred alternative of replacing the existing bridge with a new bridge (see enclosed alternatives discussion).

Recommended Section 106 Effects

Based on the alternatives analysis and lack of public opposition, FHWA recommends that the only viable alternative for the bridge is demolition. Therefore, the proposed undertaking would have an adverse effect to historic properties and FHWA recommends a project effect finding of adverse effect. FHWA has notified the Advisory Council on Historic Preservation of this adverse effect.

The FHWA is providing this documentation for your review and comment and requests that the Iowa Tribe of Kansas and Nebraska notify FHWA of any objections within 30 days of receipt of this letter.

If you have any questions regarding this information, do not hesitate to contact me at your convenience.

Sincerely yours,

Scott H. Stapp
Environmental Protection Specialist

Enclosures

From: Susan Quinn
To: Stupka-Burda, Stacy
Subject: RE: Project STP-67-2(109), CN 12974A
Date: Friday, January 22, 2016 10:48:43 AM

NO, the Nebraska City Historical Society is not interested in participating in consultation regarding this bridge.

---- "Stupka-Burda wrote:
> Again, my apologies, as I didn't see the reference to tribal government in the third paragraph.
>
> I will get a corrected version to you.
>
> Is your organization interested in participating in consultation regarding this bridge?
>
> -----Original Message-----
> From: Susan Quinn [mailto:susan-quinn44@neb.rr.com]
> Sent: Thursday, January 21, 2016 2:53 PM
> To: Stupka-Burda, Stacy
> Subject: RE: Project STP-67-2(109), CN 12974A
>
> Dear Ms. Stuka-Burda,
> The letter you sent this afternoon still refers to out tribe and tribal government.
>
> The Nebraska City Historical Society is concerned with Nebraska City. We have no wish to comment or consult on the Lorton bridges project.
>
> Thank you,
> Susan Quinn
>
>
> ---- "Stupka-Burda wrote:
> > Dear Ms. Quinn,
> >
> > Thank you for your email.
> >
> > Please accept my apologies, as it appears that the envelope sent to you contained a version of the letter that was meant for someone else. I have attached the copy that was meant for you.
> >
> > As you may know, the bridge near Lorton is historically significant, therefore we'd like to give your organization an opportunity to comment or consult with us should you wish to do so.
> >
> > If you have any questions, please don't hesitate to let me know.
> >
> > Sincerely,
> > Stacy Stupka-Burda
> >
> >
> > Stacy Stupka-Burda
> > Hwy Environmental | Section 106 Specialist Nebraska Dept. of Roads
> > Technical Documents Unit o | 402.479.3879 e
> > |stacy.stupka-burda@nebraska.gov
> >
> >
> >

> >
> >
> > -----Original Message-----
> > From: Susan Quinn [mailto:susan-quinn44@neb.rr.com]
> > Sent: Thursday, January 21, 2016 2:29 PM
> > To: Stupka-Burda, Stacy
> > Subject: Project STP-67-2(109), CN 12974A
> >
> > January 21, 2016
> >
> >
> > Stacy Stuka-Burda
> > Federal Highway Association
> > 100 Centennial Mall N Ste 220
> > Lincoln, NE 68508-3803
> >
> >
> > Dear Ms. Stupka-Burda:
> >
> > Recently the Nebraska City Historical Society received correspondence from you regarding the Nebraska Department of Roads removing and replacing two bridges near Lorton, Nebraska.
> >
> > Reference was made toward the Nebraska City Historical Society's "tribe" and "tribal government." The Nebraska City Historical Society is not associated with any tribe or tribal government. Thus, the Society does not not wish to consult with you or the NDOR on this project.
> >
> > Best to you,
> >
> >
> > Susan Quinn
> > President
> > Nebraska City Historical Society
> > P.O. Box 175
> > Nebraska City, Nebraska 68410